12—16. GALATIANS. 337   
   
 AUTHORIZED VERSION. AUTHORIZED VERSION REVISED.   
   
 18 Brethren, I speak 15 Brethren, I speak after the   
 after the manner of men; manner of men; x Even a man’s x Heb.   
 Though it be but a man’s covenant, when it hath been ratified,   
 covenant, yet if it be con- none setteth aside, or addeth there-   
 Jirmed, no man disannul- 16 Now ¥to Abraham were ¥ Gen. xi.   
 leth, or addeth thereto. the promises spoken, and to his v\*   
 16 Now to Abraham and seed. He saith not, And to seeds,   
 his seed were the promises   
 made. He saith not, And   
 to seeds, as of many; but   
   
 Joel ii. 28.—See Acts ii. 17, 33; Luke the law was given. the promises |   
 xxiy. 49,—THE PROMISE of the new cove- because the promise was many times re-   
 nant). This ‘ receiving the promise of the peated: e.g. Gen. xii. 7; xv. 5,18; xvii.   
 Spirit’ distinctly back to ver.2, whero 7, 8; xxii, 18. and to his seed]   
 he asked them whether they received the These words, on which, from what follows,   
 Spirit by the works of the law, or by the the stress of the whole argument rests, are   
 hearing of faith? ‘Here is a pause, at probably meant to be a formal quotation.   
 which the indignant feeling of the Apostle If so, the promises quoted must be Gen.   
 softens, and he begins the new train of xiii. 15; xvii. 8 [Jowett supposes xxi. 12,   
 thought which follows with words of wilder but qu.?] where the words occur as here.   
 character, and proceeds more quietly with He saith not] viz. He who gave the   
 his argument.” Windischmann. promises—God. toseeds.... to   
 15—18.] But what if the law, coming thy seed} The central point of the Apos-   
 after the Abrahamie promise, abrogated tle’s argument is this: The secd to whom   
 that promise? These verses contain the the promises were made, was Christ. To   
 refutation of such an objection: the pro- confirm this position,—see Gen. xxii. 17,   
 mise was not abrogated by the law. 18, where the collective seed of ver. 17,is   
 5.] “ What is <I speak after the manner summed up in the individual seed ver. 18,   
 of men ?? From human examples.” Chry- he alleges a philological distinction,   
 sostom. But (see 1 Cor. xv. 32) the ex- was also recognized by the Rabbinical   
 pression refers not only to the character schools. This has created considerable   
 of the example chosen, but to the tem- difficulty: and all sorts of attempts have   
 porary standing-point of him who speaks : been made to evade the argument, or to   
 I put myself for the time on a level with escape standing committed to the dis-   
 ordinary men in the world. a tinction. Jerome (ad loc.), and   
 (mere) man’s covenant (not ‘testament,’ characteristically, applics the words “I   
 although the word has alsothat meaning; for speak after the manner of men” to this   
 there is here no introduction of that idea: distinction especially, thinks that the   
 the promise spoken to Abraham was strictly Apostle used it as adapted to the’ calibre   
 a covenant, and designated by the word used those to whom he was writing: “ He had   
 here (diathéké) in the passages which were lately called Galatians foolish, and now   
 now in the Apostle’s mind, see Gen.xv.18 5 he descends to their level and becomes a   
 xvii. 7), when ratified, no one notwith- fool in his argument.” The Roman-Ca-   
 standing (that it is merely a human cove- tholic Windischmann, one of the ablest and   
 nant) sets aside, or supplements (with new most sensible of modern expositors, says,   
 conditions. Nothing is implied as to the “Our recent masters of theology have   
 nature of the additions, whether consistent taken up the objection, which is as old as   
 or inconsistent with the original covenant : Jerome, and forgetting that Panl knew   
 the simple fact that no additions are made, Hebrew better than themselves, have se- -   
 is enounced). 16.] What is zow said, verely blamed him for urging the singular   
 in a parenthetical and subsidiary manner, meaning of seed here, and thus justifying   
 is this: The covenant was not merely nor the application to Christ, seeing that the   
 principally I. with Abraham, but with word which occurs here in the Hebrew text,   
 Abraham and HIs SEED, and that seed re- has no plural (Windischmann is notaccurate   
 ferred, not to the Jewish people, but to here: the plural is found 1 Sam. viii. 15,   
 Cxrist. The covenant then was not fal- in the sense of ‘grains of wheat’), and so   
 filled, awaiting its fulfilment, and He to could not be used. Yet they are good   
 whoin it was made was yct’to appear, when enough to assume, that Paul had no frau-   
 Zz