

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 *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

SOME INFLUENCES OF APOLLOS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, I

GEORGE A. BARTON
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN the pages of the New Testament Apollos is not made prominent. In Acts 18 24-28 and 19 1 his coming to Ephesus and residence at Corinth are described. He is there said to be an Alexandrian, eloquent, fervent of spirit, and mighty in the Scriptures. At the time of his arrival at Ephesus he was still a member of the John the Baptist sect, but was won to Christianity by Priscilla and Aquila, after which he crossed to Corinth and greatly strengthened the infant Church at that place, "powerfully confuting the Jews, . . . showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ." His residence at Corinth was one of the causes of the growth of party spirit there, which St. Paul found it necessary to correct in 1 Corinthians 1-4. Apart from these passages he is mentioned but twice in the New Testament (1 Cor. 16 12 and Titus 3 13).

That Apollos had considerable influence at Corinth is unquestionable. That he had some influence in the Apostolic Age has been recognized by such scholars as Pfeleiderer,¹ Mc Giffert,² Harnack,³ Bacon,⁴ Kirsopp Lake and Foakes Jackson,⁵ but a study of the Alexandrian antecedents of Apollos, especially of Philo, and a study of certain ideas in the New Testament, makes it probable that the influence of Apollos was much more

¹ *Urchristentum*, 1887, 148 ff.

² *The Apostolic Age*, 292 ff.

³ *Expansion of Christianity*, I, 79.

⁴ *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, 1920, pp. 454 and 464.

⁵ *The Beginnings of Christianity*, II, 288.

widespread and fundamental than has been suspected. That Apollos was a man of much force of character is proved by his influence at Corinth, where he took his place in the estimation of the Christians beside St. Peter and St. Paul. He had arrived at Ephesus in the summer of the year 53; his stay at Corinth could not have been many years, for by the Passover season of 56 or 57 he had been again in Ephesus sufficiently long so that the Corinthians were asking that he might return to them once more (see 1 Cor. 16 12). If Apollos mediated Alexandrian modes of thought to the Pauline churches, he did it after the year 53.

As Apollos was an Alexandrian, if he exerted any influence on primitive Christian thought, it should be sought in phases of thought which were characteristic of Philo, the one Jewish writer of Alexandria of this period who has left a considerable body of writings. Philo probably died soon after the year 40 A. D. We know that he made a journey to Rome in the year 39—40, when he was an old man. He was at the height of his fame and power, therefore, while Apollos was growing up at Alexandria. Apollos, if influenced by him, need not follow him slavishly; no man of originality would do this. To trace the probable influence of Apollos we do not need to find the thought of Philo reproduced exactly; it will be enough to find traces of ideas and ways of treating subjects which, though not identical, have a general kinship to the thought of Philo, and which, in the circle of the Pauline churches, the presence of Apollos will account for better than any other known influence. Apollos, like Philo, was mighty in the Scriptures. It is clear from 1 Cor. 1—4, especially from what St. Paul says about wisdom, that the Corinthians regarded Apollos' teaching as much more intellectual than St. Paul's. He seems never, so far as we know, to have founded churches. He was not a missionary; his function seems to have been that of a teacher and an expounder of Scripture. It is hardly possible that such a man, arriving from Alexandria, should not have brought many new ideas and interpretations into the Christian circles of Greece and Asia, and, if he did, that they should not be embedded in the New Testament; for at the time of his coming only two, or at the most

three, of the Pauline Epistles had been written, while most of the other books were still to be composed.

If, then, we are to trace the influence of Apollos, we should seek it in phases of thought which appear in Philo or are related to Philonic ideas. We should seek to find traces of Philo's Logos doctrine, of his way of accounting for the birth of remarkable personages, of his eschatological conceptions, and of his allegorical method of interpreting the Old Testament. Let us take up these points briefly one by one, beginning with the one that has been least studied, the ideas concerning the birth of extraordinary personages.⁶

Philo makes it very clear in several passages of his writings that children granted by God as the result of prayer, or children born according to divine promise, or even children of divinely commissioned and divinely guided men were begotten of "divine seed" even though they had human fathers. In Philo's understanding of such births, there was a sense in which such children could be said to be born to God and not begotten by a mortal, even though they had human fathers. This is proved by the following passages:

In his tract *Quod Deus sit Immutabilis*, ch. 2, Philo says:⁷ *Τούτου γίνεται μαθητρὶς καὶ διάδοχος Ἄννα, τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δῶρημα σοφίας ἐρμηνεύεται γὰρ χάρις αὐτῆς. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐγκύμων ἐγένετο παραδεξαμένη θείας γονῆς καὶ τελεσφόροις ἐχρήσατο ὠδίσι, τὸν τεταγμένον ἐν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ τάξει τρόπον ἀποχήσασα, ὃν ἐπιψήμισε Σαμουὴλ, i. e. "His disciple and successor was Hannah, the gift of the wisdom of God, for 'her grace' it [her name] is translated. When she was pregnant, having become a recipient of divine seed, and experienced due labors, she brought forth in the manner appointed in the ordering of God one whom she called Samuel."*

This is Philo's interpretation of 1 Samuel 1 10: "And Elkanah knew Hannah, his wife; and Yahweh remembered her." Hannah had been barren; she had prayed for a son; hence Philo, because her barrenness was cured by Yahweh, regarded Samuel as

⁶ The subject is so large that only this one topic is treated in the present paper. In future papers the writer hopes to deal with the others.

⁷ Edition of Paul Wendland, Berlin, 1887.

begotten of "divine seed," even though he had a human father. It was far from Philo's thought to say that Samuel had no human father; Philo was an orthodox Jew and did not question the text of Scripture. He was only interpreting the facts as best he could.

Again in his treatise *De congressu Eruditionis Gratia*, ch. 1 and 3 we find the following:

Σάρα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ Ἀβραάμ οὐκ ἔτικτεν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ φησι μὴ τίκτειν τὴν Σάραν, ἀλλ' αὐτῷ τιμὴ μὴ τίκτειν; i. e. "Sarah, the wife of Abraham, did not bear him children On this account he does not say that Sarah did not bear children, but that she did not bear to a certain one."

Again in *De Mutatione Nominum*, 23:

εἶπετο δ' εὐθὺς ἡ γένεσις Ἰσαάκ· καλέσας γὰρ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ Σάρραν ἀντὶ Σάρας φησὶ τῷ Ἀβραάμ· δώσω σοι (ἐξ αὐτῆς) τέκνον. ἐν μέρει δ' ἕκαστον ἀκριβοῦτον. ὁ τοίνυν κυρίως διδούς ὅτιοῦν ἰδίον τι πάντως ἑαυτοῦ δίδωσιν· εἰ δὲ τοῦτ' ἀψευδὲς ἔστι, γένοιτ' ἂν Ἰσαάκ οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ὁ συνώνυμος τῆς ἀρίστης τῶν εὐπαθειῶν, χαρᾶς, γέλωτος, ὁ ἐνδιάθετος υἱὸς θεοῦ τοῦ διδόντος αὐτὸν μείλιγμα καὶ εὐθυμίαν εἰρηκωτάταις ψυχαῖς.

I. e. "There followed straightway the birth of Isaac; for having called his mother Sarah instead of Sara he [God] said to Abraham 'I will give to thee a child (from her).' Each thing must be examined thoroughly in turn. He, then, who is rightfully giving anything whatever, should really give something that is his own; and, if this is true, Isaac would not be a man, but being synonymous with the best of pleasures, joy, laughter, the regular son of God, who gives him as a gladdener and cheerer to peace-loving souls."

Once more in *De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia*, 2 he says: Σάρα οὖν, ἡ ἀρχουσα μου τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρετῆ, ἔτικτε μὲν, ἐμοὶ δ' οὐκ ἔτικτε εἴωθε γὰρ θεῷ μόνῳ τίκτειν. I. e. "Sarah, the virtue which rules my soul, brings forth indeed, but she does not bring forth to me She is accustomed to bring forth to God alone."

It is clear from these passages that Philo interpreted the account of the birth of Isaac in Genesis to mean that Isaac,

although he had a human father, was the product of a supernatural birth. In the third of the passages quoted above he refers to Genesis 17 16, and in the context from which the second of them is taken he quotes Genesis 17 17. He goes to the verge of denying that Abraham was the father of Isaac as the text of Genesis states, and he does assert that, under the circumstances, both Abraham and Sarah being past the age when they could expect to be parents, Isaac was really supernaturally born—was really the son of God, though born to Abraham. The next extract will make this clearer.

Both Samuel and Isaac were children into whose coming into the world the Old Testament had stated that an unusual, or supernatural element entered, but Philo extends the principle to at least two other instances. These were cases in which he regarded the fathers as persons who stood especially near to God, viz: Moses and the Patriarch Judah. These points are made clear in the following passages:

A passage in *De Cherubim*, 13 reads: *παρέξω δὲ τῶν λεγομένων ἐγγυτην ἀξιόχρεον τὸν ἱεράτατον Μωσῆν· τὴν γὰρ Σάρραν εἰσάγει τότε κύουσαν, ὅτε ὁ θεὸς αὐτὴν μονοθεῖσαν ἐπισκοπεῖ τίκτουσαν δ' οὐκέτι τῇ τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν πεποιημένην, ἀλλὰ τῇ σοφίας τυχεῶν γλιχομένην, οὗτος δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ὀνομάζεται . . . τάλιν Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ πανσόφου τὸν θεὸν ἱκετεύσαντος, ἐκ τοῦ ἱκετευθέντος ἔγκως ἢ ἐπιμονῇ Ῥεβέκκα γίνεται. χωρὶς δὲ ἱκετείας καὶ δαίσεως τὴν πτηνὴν καὶ μετάρσιον ἀρετὴν Σετφόραν Μωσῆς λαβὼν εὐρίσκει κύουσαν ἐξ οὐδενὸς θνητοῦ τὸ παράπαν. I. e. "I will bring forward as a surety of the remarkable things that have been said the most holy Moses: for he introduces Sarah as becoming pregnant at the time when God looked upon her in solitude, but as bearing the child, not at all to him who did the looking, but to him who was striving to attain wisdom, who is called Abraham . . . Again, when Isaac, the all-wise, entreated God, Rebecca, who is perseverance, became pregnant from him who was entreated. But without supplication and prayer Moses, taking Zipporah, winged and exalted virtue, finds her pregnant absolutely from no mortal."*

Again, in his treatise *De Mutatione Nominum*, 23, in speaking of the amour of Judah with Tamar in Genesis 38 by which

Perez and Zerah were begotten he says: ἡ δὲ Θάμαρ ἐγκύμων τε γενομένη θείων σπερμάτων καὶ τὸν μὲν σκείραντα οὐκ ἰδοῦσα τὰ δὲ σύμβολα καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια διαθοήσασα καὶ παρ' αὐτῆς δικάσασα, ὅτι θνητὸς ταῦτ' οὐ δίδωσιν, ἀνέκραγεν· οὐτως ταῦτ' ἐστίν, ἐξ ἐκείνου ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχω. I. e. "And Tamar, when she had become pregnant with divine seed and did not know the begetter, when she saw the tokens and evidences deciding within herself that no mortal gave these things, cried 'to whomsoever these things belong, by him I am with child'."

It is clear from these quotations that, to Philo's thinking, human paternity was not inconsistent with divine paternity. One could be begotten of divine seed and yet have a human father. Of the four instances cited by Philo, that of Isaac clearly appealed to him most strongly. He comes back to it in various writings in different ways, and at times clearly says that Isaac was really the son of God and only nominally the son of Abraham. It is difficult to tell how literally Philo meant this to be taken, because he so mingles allegory with fact, or transmutes fact into allegory. Isaac is joy, or laughter; Sarah is wisdom; Rebecca is perseverance; Abraham is "one who is striving to attain wisdom." It is, perhaps, because he is thinking of the allegory, that he says that Sarah did not bring forth to Abraham, but to God, and yet, the circumstances described in Genesis make it possible that he meant this literally. The age of both Abraham and Sarah made parenthood in the natural way impossible, and Philo may well have thought that the coming of the angel, the utterance of the promise of God, and the consequent birth of Isaac, made Isaac really God's son, and only nominally Abraham's. Whatever view one may take of these possibilities, it is clear that we have here some interesting points of comparison for the narratives of the birth of Jesus and of John the Baptist in the Gospels.

It is well known that the Gospel of Mark, which I would date about the year 50, contains no account of the birth of Christ. In it "the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ" was the revelation of his Messiahship at his baptism. St. Paul, too, as late as the year 58, when he wrote his Epistle to the Romans, accepted the view that Jesus was born in a normal way—he

was "the seed of David according to the flesh" (Romans 1 4): Harnack has, I think, shown that the Acts of the Apostles were written in the year 63 A. D. If this be so, the Gospel of Luke—the earliest Gospel to contain an account of Christ's birth—was probably written at Caesarea between 58 and 60 A. D., while St. Paul was imprisoned there, and St. Luke was his companion. This was between five and seven years after the coming of Apollos into the circle of the Pauline company. Had St. Luke met him, or come into contact with his writings? Let us see.

In Luke, chs. 1 and 2, we have an account of the births of John the Baptist and of Jesus; the Gospel of Matthew relates the circumstances connected with the birth of Jesus only. Why should Luke be so much more interested in the Baptist? Apollos had himself been a member of the John the Baptist sect (Acts 18 25) before he became a Christian, and, as the Baptist was regarded by Christians as Christ's forerunner, he would naturally continue to reverence the Baptist after he became a Christian, since it was the Baptist who prepared him for the greater Master's discipleship. No one is mentioned in the whole New Testament who would be so likely as Apollos to glorify the Baptist by giving a glowing account of his birth.

A closer examination of the narrative of the circumstances of John's birth confirms this first impression. Zacharias and Elisabeth, we are told, were both well advanced in years (Lu. 1 7), and were childless, because Elisabeth was barren. They had prayed for a son (v. 13), but their prayers had not been granted. One day as Zacharias was ministering at the altar an angel appeared and told him that his prayers had been heard, and that Elisabeth should conceive and bear him a son. Zacharias, like Sarah, was incredulous, and became dumb until the prediction had been fulfilled. In due time it was, however, fulfilled, and the child was born. The parallelism with the birth of Isaac, which, as we have seen, was so popular with Philo, and of which doubtless Apollos had often been led to think during his years of study at Alexandria, is complete. In both cases we have a son born to parents by supernatural means after the natural period of child-bearing was passed. Thus Apollos, one may suppose, intended to suggest that a divine element entered into

the nature of John the Baptist and prepared him for his exalted mission.

We may note one striking difference between the Apollon-Lucan account of this birth and Philo's treatment of similar topics. Philo allegorizes at times all personality away from the characters of whom he speaks; Sarah becomes virtue, Isaac, laughter, etc. In this narrative, however, there is no allegory; Zacharias, Elisabeth, and John are all vividly personal. Such a difference we might expect. A disciple does not usually follow his teacher in all things; if he has any originality at all, he deviates from his teacher in some important features. The absence of allegory from the account of the birth of John is not, therefore, a serious objection to the theory that Apollon was its author.

In Luke chs. 1 and 2 the birth of Christ is also narrated, and the account differs in some important respects from the story of the birth of John. As might be expected, it is more supernatural. It nevertheless presents such likenesses to the Philonic conceptions already traced as to make it very probable that this also comes from the hand of Apollon. It relates (Lu. 1 26 π.) how the angel Gabriel appeared to a virgin (*παρθένος*) and made to her the Annunciation that she should conceive and bear a son and should call his name Jesus. *Παρθένος*, like the Hebrew *עַלְמָה*, originally designated a young woman, whether married or unmarried, and in the Iliad, II, 514, is used of a young married woman. This meaning survived in Jewish Greek, as the use of *παρθένος* in Isa. 7 14 as the translation of *עַלְמָה* shows. Apollon, and after him Luke, used it in the same sense, as their elastic use of *μνηστεύειν*, treated more fully below, proves. They make it clear, however, by the attendant circumstances which they describe that in the case of Mary the *παρθένος* had not yet cohabited with her husband. Had they not done so, the birth of Christ would, from their point of view, have been less miraculous than that of John the Baptist.

The *παρθένος* is said to have been betrothed (*ἐμνηστευμένην*) to a man named Joseph. When the angel predicted that she should become a mother, she asked "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" A strange question for a betrothed maiden, who might naturally suppose that the prediction referred to the

fruit of her approaching marriage. The reply to this question was "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also that which is born shall be called holy, the Son of God."

St. Luke gives no account of the marriage of Joseph and Mary, but in ch. 2 4 he tells us that they travelled together from Nazareth to Bethlehem. Both St. Luke and Apollos knew very well that girls in that age did not travel alone before marriage with men to whom they were betrothed. The fact of this journey together implies marriage. Indeed, in verse 5 Mary is described as (*Μεριάμ ἡ ἐμνηστευμένη*) a word which is usually employed to denote betrothal, and is often supposed to signify only wooing or betrothal, but which is sometimes applied to a married woman. The verb *μνηστεύειν* is employed in Greek from Homer down in the meaning of "woo", "betroth." In the Septuagint it is employed as one of the words by which *שׂוּמַ* is translated.* *שׂוּמַ*, or some form of it occurs in the following passages: Ex. 22 15; Dt. 20 7; 22 23, 25, 26, 28; 2 Sam. 3 14; Hos. 2 21, 22 and 1 Macc. 3 26. In Hosea *שׂוּמַ* and *μνηστεύειν* are both applied to a faithless wife who has left her husband and whom he wishes to woo back again. If we translated "I will marry thee to me forever, and I will marry thee to me by righteousness and by justice and by mercy and by love; I will marry thee to me in faithfulness and by knowledge of Yahweh", we should do fuller justice to the passage in its context than the ordinary translation does. One does not betroth a wife to him forever; at some time the betrothal leads to a marriage or it is dissolved. In 2 Sam. 3 14 *שׂוּמַ* is applied to the transaction described in 1 Sam. 18 25-29, whereby Michal, Saul's daughter, became the wife of David. Here there was no betrothal; David, when he had fulfilled the conditions laid down by Saul, simply took Michal for his wife. The ordinary Hebrew word for taking a wife is *קָחַ*, and the Septuagint translators show that they think a marriage was indicated by the Hebrew *שׂוּמַ*, for they translate it by *ἐλαβον*, the Greek equivalent of *קָחַ*†

* The root *שׂוּמַ*, Assyrian *erīša*, meant "to wish for", "desire."

† The Authorized Version rendered *μνηστεύειν* by the word "espoused," which may mean either betrothed or married. This is a happier rendering than that of the Revised Version.

It is clear, therefore, from the evidence of the contexts, that both $\epsilon\omega\gamma\gamma\alpha$ and $\mu\eta\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon$ were employed for betrothal and also for marriage, especially a recent marriage. In Luke 2 5, then, it is not strange to find it applied to a married woman. Doubtless Apollos, if he was the author of the passage, intended to indicate that the girl who was $\tau\alpha\rho\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, when the annunciation was made to her, was still $\tau\alpha\rho\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, when she reached Jerusalem; that she was married to Joseph, but that they had not cohabited. Thus the birth of Jesus was as supernatural as that of John, but in a different way; John was supernaturally begotten because his parents were past the age of begetting and child-bearing; Jesus, because he was conceived before his parents had ever come together.

When we consider this narrative of the birth of Jesus and of John against the background of Philonic thought and the scientific ideas of the first century, it is not clear whether Apollos regarded the birth of Jesus as more miraculous than that of John. Apollos was, however, a Christian; he no longer regarded John as the equal of Jesus. Jesus was the Son of God in a sense in which John was not, and so, in order to make this perfectly clear, he tells of the appearance to the shepherds of the angelic host at the time of Jesus' birth, and of their song of praise to God, because he was now to bring peace to the earth by expressing through this child his good will toward men (Lu. 2 13, 14). Just as Philo represents Isaac as God-begotten, so Jesus and John were God-begotten. This did not mean that Mary did not bear Jesus to Joseph, for Joseph and Mary are later spoken of as his "parents" (Lu. 2 41) and Joseph is called his "father" (Lu. 2 48). His genealogy is also traced through Joseph (Lu. 3 23-38), whose son, it is said, Jesus "was supposed" to be. Some scholars have thought the words $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\tau\omicron$ a later gloss, added by some one who misunderstood the main purpose of the context.¹⁰ If the main contention of this paper is right, however, no such supposition is called for. The text as it is is quite in the Philonic manner and is quite what we might

¹⁰ Of course the chronological data in Lu. 21, 3 and 31 do not come from Apollos, but were added by St. Luke.

expect Apollos to write. Philo regarded Isaac as really God-begotten, though born to Abraham. While he does not specifically say that Isaac was only supposed to be the son of Abraham, his statements contain all the elements of such an assertion. It was doubtless the intention of Apollos to follow in the footsteps of his teacher, and we need not be surprised that he made the statement specific.

So far as our extant sources inform us, this view of the birth of Jesus and of John was comparatively new to the Christian public when the Gospel of Luke was composed between the years 58 and 60 A. D. The Gospel of Mark, written some ten years earlier, had represented the "beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" as his baptism, when there broke in upon his consciousness with such power the realization that he was the "Son of God." Mark clearly had never heard of the "Annunciation," for he tells us (Mk. 3 21-33), how Mary as well as Jesus' brothers thought him out of his mind and tried to stop his work. Schmiedel,¹¹ Lobstein,¹² and Berguer¹³ have all pointed out how difficult, if not impossible, it is to suppose that, if Mary had really had the experience before Jesus' birth described in Lu. 1 26 ff., she could ever have thought him out of his mind, and this difficulty does not seem to be fully met by the considerations urged by Box.¹⁴ As Schmiedel has noted, the saying of Jesus "A prophet is not without honor save in his own country, among his own kin, and in his own house" (Mk. 6 4), has in it a personal note, and seems to imply that no one in the family circle at Nazareth understood or sympathized with him. Another important point no one, so far as I know, has noted. In Mark 15 40 it is said that two Marys were at the Crucifixion, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James the less (i. e. the younger) and Joses. As James and Joses were brothers of Jesus (Mk. 6 3), their mother must have been his mother, but she seems to have been so out of sympathy with her great Son that in this older Petrine tradition Mary Magdalene, who was

¹¹ *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, Col. 2955.

¹² *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, New York, 1903, p. 50.

¹³ *Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus*, New York, 1923, p. 102.

¹⁴ *The Virgin Birth of Jesus*, pp. 140 ff. and 226.

devoted to him is mentioned before her, and she is not even called the mother of Jesus. This seems to imply that her idea that he was beside himself was not the expression of momentary psychological doubt and bewilderment, but was the result of a deep-seated misunderstanding of him which ran throughout his ministry. An echo of the early tradition that there was such misunderstanding appears even in the Fourth Gospel (John 2 4), and accounts for the otherwise inexplicable harshness with which Jesus is there said to address his mother. The appearance of harshness in this passage is the more striking from the fact that the Fourth Evangelist represents Mary as anxious to exhibit the miraculous power of her supernatural son.

It may plausibly be urged that Mary's failure to understand Jesus is not psychologically inconsistent with the historicity of the Annunciation; that her misunderstanding may have been due to the fact that she expected Jesus, as Messiah, to be an earthly king, and that, when he persisted in wearing himself out in lowly works she naturally thought the divine plan, so supernaturally disclosed, was being thwarted and that the very fact of the Annunciation intensified her feeling of disappointment and disgust. If, however, all this be granted, it still remains true that this earliest tradition knew nothing of the Annunciation, and probable that, had it known of it, the knowledge would have led those who transmitted the narratives to soften the harshness of Mary's opposition to Jesus.

The fact is (and that is all that is here being insisted upon) that in this earliest tradition, which goes back to Peter, a disciple who belonged to the innermost circle of Christ's intimate companions, there is evidence that the Virgin Birth was unknown, and that the profound misunderstanding of Jesus on the part of his mother was one of the tragedies of his life.

St. Paul's view was similar to this. He declares that Jesus was "of the seed of David according to the flesh" and that it was the Resurrection which determined that he was the Son of God (Rom. 1 4). Further, St. Paul states very clearly that he believed that the divine nature of Jesus was given him [or given back to him] because of the way he met temptation. In Phil. 2 5-11 he contrasts Christ with Adam. Adam was made in the image of

God; he was tempted to become like God, he grasped at the prize and lost his Eden. Jesus was in the "form" (*μορφή*) of God [St. Paul accepted his pre-existence], Jesus did not think equality with God a prize to be grasped at, but emptied himself [of his divine attributes] becoming obedient to death, the ignominious death of the cross. Therefore (i. e. in consequence of this), God highly exalted him and gave to him "the name that is above every name," i. e. the name Yahweh, represented in the Greek by *Κύριος*, a name which carried with it, according to Jewish modes of thinking, the attributes of deity (cf. Lev. 24 11). St. Paul could not assert more emphatically than he does in this passage his belief in the deity of Christ, nor could he state more clearly his belief that that deity was given back to him because of the choices he made as a man. As in Romans 1 4, he makes it quite clear that it was at Christ's Resurrection, after he had humbled himself and become obedient to death—the death of the cross—that God exalted him. As he had emptied himself of divinity that he might "be found in fashion as a man" before the Incarnation, and did not receive "the name that is above every name" until the Resurrection, it follows that St. Paul thought of Jesus as having been during his earthly life a man; that he came into the world like other men, and received back his divinity at the Resurrection.

It is hardly possible that Apollos should have elaborated this account of the birth of Jesus between the years 53 and 58, while working at Corinth and Ephesus, during the period of St. Paul's residence at Ephesus and his second and third visits to Corinth, without St. Paul knowing about it. The fact that in writing Romans he deliberately rejected it, and in Philippians shows that he believed the pre-existent Christ came into the world otherwise, indicates that he did not regard it as resting on authority as good as the older Petrine view.

We have, then, this situation. The early tradition which goes back to St. Peter, held that the divine nature of Jesus came upon him at the time of his baptism and temptation. The first departure from this view in the literature is found in the Gospel of Luke, in which both John the Baptist and Jesus are represented as miraculously begotten. St. Luke's account was

written five or seven years after Apollos came into the circle of the Pauline churches. We know that it was St. Luke's literary method to embody his sources with comparative entirety. Presumably, therefore, he found the material on this subject ready to his hand practically in the form in which it lies before us in his Gospel. That material, as we have seen, is controlled by conceptions of supernatural birth of which we have parallels only in Philo. The one disciple of the Philonic school of whose presence we know in that region during the years which immediately preceded the writing of the Gospel of Luke was Apollos. Apollos had been a member of the John the Baptist sect; here only in the New Testament is the birth of John narrated and made divine—almost as divine as that of Jesus himself. In view of all these facts it is difficult to escape the conviction that Apollos was the real author of Luke's source for this material. The conviction is confirmed by the abundant knowledge of the Old Testament which the material betrays, for Apollos was "mighty in the Scriptures" (Acts 18 24),¹⁵ and Luke, a Gentile, converted in the year 50, could hardly have been.

¹⁵ It has often been conjectured that St. Luke obtained his information about the Annunciation from the Virgin Mary. While it is not impossible that she lived until after 52 A. D., it is doubtful whether she left Palestine and migrated to the Aegean region where Apollos could meet her. It is possible, however, that between 52 and 58 A. D. he may have made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem at one of the festal seasons when he may have met her. We know that her son James continued to live at Jerusalem until his martyrdom in 62 A. D. (Jos. Ant. xx, 91). If she were alive when Apollos first made his appearance in the circle of the Pauline churches, she would have been at least 75 years old—a great age for a person of that period, though not an impossible one. Had she lived, however, she would probably have lived with one of her children. The only one of these of whose whereabouts the sources of the period give us any information is James, who was looked upon as the head of the Church in Jerusalem. Mary is not mentioned in the New Testament as living with him; nevertheless, she may have done so. Had she lived with him, and had the information come from her, it would seem more likely that it would have formed a part of the Petrine tradition than of that which came through Apollos or Luke. However, if one were to accept the view that either from Mary herself, or from some one who had talked with her, Apollos obtained the facts which he reports here, the Philonic features of the narrative would still be due to the manner of reporting

If this view is correct, the work of Apollos fell into the hands of Luke and appealed to him. He gave it currency in his Gospel. If that Gospel was written at the date and place we have supposed, we may suppose that St. Paul became familiar with the material, for presumably during the years of imprisonment at Caesarea, St. Luke and St. Paul would talk of such a matter. In spite of this, St. Paul never accepted the story. As we have seen, when two or three years later he wrote his Epistle to the Philippians, he still held to the older Petrine tradition, which he doubtless regarded as more historical. How did the story of Apollos fare with others? Let us see what we can discover.

It has often been assumed that the author of the Gospel according to Matthew had a source for the Infancy narratives other than that which Luke had. Apart from oral sources for some parts of his narrative, this seems an unnecessary supposition. It is clear from the main features of the Gospel of Matthew that its author was a Palestinian Jewish Christian, deeply interested in the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy. There is no evidence that he had ever been a member of the John the Baptist sect. When he compiled his Gospel, probably Apollos' account of the Infancy was known to him either in an oral or a written form. His knowledge of the Greek version of Isaiah 7 led him at once to see in Apollos' use of the word *παρθένος* a fulfilment of Isa. 7 14. He rejected, however, Apollos' account of the birth of John the Baptist, as that made John appear to be too nearly on an equality with the Messiah. He also rejected Apollos' line of ancestry for Joseph and substituted another which traced that ancestry through the line of Judaean kings, since the Messiah should come of the line that had actually occupied the throne. For similar reasons he substituted Bethlehem for Nazareth as the home of Joseph and Mary before the birth of Jesus, because the royal parents should live at the royal city. Other features concerning Herod and the Magi were added from oral tradition. One feature of Apollos' Philonic

the facts, at least in part, and the probability would remain that Apollos was the narrator. Had Apollos or Luke been aware, however, that the substance of the narrative came from Mary herself, it seems probable that they would have convinced St. Paul of the fact.

representation he retained. He still counted Joseph as the father of Jesus, going so far as to say, in a reading that the Sinai Syriac and the "Ferrar Group" have preserved (Matth. 1 16), "Joseph, who was espoused to Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus." He thus preserved, in spite of his transformation of the main parts of this story, the Philonic view that Jesus, though begotten by God, was nevertheless the son of Joseph.

By the time the Gospel of John was written the Logos idea, which it is proposed to treat in another paper, had, through St. Paul's mediation in his Epistle to the Colossians of an idea which Apollos had doubtless mediated to him, entered into the conception of the person of Christ entertained in Asia Minor, and the author of the Fourth Gospel employs it, rather than the theory of supernatural birth, to express his conception of the deity of Christ. In spite of the fact that he considers Jesus as the incarnate Logos, he speaks of him as the "son of Joseph" (ch. 1 45 and 6 42), thus perpetuating the Philonic method of mingling divine and human parentage, which Apollos had introduced from Alexandria. He further intimates (ch. 1 12, 13), that through the agency of Jesus Christians experience a birth that is similarly supernatural.

Early in the second century the Apollos view of the birth of Christ had supplanted the Petrine-Pauline view of it. The causes of this were complex. In the first place the views of Apollos lay before every Christian reader in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, while the opposite view was not clearly expressed in Mark, and its expression by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Philippians was so oratorical and involved that it probably was not generally realized that he really expressed a view divergent from that of the Gospels. This is also true of most modern readers of the New Testament. Another reason for the general acceptance of the view of Apollos was the appeal that it made to the love of the supernatural. A third and final reason was the conflict with the Docetic heretics, who reduced the earthly life of Christ to unreality. Jesus was not really divine; he only seemed to be. His divine nature came down upon him for a time at his Baptism, but it left him, when on the cross he cried "My power, my power, thou hast left me" (Gospel of Peter, ch. 5).

The Petrine-Pauline view of the birth of Jesus and of the time his divine nature came to him readily lent itself to this heresy. It is probably no accident that The Gospel of Peter became the Gospel of the Docetists. In combatting this heresy Ignatius naturally fell back upon the Infancy narratives of Matthew and Luke. Thus we find him saying in *Ad Ephes.* 18: "For our God, Jesus Christ, was conceived by Mary, according to a dispensation, from the seed of David and the Holy Ghost, who was born and baptised in order that he might purify the water by his suffering."¹⁶ Docetism made the triumph of the conceptions of Jesus' birth set forth by Apollos necessary, if in the second century the life of Christ were to continue to seem real.

These forces so fixed the views of Apollos in Christian belief that, though in the struggle with Marcion, which soon followed, it would have been an advantage to have vindicated the reality of the humanity of Jesus by asserting that he was born like other men, the confession of faith, which was adopted at Rome for this purpose, continued to say that Jesus was born of a Virgin. In course of time this was elaborated into the Apostles' Creed and has come with authority to our own time, thus transmitting even to us, if we are not mistaken, the thoughts and influence of Apollos.

¹⁶ "The entire list of passages in which Ignatius refers to the Birth of Christ is as follows: *Ad Ephes.* 7; 18; 19; *Ad Magnes.* 8; *Ad Trall.* 9; *Ad Smyr.* 1. Of these *Ad Trall.* 9 sounds so much like an anticipation of the Apostles' Creed that it is worth quoting: "Be ye deaf, therefore, whenever any one speaks to you apart from Jesus Christ, who was of the race of David, who was the son of Mary, who was truly born and ate and drank, was truly persecuted in the time of Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died in the sight of those in heaven and those on earth and those under the earth; who was also truly raised from the dead, his Father raising him, who in like fashion will so raise us who believe on him—his Father will raise us up in Christ, apart from whom we have no genuine life."