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 danger. Surrounded by habits of gross immorality and intellectual pride,   
 they were liable to be corrupted in their conduct, or tempted to despise   
 the simplicity of their first teacher.   
 4, Of this latter there was the more risk, since the Apostle had been   
 followed by one whose teaching might make his appear in their eyes   
 meagre and scanty. Apollos is described in Acts xviii. 24 ff. as a learned   
 Hellenist of Alexandria, mighty in the Scriptures, and fervent in zeal.   
 “And though by the honourable testimony there given (ver. 27; see also   
 1 Cor. iii. 6) to his work at Corinth, it is evident that his doctrine was   
 essentially the same with that of Paul, yet there is reason to think that   
 there was difference enough in the outward character and expression of   
 the two to provoke comparison to the Apostle’s disadvantage, and attract   
 the lovers of eloquence and philosophy rather to Apollos.   
 5, We discover very plain signs of an influence antagonistic to the   
 Apostle having been at work in Corinth. Teachers had come, of Jewish   
 extraction (2 Cor. xi. 22), bringing with them letters of recommendation   
 from other churches (2 Cor. iii. 1), and had built on the foundation laid   
 by St. Paul (1 Cor. iii. 1O—18 : 2 Cor. x. 13—18) a worthless building on   
 which they prided themselves. These teachers gave out themselves for   
 Apostles (2 Cor. xi. 13), rejecting the apostleship of Paul (1 Cor. ix. 2:   
 2 Cor. x. 7, 8), encouraging disobedience to his commands (2 Cor. x. 1, 6),   
 and disparaging in every way his character, and work for the Gospel (see   
 for the former, 2 Cor. iv. 1, 2 ff.: v. 11 ff, and notes in both places: for   
 the latter, 2 Cor. xi. 16—xii. 12). It is probable that these persons   
 were excited to greater rage against St. Paul by the contents of the first   
 Epistle ; for we find the plainest mention of them in the second. But   
 their practices had commenced before, and traces of them are very evident   
 in ch, ix. of this Epistle.   
 6. The ground taken by these persons, as regarded their Jewish posi-   
 tion, is manifest from these Epistles. They did not, as the false teachers   
 among the Galatians, insist on circumcision and keeping the law: for   
 not a word occurs on that question, nor a hint which can be construed   
 as pointing to it. Some think that they kept back this point in a   
 church consisting principally of Gentiles, and contented themselves   
 with first setting aside the authority and influence of St. Paul. But I   
 should rather believe them to have looked on this question as closed,   
 and to have carried on more a negative than a positive warfare with the   
 Apostle, upholding, as against him, the authority of the regularly con-   
 stituted Twelve, and of Peter as the Apostle of the circumcision, and   
 impugning Paul as an interloper and innovator, and no autoptic witness   
 of the events of the Gospel history: as not daring to prove his apostle-   
 ship by claiming sustenance from the Christian churches, or by leading   
 about a wife, as the other Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and   
 Cephas. What their positive teaching had been, it is difficult to decide,   
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