the first. For it also is written in the conjoined names of Silvanus and Timotheus, who were still with Paul, while we must understand from Acts xviii. 18 that after Paul’s departure from Corinth they ceased to be his companions. The occasion of this epistle seems especially to have arisen from the circumstance that the church had been put into fear and anxiety about the advent of Christ, perhaps by a pretended letter from Paul. Two passages point to the existence of such a thing : in ii. 2, Paul says that the church shall not let itself be alarmed “ by word or by letter as from us ” *(i.e.,* nominally coming from us), and in iii. 17 again Paul lays emphasis on his signature by his own hand as the token (of genuineness) to be noticed in each letter. In any case the chief aim of the epistle is to tran­quillize the church concerning the advent of Christ, which is not yet immediately imminent. He particularly exhorts them not to let themselves be shaken in mind, as that the day of Christ is at hand (ii. 1, 2). For before this day comes the “ man of sin ” must first appear, who seats himself in the temple of God, and gives himself out for God (ii. 3-5). And he too is for the present kept back by another power (ii. 6, 7). Only when the latter is taken out of the way shall “ that wicked ” be revealed, and the great falling away shall follow (ii. 8-12).

The genuineness of the two epistles has not remained unquestioned by the newer criticism. Baur declared him­self against the genuineness of both epistles,@@1 and he is followed by Van der Vies@@2 and several others.@@3 But in general the predominant opinion of impartial criticism at present is that the genuineness of the first epistle is certain, while that of the second must be given up.

This is the opinion of Hilgenfeld (Z. f. wiss. Theol., 1862, p. 225-264; 1866, p. 295-301; 1869, p. 441 sq.·, 1870, p. 244 sq.), Van Manen (Onderzoek naar de echtheid van Paulus tweeden brief aan de Thessalonicensen, Utrecht, 1865), S. Davidson (Introd. to the New Testament, 2d ed., 1882, i. 4—16, 336-351), Weizsäcker {Das apostolische Zeitalter, 1886, p. 249-261); and Holtzmann also leans to the same view, without, however, definitely commit­ting himself (Einl. in d. N. T., 2d ed., 1886, p. 233-241). The genuineness of the first epistle is vindicated by Lipsius {Theol. St. u. Kr., 1854, p. 905-934), Von Soden (ibid., 1885, p. 263-310), and Paul Schmidt (Der erste Thessalonicherbriefneuerklärt, Berlin, 1885), while, on the other hand, Kern (Tubing. Zeitschr. f. Theol., 1839, ii. 145-214) and Bahnsen (Jahrb. fur prot. Theol., 1880, p. 681-705) attack that of the second. Grimm (Theol. St. u. Kr., 1850, p. 753-816) and Westrik (De echtheid van den tweeden brief aan de Thessalonicensen, Utrecht, 1879) have entered the lists for the genuineness of both epistles.

The final decision of the newer criticism is justified by the evidence. No real difficulties can be brought against the genuineness of the first epistle, but they certainly can against that of the second. When Baur finds that the epistles lack the characteristic Pauline ideas, he is only so far right that the doctrine of justification by faith is not dealt with, for which, however, no occasion arises. It has been asserted that there are traces of imitation of the epistles to the Corinthians, but the points of resemblance are not such as to justify this conclusion. The connexion of the passage in 1 Thess. ii. 16 (the wrath of God is already come upon the Jews) with the destruction of Jerusalem rests on an arbitrary, nay false, interpretation. And it cannot be maintained on impartial examination that in 1 Thess. ii. 14, 15, the Jewish churches of Palestine are set forth in a way unlike Paul, as an example for the heathen churches.

The objections to the second epistle are much weightier, though here also not all the arguments adduced by hostile

critics are valid. It has been often said that the author, like the author of the Apocalypse, regards Nero as the Antichrist, expecting him to reappear as the arch-enemy of Christ. But this interpretation of the short statement of our epistle cannot be proved. The assumption that before the dawn of salvation godlessness would reach its height, through the appearance of an arch-enemy of God and His church is, so to speak, a dogmatic postulate which rests on the prophecies of Daniel and other prophets of the Old Testament. And, in so far as the picture of this arch­enemy is endowed with historical features, they can quite as well have been drawn from Caligula as from Nero. For Caligula had already laid claim to the honours of a god, and because of this appeared to the Jews to be the embodiment of godlessness. The assumption of such an Antichrist would not be striking in Paul. Even if it is correct (as is generally and with reason taken for granted) that by the hindrance which keeps back the appearance of Antichrist (2 Thess. ii. 6, 7) the established might of the Roman emperor and empire is to be under­stood, this view would be quite in keeping with Paul’s views about the Roman dominion (Rom. xiii. 1-7). Yet it must be conceded that the statements on this head create real difficulty, if we compare them with those of the first epistle, in which all stress is laid on the fact that the day of the Lord comes as a thief in the night, and that man must be prepared for it at any moment (1 Thess. v. 1-11). In the second epistle it is pointed out with equal emphasis that the day of the Lord is not immediately imminent, and that certain events must come first (2 Thess. ii. 1-10). It is certainly very striking that Paul, so soon after the admonitions of the first kind, should have given the quieting assurances of the second. And 2 Thess. ii. 2 and iii. 7 can hardly be explained except by the supposition that the readers had been thrown into alarm by a pretended epistle from Paul. Could this have been dared in that early time, almost under the eyes of the apostle ? Finally, it is not to be denied that the style of the second epistle is different from that of the first, and that the contents often appear a mere imitation, except in the eschatological passages on account of which it was written. It must therefore be admitted that weighty if not conclusive considerations have been produced against its genuineness. (e. s\*.)

THESSALONICA. See Salonica.

THESSALY is the district of northern Greece which intervenes between Macedonia and the more purely Hellenic countries towards the south, and between the upland region of Epirus and the Ægean Sea. It forms an irregular square, extending for about sixty miles in each direction, and this area, which is for the most part level, is enclosed by well-marked boundaries—by the Cambunian Mountains on the north, and by Othrys on the south, while on its western side runs the massive chain of Pindus, which is the backbone of this part of Greece, and towards the east Ossa and Pelion stand in a continuous line ; at the north-eastern angle Olympus rises, and is the keystone of the whole mountain system. The elevation of some of the summits in these ranges is considerable, for three of the peaks of Pindus are over 5000 feet, and Olympus, Ossa, and Pelion reach respectively the height of 9754, 6407, and 5310 feet. The country that is contained within these limits is drained by a single river, the Peneius, which, together with the water of its numerous confluents, passes into the sea through the Vale of Tempe. This place, which the Greeks were accustomed to associate with rural delights, is a chasm, cloven in the rocks, as the fable tells us, by the trident of Poseidon, between Olympus and Ossa ; but though it possesses every element of the sublime, yet its features are soft and beautiful, from the

@@@1 Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi, 1845, and Theologische Jahr­bücher, 1855, p. 141-168, reprinted in 2d ed. of Paulus, ii. 341-369.

@@@2 De beide brieven aan de Thessalonicensen, Leyden, 1865.

@@@3 Holsten also (Jahrb. f. prot. Theol., 1877, p. 731 sq.) and Steck (Jahrb. f. prot. Theol, 1883, p. 509-524) dispute the genuineness of the first epistle, presupposing the spuriousness of the second.