

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

THE WRITINGS OF APOLLOS.

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

I.

I. A NEW prominence has been given during the last thirty or forty years to the name of Apollos, by the revival, and more or less general acceptance, of Luther's novel conjecture that he was that "great unknown" among the writers of the Apostolic age, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It need hardly be said that there is not a scintilla of external evidence or authority, historical, traditional, or patristic, in favour of this hypothesis. Be it happy or unhappy, it rests entirely upon the internal characteristics of the Book; its rhythmical and stately style, as contrasted with the abrupt *anacolutha* of St. Paul, its uniform citation from the Septuagint, its Alexandrian tone of thought, the parallelisms which it presents, in almost every Chapter, to the phraseology of Philo. It can hardly be said that all this amounts to much more than a proof that this was just the kind of book which Apollos might have written; that it is therefore, to some extent, probable that he did write it. The eloquent man without a book, the eloquent book without an author, seem to

fit in with each other ; and the argument from the undesigned coincidence, though not demonstrative, leaves an impression that falls little short of conviction. It practically carries more weight with it, as all students of the subject will have felt, than the guesses of this or that ancient writer (for here also we have not a shadow of tradition as distinct from guesses), that it was by Clement of Rome, or Barnabas, or St. Luke.

2. An entirely independent hypothesis has connected the name of Apollos with another book which also bears on its front the characteristics of Alexandrian authorship. The Apocryphal writings of the Old Testament, as found in the Septuagint translation, had also their "great unknown," and the noblest of them all, that which bears the title of the Wisdom of Solomon, takes its place among the books in search of authors. The only ascertainable facts in connection with it are (1) that it is not mentioned by any pre-Christian writer ; (2) that Jerome reports that it was held by some to have been written by Philo ; (3) that in an obscure and probably corrupt passage of the Muratorian Canon (*circ.* A.D. 160) it is stated to have been written "ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius," and that this is supposed by some critics to represent an original Greek text, *ὑπὸ Φίλωνος* ("by Philo"), which the writer of the fragment mistook for *ὑπὸ φίλων* ("by his friends").¹

¹ See Tregelles, "Canon Muratorianus," p. 55. It is a singular and suggestive fact that the Muratorian Fragment mentions the Wisdom of Solomon *after the Catholic Epistles*, as though it belonged to the sacred literature of more recent times. As the Fragment was restored conjecturally by Bunsen, it was placed in immediate connection with the Epistle to the Hebrews, as though both were examples of any-

The conjectures of modern critics have, for the most part, placed it at some period between B.C. 150-50. Grotius thought that it had been interpolated by a Christian writer, Luther followed Jerome in ascribing it to Philo. Others (Kirschbaum, C. H. Weisse, and Tregelles) have found internal proof of Christian authorship, or have assigned it to one of the Egyptian ascetics known as the Therapeutæ, of whose devotional and contemplative life Philo himself gives a description, corresponding so closely with that of a primitive Christian community, that Eusebius was led into the error of identifying them with the disciples of the Apostolic age (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 17). One writer (Noack) has started the hypothesis, with which I now propose to deal, that it was written by Apollos.¹

3. Canon Westcott, to whose masterly article on the Wisdom of Solomon, in the "Dictionary of the Bible," I must acknowledge myself largely indebted, contends, as I think, rightly, that there is no evidence of any distinctively Christian doctrine in the book; that it even "leaves no room" in its teaching for such truths as the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection of the Body. I cannot, however, follow him in stigmatizing as "perverse," on this ground alone, the theory that Apollos was the author. The objection is at once met by remembering, or partially pseudonymous authorship. This, it will be remembered, was without any reference to the hypothesis now under consideration. It is almost incredible that the book should have been thus mentioned, had it been thought of as belonging to the Old Testament. Tregelles, it may be remarked, distinctly recognizes its Christian authorship.

¹ I regret that I only know Noack at second-hand, through Grimm's *Einleitung* and Westcott's article.

ing that Apollos was not trained as a Christian from his youth; that his was a life pre-eminently of such changes as belong to the great periods of religious transition; and that it does not follow that one who believes that he was the writer of a given book therefore holds that that book expresses his latest and most mature convictions. I proceed accordingly, unembarrassed by the objection which to Canon Westcott seems so fatal, to examine the two books (of one of which, on either of these hypotheses, Apollos was the author) on the assumption that we may claim for him the authorship of both. It will be admitted, I think, that if I succeed in proving that assumption, or even in shewing that it has a strong ground-work of probability, a new light is thrown on some questions in the history of the Apostolic Church on which we greatly need light; that the form of the eloquent Jew of Alexandria, mighty in the Scriptures, will come before us with a new vividness, not only as seen in a passing episode of his career, but in the successive phases of his spiritual and intellectual life. Should I fail in this proof, the comparison of two works, each belonging to the great Alexandrian school of Judaism, one in its Christian, the other in its pre-Christian aspect, will be felt, I trust, to be neither uninteresting nor unprofitable.

4. Over and above resemblances of thought, or contrasts almost as suggestive as resemblances (on the assumption of their belonging to different periods in the life of the same man), the primary evidence in cases of this nature lies in coincidences of phraseology. And here I point (1) to the fact that the two

most striking words in the opening of the Epistle to the Hebrews are to be found in the description of Wisdom in the book which I assign to the same author. The word *πολυμερῶς*, with which the Epistle opens, as describing, with *πολυτρόπως*, the manifold character of God's earlier revelations, is found in as remarkable a combination in Wisd. vii. 22, in the representation of wisdom as a "spirit only-begotten yet manifold" (*μονογενές, πολυμερές*). So, again, the assertion of the Son being the *ἀπαύγασμα* (the radiance, not the reflection) of the glory of the Father, stands parallel with the claim made for Wisdom that she too is "the *ἀπαύγασμα* of the Everlasting Light" (Wisd. vii. 26). When it is added that the two words which are thus found in such close juxtaposition in the two passages are found nowhere else in the whole range of the New Testament, or the LXX. version of the Old, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that the parallelism is more than accidental, and that the one passage must at least have been present to the mind of the writer of the other.

(2) Scarcely less striking is the resemblance between the language of Wisd. xviii. 22, "Thine almighty *Word* (*Λόγος*) leaped down from heaven out of thy royal throne, . . . and brought thine unfeigned commandment as a sharp sword," and that of Heb. iv. 12, "The *Word* of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword;" the *Logos* in each case being boldly personified, and yet obviously remaining to the writer, in the former passage abstract and impersonal, while in the latter, under the influence of a higher teaching, it becomes almost identical with the Eternal Judge Himself. So again

(3) the writer of the Book of Wisdom teaches that "by envy of the devil death entered into the world" (ii. 24). The Epistle to the Hebrews names the devil as "him that hath the power of death" (ii. 14).

5. I note, as extending the induction, the "place of repentance" (*τόπος μετανοίας*) of Wisd. xii. 10, and Heb. xii. 17 (this phrase also occurring in these two passages only); the *ὑπόστασις* in Wisd. xvi. 21 and Heb. i. 3, iii. 14, xi. 1; the "servant" (*θεράπων*) of Wisd. xvii. 21, as applied to Moses, with Heb. iii. 5 (the word does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament); the "maketh all things new" (*καινίζει*) of Wisd. vii. 27 with *ἀνακαινίζει* of Heb. vi. 6 (not elsewhere, as before); "God is witness of his reins and a true beholder of his heart" (Wisd. i. 6), and the "discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" of Heb. iv. 12; the mystic reference to the dress of the High Priest as a symbol of the universe (*ἐπὶ ποδήρους ἐνδύματος ἦν ὄλος ὁ κόσμος*, Wisd. xviii. 24), and the strange epithet of "the cosmic sanctuary" (*τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν*) as applied to the Tabernacle (Heb. ix. 1). I do not wish to lay too much stress on resemblances in less characteristic words which may seem to be the common property of a given school or period; but those which follow, as found in both books, are at least sufficient to shew that both belong to the same period and the same school. Like coincidences would, if I mistake not, be admitted to have weight in determining the authorship of one of the doubtful plays of Shakespeare or an anonymous poem ascribed to Milton. With this admission, therefore, of the imperfect, though, I must add, cumulative character of the evidence, I ap-

pend the following list of words found in both the books now under our inquiry: *τελειώω* (Wisd. iv. 13, Heb. ii. 10); *ἀπαλλάσσω* (Wisd. xii. 2, Heb. ii. 15); *κατασκευάζειν* (Wisd. ix. 2, Heb. iii. 4); *μέχρι τέλους* (Wisd. xvi. 6, xix. 1, Heb. iii. 6); *ἀπιστία* (Wisd. xiv. 25, Heb. iii. 12); *ἀπολείπεται* (Wisd. xiv. 6, Heb. iv. 6); *χρείαν ἔχειν* (Wisd. xiii. 6, Heb. v. 12, x. 36); *ἄπειρος* (Wisd. xiii. 18, Heb. v. 13); *τελειότης* (Wisd. vi. 15, Heb. vi. 1); *βεβαίωσις* (Wisd. vi. 18, Heb. vi. 6); *πρόδρομος* (Wisd. xii. 8, Heb. vi. 20); *ἐντύγχανειν* (Wisd. viii. 21, Heb. vii. 25); *ἀμίαντος* (Wisd. iii. 13, iv. 2, Heb. vii. 26); *κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν* (Wisd. ix. 25, Heb. x. 1); *εἴσοδος* (Wisd. vii. 6, Heb. x. 19); *παρρησία* (Wisd. v. 1, Heb. x. 19); *μετετέθη*, as applied to Enoch (Wisd. iv. 10, Heb. xi. 5); *μεταλαμβάνειν* (Wisd. xviii. 7, Heb. xii. 10); *εὐάρεστος* (Wisd. iv. 10, Heb. xii. 28); *ἔκβασις* (Wisd. ii. 17, Heb. xiii. 7); *ἀνάγω* (Wisd. xvi. 13, xiii. 21, Heb. xiii. 20). A comparison of the passages thus referred to will shew, I believe, that their weight in the scale of evidence is more than numerical; that they are, for the most part, words either characteristic themselves, or used in a characteristic sense; and that they thus tend to establish such a close affinity of thought and language as may best be explained by the hypothesis of identity of authorship.

6. Affinity, more or less close, between two books may, however, be proved in other ways. They may, over and above all words and phrases and turns of thought which they have actually in common, supply proof* that their writers have manifestly drawn from the same sources, been familiar with the same writings, and sat at the feet of the

same teacher. And this element of evidence also we find, if I mistake not, in the case before us. Any commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews will shew how largely the writer is indebted to Philo both for his thoughts and phraseology. I select the following examples of that indebtedness, but the list is far from exhaustive; and it must be borne in mind that the words already given are found, many of them, in Philo, as well as in the two books to which reference has been made. Here then we have those which are found in Philo and in the Epistle, but not in Wisdom: *χαρακτήρ* (Heb. i. 3); *ἐπιλαμβάνομαι* (ii. 16); *ἀρχιερέως τῆς ὁμολογίας* (iii. 1); *τραχηλίζομαι* (iv. 13); *δυσερμήνευτος* (v. 11); *γῆ τίκτουσα* (vi. 9); *βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης* (vii. 2); *ἐπιουργός* (xi. 10); *πατρίς*, used of heaven (xi. 13); *ἀγών* of man's life (xii. 1); the unusual formula of quotation, *διεμαρτύρατο δέ που τις* (iii. 6); the combination, *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως* (i. 1); the use of the conjunction *ἴδιον* (ii. 15); *καταβολή*, of creation (iv. 3, ix. 26); *μετριοπαθεῖν* (v. 2); *δεήσεις καὶ ἰκετηρίας* (v. 7); the play upon *ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν* (v. 8); *αἰσθητήρια* v. 14); *καταβαλλόμενος θεμέλιον* (vi. 1); *ἀμετάθετος* (vi. 17); *διηνεκές* (x. 1, *et al.*); *ἀμήτωρ* (vii. 3); the argument that the less is blessed of the greater (vii. 7); *μετάθεσις* (vii. 12); *κεφαλαῖον* (viii. 1); *σχεδὸν πάντα* (ix. 21); *σκία*, of types (x. 1); sacrifices as an *ἀνάμνησις* of sins (x. 3); *μαρτυρεῖ*, as a formula of quotation (x. 15); *ἀορατος* (xi. 27); *εἰσάγειν* (i. 6); *ἀνακαινίζειν* (vi. 6); *ἐχόμενα*, in the sense of 'attaching to' (vi. 9); *προκειῖσθαι* (vi. 13); *ἄμωμος* (ix. 14); *ὑποστέλλομαι* (x. 33); *φαινόμενον*, of the visible universe (xi. 3); *καταβολή σπέρματος* (xi. 11); *κομίζεσθαι* (xi. 19);

ἀποβλέπω (xi. 26); ἐπιλείψει με διηγούμενον (xi. 32); ὄγκον ἀποθέμενος (xii. 1); κάμνω and ἐκλύομαι (xii. 3); παραδέχεσθαι (xii. 6); καρπὸν ἀποδίδωσι (xii. 11); παρειμένος (xii. 12). It will be admitted, I believe, that here also the words are far from being of common and every-day use; that, for the most part, they are just those which are most characteristic of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and that the result of the induction is a conviction amounting to little short of absolute certainty that the writer of the Epistle was either personally a disciple of Philo, or that he had at one time of his life made his writings the object of such constant study, that he had learnt to speak, almost without knowing it, in the same dialect, and to think the same thoughts.

7. The absence of any thoroughly good commentary on the Book of Wisdom makes it less easy to produce a like list of parallelisms between it and Philo, but with the help of Grimm's, I note the following as suggestive of a like conclusion, each phase of thought quoted having its fellow in the writings of the Alexandrian teacher. ζητεῖν τὸν κύριον (Wisd. i. 1); συνέχειν τὰ πάντα (i. 7); ἄθλα (iv. 6); age not measured by years, but by wisdom (iv. 8); σύστασις κόσμου and στοιχεῖα (vii. 17); νοερὸν (vii. 22); ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης (xi. 17); the pre-existence of souls, and their adaptation to congenial bodies (viii. 19); Wisdom as the πάρεδρος of the Throne of God (ix. 4), σκῆνος, of the body (ix. 15); the description of the Egyptian darkness (xvii. 5); the ὄλος ὁ κόσμος of the priestly raiment (xviii. 24). A more careful study of Philo than I am at present able to give would probably bring to light many more verbal resemblances,

no less striking than the general resemblance of language and of thought (not, however, without some marked contrasts), which have led not a few critics, from Jerome downwards, to look to Philo as the actual writer of the *Wisdom of Solomon*. Even as it is, we are led irresistibly to the conclusion that either Philo must have been acquainted with the *Book of Wisdom*, or that the writer of that book was acquainted with Philo, and that, for our present purpose, is sufficient.

8. A like nearness in point of time or thought in authorship may fairly be inferred when we find two works, not known to be by the same writer, quoted independently in the works of an author known to be nearly contemporary with one of them; and the inference is strengthened when he happens to be the first to quote or refer to either. That this element of evidence is not wanting, I now proceed to shew.

The resemblance between parts of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (especially chaps. ix., xi., xii.) and parts of the *First Epistle of Clement of Rome* is familiar to every student. It leaves on the reader an impression, amounting almost to a conviction, that Clement must have known, directly or at second-hand, the teaching of the *Epistle*, though for some reason or other he does not cite it as inspired, authoritative, apostolic. It has led not a few critics to ascribe the authorship of the *Epistle* to him. But two other passages in the same *Epistle* make it absolutely certain that Clement was acquainted also with the *Book of Wisdom*. The identity of words and phrases, as seen when placed

in juxtaposition, puts this (as Grimm and Tregelles agree) beyond the shadow of a doubt.

τίς ἐρείαυτῶ, τί ἐποίησας; ἢ
τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κράτει
τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ.—*Clem.*
R. i. 27.

ζῆλον ἄδικον δι' οὗ
καὶ θάνατος εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὸν
κόσμον.—*Clem. R.* i. 3.

τίς γὰρ ἐρεῖ τι ἐποίησας,
ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κρίματι
σου.—*Wisd.* xii. 12.

κράτει βράχιονός σου τίς
ἀντιστήσεται.—*Wisd.* xi. 22.

φθόνῳ δέ διαβόλου θάνατος
εἰσήλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον.—
Wisd. ii. 24.

The first passage is referred to by commentators (*e. g.*, Grimm, *Einleitung*) as the earliest traceable reference in any writer, Jewish or Christian, to the Book of which we are speaking. Taking this hint as the starting-point for a fresh induction, we find the following coincidences between the phraseology of Clement and that of one or both of the books now under consideration. ἡγούμενοι for the officers of the Church (*Clem. R.* i. 1 and *Heb.* xiii. 7); φιλοξενία (*Clem. R.* i. 1 *et al.*, and *Heb.* xiii. 2); συνείδησις (*Clem. R.* i. 1, *Wisd.* xvii. 10, *Heb.* ix. 9, 14, x. 2, 22, xiii. 18); τόπος μετανοίας (*Clem. R.* i. 7, *Wisd.* xii. 10, and *Heb.* xii. 17, as before cited); δεσπότης of God (*Clem. R.* i. 7 and in 19 other passages, *Wisd.* xi. 37); Abraham as the "friend of God" (*Clem. R.* i. 10, *Wisd.* vii. 27); ἀντοφθαλμεῖν (*Clem. R.* i. 34, *Wisd.* xii. 4).

9. The position of Clement in relation to the great workers of the Apostolic Church gives to these instances of agreement a special interest. He was connected with the Church of Rome, and was traditionally its bishop, after St. Paul's imprisonment. There were some links in the past that connected

him specially with the Church of Corinth, and led him to address its members in a tone of almost fatherly solicitude. If we accept the identification of the Clement of Phil. iv. 3 with the writer of the Epistle (an identification probable in itself, and with absolutely nothing against it), then the links that bind him to the band of Pauline friends are visibly strengthened. He is in St. Paul's thoughts during his first imprisonment, and had been a fellow-worker with him at a time when the Philip-pians knew something of the labours of both of them. Let us remember then (1) that certainly after their return to Rome, and probably even before their departure from it, Aquila and Priscilla, the teachers of Apollos, were prominent among the Christians of that city, so that the Church in their house is the first to which St. Paul sends his salutations; (2) that after Apollos had been taught by them, they, with the other brethren at Ephesus, gave him letters of commendation to the Church of Corinth (Acts xviii. 27), and that he "helped them much that had believed through grace;" and (3) that there is no mention of any members of that Church but Aquila and Priscilla having joined St. Paul in his voyage to Ephesus; and it will, I think, be admitted that all the phenomena of the case fit in with admirable accuracy, on the assumption that Clement was one of those whom the edict of Claudius drove from Rome to Corinth, and who, either believing previously, as Aquila and Priscilla obviously believed, or then converted, came under the teaching of St. Paul, and was his "fellow-worker" (in his trade of tent-making, or his labours as an

apostle, or in both); that he was then left at Corinth while the other three went to Ephesus, and was therefore at that city when Apollos arrived, commended by his Ephesian teachers. So he would come under the spell of his eloquence, catch his words and phraseology, and if he were the author of the Book of Wisdom, become acquainted with that as belonging to an earlier stage in the preacher's previous life. Later events, of which we have a few traces here and there, might bring the two together once more. St. Paul watched the course of Apollos with an interest in which, though there might be some stirring of indignation at the fickleness of the Corinthians, there was yet no touch of jealousy; and after the Epistle in which he mentions Clement, speaks of him as one whom he desired to see, and to whom he wished all honour to be paid (Tit. iii. 13). The natural sequel to this would have been, that the Alexandrian teacher would press on in the track of the Apostle's footsteps, and would reach Rome before, or more probably, deterred by the horrors of the Neronian persecution, shortly after his death. Thus the links that had bound him before to the circle of Pauline Christians, whom he had known at an earlier date at Ephesus and Corinth, would be strengthened, and new ties formed. Thus Clement would come in contact with him at a later stage of his spiritual growth. Thus there would be a special force in his appeal to the Hebrews of Palestine, "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood" (Heb. xii. 4), as contrasting their lighter afflictions with the reign of terror in the imperial city. Thus his mention of "our brother Timotheus" as released

(Heb. xiii. 23), and of some who had come from Italy (Heb. xiii. 24), and were with him when he wrote, would receive an easy and natural explanation.

10. It is clear, from the whole tone of St. Paul's language in the early chapters of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, as well as from the account given of him by St. Luke (Acts xviii. 24-28), that the teaching of Apollos was characterized by a higher and more stately eloquence, by a discussion of profounder mysteries, than those which had marked the preaching of St. Paul in that Church. "Here," his admirers would seem to have said, "we have the wisdom which we seek. Here we have one who can give us not the 'milk that is fit for babes,' but the 'solid food that belongs to those that are of full age.' Here we can rise to heights and fathom depths which we never reached before." This, I say, lies on the surface of things, but how much more full a meaning is given to St. Paul's words if we think of the Alexandrian preacher as bringing with him the same of being the writer of a book that bore 'Wisdom' as its title. On that assumption we perceive, in the midst of the fullest recognition of the personal faith and zeal of Apollos, a ring of something like a righteous scorn for that earlier work which men were praising and admiring, as belonging to a lower region than the Gospel which he himself had preached. He contrasts, not without a touch of indignation, the simplicity of his own teaching with the "taught words of human wisdom" (*ἀνθρωπινῆ σοφία*) of him whom men were setting up as his rival, declares that he too can speak "wisdom" (*i. e.*, the higher development of doctrine) among

those that are "perfect," *i. e.*, of full age ; but that he had refrained from giving them that higher knowledge, because they, far from being of full age, were but as babes in Christ, and therefore needed the milk that was fit for infants, and not the "strong meat" of the full-grown man (1 Cor. ii. 2). He takes the illustration which Apollos (if he were the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews) afterwards used himself (Heb. v. 12), and which had doubtless been prominent in his teaching all along, and finds in it a justification of his own procedure. So too, over and above the agreement, often pointed out, between St. Luke's report that Apollos "helped them much which had believed through grace," and St. Paul's comparison of their respective labours, "I planted, Apollos watered;" "I laid the foundation, but another buildeth thereon" (1 Cor. iii. 6, 10), I find a special allusion in St. Paul's language to the incident which is recorded in the same passage of the Acts. Apollos had come to Corinth with "letters of commendation," dwelling, we may well believe, on his being mighty in the Scriptures, eloquent, persuasive ; and St. Paul calls on them to remember that he had won his own way without such adventitious aid, had come as a stranger and had gained a hearing. "Do we need, *as some others*, letters of commendation to you ? Do we ask you to give them to us, as others ask ?" (2 Cor. iii. 1.)

11. We cannot wonder, if we look at the Book of Wisdom as the work of Apollos, that he should seem to Aquila and Priscilla to possess the very gifts which were wanted to make the faith of Christ acceptable to those who were imbued with the

higher culture of the philosophy of Greece. Over and above all personal gifts of tone, accent, fluency, of which there may have been many, there must have seemed to them a special adaptation, rarely found in a Jew, to the wants of such hearers. It was no small gain that such an one should come there preaching the very virtues—temperance and prudence, justice and fortitude—*σωφροσύνη, φρόνησις, δικαιοσύνη, ἀνδρεία*—which from the days of Plato and Aristotle had been echoed in the discourses of the Porch, the Garden, and the Grove (Wisd. viii. 7); that not only the name of God, but the more expressive *Πρόνοια*, or Providence of God (Wisd. xiv. 5; xvii. 2; vi. 9), should remind them that he was no stranger to the wider thoughts of the great sages of Greece, from Plato downwards. They might well hold, too, that his representations of the character of that Providence as loving and beneficent; of Wisdom as a “spirit that loves men and loves goodness” (*πνεῦμα φιλόανθρωπον φιλόγαθον*, Wisd. vii. 22, 23); of God Himself as a “lover of souls” (*δεσπότης φιλόψυχος*), sparing all things that He had made (xi. 27); of the creation (in harmony with the teaching of well-nigh all Greek cosmogonists) as having been “out of a chaotic matter” (*ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης*) into the beauty of a cosmos (Wisd. xi. 18); of the Creator as having ordered all things “in measure and number and weight” (Wisd. xi. 21); would commend his teaching to those who found in Philosophy a schoolmaster leading them to Christ. It was at least some advance towards a solution of the mystery of pain and death, to proclaim that suffering was for the most part remedial, and took its place as part of the discipline

of life (xi. 10, 11) for those who would accept that discipline; that the love of God was over all his works (xi. 25); that death was not his work, but that of an enemy and destroyer (i. 13; ii. 24). And in that special task of combating the multiform idolatry by which the nations of the world had been degraded, what more effectual protest could be made than by him who was able to recognize degrees of ignorance and guilt, to make allowances for those who were "less to be blamed" as "peradventure seeking God and desirous to find Him," considering the works but not acknowledging the Workmaster (xiii. 1-7); to speak with noble and righteous scorn of the baser image-worship which, as he had seen in Egypt, reproduced the fetiche of the savage in the midst of the highest culture of civilization (xiii. 10-19); to trace the origin of idolatry after the manner which Euhemerus had made familiar, to the sorrow of parents and the vanity of kings (xiv. 17-20); to point to all the abominations in which it had been fruitful, to its human sacrifices, to its "shameless uncleanness," to the delirious passion, of which the story of Pygmalion was the familiar prototype? (xiv. 23-24, xv. 5.) Such a man was well fitted to be a preacher of the true faith in a city like Corinth, with its proverbial profligacy, its harlot-priestesses of Aphrodite, its glorious works of art, its unutterable vileness. They might well think, too, that no teacher was so fitted to deal with the dominant Epicureanism of the time, nowhere more dominant than at Corinth, as one who shewed how well he understood its charms, who had taken the measure of its appeal to our sensuous nature, and its antipathy to all higher forms of

goodness ; who could reproduce, as in *Wisd. ii. 1-9*, the very accents of Anacreon and of Horace. If we add to this that they saw in him, as they well might have done, if we hold him to have been the future writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, an equal capacity for developing the new truth under many different aspects, for tracing its affinities with the older revelation, and shewing its superiority to all, we shall not wonder that they sent him to Corinth with high expectations of what his work there would be, and that those expectations were not disappointed.

12. A work like the *Wisdom of Solomon* is, from the nature of the case, partly from its pseudonymous form, partly from the abstract nature of the subjects of which it treats, not likely to be fruitful in historical allusions which may help us to fix its date. All that can be said on this score is that there is nothing in the book to indicate either an earlier or later date than that which has been here assumed ; and that the repeated warnings to those that were "judges of the earth" (i. 1), who "ruled the people and gloried in the multitude of nations" (vi. 1, 3), fit in with the time in which the oppression of the Jews at Alexandria by their heathen magistrates drove them, as a last resource, to send Philo on an embassy to Caligula ; that the general protest against the "ungodly custom which was kept as a law," and by which "graven images were worshipped by the commandment of kings (*τύραννοι*), whom men could not honour in their presence, because they dwelt afar off" (xiv. 17), may veil a special protest against the insane claims of that emperor to the honours of an apotheosis in his

lifetime, and his attempt to erect his statue, as in other sanctuaries throughout the empire, so even in that of the Temple at Jerusalem.

13. There is one passage, more wonderful and lofty than any other in the whole book, which may perhaps suggest an approximation to a more definite date. We cannot read that noble picture of the righteous sufferer in ii. 13-20, without asking ourselves whether it be not, consciously or unconsciously, a delineation of the Passion of Him whom we acknowledge as the greatest of all sufferers. "He professeth to have the knowledge of God, and he calleth himself the servant (*παῖδα*) of the Lord. He was made to reprove our thoughts. . . . His life is not like other men's; his ways are of another fashion. . . . He blesseth (*μακαρίζει*) the end of the just, and maketh his boast that God is his father. Let us see if his words be true, and let us prove what shall happen in the end of him. For if the just man be the Son of God, He will help him, and deliver him from the hands of his enemies. Let us examine him with despitefulness and torture, that we may know his meekness and prove his patience." What was there, we ask, in the events of that period of the world's history, to suggest so noble an ideal picture, other than that which we find in the narrative of the Gospels? Do we not hear echoes of the voice and see almost the very lineaments of the face of that Just One whom we know as the Son of God, who called God his Father, making Himself equal with God. I dare not say that *that* narrative was known to the author of the Book of Wisdom, but I cannot bring myself to believe that

the writer of these wonderful words was altogether ignorant of the events which correspond so closely to his own language. On the assumption that Apollos was the author, at a comparatively early stage of his spiritual growth, the whole explains itself. What he describes was just such a report of the claims and the sufferings of the Christ as might have been brought from Jerusalem to Alexandria by some devout follower of the Baptist, knowing something, though at a distance, of the lofty claims and spotless holiness of Jesus, remembering the mocking cries of priests and scribes, as they stood by the cross, contrasting his meekness with the fury and malice of his opponents, contrasting it equally with the voluptuousness and self-indulgence of the heathen. One who came with the recollection of the Baptist's martyrdom, and had not yet acknowledged the full mission of the Christ, would be likely to unite the two in one ideal picture.

So far, then, I have set in order the material evidence in favour of the view which, though unsupported by tradition, I venture to maintain, in the absence of any tradition to the contrary, as probable. It will remain, should I have the opportunity, to study the two books, which I have thus endeavoured to restore to their true author, in the light of that hypothesis, and to see how far they illustrate the life of him who is thus assumed to be their writer, how far, beyond that personal interest, they illustrate the relation of the highest form of Alexandrian Judaism to the nobler faith in Christ crucified, which was then known as the gospel, which we have since learnt to speak of as Christianity.

E. H. PLUMPTRE.