

## *THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF APOLLOS.*

### II.

#### AN ATTEMPT TO FIX THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

I. IT seems hardly short of a paradox to attempt to construct a biography of Apollos out of the scanty materials which the New Testament presents to us. That an Alexandrian Jew arrived at Ephesus in A.D. 54 or 55, that he went to Corinth shortly afterwards, that he is heard of again at Ephesus, and some ten years later at Crete; these are all the outward facts of his life with which we have to deal. On the assumption—for which as yet I can only plead as for a tenable hypothesis—that we may ascribe to him the authorship of the Book of Wisdom and the Epistle to the Hebrews, we have, it will be admitted, much that throws light on the mind and character of the man. Combining the facts and the hypothesis, estimating the influences which must have been at work on him in the several stages of his life so as to produce the results which, according to the hypothesis, we actually find, we may succeed in bringing together the materials for a picture sufficiently vivid and distinct, which, if it must, from the necessity of the case, renounce the claim to be

received as absolutely historical, will yet serve to explain phenomena and bring them into their right relation to each other. An ideal biography, even if it were wholly fictitious, illustrating the progress by which an Alexandrian Jew was led to embrace the faith of Christ, so far as it represented the currents of thought which were then working on men's minds, would not, I trust, be altogether without interest.

2. We may at least assume without extravagance, at starting, that the teacher who was set by his admirers at Corinth on the same level as St. Paul could not have differed much from him as to age. Had there been any great difference in this respect, it would have been, we may believe, in some way referred to by the historian who describes St. Paul as "a young man," or by the Apostle who dwells upon the "youth" of Timothy. Assuming St. Paul to have been between twenty-one and twenty-eight (the limits, according to Philo, of the age of the *νεανίσκος*) at the death of Stephen, this would make him between forty-three and fifty at the time when the two names of Paul and Apollos are first brought into contact, and we shall therefore not be far wrong in fixing the birth of the latter as somewhere about A.D. 12-19. A Jew born in Alexandria at that period would find himself living in the midst of a community of his own countrymen in a separate quarter of the city, and yet subject to the manifold influences of Greek culture. If he belonged to the class that set a high value on that culture, he would learn grammar and rhetoric from Greek teachers; he would become acquainted, at least, with the terms and main ideas of the forms of Greek philosophy then dominant;

and would read, at least, selected portions of Greek dramatists and poets. Even as a Jew, his education and his worship would differ materially from that of his brethren in Jerusalem. Though still exulting in the old name of Hebrew, the speech of his fathers would be comparatively strange to him. A few etymologies of proper names, more or less accurate, often glaringly inaccurate, would be impressed upon him by his teachers, and, in proportion to his ignorance of the language as a whole, would be treasured up by him as precious. But when he read the Sacred Books of his fathers, it would be in what we have learnt to call the Version of the Seventy. His ignorance of the speech of Palestine would render him unable to correct its numerous errors. It would keep him also from studying the traditions of the elders, the casuistic disputes of Pharisees and Sadducees, of Hillel and of Shammai, in the schools of Jerusalem. The temple at Leontopolis would probably for him take the place of that at Jerusalem.

3. But pre-eminent among the influences at work on the mind of a young and thoughtful Alexandrian Jew at this period would be that of the teaching of Philo.<sup>1</sup> We know but little of the personal history of that illustrious teacher, but it is clear that he must have been the leader of Jewish thought in that city, the founder of a new school of interpretation. His position as brother of the *Alabarches*, or magistrate of the city, indicates his social influence. The fact that he was chosen as delegate of the Jews on the occasion of the special mission to the Emperor Caius is evidence that he was regarded, more than any

<sup>1</sup> Born, *circ.* B.C. 30 ; died, after A.D. 40.

other, as their acknowledged representative; that they looked on him as likely, through his Hellenic culture and persuasive eloquence, to obtain concessions where others would fail to obtain them. And we must acknowledge that the man was eloquent. His extant writings bear every mark of high elaboration. They appear to have been intended for delivery as lectures—the greater part of them as a continuous course of lectures on the Five Books of Moses. He was, so far, the forerunner of the great Masters of the Catechetical school, for which the Church of Alexandria was afterwards famous. Clement and Origen would hardly have been what they were if Philo had not preceded them. While Paul was sitting at the feet of Gamaliel, growing into the strictest Pharisaism, we may think of Apollos as drinking in new knowledge and wider thoughts from the lips of Philo. Every page of the Sacred Records became full of new meanings. The arithmetic, geometry, astronomy of the Greeks were brought to bear upon the history of the Creation in Gen. i., till it was made to read like a page from the *Timæus* of Plato. The literal meaning disappears, and an allegory is found at every step. Paradise is no garden upon earth, but the supreme element (τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν) of the soul; the trees, of which it was full, were the ten thousand thoughts that fill the mind of man; the tree of life was Godliness (θεοσεβεία), that of the knowledge of good and evil was the “neutral understanding” (ἡ φρόνησις ἢ μέση), which hovers on the border-land of vice and virtue. The serpent was but the symbol of pleasure, with its grovelling lusts, crawling on the

ground and eating dirt. The four rivers were but the four great virtues of the Greek schools,—Prudence, Temperance, Fortitude, Justice. With a winning eloquence, he leads his hearers on to these and a thousand like interpretations, as that which would complete their training and raise them out of the state of children (*νήπιοι*), in which they had been governed by rule and precept taken in their literal meaning, to that of full-grown men (*τέλειοι*), who were capable of a higher knowledge. It was obvious that this attempt to make the records of the remote past of the patriarchal age speak the thoughts of the schools of Greece involved the risk of the obliteration of what had been most characteristic in them. The Messianic hopes, which among the Jews of Palestine were growing into ever-clearer distinctness, were almost, if not altogether, absent from those of Alexandria. Of the high calling of the race of Israel, of their probable greatness in the future, Philo has something, though not much, to say; but the thought of a living personal Christ, even as a conquering king, does not come within the horizon of his vision. It is entirely absent even from his interpretation of the Protevangel of Gen. iii. Wisdom, and that a wisdom mainly after the Platonic or Stoic type, is with him the ideal at which man ought to aim, the supreme end of life.

4. We have already seen the extent to which the mind of him whom we assume to be the writer of the two books under review was influenced by this teaching,—how it shewed itself in his adhesion to the Greek Version of the Old Testament, in his allegorizing turn of thought, in his distinction between

elementary and advanced teaching, in the constant recurrence of words and phrases and turns of thought which he who has once been under the spell of a sweet and subtle eloquence never entirely loses. And yet, while we read Philo, we feel, if I mistake not, with whatever admiration for his skill of speech, that his was not the teaching to satisfy a soul that was in very deed in earnest, and had felt the pressure of the world's evil and the conviction of its own sin. His well-rounded periods would be to such an one what the rhetorical morality of Cicero was to Augustine. They wanted the element of enthusiasm, of self-devotion. Philo himself seems, indeed, to have felt this deficiency, and to have pointed to a higher standard than he had himself attained as that for more ardent minds to aim at. He speaks of the Therapeutæ and Essenes (those who gave themselves to the discipline that *heals* the soul) with a glowing fervour, as Grosseteste may have spoken to Roger Bacon of the followers of Francis of Assisi. He describes their simple life: each dwelling in his cell or monastery (the first occurrence, I believe, of a word afterwards so famous); their prayer at sunrise and at evening (comp. *Wisd.* xvi. 28); their study of the Sacred Writings; their simple and temperate meals; their ablutions and anointings; their Sabbath meetings in a common hall, in which men were separated from women; their antiphonal chants; their holy cheerfulness, and, above all, their way of studying the Sacred Books so as to find deeper meanings beneath the allegory of actual facts. Such a life, though not, as Eusebius supposed, essentially Christian, was yet,

like that of the Essenes in Palestine, a *παιδαγωγός εἰς Χριστόν*—a discipline preparing men for the reception of the higher truth and loftier standard of holiness.

5. A man such as we suppose Apollos to have been could hardly fail to be attracted by such a life, could hardly be under its influence (if he joined such a community) without some deepening of his spiritual being, some consciousness of the element in his own nature which rebelled against it, some struggle like that through which St. Paul passed when a bitter experience revealed to him that he had a baser self struggling with his higher mind and bringing him into captivity to the law of sin. But we must remember that an ascetic community of this kind could hardly fail, at the time of which we speak, to come, directly or indirectly, under influences of another kind. The reappearance, on the banks of the Jordan, of the old austere Nazarite life of the Baptist, the rules of action which he imposed on his disciples, his preaching of repentance and of baptism as the outward sign of forgiveness, could not fail to attract the attention of all communities of the Essene type in Palestine or elsewhere. I have elsewhere endeavoured to shew that the history of Manaen,<sup>1</sup> the foster-brother of Herod the Tetrarch, is probably an example of the influence thus widely exercised. I will assume, then, that the waves of the impulse thus given had spread as far as that community of Therapeutæ which I suppose Apollos to have joined, that he had there learned something of the new proclamation that had gone forth from the herald of the Kingdom—something of the death of that

<sup>1</sup> *Biblical Studies*, p. 376.

herald, and of the Just One to whom he had pointed; of the incidents of brutal mockery and outrage which had marked the latter, of the new phrases which were beginning to gain ground among the disciples of both. At this stage of progress, before any distinct preaching of the Gospel of Christ had reached him, I believe the Wisdom of Solomon to have been written. The form of pseudonymous authorship, or, to speak more accurately, of dramatic personation, as a legitimate form of authorship, had, in the judgment of most modern critics, an illustrious precedent in the Book of Ecclesiastes, and did not bring with it the stigma of conscious dishonesty. One who felt that the half-Epicurean half-cynical tone which seems to predominate in the Confessions of the Preacher did but inadequately represent the teaching of the great sage of Israel, and who, with the glowing enthusiasm for virtue which Philo had inspired, wished to shew that the wisdom which Solomon had taught was in harmony with that of those who stood highest among the sages of Greece, would be led, naturally enough, to take him as the mouthpiece through which to utter what he looked on as a message alike to Jew and Heathen.<sup>1</sup>

6. It remains to ask how far the book itself harmonizes with, or suggests, the main facts of this ideal biography. We have already seen that it bears throughout the traces of Alexandrian culture, that it reproduces to a large extent the thoughts and phraseology of Philo. The scholar, like the master,

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted, as in some degree suggestive of the personation, that the Hebrew name by which Philo was known among his own countrymen is said to have been Jedidiah, the name which the prophet Nathan gave to the historical Solomon. (2 Sam. xii. 25.)



dwells much on the workings of the Divine Providence (*Προνοία*); on the excellence of wisdom; on the four great ethical virtues—Justice, Prudence, Fortitude, Temperance (viii. 7); on the energy of the Divine Logos as creative and almighty; on the mystical cosmic symbolism of the High Priest's vestments. He reproduces almost verbally the selfsame arguments on the folly of idolatry. And yet, if I mistake not, in spite of this resemblance, we feel as we read the Wisdom of Solomon that we are in contact with a more real writer. He is less elaborately rhetorical, less artificially ingenious in hunting out mystic meanings in plain facts, and spiritualizes rather than allegorizes history. Both in his treatment of the *Λόγος* and of the Divine work of creation he Platonizes less than Philo. Still more is the influence of such higher teaching as I have assumed traceable in the new elements which appear in the work of the disciple. Philo speaks much of Virtue; but, after the manner of most of his Greek teachers, comparatively little of repentance. In the Book of Wisdom, on the contrary, the thought of repentance is prominent. The long-suffering of God in executing judgment by little and little gave men a "place of repentance" (*τόπος μετανοίας*) (xii. 10). His judgments taught his children to be of a good hope that He gave "repentance for sins" (xii. 19). Philo sees in the serpent of the history of the Fall a symbol of pleasure, and in the sentence of death the loss of the higher life of the intellect, and says nothing of a personal tempter. The Wisdom of Solomon, tracing the evil to its source, affirms that it was "by envy of the devil that death entered into

the world" (ii. 24). So, too, we may note the prominence of words and phrases which ultimately came to have a definite significance in the life of Christians, and which, even in their less definite state, were signs of an advance upon the theology of the Alexandrian lecture-room. "Grace and mercy" (the *χάρις καὶ ἔλεος* of the Pastoral Epistles) "are with the elect of God" (iii. 9; iv. 15). There is a Holy Spirit, that guides and teaches men (i. 5), sent from on high, the gift of God (ix. 17). So the righteous sufferer is shewn the "kingdom of God" (x. 10). The misery of evil-doers is that they know not "the way of the Lord" (v. 7), nor "the mysteries of God" (ii. 22). He sees in the brazen serpent a symbol of salvation, a memorial (*ἀνάμνησις*) of the commandment: "He who turned to it was not saved by the thing which he saw, but by thee, that art the Saviour of all" (xvi. 7). Above all, there is the thought of the Fatherhood of God as loving, correcting, chastising (xi. 9-11); the vivid portraiture of the righteous sufferer, so strangely like the great Pattern and Representative of all such sufferers (ii. 12-20). There are not wanting, however, yet more distinct traces of the influence of the ascetic teaching of the Therapeutæ upon the writer of this book. The very word which gave them their name, and which was almost as technical a term among them as "entering on religion," in the sense of joining a monastic order, was in the speech of mediæval Christendom, is used by him, — "Wisdom delivered from pain those that attended on her" (*τοὺς θεραπεύσαντας αὐτήν*) (x. 9). The thought which Philo ascribes to them, that they led lives of celibacy,

not by constraint, or as deeming marriage to be impure, but as seeking immortal rather than mortal offspring, *i. e.*, the holy thoughts which each soul can produce by itself when the Divine light of the Father has been sown in it (*de Vit. Cont.* p. 616), is precisely that to which the writer of the Book of Wisdom gives a conspicuous place. "Blessed is the barren that is undefiled; . . . she shall have fruit in the visitation of souls" (iii. 13). "Better it is to have no children and to have virtue; for the memorial thereof is immortal: because it is known with God and with men" (iii. 1).

7. Lastly I would call attention to what seems to me the abrupt conclusion of the treatise. The writer appears to have entered on a survey of the history of Israel, works it up to a certain point with an elaborate and rhetorical fulness, and then suddenly stops short. It is as though some change had come over the colour of his thoughts, as though some new conviction had pointed to a new plan of work, and had led him to leave his task unfinished. Is it altogether a wild conjecture that that new impulse came from the knowledge that "the way of the Lord" had been revealed in the form of a special call to repentance, and that it was his work now to be among the preachers of that repentance, who were thus to prepare the way?

8. And so we pass to that which is at least a definite and tangible fact,—the first appearance of Apollos as a worker in the Church of Christ. He then appears as "a certain Jew of Alexandria: an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures, instructed in the way of the Lord, fervent in the spirit, speak-

ing and teaching diligently the things of the Lord," and yet as "knowing only the baptism of John" (Acts xviii. 24). Let us remember what that last limitation implies. It means nothing less than that he to whom it referred had never been in fellowship with the Church of Christ since the new life which came upon it on the day of Pentecost—had no share in the gift of the Spirit, knew nothing of the faith in Christ crucified as the ground of hope, nothing even of the fact of Christ's resurrection. He came simply, as the Baptist had come, as a preacher of repentance, with a high standard of righteousness, and an earnest eloquence in enforcing it. The "things of the Lord" must be taken, like "the way of the Lord," in their widest sense. They may have been what the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls "the first principles of the doctrine of Christ" (note the Alexandrian tone of the phrase, resembling what we find both in Philo and the Book of Wisdom, — τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς), but they did not include even the outlines of the Church's distinctive creed. And so Aquila and Priscilla, when they heard him speak boldly in the synagogue, "took him and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly." We are not told what brought this Alexandrian Jew to Ephesus, nor do I pretend that even the view which I maintain throws much light, if any, upon that question. All that can be said is, that Ephesus seems in some way or other to have been the scene, probably at an earlier date, of a mission-work of the same character. St. Paul, on his return to that city a few months later, finds there certain disciples who had been

baptized only unto John's baptism—who had “not so much as heard whether there was any Holy Ghost” bestowed as the gift of God on those who had believed in Christ. (Acts xix. 2.) The Apostle knew them, it would seem, by their looks or manner of life, by their Essene-like austerity, perhaps by their gloom and depression, perhaps by their holding aloof from the meetings of other disciples. These may, of course, have been among the fruits of the work of Apollos as a preacher; but it seems hardly probable, on that assumption, that their teacher would not have imparted to them the higher knowledge to which he had himself been led; and I incline, therefore, to the belief that we may see in them an independent instance of the wide-spread effect of the preaching of the Baptist. The report that such a work was going on at Ephesus may possibly have reached the Therapeutæ of Egypt, at the time when Apollos was passing through the first stage of conviction, and hence determined the direction of his steps on his first entrance on his new work.

9. In any case, the teaching of Aquila and Priscilla was to him what that of the unnamed monk at Erfurt was to Luther, what that of William Law was to Wesley. They “expounded to him the way of God more perfectly,” and that way of God (note the connection of the phrase with the term *οἱ τῆς οδοῦ*—“those of the way,”—as a synonym for believers in Christ) was, in the nature of things, essentially Pauline. Justification by faith in Christ, the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin, the Messiahship of Jesus, as proved by the correspondence of his life and death with prophecies and types,—this

was what they, the fellow-workers and friends of Paul, must of necessity have imparted to him. And they found in him an apt and ready hearer. They recognized in him one who was qualified to carry on to completion the work which St. Paul had begun, and they sent him to Corinth with letters of commendation, in the assurance that Greeks and Jews there would appreciate the eloquence which he had gained by his Alexandrian culture. And they were not disappointed. He "helped them much that had believed through grace, and mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ," taking, *i. e.*, the very line which was afterwards taken, more exhaustively than in any other portion of the New Testament, in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

10. Of the effect of his work at Corinth, and of its probable connection with the reputation previously gained by the work which I ascribe to him, I have already in part spoken. It is obvious that those who followed him and made him, against his will, the leader of a party, did so on the ground of his higher wisdom and more persuasive eloquence. They liked the composite words, the ring and rhythm of Alexandrian periods, the assonance which emphasizes so many passages in the Wisdom of Solomon, and not a few in the Epistle to the Hebrews.<sup>1</sup> St.

<sup>1</sup> I give the following instances from both Books: I. Compound or new words. (A) Book of Wisdom: Ὑπέρμαχος (x. 20); πολυχρόνιος (ii. 10); πολύφροντις (ix. 15); παντοδύναμος (vii. 23); παντεπίσκοπος (vii. 23); πρωτόπλαστος (vii. 1, 10); ἀδελφοκτόνος (x. 3); γενεσιουργός (xiii. 5); νηποκτόνος (xi. 7); τεκνοφόνος (x. 14, 23); γεμισιάρχης (xiii. 3); κακόμοχθος (xv. 8); βραχυτελής (xv. 9); μετακινᾶσθαι (xvi. 21). (B) Hebrews: υἱοθεοσύνη (ii. 2); σαββατισμὸς (iv. 10); μετριοπαθεῖν (v. 2); δυσερμήνευτος (v. 11); ἀνασταυροῦντας (vi. 6); πληροφορία (vi. 10); ἀμετάθετος (vi. 18);

Paul does not quarrel with his work, does not charge him with any denial or distortion of the Truth; he is content to see in him one who watered where he had planted, who raised the superstructure where he had laid the foundation. He implies, in his allusive manner, that he was quite sure that he himself, as a wise master-builder, had laid the one only foundation,—that he was not equally sure that the superstructure might not contain wood, hay, stubble, as well as the gold, silver, and precious stone which would bear the test of the fire of the great day. As both metaphors were essentially Philonian (pp. 13, 365), not less than that of the milk for babes and the strong meat of wisdom for the full grown man (p. 39), it is probable that in all three there is a latent reference to phrases that had been used by

γενεαλογούμενος (vii. 6); μεγαλωσύνη (viii. 1); αντίτυπα (ix. 24); μίσθαποδότης (xi. 6); ἀναλογίσασθε (xii. 3); αίματεχυσία (ix. 22); πανήγυις (xii. 23); χρηματίσονται (xii. 25); ἀσάλευτος (xii. 28); ἀφιλάργυρος (xiii. 5). II. Assonance and oxymoron. (A) Book of Wisdom: Παροδέσω—συνοδέσω (vi. 22); εὐμαθῶς—εὐπρεπῶς (xiii. 11); στενοχωριαν—στεναζόντες (v. 3); ποταμοί—ἀποτόμῳς (v. 23); μύσους—μύστας (xii. 6); προσδοσια—προσδοκία (xvii. 12); ἰδιάς αἰδιότητος, or ἰδιότητος (ii. 23), κ. τ. λ. (B) Hebrews: πολυμίρως καὶ πολυτρόπως (i. 1); παράβασις καὶ παρακοή (ii. 2); δὲ ὄν τὰ πάντα καὶ δὲ ὄν τὰ πάντα (ii. 10); πειρασθεῖς—τοῖς πειραζομένοις (ii. 18); ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν (v. 8); καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ (v. 14); ἀνακαινίζειν—ἀνασταυροῦντας (vi. 6); διακονήσαντες καὶ διακονοῦντες (vi. 10); ἀπάτωρ—ἀμήτωρ (vii. 3); μετέσχηκεν—προέσχηκεν (vii. 13); ἀσθενές καὶ ἀνωφελές (vii. 18); βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι (ix. 10); διαθήκη—διαθεμένου (ix. 16)†; τῶν ὑπαρχόντων—ὑπαρξῶν (x. 34); μετετέθη—μετέθηκεν—μεταθέσεως (xi. 5); ἀόρατον ὡς ὄρων (xi. 27); ἐξ ἀναστάσεως—κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως (xi. 34). I might add (III.), as common to both books, the rhetorical use of a series of adjectives or verbs without a conjunction, of which we have examples in Wisd. viii. 22, 23; xiv. 25; Heb. vii. 26; xi. 33, 34, 37. In this respect both follow, *haud passibus æquis*, in the footsteps of Philo, and neither attains to the standard of the portentous phenomenon, exhibited by him, of a sentence of 147 adjectives thus strung one after another. It is obvious that these resemblances in style take their place, with almost as much force as those in actual words and phrases, among the evidence for identity of authorship.

Apollos and had been taken up and echoed by his followers.

We gather, indeed, from the very Epistle which thus tells of the nature of his work, and of the peril which it brought with it, that Apollos was no willing sharer in the position forced upon him by his admirers. He had withdrawn from Corinth, probably with "letters of commendation" from that Church (2 Cor. iii. 1), like those which he had brought with him, and had returned to the scene of his former labours at Ephesus. He was with St. Paul in that city at the time when the Epistle was written, and the few words in which he is mentioned (1 Cor. xvi. 12) bring out with wonderful clearness the reciprocated confidence of the two teachers,—the absence of jealousy in the one, of ambition in the other. The Apostle wishes the eloquent preacher to go back to Corinth and continue his work there. Apollos decides not to go, lest he might in any way countenance the partizanship of his followers. The humility which was shewn when the Alexandrian scholar, with all his fame for wisdom, sat at the feet of the tent-maker of Pontus to learn a wisdom higher than his own, had been strengthened by his experience of the spiritual life into which he had been led, and he is content to efface himself, rather than appear even as the rival of the great Apostle.

11. I venture to think with Alford, on the hypothesis that Apollos was the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that we have in this self-suppression an explanation of the absence from that Epistle of the name of the writer at least as satisfactory as any



of those which have been given on the assumption that St. Paul, who had proclaimed that his signature was the token in every Epistle (2 Thess. iii. 17), made this an exception to the rule, and for once wrote anonymously, and in a style utterly unlike that which he habitually used. The earlier treatise had been anonymous, so also should be the latter. Apollos was content, now as before, to sacrifice praise and fame rather than incur the risk of once more being set up as the leader of a school against the Master whom he honoured. There was a truer immortality to be obtained, a more everlasting memorial to be left behind him, than that after which he had once passionately thirsted (Wisd. viii. 13). I see in this, also, the solution of what would otherwise be a somewhat difficult problem. If there is any one Epistle in which, from its treatment of the higher mysteries of faith, we should have expected stress to be laid on the attainment of wisdom, it would have been this to the Hebrews. And yet, singularly enough, that word, in all its forms, is conspicuously absent from it. It is as though the writer deliberately turned away from it, even when, as in vi. 1-4, it lay directly in his path, lest it should prove once more a stumbling-block to himself and others.

12. The solitary notice of Apollos after his second departure from Ephesus (Tit. iii. 13), has been already referred to as indicating the nature of the feelings with which St. Paul, almost at the close of his career, regarded him. It is not unsuggestive, however, from another point of view, in connection with his life and labours. "Bring Zenas, the lawyer, and Apollos on their journey diligently, that nothing

may be wanting to them." Of the man who is here named as his companion in travel and fellow-labourer we find absolutely nothing beyond this isolated mention of his name. But the fact that we find Apollos in his company is not without significance in its bearing on our main argument. The term "lawyer" must obviously be taken, with hardly the shadow of a doubt, in the sense in which it is used in the Gospels, as denoting a sub-section of the class of Scribes. It was a "lawyer" who, in his admiration of the answers which our Lord had given to the Pharisees and Sadducees, put the testing question, "Which is the great commandment of the Law?" (Matt. xxii. 35.) It was against the "lawyers," as distinct in some way from Pharisees and Scribes, that our Lord uttered a special woe, as "having taken away the key of knowledge" (Luke ix. 52). So far as I know, the word was used by the Jews only or chiefly of the Scribes of Jerusalem, and would seem to have described those who, in contradistinction to the Pharisees and Scribes of their schools, with their reverence for the traditions of the Elders, dwelt much, if not exclusively, on the Law (including, perhaps, the Mishna) and on those hidden treasures of the House of the Interpreter to which the words "key of knowledge" manifestly pointed. Of some at least of these we know that they acknowledged that the Prophet of Nazareth had proclaimed an eternal Truth—that the love of God and man was "more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices," that they were "not far from the kingdom of God" (Mark xii. 32-34). With one of these, then, converted and believing in Christ, known, as the article

seems to indicate, to the Christian community, we find Apollos associated, and the association could not have been without its influence on his teaching and his life. His Alexandrian training, with its slightly Hellenic tendencies, would be supplemented by the thoughts of one whose search into the inner meaning of the Law had been influenced by his daily contact with the Temple and its ritual,—who had learnt to see burnt-offerings and sacrifices in their relation, first to the eternal Law of Love, and next to the everlasting Sacrifice. Such an one, too, would be naturally in communication with the Hebrews, strictly so called, in the Churches of Palestine. That the two were found together in Crete, where the errors that prevailed were mainly Jewish fables and “commandments of men” (Tit. i. 14), propagated by men who acted “from a love of filthy lucre,” whose “mind and conscience were defiled,” who were much occupied in “genealogies and contentions and strivings about the law” (Tit. i. 15 ; iii. 9), and that they met with St. Paul’s entire approval, is a proof that their teaching on these matters was entirely in accordance with his own. I find, then, here another missing link connecting the eloquent Jew of Alexandria with the Epistle to the Hebrews, and shewing how the scholar of Philo became in the fullest sense of the word a “scribe well instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, bringing forth out of his treasure things new and old.”

I do not wish to lay too much stress on the force of a conjunction, but I cannot refrain from calling attention to the words which follow the mention of Zenas and Apollos. “And let our’s also learn to

maintain good works for necessary uses" (Tit. iii. 14). "*Our's also.*" Does not this imply a reference to another community, suggested by these two names, as distinguished from those who looked to St. Paul as their guide and teacher? Are we not led to think of that community as leading a life like that of the Essenes and Therapeutæ, supplying their own simple wants by the labour of their own hands, and so becoming an example to other Christians to which St. Paul could point as worthy of imitation?

13. What I have assumed to have been the previous history of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews will, in part, help us in dealing with the vexed question, Who were those Hebrews? A discussion of the hypotheses which have been maintained by different commentators, that they were the Jews of Palestine at large, or of Cæsarea, or Alexandria, or Corinth, or Rome, would carry me beyond the limits to which I must now confine myself. I must be content with setting forth the conclusion to which the phenomena of the case have led me, and which seems to me to include and explain them all.

The character and the earlier life of Apollos, being such as we have seen them to be, would, we may believe, lead him, in pursuance of that aim at self-effacement of which I have already spoken, to avoid building again on St. Paul's foundation; to turn to regions in which the Apostle had not laboured; to address himself to those who were strangers at least to his personal teaching. The sympathies of such a man would be likely, on the other hand, to draw him to those whose experience had been in some measure like his own, who were in the various stages

of the path along which he himself had travelled, living as he once had lived. I conceive the Hebrews, then, to whom the Epistle is addressed, to have been for the most part members of Essene or Therapeutic communities, wherever they were to be found, with special reference to that Egyptian society with which he himself had once probably been connected. It will be remembered that Philo describes the two communities in the same terms of praise, as leading lives after the same pattern; that the word Essene, according to the most probable etymology, is identical with the word Therapeutæ; that Eusebius speaks even of the Egyptian society that bore the latter name as consisting of Hebrews. (*H. E.*, ii. 17.) By a somewhat curious coincidence, he, assuming them to have been Christians, names the Epistle to the Hebrews as being one of the books to which their deeper study of Scripture would lead them to give special attention.

14. It will be seen, if I mistake not, that this hypothesis has at least the merit of throwing light on the main scope and argument of the Epistle and clearing up some of its peculiar difficulties. The stress laid in the opening section of it on the higher excellence of the name of the Christ as compared with the angels, has a special force if we think of it as addressed to those who, like the Essenes, were drifting towards Angelolatry, and dwelt on the names of the Angels with a mysterious awe (*Josephus, B. J.* ii. 87). The list of the truths which the writer includes in the "first principles" of the doctrine of Christ, and of which it is remarkable that they do not contain one specifically Christian dogma—that

they begin with repentance and faith, not towards Christ, but towards God,—and then pass on, not to the doctrine of baptism in the definitely Christian sense, but to a doctrine of ablutions (*βαπτισμῶν*), including both Jewish lustrations and such a rite as that which the Baptist administered, is just such as would obtain in a community of Therapeutæ accustomed to manifold washings, who had so far entered into the way of the Lord and been baptized with John's baptism. The sharp tone of reproof in which the writer speaks is natural if he is addressing a society who had laid that foundation many years before, and had hardly yet got beyond it, even though they had learnt to call themselves disciples of the Crucified. So, too, the earnest exhortation that those to whom the Epistle was addressed should hold fast their profession, having their "hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and their bodies washed with pure water" (Heb. x. 22), while it admits a possible reference to baptism, seems to find a far more natural explanation when we connect it with the practice that prevailed among Essene communities (a practice which they had no reason to abandon on becoming Christians) of bathing every day before they met together for prayer and praise (Josephus, *l.c.*). So, too, the stress laid on the duty of obedience to governors and rulers, of a loving remembrance of rulers who had passed away (Heb. xiii. 7, 17), though applicable to all Christian societies, has a special force, if we think of the writer as speaking to men living under the same roof, a band of brothers governed by one head. The precepts, "Let marriage be honourable in all things and

the bed undefiled" (obviously the right rendering of the words), and "Let your mode of life be free from the love of money," and "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers" (Heb. xiii. 1-4), are altogether adapted to those who lived as the Essenes and Therapeutæ did, either in absolute chastity or in the strictest married purity, and who counted nothing that they earned their own, but had all things in common. The danger to which such societies were liable in time of persecution was that of falling back upon the simple monastic life in the strict sense of the word—a life of absolute isolation—and therefore they needed the injunction not "to forsake the assembling of themselves together" (Heb. x. 25), to maintain the *παρρησία*, which was so characteristic of the writer of the Epistle himself (Acts xviii. 26; Heb. iii. 6; iv. 16; x. 19, 35). Lastly, in the catalogue of the unnamed sufferers and heroes of faith with which the eleventh Chapter ends, we may surely see a reference not only to the Maccabean martyrs or to legends that had gathered round the history of the Old Testament, but to the more recent outrages, almost unparalleled in their atrocity, to which the Jews had been exposed at Alexandria in the time of Caligula, and from which we cannot imagine the Therapeutæ, whether Jewish or Christian, to have been altogether exempt, even though those who survived, and whom the writer addressed, had not suffered more than the "spoiling of their goods" (Heb. x. 36). Taking the best established reading of the words which follow (*συνεπαθήσατε τοῖς δεσμίαις*), we may well think of them as shewing their sym-

pathy with those who had been prisoners during that persecution.

15. It would require a separate paper to shew fully how the whole argument of the Epistle, in like manner, while full of meaning and interest for all Hebrews and all Christians, becomes at every step more intelligible, if we think of it as addressed to those who, though earnest, pure, devout, had not yet attained to a clear view of the relation of the new Covenant to the old, and who were already familiar with a system of interpretation so far-reaching in its allegories that those given by the writer would seem plain and natural. The earnest calls to repentance, or rather to avoiding the sins which make a second repentance, such as they had once passed through, impossible, would come with a special force from one who had commenced his work as a preacher by reproducing the message of the Baptist. The numerous coincidences between the phraseology of the Epistle and that of Philo, which have been already pointed out, and which were almost the first phenomena that suggested the authorship of Apollos, acquire a new significance if we think of it as addressed to those to whom the writings of Philo had been of old familiar, who would welcome each familiar word and turn of thought, to whom even such phrases as "the high-priest of our profession" (*ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας*, iii. 1), and "looking unto Jesus" (*ἀφορῶντες εἰς Ἰησοῦν*, xii. 2 — in Philo, *ἀπόβλεψας εἰς Ἰησοῦν*, of the historical Joshua), would bring back the memories of an earlier stage in their religious life. The very survey of the history of Israel, to bring out, as by a complete induction, the



true nature of the faith by which a man is justified, would have a special interest and force with those who had already travelled along the path of that history under the guidance of Philo's writings, or under the personal teaching of the writer of the Book of Wisdom.

16. I may add, lest I should be thought to have passed over evidence more or less material, that I have purposely refrained from what might have been adduced in support of the position I have maintained, the assumption, *i.e.*, that the description of the Tabernacle (in Chap. ix), apparently at variance with Old Testament descriptions both of the Tabernacle and Temple, might be explained by supposing the writer to have drawn from his recollection of the rival temple erected by the Egyptian Jews at Leontopolis. Much as my case would have been strengthened, had I been able to adduce that coincidence, and high as is the authority which might be cited on its behalf, I cannot say that I think there is sufficient evidence to justify me in laying any stress on it. The history of that strange episode of the Leontopolis temple has never yet been satisfactorily written, and, as far as I know, there are no adequate materials for writing it; and we know too little of its structure or ritual, or of its relation to the life of devout Jews in Alexandria or elsewhere, to be able to speak of it with any certainty. For a like reason, too, I lay no stress on the conjectural identification of the "Epistola ad Alexandrinos," mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment, with the Epistle to the Hebrews, though it would in part confirm my argument. That Epistle is described in the Fragment as

“Paulino nomine ficta,” and must therefore have differed from the Epistle to the Hebrews in bearing the Apostle’s name. It is said to have been written to support the heresy of Marcion; and the whole tenor of the Epistle to the Hebrews is against that heresy. If I were to venture on the region of pure conjecture, I should be disposed to surmise that the Epistle which I assign to Apollos had found its way into circulation among the Christians of Alexandria, and, being anonymous, had been ascribed by some to the Apostle with whose teaching it was in substantial agreement, and that the apocryphal Epistle of St. Paul to the Alexandrians was a device of the Marcionist party to counteract its influence.

17. Having thus set aside the broken reeds on which I do not care to lean, I will ask leave to add one or two elements of evidence of more or less weight which have come before me since my former paper was in type. (1) We have seen that Clement of Rome is the first writer who quotes either the Wisdom of Solomon or the Epistle to the Hebrews, and that he quotes from both, in the same way, as writings with which he was familiar, but to which he does not ascribe any apostolic or inspired authority. They do not as yet stand with him on the level of Scripture. I note in connection with this that it was in the Church of Rome, where we find thus the first trace of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that we also find the steadiest reluctance to admit its Pauline authorship, as though there was some traditional knowledge, though the author was not known, that it was not by the Apostle. (2) As Clement of Rome quotes from both books, so also does his

namesake of Alexandria, with more distinctness, indeed, ascribing the Epistle to St. Paul, and speaking of the Book of Wisdom as Divine (*Strom.* iv. 16, 17), but bringing his quotations into the closest possible juxtaposition. (3). I find, again, that among the lost writings of Irenæus is enumerated one "on various passages of the Wisdom of Solomon and the Epistle to the Hebrews." (Euseb. *H.E.* v. 26.) From our ordinary point of view it would be hard to understand the principle of grouping implied in this selection. What should bring two writings standing, from that point of view, on so different a level, into such close neighbourhood? I venture to think that the hypothesis which I have now maintained explains this, as it explains other difficulties. Assume that the books were by the same author, though the authorship remained in obscurity, and it would be natural that they should for a time be transcribed and circulated together. I cannot resist the conviction that if one could get a catalogue of the contents of the shop of a Christian bookseller in the obscurer quarters of Rome or Alexandria or Corinth (and such shops there must, in the nature of things, have been) at the close of the first century, there would be found among Gospels, Acts, Revelations, and Epistles, some genuine and some spurious, some still extant and some lost for ever, one manuscript volume of which the vendor would speak as of deep interest, though the writer was unknown, and that that volume would contain the two books which I have ventured to claim as the writings of Apollos.