

ings of public worship select whichever I think is the better version of the passage. *Any* translation must be open to many objections. This no doubt represents considerable compromise. I am not sure that it is very widely valued amongst non-students. The old familiar text keeps its place.

VII.

By the Rev. Professor JOHN KENNEDY, D.D.,
Hampstead.

Your question needs definition. What is meant by failure? That the Revised Version has failed so to commend itself to the common, or even the educated, mind, that the English-speaking people would be willing to accept it as an Authorised Version, I believe. And yet I am not entitled to say more than that this is my impression. I think it can scarcely be doubted that there is a feeling of considerable disappointment in regard to it. This, however, may be ascribed, not so much to any demerits of the version, as to the unreasonable, I may say the impossible, expectations which were very commonly entertained. People expected a very great change, almost a new translation, and yet they expected that their traditional affection for the old words would suffer no wound. And they are disappointed in both.

As to the real merits of the Revised Version, *quot homines tot sententia*. But it has certainly contributed largely to the better understanding of

many passages. And when a further revision is attempted—the time is distant, no doubt—the labour and learning expended on this version will be found to have not been in vain.

VIII.

By the Rev. Principal F. W. AVELING, M.A., B.Sc.,
Independent College, Taunton.

In my Bible class I use both the old version and the new. I give the altered new versions, when they are of any importance, to the boys (who mainly have the old version). Sometimes I tell them I think the new version is no improvement. *The great drawback to the new is its want of references.*

IX.

By the Rev. NEWMAN HALL, LL.B., D.D.,
Christ Church, Lambeth.

I daily use the Revised Version in my study, and value it more than I can express. He who, ignorant of Greek, consults it, is in a better position than those who consult their own very superficial knowledge of the original. So many varying opinions of learned men — and the marginal suggestions—all indicate that a *re-revision* would result in a well-nigh perfect book.

In public I use the Authorised Version, as more familiar and musical, and better recognised by the multitude.

The Scapegoat—Barabbas.

BY THE REV. A. H. WRATISLAW, M.A.

“Now every feast he used to release unto them one prisoner, whom they asked of him. And there was one called Barabbas, lying bound with them that had made insurrection, men who in the insurrection had committed murder. And the multitude went up and began to ask him to do as he was wont to do unto them. And Pilate answered them, saying, Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews? For he perceived that for envy the chief priests had delivered Him up. But the chief priests stirred up the multitude, that he should rather release Barabbas unto them. And Pilate again answered and said unto them, What then shall I do unto Him whom ye call the King of the Jews? And they cried out again, Crucify Him. And Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath He done? But they cried out more exceedingly, Crucify Him.

And Pilate, wishing to content the multitude, released unto them Barabbas, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged Him, to be crucified.”—MARK xv. 6-15 (and parallel passages in Matthew, Luke, and John).

I BELIEVE it was in 1843 that a friend heard and detailed to me a sermon preached by the late Mr. Melvill on Good Friday, in which he contended (1) that the importance of the ceremonies of the day of atonement in the Jewish economy was so great, that they *must* have had their counterpart somewhere in the actual history of the Saviour; and (2) that the account of the

young man who fled leaving the linen cloth, with which he was girded, in the hands of our Lord's captors (Mark xiv. 51, 52), was simply preserved in the gospel in order to exhibit the fulfilment of the type of the scapegoat, *i.e.* *escape*-goat. These reasonings haunted me for many a day, and I was equally unable to resist Mr. Melvill's arguments in favour of the necessity of some fulfilment of the type, and to accept his view of the actual fulfilment thereof in so trifling an incident. I was at length led to the conclusion that it was not the young man who escaped, but Barabbas, who was deliberately released, that completed the antitypical fulfilment of the ceremony.

Let us examine the patristic theory, that the two goats on the day of atonement, and the two birds in the cleansing of the leper, represented the *one* Saviour under *two* aspects. That the sacrificed goat and the bird that was killed typified the Saviour in His death, all are agreed; but agreement is by no means general as to either the bird that was released after its head had been dipped in the blood of the other, or the goat that was let go into the Wilderness $\lambda\upsilon\gamma\epsilon$ after the solemn confession and placing upon his head of the sins of the people. For the expression $\lambda\upsilon\gamma\epsilon$ the Revised Version gives us two alternative translations—(1) "for Azazel," the meaning of which is unknown, and (2) "for dismissal," corresponding to $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\mu\pi\eta\nu$ of the LXX. This sense is that indicated by the English expression "scapegoat," which is popularly so grossly misapplied. We talk of a person being made a scapegoat, who suffers the punishment which others deserve in an equal or greater degree. Whereas the Israelitish scapegoat suffered no punishment whatever for the sins laid upon his head, but was simply set free in the wilderness. The person who *escapes* punishment is properly a *scapegoat*, not the person who is sacrificed for others.

Now there is but one point in our Lord's life, death, and resurrection that bears any resemblance to what was done to or with the scapegoat, *i.e.* the fact that He is spoken of in the Scriptures as *bearing* our sins and infirmities. But this is either as *removing* them (Matt. viii. 17), or as bearing the pain and punishment of them, not as carrying them away to some other place. Whereas (Lev. xvi. 22) it is written that "the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a solitary land." Surely He did not carry them to heaven, which is the idea involved in the theory of those who identify the scapegoat with our Lord in His resurrection and ascension. If any whither, He must have carried them to Hades and left them there before His resurrection. Again, the man who conducted the scapegoat into the wilderness

was required to purify himself before re-entering the camp (Lev. xvi. 26). Can it be supposed that our Lord was unclean in His resurrection? Not to mention that the act of release by a man that is "in readiness" or "appointed" (R.V. Lev. xvi. 21) is entirely lost from view under this interpretation.

Another theory is to regard the scapegoat as representing our Lord during His sojourn in the wilderness at His temptation,—a notion which entirely separates the two goats from each other.

Others say that the ceremonies of the scapegoat are to be taken in connection with the sacrificial system in general, and cannot have any particular explanation, which sounds like giving the matter up altogether as inexplicable.

I cannot help thinking that all this confusion and perplexity has arisen from an entire misapprehension of the nature, purpose, and significance of types. That they had an immediate, moral, or spiritual significance, few will deny; and I hope that under the *representative* theory of sacrifice we shall find little difficulty in explaining the immediate import of the ceremonies of the scapegoat. But as regards their final and typical application, I consider them to have been grossly misunderstood. Their grand purpose was surely to furnish marks of identification of the Messiah, whereas they are generally explained with a view to some spiritual or mystical reference difficult to realise or understand.

Let us now briefly review the principal acknowledged types relating to our Lord, and note the number and kind of points of resemblance which they severally afford.

I. According to the ordinary view, those between our Lord and the Paschal Lamb are only three: (1) guiltlessness and non-resistance, which, however, are common to every sacrificed lamb; (2) no bones were broken in either case; (3) both victims were partaken of after death—the one actually, the other symbolically in the Eucharist. To which those who hold that the Last Supper was not a *Paschal*, but a *Paschal-Eve* meal, can add (4) that our Lord expired at the commencement of the Paschal sacrifice, (5) that He was set apart on the 10th day of Nisan, and (6) that His resurrection, as the first-fruits from the dead, coincided with the offering of the sheaf of first-fruits.

II. Our Lord Himself referred to the brazen serpent, elevated by Moses in the wilderness (Num. xxi. 9), as a type of Himself (John iii. 14, 15).

The points of resemblance are two only: (1) elevation upon a wooden support, probably in both cases a cross; (2) cure, in the one case, of bodily, in the other, of spiritual disease by the faithful contemplation of the object "lifted up."

III. The incomplete sacrifice of Isaac is generally

considered typical of that of our Lord. The points of resemblance are three: (1) the victim given up to sacrifice by his father was an only son; (2) Isaac bore the wood on which he was to have been offered, our Lord bore His cross; (3) there was a death and resurrection from the dead in each case, that of Isaac, who suffered a symbolical death in the substituted ram, figurative, ἐν παραβολῇ (Heb. xi. 19), that of Jesus, actual.

IV. The sign of Jonah is referred to by our Lord as the only one which would be given to the Jews of His day. The points of resemblance are three: (1) three days in a real or symbolical grave; (2) resurrection from that grave; (3) each was a voluntary sacrifice for the preservation of others.

V. The Aaronic high priest is treated in the Epistle to the Hebrews as a type of Christ. The points of resemblance are three: (1) Divine calling, as of Aaron by God through Moses, and of Jesus by the voice from heaven after His baptism; (2) mediatorship between God and man; (3) entrance into the unseen with blood.

These are the principal scriptural types of the Messiah, in none of which are found, according to the current explanations, more than three clear points of resemblance. Let us now proceed to the ceremonies of the great day of atonement, and to those of the cleansing of a leper, which are all but identical. The points of resemblance are no less than six at least.

(1) The two prisoners before Pilate corresponded to the two goats (or the two birds) in number.

(2) One of the goats, one of the birds, and one of the prisoners was selected for death, the other for release.

(3) Their death and release were actually carried into execution.

(4) As the two goats, or the two birds, so were the two prisoners counterparts of each other. Jesus was the Messiah of God, Barabbas the representative of the kind of Messiah that the Jews expected and desired.

(5) Even if Origen's statement (on Matt. xxvii. 16-18) that some MSS. of St. Matthew in his day read "*Jesus Barabbas*," as opposed to "*Jesus called Christ*," be not relied on, there remains a coincidence of name between the two. Barabbas (Son of the Father) stands in strong antithesis to the "*Son of man*," who claimed God as His Father.

(6) The next point is one, not so much of *resemblance* as of *contrast*, yet comes equally under the laws of association, and indicates an interruption of the ceremony, as regards the majority of the Jewish nation, though, as regards those who became Christians, it is complete, and the parallel holds in every particular. The majority of the Jewish nation did not confess its sins by the mouth of the high priest over the head of the antitype of the scapegoat, but, at the instigation of the priesthood, deli-

berately took its greatest sin upon itself: "His blood be upon us and upon our children" (Matt. xxvii. 25).

The Jews thus divided themselves into two portions, those who died with Jesus, the sacrificed goat, confessing their sins (a necessary preliminary to baptism), and those who lived with Barabbas, the polluted scapegoat, taking their sin upon their own heads. And, as identified with Barabbas, they have held the position of the scapegoat ever since. They are wanderers in the wilderness of the world, everywhere separate, nowhere identified with the people among whom they dwell, a kind of living scapegoat, representing the mystical body of Barabbas, whom they preferred, even as the Church of Christ represents the mystical body of Him, in whom every member thereof suffers a symbolical death and resurrection at his baptism.

Is it just, is it reasonable to reject so simple, so close an explanation of this solemn annual ceremony for no better reason than that it has only recently been thought of? Even the "fit" (A.V.) or "appointed" (R.V.) man, by whom the scapegoat was conducted into the wilderness, finds his antitype (7) in the officer presumably employed by Pilate to liberate Barabbas.

But, if this interpretation had been current from the first, would not Celsus, or Julian the apostate, or some other early enemy of Christianity, have stigmatised the story of Barabbas as a cunningly devised fable, invented for the purpose of identifying Jesus as the Messiah. Whereas the deferred solution of the problem secures it against any such insinuation, while it in nowise impairs its value.

Nor is it reasonable to object that Barabbas was too unimportant a personage to occupy the position of counterpart to our Lord. How many people have been great in their day and all but lost from recollection afterwards! And Barabbas was a "notable" (ἐπίσημος) prisoner, who had headed a *στάσις* or insurrection against the Romans, in which there had been bloodshed (Matt. xxvii. 16; Mark xv. 7). The mention of the *στασιώται* in Mark, and the description of the man in Matthew, taken together, certainly indicate a more than ordinary outlaw, who must have been at the head of a considerable band, perhaps amounting to a small army, which success might easily have increased to a dangerous extent, and who was evidently a popular hero. Indeed, the preference of Barabbas over Jesus appears to have been the first distinct fulfilment of our Lord's prophecy (John v. 43): "I have come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not; if another shall come in his own name, him will ye receive."

The above idea appears to have occurred to others much about the same time. Krafft and Sepp, in Germany, ventilated the same theory, which was also adopted by the late Dean Alford from Luthardt (after Krafft) in 1854.

It now only remains for me to propound a reasonable explanation of the ceremonies of the great day of atonement which will interpret their meaning at their annual occurrence, independently of their typical value. There was first a symbolical death on the part of the high priest, personally, before he was allowed to act as such officially for the people. There was then a symbolical death on the part of the people, collectively, in the sacrificed goat, after which the whole nation began a

new life, to have a similar symbolical end the next year. The sins with respect to which they had suffered this death were put upon the head of the scapegoat, the representative of the old polluted self of the nation, and with him removed to a distant region. In the same way, the released bird represented the departure of the old unclean self of the leper, who was thenceforth restored, as a new man, to the society of his fellows.

Philosophy and Theology.

Philosophy and Theology; being the First Edinburgh University Gifford Lectures. By JAMES HUTCHISON STIRLING, LL.D. (Edin.). T. & T. Clark. 1890. Price 9s. Pp. xvi, 407.

It is just a year ago since Dr. Stirling's *Gifford Lectures* were made public property. During the interval, criticism has had plenty of opportunity to expend itself usefully upon the book. Our present purpose is to give, in a very brief compass, a few observations upon one or two of the many complex questions raised by the work before us, that readers of the higher theology may be induced to study it for themselves. They will well be repaid in so doing. Indeed, it is scarcely too much to affirm that no more *suggestive* work on the mutual relations of Theology and Philosophy has ever appeared in our country.

The present lectures form, in no sense of the word, a set treatise on the matter in hand; rather, they present the ripe thoughts of a powerful and acute mind; for passages of penetrating and startling strength of insight flash out on every page, well nigh; and not seldom do we meet with splendid bursts of the highest metaphysic eloquence. Dr. Stirling has, ever since the publication in 1865 of the celebrated *Secret of Hegel*,¹ been acknowledged as without a rival among metaphysicians, whether at home or abroad; and, if we mistake not, these "First Edinburgh Gifford Lectures" will demonstrate him to be foremost also among the masters of English prose. What, for example (and it is but one example—one among many), could be finer in its way than this piece, as printed in the noble fourth lecture?

¹ Will Dr. Stirling ever be persuaded to give the world a new edition of this now very scarce work? It would be a boon, indeed, to serious students of philosophy.

"There, then, it is, that starry heaven—there—in infinite space above us, globe upon globe, in their own light, and in the light of each other, all wheeling, wheeling in and out, and round and round, and through each other, in a tangle of motion that has still a law; not without explosions in this one and the other from within, doubtless, that would sound to us, did we hear them, louder, dreader, more awfully terrific than any thunder of the tropics, that would sound to us, did we hear them, veritably as the crack of doom—well, just to think it, all *that* is taking place, all *that* is going on, all these globes are whirling in a darkness blacker than the mouth of wolf, deeper than in the deepest pit that ever man has sunk,—all that is going on, all that is taking place in a darkness absolute; and more, all that is going on, all that is taking place—for exploding globes even—in a silence absolute, in a silence dead, in a silence that never a whisper, never the faintest whisper, never the most momentary echo breaks! Is not that extraordinary? But it is no less true than extraordinary. Undulations there are, doubtless, that are light *to us*; but no undulation will give light to them, the globes. Vibrations there are, doubtless, where there is air, that are sound *to us*; but all vibrations are as the dead to them. It is in a cave, in a den, blacker than the blackest night, soundless and more silent than the void of voids, that all those intermingling motions of the globes go on—but for us, that is; but for an eye and an ear, and a soul behind them! That cannot be denied. The deepest astronomical philosopher, entranced in what he sees, entranced in what he fancies himself to hear, must confess that, but for himself and the few and feeble others that are like himself, all would be dark as Erebus, all would be silent as the grave" (pp. 77, 78).

The lectures are divided into two main parts: the first containing the *positive* proofs for the being of God, under the three sections of the arguments²—(1) Teleological, (2) Cosmological, (3) Ontological; the second part consists of objections raised by

² "The design of the teleological argument is the contingency of the cosmological argument; and it is from that contingency we infer the existence of an absolutely necessary being; while it is from the influence of the considerations under the cosmological argument that we come to the idea of an *ens realissimum*, of a being that is in himself limitless and the sum of all realities."—*Philosophy and Theology*, p. 303.