

# 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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

## ARTICLE VI.

## THE HAND OF APOLLOS IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

BY REVEREND GEORGE S. ROLLINS, D.D.

I. THE marked differences in style, ideas, and spirit between the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse create one of the most puzzling features of the Johannine problem, and have led to the widely accepted conclusion, that both books could not have come from the same author. Dionysius of Alexandria was the first to write upon this subject, and his acute criticism of the Apocalypse is one of the most scholarly productions of Christian antiquity. He admitted that both documents came from Ephesus, but affirmed, on the ground of linguistic peculiarities, that, while the Apocalypse may have been written by some good man by the name of John, he was not the Apostle. He suggested another John, because he had heard of two Johns in Ephesus. The difficulty which Dionysius discovered is real, and the problem it raises is one that has been the despair of interpreters. In his guess as to the source of the Apocalypse, Dionysius has not a few modern followers.<sup>1</sup> Some great names still stand for the apostolic authority of both books, though several of these admit that the differences are so great as to require separate treatment<sup>2</sup> for the purposes of New Testament theology. It is well known that the Tübingen school accepted the Johannine authorship of the Revelation, and used the evidences for it

<sup>1</sup> De Wette, Bleek, Düsterdieck, Bousset, Schmiedel.

<sup>2</sup> Godet, Meyer, Salmon, Zahn, Weiss, Westcott, Beysslag, Milligan.

against the apostolic source of the Fourth Gospel. Some of their followers deny both to the Apostle,<sup>1</sup> although Weizsäcker concedes that they came from a Johannine "school" in Ephesus, which represented the Apostle's teachings.<sup>2</sup> Finally, a number of reputable scholars are content to note the divergence in the two documents and there leave the question.<sup>3</sup> This variety of opinions indicates the unsettled but vital state of the whole problem. Bacon, in the article referred to, has receded from the position in his Introduction (published in 1900) in which he held to the apostolic source of the Apocalypse, but denied the same to the Gospel. He now believes with Badman,<sup>4</sup> that John was killed in the Herodian persecution (Acts xii. 1), and therefore had nothing to do with either book.

1. Of the three features which separate the two writings, it is easy to exaggerate those of theological ideas and religious spirit. Each book had its particular object, and each was produced under a set of circumstances quite diverse from that of the other. The object and circumstances of the Apocalypse would involve emphasis upon a group of ideas different from those of the Gospel. The condition and peril of the church at the time of the Patmos revelation kindled a spirit distinct from that awakened ten years later, when the danger to the church was not physical, but spiritual. For the same reasons we should expect different methods in the two documents. A book like the Apocalypse would not require

<sup>1</sup> Pfeiderer, Holtzmann, Harnäck, Weizsäcker, Bousset, Schmiegel, and Bacon (Hibbert Journal, Jan. 1904).

<sup>2</sup> *Apostolic Age* (Eng. trans.) ii. 169 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Stevens (N. T. Theology), Porter (Art. "Book of Revelation," in Hastings' Bib. Dict.), McGiffert (Apos. Age), Moffatt (Historical N. T.), etc.

<sup>4</sup> *Am. Jour. Theol.* iii. 729-740; viii. 539-554.

the exhibition of the entire theological system of the author. The aim of the writer is to comfort and encourage the church under persecution by the promise of her Lord's speedy return. It is essentially eschatological. The doctrines of the person of Christ, the Holy Spirit, salvation, and righteousness are tributary to the main idea, which is the Parousia. The Gospel, on the other hand, is distinctly Christological. It aims to set forth Jesus as the incarnate Logos, or Son of God, and conditions eternal life upon faith in him as such. Emphasis is laid upon his preëxistence, his equality in essence, though not in function, with God. He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. The First Epistle is of the same tenor, with even more insistence upon the incarnation of the Son, and the acceptance of this doctrine as a supreme test of discipleship. The object of both Gospel and Epistle is undoubtedly corrective,—one might almost say, in the case of the latter, polemical. Their design is to check the growth of Gnostic and other heresies regarding the person of Christ. Yet, with this diverse object and treatment, the Apocalypse has much in common with the Gospel and the Epistle. In all three, Jesus is the Word of God, and will be the Judge of the world. In all three writings we perceive the same metaphysical dualism, characterized by the antitheses between light and darkness, life and death, the world and the Kingdom of Christ. In all three, John is the same fiery "son of thunder," full of zeal, quickly intolerant of evil and of disparagement of Jesus. We observe in all the books the same marks of Jewish training, combined with a wide outlook upon the world. This is not to deny many disparities, necessitated by diverse circumstances and aims, as well as by different periods of the Apostle's life, but only to show that there is, after all, an underlying unity in these writings, which points to a common source.

2. The difference in diction presents a more serious question. By no sort of argument can it be shown that the Gospel and the Apocalypse came from the same pen. No fair-minded scholar denies this disparity. It obtrudes itself upon one's attention. Even the poorest English translation reveals it. It has to be accounted for. Weiss, while attempting to minimize the linguistic peculiarities of the Apocalypse, feels called upon to note many which are gross violations of form and syntax.<sup>1</sup> So conservative a scholar as Zahn, after a brave attempt in the same direction, resorts to the supposition, that John may have permitted others to edit his works.<sup>2</sup> These peculiarities of style are such as indicate unfamiliarity with the Greek language. There are many grammatical irregularities and faulty constructions (e.g., at i. 5f.; xii. 7), and confusions of case with following participles (i. 4, 10; iii. 12; v. 11; vi. 1, *et al.*). Hebraisms are plentiful, not only in the choice of words, but in construction and order, particularly in the repetition of the demonstrative pronoun in relative clauses (iii. 8; vii. 2, 9; xiii. 8; ii. 8, etc.). The *constructio ad sensum* frequently occurs, as at iv. 17; v. 6; vii. 4; xi. 4; xiii. 3; xvii. 11; xix. 4, etc. There are peculiarities of idiom. The dative of instrument is rarely used, but the Hebraistic *ἐν* is substituted. The vocative case seldom occurs. The plural predicate often follows a neuter plural (i. 19; viii. 11; xv. 4, etc.). Vacillation of tense between present and future is common. The same is true of the present and aorist in descriptive passages. The infinitive is nearly always in the aorist. The copula is often lacking, especially in relative sentences (i. 4; ii. 13; v. 13). Confusions of gender are not uncommon (cf. ix. 7; xiv. 19; xix. 20; xxi. 24, etc.). There is a noticeable monotony in the use of particles, particularly of *καί*. Weiss re-

<sup>1</sup> Introduction.<sup>2</sup> Einl. II. 617.

gards this as designed, and in keeping with the solemn character and poetic form of the book. The style is diffuse; the article and the preposition occurring before each of a series of substantives, as does also the governing word before its object. These and other violations of Greek construction are so common as entirely to differentiate the Apocalypse, not only from the Fourth Gospel, but also from any other writing of the New Testament. Milligan's explanation<sup>1</sup> of the grammatical barbarities, on the ground of the author's attempt to imitate the style of the Old Testament prophets, borders close upon the humorous, and reflects badly upon the prophets. At least such a reason gives the impression of being hard pressed for an argument. On the other hand, the Greek of the Fourth Gospel, though simple, is smooth, flowing, direct, and, for the most part, accurate. It is the style of one native to the language. The diction of the Apocalypse is that of a Jewish Christian unfamiliar with the Greek.

3. The third feature of this problem is the Alexandrian tincture of the Gospel, which is not so obvious in the Apocalypse, and entirely wanting in the Synoptic Gospels. This Alexandrian thought is admitted by nearly all scholars, although some attempt to evade it, or trace it to Jewish sources.<sup>2</sup> This school of thought is best illustrated in the Logos doctrine, which appears nowhere in the New Testament save in this Gospel, the First Epistle of John, and possibly in Rev. xix. 19. The conception is confessedly a Christian adaptation of Philo's application of the Platonic idea, which meant an expression of God, which however was not personal, much less incarnate. It is difficult indeed to trace this idea to any other source than Philonism. If it came from Judaistic philosophy,

<sup>1</sup> Discussion on Apocalypse, pp. 184-208.

<sup>2</sup> E. g., Weiss (Introduction).

why does it not appear in the other writings of the New Testament? The author in setting forth his conception of the deity and incarnation of the Son of God has deliberately snatched this Greek thought out of the mouths of false teachers, and, adapting it to the Christian system, made it do service in exalting the person of Christ. It is as though he said: 'This idea of an utterance or revelation of God which Plato was attempting to formulate, was in the right direction. Jesus is this eternal Word. He became incarnate in order to reveal God. Indeed he was God in the flesh, in so far as God can be housed in a human personality and form.' If the Gospel was written in Ephesus for Gentile readers, the conception would be appreciated, for hither much Greek culture had come by way of Alexandria. Harnack says: "The prologue to the Gospel is not the key to the comprehension of the book, but it prepares Hellenic readers for its comprehension. It starts with a familiar object, the Logos, works upon it, transforms it,—implicitly opposing false Christologies,—in order to substitute for it Jesus Christ as the *μονογενὴς θεός* ("The only begotten of God"), or in order to reveal it as this Jesus Christ. The moment this takes place, the Logos idea is allowed to drop.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps it would be more exact to say that the *term* is dropped, beyond the first chapter, rather than the idea, for the preëxistence of Jesus is affirmed throughout the Gospel. The whole book develops the notion that Jesus is the visible image of the invisible God. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (xiv. 9). Weiss<sup>2</sup> and others rightly contend that the Gospel conception of the Logos differs from the Philonic in being personified and incarnated, as opposed to a mere hypostasis or principle. Weizsäcker suggestively

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from Moffatt, *Historical N. T.*, pp. 492-493.

<sup>2</sup> Introduction (Eng. trans.), ii. 362, note.

says: "It was possible for Christian teachers to appropriate the notion without passing over into alien modes of thought, or completely revolutionizing their own. Its adoption was as legitimate and unhesitating on the part of Jewish Christians of Alexandria as on that of the Jews. The novel element added to Philo's doctrine of the Logos was nothing more nor less than that the Messiah, the manifested Son of God, was the Logos."<sup>1</sup> This is only saying that Christianity adapted to its use a heathen philosophical idea which approximated to the truth. The method of adaptation to human ideas and institutions has characterized the entire course of divine revelation and development of truth. Paul recognizes it (Acts xvii. 27), where he declares that the human constitution is such that even the heathen feel after God. The adaptation of the Logos idea is well exhibited in the Fourth Gospel. The conception is transformed in order to convey the true idea of Christ's person and work. The Logos is identified with God, is personified and incarnated. God is thus brought within the intellectual horizon of men. The believer in receiving Christ is spiritually united to him, and becomes a child of God (John i. 12; 1 John iii. 1).

But while the Logos conception is the most obvious contribution of Alexandria to the Johannine Gospel, it is not all. The book displays the philosophical insight and conclusions of a trained thinker. The metaphysical antitheses above noted, and the mystical element are present throughout. Observe especially chapters xiv.-xvii. This Alexandrian mysticism evidently appealed to the mind of John, and he would readily adapt its methods and best elements to the teachings of Jesus. The theological atmosphere, at least in its speculative characteristics, is also Alexandrian. The person of Christ, his re-

<sup>1</sup> *Apostolic Age* (Eng. trans.), ii. 227.



lation to the Father, the believer's mystical relation to Christ, salvation by faith in Christ, his bestowal of eternal life, the procession of the Spirit from Father and Son, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, resurrection in order to a larger life,—nearly all of these are conceptions peculiar to the Fourth Gospel. They show the influence of Greek thought. Why should it be thought strange that the Apostle, dwelling long in the Greek world, should adapt its best ideas to the teachings of Jesus?

Now there is nothing new in this review of these features of the Johannine literature, and the only excuse for referring to them is the relation they sustain to the solution which this article ventures to suggest. Whence came these ideas which differentiate the Johannine Gospel from the Synoptists? As Weizsäcker suggests, they did not spring up without historical antecedents. They are not traceable to the rabbinic *Memra*, for that contained no such conception as the Word holds in the Gospel. There is no adequate source but Philo and Alexandria. But, again, by what agency was this Græco-Jewish thought transferred to Asiatic Christianity? What gave it such ascendancy in Ephesus?

II. These questions bring us to the main point of this whole discussion. If the answer ventured is not demonstrable beyond doubt, it does furnish a helpful hypothesis by which some of the difficulties of the Johannine literature may be cleared up. It suggests the origin of the Alexandrianism of the Fourth Gospel. It offers an explanation of the linguistic differences between the Gospel and the Apocalypse, and retains the Johannine origin of both. In a single word, our answer is, Apollon. Weizsäcker<sup>1</sup> indeed hints at this, but leaves the conjecture without support. The arguments now offered are not all

<sup>1</sup> Apostolic Age.

conclusive, but present a workable theory. The evidence makes the following suppositions highly probable: 1. That the Alexandrian thought was brought to Ephesus by Apollos. 2. That, after he closed his labors in Greece, he settled in Ephesus, and became a companion of the Apostle John, whose Ephesian residence and labors are abundantly witnessed by patristic testimony. 3. That John received the Logos conception and the Alexandrian mystical method from Apollos, and that the two in close fellowship wrought into Christian thought the best elements of Philo's philosophy. 4. That it is not unlikely that in his old age John determined to commit his account of Jesus to writing, and Apollos became his amanuensis in this production and the First Epistle. The Gospel is thus John's, but the literary style is Apollos'; hence the purity of its Greek. If the Gospel was issued near the end of the first century, as scholars are coming to believe,<sup>1</sup> John would be close to ninety years old, and a secretary would be natural. The Apocalypse, by common consent, appeared at least ten or more years earlier, while the two were separated, and was written by John the Galilean Jew; hence the barbarous Greek. 5. Finally, this secretary hypothesis accounts for the twenty-first chapter of the Gospel, confessedly from the hand of another than the Apostle. Apparently it was written after his death.

III. But, now, what historical evidence can be adduced in support of this theory? It is admitted at once that we have

<sup>1</sup> Radical critics now push the date back from 140 A.D. to 115 or 100. So Wilkinson, Harnack (*Chron.*), McGiffert, Moffatt, Weizsäcker, etc. (See Bacon's Introduction, p. 252, and Wendt's *Johannesevangelium*, chaps. i., ii.). Conservatives have pushed the date forward from 80 A.D. to 90 or 95. So Plummer (*St. John in Camb. Bible*), Westcott (*Study of the Gospels*), Adeney (*Introd.*), Weiss, etc.

but little historical material. Hence it is suggestive rather than voluminous. The eighteenth and nineteenth chapters of Acts, a few references in First Corinthians, and one in the Epistle to Titus include all the New Testament sources. Diligent search discloses no reference to Apollos in patristic literature. Yet, limited as this material is, it will be found to yield more than is anticipated.

In Acts xviii. 24-28 we learn the following facts about Apollos: He was an Alexandrian Jew, "eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures." He had been "instructed in the way of the Lord, . . . knowing only the baptism of John." Where had he learned of John the Baptist's work and preaching? From a personal visit to Palestine during the latter's ministry, or from others who had heard him. Being an Alexandrian Jew, he was, perforce, familiar with the Philonic construction of Jewish thought, which was a union of the best elements of Platonic philosophy and Mosaism. Being "mighty in the Scriptures" implies thorough knowledge of Messianic prophecy, and that Apollos was a master of Greek dialectic in presenting these predictions of Christ. It would appear that he had imitated the ascetic life of the Baptist, and, being a recluse far from Palestine, had not learned what had transpired in Jerusalem. Hence, when Priscilla and Aquila find him preaching in Ephesus, they proceed to instruct him more fully regarding Jesus, and especially concerning the events of Pentecost (Acts xviii. 26). Professor Gilbert<sup>1</sup> raises the question of the apparent ignorance of Apollos concerning these occurrences in Jerusalem; but this is quite possible, if, as Plumptre suggests, he had remained in regions remote from towns, as had the Baptist, his exemplar. It looks as though he had come to Ephesus soon after the brief visit of Paul

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Paul*, p. 145.

(Acts xviii. 19–21). His bold and effective speech attracted the attention of Paul's helpers, whom the former had left in the city, and they at once enlightened this new evangelist concerning the dispensation of the Spirit. "They expounded unto him the way of God more accurately." Evidently he readily accepted this new light, and, taking letters from these new friends, he entered upon work in Greece with redoubled success. He greatly aided the brethren in those parts, and "did mightily confute the Jews, showing by the Scriptures (i. e. the prophecies) that Jesus was the Christ." Here, then, was an Alexandrian Jewish-Christian, permeated with the mystic elements of Philonic thought, which he easily adapted to the doctrines of Jesus, "eloquent," learned and "fervent." Such a man could not fail to make a powerful impression wherever he preached, whether to Jews or Gentiles.

Apparently the same success attended the preaching of Apollos in Corinth that he had enjoyed elsewhere, for we find an Apollos party among the others which threatened the dissolution of the church of that city (1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 4–6, 22). There is no hint that Apollos was in any way responsible for this faction, nor is there evidence that it caused a rupture of his relations with Paul. Doubtless the former's preaching was attractive and convincing to the Greek mind especially, and its allegorical methods and mystical elements would supplement the unadorned, argumentative style of Paul. It is not impossible that the philosophical element of Apollos' preaching led some, in his absence, into speculative notions. There is nothing in Paul's language (1 Cor. i. 13–18) to indicate that he attached any blame to Apollos for the presence of the faction which bore his name, and which was one of four. The Apostle reproves them all on the broad ground of Christian unity upon a platform of essentials, of which the cross of

Christ is chief. It has been assumed,<sup>1</sup> from Paul's references to the character of his own preaching (1 Cor. ii. 1-5), and to commendatory letters which others had used (2 Cor. iii. 2; cf. Acts xviii. 27), that a breach had occurred between him and Apollos. But the language of 1 Cor. ii. 1-5 should be read in the light of chapter iii. 4-6, 21-22, where the Apostle commends the work of Apollos. Rather does the former passage contain an admonition against reliance upon the philosophical methods of reasoning and the rhetorical element of preaching, two tendencies to which the Greek mind was prone. Moreover, since the instruction which Apollos received from Priscilla and Aquila (Acts xviii. 26) would be Pauline (cf. Acts xviii. 2, 18), it seems probable that the difference in the preaching of the two men would be in form rather than substance. Finally, we find them together in Ephesus,<sup>2</sup> whence Paul declares he urged Apollos to visit the Corinthian church, but the latter was not able to do so (1 Cor. xvi. 12). We have no record that Apollos ever made this intended visit, although Paul's direction to Titus (Tit. iii. 13), then in Crete (i. 5), looks like a journey to Europe.

Even these scanty materials yield considerable information that bears upon our hypothesis. It shows us the origin, training, and work of Apollos, and his relation to the apostolic church. With his Greek culture, Jewish antecedents, and ar-

<sup>1</sup>The believers whom Paul found on his return to Ephesus (Acts xix. 1) were not necessarily disciples of Apollos, as Gilbert assumes (*Life of Paul*, p. 145), but faithful Jews, who, like Apollos, had heard only of John's baptism, but had not learned of the occurrences at Pentecost. There were doubtless many faithful Jews like Simeon and Anna (Luke i. 6, xxv., xxxvi.). These particular brethren, far from Palestine, drifted into Ephesus. It was a large city, and they could remain a long time in obscurity. Attracted by the stir which Paul creates, he enlightens them as Priscilla and Aquila had enlightened Apollos, who was now in Corinth.

<sup>2</sup>Ramsay, *Life of Paul*, p. 267, *et al.*

dent acceptance of Christianity, he became its most eloquent advocate during the apostolic age. It would be strange, if, with his philosophical training, he did not find how to complete from the Christian revelation the half-truths which Greek thinkers had fondly cherished. His native tongue was Greek, and, since this was the language of the world of his day, he had the advantage in public speech over Palestinian Jews. Twice we find him in Ephesus, and the second reference to his presence there (1 Cor. xvi. 12) looks as though that city had become his settled abode. Bernard<sup>1</sup> suggests the Apollos faction in the Corinthian church as the reason why he declines to accede to Paul's advice to go, but Paul's statement that Apollos will go "when he has opportunity" points to some reason over which he then had no control. He is in Ephesus with the great Apostle, who labored there three consecutive years (Acts xx. 34).

All this is not unrelated to John. Ample and continuous patristic tradition ascribes to this Apostle a prolonged and influential activity in Asia Minor, with headquarters at Ephesus. It is even asserted that he died there. If Paul's work in the city ended in the year 55, it is not unlikely that John soon followed him. Here he would meet Apollos. If John was about twenty-one when Jesus was crucified, he would now be forty-three, and in his prime, but yet too late in life to acquire fluency in the use of the Greek language, which in this part of the world was the speech of literature, commerce, and polite society. He locates here because a church was already established as a center from which to spread Christianity, and because, Ephesus being the metropolis of the east shore of the Mediterranean, the new faith would touch men from all parts of the Empire. He would have need of a man of Apol-

<sup>1</sup> Article on "Apollos," Hastings' Bible Dict.

los' qualifications, in language, culture, and address. It is not difficult to see how the two men, by temperament and training, would supplement each other. John was a Galilean Jew of limited education, unacquainted with Greek, legalistic in temper, and provincial in outlook. Apollos was born to the Greek, cultured, philosophical, ardent, and cosmopolitan in view. John would readily absorb and Christianize the Philonic thought and allegorical method of Apollos, and together they might work out a development of Christ's teaching quite different from any produced by the Palestinian mind alone. The bearing of all this is plain.

1. If Apollos was such a companion of the Apostle John, we can explain the linguistic disparity between the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse. The latter, characterized, as we have seen, by clumsy and inaccurate Greek, and full of Hebraisms, is explicable as the product of a Galilean Jew of narrow culture who undertook to learn Greek in middle life. It is extremely difficult to acquire facility in a new language after the age of forty. The spirit and ideas of the Apocalypse point to the same conclusion; namely, that in this document we probably have the work of the son of Zebedee, while unattended in the Isle of Patmos, about the year 79, John being sixty-seven years of age.

2. On the other hand, we have in the Fourth Gospel the style of one at home in the Greek language. It is simple, smooth, correct. In contrast with the Jewish color of the Apocalypse, we have a writing permeated by a Christian reconstruction of Alexandrian philosophy, with a universal outlook and a deep mystical element unlike anything in the other Gospels. All this is quite possible if John had a man like Apollos as companion and amanuensis. The Gospel is, in a deep spiritual sense, the product of both. The facts of Christ's

life and his sayings are from John. The development of those truths is a composite work of both men. In a very real sense the Gospel is John's. The style is Apollos'. This fairly accounts for the abundant marks of an eye-witness of Jesus, and, at the same time, for the beauty of diction and the philosophical development of Jesus' truth.

3. The generally accepted order of the Johannine writings favors the hypothesis of John-Apollos authorship. As we have observed, the scholarship of to-day tends toward agreement upon the close of the first century, when John was about seventy-eight, as the date of the Gospel. The First Epistle belongs to the same period. The Apocalypse belongs to a period ten to twenty years earlier. The time had come for a life of Christ which would clearly define his person. Gnostic parties already flourished within the church. False Christologies were springing up. The First Epistle shows that the incarnation was already being boldly denied. There was danger that the Alexandrian idea of the Logos would be distorted in the interest of error. At such a time John and Apollos issue the Fourth Gospel. It is essentially John's biography of Jesus, written for him by Apollos, after they together have wrought out its matchless conception of Jesus as the true Logos, the incarnate Son of God, in whom we have eternal life by faith. Its "whosoever" or universality is one of the results of the contact of these two men. The sacrificial death of Jesus and the life of which he bestows are universal in scope.

#### CONCLUSION.

If this hypothesis is correct, we have something like a satisfactory solution of some of the features of the Johannine problem. 1. We have an explanation of the linguistic disparity between the Gospel and the Apocalypse, and we save



the Johannine origin of both. 2. We can account for the Alexandrian element of the Gospel, which differentiates it from the synoptics. 3. We have a source for the twenty-first chapter of the Gospel. 4. We can see why the First Epistle of John harmonizes so closely in diction and ideas with the Gospel, while it differs with the Apocalypse.

It is not claimed that what has been presented is more than a reasonable, helpful hypothesis. The main difficulty is the proof of an extended Ephesian residence of Apollos. It is difficult, also, to see why so prominent a man should entirely drop out of sight so early. Yet so did most of the Apostles, and Barnabas, whom Tertullian affirms was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, instead of Apollos, as suggested by Luther, and more recently by Farrar and others. But, despite the disappearance of Apollos from history, we yet have many of the leading facts of his life. He was an Alexandrian Jew, eloquent and learned in the Scriptures, was active in Asia and Greece in the Apostolic Age, and seems to have been intimately connected with Ephesus, where lived also, according to indisputable tradition, the Apostle John, whose Gospel shows unmistakable Alexandrian ideas. The inferences, that these two men were companions and co-workers, each influencing the other, and that they were both concerned in the issuance of the Fourth Gospel in the way above suggested, do not seem extravagant. Certainly such conclusions are no more beside the facts than that which affirms, on the basis of this Alexandrian element, that the book had no connection with the Apostolic Age. At least it can be claimed that the hypothesis here suggested harmonizes with the facts, is reasonable, helpful, and worthy of further consideration.