

## APOLLOS.

THE section of Acts (xviii 24-28) which deals with Apollos seems to represent the information of one who resided at Ephesus, or at least remained there while St Paul journeyed eastwards to Palestine, if not to Jerusalem. Ephesus is represented as the goal of St Paul and his company, and as the goal of Apollos no less. That St Paul should have so regarded this important station on the high-road from Rome to Syria is probable, in view of his desire to evangelize Asia at an earlier stage in his career (Acts xvi 6); but to Apollos it was only a halting-place on the road to Corinth, so that it was his goal only from the point of view of the historian or the historian's informant. The centre of St Paul's work is henceforth not Antioch or Jerusalem but Ephesus, and the editor of the Acts justifies this change by emphasizing, unobtrusively enough, the parallel between the work of St Paul in Ephesus and the life of Christ as recorded in the Gospels. To the preaching of a baptism of repentance succeeds the coming of the greater teacher. The disciples of the forerunner are taken over by his successor, who baptizes with the Holy Spirit and preaches first in the synagogue and then, after the hardening of heart of the Jews, to those without, concerning the kingdom of God. Miracles of healing are performed in attestation of the preaching, but the witnesses of both are unconvinced, and God's messenger sets his face to go to Jerusalem, undaunted by the hostility of the adherents of the established religion. Despite the warnings of his devoted followers, he bids farewell to their leaders, and, after raising the dead to life, goes up to stand his trial before the various authorities who claimed to bear rule in the sacred city of God's people. Such coincidences as these afford a solid justification for St Paul's formula of passionate devotion to his Master—*not I, but Christ in me*. The three months of persuasive argument within the synagogue, and the two years of evangelization without, which precede the last

journey to Jerusalem, explain the stress laid upon this portion of St Paul's career as that in which he so closely follows the footsteps of Jesus of Nazareth.

It may well be that St Luke stayed at Ephesus, along with Priscilla and Aquila, to arrange the materials he had collected, with St Paul's assistance, for writing his Gospel. At any rate, in his intercourse with Apollos may be found a reasonable explanation of his superior knowledge of John Baptist's work.

But the very beginning of this portion of Acts is in danger of being discredited. According to a recent pronouncement, the description of Apollos is inconsistent with itself:—'The fact that he was a Christian and taught the doctrine of Jesus exactly contradicts the statements that he knew only the baptism of John, and that he had to be instructed more perfectly in Christianity by Priscilla and Aquila.'<sup>1</sup> The conclusion reached is that verses 25 c, 26 b, c are later accretions.

It is the purpose of this paper<sup>2</sup> to appeal against this verdict as contrary to the weight of evidence and not demonstrably free from distortion of the facts on which it professes to rest.

The evidence of our only witness is as follows:—'Now a Jew, Apollos by name, an Alexandrine by race, a man of learning, arrived at Ephesus, being powerful in the scriptures. This man had been instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in spirit, was wont to speak and teach accurately the things about Jesus, knowing only the baptism of John. This man also began to be outspoken in the synagogue: but when Priscilla and Aquila heard him, they took him to them, and expounded to him the way of God more accurately.' As far as the text of this evidence is concerned, the Western variations, which have been arbitrarily raised to the power of a different edition of Acts, add and alter little of moment to our present purpose<sup>3</sup>. But many of the terms used are of doubtful interpretation. The sense given to *ἀνὴρ λόγιος*, *a man of learning*, is recognized by Hesychius and Suidas, and the word is so used by Plutarch. Phrynichus

<sup>1</sup> Schmiedel, *Enc. Bibl.* s. v. Apollos.

<sup>2</sup> Read before the Cambridge Theological Society.

<sup>3</sup> Blass (*Acta Apostolorum . . . secundum formam quae videtur Romanam*) gives *Apollonius* for *Apollos*, and adds *in his fatherland* to *instructed*, *in the name of Jehovah (Lord)* to *outspoken*. Chrysostom eliminates *Aquila* altogether, and perhaps preserves the original *lectio ardua*.

distinguishes between the ancient usage, which restricted the word to *historians*, and the popular usage of his own day in which it was applied to a *clever speaker*. The choice lies here between *eloquent* (Vulgate *eloquens*) and *learned* (*d' disertus*); and possibly the former is to be preferred in view of St Paul's description of his involuntary rival in 1 Cor.<sup>1</sup> The phrase *powerful in the Scriptures* is, like the idiom *powerful in*, peculiar to St Luke ('powerful in words and deeds,' Luke xxiv 19 and Acts vii 22), and suggests that the Scriptures have become—thanks to persistent study—part and parcel of the man's equipment. Chrysostom found a difficulty in the phrase *fervent in spirit*—'if he knew only the baptism of John, how is he fervent in the Spirit?'—and compares the interview between St Paul and 'certain disciples' (Acts xx 1 ff). But this difficulty vanishes when once *the spirit* is taken in its ordinary non-technical sense. It is not improbable that a similar misconception vitiates the verdict which condemns these verses as a patchwork.

To a Christian Jesus was Lord and the Lord was Jesus. With this key the early Church unlocked the treasures of the Old Testament and appropriated their contents. Convinced of His divinity by the descent of the Spirit they saw a new significance in the familiar facts which had led them step by step towards this final conception of the Galilean prophet. Thus the shameful death which was for the unbelievers the visible proof of God's vengeance on a blaspheming impostor became for believers the manifestation of God's kingdom and the glorification of His Vice-regent. Justin Martyr read in his handbook of proof-texts 'The Lord reigned from the tree', and did not hesitate to accuse the Jews of having mutilated the passage in their Bibles<sup>2</sup>.

But to deduce from the statement *he was instructed in the way of the Lord . . . and taught accurately the things concerning Jesus* 'the fact that he was a Christian and taught the doctrine of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* xvii 6. 2 'Ιουδαίων λογώτατοι καὶ παρ' οὐσιν τῶν πατρίων ἐξηγηταὶ νόμων.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. xcvi (xcvi) 10: see Justin, *Dialogue* 73. To refute his opponent he cites the whole Psalm, and the disputed words are omitted by the manuscripts in the place where they should occur. The Jewish definition of the kingdom as the tree or trees (ver. 12) was baptized into Christ. Jotham's parable described the usurpers who ruled for a time over God's heritage. The resultant *περιγραφή* was ambiguous: ὡς ἔν might mean 'upon the tree' as well as 'over the tree'.

Jesus exactly' is as unworthy of a historical critic as the further assertion that this 'fact' is inconsistent with his need for further instruction.

To suppose that *the way of the Lord* must mean Christianity implies an anachronism worthy of the primitive Christian exegesis of the Old Testament. Such a confusion of the *Praeparatio Evangelica* with the *Praedicatio* testifies to a complete lack of perspective, which would—if desired—admit 'celebration of the Holy Eucharist as the uniform rendering of εὐχαριστία and its cognates in the New Testament.

The 'doctrine of Jesus,' again, is simply a mistranslation of τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ. The phrase is ambiguous: two interpretations might be supported by the usage of St Luke's Gospel. On the way to Emmaus, Cleopas and his companion narrated to the stranger *the things concerning Jesus of Nazareth*, His words and works, His betrayal and crucifixion. Later Jesus, 'beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, expounded to them in all the Scriptures *the things concerning Himself*<sup>1</sup>'. Apollos's teaching, then, dealt either with the facts of the life and death of Jesus or with the prophecies which concerned the Christ. In the former case his conclusion could only have been that of the Corinthian blasphemers *Jesus is accursed*, or, if he stopped short of that, he must have shared the despair of Cleopas and John Baptist. But so he would have had no motive for teaching *the things concerning Jesus*. The adoption of the latter interpretation makes all clear and consistent. His knowledge of the baptism of John belongs to one or other of the two stages of the prophet's independent work which are clearly distinguished by St Luke from his recognition of Jesus as the Messiah on which Christian tradition generally laid almost exclusive stress.

Lastly, the astounding assertion, that this 'fact' that [Apollos] was a Christian exactly contradicts the statement . . . that he had to be instructed more perfectly in Christianity by Priscilla and Aquila, now falls to be considered. Even if Apollos were a Christian, he might need further instruction just as much as Theophilus (Luke i 3 f) or indeed all the churches founded by St Paul. Christianity did not descend from heaven full-grown,

<sup>1</sup> Luke xxiv 19 f, 27.

perfect and complete as Athene from the head of Zeus, and take up her abode armed at all points in the community or in the individual. The Gospels and Acts record the painful steps by which the leaders of the Church struggled into full comprehension of their faith and all its implications. The Parable of the Sower is the Lord's own description of the result of His work among different types of men. Even after Pentecost there were Pharisees who believed and yet had more real affinity with their unbelieving brethren than with St Paul. History which records God's verdicts shews how one and another of these tentative Christianities withered away. Apollos had been true to the light that was in him, and 'the reward of a precept is a precept'.

This 'exact contradiction' may go along with the 'fact' and the mistranslation.

Here is a Jew of Alexandria baptized with John's baptism. As Alexandrian he is learned in the Scriptures, as disciple of John Baptist he is eager to effect a reformation in Israel. The prophecies which the risen Jesus needed to put before His disciples he has found for himself: ignorant of their fulfilment, he is in the habit of expounding all the Scriptures which relate to the Messiah. He takes up his master's call for repentance, and delineates *the mightier one*, who is to come, by the aid of the Scriptures which Jesus of Nazareth fulfilled.

*Instructed in the way of the Lord* is the fit description of the disciple and successor of him to whom is appropriated the prophecy 'the voice of one that crieth, Prepare ye in the wilderness *the way of the Lord*' (Isa. xl 3: see Mark i 3; Matt. iii 3; Luke iii 4; John i 23).

The description of his preaching then expresses the historian's point of view, just as the word *only* is added by the historian, so that the motive for Apollos's preaching becomes an apology for its imperfections. He preached *because* he knew—had experienced—John's baptism.

The speaking and teaching mentioned in *v. 25* is part of the description of the general practice of Apollos, and does not refer to his work in Ephesus in particular at a stage preceding the exhortation delivered in the synagogue. The whole verse is a parenthesis: the narrative proper is resumed by the aorist

ἤρξατο (26) corresponding to κατήντησεν (24)<sup>1</sup>. It is only natural that, as Alexandrian Jew no less than as disciple of John Baptist, Apollos should use every opportunity of urging people everywhere to repent, according to the custom of all earnest philosophers, Greek or Jewish. There is no evidence for the separate existence of the Christian Church of Ephesus at this time: St Paul returns to take up work *within the synagogue* (Acts xix 8), and definitely separates his converts three months later (ib. 9).

It seems practically certain that the seed of Christianity had already been sown among the Jews of Ephesus, perhaps by some pilgrim returning from Pentecost<sup>2</sup>. Their sympathetic attitude enabled St Paul to speak to them and to promise to return (Acts xviii 19 ff). Meanwhile his companions remained in communion with them (ib.: cf. 26). So when Apollos began to *speak boldly* in the synagogue, he addressed some who had found the Messiah whom he depicted. The way was thus prepared for St Paul at Ephesus: there was no need for him, on his return, to urge them to repent, or to prove from the Scriptures that the Messiah must suffer (Acts xvii 30: ib. 3, xxvi 22 f). The herald had done his work, and therein had been led to find in Jesus of Nazareth the Saviour of whom Moses and the prophets had spoken—like sundry other disciples of John Baptist (John i 35 ff; Acts xix 1 ff).

*Priscilla and Aquila heard the sermon, took him to them and set forth to him more accurately the way of God.* The facts which they knew matched his prophecies, and so he reached the position of faith in Jesus Christ by another road than that of the Twelve, who found it so hard to comprehend the facts they had witnessed. The change of phrase *way of God* for *way of the Lord* is significant of his change of attitude towards the Scriptures: henceforth for him, as for all Christians, *the Lord* is Jesus the Son of *God*.

<sup>1</sup> The insertion of ἐν τῇ πατρίδι in 25 by the Roman text corrects the impression derived from neglect of distinction between Imperfects and Aorists.

<sup>2</sup> This seems to be the best explanation of Acts xvi 6 κωλυθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ: cf. Rom. xv 20; 2 Cor. x 15 f. The Epistle of St James was perhaps intended to pave the way for the work of such unknown heroes of Christianity by removing the suspicion current (e. g.) at Rome (Acts xxviii 22).

The *disciples* whom St Paul found in Ephesus on his return (Acts xix 1 ff) are probably hearers of Apollos who had been attracted by his speaking and teaching in the streets of Ephesus or elsewhere. Baptism, as practised by John Baptist, would be the natural sequel of professed repentance. The fact that they are not discovered by Priscilla or Aquila or the brethren at Ephesus (v 27) suggests that they were not present in the synagogue (v 26). Perhaps they had retired into seclusion to meditate upon the hope of *him that cometh* (Acts xix 4), and to consolidate their resolution to lead a new life.

*Disciples* must not be taken in the technical sense of Christians: despite St Luke's habitual use of the word, it is an anachronism to suppose that all such phrases are already stereotyped. The mention of their number, *about twelve*, calls attention again to the parallel between St Paul and Jesus, Apollos and John Baptist, which is significant in view of the exaggerated notion of Apollos's importance current later in Corinth.

In spite of the momentous change which had come over his life, Apollos continued his journey as originally planned. The 'Roman Edition' bewrays its secondary character by supplying as motive a direct appeal from certain Corinthians resident in Ephesus, modelled on St Paul's vision at Troas (Acts xvi 9 f). There is no evidence that Apollos preached as a Christian in Ephesus. But when he arrived at Corinth, armed with letters of introduction from the Christians he left behind, he was of great assistance to the believers in their controversy with the Jews. *He proved by means of the Scriptures that the Messiah was Jesus*—the significant order of words is changed in the Western text to the ordinary one . . . *that Jesus was Christ*.

At this point the evidence of Acts must be supplemented by that of St Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, which throws much light on the work of Apollos in Corinth and its deplorable results.

In this Epistle St Paul has to deal with a somewhat disingenuous letter addressed to him by the Corinthian Church, and also with doubts and dangers reported to him at Ephesus by certain known and unknown travellers. Only in the latter sources of his information was Apollos mentioned by name: the letter was characterized by a discreet reticence which St Paul imitated.

The eloquence of Apollos and his learned exposition of the Scriptures (Acts xviii 28) exercised an influence not merely upon the Jews, as yet outside the Church, but also on the Church itself, which seems to have been recruited mainly from the heathen population. Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue (Acts xviii 17), was probably his most prominent convert, and therefore associated with St Paul in his letters to the Corinthians, as practical proof of the unanimity of the evangelists whom their ill-advised partisans strove to pit one against another. But the heathen Christians also seem to have found in his Alexandrian wisdom an attractive bulwark of their new faith, if only because it supplied them with the guarantee of immemorial antiquity which soon became indispensable to its extension. The direct result was a state of faction within the Church, whose members ranged themselves under separate standards, *each puffed up on behalf of his favourite teacher against his fellow* (1 Cor. iv 6). And St Paul concludes his remonstrance against this state of things with the words, *I have transferred these things by a fiction to myself and Apollos for your sake, so that from our case ye might learn the truth of the saying, 'Not beyond what is written.'* There is no need to suppose that St Paul has substituted the name of Apollos and his own for those of the leaders of the Corinthian factions. It was inevitable that the father and the foster-father of the infant Church should be pressed into the service of the sectaries. The fiction connoted by the word *μετεσχημάτισα* consists in his disregard of Cephas and Christ, whose self-styled partisans were not as yet a factor seriously to be reckoned with, and in his assumption for the sake of softening his rebuke that they, the leaders, were imbued with the spirit of their followers. It was not Apollos who set himself to improve upon the teaching of St Paul, but the misdirected and ignorant zeal of these infantile Christians who represented his work in this light. Ignorant confidence in the letter of the Scripture was dangerous enough, but ignorant allegorization of the same was deadly. The ignorance of the elementary moral teaching of Christianity rendered it imperatively necessary that the Corinthians should cease forthwith to pry beneath and above the plain meaning of the sacred books they had adopted—to say nothing of pleasing legends which, along with the principles of



mystical interpretation, they had filched from the anti-Jewish lectures of the first Christian philosopher of Alexandria.

In vindication of his preaching, St Paul contrasts himself with his successor and involuntary rival. The teaching of Apollos was distinguished by an excess of word and wisdom (1 Cor. ii 1), by artificial rhetoric (ib. 4): it was all human wisdom (ib. 5), a wisdom of this world, more particularly of the Jews who slew Jesus, and of the powers of wickedness which acted through them (ib. 6, 8). Apollos had presented the truth in the taught words of human wisdom (ib. 13)—the new wine in the old wine-skins of Alexandria. And if he is not to be entirely exonerated from the blame which naturally attaches itself to his adherents, the technical plea that he had not as yet been baptized with the Spirit may be put forward in his defence. It is easy to see how the principles of Alexandrian exegesis, as developed in the heat of controversy, might be used by non-Jewish and therefore illegitimate hearers to justify their natural inclination to evade the outspoken and impertinent prohibitions of the Decalogue. It is easy to say that the faults which St Paul condemns are characteristically Greek, but this predominantly plebeian Church needed a great personality to lead the reaction. If Apollos was not known to have taught at Corinth it would have been necessary to invent him. And whether Apollos is mentioned by name or not, the whole of the Epistle proves that this Church was saturated with ill-digested and misunderstood Alexandrinism which some of its members had wrested to their own destruction.

In 1 Cor. v, St Paul deals with a scandal which is matter of common talk. No barbarian tribe (or Gentiles) would tolerate the regular or irregular union of son with father's wife: yet these *Christian citizens* are *puffed up* thereat. The word *φουιοῦσθαι* occurs with significant frequency in this epistle<sup>1</sup>, and only once in the New Testament (Col. ii 18) outside it. It describes the state of mind induced by their boasted *gnosis*, and is exemplified also in their factiousness. On the other hand *love*, which St Paul would have them cultivate, *is not puffed up*. The natural inference from this insistent repetition is, that St Paul has adopted a term used by the Corinthians in their letter, or rather, since the

<sup>1</sup> iv 6, 18, 19; v 2; viii 1; xiii 4.

word must carry a bad connotation, has parodied one of their cant phrases. Apparently they justified the free indulgence of their various passions by an appeal to nature (*φύσις*); and so on the most trivial point which they submit for his decision they are 'hoist with their own petard'—'Does not even nature herself teach you that long hair is a disgrace to man and a glory to woman?' (xi 14). They professed the life according to nature, and therefore countenanced unnatural vice, as St Paul himself expressly points out in Rom. i—the epistle which is largely made up of the fruits of his experience of the Greek world in Corinth. It is a plausible theory that they were emboldened to set up and to abuse the Stoic ideal by overhearing the anti-Jewish exposition of Scripture set forth by Apollos. At any rate Philo, who to our scant knowledge stands for the Judaism of Alexandria, stated once for all that the Law of Moses was identical with the law of nature, that the man who with discernment followed the precepts of the Old Testament was living the life conformed to nature which befitted a citizen of the universe<sup>1</sup>. The inevitable results of the misappropriation of such teaching were *φυσιώσεις* in both senses of the word, and in their train *ἀκαθαρσία*, *πορνεία* and even *ἀσέλγεια* (2 Cor. xii 20).

Later in this section of the Epistle St Paul refers to a misinterpretation of his earlier letter, which if put into practice would have involved the formation of monastic communities in a desert (1 Cor. v 10). This logical conclusion of their view of his command—that they should not keep company with fornicators—can hardly have escaped the notice of these wiseacres. The Alexandrian Jew-Christian may well have suggested the advisability of such retirement, if only for a time, lest old ties and associations should prove stronger than the requirements of their new faith. The communities of Therapeutae described by Philo in the *de Vita Contemplativa* presented a model for their imitation, if only in the matter with which St Paul proceeds to deal (1 Cor. vi 1-8), the settlement of all disputes outside the law courts.

In vi. 12, St Paul cites specious maxims which the Corinthians have converted to their own uses, and supplies the necessary qualifications. '*All things are lawful for me*'—but not all things are expedient—'*all things are lawful for me*'—but I will not be

<sup>1</sup> *De Opificio Mundi, init.*

*dominated by any thing—meats for the belly and the belly for meats—but God will bring both alike to nought.*

The play on words (*ἐξέστω . . . ἐξουσιασθήσομαι*) can hardly be represented in English. The point is that indulgence of any natural appetite leads to the formation of a tyrannical habit whereby a man's liberty of action is inevitably curtailed in the end. The gratification can only be temporary, but the body apart from its functions remains an integral part of the man even in the resurrection from the dead (ib. 13 f: cf. Mark xii 25). Here, as in the doubt about the resurrection itself, their fundamental error is exposed; and its source may well have been the Platonist philosophy of Alexandria, which inculcated contempt for the body and for material existence generally. Philo bases his doctrine of the resurrection upon Gen. ii 17 (*Legg. All. i. §§ 105-108*). He notes that although Adam and Eve ate of the forbidden fruit, they did not die but lived and perpetuated their life in their children. From this he infers that death is of two kinds—death of man and death of soul. The death which is the common lot of man is the separation of soul from body, whereas the soul's death is corruption of virtue and assumption of vice. The latter is the antithesis of the former, as it implies the fusion of soul and body and the domination of the body which is the inferior element in the combination. Here, then, is death indeed, when the soul dies to the life of virtue and lives only the life of vice. So Heraclitus agrees with Moses when he says, 'We live their death and have died to their life', meaning that when we live the soul is dead and buried in the body (*σώματι*) as in a tomb (*σήματι*), but if we die the soul lives its own life and is freed from its evil and dead partner the body.

St Paul's second qualification of the Corinthian watchword 'all things are lawful for me', calls attention to the safeguard of the Alexandrian doctrine which they had neglected—'I will not be dominated by any bodily appetite.' But once they had neglected this point, the remainder affords an adequate explanation both of their abuse of the body and their denial of its resurrection as ridiculous—*how do the dead rise, and with what kind of a body—body quotha—do they come*<sup>1</sup>?

<sup>1</sup> Liddell and Scott, *s. v.* *πῶτος* I 4 'In dialogue *πῶτος* is sometimes used with a word used by the former speaker, to express scornful surprise.'

It would seem, then, that most of the trouble in the Corinthian Church was due to the perversion of the teaching of Apollos, who was the disciple of John Baptist, and an Alexandrian Jew, and therefore philosopher, after the manner of Philo, and on both grounds imbued with the spirit of the Therapeutae. Space forbids the completion of a detailed enquiry into the evidence of St Paul's epistle.

In conclusion, some attempt may be made to reconstruct in outline the work of Apollos in Corinth. He found there a number of Christians converted by St Paul, by whose companions he was accredited. A student of Scripture, he naturally inclined to dwell upon and to elaborate the parallel between the old and the new Israel. As the deliverance of the old Israel was effected, under God, by two leaders, so was it now in Corinth. In his anxiety to render due honour to St Paul, Apollos naturally represented himself as another Aaron, the mere mouthpiece of the second Moses. Pharaoh, who knew not the Lord and hardened his heart, was present in the persons of the unbelievers—Jews and Greeks—who persecuted the faithful. With them were the wise men (Exod. vii 11) and the scribes (ib. v 6), standing by to deride the folly of the tongue-tied preacher, who could only repeat, again and again, his naked message, the proclamation of a crucified Messiah. And, as of old, God's despicable envoys triumphed over the magicians and the taskmasters. So far St Paul himself could not but endorse such a view of the situation (see 1 Cor. i 20 ff). But he found his faithful followers ready to murmur and cabal against him under this fresh influence. The new Israel construed the persuasive eloquence of Apollos, which whittled away the yoke of the Law, into warrant for the gratification of their longing for the fleshpots of heathenism. This Aaron was enlightened to a degree which left him free—as St Paul was not—to join the social festivals held under the merely nominal patronage of an imaginary idol, and to countenance the merely technical attendance of the new-made Christians at the familiar worship of their ancestral Rimmon. Such catholicity was noticed later by Hadrian as characteristic of the Alexandrian Christians who divided their devotion between Christ and Serapis. Confronted with such worship of the Golden Calf, the later Moses, 'on evil days now fall'n and evil tongues', was bound to enforce

the authority belonging to the rôle assigned him—in all honour by his successor, if in derision by his children. God's words were in his mouth, and if need be the staff which God had used for works of power was still in his hand<sup>1</sup>. However much the disciples of the Baptist's disciple might prize the rite of baptism, St Paul thanked God that he had done nothing to encourage their superstition or their partisanship. He realized the dangers latent in this fascinating pursuit of allegory, and condemned the immature presumption of these pioneers of syncretistic Christianity in words which recall the stern sentence, 'Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.' He insisted on the literal observance of the spirit of the decree of the Council of Jerusalem as against the spiritual interpretation of the letter, in which the disciples of Apollos, or Apollos himself, had anticipated the Epistle of Barnabas. Pagan rites and practices must be avoided by Christians, at least for the sake of the weaker brethren who had not attained to the heights of gnosis: it was not a Christian's part to read for the forbidden foods, men like swine, like hyenas, like birds of prey, whose company must be shunned, and to debate with a specious show of docility how they might obey the decrees which they had wilfully exaggerated into an unnecessary counsel of perfection<sup>2</sup>.

Apollos might say with Philo<sup>3</sup> in reference to St Paul, *τὰτα μὲν δὴ θεμελίων τρόπον προκαταβεβλήσθω, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα τοῖς σοφῆς ἀρχιτέκτονος ἀλληγορίας ἐπόμενοι παραγγέλμασιν ἐποικοδομῶμεν: Paul planted, I will water.* St Paul retorted, *ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἔθηκα, ἄλλος δὲ ἐποικοδομεῖ* (I Cor. iii 10–15). He could recognize no other *παραγγέλματα* than those of the Lord Jesus, whose spirit and mind he possessed; and later, when the glittering superstructure was revealed in its true colours, he had so much assurance of the sincerity of its builder that he was not afraid to beseech him to return to Corinth<sup>4</sup>: *Εἰ τινος τὸ ἔργον μενεῖ ὃ ἐποικοδόμησεν, μισθὸν λήμψεται· εἰ τινος τὸ ἔργον κατακαήσεται, ζημιωθήσεται, αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός.* As it is written, 'And I will bring the third through the fire and purify it as silver is purified.'

J. H. A. HART.

<sup>1</sup> I Cor. iv 21.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Philo *de Migr. Abr.* § 16 *εἰσι γὰρ τινες οἱ τοὺς ρητοῦ νόμους σύμβολα νοητῶν πραγμάτων ὑπολαμβάνοντες τὰ μὲν ἄγαν ἠκρίβωσαν τῶν δὲ βραθύμως ὀλιγώρησαν.*

<sup>3</sup> *De Somn.* ii 2.

<sup>4</sup> I Cor. xvi 12.