

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 Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

exquisite elegance of the Greek of St. James must be noted by every reader of the Greek of his Epistle. Yet St. James was the "son," in some sense, of the carpenter's cottage at Nazareth. But the literary beauty of his Greek is no serious literary difficulty if we assume, as we surely may, that he too had the expert aid of a "writer," probably his convert and intimate friend.

May I venture to go a step further still? The mental versatility of St. Paul was wellnigh unlimited, and he certainly needed, ordinarily, for his Greek no "writer" in the sense in which his Galilean brethren may so well have done. But even he may have felt that, for a peculiar purpose, in quarters where he wished his personality to lie in the background, he would do well to use some such aid. Might he not, in such a case, write down his matter and argument in his own style first, and then give it to a friend, perhaps to a St. Luke, to mould it and phrase it *de novo* in his own way? The Apostle would then revise the composition, and then at length *pass* it for issue to the Churches. Is it impossible that such was the *genesis* of the Epistle to the Hebrews? Here, in a sort of work akin to that of the "writer," may lie the solution of that great problem of its literary history, the problem of its *style*, which made Origen say (with reference precisely to the diction, if I remember right), *τίς ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν, Θεὸς οἶδεν*.

HANDLEY DUNELM.



Barnabas.¹

BY THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF DERRY AND RAPHOE.

"FOR he was a good man, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith" (Acts xi. 24). This "good man" was Barnabas. We know a good deal about him. He has an important place in the early history of the Church. But there is not in the

¹ A sermon preached in the Cathedral Church, Londonderry, November 12, 1905.

whole story a hint or sign that he was more than this text records. Of learning, of penetrating logic, of any spark of eloquence or genius, we have no reason whatever to suspect him. And his career is most instructive for this very reason: that it shows, not what a fine intellect may attain, but what is possible for an average man who has honestly given himself up to God, and is therefore full of the Holy Ghost and of faith—full according to his capacity, whatever that may be.

Someone may object: It is easy to assume that Barnabas had no brilliant gifts, but how do you know it? Can you prove it? It can almost be proved, even though we acquit him, as we may, of the authorship of that Epistle which bears his name. In this eleventh chapter, seeing that a special and grand work was to be done, he instantly felt his own limitations, and called to his side the greatest man then living. This is not conclusive evidence, but it sets up a strong presumption.

And as we follow him through the story—which I now propose to do—we can see that all he did, all that he is famous in the Church for doing, was within the powers of a very moderate brain, sustained and stimulated by a good heart. We can see plainly that he acted always, as we read here that he acted, because he was a good man, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith.

Suppose, now, that we are wronging him, and that, in fact, he was a man of genius. It would then be all the more instructive that nothing of the sort is told or hinted; that he is put before us in the simple charm of goodness—goodness in the strength of grace that was the sufficient driving-power of all that Scripture cared to tell of him.

I ask you now to consider his story in detail, and see how this ruling principle of goodness works.

The first we learn of him is a signal act of liberality. The earliest converts had all things common. As need arose, they sold their possessions and laid them at the Apostles' feet. Were they right or wrong? Ought we to turn socialists or not? Clearly their example is not put forward as a universal rule, for

in the Epistles those that are rich are only forbidden to trust in uncertain riches. The Lord demanded of one rich man that he should sell all, but it did not follow that Zacchæus should do the same; salvation came to his house when he gave half; and Joseph of Arimathæa, to whom the astonishing honour came of being given the body of Jesus, and who laid it in his own tomb, continued to be a rich man without reproach. St. Peter distinctly told Ananias that this was a matter within his own choice. And it is instructive to observe that this first movement in a socialistic direction ended in collections through all the Gentile Churches for the poor saints in Jerusalem.

But it *was* good to start with a strong and clear assertion, "All is God's; we surrender all to Him." In this movement Barnabas alone is mentioned. He had land—"a field"—and he sold that which is notoriously the hardest of all possessions to surrender. It was this example, too large-hearted for Ananias to copy, yet too alluring for him to refuse, that beguiled the pretender to his death.

You see that it was a victory of sheer goodness, devotion, and generosity; not of the intellect at all, but of the Holy Ghost, inspiring him to scorn the world, and of faith in God, who would provide for him.

Now, I have admitted that this is no example to be literally followed in all times by all. But in its spirit of generous self-sacrifice it is. And I will ask you each to consider, What difference would it make to me if this spirit were mine? Each alone can answer for each; but this is certain—that it would make an extraordinary difference in the aggregate power of the Church. All heathenism is crying out to us for our Gospel. Our own children in the Colonies are growing up hundreds of miles from the sound of a church bell. Almost every religious society could use to vast results vastly augmented revenues, and the average Christian gives away much less than he spends upon his summer holiday. And this is a matter for the good heart, not for the big brain.

There is another kind of generosity besides the giving away

of money. To be capable of judging others with a large charity—that is good, that is a fruit of the Spirit.

Now, there went out from Jerusalem one breathing out threats and slaughters, and he returned essaying to join himself to the disciples. No wonder that they were afraid of him. It looked, indeed, like the sort of net which is spread vainly in the sight of the bird.

But Barnabas (for he was a good man) took him and brought him to the Apostles, and declared, not only how he had preached boldly in Damascus, but also (and this he must have taken on Paul's own assurance) how he had seen the Lord, and He had spoken with him. Whether he had any previous knowledge of Paul's character, whether his ear caught the ring of truth in his protestations, and he inquired further, who shall guess? What we know is that you and I owe the Apostle of the Gentiles, *our* Apostle, to the sound, penetrating, brave heart of Barnabas, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith. Again, I ask, What difference would it make if our judgments of our fellow-men were kind, hopeful, charitable judgments?

What next? The seed of the Gospel was springing up here and there outside the Hebrew field. First, Philip had preached in Samaria, and had baptized the Ethiopian eunuch. Next, an Apostle had baptized Cornelius and his household, and the Church had ratified his action. But a full-blown Gentile Church—what could be thought of that?

In the persecution that followed Stephen's martyrdom some travelled far and preached, but only preached to the Jews. But some, not having been reared among the prejudices of Jerusalem—men of Cyprus and Cyrene—preached to the Gentiles in Antioch, and a great number turned to the Lord. This was new and grave; it offended many; but the Apostles, to whom the news was carried, could not forget Cornelius. The whole course of history, the destinies of the Gentile world, the world-wide vocation of the Church, were trembling in the balance then. And they sent forth Barnabas, not only to investigate, but to remain at Antioch and deal with problems as they arose.

It is here that we find our text. He was not content to give a diplomatic assent, a cold and guarded approval; he saw Christ glorified, and his heart leaped up: "he was glad, and exhorted them all that with purpose of heart they should cleave unto the Lord, for he was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith." I said the scales of history were trembling; thank God it was goodness and not cleverness that turned the beam! And here let us observe the word employed, for it indicates the gift he had, and from which he derived his name, since he is not the Son of Consolation, but of Exhortation—Barnabas ("He exhorted them.")

From this event the next, almost as vast in its results, naturally followed. Feeling his limitations, he brought Saul to Antioch; so that it was he, Barnabas, who set the future Apostle of the Gentiles to work in the first Gentile Church. It was a great act; but, again, what it required was goodness, freedom from all jealousy, desire to set the stronger man to that work in which his own heart was absorbed.

It is with the strong man that history, and even sacred history, must chiefly deal; but it is edifying to observe here, what is no doubt constant, though unobserved, the simple good man guiding the great man to his greatness, opening doors, removing barriers.

Again. For a whole year they had worked together. Together they had gone up to Jerusalem, and been consecrated to a lifelong work; and had gone forth together on the first great missionary tour, Barnabas the leader, Saul "the chief speaker." With John, better known to us as Mark, the nephew of Barnabas, for their attendant, they had travelled through Cyprus, which was the ancestral home of Barnabas and Mark, and made a charming excursion. But when they proceeded to the savage and dangerous hill-country of Pisidia the young man's courage had failed, and he deserted them. In due time they had returned, after dangerous adventures.

And now Paul proposes a second journey, but refuses to bring with them Mark, who "withdrew from them from Pam-

phylia, and went not with them to the work"—that is to say, who had failed them when the real strain began. "And the contention was so sharp between them that they parted asunder," these brethren, one of them so deeply indebted to the other. So like, after all, was the human nature of that great age to the frail humanity we know.

Which of them was right? There is a curious sign that public opinion at the time was with Paul, for we read that he departed "commended by the brethren to the grace of God," but no such statement is made concerning Barnabas.

But he held fast to his own flesh and blood, of whom he had a good hope still, who perhaps would have quite fallen had he been forsaken then in his disgrace. He saved him. And now observe that all the Epistles in which Paul speaks with so much respect and comradeship of Barnabas are subsequent to this lamentable event. That they were reconciled is certain, since he was more than reconciled to Mark. Him he found profitable to himself for ministering¹—that is to say, in the very function in which he failed before. Of him also he wrote to a Church apparently reluctant and mindful, perhaps, of that old scandal: "Mark, touching whom ye have been commanded, if he come unto you, receive him" (Col. iv. 10).

And does it not crown the kindly story of Barnabas that his tenacious affection, and faith which would not be estranged, standing alone against the judgment of the mighty Apostle Paul, whom in a sense he gave us, gave us also the writer of that great Gospel according to St. Mark?

Such was Barnabas. No mountainous character of vast proportion, shrouded in forest gloom of mystery, sublime with volcanic fires of passion and of genius. No, it is homely and domestic. His great achievements are those of a rich and wholesome humanity—good, able to see goodness in others, in the furious persecutor, in the suspected church, in the discouraged youth.

¹ The Greek is *διακονία*; before John Mark was *ὑπηρέτης* (Acts xiii. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 11).

This is not an unattainable ideal. If we ask it honestly in the name of Christ, we may have the same Holy Spirit who filled him, and our faith, like his, may be made strong and brave.

What are our lives worth, in their poverty and selfishness, that we will not surrender them, to be remodelled after this noble type, divinely possible to us all?



What is Christianity?

BY THE REV. BARTON R. V. MILLS, M.A.

III. THE CHRISTIANITY OF ST. PAUL AND HIS COLLEAGUES.

THE second period of the Apostolic age begins with the commencement of St. Paul's public ministry, about A.D. 46, and ends with his death, which probably occurred in A.D. 67. It thus covers a space of some twenty-one years—rather longer than that of the Pentecostal period. The dominant influence during this time was that of the Apostle himself. It is quite untrue to call him, as he has sometimes been called, the real founder of the Christian Church, or to look on him as replacing the Pentecostal Gospel by a new one of his own. It is true that his conversion—which took place several years before the beginning of his public ministry—was a definite breach with the past. Christianity was not to him, as it was to St. Peter, St. James, and St. John, the product of Judaism, but its opposite. To his mind the Law and the Gospel were antagonistic. But it is no less true that his whole training and thought were Jewish. He was a Grecian, not a Palestinian Jew, and this, no doubt, gave him, as did his Roman citizenship, an advantage in dealing with Gentiles. But he thoroughly understood the Jewish mind, and accepted current Hebrew ideas. His object, therefore, was not to obliterate, but to fill in the outline which his predecessors of the Pentecostal Church had drawn. Dr. Knowling has lately shown, in a most