1 THESS 2:13–16: LINGUISTIC
EVIDENCE FOR AN INTERPOLATION°

DARYL SCHMIDT

Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, TX 76129

The peculiarities of 1 Thess 2:13–16, in both form and content, have caused biblical scholars to offer a variety of explanations of how this section fits into the thought and structure of 1 Thessalonians. We will look briefly at those explanations and then suggest that the linguistic evidence favors the interpolation hypothesis.

I

Many of the issues involved in explaining this passage have already been cogently set forth by Birger Pearson[1] and will not be reconstructed here. Pearson provides evidence from both form and content to support the interpolation hypothesis. Since that hypothesis has been accepted in the recent work of both Hendrikus Boers[2] and Helmut Koester[3] it merits further testing.

Pearson argues mostly from content. The anti-Jewish polemic of v 15 has long raised doubts about its Pauline origins. Pearson shows that, in fact, the whole section is better located after A.D. 70. By treating the section as an interpolation, he then shows that form-critical problems associated with this passage are more easily solved.

The major problem for any analysis of the form of the letter has been the second "thanksgiving" formula in 2:13. Paul Schubert argued

° This paper incorporates research originally prepared for the Seminar on the Thessalonian Correspondence, SBL. I would like to thank my seminar colleagues, especially Helmut Koester and chairman William Baird, for their encouragement to pursue this line of investigation.

[1] "1 Thessalonians 2:13–16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation," *HTR* 64 (1971) 79–94. Many of the arguments are also reviewed in Ernest Best, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (London: A. and C. Black, 1972) 29–35.

[2] "The Form Critical Study of Paul's Letters. I Thessalonians as a Case Study," *NTS* 22 (1975–76) 140–58.

[3] "I Thessalonians—Experiment in Christian Writing," in *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History* (ed. F. F. Church and T. George; Leiden: Brill, 1979) 33–44.

for a thanksgiving section from 1:2 through 3:13, but had to call it "highly complex," of "excessive length," with "the absence of a formal transition" between 2:16 and 17, with "some extraneous matter" in 2:14–16, which as a whole also "constituted the main body" of the letter.[4] When further form-critical work established 1:10 as the end of the initial "thanksgiving" section[5] and 2:17 as the beginning of the "apostolic parousia,"[6] 2:1–12 emerged as the initial section of the "body" of the letter, leading quite naturally to 2:17ff., and leaving 2:13–16 as an intrusion.[7] This becomes a more plausible explanation than a theory which treats 2:13 as the beginning of a second letter that has been conflated by a later editor,[8] especially since such a theory cannot account for the admitted "difficulties" presented by the content of 2:15–16.[9] In contrast, Pearson shows how the content could well be contemporary with the perspective of several post-70 Matthean passages.[10]

II

The primary alternative explanation for the apparently non-Pauline nature of 1 Thess 2:13–16 is that Paul is using traditional material. R. Schippers offers arguments for treating this as "pre-synoptic" tradition.[11] He argues "on formal and material grounds" that this passage is closer to typical synoptic passages and is "unusual" for Paul.[12] In the process Schippers confirms many of the arguments which are given in support of the interpolation hypothesis. Schippers nonetheless claims that Paul is "creatively handling" and "has completely incorporated the pre-synoptic tradition into his letter."[13] This claim cannot explain, however, the form-critical problems noted above regarding the structure of the letter. A more serious challenge as to how well Paul "completely incorporated" this material into his letter can be seen when we consider the linguistic evidence.

[4] P. Schubert, *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgiving* (BZNW 20; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1939) 23–26.

[5] J. T. Sanders, "The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letters of the Pauline Corpus," *JBL* 81 (1962) 348–62, especially 355–56.

[6] R. W. Funk, "The Apostolic *Parousia*: Form and Significance," in *Christian History and Interpretation* (ed. W. R. Farmer et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1967) 249–68.

[7] Pearson, "Interpolation," 90–91.

[8] W. Schmithals, "The Historical Situation of the Thessalonian Epistles," in *Paul and the Gnostics* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1972) 123–218, especially 179–80.

[9] Ibid., 180.

[10] Pearson, "Interpolation," 92–94. Further evidence for this can be seen in the development of the allegorical interpretation of the Parable of the Wicked Tenants, not only in Matthew (21:33–46), but also in Luke (20:9–19).

[11] "The Pre-Synoptic Tradition in I Thessalonians II 13–16," *NovT* 8 (1966) 223–34.

[12] Ibid., 232.

[13] Ibid., 224, 233.

III

Biblical scholars most often cite "linguistic evidence" in discussions about literary authenticity and integrity, two issues which arise in the Thessalonian correspondence. The evidence usually consists of lists of words and phrases.[14] More recently, computer-aided "stylistic analysis" has been attempting to go beyond vocabulary considerations to the use of statistics on sentence-length and common-word frequency.[15] Such statistics, however, are of very limited usefulness in the analysis of a short passage such as 1 Thess 2:13–16. The word-by-word and phrase-by-phrase approach found in the commentaries[16] usually results in inconclusive evidence, often because of the lack of appropriate linguistic criteria. What constitutes Pauline or non-Pauline use of vocabulary? What are typical Pauline and non-Pauline grammatical constructions? How many non-Pauline words and constructions make a passage non-Pauline? What is the Pauline "style"?

These questions can be approached differently today than a generation ago because of the advances of contemporary linguistics and the accompanying changes in the understanding of language and grammar. The contemporary focus has shifted significantly to syntax at the sentence level, which directly affects the very definition of literary "style."[17] One implication of this new focus that we would like to pursue is the possibility of discerning the "syntactical pattern" of a text or of an author's style.[18] This would involve three levels of syntactical relationships: (1) the formation of noun and verb phrases, including those traditionally called "clauses," (2) the sequence of phrases in a sentence, and (3) the connection between sentences. While work is still progressing on how best to formalize and present this data, the schema adopted here (see the Appendix) will allow us to make some observations about (1) and to focus on (2) and (3).

In order to see 2:13–16 in the context of the structure of the letter, we have taken the entire section of 1 Thess 1:2–3:10, that is, everything between the opening greeting and the benediction which concludes the pre-exhortation section. The Greek text[19] is presented in such a way so

---

[14] See J. E. Frame, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians* (ICC 38; New York: Scribner's, 1912) 28–34.

[15] See Best, *Thessalonians*, 25.

[16] See the appropriate sections of Frame, *Thessalonians*, and Best, *Thessalonians*.

[17] For example, see N. E. Enkvist, *Linguistic Stylistics* (The Hague: Mouton, 1973) and W. O. Hendricks, *Grammars of Style and Styles of Grammar* (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1976).

[18] See Daryl Schmidt, "Pauline Syntax: The Transformational Patterns of 1–2 Thess," an unpublished paper presented to the Consultation (now Seminar) on the Thessalonian Correspondence at the 1977 meeting of the SBL.

[19] Following the third edition of the *UBSGNT*.

as to feature especially the sequence of embedded sentences (tradition-
ally called "dependent clauses"). Each embedded sentence is indented
under the sentence to which it has a syntactical connection, and the
embedding device for each one is underlined. The conjunctions connecting
matrix sentences (= "main clauses") have been placed in the left-hand
column, and some noun phrases and prepositional phrases have been
reduced to NP and PP, respectively, to allow each entire sentence, matrix
or embedded, to appear together on one numbered line. The only apparent
exceptions to placing each embedded sentence on a separate line are
parenthetical constructions (e.g., καθὼς οἴδατε), and lexicalized participles
(e.g., ὁ πιστεύων = *believer*), since their location has to do with the syntax
of the individual sentence and not with the sequence of sentences.

In our schema lines 1–22 present the opening thanksgiving section. It
consists of three independent sentences connected by γάρ. The first one
begins the thanksgiving formula proper, and it has three embedded sen-
tences under it (lines 2–4), each one using the participial embed. The
third embed has its own ὅτι-embed, which in turn has an embed (line 6)
that has an embed (line 7). Line 8 is conjoined to line 5 and again has
several layers of embedding under it. Thus while the first complete sen-
tence has nine embeds, only the last one (line 11) is embedded as deeply
as the fifth level, and in fact, it is a version of the lexicalized participle
believer which, as such, need not be treated as an embed, leaving only
four levels of embedding. The second sentence (lines 12–15) and the
third sentence (lines 16–22) are both shorter, with fewer embeds and
fewer levels of embedding, and in the case of the third sentence, with
embedding done in pairs.

In the choice of embedding device (COMP), this section has slightly
fewer embeds that use a complementizer (+COMP), an initial word such
as ὅτι, ὅς or καθώς, than it does embeds that use participle or infinitive
forms (–COMP).[20] Such forms could appear anywhere in the embedded
sentence, but here they are always placed near the very beginning of the
embed.

The same basic pattern continues in the opening of the body of the
letter, 2:1–12 (lines 23–57). The conjunction connecting the matrix sen-
tences is again γάρ, though the sentences that begin at lines 41, 47 and
50 have no conjunction. The embedding also shows the same features,
with no embedding beyond four levels, even in the long, final sentence
(lines 50–57), and with a slight preference for –COMP embeds, which
continue to be placed early in the embedded sentence, with the excep-
tion of line 47.

---

[20] For the designations +COMP and –COMP see Daryl Schmidt, *Hellenistic Greek
Grammar and Noam Chomsky: Nominalizing Transformations* (SBLDS 62; Chico:
Scholars, 1981) 42.

The section 2:17–3:10 (lines 76–114) shows the same pattern that we have outlined. The primary conjunction is still γάρ, though several others are also used. No sentence is yet as long as the opening thanksgiving sentence, nor has more than four levels of embedding. The embedding still favors –COMP, which is placed early, except in line 112 and that, interestingly, has the same νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας construction placed first as line 47, the only other exception. This summary, then, clearly emerges as the syntactical pattern of these undisputed sections of 1 Thess 1:2–3:10. It is now appropriate to analyze the disputed section in comparison with this pattern.

<div align="center">IV</div>

The second "thanksgiving" section, 2:13–16 (lines 58–75), is dominated by two sentences, lines 58–62 and the long sentence in lines 63–74, while line 75 is a separate sentence whose contents indicate that it has the same source as lines 67–74.

The first sentence is immediately noticeable for its use of the conjunction καί. Nowhere else in 1 Thessalonians is καί used to connect two matrix sentences, and no other undisputed letter of Paul uses the construction καὶ διὰ τοῦτο (though it is imitated in 2 Thess 2:11). The thanksgiving formula used here is an abbreviation of the opening one in 1:2–5, but more importantly, it is also the second of the two types that Paul developed,[21] having a content ὅτι-embed instead of participles, similar to Rom 1:8 and 1 Cor 1:4, and the type imitated in 2 Thess 1:3 and 2:13.

The second sentence is even more out of harmony with the pattern of the larger section. It has more embeds than any other sentence in the whole section, and significantly more levels of embedding (seven). While it still favors –COMP embeds, they tend to come *last* in the embedded sentence (lines 67–69, 72). Furthermore, lines 67–70 become a litany of conjoined embeds, whereas elsewhere we find only conjoined pairs of embeds (lines 17–18, 19–20, 91–92, 102–3, 113–14). Line 73 is the only instance of a +COMP embed using ἵνα in the entire first three chapters. Other unusual features in the embeds include the separation of the nouns κύριον and Ἰησοῦν by the participle in line 67, when elsewhere in Paul they always appear together. Clearly, then, whatever else we say about lines 67–74 (vv 15–16b), they are not "completely incorporated" into the syntactical pattern of the rest of this larger section. In contrast, the syntax of these lines deviates as much from the surrounding pattern as does the content.

Since not all versions of the interpolation hypothesis include vv 13

---

[21] Schubert, *Form*, 35.

and 14,[22] we need to look more closely at the internal syntax of these verses. The matrix sentence of v 14 has the same syntax as line 8: ὑμεῖς μιμηταὶ +NP^g ἐγενήθητε. However, the genitive noun phrase added to μιμηταί (+NP^g) in line 63 is placed *after* ἐγενήθητε and it has its own genitive NP: τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ. Furthermore, it is expanded with an embedded adnominal participle (line 64) having two prepositional phrases (PP). The first PP is locative and the second PP is the Pauline expression ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

The complete noun phrase can be analyzed as a combination of three different Pauline constructions:

τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν [₁τοῦ θεοῦ] [₂τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ] [₃ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ].

The noun ἐκκλησία is followed by (1) a genitive NP, (2) the adnominal equative participle with a locative PP, and (3) the "in-Christ" PP. Each of the three constructions is Pauline, but the combination of all three is not.

The first two constructions form the address for the Corinthian letters (1 Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 1:1):

τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ [₁τοῦ θεοῦ] [₂τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ].

Elsewhere Paul uses the genitive NP to express the geographical location, and in Gal 1:22 he combines that with a version of (3):

ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις [₁τῆς Ἰουδαίας] [₃ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ].

A genitive NP is used for location similarly in 1 Cor 16:1, 19; 2 Cor 8:1; Gal 1:2; 1 Thess 1:1.

A third combination of constructions in a Pauline greeting is found in Phil 1:1:

τοῖς ἁγίοις [₃ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] [₂τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις].

Here the Pauline expression in (3) is used first and then (2) is used for the geographical designation. Other variations of this combination are found in Eph 1:1 and Col 1:2, the latter without the participle; and Rom 1:7 uses only (2). Therefore, in the rest of the Pauline addresses and church location designations, various combinations of these three constructions are used, but never all three. A possible explanation is that in the process of imitating Paul, someone has put together here an overly-Pauline construction.

Another feature of the matrix sentence in line 63 is the position of ἀδελφοί. Paul frequently uses the vocative ἀδελφοί, especially with ὑμεῖς (or the second person plural verb ending). It occurs in 1 Thess 1:4; 2:1, 19;

---

[22] Pearson, "Interpolation," 80.

another ten times after 2:14, and over 40 times in Romans, 1–2 Corin-
thians, Galatians and Philippians. What is noteworthy about its use in 1
Thess 2:14 is its position between μιμηταὶ ἐγενήθητε and τῶν ἐκκλη-
σιῶν . . . , the long genitive construction which belongs with μιμηταί. In
the more than 50 times that Paul uses the vocative ἀδελφοί, it always comes
at a natural syntactical break in the sentence, such as between complete
noun phrases, not between parts of the same noun phrase. The one instance
which might be an exception is also textually uncertain: namely, 1 Cor
15:31, where the vocative comes between an NP and its embedded relative
sentence. However, the relative pronoun, as +COMP, functions as the
syntactical device which begins the embed and, therefore, is the beginning
of a separate syntactical unit whose function is clearly indicated by the
gender-number ending of the relative pronoun.[23] In 1 Thess 2:14 there is
no such syntactical break for the vocative. Instead, it separates the genitive
NP τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν . . . from its head noun μιμηταί, rather than being in
front of the head noun, where we frequently find it in Paul.

When we consider the internal syntax of 2:13, we also find some
features not typical of Paul. The most troublesome construction in the
verse[24] is the noun phrase following the participle in line 60:

$$\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{o}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\sigma\nu\ [_1\dot{\alpha}\kappa\sigma\hat{\eta}\varsigma]\ [_2\pi\alpha\rho'\ \dot{\eta}\mu\hat{\omega}\nu]\ [_3\tau\sigma\hat{\upsilon}\ \theta\epsilon\sigma\hat{\upsilon}].$$

The relationship of the three components to the head noun is not clear.
Because of its position, (1) must be taken with the head noun immediately
preceding it, probably in the sense of "what is heard" (= the content of
preaching), as in Rom 10:16–17 and Gal 3:2, 15, and thus like the expres-
sion in Heb 4:2 ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς. The position of (2) then suggests that it is
connected with (1), though its use here may also have been influenced by
παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν in 4:1 (which is imitated in 2 Thess 3:6).[25]

The syntactical position of (3) is even more difficult.[26] It cannot
meaningfully be related to (2) and would be very awkward associated
with (1),[27] so it is usually connected with the head noun. Paul does use

[23] The textual evidence for omitting ἀδελφοί (P[46] D G Ψ 1739) may suggest that even
this much of a syntactical connection was considered by some scribes too close to allow a
proper break for a vocative. Of course, if the evidence for the omission is accepted, our
case is even stronger.

[24] N. Turner cites this verse, along with Rom 11:3, which is taken from the LXX and,
therefore, an inappropriate example, to illustrate one of the "harsh" features of Paul's
style: "the removal of words from their logical order" (*Style*, vol. IV of J. H. Moulton, *A
Grammar of New Testament Greek* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976] 85).

[25] In fact, Frame (*Thessalonians*, 107) and Best (*Thessalonians*, 111) both treat the
construction the same as 4:1: "received from us."

[26] Frame notes "the striking position of τοῦ θεοῦ (which leads P to put παρ' ἡμῶν before
λόγον ἀκοῆς and induces Schmiedel to consider τοῦ θεοῦ a gloss)" (107).

[27] Best chooses to connect (3) with (1) and renders the whole phrase "you received from
us the word of the message of God" (109). The position of (2) makes this highly unlikely.

(3) with λόγος in Rom 9:6; 1 Cor 14:36; 2 Cor 2:17, but never with "receive," though Luke uses it in that way in Acts 8:14; 11:1. The λόγον θεοῦ in line 61 makes clear that λόγον θεοῦ is also the content here. However, this is noticeably in contrast to the rest of 1 Thessalonians where Paul talks about λόγος κυρίου (1:8; 4:15), but not about λόγος θεοῦ.

Consequently, line 60 can be analyzed as an amalgamation of several different "Pauline" constructions, each one found somewhere in the Pauline corpus, but the final combination itself is not typical of Pauline syntax.

<center>V</center>

In summary: the content of 2:13–16 does not fit well into 1 Thessalonians, nor into Pauline thought in general; formally this section intrudes into the overall structure of the whole letter; and finally, the linguistic evidence suggests that it did not come from the same author as the rest of the letter, but is rather built around a conflation of Pauline expressions. Therefore, the interpolation hypothesis seems to be the best explanation for all three of these matters, especially since Birger Pearson has already offered a very plausible setting for such an interpolation.

Appendix

1 Thess 1:2–3:10

1	² εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν
2	μνείαν ποιούμενοι ἐπὶ προσευχῶν ἡμῶν ἀδιαλείπτως
3	³μνημονεύοντες ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως καὶ NP καὶ NP PP
4	⁴εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν
5	⁵ὅτι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐγενήθη PP PP μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ . . .
6	καθὼς οἴδατε
7	οἷοι ἐγενήθημεν ἐν ὑμῖν δι᾽ ὑμᾶς
8	⁶καὶ ὑμεῖς μιμηταὶ ἡμῶν ἐγενήθητε καὶ τοῦ κυρίου
9	δεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον PP PP
10	⁷ὥστε γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς τύπον πᾶσιν
11	τοῖς πιστεύουσιν PP καὶ PP.
12 ⁸γὰρ	ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου οὐ μόνον PP καὶ PP
13	ἀλλ᾽ PP ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐξελήλυθεν
14	ὥστε μὴ χρείαν ἔχειν ἡμᾶς
15	λαλεῖν τι.
16 ⁹γὰρ	αὐτοὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν
17	ὁποίαν εἴσοδον ἔσχομεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς
18	καὶ πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων
19	δουλεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ
20	¹⁰καὶ ἀναμένειν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν
21	ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦν
22	τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης.
23 ¹γὰρ	αὐτοὶ, οἴδατε, ἀδελφοί, τὴν εἴσοδον ἡμῶν τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς
24	ὅτι οὐ κενὴ γέγονεν
25	²ἀλλὰ
26	προπαθόντες καὶ ὑβρισθέντες, καθὼς οἴδατε, ἐν Φιλίπποις
27	ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν
28	λαλῆσαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πολλῷ ἀγῶνι.
29 ³γὰρ	ἡ παράκλησις ἡμῶν οὐκ PP οὐδὲ PP οὐδὲ PP
30	⁴ἀλλὰ
31	καθὼς δεδοκιμάσμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ
32	πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον
33	οὕτως λαλοῦμεν
34	οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκοντες ἀλλὰ θεῷ
35	τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν.
36 ⁵γὰρ	οὔτε ποτε ἐν λόγῳ κολακείας ἐγενήθημεν, καθὼς οἴδατε, οὔτε PP, θεὸς μάρτυς,
37	⁶οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν οὔτε PP οὔτε PP
38	⁷δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι
39	ὡς Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι
40	ἀλλὰ ἐγενήθημεν νήπιοι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν.
41	ὡς ἐὰν τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα
42	⁸οὕτως ὁμειρόμενοι ὑμῶν
43	εὐδοκοῦμεν
44	μεταδοῦναι ὑμῖν οὐ μόνον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ καὶ NP

45   διότι ἀγαπητοὶ ἡμῖν ἐγενήθητε.

46 [9]γάρ   μνημονεύετε, ἀδελφοί, τὸν κόπον ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν μόχθον.

47   νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργαζόμενοι

48   πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα ὑμῶν

49   ἐκηρύξαμεν εἰς ὑμᾶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ.

50   [10]ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες καὶ ὁ θεός

51   ὡς ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐγενήθημεν

52   [11]καθάπερ οἴδατε

53   ὡς ἕνα ἕκαστον ὑμῶν

54   ὡς πατὴρ τέκνα ἑαυτοῦ

55   [12]παρακαλοῦντες ὑμᾶς καὶ παραμυθούμενοι καὶ μαρτυρόμενοι

56   εἰς τὸ περιπατεῖν ὑμᾶς ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ

57   τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς PP. . . .

58[13]καὶ   διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ ἀδιαλείπτως

59   ὅτι

60   παραλαβόντες λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ

61   ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ, καθώς ἐστιν ἀληθῶς, λόγον θεοῦ

62   ὃς καὶ ἐνεργεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν.

63[14]γὰρ   ὑμεῖς μιμηταὶ ἐγενήθητε, ἀδελφοί, τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ

64   τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

65   ὅτι τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπάθετε καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων συμφυλετῶν

66   καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων

67   [15]τῶν καὶ τὸν κύριον ἀποκτεινάντων Ἰησοῦν

68   καὶ τοὺς προφήτας καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐκδιωξάντων

69   καὶ θεῷ μὴ ἀρεσκόντων

70   καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐναντίων

71   [16]κωλυόντων ἡμᾶς

72   τοῖς ἔθνεσιν λαλῆσαι

73   ἵνα σωθῶσιν

74   εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρῶσαι NP. . . .

75 δὲ   ἔφθασεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος.

76[17]δέ   ἡμεῖς, ἀδελφοί,

77   ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας προσώπῳ οὐ καρδίᾳ

78   περισσοτέρως ἐσπουδάσαμεν

79   τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν ἰδεῖν ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ

80   [18]διότι ἠθελήσαμεν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος . . .

81   καὶ ἐνέκοψεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς.

82[19]γὰρ   τίς ἡμῶν ἐλπὶς ἢ χαρὰ ἢ στέφανος καυχήσεως, ἢ οὐχὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς, PP PP;

83[20]γάρ   ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά.

84 [1]διὸ   μηκέτι στέγοντες

85   εὐδοκήσαμεν

86   καταλειφθῆναι ἐν Ἀθήναις μόνοι

87   [2]καὶ ἐπέμψαμεν Τιμόθεον τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν καὶ συνεργὸν τοῦ θεοῦ PP

88   εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλέσαι ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν

89   [3]τὸ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν ταύταις.

90 γὰρ   αὐτοὶ οἴδατε

91   ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο κείμεθα.

92 [4]γὰρ   καὶ ὅτε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἦμεν

93   προελέγομεν ὑμῖν

94   ὅτι μέλλομεν θλίβεσθαι

95   καθὼς καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ οἴδατε.

96 [5]διὰ   τοῦτο κἀγὼ

97   μηκέτι στέγων

98   ἔπεμψα

99   εἰς τὸ γνῶναι τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν

100   μή πως ἐπείρασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων

101   καὶ εἰς κενὸν γένηται ὁ κόπος ἡμῶν.

102 [6]δὲ   ἄρτι ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν

103   καὶ εὐαγγελισαμένου ἡμῖν τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ὑμῶν

104   καὶ ὅτι ἔχετε μνείαν ἡμῶν ἀγαθὴν πάντοτε

105   ἐπιποθοῦντες ἡμᾶς ἰδεῖν

106   καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς

107   [7]διὰ τοῦτο παρεκλήθημεν, ἀδελφοί, ἐφ᾽ ὑμῖν ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ ἀνάγκῃ καὶ NP PP

108   [8]ὅτι νῦν ζῶμεν

109   ἐὰν ὑμεῖς στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ.

110 [9]γὰρ   τίνα εὐχαριστίαν δυνάμεθα τῷ θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι PP ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ χαρᾷ

111   ᾗ χαίρομεν δι᾽ ὑμᾶς ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν

112   [10]νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ δεόμενοι

113   εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν ὑμῶν τὸ πρόσωπον

114   καὶ καταρτίσαι τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν;