

phet spake, and shrank back in horror from the thought that "the Leprous One" of Isaiah was none other than the Christ of God.

CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT.

(To be continued.)

THE MEDIATOR-ARGUMENT OF GAL. III. 19, 20.

THERE are three conditions that appear to us to form a good preliminary test of every offered interpretation of this passage, and we should fain see them applied with all the rigour and consistency of an "Ockham's razor." In the first place, Does the interpretation preserve the internal unity of the passage? In the second place, does it pay scrupulous regard to the writer's aim and object—to the point he wishes to establish? And, in the third place, is it such as to be in perfect harmony with other parts of the reasoning—both coming after and preceding? We do not know if these conditions have ever before been distinctly formulated, but, once enunciated, they commend themselves by their simplicity and their reasonableness; and, if a strict application of them were made to current interpretations, the number of competitors would soon be reduced to a manageable compass. No interpretation ought to be allowed a claim on our attention that transgresses any one of them: every such transgression should be regarded as a sin of the first magnitude, for which no extra merits—however great and fascinating—can really compensate or make atonement.

Let us, then, consider these conditions for a little; and let us take them in conjunction with the interpretation here preferred. And, first, let us inquire, What is the connexion between the members of our text—how do the various clauses stand related? This inquiry should not detain us

long. For, plainly, the passage occurs in the second part of an argument that is concerned with the Law and the Gospel, viewing both as covenants or contracts; and verse 20, standing at the very end of that part and being introduced by δὲ, is to be taken along with the clause immediately preceding it. In other words, a certain conclusion has to be reached; verse 20 is the intervening step between this conclusion and the proposition, "Ordnained by angels in the hand of a mediator."

What then *is* this conclusion? for that is the important question, and it is there that we first meet with difficulty. In answer, it is commonly affirmed,—that the Apostle wants to prove his thesis of the 17th verse, and that the Mediator-argument is the proof of it. In this view, we are debarred from regarding the reasoning that succeeds verse 17 as progressive, as advancing the general argument step by step; we are simply to look upon it as cumulative, so much evidence all bearing upon one and the same point—all going to prove that the law cannot disannul the Gospel. But nothing, in our opinion, could be wider of the mark, and nothing has so conduced to far-fetched and fantastic theories. The bearing of the Mediator-argument on the thesis of verse 17 (and we emphasize it) is only *indirect*; its *primary* object (as is clearly shown by the participle *διαταγείς*—wrongly translated in the English version, "And it was ordained") is, to support the positions of verse 19. Verse 17 lays down that the Law cannot abrogate the promise; verse 19 takes up the converse and maintains that the promise, when fulfilled, supersedes the Law: manifestly, two entirely different, though related, things. Verse 19 asserts: (1) That the Law was an *addition* to the promise (or "it was *superadded*," if we accept the reading *προσπετέθη*); (2) That it was added *because of transgressions*; and (3) that it was intended only for a *temporary* purpose. Now these clearly were assertions that needed to be *proved*

—they could not be quietly taken for granted; and the last of them (being the very point at issue between the Judaizing Galatians and the Apostle) would be most keenly contested, and, if left unsupported, would appear to be nothing less than a begging of the whole question—a *petitio principii*. The problem then for the commentator at this stage is,—What interpretation of the passage will yield the desired conclusion? what interpretation will prove, that “because of transgressions the Law was superadded, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made”? We submit the following.

That the Law was an addition, is a simple fact of history; it was “ordained through angels” (end of ver. 19), in the hand of Mediator-Moses. Again, that it was “added because of transgressions”—*i.e.* for the purpose of *creating* transgressions, of bringing sin into bold relief and of carrying it home as *παράβασις* to the heart of the sinner—is evident (*ib.*) from the circumstances under which it was delivered. The ministering angels and the mediating Moses prove *that*; for, when “the Lord came from Sinai, with ten thousands of saints,” and *ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ’ αὐτοῦ* (Deut. xxxiii. 2, *Sept.*), we read that “all the people that was in the camp *trembled*” (Exod. xix. 16), “and they said unto Moses (Exod. xx. 19), Speak thou with us, and we will hear: but let not God speak with us, lest we die,” and (Deut. v. 5) “I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to show you the word of the Lord: for ye were afraid.” And, lastly (*v.* 20), that it was limited, provisional, and evanescent is demonstrated thus:—Moses (*ὁ μεσίτης*) was the internuntius for Israel, and for Israel alone. His covenant had reference simply to the Jews; it never contemplated the whole human race as included under it; it could not rise to the conception of Jew and Gentile together forming “the one seed” of Abraham: hence *ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν*. The Gospel, on the other hand, “pre-announced

to Abraham" and "confirmed before of God in Christ," took a much wider sweep than this, and it looked forward to a time when not Israel alone but "all nations" should be blessed; when, therefore, there should be one God (*ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς*) to the human family, one to Jew and Gentile equally. But what is this but saying that, when that time arrived, the Jewish mediator and his functions would cease? There would then be no use for them: the special party for whom Moses mediated would not as formerly stand alone, separated from the rest of the world; the Jews would become merged in the one great community under the one great Head, and would be simply heirs, along with others, of the promise and of the inheritance.¹

This, it appears to us, is the Apostle's meaning, when fully drawn out; and most beautifully does it suit the two first of our conditions. On the one hand, it has due respect to the relation and dependence of the parts in the reasoning; and, on the other hand, it is an affirmative answer to the question in dispute, Was the Law but temporary? was it really an addition and not rather the fulfilment of the promise? was it ever intended to wax old, or to be superseded? Let us now see if it conforms to the third. Is it in harmony with the other parts of the demonstration?

¹ It will be observed, that in this interpretation we regard *ὁ μεσότης* as a synonym for *Moses*, and we think that it ought to be translated "the mediator," not "a mediator." At the same time, even supposing we accepted the generic rendering ("a mediator"), it would still be possible to attain the same result as above in so far as the interpretation of *ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἔστιν* is concerned, viz. through the intercalated proposition, that the sole objects of a mediator's care are those for whom he mediates. In that case, the argument would run thus:—A mediator has reference to the parties (always two at least) between whom he mediates; and, as mediator, he is concerned with no one else. Now, in the case of Moses, he mediated between God and Israel; which just means that the Mosaic covenant referred to Israel, and, of men, to them solely. The Gospel, on the other hand, etc.

It is further to be observed that on this interpretation the *ἐνός* of v. 20 may be regarded either as masculine or as neuter. If it be neuter, then we supply *σπέρματος*, and it refers back to the *ἐν σπέρμα* of v. 16, and forward to the *τοῦ Ἀβραάμ σπέρμα* of v. 29; if it be masculine, then the parallel is *εἷς ἔστε* of v. 28.

Certainly it is,—most fully. For, in the first place, the promise to Abraham, on which St. Paul has insisted from the sixth verse and onwards, was a promise of a *universal* blessing: “in thee shall all nations be blessed.” In the next place, it is in thorough agreement with the argument in *v.* 16, where the Apostle lays stress upon the circumstance that Abraham’s seed is spoken of as “one” (ἐφ’ ἑνός), not “many.” And, last of all, it is a necessary step in the onward march of the discussion; it is the natural passage to a consideration of the Law’s function as pedagogue, and it paves the way for the great climax of the sequel,—“In Him there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” Indeed, in the light of this explanation, the whole chapter is seen to be one grand *connected* dissertation on ἐνότης and ἔνωσις. There is no longer the anomaly of a single word (εἷς) being translated in three different ways within the compass of a few verses; being taken now for numerical unity, now for unchangeableness, now for identity of privilege: but, in each and every case, the meaning attached to it is the same. By this view, full homogeneity is given to the three members—*one* seed, *one* God, *one* people (a people one in sin—“the whole,” τὰ πάντα, *v.* 22, being included; and one in redemption—“ye are all one in Christ Jesus”); and the parallelism (which we cannot but regard as intended) is kept intact, between the oneness of God in *v.* 20 (ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἔστιν) and the oneness (same word) of the redeemed in *v.* 28 (πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ).

But is it sufficient, in order to establish an interpretation, merely to be able to show that it meets all the requirements of the case—that it conforms fully to the foresaid conditions? Manifestly not; for it is conceivable that more interpretations may do this than one—more than one key may fit the lock,—and then how are we to decide between

them? We look upon interpretations of obscure passages in Scripture much in the same way as we look upon hypotheses in Logic, and we think both ought to be governed by the same laws. Logicians tell us that no hypothesis is valid unless it both explain the phenomena under investigation and also be supported by evidence *aliunde*. Scripture interpretations, in like manner, must not only solve the difficulty for which they were called into existence, but must further be established by considerations *ab extra*. Now, are there any *ab extra* considerations that can be produced in favour of the above interpretation? We think there are.

1. In the first place, that interpretation is in thorough keeping with the teaching of St. Paul in general—with the view of Christianity that, as Apostle of the Gentiles, it was his particular function to enforce. It shows Galatians iii. 20 to be a veritable echo of that voice which we first hear in the Acts of the Apostles—a voice that swells and grows as it proceeds, that gains in clearness and in power as it passes from one epistle to another,—that God “hath made of one (ἐξ ἑνὸς) all nations, . . . that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us: for in Him we live and move and have our being.” And, in particular, it is in striking unison with the teaching of the Romans—a letter dealing with the very subject of the Galatians and probably written about the same time. We would almost challenge any one to read the third and fourth chapters of Romans in close connection with Galatians iii. and not feel that, whatever is the meaning in the one place, the same must be the meaning in the other. The train of reasoning is obviously identical in both, and identical are many of the arguments and illustrations.

2. But, in the next place, our interpretation has the merit of giving to the expression “God is one” (ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν) the same rendering that it gets in corresponding

passages of the Pauline writings. We have already referred to Romans iii. Verses 29 and 30 are specially in point. It is there argued, "Is He the God of the Jews only? is He not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: seeing it is one God (*ἑνείπαιρος εἰς ὁ Θεός*) which shall justify the circumcision by faith and the uncircumcision through faith." In this place at any rate, no interpretation of the *εἰς ὁ Θεός* is admissible but that which makes it equivalent to "one and the same God"—a God the same to Gentile as to Jew. Parallel to this is 1 Timothy ii. 5. St. Paul is there counselling that prayer be made for ALL men, on the ground that "God our Saviour will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." He then supports his last position by the pregnant consideration, "For there is one God (*εἰς γὰρ Θεός*), and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." "One God," he says—*i.e.* to the heathen ruler and to the Christians ruled, one to men of every rank and situation, one to mankind in general; and, furthermore, humanity has one, and one only, Saviour. Now we would simply ask, What interpretation of Galatians iii. 20 can afford to overlook this passage? And we would submit that *that* interpretation has the greatest claim upon us that fits into the passage most naturally and most easily.

3. Thirdly, it may not be out of place to remark on the resemblance between the Mediator-argument as above interpreted and certain parts of the last speech of St. Stephen; a speech that in all likelihood St. Paul heard, and that probably was in his mind when he wrote the Galatians—that, at all events, shows striking points of coincidence which it is scarcely practicable to ignore. St. Stephen (in Acts vii.), when introducing Moses, does so as one prophesying of the coming Saviour: "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me; Him shall ye hear." And, immediately there-

after, he emphasizes Moses' own position as the guide of the early Jewish Church and as the early Church's mediator: "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us." He then passes to the Tabernacle erected by the Mediator and to its successor the Temple, and from this leaps direct to the grand and comprehensive thought that neither Mediator-Moses nor Moses' tabernacle was adequate to represent the fulness of the Gospel blessing: "Howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as saith the prophet, Heaven is My throne and earth is My footstool: what house will ye build Me? saith the Lord: or what is the place of My rest? Hath not My hand made all these things?" This train of thought is certainly remarkable, and it bears a striking similarity to that before us. St. Paul too reasons on the Mediator-Moses; St. Paul too makes the very same leap: Mediator-Moses dealt with Jews only, God is wider than the Jews and includes the Gentiles. Yea, and St. Stephen's teaching would exactly bear out St. Paul's conclusion; it would demonstrate that the Law was only temporary and evanescent. And, as matter of fact, we find that this was how his opponents actually understood it. "They suborned men," we read (Acts vi. 11-14), "which said, We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God. . . . This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law; for we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us."

4. Once more, our interpretation avoids certain inconsistencies that are often very patent in others, and that ought of themselves, where they exist, to create a suspicion that the interpreter has somewhere erred. Need we refer

again to the handling that the single word εἰς has commonly received? Three different significations have sometimes been assigned to it within the range of these few verses, and it is the rarest thing imaginable to find an interpretation that is content with less than two. But, further, we observe that there is often an inconsistency hinging on the term ὁ μεσίτης, and one that seems to us to be of a very grave kind indeed. Translate ὁ μεσίτης (as is usually done) *generically*, and you need not thereby (as we said in the footnote) surrender the proper meaning of ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἰς, but you do something equally outrageous: you make St. Paul reason in a most remarkable and curious fashion. You make him first maintain that the Gospel is distinguished from the Law by its not requiring a mediator, (and what becomes of 1 Timothy ii. 5 then? what becomes of the teaching of the Hebrews, particularly of chap. viii.? yea, what becomes of Christianity itself?) and, then, by translating ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν (as you needs must do) by "not of one party, but of two," you make him forget that the original promise (in which "God is one," ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ἔστιν), *being confirmed to Abraham and his seed*, had as much reference to *two* parties as the Law had. In short, you reduce the logical acumen of the Apostle to a minimum, and by a single stroke thrust him from the lofty intellectual pedestal on which for centuries he has nobly stood. Accept, on the other hand, ὁ μεσίτης as the equivalent of *Moses*, and these consequences and these difficulties are avoided. St. Paul is then seen to be thoroughly consistent, and his reasoning throughout to be logically exact and to the point.

Now, putting all these considerations together, we do not think that any other interpretation can boast of a phalanx of stronger *aliunde*-evidence than this, and none seems better fitted to stand the ordeal of a strict preliminary

testing. At any rate, it is an interpretation that appears to us to merit a closer and more careful inspection than it has yet received ; and we should rejoice to see it thoroughly argued and examined by competent scholars, who would handle the subject with impartiality, having, as Locke happily expresses it, "an equal indifferency to all truth."

WILLIAM L. DAVIDSON.

THE CHIEF PAULINE NAMES FOR CHRIST.

IN reading through the Pauline Epistles with a special aim in view, I have found it needful to mark by the way the most frequent designations given to our Lord, to enumerate and to classify them. The results of this side-study present considerable food for reflection, and I have thought it worth while to put them in tabular form for the convenience of others. The subjoined table forms the substance of this contribution. I have ventured to add a few remarks by way of explaining the chart and also by way of calling attention to some of its more important statistics.

1. I have followed Westcott and Hort's text (edition 1881) in every case, not heeding the brackets in the body of the text, nor the alternative readings suggested in the margin.

2. I use the word Pauline as a convenient adjective to describe all those epistles (excepting that to the Hebrews) which have been rightly or wrongly ascribed to Paul. I venture to think that the figures contained in the table may help to throw some light on the question of authorship in the case of certain epistles : as I shall indicate later.

3. The epistles are tabulated, in the main, in chronological order.

4. The application of the term *κύριος* to Jesus is the chief if not the sole essential in the early Christian confession, as