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HE modern school of exegesis had its rise in Germany. Its excellence and peculiarity consisted in a rigid adherence to the philological characteristics of the sacred text, and its sole aim was to reproduce the exact meaning of the original, unbiassed by preconceived views. Among modern exegetes, Meyer undoubtedly holds the first place. His peculiar excellences, his profound learning, his unrivalled knowledge of Hellenistic Greek, his exegetical tact, his philological precision, his clear and almost intuitive insight into the meaning of the passage commented on, and his deep reverential spirit, all qualified him for being an exegete of the first order. Indeed, for the ascertainment of the meaning of the sacred text his commentaries are, and we believe will long continue to be, unrivalled. These qualifications and acquirements of the great exegete are well stated by Dr. Dickson, the general editor of this series, in the general preface affixed to the first volume of the Epistle to the Romans. The similar commentaries of de Wette are certainly of very high merit, and have their peculiar excellences; but I do not think that there can be any hesitation among Biblical scholars in affirming the superiority of those of Meyer. Perhaps the constant reference to the opinions of others inserted in the text, the long lists of names of theologians who agree or disagree in certain explanations, and the consequent necessity
of the breaking up of sentences by means of parenthetic clauses, are to the English reader a disadvantage as interrupting the sense of the passage. Much is inserted into the text which in English works would be attached as footnotes. Still, however, it has been judged proper by the general editor to make as little change in the form of the original as possible.

Meyer himself wrote and published the Commentaries on the Gospels, on the Acts, and on the Pauline Epistles to the Romans, the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon in ten volumes—a monument of gigantic industry and immense erudition. Indeed, the treatment of each of these volumes is so thorough, so exhaustive, and so satisfactory, that its composition would be regarded as sufficient work for the life of an ordinary man; what, then, must we think of the labours and learning of the man who wrote these ten volumes? The other books of the New Testament in the series were undertaken by able coadjutors. Dr. Lünemann wrote the Commentaries on the Epistles to the Thessalonians and Hebrews, Dr. Huther on the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles, and Dr. Düsterdieck on the Apocalypse. At one time the Messrs. Clark intended merely to publish the translations of those commentaries which were written by Meyer himself; but, urged by numerous requests, they have wisely agreed to complete the whole work, with the possible exception of Düsterdieck's Commentary on the Apocalypse. Although the translations of these commentaries are deprived of the able and scholarly editorship of Dr. Dickson and his colleagues, yet the general method in its broad outlines has been carefully retained; the same abbreviations have been adopted, and references have been made throughout to the English translation of Winer's Grammar of the New Testament, by Professor Moulton, 8th edition, and to the American translation of the similar work of Alexander Buttmann.
The commentaries of Lüneemann, Huther, and Düsterdieck are undeniably inferior to those of Meyer. We feel the want of that undefinable spiritual insight into the meaning of the passage which is so characteristic of all that Meyer has written, and, accordingly, we do not place the same reliance on the interpretations given. But still the exegetical acumen and learning of these commentators are of a very high order, and will bear no unfavourable comparison with other writers on the same books of the New Testament. Indeed, in this Commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians, by Dr. Lüneemann, with which we are at present concerned, its inferiority to the writings of Meyer is not very sensibly felt; there is here ample evidence of profound learning, sound exegesis, sober reasoning, and a power of discrimination among various opinions. The style also is remarkably clear for a German exegete; and although there is often difficulty in finding out the exact meaning of those whose opinions he states, there is no difficulty in discovering his own views. Occasionally there is a tedious minuteness, but this is referable to the thoroughness with which the work is executed. Of course, in these translations the same caveat has to be made that was made in regard to Meyer's Commentaries, that the translators are not to be held as concurring with the opinions given; at the same time, in this Commentary there is little which one who is bound to the most confessional views can find fault with. The first edition of this Commentary was published in 1850, the second in 1859, and the third, from which this translation is made, in 1867.

We have, in conformity with the other volumes, attempted to give a list of the exegetical literature of the Epistles to the Thessalonians. For commentaries and collections of notes embracing the New Testament, see the preface to the Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew; and for commentaries on
the Pauline Epistles, see the preface to the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The literature restricted to the Epistles to the Thessalonians is somewhat meagre. Articles and monographs on chapters or sections are noticed by Dr. Lünemann in the places to which they refer; and especially a list of the monographs on the celebrated passage concerning "the Man of Sin" (2 Thess. ii. 1—12), as given by Dr. Lünemann, is to be found in p. 203 of this translation. The reader is also referred to Alford’s Greek Testament as being peculiarly full on these Epistles, and as following the same track as Dr. Lünemann. I would only further observe that the remarks made in this Commentary on the Schriftbeweis of the late von Hofmann of Erlangen appear to be too severe. Hofmann is certainly often guilty of arbitrary criticism, and introduces into the sacred text his own fancied interpretations; but the Schriftbeweis is a work of great learning and ingenuity, and may be read with advantage by every scholar.

PATON J. GLOAG.

GALASHIELS, November 1880.
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THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

INTRODUCTION.¹

SEC. 1.—THE CHURCH.

THESSALONICA,² the ancient Θέρμη (Herod. vii. 121; Thuc. i. 61, al.), the Salneck celebrated by the German poets of the Middle Ages, now Saloniki, situated in the form of an amphitheatre on the slope of a hill at the north-east corner of the Thermaic gulf, was in the time of Christ the capital of the second district of the Roman province of Macedonia (Liv. xlv. 29), and the seat of a Roman praetor and questor (Cic. Plane. 41). The city was rebuilt, embellished, and peopled by the settlement of the inhabitants of the surrounding districts by Cassandra, who called it Thessalonica (first mentioned among the Greeks by Polybius), in honour of his wife Thessalonica, the daughter of the elder Philip. So we are informed in Dionys. Halicarn. Antiq. Rom. i. 49; Strabo, vii. fn. vol. i. p. 480, ed. Falconer; Zonaras, Annal. xii. 26, vol. i. p. 635, ed. Du Fresne. Their account is more credible than the statement given by Stephan. Byzant. de urb. et popul. s.v. Θεσσαλονίκη, Tzetza, chil. x. 174 ff. (yet with both along with the above view), and the emperor Julian (Oratio iii. p. 200; Opp. Par. 1630, 4), that the change of name proceeded from Philip of Macedon to per-

¹ See Burgerhoudt, de coetus Christianorum Thessalonicensis ortu fatigque et prioris Pauli iis scriptae epistolae consilio atque argumento, Lugd. Bat. 1825.
² See Tafel, de Thessalonica ejusque agro dissertatio geographica, Berol. 1839.

MEYER—1 THESS.
petuate his victory over the Thessalians (Θεσσαλών... νίκη).
By its situation on the Thermaic gulf, and on the great commercial road (the so-called via Ignatia) which led from Dyrrachium, traversed Macedonia, extended to Thrace to the mouth of the Hebrus (Strabo, vii. vol. i. p. 467), and accordingly united Italy with Asia, Thessalonica became a flourishing commercial town,—great, rich, and populous by its trade (Strabo, vii. vol. i. p. 468: ἡ νῦν μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων εὐανδρεί), luxurious and licentious by its riches. Greeks formed the stock of its inhabitants; next in number were the Roman colonists; and there was also a considerable Jewish population, who had been attracted by the briskness of trade, and were so considerable that, instead of a mere προσευχή (see Meyer on Acts xvi. 13), they possessed a synagogue proper (Acts xvii. 1). Already in the time of Christ Thessalonica was named by Antipater μήτηρ ἡ... πάσης Μακεδονίας (comp. Anthol. gr., ed Jacobs, vol. II., Lips. 1794, p. 98); in the fifth century it was the metropolis of Thessaly, Achaia, and other provinces which were under the praefectus praetorio of Illyricum, who resided at Thessalonica. Many wars in subsequent ages oppressed the city; but as often as it was conquered and destroyed by the barbarians, it always rose to new greatness and power. Its union with the Venetians—to whom, on the weakness of the Greek empire, the Thessalonians sold their city—was at length the occasion of its becoming, in the year 1430, a prey to the Turks. Even at this day Thessalonica, after Constantinople, is one of the most flourishing cities of European Turkey.

Paul reached Thessalonica, so peculiarly favourable for a rapid and wide diffusion of Christianity, on his second great missionary journey (see Meyer on Rom., ed. iv. p. 8 f.), when for the first time he came into Europe, in the year 53. He journeyed thither from Philippi by Amphipolis and Apollonia (Acts xvii. 1), accompanied by two apostolic assistants, Silas (Silvanus) and Timotheus (see Acts xvii. 4, comp. with xvi. 3 and xvii. 14; see also Phil. ii. 22 comp. with Acts xvi. 3, 12 ff.). Paul, faithful to his custom, first turned himself

1 At present there are about 22,000 Jews in Saloniki.
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to the Jews, but of them he gained only a few converts for
the gospel. He found greater access among the proselytes
and Gentiles (Acts xvii. 4). There arose, after the lapse of a
few weeks (comp. also Phil. iv. 16), a mixed Christian con-
gregation in Thessalonica, composed of Jews and Gentiles, but
the latter much more numerous (i. 9 and Acts xvii. 4, accord-
ging to Lachmann's correct reading). The Jews, embittered by
this success among the Gentiles, raised a tumult, in conse-
quence of which the apostle was forced to forsake Thessalonica
(Acts xvii. 5 ff.). Conducted by night to the neighbouring
Macedonian city of Berea, Paul found there, among Jews and
Gentiles, the most ready reception for the gospel. But scarcely
had the news of this reached his opponents in Thessalonica
than they hastened to Berea, and, stirring up the multitude,
expelled the apostle from that city also. Yet Silas and
Timotheus remained behind, for the confirmation and further
instruction of the church at Berea. Paul himself directed his
steps to Athens, and from thence, after a short residence, to
Corinth, where he remained more than a year and a half
(Acts xvii. 10 ff., xviii.). At a later period, the third great
missionary journey of the apostle led him repeatedly back to
Thessalonica (Acts xx. 1 ff.).

SEC. 2. OCCASION, DESIGN, AND CONTENTS.

The persecution which had driven the apostle from Thessa-
lonica soon also broke out against the church (ii. 14, iii. 3,
i. 6). Thus it was not the mere yearning of personal love
and attachment (ii. 17 ff.), but also care and anxiety (iii. 5)
that urged him to hasten back to Thessalonica. Twice he
resolved to do so, but circumstances prevented him (ii. 18).
Accordingly, no longer able to master his anxiety, he sent
Timotheus, who had not suffered in the earlier persecution,
from Athens (see on iii. 1, 2), in order to receive from him
information concerning the state of the church, and to
strengthen the Thessalonians by exhortation, and encourage
them to faithful endurance. The return of Timotheus (iii. 6),
and the message which he brought, were the occasion of the
Epistle. This message was in the main consolatory. The church, in spite of persecution and trial, continued steadfast and unshaken in the faith (i. 6, ii. 14), so that its members could be named as examples for Christians in all Macedonia and Achaia (i. 7), and their heroic faith was everywhere spread abroad (i. 8). They were also distinguished by their active brotherly love (i. 3, iv. 9, 10), and, upon the whole, by their faithful adherence to those rules of conduct pointed out to them by the apostle (iv. 1). Moreover, they had an affectionate remembrance of the apostle (iii. 6), and their congregational life had so flourished that the gifts of the Holy Spirit (v. 19) and prophecy (v. 20) were manifested among them. But Timotheus had also to tell of defect and incompleteness (iii. 10). The church had not yet succeeded in preserving itself unstained by the two cardinal vices of heathenism—sensuality and covetousness (iv. 3 ff.); they had not everywhere shown to the presbyters due respect and obedience (v. 12); and in consequence of their thought and feeling being inordinately directed to the advent of Christ, an unsettled and excited habit prevailed, which led to the neglect of the duties of their earthly calling, and to idleness (iv. 11 ff.). Lastly, the church was in great perplexity concerning the fate of their deceased Christian friends, being uncertain whether only those who were then alive, or whether also deceased Christians, participated in the blessings of the advent (iv. 13 ff.). Concerning this subject, it would appear, to judge from the introductory words of iv. 13, that the Thessalonians had requested information from the apostle.

The design of the Epistle accordingly was threefold. 1. The apostle, whilst testifying his joy for their conduct hitherto, would strengthen and encourage the church to persevering steadfastness in the confession of Christianity. 2. He would exhort them to relinquish those moral weaknesses by which they were still enfeebled. 3. He would calm and console them concerning the fate of the deceased by a more minute instruction in reference to the advent.

Remark. — The opinion of Lipsius (Theol. Stud. u. Krit.)
1854, 4, p. 905 ff.), that the design of the Epistle is to be sought for in considering it as a polemic directed against Judaistic opponents, is to be rejected as entirely erroneous. The supposed traces indicating this, which the Epistle is made to contain in rich abundance, are only forcibly pressed into the service. From i. 4–ii. 12, Lipsius infers that the apostolical dignity of Paul had been attacked, or at least threatened, in Thessalonica; for it must have been for reasons of a personal nature that Paul so repeatedly and designedly puts stress upon his mode of preaching the gospel, his personal relation to the Thessalonians, the reception and entrance which he had found among them. But such an inference is wholly inadmissible, as everything that Paul says concerning himself and his conduct has in the context its express counterpart—its express correlate. In the whole section, i. 2–ii. 16 (for the whole, and not merely i. 4–ii. 12, according to Lipsius, is closely connected together), the corresponding conduct of the Thessalonians is placed over against the conduct of Paul and his companions. There is therefore no room for the supposition, that in what Paul remarks concerning himself there is a tacit polemical reference to third persons, namely, to Judaistic opponents; rather the apostle's design in the section i. 2–ii. 16 is to bring vividly before the Thessalonians the facts of their conversion, in order to encourage them to steadfastness in Christianity by the representation of the grace of God, which was abundantly manifested amid those troubles and persecutions which had broken out upon them. Besides, the opinion of Lipsius, if we are to measure it according to the standard of his own suppositions, must appear unfounded. According to Lipsius, the opponents, with whom the apostle had to do in Thessalonica, were unconverted Jews, and only as a later effect of their machinations Paul was afraid of the formation of a Judaizing Christian party at Thessalonica, so that his labour was only directed to prevent and to make the attempt while yet there was time, whether the formation of a Jewish-Christian faction could not be suppressed in its first germs. But where in early Christianity is there any example of the apostolical dignity of Paul being disputed by the unconverted Jews? Such attacks, in the nature of the case, were raised against Paul only by the Jewish Christians; whereas the unconverted Jews naturally laboured only to hinder him in the diffusion of the gospel, and accordingly manifested their hostility by acts of external violence, by opposition to his preaching, by laying snares for his life, etc. Comp. Acts ix. 23 ff., xiii. 45, xvii. 5, 13, xxii. 22, al. — From what has been
said it follows how arbitrary it is when Lipsius further makes a selection from the account in ii. 3 ff., that the mention of σλάνιν, ἀκαθαρσία, δόλος, ἀνθρώπους ἄρισκεν, λόγος καλακείας, σφάσας στήνειας, and ἕτεροι εἰς ἀνθρώπων δόξαν, was designed to defend the apostle from the reproaches which, in point of fact, had been raised against him, on the part of the Jews, at Thessalonica; that, according to ii. 7 ff., the purity of his motives was doubted; and that, according to ii. 13, it had been contended from a Judaistic point of view that his word was a human ordinance, and not founded on divine truth. Everything there adduced is explained simply and without any violence from the specified design of the apostle, without our being constrained to think on any polemical subsidiary references. Where do we find a similar polemic in Paul, in which everything is veiled in mysterious darkness, and what is really intended never openly and decidedly brought forward? For no unprejudiced reader would maintain that the passage ii. 14–16, which Lipsius, entirely mistaking the whole plan of the Epistle, calls its most characteristic section, warrants, on account of the violent outburst against the Jews contained in it, the inferences which he deduces from it.— Further, when Lipsius makes the yearning of the apostle after the Thessalonians expressed in ii. 17–20, and his twofold resolution to return to them, occasioned because he saw in spirit the church perverted and distracted by the same hateful Judaistic opponents who caused him so much grief in Galatia, so that he wished to be personally present in Thessalonica in order to baffle the attacks of those enemies, all that he would here prove is forcibly introduced into the text. Paul himself, in iii. 1 ff., states the reason of his anxiety and twofold proposed journey quite differently. Certainly what Paul himself here says has little authority for Lipsius. He thinks that only a “slight power of combination” (!) is requisite in order to perceive that it is not here only the effect of external trials that Paul feared; certainly it is only of this that the apostle directly speaks, but surely the confirmation and encouragement in the faith was a yet deeper reason, namely, the reason given by Lipsius (!).—When, further, Lipsius refers τιτανίζων, iii. 5, to “the machinations of the Judaists,” this is a violence done to iii. 3; when, in fine, he discovers in v. 21, “an exhortation to caution in reference to those teachers who—to obtain for themselves an undisturbed entrance under the pretext of the free Christian χάρισμα of prophecy—might aim at the subversion of the faith planted by Paul,” and in v. 22 a reference to “Judaistic machinations,” these special explanations are nothing else than
the vagaries of the imagination, which are not able to stand before a pure and thoughtful interpretation.

The same remark, moreover, holds good of the opinion recently advanced by Hofmann (Die heil. Schrift neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht, part 1, Nördl. 1862, p. 270 f.), that the first part of the Epistle was occasioned by the news brought by Timotheus to the apostle, that the Christians in Thessalonica had been persuaded by their heathen countrymen that they had become the prey of self-interested and crafty men, been involved by them in their Jewish machinations, and then given up to the misery occasioned thereby; and also that the Thessalonians could not understand why, during the whole time of their distress, Paul remained at a distance from them, and on this account they felt their distress the more severely. To all this the contents of the first three chapters were an answer. They were designed to deliver the church from their depressed frame of mind, to meet the suspicions they entertained of their teachers and founders, and to efface the evil impression which their, and especially Paul's absence, made on them. This three-fold design was sufficiently satisfied by the three sections, i. 2–10, ii. 1–12, ii. 13–iii. 13.

According to its contents, the Epistle is divided into two parts. After the salutation (i. 1) in the first or historical part, taken up with personal references (i. 2–iii. 13), Paul declares first, in general terms, his joy, expressed in thanksgiving, for the Christians soundness of the church (i. 2, 3); and then in separate particulars, in an impressive and eloquent description, he asserts the operation of the grace of God manifested in their conversion to Christianity; whilst the gospel had been preached by him, the apostle, with energy and confidence, with undaunted, pure, and self-sacrificing love to his divine calling, and had been received by them, the Thessalonians, with eager desire, and stedfastly maintained amid suffering and persecution (i. 4–ii. 16). Paul then speaks of the longing which came upon him, of the mission of Timotheus, and of the consolation which the return of Timotheus had now imparted to him (ii. 17–iii. 13). In the second or ethical-dogmatic part (iv. 1–v. 28) the apostle beseeches and exhorts the Thessalonians to make progress in holiness, to renounce fornication and covetousness (iv. 1–8), to increase yet more
and more in brotherly love (iv. 9, 10), and, instead of surrendering themselves to an unsettled disposition and to excitement, to be diligent and laborious in their worldly business (iv. 11, 12). The apostle then comforts them concerning the fate of their friends who had died before the advent, and exhorts them to be ever watchful and prepared for the coming of the Lord (iv. 13–v. 11). Then follow divers exhortations, and the wish that God would sanctify the Thessalonians wholly for the coming of Christ (v. 12–24). Concluding remarks succeed (v. 25–27), and the usual benediction (v. 28)

SEC. 3. TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

When Paul composed this Epistle a long time could not have elapsed since the founding of the church of Thessalonica. The apostle is as yet entirely full of the impression which his residence in Thessalonica had made upon him; he lives and moves so entirely in the facts of the conversion of the Thessalonians and of his personal conduct to them, that only events can be here described which belong to the recent past. To this also points the fact that the longing after the Thessalonians which came over the apostle soon after his separation from them (ii. 17), still endures at the moment when he is composing this Epistle (iii. 11). And lastly, the whole second or moral-dogmatic portion of the Epistle shows that the Thessalonian Church, although in many respects already eminent and flourishing, as yet consisted only of novices in Christianity. Moreover, when Paul composed this Epistle, according to i. 7, 8, he had already preached the gospel in Achaia. According to iii. 6 (ἀπε), the Epistle was written immediately after the return of Timotheus from Thessalonica. But from Acts xviii. 5, 6, we learn that Timotheus and Silas, returning from Macedonia, rejoined Paul at Corinth at a time when he had not long sojourned there; as until then the gospel was preached by him chiefly to the Jews. Thus, then, there can exist no reason to doubt that the composition of this Epistle is to be assigned to the commencement of Paul's
INTRODUCTION.

residence at Corinth, thus in the year 53, perhaps half a year after the arrival of the apostle in Macedonia, or after his flight from Thessalonica (comp. Wieseler's Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalter, Göttingen 1848, p. 40 ff.).

The subscription of the Epistle: ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἀθήνων, is consequently erroneous, arising from a careless inference drawn from iii. 1. Not only the modification of this view by Theodoret, followed by Hemming, Bullinger, Baldwin, and Aretius, that the first visit of the apostle to Athens (Acts xvii. 15 ff.) is here to be thought of,¹ is to be rejected; but also the suppositions of others, differing among themselves, according to which a later residence of the apostle at Athens is referred to. According to Calovius and Böttger (Beitr. zur hist.-krit. Einleit. in die Paulin. Br., Gött. 1837, Part III. p. 18 ff.), our Epistle was written at Athens on a subsequent excursion which Paul made to that city during his first residence at Corinth (against Böttger, see Wieseler's Chron. p. 247); according to Wurm (Tübing. Zeitschr. f. Theologie, 1833, Part I. p. 73 ff.), on a journey which Paul undertook at the time indicated in Acts xviii. 22 from Antioch to Greece (see against him Schneckenburger in the Studien der ev. Geistlichkeit Württembergs, 1834, vol. VII. Part I. p. 137 ff.); according to Schrader (Apostel Paulus, Part I. p. 90 ff., p. 162 ff.), at the time indicated in Acts xx. 2, 3, after a third (?) visit of the apostle to the Thessalonians (see against him Schneckenburger, Beit. zur Einleit. in's N. T. p. 165 ff.; Schott, proleg. p. 14 ff.); according to Köhler (Über die Abfassung der epistolischen Schriften in N. T. p. 112 f.) and Whiston (Primitive Christianity Revived, vol. III., Lond. 1711, p. 46 f., p. 110), at a residence in Athens at a period beyond the history contained in the Acts, Köhler assuming the year 66, and Whiston the year 67 after Christ as the period of composition (see against

¹ Euthalius (in Zacagn. Collectan. monument. vet. t. I. p. 650), and Oecumenius following him verbatim, do not judge so. For although they assume the place of composition to be Athens, yet they must have thought on a later residence in Athens than Acts xvii. 15 ff. For after the words: Ταῦτα ἐπιστέλλει ἀπὸ Ἀθηνῶν, in giving the occasion of the Epistle, they add: 'Ο ἀπόστολος παλαιός εἰς Ἀθήνας καὶ τῷ Ἐλέατης τῆς Μακεδονίας καὶ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, ... ἐπιστέλλει Τιμίῳ τρίῳ αὐτῶν μετὰ τῆς ἑπτάνομης ταῦτα.
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the former, Schott, proleg. p. 21 ff.; and against the latter, Benson's Paraphrase and Notes, 2d ed. p. 9 ff).

SEC. 4.—GENUINENESS.1

The historical attestation of the Epistle, although there are no sure indications of it found in the apostolic Fathers,2 is yet so old, continuous, and universal (Iren. Haer. v. 6. 1; Clem. Al. Paedag. i. p. 88 D, ed. Sylb.; Tertull. de resurr. carn. 24; Orig. c. Cels. ii. 65; Canon Murat., Peschito, Marcion [in Tert. adv. Marc. v. 15, and Epiph. Haer. xlii. 9], etc., see van Manen, l.c. pp. 5-21), that a justifiable reason for doubting its authenticity from external grounds is inconceivable.

Schrader was the first to call in question the genuineness from internal grounds (Apostel Paulus, Part V., Leipz. 1836, p. 23 ff.). In his paraphrase on iii. 13, iv. 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 14, 17, v. 8, 10, 19, 23, 26, 27, he thought that he had discovered suspicious abnormal expressions (see exposition of these passages). Baur (Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi, Stuttg. 1845, p. 480 ff.; see against him, W. Grimm in den Stud. u. Krit. 1850, Part IV. p. 753 ff.; J. P. Lange, das apost. Zeitalter, vol. I., Braunschw. 1853, p. 108 ff.), in a detailed justification of his formerly cherished doubts (see Baur, die sogen. Pastoralbriefe des Ap. P., Stuttg. u. Tüb. 1835), but until then only merely asserted, questions the genuineness of the Epistle. At a still later period he has maintained its spuriousness in his and Zeller's Theolog. Jahrbüchern, 1855, Part II. p. 141 ff.3

1 See W. C. van Manen, Onderzoek naar de echtheid van Paulus' eersten brief aan de Thessalonicensen (De echtheid van Paulus' brieven aan de Thess. onderzocht. I.), Weesp. 1865.
2 Such references are erroneously supposed to be found in Clem. Rom. ep. I. ad Corinth. 38. Ignat. ad Polyc. I. Polyc. ad Philipp. ii. 4.
3 The difference of Baur's views in reference to the First Epistle in this last-mentioned place consists in this:—1. That the presumed dependence of our Epistle on the Corinthian Epistles is more emphatically stated and supported by some further parallels forcibly brought together; 2. Not, as formerly (comp. Baur's Apost. Paulus, p. 488), the First, but the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, is regarded as having been written first; and from its spuriousness, as it was not composed until the death of Nero, the spuriousness of our Epistle is inferred.
INTRODUCTION.

The arguments insisted upon by Baur in his *Apostel Paulus* are the following:—1. In the whole collection of Pauline Epistles there is none so inferior in the character and importance of its contents as 1 Thessalonians; with the exception of the view contained in iv. 13–18, no dogmatic idea whatever is brought into prominence. The whole Epistle consists of general instructions, exhortations, wishes, such as are in the other Epistles mere adjuncts to the principal contents; but here what is in other cases only an accessory is converted into the principal matter. This insignificance of contents, the want of any special aim and of any definite occasion, is a mark of un-Pauline origin. 2. The Epistle betrays a dependence on the Acts of the Apostles and on the other Pauline Epistles, especially those to the Corinthians. 3. The Epistle professes to have been written only a few months after the apostle's first visit to Thessalonica, and yet there is a description of the condition of the church which evidently only suits a church already existing for a considerable time. 4. What the Epistle in iv. 14–18 contains concerning the resurrection of the dead, and the relation of the departed and the living to the advent of Christ, seems to agree very well with 1 Cor. xv. 22; but it goes farther, and gives such a concrete representation of those transcendent matters as we never elsewhere find with the apostle.

As to the first objection, according to Baur's view, our Epistle "arose from the same interest in the advent, which is still more decidedly expressed in the second Epistle." Baur, then, must have considered all the other contents of the Epistle only as a foil for this one idea; and as in his representation of the Pauline doctrine (p. 507 ff.) he judged the eschatology of Paul not worth an explanation, it is not to be wondered at that he considered it impossible that Paul could have made the advent the chief subject of a whole Epistle. But apart from this, that, according to other testimonies of the Pauline Epistles, the idea of an impending advent had a great practical weight with the apostle; that, further, the expectation of it and of the end of the world in connection with it, was well fitted to produce the greatest excitement in a church the
majority of which consisted of converted heathens, so that it was necessary to calm them concerning it; that, lastly, the explanation concerning the advent in so many _special_ points, as, for example, concerning the relation of unbelievers, etc., is left entirely untouched, so that the interest in the advent in and for itself cannot have been the reason for this instruction, but only a _peculiar want of the church_: apart from all these considerations, the disorder existing among the Thessalonians on account of the advent does not form the _chief_ contents of the Epistle, but only _one point along with others_ which gave occasion to its composition. Add to this, that all the further circumstances, which were the occasion of our Epistle, present themselves before us in it, united together with such clearness and in so living a character, as to form a distinct general picture of the Thessalonian church, so that it cannot be asserted that there is a want of a definite exciting occasion (comp. sec. 2). It is admitted that the didactic and dogmatic element in our Epistle recedes before the hortatory, and generally before the many personal references of the apostle's love and care for the church; but the amount more or less of dogmatic explanations can never decide whether an epistle belongs to Paul or not. The Epistles of the apostle are not the products of Christian learning in the study, but were called forth by the urgency of circumstances, and thus are always the products of historical necessity. We have then only to inquire whether our Epistle corresponds to the relations of the church, which it presupposes; if it does correspond with the relations and wants of the church, as is evident to every unprejudiced mind, its contents receive thereby the importance and special interest which Baur misses. Lastly, it is not true that the instructions, exhortations, and wishes in our Epistle are of so general a nature, that what is elsewhere a mere accessory is here raised into an essential. Rather an exhortation is never found in our Epistle, which had not a special reference to the peculiar condition of the Thessalonian church.

As regards the _second_ argument, a use of the _Acts of the Apostles_ by the author of the Epistle is inferred chiefly from
the fact that the Epistle is nothing else than an extended statement, reminding the Thessalonians of what was already well known to them, of the history of their conversion, known to us from the Acts. Thus i. 4 ff. merely states how the apostle preached the gospel to them, and how they received it; ii. 1 ff. points more distinctly to the circumstances of the apostle's coming to Thessalonica, and the way in which he laboured among them; iii. 1 ff. relates only what happened a short time before, and what the Thessalonians already knew. Everywhere (comp. already Schrader, supra, p. 24) only such things are spoken of as the readers knew well already, as the writer himself admits by the perpetually recurring εἰδότες (i. 4), αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε (ii. 1), καθὼς οἴδατε (ii. 2), μνημονεύετε γάρ (ii. 9), καθάπερ οἴδατε (ii. 11), αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε (iii. 3), καθὼς καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ οἴδατε (iii. 4), οἴδατε γὰρ (iv. 2). In answer to this objection, it is to be observed: (1) Apart from the inconsistency that what, according to Baur, should be only a foil is here converted into the chief contents, the history of the conversion of the Thessalonians does not form the chief contents of the Epistle, but only the contents of a portion of the first or historical half. (2) The remembrance of the founding of the church was not useless, nor a mere effusion of the heart (de Wette), but an essential part of the design of the apostle, serving as it did to strengthen and invigorate the church in steadfastness in the faith. (3) The often repeated appeal to the consciousness of the readers is so much the more natural as it refers to facts which happened during the apostle's recent visit to Thessalonica, and with which his mind was completely occupied. (4) The supposed lengthiness is only the fulness and inspired liveliness of the discourse. (5) If the account of the conversion of the Thessalonians as described in the Epistle is in agreement with the narrative in the Acts, this circumstance is not a point against, but for the authenticity of our Epistle, inasmuch as Baur's view that the Acts is a patched work of the second century, ransacking Christian history for a definite purpose, and accordingly designedly altering it (see Baur, Ap. Paulus, p. 180), merits no respect on account of its arbitrariness and want of
consistency. (6) Lastly, the harmony between the Acts and our Epistle is so free, so unforced, and so slightly pervading (comp. iii. 1, 2, with Acts xvi. 15, xviii. 5), that a literary use of the one by the other is absolutely inconceivable.—The passage ii. 14–16, on which Baur lays peculiar stress, is neither dependent on the Acts nor un-Pauline (see Commentary).

It is also asserted that there are evident reminiscences more or less of other Pauline Epistles, especially of the Epistles to the Corinthians. Thus i. 5 is manifestly an imitation of 1 Cor. ii. 4; i. 6 is taken from 1 Cor. xi. 1, and i. 8 from Rom. i. 8; the passage ii. 4 ff. briefly condenses the principles enunciated in 1 Cor. ii. 4, iv. 3 f., ix. 15 f., and especially 2 Cor. ii. 17, v. 11. Besides πλεονεξία, ii. 5, points to 2 Cor. vii. 2, διωιμένων ἐν βάρει εἶναι, ii. 6, and μὴ ἐπιθαρπάσαι, ii. 9, to 2 Cor. xi. 9, and ii. 7 to 1 Cor. iii. 2. A simple comparison of these passages suffices to show the worthlessness of the inferences derived from them. Verbal similarities of so trifling and harmless a nature as those adduced might easily be discerned between the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, both of which Baur regards as genuine. Besides, the circumstances of the Thessalonian and Corinthian churches, as well as the history of their founding, were in many respects similar; but similar thoughts in the same writer clothe themselves easily in a certain similarity of expression.

Baur supports his third argument on i. 7, 8, ii. 18, iii. 10, iv. 9 f., 11 f. But these passages do not prove what is intended (see exposition).

Lastly, in reference to the fourth argument, Baur himself confesses that the section iv. 14–18 can only be made valid against the authenticity of the Epistle, provided its spuriousness is already proved on other grounds. But as such other grounds do not exist, and as Baur has not explained himself further on the subject, we might dismiss this argument, were it not that it might be turned into a sharp weapon against himself. For, according to iv. 15, 17, the author of the Epistle regards the advent of Christ as so near that he himself hopes to survive (comp. v. 1 ff.). What a foolish and indeed
inconceivable proceeding would it be, if a forger of the second century were to put into the mouth of the Apostle Paul a prophetic expression concerning himself, the erroneousness of which facts had long since demonstrated! Moreover, it necessarily follows from 2 Thess. ii. 4 (see on passage) that the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians at least, and, as this (see sec. 2 of the Introduction to 2 Thess.) was composed later than the first, our Epistle also were written before the destruction of Jerusalem.
CHAPTER I.

Ver. 1. After εἰρήνη, Elz. Matth. Scholz, Bloomfield (The Greek Testament, with English notes, 9th edit. vol. II., London 1855) add: ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Bracketed by Lachm. Correctly erased by Tisch. and Alford (The Greek Testament, with a critically revised text, etc., vol. III., London 1856), according to B F G 47, 73, 115, et al. Syr. Baschm. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. Or. lat. seu Ruf. (dis.) Chrys. (comm.) Theoph. Ambrosiast. Pel. An interpolation, for the sake of completion, taken from the usual commencement of Paul's Epistles. Recently the addition: ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, is defended by Bouman (Chartae theologicae, lib. i., Traj. ad Rhen. 1853, p. 61) and Beiche (Commentar. criticus in N. T. tom. II. p. 321 sqq.), but on insufficient grounds. For that the addition might easily have been erroneously overlooked by scribes, on account of the similar preceding words: ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, is very improbable on account of the difference in the prepositions and cases of the two forms; that it might have been erased as an inelegant repetition has 2 Thess. i. 2 against it, for then there also traces of similar corrections in the critical testimonies would appear; and lastly, that the bare χάρις ἡμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη, without any further definition, is not elsewhere found in any of Paul's writings, would only occasion a doubt, were it in itself unsuitable; but this is not the case here, as, from the directly preceding words ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, the specific Christian sense of the formula is self-apparent. — Ver. 2. ιμᾶν, in the Receptus, after μετα, is wanting in A B K* 17, et al. It is found in C D E F G K L 31111, in almost all min. as well as in many Greek and Latin Fathers. Lachm. and Tisch. 1st ed. erroneously erase it. How easily might
iμᾶς after μιᾶς be overlooked on account of iμᾶς before μιᾶς! Comp. Eph. i. 16, where, in a similar case, there is the same uncertainty of MSS.— Ver. 3. Elz. has iμᾶς τοῦ ἑργοῦ τῆς πίστεως. Instead of this, D E F G, Syr. Arr. Aeth. Vulg. It. Ambrosiast. have τοῦ ἑργοῦ τῆς πίστεως iμᾶς. An interpretation from misunderstanding.— Ver. 5. τῆς iμᾶς] Elz. Griesb. Matth. Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Alford, Reiche have εἰς iμᾶς. Against A C D E F G, min. Copt. Chrys. ed. Theoph. ed.— Instead of the Receptus in iμᾶς, A C N, min. Vulg. ms. have iμᾶς; but iv was absorbed by the last syllable of ἵσεν ὑπέρ. — Ver. 7. τοῦ τοῦτοι recommended to consideration by Griesb., received by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, according to B D* min. Syr. Erp. Capt. Sahid. Baschm. Aeth. Slav. Vulg. Clar. Germ. Ambrosiast. Pel. The Elz. Matth. Scholz, Reiche, read the plural τοῦτοις (from which τοῦτος, in D** E 49, proceed, which Mill takes for a neuter form, as πλοῦτος, according to A C F G K L N, most min. and many Gr. vss.; but it is a correction the better to adapt the predicate to the collective subject, and thus apparently to strengthen the expressed praise; whilst the plural transfers to individual members of the church what the singular predicates of them in general, considered as a unity. Otherwise Bouman (l.c. p. 62 f.), according to whom τοῦτοι of the Receptus is the original, from which τοῦτος was erroneously formed, and from it τοῦτον proceeded, being regarded as an error of the nom. sing., and it was considered the easiest method to correct the mistake by changing the nominative singular into the accusative singular. — Χαὶ in τῇ is to be received, according to A B C D E F G N, min. Vulg. It. Syr. utr. Theodoret, Ambrosiast. Pel., instead of the Receptus Χαὶ τῇ; so Lachm. Scholz (with whom it has been omitted by an error of the press), Tisch.— Ver. 8. Elz. has Χαὶ ἀ'Χαὶς. So also Tisch. Bloomfield, and Alford. But Griesb. Matth. Lachm. and Scholz have Χαὶ in τῇ ἀ'Χαὶς, according to C D E F G K L N, min. plur. Syr. Slav. ms. Vulg. It. Cyr. Damasc. Oec. Ambrosiast. Pelag. Correctly; for the repetition of the preposition and the article is necessary, as Macedonia and Achaia were to be distinguished as separate provinces.— The Χαὶ of the Receptus before in παντὶ τῶν (defended by Matth. and Scholz, suspected by Griesb.) is to be erased, according to A B C D* F G N, 17, 37, et al. mult. Syr. utr. Capt. Sahid. Baschm. It. Ambrosiast. ed.; so Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. Because, being usually after οὐ μίνον. ἀλλὰ, it was easily inserted. — ἡμᾶς ἡχοῦ correctly changed by Lachm. Scholz, Tisch. and Alford into ἡχοῦ ἡμᾶς, according to A B C D E F G N, min. perm. Theodoret. The Receptus is an alteration, for emphasis,
to contrast ἡμᾶς, ver. 8, and αὐτοί, ver. 9.—Ver. 9. ἵσχωμεν]
Elz. has ἵσχωμεν against preponderating evidence, and devoid
of meaning. On account of the similar form with σ in uncial
mss., σ might easily be omitted.—Ver. 10. ἵνα τῶν νεκρῶν]
Elz. has ἵνα νεκρῶν, against B D E F G L κ, min. plur. and Fathers.
The article τῶν was lost in the last syllable of νεκρῶν.

CONTENTS.—After the address and salutation (ver. 1), Paul
testifies to his readers how in his prayers he constantly
thanks God for them all, mentioning without ceasing their
faith, love, and hope, being firmly convinced of their election;
for, on the one hand, the gospel was preached to them with
power and much confidence; and, on the other hand, they,
amid many trials, had received it with joyfulness, so that
they had become examples to all believers in Macedonia and
Achaia: for from them the word of the Lord had spread, and
the knowledge of their faith had penetrated everywhere, so
that he had not to relate anything about it, but, on the
contrary, he hears it mentioned by others what manner of
entrance he had to them, and how they had turned from idols
to the living and true God (vv. 2—10).

Ver. 1. It is a mark of the very early composition of the
Epistle, and consequently of its authenticity, that Paul does
not call himself ἀπόστολος. For it was very natural that
Paul, in regard to the first Christian churches to whom he
wrote, whom he had recently left, and who had attached
themselves with devoted love to him and his preaching, did
not feel constrained to indicate himself more definitely by an
official title, as the simple mention of his name must have
been perfectly sufficient. It was otherwise in his later life.
With reference to the Galatians and Corinthians, in conse-
quence of the actual opposition to his apostolic authority in
these churches, Paul felt himself constrained to vindicate his
full official dignity at the commencement of his Epistles. And
so the addition ἀπόστολος, occasioned at first by imperative
circumstances, became at a later period a usual designation,
especially to those churches which were personally unknown
to the apostle (Epistles to Rom. Col. Eph.), among whom,
even without any existing opposition, such a designation was
necessary in reference to the future. An exception was only natural where, as with the Philippians and with Philemon, the closest and most tried love and attachment united the apostle with the recipients of his Epistles. The supposition of Chrysostom, whom Oecumenius and Theophylact follow, is accordingly to be rejected, that the apostolic title was suppressed διὰ τὸ νεοκαταχώτους εἶναι τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ μηδέπω αὐτοῦ πείραν εἰληφέναι, for then it ought not to be found in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians. Further, the view of Zwingli, Estius, Pelt, and others is to be rejected, that Paul omitted his apostolic title out of modesty, as the same title could not be assigned to Silvanus (and Timotheus); for, not to mention that this reason is founded on a distorted view of the Pauline character, and that the two companions of the apostle would hardly lay claim to his apostolic rank, such a supposition is contradicted by 2 Cor. i.1; Col. i.1.—καὶ Σιλωνᾶς καὶ Τιμόθεος] Both are associated with Paul in the address, not to testify their agreement in the contents of the Epistle, and thereby to confer on it so much greater authority (Zanchius, Hunnius, Piscator, Pelt), or to testify that the contents were communicated to the apostle by the Holy Ghost (Macknight), but simply because they had assisted the apostle in preaching the gospel at Thessalonica. The simple mention of their names, without any addition, was sufficient on account of their being personally known. By being included in the address, they are represented as joint-authors of the Epistle, although they were so only in name. It is possible, but not certain, that Paul dictated the Epistle to one of them. (According to Berthold, they translated the letter conceived in Aramaic into Greek, and shared in the work.) — Silvanus (as in 2 Cor. i. 19) is placed before Timotheus, not perhaps because Timotheus was the amanuensis, and from modesty placed his name last (Zanchius), but because Silvanus was older and had been longer with Paul.—Ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ...Χριστῷ is to be closely united with τῇ εἰκονικῷ τῆς Θεσσαλονικῶν: to the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ,—that is, whose being, whose characteristic peculiarity, consists in fellowship with
God the Father (by which they are distinguished from heathen ἐκκλησίαι) and with the Lord Jesus Christ (by which they are distinguished from the Jewish ἐκκλησία). Erroneously, Grotius: quae exstitit, id agenti Deo Patre et Christo. The article τῷ is neither to be repeated before ἐν Θεῷ, nor is τῷ ὁσεῖ to be supplied (Olshausen, de Wette, and Bloomfield erroneously supply ὁσεῖ by itself, without the article; this could not be the construction, as it would contain a causal statement), because the words are blended together in the unity of the idea of the Christian church (see Winer's Grammar, p. 128 [E. T. 170]). Schott arbitrarily refers ἐν Θεῷ κ.τ.λ. to χαίρειν λέγωνων, to be supplied before χαίρειν ὑμῖν; for χαίρειν ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνῃ. Hofmann's view (Die h. Schrift neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht, Part I. Nördl. 1862) amounts to the same as Schott's, when he finds in ἐν Θεῷ κ.τ.λ. "a Christian extension of the usual epistolary address," importing that it is in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ that the writers address themselves by letter to the churches. Still more arbitrarily Ambrosiaster (not Theophy-lact) and Koppe, who erase the concluding words: ἀπὸ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. (see critical note), have placed a point after Θεσσαλονικείων, and united ἐν Θεῷ κ.τ.λ. with χαίρειν καὶ εἰρήνῃ. For (1) the thought: χαίρεις ὑμῖν (ἔστω) ἐν Θεῷ κ.τ.λ., instead of ἀπὸ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ., is entirely un-Pauline; (2) the placing of ἐν Θεῷ κ.τ.λ. first in so calm a writing as the address of the Epistle, and without any special reason, is inconceivable; (3) 2 Thess. i. 1, 2 contradicts the idea.—χαίρεις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνῃ See Meyer on Rom. i. 7. As a Christian transformation of the heathen form of salutation, the words, grammatically considered, should properly be conjoined with the preceding in a single sentence: Πάῦλος καὶ Σ. . . τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θ. . . χαίρειν καὶ εἰρήνην (σε λέγουσι).

Ver. 2. Εὐχαριστοῦμεν] The plural, which Koppe, Pelt, Koch, Jowett, and others refer to Paul only, is most naturally to be understood of Paul, Silvanus, and Timotheus, on account of ver. 1 compared with ii. 18, where the apostle, to obviate a mistaken conception of the plural, expressly distinguishes him-
self from his apostolic helpers. — τῷ Θεῷ] Thanks is rendered to God, because Paul in his piety recognises only His appointment as the first cause of the good which he has to celebrate. — πάντωτε] even if ὑμῶν after μνείαν (see critical note) is omitted, belongs to εὐχαριστοῦμεν, not to μνείαν ποιοῦμεν, as the expression: μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι περὶ τινός, instead of τινὸς, is un-Pauline. It is not to be weakened (with Koppe) in the sense of πολλάκις, certainly also not (with Zanchius and Pelt) to be limited to the feelings of the apostle, that the εὐχαριστεῖν took place "non actu sed affectu" (comp. already Nicholas de Lyra: semper in habitu, etsi non semper in actu), but to be understood absolutely always; certainly, according to the nature of the case, hyperbolically. Moreover, not without emphasis does Paul say: περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν, in order emphatically to declare that his thanksgiving to God referred to all the members of the Thessalonian church without exception. — μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμεν. ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν] These words are conjoined, and to be separated from the preceding by a comma. The clause is no limitation of εὐχαριστοῦμεν πάντωτε: when, or as often as we make mention of you (Flatt, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bisping; on ἐπὶ, see Meyer on Rom. i.10); but the statement of the manner of εὐχαριστεῖν: whilst we, etc. Only by the addition of this participial clause is the statement of his thanks and prayer for the Thessalonians completed.

Ver. 3. As the apostle has first stated the personal object of his thanksgiving, so now follows a further statement of its material object. Ver. 3 is therefore a parallel clause to μνείαν...ἡμῶν (ver. 2), in which μνημονεύοντες corresponds to μνείαν ποιοῦμενοι, ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου...Χριστοῦ τοῦ ὑμῶν after μνείαν, and lastly, ἐξμπροσθέν...ἡμῶν to ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν. Schott, Koch, and Auberlen (in Lange's Bibelwerk, Th. X., Bielef. 1864) incorrectly understand ver. 3 as causal; the statement of the cause follows in ver. 4. — ἄδιαλείπτως] unceasingly does not belong to the preceding μνείαν ποιοῦμενοι (Luther, Bullinger, Balduin, Er. Schmid, Harduin, Benson, Moldenhauer, Koch, Bloomfield, Alford, Ewald, Hofmann, Auberlen), for, as an addition inserted afterwards, it would drag, but to μνημονεύοντες (Calvin and others),
so that it begins the new clause with emphasis. — \(\text{μνημονεύειν}\)

is not intransitive: to be mindful of (Er. Schmid: memoria repetentes; Fromond: memores non tam in orationibus sed ubique; Aubérlen), but transitive, referring to the making mention of them in prayer. — \(\text{ὑμῶν}\) is, by Oecumenius, Erasmus (undecidedly), Vatablus, Calvin, Zwingli, Musculus, Hemming, Bullinger, Hunnius, Balduin, regarded as the object of \(\text{μνημονεύοντες}\) standing alone, whilst \(\text{ἐνεκά}\) is to be supplied before the genitives \(\text{τοῦ \ έργου \ τῆς \ πίστεως}\). But this union is artificial, and the supposed ellipsis without grammatical justification. It would be better to regard \(\text{τοῦ \ έργου \ κ.τ.λ.}\) as a development of \(\text{ὑμῶν}\) in apposition; but neither is this in itself nor in relation to ver. 2 to be commended. Accordingly, \(\text{ὑμῶν}\) is to be joined to the following substantives, so that its force extends to all the three following points. What Paul approvingly mentions in his prayers are the three Christian cardinal virtues, faith, love, and hope, in which his readers were distinguished, see v. 8; Col. i. 4, 5; 1 Cor. xiii. 13. But Paul does not praise them simply in and for themselves, but a peculiar quality of each—each according to a special potency. First their \(\text{πίστις}\), and that their \(\text{έργων \ τῆς \ πίστεως}\). \(\text{Πίστις}\) is faith subjectively. That \(\text{τοῦ \ έργου \ τῆς \ πίστεως}\) is not to be understood periphrastically for \(\text{τῆς \ πίστεως}\) (Koppe), nor does it correspond with the pleonastic use of the Hebrew \(\text{יְהוָה}\), as evident, as (1) such a use of the Greek \(\text{έργων}\) is not demonstrable (see Winier’s Grammar, p. 541 [E. T. 768]); and (2) \(\text{έργων \ τῆς \ πίστεως}\) must be similarly understood as the two following double expressions, but in them the additions \(\text{κόπου}\) and \(\text{υπομονῆς}\) are by no means devoid of import. Also Kypke’s explanation, according to which \(\text{έργων \ πίστεως}\) denotes \(\text{veritas fidei}\), is to be rejected, as this meaning proceeds from the contrast of \(\text{έργων}\) and \(\text{λόγος}\), of which there is no trace in the passage. Not less erroneous is it, with Calvin, Wolf, and others, to take \(\text{έργων \ τῆς \ πίστεως}\) absolutely as faith wrought, \(\text{i.e.}\) wrought by the

\[\text{So in essentials Hofmann, who considers \(\text{τῆς \ πίστεως}\) as an expository genitive, and converts the double expression into the unimportant saying: “Their doing or conduct consists in this, that they believed.”}\]
Holy Ghost or by God. An addition for this purpose would be requisite; besides, in the parallel expressions (ver. 3) it is the self-activity of the readers that is spoken of. In a spiritless manner Flatt and others render ἔργον as an adjective: your active faith. Similarly, but with a more correct appreciation of the substantive, Estius, Grotius, Schott, Koch, Bloomfield, and others: operis, quod ex fide proficiscitur; according to which, however, the words would naturally be replaced by πίστεως ἐνεργουμένη (Gal. v. 6). So also de Wette: your moral working proceeding from faith. Hardly correct, as—(1) τὸ ἔργον can only denote work, not working. (2) The moral working proceeding from faith, according to Paul, is love, so that there would here be a tautology with what follows. Clericus refers τὸ ἔργον τῆς πίστεως to the acceptance of the gospel (Opus...erat, ethnicismo abdicato mutatoque prorsus vivendi instituto, christianam religionem profiteri atque ad ejusdem normam vitam in posterum instituere; quae non poterant fieri nisi a credentibus, Jesum vere a Deo missum atque ab eo mandata accepisse apostolos, ideoque veram esse universam evangelii doctrinam); so also Macknight, according to whom the acceptance of the gospel is called an ἔργον on account of the victory over the prejudices in which the Thessalonians were nourished, and on account of the dangers to which they were exposed by their acceptance of Christianity. But this reason is remote from the context. Chrysostom (Τῇ ἐστι τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως; ὅτι οὐδὲν ἦμῶν παρέκλινε τὴν ἐνστασιν τοῦτο γὰρ ἔργον πίστεως. Εἰ πίστεως, πάντα πάσχει· εἰ δὲ μὴ πάσχεις, οὐ πίστευες), Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calovius, Bisping, and others understand the words of the verification of faith by steadfastness under persecution. This meaning underlying the words appears to come nearest to the correct sense. ἦμῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως denotes your work of faith; but as ἔργον has the emphasis (not πίστεως, as Hofmann thinks), it is accordingly best explained: the work which is peculiar to your faith—by which it is characterized, inasmuch as your faith is something begun with energy, and held fast with resoluteness, in spite of all obstacles and oppositions. This
meaning strikingly suits the circumstances of the Epistle. —

_"Kai τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης"]_ the second point of the apostle's thanksgiving. 'Ἀγάπη is not love to God, or to God and our neighbour (Nicol. Lyr.), also not to Christ, as if τοῦ κυρίου ἡμ. 'I. X. belonged to ἀγάπης (Cornelius a Lapide), still less love to the apostle and his companions (Natal. Alexander: labores charitatis vestrae, quibus nos ex Judaeorum seditione et insidiis eripuistis, quum apud vos evangelium praedicaremus; Estius, Benson), but love to fellow-Christians (comp. Col. i. 4). _Kόπος τῆς ἀγάπης_ denotes the active labour of love, which shuns no toil or sacrifice, in order to minister to the wants of our neighbours: not a forbearing love which bears with the faults and weaknesses of others (Theodoret); nor is the genitive the genitive of origin, the work which proceeds from love (so Clericus, Schott, de Wette, Koch, Bloomfield, and most critics); but the genitive of possession, the work which is peculiar to love, by which it is characterized. According to de Wette, _κόπος τῆς ἀγάπης_ might refer also to the labour of rulers and teachers (v. 12). Contrary to the context, as ver. 3 contains only the further exposition of ver. 2; but according to ver. 2, the apostle's thanksgiving extends to all the members of the church (περὶ πάντων ἡμῶν), not merely to individuals among them. — The third point of the apostle's thanksgiving is the ἐλπίς of his readers, and this also not in and for itself, but in its property of ἵπτομαι. ἤπτομαι is not the patient waiting which precedes fulfilment (Vatablus), but the constancy which suffers not itself to be overcome by obstacles and oppositions (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact). The genitive here also is not the genitive of origin (Clericus, Schott, de Wette, Koch, Bloomfield), but of possession: your endurance of hope; that endurance which belongs to your hope, by which hope is characterized. ἐλπίς is here as usual subjective: hoping (otherwise, Col. i. 5). — τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν _I. X._] does not refer to all the three above-mentioned virtues, "in order to show that they are one and all derived from Christ, and instilled into man by the Holy Spirit" (Olshausen), or are directed to Christ as their object (Cornelius a Lapide, Hofmann), but is the object only of
The hope refers to Christ, that is, to His advent, because the judgment and retribution will then take place, and the divine kingdom completed in all its glory will commence.— *ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν*] belongs not to *εἰδότες* (ver. 4), which Musculus thinks possible, and as little to *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμ.* I. X.; for—(1) the article *τοῦ* before *ἐμπροσθεν* must then have been omitted, and (2) an entire abnormal representation of Christ would occur; also not to *τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος*, or to all the three ideas, to indicate thereby these three virtues as existing before the eyes and according to the judgment of God, and thus as true and genuine (Theodoret, Oecumenius, Arelius, Fromond, Cornelius a Lapide, Baumgarten-Crusius, Aubelen); for in this case the repetition of the article would be expected, and besides, *ἐνόμισιν τοῦ Θεοῦ* and similar expressions have, in the above sense, always an adjective or corresponding clause; but it belongs—which only is grammatically correct—to *μνημονεύοντες*, so that *μνημονεύοντες ἐμπροσθεν κ.τ.λ.* corresponds to *μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν* (ver. 2).— *τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν* may mean Him, who is our God and our Father.

Ver. 4. *Εἰδότες* is incorrectly referred by many (thus Baur) to the Thessalonians, either as the nominative absolute in the sense of *εἰδάτε γάρ* (Erasmus), or *εἰδότες εἰσέ* (Homberg, Baumgarten-Crusius); or (Grotius) as the beginning of a new sentence which has its *tempus finit.* in *ἐγενέθητε* (ver. 6), "knowing that ye became followers of us." Rather, the subject of vv. 2 and 3, thus Paul, Silvanus, and Timotheus, is continued in *εἰδότες*. It is further erroneous to supply *καλ* before *εἰδότες* (Flatt), as this participle is by no means similar to the two preceding. Lastly, it is erroneous to make *εἰδότες* dependent on *μνείαν ποιεῖμεν* (Pelt). *Εἰδότες* is only correctly joined to the principal verb *ἐυχαριστοῦμεν* (ver. 2), and adduces the *reason* of the apostle's thanksgiving, whilst the preceding participles state only the *mode* of *ἐυχαριστοῦμεν*. — *ὑπὸ Θεοῦ* cannot be conjoined with *εἰδότες* (scientes a deo, *i.e.* ex dei revelatione), which Estius thinks possible, against which *ὑπὸ* instead of *παρά* is decisive. Nor does it belong to *τὴν*
ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν, so that εἶναι would require to be supplied, and ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι to be taken by itself (Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calvin, Musculus, Hemming, Zanchius, Justinian, Vorstius, Calixtus, Clericus), but to ἡγαπημένοι. For—(1) this union is grammatically the most natural (see 2 Thess. ii. 13, the Hebrew נֵּחַ֣ת, 2 Chron. xx. 7, and ἀγαπημένοι Θεοῦ, Rom. i. 7). (2) By the union of ὑπὸ Θεοῦ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν, a peculiar stress would be put on ὑπὸ Θεοῦ; but such an emphasis is inadmissible, as another ἐκλογὴ than by God is in Paul's view a nonentity, and therefore the addition ὑπὸ Θεοῦ would be idle.— Moreover, ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ is a pure address, and not the statement of the cause of τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν (Estius).— ἐκλογὴ [election or choice, denotes the action of God, according to which He has predetermined from eternity individuals to be believers in Christ. ἐλήξεις is related to ἐληξία as the subsequent realization to the preceding determination. Erroneously Pelt: ἐκλογὴ is electorum illa innovatio, qua per spiritum divinum mutatur interna hominem conditio; and still more arbitrarily Baumgarten-Crusius: ἐκλογὴ is not “choice among others (church election), but out of the world, with Paul equivalent to ἐλήξεις, and exactly here as in 1 Cor. i. 26; not being elected, but the mode or condition of the election” (!), so that the sense would be: “Ye know how ye have become Christians” (!!).— ὑμῶν] the objective genitive to ἐκλογὴν: the election of you.

Ver. 5. Bengel, Schott, Hofmann, and others unite ver. 5 by a simple comma to the preceding, understanding ὅτι in the sense of “that,” or “namely that,” and thus the further analysis or explication of ἐκλογὴ, i.e. the statement wherein ἐκλογὴ consists. But evidently vv. 5, 6 are not a statement wherein ἐκλογὴ consists, but of the historical facts from which it may be inferred. Accordingly, ὅτι (if one will not understand it with most interpreters as quia, which has little to recommend it) is to be separated from ver. 4 by a colon, and to be taken in the sense of for, introducing the reason on which the apostle grounds his own conviction of the ἐκλογὴ of his readers. This reason is twofold—(1) The power and confidence by which the gospel was preached by him and his
companions in Thessalonica (ver. 5); and (2) The eagerness and joy with which it was embraced by the Thessalonians (ver. 6 ff.). Both are proofs of grace, attestations of the εὐαγγέλιον of the Thessalonians on the part of God. — τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν] our gospel, i.e. our evangelical preaching.— οὐκ ἐγενήθη πρὸς ὑμᾶς] was not carried into effect among you, i.e. when it was brought to you. The passive form ἐγενήθη, alien to the Attic, and originally Doric, but common in the κοινή (see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 108 ff.; Kühner, I. 193; Winer's Grammar, p. 80 [E. T. 102]), characterizes the being carried into effect as something effected by divine grace, and the additions with ἐν following indicate the form and manner in which the apostolic preaching was carried into effect. From this it follows how erroneous it is with Koppe, Pelt, and others to refer ἐν λόγῳ ... πολλῇ to the qualities of the Thessalonians which resulted from the preaching of the apostle. According to Koppe, the meaning is "quantam enim mea apud vos doctrina in animos vestros vim habuerit, non ore tantum sed facto declaravistis." That the concluding words of ver. 5, καθὼς ἔδωκε ... ὑμᾶς, which apparently treat of the manner of the apostle's entrance, contains only a recapitulatory statement of ἐν λόγῳ ... πολλῇ, appealing to the testimony of the Thessalonians, is a sufficient condemnation of this strange and artificial explanation. — ἐν λόγῳ μονον] in word only, i.e. not that it was a bare announcement, a bare communication in human words, which so easily fade away. Grotius: Non stetit intra verba. But the apostle says οὗ μονον, because human speech was the necessary instrument of communication. — ἄλλα καὶ ἐν δύναμι κ.τ.λ.] By δύναμις is not to be understood miracles by which the power of the preached gospel was attested (Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Natalis Alexander, Turretine, etc.); for if so, the plural would have been necessary. Nor is the gospel denoted as a miraculous power (Benson), which meaning in itself is possible. Nor is the efficacy of the preached word among the Thessalonians indicated (Bullinger: Per virtutem intellexit efficaciam et vim agentem in cordibus fidelium). But it forms simply the
contrast to λόγος, and denotes the **impressive power** accompanying the entrance of Paul and his followers.— *ἐν πνεύματι ἄγίῳ* Theodoret, Musculus, Cornelius a Lapide, Fromond, B. a Piconius, Natalis Alexander, Benson, Macknight interpret this of the communication of the Holy Spirit to the readers. But the communication of the Holy Spirit is beyond the power of the apostles, as being only possible on the part of God. Besides, *ἐν πνεύματι* can only contain a statement of the manner in which Paul and his assistants preached the gospel. Accordingly, the meaning is: our preaching of the gospel was carried on among you in the Holy Ghost, that is, in a manner which could only be ascribed to the operation of the Holy Ghost. *ἐν πνεύματι ἄγίῳ* serves, therefore, not only for the further amplification, but also for the intensification of the idea *ἐν δυνάμει*. It is therefore incompetent to consider *ἐν δυνάμεις καὶ ἐν πνεύμ. ἄγίῳ* as a *ἐν διὰ δυνάμ. ἄγιου* (Calvin, Piscator, Turretine, Bloomfield, and others).— *πληροφορία* (comp. Col. ii. 2; Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5) denotes neither the fulness of spiritual gifts which were imparted to the Thessalonians (Lombard, Cornelius a Lapide, Turretine), nor the completeness of the apostolic instruction (Thomasius), nor the completeness with which Paul performed his duty (Estius), nor the proofs combined with his instructions, giving complete certainty (Fromond, Michaelis), nor generally “certitudo, qua Thessalonicenses certi de veritate evangelii ac salute sua redditi fuerant” (Musculus, Benson, Macknight); but the fulness and certainty of conviction, *i.e.* the inward confidence of faith with which Paul and his assistants appeared preaching at Thessalonica. — καθὼς οἶδατε κ.τ.λ.] a strengthening of διότι . . . πολλῇ by an appeal to the knowledge of his readers (Oecum.: καὶ τί, φησί, μακρυγγορό; αὐτὸι ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες ἐστε, οἱ δὲ ἐγεννηθήμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς). Pelt, entirely perverting the meaning, thinks that the apostle in these concluding words would hold forth his example for the emulation of his readers. This view could only claim indulgence if Koppe’s connection, which, however, Pelt rejects, were correct. Koppe begins a new sentence with καθὼς, considering καθὼς οἶδατε as the protasis and καὶ ὑμεῖς as the
apodosis, and gives the sense: qualem me vidistis, quum apud vos essem . . . tales etiam vos nunc estis. But this connection is impossible—(1) Because oìdàte cannot mean me vidistis, but has a purely present signification—ye know. (2) Because if there were such an emphatic contrast of persons (qualem me . . . tales etiam vos), then, instead of the simple ἐγενήθημεν, ἡμεῖς ἐγενήθημεν would necessarily be put. (3) Because ἐγενήθητε does not mean nunc estis, but facti estis. (4) Instead of the asyndeton καθὼς oìdàte, we would expect a connection with the preceding by some particle added to καθὼς. (5) And lastly, the apodosis would not be introduced by καὶ ἡμεῖς, but by oὗτως ἡμεῖς (comp. 2 Cor. i. 5, viii. 6, x. 7). Pelt's assertion is also erroneous, that instead of καθὼς oìdàte οἷοι ἐγενήθημεν, the more correct Greek phrase would have been οἷοι oìdàte ἡμᾶς γεγονότας. For the greatest emphasis is put on οἷοι ἐγενήθημεν, but this emphasis would have been lost by the substitution of the above construction. —οἷοι ἐγενήθημεν] recapitulates the preceding τὸ εὐαγγ. . . πολλά, but with this difference, that what was before said of the act of preaching is here predicated of the preachers. οἷοι ἐγενήθημεν does not denote the privations which Paul imposed upon himself when he preached the gospel, as Pelagius, Estius, Macknight, Pelt, and others think, making an arbitrary comparison of ii. 7, 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8, 9; also not κινδύνοις, οὐκ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ὑπέστησαν, τὸ σωτήριον αὐτῶς προσφέροντες κήρυγμα (Theodoret), nor both together (Natal. Alexander). It also does not mean quales fuerimus (so de Wette, Hofmann, and others), but can only denote the being made for some purpose. It thus contains the indication that the emphatic element in the preaching of the gospel at Thessalonica was a work of divine appointment—of divine grace. Accordingly, δι' ἡμᾶς, for your sake, that is, in order to gain you for the kingdom of Christ, is to be understood not of the purpose of the apostle and his assistants, but of the purpose of God. 

Ver. 6 contains the other side of the proof for the ἐκλογή of the Thessalonians, namely, their receptivity for the preaching of the gospel demonstrated by facts. Ver. 6 may either be separated by a point from the preceding (then the proof of
ver. 6, in relation to ver. 4, lies only in thought, without being actually expressed), or it may be made to depend on ὅτι in ver. 5 (provided this be translated by for, as it ought). In this latter case καθὼς ἀπάντε... δι' ὑμᾶς, ver. 5, is a parenthesis. This latter view is to be preferred, because vv. 5 and 6 appear more evidently to be internally connected, and, accordingly, the twofold division of the argument, adduced for the ἐκλογή of the readers, is more clearly brought forward.— μιὴν] See 1 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 1; Phil. iii. 17; Eph. v. 1; Gal. iv. 12.— ἐγενήθητε denotes here also the having become as a having been made, i.e. effected by the agency of God.— καὶ τοῦ κυρίου is for the sake of climax. Erroneously Bullinger: Veluti correctione subjecta addit: et domini. Eatenus enim apostolorum imitatores esse debemus, quatenus illi Christi imitatores sunt.— The Thessalonians became imitators of the apostle and of Christ, not in δύναμις, in πνεῦμα ἄγιον, and in πληροφορία, as Koppe thinks; but because they received the evangelical preaching (τὸν λόγον, comp. Gal. vi. 6, equivalent to κηρύγμα), allowed it an entrance among them, in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost, i.e. not merely that they received the λόγος (here the tertium comparationis would be wanting), but that they received it ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ μετὰ χαρᾶς πνεύμ. ἄγιον.— ἐξάμενοι τὸν λόγον] The reception of the gospel corresponds to its announcement brought to the readers (ver. 5), whilst μιὴν is explained by ἐν θλίψει... ἄγιον. The chief emphasis is on the concluding words: μετὰ χαρᾶς πνεύματος ἄγιον, containing in themselves the proper tertium comparationis between Christ and the apostle on the one hand, and the Thessalonians on the other; but ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ is placed first to strengthen it, and for the sake of contrast, inasmuch as δέχεσθαι τὸν λόγον μετὰ χαρᾶς πν. ἄγ. is something high and sublime, but it is something far higher and more sublime when this joy is neither disturbed nor weakened by the trials and sufferings which have been brought upon believers on account of their faith in Christ. — ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ] Erroneously Clericus: Subintelligendum διντα, quum acceperitis verbum, quod erat in afflictione multa,
h. e. cujus praecones graviter affligerantur. The Θέλψις of the Thessalonians had already begun during the presence of the apostle among them (Acts xvii. 6 ff.), but after his expulsion it had greatly increased (ii. 14, iii. 2, 3, 5). The apostle has in view both the commencement and the continuance of the persecution (comp. ver. 7, and the adjective πολλῇ attached to Θέλσις), against which δεξάμενοι is no objection, as the two points of time are united as the spring-time of the Christian church.—χαπα πνεύματος ἀγίου] is not joy in the Holy Ghost, but a joy or joyfulness which proceeds from the Holy Ghost, is produced by Him (comp. Rom. xiv. 17; Gal. v. 22; Acts v. 41). In reality, it is not to be distinguished from χαίρειν ἐν κυρίῳ (see Meyer on Phil. iii. 1).

Ver. 7. The Thessalonians had so far advanced that they who were formerly imitators had now become a model and an example to others.—τύπον] The singular is regular, as the apostle considers the church as a unity (see Winer's Grammar, p. 164 [E. T. 218]; Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 60; Kühner, II. p. 27).—πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύοντες] not to all believers (de Wette), but to the whole body of believers. See Winer, p. 105 [E. T. 137]. πᾶσιν augments the praise given. οἱ πιστεύοντες are believers, Christians (comp. Eph. i. 19). Chrysostom, whom Oecumenius, Theophylact, and most interpreters (also Pelt and Schott) follow, takes πιστεύοντες in the sense of πιστεύοντας, finding in ver. 7 the idea that the Thessalonians converted at a later period were further advanced in the intensity of their faith than those who had been earlier believers: Καὶ μὴν ἐν ὑστέρῳ ἰδθέο πρὸς αὐτούς· ἀλλ’ οὕτως ἀλάμψατε, φησίν, ὡς τῶν προλαβόντων γενέσθαι διδασκάλους . . . Οὐ γὰρ έλπιν, ὡστε τύπον γενέσθαι πρὸς τὸ πιστεύειν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἤδη πιστεύοντες τύπος ἐγένεσθε. But this view would contain a historical untruth. For in Europe, according to the Acts (comp. also 1 Thess. ii. 2), only the Philippians were believers before the Thessalonians; all the other churches of Macedonia and Achaia were formed afterwards. The present participle is rather to be understood from the standpoint of the apostle, so that all Christians then present in Macedonia and Achaia, that is, all Christians actually existing there at the
time of the composition of the Epistle, are to be understood. —
ev τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ] Comp. Rom. xv. 26 ; Acts
xix. 21 : the twofold division of Greece usually made after
its subjection to the Romans (comp. Winer, Realwörterb.
2d ed. vol. I. p. 21). The emphasis which Theodoret puts on
the words (Ἡζησεὶ τὴν εὐφημίαν, ἀρχέτυπα αὐτοῦς εὐσεβείας
γεγονόθαι φήμα πένθος μεγίστους καὶ ἐπὶ σοφία θαυμαζομέ-
νοις) is not contained in it. Baur's (p. 484) assertion, that
what is said in ver. 7 is only suitable for a church already
existing for a longer time, is without any justification. For to
be an example to others depends on the behaviour; the idea of
duration is entirely indifferent.

Ver. 8. Proof of the praise in ver. 7. See on the verse,
Storr, Opusc. III. p. 317 ff.; Rückert, locorum Paulinorum
1 Thess. i. 8 et 1 Thess. iii. 1–3, explanatio, Jen. 1844.—
Baumgarten-Crusius arbitrarily assumes in ver. 8 ff. an
address, not only to the Thessalonians, but also to the
Philippians, in short, to “the first converts in Macedonia.”
For ὑμῶν (ver. 8) can have no further extension than ὑμᾶς
(ver. 7). — ἀφ' ὑμῶν] does not import vestra opera, so that
a missionary activity was attributed to the Thessalonians
(Rückert), also not per vos, ope consilioque vestro, so that the
sense would be: that the gospel might be preached by me in
other parts of Macedonia and Achaia, has been effected by
your advice and co-operation, inasmuch as, when in imminent
danger, my life and that of Silvanus was rescued by you
(Schott, Flatt). For in the first case ὅσ' ὑμῶν would be
required, and in the second case ἃν' ὑμῶν, not to mention
that the entire occasion of the last interpretation is invented
and artificially introduced. Rather ἀφ' ὑμῶν is purely local
(Schott and Bloomfield erroneously unite the local import
with the instrumental), and denotes: out from you, forth from
you, comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 36. Yet this cannot be referred, with
Koppe and Krause, to Paul: from you, that is, when I left
Thessalonica, I found in the other cities of Macedonia and
Achaia a favourable opportunity for preaching the gospel.
For (1) this would have been otherwise grammatically
expressed, perhaps by ἀφ' ὑμῶν γάρ ἀπελθόντι θύρα μοι
CHAP. I. 8.

ἀνέψω μεγάλη εἰς τὸ κηρύσσειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου;
add to this (2), which is the chief point, that the logical
relation of ver. 8 to ver. 7 (γὰρ) does not permit our seeking
in ver. 8 a reference to the conduct of the apostle, but
indicates that a further praise of the Thessalonians is con-
tained in it.— ἐξῆλθαται] Comp. Sir. xl. 13; Joel iii. 14;
an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in N. T. is sounded out, like the tone
of some far-sounding instrument, i.e. without a figure: was
made known with power.— ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου] is not the
word from the Lord, or the report of what the Lord has done
to you (so, as it seems, Theodore Mopsuest. [in N. T. com-
mentariorum, quae reperiri potuerunt. Colleg., Fritzsche, Turici
1847, p. 145]: ὁ λόγον κυρίου ἐνταῦθα οὐ τὴν πίστιν λέγει,
οὐ γὰρ ἡ πίστις ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχήν, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ
tοῦ πάντων ἐγνώσαν ὅσα ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ἐπάθετε, καὶ
πάντες ὑμῶν τὸ βέβαιον θαυμάξουσι τῆς πίστεως, δούτε καὶ
προτροπὴν ἐτέρους γενέσθαι τὰ υμέτερα), but the word of the
Lord which He caused to be preached (subjective genitive),
i.e. the gospel (comp. 2 Thess. iii. 1; Col. iii. 16); thus
similar to the more usual expression of Paul: ὁ λόγος τοῦ
Θεοῦ. But the meaning is not: The report of the gospel,
that it was embraced by you, went forth from you, and made
a favourable impression upon others (de Wette); but the
knowledge of the gospel itself spread from you, so that the
power and the eclat which was displayed at the conversion of
the Thessalonians directed attention to the gospel, and gained
friends for it.— The words ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν have given much trouble
to interpreters. According to their position they evidently
belong to ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαιᾷ, and form a
contrast to ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ. But it does not agree with this
view that a new subject and predicate are found in the con-
trast introduced with ἀλλά, because the emphasis lies (as the
position of ὁ λόγος . . . ἀλλά appears to demand) only on the
two local statements, so that only ἀφ' ὑμῶν . . . τόπῳ should
have been written, and δοῦτε μὴ κ.τ.λ. should have been directly
connected with them. This double subject and predicate could
only be permissible provided the phrases: ἐξῆλθαται ὁ λόγος
tοῦ κυρίου, and: ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τ. Θεοῦ ἐξειληθευθεν
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were equivalent, as de Wette (also Olshausen and Koch) assumes ("the fame of your acceptance of the gospel sounded forth not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place the fame of your faith in God is spread abroad"); but, as is remarked above, de Wette does not correctly translate the first member of the sentence. Zanchius, Piscator, Vorstius, Beza, Grotius, Koppe, Storr, Flatt, Schrader, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others have felt themselves obliged to assume a *trajectio*, uniting ὃδε μόνον not with ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαίᾳ, but with ἐξήχυται, and thus explain it as if the words stood: ἀφ’ ὑμῶν γὰρ ὃδε μόνον ἐξήχυται κ.τ.λ. But this *trajectio* is a grammatical impossibility. Bloomfield has understood the words as a *mingling of two different forms of expression*. According to him, it is to be analyzed: "For from you sounded the word of the Lord over all Macedonia and Achaia; and not only has your faith in God been well known there, but the report of it has been disseminated everywhere else." But that which is united by Paul is thus forcibly severed, and arbitrarily moulded into an entirely new form. Lastly, Rückert has attempted another expedient. According to him, the apostle, after having written the greater part of the sentence, was led by the desire of making a forcible climax so to alter the originally intended form of the thought that the conclusion no longer corresponded with the announcement. Thus, then, the sense would be: Vestra opera factum est, ut domini sermo propagare tur non solum in Macedonia et Achaia, sed etiam—immo amplius quid, ipsa vestra fides ita per famam sparsa est, ut nullus jam sit locus, quem ejus nulla dum notitia attigerit. But against this is — (1) that ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν, on account of its position after ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, cannot have the principal accent; on the contrary, to preserve the meaning maintained by Rückert, it ought to have been written: ἀλλ’ αὕτη ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ἐξήλησεν; (2) that the wide extension of the report of the πίστις of the readers is not appropriate to form a *climax* to their supposed missionary activity expressed in the first clause of the sentence. However, to give ὃδε μόνον ... ἀλλά its proper force, and thereby to avoid the objec-
tion of the double subject and predicate, there is a very simple expedient (now adopted by Hofmann and Auberlen), namely, another punctuation; to put a colon after κυρίου, and to take together all that follows. According to this, ver. 8 is divided into two parts, of which the first part (α' ύμ.ων . . . κυρίου), in which α' ύμ.ων and ἐξήχυται have the emphasis, contains the reason of ver. 7, and of which the second part (ον μόνον . . . λαλεῖν τι) takes up the preceding ἐξήχυται, and works it out according to its locality.—From the fact that εν παντὶ τόπῳ is not to be limited (with Koppe, Storr, Flatt, Schott, and others) to Macedonia and Achaia (εν παντὶ τόπῳ τῆς Μακεδονίας καὶ τῆς Αχαίας), but must denote every place outside of Macedonia and Achaia, entirely apart from the consideration whether Paul and his companions had already come in contact with those places or not (against Hofmann), thus the whole known world (Chrysostom: τὴν οἰκουμένην; Oecumenius: ἀπαντᾶ τὸν κόσμον); by which it is to be conceded that Paul here, as in Rom. i. 8, Col. i. 6, 23, expresses himself in a popular hyperbolical manner.—ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν] your faith, that is, your believing, or becoming believers in God (πίστις thus subjective); the unusual preposition πρὸς instead of εἰς is also found in Philem. 5. That here God, and not Christ, is named as the object of faith does not alter the case, because God is the Father of Christ and the Author of the salvation contained in Him. But the unusual form ἡ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν is designedly chosen, in order to bring prominently forward the monotheistic faith to which the Thessalonians had turned, in contrast to their former idolatry.—ἐξελήλυθεν] has gone forth, has spread forth, namely, as a report. Comp. on ἐξέκρεισθαί in this sense, Matt. ix. 26; Luke viii. 17, etc. Probably the report had spread particularly by means of Christian merchants (Zanchius, Grotius, Joach. Lange, Baumgarten, de Wette), and the apostle might easily have learned it in the great commercial city of Corinth, where there was a constant influx of strangers. Possibly also Aquila and Priscilla, who had lately come from Rome (Acts xviii. 2), brought with
them such a report (Wieseler, p. 42). At all events, neither a longer existence of the Thessalonian church follows from this passage (Schrader, Baur), nor that Paul had in the interval been in far distant places (Wurm). As, moreover, εξελήλυθεν is construed not with εἰς, but with ἐν, so not only the arrival of the report in those regions is represented, but its permanence after its arrival (see Winer, p. 385 [E. T. 514]; Bernhardy, Synt. p. 208).— ὀστε μὴ χρείαν ἔχειν ἡμᾶς λαλεῖν τι] so that we have no need to say anything of it (sc. of your πίστις; erroneously Michaelis, “of the gospel;” erroneously also Koch, “something considerable”), because we have been already instructed concerning it by its report; although this is contained in εξελήλυθεν, yet it is impressively brought forward and explained in what follows.

Ver. 9. Αὐτοὶ] not: sponte, αὐτομαθῶς, of themselves (Pelt), but emphatically opposed to the preceding ἡμᾶς: not we, nay they themselves, that is, according to the well-known constructio ad sensum (comp. Gal. ii. 2): οἱ ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ καὶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ. See Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 288; Winer, p. 137 [E. T. 181]. Beza erroneously (though undecidedly) refers αὐτοὶ to πάντες οἱ πιστεύοντες (ver. 7).— περὶ ἡμῶν] is not equivalent to ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, in our stead (Koppe), but means: concerning us, de nobis; and, indeed, περὶ ἡμῶν is the general introductory object of ἀπαγγέλλομεν, which is afterwards more definitely expressed by ὅποιαν κ.τ.λ. — ἡμῶν, however, refers not only to the apostle and his assistants, but also to the Thessalonians, because otherwise καὶ πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε in relation to ἡμῶν would be inappropriate. This twofold nature of the subject may be already contained in ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν (ver. 8); as, on the one hand, the producing of πίστις by the labours of the apostle is expressed, and, on the other hand, its acceptance on the part of the Thessalonians. — ὅποιαν εἶσοδον ἐσχομεὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς] what sort of entrance we had to you, namely, with the preaching of the gospel, i.e. (comp. ver. 5) with what power and fulness of the Holy Spirit, with what inward conviction and contempt of external dangers (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact erroneously limit ὅποιαν to danger), we preached the gospel
to you. Most understand ὃπολαν ἐλυσόν (led astray by the
German Eingang) of the friendly reception, which Paul and
his companions found among the Thessalonians (indeed,
according to Pelt, ἐλυσόν in itself without ὃπολα denotes
facilem aditum); and accordingly some (Schott, Hofmann)
think of the eager reception of the gospel, or of its entrance
into the hearts of the Thessalonians (Ols Hansen). The first
view is against linguistic usage, as ἐλυσόν ἕχειν πρὸς τινα can
only have an active sense, can only denote the coming to one,
the entrance (comp. ii. 1); as also in the classics ἐλυσόν is
particularly used of the entrance of the chorus into the
orchestra (comp. Passow on the word). The latter view is
against the context, as in πῶς ἐπεστρέφωσεν κ.τ.λ. the effect
of the apostle's preaching is first referred to. — πῶς] how, that is,
how joyfully and energetically. — ἐπιστρέψειν] to turn from
the false way to the true. — πρὸς τὸν Θεόν] to be converted
to God: a well-known biblical figure. It can also denote to
return to God; for although this is spoken of those who once
were Gentiles, yet their idolatry was only an apostasy from
God (comp. Rom. i. 19 ff.). — δουλεύειν] the infinitive of
design. See Winer, p. 298 [E. T. 408]. — Θεῷ ζωντι] the
living God (comp. ἡ ζωὴ, 2 Kings xix. 4, 16, and Acts
xiv. 15), in contrast to dead idols (Hab. ii. 19). — ἄληθινός]
true, real (comp. ἄληθεν, 2 Chron. xv. 3; John xvii. 3;
1 John v. 20), in contrast to idols, which are vain and unreal.
The design intended by δουλεύειν Θεῷ ζωντι καὶ ἄληθινός
contains as yet nothing specifically Christian; it is rather
δουλεῖα consecrated to the living and true God, common to
Christians and Jews. The specific Christian mark, that which
distinguishes Christians also from Jews, is added in what
immediately follows.

Ver. 10. It may surprise us that this characteristic mark
is given not as faith in Christ (comp. Acts xx. 21; also John
xvii. 3), but the hope of His advent. But, on the one hand,
this hope of the returning Christ presupposes faith in Him, as
also ἤναμενον clearly points to faith as its necessary condition
and presupposition; and, on the other hand, in the circum-
stances which occasioned the composition of this Epistle, the
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The apostle must have been already led to touch in a preliminary manner upon the question, whose more express discussion was reserved to a later portion of his Epistle. — ἀναμένειν] here only in the N. T.; in 1 Cor. i. 7, Phil. iii. 30, etc., ἀπεκδέχ-σθαι stands for it. Erroneously Flatt: to expect with joy. The idea of the nearness of the advent as an event, whose coming the church might hope to live to see, is contained in ἀναμένειν. — ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν] belongs to ἀναμένειν. A brachyology, in the sense of ἀναμένειν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐρχόμενον, see Winer, p. 547 [E. T. 775]. — δι' ἡγείρειν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν] is emphatically placed before Ἰησοῦν, as God by the resurrection declared Christ to be His ζωή (comp. Rom. i 4). Hofmann strangely perverts the passage, that Paul by δι' ἡγείρειν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν assigns a reason for ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, because "the coming of the man Jesus from where He is with God to the world where His saints are, has for its supposition that He has risen from where He was with the dead." There is no emphasis on ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, its only purpose is for completing the idea of ἀναμένειν. — τὸν ῥύσιμον] The present participle does not stand for τὸν ῥύσιμον (Grotius, Pelt); it serves to show that ῥύσιμον is not begun only at the judgment, but already here, on earth, inasmuch as the inward conviction resides in the believer that he, by means of his fellowship with Christ, the σωτήρ, is delivered from all fears of a future judgment. — τὸν ῥύσιμον] stands therefore as a substantive. See Winer, p. 331 [E. T. 443]. — ὀργὴ] wrath, then the activity of wrath, punishment. It has also this meaning among classical writers. See Kypke, in den Obse. sacr., on Rom. ii. 5. — Also τῆς ἐρχομένης] is not equivalent to ἐλευσομένης (Grot., Pelt, and others), but refers to the certain coming of the wrath at the judgment, which Christ will hold at His advent (comp. Col. iii. 6).
CHAP. II.

CHAPTER II.

VER. 2. προσαθόντες] Elz. has καὶ προσαθόντες. Against A B C D E F G L Χ, min. plur. vss. and Fathers. καὶ is a gloss for the sake of strengthening. — Ver. 3. Elz. has αὐτῷ ἐν δῆλῳ. So also Griesb. Matth. Scholz, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, Alford. But it is to be read οὐδὲ ἐν δῆλῳ, with Lachm. and Tisch. 1, after A B C D* F G Χ, min., which also the gradation of the language requires (see exposition). — Ver. 4. Instead of the Receptus τῷ Ἐνωστίῳ B C D* K* 67** 114, et al., Clem. Bas. Oecum. require Θεῷ. The article is erased by Tisch. and Alford, bracketed by Lachmann. The omission is not sufficiently attested. Opposed to this omission are the weighty authorities of A D*** E F G K L Χ*** min. and many Fathers. The article might easily have been omitted, on account of the similarity of sound with the two following words. — Ver. 7. B C* D* F G Χ* min. vss. (also Vulg. and It.) Orig. (once) Cyr. et al. have νῦντιον, instead of the Receptus ἤπιον. Received by Lachm. But against the unity of the figure, and arisen from attaching the ν of the preceding word έγνήθησαν. — Ver. 8. άναμερόμενοι] Elz. has άναμερόμενοι. Against A B C D E F G K L Χ, min. plur. edd. Chrys. (alic.) Damasc. ms. Theophyl. dia. Reiche, I. 1, p. 326 ff., indeed, recognises άναμερόμενον as πρωτοτύχει σχετήρυκα; but he thinks that άναμερόμενον was the word designed to be written by Paul, whilst άναμερόμενον owed its origin to an error in dictation—to a mistake of the amanuensis in hearing or in writing. — γέγονέν] A B C D E F G K L Χ, min. plur. Bas. al. read ἠγιάστη. Recommended by Griesbach. Rightly received by Lachm. Scholz, Tisch. Bloomfield, Alford. The Receptus γεγίνθησα is a correction, from erroneously imagining εὐναοῦμαι to be in the present. — Ver. 9. νεικεῖς] Elz. Matth. have νεικεῖς γάρ. But γάρ is rightly erased by Griesb. Lachm. Scholz, Tisch. Alford, according to A B D* F G Χ, 23, 71, et al. perm. Syr. Copt. Arm. Vulg. It. Chrys. (comm.) Theophyl. Ambrosiast. Aug. An explanatory correction. — Ver. 12. Instead of the Receptus μαρτυροῦμαι, Β D*** (also D** Ἐ?) K L Χ, min. plur. Chrys. Damasc. Oec. have μαρτυρώμενοι. Rejected by Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. 1. Correctly approved by Matth. Fritzsche (de conform. N. T. critica, quam
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Lachm. edidit, comment. I., Giessen 1841, p. 38), de Wette, Tisch. 2 and 7, Bloomfield, Alford, and Reiche, as εὐαγγελίζεται is everywhere used only in a passive sense (see Meyer on Acts xxvi. 22, and Rinck, lucubr. crit. p. 95), so that εὐαγγελίζεται would be without meaning. Also εὐαγγελίζεται by a careless scribe might easily have been formed into εὐαγγελίζομαι, on account of the preceding παραμυθεύματος, as the similarity of termination gave occasion to the entire omission of καὶ εὐαγγ. in A. — Instead of the Recep. περιτιμηταί ις, with Lachm. Scholz, Tisch. Alford, to be read περιτιμήτη, according to A B D* F G Ν, min. Recommended to consideration by Griesb. — Ver. 13. Instead of the Recep. διὰ τοῦτο, Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, according to A B Ν, Copt. Syr. p. al. Theodoret (cd.) Ambrosiat. read καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, which, as the more unusual reading, merits the preference. — Ver. 15. τοῖς προφητίσαν] Elz. Matth. Bloomfield, Reiche read τοῖς ἰδίως προφητίσαν. Against A B D* E* F G Ν, min. vss. (also It. and Vulg.) and Fathers. A gloss from ver. 14 for the sake of strengthening. — Ver. 16. ἰδαμασθή] Lachm. and Tisch. 1 read ἰδαμασθή, which is only attested by B D*, whilst the Recep. has the important authority of A C D** and *** E F G K Λ Ν, and as it appears of all min. of Orig. (twice) Chrys. Theodoret, Dam. et al. — Instead of the Recep. ἡ ὑπαρχή Ε F G, Vulg. It. Ambrosiat. Pel. Sodul. have ἡ ὑπαρχή τοῦ θεοῦ; an explanatory addition. — Ver. 18. Διότι] Elz. Matth. Scholz, Tisch. 2, Bloomfield, Reiche have διό. Against preponderating testimonies (A B D* F G Ν, al.). Suspected also by Griesbach. — Ver. 19. ἔλεος] Elz. Matth. Scholz have ἔλεος ἕρεμος. ἕρεμος is doubted by Griesb., correctly erased by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, according to A B D E Κ Ν, min. plur. Syr. utr. al. Theodoret, Damasc. Oec. Ambrosiat. ed.

Contents.—The readers themselves know that the apostle's entrance among them was not without effect: although he had just been maltreated at Philippi, yet he has the courage to preach the gospel at Thessalonica amid contentions and dangers; for God Himself has called him to preach the gospel. It is accordingly solely and entirely the approval of God which he seeks; impure motives for preaching the gospel, such as vanity, covetousness, desire of honour, are far removed from him; he has, full of love, interested himself for the Thessalonians; he himself day and night worked for his maintenance, that he might not be burdensome to them; he then,
in a paternal manner, exhorts and beseeches every one of them to show themselves worthy in their life of the call to eternal blessedness, which had been brought to them (vv. 1–12). He then thanks God that the Thessalonians had actually received the gospel as the word of God, which it really is, and that it had already been so mighty in them, that they shunned not to endure sufferings for its sake (vv. 13–16). Hereupon the apostle testifies to his readers how he, full of longing toward them, who are no less than other Christian churches his hope, his praise, and his joy, had wished twice to return to them, but had been hindered by the devil (vv. 17–20).

Ver. 1 is referred by Grotius to a thought to be supplied after i. 10: Merito illam speravit vitae aeternae retinietis. Vera enim sunt, quae vobis annuntiavimus. Arbitrarily, as auton γὰρ, emphatically placed first, yea, you yourselves, must contain a contrast of the readers to other persons; and, besides, this view is founded on a false interpretation of οὐ κενὴ γέγονεν (see below). Also ver. 1 cannot, with Bengel, Flatt (who, besides, will consider i. 8–10 as a parenthesis), Pelt, Schott, and others, be referred to i. 5, 6; nor, with Hofmann, “extending over εἰςδότες τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν” (i. 4) to εἰςχριστοῦμεν τῷ Θεῷ (i. 2), the thought being now developed, “what justification the apostle had for making the election of his readers the special object of thanksgiving to God.” But must, with Zanchius, Balduin, Turretin, de Wette, Bloomfield, Alford, and others, be referred back to i. 9. For to i. 9 points—(1) auton γὰρ οἴδατε, by which the Thessalonians themselves are contrasted to the strangers who reported their praise; (2) τὴν εἰσοδον ἡμῶν τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, even by its similarity of sound refers to ὁποίαν εἰσοδον ἔσχωμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς (i. 9); (3) the greater naturalness of referring γὰρ (ii. 1) to the preceding last independent sentence. The relation of this reference is as follows: in chap. ii. 1 the apostle refers to i. 9, in order to develop the thought expressed there—which certainly was already contained in i. 5, 6—by an appeal to the consciousness of the readers. But the thought expressed in i. 9 was twofold—(1) a statement concerning Paul and his assistants, namely, with what energy they preached the gospel at Thessalonica
(ὅπολαν ἑσοδον ἑσχομεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς); and (2) a statement concerning the Thessalonians, namely, with what eagerness they received the gospel (καὶ πῶς κ.τ.λ.). Both circumstances the apostle further develops in chap. ii.: first, and most circumstance ally, the manner in which he and his assistants appeared in Thessalonica (ii. 1—12); and, secondly, the corresponding conduct of his readers (ii. 13—16). But the description of himself (vv. 1—12) was not occasioned by the calumniations of the apostle, and a diminution of confidence in him occasioned thereby (Benson, Ritschl, Hall. A. Lit. Z. 1847, No. 125; Auberlen); also, not so much by the heartfelt gratitude for the great blessings which God had conferred on his ministry at Thessalonica, as by the definite design of strengthening and confirming, in the way of life on which they had entered, the Christian church at Thessalonica,—which, notwithstanding their exemplary faith, yet consisted only of novices,—by a vivid representation of the circumstances of their conversion. How entirely appropriate was the courageous, self-sacrificing, and unwearied preaching of the apostle to exhibit the high value of the gospel itself, seeing it was capable of inspiring such a conduct as Paul and his companions had exhibited! — γάρ] yes, or indeed. See Hartung, Partikellehre, I. p. 463 ff. — The construction: οἰδατε τὴν ἑσοδον, ὅτε—where we, according to our idiom, would expect οἰδατε, ὅτε ἡ ἑσοδος κ.τ.λ.—is not only, as Schott and others say, “not unknown” to classical writers, but is a regular construction among the Greeks. See Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 466.— ἡ ἑσοδος ἡ πρὸς ὑμᾶς] denotes here nothing more than our entrance among you. — κενὸς] is the opposite of πλήρης, and denotes empty, void of contents, null.—οὐ κενὴ γέγονεν] Grotius (whom Hammond follows) translates this by mendax, fallax (ἀλήθεια), and gives the sense: non decepturi ad vos veni mus. But although κενὸς often forms the contrast to ἀλήθεια (see also Eph. v. 6), yet it obtains only thereby the meaning falsus, never the meaning fallax; also ver. 2 would not suit to the meaning fallax, because then the idea of uprightness would be expected as a contrast. Oecumenius finds in vv. 1, 2 the contrast of truth and falsehood: οὐ κενὴ γέγονεν.
touستιν οὗ ματαία οὗ μῦθοι γὰρ ψευδεῖς καὶ λήροι τὰ ἡμέτερα κηρύγματα. But he obtains this meaning only by incorrectly laying the chief stress in ver. 2 on τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ (οὔδε ἡμεῖς ἀνθρώπινόν τι ἐκηρύξαμεν εἰς ὑμᾶς ἀλλὰ Θεοῦ λόγους). Similarly to Grotius, but equally erroneously, Koppe (veni ad vos eo consilio et studio, ut vobis prodessem, non ut otiose inter vos viverem) and Rosenmuller (vani honoris vel opum acquirendarum studio) refer οὗ κενή γέγονεν to the design of the apostle, interpretations which are rendered impossible by the perfect γέγονεν. With a more correct appreciation of γέγονεν, Estius, Piscator, Vorstius, Turretin, Flatt, and others give the meaning inutilis, fructu earens, appealing to the Hebrew p*! This meaning is in itself not untenable, but it becomes so in our passage by the contrast in ver. 2; for ver. 2 does not speak of the result or effect of the apostle's preaching at Thessalonica, but of the character of that preaching itself. For the sake of this contrast, therefore, οὗ κενή is equivalent to δυνατή, δεινή (Chrys.: οὐκ ἀνθρώπινὴ οὔδε ἡ τυχόσα), and the meaning is: the apostle's εἰσοδος, entrance, among the Thessalonians was not weak, powerless, but mighty and energetic. Pelt, Schott, Olshausen, de Wette, and Bloomfield erroneously unite with this idea of οὗ κενή the idea of the success of the apostle's εἰσοδος, which is first spoken of in ii. 13 ff.

Ver. 2. Calvin makes ver. 2 still dependent on δι of ver. 1; but without grammatical justification. — προπαθόντες] although we suffered before. προπαθέσανε in the N. T., an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, denotes the sufferings previous to the time spoken of (comp. Thucyd. iii. 67; Herod. vii. 11). As however, the compound as well as the simple verb is a vox media, and so may denote the experience of something good (comp. Xen. Mem. ii. 2. 5), Paul fitly adds καὶ ὑβρισθέντες, and were insolently treated (comp. Demosth. adv. Phil. iii., ed. Reisk, p. 126; Matt. xxii. 6; Acts xiv. 5), by which προπαθόντες is converted in malam partem, and likewise the idea of πάρχειν strengthened. (For the circumstance, see Acts xvi.) — καθὼς οἴδατε] although αὐτὸς γὰρ οἴδατε had just preceded, is involuntarily added by Paul, by reason of the lively feeling
with which he places himself, in thought, in the time whereof he speaks. — ἐπαρθησιασάμεθα is not, with de Wette, to be referred to the bold preaching of the gospel, and to be translated: “we appeared with boldness,” but is to be rendered: “we had confidence.” παρθησιάζεσθαι, indeed, primarily denotes speaking with boldness (Eph. vi. 20), then, also, acting with boldness and confidence. — ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν] in our God, by means of fellowship and union with Him, belongs to ἐπαρθησιάζεσθαι, and indicates wherein this confidence was founded — in what it had its ground. Oecum.: διὰ τῶν ἐνδυναμοῦντα Θεόν τοῦτο ποιῆσαι τεθαρρήκαμεν. ἡμῶν does not denote: eundem ipsam, idolorum quondam culturibus, deum esse ac ipsi (Pelt), but is the involuntary expression of the internal bond which unites the speakers with God, with their God; comp. Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 4; Phil. i. 3, iv. 19; Phillem. 4. — λαλήσαι cannot be united with ἐπαρθησιασάμεθα in the sense of fierct ἐπαρθησιασάμεθα (Koppe, Flatt, Pelt); nor is it the statement of design (Schott: summa dicendi libertate usi sumus, ut vobis traderemus doctrinam divinam laetanuntiantem); nor is it an epxexegetical infinitive (Ambrosiaster: exerta libertate usi sumus in deo nostro, loquendo ad vos evangelium dei in magno certamine; Fritzsche, ad 2 Cor. diss. II. p. 102: non frustra vos adii (ver. 1), sed . . . libere deo fretus doctrinam div. tradidi, ut vel magnis cum aerumnis conflictans evangelium apud vos docerem; de Wette: “so that we preached the gospel to you amid much contention;” Koch); but it is the statement of the object attached to ἐπαρθησιασάμεθα, as this gives to our passage a dependent sense, and only introduces the infinitive clause, thus: we had the confidence to preach to you the gospel of God amid much contention. From this it follows that the chief stress is not to be laid on ἐπαρθησιασάμεθα (ver. 2); and thus the unbroken boldness of the apostle does not form the contrast to οὗ κενὴ γέγονεν, as de Wette thinks, but οὗ κενὴ γέγονεν has its contrast in λαλήσαι τὸ εὗ. ἐν πολλῷ ἀγὼν. It is only thus that a real relation exists between the thoughts in vv. 1 and 2 (and also only thus a real relation of ver. 3 to ver. 2; see below); for that the preaching of the apostle in Thessalonica was so powerful and
energetic (οὗ κενη), was by no means proved by the boldness of his preaching at Thessalonica, though a boldness unbroken by the persecutions which he suffered elsewhere shortly before; but rather this was something great, and demonstrated the power and energy of the apostle's preaching, that he and his companions, though they had just undergone suffering and persecution at Philippi, nevertheless had the courage and confidence even in Thessalonica to preach the gospel amid sufferings and persecutions. — εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ] The genitive denotes not the object of the gospel, but its author; comp. Rom. i. 1. Moreover, εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ is the usual form; and therefore, although Θεοĩ precedes, εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ is not put. — ἐν πολλῷ ἀγώνι] in much contention. ἀγών is to be understood neither of the cares and anxieties of the apostle (Fritzsche), nor of his diligence and zeal (Moldenhauer), but of external conflicts and dangers. Vv. 3, 4 explain what enables and obliges the apostle to preach the gospel in sufferings and trials. The objective and subjective truth of his preaching enables him, and the apostolic call with which God had entrusted him obliges him. γάρ, ver. 3, accordingly does not refer to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ (Moldenhauer, Flatt), nor to ἐπαρφησιασμένα (Olshausen, de Wette, Koch), but to λαλῆσαι ἐν πολλῷ ἀγώνι. — ἡ γὰρ παράκλησις ἡμῶν ὡς ἐκ τοῖς κτ.λ.] see. estin, not ἦν (Bloomfield), for Paul establishes (vv. 3, 4) the manner of his entrance in Thessalonica (as the present λαλοῦμεν proves) by qualities which were habitual to him; and not until ver. 5 does he return to the special manifestation of those general qualities during his residence in Thessalonica. — παράκλησις] denotes exhortation, address. The meaning of this word is modified according to the different circumstances of those to whom the address is directed. If the address is made to a sufferer or mourner, then it is naturally consolatory, and παράκλησις denotes comfort, consolation; but if it is directed to a moral or intellectual want, then παράκλησις is to be translated exhortation, admonition. Now the first evangelical preaching naturally consists in exhortation and admonition,—namely, in a demand to put away their sins, and to lay hold on the
salvation offered by God through the mission of His Son (comp. 2 Cor. v. 20). Accordingly, παράκλησις might be used to denote the preaching of the gospel generally. So here, where to adhere to the meaning consolatio, with Zwingli, would be unsuitable. Yet it is erroneous to replace παράκλησις with διδαχή (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, de Wette) or with διδακτικά (Theodoret); for, according to the above, more is contained in παράκλησις than in these ideas. Pelt explains παράκλησις erroneously by docendi ratio. But παράκλησις, understood as an exhortative address, or as the preaching of the gospel, may be taken either in an objective or subjective meaning: in the first case, it denotes the contents or subject of the preaching; in the second case, the preaching itself. The latter meaning is to be preferred on account of ver. 4.—The παράκλησις of the apostle and his assistants had its origin not εκ πλάνης. πλάνη, error, is used in a transitive and intransitive sense. In the former case it denotes deceitfulness (Matt. xxvii. 64) or seduction (Eph. iv. 14); in the latter, which is the more usual meaning, delusion. In both cases πλάνη is the contrast of ἀλήθεια (1 John iv. 6): in the former case, of ἀλήθεια in a subjective sense, truthfulness; in the latter, of ἀλήθεια in an objective sense, truth (thus in Rom. i. 27, where πλάνη refers to the idolatrous perversion of Monotheistic worship). Also, here πλάνη (on account of the succeeding ἐν δόλῳ) is best rendered not impostura (Erasmus, Calvin, Hemming, Estius, Beza, Turretin) or seducendi studium (Vorstius, Grotius, Baumgarten-Crusius), but delusion. Accordingly the sense is: the apostle and his associates avoided not sufferings and trials in the preaching of the gospel, because their preaching rested not on a fiction, a whim, a dream, a delusion,—consequently it had not such as these for its object and contents; but it is founded on reality,—that is to say, it has divine truth as its source.—οὐδὲ εἷς ἀκαθάρσιας] a second reason different from the first, and heightening it. Paul turns from the objective side of the origin of his preaching to its subjective side,—that is, to the motive which lay at the foundation of the gospel preaching of himself and his assistants. This motive is not ἀκαθάρσια (see Tittmann, de synonym. in N. T.
I. p. 150 f.), uncleanness, i.e. impurity of sentiment, as would be the case were the apostle to preach the gospel from covetousness, vanity, or similar reasons. — οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ nor also (does it consist or realize itself) in guile or deceit (contrast to εἰλικρίνεια, 2 Cor. ii. 17); a new emphasis, as it was something still worse, if not only an impure purpose lay at the foundation of a transaction, but also reprehensible means (e.g. κολακεία, ver. 5) were employed for the attainment of that purpose.

Ver. 4. The contrast. — καθὼς] not equivalent to because, quoniam (Flatt), but according as, or in conformity with this. — δοκιμάζειν] denotes to prove, to try, then to esteem worthy, so that it corresponds to the verb ἄξιον, 2 Thess. i. 11. Comp. Plut. Thes. 12: Ἐλθὼν οὖν ὁ Θεὸς ἐπὶ τὸ ἀριστὸν οὐκ ἐδοκίμαζε φράτειν αὐτόν, δοσὶν εἶν. — δοκιμάσμεθα denotes, accordingly, not the divine act of the purification of the human character (Moldenhauer), but the being esteemed worthy on the part of God; not, however, as a reward of human merit, or a recognition of a disposition not taken up with earthly things (Chrysostom: εἰ μὴ εἰδείς παντὸς ἀπηλλαγμένους βιωτικοῦ, οὐκ ἄν ἡμᾶς ἐξετεί; Theophylact: οὐκ ἂν ἔξελέξατο, εἰ μὴ ἄξιος ἐγίνοντε); also, not as an anticipation that Paul and his associates would preach the gospel without pleasing men (Oecumenius: ὁ Θεὸς ἐδοκίμασεν ἡμᾶς μηδὲν πρὸς δόξαν λαλεῖν ἀνθρώπων μέλλοντας), but as a manifestation of the free and gracious counsel of God (Theodoret, Grotius, Pelt). The chief idea, however, is not δοκιμάσμεθα (so Hofmann), but πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. — The passive form: πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, is according to the well-known Greek idiom, of using in the passive the nominative of the person, even in verbs which in the active govern the genitive or dative. Comp. Rom. iii. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 17; Gal. ii. 7; Kühner, II. p. 34; Winer, p. 205 [E. T. 286]. — οὕτως emphatically: even in this condition, even according to this rule. It does not refer to the following ὡς (Flatt), but to the preceding καθὼς, and denotes that the gospel preaching of the apostle and his associates was in correspondence with the grace and obligation imparted to them. — οὐχ ὡς κ.τ.λ. explains and defines
the whole preceding sentence: καθώς ... οὕτως λαλοῦμεν. — ἄρεσκειν] is here, on account of the concluding words ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ κ.τ.λ., not to please, to find approbation, but to seek to please. For, in reference to God, the apostle, according to his whole religious views and habits of thought, could only predicate of himself an endeavour to please, but not the actual fact that he pleased Him. It would, however, be erroneous to put this meaning into the verb itself;1 it arises only when the present or imperfect is employed, because these tenses may be used de conatu. See Pflugk, ad Eur. Hel. V. 1085; Stallb. ad Plat. Gorg. p. 185, and ad Protag. p. 46; Kühner, II. p. 67. — ὁσ] may either be—(1) a pure particle of comparison: not as men-pleasers, but as such who seek to please God; or (2) may mark the condition: not as such who, etc.; or lastly, (3) may emphasize the perversity which would exist, if the apostle was accused of ἀνθρώπους ἄρεσκειν: not as if we sought to please men. In the two first cases ὁσ extends over the second member of the sentence: ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ κ.τ.λ., in the last only over ἀνθρώπους ἄρεσκειν. The second meaning is to be preferred, as according to it οὐχ ὁσ κ.τ.λ. corresponds best to the qualifying words expressive of the apostle's mode of preaching (ver. 3). — τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν] who proves, searches our hearts. ἡμῶν refers to the speaker. To understand it generally, with Koppe, Pelt, Koch, and Bloomfield, is indeed possible, but not to be commended, as the general form τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας, without the addition of ἡμῶν, would be expected. Comp. Rom. viii. 27; Rev. ii. 23; Ps. vii. 10. Moreover, Paul speaks neither here nor in ver. 7 ff. of himself only, as de Wette thinks "very probable" in vv. 3, 4, but "certain" in ver. 7, but includes his associates mentioned in i. 1. If the apostle spoke only of himself, he would not have put τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν (ver. 4) and τὰς έαυτῶν ψυχὰς (ver. 8), but would have written both times the singular, τὴν καρδιὰν ἡμῶν and τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν.

1 So Wieseler on Gal. i. 10, who, however, explains it not "to seek to please," but "to live to please;" and after him, Hofmann and Mühler in the 3d ed. of de Wette's Commentary.
Ver. 5. Proof of the habitual character of the gospel preaching by an appeal to the character which it specially had in Thessalonica. — γάρ refers to οἷς ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκοντες ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ. — ἐγενήθημεν ἐν] we proved ourselves in, or we appeared as of such a character. The passive form ἐγενήθημεν (see on i. 5) denotes here also that the mode of appearance mentioned lay in the plan of God, was something appointed by Him. — κολακεία] comp. Theophrast. charact. c. 2: Τὴν δὲ κολακείαν ὑπολάβοι οDidAppear ἔτι δὴ κολακείωντε. The word is not again found in the N. T. ἐν λόγῳ κολακείαις cannot denote in a rumour (report) of flattery, according to which the sense would be: for never has one blamed us of flattery (so Heinsius, Hammond, Clericus, Michaelis). Against this is the context, for the point here is not what others said of the apostle's conduct, but what it was in reality. Also it is inadmissible to take ἐν λόγῳ κολακείαις, according to the analogy of the Hebrew יִרְמֹת with the following substantive, as a circumlocution for ἐν κολακεία (so Pelt, who, however, when he renders the clause: in assentation is crimen incurri, involuntarily falls into the afore-mentioned explanation). For — (1) the Hebrew use of יִרְמֹת is foreign to the N. T.; (2) it is overlooked that λόγος κολακείαις finds in the context its full import and reference, inasmuch as the apostle, in complete conformity to the contents of the preceding verses (comp. λαλήσας, ver. 2; παράκλησις, ver. 3; λαλοῦμεν, ver. 4), in the beginning of ver. 5 still speaks of a quality of his discourse, and only in ver. 6 passes to describe his conduct in Thessalonica in general. Accordingly, the apostle denies that he appeared in Thessalonica with a mode of speech whose nature or contents was flattery (Schott falsely takes κολακείαις as the genitive of origin), or that he showed himself infected with it. In Thessalonica, for this limitation of οὗ ... ποτὲ is demanded by the accessory appeal to the actual knowledge of the readers — καθὼς οἴδατε, ὡς γε οἴδατε. — οὗτε ἐν προφάσει πλεονεξίας] sc. ἐγενήθημεν. πρόφασις, from προφαίνω (not from πρόφημι), denotes that which one puts on for appearance, and with the definite design to colour or to cloak something else
It therefore denotes pretext, the outward show, and has its contrast (comp. Phil. i. 18) in ἀλήθεια. See proofs in Raphel, Polyb. p. 354. The meaning accordingly is: we appeared not in a pretext for covetousness, i.e. our gospel preaching was not of this nature, that it was only a pretext or cloak to conceal our proper design, namely, covetousness. Without linguistic reason, and against the context, Heinsius and Hammond understand πρόφασις as accusatio; Pelt, weakening the idea, and not exhausting the fundamental import of πρόφασις (see below), nunquam ostendi avaritiam; Wolf also unsatisfactorily considers πρόφασις as equivalent to species; similarly Ewald, "even in an appearance of covetousness;" for the emphatic even (by which that interpretation is at all suitable, and by means of which there would be a reference to a supplementary clause, "to say nothing of its being really covetousness") is interpolated, and the question at issue is not whether Paul and his associates avoided the, appearance of πλεονεξία, but whether they actually kept themselves at a distance from πλεονεξία. Lastly, erroneously Clericus (so also the Vulg.): in occasione avaritiae, ita ut velit apostolus se nullam unquam occasionem praebuisse, ob quam posset insimulari avaritiae.—Θεὸς μάρτυς] comp. Rom. i. 9; Phil. i. 8. Paul having just now appealed to the testimony of his readers that he was removed from κολακεία, now takes God for witness that the motive of his behaviour was not πλεονεξία. Naturally and rightly; for man can only judge of the character of an action when externally manifested, but God only knows the internal motives of acting.

Ver. 6. Nor have the apostle and his associates had to do in the publication of the gospel with external honour and distinction. Comp. John v. 41, 44. — ζητούντες] sc. ἔγνωθην μεν. — ἐξ ἀνθρώπων] emphatic. Oecumenius: καλὸς δὲ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τὴν γὰρ ἐκ Θεοῦ (sc. σόφων) καὶ ἔξηγην καὶ ἐλάμβανον. — According to Schott and Bloomfield, the preposition ἐκ refers to the direct and ἀπό to the indirect origin,—a distinction in our passage impossible, as ἐξ ἀνθρώπων is the general expression which is by οὔτε...οὔτε divided into subordinate members, or specialized. See Winer, p. 365
A new sentence is not to be begun with δυνάμενοι, so that either, with Flatt, ήμεν would have to be supplied; or, with Calvin, Koppe, and others, δυνάμενοι κ.τ.λ. would have to be considered as the protasis, and ἀλλ' ἐγενήθημεν (ver. 7) as the apodosis belonging to it; or, with Hofmann, ἀλλ' ἐγενήθημεν ἦπιοι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν as an exclamatory interruption of the discourse in its progress, distinctions chiefly occasioned by the misunderstanding of ἐν βάπει. But δυνάμενοι is subordinate to ζητοῦντες (sc. ἐγενήθημεν) and limits it, on account of which it is inappropriate to enclose δυνάμενοι ... ἀπόστολοι, with Schöttgen and Griesbach, in a parenthesis. The meaning is: Also in our entrance to you our motive was not in anywise to be honoured or distinguished by men, although we certainly might have demanded external honour. Theodoret, Musculus, Camerarius, Estius, Beza, Grotius, Calixtus, Calovius, Clericus, Turretin, Whitby, Baumgarten, Koppe, Flatt, Ewald, Hofmann, and others take ἐν βάπει εἰναι in the sense of being burdensome (sc. by a demand of maintenance from the church), and thus equivalent to ἐπιβαπεῖν (ver. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8; and καταβαπεῖν, 2 Cor. xii. 16; comp. ἄβαρη ἐμαυτὸν ἐτήρησα, 2 Cor. xi. 9); but this is an arbitrary assumption from ver. 9—arbitrary, because ζητοῦντες δοξαν and ἐν βάπει εἰναι must correspond; but in the first half of ver. 6 Paul's custom of not suffering himself to be supported by the church, but gaining his maintenance by working with his own hands, is not indicated by a single syllable. On account of this correspondence of ἐν βάπει with δοξαν, the explanation of Lipsius (Stud. u. Krit. 1854, 4, p. 912) is wholly untenable: "As the apostles of Christ we did not at all need glory among men, but were rather in a position to endure trouble and burden,—that is, to endure with equanimity persecutions and trials of all kinds which men inflict upon us," not to mention that the idea of "not at all
needing,” and the emphatic “rather,” are first arbitrarily interpolated. Heinsius, after the example of Piscator (who, however, wavers), understands ἐν βάρει εἶναι of severitas apostolica: Seigitur, ἐν βάρει εἶναι δυνάμενον, quum severitatem exercere apostolicam posset, lenem fuisse, eo fere modo, quo ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἐλθεῖν καὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ πνεύματι τε πραΐτητος, 1 Cor. iv. 21, opposit. But thus ἐν βάρει and ἡπιοι will be erroneously opposed to each other. (See on ver. 7.) βάρος, heaviness, weight, occurs even among classical writers, as the Latin gravitas, in the sense of distinction, dignity (see Wesseling, ad Diodor. Sicul. IV. 61). ἐν βάρει εἶναι accordingly means to be of weight, to be of importance, i.e. to be deserving of outward honour and distinction. Thus Chrysostom, Oecumenius and Theophylact (both, however, undecidedly), Ambrosiaster, Erasmus, Calvin, Hunnius, Wolf, Moldenhauer, Pelt, Schott, Olshausen, de Wette, Koch, Bisping, Alford, Aubelen, and others.— Paul annexes the justification of such an ἐν βάρει εἶναι by the words οὐκ Ἀρτου ἀπόστολοι; i.e. not sicut apostoli alii faciunt (1 Cor. ix. 6; Grotius), but in virtue of our character as the apostles of Christ. ἀπόστολοι is, however, to be used in its wider sense, as Paul not only speaks of himself, but also of Silvanus and Timotheus, as in Acts xiv. 14.

Ver. 7. Paul begins in this verse the positive description of his appearance and conduct in Thessalonica.— ἀλλ' ἐγενήθημεν ἡπιοι] a contrast not to δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι (Heinsius, Turretin, and others), but to the principal idea of ver. 6. The apostle's conduct is not that of one δόξαν ἐξ ἀνδρώτων ἡπιοσ, but of one who was ἡπιοσ; God had made him show himself (ἐγενήθημεν) not as master, but as servant. Oecumenius: ὥσ εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐγενήθημεν.— ἡπιοι] mild, kindly, is used of an amiable disposition or conduct of a higher toward a lower, i.e. of a prince to his subjects, of a judge to the accused, of a father to his children. Comp. Hom. Od. ii. 47; Herodian, ii. 4, init.; Pausan. Elia. ii. 18.— ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν] in your midst, i.e. in intercourse with you. Erroneously Calovius, it denotes: erga omnes pariter. Non erga hos blandi, ergo illos morosi. There is, however, no emphasis on ὑμῶν; the apostle does not indicate that he behaved otherwise in other
places.—A colon is to be put after ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, so that ὡς ... οὖν are connected as protasis and apodosis, and describe the intensity of Paul's love to the Thessalonians; whilst in ἐγενήθησαί ... ὑμῶν this love only in and for itself, or according to its general nature, was stated as a feature of the apostle's behaviour.—τροφός] a nurse (μητρός) here, as is evident from τὰ ἐαυτῆς τέκνα, the suckling mother herself. Under the image of a mother Paul represents himself also, in Gal. iv. 19, as elsewhere, under the image of a father; see ver. 11; 1 Cor. iv. 15; Philem. 10.—θάλπσειν] originally to warm, of birds which cover and warm their young with their feathers: (see Deut. xxii. 6); consequently an image of protecting love and anxious care generally, our cherishing; see Eph. v. 29.

Ver. 8. Ὑμείρεσθαι] occurs, besides LXX. Job iii. 21, and Symmachus, Ps. lxii. 2 (yet even in these two places mss. differ), only in the glossaries. Hesychius, Phavorinus, and Photius explain it by ἐπιθυμεῖν. Theophylact derives it from ὄμοιο and εἰρεῖν; and corresponding to this, Photius explains it by ὄμοι ἡρμόσθαι. Accordingly, ὅμειρόμενοι ὑμῶν would denote bound with you, attached to you. Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 792 f., Schott, and others agree. But this is questionable—
(1) Because the verb is here construed with the genitive, and not with the dative; (2) because there is no instance of a similar verb compounded with ὄμοι or ὄμος; see Winer, p. 92 [E. T. 125]. Now, as in Nicander (Theriaca, ver. 402) the simple form μείρεσθαι occurs in the sense of ἰμείρεσθαι, it can hardly be doubted that μείρεσθαι is the original root to which ἰμείρεσθαι and ὅμειρεσθαί (having the same meaning) are related, having a syllable prefixed for euphony. Compare the analogous forms of καλῶ and ὁκαλῶ, δύρομαι and ὁδυρομαι, φλέω and ὁφλέω, αἰω and ἀιω, and see Kühner, I. p. 27. Accordingly, as ἰμείρεσθαι τινός denotes primarily the yearning love, the yearning desire for union with an absent friend, and secondarily is, according to the testimony of Hesychius, synonymous with ἐράν, ὅμειρόμενοι ὑμῶν receives here the suitable meaning of filled with love to you. Beza unnecessarily, and against the context (because the word is a verbum ἐρωτικόν), supplies: videlicet vos adv. Christum tanquam sponsam
ad sponsum adducendi. — o{tov] belongs not to ὑμειρὸμενον (Schrader), but to εἴδοκοιμεν; thus it is not intensifying so much, but a simple particle of comparison: thus, in this manner. — εἴδοκοιμεν] not present, but imperfect with the augment omitted. See Winer, p. 66 [E. T. 83]. εἴδοκείω, to esteem good, here, to be willing, denotes that what took place was from a free determination of will. Thus it is used both of the eternal, gracious, and free counsels of God (Col. i. 19; Gal. i. 15; 1 Cor. i. 21), and of the free determination of men (Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. v. 8). — τὰς ἐαυτῶν ψυχᾶς] not a Hebraism in the sense of nosmet ipsos (Koppe, Flatt), but our lives (Hom. Od. iii. 74; Aristoph. Plut. 524); the plural ψυχᾶς proves that Paul thinks not of himself only, but also of Silvanus and Timotheus. — On ἐνατῶν, comp. Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 272; Winer, p. 136 [E. T. 187]. However, the verb μεταδοῦναι does not strictly apply to τὰς ἐαυτῶν ψυχᾶς, as the idea of imparting is here transformed into that of offering up, devoting. (Erroneously Bengel: anima nostra cupiebat quasi immeare in animam vestram. Hofmann: In the word preached, which Paul and his companions imparted to the Thessalonians even to the exhaustion of their vital power, this as it were passed over to them, just as the vital power of the mother passes over to the child, whom she is not content with nourishing generally, but, from the longings of love to it, desires to nourish it by suckling.) From the compound verb μεταδοῦναι the idea of the simple verb δοῦναι is accordingly to be extracted (a zeugma; see Kühner, II. 606). — The thought contained in ὡς . . . o{tov is accordingly: As a mother not only nourishes her new-born child with her milk, but also cherishes and shelters it, yea, is ready to sacrifice her life for its preservation, so has the apostle not merely nourished his spiritual child, the Thessalonian church, with the milk of the gospel, but has been also ready, in order to preserve it in the newly begun life, to sacrifice his own life. — The inducement to such a conduct was love, which the apostle, although he had already mentioned it, again definitely states in the words διότι ἁγαπητοί ἡμῖν ἐγενήθητε, because ye were dear and valuable to us.
Ver. 9. Τὰρ refers not to δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι, ver. 6 (Flatt), but either to ἐγεννήθηνεν ἦπιοι (ver. 7), or to εὐδοκοῦμεν μεταδοῦναι, or, finally, to ύπατητοὶ ἦμων ἐγεννήθητε (ver. 8). For the first reference (ἐγεννήθηνεν ἦπιοι), it may be argued that ἐγεννήθηνεν ἦπιοι is the chief idea, the theme as it were, of vv. 7 and 8; but against this is, that the same thought which was expressed in ἐγεννήθηνεν ἦπιοι is repeated and more definitely developed in a much more vivid and special manner by means of the parallel sentence, attached without a copula, and thus complete. In such a case a causal conjunction following refers rather to the more vivid and concrete expression than to the more general and abstract. Accordingly, we are referred to the connection with εὐδοκοῦμεν μεταδοῦναι. Neither can this, however, be the correct connection; for then must ver. 9 have proved the readiness of the apostle when at Thessalonica to sacrifice his own life for the Thessalonians, as is expressed in ver. 8. But this is not the case, for in ver. 9 Paul speaks indeed of his self-sacrificing love, but not of the danger of his life which arose from it. Also Auberlen, who recently has maintained a reference to εὐδοκοῦμεν μεταδοῦναι, can only support this meaning, that Paul has adduced his manual labour mentioned in ver. 9 as a “risking of his health and life.” But how forced is this idea of the context, and how arbitrarily is the idea of the sacrifice of life, supposed to be expressed therein, contorted and softened down! It is best, therefore, to unite γὰρ with διότι ὑπατητοὶ ἦμων ἐγεννήθητε, a union which, besides, is recommended by the direct proximity of the words.—μνημονεύετε] as γὰρ proves, is indicative, not imperative.—κόπος and μόχθος] labour and pains: placed together also in 2 Thess. iii. 8 and 2 Cor. xi. 27. Musculus: Significat se haud leviter et obiter, sed ad fatigacionem usque incubuisse laboribus. Arbitrarily separating and mixing the gradation, Balduin interprets κόπος “de spirituali labore, qui consistebat in praedicatione evangelii;” and μόχθος “de manuario labore scenopegiae.”—νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας] a concrete and proverbial circumlocution of the abstract διαηλεύτως. But νυκτὸς, as usual (Acts ix. 24 is an exception), is placed first, because the Jews (as also the
Athenians, see Plin. Nat. Hist. ii. 79; Funke, Real-Schullex. II. p. 132) reckoned the civil day from sunset to sunset (see Winer's bibl. Realwörterb. 2d ed. vol. II. p. 650). Pelagius, Faber, Stapulensis, Hemming, Balduin, and Aretius arbitrarily limit νυκτός to ἐργαζόμενοι, and ημέρας to ἐκηρύξαμεν.—ἐργάζεσθαι (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 6; 2 Thess. iii. 10, 12; Acts xviii. 13) the usual word also among the classics (comp. Xen. Mem. i. 2. 57) to denote working for wages, especially manual labour or working by means of a trade (therefore the addition ταῖς χερσὶ, 1 Cor. iv. 12; Eph. iv. 28). Paul means his working as a tent-cloth maker, Acts xviii. 3.—πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρήσασθαι των ὑμῶν] in order not to be burdensome to any, sc. by a demand of maintenance. Incorrectly, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Pelt, and others infer from this that the converted Thessalonians were poor. Evidently this unselfish conduct of the apostle had its ultimate reason in an endeavour that there should be no hindrance on his part to the diffusion of the gospel. —εἰς ὑμᾶς] represents the readers as the local objects of κρίναςειν; comp. Mark xiii. 10; Luke xxiv. 47. Therefore, according to the general sense, it is true that εἰς ὑμᾶς and ὑμῖν do not differ, but the mode of looking at it is somewhat different. See Winer, p. 191 [E. T. 266].

Ver. 10. This verse is designed to represent in a summary manner the conduct of the apostle among the Thessalonians, which was hitherto only represented by special features; but as thereby not merely what was patent to external observation, that is, the visible action on which man can pronounce a judgment, but likewise the internal disposition, which is the source of that action, was to be emphasized; so Paul naturally appeals for the truth of his assertion not only to his readers, but to God. The apostle, however, proceeds without a particle of transition, on account of the warmth of emotion with which he speaks. —ὅσα] how very.—ὅσιος καὶ δικαίως] (comp. Eph. iv. 24; Luke i. 75; Wisd. ix. 3, ὑσίωτης and δικαιοσύνη) is put entirely in accordance with classical usage; the first denotes dutiful conduct toward God, and the latter toward our neighbour. Comp. Plat. Gorg. p. 507: καὶ μὴν περὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπους τὰ προσήκοντα πράττων δικαί᾽ ἂν πράττοι, περὶ
CHAP. II. 10.

δὲ θεοῦ δοσιμα; Polyb. xxxiii. 10. 8; Schol. ad Eurip. Hec. 788. —ἀμέμπτως] unblameably. Turretin, Bengel, Moldenhauer interpret this of dutiful conduct toward oneself, evidently from the desire of a logical division of love, in order to obtain a sharply marked threefold division of the idea. Flacius refers it to the reliqui mores besides justitia, that is, to castitas, sobrietas, and moderatio in omnibus; but this is without any reason. It is the general negative designation, comprehending the two preceding more special and positive expressions, thus to be understood of a dutiful conduct toward God and man. Too narrowly Olshausen: that it is the negative expression of the positive δικαίως. — ύμων τοῖς πιστεύοντεσον] belongs not only to ἀμέμπτως, but to the whole sentence: ὃς σοίως καὶ δικ. καὶ ἁμ. ἐγενήθη. It is not dat. commodi: “to your, the believers’, behoof;” so that it would be identical with δι’ ὑμᾶς τοῖς πιστεύοντας. Nor does it mean toward you believers (de Wette: “This, his conduct, had believers for its object with whom he came into contact;” Hofmann, Auberlen), for (1) σοίως does not suit this meaning; (2) as ύμων τοῖς πιστεύοντεσον is not without emphasis, the unsuitable contrast would arise, that in reference to others the apostle did not esteem the upright conduct necessary. For, with Hammond, to apply ύμων τοῖς πιστεύοντεσον, in contrast to the time when those addressed had not yet been brought to the faith, is grammatically impossible, as then the participle of the aorist without the article must be used; (3) ἐγενήθημεν does not obtain its due force, as the passive form cannot denote pure self-activity. ύμων τοῖς πιστεύοντεσον is, as already Oecumenius and Theophylact (and recently Alford) explain it, the dative of opinion or judgment (see Winer, p. 190 [E. T. 265]; Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 83): for you, believers, so that this was the character, the light in which we appeared to you. Thus an appropriate limitation arises by this addition. For the hostility raised against the apostle, and his expulsion from Thessalonica, clearly showed how far from being general was the recognition that God had enabled the apostle to behave ύσιῶς καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως. Moreover, ὃς όσιῶς κ.τ.λ. ἐγεν. is not equivalent.
to ὁς ὁσιωὶ κ.τ.λ. ἐγένετο. (Schott). The adverbs bring prominently forward the mode and manner, the condition of γενομένου. See Winer, p. 413 [E. T. 582]; Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 337 ff.

Vv. 11, 12 are not a mere further digression into particulars, which we can scarcely assume after the general concluding words in ver. 10, without blaming the author, notwithstanding the freedom of epistolary composition, of great logical arbitrariness and looseness, but are a proof of the general concluding sentence ver. 10, ex analogia. As in all that has hitherto been said the twofold reference to the apostle and his two associates on the one hand, and to the readers on the other, has predominated, so is this also the case in vv. 10–12. The circumstance that he has anxiously and earnestly exhorted his readers to a similar conduct in ὀσίωτης, δικαιοσύνη, and ἀμεμπτωτικα, is asserted by the apostle as a proof that he himself behaved in the most perfect manner (ὁς) among the Thessalonians ὁσιωὶ καὶ δικαλως καὶ ἀμεμπτωτος. For if any one be truly desirous that others walk virtuously, this presupposes the endeavour after virtue in himself. It is thus erroneous when de Wette and Koch, p. 172, think that the apostle in ver. 10 speaks of his conduct generally, and in vv. 11, 12 of his ministerial conduct particularly. In vv. 11, 12 Paul does not speak wholly of his ministerial conduct, for the participles παρακαλοῦντες, παραμυθοῦμενοι, and μαρτυροῦμενοι are not to be taken independently, but receive their full sense only in union with εἰς τὸ περιπατεῖν κ.τ.λ., so that the chief stress in the sentence rests on εἰς τὸ κ.τ.λ., and the accumulation of participles serves only to bring vividly forward the earnestness and urgency of the apostle's exhortation to περιπατεῖν. Entirely erroneous, therefore, is Pelt's idea of the connection: Redit P. ad amorem, quo eos amplectatur, iterum profitendum; for the attestation of love, in the conduct described in vv. 11, 12, is only expressed by the addition: ὅς πατὴρ τέκνα ἐάντος, and is thus only subsidiary to the main thought. — καθάπερ as then, denotes the conformity of what follows to what precedes. As regards the construction: οἴδατε ὁς κ.τ.λ., we miss
a finite tense. Koppe considers that the participles are put instead of the finite tenses, ὡς παρεκαλέσαμεν καὶ παρεμθησάμεθα καὶ ἐμαρτυρησάμεθα, an assertion which we can in the present day the less accept, as it is of itself self-evident that the participles of the present must have another meaning than that which could have been expressed by the finite forms of the aorist, i.e. of the purely historical tense. Others, objecting to the two accusatives, ἐνα ἐκαστον and ὑμᾶς, have united ὑμᾶς with the participle, and suggested a finite tense to ἐνα ἐκαστον, which, at the beginning of the period, must have been in Paul’s mind, but which he forgot to add when dictating to his amanuensis. Vatablus, Er. Schmid, Ostermann would supply to ἐνα ἐκαστον, ἡγαπήσαμεν; Whitby, ἐφελήσαμεν, or ἡγαπήσαμεν, or ἐθάλψαμεν, from ver. 7; Pelt, οὖν ἀφήκαμεν (?); Schott, a verb containing the “notio curandi sive tractandi sive educandi.” But (1) the two accusatives do not at all justify supplying a special verb to ἐνα ἐκαστον, as not only among the classics is the twofold use of personal determinations not rare (see Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 275), but also in Paul’s Epistles there are similar repetitions of the personal object (comp. Col. ii. 13; Eph. ii. 1, 5). (2) To supply ἡγαπήσαμεν, or a similar idea, is in contradiction with the design and contents of vv. 11, 12, as the chief point in these verses is to be sought in the recollection of the impressive exhortations addressed to the Thessalonians to aim at a conduct similar to that of the apostle. Not only the simplest, but the only correct method, is, with Musculus, Wolf, Turretin, Bengel, Alford, and Hofmann, to supply ἐγενηθησαμεν, which has just preceded ver. 10, to ὡς ... παρακα-
λούντες κ.τ.λ. And just because ἐγενήθημεν precedes, the supplying of ἤμεν, which Beza, Grotius, Flatt, and others assume, and which otherwise would be the most natural word, is to be rejected. Accordingly, there is no anacoluthon in vv. 11, 12, but ἐγενήθημεν to be supplied in thought is designedly suppressed by the apostle in order to put the greater emphasis on the verbal ideas, παρακαλεῖν, παραμυθεῖσθαι, and μαρτύρεσθαι. The circumlocutionary form, ἐγενήθημεν παρακ. κ.τ.λ., has this in common with the form ἤμεν παρακ. κ.τ.λ., that it denotes duration in the past, but it is distinguished from it by this, that it does not refer the action of the verb simply as something actually done, and which has had duration in the past; but this action, enduring in the past (and effected by God), is described in its process of completion, i.e. in the phase of its self-development. — ἐνα ἐκαστον ὑμῶν ὡς πατήρ τέκνα ἐαυτοῦ] The thought, according to Flatt, consists in this: the apostle has exhorted and charged, “with a view to the special wants of each, just as a father gives heed to the individual wants of his children.” But ἐνα ἐκαστον ὑμῶν denotes only the carefulness of the exhortation which is addressed to each individual without distinction (of rank, endowment, Chrysostom: Βαβαί ἐν τοσούτῳ πλήθει μηδένα παραλείπειν, μη μικρόν, μη μέγαν, μη πλοῦσιον, μη πένητα), and the addition ὡς πατήρ τέκνα ἐαυτοῦ denotes only paternal love (in contrast to the severity of a taskmaster) as the disposition from which the exhortations proceeded. But in a fitting manner Paul changes the image formerly used of a mother and her children into that of a father and his children, because in the context the point insisted on is not so much that of tender love, which finds its satisfaction in itself, as that of educating love; for the apostle, by his exhortation, would educate the Thessalonians for the heavenly kingdom. That the apostle resided a long time in Thessalonica (Calovius) does not follow from ἐνα ἐκαστον. — παρακαλεῖν] to exhort by direct address. Erroneously Chrysostom, Theophylact: πρὸς τὸ φέρειν πάντα. — ὑμᾶς] resumes ἐνα ἐκαστον ὑμῶν; but whilst that emphatically precedes, this is placed after παρακαλοῦντες, because
here the verb παραξ. has the emphasis (comp. Col. ii. 13). Paul adds ὑμᾶς, which certainly might be omitted, not so much from carelessness or from inadvertence, but for the sake of perspicuity, in order to express the personal object belonging to the participles in immediate connection with them.— Also παραμυθεῖται does not mean here to comfort (Wolf, Schott, and others), but to address, to exhort, to encourage; yet not to encourage to stedfastness, to exhort to moral courage (Oecumenius, Theophylact, de Wette), for the object of παραμυθούμενοι does not follow until ver. 12.

Ver. 12. Μαρτύρεσθαι] (comp. Eph. iv. 17) in the sense of διαμαρτύρεσθαι (1 Tim. v. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1), earnestly conjuring; comp. also Thucyd. vi. 80: ἐδέομεν ἡ καὶ μαρτυρόμεθα ἡμα, and viii. 53: μαρτυρομένον καὶ ἐπιθειαζόντων μὴ κατάγειν, which later passage is peculiarly interesting on this account, because there (as in our verse, see critical notes) most mss. read the meaningless μαρτυρομένων. μαρτυρόμενοι strengthens the two former participles.— εἰς τὸ περιπατεῖν ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] contains not the design (de Wette, Koch), also not the design and effect of the exhortation (Schott), but is the object to all three preceding participles. The meaning is: Calling on you, and exhorting, and adjuring you to a walk worthy of God, i.e. to make such a walk yours. But Christians walk ᾧ ὁ θεός τοῦ Θεοῦ (comp. Col. i. 10; Eph. iv. 1; Rom. xvi. 2; Phil. i. 27; 3 John 6), when they actually prove by their conduct and behaviour that they are mindful of those blessings, which the grace of God has vouchsafed to them, and of the undisturbed blessedness which He promises them in the future. — τοῦ καλοῦντος] The present occurs, because the call already indeed made to the Thessalonians is uninterruptedly continued, until the completion succeeds to the call and invitation, namely, at Christ’s return. The meaning of Hofmann is wide of the mark: that by the present, the call is indicated as such that would become wholly in vain for those who walk unworthily. — βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν] not an ἐν διὰ δυν. to the kingdom of His glory, or to the glory of His kingdom (Turretin, Benson, Bolten, Koppe, Olshausen). Both substantives have the same rank
and the same emphasis. Baumgarten-Crusius erroneously distinguishes βασιλεία and δόξα as the earthly and heavenly kingdom of God. Further, δόξα is not the glory of the Messianic kingdom, which is specially brought forward after the general βασιλεία (de Wette); but God calls the readers to participate in His kingdom (i.e. the Messianic) and in His (God's) glory, for Christians are destined to enter upon the joint possession of the δόξα which God Himself has; comp. Rom. v. 2; Eph. iii. 19.

Ver. 13. Paul in ver. 13 passes from the earnest and self-sacrificing publication of the gospel to the earnest and self-sacrificing reception of the gospel. Erroneously Baumgarten-Crusius: Paul, having taught in what manner he has been among the Thessalonians, shows in vv. 13—16 what he has given to them, namely, a divine thing. — Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο And even in this account. Καὶ, being placed first, connects the more closely what follows with what precedes. Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 11.— διὰ τοῦτο not: "quoniam tam felici successu apud vos evangelium praedicavimus" (Pelt, Bloomfield); for (1) from ver. 1 and onwards the subject spoken of is not the success or effect, but only the character of the apostle’s preaching; (2) the intolerable tautology would arise, as we have preached to you the gospel with such happy success, so we thank God for the happy success of our ministry; (3) lastly, if Paul wished to indicate a reference of ver. 13 to the whole preceding description, he would perhaps have written διὰ ταῦτα, though certainly διὰ τοῦτο might be justified, as vv. 1—12 may be taken together as one idea. According to Schott, διὰ τοῦτο refers back to εἰς τὸ περιπατεῖν: "Quum haec opera in animis vestris ad vitam divina invitationem dignam impellendis minime frustra fuerit collocata, quam vos ejusmodi vitam exhibueritis, ego vicissim cum sociis deo gratias ago assiduas, ὅτι ff." But still a tautology remains, which Schott himself appears to have felt, since he takes καὶ ἡμεῖς in sharp contrast to ὑμᾶς, ver. 12; besides, the ground of this explanation gives way, inasmuch as εἰς τὸ περιπατεῖν can only denote the object, but in no way the result of the exhortations. Also de Wette refers διὰ τοῦτο to εἰς τὸ περιπατεῖν, but
explains it thus: Therefore, because it was so important an object for us (so already Flatt, but who unites what is incapable of being united) to exhort you to a worthy walk. But there is in the preceding no mention of the importance of the object of the apostle's exhortations. Accordingly there remains for διὰ τοῦτο only two connections of thought possible, namely, either to refer to the earnestness and zeal described in vv. 11, 12, with which the exhortations of the apostle were enforced. Then the thought would be: because we have so much applied ourselves to exhort you to walk worthy (Flatt), so we thank God for the blessed result of our endeavours. Or διὰ τοῦτο may be referred to the concluding words of ver. 12: τοῦ καλούντος ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν, so that the meaning is: Because God calls you to such a glorious goal, so we thank God continually that you have understood this call of God which has come to you, and that you have obeyed it. Evidently this last reference, which is found in Zanchius, Balduin, and Olshausen, is to be preferred as the nearest and simplest. So recently also Alford and Auberlen. — καὶ ἡμεῖς] to be taken together, we also. For not only Paul and his companions, but every true Christian who hears of the conduct of the Thessalonians, must be induced to thankfulnessto God. Comp. Eph. i. 15. Hardly correctly, Zanchius, whom Balduin follows, places καὶ in contrast to the Thessalonians: non solum vos propter hanc vocationem debetis agere gratias, sed etiam nos. Erroneously also de Wette; καὶ belongs to the whole clause: therefore also, which would require διὰ καὶ τοῦτο. — εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ Θεῷ] For although the spontaneous conduct of the readers is here spoken of, yet thanks is due to God, who has ordained this spontaneous conduct.— διὸ παραλαβόντες λόγον κ.τ.λ.] The object of εὐχαριστοῦμεν, because that when ye received, etc.— παραλαμβάνειν] which Baumgarten-Crusius erroneously considers as equivalent to δέχεσθαι, indicates the objective reception— the obtaining (comp. Col. ii. 6; Gal. i. 9); δέχεσθαι, on the other hand, is the subjective reception— the acceptance (comp. i. 6; 2 Cor. 1:18 especially Alford: Ὡς αὐτῇ ἐστὶ διακόνησαι καὶ ἐστὶ ἄχρι, i. 7.
viii. 17). — ἀκοή] is used in a passive sense, that which is heard, i.e. the preaching, the message (comp. Rom. x. 16; Gal. iii. 2; John xii. 38). Arbitrarily Pelt; it is that to which one at once shows obedience. παρ' ἡμᾶς is to be closely connected with ἀκοής (Estius, Aretius, Beza, Calixtus, Koppe, Pelt, Schott, Olshausen, Alford, Hofmann, and others), and to the whole idea λόγον ἀκοής παρ' ἡμᾶς is added the more definite characteristic τοῦ Θεοῦ. Thus: the word of God which ye have heard of us, the word of God preached by us. We must not, with Musculus, Piscator, Er. Schmid, Turretin, Fritzsche (on 2 Cor. diss. I. p. 3), de Wette, Koch, and Auberlen, unite παρ resembled with παρασκευάσεις; for against this is not only the order of the words, as we would expect παρασκευάσεις παρ' ἡμᾶς λόγον ἀκοής τοῦ Θεοῦ, whereas in the passage there exists no reason for the separation of the natural connection; but also chiefly the addition of ἀκοής would be strange, as along with παρασκευάσεις παρ' ἡμᾶς it would be superfluous. It is otherwise with our interpretation, in which an important contrast exists, Paul contrasting himself as the mere publisher to the proper author of the gospel; and in which also the construction is unobjectionable (against de Wette), as ἄκοινος παρὰ τινος (see John i. 41) is used, substantives and adjectives often retaining the construction of verbs from which they are derived. See Kühner, II. pp. 217, 245. — τοῦ Θεοῦ] not the objective genitive, the word preached by us which treats of God, i.e. of His purposes of salvation (Erasmus, Vatablus, Musculus, Hunnius, Balduin, Er. Schmid, Grotius), against which the following οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων ... ἄλλα λόγον Θεοῦ is decisive; but the word which proceeds from God, whose author is God Himself. — ἐδέξασθε ye have received it, sc. the word of God preached. — οὐ λόγον κ.τ.λ.] not as the word of man. The addition of a ὡς (οὐχ ὡς λόγον ἀνθρ. ἄλλα ... ὡς λόγον Θεοῦ), dispensable in itself (see Kühner, II. p. 226), is here the rather left out, because the apostle would not only express what the preaching of the word was in the estimation of the Thessalonians, but likewise what it was in point of fact, on which account the parenthesis καθὼς ἔστων ἀληθῶς, according as it is in truth, is emphatically
added. — The Thessalonians received λόγος Θεοῦ as the word of God, seeing they believed it, and were zealous for it. — δὲ is not to be referred to Θεοῦ (Cornelius a Lapide, Bengel, Koppe, Flatt, Auberlen, and others), but to λόγον Θεοῦ (Syr. Ambrose, Erasmus, Estius, Balduin, Aretius, Wolf, Turretin, Benson, Fritzsche, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Koch, Hofmann); for (1) in what immediately precedes, the subject is not Θεὸς, but λόγος Θεοῦ. (2) Paul uses always the active ἐνεργεῖν of God (comp. 1 Cor. xii.6; Gal. ii.8, iii.5; Eph. i.11; Phil. ii.13), and of things the middle ἐνεργεῖσθαι (comp. Gal. v.6; Eph. iii.20; Col. i.29). — ἐνεργεῖσθαι is middle (which is active), not passive (which is made active), as Estius, Hammond, Schultess, Schott, Bloomfield, and others think. — εἰν ὑμῶν τοῖς πιστεύονσιν] does not mean: “ex quo tempore religionem suscepsistis” (Koppe); for then εἰν ὑμῖν πιστεύοσαν would have to be put. Also not: “quum susceperitis” (Pelt), or “propter ea quod fidem habetis” (Schott), because or in so far as, ye believe and continue believing (Olsh. Koch); for if it were a causal statement, the participle πιστεύονσιν without the addition of the article would be put. τοῖς πιστεύονσιν rather serves only for the more precise definition of ὑμῖν, thus indicating that πιστεύοντες belongs to the Thessalonians.

Ver. 14 is not designed, as Oecumenius, Calvin, and Pelt think, to prove the sincerity with which the Thessalonians received the gospel, but is a proof of δὲ καὶ ἐνεργεῖται, ver. 13. In not shunning to endure sufferings for the sake of the gospel, the Thessalonians had demonstrated that the word of God had already manifested its activity among them, had already become a life-power, a moving principle in them. — ὑμεῖς γὰρ] an emphatic resumption of the previous ὑμῶν τοῖς πιστεύονσιν. — μιμηται] imitators, certainly not in intention or design, but in actual fact or result. — ἅδειλθο] The frequent repetition of this address (comp. i.4, ii.1, 9, 17) is significant of the ardent love of Paul toward the church. That Paul compares the conduct of the Thessalonians with that of the Palestinian churches is, according to Calvin, whom Calixtus follows, designed to remove the objection which might easily arise to his readers. As the Jews were the only worshippers

Meyer—1 Thess.
of the true God outside of Christianity, so the attack on Christianity by the Jews might give rise to a doubt whether it were actually the true religion. For the removal of this doubt, the apostle, in the first place, shows that the same fate which had at an earlier period befallen the Palestinian churches had happened to the Thessalonians; and then, that the Jews were the hardened enemies of God and of all sound doctrine. But evidently such a design of the apostle is indicated by nothing, and its supposition is entirely superfluous, as every Christian must with admiration recognise the heroism of Christian resistance to persecution with which the Palestinian churches had distinguished themselves. Accordingly, it was a great commendation of the Thessalonians if the same heroic Christian steadfastness could be predicated of them. This holds good against the much more arbitrary and visionary opinion of Hofmann, that Paul, by the mention of the Palestinian churches, and the expression concerning the Jews there-with connected, designed to meet the erroneous notion or representation of what happened to the readers. As the conversion of the Thessalonians might in an intelligible manner appear in the eyes of their countrymen as a capture of them in the net of a Jewish doctrine, and hence on that side the reproach might be raised that, on account of this strange matter, they had become hostile to their own people; so it was entirely in keeping to show that the apostolic doctrine was anything but an affair of the Jewish people, that, on the contrary, the Jews were its bitterest enemies! Grotius would understand the present participle τῶν οὐσῶν in the sense of the participle of the preterite; whilst, appealing to Acts viii. 4, xi. 19, he thinks that the Palestinian churches had by persecutions ceased to exist as such, only a few members remaining. But neither do the Acts justify such an opinion, nor is it in accordance with the words of Paul in Gal. i. 22. The further supposition which Grotius adds is strange and unhistorical, that some Christians expelled from Palestine had betaken themselves to Thessalonica, and that to them mainly a reference in our passage is made. — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦς

Oecumenius: ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦς διελήφη ἐπειδή γὰρ καὶ αἱ συναγωγαὶ
tῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐν Θεῷ εἰναι δοκοῦσι, τὰς τῶν πιστῶν ἐκεῖσθαι καὶ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ νῷ αὐτοῦ λέγει εἰναι. — ὅτι] for. — τὰ αὐτά] the like things, denotes the general similarity of the sufferings endured. Grotius precariously specifies them by res vestras amisistas, pars fuistis ejectis. — συμφυλέτης] of the same φυλή, belonging to the same natural stock, contribulis, then generally countryman, fellow-countryman, ὁμοεθνής (Hesychius). Comp. Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 172, 471. By συμφυλέται we are naturally not to understand the Jews (Cornelius a Lapide, Hammond, Joachim Lange); for that the expression is best suited to them, as Braun (with Wolf) thinks, whilst possibly Jews of a particular tribe (perhaps of the tribe of Juda or Benjamin) were resident in Thessalonica, only merits to be mentioned on account of its curiosity. Also συμφυλέται is not, with Calvin, Piscator, Bengel, and others, to be understood both of Jews and Gentiles, but can only be understood of Gentiles. To this we are forced—(1) by the sharp contrast of συμφυλέτῶν and Ἰουδαίων, which must be considered as excluding each other; (2) by the addition of ἰδιών to συμφυλέτῶν, as the great majority of the Thessalonian church consisted of Gentiles; comp. i. 9. However, although Paul in the expression συμφυλέτῶν speaks only of Gentiles as persecutors, yet the strong invective against the Jews which immediately follows (vv. 15, 16) constrains us to assume that the apostle in ver. 14 had more in his mind than he expressed in words. As we learn from the Acts, it was, indeed, the heathen magistrates by whose authority the persecutions against the Christian church at Thessalonicæ proceeded, but the proper originators and instigators were here also the Jews; only they could not excite the persecution of the Christians directly, as the Jews in Palestine, but, hemmed in by the existing laws, could only do so indirectly, namely, by stirring up the heathen mob. This circumstance, united with the repeated experience of the inveterate spirit of opposition of the Jews, which Paul had in Asia at a period directly preceding this Epistle (perhaps also shortly before its composition at Corinth), is the natural and easily psychologically explanatory occasion of the polemic in vv. 15, 16. Erroneously
Olshausen gives the reason; he thinks it added in order to turn the attention of the Christians in Thessalonica to the intrigues of those men with whom the Judaizing Christians stood on a level, as it was to be foreseen that they would not leave this church also undisturbed; against which view de Wette correctly remarks, that there is no trace of such a warning, and that the Thessalonians did not require it, as they had learned sufficiently to know the enmity of the Jews against the gospel. — καθὼς] Instead of this, properly ἄ or ἄπερ should have been put, corresponding to τὰ αὐτά (comp. Phil. i. 30, τὸν αὐτὸν . . . οἶνον). However, even in the classics such inexact connections are very frequently found. See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 426 f.; Bremi, ad Demosth. adv. Phil. I. p. 137; Kühner, II. p. 571. The double καὶ (καὶ ἕμείς . . . καὶ αὐτοί) brings out the comparison. — αὐτοὶ] denotes not the apostle and his assistants (Erasmus, Musculus, Er. Schmid), as such a prominent incongruity in the comparison is inconceivable; but the masculine as a recognised free construction (comp. Gal. i. 22, 23) refers to τὸν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, thus denotes the Palestinian Christians.

Vv. 15, 16. As to the occasion of this invective, see on ver. 14. — καὶ] not signifying even; also not to be connected with the next καὶ, both . . . and; but τὸν καὶ means who also, and proves the propriety of the preceding statement from the analogous conduct in ver. 15. Grotius (comp. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Pelagius): Quid mirum est, si in nos saeviunt, qui dominum nostrum interfecerunt . . . ? . . . Non debent discipuli meliorem sortem exspectare quam magistri fuit. — Moreover, τὸν κύριον emphatically precedes, and is separated from Ἰησοῦν in order to enhance the enormity of the deed. — καὶ τοὺς προφήτας] De Wette and Koch unite this with ἐκδιωκόντων; Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calvin, Musculus, Bengel, Pelt, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bloomfield, Alford, Hofmann, Auberlen, and most critics, more correctly refer it to ἀποκτείνοντων. In the catalogue of the sins of the Jews which Paul here adduces, he begins directly with that deed which formed the climax of their wickedness—the murder of the Son of God, of Jesus.
the Messiah. In order to cut off all excuses for this atrocious deed of the Jews, as that they had done it in ignorance, not recognising Jesus as the Son of God, Paul adds, going backwards in time, that they had already done the same to the Old Testament prophets, whom, in like manner, they had murdered against their better knowledge and conscience. Christ Himself accuses the Jews of the murder of the prophets, Matt. xxiii. 31, 37, Luke xi. 47 ff., xiii. 34; and Stephen does the same, Acts vii. 52; with which passages comp. 1 Kings xix. 10, 14 (see Rom. xi. 3); Jer. ii. 30; Neh. ix. 26. — καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐκδιώξαντον and have persecuted us. ἡμᾶς refers not to Paul only (Calvin), also not to Paul and Silas only (de Wette, Koch, Alford), or to Paul and the companions who happened to be with him at Thessalonica (Auberlen); but to Paul and the apostles generally (Estius, Arctius, Bengel, Koppe, Flatt, Pelt, Schott). The preposition ἐκ in ἐκδιώξαντον strengthens the verbal idea. In an unjustifiable manner, Koppe and de Wette (the latter appealing to Luke xi. 49 and Ps. cxix. 157, LXX.) make it stand for the simple verb. — καὶ Θεῷ μὴ ἀρεσκόντων] and please not God. Erroneously Wieseler on Gal. i. 10, p. 41, note, and Hofmann: live not to please God; similarly Bengel, Koppe, Flatt, and Baumgarten-Crusius: placere non quaerentium; for after the preceding strong expressions that would be flat. Rather the result is inferred from the two preceding statements, namely, the consequences of the obstinacy of the Jews, with which they persecute the messengers of God, is that they please not God, that is, are hateful to Him (Θεοστυγεῖς, Μειοσίς). — καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐναντίων] and are hostile to all men. Grotius, Turretin, Michaelis, Koppe, Olshhausen, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Koch, Bloomfield, Jowett, and others, erroneously find here expressed the narrow exclusiveness, by means of which the Jews strictly separated themselves from all other nations, and about which Tacit. Hist. v. 5 ("adversus omnes alios odium"); Juvenal, Sat. xiv. 103 ff.; Diod. Sic. xxxiv. p. 524; Philostr. Apollon. v. 33; Joseph. c. Apion. ii. 10, 14, wrote. For (1) that hostile odium and desire of separation among the Jews was nothing else than a shrinking from staining them-
selves and their monotheistic worship by contact with idolaters. But Paul would certainly not have blamed such a shrinking, which was only a fruit of their strict observance of their ancestral religion. (2) If ver. 16 begins with an independent assertion, κωλύντων . . . σωθῶσιν would denote nothing essentially new, but would only repeat what was already expressed in ἡμᾶς ἐκδιώξαντον, ver. 15. (3) It is grammatically inadmissible to understand the words καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐναντίον as an independent assertion, and thus to be considered as a general truth. For the participle κωλύντων (ver. 16) must contain a causal statement, as it is neither united with καὶ, nor by an article (καὶ κωλύντων κ.τ.λ. or τῶν κωλύντων κ.τ.λ., or τῶν καὶ κωλύντων κ.τ.λ.), and thus is closely and directly connected with the preceding, and giving a reason for it, i.e. explaining wherefore or in what relation the Jews are to be considered as πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐναντίοι. Thus the thought necessarily is: And who actually proved themselves to be hostilely disposed to all men since they hindered us from publishing the gospel to the Gentiles, and thus leading them to salvation. That is to say, the gospel offers salvation to every one, without distinction, who will surrender himself to it. But the Jews, in opposing themselves with all their might to the publication of this free and universal gospel, prove themselves, in point of fact, as enemies to the whole human race, in so far as they will not suffer the gospel, which alone can save men, to reach them. So Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calovius, Bern. a Piconio, Schott, Alford, Hofmann, and others correctly interpret the words; also Wieseler on Gal. i. 10, p. 49, note, and Auberlen, only that he would incorrectly unite καὶ Θεῷ μὴ ἀρεσκόντων with κωλύντων, which would only be tenable if, instead of the simple connected clause καὶ Θεῷ μὴ ἀρεσκόντων, the more definitely separating form τῶν Θεῶν κ.τ.λ. had been put.1 — κωλύντων ἡμᾶς] hindering us, namely, by contradictions, calumnies, laying snares for our life, etc. Comp. Acts ix.

1 The article τῶν, wanting before καὶ Θεῷ μὴ ἀρεσκόντων, makes it likewise impossible to make the two last καὶ in ver. 15 to signify, with Hofmann, “both . . . and.”
23 ff., xiii. 45, xvii. 5, 13, xxii. 22. Unnecessarily, Pelt, Schott, de Wette, Koch, seeking to hinder; for the intrigues of the Jews are an actual hindrance to the preaching of the apostle,—certainly not an absolute, but a partial hindrance, conditioned by opportunity of place and influence. — ήμᾶς] as above, us the apostles. — τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] to the Gentiles, with emphasis; for it was the preaching to the Gentiles that enraged the Jews. τοῖς ἔθνεσιν resumes the previous πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, as that expression comprehended the non-Jewish humanity, i.e. the Gentile world. — λαλήσατε] is not to be taken absolutely, so that it would be equivalent to docere (Koppe, Flatt), or would require τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ for its completion (Piscator), but is to be conjoined with ἵνα σωθῶσιν in one idea, and the whole is then another expression for ἐναγγελίζοντες, but in a more impressive form. — εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρώσας κ.τ.λ. to fill up their sins always. εἰς does not denote the result = ὅστε or quod fit ut (Musculus, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Koppe, Flatt, Pelt, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, Koch, Bloomfield), but the object, the design; and that not of κακιόντων (Hofmann), as this is a dependent clause, but of the whole description. But it expresses not the ultimate design which the Jews themselves, in their so acting, had either consciously (Oecumenius: φησί γάρ, διὶ πάντα ἐποίησαν οἱ Ionuδοί, σκοπῶ τοῦ ἀμαρτάνειν ἐποίουν, τουτέστιν ἤδεισαν, ὅτι ἀμαρτάνουσι καὶ ἡμᾶρτανον) or unconsciously (de Wette: they do it, though unconsciously, to the end, etc.; Auberlen), so that an ironical expression would have to be assumed (Schott). But in entire conformity with the Pauline mode of thought, which delights to dive into the eternal and secret counsels of God, it expresses the design which God has with this sinfulness of the Jews. So, correctly, Piscator. God's counsel was to make the Jews reach in their hardness even to the extreme point of their sinfulness, and then, instead of the past long-suffering and patience, the severity of anger and punishment was to commence. — ἀναπληρώσας τὰς ἁμαρτιάς] to fill up their sins, i.e. to fill up the measure destined for them, to bring them to the prescribed point; comp. LXX. Gen. xv. 16; 2 Macc. vi. 14. — αὐτῶν]
refers to the subject of the preceding verses—the Jews. — 
πάντοτε[ emphatically placed at the end, is not equivalent to 
πάντως or παντελῶς (Bretnscheider, Olshausen), on all sides, 
in every way (Baumgarten-Crusius), but merely involves the 
notion of time, always, that is, the Jews before Christ, at the 
time of Christ, and after Christ, have opposed themselves to 
the divine truth, and thus have been always engaged in filling 
up the measure of their iniquities. (Oecumenius: Ταύτα δὲ 
καὶ πάλαι ἐπὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἔφ' 
ήμων ἐπραξαν, ὅνα πάντοτε ἀναπληροθῶσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῶν.) 
When, however, the apostle says that this ἀναπληρῶσιν τὰς 
ἁμαρτίας is practised by the Jews πάντοτε, at all times, his 
meaning cannot be that the Jews had at any given moment, 
thus already repeatedly, filled up the measure of their sins 
(Musculus), but he intends to say that at every division of 
time the conduct of the Jews was of such a nature that the 
general tendency of this continued sinful conduct was the 
filling up of the measure of their sins. Paul thus conceives 
that the Jews, at every renewed obstinate rejection of the 
truth, approached a step nearer to the complete measure of 
their sinfulness. ἔφθασε δὲ ἐπὶ αὐτοῖν ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος] but 
the wrath has come upon them even to the end. The Vulgate, 
Luther, Beza, Wolf, erroneously take δὲ in the sense of γὰρ. 
Rather, δὲ forms the contrast to ἀναπληρῶσιν πάντοτε (not to 
the whole preceding description), in so far as the increase of 
the divine wrath is contrasted to the continued wicked conduct 
of the Jews. — φθάνειν[ contains, in classical usage, the idea 
of priority in time. Schott thinks that this idea must also be 
here preserved, whilst he finds indicated therein the ὀργή 
breaking forth upon the Jews citius quam exspectaverint vel 
omino praeter opinionem eorum. Incorrectly; for when 
φθάνειν is united not with the accusative of the person 
(comp. iv. 15), but with prepositions (φθάνειν εἰς τι, Rom. 
ix. 31 [see Fritzche in loco]; Phil. iii. 16; φθάνειν ἄχρι τινός, 
2 Cor. ix. 14; φθάν. ἐπὶ τινα, Matt. xii. 28; Dan. iv. 25), 
then, in the later Greek, the meaning of the verb “to antici-
pate” is softened into the general meaning of reaching the 
intended end. The aorist ἔφθασε is not here to be taken in
the sense of the present (Grotius, Pelt), also not prophetically instead of the future (Koppe: mox eveniet iis; Flatt: it will certainly befall them, and also it will soon befall them; and so also Schott, Bloomfield, Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. f. wissenschaft. Theol., Halle 1862, p. 239), but reports in quite a usual manner a fact which already belongs to the past. — \( \dot{\eta} \dot{\omicron} \rho\gamma\eta \) \textit{sc. \Theta\epsilon\sigma\omega}, does not mean the divine \textit{punishment}, which certainly in itself it may denote (Erasmus, Musculus, Cornelius a Lapide, Flatt, Schott, de Wette, Ewald), but the divine \textit{wrath}. The article \( \dot{\eta} \) denotes either the wrath predicted by the prophets (Theophylact, Schott), or generally the wrath which is merited (Oecumenius). — \( \epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\sigma \) belongs to the whole sentence \( \xi\phi\theta\alpha\sigma\epsilon \ldots \dot{\omicron} \rho\gamma\eta \), and denotes \textit{even to its} (the wrath's) \textit{end}, \textit{i.e.} the wrath of God has reached its extreme limits, so that it must \textit{now} discharge itself,—now, in the place of hitherto long-suffering and patience, \textit{punishment} must step in. The actual \textit{outbreak} of the wrath, the punishment itself, has thus \textit{not yet} occurred at the composition of this Epistle. To interpret the words of the destruction of Jerusalem \textit{as already happened}, would be contrary to the context. On the other hand, it is to be assumed that Paul, from the by no means dark signs of the times, had by presentiment foreseen the \textit{impending catastrophe} of the Jewish people, and by means of this foresight had expressed the concluding words of this verse. It is accordingly an unnecessary arbitrariness when Ritschl (Hall. A. Lit. Z. 1847, No. 126) explains the words \( \xi\phi\theta\alpha\sigma \ldots \tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\sigma \) as a gloss. Incorrectly, Camerarius, Er. Schmid, Homberg, Koch, and Hofmann understand \( \epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\sigma \) in the sense of \( \tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\sigma, \textit{penititus} \). Also incorrectly, Heinsius, Michaelis, Bolten, Wahl: \textit{postremo, tandem}. Others erroneously unite \( \epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\sigma \) with \( \dot{\eta} \dot{\omicron} \rho\gamma\eta \), whilst they supply \( \sigma\nu\sigma \), and then either explain it: the wrath which will endure eternally or to the end of the world (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Theodoret, Fab. Stapulens., Hunnius, Seb. Schmid, and others); or: the wrath which will continue to work until its full manifestation (Olsenhagen); or lastly: the wrath which shall end with their (the Jews') destruction (Flatt). In all these suppositions the article \( \dot{\eta} \) must be repeated before \( \epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\sigma \). Erroneously, moreover
de Wette refers εἰς τέλος to the Jews, although he unites it with the verb: "so as to make an end of them." So also Bloomfield and Ewald: "even to complete eradication." The apostle rather preserves the figure used in ἀναπληρώσας; namely, as there is a definite measure for the sins of the Jews, at the filling up of which the divine wrath must discharge itself; so also there exists a definite measure for the long-suffering patience of God, whose fulness provokes divine punishment. Comp. also Rom. ii. 5.

**Remark.**—In vv. 14–16, Baur (see Introd. § 4) finds a "particularly noticeable" criterion for the spuriousness of the Epistle. "The description has a thoroughly un-Pauline stamp," and, besides, betrays a dependence on the Acts. First of all, the comparison of the Thessalonian church with the Palestinian churches is "far-fetched," although nothing is more simple, more natural, and more unforced than these very parallels, since the tertium comparationis consists simply in this, that both were persecuted by their own countrymen, and both endured their persecutions with similar heroic courage. The parallels are further "inappropriate" to Paul, as he does not elsewhere hold up the Jewish-Christians as a pattern to the Gentile-Christians. As if the repeated collections which the apostle undertook for the poor churches of Palestine had not demonstrated by fact that his love extended itself equally to the Jewish as to the Gentile churches! As if the words of the apostle, in 2 Cor. viii. 13–15, did not express a high esteem for the Palestinian Jewish-Christians! As if, in Rom. xv. 27, the Gentile churches are not called debtors to the Jewish-Christians, because the spiritual blessings of Christianity reached the Gentiles only from the mother church of Jerusalem! As if Paul himself, after the fiercest persecutions, and after openly manifested obstinacy, did not always cleave to his people with such unselfish and solicitous love, that he could wish in his own person to be banished and driven from Christ, who was his all in all, in order by such an exchange to make his hardened and always resisting fellow-countrymen partakers of salvation in Christ! But if such were his feelings toward the unconverted among his people, why should he not have been proud of those among them who believed? Why should he not have recognised the heroic faith of the Palestinian brethren, and recognised and praised the steadfastness of a Gentile church as an imitation and emulation of the pattern given by these?—Further, the mention of the persecutions of the Palestinian Christians was inappropriate, be-
cause Paul could not speak of them "without thinking of himself as the person principally concerned in the only persecution which can have come properly into consideration." But how little importance there is in such an inference is evident from this, that Paul elsewhere does not shun openly to confess his share in the persecutions of the Christians, although with a sorrowful heart (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 9; Gal. i. 13); and, besides, this very participation in the persecution was for him the occasion that, from being the bitterest enemy of Christianity, he became its most unwearied promoter and the greatest apostle of Christ. If, further, "the apostle unites his own sufferings for the sake of the gospel with the misdeeds of the Jews against Jesus and the prophets," this serves strikingly to represent the continuation of Jewish perversity.—Baur may be right when he asserts that we could not expect from the apostle "a polemic against the Jews so general and vague, that he knew not how to characterize the enmity of the Jews against the gospel than by the well-known charge brought against them by the Gentiles, the odium generis humani;" only it is a pity that this odium generis humani is an abortion of false exegesis.—Baur infers a dependence upon the Acts from "the expressions: ἐκδίωκεν, ἐκδόλεν, etc., which correspond accurately with the incidents described in Acts xvii. 5 ff. and elsewhere;" likewise from the verb λαλικ, which "elsewhere is never used by Paul of his own preaching of the gospel, but is quite after the manner of the Acts (xiv. 1, xvi. 6, 32, xviii. 9)." But that the expressions: ἐκδίωκεν, ἐκδόλεν, etc., cannot be borrowed from Acts xvii. 5 ff. is evident enough, as they are not even found there; that, moreover, the circumstances of the persecution itself are narrated in both writings, is only a proof of its actual occurrence; also there is nothing objectionable in λαλικ as it is so used by Paul in 2 Cor. ii. 17, iv. 13; Col. iv. 4; Eph. vi. 20, and elsewhere.—Lastly, if Baur, in ἰραθεὶς δὲ ἐστ’ αὐτοῖς ἡ ὅργῃ καὶ τίλος (so also Schrader on iii. 13), finds the destruction of Jerusalem denoted as an event that has already occurred, this is only the result of an interpretation contrary to the context.

Ver. 17 begins a new section of the Epistle.—‘Ἡμεῖς δὲ] is not in contrast to ἦμεῖς, ver. 14 (de Wette, Koch, Hofmann); for ver. 14 is only an explanation of the main thought in ver. 13, and, besides, the invective against the Jews given in vv. 15, 16 is too marked and detailed, that δὲ passing over it could be referred to ἦμεῖς in ver. 14. It is therefore best
to assume that ἢμεῖς δέ, whilst it contrasts the writer to the Jews whose machinations have just been described, and accordingly breaks off the polemic against the Jews, refers to ver. 13 as the preceding main thought, and accordingly resumes the ἢμεῖς in ver. 13. To the attestation of his thanksgiving to God on account of the earnest acceptance of the gospel on the part of the Thessalonians, the apostle joins the attestation of his longing for his readers, and his repeatedly formed resolution to return to them. The view of Calvin, which Musculus, Zanchius, Hunnius, Piscator, Vorstius, Gomarus, Benson, Macknight, Pelt, Hofmann, and Auberlen maintain, is erroneous, that vv. 17 ff. were added by Paul as an excusatio “ne se a Paulo desertos esse putarent Thessalonicenses, quum tanta necessitas ejus praesentiam flagitaret.” For evidently in the circumstances that constrained the apostle to depart from Thessalonica, such a suspicion could not arise, especially as, according to Acts xvii. 10, the Thessalonians themselves had arranged the departure of the apostle. Accordingly no justification was requisite. The explanation has rather its origin only in the fulness of the apostolic Christian love, which cared and laboured for the salvation of these recent disciples of Christ.—ἀπορροφανοθεντες] bereaved. ὀρφανοῖς ξεσθαί is originally used of children who are deprived of their parents by death. It is however used, even by the classics, in a wider sense, expressing in a figurative and vivid manner the deprivation of an object, or the distance, the separation from a person or thing. Thus the adjective ὀρφανός occurs in Pindar (see Passow) in a wider sense (e.g. ὀφ. ἐταίρον, Isthm. vii. 16); also of parents, ὀρφανοῖ γενεάς, childless, Ol. ix. 92; comp. Hesych.: ὀρφανός ὁ γονέων ἑστερημένος καὶ τέκνων. Here also ἀπορροφανοθεντες expresses the idea of distance, of separation, but is not exhausted by this idea. We would accordingly err, if we were to find nothing further in it than is expressed by χωρισθέντες; for the verb, in union with the feeling of tender love which pervades the whole passage, vividly describes the feeling of emptiness and solitude which by the separation came over the apostle—a feeling of solitude, such as befalls children when they are placed in a condition of orphanage.—
CHAP. II. 17.

ἀφ’ ἵματιν] away from you. The apostle repeats the preposition ἀπό, instead of putting the simple genitive ἵματιν after the participle, in order to give prominence to the idea of local severance, which was already expressed in ἀπορφανισθέντες, here once more specified by itself. — πρὸς καρδίαν ὀρασίν] not subito (Balduin, Turretin), literally, for the space of an hour; but as an hour is relatively only a short space, generally "for the space of an instant," i.e. for a very short period.¹ It is a more definite expression for the simple πρὸς ὀρασιν, Gal. ii. 5, 2 Cor. vii. 8, Philem. 15, John v. 35, or πρὸς καρδίαν, 1 Cor. vii. 5, Luke viii. 13, and corresponds to the Latin horae momentum. Comp. Hor. Sat. I. 1. 7, 8: "horae | momento aut cita mors venit aut victoria laeta." Plin. Nat. Hist. vii. 52: "Eidem (sc. Maecenati) triennio supremo nullo horae momento contiguit somnus." The expression does not import that the apostle even now hopes soon to return to the Thessalonians (Flatt; and appealing to iii. 10, de Wette and Koch). This is forbidden by the grammatical relation of ἀπορφανισθέντες to the preterite ἐπουθισάμεν, according to which πρὸς καρδίαν ὀρασίν can only be the time indicated by the participle. Thus the sense is: After we were separated from you for scarcely an instant, that is, for a very short season, our longing to return to you commenced. — ἵππον τῷ οὐ καρδίᾳ] comp. 2 Cor. v. 12, in presence, not in heart, for the severance refers only to our bodies; but love is not bound in the fetters of place or time; comp. Col. ii. 5. — περισσοτέρως ἐπουθισάμεν] we endeavoured so much the more. σπουδάζειν, to show diligence to reach something, implies in itself that the apostle had already taken steps to realize his resolution to return, and thus proves the earnestness of the design. περισσοτέρως is not to be referred to οὐ καρδίᾳ, "more than if I had been separated from you in heart" (de Wette, Koch), for then there could have been no mention of a σπουδάζειν

¹ The assertion of Hofmann, that πρὸς καρδίαν ὀρασίν "cannot possibly denote how long it was since Paul had been separated from the Thessalonians, but only how long this was to happen: as he was obliged to be separated from them, yet this separation was not for ever," etc., could only have a meaning if instead of the passive form ἀπορφανισθέντες a participle had been put, which denoted the free action of the apostle.
at all;¹ but is, with Schott, to be referred to πρὸς καὶ ἄρας, so much the more, as the separation has only recently occurred. For it is a matter of universal experience, that the pain of separation from friends, and the desire to return to them, are more vivid, the more freshly the remembrance of the parting works in the spirit, i.e. the less time has elapsed since the parting. Therefore the explanation of Oecumenius and Theophylact, after Chrysostom, is unpsychological: περισσοτέρως ἐσπονδάσαμεν ἣ ὡς εἰκός ἡν τοὺς πρὸς ἄραν ἀπολευθέντας.

Winer's view (Gram. p. 217 [E. T. 305]) is also inappropriate, because without support in the context: The loss of their personal intercourse for a time had made his longing greater than it would have been, if he had stood with them in no such relation. Further, arbitrarily, because the proximate reference of ἐπιτιθύμησις can only result from the directly preceding participial sentence, but not from ver. 14, Fromond.: “magis et ardentius conati sumus, quum sciremus pericula, in quibus versaremini;” and Hofmann: “for the readers the time after their conversion is a time of trouble; for their teachers it is on that account a time of so much the more anxious endeavour to see them again.” Lastly, grammatically incorrect Turretin, Olshausen, and de Wette, ed. 1, more than usual, i.e. very earnestly.— Schott discovers an elegance and force in Paul, not having written ἤμα τε ἵδει, but the fuller form τὸ πρῶσωπον ὑμῶν ἵδει, with reference to the preceding προσώπῳ; but hardly correct, as τὸ πρῶσωπον ἵδει is a usual form with Paul. Comp. iii. 10; Col. ii. 1.— ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιτιθύμησις] with much desire (longing). A statement of manner added to ἐσπονδάσαμεν, for the sake of strengthening.

Ver. 18. Διὸ τί] on which account, that is, on account of this great longing for you (διὰ τὸ ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιτιθύμησις σπονδάζεις τὸ πρῶσωπον ὑμ. ἱδεῖ). — θελήσαμεν] Paul uses θέλειν in agreement with ἐσπονδάσαμεν (ver. 17), not βουλέσθαι, as the latter word expresses only the wish, the inclination to some-

¹ This reference is in a positive form expressed logically more correctly by Musculus: “quomagiscorde praesens vobisculam, hoc abundantius faciem vestram videre studui;” and Baumgarten-Crusius: with so much the greater desire, because I was sincere with you.
thing; but the former the active will, the definite purpose. See Meyer on Philem. 13 f., and Tittm. Synon. p. 124 ff. But whether this purpose was already formed at Berea (Fromond., Baumgarten-Crusius), or elsewhere, cannot be determined. — ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος] a restriction of the subject contained in ἡθελήσαμεν, as the apostle in this section intends only to speak of himself. But that he considered the addition ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος here necessary, whilst he omitted it in what preceded, is a proof that he there regarded what was said as spoken likewise in the name of his two associates. Moreover, ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος is an actual parenthesis, and is not to be connected with καὶ ἄπαξ καὶ δίς, as Hofmann thinks, from the insufficient reason, because otherwise ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος must have stood after ἡθελήσαμεν (?); and as we find also with Grotius, who makes a suppressed δὲ correspond to the μὲν, in the sense: "nempe Timotheus et Silas semel." 1 — Μὲν] serves only to bring the subject into prominence. See Hartung, Partikell. II. p. 413. — καὶ ἄπαξ καὶ δίς] both once and twice, a definite expression for twice (comp. Phil. iv. 16); not in the general sense of saepius (Grotius, Joachim Lange, Turretin, Koppe, Pelt), for then ἄπαξ καὶ δίς would have been written. Calvin: "Quum dicit semel et bis voluimus, testatur non subitum fuisse fervorem, qui statim refrexerit, sed hujus propositi se fuisse tenacem." A longer continuance of the church (Baur) is not to be assumed from this expression, as the interval of probably half a year, which is to be assumed between the departure of Paul from Thessalonica and the composition of this Epistle (see Introd. § 3), was a period sufficiently long to give rise to the twice formed resolution to return.— καὶ ἐνεκόψει ἡμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς] and Satan hindered us. καὶ, not equivalent with δὲ, by which certainly this new sentence might have been introduced (Vorstius, Grotius, Benson, Koppe, Schott, Olshausen, de Wette, Koch, Bloomfield), mentions simply the result of the apostle's resolution in the form of juxtaposition. In an unnatural and forced manner

1 Comp. also Wurm, Tüb. Zeitschr. 1833, 1, p. 75 f., ἐγὼ καὶ Παῦλος is to be united directly with καὶ ἄπαξ καὶ δίς. All three had resolved to visit the Thessalonians, but Paul particularly more than once.
Hofmann subordinates ἠθελήσαμεν εἰλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς as the antecedent to καὶ ἐνέκοψεν ὑμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς as the principal sentence, whilst διότι denotes while, and ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ (ver. 17) is "in intention added to the sentence introduced by διότι." Accordingly the sense would be: Therefore the anxiety to visit the church became so strong, that when it came to the intention to go to Thessalonica, Satan hindering prevented it (!).— On ἐγκόπτειν, comp. Rom. xv. 22; Gal. v. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 7.— ὁ σατανᾶς] denotes not "the opponents of Christianity, the enemies of God and men" (Schrader), but, according to the Pauline view, the personal author of evil, the devil, who, as he is the author of all hindrances in the kingdom of God, has brought about the circumstances which prevented the apostle from carrying out his purpose. But whether, under these preventive circumstances occasioned by the devil, are to be understood the wickedness of the Thessalonian Jews (Fromond., Schott, de Wette, Bisping), "qui insidias apostolo in itinere struebant" (Quistorp and, though wavering, Zanchius), or the contentions of the church where Paul was, and which prevented his leaving them (Musculus), or even the "injecta ei necessitas disputandi saepius cum Stoiciis et Epicureis, qui Athenis erant" (Grotius), or what else, must be left unexplained, as Paul himself has given no explanation.

Ver. 19. A reason not for περισσοτέρως ἐσπονδάσαμεν τὸ πρῶτον ὑμῶν ἰδεῖν, ver. 17 (Hofmann), but of the twice formed resolution of the apostle to return to Thessalonica, ver. 18. This earnest desire to return is founded on the esteem of the apostle for his readers, on account of their promising Christian qualities. Grotius: Construì haec sic debent: τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐλπίς ... ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ κυρίου ... ἢ οὐχὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς; Certainly correct as regards the matter and the thought, as ἐμπροσθεν ... παρουσία is to be referred to the preceding predicates, but ought not to be connected with ἢ οὐχὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς, as a second independent question. So also Olshausen, who renders it thus: "or do not ye also (as I myself and all the rest of the faithful) appear before Christ at His coming, i.e. without hesitation, without any doubt, ye will surely be also recognised by Christ as His, and therefore will
not fall away again at any time from the faith.” But the reason and justification for this strange position of the words consist in this, that Paul originally conjoined the words τὸς γὰρ ... ἕμειν in thought, and originally wrote them by themselves; but then to present the predicates already put down as considered not in a worldly, but in a specifically Christian sense, he introduces, as a closer definition and explanation of the whole clause τὸς ... ἕμειν, the words ἐμπροσθεν ... παρουσία. There is, accordingly, no need for the supposition of Laurent (Neutestam. Studien, Gotha 1866, p. 28 f.), that Paul only at a later period, after he had read through the whole Epistle once, placed these words in the margin, or ordered them to be inserted. Accordingly, the apostle says: For who is our hope or joy or crown of rejoicing, or are not even ye this? before our Lord Jesus at His coming; i.e., if any one deserves to be called our hope, etc., ye deserve it. As the addition ἐμπροσθεν κ.τ.λ. proves that the apostle thinks on the judgment connected with the coming of Christ.— Paul, however, calls the Thessalonians ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν (comp. Liv. xxviii. 39), not because he anticipates a reward for himself on account of the conversion of the Thessalonians effected by him (Estius, Fromond., Joachim Lange, Hofmann, and most critics), or at least a remission of the punishment for his early persecution of the Christian church (for the emphasis rests not on ἡμῶν, but on the predicates ἐλπὶς κ.τ.λ.), but because he has the confident hope that the Thessalonians will not be put to shame at the trial to be expected at the advent, but will rather be found pure and blameless, as those who embraced the faith with eagerness, and heroically persevered in it in spite of all contentions.— ἡ χαρά] or joy, as by the conversion and Christian conduct of the Thessalonians the kingdom of God has been promoted.— ἡ στέφανος καυχήσεως] or crown of glory (comp. ἡμῖν ἡμῶν, Ezek. xvi. 12, xxiii. 42; Prov. xvi. 31, and also the LXX.; Phil. iv. 1; Soph. Aj. 460; Macrob. in somn. Scip. i. 1), inasmuch as this greatness and glory, occasioned by the labours of the apostle for the church, is, as it were, the victorious reward of his strivings.— ἡ ὁμοιότης] not nonne (Erasmus, Schott, and others), but an non, for ἡ here.
introduces the second member of a double question. — καὶ ὑμεῖς also ye: for, besides the Thessalonians, there were other churches planted by Paul worthy of the same praise. According to de Wette, to whom Koch and Bisping attach themselves, ἢ ὑμεῖς should properly have followed στέφανον. καὶ ναῦσας. “no one is more our hope than you;” but with καὶ the apostle corrects himself, not to say too much, and not to offend other churches. But just because ὑμεῖς imports too much, why should not the apostle have designed to put ὡς καὶ ὑμεῖς from the very first! — ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ at his coming (return) to establish the Messianic kingdom (comp. iii. 13, iv. 15, v. 23, et al.; Usteri, Lehrbegr. p. 341 ff.) an epegegesis to ἐμπροσθέν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ.

Ver. 20. An impassioned answer to the question in ver. 19. Thus γάρ is not causal, but confirmatory, ye or truly ye are (ὑμεῖς ἐστέ, emphatic) our glory and our joy. Comp. Winer, p. 396 [E. T. 558]; Hartung, Partikell. I. p. 473. Flatt and Hofmann refer ver. 19 to the future, to the παρουσία Χριστοῦ, and ver. 20 to the present: “Ye are now our glory and our joy, therefore I hope that ye will be yet more,” etc. Without justification, as this distinction of time would have been marked by Paul.
CHAPTER III.

VER. 1. Elz. has ἡδ. Διότι, found in B, is a mere error of the transcriber, occasioned by the following μηκετι. — VER. 2. After τὸ δᾶλφον ἡμῖν the Receptus has καὶ διάκονον τοῦ Ἑσύ καὶ συνεργὸν ἡμῖν. Defended by Bouman (Chartae theol. Lib. I. p. 63 f.) and Reiche. But instead of this, Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. 2 and 7, and Alford, after D* Clar. Germ. Ambrosiast., have correctly received into the text καὶ συνεργὸν τοῦ Ἑσύ, from which all variations are explained. In order to remove the objectionable character which the expression συνεργὸς τοῦ Ἑσύ appeared to have, sometimes τοῦ Ἑσύ was suppressed (so the reading received by Tisch. 1, καὶ συνεργὸν, in B, Arm.), at other times συνεργὸν was changed into διάκονον (καὶ διάκονον τοῦ Ἑσύ, A Ν, 67**, 71, et al., Copt. Aeth. Vulg. Bas. Pel. [in textu]; approved by Scholz), from which further grew, by blending with the original wording, διάκονον καὶ παρακάλειαν ἡμῖν, only παρακάλεια is to be read, with Lachm. Tisch. and Alford, according to A B D* F G Κ, min. Copt. Sahid. Baschm. Arm. Slav. ant. Vulg. It. Chrys. Theodoret (alik.) Damasc. Ambrosiast. Pelag. — ἐκείνη τῆς πίστεως] Elz. has περὶ τῆς πίστεως. Against A B D* E* F G K Κ, 17, 31, et al., Bas. Chrys. Theodoret (alik.). — VER. 3. Elz. has τῷ μηδένα. But A B D E K L Χ, min. plur. edd. Bas. Oecum. have τῷ μηδένα. Correctly accepted by Matth. Lachm. (in the stereotype edition; in his larger edition Lachm. writes τῷ μηδεν ἀπανθανειτε!) Tischendorf, and Alford. Preferred also by Reiche. In the place of the misunderstood τῷ, τῷ of the Receptus was put (although this is impossible from grammatical considerations; see notes on passage), or τῶ (67, 87, al.), or ἰνα (F G, 73). — VER. 7. Elz. has ὅλης καὶ ἀνάγκη. According to the preponderating testimony of A B D E F G Κ, min. edd. Syr. utr. Copt. Arm. Vulg. It. Ambrosiast. Pel., to be transposed ἀνάγκη καὶ ὅλης. — VER. 11. Instead of the Recept. ἐποιεῖ χριστοῦ, A B D* (in D* ἐποιεῖ is wanting) Κ, 3, 17, et al., Aeth. Vulg. ms.
Ambr. al., Lachm. Tisch. Alford have 'ιησοῦς, which is to be preferred.— Ver. 12. Elz. has ὁ χάρις. This is wanting in Syr. Erp. Suspected by Mill. Apparently spurious, as in A, 73, et al., ὁ Θεός, and in D* E* F G, It. ὁ χάρις: 'ιησοῦς is found. If Paul added no subject in ver. 12, but caused the same to be continued from ver. 11, the early insertion of additions as glosses was natural.— Ver. 13. 'Ιησοῦ] Elz. has 'Ιησοῦς χριστοῦ. Against it A B D E K n, 37, 39, et al., Aeth. Germ. Vulg. ms. Damasc. Ambr. — After the Recept. ἀγίων αὐτοῦ, A D* E* K* min. Copt. Aeth. Vulg. al. add ἄμην. Bracketed by Lachm. But ἄμην was inserted, as an ecclesiastical lection ended with ver. 13.

Contents.— No longer the master of his longing and anxiety for his readers, Paul has sent Timotheus from Athens to them, to exhort them to endurance under persecutions, and to bring him exact information concerning their conduct. Timotheus has just returned, and by his message has comforted and calmed the apostle. He entreats God that he might soon be permitted to reach Thessalonica to assist the church in its remaining deficiencies, and that God might cause the Thessalonians so to abound in Christian excellence, that they may be blameless at the coming of Christ (vv. 1–13).

Vv. 1 ff. are most closely connected with the preceding;¹ it is therefore to be regretted that a new chapter should commence here. On vv. 1–3, comp. the treatise of Rückert alluded to in comment on i. 8.

Ver. 1. Διὸ] Therefore, i.e. διὰ τὸ εἶναι ὑμᾶς τὴν δόξαν ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν χαράν (ii. 20). — μηκέτι στέγοντες] no longer bearing it, i.e. incapable of mastering our longing for you any longer (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 12, xiii. 7; Philo, in Flacc. p. 974, Opp. Lut. Par. 1640, fol.: μηκέτι στέγειν δυνάμενοι τὰς ἐνδειας). So Erasmus, Vorstius, Cornelius a Lapide, Wolf, Pelt, de Wette, only the latter conjoins with the idea of longing, that of anxiety for the Thessalonians, which, indeed, is in accordance with fact, but anticipates the representation, as the idea of anxiety on the part of the apostle is first added in what follows. — μηκέτι] is not here instead of οὐκέτι, as

¹ Strikingly, Calvin: Hac narratione, quae sequitur, desiderii illius sui fidem facit.
Rückert thinks, appealing to an abusus of the later Greek, which abusus we should be cautious in recognising (see Winer, p. 431 [E. T. 609]), but as spoken from a subjective standpoint: as those who, etc. Moreover, to take the participle στέγουσες in the sense of occultantes, to which Wolf and Baumgarten are inclined: "no longer concealing my longing," i.e. no longer observing a silence concerning it, would be flat, and contrary to the context. — εὐδοκήσαμεν] as well as ἐπέμψαμεν, ver. 2, and ἐπέμψα, ver. 5, is a simple historical statement of a fact belonging to the past. Grotius and Pelt erroneously take the aorists in the sense of the pluperfect. εὐδοκήσαμεν does not denote a mere promptam animi inclinationem (Calvin, Pelt); also not acting gladly (Grotius: Triste hoc, sed tamen hoc libenter feceramus), but the freely formed resolution of the will: accordingly we resolved. Nicolas Lyrencis, Hunnius, Grotius, Calovius, Turretin, Whitby, Bengel, Michaelis, Wurm,¹ Hofmann, consider Paul and Silas as the subjects of εὐδοκήσαμεν; that καγώ (ver. 5), I also, is a proof of this, for it contains in itself the reference to a wider subject, so that from a plurality of the subject in ver. 1, a single individual was, in ver. 5, brought forward. However, this view cannot be the correct one. By the insertion of ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος, ii. 18, the subject of ii. 17–20 is expressly restricted to Paul himself; and, as chap. iii. is most closely connected with ii. 17–19, the subject here must be the same as there. εὐδοκήσαμεν must therefore, with Calvin, Hemming, Estius, Fromond., Koppe, Pelt, Schott, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Alford, Riggenbach (in J. P. Lange's Bibelwerk, Part X., Bielef. 1864), and others, be referred to Paul only, to which καγώ, ver. 5, is no objection (see below). — καταλειψθήναι ἐν Ἀθηναῖς μόνοι] Zachariae, Koppe, Hug, Hemsen, also Wieseler (Chronologie des apost. Zeitalters, p. 249) and Alford (Proleg. p. 45), understand this of Paul's being left alone at Athens, Timotheus not having

¹ In the strange interpretation: "We resolved that one of us should go to Thessalonica, accordingly we two remained behind at Athens, and sent Timotheus." As an analogy to this, the form should be οἱ πρὶ σῖν Παῦλον. Comp. Tüb. Zeitschr. 1833, 1, p. 76.
been previously there with the apostle. They assume that Timotheus, left behind at Berea (Acts xvii. 14), either at the time of his being left behind, or at some later period, received the direction from the apostle, countermanding the charge given in Acts xvii. 15, that before proceeding to Athens, he should return from Berea to Thessalonica to strengthen the church there. This view is brought forward from a desire of reconciling our passage with the narrative in the Acts of the Apostles. Acts xvii. 16 informs us only of a waiting for Timotheus at Athens, but not of his arrival there; on the contrary, it is stated that Silas and Timotheus did not return from Macedonia until the residence of the apostle at Corinth (Acts xviii. 5). But this view does not correspond with the natural wording of our passage, as φυλασσωμαι, to be left behind, to remain behind, evidently presupposes the previous presence of Timotheus. We must therefore, with Zanchius, Piscator, Cornelius a Lapide, Beza, Wolf, Benson, Macknight, Eichhorn, Schott, Olshausen, de Wette, Koch, Hofmann, and others, suppose that Timotheus actually came from Berea to Athens, and was sent from it by the apostle to Thessalonica. To this interpretation we appear constrained by ἐπέμψαμεν, ver. 2, and ἐπέμψα, ver. 5, as hardly anything else can be denoted with these words than a commission given directly by Paul to one present.

Ver. 2. Τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν καὶ συνεργῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῇ εὐαγγ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ] our brother (Christian brother) and fellow-labourer of God in the gospel of Christ. The σὺν in συνεργῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ refers not to man, but to God, the chief ruler of the church; comp. Meyer on 1 Cor. iii. 9. In this apposition attached to Τιμόθεου, Theophylact, Musculus, and most critics (comp. already Chrysostom) discover the design, that Paul wished thereby to indicate what a great sacrifice he put himself to for the sake of the Thessalonians, as he surrendered to them at once his faithful assistant, whom he himself so much required, in order that he might minister to their wants. 1

1 Thus also Hofmann, only he finds the reason of the honourable appellation in this: "that the Christians of Thessalonica who longed for the apostle himself might be tempted to undervalue this mission of a subordinate associate!"
Such a view is remote from the apostle. The epithets which he gives to Timotheus are nothing more than a commendation of his apostolic associate, which the apostle felt himself constrained spontaneously to express, on account of the faithfulness and zeal which he displayed for the sake of the gospel; and we are the less to look for any ulterior design, as it was the constant practice of the apostle, when he had occasion specially to mention his faithful associates, to designate them by some honourable appellation. — ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ Statement of the sphere in which he was a συνεργὴς. Comp. Rom. i. 9; Phil. iv. 3. — εἰς τὸ στηρίζαι ὑμᾶς] not that we (the senders) might (by the instrumentality of Timotheus) strengthen you (Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius), but that he (Timotheus) might strengthen you. But erroneously (comp. already Chrysostom) Oecumenius, whom Theophylact, Estius, Luc. Osiander, Fromond, Nat. Alexander, Macknight, and others follow: ὅς σαλευομένους, ἐφ' οἷς ἦν ὁ διδάσκαλος ἐν πειρασμοῖς· μέγας γὰρ ἄνωθεν θάρυσσας τοῖς μαθηταῖς τὸ εἶναι τὸν διδάσκαλον ἐν πειρασμοῖς. — Grotius and others understand παρακαλέσαι in the sense of to comfort. More correctly (on account of ver. 3), it is to be taken in the meaning of to exhort or encourage. Schott erroneously unites both ideas. Also, arbitrarily separating the words, Olshausen refers στηρίζαι to patience in persecution, and παρακαλέσαι to growth in faith. — ἐπέρ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν] not equivalent to ἐπὶ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν (de Wette and others), as if it were a mere statement of the object, but: for the good of your faith, i.e. in order that you might preserve it.¹

Ver. 3. Σαίνειν] related to σαέλειν,—only here in the N. T., —means, to shake, to swing hither and thither. It is used specially of dogs who wag their tails (comp. Hom. Od. xvi. 4 ff., x. 217; Arist. Eq. 1031), from which the wider acceptation of fawning or caressing is derived. Then the verb stands generally for any act of shaking, passing from the sphere of sense to that of mind. Comp. Diog. Laert. viii. 41: οἷς δὲ

¹ That Calvin here speaks of a fides Pauli ubique adversus Satanam et mundum victrix, is because, in the oldest Greek editions of the N. T., πίστις ἡμῶν was put in place of πίστεως ὑμῶν.
σαινόμενοι τοῖς λεγομένοις ἐδάκρυεν τε καὶ φυμὸν. — Sophocl. Antig. 1214: παῖδος με σαίνει φθόγγος. (Other proofs in Wetstein.) Thus here σαίνεσθαι denotes a being disquieted, becoming wavering in the faith. Chrysostom correctly explains it by θορυβεῖσθαι καὶ ταράττεσθαι. With unnecessary harshness Faber Stapulensis, to whom also Beza (ad blandiri, adversariis videbant evangelii) is inclined, Elsner, Observ. sacr. II. p. 275 f., Wolf, and Tittmann, de synonym. in N. T. p. 189, think to preserve the meaning fawning (and alluring), giving the sense: that they should not permit themselves, by "adulationes et illicitamenta carnis" (Faber Stapulensis), to apostatize from Christianity, and relapse into heathenism or Judaism. Also Rückert, whom Koch follows, adopts this view, as he will not acknowledge the meaning ἀνίμηδεσθαι in the verb: he thinks, rather, that from the meaning to fawn, the meaning blanditiis corrumpi in the passive is formed; and from that, in consequence of the toning down of the meaning, the general idea of corrumpi arose. Hofmann explains σαινεῖν directly by to delude, a meaning which the word never has. — ἐν ταῖς θλίψεωις ταύταις] in these afflictions. ἐν is purely temporal, not instrumental, although, in regard to the subject in hand, it cannot be doubted that it was the θλίψεωις to whose influence the possibility of a σαίνεσθαι is attributed. ταύταις is δεικτικῶς, indicative, denoting the afflictions which both the Thessalonians and Paul (so Calixtus, Flatt, Schott, and others; Oecumenius, Theophylact, Estius, Osiander, Nat. Alexander, Benson, Macknight, erroneously refer the θλίψεως to Paul only) have just experienced, and which are here considered as belonging to the present, since a renewed outbreak of them was every instant to be feared. The first part of ver. 3, accordingly, contains the warning not to suffer themselves to apostatize from the faith in Christ in the time of trouble and of need. — But it is asked how ver. 3 is to be connected with the preceding. Those who read, with the Receptus, τῷ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι (see critical note), regard τῷ as the Dativus commodi, which, as the Hebrew τῇ placed before an infinitive, serves for the statement of the object; thus τῷ would be equivalent to εἰς
τό (Grotius, Turrettin, Benson, Koppe, Pelt, Olshausen). But τῷ with the infinitive is used exclusively to denote the reason or the inducing cause, never to denote the design; comp. 2 Cor. ii. 12, and Winer, p. 293 [E. T. 413]. Rückert, indeed, retaining this grammatical use of τῷ, makes it denote: "unde nascituram τῷ παράκλησιν speraverat, quam Timotheum misit, apostolus;" and, although he does not decide positively, prefers the reading τῷ, in order that he may find expressed therein a twofold object in sending Timotheus, in conformity with the longing of the apostle previously stated: (1) in respect to the readers, and (2) in respect to himself. Timotheus, Paul intends to say, is sent "fratres ut firmaret, sibi ut afferret ex bona illorum conditione solatium." But this interpretation is simply impossible, as, in referring παρακαλέσαι to the apostle, it would be indispensable only, on account of the preceding ἵμας, to subjoin ἵμας. Accordingly, even from internal reasons, criticism requires us to read τῷ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι. But here, also, a different view is conceivable:—(1) We might, with Matthaei, supply a second εἰς to τῷ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι from the preceding εἰς τό σπηρίζαι. But in this case we cannot understand why the second εἰς has been suppressed by Paul, as elsewhere he does not avoid the repetition of the form εἰς τό; comp. e.g. Rom. iv. 11. Or (2) with Schott, Koch, and Bisping, we might take τῷ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι as an absolute accusative, in the sense of quod attinet ad. But, considering the rarity of this construction, and the misuse which is practised with its assumption (comp. Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 132 f.; also Phil. iv. 10, on which Schott founds, is no analogy, as there τῷ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονείν is the usual objective accusative to ἀνεθάλητε, used transitively), this shift should only be resorted to when no other expedient presents itself. (3) Winer, 5th ed. p. 375 [E. T. 413], whom de Wette, Reiche, Buttmann, Gramm. des neutestam. Sprachgebrauchs, p. 226 [E. T. 263 f.], Hofmann, and Riggenbach follow, makes τῷ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι dependent on παρακαλέσαι, and considers it as a further explanation of ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως, namely, to exhort that none should become wavering. But if τῷ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι depended on παρακαλέσαι, then παρακαλεῖν, in the sense of to exhort,
would be construed with the simple accusative of the thing, an assumption the possibility of which is to be absolutely denied. (The passages on which Reiche supports the opposite view are without force. In Luke iii. 18 both accusatives are not governed by παρακαλέων, but, in agreement with Acts xiii. 32, by εἰσήγγελλησέντο; in 1 Tim. vi. 2, ταῦτα depends on διδασκεῖν, and καὶ παρακάλει is annexed only in a loose manner to ταῦτα διδασκεῖ; so also in Tit. ii. 15 ταῦτα belongs only to λάλει, but not also to the following verbs; further, in Mark v. 23 πολλά does not depend on παρακαλέω, but is the adverbial much, very; lastly, Mark v. 17 and Acts viii. 31 are not analogous, as there παρακάλεῖν is put with the accusative of the person, to which a simple infinitive, but not an infinitive with the article τὸ, follows.) Besides, if τὸ μηδένα σαίν. were a further explanation or exegesis of ἕτορ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, then not the accusative τὸ μηδένα σαίν. would have been put, but the genitive τοῦ μηδένα σαίν., in agreement with ἕτορ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν. Accordingly, this interpretation is also to be rejected. There consequently remains only (4) to consider τὸ μηδένα σαίν. ἵνα ταῦτα ὑμᾶς as an opposition to the whole preceding sentence ἵνα ταῦτα καὶ παρακάλεσαι ἐπί τῶν πίστεως ὑμῶν, so that τὸ μηδένα σαίν. serves only to repeat the same thought which was before positively expressed in a negative but better defined form; thus, instead of τὸ, τοῦτο τί might have been written. Thus the sense is: to strengthen you and to exhort you on behalf of your faith—that is, that no one may be shaken in these troubles; or, to strengthen and exhort you on account of your faith, particularly on one point, which is contained in one requirement: that no one may be shaken, etc.¹ Accordingly, τὸ μηδένα σαίν. certainly depends on the preceding ἵνα; but our interpretation is entirely different from that adduced in (1), as no second ἵνα can be inserted before τὸ μηδένα σαίν. without injuring

¹ Alford accedes to this interpretation. Bouman (Chartae theolog. I. p. 79 ff.) assumes a middle position between this view and that adopted by Winer, de Wette, and Reiche: Ego...its de Wettium sequor ac Winerum, ut μηδένα σαίν. cum proxime praecedente Infinitivo παρακάλεων connectendum existimem. Verum tuto tertiae sectionis dicto: μηδένα...καίμεθα, Illius,
the indissoluble unity which combines ἄρε τὸ μὴδένα σαΐνε ὑμᾶς. κτλ. with what precedes.— αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε, ver. 4, is not, with Moldenhauer, Griesbach, Vater, Flatt, to be included in a parenthesis, as διὰ τοῦτο, ver. 5, is connected with what directly precedes.— γὰρ proves the legitimacy of the demand μὴδένα σαΐνεθας. — οἴδατε] ver. 4, explains whence they knew it,—namely, partly from previous definite intimations of the apostle, and partly from their own experience. Contrary to the text, Theodoret: from the previous intimation of Christ. — ὅτι εἰς τὸν κείμεθα] that we were appointed thereto. Comp. Phil. i. 17; Luke ii. 34. εἰς τὸν, i.e. not εἰς τὸ μὴδένα σαΐνεθας, but εἰς τὸ ὑπερβεθαῖ (comp. ver. 4), in connection with θέλησιμων. Moreover, κείμεθα refers not only to Paul (Oecumenius, Estius, Osiander, and others), or to Paul and his companions (Hofmann), nor also to Paul and the Thessalonians (Koppe), but to Christians in general. 

Ver. 4. Reason of αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε.— πρὸς ὑμᾶς] The accusative, as in Gal. i. 18, ii. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 7, etc.— Also μᾶλλονεν is neither to be restricted to Paul (Oecumenius, Estius, Osiander, Nat. Alexander, Macknight), nor to Paul and his companions (Hofmann), nor to Paul and the Thessalonians (Grotius, Koppe); but, as κείμεθα, ver. 3, to be taken generally: we Christians in general. Μᾶλλονεν ὑπερβεθαῖ, however, is distinguished from the simple future—it characterizes the sufferings as inevitable, as predetermined in the counsels of God. — οἴδατε] from your own experience. Baumgarten-Crusius incorrectly refers it to προελέγομεν.

Ver. 5. Διὰ τοῦτο] on this account, i.e. on account of the actual commencement of trouble. But, incorrectly, Fromond.: ne tribulationibus meis turbaremini.— The καὶ in κάγῳ does not belong to the whole sentence: “therefore also, no longer forbearing, I sent” (de Wette, Koch, Bisping), for then διὰ καὶ τοῦτο would have been written (the passages adduced by de quam Timothei ministerio ad Thessalonicon esse curerat Apostolus, σαμαριταίων praecipuam argumentum ac summa contineri mihi videtur. Cujus rei, ni fallor, indicium est dictumque adeo acruit et a caeteris distinguunt prae- missus ille articulus si. Quem ibi ponere Graecos, ubi nos sigmam citationis vulgo notum est. Veluti postmodum, chap. iv. 1: τῷ τοἰ προς ὑμῖν κτλ.
Wette to the contrary do not prove what is designed); rather καὶ impressively gives prominence to the person of the ἐγώ: therefore I also. Thus a relation must be contained in it to other persons. Schott, whom Olshausen follows, supposes these others the Thessalonians, finding the thought expressed: “as ye, in consequence of the troubles which befell me, were anxious for me, so I also could no longer bear to be without information concerning you.” But, according to the connection (καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ ὅδε, ver. 4), a relation must be contained in κἀγώ to others, of whom, as of Paul, a μηκέτι στέγευν in respect of the Thessalonians is asserted.1 These others are the Christian circle with the apostle in Athens (Acts xvii. 34), including Timotheus sent from it to Thessalonica. Events such as befell the Thessalonians must have awakened lively sympathy in every Christian who heard of them. Entirely perverted is the view of Hofmann, who takes the singular, ver. 5, as a contrast to the plural, ver. 1. In ver. 5 only Paul is spoken of, whereas in ver. 1 Paul and Silvanus are referred to. He accordingly infers, that besides Timotheus, sent by Paul and Silvanus jointly to Thessalonica, there was another sent specially by Paul. After Timotheus was on his journey to strengthen the Thessalonian Church against the persecution which had broken out upon them, Paul, at a time when Silvanus was also absent, sent a second, this time for his own sake; his own troubled condition making the want of news from Thessalonica insupportable, lest perhaps the fruit of his labours among them might be entirely lost. Yet before the return of this unknown messenger Silvanus and also Timotheus had rejoined the apostle! — εἰς τὸ γνῶμαι] in order to learn, belongs to the subject of the verb ἐπεμψα; thus: “in order that I, the sender, might learn;” not: in order that he (Timotheus) might learn (Pelt, Olshausen, and others). — τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν] your faith, i.e. how it is with it, how it stands.

1 It might otherwise be assumed that Paul here anticipates what he first, in ver. 6, observes of the Thessalonians, namely, that they also had a longing for him; and thus κἀγώ, which belongs to μὴνιστί στέγων, not to ἐπεμψα, is explained. But this is an expedient which is artificial, and is to be rejected because μὴνιστί στέγων, ver. 5, and ἵππος, ver. 6, are not co-extensive ideas.
— *μήπως*] depends on *γνῶναι*, not on *ἐπέμψα*, and is the introductory particle of an indirect question: *whether perhaps the tempter has tempted you*. So Wahl, Schott, and de Wette; also Bouman, *Chartae theolog.* I. p. 80. Without reason, Beza, Grotius, Turretin, Benson, Koppe, Flatt, Pelt, Winer, p. 448 [E. T. 633 f.], supply *φοβοῦμενος* before *μήπως*: "filled with anxiety lest the tempter should have tempted you." — *ὁ πεπραξὼν*] another expression for *ὁ σατανᾶς*, ii. 18. Comp. Matt. iv. 3. — *εἰς κενόν*] see Meyer on Gal. ii. 2. — *ἐπείρασεν*. . . *γένηται*] correctly, Schott: *ut cognoscerem, quomodo se haberet persuasio vestra, num forte tentator vos tentaverit, adeo ut* (quod deus avertat!) labor meus irritus fieri possit. The aorist indicative refers to a fact which possibly may have already happened; but the conjunctive *γένηται* refers to a fact which belongs to the future, and is conceived as a consequence of the first fact. Fritzschke (*Opusc. Fritzschiorum*, p. 176), to whom de Wette and Koch adhere, explains it: *ut ... cognoscerem, an forte Satanas vos tentasset et ne forte labores mei irrit essent*. He thus takes *μήπως* in the first clause as an interrogative particle, and in the second clause as an expression of fear; an explanation which Winer rightly designates as harsh. — Moreover, incorrectly, Whitby, Macknight, Baumgarten-Crusius: in *ἐπείρασεν* is implied "tempted with success," "seduced." The idea of seduction exists only by the addition of *εἰς κενόν* *γένηται*.

Ver. 6. *Ἀρτὶ δὲ*] but now, belongs not to *ἐλθόντος* (Grotius, Pelt, Schott, Alford, Ewald, Hofmann, Riggenbach), but is to be separated from it by a comma, and belongs to *παρεκκλήθησεν*, ver. 7. For (1) not the mission of Timotheus and his return, but the mission and the consolation obtained from his return, is the main point on which it depends; (2) If Paul would connect *ἀρτὶ δὲ* *ἐλθόντος*, *διὰ τοῦτο* would scarcely be inserted in ver. 7 for the recapitulation of ver. 6; (3) *ἀρτὶ* *δὲ* emphatically opposes the present to the past, to *ἐπέμψα* (ver. 5); but *ἀρτὶ* would be flat if we referred it to *ἐλθόντος*, and that whether it was to be understood in its temporal or in its logical sense; (4) Lastly, we would expect *παρεκκλήθησα* (which certainly is found in A and some minus-
culi), but not παρεκκλήθημεν, in ver. 7.—διόντος κ.τ.λ.] not after, but because; διὰ τοῦτο requires this. The joyful message which Timotheus brought (Chrysostom: 'Ορᾶς τὴν περικήρειαν Παύλου; οὐκ ἐπεν ἀπαργεγελαντος ἀλλ' εὔαν- γελισμένου τοσοῦτον ἥγειτο τὴν ἑκείνων βεβαλωσιν καὶ τὴν ἀνάπην. Comp. also Luke i. 19, and Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 266 ff.) refers (1) to the Christian condition of the Thessalonian Church generally (τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀνάπην ὑμῶν), and (2) to the personal relation of the Thessalonians to the apostle (καὶ ὅτι έχετε κ.τ.λ.). Theodoret: Δὴλοὶ ἢ μὲν πίστις τῆς εὐσεβείας τὸ βέβαιον ἢ δὲ ἀνάπη τὴν παρακτικὴν ἄρετὴν ἢ δὲ τοῦ διδασκάλου μνήμη καὶ ὁ περὶ αὐτῶν πόθος μαρτυρεῖ τῇ περὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν στοργῆ. Hammond incorrectly understands ἀνάπην of love to God.—καὶ ὅτι έχετε μνείαν ἡμῶν ἁγαθὴν] and that ye have us in good remembrance. Arbitrarily Grotius: Est fieri, cum nam per memoriam intelligit mentionem, et bonam intelligit, in bonam partem, i.e. honorificam. For then ποιεῖτε must be put instead of έχειν.—πάντωτε] belongs to the foregoing, not, as Koch and Hofmann suppose, to what follows.—ἐπιτυθοῦτεν] Comp. Rom. i. 11; Phil. i. 8, ii. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 14.—Strikingly Musculus (also Bengel): Non modo amoris hoc erat indicium, sed et bonae conscientiae. The compound verb, however, makes prominent the direction, not the intensity, of ποιεῖτε. Comp. Fritzsche on Röm. i. 11.—καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς] sc. ίδειν ἐπιτυθοῦμεν.

Ver. 7. Διὰ τοῦτο] is added in consequence of the preceding long participial sentence, and as its recapitulation. But Paul says διὰ τοῦτο, not διὰ ταῦτα, as we would naturally expect, because he here regards the joyful message of Timotheus as a whole or in its unity, but does not think on the separate points enumerated above.—παρεκκλήθημεν] the aorist, in connection with ἄρτι, ver. 6, proves that this Epistle was composed immediately after the return of Timotheus.—ἐφ' ὑμῖν] in reference to you (comp. 2 Cor. vii. 7), is not superfluous on account of the following διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν πίστεως (Koppe, Pelt), but puts the personal object first in regard to whom the consolation of the apostle occurred, whilst διὰ τῆς
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νμόν πίστεως brings in afterwards the actual circumstances, by which the consolation was called forth. — ἐπὶ πάση τῇ ἀνάγκῃ καὶ θόλψει ἡμῶν on (or in) all our necessity and tribulation. ἐπὶ is not a causal, but a temporal statement. Comp. 2 Cor. vii. 4; Winer, p. 350 [E. T. 489]. Erroneously Schott, in every necessity and tribulation which we endure; this would be expressed by ἐπὶ πάση ἀνάγκῃ κ.τ.λ. (without an article). By θόλψει Schott understands the tribulation caused by the Corinthian adversaries of the apostle; and by ἀνάγκῃ, either sickness or (so also Macknight) pecuniary indigence, combined with hard labour; whilst Bouman (Chartae theolog. I. p. 80) considers "ἀνάγκην vocabulum generale esse, quod nullum non calamitatum genus contineat; θόλψει de oppressionibus singularibus dici ac persecutionibus, quibus Christianos vel Ethnici vexarent vel Judaei." These special determinations or limitations are certainly precarious; still so much is certain, that ἀνάγκῃ and θόλψει cannot here be interpreted, with de Wette and Koch, of care and anxiety, but are to be understood of external necessity and tribulation. For the care and anxiety of the apostle could only, according to the context, refer to the Thessalonians, and must have been removed by the message of Timotheus. But ἐπὶ imports that the ἀνάγκῃ and θόλψει of the apostle continued in spite of the glad message of Timotheus; on the other hand, by reason of it they were no longer esteemed or felt by the apostle as an evil (comp. ver. 8). For the thought can only be: We were comforted during, or in spite of, the heavy burden of necessity and tribulation which weighs upon us, consequently still rests upon us. With this interpretation what follows in ver. 8 must suitably agree.

Ver. 8. Paul considers the ἀνάγκῃ and θόλψει which lay upon him as a δάνατος, but he does not feel this evil; the δάνατος is converted to him into ζωή, when he learns how the churches which he had founded cleave to the Lord.

1 The opinion of Hofmann, that ἦν τῆς ὑμῶν πίστεως is to be combined with ἦν τῶν ζωῆς, ver. 8, whilst with the emphasis on ὑμῶν it must be translated: "because it is your faith by which we now live," is so monstrous that it requires no refutation.
External matters are, in general, indifferent to the apostle, provided he reaches his life-aim, to lead souls to Christ; every success in reference to this imparts strength and fulness of life to him. — τών is not to be understood in contrast to the pre-Christian life of the apostle, when his thought and aim were entirely different; whereby a thought entirely foreign to the context would be introduced. The force of τών as an adverb of time, at present, is not to be too greatly pressed (Marloratus: Sub adverbio nunc repetit, quod prins dixerat, se afflictione et necessitate graviter fuisse oppressum), but has here (on account of εδών) a causal reference; now, serving as an introduction to what follows: εδών ἡμεῖς στήκατε ἐν κυρίῳ. Comp. Kühner, II. p. 385; Hartung, Partikell. II. p. 25. — ζώον not to be referred, with Chrysostom, to the future, eternal life, nor weakened to “we are happy” (Pelt and others), or “satisfied” (Grotius, Moldenhauer), but the meaning is: For now we live, i.e. we are in full strength and freshness of life, we do not feel the sorrows and tribulations which the outer world prepares for us.— εδών ἡμεῖς στήκατε ἐν κυρίῳ when, or so soon as ye stand fast in the Lord, hold fast to His fellowship.— ἡμεῖς applies specially to the Thessalonians what holds good of Christians generally.— εδών makes the fact of the stedfastness of the readers appear as a well-grounded supposition (see Schmalfeld, Syntax des Griech. Verbums, p. 201). But the hypothetical form of the sentence includes, indirectly, the exhortation to hold fast to the Lord for the future.

Ver. 9. Reason of ζώον, ver. 8; γάρ, consequently, is not “mera particula transeundi” (Koppe, Pelt). In a truly monstrous construction, Hofmann, with a renunciation of all exegetical tact, pulls to pieces the simple and clear structure of the words, taking τών γάρ εὐχαριστήσαν δυνάμεθα τῷ Θεῷ ἀνταποδοθεῖν περὶ ἡμῶν (ver. 9) as a parenthetic clause, the object of which is to give beforehand the reason of δεόμενοι (ver. 10), referring εἰπὶ πάσῃ τῇ χαρᾷ, ἵ χαίρομεν δι’ ἡμᾶς to δεόμενοι “as a statement of what he joined to his request;” considering δεόμενοι, which is “a participle of the imperfect,” as an apodosis, which, passing over the parenthesis, is annexed
to παρεκλήθημεν (ver. 7), and to which διὰ τῆς ήμῶν πίστεως ὃτι νῦν ζώμεν (vv. 7, 8) forms the protasis! — τίνα γὰρ εὐχαριστίαν κ.τ.λ.] for what thanks can we give in return to God on behalf of you for all the joy we feel for your sakes before our God? i.e., What expression of thanks can be sufficiently great to be an equivalent for the fulness and super-abundance of our joy? Theophylact: Τοσαύτην, φρόνιμον, ἧ δὲ ήμᾶς χαρά, ὅτι οὐδὲ εὐχαριστήσατι τῷ Θεῷ κατ' ἄξιαν δυνάμεθα ὑπὲρ ήμῶν. God has brought about and arranged this joy by His higher guidance; therefore to Him belongs the thanks; therefore is this thanks a return for the proof of His grace (ἀνταποδόουσι). — πάσα ἡ χαρά] cannot denote joy of every kind; accordingly, cannot indicate the multiplicity of objects which the joy for the Thessalonians has (which Schott thinks possible). It means, as the article added requires, the whole joy — joy in its sum total. See Winer, p. 101 [E. T. 137]. A joy in its totality is certainly the greatest conceivable joy; so that it may be said that πάσα ἡ χαρά denotes laetitia maxima (Flatt, Pelt, Schott). — ἡ χαῖρομεν] by attraction instead of ἡ χαίρομεν; comp. Matt. ii. 10. — εἰμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν] belongs not to the following (Ewald, Hofmann), but to the preceding; but not to χαρά (Koppe, Pelt, Bloomfield), but to χαίρομεν. The addition serves to bring forward the purity of this joy, to which nothing earthly cleaves. Erroneously Oecumenius and Bloomfield: “Paul would think on God as the Author of the joy.” — On ἡμῶν, comp. on ii. 2.

Ver. 10. Αἰείμενον] is not used absolutely instead of δεόμεθα or ἐσμὲν δεόμενον, which Cornelius a Lapide and Baumgarten-Crusius assume, and Flatt thinks possible, but neither is it to be united with χαίρομεν (Schott, de Wette, Koch, Riggenbach), but belongs to the main thought τίνα... ἀνταποδοιητ]. and assigns the reason for it by the fervent longing for the readers, and anxiety for their Christian character: What sufficient thanks are we able to give to God for our joy over you, as we (cleaving to you with such paternal love that we), without ceasing, pray to see you again, and complete the defects of your faith? — νυκτός] See on ii. 9. Erroneously Fromond.:
it is placed first, quia nocte praecipue propter solitudinem et silentium sancti se orationi dare solent.—The accumulation of expressions νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ὑπὲρεκπερισσοῦ, is the natural outflow of the strength of his feeling; comp. Phil. i. 23. — ὑπὲρεκπερισσοῦ] above measure, is found only in v. 13, Eph. iii. 20, and Theodoton, ad Daniel. iii. 22. Erroneously—because grammatically impossible—Clericus insists on referring it by means of a trajectio not to δεόμενοι, but to ιδεῖν, defending his opinion on the ground that ὑπὲρεκπερ. denotes something not strictly necessary, whereas prayer is a duty, a necessity: orantes ut videamus vultum vestrum, quasi cumulum laetitiae nostrae. Non satis erat Paulo acire Thessalonicienses constanter evangelio adhaerere, quamvis summam laetitiam ex eo nuntio perciperit, volebat ὑπὲρεκπερισσοῦ, ex abundanti, eos videre.—εἰς τῷ κ.τ.λ.] the design of δεόμενοι: praying to this end, in order by means of prayer (by the answer to it) to attain the ιδεῖν and καταρτίσαι. — καταρτίζεων] is to place in the condition of perfectness, of completeness. Thus καταρτίζεων τὰ υστερήματα τῆς πίστεως signifies: to render complete the defects of faith, that is, in order to make perfect that which is wanting in faith (Theodoret: τὰ ἐκλείσοντα πληρῶσαι). By this υστερήματα τῆς πίστεως Paul understands partly defects of faith as regards insight (particularly in respect of the impending advent; comp. iv. 13 ff.); partly defects of faith as regards its practical verification in the Christian life (comp. iv. 1 ff.). It follows, moreover, from καταρτίσαι τὰ υστερήματα, with what inconsiderate arbitrariness Baur misuses even this passage in support of his assertion that the Thessalonian church had already existed for a long time.

Ver. 11. Αὐτὸς] is not a general introductory subject to which the special designations are annexed as an apposition: "but He, God our Father," etc. (Luther, de Wette, Hofmann, Riggenbach. According to de Wette, whom Koch and Bisping follow, αὐτὸς serves for bringing forward the contrast with the petitioner). But the whole designation of the subject Αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς is most closely connected: But God Himself, our Father and our Lord Jesus. It has its contrast in reference
to κατευθύνειν τὴν ὁδόν. Paul thinks on a κατευθύνειν τὴν ὁδόν, both on his (man's) side and on the side of God. The first does not conduct certainly to the end, as in reference to it the power of ἐγκόπτειν is given to the devil (comp. ii. 18). Only when the κατευθυνειν is undertaken by God Himself and Christ is its success assured, for then the hindrances of the devil are without power. Thus Paul contrasts simply and naturally God and Christ to himself.— ἡμῶν] may be referred both to Ἐθέσ and to πατήρ (Hofmann, Riggenbach), so that God is called our (the Christians') God and our Father: but it is best to restrict it to πατήρ, so that God is first considered in His existence as God simply, and then afterwards in reference to us as our Father.— καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς] This addition (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17), particularly with the following κατευθυναί, which is to be understood as the third person singular optative aorist, not as the infinitive (see Winer, ed. 5, p. 383), might appear strange. But, according to the Pauline view (comp. Usteri, Lehrbegr. p. 301), Christ, exalted to the right hand of the Father, takes part in the government of the world, and orders everything for the promotion of His kingdom. And, inasmuch as His will is not different from the will of God, but identical with it, the verb in the singular is suitable.— κατευθυναί] make straight, plain, so in order that it can be trod. Without a figure: may cause it to be realized.— πρὸς ὑμᾶς] belongs not to τῇ ὁδόν ἡμῶν, but to κατευθυναί.

Ver. 12. To the wish as regards himself, Paul adds a further wish as regards his readers.¹ — ὑμᾶς δὲ] Bengel puts it well: sive nos viniemus, sive minus. — If ὁ κύριος (see critical note) is genuine, it may grammatically refer either to God or to Christ (although the latter is the more usual); also ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ver. 13, instead of αὐτοῦ, is no objection to the reference to God, as the repetition of the name in full shortly after its mention is not rare; comp. ii. 2; Eph. iv. 12, 16; Winer, p. 130 [E. T. 180]. — The optatives (not infinitives, as Bretschneider thinks, who without justification supplies οὖν)

¹ Entirely erroneously, Piscator begins with this verse the second or exhortative portion of the Epistle.
υμῶν) πλεονάσαι and περισσεύσαι are in a transitive sense: but the Lord make you to become rich and abound in love. On πλεονάζεω, comp. LXX. Num. xxvi. 54; Ps. lxxi. 21; on περισσεύειν, comp. Eph. i. 8; 2 Cor. ix. 8, etc. Erroneously Theodoret, whom Cornelius a Lapide follows, takes πλεονάσαι by itself, of the external increase of the church: εἴσαχεται τοινύν αὐτοῖς καὶ τῷ ἁριθμῷ πλεονάσαι καὶ τῇ ἧγάπῃ περισσεύσαι, τούτωσι τελεῖν αὐτὴν κτήσασθαι, ὥστε μηδὲν ελλείπειν αὐτῇ. So also Olshausen and Koch erroneously distinguish πλεονάζεω and περισσεύειν as cause and effect: to increase, and arising from this increase, abundance. Similarly Fromond, as extensio and intensio charitatis.— εἰς ἄλληλους] towards fellow-Christians. — εἰς πάντας] is not an explication of εἰς ἄλληλους: erga vos invicem et quidem omnes, which Koppe thinks possible, but means toward all men generally. Estius: etiam infideles et vestrae salutis inimicos. Theodoret, without reason, limits it to fellow-Christians of all places; whilst he interprets εἰς ἄλληλους of fellow-Christians in Thessalonica.— καθάπερ καὶ ἡμῖν εἰς υμᾶς] sc. τῇ ἧγάπῃ πλεονάζομεν καὶ περισσεύομεν, as we also are rich in love and abound toward you. Only this completion of the ellipsis corresponds to the context, and the objection to it, that πλεονάζειν and περισσεύειν is used first in a transitive and then in an intransitive sense, is of no force, as the passage of the one into the other here is so insensible and easy, that no reader could take objection to it. Arbitrary are the completions of Calvin: affecti sumus; Nösselt: animati sumus; Baumgarten-Crusius: έχομεν (?); Pelt and Schott: πολλήν ἧγάπην έχομεν; Wolf (and so essentially already Musculus): περισσεύσαι, abundare nos in vos faciat; in which latter case the accusative ἢμᾶς (as certainly Laurent, Neutestam. Studien, Gotha 1866, p. 188, actually reads, but without justification) must be put in place of the nominative ἢμεῖς. Also, supplying the simple copula sumus (Grotius) is to be rejected, which would suppose a form of speech entirely un-Grecian. Correctly, according to the sense, Theophylact: έχετε γὰρ μέτρον καὶ παράδειγμα τῆς ἧγάπης ἢμᾶς.

Ver. 13. The final aim is derived from the wish, ver. 12, because love is the fulfilling of the law (Rom. xiii. 10), and
the band of perfection (Col. iii. 14). — *eis to στηρίζαι* not so that (Pelt, Baumgarten-Crusius); also, not so much as καὶ στηρίζαι (Koppe), by which the words would only annex a new wish to the preceding. It is designed to introduce a *majus*, a greater, specifying the higher or final aim to which πλεονάζειν and περισσεύειν are to conduct. But the subject in στηρίζαι is not τὴν ἀγάπην (Oecumenius), but τὸν κύριον (which, however, is not, with Theophylact and Schrader, to be converted into the idea τὸ πνεῦμα), or, with the contingent spuriousness of ὁ κύριος in ver. 12: God and Christ, ver. 11. — στηρίζαι denotes *confirming, strengthening generally*, not confirming in the faith (Flatt, Pelt), against which is the context. — τὰς καρδίας] Chrysostom: οὐκ ἐπειν υμᾶς στηρίζαι, ἀλλὰ τὰς καρδίας υμῶν. 'Εκ γὰρ τῆς καρδίας ἐξέρχονται διαλογισμοὶ ποιηθο. — ἀμέμπτους] proleptic: so that you will be blameless. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 8; Phil. iii. 21 (according to the correct reading); Winer, p. 549 [E. T. 779]; Kühner, II. p. 121. — ἐν ἀγιωσύνῃ] belongs not to στηρίζαι, but to ἀμέμπτους, specifying the sphere in which the blamelessness is to be shown. The expression denotes the condition of holiness, comp. Rom. i. 4; 2 Cor. vii. 1; erroneously Koppe: alias ἀγιασμός, and Olshausen: ἀγιωσύνη is the process of becoming holy, the result of which is ἀγιασμός. — ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ] before God, according to His judgment, His judicial sentence, belongs neither to ἀγιωσύνη (Koppe, Pelt), nor to ἀμέμπτους (de Wette, Koch), but to the whole ἀμέμπτους ἐν ἀγιωσύνῃ. — μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ] Flatt, with whom Hofmann, in his Schriftbeweis, II. 2, ed. 1, p. 595, agrees (he construes the passage differently in ed. 2, p. 649, and in his H. Schr. N. T., without altering his interpretation of οἱ ἁγιοὶ), unites the clause with ἀμέμπτους ἐν ἀγιωσύνῃ: "in order that ye may appear blameless on that day with all who are consecrated to God, who are the genuine members of His people, who truly honour God and Christ." So also Musculus; and also Benson and Olshausen (comp. also Bouman, Chartae theol. I. p. 81 ff.), although they do not construe with Musculus and Flatt, understand by ἁγιοὶ the earlier perfected believers. But the difficulty which impelled Flatt to this interpretation (and in which
Schrader finds even an objection against the *authenticity of the Epistle*, namely, that ἄγιοι in the New Testament never denotes the angels when it is by itself, that is, without the addition of ἄγγελοι, vanishes, as — (1) The advent is considered as glorified by the appearance of angels; comp. 2 Thess. i. 7; Matt. xvi. 27, xxv. 31; Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26. (2) In the Old Testament without any further addition סַפִּים, and in the LXX. so ἄγιοι, is a designation of the angels; comp. e.g. Zech. xiv. 5; Dan. iv. 10; and therefore this current designation cannot surprise us in Paul. Also, what Hofmann in the above-mentioned place urges in favour of Flatt’s interpretation is without force. For to “the probability of the three prepositions ἐπροσθεν, ἐν, and μετά being used in a similar connection,” is opposed the greater naturalness and easiness of the connection of μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἄγγελων αὐτοῦ with the directly preceding ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ. “And that also the connection” supports Flatt’s explanation, “since the brotherly love in which the Thessalonians are to grow finds its suitable reward in sharing at length the blessed fellowship of all the saints of God,” so that hereby is already introduced “what the apostle has particularly to teach the Christians of Thessalonica for their comfort, that those believers who fell asleep before the Advent of the Lord will not be wanting at it,” can only be maintained without arbitrariness, if not only the explanation in iv. 1—12, but the section iv. 13 ff., be directly joined to iii. 13; and then this section would be introduced with Οὗ θέλομεν γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἄγνοεῖν, instead of with Οὗ θέλομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἄγνοεῖν. — Moreover, the concluding word αὐτοῦ is more correctly referred to τοῦ Θεοῦ, than, with Pelt, Riggenbach, and others, to τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ.
CHAPTER IV.

VER. 1. Λοιπὸν] Elz. Matth. read τὸ λοιπὸν. Correctly rejected, according to overwhelming testimony (A B* D E F G K L N, min. Chrys. cod. Damasc.), by Griesb. Lachm. Scholz, Tisch. and Alford. τὸ arose from the last syllable of the preceding αἰτιῶ.— οὕν in the Receptus after λοιπὸν is erased by Tisch. 1. But the omission is only attested by B* some min. Copt. Chrys. and Theoph., and might easily have been occasioned by the preceding οὐ.— After ἰησοῦ Elz. has καθὼς παρελάβετο παρ ἡμῶν τὸ πῶς δι' ἡμᾶς προσπαθεῖν καὶ ἀρίσκειν Θείῳ, ἵνα περισσεύῃ μᾶλλον. Defended by Reiche. But ἵνα is to be inserted before καθὼς παρελάβετο, with Lachm. Tisch 1 and 7, and Alford (after B D* E* F G, 17, 37, al., Arm. Vulg. It. Ambrosiast. Pel.), and the parenthesis καθὼς καὶ προσπαθεῖν is to be inserted before ἵνα περισσεύῃ (after A B D E F G N, min. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Syr. p. Slav. ed. Vulg. ms. It. Harl. Ambrosiast.). Internal criticism also requires this. For ἵνα περισσεύῃ presupposes the earlier mention of a prior commencement (comp. ver. 10), and such a commencement would not be implied in the preceding text without καθὼς καὶ προσπαθεῖν. Evidently the apostle would originally have written ἵνα, καθὼς παρελάβετο παρ ἡμῶν τὸ πῶς κ.τ.λ., οὕτως καὶ προσπαθεῖν; but, while writing, altered this his intended expression, that he might not say too little, wishing to notice the good beginning already made by the Thessalonians. The repetition of ἵνα after so long an intervening clause was too natural, so that it might excite suspicion.— Ver. 6. προείστομεν. So Griesbach and Schott, after A K L, most min. (as it appears) Clem. Chrys. Theodoret, al.; whilst Elz. Matth. Lachm. Tisch. Alford, after B (e sil.) D E F G N, al. read προείστομεν.— Ver. 8. Elz. has τὸν καὶ δόντα. καὶ is wanting in A B D*** E, min. edd. Syr. Arr. al., Ath. Chrys. al. Erased by Lachm. and Tisch. 1. However, it might easily have been omitted, the eye of the translator passing from τὸν to δόντα. — Instead of δόντα, B D E F G N* 67* et al., mult. edd. Ath. Didym. have δίδοντα. Preferred by Lachm. and Tisch. 1. But δίδοντα appears to be a correction from a dogmatic point of view, in order, instead of the objectionable preterite, to obtain the statement that the Holy Spirit is per-

CONTENTS. — The apostle entreats and exhorts his readers to progress with the greatest earnestness in the Christian life, which they had begun, according to the instructions and commandments which they had received. God desires holiness; they should therefore abstain from fornication, covetousness, and overreaching their neighbours (vv. 1–8). He has no necessity to exhort them to active brotherly love; they practise this already far and wide; but he exhorts them to increase therein, and to seek honour in distinguishing themselves by a quiet and busy life (vv. 9–12). With regard to their anxiety for the fate of their fellow-Christians who had fallen asleep before the commencement of the advent, it may serve for their information and comfort that those who are then alive would receive no preference over those who are already asleep; Christ will descend from heaven; then will the dead rise first, and afterwards the living also will be uplifted with them to eternal fellowship with the Lord (vv. 13–18).

Ver. 1. Τὸ λοιπὸν (see critical remark) would now directly
oppose what follows with what precedes: "for the rest," "what is yet besides to be said;" whereas λοιπόν is a less prominent particle of transition—"besides." Both forms, however, introduce something different from what precedes, and serve properly to introduce the concluding remarks of an Epistle; comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 8; Eph. vi. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 1. Here λοιπόν introduces the second portion of the Epistle, and that in an entirely natural and usual manner, as this second portion is the concluding portion of the Epistle. — (Τὸ) λοιπόν is incorrectly explained by Chrysostom, Theophylact: δει μὲν καὶ εἰς τὸ διψακές; Theodoret, to whom Oecumenius, though wavering, adheres: ἀποχρώντως; Luther: "furthermore;" Baumgarten-Crusius: "generally, what is the main thing." — οὖν therefore, represents what follows as an inference from the preceding, and especially from iii. 13. As it is the final destination of Christians to be ἄμεμπτοι ἐν ἀγιωσύνῃ, in order to reach this end prayer directed to God does not suffice, but also man's own striving is requisite; so the apostle beseeches and exhorts his readers to increase in striving after a holy walk. Comp. Theodoret: Τούτῳ κεχρημένοι τῷ σκοπῷ προσφέρομεν ὑμῖν τὴν παράλειψιν. Calixtus refers οὖν to the idea of the judgment taken from iii. 13: Ergo, ... quum sciatis non stare res nostras fine temporali aut terreno, sed expectari adventum domini a coelis ad judicium, precamur vos et obtentamur, etc. Incorrectly Musculus: Quum igitur gratiam hanc acceperitis a domino, ut in fide illius firmi persistatis, quemadmodum ex relatione Timothei cum ingenti gaudio accepi: quod jam reliquum est, rogo et hortor, etc. — ἐρωτάω in the classics is used only in the sense of to inquire (see the Lexicons); here, as in v. 12, 2 Thess. ii. 1, Phil. iv. 3, John iv. 40, xiv. 16, Acts xxiii. 20, etc., in the sense of to request, to beseech, analogous to the Hebrew בקַשּׁ (so also the English to ask), which unites both meanings. Ἐρωτάωμεν denotes the entreaty address of a friend to a friend; παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν κυρίῳ, the exhortation in virtue of the apostolic office, thus the exhortation of a superior to subordinates. — ἐν κυρίῳ in the Lord, belongs only to παρακαλοῦμεν (against Hofmann), and means, as in Rom. ix. 1, 2 Cor. ii. 17, xii. 19, Eph. iv. 17, as found in
Christ, by means of life-fellowship with Him, Paul being only the organ of Christ; not for the sake of the Lord (Flatt), which would require διὰ τὸν κύριον; also not per dominum Jesum, as a form of oath (Estius, Grotius, and others), against which is the Greek usage; comp. Fritzsche on Rom. ix. 1; Kühner, II. p. 307. Falsely, moreover, Theophylact: ὁρᾷ δὲ ταπεινοφροσύνην, ὅπως οὐδὲ πρὶς τὸ παρακαλεῖν ἄξιοπιστον ἐαυτον εἶναι φήσιν, ἀλλὰ τὸν Χριστὸν παραλαμβάνει ε.τ.λ. — ὅτα] the contents of the request and exhortation in the form of its purpose. — παρελάβητε] see on ii. 13. Oecumenius, after Chrysostom (and so also Theophylact, also Pelt): τὸ παρελάβητε οὐχὶ ῥημάτων μόνον ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πραγμάτων ἔξ ὅν γὰρ αὐτός ἐβίου, τύπος τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐγίνετο. But this extension of the idea is arbitrarily inserted against the natural meaning of the word, and against ver. 2. — τῇ] is not superfluous (Grotius), but specifies in a substantive sense the following words, in order to collect them into one idea, as in Rom. iv. 13, viii. 26, xiii. 9; Gal. v. 14; Phil. iv. 10; Luke i. 62. Comp. Winer, p. 99 [E. T. 134]; Bremi, ad Demosth. de Cherson. p. 236. — καὶ ἀρέσκειν Θεῷ] and (thereby) to please God, is co-ordinate to περιπατεῖν, although logically considered it is the consequence of περιπατεῖν; περιπατεῖν can only be the means of ἀρέσκειν. — περισσεύτε] so. ἐν τῷ οὕτως περι-πατεῖν. Falsely Theophylact, adhering to Chrysostom: ἵνα πλέον τι τῆς ἐντολῆς φιλοτιμήσῃ ποιεῖν καὶ ἱπερβαλήσῃ τὰ ἐπιτάγματα. — μᾶλλον] a further intensification, as is a favourite custom with Paul; comp. iv. 10; Phil. i. 23; 2 Cor. vii. 13, etc.

Ver. 2. A strengthening of παρελάβητε παρ' ἡμῶν, ver. 1, by appealing to the knowledge of the readers: for it is well known to you, ye will thus be the more willing to περισσεύειν. This appeal to their own knowledge is accordingly by no means useless, and still less un-Pauline (Schrader, Baur), as it is elsewhere not rare with Paul; comp. Gal. iv. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 1 ff., etc. — παραγγελίας] not evangelii praedicatio, in qua singula praecepta semina quasi inclusa latitant (Pelt), against which is the context and the plural form; but commands (comp. Acts v. 28, xvi. 24; 1 Tim. i. 5, 18), and that to a Christian
life. The stress is on *tίνας*, to which *τοῦτο*, ver. 3, corres-
sponds. — *διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ῥησοῦ* through the Lord Jesus, by
means of Him, i.e. Paul did not command διὰ εαυτοῦ, but Christ
Himself was represented by him as the Giver of the *παραγ-
the ideas in a strange manner: Auxilio sive beneficio Christi,
siquidem Paulus, ab ipso domino ad provinciam apostoli obe-
dam vocatus, δι' ἀποκάλύψεως Χριστοῦ inter illos docuerat.
So also de Wette: by means of the revelation given in the
Lord, so that the general divine truth is communicated through
Him. Falsely Pelt, διὰ is equivalent to εν; and Grotius,
*accepta* is to be supplied.

Ver. 3. Further specification of *τίνας παραγγγελίας*, accord-
ing to its contents. *τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ*] for
this (the following) is the will of God. — *τοῦτο* not the pre-
dicative (de Wette, 2d ed.), but the subject (comp. Rom. ix. 8;
Gal. iii. 7; Winer, 5th ed. p. 130 [E. T. 199]), is emphatically
placed first, accordingly not superfluous (Pelt). — *θέλημα τοῦ
Θεοῦ* without the article, as the will of God is not exhausted
with what is afterwards adduced. The words are without
emphasis; they resume only the idea already expressed in
ver. 2, although in another form. For a command given *διὰ
τοῦ κυρίου Ῥησοῦ* is nothing else than *θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ.* —
*ὁ ἁγιασμός ὑμῶν*] namely, your sanctification, in apposition to
*τοῦτο* and the subject-matter, whereas *τοῦτο* was only a pre-
liminary and nominal subject. *ἁγιασμός* has an active mean-
ing, *your sanctification* (ὑμῶν, the genitive of the object), i.e.
that you sanctify yourselves, not passive (Estius, Koppe, Usteri,
p. 236; Olszhausen, Baumgarten-Crusius), so that it would be
identical with ἁγιοσώνη, iii. 13. Calovius, Wolf, Flatt, de
Wette, Koch, Alford, and others take ἁγιασμός as a “quite
general” idea, under which not only ἀπέκεισθαι κ.τ.λ., but
also ver. 6, are specified as particulars. This view, in itself
entirely suitable, becomes impossible by the article *τὸ* before
*ὑπερβαλέων*, ver. 6. This does not permit us to consider
ver. 6 as a parallel statement to ἀπέκεισθαι, ver. 3, and εἰδέναι,
ver. 4, but places the statement *τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαλέων* κ.τ.λ.
evidently on the same level with ὁ ἁγιασμός ὑμῶν. Accord-
ingly τοῦτο receives a double specification of the subject-matter in the form of apposition—(1) in ὁ ἁγιασμὸς ὑμῶν, and (2) in τῷ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν, ver. 6. Thus the meaning is: For the following is the will of God, first, that ye sanctify yourselves, and then that ye overreach not, etc. But from this relation of the sentences it follows that ἁγιασμὸς must denote holiness in a special sense, i.e. must be considered in special reference to sins of lust, thus must be used of striving after chastity (Turretin, Pelt, Schott, Olshausen, Bloomfield, and others).—ὁ ἁγιασμὸς ὑμῶν is further exegetically explained—(1) negatively by ἀπέχεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς πορείας, and (2) positively by εἰδέναι κ.τ.λ., ver. 4. In an entirely erroneous manner by Hofmann, according to whom the stress is to be laid on θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦτο is to indicate ἀπέχεσθαι κ.τ.λ., and ὁ ἁγιασμὸς is a parenthetic apposition. Moreover, “a contradiction” to the praise of the church, expressed elsewhere in the Epistle, is not contained in the exhortation, ver. 3 ff. (Schrader), as the reception of Christianity never delivers, as with the stroke of a magician, from the wickedness and lusts of the heathen world which have become habitual; rather a long and constant fight is necessary for vanquishing them.

Ver. 4. That every one of you may know (understand, be capable; comp. Col. iv. 6; Phil. iv. 12) to acquire his own vessel in sanctification and honour. By σκέπος, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascenus, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Tertullian, Pelagius, Haimo, Calvin, Zeger, Musculus, Hemming, Bullinger, Zanchius, Hennius, Drusius, Piscator, Olimar, Aretius, Vorstius, Cornelius a Lapide, Beza, Grotius, Calixt, Calovius, Hammond, Turretin, Benson, Bengel, Macknight, Zacharias, Flatt, Pelt, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bloomfield, Meyer (Rom. 4th ed. p. 74), and others, understand the body (τὸ σῶμα). But—(1) κτάσθαι cannot in any way be reconciled with this interpretation. For that can only denote

1 In a special manner Ernest Schmid explains it: Suum vas i. e. suum corpus et in specie sua membra, quibus ad ἁπλοπρίαν homo abutus potest. So also Majus, Observat. sacr. III. p. 75. Schomer, Woken, and Triller (comp. Wolf in loc.). Bolten, entirely contrary to the context: τῇ λαυτῇ συνίει is “his means, his vessels, or singularis pro plurali, his goods, his utensils.”
to gain, to acquire, but not to own, to possess (for which one in vain appeals to Luke xxii. 19; Sir. vi. 7, xxii. 23, li. 20). If one would, with Olshausen (comp. also Chrysostom), retain the idea of acquiring, and then find the sense: "to guide and master his body as the true instrument of the soul," yet, as de Wette remarks, the contrast μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας, ver. 5, which likewise belongs to κτάσθαι, would be irreconcilable with it.

(2) The body may be compared with a σκεῦος, or, when the context points to it, may be figuratively so called, but σκεῦος by itself can hardly be put in the sense of σῶμα. All the passages which are usually brought forward do not prove the contrary; e.g. Barnabas, Ep. vii. and xi.: τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεῦματος (αὐτοῦ), where σκεῦος has its usual meaning, and only the full expression serves as a circumlocution for the body of Christ. Philo, quod deter. pot. ins. p. 186: τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἁγγείον τὸ σῶμα, and de migr. Abrah. p. 418: τοῖς ἁγγείοις τῆς ψυχῆς σώματι καὶ αἰσθήσει. Cicero, disput. Tusc. i. 22: corpus quidem quasi vas est aut aliquod animi receptaculum. Lucretius, iii. 441: corpus, quod vas quasi constitit ejus (sc. animae). How different also from our passage is 2 Cor. iv. 7, by the addition ὁστρακίνως, according to which the σῶμα is only compared with a σκεῦος ὁστράκινως! (3) The position of the words τὸ ἑαυτῷ σκεῦος is against it. For ἑαυτῷ can only be placed first, because the emphasis rests on it; but a reference to the body of an individual cannot be emphatic; it would require to be written τὸ σκεῦος ἑαυτῷ. Olshausen certainly finds in ἑαυτῷ a support for the opposite view; but how arbitrary is his assertion, that by the genitive "the subjectivity, the ἄνωθεν, is distinguished from the σκεῦος," as only the belonging, the private possession, can be designated by ἑαυτῷ! (4) The context also does not lead us to understand σκεῦος of the body. Paul, namely, has brought forward the ἀγαθομοί of his readers as the will of God, and has further explained this ἀγαθομοί, first, negatively as an abstinence from fornication. If, now, this negative specification is still further explained by a positive one, this further positive addition can only contain the reverse, that is, the requirement to satisfy the sexual impulse in chastity and honour. The words import this, if
σκευος is understood in its original meaning, "retain a vessel," and the expression as a figurative designation of wife. So, in essentials, Theodore Mopsuestius (ed. Fritzsche, p. 145: Σκευος την ἰδιαν ἐκάστου γαμετὴν ὄνομάξει; τίνες in Theodoret (τὴν ὀμαξίγα); Augustin, contra Julian. iv. 10, v. 9; de nupt. et concup. i. 8; Thomas Aquinas, Zwingli, Estius, Balduin, Heinsius, Seb. Schmid, Wetstein, Schoettgen, Michaelis, Koppe, Schott, de Wette, Koch, Bisping, Ewald, Alford, Hofmann, Riggenbach, and others. How suitably does the emphatic ἐαυτῷ become through this interpretation, the apostle, in contrast to the πορφεία, the Venus vulgivaga, urging that every one should acquire his own vessel or means to appease the sexual impulse—that is, should enter into marriage, ordained by God for the regulation of fleshly lusts; comp. 1 Cor. vii. 2, where the same principle is expressed. To regard the expression σκευος as a figurative designation of wife is the less objectionable, as this figurative designation is besides supported by Jewish usage. Thus it is said in Megilla Esther, i. 11: In convivio illius impii aliqui dixerunt: mulieres Medicae sunt pulchriores, ali vero Persicae sunt pulchriores. Dixit ad eos Ahasverus: vas meum, quo ego utor (ב ינש וינש), neque Medicum neque Persicum est, sed Chaldaicum. Comp. Sohar Zevit. fol. 38, col. 152: Quicunque enim semen suum immittit in vas non bonum, ille semen suum deturpat. See Schoettgen, Hor. hebr. p. 827. Lastly, add to this that the expression κτασθαι γυναικα, in the sense of ducere uxorem, is usual; comp. Xen. Conviv. ii. 10: ταύτην (Ξανθήπτην) κέκτημαι; LXX. Ruth iv. 10; Sir. xxxvi. 24.—ἐκαστον ἰμῶν] every one of you, sc. who does not possess the gift of continence; comp. 1 Cor. vii. 1, 2.—ἐν ἄγιασμῳ καὶ τιμῇ] in chastity and honour, belongs not to ἐκαστον, so that διὰ would require to be supplied (Koppe, Schott), but to κτάσθαι, and is an epexegeesis to ἐαυτῶν, so that after κτάσθαι a comma is to be put. In τὸ ἐαυτῶν σκευος κτάσθαι there is contained κτάσθαι ἐν ἄγιασμῳ κ.τ.λ. already implicitly included. Accordingly, by this addition there is by no means expressed in what way one should marry, which, as a too special prescription, would certainly be unsuitable; but ver. 4 contains only the
general prescription, instead of giving oneself up to fornication, to marry, and this is opposed as honourable and sanctified to what is dishonourable and unsanctified.

Ver. 5 brings forward the prescription ἐν ἄγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ once more on account of its importance, but now in a negative form. — μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας] not in the passion of desire. Accordingly, Paul does not here forbid ἐπιθυμία, for this in itself, as a natural impulse, rests on the holy ordinance of God, but a πάθος ἐπιθυμίας, that is, a condition where sense has been converted into the ruling principle or into passion. Theodore Mopsuestius (ed. Fritzsche, p. 165): ὅσαν τοῦτο ποιοῦντος οὐκέτι ταύτη ὡς γνωστὴ συνόντος ἄλλα διὰ μέν μόνην ἀπλῶς, διὰ πάθος ἐπιθυμίας ἐκάλεσεν. — καὶ after καθάπερ is not added for the sake of elegance (Pelt), but is the usual καὶ after particles of comparison; see ii. 14, iii. 6, 12, iv. 6, 13; Rom. iv. 6, etc.; Hartung, Partikell. I. p. 126. — τὰ μὴ εἰδώτα τοῦ Θεοῦ] of whom nothing better is to be expected. Comp. on the expression, Gal. iv. 8; 2 Thess. i. 8.

Ver. 6. The second chief point which the apostle subordinates to the θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ (ver. 3), adding to the prohibition of unchastity the further prohibition of covetousness and overreaching our neighbour (Nicolas Lyrensis, Faber Stapulus, Zwingli, Calvin, Bullinger, Zanchius, Hunnius, Luc. Osianer, Balduin, Aretius, Vorstius, Gomarus, Grotius, Calovius, Clericus, Wolf, Koppe, Flatt, de Wette, Koch, Bouman, supra, p. 82; Bisping, Ewald, Hofmann, Riggenbach, and others). It is true Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascenus, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Jerome on Eph. v. 5, Erasmus, Clarius, Zeger, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Hein- sius, Whitby, Benson, Wetstein, Kypke, Bengel, Baumgarten, Zachar., Michaelis, Pelt, Schott, Olshausen, Bloomfield, Alford, and others, refer it still to the prohibition of unchastity given in vv. 4, 5, whilst they find in ver. 6 a particular form of it designated, namely, adultery, and consider the sentence as dependent on εἰδέναι (Pelt), or as in apposition to vv. 4, 5. But this is without justification. For—(1) the expressions ὑπερβαλλεῖν and πλεονεκτεῖν most naturally denote a covetous, deceitful conduct in common social intercourse. (2) If the
discourse had been only of πορευέα, the words περὶ πάντων 
tούτων would scarcely have been put. Different kinds of
πορευέα must at least have been previously enumerated. But
not even this could be the case, as then to the dissuasion from
πορευέα in general, the dissuasion from a special kind of
πορευέα would be united. (3) Lastly, the article imperatively
requires us to consider τὸ ... αὐτοῦ as parallel to ὀ ἀγασιμῶν
ἡμῶν, ver. 3, and, accordingly, as a second object different from
the first. If Pelt objects against our view that a mention of
covetousness (ver. 6) would occur "plane inexpectato," he
does not consider that lust and covetousness were the two
cardinal vices of the heathen world, and that Paul was accus-
tomed elsewhere to mention them together; comp. Eph. iv. 19,
v. 3, 5; Col. iii. 5. Also, the further objection which is in-
sisted on, that on account of ver. 7 an exhortation to chastity
must be contained in ver. 6, is not convincing, as there is
nothing to prevent us taking ἀκαθαρσία and ἀγασιμῶς, ver. 7
(see on passage), in the wider sense. — τὸ not equivalent to
ὁστε (Baumgarten-Crusius), but a second exponent of the
object-matter of διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (ver. 3). — ὑπέρβαίνειν] here only in the N. T., stands absolutely: just as fines migrate,
to grasp too far (Luther). Comp. Eurip. Alc. 1077: μὴ νῦν ὑπέρβαιν', ἄλλ' ἐναλάμφως φέρε; Π. ix. 501: ὡς κέν τις ὑπερβήθη καὶ ἀμάρτη. The idea of an "oppressio violenti, qualis tyrann-
norum et potentium est, qui inferiores injustis exactionibus aut 
aliis illicitis modis premut," (Hemming) is inserted, and every 
supplement, as that of Piscator, "excedere mordum in augendis 
rerum pretiis," is to be rejected. What Paul particularly
understood by the entirely general μὴ ὑπέρβαίνειν he himself 
indicates by καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν ... αὐτοῦ, which latter words, as
μὴ is not repeated before πλεονεκτεῖν, can contain no inde-
pendent requirement, but must be an explanatory specification 
of ὑπέρβαίνειν. καὶ is accordingly to be understood in the
sense of "and indeed." Others, as Beza, Koppe, Pelt, Baum-
garten-Crusius, Alford, Hofmann, Riggenbach, have united 
both verbs with τὸν ἀδελφόν. But the union of ὑπέρβαίνειν
with a personal object is objectionable, and also in the two
passages adduced for it by Kypke (Plutarch, de amore prolis,
p. 496, and Demosthenes, adv. Aristocrat. p. 439) the meaning oppressere is at least not demonstrable. Moreover, not ἐκαστὸν, from ver. 4 (Baumgarten-Crusius, Alford), but τινὰ, is to be considered as the subject to τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν κ.τ.λ.—πλεονεκτεῖν] expresses the overreaching, the fraudulent pursuit of our own gain springing from covetousness (comp. 2 Cor. vii. 2, xii. 17, 18), not the covetous encroaching upon the possession of a brother, as a figurative expression for adultery.—ἐν τῷ πράγματι] is not verecunde pró concubitu (Estius and those mentioned above), but means in the business (now, or at any time in hand). Too narrow a sense, Piscator: in emendo et vendendo. Rittershus. Polyc. Leyser (in Wolf), and Koppe consider the article as enclitic (ἐν τῷ instead of ἐν τινὶ); unnecessary, and without any analogy in the New Testament. Comp. Winer, p. 50 [E. T. 61]. But also erroneously, Macknight, Schott, Olshausen, and others, ἐν τῷ πράγματι is equivalent to ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πράγματι. —τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ] is not equivalent to τὸν πλησίον (Schott, Koch, and others), but denotes fellow-Christians; comp. ver. 10. This limitation of the prohibition to Christians is not surprising (Schrader), as there is no emphasis on τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ (for otherwise it must have been written τὸ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ μὴ κ.τ.λ.), and accordingly the misinterpretation that the conduct of Christians to those who are not Christians is to be different, could not possibly arise. Paul simply names the circle which stood nearest to the Christians, but without intending to exclude thereby the wider circles. —ἐκδίκος] an avenger; comp. Rom. xiii. 4. The same reason for prohibition in Eph. v. 5, 6; Col. iii. 6; Gal. v. 21. Compare the saying: ἔχει Θεὸς ἐκδίκον ἐμμα (Homer, Batrachom.), which has become a proverb. —καθὼς καὶ] refers back to διότι. —προείπομεν] foretold; the πρὸ refers to the time preceding the future judgment, and the preterit to the time of the apostle's presence among the Thessalonians.—διεμαρτυρόμεθα] an intensifying of προείπομεν.

Eph. ii. 10; Winer, p. 351 [E. T. 492]; Erasmus: Non vocavit nos hac lege, ut essemus immundi, siquidem causa et conditio vocationis erat, ut desineremus esse, quod eramus. — ἀκαθαρσία is uncleanness, moral impurity generally (comp. ii. 3), and thus includes covetousness as well as lust. — ἀλλ' ἐν ἁγιασμῷ gives, by means of an abbreviation (comp. Kühner, II. p. 316), instead of the purpose, the result of the calling: but in holiness, i.e. so that complete holiness of life has become a characteristic property of us Christians. Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 15; Gal. i. 6; Eph. iv. 4. But ἁγιασμός, as it forms the counterpart to ἀκαθαρσία, must denote moral holiness in its entire compass, and is accordingly here taken in a wider sense than in ver. 3.

Ver. 8. An inference from ver. 7 (not likewise from ver. 3, Flatt), and thereby the conclusion of the matter treated of from ver. 3 and onwards. — τοιῷ τούτου (Koppe, Pelt). See Hartung, Partikell. II. p. 354. — ὁ ἀδετῶν] the rejecter (Gal. ii. 21, iii. 15; 1 Cor. i. 19), stands absolutely (used as a substantive). Comp. Winer, p. 316 [E. T. 444]. What is rejected by him is evident from the context, namely, the above exhortations to chastity and disinterestedness. So already Beza. But the rejection of these exhortations is actual and practical, manifesting itself by the transgression of them. To ὁ ἀδετῶν Koppe erroneously supplies:  ἵσταμ τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ λεγεμ, ver. 7; Pelt and Bloomfield: τὴν τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ κλῆσιν; Ernest Schmid: τῶν τοιαύτα παραγγέλλωντα; Flatt: ἐμὲ τῶν παρακαλοῦντα. It is decisive against the last two supplements, that hitherto not the person who gave the exhortations to the Thessalonians, but only the contents of those exhortations themselves, are emphatically brought forward (even on ὁ Θεὸς, ver. 7, there is no emphasis). To seek to determine more definitely ὁ ἀδετῶν from the following ὁμ ἄνθρωπον ἀδετεὶ were arbitrary, as the course of thought in ver. 8 would be interfered with. — ὁμ ἄνθρωπον ἀδετεὶ ἀλλὰ τῶν Θεόν] rejecteth not man (this may be excused) but God, inasmuch as he who enjoins the readers to avoid lust and covetousness, impresses on them not his own human opinion, accordingly not a mere arbitrary command of man, but delivers
to them the solemn and unchangeable will of God. — οὐκ... ἀλλὰ] is here, as always, an absolute contrast, therefore not to be weakened into “not, but especially,” or, “not only, but also” (Macknight, Flatt, and others). Comp. 1 Cor. i. 17; Acts v. 4; Winer, p. 440 [E. T. 623]; Klotz, ad Devar. p. 9 f. In the anarthrous singular ἀνθρωπόν, moreover, Paul expresses not merely the general idea man in contrast to ὁ Θεός, but there is likewise contained therein an (untranslatable) subsidiary reference to himself, as the person from whose mouth the Thessalonians have heard these commandments. Others incorrectly understand by ἀνθρωπος the defrauded brother (ver. 6); so Oecumenius: τοιγαροῦν ὁ παρὰ τὴν κλῆσιν πράττων (οὗτος γὰρ ὁ θετὼν) τὸν καλέσαντα ἔβρισε μᾶλλον ἢ τὸν πλεονεκτηθέντα· τοῦτο δὲ εἶπε, δεικνύς ὡς οὐ μόνον, ἐνθα ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὁ ἀδικούμενος ἢ, δεὶ φεύγειν τὴν μοιχείαν, ἀλλὰ κἂν ἀπίστος ἢ κ.τ.λ.; and Pelt: Vestrum igitur quicumque vocationem suam spernit fratremque laedit, quem diligere potius debuisset, is sane non hominem con- temnit, sed, etc.; also Alford. In a manner still more mis- taken, Hofmann, referring to the whole section vv. 3—6, makes ἀνθρωπος denote humanity, against which he sins who misuses the woman for the sake of lust, or injures his brother for the sake of gain; whilst with an entirely inadmissible comparison of the Hebrew יִשְׂרָאֵל, he arbitrarily inserts into ἀθετεῖν the idea of an “act of sin which is a breach of peace, a violation of a holy or righteous relation,” and finds in ver. 8 the impossible and wholly abstract thought expressed, that every action which treats man as if there were no duty towards man as such, will accordingly be esteemed as having not man, but God for its object. — τὸν καὶ δόντα τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ. εἰς ψυμαῖς] who besides, etc., an emphatic representation of the greatness of the crime which the Thessalonians would commit, were they to disobey these exhortations. In such a case they would not only set at nought the eternal will of God, but also repay the great grace which God had shown to them with shameful ingratitude. καὶ has an intensifying force, and brings prominently forward, by an appeal to the conscience of the readers, the inexcusableness of
such conduct. — το πνεύμα από το ἄγιον] is the Holy Spirit proceeding from God, who transforms the believer into a new personality, and produces extraordinary capabilities and gifts (v. 19 f.; 1 Cor. xii.—xiv.). — εἰς ὑμᾶς] is not precisely equivalent to ὑμῖν (Koppe, Flatt, Pelt), but denotes, instead of the mere logical relation which the dative expresses, the communication under the form of locality; accordingly, unto you.

Remark.—If the present tense διδότα is read, the communication of the Holy Spirit is represented as something continuing in the present. If, along with διδότα, the reading of the Receptus, εἰς ὑμᾶς, is retained, this may be either taken in a wide sense, as ὑμᾶς in ver. 7, “to us, Christians;” or, in a narrow sense, “to us (me) the apostle.” In the first case, the addition on account of its generality would be somewhat aimless. In the second case, the following thought might be found therein: “but God, who not only commissions us to utter such exhortations, but who has also imparted to us His Holy Spirit, put us in a position to speak every moment the correct thing;” comp. 1 Cor. vii. 40. — But (1) this view is objectionable on account of the many additions and supplements which it requires; (2) τὸν καὶ διδότα would introduce no new thought which is not already contained in the contrast ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπον ... ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεόν; for, being commissioned by God to give such exhortations, speaking in His name is one and the same with being qualified for this purpose by God’s Holy Spirit; (3) Lastly, it is generally improbable that the addition τὸν καὶ Χ.Υ.Λ. should contain a statement concerning the apostle, as such a statement is too little occasioned by the preceding. For, in the contrast ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπον ... ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεόν, the general idea not man is contained in ἄνθρωπον as the main point, whilst the reference to the apostle’s own person in ἄνθρωπον is very slight, and forms only a subsidiary point. — If, on the other hand, εἰς ὑμᾶς be received along with the present participle, this might be explained with de Wette, whom Koch follows, that the apostle for the sake of strengthening his words reminds the Thessalonians how God still continues to communicate to them His Holy Spirit; how this communicated Holy Spirit, partly by inspired persons, partly by the voice of conscience, gives the same exhortations which he, Paul, now enforces. But who does not see that here also the chief matter, by which the addition becomes appropriate, must first be introduced and supplied?

Ver. 9. Αὕτη] introduces a new requirement. — φιλαδελφία]
brotherly love, i.e. love to fellow-Christians; Rom. xii. 10; Heb. xiii. 1; 1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Pet. i. 7. But the apostle thinks on this not only as a disposition, but also as verifying itself by action, that is to say, as liberality toward needy companions in the faith (comp. ποιεῖτε ... eis, ver. 10). It is self-evident that this brotherly love does not exclude love to man in general, comp. Gal. vi. 10; 2 Pet. i. 7.— When, moreover, the apostle says that he has no need to exhort the Thessalonians to brotherly love, as they practise this already, but nevertheless requires them to increase in it, this is a touch of delicate rhetoric (praeteritio, παράλευψις, see Wilke, neutestamentliche Rhetorik, p. 365), not unusual to Paul (comp. v. 1; 2 Cor. ix. 1; Philem. 19), in order to gain willing hearts for the fulfilment of an exhortation whose necessity was evident. Chrysostom: Οὐ χρείαν ἔχομεν γράφειν ὑμίν. Ἐξρήν οὖν σιωπήσατε καὶ μηδὲν εἰπεῖν, εἰ μὴ χρεία ἤπ. Νῦν δὲ τῷ εἰπεῖν, οὐ χρεία ἐστί, μείζον ἐποίησεν ἢ εἰ εἰπεῖν. Erroneously Estius, to whom Benson assents: Tacit signifícit, eos omnino opus habuisse admonitione superiori, quae erat de sanctimonia seu munditia vitae; difficile enim erat, homines gentiles immunditiae peccatis assuetos a talibus subito revocare.— αἱτοῖ] not equivalent to sponte (Schott), which would not suit θεοδίδακτοι, but αὐτοὶ γάρ ὑμεῖς are to be taken together, and form the contrast to the person of the writer formerly named (however without further emphasis).— θεοδίδακτοι] an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in the N. T., but analogous to διδακτοί Θεοῦ, John vi. 45 (Isa. liv. 13), and by no means un-Pauline, because Paul elsewhere uses πνευματικός in this sense (Schrader); for πνευματικός could not here have been put. The expression is not to be taken absolutely in the sense of θεόπνευστοι, according to which εἰς τὸ ἀγαπάν ἄλληλον would only be a more definite exegesis of it—“so that ye, in consequence of this theopneustia, love one another;” but it contains a blending of two ideas, as properly only διδακτοὶ ἐστε is expected, but now the source of this instruction is immediately united with the word (without any one exhorting you, you yourselves know, namely, being taught of God, etc.). The knowledge or the instruction is not theo-
retical, not a knowledge from the Old Testament, not a knowledge from a word of the Lord (John xiii. 34 ; Baumgarten-Crusius), also not a knowledge from the instructions of the prophets, such as actually were, according to v. 20, among the Thessalonians (Zachariae), but a practical knowledge which has its ground and origin in the purified conscience of the inner man, effected by God through the communication of the Holy Spirit; consequently a knowledge or instruction of the heart. Moreover, incorrectly Olshausen: "where God teaches, there, the apostle says, I may be silent." For the stress lies not on the first, but on the second half of θεοδίδακτοι. — εἰς τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους is dependent on the διδακτοῖς θεοδίδακτοι, and denotes, under the form of the design at which that instruction aims, its object. Incorrectly Flatt, εἰς denotes quod attinet ad.

**Remark.**—Pelt, Schott, de Wette, Hofmann, also Winer, p. 303 [E. T. 426], and Buttmann, Grammatik des neutest. Sprachgebr., Berlin 1859, p. 223 [E. T. 259], consider the reading of the Receptus: οὗ χαίνω τίξεις γράφων ὑμῖν (see critical remark), as correct Greek, appealing to the frequent use of the infinitive active, where one would expect the infinitive passive (see Kühner, II. p. 339). I cannot agree with this; on the contrary, most decidedly deny the applicability of that use to our passage. For, in the instances given, the characteristic distinction is throughout observable, that the infinitive active expresses the verbal idea in a vague generality, entirely free from any personal reference, so that this active infinitive, in its import and value, can scarcely be distinguished from an absolute accusative. Comp. for example, Sophocles, Oed. Col. 37: ἢξεις. ἦξεις γὰρ χάριν ὑμῖν ἀγαπᾶν. — Thucydides, i. 38: ὡς ὁ Θημιστοκλῆς ἄξος βαμμάσαι. — Euripides, Med. 318: λόγος ἀκούσας μαλλάκες. — Comp. also Heb. v. 11: λόγος δυσορμηθέντος λέγειν. Entirely different from these is our passage, where γράφω, by means of ὑμῖν, instead of forming an absolute statement, is put in a special personal reference to the readers; indeed, as the subject of γράφω can only be the apostle, in a special personal reciprocal reference to Paul and the Thessalonians, and accordingly the whole expression acquires an individual concrete form. If τίξεις is not to be without meaning, it would require accordingly either ὑμῖν γράφων, or, as in v. 1, the passive γράφοντος to be written. For that, as
Bouman, *Charitae theolog.* I. p. 65, and Reiche, p. 339, think, ἢμι or ἢμὰ, or rather the indefinite ἤμα, readily suggest themselves to be supplied, and that the more so, as the necessity of some such supplement is obvious from the following θεοδίδακτοι (Bouman), can hardly be maintained. Also Heb. v. 12, to which an appeal is made, proves nothing; for here from a similar reason ἤμα is to be accented (with Lachmann) instead of ἤμα; whereby the reference and the relation of the words are entirely transformed. Comp. my commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 3d ed. p. 188 f.

Ver. 10. An explanatory confirmation of the statement θεοδίδακτοι ἐστε εἰς τὸ ἀγαπάν ἀλλήλους by an actual historical instance. Calvin finds in ver. 10 an *argumentum a majore ad minus:* "nam quum eorum caritas per totam Macedoniam se diffundat, colligit non esse dubitandum, quin ipsi mutuo inter se amem." But the emphasis rests not on ἀλλήλους and τοὺς ἄδελφον τοὺς ἐν δόξῃ τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ, but on ἀγαπάν and ποιεῖτε. Also the opinion of de Wette, whom Koch follows, that an additional reason is here adduced why the Thessalonians require no further exhortation, is to be rejected, as then καὶ ποιεῖτε would require to be written instead of καὶ γὰρ ποιεῖτε, because γὰρ cannot be co-ordinate with the preceding γὰρ. — καὶ γὰρ] not equivalent to simple γὰρ (so most critics), and also not quin etiam, or imo (Calvin), but *for also;* comp. Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 137 f. Whilst γὰρ is a justification of ἀγαπάν, the idea of διαχθῆναι is carried on to the idea of ποιεῖν by means of the corresponding καὶ. — ποιεῖτε] has the chief accent; it denotes the actual practice. — αὐτὸ] *scilicet,* τὸ ἀγαπάν, not τὸ τῆς φιλαδελφίας (Baumgarten - Crusius and Koch). — περισσεύειν μᾶλλον] to increase yet more, *scilicet,* in brotherly love. Musculus, appealing to Phil. iv. 12, arbitrarily takes περισσεύειν absolutely, whilst he makes a new train of thought commence with παρακαλοῦμεν: "qua eos redigat in ordinem, qui doctrina charitatis ad ignaviae suae, desidiei, curiositatis et quaestus occasionem abutebantur, nihil operis facientes, sed otiose ac curiose circumdeundo ex aliorum laboribus victitantes," and finds the meaning: "ut abundetis magis, h. e. ut magis in eo sitis, ut *copiam* eorum, quae ad vitae hujus sunt sustenta-
tionem necessaria, *habeatis*, quam ut penuriam patientes fratribus sitis oneri." Equally erroneously, because unnatural, Ewald thinks that as the following *φιλοτιμεῖσθαι*, so also even *περισσεύειν μᾶλλον*, is to be included in the unity of idea with *ήσυχάζειν κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 11: "to keep quiet still more, and zealously," etc. Besides, the construction of *περισσεύειν*, with a simple infinitive following, would be wholly without example.\(^1\) — *μᾶλλον*] The same intensification as in iv. 1.

**Remark.**—After the example of Schrader, Baur (p. 484) finds also vv. 9, 10 only suitable for a church which had already existed for a considerable time. How otherwise could the brotherly love of the Thessalonians, which they showed to all the brethren in all Macedonia, be praised as a virtue already so generally proved? Certainly Paul recognises the brotherly love of the Thessalonians as a "virtue already proved," but Baur, no less than Schrader, overlooks (1) that not *εἰς πάνας τοὺς ἁγίους*, but *εἰς πάνας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἐν διὸ τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ*, is written; consequently, the exercise of that virtue is limited to the Christian circle nearest to the Thessalonians; (2) that Paul yet desires an *increase* in that virtue, thus indicating that the exercise of it had only *shortly before* commenced. An interval of half a year (see Introduction, § 3) was accordingly a sufficient time for the Thessalonians to make themselves worthy of a praise restricted within such bounds.

Ver. 11 is attached to the preceding in the loosest grammatical connection. It has been thought that ver. 11 is only a further development of the preceding exhortation. So Olshausen, who finds in the whole section, vv. 9–12, only an exhortation to love, and in such a manner that vv. 9, 10 refer to love to fellow-Christians, and vv. 11, 12 to love to man in general. To the latter in particular, inasmuch as the

\(^1\) Ewald in vain endeavours anew to defend the above construction of the words in his *Jahrb. d. bibl. Wissenschaft*, 10 Jahrb. Gött. 1860, p. 241 ff.: That the apostle, after he had before said that it was not necessary to write to the Thessalonians concerning brotherly love, because they sufficiently practised it, could not, without self-contradiction, proceed to say, but we exhort you yet to increase in brotherly love. In this Ewald is certainly right. But Paul only declared before that the Thessalonians *practised* brotherly love—that they already practised it *sufficiently* we do not read; this, on the contrary, is only arbitrarily introduced by Ewald.
Thessalonians were required to give no occasion to those who were not Christians to blame anything in the professors of the gospel. But evidently the apostle, when he exhorts his readers to give no offence by their conduct to those who were not Christians, considers this not as the fulfilment of the commandment of love to man in general, but as a matter of prudence and discretion, in order in such a manner to counteract the prejudices against Christianity, and so to pave the way for its diffusion in wider circles. Comp. also Col. iv. 5, 6. Others suppose that to the exhortation to φιλαδελφία a warning against its abuse is attached; as some in the church practised liberality, so others made use of this liberality as an occasion of leading an idle life. So already Theodoret: Οὐκ ἐναυτία τοῖς προφθατέσων ἐπαίνοις ἡ παράλευσις συνέβαινε γὰρ, τοὺς μὲν φιλοτιμὸς χορηγεῖν τοῖς διομένους τὴν χρεὰν, τοὺς δὲ διὰ τὴν τούτων φιλοτιμίαν ἀμελεῖν τὴς ἐργασίας εἰκότως τοῖνυν κάκελνουσι ἐπήνευσε καὶ τούτως τὰ πρόσφορα συνεβούλευσε; and after him Estius (“Hac eorum liberalitatem guidam pauperiores abutentes, otio et inertiae vacabant, discurrentes per domos et inhiantes mensis divitum atque in res alienas curiosi, adeo ut hoc nomine etiam apud infideles male audirent”), Benson, Flatt, Schott, de Wette (wavering), and Koch. But against this view is decisive—(1) That such a sharp division of the church into two different classes is not justified by the context; for, on account of the close connection of ver. 11 with the preceding, those of whom περισσεύων μᾶλλον is required are the same with those to whom the exhortation to φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν κ.τ.λ. is addressed. It accordingly follows, that as the church as such was distinguished by active brotherly love, so also the church as such (not a mere fraction of it) did not possess the qualities mentioned in ver. 11. (2) According to this view, the stress is placed only on ἐργάζεσθαι ταῖς χεραῖν ῥόμων, whereas the demand to ἡσυχάζειν and πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια is entirely left out of consideration. And yet it apparently follows, from φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν καὶ πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια being placed first, that the main point lies on these, whilst the idleness blamed in the readers is evidently described
only as a consequence or result of the neglected ἡσυχάζειν καὶ πράσσειν τὰ ἄξια.— Accordingly, as a closer connection of ideas, than that which the form of the grammatical construction appears to indicate, is not without force demonstrable, we must, mindful of the rapid transitions which are peculiar to the Apostle Paul, especially in the practical parts of his Epistles, consider vv. 11, 12 as a new exhortation, internally distinct from that in vv. 9, 10, and which only happens to be united with it, as both refer to the moral furtherance of the Christian life.— φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν is to be taken together: to make it your ambition to live quietly, and the juxtaposition of the two verbs is an oxymoron, as in the usual course of things every φιλοτιμία is properly an impulse to shine by actions.1 Calvin takes φιλοτιμεῖσθαι by itself, referring it back to the command to brotherly love: Postquam enim admonuit, ut crescant in caritate, sanctam aemulationem illis commendat, ut mutuo inter se amore certent, vel (?) certe præcipit, ut se ipsum unusquisque vincere contendat, atque hoc posterius magis amplerctor. Ergo ut perfecta sit eorum caritas, contentionem in illis requirit. So also Hemming, and already Theophylact, leave this and the usual construction a matter of choice. But the omission of καὶ before ἡσυχάζειν would be harsh. On φιλοτιμεῖσθαι, comp. Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. v. 9; Kypke, II. p. 189. The counterpart of ἡσυχάζειν is περιεργάζεσθαι, 2 Thess. iii. 11, and πολυπραγμονεῖν, Plat. Gorg. 526 C.— The disquiet or unsteadiness which prevailed in the church is not to be sought for in the political (so Zwingli: Nemo tumultuetus, nemo motum excitet; and, but undecidedly, Koppe: seditioner adversus magistratus Romanos; comp. also Schott, p. 121), but in the religious sphere. It was, as it appears, an excitement of mind which had been called forth by the new world of thought produced by Christianity; but an excitement, on the one hand, risen to such an unnatural height that worldly business was neglected, and idleness stepped into the place of a regular laborious life; and, on the other hand, manifesting itself by such a fanatical spiritual zeal that the Christians by

1 Bengel: φιλοτιμία politica erubescit ἡσυχάζειν.
such a line of conduct must fall into discredit with those who are not Christians. It is not improbable that the thought of the impending advent of Christ formed the centre part of this excitement. At least this, by a natural association of ideas, would give the reason why Paul after vv. 11, 12 suddenly interrupts the course of his admonitions, in order, exactly at this place, to attach instructions concerning the advent, whilst v. 12 ff. shows that he intended to give various other admonitions.—The exhortation of the apostle in v. 6, 8, to be prepared for the unexpected entrance of the advent, which might be abused in favour of such an excitement, is not decisive against the reference to an apocalyptic fanaticism (against de Wette, who for this reason supposes only “pious excitement in general”), because that exhortation intervenes between preceding (v. 4, 5) and succeeding (v. 9 ff.) consolatory expressions, and, accordingly, loses all that is alarming about it; the addition of that exhortation was too naturally and necessarily required by the explanation of the circumstance itself, that Paul should have suppressed it from mere fear of a possible abuse. —πράσσειν τὰ ἑδα] same as ἰδιοπραγεῖν, to be mindful of one’s own concerns, without wishing to take the oversight of the concerns of our neighbour. If the above remarks are not incorrect, Paul thinks on the unauthorized zeal, by which they had used the advent as a means of terror, in order to draw before their tribunal what was a matter of individual conscience, and by which a care for the salvation of their neighbour was assumed with an objectionable curiosity. τὰ ἑαυτοῦ πράσσειν would be more correct Greek than τὰ ἑδα πράσσειν. See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 441 f.; Kypke, II. p. 338 f. Comp. Dio Cass. lx. 27: τὴν δὲ δὴ ἥσυχαν ἁγνω καὶ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ πράττων ἐσώξωτο.—ἔργαζονθα] means nothing else than to work. Incorrectly, Flatt: to gain one’s maintenance by work; Baumgarten-Crusius: not to be ashamed of work. From the addition τὰ ἑροῦν ὑμῶν, it follows that the Thessalonian church was mostly composed of the working class. Comp. also 1 Cor. i. 26. Calixt, Pelt, Schott, Hofmann, and others erroneously find expressed in the words any imaginable business. Paul
mentions only the business of hand labour, and to apply this to regular business of any form or kind is entirely to sever it from this meaning of the expression. — καθὼς ὑμῖν παρηγγελ-λαμεν] refers not only to ἐργάζεσθαι, but to the whole of ver. 11. It would seem from this that these disorders already prevailed in their beginnings during the apostle's personal residence in Thessalonica. There is nothing objectionable in this inference, as (1) from 2 Thess. ii. 5 it appears that at the publication of the gospel in Thessalonica the advent had been the subject of very special explanations; and (2) the effect of such explanations on the minds of Gentiles anxious about salvation must have been overwhelming. Baur, p. 484, therefore is entirely mistaken when he maintains that exhortations, such as those given in vv. 11, 12, could not have been necessary for a church recently founded.

Ver. 12 is not the statement of an inference (Baumgarten-Crusius), but of a purpose: dependent, however, neither on παρηγγελλαμεν, nor on what has hitherto been said, including the precept to φιλαδελφία, ver. 10 (Flatt), but on ver. 11, and in such a manner that the first half of ver. 12 refers to φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἵσυνχαζειν καὶ πρᾶσσειν ὑπὸ ἑαυτᾶ, and the second half to ἐργάζεσθαι ταῖς χεραῖν ὑμῶν. — εὐσχημόνως] well-becoming, honourably, Rom. xiii. 13 ; 1 Cor. vii. 35, xiv. 40. The opposite is ἀτάκτως, 2 Thess. iii. 6. — πρός] not coram (Flatt, Schott, Koch), but in relation to, or in reference to those who are ἐξω. Comp. Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 265. — οἱ ἐξω] those who are without (sc. the Christian community), those who are not Christians, whether Jews or Gentiles. Comp. Col. iv. 5 ; 1 Cor. v. 12, 13 ; 1 Tim. iii. 7. Already among the Jews οἱ ἐξω (הנהרי) was the usual designation of Gentiles. See Meyer, on 1 Cor. v. 12. — μηδενός] is by most considered as masculine, being understood partly of Christians only (so Flatt), partly of unbelievers only (Luther, Camerarius, Ernest Schmid, Wolf, Moldenhauer, Pelt), partly both of Christians and unbelievers (Schott, de Wette,—who, however, along with Koch, thinks that there is a chief reference to Christians,—Hofmann, Riggenbach). But to stand in need of no man, is for man an impossibility. It is better therefore,
with Calvin, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, Baumgarten - Crusius, Alford, to take \( \mu \theta \delta \epsilon \nu \nu \theta \) as neuter, so that a further purpose is given, whose attainment is to be the motive for fulfilling the exhortations in ver. 10: to have need of nothing, inasmuch as labour leads to the possession of all that is necessary for life, whereas idleness has as its inevitable consequence, want and need.

Ver. 13—v. 11. A comforting instruction concerning the advent. This is divided into three sections— (1) iv. 13—18 removes an objection or a doubt; (2) v. 1—3 reminds them of the sudden and unexpected entrance of the advent; and lastly, in consequence of this, v. 4—11 is an exhortation to be ready and prepared for the entrance of the advent.

(1) Vv. 13—18. A removal of an objection. The painful uneasiness, which had seized on the Thessalonians concerning the fate of their deceased Christian friends, consisted not, as Zachariae, Olshausen, de Wette, Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 2, 2d ed. p. 649 f., and in his H. Schr. N. T.; Luthardt, die Lehre von den letzten Dingen, Leipz. 1861, p. 138 f., and others assume, in anxiety lest the deceased should only be raised at the general resurrection of the dead, and would thus forfeit the blessedness of communion with the Lord in the interval between the advent and this general resurrection ("the so-called reign of a thousand years," Olshausen). There is no trace in our section of a distinction between a first and a second resurrection; and the idea of a long interval of time between the resurrection of believers and the resurrection of the rest of mankind (Rev. xx.) is, moreover, entirely strange to the Apostle Paul, as it is evident from 1 Cor. xv. 22 ff. correctly understood that the resurrection of unbelievers takes place in immediate connection with the resurrection of Christians. Rather it was feared that those already dead, as they would no more be found alive at the advent of Christ, would receive no share in the blessedness of the advent,\(^1\) and accordingly would be placed in irreparable disadvantage to those who are then alive. See exposition of particulars.

\(^1\) Calvin: Vitam aeternam ad eos solos pertinere imaginabantur, quos Christus ultimo adventu vivos adhuc in terris deprehenderet.

Ver. 13. Ὑπὲρ τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἐὰν ἕμασ τοῦ ἀγνοεῖν] but we wish not that ye be in ignorance. A recognised Pauline formula of transition to new and important communications; comp. Rom. i. 13, xi. 25; 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1; 2 Cor. i. 8. In an analogous manner, Paul uses also positive turns of expression: θέλω ἕμασ, Col. ii. 1, 1 Cor. xi. 3, and οὐκ ὠφελεῖν ἕμασ βούλομαι, Phil. i. 12.— ἑρμῆνευτής ὑπὲρ τῶν κεκοιμημένων] concerning those that are asleep, that is, by means of euphemism, “concerning the dead;” comp. 1 Cor. xi. 30, xv. 6, 18, 20; John xi. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 4; Sophocles, Electr. 509. The selection of the word is the more appropriate, as the discourse in what follows is concerning a revivification. But not the dead generally are meant, which Lipsius (Theolog. Stud. u. Krit. 1854, p. 924), with an arbitrary appeal to 1 Cor. xv. 29, considers possible, but the dead members of the Thessalonian Christian church. This is evident from all that follows, particularly from the confirmatory proposition in ver. 14, and from the expression ὁ νεκρὸς ἐν Χριστῷ, ver. 16. — After the example of Weizel (Stud. u. Krit. 1836, p. 916 ff.), de Wette (though in a hesitating manner) finds in κεκοιμημένων the idea indicated “of an intermediate state, i.e. of an imperfect and, as it were, a slumbering continuance of life of the departed soul;” whereas Zwingli, Calvin, Hemming, Zanchius, in express contradiction to the idea of the sleep of the soul, insist on referring this state of being asleep to the body exclusively. But neither, according to the one side, nor according to the other, are we justified in such a limitation, as ὁ κεκοιμημένος only denotes those who are asleep as such, i.e. according to their whole personality. — The article in ἑρμῆνευτής τῶν κεκοιμημένων represents the question, to the solution of which the apostle now passes, as one well known to the readers, and discussed by them. The brevity and generality of the statement of the subject, combined with the solemn formula of transition ὕπερ τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἐὰν ἕμασ τοῦ ἀγνοεῖν, renders it not improbable that a request was directly made to Paul for explanation on the subject. — ὁν γὰρ λυτήσθη] sc. concerning those who are asleep. — καθὼς καὶ
oi λοιποί] sc. λυποῦνται. Woken (in Wolf) gives the directly opposite meaning to the words: Absit a vobis tristitia, quem-admodum etiam abest et reliquis illis, qui nempe non tristantur ob mortuos et tamen spem nullam certam habent de felicitate. Erroneously, because then καθὼς καὶ οὐ λυποῦνται οἱ λοιποί, μὴ ἔχοντες (instead of οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες) ἐπιτίθα would require to have been written: not to mention that Paul would hardly propose unbelievers as an example to Christians.— Theodoret, Calvin, Hemming, Zanchius, Piscator, Cornelius a Lapide, Calovius, Nat. Alexander, Benson, Flatt, Pelt, Koch, Bisping, Bloomfield, Hofmann, Riggenbach find in ἵνα μὴ λυπήσηθε καθὼς κ.τ.λ. the thought that the Thessalonians should not mourn in the same degree, not so excessively as οἱ λοιποί, because the apostle could not possibly forbid every mourning for the dead. Incorrectly; for then ἵνα μὴ λυπήσηθε τοσοῦτον ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποί would require to have been written. καθὼς is only a particle of comparison, but never a statement of gradation. The apostle forbids λυπεῖσθαι altogether. Naturally; for death has no more any sting for the Christian. He does not see in it annihilation, but only the transition to an eternal and blessed fellowship with the Lord. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 54 ff. — οἱ λοιποί] the others, that is, the Gentiles; comp. Eph. ii. 3. It is, however, possible that Paul may also have thought on a portion of the Jews, namely, the sect of the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection.— οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐπιτίθα] namely, of an eternal life of blessedness. Comp. Theocrit. Idyll. iv. 42 : Ἐκπιέδες ἐν ξωοῖσιν, ἀνέλπιστοι δὲ θανόντες. Aeschyl. Eumenc. 638 : ἀπαξ ἡθούντος οὕτως ἐστὶ ἀνάστασις. Catull. v. 4 ff.: Solas occidere et redire possunt. | Nobis quum semel occidit brevet lux, | Nox est perpetua una dormienda. Lucret. iii. 942 f.: Nec quisquam expersedium exstat, | Frigida quem semel est vitae pausa seca. "From this comparison with those who do not believe in a future life in general, it inevitably follows that also the Thessalonians feared for their deceased Christian friends, not merely a temporary deprivation of the eternal life of bliss to be revealed at the advent, but an entire exclusion from it. If the comparison is to have any meaning (which Hofmann with great
arbitrariness denies), the blessing for whose loss the Gentiles mourn must be the same as the blessing for whose loss the Christians are not to mourn. The solution of the theme περὶ τῶν κεκοιμημένων is therefore already indicated by the objective sentence, and what follows has only the purpose of further explaining this solution.

Ver. 14. Reason not of οὐ θέλομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, but of ἵνα μὴ λυπηθοῦσε. The Thessalonians were not to mourn, for Christ has risen from the dead; but if this fact be certain, then it follows that they also who are fallen asleep, about whom the Thessalonians were so troubled, will be raised. There lies at the foundation of this proof, which Paul uses as a supposition, the idea that Christ and believers form together an organism of indissoluble unity, of which Christ is the Head and Christians are the members; consequently what happens to the Head must likewise happen to the members; where that is, there these must also be. Comp. already Pelagius: Qui caput suscitavit, etiam caetera membra suscitaturum se promittit. From the nature of this argument it is evident (1) that those who are asleep, about whom the Thessalonians grieved, must already have been Christians; (2) that their complete exclusion from the blessed fellowship with Christ was dreaded.¹ — εἰ γὰρ πιστεύομεν] for if we believe. εἰ is not so much as "quodsi, since, because" (Flatt), also not equivalent to quodsi: "for as we believe" (Baumgarten-Crusius), but is here, as always, hypothetical. But since Paul from the hypothetical protasis, without further demonstrating it, immediately draws the inference in question, it is clear that he supposes the fact of the death and resurrection of Christ as an absolute recognised truth, as, indeed, among the early Christians generally no doubt was raised concerning the reality of

¹ Hofmann's views are very distorted and perverted. He will not acknowledge that from the fact of the resurrection of Christ, the resurrection of those fallen asleep in Thessalonica is deduced; and—against which the οὐχιναι of the apodosis should have guarded him—he deduces the aimless platitude, that "the apostle with the words: ἵνα τὰς κοιμήσεις ἡμᾶς τινὰ ἂν ἐξελθήσητε, gives an assurance which avails us in the case of our death, if we believe on the death and resurrection of Jesus." As Hofmann misinterprets the words, so also does Luthardt, supra, p. 140 f.
this fact. For even in reference to the Corinthian church, among whom doubts prevailed concerning the resurrection of the dead, Paul, in combating this view, could appeal to the resurrection of Christ as an actual recognised truth; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 12–23. — The apodosis, ver. 14, does not exactly correspond with the protasis. Instead of οὕτως κ.τ.λ. we should expect καὶ πιστεύειν δεῖ, ὅτι ὠσαύτως οἱ ἐν Ἑκατοντάρεσ ἄναστήσωνται, οὐ δια τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦς κοιμηθέντας διὰ τοῦ Ἑκατεοῦ ἐγερεῖ. — οὕτως] is not pleonastic as the mere sign of the apodosis (Schott, Olshausen); also not, with Flatt, to be referred to ἀνέστη, and then to be translated “in such a condition, i.e. raised, revived;” or to be interpreted as “then under these circumstances, i.e. in case we have faith” (Koch, Hofmann), but denotes “even so,” and, strengthened by the following καὶ, is designed to bring forward the agreement of the fate of Christians with Christ; comp. Winer, p. 478 [E. T. 679]. — διὰ τοῦ 'Ἰησοῦ] is (by Chrysostom, Ambrosiaster, Calvin, Hemming, Zanchius, Estius, Balduin, Vorstius, Cornelius a Lapide, Beza, Grotius, Calixt, Calov, Wolf, Whitby, Benson, Bengel, Macknight, Koppe, Jowett, Hilgenfeld (Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theolog., Halle 1862, p. 239), Riggenbach, and others) connected with τοῦς κοιμηθέντας, and then the sense is given: “those who have fallen asleep in Christ.”

But this would be expressed by ἐν τῷ 'Ἰησοῦ, as οἱ διὰ τοῦ 'Ἰησοῦ κοιμηθέντας would at most contain a designation of those whom Christ had brought to death, consequently of the Christian martyrs. Salmeron, Hammond, Joseph Mede, Opp. p. 519, and Thiersch (die Kirche im apostol. Zeitalter, Frankf. u. Erlang. 1852, p. 138)

---

1 Also Alford connects ἐν τῷ 'Ἰησοῦ with κοιμηθέντας; but then arbitrarily (comp. οἱ κυριεύον ἐν Χριστῷ, ver. 16) pressing the expression κοιμηθέντας (οἱ κυριεύοντες are distinguished from the merely κοιμήτως). What makes this distinction? Why are they asleep and not dead? By whom have they been thus privileged? Certainly ἐν τῷ 'Ἰησοῦ), and inappropriately regarding the constructions ἐν τῷ 'Ἰησοῦ, Rom. i. 8; ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, Rom. v. 1; καυχόμενοι διὰ 'Ἰησοῦ, Rom. v. 11, as analogous expressions, he brings out the following grammatically impossible meaning: If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, then even thus also those, of whom we say that they sleep just because of Jesus, will God, etc.

Meyer—1 Thess.
actually interpret the words in this sense. Yet how contrary to the apostle’s design such a mention of the martyrs would be is evident, as according to it the resurrection and participation in the glory of the returning Christ would be most inappropriately limited to a very small portion of Christians; not to mention that, first, the indications in both Epistles do not afford the slightest justification of the idea of persecutions, which ended in bloody death; and, secondly, the formula κοιμηθηναι διὰ τινὸς would be much too weak to express the idea of martyrdom. Also in the fact that Paul does not speak of the dead in general, but specially of the Christian dead, there is no reason to unite τῶν κοιμηθηντῶν with διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ; for the extent of the idea of οἱ κοιμηθηντες in our passage is understood from the relation of the apodosis, ver. 14, to the protasis εἰ πιστεύομεν κ.τ.λ. We are accordingly constrained to unite διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ with ἀξεῖ. — Christ is elsewhere by Paul and in the New Testament generally considered as the instrument by which the almighty act of God, the resurrection of the dead, is effected; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 21; John v. 28, vi. 39, 44, 54. — ἀξεῖ] will bring with Him, is a pregnant expression, whilst, instead of the act of resuscitation, that which follows the act in time is given. And, indeed, the further clause σὺν αὐτῷ, i.e. σὺν Ἰησοῦ (incorrectly Zacharius and Koppe = σὺν Ἰησοῦ), is united in a pregnant form with ἀξεῖ. God will through Christ bring with Him those who are asleep, that is, so that they are then united with Christ, and have a complete share in the benefits of His appearance. Hofmann arbitrarily transforms the words into the thought: “that Jesus will not appear, God will not introduce Him again into the world, without their deceased brethren coming with Him.” For the words instruct us not concerning Jesus, but concerning the κοιμηθηντες; it is not expressed in what manner the return of Christ will take place, but what will be the final fate of those who have fallen asleep. The apostle selects this pregnant form of expression instead of the simple ἐγερεῖ, because the thought of a separation of deceased Christians from Christ was that which so greatly troubled the Thessalonians, and therefore it was his
endeavour to remove this anxiety, this doubting uncertainty, as soon as possible.1

Ver. 15. A solemn confirmation of the comforting truth τῶν κοιμηθέντων ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ, by bringing forward the equality between those living at the advent and those already asleep. Koppe, Flatt, and Koch erroneously assume a reference to ver. 13, making the γάρ in ver. 14 parallel to the γάρ in ver. 15, and finding in ver. 15 a new reason for comfort. — τοῦτο] refers not to the preceding, but is an emphatic introduction to what follows the first ὅτι: this, namely, we say to you, ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου, that we, the living, etc.— ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου] in or by means of a word of the Lord (comp. ὁ λόγος, Esth. i. 12; ἔως ὅτι, 1 Kings xx. 35), that is, the following statement on the relation of the living to those who are asleep at the advent does not rest on my (the apostle's) subjective opinion, but on the infallible authority of Christ. Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25. — Pelagius, Musculus, Bolten, Pelt, and others have regarded this λόγος κυρίου, to which Paul appeals, as the words of Christ in Matt. xxiv. 31 (comp. Mark xiii. 27); whereas Hofmann is of opinion that Paul might have inferred it from the promises of Christ in Matt. xxvi. 25 ff.; John vi. 39 f. But the expressions found there are too general to be identified with the special thought in our passage. Schott's statement, that Paul might justly appeal to the prophecy in Matt. xxiv. 31, because it contained nothing of a prerogative of the living before the dead, but on the contrary represents simply an assembling of believing confessors with a view to the participation of the Messianic kingdom, is subtle, and does not correspond to the expression ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου, which points to positive information concerning the definite subject in question. Also Luthardt's (l.c. pp. 141, 57) view, that in λόγος κυρίου a reference is made to the parable of the virgins who went out to meet the bridegroom (Matt. xxv.), and for which view eἰς ἀπάντησιν (ver. 17)

1 The idea of "a general ascension of all Christians," which Schrader finds in this verse, and in which he perceives a mark of un-Pauline composition, because Paul thought "only on a kingdom of God on earth," is, according to the above, introduced by him into the passage.
is most arbitrarily appealed to, is evidently erroneous. Others, as Calvin and Koch, have thought that Paul referred to a saying of Christ not preserved in the Gospels, but transmitted by tradition. (So, recently, also v. Zezschwitz, _l.c._ p. 121, according to whom the apostle thought "on a word," which is "to be sought for in the peculiar and intimate communications of our Lord to His disciples, such as He would have given them during the forty days, when He spoke with them concerning the μαθητεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ." This supposition may certainly be supported by the analogy of Acts xx. 35; but it must always remain precarious, the more so as there was no inducement to Christ, in His intimations concerning the period of the fulfilment of the Messianic kingdom, to make such _special_ questions, arising only in consequence of concrete circumstances, the subject of an anticipated instruction. It is best, therefore, with Chrysostom, Theodoret, Hunnius, Piscator (who, however, arbitrarily supposes the fact described in 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4), Aretius, Turrettin, Benson, Moldenhauer, Koppe, Olshausen, de Wette, Gess ( _die Lehre von der Person Christi_ , Basel 1856, p. 69 f.), Alford, Riggenbach, and others, to suppose that Paul appeals to information concerning the matter in hand which had been communicated to Him in a direct revelation by the _heavenly_ Christ; comp. Gal. i. 12, ii. 2; Eph. iii. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 1. — ἡμεῖς οἱ ζωντες οἱ περιλευτόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου _we, the living, who remain unto the presence (or return) of the Lord._ From the construction of these words it undoubtedly follows, that Paul reckoned himself with those who would survive till the commencement of the advent, as indeed the same expectation is also expressed in 1 Cor. xv. 51 f. Comp. besides, 1 Cor. vii. 26, 29–31, i. 7, 8; Rom. xiii. 11, 12; Phil. iv. 5. See also Dähne, _Entwickel. des Paulin. Lehrbegr._ pp. 175 f., 190; Usteri, _Paulin. Lehrbegr._ p. 355; Messner, _Die Lehre der Apostel_ , Leipz. 1856, p. 282. This expectation is not confirmed by history: Paul and all his contemporaries fell a prey to death. What wonder, then, if from an early period of the Christian church this plain meaning of the word was resisted, and in its place the most artificial and distorted interpretations
were substituted? For that Paul could be capable of error was regarded as an objectionable concession, as an infringement upon the divine authority of the apostle. It has therefore almost universally been maintained by interpreters, that Paul speaks neither of himself nor of his contemporaries, but of a later period of Christianity. So Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascenus, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Castalian, Calvin, Musculus, Bullinger, Zanchius, Hunnius, Baldwin, Vorstius, Cornelius a Lapide, Jac. Laurentius, Calixt, Calov, Joach. Lange, Whitby, Benson, Bengel, Flatt, and many others. Whilst Calvin and Cornelius a Lapide, in order to remove difficulties, do not scruple to charge the apostle with a pious fraud; supposing that he, although he was convinced of the distance of the advent, nevertheless represented himself as surviving, in order in this way to stimulate believers to be in a state of spiritual readiness at every instant; Oecumenius, after the example of Methodius, interprets οἱ ζῶντες κ.τ.λ. of the souls, and οἱ κοιμηθέντες of the bodies of Christians: ζῶντας τὰς ψυχὰς, κοιμηθέντα δὲ τὰ σώματα λέγει οὐκ ἀν ὁμ προλάβωσιν αἱ ψυχαί· πρῶτον γὰρ ἐγείρεται τὰ σώματα, ἣν αὐτὰ ἀπολάβωσιν αἱ ψυχαί, ἃ καὶ περιλιμπάνεται φησι διὰ τὸ ἀβάνατον· οὐ γὰρ ἀν, εἰ μὴ περὶ ψυχῶν ἔλεγεν, εἴπε το ήμείς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλυπόμενοι, τελευτησεις μέλλων· λέγει οὖν, ὅτι οἱ ζῶντες αἱ ψυχαί οὐκ ἀν τὰ σώματα προφθάσωμεν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει, ἀλλὰ μετ' αὐτῶν τῆς ἀναστάσεως τενζόμεθα. Usually, however, in order to remove the objectionableness of the words, an appeal is made to the fact that by means of an „enallage personae,” or an ἀνακοίνωσις, something is often said of a collective body which, accurately taken, is only suited to a part. Then the sense would be: we Christians, namely, those of us who are alive at the commencement of the advent, i.e. the later generation of Christians who will survive the advent. But however often ἡμεῖς or ἡμεῖς is used in a communicative form, yet in this passage such an interpretation is impossible, because here ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες κ.τ.λ., as a peculiar class of Christians, are

1 Exceptions in early times are very rare. They are found in Piscator (yet even he hesitates), Grotius, and Moldenhauer. To bring the correct view to more general recognition was reserved for recent times.
placed in sharp distinction from κοιμηθέντες, as a second class. Accordingly, in order to obtain the sense assumed, the words would require to have been written: ὅτι ἡμῶν οἱ ζώντες κ.τ.λ. οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμηθέντας, apart altogether from the fact that also in v. 4 the possibility is expressed, that the day of the Lord might break in upon the presently existing Thessalonian church. Not less arbitrary is it, with Joachim Lange, to explain the words: "we who live in our posterity," for which an additional clause would be necessary. Or, with Turretin, Pelt, and others, to understand οὐ ζώντες, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι in a hypothetical sense: we, provided we are then alive, provided we still remain. (So, in essentials, Hofmann: by those who are alive are meant those who had not already died.) For then, instead of ἡμεῖς οἱ ζώντες, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι, it would necessarily require ἡμεῖς ζώντες, περιλειπόμενοι (without an article). The same also is valid against J. P. Lange (Das apostol. Zeitalter, I., Braunschw. 1853, p. 113): "The words, 'the living, the surviving,' are for the purpose of making the contrast a variable one, whilst they condition and limit the ἡμεῖς in the sense: we, so many of us (!), who yet live and have survived; or (?) rather, we in so far as we temporarily represent the living and remaining, in contrast to our dead." Lastly, the view of Hoelemann (Die Stellung St. Pauli zu der Frage um die Zeit der Wiederkunft Christi, Leipz. 1858, p. 29) is not less refuted by the article before ζώντες and περιλειπόμενοι: "The discourse, starting from the ἡμεῖς and rising more and more beyond this concrete beginning, by forming, with the next two notions οἱ ζώντες, οἱ περιλειπό-μενοι, always wider (!) and softer circles, strives to a generic (!) thought—namely, to this, that Paul and the contemporary Thessalonians, while in the changing state of περιλειπότεσθαι (being left behind), might be indeed personally taken away beforehand; although the opposite possibility, that they themselves might yet be the surviving generation, is included in the ἡμεῖς οἱ ζώντες with which the thought begins, and which always echoes through it." Every unprejudiced person must, even from those dogmatic suppositions, recognise that Paul here includes himself, along with the Thessalonians, among
those who will be alive at the advent of Christ. Certainly this can only have been a hope, only a subjective expectation on the part of the apostle; as likewise, in the fifth chapter, although he there considers the advent as impending and coming suddenly, yet he supposes the indefiniteness of the proper period of its commencement (comp. also Acts i. 7; Mark xiii. 32). That the apostle here states his surviving only as a supposition or a hope, is not nullified by the fact that he imparts the information (ver. 15) ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου. For the λόγος κυρίου can, according to the context, only refer to the relation of those who are asleep to the living; but does not refer to the fact who will belong to the one or to the other class at the commencement of the advent. Only on the first point was the comforting information contained which the Thessalonians required.— The present participles ξύνετε and περιλειπόμενοι are not to be taken as futures (Calvin, Flatt, Pelt), but denote the condition as it exists in the present, and stretches itself to the advent.— οὔ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοῖς κοιμηθένταις] shall by no means precede those who are asleep, so that we would reach the end (the blessedness of the advent), but they would be left behind us, and accordingly lose the prize. The apostle speaks in the figure usual to him of a race, in which no one obtained the prize who was forced half way to interrupt his running. — On the emphatic οὔ μή, see Winer, p. 449 [E. T. 634].

Vv. 16, 17. Proof of the truth of οὔ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοῖς κοιμηθένταις by a description of the particulars in which the advent will be realized.

Ver. 16. Comp. Flatt, Opusc. acad. p. 411 ff. — δὲ] not that, as Koch and Hofmann think, so that vv. 16 and 17 (according to Hofmann, only ver. 16 !) still depend on λέγομεν ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου, ver. 15; but for. — αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος] the Lord Himself. αὐτὸς is neither a mere introductory subject ("He, the Lord," de Wette, Hofmann); nor added with the design to refer "the coming of Christ expressly to His holy personality and corporality," accordingly designed to exclude "every manifestation of Him by mere instruments," or by angels (so Olshausen and Bisping, and already Musculus, Estius, and
Fromond.\(^1\)); also is not inserted here "for solemnity's sake, and to show that it will not be a mere gathering to Him, but \(He\) \(Himself\) will descend, and we shall be summoned before Him" (Alford);—but it represents Christ as the chief Person and actor at the advent, emphatically opposed to His faithful ones—both those already asleep (\(οἱ\) \(νεκροὶ\) \(ἐν\) \(Χριστῷ\)) and those still living—as they who are acted upon. — \(κέλευσμα\]

in the N. T. an \(ἀπαξ\) \(λεγόμενον\), denotes an imperative call, \(e.g.\) of a commander to his host to exhort them to the conflict or to warn them to decamp, of a driver to excite his horses to greater speed, of a huntsman to encourage his hounds to the pursuit of the prey, of sailors to excite themselves to vigorous rowing, etc. Comp. Thucyd. ii. 92; Xen. \(de\) \(venat.\) vi. 20; Lucian, \textit{Catapl.} 19. Here the \(κέλευσμα\) might be referred to God. Only then we must not, as Hunnius does, identify it with the \(σάλπιγξ\) \(Θεοῦ\), and find represented in the two expressions the "horribilis fragor inclarescentium tonitruum;" but, in conjunction with the statement that God only knows beforehand the time and hour of the advent (Matt. xxiv. 3), it must refer to the imperative call to bring about the advent. So recently Bisping. This interpretation is, however, to be rejected, because the three sentences introduced with \(ἐν\) are evidently similar, \(i.e.\) all three are a statement of the mode of \(καταβαίνειν\), accordingly contain the description of the circumstances with which the descent during the course of its completion will be accompanied. But, understood in the above manner, \(ἐν\) \(κέλευσματι\) would denote an act \textit{preceding} the \(καταβαίνειν\), and thus another preposition instead of \(ἐν\) would necessarily be chosen. Others, as Theodoret, Oecumenius, Grotius, and Olshausen, refer \(ἐν\) \(κέλευσματι\) to Christ. But in this case we would be puzzled so to define the \textit{contents} of the \(κέλευσμα\), as to prevent them coming into collision with the \(φωνῆ\) of the \(ἀρχάγγελος\). For that we are not justified, with Theodoret, in distinguishing the \(κέλευσμα\) and the \(φωνῆ\) by a \textit{prius and post} (\(ὁ\) \(κύριος\) . . . \(κέλευσει\) \(μὲν\) \(ἀρχάγγελον\)

\(^{1}\) Koch accepts both de Wette's interpretation and the meaning of Olshausen, and thus falls into the contradiction of making \(αινῖ\) at the same time un-accented and emphatic.
f soirée is evident, as both are simultaneous — both in a similar manner are represented as accompanying the καταβάσεως. It is accordingly most probable that Paul places εν κελεύσματι first as a primary, and on that account absolute expression, and then, in an expository manner, more fully develops it by εν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ εν σάλπιγγι Θεοῦ. If this is the correct interpretation, the apostle considers the κελεύσμα as given by the archangel, directly afterwards mentioned, who for the publication of it uses partly his voice and partly a trumpet; and, as the contents of the κελεύσμα, the imperative call which reaches the sleeping Christians to summon them from their graves (comp. also the following καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ κ.τ.λ.), consequently the resurrection-call (Theodoret, John Damascenus, Calixt, and others). — εν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ εν σάλπιγγι Θεοῦ] with the call, namely, of an archangel, and with (the sound) of the trumpet of God. Christ will return surrounded by hosts of angels; comp. iii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 7; Matt. xvi. 27, xxiv. 30 f., xxv. 31; Mark viii. 38, xiii. 26 f.; Luke ix. 26. According to the post-exile Jewish notion, the angels were distinguished into different orders and classes, over each of which presided an ἀρχάγγελος. (See Winer's bibl. Realwörterb. 2d ed. vol. I. p. 386 f.) One of these ἀρχάγγελοι (Σαλέντιος) — whom Nicolas de Lyra, Hunnius, Estius (appealing to Jude 9 and Rev. xii.), Bern. a Picon., Bisping suppose to be the archangel Michael; and Cornelius a Lapide, Michael or Gabriel; whilst Ambrosiaster and Olshausen, as well as Alphen and Honert (in Wolf), understand no angel at all, but the two first understand Christ (!), and the two last the Holy Ghost (!) — is considered as the herald at the commencement of the advent, who with a loud voice calls upon the dead, and arouses them by the sound of a trumpet. The Jews used trumpets for summoning the people together; comp. Num. x. 2, xxxi. 6, Joel ii. 1. Also the manifestations of God were considered as

1 Macknight incorrectly refers the σίλιους to the whole of the attendant angelic host, and finds therein "the loud acclamation which the whole angelic hosts will utter to express their joy at the advent of Christ to judge the world," — an interpretation which finds no support in the context, and militates against the meaning of σίλιους.
accompanied by the sound of a trumpet; comp. Ex. xix. 16; Ps. xlvi. 6; Zech. ix. 14; Isa. xxvii. 13;—and as it was the opinion of the later Jews that God will use a powerful and far-sounding trumpet to raise the dead (comp. Eisenmenger's enidecktes Judenthum, II. p. 929 f.), so in the N. T. mention is made of a σάλπνυξ in reference to Christ's advent; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 52; Matt. xxiv. 31. The trumpet is called σάλπνυξ Θεοῦ, either because it excels all human or earthly trumpets in the power of its sound (so Cornelius a Lapide, Calov, Wolf, Benson, Bengel, Baumgarten, Bolten, and several); or because it will be blown at the command of God (so Balduin, Jac. Laurentius, Pelt, Schott, Olshausen, and others); or, lastly, because it belongs to God and is used in His service (so de Wette, who refers to the expression "harps of God," 1 Chron. xvi. 42; Rev. xv. 2 [see also Winer, p. 221, E. T. 310], Koch, and Alford).—ἀπὸ οὐρανοῦ] down from heaven. For the crucified and risen Christ is enthroned in heaven at the right hand of God; comp. Rom. viii. 34; Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1; Phil. iii. 20. — καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ κ.τ.λ.] a consequence of ἐν κελεύσματι κ.τ.λ. καταβήσεται. — ἐν Χριστῷ] is not to be connected with ἀναστήσωσινται (Pelt, Schott), but with οἱ νεκροὶ; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 18; Winer, p. 123 [E. T. 169]. For if connected with ἀναστήσωσινται, then ἐν Χριστῷ would receive an emphasis which, according to the context, it cannot have; as the apostle does not intend to bring forward the person by whom the resurrection is effected, which is evident of itself, but designs to show what relation it will have to those who sleep on the one hand, and to those who are alive on the other. Theodoret has arbitrarily inserted into the text: Νεκροῖς τούς πιστοὺς λέγει, οὐ μόνον τούς τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ πεπιστευκότας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐν νόμῳ καὶ τοὺς πρὸ νόμου διαλάμψαντας; and Musculus, that there are also to be reckoned among the νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ the dead children of Christians before they believed on Christ, and the "patres priorum saeculorum qui ante tempora Christi vixerunt. Nam et illi cum semine ipsorum propter fidem venturi servatori in Christo fuerunt." —πρῶτον] does not denote, as Oecumenius (οἵ ἐν Χριστῷ, τευτέστιν οἱ πιστοὶ, πρῶτον ἀναστήσωσιν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἔσχατοι,
CHAP. IV. 17.

ως μὴ ἀρπάξεσθαι μήτε ἀπαντᾶν μέλλοντες) and others maintain, the first resurrection,—the so-called resurrection of the just,—in contrast to the resurrection of all men following at a much later period; a distinction which is left entirely unnoticed in our passage, and in the form stated would be un-Pauline. Rather πρῶτον is in contrast to ἑπετα, ver. 17, and denotes that the first act of Christ at His reappearance will be the resurrection of the Christian dead, and then the ἀρπάξεσθαι of the living, ver. 17, will follow as the second act.

Ver. 17. Σὺν αὐτοῖς] i.e. with the raised νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ. — ἀρπαγησόμεθα] we will be snatched away. The expression (comp. 2 Cor. xii. 4; Acts viii. 39) depicts the swiftness and irresistible force with which believers will be caught up. But, according to 1 Cor. xv. 50—53, the apostle must have conceived this ἀρπάξεσθαι as only occurring after a change has taken place in their former earthly bodies into heavenly, to qualify them for a participation in the eternal kingdom of the Messiah. — ἐν νεφέλαις] not instead of eis νεφέλας (Moldenhauer), but either in clouds, i.e. enveloped in clouds, or better, on clouds, i.e. enthroned in their midst. According to the Old Testament representation (Ps. civ. 3), God rides on clouds as on a triumphal chariot. Also the Messiah appears on clouds (Dan. vii. 13). According to Acts i. 9, Christ ascended to heaven on a cloud; and according to Acts i. 11, Matt. xxiv. 30, He will return on a cloud. Theodoret: "Τοῦ μέγεθος τῆς τιμῆς, ὡσπερ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ δεσπότης ἐπὶ νεφέλης φωτισθεὶς ἀνέληφθη, οὕτω καὶ οἱ εἰς αὐτὸν πεπιστευκότες κ.τ.λ. — eis ἀπάντησιν τοῦ κυρίου] to the meeting of the Lord, i.e. in order to be led towards the Lord. eis ἀπάντησιν, corresponding to the Hebrew נקר, is united both with the genitive (Matt. xxv. 1, 6), as here, and with the dative (Acts xxviii. 15). From the words it follows that the apostle did not think of Christ descending completely down to the earth. — eis ἄπα] into the air, belongs to ἀρπαγησόμεθα, and can as little be considered as equivalent to eis τοὺς ὕψινοφοις (Flatt) as it can denote through the air, i.e. through the air to the higher regions (Flatt). Nor, on the other hand, can it be the apostle's mean-
ing—although Pelt, Usteri, *Paulin. Lehrbegr.* pp. 356, 359 (hesitatingly), and Weizel in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 935 f. assume it—that the Christian host would be caught up into the air, in order to have their permanent abode with Christ in the air. For, according to 2 Cor. v. 1, the future eternal abode of Christians is ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Nevertheless the apostle was constrained to express himself as he has done. For when Christ descends down from heaven, and Christians are caught up to meet Him, the place of meeting can only be a space between heaven and earth, i.e. the air. Comp. Augustine, *de civit. Dei*, xx. 20, 2: Quod enim ait . . . non sic accipiendum est, tanquam in aëre nos dixerit semper cum domino esse mansuros; quia nec ipse utique ibi manebit, quia veniens transiturus est. Venienti quippe ibitur obviam, non manenti. But that Paul adds nothing concerning the removal of the glorified Christian host to heaven, following their being caught up with Christ, and of the resurrection of all men connected with the advent, along with the judgment of the world, is naturally explained, because the description of the advent as such is not here his object, but his design is wholly and entirely to satisfy the doubts raised by the Thessalonians in respect of the advent. But to effect this purpose it was perfectly sufficient that he now, specifying the result of the points described, proceeds: καὶ οὕτως πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα] and so shall we ever be united with the Lord. — οὕτως] so, that is, after that we have actually met with Him. It refers back to εἰς ἀπάντησιν. — σὺν] imports more than μετά. It expresses intimate union, not mere companionship. — ἐσόμεθα] comprehends as its subject both νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ and the ζῶντες.

Ver. 18. A concluding exhortation.— ἄρακαλεῖν] not to

1 Also on this account Paul cannot have thought on a permanent residence on the glorified earth (Georgii in Zeller's *theol. Jahrb.* 1845, I. p. 6, and Hilgenfeld in the *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Theol.*, Halle 1862, p. 240).

2 For the same reason also the silence concerning the change of believers who happened to be alive at the advent is justified. Against Schrader, who thinks on account of this silence that the author must have conceived the circumstances of the advent "in an entirely sensible manner;" "the incongruities of this representation, if it is understood sensibly," cannot be Pauline, because with Paul the doctrine of the last things has a "purely (?) spiritual character."
exhort (Musculus), but to comfort; comp. ἵνα μὴ λυπῆσθε, ver. 13.—λόγοι] denotes nothing more than words. Erroneously Aretius, Flatt, Pelt, Olshausen, and others: principles or doctrines (of faith). And ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις denotes on the ground of these or the above words.
CHAPTER V.

In ver. 2 Lachm. and Tisch., after B D E F G Ν, 17, 67** et al., read only ἦμῖρα. But the Receptus ἦ ἦμῖρα is to be retained. The article was omitted in consequence of the similar letter at the beginning of the following word.— Ver. 3. "Οὗτοι λέγωσιν] Elz. Matth. read "Οὗτοι γὰρ λέγωσιν. But γὰρ is wanting in A F G Ν* 17, 44, al., m. Syr. It. Tert. Cypr. Ambrosiaster, ed., and instead of it B D E Ν**** Copt. Syr. p. Chrys. Theodoret have δῖ (bracketed by Lachm.). This diversity of authorities makes it highly probable that Paul wrote only "Οὗτοι (received by Griesb. Scholz, Tisch. and Alford), but that at a later period, after the relation of ideas was defined, a γὰρ or a δῖ was inserted for explanation.— Ver. 4. Elz. has ἦ ἦμῖρα ὑμᾶς. Instead of this Lachm. and Tisch. I have ὑμᾶς ἦ ἦμῖρα. Correctly; for this position is not only required by predominant attestation (A D E F G, al., Vulg. It. Chrys. in comm.), but also by the internal design of the discourse.— Elz. has ὡς κλίστης. ὡς κλίστης, accepted by Lachm. (not Tisch.), is not sufficiently attested by A B, Copt., and unsuitable by the change of the image without any reason.— Ver. 5. σάντις γὰρ] Elz. Matth. read σάντις. Against A B D E F G L Ν, 17, 23, al., perm. edd. Syr. utr. Arr. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Slav. ed. Vulg. It. Clem. Chrys. Theodoret, Theoph. Ambrosiast. Aug. Pel.— Elz. has ὁδι ἵπτων. ὁδι ἵπτων, found in D* F G, Syr. It. Harl.** Marian, Ambrosiast., is a correction for the sake of conformity with the preceding.— Ver. 6. Elz. has ὡς καὶ ὁ λοιπὸν. Lachm. and Tisch. I read ὡς δὶ λοιπὸν. But the omission of καὶ is not sufficiently attested by A (B ?) Ν* 17, al., Syr. Arr. Aeth. Vulg. ms. Clem. (bis) Antioch. According to Schott, καὶ is a gloss from iv. 13 (?).— Ver. 13. Instead of the Receptus ἐπηρεῖπερισσοῦ, B D* F G, al. have ἐπηρεῖπερισσῶς. Preferred by Lachm. Tisch. and Alford. Probably original; ἐπηρεῖπερισσῶς, not occurring elsewhere, being corrected according to iii. 10 and Eph. iii. 20.— Instead of in αὐτῶς, which D* F G Ν, 47, al., pl. edd. Syr. Erp. Aeth. Slav. ms. Vulg. It. Chrys. Theodoret, Codd. ap. Theophl. Ambrosiast. ed. Pelag. require, and Griesb. has commended to special consideration, in ἱπτῶς of the Receptus is to be retained, with Matth. Lachm. Scholz, Tisch. Bloomfield,

CONTENTS. — Concerning the period of the commencement of the advent the readers require no instruction. They themselves well knew that the day of the Lord will suddenly break in, as a thief in the night. Therefore as children of the light they are to be watchful, and to arm themselves with the spiritual armour of faith, love, and hope, comforted with the assurance that God has not appointed them to destruction, but to eternal salvation through Jesus Christ who died for us, that we, whether living or dead, may receive a share in His glory. Therefore they are to comfort and edify one another (vv. 1—11.). They are to esteem those who had the rule over them, to be peaceful among themselves, to admonish the unruly, to encourage the faint-hearted, to assist the weak, and to be forbearing toward all men. No one is to repay evil
with evil. They are always to retain Christian joyfulness, to pray continually, to thank God for all things. They are not to quench the Spirit, nor to despise prophecy, but to prove all things, and to preserve the good. May God sanctify them thoroughly, in order that they may be blameless at the coming of Christ (vv. 12–24). After an exhortation to the readers to pray for him, to salute all the brethren, and to read the Epistle to the whole assembled congregation (vv. 25–27), the apostle concludes with a Christian benediction (ver. 28).

(2) Vv. 1–3. A reminder of the sudden and unexpected entrance of the advent.

Ver. 1. Περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν] but concerning the times and periods, i.e. concerning the time and hour, sc. of the advent. The conjunction of these two words frequently occurs; comp. e.g. Acts i. 7; Dan. ii. 21; Eccles. iii. 1. χρόνος denotes time in general; καιρός, the definite point of time (therefore usually the favourable moment for a transaction). See Tittmann, de synonym. I. p. 39 ff. Paul puts the plural, because he thinks on a plurality of acts or incidents, in which partly preparation is made for the advent (2 Thess. ii. 3 ff.), and partly it is accomplished. That, moreover, the apostle, although he has not treated of the advent in itself, but only of an entirely special objection regarding it, feels necessitated also to make the commencement of the advent a subject of explanation, is an evident intimation that this point also formed the subject of frequent discussion among the Thessalonians. Yet on account of the relation of the second Epistle to the first, the opinion that the return of Christ was immediately to be expected was not yet diffused. — οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε] a praeteritio, as in iv. 9. The reason why the readers did not require instruction on the time and hour of the advent, is neither because instruction concerning it would not be useful to them (Oecumenius: ὡς ἀσύμφορον ὁ δὲ γε Παῦλος ἵσως ἤδει αὐτῷ, ἐκ τῶν ἀρρήτων καὶ τοῦτο καθὼς, Theophylact, and others), nor also because no instruction can be given concerning it (Zwingli, Hunnius, Estius, Fromond., Flatt, Pelt, Baumgarten-Crusius, Koch, and others), but because the Thessalonians were already sufficiently acquainted with it from
the oral instruction of the apostle. Accordingly the apostle adds—

**Ver. 2.** *Aπόλ γάρ*] *For ye yourselves,* emphatically contrasted with the person of the writer, as in iv. 9. — *ἀκριβῶς*] exactly, *i.e.* very well. — By the *ἡμέρα κυρίου,* Hammond, Schoettgen, and Harduin arbitrarily understand the time of the destruction of Jerusalem; Nicolas de Lyra, Bloomfield, and others, the day of each man's death; Oecumenius, Theophylact, and Zwingli, the death of the individual and the end of everything earthly. *ἡμέρα κυρίου* can only be another expression for *παροικία τοῦ κυρίου,* iv. 15, and denotes, as everywhere else, the near impending period, when the present order of the world will come to an end, and Christ in His glory will return to the earth for the resurrection of the dead, the general judgment, and the completion of the kingdom of God; comp. 2 Thess. ii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 8, v. 5; 2 Cor. i. 14; Phil. i. 6, 10, ii. 16. Besides, the corresponding expression *ην κατ᾿ εἰς* is used in the Old Testament to denote a time in which God will manifest in a conspicuous manner His penal justice, or also His power and goodness; comp. Joel i. 15, ii. 11; Ezek. xiii. 5; Isa. ii. 12. — *ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτί*] *as a thief in the night,* sc. *ἐρχεται*; comp. 2 Pet. iii. 10. The figure is designed to depict the suddenness and unexpectedness of the coming; comp. Matt. xxiv. 43; Luke xii. 39. Others, as Flatt, Schott, and Alford (similarly also Hofmann and Riggenbach), find expressed therein the further reference that the day of the Lord will also be terrible to all those who are not properly prepared for it. But this further idea is not contained in ver. 2, but only meets us in what follows. The comparison *ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτί* was undoubtedly the chief reason of the opinion in the ancient church, that the advent is to be expected at night (more specifically, on an Easter-eve), which gave rise to the vigils, as one wished to be overtaken in a waking condition by the return of Christ. Comp. Lactantius, *Instit.* vii. 19: "Haec est nox, quae a nobis propter adventum regis ac Dei nostri pervigilio celebratur; cujus noctis duplex ratio est, quod in ea et vitam tum receptit, quem passus est, et postea orbis terrae regnum recepturus est."
Jerome on Matt. xxv. 6 (vol. vii. p. 203): “Traditio Judaeorum est, Christum media nocte venturum in similitudinem Aegyptii temporis, quando pascha celebratum est et exterminator venit, et dominus super tabernacula transit. . . . Unde reor et traditionem apostolicam permansisse, ut in die vigiliarum paschae ante noctis dimidium populos dimittere non liceat, exspectantes adventum Christi.” — οὕτως even so, a strong resumption of the preceding ὡς.— The present ἐρχεται is not here used instead of the future ἐλεύσεται (Vorstius, Koppe, Flatt, Pelt), but is designed to characterize the coming thus taking place as an absolute and certain truth. See Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 371; Winer, p. 237 [E. T. 331].

Ver. 3. Paul carries on in a vivid manner (therefore asyndetically) the description of the sudden and unexpected nature in which the advent is to break in, whilst he indicates that precisely at the time when man fancies himself in the greatest security, the advent will occur. But with this thought is the wider and more special thought blended, that they who dream of security and serve earthly things will reap the fruit of their carelessness, namely, destruction. — ὅταν λέγουσιν when they shall say, when it is said. As the subject of the verb, the apostle naturally thinks not on the inhabitants of Jerusalem (Harduin), but, as is evident from the nature of the expression of opinion added, and from the apodosis, unbelievers and merely nominal Christians, the children of this world; comp. Matt. xxiv. 38 ff.; Luke xvii. 26 ff. For the pious and true Christian never abandons himself to the feeling of security, but is always mindful of his salvation with fear and trembling; comp. Phil. ii. 12. — εἰρήνη καὶ ἀσφάλεια sc. εστίν; comp. Ezek. xiii. 10. — ἐφισταται] imminet, or it surprises them. — ἐκφύγωσιν] stands absolutely. Came-rarius and others unnecessarily supply τὸν ἐλεβρον. Moreover, de Wette justly remarks, that in the comparison of the pangs of a pregnant woman, the supposition is contained that the advent is close at hand; for although the day and the hour, indeed, is not known to her, yet the period of her bearing is proximately known. Comp. Theodoret: σφόδρα πρόσφορον τὸ παράδειγμα· καὶ γὰρ ἡ κύουσα οἶδεν ὅτι φέρει τὸ ἐμβρυον,
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αγνοεί δὲ τῶν τῶν ὀξινῶν καιρῶν· οὐτώ καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὅτι μὲν ἐπιφανῆς τῶν ἄγων ὁ κύριος, ἵσμεν, σαφῶς δὲ αὐτῶν τῶν καιρῶν οὖν ἀλαμοῦς ἐπιδιάκυψατε. Οἰκεμενιος: καλῶς δὲ τὸ ὑπόθεναμα τέθεικε τῆς ἐν γαστρί ἐχούσης· καὶ ὅρα καὶ αὐτὴ σημεία μὲν ἔχει τοῦ τόκου πολλά, αὐτῆς δὲ τῆς ἀρας ἢ τῆς ἡμέρας οὐκ ἔτι.

REMARK.—If ὅταν ἄ (see critical remark) is read, we might, with Schott, whom Koch follows, find the following contrast with αἰνεῖ in ver. 2 expressed: ye indeed know certainly that the day of the Lord will infallibly and suddenly arrive; but the day of the Lord, bringing destruction, will surprise the unbelieving and ungodly, who live in carelessness and security. But were such an emphatic opposition of persons the intention of the apostle, he would have attached to the simple verb ὅταν ἄ δι λέγων a particular personal designation. Besides, αἰνεῖ, ver. 2, already forms a contrast with the person of the writer, ver. 1; accordingly, it is improbable that αἰνεῖ, ver. 2, should be so emphatically placed first, in order at the same time to introduce a contrast to third persons who are not mentioned until ver. 3. Lastly, it is evident from the context that it is by no means the design of the apostle to explain that the day of the Lord will befall Christians prepared, but unbelievers unprepared; but he purports to remind them only of the sudden and unexpected entrance of the advent itself.

(3) Vv. 4—11. Exhortation to be ready and prepared for the coming of the advent, occasioned and also softened by the previous indication of their character as “of the light,” which the readers by reason of their peculiarity as Christians possessed.

Ver. 4. 'Τιμεῖς δὲ] but ye, in contrast to the unbelieving and worldly-minded described in ver. 3. — ἐστέ] indicative, not imperative; for otherwise μὴ ἐστε would require to be written instead of οὐκ ἐστε (see Schmalfeld, Syntax des Griech. Verb. p. 143), not to mention that, according to the Pauline view, Christians as such, i.e. in their ideas and principles, are no more σκότος, but φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ; comp. Eph. v. 8; 2 Cor. vi. 14; Col. i. 12. The expression σκότος, darkness, here occasioned by the comparison ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτί, ver. 2, is a designation of the ruined condition of the sinful and unredeemed world, which in its estrangement from God is neither
enlightened concerning the divine will, nor possesses power to
fulfil it. — ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἡ ἡμέρα κ.τ.λ.] By ὑμᾶς placed first the
readers are fittingly and emphatically brought forward in
opposition to those described in ver. 3. — ἵνα is not ἐκβατικῶς
in the sense of so that (Flatt, Pelt, Olshausen, Baumgarten-
Crusius, Bisping, and others), but τελικῶς: that, or in order that.
But the design contained in ἵνα is to be referred to God.
Paul intends to say: Ye are not among the unbelieving
world alienated from God, and thus the design which God
has in view in reference to that unbelieving and alienated
world, namely, to surprise them by the day of the Lord, can
have no application to you. Why this design of God can have
no application to the readers, the apostle accordingly states—

Ver. 5, first positively, and then negatively with a general
reference to all Christians. — τινοι φωτός] sons of the light, and
τινοι ἡμέρας, sons of the day, are Hebraisms: being a concrete
mode of expression, in order to represent "belonging to."
Comp. Eph. ii. 2, 3, v. 8; Luke xvi. 8; 1 Pet. i. 14, and
other passages. See Winer, p. 213 [E. T. 298]. ἡμέρα is
here used as a synonym for ημέρα. The transition from the
notion of the day of the Lord to the notion of day generally, in
contrast to the darkness, was so much the more natural, inasmuch as the day of the Lord is according to its nature light,
before which no darkness can exist, or rather by which every
impiety of the darkness will be discovered and judged. An
entirely similar transition from the ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
generally is found in Rom. xiii. 12, 13.— Ἄν δὲ καθεύδεων
νυκτὸς υἱῶν σκότους, Estius, Pelt, Schott, and others incorrectly
again supply τινοι; for τινοι, with the simple genitive, is the
genuine Greek mode of expressing the idea of a possessive
relation. See Kühner, II. p. 167; Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 165.

Ver. 6 infers from the Christian's character as children of the
light, the duty to behave conformably to it, i.e. to be
watchful and sober, that they might not be taken unprepared
by the day of the Lord. — καθεύδεων] denotes, under the
image of sleep, carelessness about the eternal salvation of the
soul. In Eph. v. 14 it is of the sleep of sin. — οἱ λουποί] the
others (comp. iv. 13; Eph. ii. 3), i.e. the unbelievers. — γηρή-
γορεῖν and νίφεῖν are also conjoined in 1 Pet. v. 8. νίφεῖν is the opposite of μεθύσκεσθαι, ver. 7. Oecumenius: ἐπίτασις ἕγρηγόρεσι τὸ νίφεῖν. ἐν γὰρ καὶ ἕγρηγορέναι καὶ μηδὲν διαφέρειν καθεύδοντος.

Ver. 7. A reason for the exhortation in ver. 6 by a reference to the practice of the outward life. — νυκτὸς μεθύσκεσθαι refers to the known custom of devoting the evening and the night for debauchery. — μεθύσκεσθαι is entirely synonymous with μεθύειν. It is not to be assumed that the change of the verb is intentional, in order to denote with the first "the act of getting drunk," and with the second "the state of being so" (Macknight); since, as also the analogy of the first half of the sentence proves, the progress of the discourse is contained in the addition of νυκτός, and accordingly only the idea already expressed in μεθυσκόμενοι is again taken up by μεθύσκεσθαι. The view of Baumgarten-Crusius, repeated by Koch and Hofmann, that ver. 7 is to be understood in a figurative sense (comp. already Chrysostom and Oecumenius), and that Paul intends to say: "A want of spiritual life (καθεύδειν) and immorality (μεθύσκεσθαι) belong to the state of darkness (νυκτός), thus not to you," is logically and grammatically impossible, since νυκτός, on account of the same verbs as subjects and predicates, can only contain a designation of time. In order to justify the above interpretation, οἱ γὰρ καθεύδοντες καὶ (οἱ) μεθυσκόμενοι νυκτὸς εἶσιν would require to have been written.

Ver. 8. The apostle passes over to a new image, whilst he, as the proper preparation for watchfulness and sobriety, requires the putting on of the Christians' spiritual armour, with the help of which they are in a condition victoriously to repel all the assaults of internal and external enemies.¹ The apostle delights to represent the Christian under the image of a warrior; comp. 2 Cor. x. 4 ff.; Rom. vi. 13, xiii. 12; and especially Eph. vi. 11 ff. Here the transition to this new image was very easily occasioned either by the expression

¹ This design of the armour is evident from the context. Schrader's objection to the words, that "Paul elsewhere only speaks of an arming against evil in order to overcome it," is therefore without meaning.
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ήμέρα, ver. 5, inasmuch as in the day one is not only watchful, but also completely clothed; or by the idea of γρηγορεῖν, ver. 6, inasmuch as whoever watches must also be provided with weapons. Whilst in Eph. vi. 11 ff. not only weapons of defence, but also of offence are mentioned, the apostle here names only weapons of the first description. He designates as weapons the three principal parts of the Christian life—faith, love, and hope; comp. i. 3 and 1 Cor. xiii. 13.—πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης] are genitives of apposition. πίστεως and ἀγάπη do not import “trust in God and Christ, and in connection with it love to Him and to our fellow-men and to our fellow-Christians” (Flatt); but the first is faith in Christ as the Redeemer, and the latter love to our neighbour. The πίστεως and the ἀγάπη are a θώραξ, a coat of mail (comp. Isa. lix. 17; Wisd. v. 19), i.e. they protect the Christian’s heart against the influences of evil, even as a coat of mail protects the breast of the earthly warrior.—καὶ περικεφαλαίαν ἐπιθήκας σωτηρίας] and as a helmet the hope of salvation. This hope of eternal salvation is so much the more a powerful protection against all the attacks and allurements to evil, as it by means of a reference to a future better world sustains our courage amidst trial and tribulation, and communicates strength to stedfast endurance.—The helmet is already in Isa. lix. 17 represented as a symbol of victory.

Ver. 9. In this verse does not follow a new reason for the duty of watchfulness and sobriety (Musculus), but a confirmation of the concluding words of ver. 8: ἐπιθήκας σωτηρίας. Hofmann strangely perverts the passage: ὅτι is to be translated by that (not by for), and depends on ἐπιθήκα, a construction which is plainly impossible by the addition of σωτηρίας to ἐπιθήκα, on account of which the passage Rom. viii. 21, which Hofmann insists on as an alleged analogy, cannot be compared. —The construction τιθέναι or τίθεω οὖν τινα εἰς τι, to appoint one for a purpose, to destine one to something, is conformable with the Hebrew יָּסָּד, יָּשָׁו, or יָּשָׁנ with ה following; comp. Acts xiii. 47; 1 Pet. ii. 8; 1 Tim. i. 12.—eis ἀγωγή] to wrath, i.e. to be subject to it, to become its prey; comp. i. 10.—αλλ’ εἰς περιποιήσιν σωτηρίας] but to the acquisition of salvation.
Periputoieiv means to cause something to remain, to save, to acquire. The middle periputoieidvas signifies to save for oneself. Therefore periputoieiv denotes the acquisition, and particularly the possession of a people; comp. Eph. i. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 9; Acts xx. 28, corresponding to the Hebrew Ἴσραή, by which the people of Israel were denominated God's holy property; comp. Ex. xix. 5; Deut. vii. 6, etc. Here as in 2 Thess. ii. 14 periputoieiv has the meaning of acquisition generally. — διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] belongs to periputoieiv, not to ἔθεσο (Estius). Even by this grammatical relation of the words, Hofmann's opinion, that by διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ the pledge of salvation is prominently brought forward, is refuted. But the meaning is not: per doctrinam eam, quam Christus nobis attulit, non rabbini, non philosophi (Grotius), but: by faith on Him.

Ver. 10. That by which the acquisition of salvation is rendered objectively possible is the death of Christ for our redemption. However, this objective reason of periputoieiv σωτηρίας appears, according to the verbal expression, here not in causal connection with the preceding; for otherwise ver. 10 would have been attached with the simple participle αποθανόν-τος without the article. Rather Paul adds in ver. 10 simply the fact of the death of Christ for our redemption as an independent expression, in order, by the addition of the final end of His death, to return to the chief reason which led him to this whole explanation concerning the advent, namely, to the comforting assurance that Christians who have already fallen asleep at the entrance of the advent will, as well as those who are alive, be partakers in Christ's glory. — ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν] for our benefit, not in our stead (Baumgarten-Crusius). See Meyer on Rom. v. 6. — ἔρχομαι and καθεύθειν cannot here, as formerly, be taken in an ethical sense; for in what precedes καθεύθειν was represented as a mark of the unbelieving, of the children of this world, something incompatible with Christians in their character as children of the light. But to understand the words in their literal sense, with Musculus, Aretius, and Whitby, that is, to interpret them of day and night: "whether the advent happens in the day-time or at night," would be
feeble and trite. It only remains that waking and sleeping here is to be regarded as a *figurative designation of life and death*, whether we are yet alive at the advent, or whether we are already dead. Accordingly the same thought is expressed in the sentence with ἑνα, generally considered, which is contained in the concluding words of Rom. xiv. 8 (εἰς τε ὁδὸν ζήμεν εἰς τε ὑποθνήσκωμεν, τοῦ κυρίου ἐσμέν).—On καθεῦθεν of death, comp. LXX. Dan. xii. 2; 2 Sam. vii. 12; Ps. lxxxviii. 5.—On εἰς...εἰς, with the conjunctive, see Winer, p. 263 [E. T. 368].—ἀμα does not belong to σὺν αὐτῷ (Hofmann, Riggenbach), but to ζήσομεν. It here corresponds to the Hebrew ὑμῖν, altogether (Rom. iii. 12), so that it emphatically brings forward the similar share in the ζήν σὺν Χριστῷ for all Christians, whether living or dead.—ζήσομεν] more specific than ἐσόμεθα, iv. 17; for being united with the Lord is a partaking of His glory. According to Hofmann (comp. also Möller on de Wette), ζήσομεν is designed to denote only a state of life-fellowship with Christ, so that there is indicated by it not something future, but the present condition of Christians. But this weakening of the verbal idea militates against the context of our passage, as it has for its contents questions respecting the advent, and we are reminded of the period of the advent by εἰς ὄργην and εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας directly preceding. Besides, Paul, if he would have expressed nothing more than “a fellowship of life with Christ, for which the distinction of corporeal life and death is indifferent,” would much more naturally have written αὐτοῦ ὕμεν (comp. Rom. xiv. 8) instead of σὺν αὐτῷ ζήσωμεν.

Ver. 11. Αἰώ therefore, sc. because we will undoubtedly be made partakers of the glory of Christ, brings the preceding explanation to a conclusion; comp. ὡστε, iv. 18.—παρακά-λειν] Grotius, Turretin, Flatt, Pelt, de Wette, Koch, Hofmann,

1 By this parallel with Rom. xiv. 8, 9, the objections of Schrader against our passage are settled, who thinks that “the manner in which the death of Christ and His coming again are spoken of, is not similar to what is found elsewhere in Paul, but rather to what Mark and Luke say concerning it. We do not find here the words taught by the Holy Spirit as we are accustomed to hear from Paul, but the words from tradition, such as were at a later period prevalent among Christians!”
and others interpret it as “to exhort.” More correctly, it is to be taken, as in iv. 18, “to comfort.” For (1) the exhortation begun in ver. 6 has already, in vv. 9, 10, been changed into words of comfort and consolation; (2) vv. 10, 11 stand in evident parallelism with chap. iv. 17, 18.—καὶ οἰκοδομεῖτε εἰς τὸν ἑνα] and edify one the other. Paul considers the Christian church, as also the individual Christian, as a holy building, a holy temple of God which is in the course of construction; comp. Eph. ii. 20 ff.; 1 Cor. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 16. Accordingly οἰκοδομεῖν is a figurative designation of Christian progress generally; comp. 1 Cor. viii. 1, x. 23, xiv. 4.—εἰς τὸν ἑνα] equivalent to ἀλληλούων, see Kypke, Observ. sacr. II. p. 339. Comp. οἱ καθ’ ἑνα, Eph. v. 33. Faber Stapulensis, Whitby, and Rückert (Römerbr. II. p. 249) read εἰς τὸν ὑπαλληλεῖν, but differ from one another in their renderings. Faber Stapulensis finds the thought: “aedificate vos mutuo ad unum usque, h. e. nullum omittendo;” Whitby explains it: “edify yourselves into one body;” lastly, Rückert maintains οἰκοδομεῖν εἰς τὸν ἑνα is used “in order to denote the One, Christ, as the foundation on whom the building should be reared.” But in the first case Paul would have written εἰς τὸν ἑνο (comp. Rom. iii. 12), in the second εἰς τὸν ἑνο (comp. Eph. ii. 14), and in the third εἰς τῷ τῷ ἑνο (comp. Eph. ii. 19).—καθὼς καὶ ποιεῖτε] a laudatory recognition, that the οἰκοδομεῖν had already begun with the readers; comp. iv. 1, 10.

Vv. 12–24. Miscellaneous exhortations, and the wish that God would sanctify the Thessalonians completely for the coming of Christ.

Ver. 12. The apostle commences with an exhortation to a dutiful conduct toward the rulers of the church. —δὲ] can only be a particle of transition to a new subject. It were possible that ver. 12 might be in the following closer connection with ver. 11: Certainly I have praised you, because you seek to edify one another; but this by no means excludes the duty of treating those who are appointed for the government of the church with becoming esteem and respect. At all events, it

¹ Already Chrysostom closely unites ver. 12 with ver. 11, but determines the connection in the following form not much to be commended: Ἐνώπιον ἰκεῖν
appears from this that Paul considered this exhortation in respect to the rulers of the church necessary, to prevent the Thessalonians failing in any way in the respect due to them. — *eidevai* to recognize, sc. what they are, according to their nature and position, i.e. in other words, highly to value, highly to esteem. Comp. *epignwsokeiv*, 1 Cor. xvi. 18, and ἔτη, Prov. xxvii. 23; Ps. cxxlv. 3; Nah. i. 7. — Paul does not by *koptinwv*, *proisstaménous*, and *noubetovntas* indicate different classes of persons (Bernard a Picon and others), for otherwise the article τοὺς would have been repeated before the two last predicates; but the same men, namely, the *preобрýteroi*, whom the apostles were accustomed to place in newly founded churches, and who in apostolic times were not different from the ἐπίσκοποι; comp. Tit. i. 5, 7; Acts xx. 17, 28; Winer, bibl. Realwörterb. 2d ed. vol. I. p. 217 f. These presbyters are at first named generally *koptinwv* in ὑμῖν] those who labour among you, i.e. in your midst (Musculus, Zanchius, Flatt, Pelt, Hofmann erroneously explain it: on you, in vobis sc. docendis, monendis, consolidandis, sedificandis), in order to make it appear beforehand that the *eidevai*, the esteeming highly, was a corresponding duty due to the presbyters on account of their labour for the church. The expression *koptinwv* might, on account of its generality, have been understood of any member of the church they liked; therefore, in order with *koptinwv* to make them think definitely on presbyters, Paul adds by way of explanation, καὶ προϊσταμένους καὶ νοβετοῦντας, by which presbyters are more particularly described, according to the diversity of their official functions, namely, as such to whom it belongs, first, to direct the general and external concerns of the church; and to whom, secondly, the office of teaching and exhortation is assigned. Incorrectly Theodoret: τὸ δὲ προϊσταμένους ὑμῶν ἐν κυρίῳ ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπερενχομένους ὑμῶν καὶ τῷ Θεῷ τὴν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσβείαν προσφέροντας. — ἐν κυρίῳ] in the sphere of the Lord, a limitation of προϊσταμένους. Theophylact: οὐκ ἐν τοῖς κοσμικοῖς προϊσταταί σου,
13. καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι αὑτοῖς] is by Theodoret, Estius, Grotius, Wolf, Baumgarten, Koppe, de Wette, Koch, Bloomfield, and others, connected with ἐπερεκπεριστασάς, “and to esteem very highly, to value much,” to which ἐν ἀγάπῃ is added as a supplementary statement, to express that this esteem is not to be founded on fear, but on love, or is to express itself in love. But the requirement to esteem highly is already, ver. 12, expressed by εἰδέναι. Add to this that ἡγεῖσθαι, in order to denote the idea of high esteem or regard, requires an additional clause, as περὶ πλείωνος, or περὶ πλείστου; but the adverb ἐπερεκπεριστασάς cannot represent that additional clause. We must therefore, with Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Beza, Flatt, Pelt, Schott, Olshausen, Alford, Hofmann, Riggenbach, and others, unite ἡγεῖσθαι with ἐν ἀγάπῃ, by which, along with the duty of high esteem, ver. 12, the duty of love toward the rulers of the church is specially brought forward. The formula ἡγεῖσθαι τινὰ ἐν ἀγάπῃ, to hold a person in love, to cherish toward him a loving disposition, is not without harshness, but has its analogy in the genuine Greek construction, ἐχεῖν τινὰ ἐν ὀργῇ (Thucyd. ii. 18). Others less suitably compare ἡγεῖσθαι τι ἐν κρίσει, LXX. Job xxxv. 2.— διὰ τὸ ἐργούν αὐτῶν] for their works' (office) sake, i.e. first, on account of the labour which is connected with it; but secondly and chiefly, because it is an office in the service of Christ.— ἐπηγείατε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς] preserve peace among yourselves, comp. Rom. xii. 18; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Mark ix. 50. ἐν ἑαυτοῖς is equivalent to ἐν ἄλληλοις, see Kühner, II. p. 325; Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 273. The words contain an independent exhortation to be separated from the preceding, the apostle passing from the conduct enjoined respecting rulers, to the conduct enjoined generally of the readers to one another. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Faber Stapulensis, Zwingli, Calvin, Bullinger, Balduin, Cornelius a Lapide,
Ernest Schmid, Fromond., and others, adopting the reading ἐν αὐτῶι (see critical note), have indeed explained it: “preserve peace with them, the presbyters,” but without grammatical justification, because for this εἰρηνεύετε μετ' αὐτῶι would be required, comp. Rom. xii. 18.

Ver. 14. "Ἀτακτος"] is especially said of the soldier who does not remain in his rank and file (so inordinatus in Livy); then of people who will not conform to civil regulations; then generally disorderly. Here the apostle alludes to those members of the Thessalonian church who, instead of applying themselves to the duties of their calling, had given themselves up to an unregulated and unsteady nature and to idleness, comp. iv. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 6, 11. We are not to understand, with Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Estius, Fromond., Turretin, Benson, Bolten, Bloomfield, and others, the presbyters as the subject of νουθετέω, but, as is already evident from the addition of ἀδελφοι, and generally from the similarity of the introductory words of ver. 14 with those of ver. 12, the members of the church in their totality. Paul thus here puts it out of the question that the church as such had fallen into ἀταξία (see on iv. 11). But it also follows from these words that the apostle was far removed from all hierarchical notions in regard to rulers (Olshausen). — Further, they were to comfort, to calm τοὺς ὀλυνοψίους] the faint-hearted, the desponding. Paul here thinks particularly on those who, according to iv. 13 ff., were painfully agitated concerning their deceased friends. Yet this does not prevent us from extending the expression also to such who failed in endurance in persecution, or who, conscious of some great sin, despaired of the attainment of divine grace, etc. — The ἄσθενεῖς] the weak, whom the church is to assist, are not the bodily sick, but fellow-Christians who still cling to prejudices, and were more imperfect than others in faith, in knowledge, or in reference to a Christian life; comp. Rom. xiv. 1, 2; 1 Cor. viii. 7, 11, 12. — μακροθυμεῖν] to be long-suffering, denotes the disposition by which we do not fly into a passion at injuries inflicted, but bear them with patience and forbearance, comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 4; Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12. — πρὸς πάντας] to all, is not to be
limited to ἀτακτοὶ, ἀλητῶνοι, and ἄσθενεῖς (Koppe), nor to fellow-Christians (Riggenbach), but is to be understood of all men generally; comp. εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας, ver. 15.

Ver. 15. Prohibition of revenge. This is easily and fitly added to the command of μακροθυμία. — ὀρᾶτε] take care, take heed. The apostle speaks thus, because man is only too ready to gratify his natural inclination to revenge. Watchfulness, struggle, and self-conquest are necessary to offer resistance to it. — μὴ τις] sc. ὑμᾶν. Erroneously Fromond.: “subditorum vestrorum.” Also incorrectly de Wette: “Since revenge is entirely unworthy of the Christian, so all are not warned against it, but the better disposed are exhorted to watch that no outbreaks of it should occur (among others).” For (1) the prohibition of revenge is peculiarly Christian, corresponding neither to the spirit of heathenism (see Hermann, ad Sophoc. Philoct. 679; Jacobs, ad Delect. Epigr. p. 144) nor to that of Judaism (comp. Matt. v. 38, 43). But de Wette’s reason makes the prohibition appear as if it were something long known, something evident of itself. (2) Also the better disposed are not free from momentary thoughts of revenge; accordingly also upon them was that prohibition to be pressed. (3) The fulfilling of that command appertains to the individual life of every one; whereas to guard against the outbreaks of revenge among others is only rarely possible. — κακὸν ἐντις κακοῦ τινι ἀποδίωναι] to render to any one evil for evil, comp. Rom. xii. 17; 1 Pet. iii. 9; Matt. v. 44. — τὸ ἄγαθον] denotes not the useful or agreeable (Koppe, Flatt, Schott, Olshausen, and others), or “what is good to one” (Hofmann, Möller), nor does it contain an exhortation to benevolence (Piscator, Beza, Calixt, Pelt, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others), but denotes the moral good; see Meyer on Gal. vi. 10. — διώκειν τι] to pursue something, to seek to reach it in the race (Phil. iii. 12, 14), then generally a figurative expression for striving after a thing, comp. Rom. ix. 30, 31, xii. 13, xiv. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 1.

Ver. 16. Comp. Phil. iv. 4. Also this exhortation is closely connected with the preceding. The readers are to be always
joyfully inclined, even when the case indicated in ver. 15 occurs—that sufferings are prepared for them. The Christian can always feel inspired and elevated with internal joy, as he has the assured confidence that all things promote the good of the children of God; comp. Rom. viii. 28; 2 Cor. vi. 10; Rom. v. 3. In a forced manner Chrysostom, whom Theophylact and others follow, refers ver. 16 to the disposition required in ver. 15: "Ὅταν γὰρ τοιαύτην ἔχωμεν ψυχήν, ὠς τε μηδένα ἀμώνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντας ἐνεργεῖτέν, πόθεν, εἰπέ μοι, τὸ τῆς λύπης κέντρον παρασελθεῖν δυνήσεται;— Also it deserves to be mentioned as a curiosity that Koppe and Bolten hold it possible to consider ἵππος χαίρετε as a concluding salutation (intended, but afterwards overlooked amid further additions): "Semper bene valere vos jubeat deus!" (Koppe). "Farewell always!" (Bolten).

Ver. 17. One means of promoting Christian joyfulness is prayer. Theophylact: Τὴν ὅδον ἔδειξε τὸν ἰὴρ χαίρειν, τὴν ἀδιάλειπτον προσευχὴν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὃ γὰρ ἔθεσθε ὁμολογὶς τῷ Θεῷ καὶ εὐχαριστεῖν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ πᾶς ὡς συμφερόντως συμβαίνοναι, προδῆλοι, ὧτι χαράν ἔδει διηνεκῆ. Paul also exhorts to continued prayer in Eph. vi. 18, and to perseverance in prayer in Col. iv. 2; Rom. xii. 12.

Ver. 18. Christians ought not only to pray to God, but also to give thanks to Him, and that ἐν πάντι, in everything, i.e. under every circumstance, in joy as well as in sorrow; which is different only in form, but not in meaning, from περὶ παντὸς, for everything. Incorrectly Estius: in omnibus sc. bonis; and Flatt: ἐν παντὶ, sc. καὶ αἰρῆτο.—τοῦτο] sc. τὸ ἐν παντὶ εὐχαριστεῖν. This is the most natural meaning. Yet it were not incorrect, with Grotius, Scholt, and Bloomfield, to refer τοῦτο to ver. 17, as prayer and thanksgiving form a closely connected unity; comp. Phil. iv. 6; Col. iv. 2. Also to refer it even to ver. 16 (Cornelius a Lapide, Alford) may be justified from the same reason. On the contrary, there is no reason to refer it to the whole passage from ver. 14 onwards (Musculus, Calovius, and others), as then τὰῦτα would require to have been written.—θέλημα] (sc. ἐστὶν) denotes will, requirement, as in iv. 3: the article is here wanting, because
the will of God comprehends more than εἰδχαριστείν: this is only one requirement among many. Otherwise Schott, who finds in θέλημα Θεου the divine decree of salvation indicated. According to him, the meaning is: "Huc pertinet sive hoc secum fert decretum divinum (de vobis captum, itemque in Christo positum), ut gratias deo pro omnibus agere debeatis. Vos enim, huic servatori addicteos, latere amplius non potest, quaecunque Christianis acciderint, deo volente, eorum salutis consulere aeternae, Rom. viii. 28 ff." But (1) the εστίν to be supplied cannot denote: hoc pertinet or hoc secum fert; (2) the article τὸ would not be wanting either before θέλημα or before ἐν Χριστῷ; (3) the reason alleged is introduced contrary to the context, and so much the more arbitrarily, as τὸ τοῦτο γὰρ θέλημα κ.τ.λ. is a dependent clause which is founded on the preceding, not an independent point which requires a reason of its own. Storr also takes θέλημα as the decree of redemption, but he understands τοῦτο in the sense of τοιοῦτο, which is contrary to the Greek. — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] Christ is, as it were, the vehicle of this requirement, inasmuch as it is made known through Him.

Ver. 19. Comp. Noesselt, in locum P. ap. 1 Thess. v. 19–22, disputatio (Exercit. p. 255 ff.).—Lasch, de sententia atque ratione verborum Pauli, πάντα δὲ δοκίμα, τὸ καλὸν κατ., 1 Thess. v. 19–22, Lips. 1834.—The prayer of the Christian is an outflow of the Holy Spirit dwelling and working in him; comp. Rom. viii. 16, 26. Accordingly the new admonition, ver. 19, is united in a natural manner to the exhortations, vv. 17, 18. Schrader's view requires no contradiction. He, indeed, finds in this admonition a genuine Pauline reminiscence; but also an objection against the composition of this Epistle by Paul, because "if such an admonition had been necessary for the Thessalonians, it is not elsewhere noticed in the whole Epistle." — τὸ πνεῦμα] is the Holy Spirit, and that as the source of extraordinary gifts—speaking with tongues, prophecy, etc., as they are more fully described in 1 Cor. xii. 7 ff. Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Oecumenius will have τὸ πνεῦμα to indicate either spiritual illumination which fits us for the exercise of Christian virtues, but may be lost by
immoral living,¹ or specially prophecy (so also Michaelis and others). Both are erroneous on account of ver. 20. — μὴ σβέννυτε] extinguish not, quench not. The πνεῦμα is conceived as a flame, whilst there is particular reference to the strained and inspired speech in which those who were seized by the Spirit expressed themselves. On the figurative expression, comp. Galen. ad Pison. de Ther. i. 17 (Opq. T. xiii. p. 956, Lut. Par. 1639 fol.): ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν παιδίων παντάπασι δὲι φυλάττεσθαι τὸ φάρμακον μείζων γὰρ ἐστιν αὐτῆς τῆς δυνάμεως τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ φαρμάκου καὶ διαλύει μαίνω τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ ἔμφυτον πνεῦμα ταχέως σβέννυσιν, ἀσπερ δὴ καὶ τὴν λυχναίαν φλόγα τὸ ἑλαιον, τοῦ πυρὸς πλέον γενόμενον, εὐκόλως ἀποσβέννυσιν.

Ver. 20. Paul passes from the genus to a species. — προφητεῖα] denotes prophetic discourse. Its nature consisted not so much in the prediction of future events, although that was not excluded, as in energetic, soul-captivating, and intelligent expression of what was directly communicated by the Holy Ghost to the speaker for the edification and moral elevation of the church. See Meyer on Acts xi. 27; Rückert on 1 Cor. p. 448 f.; Fritzsche on Rom. xii. 6. The Thessalonians were not to despise these prophetic utterances; they were rather to value them as a form of the revelation of the Holy Spirit; comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 5. The undervaluing of the gifts of the Spirit, of which some members of the church must at least have been guilty, had its reason probably in their abuse, whilst partly deceivers who pursued impure designs under the pretext of having received divine revelations, and partly self-deceivers who considered the deceptions of their own fancy as divine suggestions, appeared (see 2 Thess. ii. 2), and thus spiritual gifts in general might have been brought into discredit among discerning and calmer characters.

Ver. 21. The apostle therefore adds to the prescription, "Prove all things," whether they have their origin from God or not, and to retain the good. — πάντα δὲ] but all things, namely, what is brought forward in inspired discourse. — δοκιμάζετε]

¹ Similarly Noesselt: πνεῦμα denotes "vim divinam, Christianis proprium, h. e. quidquid rerum divinarum, deo ita providente, cognovisset."
Paul expresses the same requirement of testing in 1 Cor. xiv. 29, and according to 1 Cor. xii. 10 there was a peculiar gift of testing spirits, the διάκρισις πνευμάτων. That, moreover, this testing can only proceed from those who are themselves illuminated by the Holy Spirit was evident to the apostle. The fundamental principle of rationalism, that the reason as such is the judge of revelation, is not contained in these words.—τὸ καλὸν] the good, namely, that is found in the πάντα. Hofmann arbitrarily thinks that “the good generally” is meant, which the Thessalonians “as Christians already have, and do not now merely seek or expect.”

Ver. 22. With ver. 22 the discourse again reverts to what is general, whilst the requirement to hold fast that which is good in the discourses of the inspired very naturally required the transition to the further requirement to keep at a distance from every kind of evil, accordingly also from that which was perhaps intermixed in these discourses. Usually ver. 22 is referred exclusively to the discourses of the inspired, so that πάντα δὲ δοκιμάζετε contains the chief point which is then unfolded according to its two sides, first positively (τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε), and then negatively (ver. 22). But ἀπὸ παντὸς εἰδοὺς πονηροῦ is against this view: ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ would require to have been written. Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Drusius, Piscator, Grotius, Calixt, Calovius, Seb. Schmid, Michaelis, and others find in ver. 22 the meaning: avoid all evil appearance. But (1) εἰδοὺς never signifies appearance. (2) A distorted thought would arise. For as the apostle has required the holding fast not that which has the appearance of good, but that which is actually good; so also in ver. 22, on account of the close reference of πονηρῶν to the preceding καλὸν, the discourse must also be of an abstinence from that which is actually evil. (3) To preserve oneself from all appearance of evil is not within the power of man.—Εἰδοὺς denotes very often the particular kind of a class (the species of a genus). Comp. Porphyry, ἱσαγογῆ de quinque vocibus 2: λέγεται δὲ εἰδοὺς καλὸ τὸ ὑπὸ τὸ ἀποδιδέν γένος· καθ’ ο’ εἰσόθαμεν λέγειν τὸν μὲν ἄνθρωπον εἰδοὺ τοῦ ἥπου, γένους ὄντος τοῦ ἥπου τὸ δὲ λευκὸν τοῦ χρώματος εἰδοὺς· τὸ δὲ
τρέφων τοῦ σχήματος εἶδος.—πονηροῦ] is not to be taken, with Bengel, Felt, Schott, and others, as an adjective (ab omni mala specie), but as a substantive (ab omni specie mali). What Bengel and Schott object against this meaning, that the article τοῦ would be required before πονηροῦ, would be correct if the discourse were specially of the πονηρῶν contained in the πάντα, ver. 21; but is erroneous, as πονηροῦ is taken in abstract generality. See Kühner, Π. pp. 129, 141. Comp. Heb. v. 14; Joseph. Ant. vii. 4. 2: τὰν εἶδος μέλους; ibid. x. 3. 1: τὰν εἶδος πονηρὰς.—Ver. 22, as well as ver. 21, is peculiarly interpreted by Hänsel (Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1836, Part 1, p. 170 ff.).

Vv. 21, 22 are repeatedly cited by Cyril Alexandrinus as an expression of the Apostle Paul, in such a manner that with this citation, and indeed as its contents, the words γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζίται are united. Also these words are elsewhere frequently by the Fathers united with our passage, being quoted sometimes as a saying of Christ, sometimes generally as a saying of Scripture, and sometimes specially as a saying of the Apostle Paul. See Suicer, Thesaurus, Π. p. 1281 ff. (Sacr. Observ. p. 140 ff.); Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N. T. I. p. 330 ff., III. p. 524. On this Hänsel supports his opinion. He regards the words γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζίται as a saying of Christ, and thinks that this dictum ἀγραφοῦ of the Lord was in the mind of the Apostle Paul, and in consequence of this the expressions in vv. 21, 22 were selected by him, which were usual in the money terms employed by antiquity. So that the sense would be: “Act as experienced exchangers; everything which is presented to you as good coin, test; preserve the good coin (what actually is divine truth), but guard against every false coin (reject all false doctrine).” But evidently only the expression δοκιμάζετε was the occasion for the Fathers uniting the dictum ἀγραφοῦ of Christ, handed down by tradition, with our passage. Paul, on the contrary, could not have thought of it, even supposing it to have been known to him. For although the verb δοκιμάζειν would well suit, if otherwise the reference was to the

1 Baumgarten-Crusius accedes to the interpretation of Hänsel; Koch strangely rejects it for ver. 22, but adopts it for ver. 23.
figure of exchangers, yet in an actual reference to the same
the words τὸ καλὸν εἶδος κατέχετε, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ πνευμο
ἀπέχεσθε would have been written. Lastly, add to this that
εἶδος cannot import in itself a coin, νομίσματος must be added,
or money must have been spoken of in what goes before.

Ver. 23. If what the apostle requires in ver. 22 is to be
actually realized, God's assistance must supervene. Accord-
ingly, this benediction is fitly added to the preceding.—αὐτὸς
dὲ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης] the God of peace Himself ; an
emphatic contrast to the efforts of man.—ὁ Θεὸς τῆς
eἰρήνης] the God of peace, i.e. who communicates Christian
peace. Neither the connection with ver. 22 nor the contents
of the benediction itself will permit us to understand εἰρήνη
of harmony. To refer to εἰρηνεύετε, ver. 13, for this meaning
is far-fetched.—ὅλοτελής] here only in the N. T. spoken of
what is perfect, to which nothing belonging to its nature is
wanting. Jerome, ad Hedib. 12, Ambrosiaster, Koppe, Pelt,
and others understand ὅλοτελής in an ethical sense, as an
accusative of result: "so that ye be entire, that is, pure and
blameless." But it is better, on account of what follows, to
take ὅλοτελής as an adverb of quantity, uniting it closely
with ὑμᾶς, and finding the whole personality of the
Thessalonians denoted as if the simple ὅκος were written:
"in your entire extent, through and through."—καὶ ὅλοκληρον
...τηρηθεῖν] a fuller repetition of the wish already expressed.
—καὶ[ and indeed.—ὅλοκληρος] means, as ὅλοτελής, perfectly,
consisting of all its parts. ὅλοκληρον refers not only to τὸ
πνεῦμα, although it is governed by it, as the nearest noun, in
respect of its gender, but also to ψυχῇ and σῶμα. Comp.
Winer, p. 466 [E. T. 661]. The totality of man is here
divided into three parts: spirit, soul, and body. See
Olshausen, de naturae hum. trichotomia N. T. scriptoribus
recepta in s. Opusc. theol., Berol. 1834, p. 143 ff.; Messner,
die Lehre der Apostel, Leipzig. 1856, p. 207. We are not to
assume that this trichotomy has a purely rhetorical significa-
tion, as elsewhere Paul also definitely distinguishes πνεῦμα
and ψυχῇ (1 Cor. ii. 14, 15, xv. 44, 46). The twofold
division, which elsewhere occurs with Paul (1 Cor. vii. 34;
2 Cor. vii. 1), is a popular form of representation. The origin of the trichotomy is Platonic; but Paul has it not from the writings of Plato and his scholars, but from the current language of society, into which it had passed from the narrow circle of the schools. — πνεῦμα denotes the higher and purely spiritual side of the inner life, what is elsewhere called by Paul νοῦς (reason); ψυχή is the lower side, which comes in contact with the region of the senses. The spirit is preserved blameless in its totality at the advent, i.e. so that it approves itself blameless at the advent (ἀμέμπτως is a more exact definition of ὀλόκληρον τηρηθείη), when the voice of truth always rules in it; the soul, when it strives against all the charms of the senses; and, lastly, the body, when it is not abused as the instrument of shameful actions.¹

Ver. 24. Paul knows that he does not implore God in vain. For God is faithful; He keeps what He promises; if He has called the Thessalonians to a participation in His kingdom, He will preserve them pure and faultless even to its commencement. — πιστὸς] comp. 2 Thess. iii. 3; 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13. Τὸ πιστὸς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀληθῆς, Theodoret. — ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς] not equivalent to ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς (Koppe and others), but the present participle used as a substantive, and therefore without regard to time: your Caller. See Winer, p. 316 [E. T. 444]. — ὃς καὶ ποιήσει] who also will perform it, sc. τὸ ἀμέμπτως ὑμᾶς τηρηθῆναι.


Ver. 25. Comp. Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 19; Col. iv. 3; 2 Thess. iii. 1. — περὶ ἡμῶν] for us, namely, that our apostolic work may be successful.

Ver. 26. Ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς πάντας] That here

¹ According to Schrader, ver. 23 contains an un-Pauline thought, because when Paul distinguishes the ψυχή from the spirit, the latter is considered as something “divine,” as “unutterably good,” as “eternally opposed to every perversity.” Paul, accordingly, could not have assumed, “besides the soul in man, a mutable spirit which must be preserved from blemish.” But the discourse is not of the holy Divine Spirit which rules in man, but of a part of man, himself, of the νοῦς; but the νοῦς may fall into ματαιότης (Eph. iv. 17), may be ἀδίκημοι (Rom. i. 28), μημασμένοι (Tit. i. 15), καταδειρμένοι (2 Tim. iii. 8), etc.
individuals\(^1\) are exhorted to salute the other members of the church, whilst in the parallel passages, Rom. xvi. 16, 1 Cor. xvi. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 12, it is ἀπόστασας ἄλληλους, is a proof that this Epistle was to be received by the rulers of the church. (So also Phil. iv. 21.) By them it was to be read to the assembled church (ver. 27). Erroneously, because in contradiction with the entire character of the Epistle, Schrader infers from τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς πάντας that “the writer of the Epistle wished to impart to it a general destination.” — ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίῳ with a holy kiss. Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; Rom. xvi. 16; also 1 Pet. v. 14 (φιλήμα ἀγάπης); Constit. ap. ii. 57 (τὸ ἐν κυρίῳ φιλήμα); Tertullian, de orat. 14 (osculum pacis). The brotherly kiss, the usual salutation of Christians, proceeded from the custom of antiquity, particularly in the East, to unite a salutation with a kiss. But Paul calls it ἀγατίως, as a symbol of the holy Christian fellowship. In the Greek church it is still used at Easter.

Ver. 27. This command has not its reason in any distrust of the rulers of the church; nor, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact think, in the yearning love of the apostle, who, in compensation of his bodily absence, wished this letter read to all; nor, as Hofmann supposes, in the anxiety of the apostle lest they should not properly value a mere epistle which he sent, instead of coming in person to Thessalonica; but simply because Paul regarded the contents of his Epistle of importance for all without exception. How, moreover, Schrader can infer from ver. 27 that the composition of the Epistle belongs to a time when already a clerus presided in the churches, surpasses comprehension. Completely groundless and untenable is also Baur’s opinion (p. 491), that “the admonition so emphatically given in 1 Thess. v. 27 was written from the opinions of a time which no longer saw in the apostolic Epistles the natural means of spiritual communication, but regarded them as sacred objects, to which due reverence

\(^1\) Contrary to the sense, Hofmann, whom Riggenbach follows, makes the whole church, the ἁγίοι πάντες, be addressed in ἀναγγέλει; thus the church is to salute itself.
was to be shown by making their contents known as accurately as possible, particularly by public reading. How could the apostle himself have judged it necessary so solemnly to adjure the churches, to which his Epistles were directed, not to leave them unread? An author could only say this who did not write from the natural pressure of existing circumstances, but in writing placed himself in an imagined situation, and sought to vindicate for his pretended apostolic Epistle the consideration which the apostolic Epistles received in the practice of a later age.” But does the author adjure the church to leave his Epistle not unread? What a mighty difference is there between such a command and his urgent desire that the contents of the Epistle should be made known to all the members of the church? If the former were objectionable, the latter is natural and unobjectionable. And further, how is it possible that ver. 27 is the reflex of a time in which the apostolic Epistles were valued as sacred objects, and to which due honour must be paid by public reading, since ἀναγρωσθῆναι is in the aorist, and accordingly a single and exclusive act of reading is referred to! And what a wrong method would the post-apostolic author have employed to secure for his letter the consideration of an apostolic Epistle, when he did not select the infinitive of the present, and did not fail to add πασιν! — τῶν κυρίων] Comp. Mark v. 7; Acts xix. 13; LXX. Gen. xxiv. 3. See Matthiae, p. 756. On the Greek idiom ἐνορκίζω, see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 360 ff. — ἀναγρωσθῆναι that it be read to (Luke iv. 16; 2 Cor. iii. 15; Col. iv. 16), not that it be read by. Incorrectly also Michaelis, appealing to 2 Thess. ii. 2 (!): there is here intended the recognition of the Epistle as a genuine Pauline Epistle, by means of a conclusion added by his own hand. — τὴν ἐπιστολήν] comp. Rom. xvi. 22; Col. iv. 16. — πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς] to the whole of the brethren, sc. in Thessalonica; not also in all Macedonia (Bengel, Flatt); still less also in neighbouring Asia (Grotius), or even the churches of all Christendom (Seb. Schmid).

Ver. 28. Paul concludes with the usual benediction.— ἦ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμ. 'I. Xp.] See Meyer on Gal. i. 6. — μεθ' ἑαυτῶν] sc. εἰη.
THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

SEC. 1.—OCCASION, DESIGN, CONTENTS.

PAUL, after having sent away his first Epistle, received further information concerning the state of the Thessalonian church. The church had actively progressed on the path of Christianity; their faith had been confirmed; their brotherly love had gained in extent and intensity; and their enduring steadfastness under persecution, which had broken out afresh, had been anew gloriously displayed (i. 3, 4). But along with this the thought of the advent had given rise to new disquietude and perplexity. The question concerning this Christian article of faith had advanced another stage. The former anxiety concerning the fate of their Christian friends who were already asleep at the time of the commencement of the advent had disappeared; on this point the instructions of the apostle had imparted complete consolation. But the opinion now prevailed, that the advent of the Lord was immediately at hand, that it might daily, hourly be expected. Accordingly, on the one hand fear and consternation, and on the other hand an impatient and fanatical longing for the instant when by the coming of the Lord the kingdom of God would be completed, had taken possession of their spirits; and it was no wonder that in consequence of this the unsteadiness and excitement, which at an earlier period had afflicted the church, and its result, the neglect of their worldly business, had increased to an
alarming extent. This opinion, that the commencement of the advent was close at hand, had seized upon them the more readily, as men had arisen among them who maintained that they had received divine revelations concerning it, and they had even proceeded so far as to forge an epistle in the name of the apostle, in order by its contents to establish the truth of that doctrine (ii. 2). An appeal was also made to the alleged oral statement of the apostle (ii. 2), and it is not inconceivable that even the explanations which the genuine Epistle of the apostle contained concerning the advent may have promoted that view. It is true that there nothing is expressly said concerning the immediateness of the advent, but on the one hand it is described as sudden and unexpected (1 Thess. v. 2, 4), and on the other hand it is so characterized as if Paul himself, and his contemporaries, might hope still to survive (1 Thess. iv. 15, 17).

Such was the state of matters which gave occasion for the composition of the second Epistle. Its design is threefold. First, The apostle wished—and this is the chief point—to oppose the disturbing and exciting error as if the advent of Christ was even at the door, by further instructions. Secondly, He wished strongly and emphatically to dissuade from that unsettled, disorderly, and idle disposition into which the church had fallen. Thirdly, He wished by a laudatory recognition of their progressive goodness to encourage them to stedfast perseverance.

The Epistle is divided, according to its contents, after a salutation (i. 1, 2) and introduction (i. 3–12), into a dogmatic (ii. 1–12) and a hortative portion (ii. 13–iii. 15). In the introduction the apostle thanks God for the great increase of the church in faith and love, praises their endurance under fresh persecutions, comforts them with the recompense to be expected at the coming of Christ, and testifies that the progress and completion of the Thessalonians in Christianity was the constant object of his prayer. In the dogmatic portion, for the refutation of the fancy that the day of the Lord already dawns, the apostle directs attention to the historical pre-conditions of its commencement. Christ cannot return until the power of evil, which certainly already begins to develope itself, is consolidated
and has attained to its maximum by the appearance of Anti-
christ. Lastly, in the hortative portion Paul exhorts his readers
to hold fast to the Christianity delivered to them (ii. 13—17),
claims their prayers for his apostolic work (iii. 1 ff.), earnestly
and decidedly warns them against unsteadiness and idleness
(iii. 6—15), and then the Epistle is closed with a salutation by
his own hand, and a twofold benediction (iii. 16—18).

SEC. 2.—TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

Interpreters and chronologists agree that this so-called
Second Epistle was composed shortly after the First, with the
exceptions of Grotius, Ewald (Jahrb. d. bibl. Wissenschaft, Gött.
1851, p. 250; Die Sendbriefe des Ap. Paulus, Gött. 1857,
p. 17; Geschichte des apost. Zeitalters, Gött. 1858, p. 455;
Tüb. 1855, 2, p. 165), and Laurent (Theol. Stud. u. Krit.
1864, 3, p. 497 ff.; Neuest. Stud., Gotha 1866, p. 49 ff.),
who hold that the Second Epistle was the first composed.
This view has nothing for it, but much against it. Grotius
relies chiefly on the following reason: that in iii. 17 a mark
is given by which the genuineness of the Epistles of Paul may
be recognised, but such a mark belongs properly to the first
Epistle, not to a second; and that ii. 1—12 is to be referred
to the Emperor Caius Caligula. But there is not the slightest
reason for the reference of ii. 1—12 to Caligula (see on passage),
entirely apart from the fact that on such an assumption, as
Caligula was already dead in the beginning of the year 41
after Christ, the Epistle must have been composed more than
ten years before Paul, according to the narrative of the Acts,
arrived at Thessalonica! The mark of authenticity in 2 Thess.
iii. 17 was not required until, as we learn from ii. 2, attempts
had occurred to forge epistles in the name of the apostle.
According to Ewald,¹ the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians
was placed after the First “on account of its brevity.”

¹ Baur has not entered upon the reasons of his subsequent opinion. He judged
differently in his Paulus der Ap. Jesu Christi, p. 488. He only remarks that
there is no difficulty (!) in considering those passages in which the Second Epistle
thinks that it is manifestly a first Epistle written to a church which Paul had shortly before founded. It has indeed been attempted to show that, according to ii. 2, Paul had previously written an epistle to the church; but this might easily have been possible in the number of letters which the apostle had indisputably already then written; on the other hand, however, Paul for the first time directs them in this Epistle to give heed to his actually genuine letters to them as to his living word (ii. 15, iii. 17). Further, with regard to the advent, the error as if it were close at hand—and this, according to the existing state of matters and of doctrine generally, would be the first error which would have arisen—had then broken out in the church, and which was the chief occasion of this Epistle. The very correction of it might easily have given rise to a second error, that the fate of the many who had died previously was sad, and which the following Epistle corrects (1 Thess. iv. 13 ff.). Also it would not at that time have been necessary to send Timotheus to the church, in order to correct the increasing disorders within it; this would only happen in the interval between this and the larger Epistle, which might be about four or six months. Lastly, 1 Thess. iv. 10, 11 contains a reference to 2 Thess. iii. 6–11. Accordingly Ewald makes the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians to have been composed during the residence of Paul at Berea, succeeding his residence at Thessalonica.

But that in the smaller compass of the Second Epistle a definite reason is to be sought for its position after the First, is historically completely undemonstrable, and not even probable, because—just as with the Second Epistle to the

Laurent in all essentials agrees with Ewald. The peculiarity of his view is so manifestly erroneous, that it does not need a special refutation.

1 Otherwise Baur. According to him, the larger Epistle was not written shortly after the lesser. On the supposition of the authenticity of the Epistle, taking into consideration the church of Thessalonica scarcely founded, and the Epistle of the apostle written only a few months after its founding, how many μεταμορφωμένοι—already deceased members of the church—could there be? The question as regards the deceased Christians was naturally only then (?) an object of lively interest the greater the number of the dead, perhaps after a whole generation had passed away from the midst of Christendom.
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Corinthians—the internal relation of the lesser Epistle to the greater necessarily required that position. Ewald’s assertion, that our Second Epistle manifestly declares itself to be a first Epistle written by Paul to a church recently founded, is thoroughly erroneous. On the contrary, our Second Epistle undoubtedly and evidently refers back to the First, serves for its completion, and makes known a progress from an earlier condition to one partially more advanced. If the First Epistle describes the eager desire of salvation with which the Thessalonians received the publication of the gospel, and dwells in vivid and detailed recollection of the facts of their conversion belonging to the immediate past,—contents which are suitable only for the Epistle composed first according to time; in the Second Epistle, i. 3 ff., mention is made of a blessed progress in their Christian life. If in the First Epistle the proximity of the advent is presupposed without anticipation of a possible misunderstanding, in the Second Epistle the correction and the further explanation in respect of this truth was necessary, namely, that the advent was not to be expected in the immediate present. So also the exhortation to a quiet and industrious life, which was already contained in the First Epistle, was more strongly and categorically expressed in the Second. Add to this, that the words καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγής ἐπ’ αὐτός, 2 Thess. ii. 1, are apparently to be referred to 1 Thess. iv. 17; whereas to obtain, with Ewald, a reference in 1 Thess. iv. 10, 11, to 2 Thess. iii. 6–16, you must first have recourse to an ungrammatical and in the highest degree unnatural construction (see commentary on 1 Thess. iv. 10, p. 119). Lastly, over and above, it follows from ii. 15 that Paul before our Second Epistle had already sent another letter to the Thessalonians; and thus to maintain that the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians manifestly shows itself as a first epistle of Paul to a church recently founded, is in contradiction with the apostle’s own testimony. To explain the epistle to the Thessalonians preceding our Second Epistle as not identical with our First Epistle, but as having been lost, would be in the controverted circumstances of the case a mere shift justified by nothing. Moreover, it is not even correct that the apostle
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in 2 Thess. ii. 15 “for the first time directed the church to give heed to his genuine letters written to them as to his living word.” For only the exhortation is there given to hold fast the instructions in Christianity, which Paul had already at an earlier period given to his readers both orally and in an epistle. A direction how to recognise the genuineness of epistles written at a later period to the Thessalonians only follows from iii. 17. But this notice has in the fact recorded in 2 Thess. ii. 2 its sufficient explanation. Further, as regards the eschatological explanations in both Epistles, the possibility of such a development as Ewald assumes is not to be denied, but its necessity is by no means to be proved. The actual fact that individual instances of death—for there is no mention “of many dying before the advent”—had occurred within the church might very well form the point of departure for the eschatological discussions of the apostle; and then to it the refutation of the error, that the advent was in the immediate present, might be added, as the later form of error, especially as the apostle’s own expressions in 1 Thess. v. 2 were so framed that they might have contributed to the origin of that error. Lastly, “increasing disorders” within the church are by no means supposed in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians. Timotheus was not sent to Thessalonica “to correct increasing disorders,” but to exhort the Thessalonians to steadfastness in persecution. Comp. 1 Thess. iii. 1 ff. But even supposing that the “correction of increasing disorders” was the reason for the mission of Timotheus, yet nothing can be inferred from this regarding the priority of the one Epistle to the other. For with the same truth with which it might be said it was not yet necessary to send Timotheus to the church, it might be affirmed that it was no longer necessary to send him thither.

The following reasons prove that the Second Epistle was composed not long after the sending away of the First. Silas and Timotheus are still in the company of the apostle (i. 1), but the Acts of the Apostles at least never inform us that after Paul left Corinth (Acts xviii. 18) these two apostolic assistants were again together with him. We find Timotheus again in the apostle’s company, first at Ephesus (Acts xix. 22),
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whilst there is no further mention of Silas in the Acts of the Apostles after his Corinthian residence. Besides, the relations and wants of the church are throughout analogous to those which are presupposed in the First Epistle. The same circle of thought occupies the apostle; similar instructions, similar praises, similar exhortations, warnings, and wishes are found throughout in both Epistles. It is accordingly to be assumed that also the Second Epistle was composed during the first residence of the apostle at Corinth, but, according to iii. 2, at a time when he had already suffered hostility on the part of the Jews, and, according to i. 4 (ταὶς ἐκκλησίαις, comp. 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 1; Rom. xvi. 1), when branch churches had already been founded from Corinth—probably at the commencement of the year 54.

SEC. 3.—GENUINENESS.

With respect to the external attestation of Christian antiquity, the authenticity of the Epistle is completely unassailable. Polyc. ad Phil. 11 fin.; Just. Mart. dial. c. Tryph. Col. 1686, p. 336 E, p. 250 A; Iren. adv. Haer. iii. 7. 2; Clem. Alex. Strom. v. p. 554, ed. Sylb.; Tertull. de resurr. carm. c. xxiv.; Can. Murat., Peschito, Marcion, etc. Doubts from internal grounds did not arise until the beginning of the nineteenth century. The first who objected to the Epistle was Christian Schmidt. In his Bibliothek f. Kritik und Exegese des N. T., Hadamar 1801, vol. II. p. 380 ff., he contests the genuineness of 2 Thess. ii. 1–12, and then in his Einleit in’s N. T., Giess. 1804, Part 2, p. 256 f., he proceeds

1 The words τὸν πάντα τῶν ἑπτανενήμων σ. ἁ. Ἀ., 1 Cor. i. 2, I take as a continuation of the address of the Epistle, αὐτόν τι καὶ ἡμῖν as dependent on ἵνα τότε, and ἵνα τότε as closely connected with τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῖν Ἰησοῦ Χρ., “Jesus Christ who is our (sc. Christians’) Lord in every place, both in theirs and ours.” Only with this explanation—which is in itself so simple and unforced that it is marvellous that it is not to be found in any interpretation—the addition, otherwise entirely inexplicable, ἵνα τότε, αὐτόν τι καὶ ἡμῖν, receives its full import and propriety, whilst the words obtain a suitable reference to the Corinthian factions, by means of which Christ, who is everywhere the only and the same Lord of Christianity, is divided; comp. 1 Cor. i. 13.

The following reasons are chiefly insisted on:—1. The Second Epistle contradicts the First, inasmuch as it disputes the opinion of the nearness of the advent which is presupposed in the First Epistle. But the Second Epistle does not dispute that opinion,—it rather presupposes it,—whilst only the view of the directly immediate nearness of the advent is contested as erroneous. 2. When the author lays down, in iii. 17, a mark of authenticity for the Pauline Epistles in general, which yet is found neither in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians nor elsewhere, he seems thereby to wish to cast suspicions on the First Epistle as un-Pauline. But it is entirely a mistake to find in iii. 17 a mark which Paul would affix to all his Epistles generally; the meaning of these words can only be, that in all those epistles which he would afterwards write to the Thessalonians he would add a salutation by his own hand as an attestation of genuineness. 3. The doctrine of Antichrist, ii. 3 ff., is un-Pauline; it points to a Montanist as the author. But this idea is by no means peculiar to the Montanists. It has its root already in Jewish Christology (see Bertholdt, christologia Judaorum Jesu apostolorumque ætate, p. 69 ff.; Gesenius in Ersch and Gruber's ally. Encyclop. vol. iv. p. 292 ff.), and is elsewhere not foreign to the N. T.; comp. 1 John ii. 18, 22, iv. 3; 2 John 7; Rev. xii. 13. Accordingly we are not entitled, because this view does not occur elsewhere with Paul, to maintain that it is un-Pauline, the less so as it neither contradicts the other
statements of the apostle concerning the advent, nor did an occasion occur to Paul in his other Epistles, as in this, to describe it more minutely. 4. The Epistle is defective in peculiar historical references. But, according to sections 1, 2; the state of matters which the Second Epistle supposes was throughout a more developed state, and consequently, of course, a peculiar one. 5. The author carefully seeks to represent himself as the Apostle Paul. But the personal references which are contained in the Second Epistle do not make this impression, as they are analogous to those in the First Epistle, and the words, ii. 2, 15, iii. 17, are fully explained by the actual abuse which occurred of the apostle's name.

In more recent times the authenticity of the Epistle has again been disputed, first by Schrader in scattered remarks in his paraphrase to the Epistle (see the exposition), then by Kern in the Tübing. Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1829, Part 2, p. 145 ff.; further, by Baur in his Paulus der Ap. Jesu Christi, Stuttg. 1845, p. 480 ff., and in his and Zeller's Theol. Jahrbücher, 1855, Part 2, p. 141 ff.; likewise by Hilgenfeld in his Ztschr. fur wiss. Theol., 5th year, Halle 1862, p. 242 ff.; and lastly, by W. C. van Manen, Onderzoek naar de echtheid van Paulus' tweeden brief aan de Thessaloniciens (De echtheid van Paulus' brieven aan de Thess. onderzoek, II.), Utrecht 1865, whose chief argument, however, that the opinion contested in 2 Thess. ii. 2, namely, that the advent was to be expected in the immediate present, was the opinion of the Apostle Paul himself, evidently rests on an error.1 Against Kern, see Pelt in the Theolog. Mitarbeiten, 4th year, Kiel 1841, Part 2, p. 74 ff.; against Baur, in the place first mentioned, see Wilibald Grimm in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1850, Part 4, p. 780 ff.; J. P. Lange, das apost. Zeital. vol. i., Braunschw. 1853, p. 111 ff.

The reasons on which Kern relies are the following:—

1. From the section 2 Thess. ii. 1–12 it follows that the

1 Also Weiss (Philosophische Dogmatik oder Philosophie des Christenthums, vol. I., Leipz. 1855, p. 146) has declared that the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, with perhaps the exception of the conclusion, is throughout “un-apostolic in its verbal construction,” without, however, entering into a justification of this judgment.
Epistle could not have been composed until after the death of Paul. For even if it be not granted, what yet is most probable, that Paul perished in the Neronian persecution, during the imprisonment recorded in the Acts, in the year 64,—even if a second Roman imprisonment be maintained,—yet all the traditions of antiquity agree on this point, that Paul suffered martyrdom under Nero (p. 207). But the author of the Epistle makes his announcement of Antichrist and its adjuncts from the state of the world as it was immediately after the overthrow of Nero, when Nero was believed to be still alive, and a speedy return of him to the throne was expected, and that from the East, or more precisely from Jerusalem (Tacit. Hist. ii. 8; Sueton. Nero, c. 57, compared with c. 40). The Antichrist whose appearance is described as impending, is Nero; that which withholdeth him are the existing circumstances of the world; the withholder is Vespasian with his son Titus, who then besieged Jerusalem; and what is said of the apostasy is a reflection of the horrid wickedness which broke out among the Jewish people in their war against the Romans (p. 200). Accordingly the Epistle could not have been composed about the year 53 or 54, but only between the years 68–70 (p. 270). Moreover, Kern thinks that “the Epistle might be called Pauline in the wider sense”—that a Paulinist was its author. For in general the Epistle agrees with the Pauline mode of thought. A Paulinist, affected with a view of the present, that is, of the circumstances of the times between the years 68–70, saw in spirit the apocalyptic picture which he describes in ii. 1–12. In order to impart it to his Christian brethren, he has drawn it up in a letter to which he has given the form of a Pauline Epistle. As the already existing Epistle to the Thessalonians was of such a nature that to carry out that purpose a second could be attached to it, the author of the second Epistle has presupposed the first. He has surrounded his apocalyptic picture, ii. 1–12, the proper germ of the whole, with a border which he has formed from what he has sketched from the genuine Pauline Epistle, so that he has made the first part serve as an introduction to the section chiefly intended by him (ii. 1–12), and the second
part as a continuation of his thoughts passing over into the hortative (ii. p. 214).

This view of Kern, which is certainly carried out with acuteness, falls into pieces of itself, as it proceeds on an entirely mistaken interpretation of ii. 1–12. It is entirely erroneous to seek the Antichrist, who belongs to the purely religious sphere, in the political—among the number of the Roman emperors. Accordingly ii. 1–12 contains nothing which in any way transcended the circle of the Apostle Paul's vision (see the interpretation).

The additional arguments, which Kern insists on as marks of the spuriousness of the Epistle, are sought by him only in consequence of the result which to him followed from the passage ii. 1–12; they would even to himself, were it not for that first argument, have been of hardly any weight. They are the following:

2. The suspicion resulting from 2 Thess. iii. 17, as if by the addition of ὅ ἐστι σημεῖον a safer reception was designed to be procured for the spurious Epistle, arises from the fact that Paul could not possibly have appealed to πᾶσαν ἐπιστολὴν, especially if we consider the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians as one of the earliest of his Epistles. But we have already adverted to the correct meaning of ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ, and the addition ὅ ἐστι σημεῖον is, moreover, sufficiently occasioned by the notice in ii. 2, which Kern, without right, denies, understanding the ἐπιστολὴ ὡς δὲ ἡμῶν, ii. 2, entirely arbitrarily, not of a forged epistle, but of the First Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, which was only falsely interpreted.

3. The Second Epistle betrays an intentional imitation of the First. The whole first chapter of the Second Epistle rests on the groundwork of the First Epistle; its beginning corresponds to the beginning of the First Epistle; what is said concerning the θλήψις for the sake of the gospel, has many parallels in 1 Thess. ii. and iii.; ver. 6 ff. entirely depends on 1 Thess. iv. 13 ff. (); lastly, vv. 11, 12 are similar to 1 Thess. iii. 12 f., v. 23 ff. Also what follows the section ii. 1–12 (which is peculiar to the Second Epistle) is also dependent on the First Epistle. Thus ii. 13–17 is dependent on 1 Thess.
i. 4, 5, iii. 11 ff. The address: ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ἑπά
kυρίον, ver. 13, is borrowed from 1 Thess. i. 4. Further, 2 Thess. iii. 1, 2 is an extension of 1 Thess. v. 25, but where in ver. 2 an additional clause is added, which neither as regards ἵνα ῥυθῶμεν κ.τ.λ., nor as regards οὗ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις, can properly be explained from the condition which Paul was supposed at that time to be in, when he was thought to have written the second Epistle soon after the first (!). Vv. 3–5 point back to 1 Thess. v. 24, iii. 11–13; vv. 6–12 rest entirely on 1 Thess. ii. 6–12, iv. 11, 12, v. 14; and ver. 16 is borrowed from 1 Thess. v. 23. However, on a more exact examination, a great diversity will be seen in many of those compared passages; and the resemblance and similarity remaining—which, moreover, is not greater than that between the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, and between many passages in the Epistles to the Galatians and the Romans—has its complete explanation in the analogous circumstances of the church which occasioned both Epistles, and in the short interval which intervened between their composition.

4. Lastly, much that is un-Pauline is seen in the Epistle. To this belongs εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν, i. 3, which is repeated in ii. 13, and in the first passage, moreover, is the more prominently brought forward by καθὼς ἔξιν ἐστιν; whilst Paul elsewhere, out of the fulness of his Christian consciousness, simply says: “we thank God.” Directly following it ῥεπανεῖαι ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν is surprising, which does not rightly agree with 1 Thess. iii. 10 (καταρτίσας τὰ ὑπερήματα τῆς πίστεως); and ἐνός ἐκάστου πάντων ὑμῶν, which agrees not with what they are reminded of in the second Epistle itself (iii. 11) (!). Ver. 6 reminds us not so much of Paul as of Rev. vi. 9, 10. In ver. 10 the expression ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς is un-Pauline; in ver. 11 the phrase τᾶς εὐδοκίας ἀγαθωσύνης, and still more ἔργον πίστεως, is remarkable. In the section ii. 1–12, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, which never elsewhere occurs, is placed instead of διὰ τοῦτο, elsewhere constantly used by Paul. In the same section, ver. 8, ἐπιφάνεια τῆς παρουσίας, and ver. 10, δέχεσθαι τὴν ἀγάπην
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τής ἀληθείας, instead of the simple δέχεσθαι τὸν λόγον, τὴν ἀληθείαν, are peculiar. The idea of election is entirely Pauline, but it is never (?) otherwise expressed than by ἐκλογή, ἐκλέγεσθαι; but in ii. 13 αἱρεῖσθαι is found for it. In chap. iii. 13, καλοποιεῖν, not found elsewhere in the N. T., is a transformation of the Pauline τὸ καλὸν ποιεῖν, Gal. vi. 9. Lastly, the addition διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, in ver. 14, is remarkable, as it purposely directs attention to the present Epistle. — But these expressions partly have their analogies elsewhere with Paul, partly they belong to those peculiarities which are found in every Pauline Epistle blended with the general fundamental type of Pauline diction, which this Epistle also possesses; and lastly, partly they are deviations so unimportant, that the reproach of being un-Pauline can in no way be proved by them.

Further, as regards Baur's objections to this Epistle, these, in the first-mentioned place (Apostel Paulus), consist essentially only in a repetition of those already made by Kern. Only the assertion (p. 487) is peculiar to him, that the representation of Antichrist given in 2 Thess. ii. directly conflicts with the expectation of the apostle in 1 Cor. xv. For in 1 Cor. xv. 52 the apostle supposes that he himself will be alive at the advent, and will be changed with the living. In 2 Thess. ii., on the contrary, it is attempted by means of a certain theory to give the reason why the advent cannot so soon take place. Christ, according to that passage, cannot appear until Antichrist has come, and Antichrist cannot come so long as that continued which must precede the commencement of the last epoch. How far is one thereby removed, not only beyond the standpoint, but also beyond the time of the apostle!

The wantonness and superficiality of such an opinion is evident. Even ἐνέστηκεν (ii. 2) suffices to show its worthlessness. For that by means of this expression "the day of the Lord is only removed from the most immediate present, but by no means from being near at hand; and that accordingly he also could have thus expressed himself who expected the day of the Lord as near, as very near, only not precisely as in
the present,” Baur, already from the treatise of Kern (p. 151), which he indeed elsewhere so carefully follows, might have learned. Indeed, it inevitably follows from the emphatic position of ἐνέστηκεν, that not only also he, but rather only he, who considered the advent as near could thus express himself as to how it should take place. If the author had wished to refute the error that the day of the Lord has dawned, whereas he himself considered the circumstances preceding it, instead of occurring in a short space of time and rapidly succeeding one another, only developing themselves in long periods, he would not have put the chief stress of the sentence on ἐνέστηκεν, and would have required to have written ὡς ὅτι ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἐνέστηκεν instead of ὡς ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου. And, only to mention one other particular, might not one with the same argument of Baur call in question the authenticity of the Epistle to the Romans? For, according to the Romans, the return of Christ was not to be expected until the completion of the kingdom of God, until all Israel will be converted (Rom. xi.26); but all Israel cannot be converted until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in (Rom. xi.25). “How far is one thereby removed, not only from the standpoint, but also from the time of the apostle!”

Moreover, whilst Baur in the first-mentioned place (Apostel Paulus, p. 485), differing from Kern, had assumed that the representation of Antichrist given in 2 Thess. ii. rested entirely on Jewish ground, and contained only a repetition of the thoughts which were already expressed in their chief points, particularly according to the type of the prophecies of Daniel, and that accordingly the author moved only in the sphere of Jewish eschatology, and that even the Apostle Paul might have shared these views; in the last-mentioned place (Baur and Zeller’s Tüb. Jahrbüch. p. 151 ff.) he maintains, in agreement with Kern, that in the section 2 Thess. ii. a representation of Antichrist occurs as could only have been formed on the soil of Christian ideas, and also on the ground of events which belong to a later period than that of the Apostle Paul. According to Baur's subsequent opinion, the author borrowed the colours for his picture of Antichrist from the Apocalypse,
and accordingly has imparted to the image of Antichrist features which are evidently borrowed from the history and person of Nero. But to think on the dependence of the author on the Apocalypse is so much the more erroneous, as the description in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, compared with that in the Apocalypse, is one very simply and slightly developed. The Apocalypse, therefore, can only have been written at a period later than the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. So also Baur's argument from 2 Thess. ii. 2 is destitute of any foundation. For it is manifestly an exegetical impossibility to find, with Baur, in the expression εἰς ητὶ ητὶ ταχέως σαλευθήναι an indication "of an historical circumstance," such as that which most naturally presents itself, the "pseudo-Nero disturbances" mentioned by Tacitus, Hist. ii. 8. For the author himself expressly tells us, by the three clauses commencing with μήτε, by what this σαλευθήναι and θροεισθαι of the readers was historically occasioned. Therefore no place remains in the context for such a historical reason of σαλευθήναι and θροεισθαι as Baur demands.

Lastly, Hilgenfeld removes the origin of the Epistle still farther than Kern and Baur. According to Hilgenfeld—who, however, holds fast to the genuineness of the First Epistle—it was not composed until the time of Trajan. The Epistle is a clear monument of the progress of the primitive Christian eschatology at the beginning of the second century. But his reasons for this view are extremely weak. Exactly taken, they are only the following:—(1) The first rise of the Gnostic heresies falls to the time of Trajan; (2) The continued persecution mentioned in 2 Thess. i. 4 ff. suits the time of Trajan; (3) Also to this time the prophetical announcement in 2 Thess. ii. 2, that the day of the Lord had already commenced, agrees. But the opinion, that by the already working mystery of iniquity, 2 Thess. ii. 7, the rise of the Gnostic heresies is meant, is entirely untenable, as it has elsewhere no support in the Epistle; it is as arbitrary as is the further assertion of Hilgenfeld, that the expression: ὁ ἄνθρωπός τῆς ἀμαρτίας, 2 Thess. ii. 3, refers back to the blood-stained life of the matricide Nero, as Antichrist who had already existed. The
two additional arguments can only lay claim to respect, pro-
vided the new outbreak of persecution presupposed in chap. i.,
and the opinion discussed in chap. ii. 2, that the advent was
in the immediate present, were not sufficiently explicable from
the natural development of the historical situation of the
First Epistle, or provided it could otherwise have been proved
that Paul could not be the author of the Epistle. But neither
of these is the case. Also the notion, preserved to us in
Hippolytus, refut. omn. haeres. ix. 13, p. 292, ix. 16, p. 296,
that the Elxai-book, in the third year of Trajan, proclaimed
the eschatological catastrophe as occurring after other three
years of this emperor, is, in reference to ὥσ δτι ἐνέστηκεν ἦ
ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου, 2 Thess. ii. 2, wholly without value.
Παύλου πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς ἐπιστολή δευτέρα.

A B K Ν, Copt. 80, 87 have only: Πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς β'. The simplest and apparently oldest title.

CHAPTER I.

184 THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.


Vv. 1, 2. Address and salutation. See on 1 Thess. i. 1.—ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ι. Χρ.] from God the Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ; not: from God who is the Father and Lord of Jesus Christ. For, according to the Pauline custom, the fulness of Christian blessings is derived in common from God and Christ. The absolute πατρὸς (comp. Gal. i. 3 ; 1 Tim. i. 2 ; 2 Tim. i. 2 ; Tit. i. 4) is equivalent to πατρὸς ἡμῶν, more frequently used elsewhere in similar places; comp. Rom. i. 7 ; 1 Cor. i. 3 ; 2 Cor. i. 2 ; Eph. i. 2 ; Phil. i. 2 ; Col. i. 2 ; Philem. 3.

Vv. 3–12. Introduction of the Epistle. Commendatory recognition of the progress of the church in faith and love, as well as in the steadfastness which proved itself anew under persecution (vv. 3, 4), a comforting and encouraging reference to the recompense commencing at the advent of Christ (vv. 5–10), and an assurance that the progress and completion of the Thessalonians in Christianity was continually the subject of the apostle’s prayer (vv. 11, 12).

Ver. 3. Ὄφειλομεν] namely, I Paul, together with Silvanus and Timotheus.—καθὼς ἄξιόν ἐστιν] as it is meet, as it is right and proper, is usually considered as a mere parenthesis, resuming Ὄφειλομεν, so that διὶ is considered in the sense of that dependent on εὐχαριστεῖν. However, as the discourse afterwards follows quickly on διὶ, so καθὼς ἄξιόν ἐστιν would sink into a mere entirely meaningless interjection and parenthesis; but as such, on account of the preceding Ὄφειλομεν, it would be aimless and superfluous. In direct contrast to this view, Schott places the chief emphasis on καθὼς ἄξιόν ἐστιν, which he rightly refers back to εὐχαριστεῖν instead of to Ὄφειλομεν. According to Schott, καθὼς is designed to denote “modum eximium, quo animus gratus declarari debet,” and the thought to be expressed is “oportet nos deo gratias agere,
quales convenient praestantiae beneficii, i.e. eximias. But neither can this interpretation be the correct one. For (1) kathos is never used as a statement of gradation; (2) it is hardly conceivable that Paul should have concentrated the emphasis of the sentence on kathos axiwn estin. If he had wished to do so, he would at least have written Euycharistetein ofileromeven to Thel peri uinon, kathos axiwn estin, but would not have inserted piuvote and adelphi. Taking this insertion into consideration, we are obliged to decide that after adelphi a certain pause in the discourse commences, so that Euycharistein... adelphi is placed first as an independent general expression, to which kathos axiwn estin is added as a connecting clause, for the explanation and development of the preceding by what follows. But from this it follows that esti belongs not to euycharistein, but to kathos axiwn estin, and denotes not that, but because. The meaning is: We ought to thank God always on your behalf, as it (sc. the euycharistein) is right and proper, because, etc. As by this interpretation kathos axiwn estin is neither unduly brought forward nor unduly placed in the shade, so also every appearance of pleonasm vanishes. For ofileromeven expresses the duty of thanksgiving from its subjective side, as an internal conviction; kathos axiwn estin, on the other hand, from the objective side, as something answering to the state of circumstances, since it is meet, since it is fit and proper, to give thanks to God for the divine proof of His grace. — υπερανεγαίει grows above measure, exceedingly. The compound verb is an apax λέγομεν in the N. T. But Paul loves such intensifying compounds with υπέρ. They are an involuntary expression of his overflowing feelings. Comp. Fritzsche, ad Rom. I. p. 351. Olshausen certainly represents it otherwise. He finds in the compound verb a forbearing allusion to the fact that the Thessalonians were guilty of extravagance in their religious zeal,— an

1 Comp. already Ambrosiaster: ut non qualecumque esse debitum ostenderet, sicut dignum est, ait, ut pro tam infinito dono magnas gratias referendas deo testentur.—Oecumenius: η, ητι φοι γιναις γινετι, ενδειας η τη μεγαλας δεξαμενοτην, ην η μεγαλη καθος αξιω τη μεγαλη παρισκεται.—Theophylact: η ητι και δια λογου και δι' ιγρον αυτη γαρ η δξια ευχαριστει. Comp. also Erasmus' paraphrase, and Fromond.
allusion which, as at all events it would contain a certain degree of irony, it is impossible to assume here, where Paul speaks of the reasons of his thanksgiving to God. Such an interpretation is not ingenious, as Baumgarten-Crusius judges, but meaningless. — ἐνὸς ἐκάστου πάντων ὑμῶν] instead of the simple ὑμῶν, emphatically strengthens the praise bestowed. Fromond.: non tam totius ecclesiasticorum corporis, sed uniuscujusque membrorum, quod mirum est et rarissimae laudis. But Hofmann, in a strangely erroneous manner, thinks that πάντων ὑμῶν does not depend on ἐνὸς ἐκάστου, but is in apposition to it. — εἰς ἀλλήλοις] does not belong to ἐκάστῳ. It is the further objective specification of ἰγάπης, as ἐνὸς ἐκ πάντων. ὑμῖν is the subjective. ἀλλήλοις denotes the fellow-Christians in Thessalonica. Therefore erroneously, Pelt: Nec vero sine causa Paulus tam multus est in commendanda eorum caritate in omnès effusa; quum enim sciret, quam faciliter tum temporis accideret, ut Christiani se invicem diligere, exteros vero asperrerrur, hac potissimum laude ad omnium hominum amorem eos excitare studuit.¹

Ver. 4. The progress of the Thessalonians in Christianity so rejoiced the heart of the apostle, that he expresses this joy not only in thanksgiving before God, but also in praises before men. — ὡστε] refers back to ἵππειν. . . ἄλληλοις. — ἡμᾶς αὐτῶν] This emphatic designation of the subject might be thus explained, that otherwise such praise was not the usual custom of the speakers, but that the glorious success of the gospel in Thessalonica caused them to forget the usual limits of moderation and reserve. This opinion is, however, to be rejected, because it would then without any reason be supposed that Paul had inaccurately written ἡμᾶς αὐτῶν (we ourselves) instead of αὐτῶν ἡμᾶς (even we).² It is therefore more correct to see in ἡμᾶς αὐτῶν, that although it was true that the praise of the Thessalonians was already sufficiently spread abroad by others, yet that they themselves, the writers of the Epistle, in the fulness of their joy could not forbear to glory in their spiritual offspring. A reference to 1 Thess. i. 3

¹ So also arbitrarily Schrader: from the limitation of love to Christians is to be inferred an abhorrence of Gentiles.
² The latter, however, is actually found in B Β and some min.
(de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius) is not to be assumed. Schott erroneously attempts to justify the emphasis on ἡμᾶς αὐτῶν, by understanding the same of Paul only in contrast to Silvanus and Timotheus, the subjects along with Paul of the verb ὑπείλομεν, ver. 3; for to maintain such a change of subject between ver. 3 and ver. 4 is impossible. Equally incorrect is also the notion of Hofmann, that αὐτῶν added to ἡμᾶς denotes "of ourselves" “unprompted." For it is absurd to attempt to deny that ἡμᾶς αὐτῶν must at all events contain a contrast to others.— ἐν ἰμών ἐγκαθάσθαι] boast of you. ἐν ἰμών is a preliminary object to ἐγκαθάσθαι, which is then more completely unfolded in ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς κ.τ.λ.— ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ] in Corinth and its filiated churches. The cause which gave occasion to Paul’s boasting of his readers is more specially expressed, being what was formerly represented as the motive of the apostolic thanksgiving; whilst formerly faith in Christ and brotherly love were mentioned (ver. 4), the latter is here left entirely unmentioned, whilst the first is named in its special operation as Christian steadfastness under persecution.— ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ἰμῶν καὶ πίστεως] is not, with Grotius, Pelt, and others, to be understood as ὑπὲρ ἰμῶν, in the sense of ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ἰμῶν ἐν πίστει, or ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ἰμῶν ὑπομονεύσης. Nor is steadfastness, as Calvin, Hemming, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bouman, Chartae theol. Lib. I. p. 83 ff., Alford, and others think, particularly brought forward by the πίστεως mentioned in ver. 3; and then, in addition, πίστεως is once more insisted on as the foundation on which ὑπομονῆς rests, which would indeed be a strange proceeding, and would greatly interfere with the clearness of thought. But πίστεως is here used in a different sense from that in ver. 3. Whilst πίστεως in ver. 3 denoted faith in

1 But Bouman ultimately adds (p. 85): "Cujus (sc. dicti Paulini) intacta vulgari utriusque substantivi significatio, explicand a etiam in promptu est, ab illa, quam memoravimus, paullo diversa via ac ratio. Etenim optimis quibusque scriptoribus non raro placuisse novimus, ut a singularibus ad generalera nuncupanda progrederentur. Quidnigit primum singularum constantiae, virtutem celebref potuit apostolus, atque hinc ad universae vitae Christianae moderatricem fidem, Domino habitam, praedicandam gressum facere? But also against this the non-repetition of the article before πίστεως decides.
Christ, the expression here, as the article τῆς only placed once proves, is of a similar nature with ἰσομονή; whilst the reference to Christ as the object of faith steps into the background, and the idea of “faith” is transformed into the idea of “fidelity.” This rendering is the less objectionable as Paul elsewhere undoubtedly uses πίστις in the sense of fidelity (comp. Gal. v. 22; Rom. iii. 3; Tit. ii. 10; comp. also the adjective πιστικός, 1 Thess. v. 24; 2 Thess. iii. 3; 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13; 2 Cor. i. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 13); and, besides, the notion of fidelity in this passage implies the more general notion of faith in Christ; πίστις here denoting nothing else than faith in Christ standing in a special and concrete relation, i.e. proving itself under persecutions and trials. — πᾶσων belongs only to διωγμός ἵμων. This is shown by the article repeated before θλίψεως, and by the additional clause αἰς ἀνέχεσθε, which is parallel with ἵμων. — Clearer distinctions between διωγμός and θλίψεως (as “pericula, quae totum coetum concernunt,” and “singulorum privata infortunia,” Aretius; or “open and hidden distress,” Baumgarten-Crusius) are precarious. Only so much is certain that διωγμὸς is speciale nomen, θλίψεως generalius (Zanchius). — αἰς ἀνέχεσθε] an attraction for δν ἀνέχεσθε (so, correctly, also Buttmann, Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr. p. 140 [E. T. 161]), — not, as Schott, Olshausen, de Wette, and Hofmann maintain, instead of αἰς ἀνέχεσθαι; for ἀνέχομαι always governs the genitive in the N. T., never the accusative; comp. Matt. xvii. 17; Mark ix. 19; Luke ix. 41; Acts xviii. 14; 2 Cor. xi. 19; 19; Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Heb. xiii. 22. Fritzsche’s opinion (on 2 Cor. diss. II. p. 53 ff.), that there is no attraction at all, and that ἀνέχεσθαι is here (as in Eurip. Androm. 981, ἰευρίξομην) construed with the dative, and denotes “sustinendo premi calamitibus h. e. preferre mala,” is contradicted by the above N. T. usage. — The present ἀνέχεσθε represents the persecutions and the trials as belonging to the present. Accordingly a new outbreak of persecution must be meant, as the First Epistle describes the persecutions as past.¹

¹ That a critic such as Baur knows how to convert this deviation from the First Epistle into a dependence upon it is not strange (see Apostel Paulus,
Ver. 5. Judgment of the apostle concerning the conduct of his readers described in ver. 4. Their steadfastness in the sufferings of the present is a guarantee of future glory. Ver. 5 is a sentence in apposition, which is united to the preceding in the nominative, not in the accusative, to which Buttmann, Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr. p. 134 [E. T. 153], is inclined. See Winer, p. 472 [E. T. 669]. But ἐνδέεγμα refers not to the subject of ἀνέχεσθε, that is, to the Thessalonians, as if αἱς ἀνέχεσθε, δυντες ἐνδέεγμα were written (comp. Erasmus, Annot., Camerarius, Estius); for however simple and easy such a connection might be grammatically, yet logically it is objectionable. Besides, Paul would hardly have put καταξιωθήναι ὑμᾶς instead of the simple infinitive, if he thought on no difference of subject in ἐνδέεγμα and καταξιωθήναι. But also ἐνδέεγμα is not to be referred to τάσιν τοῖς διωγμοῖς... ἀνέχεσθε (Ambrosiaster, Zwingli, Calvin, Bullinger, Aretius, Wolf, Koppe, Pelt, Schrader, Ewald, Bisping, and others), but to the whole preceding principal and collective idea, ἐπέρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς... ἀνέχεσθε. Accordingly it is to be analyzed as follows: δ (that is to say, καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐν ὑπομονῇ καὶ πίστει πάντων τῶν διωγμῶν ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν θλίψεων ἀνέχεσθε) ἠστὶν ἐνδέεγμα τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ.—ἐνδεεγμα] is found here only in the N. T. It denotes a sign, guarantee, proof (comp. the active ἐνδεξιασθε, Phil. i. 28); here, according to the context, a prognostic.—τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ cannot, with Olshausen and Riggenbach, be understood of the present judgments executed on the earth, and which befall believers in order to perfect them and to make them worthy of the kingdom of God. Not only the article τῆς, pointing to the judgment καὶ ἐξοχήν, but also the explanation in p. 488). “This present tense evidently shows how the author transfers what had been said in 1 Thess. to his own time.” Also Schrader draws from ver. 4 an objection against the authenticity of the Epistle, but for this reason: “because later in the course of the Epistle the writer appears to have forgotten that at that instant the Thessalonians were in great tribulation.” But Paul dwells on this subject throughout the whole of the first chapter. Why should he tarry longer on it, or recur to it anew, since it referred to a virtue of the Thessalonians already proved, whereas the chief object of his Epistle consisted in supplying the actual and considerable wants of the church in knowledge and conduct!
ver. 6 ff., decides against this view. The future judgment is meant which God will execute by Christ at the advent.— *eis tò kataξιωθῆναι ἰμάς κ.τ.λ.* whose result will be that ye will be esteemed worthy of the kingdom of God, depends not on *αἷς ἀνέχεσθε*, so that ένδειγμα τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ would become a parenthetic exclamation (Bengel, Zacharize, Bisping, Hofmann, and others), nor does it also belong to the whole sentence ένδειγμα . . . Θεοῦ: in reference to which ye, etc., but only to τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως. Accordingly *eis tò kataξιωθ. κ.τ.λ.* is not a statement of purpose (thus Alford and Ewald), but an expository statement of result. *eis tò*, with the infinitive, also stands for the result in 2 Cor. viii. 6, etc. Comp. Winer, p. 294 [E. T. 414].— The infinitive *aorist kataξιωθῆναι* expresses the verbal idea simply, without any regard to time. See Kühner, II. p. 80.— *ὑπέρ ἦς καὶ πάσχετε* for striving to obtain which ye suffer, an additional statement of the cause whose corresponding result will be *kataξιωθῆναι*. The Thessalonians, by their enduring steadfastness, the motive of which was striving after the kingdom of God, made themselves worthy of participation in this kingdom, for they thereby showed how precious and dear Christ is to them; it is thus certain that the judgment of God to be expected at the return of Christ will recognise this worthiness, and will exalt the Thessalonians to be fellow-citizens of His kingdom. Comp. Phil. i. 28; Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 12.

Ver. 6. The suitableness and naturalness of this result to be expected from the righteousness of God, the mention of which was to comfort the Thessalonians and encourage them to continued endurance, is further carried out by an intimation of the retribution to be expected at the return of Christ. To assume a parenthesis from ver. 6 to *μεθ' ἡμῶν*, ver. 7 (Grotius), or to ver. 10 inclusive (Moldenhauer), is unnecessary arbitrariness.— *eíμεν* provided, does not express any doubt, but introduces by means of an elegant expression, under the form of suspense, a saying whose truth is fully acknowledged. Comp. viii. 9, 17. See Hermann, ad Viger. p. 834; Hartung, Partikellehre, I. p. 343; Klotz, ad Devar. p. 528.— *δίκαιον*
righteous, joined to δικαίας κρίσεως, ver. 5. The apostle here places himself upon the standpoint of the strict righteousness of God, which is conceived according to the analogy of human jus talionis, and is also so asserted in Rom. ii. 5 ff.; 2 Cor. v. 10; Eph. vi. 8, 9; Col. iii. 24, 25. It is accordingly inadmissible to interpret δίκαιον, with Pelt and others, of the manifestation of divine grace. The idea that one may obtain eternal salvation by his own merits, which recently Bisping finds here expressed, is removed from the Pauline mode of thought generally, and also from this passage. Certainly, as all men are subject to sin as a ruling power, the possibility of obtaining salvation can only be contained in Christ; and that God revealed this possibility of salvation, and by the mission of Christ invited us into His kingdom, is a pure contrivance of His free grace; but with this grace His holiness and righteousness are not abolished. There remains room for the exercise of the strict righteousness of God, as only he can enter into His eternal kingdom who, with the desire of salvation, accepts the call; whereas whoever closes himself against it, or rises up in enmity against it, must incur righteous punishment at the last day.

Ver. 7. Ἡλισθομένου is passive. Bengel erroneously considers it as middle. — ἄνεσις] from ἀνίμη, denotes the relaxing which follows exertion, the ἐπίτασις (Plat. Rep. i. p. 349 E: ἐν τῇ ἐπίτασει καὶ ἄνεσε τῶν χορδῶν. Plutarch, Lyc. 29: οὐκ ἄνεσις ἤν ἀλλ' ἐπίτασις τῆς πολιτείας) passing over to the idea comfort, refreshment, rest. Comp. 2 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 5, viii. 13, and the analogous expression ἀνάψυξις, Acts iii. 19. Here ἄνεσις characterizes the glory of the kingdom of God according to its negative side as freedom from earthly affliction and trouble. — μεθ' ἡμῶν] along with us. From this it follows that the apostle and his companions belonged to the θλιψεως. μεθ' ἡμῶν accordingly contains a confirmation of the notice contained in iii. 2. Others (as Turretin, comp. also de Wette) understand μεθ' ἡμῶν entirely generally: with us Christians in general. But the ἄνεσις which will likewise be imparted to the ἡμεῖς presupposes a preceding θλιψις, that is, according to the context, persecution by those who are not
Christians. But such persecutions do not befall Christians everywhere. Strangely, Bengel (and also Macknight), μεθ' ἡμῶν denotes: "nobiscum i.e. cum sanctis Israelitis." Ewald: "with us, i.e. with the apostles and other converted genuine Jews of the Holy Land, so that they shall have no preference." — ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλυφθην τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ a statement of the time when ἀνταποδοῦναι will take place, equivalent to διὰ τὴν ἀποκαλυφθην οἱ κύριοι Ἰησοῦς. ἀποκάλυφθη (1 Cor. i. 7) is a more definite expression for παροιμία. The return of Christ is the period at which He, so long hitherto concealed, will as Ruler and Judge be manifested, will publicly appear. — ἐν τῇ ὑπερανοῦ μετ' ἄγγελον δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ] a specification of the mode of the ἀποκαλυφθην. — ἐν τῇ ὑπερανοῦ] see on 1 Thess. iv. 16. — μετ' ἄγγελον δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ] with the angels of His power, i.e. through whom His power manifests itself, inasmuch as the angels are the executors of His commands, by their instrumentality e.g. the resurrection-call to the dead is issued (1 Thess. iv. 16). Calvin: Angelos potentiae vocat, inquibus suam potentiam exseret. Angelos enim secum adduct ad illustrandam regni sui gloriam. Oecumenius, Theophylact, Piscator, Benson, Flatt, and others erroneously explain it: "with His mighty angels;" still more erroneously Drusius, Michaelis, Krause, Hofmann, and others: "with His angelic host." For this the Hebrew ἄγγελον is appealed to. But δύναμις never occurs in this sense in the N. T.; the proofs to the contrary, which Hofmann finds in Luke x. 19, Matt. xxiv. 29, Mark xiii. 35, Luke xxi. 26, are entirely inappropriate. It would then require to have been written μετὰ δύναμεως ἄγγελων αὐτοῦ. It is a wanton error, proceeding from a want of philological tact, when Hofmann separates αὐτοῦ from the words μετ' ἄγγελων δυνάμεως, refers this pronoun to God, and joins it with διδόντος ἐκδίκησιν into a participial clause, of which ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλυφθην κ.τ.λ. forms the commencement. Granted that μετ' ἄγγελων δυνάμεως, without the additional αὐτοῦ, might denote with an angelic host, yet Paul, in order to express the thought assigned to him by Hofmann, if he would be at all understood, would

1 That also we are not here to think, with Hammond, on the destruction of Jerusalem is evident.
at least have entirely omitted αὐτοῦ, and would have put the dative διδόντες instead of the genitive διδόντος.

Ver. 8. 'Εν φλογὶ πυρὸς is not, as Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Seb. Schmid, Harduin, Moldenhauer, Macknight, Hilgenfeld (Zeitsch. f. wissensch. Theol. 1862, Part 3, p. 245), Hofmann, and others ¹ assume, a statement declaring the instrument of ἀποκαλύφει, ver. 7: in flaming fire (Ἔν ἐκλέψαν, Isa. xxix. 6, xxx. 30, etc.). In the O. T. God is described as appearing in flames of fire, and especially His coming to judgment is described as a coming in fire; comp. Ex. iii. 2 ff., xix. 18; Dan. vii. 9, 10, etc. What is there asserted of God is here transferred to Christ. (Comp. also 1 Cor. iii. 13, where of the day of Christ, i.e. of His advent, it is said: έν πυρὶ ἀποκαλυφτεται.) The additional clause accordingly serves for a further exaltation of the majesty and glory in which Christ will return. More special statements, that Paul thought on thunder and lightning (Zachariae, Koppe, Bolten), on a fire consuming the ungodly, or the world, or both together (Zwingli, Hemming, Aretius, Cornelius a Lapide, Fromond., Sebastian Schmid, and others), are to be discarded, from want of data to decide on.— διδόντος] is joined, not to πυρὸς, but to τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ver. 7. The formula διδόναι ἐκδικήσεις τῶι, to impart vengeance, that is, punishment, to any one, is only found here in the N. T. But comp. the LXX. Ezek. xxv. 14; Num. xxxi. 3 ( seçen τη). Paul does not mention only one class of persons who are to be punished (Calvin, Hemming, Turretin, Pelt, Schott, de Wette, Riggenbach), but two classes of persons. This is required by the article repeated before μη ὑπακοόνωσιν. These were the two classes of persons from whom the church of Thessalonica had to suffer persecution—Gentiles and Jews. By τοῖς μη εἰδόσων Θεον Paul means the former, and by τοῖς μη ὑπακοόνωσιν τῷ εὐαγγ. κ.τ.λ. the latter, so that the general τοῖς θηλβασίων ὑμᾶς, ver. 6, is now specialized. The correctness of this interpretation is further evident from the fact that else-

¹ Thus also Theodoret must have united the words. For although he does not clearly express himself concerning this union, yet he finds in φλογὶ πυρὸς expressed: τίς τιμορίων τό ἄδει, and adds: φλογὶ μὴ πυρὸς παραδίδωσιν.
where μὴ εἰδότες Θεόν is with Paul a characteristic designation of the Gentiles (1 Thess. iv. 5; Gal. iv. 8; comp. Rom. i. 28; Eph. ii. 12); whereas the characteristic of the theocratic nation of the Jews, as shown by experience, was disobedience to God and His plan of salvation; comp. Rom. x. 3, 16, 21, etc. This reference to Gentiles and Jews is already found in Ambrosiaster, Grotius, Quistorp, Benson, Bengel, Koppe, Baumgarten-Crusius; and also recently, in Alford, Ewald, and Bisping. On the other hand, Harduin and Hofmann interpret the first clause of Gentiles, and the second of Jews and Gentiles; Schrader, the first of Gentiles, and the second of Christians; Aretius, the first of "manifesti Christi hostes, sive Judaeis sint sive ethici," and the second of "pestes in sinu ecclesiae latitantes." But with the first view the division, which the article repeated requires, becomes illusory; and the context decides against the last two views.

For when, as here, Christians are comforted on account of the afflictions which they suffer from those who are not Christians by an intimation of a future retribution, the discourse cannot possibly have reference to a punishment which is impending on Christians. — τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ιησοῦ a repetition of the subject already contained in διδόντως in a fuller form, on account of the preceding Θεόν.

Ver. 9. Paul names eternal destruction as the punishment which those ungodly ones will have to endure.—οὖν qui, refers back to the characteristics of the two classes named in ver. 8, and accordingly recapitulates the reason for δἰκήν τίσουσιν. See Hermann, ad Soph. Oed. R. 688. — ἀπὸ προσόπου τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ.] has received a threefold interpretation. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Vatablus, Estius, Fromond., and others interpret ἀπὸ of time: immediately after the appearance of the πρόσώπου τοῦ κυρίου and of the δόξα τῆς ἱσχύος αὐτοῦ. The swiftness and facility of the punishment are thereby described, inasmuch as it required Christ merely to become visible. The artificiality of this interpretation is evident. For however often ἀπὸ denotes the point of commencement of a period, yet the bare ἀπὸ προσόπου cannot possibly be considered as parallel with such constructions as ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου, Rom. i. 20; ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας, Phil.
i.5, and the like. At least ἀπ’ ἀποκαλύψεως τοῦ προσώπου or something similar would require to have been written. Add to this that ἀπὸ προσώπου κ.τ.λ., on account of its position at the end of the sentence, cannot have such an emphasis, that the idea of the swiftness and facility of the punishment can be derived from it. ἀπὸ is understood as a statement of the operating cause by Grotius, Harduin, Benson, Bengel, Moldenhauer, Flatt, Pelt, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, and Hofmann: “from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power” (comp. Acts iii.19). Pelt (and so also Castalio, Koppe, Bolten, and others) arbitrarily considers ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου as equivalent to the simple ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου; and equally arbitrarily Harduin, Benson, and Moldenhauer (comp. also Hofmann) understand πρόσωπον of a wrathful or gloomy countenance. But there is an essential inconvenience to this second mode of interpretation, inasmuch as by its assumption without the introduction of a new idea there is only a repetition in other words of what has already been said in vv. 7, 8 from ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ δίδωτος ἐκδικήσεως; the whole of the 9th verse would only contain αἰώνιον as a new point. Accordingly the third mode of explanation, adopted by Piscator, Ernest Schmid, Beza, Calixt, Koppe, Krause, Schott, Bloomfield, Alford, Bisping, and Riggenbach, is decidedly to be preferred, according to which ἀπὸ expresses the idea of separation, of severance from something. Comp. ii.2; Rom. ix.3; 2 Cor. xi.3; Gal. v.4. According to Flatt and de Wette, the expression ἵσχύος is opposed to this explanation, which directly points to an operating cause. But τῆς ἵσχύος is to be rendered the genitive of origin, and the δόξα is to be understood, not of the glory of Christ, but of the glory which is to be imparted to believers. The meaning is: apart or separated from the face of the Lord, and apart from the glory which is a creation of His power. By this explanation πρόσωπον receives its full import; “to see the face of the Lord” is a well-known biblical expression to denote blessedness (comp. Ps. xi.7, xvii.5; Matt. v.8, xviii.10; Heb. xii.14; Rev. xxii.4), whereas distance from it is an expression of misery.

Ver. 10. Further, with this explanation ver. 10 agrees best,
since in it, as the counterpart to ver. 9, the discourse is not so much of a glorification of Christ as of a glorification of Christians—a glorification certainly which necessarily reflects on Christ Himself as its producer. — δὴν ἐλθῇ] when He shall have come, a statement of the time of δικην τίσουσιν, ver. 9. Schott less simply unites it with διδόντος ἐκδίκησιν, ver. 8. — ἐνδοξα-θήναι] the infinitive of design. See Winer, p. 284 [E.T. 399]. The ἄγιοι are not the attending angels (Macknight, Schrader), but Christians. ἐν τοῖς ἄγιοις αὐτῶν does not, however, import through His saints (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Kypke, II. p. 341, Vater, Pelt, Schott, and others), nor among them, but in them, so that the glorification of Christians becomes a glorification of Christ Himself. So also Christ is admired in all believers, because the admiration of the blessedness to which believers have been exalted has as its consequence an admiration of Christ as the Creator of that blessedness. — ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη ... ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς] is a parenthesis: \[Certainly otherwise Hofmann. According to him, ἵνα ἐπιστευθῇ τοῦ μαρτύρου ἡμῶν ἵν’ ὑμᾶς is to be added as a reason to ἀναπτάδωσιν ἡμῖν ἀνώτερον μὲν ἡμῖν, ver. 6 f. (!). But this is not yet enough. Besides the statement of design, ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἐξώσῃ ἡκ. λα., ver. 11, is made also to depend on ἐπιστεῦθη τοῦ μαρτύρου ἡμῶν ἵν’ ὑμᾶς; to this statement of design also is ἵνα ἡμῖν ἐξώσῃ belongs; this is placed before ἵνα for the sake of emphasis, and ἵνα ἐν ὑμῖν ἀρρενοτρίμενα τάς τοις προφ. ὑμᾶς forms a mere parenthesis—suppositions which are certainly worthy of an exegesis like that of Hofmann, but are only possible to it.\]
sion, the rather because he has said directly before that God (?) will be admired in those who believed, as if a verification or complete confirmation (?) of the contents of faith must at last justly correspond to the human faith regarding them.” — τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν] our testimony, i.e. the testimony proclaimed by us. Really different, neither from μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. i. 6 : the testimony whose subject is Christ; nor from μαρτύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ, 1 Cor. ii. 1 : the testimony which God published through the apostles concerning Christ. To limit, with Bretschneider, μαρτύριον to the instructions of the apostle concerning the advent of Christ contained in the First Epistle, instead of taking it entirely generally in the sense of κήρυγμα or εὐαγγέλιον, is rendered impossible by the relation of ὅτι επιστεῦθη to πιστεύσασιν. — ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς] is connected with τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν into one idea; and hence the article τῷ, whose repetition before ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς might have been expected, is omitted. See Winer, p. 123 [E. T. 169]. Comp. on ἐπὶ with μαρτύριον, Luke ix. 5. Ingenious, but erroneous, Bengel: ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς denotes: ad vos usque, in occidente. — ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ belongs not to ἐλθεῖν (Zeger, Pelt, Olshausen), but to ἐσται θήναι, whilst by it the indication of time, ὅταν ἐλθῇ, is resumed. The Peshito, likewise Pelagius, John Damascenus, Estius, Lucius Osiander, Menochius, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Harduin, Storr, Koppe, Krause, Rosenmüller, Nößelt, Flatt, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others, not assuming a parenthesis, unite ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ with the directly preceding, either with μαρτύριον or with ἐπιστεῦθη. The interpretations resulting from this mode of connection vary much from each other; but are all arbitrary, inasmuch as, on the one hand, in order to preserve the statement of time in ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, one feels himself constrained to consider the aorist ἐπιστεῦθη as placed for the future, and thus to alter the import of the verb (will be authenticated); or, on the other hand, in order to preserve ἐπιστεῦθη in the sense of the aorist, one has recourse to the expedient of construing ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ as the objective statement belonging to μαρτύριον, in the sense of περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης. — But wherefore did Paul add ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ after the sentence beginning with ὅτι? Perhaps only
for the sake of parallelism. But possibly also Calvin is correct when he says: "repetit in die illa ... Ideo autem repetit, ut fidelium vota cohiebeat, ne ultra modum festinent."

Ver. 11. *Eis δ* [in reference to which, namely, that such a glorification of Christ in His people is to be expected. Comp. Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 220; Kühner, II. p. 279. Philologically incorrect, Grotius, Flatt, Pelt, Baumgarten-Crusius take *eis δ* as equivalent with quapropter, and Koppe as "mora particula transeundi," equivalent with itaque. Logically incorrect, de Wette, Bloomfield, Hofmann, and Riggenbach: "to which end." For, since *eis δ* must refer to the chief thought in ver. 10, this could only be analysed by: "in order that the ἐνδοξασθήναι and the θαυμασθήναι of Christ may be realized in believers." But this fact in itself is clear to the apostle as a settled truth; he cannot think on it as dependent on his prayer; he can only have it in view in his prayers, that the Thessalonians also may find themselves in the number of those among whom Christ will be glorified. — *καί* belongs not to *eis δ*, so that the suitableness of this (supposed) design was denoted (de Wette), but to προσευχόμεθα. It imports that the prayer of the apostle was added on behalf of the Thessalonians to the fact of the ἐνδοξασθήναι. — *ἰνα*] The contents of the prayer in the form of a purpose. ἄξιον τῆς κληρονομίας is that to which Paul would attain through his prayer. Comp. Meyer on Phil. i. 9.— ἄξιον] means to judge worthy; comp. 1 Tim. v. 17; Heb. iii. 3, x. 29. It never has the meaning to make worthy, which Luther, Grotius, Flatt, Olshausen, Ewald attribute to it. From this it follows that κληρονομία cannot express the act of the divine calling, already belonging to the past, but must denote something future. κληρονομία is accordingly to be understood, as in Phil. iii. 14, in a passive sense, as the good thing to which we are called, i.e. the future heavenly blessedness of the children of

1 So also Meyer on Phil. iii. 14; likewise Grimm in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1850, Part 4, p. 806 f.: "The Christians are declared worthy of the call already promulgated to them, or the κληρονομία εἰς Θείον may be in reference to them ἐκμακραίνεις (Rom. xi. 29), because the Christian can again make himself unworthy of the divine grace which he has received (Rom. xi. 20 ff.; 2 Cor. vi. 1; Gal. v. 4)."
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God. Col. i. 5 (see Meyer on that passage) is entirely analogous, where ἔλπις, elsewhere active, is used in a passive or objective sense.—With καὶ πληρώσῃ κ.τ.λ., which is grammatically subordinate to ἀξιώσῃ, Paul adds, logically considered, the means which is to lead to the result of being judged worthy.—πληρῶν] to bring to completion or perfection.—πᾶσαν εὐδοκιαν ἀγαθωσύνης] cannot be referred to God, as if it meant all His good pleasure, and denoted the divine decree of election (Oecumenius, Zwingli, Calvin, Estius, Justinian, Beza, Calixt, Wolf, Benson, Bengel, Macknight, Koppe, Flatt, Pelt, Bisping, and others). It is against this that ἔργον πιστεως, which forms an additional accusative to πληρώσῃ, is undoubtedly to be referred to the Thessalonians; that ἀγαθωσύνη is never used by Paul of God; and lastly, that πᾶσαν τὴν εὐδοκίαν would require to have been written instead of πᾶσαν εὐδοκιαν. Others refer πᾶσαν εὐδοκίαν partly to God and partly to the Thessalonians. Thus Theophylact: ἵνα πᾶσα εὐδοκία τοῦ Θεοῦ, τούτως πᾶσα ἄρεσκεια, πληρώθη ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ πᾶν ἄγαθον διαπράττησθε, καὶ σὺν ὦτος ὦν βούλεται ὁ Θεὸς, μὴ δεινὸς ὑμῖν λείπωντος. Grotius: Omnem bonitatem sibi gratam . . . ἀγαθωσύνη, ἢ ἐστιν αὐτῶν εὐδοκία. Olshausen,2 with whom Bloomfield agrees: May God fill you with all the good which is pleasing to Him. This second explanation is even more inadmissible than the first. It is not even supported by the appearance of justification, as at least πᾶσαν ἀγαθωσύνην εὐδοκίας must be put, in order to afford a point of connection for it. The exclusively correct meaning is to understand both εὐδοκίας and ἀγαθωσύνης of the Thessalonians. But ἀγαθωσύνη does

1 Alford incorrectly objects to the passive interpretation adopted by me, that the position of the words would require to be τῆς ἀληθείας ἀξιώτερος. For the emphasis rests on μετέχει placed first, whilst with τῆς ἀληθείας the idea, already supposed as well known by καταχωρισμὶς ὑμᾶς τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, ver. 5, as well as by the contents of ver. 10, is only resumed, although under a different form. Alford, appealing to 1 Cor. vii. 20, understands καλίτερς "not merely as the first act of God, but as the enduring state produced by that act, the normal termination of which is glory."

2 In an excess of arbitrariness, Olshausen besides takes εὐδοκίαν and ἔργον as absolute accusatives, whilst he unites ὑμᾶς not only with ἀξιώσῃ, but likewise with πληρῶσῃ.
not denote benevolence (Chandler, Moldenhauer, Nosselt, Schott), but moral goodness generally. Comp. Rom. xv. 14; Gal. v. 22; Eph. v. 9. Accordingly, with πᾶσα εὐδοκία ἀγαθοσύνης is expressed every satisfaction in moral goodness. — ἔργον πίστεως] here, as in 1 Thess. i. 3, represents faith as an ἔργον, i.e. as something begun with energy, and persevered in amid persecution. — ἐν δύναμι] belongs to πληρώσῃ, and takes the place of an adverb. See Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 209. Comp. Rom. i. 4; Col. i. 29. Thus powerfully.

Ver. 12. Τὸ ὅνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμ. Ἰησοῦ] The name of our Lord Jesus, i.e. so far as He is the κύριος, the Lord; comp. Phil. ii. 9 ff. Arbitrarily, de Wette: Christ, so far as He is recognised and known. Still more arbitrarily Turretin, Moldenhauer, Koppe, and others: ὅνομα κυρίου is a mere circumlocution for κυρίος. — ἐν αὐτῷ] refers not to Ἰησοῦ (so Alford), but to τὸ ὅνομα; and the giving prominence to the mutual reciprocity, ἐν υἱῷ καὶ υἱήσει ἐν αὐτῷ, is an exhaustive representation. Comp. Gal. vi. 14; 1 Cor. vi. 13. — κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ] according to the grace of our God and of the (see Winer, p. 113 [E. T. 154]) Lord Jesus. According to Hofmann and Riggenbach, Christ is here named both our God and our Lord,—an interpretation which, indeed, grammatically is no less allowable than the interpretation of the doxology, ὁ ὅν ἐν πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, Rom. ix. 5, as an apposition to ὁ Χριστός, but is equally inadmissible, as it would contain an un-Pauline thought; on account of which also Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. f. d. wiss. Theol., Halle 1862, p. 264, in the interest of the supposed spuriousness of the Epistle, has forthwith appropriated to himself this discovery of Hofmann.
CHAPTER II.


Vv. 1–12. Dogmatic portion of the Epistle. Information, by way of correction, concerning the commencement of the advent. The day of the Lord is not yet. It will only then occur when Antichrist, whom now a preventing power hinders from appearing, will be manifested. — See on vv. 1–12,
Ver. 1. Ἐπωρωτάμεν δὲ] passing from what the apostle prays for the Thessalonians (i. 11, 12) to what he requires of them. On ἐπωρώτω, see on 1 Thess. iv. 1.—ἀδελφοί] an affectionate and winning address.—ὑπέρ] is in the Vulgate, as well as by Pelagius, Faber Stapulensis, Bugenhagen, Clarius, Erasmus, Zwingli, Calvin, Hemming, Hunnias, Justinian, Estius, Piscator, Baldwin, Aretius, Cornelius a Lapide, Beza, Fromond., Calixt, Bern. a Piconius, Nat. Alexander, and many others, understood as a form of adjuration (per adventum); and then the meaning attributed to it is either: si vobis dies ille tremendus est...obtestor vos per illum (Zwingli), or: si vobis animo carus est adventus domini, si desiderabile est vobis ad ipsum dominum colligi, etc. (Hemming), or lastly: quam vere exspectatis domini adventum, etc. (Beza). Certainly ὑπέρ, as elsewhere πρὸς, sometimes occurs in protestations with the genitive; comp. Hom. II. xxiv. 466 f.—Καὶ μὲν ὑπέρ πατρός καὶ μητέρος ἡνίκαμοι | Δίσεο καὶ τέκεος, ἵνα οἱ σὺν θυμὸν ὅρινης, Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 244. But (1) such a usage is entirely foreign to
the N. T. (2) It is hardly conceivable that Paul should have chosen that as an object of adjuration, concerning which he was about to instruct them in what follows. Therefore Zeger, Vorstius, Grotius, Hammond, Wolf, Noesselt, Koppe, Storr, Heydenreich, Flatt, Pelt, Schott, de Wette, Winer (p. 343 [E. T. 479]), Baumgarten-Crusius, Wieseler, Bloomfield, Alford, Ewald, Bisping, Riggenbach, and others more correctly take ἵπτα in the sense of pept, in respect of. Comp. Rom. ix. 27; 2 Cor. i. 8; Passow, A 3; Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 244; Kühner, II. p. 288. Yet this does not prevent the maintenance of the special import of the preposition also here. The meaning is in the interest of the advent, namely, in order to preserve it from everything that is erroneous. When, then, the apostle says: we entreat you in the interest of the advent, the meaning of this abbreviated form of expression is: we entreat you in the interest of the advent, namely, to guard it against all misrepresentations, not to deviate from the correct view concerning it. — παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου] here also, as everywhere with Paul, is nothing else than the personal coming (return) of Christ at the completion of the kingdom of God. — ἐπισκοπογενή] points back to 1 Thess. iv. 17, denoting the act by which all believers are caught up to Christ, or gathered together to Him, to be then eternally united to Him, following the resurrection and change. — ὑμῶν] is placed first in order to obtain a more direct contrast to κυρίου. — ἐπὶ αὐτῶν] up to Him. Incorrectly Grotius, Koppe, Heydenreich, Pelt, Alford, and others, that it is equivalent to πρὸς αὐτῶν.

Ver. 2. A statement of the object of the whole sentence, ver. 1. — σαλεύεσθαι from σάλος, which is especially used of the sea agitated by a storm (comp. Luke xxi. 25), denotes being placed in a state of commotion and vacillation. It is spoken both in a natural sense of circumstances in the external world (comp. Matt. xi. 7; Acts iv. 31, xvi. 26; Heb. xii. 26, etc.), and also transferred to mental conditions (comp. Acts xvii. 13). σαλεύθηκεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῶς is a pregnant construction, including two ideas: to be put in a state of mental commotion away from the νοῶς, i.e. so that the νοῶς goes astray, does not attain to its proper function. Comp. Rom.
ix. 3: ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. — νοῦς] is to be taken quite generally. It denotes the reasonable, sober, and considerate state of mind, mentis tranquillitas (Turretin). Others, contrary to the meaning of the word, understand by νοῦς the more correct view or conviction, received by the personal instruction of the apostle concerning the advent, from which the Thessalonians were not to suffer themselves to be removed. So Hemming, Bullinger, Estius, Lucius Osiander, Piscator, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Fromond., Bern. a Piconius, Nat. Alexander, Moldenauer, Flatt, Heydenreich, and many others; whilst, in an equally erroneous manner, Wolf interprets the expression of the "sensus verborum Pauli, de hoc argumento in superiore epistola traditorum." — μὴ ταχέως] not suddenly. This does not import, "so soon after my departure" (Joachim Lange), or so shortly after the instructions received from us (Piscator, Calovius, Olshausen, and others), but: suddenly, so soon after the matter in question was spoken of. — μηδὲ θροείσθαι] nor yet be frightened. A new and stronger point, which is more definitely described or divided by the following μήτε, according to a threefold statement of the cause. See on this distinction between μηδὲ and μήτε, Winer, p. 432 [E. T. 611]. — μήτε διὰ πνεύματος] neither by inspiration. Falsely-understood prophecies of the O. T. (Krause), or signa quasi per spiritum facta (Pelagius), or deceitful revelations by spiritual appearances (Ernest Schmid, Schrader), or by dreams (Schrader), are not meant; but inspired prophetical discourses, delivered by the members of the church in Christian assemblies, and whose contents were falsely given out as divine revelations. To understand, with Chrysostom, Bugenhagen, Vatablus, Koppe, Storr, Bolten, Heydenreich, and others (Flatt and de Wette give the alternative), πνεῦμα as an abstract noun, instead of the concrete πνευματικός, so that the persons who delivered the inspired discourses are to be understood, although not without analogy, is yet objectionable in itself, and has the want of harmony occasioned by it with the following λόγου and ἐπιστολής against it. — μήτε διὰ λόγου] is by Baumgarten-Crusius referred to a traditional (falsified) word of Jesus, more specifically by Noesselt to the prophecy of Christ in Matt. xxiv,
Mark xiii., Luke xxi. But if Paul had in view a saying of Christ, he would have indicated it (perhaps by μὴ διὰ λόγου ὡς κυρίου, or something similar). Others, as Michaelis and Tychsen, translate λόγος by "reckoning," and suppose that one made a reckoning of the times on the ground of the Book of Daniel, and in consequence inferred that the advent of Christ was directly at hand. But λόγον by itself certainly does not justify such an artificial hypothesis. Lastly, others, in distinction from prophecy delivered by inspiration, take λόγος in the sense of a calm and didactic discourse, whether aiming at conviction or seduction. So, after the example of Chrysostom, Oecumenius (διὰ πιθανολογίας), Theophylact (διὰ διδασκαλίας ζωῆς φωνῆ γυμνόμενης), Clarus (oratione persuasoria), Zeger (per doctrinam viva voce praelatam), Ewald ("by word; that is, by discourse and doctrine [διδαχὴ, 1 Cor. xiv. 26]; whilst one sought to prove the error in a learned manner by a clever discourse, perhaps from the Holy Scriptures"), Hofmann, Rigganbach, and many others. However, from the parallel arrangement in ver. 15, which opposes the true to the false expressed in ver. 2, it is evident that διὰ λόγου and δι’ ἐπιστολῆς are closely connected ideas, of which the first denotes the oral, and the second the written statement. It is accordingly most natural to construe διὰ λόγου not by itself, but to unite ὡς δι’ ἡμῶν, as proceeding from us, both with διὰ λόγου and with δι’ ἐπιστολῆς; and to understand the first of oral expressions which were imputed to the apostle, and the latter of written expressions which were imputed to him by means of a forged epistle. On the other hand, with Erasmus, to refer ὡς δι’ ἡμῶν also to διὰ πνεύματος is impossible; as, although λόγοι and ἐπιστολαὶ may be placed in the category of those things which proceed from one absent, yet this cannot be the case with inspired prophetical discourses, as with these the personal presence of the speaker was requisite. Correctly Theodoret: παρεγγυᾷ τοῖς ὦ θείοις ἀπόστολοι, μὴ πιστεύειν τοῖς λέγουσιν ἐνεστηκέναι τοῦ τῆς συντελείας καιρὸν, καὶ παραντίκα τὸν

1 But not, as Macknight (comp. also Bloomfield) thinks, of a pretended oral message of the apostle to his readers; nor, as Grotius explains it, of "rumores de nobis, quasi alius nunc dicercemus, quam antehae diximus."
kύριοι ἐπιφανέσθαι, μήτε εἰ προσποιοῦμαι χρησμοῦν καὶ προφητεύειν. τοῦτο γὰρ λέγει μὴτε διὰ πνεύματος· μήτε εἰ πλασάμενοι ὡς εξ αὐτοῦ γραφεῖσαν ἐπιστολὴν προφέροιεν, μήτε εἰ ἀγράφως αὐτὸν εἰρηκέναι λέγοιεν. — ὡς δὲ ἡμῶν] simply denies that such a saying or letter, containing such an assertion, arose from Paul and his two companions, or proceeded from them. The apostle accordingly supposes, that as there were actually in Thessalonica prophetical announcements (πνεῦμα) which had the assertion which follows as their contents, so there were also actually present a λόγος and an ἐπιστολὴ containing the contents here stated. Accordingly, it is a completely arbitrary assumption when Kern, p. 149 f.; Reuss, Gesch. der heil. Schriften N. T., 4th edit., Braunschw. 1864, p. 71; Bleek, Einleit. in d. N. T., Ber. 1862, p. 385 f.; and Hilgenfeld, in d. Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol., Halle 1862, p. 249, after the example of Beza (but he not decidedly), Hammond, and Krause, refer the ἐπιστολὴ to the apostle's First Epistle to the Thessalonians, which was wrongly understood, or, as Hilgenfeld thinks, from which an inference suggested by it was drawn. — ὡς δὲι εὐστηκέαν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου] as if, or, like as if the day of the Lord is already present, or, is even on the point of commencing¹ (comp. Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26; Gal. i. 4), gives the contents of the communications unsettling and terrifying them, to placed before δὲν brings into prominence the fact that this notion was completely unfounded and purely imaginary. Comp. also 2 Cor. xi. 21, and Winer, p. 544 [E. T. 771]. Completely erroneous Hofmann: ὡς δὲι is equivalent to ὡς ἐάν, 1 Thess. ii. 7. — When, moreover, the apostle says that these illusions unsettled and terrified the Thessalonians, this effect might be produced both on those who regarded the advent with longing desire and on those who regarded it with fear. For what is eagerly expected puts a man in a state of excitement, and if it is something decisive of his fate, into a state of fear, as soon as he believes that the moment of its realization has come.

Vv. 3, 4. An emphatically-repeated exhortation, and the

¹ Incorrectly Hoelemann, Die Stellung St. Pauli zu der Frage um die Zeit der Wiederkunft Christi, Leipzig. 1858, p. 14: "as if the day of the Lord was at hand."
reason of it. The readers were by no means to be misled into
the fancy, that the day of the Lord was now to dawn; for
the apostasy and the appearance of Antichrist must precede
it. — ἐγκατατάφν] does not precisely convey the idea of a deceit
occurring from wicked intention, whilst it may be correctly
imagined that nothing evil was seen in the mode of deception
mentioned in ver. 2—rather it was considered as an excusable
vehicle for the diffusion of views which were believed to be
recognised as true; only the idea of delusion, i.e. of being
misled into a false and incorrect mode of contemplation, is
expressed by the verb.— When, then, the apostle says, Let
no man befool you, it is, similar to a form of representation
usual to him, in the meaning of suffer yourselves to be befooled
by no one. Comp. Eph. v. 6; Col. ii. 16, 18. — κατὰ μηδένα
τρόπον] not only recapitulates the three modes of misleading
mentioned in ver. 2 (Bengel, Baumgarten-Crusius), but is an
absolute expression, so that accordingly it may be supposed
that some other mode of deception might be employed.— The
sentence vv. 3, 4 is grammatically incomplete. The finite
verb to ὅτι is wanting, which Paul intended to accompany the
conjunction, but easily forgot as he added to ὅ ἀνθρωπος τῆς
ἀμαρτίας a longer description. It is perfectly clear from the
connection that οὐκ ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου from ver. 2
is to be supplied to ὅτι. In a very forced manner Knatchbull
attempts to remove the incompleteness of the construction by
placing a comma after ὅτι, supplying ἐνέστηκεν to ὅτι, and
uniting it with μὴ τις ... τρόπον into one sentence. “Suffer
yourselves to be deceived by no one that (the day of the Lord
is at the door), unless first there shall have come,” etc. To
maintain this meaning ἐνέστηκεν must necessarily be added to
ὅτι. But still more arbitrary is the attempt of Storr and Flatt
to remove the ellipsis by explaining ἐὰν μὴ as analogous (!) to
the Hebrew קָשַׁה, in the sense of most certainly, most positively.
— ὅτι] is to be separated from the preceding by a colon, and
does not denote indeed (Baumgarten-Crusius), but for. — ἀπο-
στασία] a later Greek form for the older ἀπόστασις. See
Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 528. The expression is to be left in its
absoluteness, not, with Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact,
Augustin (de cívitate dei, xx. 21), and Bolten, to be taken as *abstractum pro concreto*, so that *Antichrist himself* is to be understood. But not apostasy in the *political* sense, but entirely *religious* apostasy—that is, a falling away from God and true religion—can have been meant by *ἀποστασία*. (1) What is said of the *ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας* in direct internal connection with the apostasy, (2) the characteristic of the *ἀποστασία*, ver. 3, by *ἀνομία*, ver. 7, and (3) the constant biblical usage, constrain us to this view. Comp. LXX. 2 Chron. xxix. 19; Jer. ii. 19; 1 Macc. ii. 15, etc.; Acts xxi. 21; 1 Tim. iv. 1. Accordingly, also, Kern's view (comp. already Aretius and Vorstius) is to be rejected as inadmissible, that we are to think of a *mixture* of political and religious apostasy.—Moreover, the apostle speaks of *ἡ ἀποστασία* (with the article), and also *ὁ ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας κ.τ.λ.*, either because the readers had already been orally instructed concerning it (comp. ver. 5), or because the Old Testament prophets had already foretold the apostasy and the appearance of Antichrist. But the apostasy is not the *consequence* of the appearance of Antichrist, so that Paul by *καὶ ἀποκαλύφθη κ.τ.λ.* goes backwards from a statement of its effect to a specification of its author (so Pelt and de Wette, appealing to vv. 9, 10); but it *precedes* the appearance of antichrist, so that this is the historical climax of the *ἀποστασία*, and serves for its completion (vv. 7–10).—The apostle considers Antichrist as a parallel to Christ; therefore he here speaks of an *ἀποκάλυψις* (comp. i. 7), a revelation of what was hitherto concealed, as well as, in ver. 9, of an advent of the same. — *ὁ ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας* the man of sin, i.e. in whom sin is the principal matter, and is, as it were, incorporated—who thus forms the climax of wickedness. — *ὁ νῦν τῆς ἁπαλείας* the son of perdition, i.e. who on account of his wickedness falls a prey to perdition. Comp. John xvii. 12. See Winer, p. 213 [E. T. 298]. Schleusner and Pelt erroneously take the expression as transitive: “who will be the cause of perdition to others.” Equally erroneously Theodoret, Occumenius, and others; also Heydenreich and Schott: the transitive sense is to be *united* with the intransitive.

Ver. 4. *"O ἀντικεῖμενος*] is not to be united by *zeugma* with Meyer—2 Thess.
\(\text{περαιρόμενος, so that out of ἐπὶ πάντα κ.τ.λ. the dative παντὶ λεγομένῳ Θεῷ ἵ ἑσπάσματι is to be taken (Benson, Koppe, Krause, Rosenmüller, Flat, Pelt, Bloomfield, Hofmann, Riggenbach), but is absolute, in the sense of a substantive—the opposer. It has been erroneously maintained by Pelt, that the article being only put once necessitates the assumption of a zeugma. But all that follows from the single insertion of the article is only that the two statements, ἀντικείμεναι and ἰπεραιρεσθαι, must contain something related to each other, which is summed up in a common general idea. This general idea is extremely evident from what follows. Accordingly, the person of whom Paul speaks was designated according to his internal nature by ὁ ἀνθρωπὸς τῆς ἀμαρτίας, then characterized according to his ultimate fate by ὁ νιὸς τῆς ἀπολέσθαι, and now—whilst Paul in his delineation takes a step backward (comp. ver. 8 and ver. 9)—the mode and manner of his public external appearance and conduct is described.—but if ὁ ἀντικειμένος denotes simply and absolutely the opposer, the question is asked, whom does he oppose? Baumgarten and Michaelis erroneously answer: the human race; for this interpretation has no point of contact in the context, and would explain away the form so definitely brought before us by Paul by a vague generality. De Wette and others more definitely answer: God and Christ. And certainly the description that immediately follows shows that the opposer opposes himself in the highest degree to God. But this fact does not justify such a wide meaning, if another is opposed to it in the context. Now the context specially points to the opposer of Christ (thus Heydenreich, Schott, and Kern). For the man of sin stands in the closest and strictest parallelism with Christ. He is the forerunner of Christ's advent, and has, as the caricature of Christ, like Him an advent and a manifestation: he raises the power of evil, which exalts itself in a hostile manner against Christ and His kingdom, to the highest point; his working is diametrically the opposite of the working of Christ, and it is Christ's appearance which destroys him. Accordingly, the opponent can be none other than the Antichrist (ὁ ἀντιχριστός, 1 John ii. 18). This Antichrist is not the devil himself}
(Pelagius and others), for he is distinguished from him (ver. 9); but according to ver. 9 he is an instrument of the devil. — In καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος κ.τ.λ. he is further described as he who, in frivolous arrogance, exalts himself above all that is called God. With this description the delineation of Antiochus Epiphanes, in Dan. xi. 36, 37, was before the mind of the apostle, where it is said: καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑψωθέται καὶ μεγαληνυθησται ἐπὶ πάντα Θεόν, καὶ λαλήσει ὑπέρωγκα ... καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας θεοὺς τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ οὐ συνήσει ... καὶ ἐπὶ πάν Θεόν οὐ συνήσει, ὅτι ἐπὶ πάντας μεγαληνυθησται. Comp. Dan. vii. 25: καὶ λόγους πρὸς τὸν ὑψιστὸν λαλήσει. — ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεόν] includes the true God as well as the false gods worshipped by the heathen; but λεγόμενον is a natural addition from Christian caution, as πάντα Θεόν would have been a senseless and indeed blasphemous expression for a Christian. — ἡ σέβασμα] serves for a generalization of the idea Θεόν. Accordingly the meaning is: or whatever else is an object of adoration, sc. of divine adoration (= numen). — ὁ δέστε κ.τ.λ.] The arrogant wickedness of Antichrist proceeds so far that he claims divine adoration for himself. — καθίσαι] intransitive, seats himself; accordingly not αὐτῶν (Grotius, Koppe, Pelt), but αὐτὸν is to be written. αὐτὸν is placed for the sake of emphasis: he, who has lost all reverence for the divine, in whose form he wishes to appear. — ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ] is not, as Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calvin, Musculus, Hunnus, Estius, Lucius and Andrew Osiander, Aretius, Vorstius, Calixt, Calovius, Wolf, Benson, Moldenhauer, Bolten, and others, also Heydenreich, Pelt, Olshausen, Bloomfield, Alford, Bisping, and Hilgenfeld (l. c. p. 253) assume, a figurative representation of the Christian church, but, on account of the definite expression καθίσαι, cannot be otherwise understood than in its proper sense. But on account of the repetition of the article can only one definite temple of one definite true God—that is, the temple of Jerusalem—be meant (Grotius, Clericus, Schöttgen, Whitby, Kern, de Wette, Wieseler, v. Döllinger, l. c. p. 282).1 — ἀποδεικνύται ἐαυτὸν ὅτι

1 Schrader certainly finds in ὁ ναὸς a heathen temple; and by the addition τοῦ Θεοῦ its interior is denoted, the place where the god had its seat.
exhibiting himself that he is a god, i.e. whilst he not only actually takes possession of the temple of the only true God as his own, as a dwelling-place belonging to him, but also publicly predicates of himself divine dignity, and accordingly requires to be adored. The interpretation of Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, and others, also Heydenreich, Schott, Olshausen, de Wette, Bising, and Riggenbach: “who shows himself or seeks to show himself as a god by deceitful miracles” (ver. 9), agrees not with the preceding καθισα.

Ver. 5. Estius: “Est . . . tacita objurgatio, quasi dicat: quum haec vobis prae sens dixerim, non debebatis commoveri rumoribus aliquorum dicentium instare diem domini.”—On προς ὑμᾶς] see on 1 Thess. iii. 4.—ταῦτα] namely, the contents of vv. 3, 4. To assume, however, a parenthesis from ver. 5 to οὖδατε in ver. 6 (so Heinsius) is arbitrary.

Ver. 6. Τὸ κατέχου] is that which keeps back, that which hinders (τὸ κωλύων, Chrysostom). But it does not denote, as Heinsius thinks (here and in ver. 7), that which hinders the apostle from speaking freely of Antichrist;1 also not that which hinders the commencement of the advent of Christ (Nback, der Ursprung des Christenthums, Bd. 2, Leipz. 1857, p. 315), but that which hinders the appearance of Antichrist. This follows from the additional sentence εἰς τὸ κ.τ.λ., in which (1) αὐτῶν can only be referred to the ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας, and (2) ἀποκαλυφθήναι ἐν τῷ ἐαυτοῦ καιρῷ forms a contrast to the idea of keeping back contained in κατέχου. Τὸ κατέχου is therefore, according to its objective side, to be completed by τὸ τῶν ἀνθρωπον τῆς ἀμαρτίας κατέχου. What, on the other hand, the apostle supposes to be the subject of this preventing power can only be explained at the conclusion of this section. —εἰς τὸ κ.τ.λ.] not donec, usque dum, but in order that (the aim of God in the κατέχειν). — ἐν τῷ ἐαυτοῦ καιρῷ] in his time, i.e. in the time appointed for him by God. More difficult than these determinations is the solution of the question, In what connection this verse is conjoined to the preceding by

1 “Neque ignoratis, quid sit, quod me nunc aperte vetat loqui;” and on ver. 7: “ille, qui nunc obstat, quo minus aperte loquar.” Heinsius makes the words refer to the apostle’s fear of offending Nero!
means of καὶ νῦν. Storr, with whom Flatt agrees, finds in νῦν a contrast to ἡτι, ver. 5. The thought would then be, that the advent cannot commence until Antichrist appears, this I have told you by word of mouth; but now, after my written declaration (ver. 3), you know also why the appearance of Antichrist is still delayed, namely, by the circumstance that the ἀποστασία must precede his appearance. But if Paul had actually wished to have expressed this contrast, he would have been obliged to write in ver. 5, ὅτι ταῦτα μὲν ἦτι ὑπὸ τῶν ὑμῶν ἐλεγον ὑμῖν, and in ver. 6, νῦν δὲ καὶ τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε. Related to Storr's view is the interpretation of Kern, with whom Hilgenfeld (l.c. p. 247) agrees: "That the advent of Christ does not take place until the man of sin be revealed, is already known to you: and now, in reference to what the present presents to you, ye know also that which hinders."

The same objection is decisive against this view. Further, according to Hofmann, who considers vv. 5, 6 as "two halves of one question united with καὶ," νῦν stands not, indeed, in opposition to ἡτι, ver. 5, but must express "the present in reference to that future which was known to the readers," that they know that in the present by which its commencement is still hindered. But the temporal νῦν can never form a contrast to ταῦτα in ver. 5; and to assume that the words in ver. 6 are still contained in the question in ver. 5 is entirely erroneous, because in this case καὶ νῦν κ.τ.λ. could only be considered as dependent on ὅτι, but it is not necessary to recall to mind what is actually known in the present. — νῦν is also understood as a particle of time, by Whitby, Macknight, Heydenreich, Schrader, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Wieseler, and Bisping, but they do not connect it with οἴδατε, but with τὸ κατέχον: "and ye know that which at present hinders." But only a grammatical impropriety would be expressed thereby, as καὶ τὸ νῦν κατέχον would be required. For it is inconceivable that an adverb, whose proper place is between the article and the participle, should by a hyperbaton

---

1 For if in the presumed question, not οἴδατε and ἐλεγον, but οἴδατε and ὑπομνήσατε were to correspond, καὶ οὐκ οἴδατε νῦν τὸ κατέχον would require to have been written.
be placed first, because it has already in its natural position the same emphasis which it would receive by its being placed first. The passages appealed to, as ver. 7, 1 Cor. vii. 17, Rom. xii. 3, etc., are not analogous. And as little do the temporal particles ἂρτι and ἕδη, ver. 7, decide for this construction. For the emphasis lies not on ἂρτι, but on κατέχων, so that ἂρτι might be omitted without injury to the sense; and ἕδη is not put in exchange for νῦν, but for ἐν τῷ ἐστιν οὐκαρ. Likewise νῦν is understood by Schott as a temporal and consecutive particle, but καλ is then taken in the sense of also: "For ye know also now (not only have ye learned it at that time when I was with you), why the appearance of Antichrist is still delayed." But (1) τὸ νῦν κατέχων οἴδατε καλ νῦν would require to have been written; (2) τὸ κατέχων must refer to a point formerly already explained; but it is entirely a new point, as in what goes before what hindered the appearance of Christ, but not what hindered the appearance of Antichrist, was spoken of; (3) lastly, to what an idle, dragging, and trivial addition would ver. 6 be degraded! The only correct view is to take καλ νῦν in a logical sense, but not, with Koppe and Krause, as an inferential particle ("and accordingly"), but with de Wette, Alford, and Ewald, as a particle of transition to a new communication: and now, comp. Acts vii. 34, x. 5, xiii. 11, xx. 25, etc.; Hartung, Partikellehre, II. p. 26. Accordingly, the emphasis does not lie on νῦν, but on κατέχων. The meaning is: and now—to pass on to a further point— ye know what hindereth, namely, wherein it consists, and why the appearance of Antichrist is still prevented, that it should be revealed in its appointed time, marked out by God. The Thessalonians knew this point from the apostle's oral instructions, so that they required only to be reminded of it.

Ver. 7.1 An explanatory justification of εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ ἐστιν οὐκαρ, but not a parenthesis (Hemming). The mystery of wickedness is certainly even now active, but Antichrist cannot be manifest until the power

1 Comp. C. Th. Beyer, de κατεχών τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, 2 Thess. ii. 7, commentatio, Lips. 1824.—J. Grimm, the κατεχών of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians (Regensburger Lyceal-Programm), 1861.
preventing him be overcome. — \( \text{μυστήριον} \) is contrasted with \( \text{ἀποκαλυφθηναι} \), and \( \text{ηδή} \) with \( \text{ἐν τῷ ἐαντοῦ καὶρᾳ} \). But the chief emphasis of the sentence lies on \( \text{μυστήριον} \), which on that account is not only placed first, but is besides separated from its further definition \( \text{τῆς ἀνομίας} \) by the verb and adverb. Comp. Gal. ii. 6, 9; Arrian, Exp. Al. i. 7. 16: \( \text{kai εὐφέσθαι συγγυμνὴν τῷ πλήθει τῶν Ἑβαλων τῆς ἀποστάσεως.} \) — \( \text{ἀνομία} \) means lawlessness, then ungodliness or wickedness generally. The expression corresponds to \( \text{ἀποστασία}, \) ver. 3. For the \( \text{ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας} \) was mentioned in ver. 3 as the historical crown of the \( \text{ἀποστασία}; \) whilst here, in like manner, \( \text{ἀνομία} \) appears as its forerunner (\( \text{ηδή} \)). The genitive \( \text{τῆς ἀνομίας} \) is not a genitive of the working cause — wickedness, which lays its concealed snares (Theodoret), or which works under the appearance of good intentions, but uses secret unworthy means for its object (Flatt); or the plan of ungodliness (Baumgarten-Crusius); or the secret counsel of the supernatural power of darkness (\( \text{κατ’ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ σατανᾶ}, \) ver. 9), which is placed in parallelism with God’s eternal counsel or \( \text{μυστήριον} \) in reference to Christ and His kingdom (Kern); but is the genitive of opposition. But neither is \( \text{Ἀντιχριστ himself} \) meant, who, as Christ, because God manifest in the flesh, is called in 1 Tim. iii. 16: \( \text{τὸ τῆς ἐνσεβείας μυστήριον} \), is likewise named \( \text{τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας}, \) because he is an incarnation of the devil (Olshausen); nor is \( \text{μυστήριον} \) a mere intensification of the idea \( \text{ἀνομία}, \) so that a hitherto unheard of, unexampled godlessness was designated (Krebs, Hofmann, comp. also Heydenreich, p. 41, and Schott, p. 22).\(^1\) Rather, taking into consideration the emphatic antithesis which \( \text{μυστήριον} \) forms to \( \text{ἀποκαλυφθηναι} \), the natural meaning of the words can only be the mystery of wickedness, i.e. wickedness in so far as it is still a mystery, something concealed, not yet publicly brought to light. Paul thinks on the detached traces of wickedness,recognisable in their true import only to a few as to himself, which already appeared, but which only at a later period will concentrate themselves,

\(^1\) For this meaning an appeal is made to Joseph. de bello Jud. i. 24. 1: \( \text{kai τὸν Ἀντιπάτρον βιον ὡς ἅν ἀμέρτην τε καὶ τῆς ἐπίκουν κατέλεις μυστήριον.} \)
and reach their climax in Antichrist. — ἐφεργεῖται is not passive, as Estius, Grotius, Kypke, Nösselt, Storr, Schott, Bloomfield, and others assume, but middle, is active, begins to bestir itself or to develop its activity. The subject of ἐφεργεῖται is τὸ μυστηρίον, not Antichrist, as Zeger thinks. — μόνον] is still by Heinsius¹ and Kypke connected with the preceding, and separated from what follows by a comma. Erroneously, as μόνον is irreconcilable with ἡδη in the same clause. But also μόνον does not begin a protasis to which καὶ τότε, ver. 8, introduces the apodosis (Koppe). Rather a comma is to be put after ἀνομίας, and a colon after γεννῆται. Accordingly ver. 7 is divided into two halves, of which the first forms a concession, and the second a limitation. The meaning is: as a mystery wickedness certainly works even now, only, before Antichrist can be manifested, we must wait until, etc. — ἐστὶ] until that, should properly stand before καὶ τότε; but it is placed after, in order to bring forward more emphatically ὁ κατέχων as the chief idea. Comp. Gal. ii. 10: μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μημονεύομεν. See Winer, p. 485 [E. T. 688]. Erroneously Tychsen: the construction is “somewhat distorted;” it should have been μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἐς ἄρτι. Others, equally erroneously, assume that for the completion of the sentence an additional verb is to be taken from the participle καὶ τότε; Thus, in conformity with the Vulgate (tantum ut qui tenet nunc, teneat, donec de medio fiat), Nicolas de Lyra, Erasmus, Zwingli, Zeger, Camerarius, Estius, Lucius and Andrew Osiander, Balduin, Menochius, Cornelius a Lapide, and others, who supply κατέχέω; Jac. Cappellus, Beza, Calixt, Joachim Lange, Whitby, who supply καθέξει; Bengel, Storr, Pelt, who supply κατέχει. Not less arbitrarily do Knatchbull, Benson, and Baumgarten proceed, who would add ἔστιν after μόνον. For not the mere copula ἔστιν, but the emphatic and independent ἐστίν, would warrant the sense assumed by them; but a word which has the emphasis cannot be left out. — ὁ κατέχων] must be essentially the same as what was designated in ver. 6 by the neuter τὸ κατέχον. For the

¹ Heinsius finds the thought expressed: what was only begun in the time of Nero, Antichrist will at a later period bring to a conclusion.
same function is ascribed to both, whilst in a similar manner as τὸ κατέχων formerly, so now also ὁ κατέχων (comp. ver. 8) appears as that by which the ἀποκάλυψις of Antichrist is still delayed. The restraining power, on which Paul thought, must accordingly have been so constituted that it can be brought under a twofold form of description, and be represented both as a thing and as a person. To make ὁ κατέχων denote the ruling power (qui obtinet, i.e. rerum potitur, Beza, and so also Whitby, Noesselt, and others) is as contrary to the context as it would be to supply fidem as an accusative to it (Nicolas de Lyra: “qui tenet nunc fidem catholicam, teneat eam firmiter”), or fidem atque caritatem (Zeger), or Christum et veram ejus religionem (Estius), or Christi adventum (Vatablus), or τὴν ἀνομίαν (Flatt, Heydenreich, Schott), and the like.—ἀρτι is closely connected with ὁ κατέχων, and brings specially forward the reference already contained in the present participle to the immediate present time of the writer. Schott, after Flatt and Pelt, thinks that if ἀρτι is to be limited to the time of the speaker, it is not suitable to the view of the apostle (see on 1 Thess. iv. 15); that it may accordingly be understood generally: “tempus efficientiae τοῦ κατέχοντος opportunum, quod porro elapsurum sit ad initium usque temporis illi oppositi i.e. donec, remoto τῷ κατέχοντι, palam sit profutura ἡ ἀποστασία.” — ἐκ μέσου γίνεσθαι] is not necessarily to be considered of death or violence (Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius). It can denote any removal or being taken out of the way, however it may happen. Comp. 1 Cor. v. 2; Col. ii. 14; Plutarch, Timol. p. 238: ἔγραψε ζήν καθ' εαυτὸν ἐκ μέσου γενόμενος. The opposite of ἐκ μέσου γίνεσθαι or ἀρεσθαί is ἐν μέσῳ εἶναι, to be in the way, or to be obstructive. Comp. Xenoph. Cyrop. v. 2. 26: καὶ σφόδρ’ ἀν εἶ πη γε δύναμτο συμμίξαι. Τι ὤ ἐν μέσῳ, ἐφ’ ἐστὶ τοῦ συμμίζει; Ἀσσύριοι, ἐφασαν, τὸ αὐτὸ ἔθνος, δὲ οὐπερ νῦν πορεύθη. Ver. 8. What was left to the readers themselves to supply to μόνον, ver. 7, from the conclusion of ver. 6, is now, in its essence, although in an altered form, expressly indicated by καὶ τότε ἀποκαλυφθῆσεται ὁ ἀνόμος. — καὶ τότε] and then, namely, as soon as the κατέχον is taken out of the way. The
emphasis is on καὶ τότε, not on ὁ ἄνωμος (Grotius), nor on ἀποκαλυφθήσεται. — ὁ ἄνωμος] the lawless one, is not a different person from ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας (Grotius), but identical with him. For καὶ τότε ἀποκαλυφθήσεται points back to μόνον, ver. 7, and by this to ἀποκαλυφθήσειν αὐτόν, ver. 6. The expression ἄνωμία, just used, afforded the easily explained occasion for calling Antichrist ἄνωμος. — With the relative sentence δὲν ὁ κύριος ... παρουσίας αὐτοῦ (which is incorrectly enclosed in a parenthesis by Benson, Moldenhauer, Schott, and Kern) the apostle immediately adds the ultimate fate which Antichrist has to expect. That Paul so directly passes over to this, although he has it yet in view to speak of the working of Antichrist before his destruction (comp. vv. 9, 10), is an involuntary impulse of his Christian heart which causes him immediately to resolve the horror which the announcement of such an event as the ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ ἄνωμου has into comfort and consolation, as a discord into harmony, comp. vv. 3, 4. — In a soaring and poetical form of expression, the members of which have their Hebrew parallels, Paul describes the fate of Antichrist. Not improbably Isa. xi. 4 was present to his mind, where it is declared of the promised Deliverer of the seed of Jesse: καὶ πατάξει γῆν τῷ ἄγω τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν πνεύματι διὰ χειλέων ἀνελεί αἴσθηται. — ἀναλυόμενον] to consume, to destroy. — τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ] describes the power and irresistible might of the reappearing Christ, the breath of whose mouth suffices to bring His opponents to nothing. More definite interpretations, as the sentence of condemnation (Vatablus, Cornelius a Lapide), or a command or address (Theodoret: φθέγξεται μόνον; Theodore Mopsuestia, ed. Fritzsche, p. 148: μόνον ἐπι-βοήσας ... τοῦτο γάρ λέγει τῷ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ τοῦ τῇ φωνῇ, ἀπὸ τοῦ παρ᾽ ἡμῖν αὐτὸ εἰρηκός, ἐπειδὴ ἡμεῖς τῷ πνεύματι συνεργᾶσαι κεχρήμεθα πρὸς τὴν ἐναρθρον λαλιάν), are to be rejected; for they destroy or weaken the picturesque directness and strength of the figure. Comp. moreover, Eurip. Med. 588: ἐν γὰρ ὁ ὄν κτενεὶ ὁ ἐπός. — καταρρέων] to overthrow, to annihilate. On account of Rev. xix. 20, Calovius and Olshausen interpret the verb of a mere “ rendering inefficient,” depriving Antichrist of his influence; but the parallel ἀναλύομεν...
CHAP. II. 9, 10.

decides against this meaning, and a comparison of the Pauline form of expression with that of the Apocalypse is useless labour. — τῇ ἐπιφάνειᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ] by the appearance of His presence. The majestic brightness of the advent is not described by ἐπιφάνεια (Musculus, Hemming, Bullinger, Heinsius, Andrew Osiander, Cornelius a Lapide, Erasmus Schmid, Calixt, Clericus, Bernard a Piconius, Sebastian Schmid, Schoettgen, Turretin, Whitby, Benson, Macknight, Koppe, Krause, Bolten, Heydenreich, Pelt, Schott, Kern, Wieseler, and others); also παρουσία and ἐπιφάνεια are not to be distinguished, as Olshausen strangely thinks, as objective and subjective, i.e. as "the actual fact of the appearance of Christ," and "the contemplation of it on the part of man, the consciousness of His presence;" but the placing the two together has the same design as formerly, τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, namely, vividly to represent the power of Christ, inasmuch as the mere advent of His presence sufficesto annihilate His adversaries. Comp. Bengel: "apparitio adventus ipso adventu prior est, vel certe prima ipsius adventus emicatio, uti ἐπιφάνεια τῆς ἡμέρας."

Vv. 9, 10. The apostle has in ver. 8 not only said when Antichrist will appear, but he has also immediately added what fate awaits him. He now goes backward in point of time, whilst in addition he describes the character of the working which Antichrist will develop before his destruction, brought about by the appearance of Christ. — ὅ] sc. τοῦ ἀνόμου. Parallel with ὅ, ver. 8. — ἐστίν] the present describes the certainty of the coming in the future. See Winer, p. 237 [E. T. 331]. Incorrectly Koppe, it imports: "jam agit et mox apertius maioque cum vi aget." — κατ' ἐνέργειαν τοῦ σατανᾶ] does not belong as an independent statement to ἐστίν (so Hofmann, as before him already Georgii, in Zeller's theol. Jahrb. 1845, Part 1, p. 8, who gives the meaning that the act of the appearing of the ἀνόμος will itself be a work of Satan), but is a subsidiary statement to the principal clause ἐστίν ἐν κ.τ.λ., assigning the reason of it. It does not import "after the example of the working of the devil" (similiter ac si satanas ageret, Michaelis), but in conformity with it, that an ἐνέργεια τοῦ σατανᾶ is its characteristic, that is, that the devil works in
and through him. — eivai ev twi] to consist in something, to prove or make itself known in something. Against Hofmann, who arbitrarily denies this use of the phrase, comp. Winer, p. 345 [E. T. 482]. — δύναμις καὶ σημεῖας καὶ τέρασιν] a rhetorical enumeration, as in Acts ii. 2, for the exhaustion of the idea. But as πᾶσα (see Winer, p. 466 [E. T. 660]), so also ψεύδος belongs to all three substantives. The genitive may import: in every kind of power, and in all signs and wonders whose nature is falsehood, or which proceed from falsehood, or which lead to falsehood, whose aim is falsehood. The last meaning is, with Aretius, de Wette, and others, to be preferred, as Antichrist is indeed the first to bring evil to its climax. — ψεύδος falsehood, belongs to the essential nature of the devil (comp. John viii. 44). It represents evil as the counterpart of divine truth (the ἀλήθεια).

Ver. 10. Καὶ εν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ ἀδικίας] and in every deceit which leads to or advances unrighteousness, i.e. ungodliness (Estius, Aretius, Grotius, de Wette, and others). — But this energetic working of Antichrist by no means describes his power as irresistible; only the ἀπολλυόμενοι succumb under it. Theodoret: Οὐ γὰρ πάντων κρατήσει, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀπωλειας ἄξιον, οὐ καὶ δίκαι τῆς τούτων παρουσίας σφάς αὐτοὺς τῆς σωτηρίας ἐστέρησαν. — τοῖς ἀπολλυόμενοις] is dativus incommodi, and belongs not only to εν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ ἀδικίας (Haydenreich, Flatt, Hofmann), but to the whole sentence from ver. 9 onwards. — οἱ ἀπολλυόμενοι] are they who perish, who fall into eternal ἀπώλεια (comp. 1 Cor. i. 18; 2 Cor. ii. 15, xiv. 3), and the present participle characterizes this future fate as already decided. Comp. Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 371. But the addition ἀνθ' δὲν κ.τ.λ. denotes that this was occasioned by their own fault. — ἀνθ' δὲν τὴν ἁγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐδέξατο] in requital for this (comp. Luke i. 20, xix. 44; Acts xii. 23; LXX. 1 Kings xi. 11; Joel iii. 5; Xen. Anab. i. 3. 4, ibid. v. 5. 14), that they have not received in themselves the love of the truth. To interpret, with Bolten: τὴν ἁγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας, “the loveable and true religion,” is naturally as impossible as, with Chrysostom, Theodoret, 1

1 Ἀγάπην ἀληθείας τινῷ κρίνει κινήσας, ὡς ἄλλος ἤμως καὶ γενόμενος ἀγαπηθέντα,.
Oecumenius, and Theophylact, to find therein a circumlocution for Christ Himself. \( \text{ἡ ἀλήθεια} \) denotes moral and religious truth generally, not, as is usually supposed, Christian truth specially. Thus every objection which Kern (p. 212) takes to it vanishes, that \( \text{ἡ ἀγάπη τῆς ἀλήθειας οὐκ ἔδεξαντο} \) was written instead of the simple \( \text{ἡ ἀλήθειαν οὐκ ἔδεξαντο} \). For in a similar manner, as the apostle in Gal. v. 5, instead of the simple \( \text{δικαίωσύνη ἀπεκδεχόμεθα} \), which one would expect, put the apparently strange \( \text{ἐλπίδα δικαίωσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα} \), but did so designedly, in order to oppose to the arrogant feeling of the legally righteous the humble feeling of the true Christian; so here the expression \( \text{ἡ ἀγάπη τῆς ἀλήθειας οὐκ ἔδεξαντο} \) is designedly chosen to bring forward the high degree of guilt. Not only have they not received the Christian truth presented to them; for it might be still conceivable that they highly esteemed the truth itself and felt themselves drawn to it, although in consequence of spiritual blindness they had not known and recognised Christianity as an embodiment and full expression of the truth; but they have not even received into their hearts the love of the truth under whatever form it may be presented to them; they have rendered themselves entirely unsusceptible of the truth, they have hardened themselves against it. — \( \text{εἰς τὸ σωτηρία αὐτῶν} \) in order that they might be saved, brings still more prominently forward this hardness. They ought to have received that \( \text{ἀγάπη τῆς ἀλήθειας} \), to the end that they might receive σωτηρία, eternal salvation. But the attainment of such an end did not trouble them, was something indifferent to them.

Ver. 11. \( \text{Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο} \) and on this account, refers to \( \text{ἀνθ} \) \( \text{ὁ} \) \( \text{ἡ ἀγάπη τῆς ἀλήθειας οὐκ ἔδεξαντο} \), ver. 10, and \( \text{kαὶ} \) serves to bring forward the reciprocal relation between cause and effect. — \( \text{πέμπει αὐτῶς ὁ Θεός} \) the present is chosen, because according to ver. 7 the beginnings of lawlessness even now appeared. But the verbal idea is not, with Theodoret, John Damascenus, Theodore Mopsuestius, p. 148, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Pelagius, Nicolas de Lyra, Hunnius, Justinian, Wolf, Turretin, Whitby, Moldenhauer, Koppe, Heydenreich, Platt, and others, to be weakened into the idea of the divine
permission, but must be taken in its proper sense. For according to the Pauline view it is a holy ordinance of God that the wicked by their wickedness should lose themselves always the more in wickedness, and thus sin is punished by sin. But what is an ordinance of God is also accomplished by God Himself. See Meyer on Rom. i. 24. — ἐνέργειαν πλάνης] active power of seduction. On πλάνη, see on 1 Thess. ii. 3. — eis τὸ πιστεύσαι κ.τ.λ.] not a statement of the consequence (Macknight and others), but of the design of God. In a forced manner, Hofmann: eis τὸ πιστεύσαι belongs to ἐνέργειαν.

Ver. 12. "Iva] dependent on eis τὸ πιστεύσαι κ.τ.λ., not on πίμπει, as Hofmann thinks. A statement of the further or higher design. — ὑπὸ κρίσιον] in order that they may be judged, i.e. according to the context, condemned. — The truth is the Christian truth, and the unbelief, shown against it, is the consequence of the love for the truth in general being wanting (ver. 10).

CONCLUDING REMARKS ON CHAP. II. 1–12.

The apocalyptic teaching of the apostle in chap. ii. 1–12 has occupied Christians of all times, and has been very variously interpreted. A chief distinction in the interpretations consists in this, that this Pauline prediction may be considered either as that which will be fulfilled in the near or more distant future, or as having already received its fulfilment.

I. The Church Fathers belong to the representatives of the first view (Irenæus, adv. haer. v. 25, 29, 30; Tertullian, d: resur. carn. c. 24; Chrysostom in loco; Cyril. Hierosolym. Catech. 15; Augustine, de civit. dei, xx. 19; Theodoret in loco, and epit. decret. div. c. 23; Theodorus Mopsuestius, and others). They correctly agree in considering that by the advent (vv. 1, 8), or the day of the Lord (ver. 2), is to be understood the personal advent of Christ for the last judgment and for the completion of the Messianic kingdom. Also it is correctly
regarded as proved, that the Antichrist here described is to be considered as an individual person, in whom sin will embody itself. Yet Augustin already remarks, that "nonnulli non ipsum principem, sed universum quodam modo corpus ejus i. e. ad eum pertinientem hominum multitudinem simul cum ipso suo principi hoc loco intelligi Antichristum volunt." The restraining power by which the appearance of Antichrist is delayed, is usually considered to be the continuance of the Roman Empire (τὸ κατέχον) and its representative the Roman emperor (ὁ κατέχων). Some, however, as Theodorus Mopseustius and Theodoret, understand by it τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν ὄρον, i.e. more exactly, the counsel of God to keep back the appearance of Antichrist until the gospel is proclaimed throughout the earth. This latter interpretation is certainly unsuitable enough. For although the difference of gender τὸ κατέχον and ὁ κατέχων may be to distinguish God's counsel and God Himself, yet ἐκ μύσων γίνεσθαι is not reconcilable with the masculine ὁ κατέχων. Chrysostom chooses a third interpretation, that by the restraining power is meant the continuance of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. But he directly refutes this by the fact that if so, Antichrist must have already appeared, as those gifts have long since disappeared in the Christian church. The temple of God, in which Antichrist will place himself, is referred either to the Christian church (so Chrysostom, Theodoret, Augustin), the expression being taken figuratively, or to the actual temple of Jerusalem (so Irenaeus and Cyril); in which latter case the objection, that this temple was already destroyed, is met by the shift that a new temple rebuilt in place of the old one by Antichrist is to be thought on. Lastly, some, as Chrysostom,1—although in contradiction to the chronology of the Epistle,—interpret the μυστήριον τῆς ἀνωμαίας, which already begins to work, of Nero, the forerunner and type of Antichrist in St. Paul's time; and others, as Theodoret, of the outbreak of heresies.

1 Νερών ἠπαθή φανερώθη τὸ κατέχον ἀπὸ της ἀνωμαίας αὐτῆς καὶ ἑ σῶσῃ ἐπί θανατοῦ ἔμπροσθεν Θεός. Καὶ καὶ τῇ τοῦ μυστήριου τοῦ τέλους ἐς τῷ φάναρι ἀντικεῖται οὐ πλησίον, εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἀνδραμέμην. Εἰ γάρ τρίτον τῆς ἀνωμαίας ἀρχῆν, οὕτως ὡς τοῦ τῆς κατάληψιος κατὰ τῷ τινὶ κατάκειται, εἰ ὄρον ἄνω τῶν.
The common and grave error in the explanations of the Fathers, by means of which they run counter to the Pauline representation, consisted in their not doing sufficient justice to the point of nearness of the event predicted by Paul. It is incontestable, as the result of correct exegesis, that Paul not only considered Antichrist as directly preceding the advent, but also regarded the advent as so near, that he himself might then be alive. It was natural that the Fathers, as the prophecy of the apostle had not been fulfilled in their times, should disregard this point; but they held that in this prophecy a picture of the last things, fully corresponding to the reality in the future, must have been given. They therefore satisfied themselves with the consideration that the prediction had already begun to be fulfilled in the apostolic times, but that the apostle could not possibly give an exact statement of time, as he only says that Antichrist will be revealed in his appointed time.

The view of the Fathers remained in the following ages the prevalent one in the Christian church. It was necessary, however, partially to change and transform it, the relation of Christianity to the Roman state having altered, as the Christian church, instead of being exposed to renewed hostilities from the secular power, had obtained the sovereignty of the state, and, penetrating larger portions of the world, represented itself as the kingdom of God on earth, and an imposing hierarchy was placed at its head. Whilst, accordingly, the idea of the advent stepped more and more into the background in the church generally, and especially with the hierarchy, on the other hand, those who had placed themselves in opposition to the hierarchy believed themselves obliged to apply to it the description of the apostle, as well as the figures in the Apocalypse of St. John. Thus arose—whilst the early view concerning the παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου was held with only the modification that its entrance was to be expected in the distant future—the view, first in the eleventh

1 Comp. Augustin, Epist. 80 (Ep. 199, ed. Bened.): ...ita non obscure sunt et mystice dicta, ut tamem apparet, eum nihil de statutis dixisse temporibus, nullumque eorum intervallum spatiumque aperuisset. Ait enim: ut reveletur in suo tempore, nec dixit, post quantum temporis hoc futurum sit.
century, that the establishment and growing power of the Papacy is to be considered as the Antichrist predicted by Paul. At first this view was expressed in the conflict between the emperors and the popes by the partisans of the imperial power; but was then repeated by all those who had placed themselves in opposition with the hierarchy, because they wished, instead of the rigid ecclesiastical power, a freer spirit of Christianity to rule; thus by the Waldenses, the Albigenses, and the followers of Wickliffe and Huss. The empire—which was regarded as nothing else than a revival and renewal of the old Roman Empire—was considered as the restraining power which still delayed the destruction of the Papacy.

This reference of Antichrist to the papal hierarchy became specially prevalent toward the time of the Reformation, and after that event was almost regarded as a dogma in the evangelical church. It is found in Bugenhagen, Zwingli, Calvin, Victorin Strigel, Herumng, Hunnius, Lucius and Andrew Osiander, Camero, Balduin, Aretius, Er. Schmid, Beza, Quistorp, Calixt, Calovius, Newton, Wolf, Joachim Lange, Turretin, Benson, Bengel, Macknight, Zachariae, Michaelis, and others. Accordingly it is expressed in the Lutheran symbolical books; comp. Articul. Smalcald. II. 4 (ed. Meyer, p. 189 f.): Haec doctrina praecclare ostendit, papam esse ipsum verum Antichristum, qui supra et contra Christum sese extulit et evexit, quandoquidem Christianos non vult esse salvos sine sua potestate, quae tamen nihil est, et a deo nec ordinata nec mandata est. Hoc proprie loquendo est se effere supra et contra deum, sicut Paulus 2 Thess. ii. loquitur.— De pot. et prim. pap. (p. 210): Constat autem, Romanos pontifices cum suis membris defendere impium doctrinam et impios cultus. Ac plane notae Antichristi competunt in regnum papae et sua membra. Paulus enim ad Thessalonicenses describens Antichristum, vocat eum adversarium Christi, extollentem se super omne, quod dicitur aut colitur deus, sedentem in templo dei tanquam deum. Also Luther's powerful treatise against the papal bull bore the title: "Adversus exsecrabilem bullam Antichristi." It was thought that the Papacy would go on

1 See against this view, Koppe, Excur. II. p. 120 ff.
more and more developing what was anti-Christian in it, and that then the last judgment would overtake it. The ἀποστασία was the falling away from the pure gospel to the traditions of men. The singular ὁ ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας κ.τ.λ. is to be understood collectively as a series et successio hominum, inasmuch as the question is concerning an imperium monarchicum which remains one and the same, although its temporal head may be changed. The godlessness of Anti christ, described in ver. 4, is historically proved by the pope placing himself above all human and divine authority, the words πάντα λεγόμενον Θεόν κ.τ.λ., in accordance to biblical usage, being referred to the princes and great men of the world, and an allusion being discovered in σίβασμα to the Roman imperial title Σεβαστός. The objection, that there have been pious popes, is removed by the proverb: "a potiori fit denominatio." ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ is referred to the Christian church, and the καθίσαι to the tyrannical power usurped over it. By τὸ κατέχον is nearly universally understood the Roman Empire, and by ὁ κατέχων the Roman emperor, for which proof is deduced from history, that the papal power sprang from the ruins of the Roman Empire, whilst in reference to the continuation of the empire in Germany, it is observed that praetertitulum nihil fere remains. The declaration τὸ μνηστηρίον ἢδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνωμίας, ver. 7, is considered as justified by the fact that at least the semina erroris et ambitionis, which paved the way for the Papacy, were present in the time of the apostle; for which Camero appeals to Gal. i., ii., and others to other proofs. For an enumeration of τίρατα ψεύδων, ver. 9, relics, transubstantiation, purgatory, etc., afford rich material. The annihilation of Antichrist by the πνεῦμα τοῦ στόματος of the Lord, is understood to denote the annihilation of his importance in the minds of men by the divine word of Scripture being again opened up and diffused in its purity by means of the Reformation; whilst the καταργήσει τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ denotes the final and material destruction of Antichrist by the coming of Christ to judgment.

In the presence of such polemics used against them, the
Catholics are certainly not to be blamed that in retaliation they interpreted ἀποστασία as the defection from the Roman church and from the pope, and Antichrist as the heretics, especially Luther and the evangelical church. Comp. Estius, Fromond., Bern. a Piconio.

Yet, even before the reference of Antichrist to Popery was maintained, Mohammed was already regarded by the divines of the Greek church (latterly by Faber Stapulensis and others) as the Antichrist predicted by Paul, and in the ἀποστασία was seen the defection of several Oriental and Greek churches from Christianity to Mohammedanism. This interpretation at least so far exercised an influence on the evangelical church, that some of its theologians have assumed a double Antichrist—one Oriental, viz. Mohammed and the Turkish power, and the other Western, viz. the pope and his power. So Melancthon, Bucer, Musculus, Bullinger, Piscator, and Vorstius.

Related to this whole method of interpretation is the assumption, made in our own century, that by the apostasy is to be understood the enormities of the French Revolution; by Antichrist, Napoleon; and by him that restraineth, the continuation of the German Empire—an interpretation which the extinction of the German Empire in 1806 has already condemned.

In recent times it has often been considered as objectionable to determine exactly the individual traits of the imagery used by Paul. Accordingly the representation of the apostle has been interpreted in a general, ideal, or symbolical sense. To this class of interpreters belongs Koppe, according to whom Paul, founding on an old national Jewish oracle, supported especially by Daniel, would describe the ungodliness preceding the last day, which already worked, but whose full outbreak was only to take place after the death of the apostle; so that Paul himself was the κατέχων. Similarly

1 See against this view, Turretin, p. 515 ff.
2 See Leutwein, das Thier war und ist nicht, und wird wieder kommen aus dem Abgrunde. Eine Abhandlung für nachdenkende Leser, Ludwigsb. 1825.
3 To prove this view of the κατέχων by Koppe as the correct one by a closer exposition, is the object of the above-mentioned treatise of Beyer (on II. 7). Also
Storr (l.c.), who understands by the ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας "potestas aliqua, deo omnique religioni adversaria, quae penitus incognita et futuro demum tempore se proditurasit," and by the preventing power the "copia hominum verissimo amore inflammatorum in christianam religionem." — Further, Nitzsch (l.c.) thinks on the power of atheism first come to have public authority, or the contempt of all religion generally. Further, the opinion of Pelt is entirely peculiar.

Heydenreich, Schott, and Grimm (Stud. u. Krit. 1850, Part 4, p. 790 ff.) so far agree with Koppe, that they understand the neuter as the multitude of the truly pious and believers (Heydenreich), or as the veri religionis doctores (Schott), or as the apostolorum chorus (Grimm). For the removal of the objection, that Paul hoped to survive the advent, and that accordingly in πίστις γινεσθαι would be unsuitable, Schott and Grimm consider it probable that by this expression we are to think not on death, but on "alia res externa, e.g. captivitas dura." Akin to this interpretation of the ἄπωτος is Wieseler's view (Chronologie des apost. Zeitalt., Götting. 1848, p. 272 f.), that Paul would denote with it the pious in Jerusalem, particularly the Christians, or in case κατιχωμ shall necessarily denoted an individual, the Apostle James the Just. Comp. also Böhme, de apo messicana apostolica, Hal. 1826, p. 30, according to whom the apostolic circle are denoted in general, and in particular the most prominent member, perhaps the Apostle James. Hofmann judges differently upon τι κατιχωμ and ἄπωτος, Schriftenweis, Part 1, 2d ed. Nördling. 1857, p. 352 ff., and in his A. Schr. N. T., Part 1, p. 318 ff., with whom Baumgarten, i.e. p. 609, Luthardt, i.e. p. 159 ff., and Riggenbach coincide. According to Hofmann, as throughout the whole passage 2 Thess. ii. 5-7 Paul refers apparently to the visions of Daniel, he must have spoken to the Thessalonians of that which hinders the man of sin from coming sooner than his proper time with reference to these prophecies of Daniel. Therefore, in agreement with Daniel, a spiritual power is to be thought of which rules in the secular world and in the various governments in agreement with the divine will, and opposes the influences of the spirit of nations and kingdoms working contrary to the divine will. This power may be designated both as neuter and as masculine, as κυρίσει and as πληρος, and the words μόνον τι κατιχωμ ἄρτι ίσων ἐν νόμω γίνεσθαι καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωποφθονίας ἁμαρτίας are sufficiently similar to those of Daniel: וְהָעִם (Dan. x. 20), in order to be recognised as a transfer of the same to those last times when the spiritual power which now preserves the earthly commonwealth in agreement with the kingdom of God entirely recedes, in order that every form of secular power may enter which will allow no more place for the church of God on earth. Still differently, Ewald, Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch., Jahr. 3, Gött. 1851, p. 250 f. (comp. Sendeschreiben des Ap. Paulus, Gött. 1857, p. 27): "We have here a mystery before us which in the early apostolic times only believers loved to talk over and to diffuse among themselves, so that Paul may have been unwilling to speak openly upon it. The appearance of Antichrist was expected according to Matt. xxiv. 15 (!), and Paul here describes it, only more openly and freely than it is there indicated in the prophecy of Christ;
who in his Commentary, p. 204, sums up his views in the following words: "Mihi ... adversarius illi *principium* esse videtur sive *vis spiritualis evangelio contraria*, quae huc usque tamen in Pontificiorum Romanorum operibus ac serie luculentissime sese prodidit, ita tamen, ut omnia etiam mala, quae in ecclesia compareant, ad eandem Antichristi *évépyeav* sint referenda. Ejus vero *παροποιεῖ*, i.e. summum fastigium, quod Christi reditum *qui nihil aliud est, nisi regni divini victoria*, antecedet, futurum adhuc esse videtur, quam illud tempus procul etiamnum abesse putemus, ubi omnes terrae incolae in eo erunt, ut ad Christi sacra transeant. *Κατέχων* vero cum Theodoreto putarim esse dei voluntatem illud Satanae regnum cohibentem, ne erumpat, et, si mediae spectantur causae, apostolorum tempore maxime imperii Romani vis, et quovis aevo illa resistentia, quam malis artibus, quae religionem subvertere studet, pravati commodi et honoris augendorum cupiditas oppositum esse. Pelt thinks that the symptoms of the future corruption of the Christian church were already present in the apostolic age in the danger of falling away from Christian freedom into

but an opinion must have been formed in the bosom of the mother church at Jerusalem why Antichrist had not as yet appeared, which was imparted only to believers. We may, however, pretty nearly guess what it was from other signs. If we reflect that, according to Rev. xi. 3 ff., Antichrist was not to be considered as coming until the two martyrs of the old covenant had appeared, and their destruction was the true beginning of his extreme rage; further, that instead of these two assumed martyrs, it was also, or rather originally, still more commonly supposed that only Elijah must return before Christ, and accordingly also before Antichrist. Elijah's return is not actually denied in that passage, where this expectation is treated of in the freest manner (Matt. xvii. 11 f., comp. xi. 13 f.), so it is most probable that by that which hindereth the appearance of Antichrist the *coming of Elijah* is meant (Sendschr. des Ap. Paulus, p. 27: the tarrying of Elijah in heaven); and by him who hitherto hindered, and who must be taken out of the way before the last atrocious wickedness of Antichrist, is meant *Elijah himself.* Still otherwise Nöck (Der Ursprung des Christenthums, vol. II., Leipz. 1857, p. 313 ff.), who by him that hindereth—arbitrarily identifying the same with the man of sin—understands Simon Magus and his machinations. Still differently Jowett, according to whom (after the suggestion of Ewald, Jahrb. X., Göttingen 1880, p. 235) *ei ἔστι* is designed to indicate the Mosaic law.

1 In only an unessentially modified form Pelt has latterly maintained the same view in the Theolog. Mitarbeiten. Jahrg. 4, Kiel 1841, H. 2, p. 114 ff.

2 Comp. Pelt, p. 185: . . . "tenentes, illum Christi adventum a Paulo *non visibilem* habitum."
Jewish legalism, in the mingling of heathenism with Christianity, in the false gnosis and asceticism, in the worship of angels, and in the fastus a religione Christiana omnino alienus. To the same class belongs Olshausen, who considers the Pauline description only as a typical representation of future events. According to him, the chief stress lies on τὸ μυστήριον ἔνεργειας τῆς ἁνωμᾶς. Antichrist is a union of the individuality and spiritual tendency in masses of individuals. The revolt of the Jews from the Romans, and the fearful divine punishment in the destruction of Jerusalem, Nero, Mohammed and his spiritual devastating power, the development of the Papacy in the Middle Ages, the French Revolution of 1789, with the abrogation of Christianity, and the setting up of prostitutes on altars for worship, in the external world, as well as the constantly spreading denial of the fundamentals of all religious truth and morality, of the doctrines of God, freedom, and immortality, and likewise the self-deification of the ego in the internal world,—all these phenomena are the real precursors of Antichrist; but they contain only some of his characteristics, not all; it is the union of all these characteristics which shall make the full Antichrist. The preventing power is to be understood of the preponderance of the Christian world in its German and Roman constituents over the earth; i.e. of the whole political condition of order, with which, on the one hand, there is the constant repression of all ἀποστασία and ἁνωμά, and on the other hand, the continued and peaceful development of Christianity. Of this condition the Roman Empire, as the strongest and most orderly secular organization which history knows, is the natural type. Baumgarten-Crusius is also here to be named. According to him, the Pauline prediction contains no new teachings peculiar to the apostle, but only representations from the old Messianic pictures in the prophets, especially in Daniel. The apostle's design is practical, to make the Thessalonians calmly observant, attentive to the times, prepared and strong for the future; the passage has a permanent value in this reference, and in the chief thought that the development and determination of these

1 Bisping follows him in all essential points.
things can only gradually take place. The passage is indeed historical and for the near future, but Paul has no definite or personal manifestations, whether present or future, in view, at least not in ἀντίκειμενος, which he describes as still entirely concealed; and it is even doubtful whether he understood by it an individual person. Only τὸ κατέχον has a definite reference, but not to a person; on the contrary, the new spirit of Christianity is meant. The difference in gender, ὁ κατέχον and τὸ κατέχον, is used either only to correspond with ἀντίκειμενος, or Paul thinks on Χριστὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, Col. i. 27! Lastly, to the same class belong Bloomfield and Alford. According to the former, the μνατηρίων τῆς ἀνωμίας is something still continuing; the prediction of the apostle will obtain its complete fulfilment only at the end of time, when only then the preventing power—which is most probably to be understood, with Theodoret, of the council of divine Providence—will be removed. According to the latter (see Proleg. p. 67 ff.),

¹ Comp. also Düsterdieck, die drei johanneischen Briefe, Bd. I., Gött. 1852, p. 306: “John, as Paul (2 Thess. ii. 1–12), in conformity to the instruction of the Lord, recognises in the powerful errors of the present the signs of an approaching decision. The last hour is present, the advent is at hand. The last hour is the concluding period of αἰών ὁφρονίας, the period of travail, which continues in an unbroken connection from its commencement, the destruction of Jerusalem, even to the end, to which the advent directly succeeds.” John has not erred in that he soon expected the real commencement of the crisis, continually carried on throughout the whole historical development of the kingdom of Christ; for that generation, as our Lord had predicted, survived the destruction of the holy city, an event of whose importance in the history and judgment of the world there can be no doubt. Moreover, in reference to 1 Thess. iv. 15 (ὥσπερ ξυνάγεται κατ' αὐτόν), Düsterdieck (l.c. p. 308) recognises that there Paul has shortened the chronological perspective too much; but then he thinks, referring to 2 Thess. ii. 1 ff. and Rom. xi. 25 ff., that this is an imperfection which was gradually overcome in the apostle by the moral development of his life in God, and that it was changed for the real truth. But it is assumed, without right, that an entirely different view of things lies at the foundation of the section 2 Thess. ii. 1–12 than of the section 1 Thess. iv. 13 ff., as the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians was written only a few months after the First; and besides, 2 Thess. ii. 5 points to the agreement of the written explanations there given with the oral instructions to the Thessalonians given even previously to the First Epistle. Further on, Düsterdieck (p. 330) concedes that because Paul in 1 Thess. iv. 13 ff. has abbreviated the interval to the advent, he was also in 2 Thess. ii. 1 ff. constrained to represent the personal appearance of the opponent incorrectly in point of chronology.
we stand, though 1800 years later, with regard to the ἀνομίας where the apostle stood; the day of the Lord not present, and not to arrive until the man of sin be manifested; the μυστηρίου τῆς ἀνομίας still working, and much advanced in his working; the preventing power not yet taken out of the way. All this points to a state in which the ἀνομία is working on underground, under the surface of things, gaining an expansion and power, although still hidden and unconcentrated. It has already partially embodied itself in Popery, in Nero and every Christian persecutor, in Mohammed and Napoleon, in Mormonism, and such like. The κατέχων and the κατέχων are to be understood of the fabric of human polity and those who rule that polity, by which hitherto all outbursts of godlessness have been suppressed and hindered in their course and devastations.

It is evident that all these explanations are arbitrary. The Pauline description is so definitely and sharply marked, and has for its whole compass so much the idea of nearness for its supposition, that it can by no means be taken generally, and in this manner explained away.

II. Others have regarded the apocalyptic instruction of the apostle as a prophecy already fulfilled. Thus Grotius, Wetstein, Hammond, Clericus, Whitby, Schoettgen, Noesselt, Krause, and Harduin. The reference of the παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου to the coming of the Lord in judgment at the destruction of Jerusalem, is common to all these writers. In reference

1 What is necessary to be said on Kern's view has already been observed in the Introduction, sec. 3. Döllinger (i.e.), who like Kern understands by Antichrist Nero, thinks, however, that with this assumption the authenticity of the Epistle, and even its composition in the year 53, are perfectly reconcilable. According to Döllinger, the prophecy in all its essentials was fulfilled close upon the apostle's days, although a partial fulfilment at the end of time is not excluded by this assumption. Already Paul has recognised the youthful Nero as the future Antichrist, whose public appearance was already prepared, but was yet prevented by Claudius as the then possessor of the imperial throne. The coming of Christ is His coming to execute judgment on Jerusalem. Nero, although he personally undertook nothing against the temple of Jerusalem, yet entrusted Vespasian with the guidance of the war, and accordingly brought—certainly only after his death—the abomination of desolation into the holy city. Lastly, the apostasy is the being led astray into the false doctrines of the Gnostics.
to the other chief points of the Pauline representation they
differ as follows:—

Grotius\(^1\) understands by Antichrist the Emperor Caius
Caligula, notorious for his ungodliness, who, according to
Suetonius, Caligul. xxi. 33, ordered universal supplication to
himself as the supreme God, and according to Joseph. Antiq.
xxviii. 8, and Philo, legat. ad Caf. p. 1022, wished to set up his
colossal statue in the temple of Jerusalem; by the κατέχων, I.
Vitellius, the proconsul of Syria and Judea, who dissuaded from
the erection of the statue; and by the ἀνομος, Simon Magus.
—This opinion is sufficiently contradicted, partly by the
impossibility of distinguishing the ἀνομος from ἀνθρωπος τῆς
ἁμαρτίας as a separate person, and partly by its incongruity
with the period of the composition of the Epistle. See sec. 2
of the Introduction.

According to Wetstein, the ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας is Titus,
whose army, according to Joseph, de bello Jud. vi. 6. 1, brought
idols into the captured temple of Jerusalem, sacrificed there,
and saluted Titus as imperator. The κατέχων is Nero, whose
death must precede the rule of Titus; and the ἀποστασία is
the rebellion and murder of Galba, Otho, and Vitellius. But
how can Titus, the ornament of the Roman emperors, pass for
Antichrist; and Nero, that monster in human form, the power
which hinders the outburst of Antichrist?

Hammond\(^2\) understands by the man of sin Simon Magus and
the Gnostics, whose head he was. The ἐπισυναγωγη ἐπ’ αὐτὸν,
ver. 1, is the “major libertas coeundi in ecclesiasticos coetus
ad colendum Christum;” the ἀποστασία is the falling away
of Christians to the Gnostics (1 Tim. iv. 1); ἀποκαλυφθήναι
denotes the casting off the mask of Christianity; ver. 4 refers
to the fact that Simon Magus “se dictaret summum patrem
omnium rerum, et qui ipsum Judaecorum deum creaverat.” Τὸ
κατέχον is the circumstance that the apostles and orthodox
Christians still preserved union with the Jews, and had not
yet turned themselves to the Gentiles. The neuter κατέχον
and the masculine κατέχων are equivalent; or if a distinction

\(^1\) See against him, Turretin, p. 483 ff.
\(^2\) Comp. against him, Turretin, p. 488 ff.
is to be maintained, ὁ κατέχων must be regarded as the same as ὁ νόμος. The μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας is the "duplicis generis scelerorum hominum, libidines nefariae et odium in Christianos." Ver. 8 refers to the contest of Peter and Paul with Simon Magus in Rome, which ended in the death of the latter.—The exegetical and historical monstrosity of this interpretation is at present universally acknowledged.

The interpretations of Clericus, Whitby, Schoettgen, Noesselt, Krause, and Harduin have a greater resemblance between them.

According to Clericus, the apostasy is the rebellion of the Jews against the Roman yoke; the man of sin is the rebellious Jews, and especially their leader, Simon the son of Giora, of whose atrocities Josephus informs us. πᾶς λεγόμενος Ὁ διὸς κ.τ.λ. denotes the government. Τὸ κατέχον is whatever hindered the open outbreak of the rebellion, partly the fear of the proceres Jудаеае gentis, who mistrusted the war because they expected no favourable result, partly the fear of the Roman army; ὁ κατέχων on the one side "praesides Romanus," on the other side "gentis proceres, rex Agrippa et pontifices plurimi." The μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας which already works consists in the rebellious ambition which conceals itself under the pretext of the independence of the Jewish people, yea, under the cloak of a careful observance of the Mosaic law, until at length what strives in secret is openly manifested.

Whitby considers the Jewish people as Antichrist, and finds in the apostasy the rebellion against the Romans, or also the falling away from the faith; and in the κατέχον the Emperor Claudius, during whose life the Jews could not possibly think of a rebellion, as he had shown himself favourable to them.

According to Schoettgen, the Jewish Pharisees and Rabbis are Antichrist. The ἀποστασία is the rebellion excited by them, of the Jews against the Romans; πᾶς λεγόμενος Ὁ διὸς refers likewise to the rulers; τὸ κατέχον and ὁ κατέχων are probably the Christians who by their prayers effected a respite from the catastrophe, until, in consequence of a divine oracle,

1 See against him, Turretin, p. 501 ff.
2 See against him, Turretin, p. 508 ff.
they left Jerusalem, and betook themselves to Pella; μυστήριον τῆς ἀνουμίας denotes ipsa doctrina perversa.

Noesselt, whom Krause follows, understands Antichrist of the Jewish zealots, but interprets the preventing power, as Whitby does, of the Emperor Claudius.

Lastly, Harduin explains the ἀποστασία of the falling off of the Jews to heathenism. He considers the high priest Ananias (Acts xxiii. 2) as the ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας, and his predecessor in office as the κατέχων, who must first be removed by death in order to make place for Ananias. At the beginning of his high-priesthood the ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας will appear as a deceitful prophet, and be destroyed at the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus.

All these interpretations of the second class avoid, it is true, the common error of the interpretations of the first class, as they give due prominence to the point of the nearness of the catastrophe described by Paul; but, apart from many and strong objections which may be brought against each, they are all exposed to this fatal objection, the impossibility of understanding the coming of the Lord, mentioned by Paul, of the period of the destruction of Jerusalem.

Tychsen (l.c.) has endeavoured to divest the Pauline representation of its prophetic character, by assuming that the apostle follows step by step the course of an Epistle received from Thessalonica, from which he perceived that the church had been led astray into the erroneous notion that the advent of Christ was already at hand. The apostle cites passages from that writing, and adds each time his refutation. For the statement of this opinion, which only claims attention on account of its strangeness, it will be sufficient to give the translation from ver. 3 and onwards, in which Tychsen (p. 184 f.) sums up the view he has already stated at length. It is as follows: "You certainly wrote to me, 'This day cannot come until the great apostasy will occur; when a thoroughly lawless and corrupt man will publicly appear, who in hostile pride exalts himself above all that man calls divine
and honourable, who also intrudes even into the temple of
God, and gives himself out as a god.' But do you not
remember that I, when I was with you, told you something of
this? and besides, you know what is in the way of that
lawless one, so that he can only appear in his time, not yet
at present. 'This wickedness,' you say further, 'even now
secretly works.' Only that hindrance must first be removed
out of the way! 'And when this is removed,' ye think, 'the
wicked one will soon fearlessly show himself.' Now let him
do it! The Lord Jesus will annihilate him with His divine
power, and destroy him by His solemn appearance. 'When
this lawless one comes,' ye continue, 'so will his appearance be
accompanied by the assistance of Satan with deceiving miracles,
delusions, and everything which can lead to blasphemy.' Yet
all this cannot seduce you, but only those unhappy persons
who have no love for true religion, and accordingly are help-
lessly lost by their own fault. God for a punishment to
them permitted seducers to rise up, that they might believe
the lie. A merited punishment for all friends of vice who are
prepossessed against true doctrine!'

For a correct judgment of the apocalyptic instruction of
the apostle, it is firmly to be maintained that Paul could not
possibly wish to give a representation of the distant future.
On the contrary, the events which he predicted were for him
so near, that he himself even thought that he would survive
them. He hoped to survive even to the personal return of
the Lord for judgment and for the completion of His king-
dom; His return shall be preceded by the appearance of
Antichrist, whom he considered not as a collective idea, but
as an individual person, and not in the political, but in the
religious sphere, and specially as a caricature of Christ and
the culmination of ungodliness; but Antichrist can only appear
when the preventing power, which at present hinders his
appearance, will be removed. As, now, these circumstances,
which Paul thinks were to be realized in the immediate future,
have not actually taken place, so it is completely arbitrary to
expect the fulfilment of the prophecy only in a distant future; rather it is to be admitted, that although, as the very kernel of Paul's representation, the perfectly true idea lay at the bottom, that the return of the Lord for the completion of the kingdom of God was not to be expected until the moral process of the world had reached its close by the complete separation of the susceptible and the unsusceptible, and accordingly also until the opposition to Christ had reached its climax, yet Paul was mistaken concerning the nearness of the final catastrophe, and, carried along by his idiosyncrasy, had wished to settle more exactly concerning its circumstances and moral conditions than is allotted to man in general to know, even although he should be the apostle, the most filled with the Spirit of Christ. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 36; Mark xiii. 32; Acts i. 7.—We can thus only determine the meaning and interpretation which Paul himself connected with his prophecy, and how he came to the assertion of such a prophecy. It rests on the apocalyptic views of the Jews. It was a prevalent opinion of the Jews in the time of Christ, that a time of tribulation and travail and an Antichrist were to precede the appearance of the Messiah. Comp. Gfrörer, das Jahrhundert des Heils, Part 2, p. 256 ff., 300 ff., 405 ff. The description of Antiochus Epiphanes in Dan. viii. 23 ff., xi. 36 ff., and the apocalyptic representation of Gog and Magog in Ezek. xxxviii. 39, were esteemed as types of Antichrist. From these passages it is further explicable how Paul conceived Antichrist as a personality, as an individual.

Accordingly, it remains only still to determine, for the explication of the Pauline prophecy, what is to be understood by the preventing power, which still delayed the appearance of Antichrist. Without doubt, the Fathers have already correctly recognised by τὸ κατέχων the Roman Empire, and—in another form of expression for it—by ὁ κατέχων the Roman emperor, as the representative of the empire. This is the more probable as, according to the Book of Daniel, the whole history of the world was to fall within the four monarchies of the world, but the fourth was by Josephus and others regarded as the Roman Empire, whose impending ruin
the apostle might not without reason think himself justified in inferring from many symptoms.

Ver. 13—iii. 15. Hortatory portion of the Epistle.

Vv. 13—17. Exhortation to the readers to hold fast to the Christianity delivered to them (ver. 15), grounded on the comfortable fact that they belonged not to those who perish, but were fore-ordained by God to salvation, and called to it by the gospel (vv. 13, 14), and united with a pious wish that Christ and God Himself would comfort their minds, and strengthen them to all goodness (vv. 16, 17).

Ver. 13. 'Ἡμεῖς δὲ] but we, namely, I, Paul, together with Silvanus and Timotheus, in contrast to the persons described in vv. 10—12. — ὅσειλομεν] denotes here, as in i. 13, the subjective obligation, an internal impulse. — ἄδελφοι ἡγατημένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου] comp. 1 Thess. i. 4. The κύριος here is Christ, because τῷ Θεῷ directly precedes and ὁ Θεός directly follows, consequently another subject was evidently thought on by the apostle. — ὅτι εἰλατο ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] the material object of εὐχαριστεῖν for the purpose of a further statement of the personal object περὶ ὑμῶν, that, namely, etc. — αἰρέσθαι] in the sense of divine election (Deut. xxvi. 18, vii. 6, 7, x. 15), does not elsewhere occur with Paul. He uses ἐκλέγεσθαι (Eph. i. 4; 1 Cor. i. 27, 28), or προσωπόκειν (Rom. viii. 29, xi. 2), or προορίζειν (Rom. viii. 29; Eph. i. 11). αἰρέσθαι is found in Phil. i. 22 in the related sense of "to choose between two objects the preferable." — ἀπ' ἀρχῆς] from the beginning, i.e. from eternity. Comp. 1 John i. 1, ii. 13. The following forms are analogous: ἀπὸ τῶν αἰῶνων, Eph. iii. 9; ἀπὸ τῶν αἰῶνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν, Col. i. 26; πρὸ τῶν αἰῶνων, 1 Cor. ii. 7; πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, Eph. i. 4; πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, 2 Tim. i. 9. Others, as Vorstius and Krause, interpret ἀπ' ἀρχῆς of the beginning of the publication of the gospel, so that the Thessalonians were reckoned as the first who embraced the gospel in Macedonia. But this does not suit εἰλατο, for the election on the part of God belongs to the region of eternity; the calling (ver. 14) is its realization in
time. Besides, an addition would be necessary to ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, as Phil. iv. 15 proves, ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Lastly, the objection of Vorstius: "absurdum est, per principium intelligere aeternitatem, quippe in qua nullum est principium," overlooks the fact that ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς is nothing more than a popular expression. ¹— eἰς σωτηρίαν] is by Flatt referred to salvation in this life, whilst he considers included therein the forgiveness of sins, the assurance of God's peculiar love, and the freedom from the dominion of sinful inclinations. Incorrect on this account, because the σωτηρία of the Thessalonians is in undeniable contrast with the condemnation of the ungodly (ver. 12), and thus likewise must be referred to the result to be expected at the advent of Christ, accordingly must denote eternal salvation.— ἐν ἀγίασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας] belongs neither to σωτηρίαν alone (Koppe, Flatt, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hofmann, Riggenbach), nor to εἰλατο alone (de Wette), but to the whole idea εἰλατο εἰς σωτηρίαν, and states the means by which the election, which has taken place to eternal salvation, was to be realized.² To assume, with de Wette, that ἐν is placed for εἰς, and to find the next aim denoted by ἐν ἀγίασμῷ κ.τ.λ., is unmaintainable. For if εἰς σωτηρίαν and ἐν ἀγίασμῷ were co-ordinates, then (1) εἰς σωτηρίαν, because the highest aim, would be put not in the first, but in the second place; and (2) the sudden transition from a preposition of motion to one of rest would be inexplicable. πνεῦμα is not the spirit of man, to which the being sanctified was to be referred (genitive of the object: "by the improvement of the spirit," Koppe, Krause, Schott), but the Holy Spirit, from whom the sanctification of the whole man is to proceed, or by whom it is to be effected (genitive of origin). Accordingly it is also evident wherefore the apostle mentions the belief in the Christian truth only after ἀγίασμος, although

¹ Also Schrader's assertion, that the author (the pseudo-Paul) betrays by ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς "that he considered the time when the gospel was first preached in Thessalonica as already long past," has no meaning according to the above.

² In a manner entirely incorrect, and with a mistake of the actual use of the preposition ἐ in narrowing its meaning, Hofmann objects—and Möller should not have followed him—against the above interpretation, that then the means would be taken for the act of the election itself.
otherwise the sanctification of man follows only on his reception of the divine word. For Paul considers a twofold means of the realization of the divine election—first, the influence of the Holy Spirit upon man, and secondly, man’s own reception. But the former already precedes the latter.

Ver. 14. Eἰς τὸ to which. Incorrectly, Olshausen: therefore. Eἰς τὸ does not refer to πίστει (Aretius), also not to ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ πίστει (Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Fromond., Nat. Alexander, Moldenhauer, Koppe, Flatt, Schott, Schrader, de Wette, Hofmann), still less to the “electio” and the “animus, quo eadem digni evadimus” (Pelt), but to eἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ κ.τ.λ.; whilst to the aim of the election, and to the means by which it was to be realized according to God’s eternal counsel, is added the actual call of the readers occurring in time. Accordingly, eἰς τὸ is to be completed by eἰς τὸ σωθῆραι ὑμᾶς δι’ ἁγιασμὸν πνεύματος καὶ πίστεως ἁληθείας. — διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἡμῶν] through our publication of the gospel. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 5. The historical condition of πίστει.—eἰς περιποίησιν δόξης τοῦ κυρίου] an appositional resumption of eἰς σωτηρίαν, in order further to characterize the salvation, whose reception God had predetermined to the readers, as an acquisition (see on 1 Thess. v. 9) of the glory which Christ possesses. So in essentials, Pelagius, Musculus, Hunnius, Fisca tor, Vorstius, Grotius, Wolf, Schott, Olshausen, de Wette, Alford, Ewald, Bis ping, Riggenbach, and others. Less suitably, because weakening the force and the important contents of the expression, Luc. Osiander, Benson, Moldenhauer, and Pelt explain δόξα τοῦ κυρίου of the glory, of which Christ is the source or bestower. Against the reference to God as the subject in περιποίησιν, and to Christ as the receiver of the δόξα (Oecumenius: ἵνα δόξαν περιποίηση τῷ νῦν αὐτοῦ; Theophylact, Vatablus, Cornelius a Lapide), is the circumstance, that although eἰς περιποίησιν might stand instead of eἰς τὸ with the infinitive, yet the dative τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν would require to be placed instead of the genitive τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. Lastly, the passive signification of περιποίησις: “ut essetis gloriosa possessio domini nostri Jesu Christi” (Menochius, Harduin; also Luther: “to the glorious inheritance,” and
Calvin), has against it the weakening of the substantive δόξης into an adjective, and the parallel passage in 1 Thess. v. 9. Besides, the context decides against the two last-mentioned views. For the object of vv. 13, 14 is to bring forward the glory of the lot which is assigned to the Thessalonians, in order thereby to lead to the exhortation in ver. 15.

Ver. 15. "Αρα οὖν] wherefore then, as such an end awaits you. — στήκετε] stand fast, comp. 1 Thess. iii. 8. The opposite of σαλευθήσαι, ver. 2. — καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις] and hold fast to the traditions, instructions in Christianity. As κρατεῖν here (comp. Mark vii. 3), so does κατέχειν τὰς παραδόσεις stand in 1 Cor. xi. 2. — ἃς ἔδιδάχθητε] See Winer, p. 204 [E. T. 284]. — εἴτε διὰ λόγου] whether by oral discourse. — δι' ἐπιστολῆς] refers to the First Epistle to the Thessalonians.

Vv. 16, 17. The apostle rises from his evangelical activity (ver. 15) up to Christ, the Lord and Ruler of the Christian church, and concludes with the mention of God, who is the final reason and contriver of the Christian salvation. The unusual (2 Cor. xiii. 13) naming of Christ first and of God second, is sufficiently explained from the fact that Christ is the Mediator between God and man. — On the union of the two nominatives, Christ and God, with a verb in the singular, see on 1 Thess. iii. 11. — ὁ ἀγαπήσας ἡμᾶς καὶ δόσῃ παράκλησιν. κ.τ.λ.] a fittingly-selected characteristic, in order to mark the confidence with which Paul expects the hearing of his supplications. — ὁ ἀγαπήσας ἡμᾶς καὶ δόσῃ] refers exclusively to ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν. Baumgarten-Crusius incorrectly refers only the second participle to God, and the first to Christ. But the participle aorist ἀγαπήσας must not be weakened into "qui nos amat et quovis tempore amavit" (so Schott, after Flatt and Pelt), but refers to the divine proof of love already belonging to the past,—accomplished, i.e. to the fact by which the love of God to mankind is κατ' ἐξουσίαν proved,—to the mission of His Son in order to rescue sinners from destruction. — καὶ δόσῃ] and has thereby communicated to us.—παράκλησιν] comfort. This is called eternal,¹ not, perhaps, on account of the blessings of eternal life which Christians have

¹ The feminine form αἰωνία is found only here in the N. T. and in Heb. ix. 12.
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to expect (Chrysostom, Estius, Vorstius, Grotius, Fromond, and others), but because Christians have become the sons of God, and as such are filled with *indestructible confidence* that all things, even the severest affliction which may befall them, infallibly serves for their good, because God has so ordained, and that nothing in the world will be able to separate them from the love of God in Christ; comp. Rom. viii. 28, 38 f. The opposite of this *eternal consolation* is the fleeting and deceptive consolation of the world (Olshausen). *παράκλησις* accordingly refers to the *present*. On the other hand (vv. 13, 14), *ἐλπὶς ἀγαθή* refers to the blessedness and glory to be expected in the *future*. — *ἐν χάριν*] *in grace*, i.e. by means of a gracious appointment, belongs not to *ἐλπίς*, but to the participles. The opposite is man's own merit. — *παρακαλέσαι*] *may comfort or calm*, refers particularly to the disquiet of the readers in reference to the advent (ii. 2). — *καὶ στηρίζαι*] *sc. ὑμᾶς* (see critical remarks), which is in itself evident from the preceding ὑμῶν. — *ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἀγαθῷ*] *in every good work and word*. Grotius incorrectly takes it in the sense of *εἰς πᾶν ἔργον καὶ πάντα λόγον ἀγαθόν*. But, with Chrysostom, Calvin, Turretin, Bolten, Flatt, and others, to limit *λόγος* to teaching is erroneous, on account of the universal *παντὶ* and its being placed along with *ἔργῳ*. The apostle rather wishes an establishment in *every* good thing, whether manifested in works or in words.
CHAPTER III.

Ver. 3. Instead of the Receptus ὁ κύριος, A D* F G 71, Vulg. It. Copt. Arm. in marg. and some Latin Fathers have ὁ Θεός. Accepted by Lachm. But πιστεὶς δὲ ἐστιν ὁ κύριος does not elsewhere occur, whilst πιστεὶς ὁ Θεός is a usual form. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13; 2 Cor. i. 13. Therefore the former might have been corrected according to the latter. ὁ κύριος is attested by B (e sil.) D*** E K L κ, almost all min., most versions, many Greek Fathers, and Hier.— Ver. 5. τὴν ἵπτομήν] The Elz. reads ἵπτομήν. Against all uncial mss. (also κ), most min., and many Greek Fathers.— Ver. 6. Instead of παρέλαβον (D** D*** E K L κκκκκ 23, 31, al., pl. edd. Aeth. Syr. p. Slav. Vulg. Clar. Germ. Bas. [alicubi] al., Cypr. [ter] Lucif. Aug. Ambrosiast. ed. Pelag. received by Matth. and Scholz, preferred also by Reiche), Elz. reads παρέλαβε (very weakly attested, namely, only by 3, 49, 57, 71, Syr.); Lachm. reads παρελάβεται (after B F G 43, al., Copt. Arm. Antonius, Theodoret [sem.], Ambrosiast. ed. Auct. de sing. cler.); Griesbach, Tisch. and Alford read παρελάβον τοῦ (after A κ Bas.; D* has for it the simple verb ἵπτομαι). παρέλαβε and παρελάβεται are corrections, and not so well attested as the third person plural. But the Alexandrian form παρέλαβον merits the preference before παρέλαβον, as the less usual form in the N. T., which on that account might easily have led to an alteration.— Ver. 8. Instead of the Receptus νίκη καὶ ἡμέραν, B F G κ 17, al., Chrys. ms. Damasc. (sem.) have νικῆ καὶ ἡμέρας. Received by Lachm. Against the preponderating authority of A D E K L, the great majority of min., and many Fathers, and the probable conformity to 1 Thess. ii. 9, iii. 10.— Ver. 12. Elz. Tisch. 2 read διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Lachm. Tisch. 1 and 7, and Alford read εἰς κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The latter is required by A B D* E* F G κ κ 17, 31, al., Vulg. It. Goth. Copt. al., Damasc. (sem.) Ambrosiast. Aug. Pel.— Ver. 13. Elz. reads μὴ ἰνακαχῆς. Instead of this, Lachm. Schott, Tisch. and Alford have preferred μὴ ἰγκαχῆς, after A B D* κ (Tisch. 7: μὴ ἰγκαχῆς). But the latter is a probable correction, as the writing ἰνακαχῆ, instead of ἰγκαχῆ, never elsewhere occurs with certainty in the N. T., and is
authenticated by the Fathers. Comp. Meyer on 2 Cor. iv. 1.

— Ver. 16. Elz. Tisch. 2 and 7 read τρόπω. Lachm. and Tisch. I read τόπω, after A* D* F G, 17, 49, Vulg. It. Goth. Chrys. Ambrosiast. Pel. Commended to attention by Griesb.; already preferred by Piscator, Beza, and Grotius. But τρόπω (attested by A** B [e sil.] D*** E K L & α, almost all min. Syr. utr. Copt. al. m. Theodoret, Damasc. al.) decidedly merits the preference on account of the sense, and might, on account of the more frequent form ἐπὶ παντὶ τόπῳ (1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8), be easily transformed into τόπῳ. Also Bouman (Chartae theologicae, lib. I. p. 67) considers τρόπῳ as the original; but then he advances the following supposition for the origin of the false reading τόπῳ: "Proxime cum praecessisset ẹπὶ παντὶ omni tempore, dictionis elegantiam ac concinnitatem hoc requirere putarunt librarii, ut nihil potius adjiceretur quam ἐπὶ παντὶ τόπῳ omni loco; quippe qui temporis ac spatii notiones frequentissime conjungi, pro sua scilicet sapientia, optime novissent."

Vv. 1–5. Paul requests the Thessalonians to pray that the gospel may be more widely diffused, and that he himself (and his companions) might be delivered from the persecutions to which he was exposed. He then expresses his trust that the Lord will assist the Thessalonians, and also declares his confidence that they will obey his (the apostle's) commandments, and he unites therewith an additional benediction.

Ver. 1. Τῷ λαοπτῷ see on 1 Thess. iv. 1. — περὶ ἡμῶν] on our behalf. But the apostle's wish is completely unselfish, as he refers to the promotion of Christianity, and to himself only so far as he stands in connection with that object. — ἱπά] comp. on i. 11. — ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου Genitivus subjectivus; see on 1 Thess. i. 8. — τρέχει] may run. A representation of quick and unimpeded advancing. — δικαίωσιαι is passive: may be glorified. Felt erroneously understands it as middle. But the gospel is only glorified when it is recognised as what it is, namely, as a δώμας Θεοῦ εἰς σωματίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι (Rom. i. 16). Nicolas de Lyra arbitrarily limits the verb to the "miracula, veritatem ejus declarantia." — καθὼς καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς even as it is among you. A laudatory recognition of the eager desire for salvation, with which the Thessalonians surrendered themselves to the preaching of the gospel. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 6 ff. The words are closely connected with καὶ
According to Hofmann, with whom Möller, although wavering, coincides, the words are to be united with τρέχω, passing over καὶ δοξάζηται. Incorrectly, because δοξάζηται is a higher idea than τρέχω, whilst it adduces that point by which the external act of τρέχειν can only receive its internal value. Accordingly καὶ δοξάζηται is too important to be considered only as a subsidiary point "appended" to τρέχω. — πρὸς ὑμᾶς see on 1 Thess. iii. 4.

Ver. 2. In deliverance from his adversaries lay the condition that he, the apostle, could work the more effectively for the diffusion of the gospel. Theodoret: Διναλή μὲν ἡ ἀπιστίας εἶναι δοκεῖ, μὴ δὲ ὁμοιὸς ἐστὶν τῶν γὰρ ποιηρῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡττωμένων, ἀκολούθως καὶ ὁ τοῦ κηρύγματος συντρέχει λόγος. — ἄντοτος] is used of that which is not in its right place. Used of persons, it denotes one who does or says that which is inappropriate under the circumstances. Thus it is equivalent to ineptus (Cic. de orat. ii. 4). From "propriety" it passes to its wider ethical meaning, and is used of men who act contrary to human or divine laws. Thus it receives the general signification of bad or godless. See examples in Kypke, Observ. II. p. 145 f.; Loesner, and Wetstein. — But the Thessalonian Jews are not to be understood by the ἄντοτος καὶ ποιηρὸι ἀνθρώποι, from whose persecution the apostle had already, at an earlier period, frequently suffered (so, as it would seem, Pelt), for their influence hardly extended to Corinth. Persons must be meant who were then present in Corinth itself. But we are not to think on Christians who were only so in name (Zwingli, Musculus, Hemming, Flatt, Schrader, and others), and particularly on false teachers among the Jewish Christians (Schott), but on fanatical Jews. Comp. Acts xviii. 6, 12 ff. That the adversaries of the apostle could not have been already Christians, follows from the inferential clause setting forth the naturalness of the existence of such people, οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις, for faith is not an affair of all, i.e. it finds not a place among all, all have not a susceptible heart for it. On the form of the expression, compare the well-known proverb: Οὐ παυσότος ἄνδρος ἐστὶ Ἀρμινίου ἐσθ'
on account of the article, can only denote the Christian faith simply and generally. To understand the expression of fidelity or honesty, with Schoettgen, Moldenhauer, Koppe, Bolten, Krause, Flatt, and others, is as incorrect as to interpret it of true faith, with Schott. For in the first case ὣν γὰρ πάντες πιστεῖ would require to have been written, and in the second case ὣν γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις ἀληθὴς.

Ver. 3. A contrast to ὣν γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις, with a play upon the word πίστις, and a return to the statement in ii. 16, 17.—ὁ κύριος not a designation of God (Schott, Schrader, Olshausen, and Hilgenfeld, Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol., Halle 1862, p. 261), but of Christ. His faithfulness consists in this, that He, as Protector of the church, watches over the continuance of the faith, and effects its diffusion in spite of all ἀτόποι and πονηροὶ. Strikingly, Calvin: “Ceterum de aliis magis quam de se anxium fuisse Paulum, ostendunt haec ipsa verba. In eum maligni homines improbitatis suae aculeos dirigeabant, in eum totus impetus irruebat: curam interea suam ad Thessalonicenses convertit.”—τοῦ πονηροῦ] is, by Calvin, Musculus, Estius, Piscator, Menochius, Nat. Alexander, Benson, Bengel, Baumgarten, Moldenhauer, Macknight, Olshausen, Hofmann, also Cornelius a Lapide, Er. Schmid, and Beza, though not decidedly held by the latter, understood as masculine, accordingly as a designation of the devil. In itself nothing can be objected against this interpretation, as in Matt. xiii. 19 and elsewhere frequently in the N. T., also with Paul in Eph. vi. 16, ὅ πονηρὸς is found in this sense. But here this interpretation is untenable, because δὲ στηρίζει ὑμᾶς καὶ φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ evidently resumes στηρίζει ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἀγαθῷ, ii. 17, and only arranges it positively and negatively. But if τοῦ πονηροῦ corresponds to the negation of the position ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἀγαθῷ, it must be neuter, and denote moral evil generally. But it would be arbitrary to make this neuter equivalent to τῶν πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων, to which Koppe and Flatt give their countenance.

Ver. 4. The apostle has confidence in Christ that He will come to the assistance of the Thessalonians, promoting their
faith and protecting them; but he is likewise confident in them, that they on their part will not fail in obedience to the apostle's commands. Thus the apostle paves the way for a suitable transition to the exhortation in ver. 6 ff. — ἐν κυρίῳ] a statement of the element of his confidence annexed to πεποιθαμέν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς, in order to express that the apostle's confidence in his readers was one founded on Christ, caused by the participation of Christianity. Comp. Gal. v. 10; Phil. ii. 24; Rom. xiv. 14. — ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς] see Meyer on 2 Cor. ii. 3. — καὶ ποιείτε] does not still belong to the protasis (see Erasmus on the passage), but begins the apodosis.

Ver. 5. A fresh involuntary effusion of piety on the part of the apostle, by means of which he calls down the divine blessing on every action of man as a condition of its success. Theodoret: Ἀμφωτέρων ἡμῶν χρεία, καὶ προθέσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ τῆς ἀνοθέων συνεργείας. To assume that ver. 5 was added by Paul, because he could not yet entirely trust the Thessalonians (de Wette), is without foundation. — ὁ κύριος] Christ, as in vv. 3, 4. — κατευθύνατε ὑμῖν τὰς καρδίας εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ] direct your hearts to the love of God, namely, in order to be filled and pervaded by it, not in order to remain contemplating it (Koppe, Olshausen). — ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ] is not "amor a deo praeceptus" (Clericus), or "amor, quem deus hominum quasi infundit animis" (Pelt), also not the love of God to men, which was to be the pattern for Christian brotherly love (Macknight, Koppe), or, more specially, the manifestation of the love of God in Christ and in His work of redemption (Olshausen, Riggenbach); but love toward God (Gen. object.). Paul wishes the Thessalonians to be inspired with it, because it is the centre uniting all commandments; comp. Matt. xxii. 37 ff. — καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπομονήν τοῦ Χριστοῦ] Oecumenius, Ambrose, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Vatablus, Cornelius a Lapide, Beza, Bernard a Piconio, and Benson, to whom recently Hofmann has attached himself, understand by this the patient waiting for Christ, that is, for His coming. Erroneous, because — (1) ἀναμονή (comp. 1 Thess. i. 10) would require to be written instead of ὑπομονή; and (2) the idea of patient waiting, by which addition the statement
becomes only suitable, would require to be expressly brought forward by an additional clause. The stedfastness of Christ (Gen. possessiv.) is meant, inasmuch as the endurance which the Christian manifests in tribulation for the sake of the gospel is in its nature nothing else than the stedfastness which was peculiar to Christ Himself in His sufferings. Comp. the analogous expression τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 2 Cor. i. 5, and Meyer in loco. The simple genitive cannot express stedfastness for the sake of Christ, as it is usually explained.

Vv. 6-15. Dehortation from a disorderly and idle life in the church. Paul had already touched upon this subject in his First Epistle (iv. 11, 12, v. 14). But here it is more expressly treated, and also with greater severity, because, without doubt, in the restless and fanatical excitement of spirits on account of the advent, this evil had greatly increased instead of diminishing. Paul represents the core of the church as free from this fault; he exorts them to withdraw themselves from every Christian brother living disorderly, in order to bring him to shame and amendment. Only in ver. 12 does he direct his apostolic word to the erring brethren themselves.

Ver. 6. Παραγγέλλομεν δὲ] An application of the general ἄ παραγγέλλομεν, ver. 4, to a special case. — εἰν οὖν ὁμοίως τοῦ χυτρίου ἡμῶν 'I. Χρ. belongs to παραγγέλλομεν, not to what follows. A solemn reference to the high authority for this injunction. Comp. 1 Cor. v. 4.— στελέσθαι απὸ τιμός] to withdraw himself from every one, to avoid his company. Comp. ὑποστέλλειν ἑαυτῶν, Gal. ii. 12, and ὑποστέλλεσθαι, Heb. x. 38. — ἀτάκτως] see on 1 Thess. v. 14.— κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν, ἣν κ.τ.λ.] refers not to instruction by the example of the apostle (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Hofmann), which is first mentioned in what follows, but to the definite instruction which the apostle had given to them orally, during his presence at Thessalonica (comp. ver. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 11), and then confirmed by writing (1 Thess. iv. 11, 12). — παρελάβοσαν] A well-known constructio ad sensum adapted to the collective form ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ.
See Kühner, II. p. 42. — On the verbal form, comp. Sturz, de dial. Alex. p. 60; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 349.

Ver. 7. Confirmation of κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν, ἢν παρελάβοσαν. The instruction imparted was sufficiently known to the readers: what Paul commanded, he practically exhibited by his own conduct. — ἀνταὐτῶν ye yourselves, without it being necessary for me to speak much about it. — πῶς δεῖ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς a concise expression, meaning: What is your incumbent walk, and how, in consequence of it, ye will be my imitators. — ὅτι for. Unnaturally, Hofmann: ὅτι is to be translated by that, and is added as a parallel expression to τῶς δεὶ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς, in which also ver. 9 is absorbed. — ἀπεκτέειν equal to ἀπέκτως περιπάτειν, ver. 6. Only here in the N. T.

Ver. 8. See on 1 Thess. ii. 9. — δοσιμαί] by way of gift. — ἄρτον φαγεῖν] to eat bread (Mark iii. 20; Luke xiv. 1; ἄρτον ἑσθίειν, Matt. xv. 2), has as the Hebrew בָּן הוֹעַס (Gen. xliii. 25; 2 Sam. ix. 7; Prov. xxiii. 6, etc.) the idea of eating generally, so that it is not to be distinguished from the simple φαγεῖν (Mark vi. 31) or ἑσθίειν (ver. 10). ἄρτον φαγεῖν παρά τινος denotes: to have maintenance from any one, without care on our part. — ἐργαζόμενοι is not to be taken in the sense of temp. finit. (Flatt and others), but ἐν κόπῳ... ἐργαζόμενοι is to be taken together, and forms a statement of mode attached to ἄρτον ἐφάγομεν in contrast to δοσιμαί. Yet we may, with Winer, p. 314 [E. T. 442], de Wette, and Hofmann, assume that to ἐφάγομεν, as a contrast to δοσιμαί, are added first ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ taking the place of an adverb, and then to this νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν ἐργαζόμενοι as a parallel clause.

Ver. 9. Paul has indeed the right to be maintained by the churches, but he freely renounces this right, in order to present believers with a good example. Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 4 ff. — ὅτι] My meaning is by no means that; by no means as if. A restriction of the previous statement, in order to prevent a possible misunderstanding. Comp. 2 Cor. i. 24, iii. 5; Phil. iii. 12, iv. 11, 17; Hartung, Partikellehre, II. p. 153 f. — ἐξουσίαιν] power or authority, sc. τοῦ δοσιμαί φαγεῖν ἄρτον. — ἀλλ' sc. ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν
The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians.


Ver. 10. A further reason, along with the example of the apostle, which should preserve them from ἀτάκτως περιπατεῖν. — γάρ] co-ordinate with the γάρ in ver. 7. καί cannot serve to bring out ὅτε ἦμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς (so Hofmann), so that it would be explained, with Theodoret: Οὐδὲν κανὼν ὑμῖν γράφομεν, ἀλλὰ ἀπερ ἄρχῇς ὑμᾶς ἐδιδάξαμεν. For ὅτε ἦμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς is no new additional idea, but only again resumes what was at least already implied in vv. 7 and 8. Καί must accordingly be taken with τοῦτο παραγγέλλωμεν ὑμῖν, and the emphasis lies on τοῦτο, which is placed first. The meaning is: for even when we were with you, this we commanded you. — τοῦτο] namely, what follows: ὅτι εἰ τις κ.τ.λ. — εἰ τις οὖ θέλει ἐργάζεσθαι, μηδὲ ἐσθιετο] was a Jewish proverb; see Schoettgen and Wetstein in loco. It has its root in the expression in Gen. iii. 19, that man in the sweat of his brow shall eat his bread.— οὖ θέλει] Bengel: Nolle vitium est.

Ver. 11. The reason for reminding them of this saying, ver. 10. Arbitrarily, Hofmann: γάρ refers to the whole section vv. 6—10. The verb περιεργάζεσθαι is only found here in the NT. (but comp. περιέργος, 1 Tim. v. 13, and τὰ περιέργα πράσσειν, Acts xix. 19). It denotes a bustling disposition, busy in useless and superfluous things, about which one should not trouble himself. Paul thinks on the fanatical excitement, on account of which one busied himself about everything except the fulfilment of the duties of his earthly calling. περιεργαζομένως forms a paronomasia with μηδὲν ἐργάζομένως.1 Comp. Quintilian, inst. orat. vi. 3. 54: Afer enim venuste Mallium Suram, multum in agendo discursantem, salientem, manus jactantem, togam dejicientem et reponentem, non agere dixit sed satagere.

Ver. 12. Καί παρακαλοῦμεν] sc. αὐτοῦ. — μετὰ ἡσυχίας ἐργαζόμενοι] with quietness, i.e. applying yourself to your earthly calling, subjectively with a quiet and collected mind, and objectively with noiseless modesty. Contrast to μηδὲν ἐργάζεσθαι ἀλλὰ περιεργάζεσθαι. Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 11. — 1 Ewald translates it: “nicht Arbeit treibend, sondern sich herumtreibend.”
CHAP. III. 13, 14. 251

ἐαυτῶν] emphatic, their own bread, that is to say, their self-
earned sustenance, avoiding a maintenance which depends on
the charity of others.

Ver. 13. The apostle again turns himself to those who had
kept themselves free from this fault.— ἐκκακεῖν with the
following participle (see Kühner, II. p. 369) denotes to be
weary in doing something.— καλοποιεῖν] cannot signify “to
be charitable” (Calvin, Estius, Flatt, Pelt, de Wette, Bloom-
field, Ewald, Bisping, and most critics), so that the sense
would be: But suffer not yourselves, through those who abuse
your charity, to be restrained from exercising charity in
general. The verb can only denote, so act as is right and
proper. Comp. Gal. vi. 9. As Paul still speaks, even in
vv. 14, 15, of the special matter which he treated of in the
preceding words, καλοποιεῖν cannot be understood in its most
general sense, but must be referred to the matter in question.
Accordingly, the apostle requires that those who had kept
themselves free from this fault should not be weary in doing
what is right and proper, that is to say, that they should not
suffer themselves to be infected with the evil example given.

Ver. 14. Διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς] is, by Nicolas de Lyra, Luther,
Calvin, Musculus, Hemming, Bullinger, Lucius Osianer,
Balduin, Grotius, Calovius, Clericus, Sebastian Schmid, Bengel,
Moldenhauer, Zachariae, Koppe, Krause, Pelt, Winer, p. 108
[E. T. 147], and others, united with what follows. It is
usually explained: If any obey not my word, note that man to
me in writing, sc. in order that I may direct what punishment is
to be inflicted on him. But this interpretation is to be rejected
—(1) on account of the article τῆς, which, if unforced, can
only denote a definite epistle lying before them, not an epistle
to be written only at a later period; (2) as the inversion of
the words: διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τοῦτον σημειώσατε, instead of the
natural order: τοῦτον διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς σημειώσατε, would not
be justified; (3) lastly, because it is very improbable that
Paul should still have retained for himself a statement of the

1 Also Olshausen understands καλοποιεῖν only of doing good in general, but
arbitrarily refers it—because anticipating the contents of ver. 15—to the loving
and forbearing treatment of the brethren.
punishment, as he has already in ver. 6 stated the mode of punishment, and again repeated it in this verse, commanding them to withdraw from the society of every brother acting contrary to his admonitions. But interpretations in this connection, as that of Bengel: "notate notâ censoriâ, hanc epistolam, ejus admonendi causa, adhibentes eique inculcantes, ut, aliorum judicio perspecto, se demittat," or that of Pelt: "eum hac epistola freti severius tractate," alter the idea of the verb σημειούονθαι. We are obliged to unite διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς with τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν. So, correctly, Chrysostom, Clarus, Estius, Piscator, Andrew Osiander, Aretius, Menochius, Vorstius, Cornelius a Lapide, Beza, Fromond, Hammond, Nat. Alexander, Joachim Lange, Harduin, Whitby, Benson, Bolten, Flatt, Schott, Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bloomfield, Alford, Ewald, Bisping, Buttmann, Gramm. des neuest. Sprachgeb. p. 80 [E. T. 92]; Hofmann, Riggenbach, and others. It was not necessary to repeat the article τῷ before τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν, because τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς is blended into the unity of the idea of a written command. Comp. Winer, p. 123 [E. T. 169]. ἡ ἐπιστολή denotes the definite Epistle, i.e. our Second Epistle to the Thessalonians (comp. 1 Thess. v. 27; Rom. xvi. 22; Col. iv. 16); and the command expressed by that Epistle is the admonition in ver. 12. The meaning is: But if any one acts contrary to my prohibition repeated in this Epistle, note that man, i.e. mark him, sc. in order to avoid intercourse with him (comp. 1 Cor. v. 9, 11), and thereby to bring him to shame (and amendment); as Paul, explaining himself, expressly adds: καὶ μὴ συναναμένανθε αὐτῷ, ἵνα ἐντραπῆ. This meaning also remains, if, instead of the Receptus καὶ μὴ συναναμένανθε, we read, with Lachmann and Tischendorf 1, after A B D* K, the infinitive μὴ συναναμένανθαι, only the form of expression being changed. — ἐντραπῆ] is passive, not middle (Pelt). Comp. Tit. ii. 8; 1 Cor. iv. 14, vi. 5, xv. 24.

Ver. 15. But no hostile feeling against the erring was to be conjoined with this avoidance of social intercourse; on the contrary, as he is a Christian brother, advice and admonition are not to be omitted in order to convert him from his error by convincing reasons. — ὡς] united with ἴγειοθαί,
otherwise unusual, brings still more prominently forward the
subjective notion or representation implied in the verb. In
a corresponding manner ὅσπερ occurs with ἤγείσθαι in the
LXX. Comp. Job xix. 11, xxxiii. 10.

Ver. 16. The apostle, hastening to a conclusion, annexes a
benediction to the exhortation. By ὁ κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης is
meant not God, but Christ, and the genitive designates Him
as the Creator and Producer of εἰρήνη. — τῆς εἰρήνης and
τῆν εἰρήνην] are usually interpreted, either of mutual har-
mony or of peace of mind (or even, as e.g. by Schott, of both
together, external and internal peace). The first-mentioned
interpretation is untenable, because there is in the Epistle not
the slightest trace of dissensions in the church; and the shift
that the fanatical excitement in the church, and the idleness
consequent upon it, might lead to external disquiet, and
accordingly the wish of the apostle was occasioned with a
view to the future, is far-fetched and arbitrary, because
Paul prays for what was immediately to occur. There is
nothing against the second interpretation, as calmness of mind
or peace of soul is undoubtedly indicated by εἰρήνη (Phil.
iv. 7). See Meyer and Weiss in loco. Yet it is also admis-
sible to understand εἰρήνη both times (corresponding to the
Hebrew דְּבָרָי; see Fritzsche, ad Rom. i. p. 22 ff.) in the sense
of salvation or blessing, and, indeed, on account of the article τῆς
and τῆν, of the definite,—that is to say, the specifically
Christian blessing or salvation. This interpretation is also
supported by the fact, that as χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη at the com-
mencement of the apostolic Epistles corresponds to the Salutem
or εὖ πράττειν of profane writers, so the apostolic benediction
at the conclusion of the Epistles is nothing else than the
Christian transformation of the usual Valete or ἔρροσθε. — διὰ
παντὸς] always, Rom. xi. 10; Matt. xviii. 10; Acts ii. 25.—
μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν] accordingly even with the ἀτάκτως περι-
πατούντες.

Vv. 17, 18. Autographic salutation, with a repeated benediction.
Paul had not written the letter with his own hand, but dictated it. Comp. Rom. xvi. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Col.
iv. 18. — δὲ] does not stand by attraction for δι, nor also does
it bring forward a simple special point from the foregoing (so Wieseler on Gal. vi. 11; and Laurent in the Stud. u. Krit. 1864, p. 639; Neutestam. Studien, Gotha 1866, p. 5: "which, namely, the autographic writing"), but it refers to the whole preceding idea: which circumstance of the salutation now written. — σημείον] a sign, i.e. a mark of authenticity. Comp. ii. 2. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Bullinger, Estius, Piscator, Menochius, Cornelius a Lapide, Er. Schmid, Beza, Joachim Lange, Harduin, Benson, Bengel, Moldenhauer, Zachariae, Baur (Paulus, p. 489), Hofmann, Riggenbach, and most critics, incorrectly find this mark in the addition of the words following in ver. 18; for the autographic salutation is expressly designated as this mark. But a salutation and a benediction are different from each other. — εν πάσῃ ἐσιστολῇ] in every Epistle, can only be referred to all the Epistles which the apostle has, perhaps, at a later period, still to write to the Thessalonians. For only for the Thessalonians, who had already been actually deceived by a false Pauline Epistle, and led into error, was such a precaution of practical importance against a new deception. Besides, if εν πάσῃ ἐσιστολῇ is to be understood absolutely instead of relatively, the autographic salutation would be found in all the Epistles of the apostle. But it is only found in 1 Cor. xvi. 21 and Col. iv. 18. — οὕτως γράφω] thus—that is to say, in such characters as are given in vv. 17 and 18—I write. The handwriting of the apostle was accordingly still unknown to the readers. From this it follows, that also the First Epistle to the Thessalonians was not written by the apostle's own hand. Moreover, Zeltner (de monogrammate Pauli, Altorfii 1721), Bengel, and Moldenhauer erroneously—because transferring a modern custom into antiquity—consider that we are here to think on characters artificially twisted into a monogram by the apostle and rendered incapable of imitation. Against Zeltner, see Wolf, p. 402 ff.
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'Fresh, vigorous, learned, and eminently thoughtful.'—Contemporary Review.
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'We have nothing but praise for its clearness, its method, its thoroughness, and its tolerance. We most warmly commend Mr. Cave's book to the study of the clergy, who will find it full of suggestiveness and instruction.'—English Churchman.
'A thoroughly able and erudite book, from almost every page of which something may be learned. The Author's method is exact and logical, the style perspicuous and forcible—sometimes, indeed, almost epigrammatic; and, as a careful attempt to ascertain the teaching of the Scripture on an important subject, it cannot fail to be interesting even to those whom it does not convince.'—Watchman.
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