Jehovah, who is meek and gentle and conquers by speaking the truth in love. The affinity in the language of our texts of the LXX is not so apparent, but notice that which, as quoted in Mt. 12, doubtless comes nearest to the form in which the passage was familiar to Jesus himself:

Ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ᾑρέτισα
ὁ ἀγαπητός μου ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου·
[cf. ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός· ἐν σοι εὐδόκησα]
θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν,
καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ.
Οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κραυγάσει,
οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ.
κάλαμον συντετριμμένον οὐ κατεάξει,
καὶ λίνον τυφόμενον οὐ σβέσει,
ἕως ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νῖκος τὴν κρίσιν.
καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν.

But I do not rest my rendering of εὐδόκησα by *I have chosen*, instead of *I have come to take pleasure* or *am well pleased*, on the testimony of grammar, lexicon, and concordance only; nor even on these *plus* the strong internal probability, based on the overwhelming effect of the words on the mind of the recipient, that they conveyed some startling announcement. It seems to me that we have something to learn also from the six practically parallel passages of the New Testament; for as such we may surely reckon, besides the synoptic parallels in Mt. 3^{17} and Lk. 3^{22}, the three accounts of the בת קול at the Transfiguration (Mt. 17^{5} Mk. 9^{7} Lk. 9^{35}) and the reference to the same in 2 Pet. 1^{17}. The utterance is abbreviated indeed in the Transfiguration story, but 2 Pet. 1^{17} is evidence that the meaning was taken to be the same, and we may fairly consider them parallels. Now among these seven there are two variants. 2 Pet. 1^{17} has instead of ἐν σοί, εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησα. Certainly the accusative with εἰς is not less favorable than ἐν with the dative to the sense 'on thee my choice hath fallen.' Again, Lk. 9^{35} has in all critical texts not ὁ ἀγαπητός, but ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, 'my chosen,' which, if the author was really trying to give the same sense as in the previous case, is certainly significant of what that intended sense must have been, and points to Is. 42^{1-4} as the true underlying passage.

II. ON GAL. iii. 16.

Meyer, Lightfoot, and modern commentators generally seem to me to violate a primary canon of exegesis in their interpretation of

this famous passage. The canon I would express thus: "If the sense proposed by the commentator could be better expressed by some other Greek phraseology than that of the text, it must be assumed that the author would so have written, and the interpretation must be rejected." This does not mean that the New Testament writer always chose the most perfect expression for his thought. He did not. But we are bound to make that presupposition, because any other will throw the reins on the neck of fancy.

Modern commentators generally make the contrast in Gal. 3^{16b} depend upon the use of the collective *σπέρμα* in Gen. 13^{15} instead of *τὰ τέκνα, οἱ ἀπόγονοι* (so Lightfoot), or some other distributive. If Paul had meant that, he would have written *οὐ λέγει, καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις, οὐδέ, τοῖς ἀπογόνοις, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἑνός, καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου.* What he really writes is this: *οὐ λέγει, τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ἀλλὰ τῷ σπέρματι.* The way to understand the contrast, therefore, is to ask, What would the meaning have been, according to Paul's conception, if the Scripture had said *τοῖς σπέρμασιν?*

There are two means of finding out: First, by looking to the conclusion of the argument of which vs.[16] is the thesis. Second, by looking at the parallel passage in Rom. 4.

The seed of Abraham in the promise, says Paul, is not a plurality such as would have been expressed by *σπέρματα*, but a unity, expressed by *σπέρμα*. Then he goes on to explain, *τοῦτο δὲ λέγω*, 'now this is what I mean, the promise looks clear down beyond the law, which was merely a temporary, preparatory discipline for Israel, to believers generally, including the Gentiles, who on their part also had been undergoing a different discipline. These are the "seed." I mean all together in a comprehensive unity, not Jew on one side, Greek on the other; not slave on one side, free on the other; not a *σπέρμα Ἰουδαῖον* and a *σπέρμα Ἑλληνικόν, σπέρμα δοῦλον* and *σπέρμα ἐλεύθερον, σπέρμα ἄρσεν* and *σπέρμα θῆλυ*; not *σπέρματα*, but *σπέρμα*, for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus (*πάντες εἷς ἐστε*), and if ye are members of Christ, then are ye the seed of Abraham, heirs according to promise.'

It is denied that this can be the collective Christ which is meant. It is said (Meyer) "*Χριστός* (in vs.[16]) is the *personal Christ Jesus*, not as some, following Irenæus and Augustine, have explained it, *Christ and his church*, or *the church* alone. Such a *mystical sense* of *Χριστός* must necessarily have been suggested by the context (as in 1 Cor. 12^{12}); here, however, the very contrast between *πολλῶν* and *ἑνός* is against it." I think I have shown that the context does

suggest the "one man, Christ Jesus," of whom both Jews and Gentiles are members, *i.e.* a collective Christ in some sense, though possibly not quite the same sense as Irenæus and Augustine, Beza, Gomarus, Crell, Drusius, Hammond, Locke, Tholuck, Olshausen, Philippi, and Hofmann have argued. I shall now undertake to show from the parallel passages that this is the sense intended.

No one can deny that to Paul, both in Galatians and in Romans, as well as in Ephesians, the abolition of the law by the death of Christ is a subject of rejoicing, not merely because men are brought by it into unity with God by being lifted out of the servile into the filial relation; but also because by its abolition of the great cause of division between Jew and Gentile, men are brought into unity with one another. It is a lifting of the veil as towards God; it is a "breaking down of the middle wall of partition" as towards man. This is expressed in Eph. 2^{15}, the passage which Lightfoot himself cites as parallel to Gal. 3^{28}: *ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον.* The whole passage, $2^{13\text{-}16}$, should be cited as parallel. If there were any doubt as to who this "one new man" is, it would be removed by the further use of the figure in the epistle, where, as in Gal. 3^{27}, we "put on" the new man, grow up into him till the whole body, growing by that which every joint supplieth, maketh increase in love unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, the collective Christ, the living body which is the earthly temple of the Holy Ghost.

But there may be doubt whether in Ephesians Paul is not using a new figure, not thought of in Galatians. There can be no such doubt in Rom. $4^{1\text{-}16}$, where the same argument is made from the same text to the same conclusion, and although stress is no longer laid on the rather fanciful appeal to the use of *σπέρμα* and not *σπέρματα*, the thought is not abandoned, but the conclusion is precisely as in Galatians: "To the end that the promise may be sure to *all* the seed, not to that only which is of the law (the *σπέρμα τοῦ νόμου*), but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham (the *σπέρμα τῆς πίστεως*), who is the father of us *all* (Jews and Gentiles), as it is written, a father of many nations have I made thee."

'The Scripture saith not *σπέρματα* as of *many* seeds, a *σπέρμα τοῦ νόμου, i.e.* οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, and a *σπέρμα τῆς πίστεως, i.e.* οἱ Ἕλληνες, but it saith *σπέρμα* as of *one, i.e.* Christ, who maketh of the twain in himself one new man. If then ye are members of Christ ye are the *σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ*, heirs according to promise.' This is the argument both in Romans and Ephesians, and we cannot but infer that the thought is the same in Galatians. Those commentators, therefore, who with

Lightfoot, Meyer, *et al.*, make the contrast between σπέρμα and a possible τέκνα or other distributive are wrong. Paul says what he means. The contrast is between σπέρμα, "as of one," the collective καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, "which is Christ;" and σπέρματα, "as of many," which would be a σπέρμα Ἰουδαῖον, τὸ κατὰ τὸν νόμον, and a σπέρμα Ἑλληνικόν, τὸ κατὰ τὴν πίστιν, a σπέρμα τῶν δούλων and a σπέρμα ἐλευθέρων κ.τ.λ., which is not Christ; "for Christ is not divided."