

* OCT 24 1910
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VIII

OCTOBER 1910

NUMBER 4

MIRACLES AND HISTORY.

The remark is frequently made that miracles were formerly a means or weapon of apologetics, but have now become an object of defense. Once an aid to faith, miracles are now regarded by many as a burden, and as some would have it a burden too grievous to be borne. As the work of Paul was to throw off the yoke of legalism, and the task of Luther was to break the bands of sacerdotalism, so, it is assumed, the duty of the present age is to complete the work of emancipation, and to free religion from the twofold yoke of miracle and dogma.

Whatever other aspects the question of miracle may have it is primarily an historical question. Back of such considerations as the possibility or credibility of miracles, or their value as an evidence for the truth of Christianity, lies the more important question, Did the miracles recorded in the New Testament really happen? The perennial interest in the discussion is no doubt due to its inseparable connection with central and cherished beliefs in philosophy and religion, but it is this connection which makes the task of the historian peculiarly difficult. Absolute impartiality in investigating the evidence would be the ideal condition for the historian, but the historical student, as a man of like passions with other men, cannot but be influenced, in considering a question with so intimate philosophical and religious bearings, by the dominant thought of his time.

“SCRIPTURE”, “THE SCRIPTURES”, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT¹.

The scope of this article does not permit the full discussion in it of the employment of Scripture, or of the estimate put upon Scripture, by either our Lord or the writers of the New Testament. It is strictly limited to what is necessary to exhibit the use of the terms ‘Scripture’, ‘The Scriptures’, in the New Testament and the more immediate implications of this use.

This use was an inheritance, not an invention. The idea of a ‘canon’ of ‘Sacred Scriptures’, and, with the idea, the ‘canon’ itself were derived by Christianity from Judaism. The Jews possessed a body of writings, consisting of ‘Law, Prophets and (other) Scriptures (K’tubhim)’, though they were often called for brevity’s sake merely ‘the Law and the Prophets’ or even simply ‘the Law’. These ‘Sacred Scriptures’ (כתבי הקדש),—or, as they were very frequently pregnantly called, this ‘Scripture’ (הכתיב), or these ‘Books’ (ט כפרים) or, even sometimes, in the singular, this ‘Book’ (הכפר)—were looked upon as all drawing their origin from divine inspiration and as possessed in all their extent of divine authority. Whatever stood written in them was a word of God, and was therefore referred to indifferently as something which ‘the Scripture says’ (זס אמר הכתיב זס אמר קרא) or ‘the All-merciful says’ (אמר רחמנא), or even simply ‘He says’ (ואמר or כן הוא אומר)—that God is the speaker being too fully understood to require explicit expression. Every precept or dogma was supposed to be grounded in Scriptural teaching, and possessed authority only as buttressed by a Scriptural passage, introduced com-

¹ A condensation of this article was published in Dr. Hastings’ *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, sub voc. “Scripture.” It has been thought desirable after this interval to print the entire article.

monly by one of the formulas, 'for it is said' (שנאמר), or 'as it is written' (ככתוב or ככתוב), though of course a great variety of less frequently occurring similar formulas of adduction are found².

Greek-speaking Jews naturally tended merely to reproduce in their new language the designations and forms of adduction of the sacred books current among their compatriots. This process was no doubt facilitated by the existence among the Greeks themselves of a pregnant legislative use of *γράφω, γραφή, γράμμα*, in which they were already freighted with a certain implication of authority³. But it is very easy to make too much of this (as *e. g.*, Deissmann does), and the simple fact should not be obscured that the Greek-speaking Jews follow the usage of the Jews in general. It may no doubt very possibly be due in part to his Graecizing tendencies that the Scriptures are spoken of by Josephus apparently with predilection as the "Sacred Books" (*ἱερὰ βιβλοι* or *ἱερὰ βιβλία*) or "Sacred Scriptures" (*ἱερὰ γράμματα*) or more fully still as the "Books of the Sacred Scriptures" (*αἱ ἱερῶν γραφῶν βιβλοι*); and quoted with the formula *γέγραπται* or more frequently *ἀναγέγραπται*—all of which are forms which would be familiar to Greek ears, with a general implication of authority⁴. Perhaps, however, the influence of the Greek usage is more clearly traceable in certain passages of the LXX in which *γραφή* may

² Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus, etc.*, Ed. 1, I. p. 187, note 2; *cf.*, in general, Surenhusius, ספר הכשר *sive* βίβλος καταλλαγῆς (1713), pp. 1-36; Döpke, *Hermeneutik der NT. Schriftsteller* (1829), I. pp. 60-69; Pinner, Translation of the Tract *Berachoth*, Introd. p. 21b; Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden*, p. 44; Weber, *Jüdische Theologie* (1897) § 20, p. 80 sq.; Schürer, *Jewish People* II. i. p. 311; Buhl, *Canon and Text*, § 2; Ryle, *Canon of O. T.*, Excursus E.

³ *Cf.* the passages in the Lexicons, and especially in Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 112, 249, and Cremer, *Biblico-Theol. Lex.* sub vocc. especially the later edd.

⁴ *Cf.* Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 149, note 4. For Josephus' use of Scripture, in general, see Gerlach, *Die Weissagungen d. A T in d. Schrift. d. F. Josephus* (1863), and Dienstfertig, *Die Prophetologie in d. Religionsphilosophie d. ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderts* (1892), the latter of whom discusses Philo's ideas of Scripture also.

seem to hover between the pregnant Greek sense of authoritative 'ordinance', and the pregnant Hebrew sense of authoritative 'Scripture'. When, for example, we read in I Chron. xv. 15, "And the sons of the Levites took upon themselves with staves the Ark of God, *ὡς ἐνετείλατο Μωσῆς ἐν λόγῳ θεοῦ κατὰ τὴν γραφήν*," we scarcely know whether we are to translate the *κατὰ τὴν γραφήν* (which has no equivalent in the Hebrew) by "according to the precept", or by "according to the Scriptures". Something of the same hesitancy is felt with reference to the similar passages: II Chron. xxx. 5, "Because the multitude had not done it lately *κατὰ τὴν γραφήν*" (= וַיִּזְכְּרוּ); II Chron. xxx. 18, "But they ate the passover *παρὰ τὴν γραφήν*" (= וַיִּזְכְּרוּ אֶלֶּף); II Esdr. vi. 18, "And they established the priests in their courses and the Levites in their divisions for the service of God in Jerusalem, *κατὰ τὴν γραφήν βίβλου Μωσῆ*" (= וַיִּזְכְּרוּ כִּפְר מִשְׁפָּ); I Chron. xxviii. 19, "All these things David gave to Solomon *ἐν γραφῇ χειρὸς κυρίου*" (= וַיִּזְכְּרוּ מִדָּבָר יְהוָה); II Chron. xxxv. 4, "Prepare yourselves . . . *κατὰ τὴν γραφήν Δαυὶδ . . . καὶ διὰ χειρὸς Σαλωμῶν*" (= וַיִּזְכְּרוּ יוּד וּבְמִתְּבַת שְׁלֹמֹה); I Esdr. i. 4, "*κατὰ τὴν γραφήν Δαυὶδ*" κτλ; and especially the very instructive passage II Esdr. vii. 22, "For which there is no *γραφῆ*." Similarly in II Esdr. iii. 2, "*κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα*" (= וַיִּזְכְּרוּ) in the law of Moses," *τὰ γεγραμμένα* might very well appeal to a Greek ear as simply "the prescriptions"; and there are a series of passages in which *γέγραπται* might very readily be taken in the Greek sense of "it is prescribed", such as Josh. ix. 4, (viii. 31), II Kings xiv. 6, xxiii. 21, II Chron. xxiii. 18, xxv. 4, Neh. x. 34, (35), 35, (37), Tob. i. 6. Should this interpretation be put on these passages, there would be left in the LXX little unalloyed trace of the peculiar Jewish usage of pregnantly referring to Scripture as such by that term, and citing it with the authoritative 'It is written'. For clear instances of the former usage we should have to go to IV Macc. xviii. 14, and of the latter to Dan. ix. 13, and to

the Greek additions to Job (xlii. 18).⁵ Philo on the other hand is absolutely determined in his usage by his inherited Jewish habits of thought. With him the Sacred books are by predilection a body of divine Oracles and are designated ordinarily either *ὁ λόγος* with various adjectival enhancements—‘prophetic’, ‘divine’, ‘sacred’—or, perhaps even more commonly, “the Oracles”, or even “the Oracle”, (*οἱ χρησμοί, τὰ λόγια, ὁ χρησμός, τὸ λόγιον*, or even possibly the anarthrous *χρησμός, λόγιον*); and are adduced (as is also most frequently the case in the Mishna, *cf.* Edersheim as cited) rather with the formula, “As it is said”, than with the “As it is written” which would more naturally convey to Greek ears the sense of authoritative declarations. Of course Philo also speaks on occasion (for this too is a truly Jewish mode of speech) of these “Oracles” as “the Sacred Books” (*ἱεραὶ βίβλοι. De Vita Moysis*, iii. 23, Mangey ii. 163; *Quod det. pot. insid.* 44, Mangey i. 222), or as “the Sacred Scriptures” (*αἱ ἱερώταται γραφαί, De Abrah.* i, Mangey ii. 2; *ἱεραὶ γραφαί. Quis rerum div. heres.* 32, Mangey i. 495; *τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, Legat. ad Caium*, 29, Mangey ii. 574); and adduces them with the pregnant *γέγραπται*. But the comparative infrequency of these designations in his pages is very noticeable⁶.

What it is of importance especially to note is that there was nothing left for Christianity to invent in the way of designating the Sacred Books taken over from the Jewish Church pregnantly as “Scripture”, and currently adducing their authority with the pregnant ‘It is written’. The Christian writers merely continued in their entirety the established usages of the Synagogue in this matter, already prepared to

⁵ IV Macc. xviii. 14, “And he reminded you of Ἡσαίου γραφήν which says, Though you pass through fire, &c.”; Dan. ix. 13, “Καθὼς γέγραπται in the law of Moses, all this evil is come upon us”; Job xlii. 18, “And Job died an old man and full of days, γέγραπται δὲ that he shall rise again along with those whom the Lord will raise.”

⁶ Philo’s designations of Scripture have been collected by Horne-mann, *Observationes ad illustr. doctr. de V. T. ex Philone* (1775); more briefly by Eichhorn, *Einleitung in d. A. T.*; and less satisfactorily by Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture. Cf. The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, x. 504 (July, 1899) and xi. 235 (April, 1900).

their hands in Hebrew and Greek alike. There is probably not a single mode of alluding to or citing Scripture in all the New Testament which does not find its exact parallel among the Rabbis⁷. The New Testament so far evinces itself a thoroughly Jewish book. The several terms made use of in it, to be sure, as it was natural they should be, are employed with some sensitiveness to their inherent implications as Greek words; and the Greek legislative use of some of them gave them no doubt peculiar fitness for the service asked of them, and lent them a special significance to Gentile readers. But the application made of them by the New Testament writers nevertheless has its roots set in the soil of Jewish thought, from which they derive a fuller and deeper meaning than their most pregnant classical usage could accord them. Among these terms those which more particularly claim our attention at the moment are the two substantives *γραφῆ* and *γράμμα*, with their various qualifications, and the cognate verbal forms employed in citing writings pregnantly designated by these substantives. There is nothing in the New Testament usage of these terms peculiar to itself; and throughout the New Testament any differences that may be observed in their employment by the several writers are indicative merely of varying habits of speech within the limits of one well-settled general usage.

To the New Testament writers as to other Jews, the Sacred Books of what was in their circle now called the Old Covenant (II Cor. iii. 14), described according to their contents as "the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms" (Lk. xxiv. 44)—or more briefly as "the Law and the Prophets" (Mt. vii. 12, Lk. xvi. 16, *cf.* Acts xxviii. 23, Lk. xvi. 29-31) or merely as "the Law" (Jno. x. 34, I Cor. xiv. 21) or even "the Prophets", (Rom. xvi. 26),⁸—were, when thought of

⁷ This has been shown in detail by, for example, Surenhusius and Döpke, as cited above.

⁸ Sometimes the whole is spoken of, in accordance with its character as revelation, as "prophetical Scriptures" or "the Scriptures of the prophets" (*cf.* Mat. ii. 23, xi. 13, xxvi. 56; Lk. i. 70, xviii. 31, xxiv. 25, 27; Acts iii. 24, xiii. 27; Rom. i. 2, xvi. 26).

according to their nature, a body of “Sacred Scriptures” (Rom. i. 2, II Tim. iii. 16), or, with the omission of the unnecessary because well-understood adjective, by way of eminence, “the Scriptures”, “the Scripture”, “Scripture”, (Mat. xxii. 29, Jno. x. 35, I Pet. ii. 6). For employment in this designation, either of the substantives, *γραφὴ* or *γράμμα*, would apparently have been available; although of course with slightly differing suggestions arising from the differing implications of the forms and the respective general usages of the words. In Philo and Josephus the more usual of the two in this application is *γράμμα*, or, to speak more exactly, *γράμματα*,— for although *γράμμα* is sometimes in later Greek so employed in the singular⁹ it is in the plural that this term most properly denotes that congeries of alphabetical signs which constitutes a book (*cf.* Latin, *literae*). In the New Testament on the contrary, this form is rare. The complete phrase, *ἱερὰ γράμματα*, which is found also both in Josephus (*e. g.* *Antt. proem.* 3; iii. 7, 6; x. 10, 4; xiii. 5, 8) and in Philo (*e. g.*, *De Vita Moys.* i. 2, *Legat. ad Caium*, 29) occurs in II Tim. iii. 15 as the current title of the Sacred Books, freighted with all its implications as such, or rather with those implications emphasized by its anarthrous employment, and particularly adverted to in the immediate context (verse 16).¹⁰ Elsewhere in the New Testament, however, *γράμματα* scarcely occurs as a designation of Scripture. In Jno. v. 47, “But if ye believe not his (Moses’) writings, how shall ye believe my (Jesus’)

⁹ Strabo, *Geog.* i. 7, “Hecataeus left a *γράμμα* believed to be his from his other *γραφὴ*.” Callimachus, *Epigr.* xxiv. 4, “Plato’s τὸ περὶ ψυχῆς *γράμμα*”. In the Church Fathers τὸ *θεῖον* (or *ἱερὸν*) *γράμμα* occurs frequently for “Holy Scripture,” *e. g.* Greg. Thaum. in *Orig. orat. paneg.* VI. *ad fin.*; Epiph. *Adv. Hær.* III, ii. (1xxx. A.); Cyr. Al. *Epistula* 50 (formerly 44): in Cyr. Al. *De Adver.* p. 44, the N. T. is the *νέον γράμμα*; in Eus. *h. e.* x. 4*fin.*, τῶν τεττάρων εὐαγγελίων τὸ *γράμμα* is the Gospels, etc.

¹⁰ H. Holtzmann accordingly accurately comments on this passage: “The writer shares the Jewish view of the purely supernatural origin of Scripture in its strictest form, according to which ‘theopneustie’ is ascribed directly to the Scriptures.” (*N. T. Theologie* ii. 261).

words?" to be sure we must needs hesitate before we refuse to give to it this its most pregnant sense, especially since there appears to be an implication present that it would be more reprehensible to refuse trust to these "writings" of Moses than to the "words" of Jesus Himself. But on the whole, the tendency of the most recent exegesis to see in "his writings" here little more than another way of saying "what he wrote," seems justified. The only other passage which can come into consideration is Jno. vii. 15, "How knoweth this man *γράμματα*, not having learned?" in which some commentators still see a reference to "the *ἱερὰ γράμματα* (II Tim. iii. 15) from which the Jewish *γραμματεῖς* derived their title" (Th. Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii. 99). Most readers, however, doubtless will agree that "letters" in general are more naturally meant (*cf.* Acts xxvi. 24 and Meyer's judicious note).¹¹ Practically, therefore, *γράμμα* is eliminated; and *γραφή*, *γραφαί*, in their varied uses, remain the sole terms employed in the New Testament in the sense of "Scripture", "Scriptures".

This term, in singular or plural, occurs in the New Testament some fifty times (Gospels twenty-three, Acts seven, Catholic Epistles six, Paul fourteen) and in every case bears the technical sense in which it refers to the Scriptures by way of eminence, the Scriptures of the Old Testament. This statement requires only such modification as is involved in noting that from II Pet. iii. 16 (*cf.* I Tim. v. 18) it becomes apparent that the New Testament writers were perfectly aware that the term "Scripture" in its high sense was equally applicable to their own writings as to the books included in the Old Testament; or, to be more precise, that it included within itself along with the writings which

¹¹ For the currency of this sense, *cf.* G. Milligan, *Selections from the Greek Papyri*, p. 58, where commenting on the phrase *μὴ ἰδὸτος γράμματα*, he remarks: "The phrase occurs in countless papyrus documents written either in whole or in part by a scribe on behalf of the 'unlettered' author. *Cf.* the use of the corresponding adjective *ἀγράμματος* in Acts iv. 13 (*cf.* Jo. vii. 15, Ac. xxvi. 24)='unacquainted with literature or Rabbinical learning'."

constituted the Old Testament those also which they were producing, as sharing with the Old Testament books the high functions of the authoritative written word of God.¹² No modification needs to be made for the benefit of the few passages in which words are adduced as Scriptural which are not easily identified in the Old Testament text.¹³ The only passages which come strictly under consideration here are Jno. vii. 38 and Jas. iv. 5, to which may be added as, essentially of the same kind (although the term *γραφη* does not occur in connection with them), I Cor. ii. 9, and Lk. ix. 49. It is enough to remark as to these passages that, however difficult it may be to identify with certainty the passages referred to, there is no reason to doubt that Old Testament passages were in mind and were intended to be referred to in every case (see Mayor on Jas. iv. 5, and *cf.* Lightfoot on I Cor. ii. 9, Westcott on Jno. vii. 38, Godet on Lk. xi. 49). In twenty out of the fifty instances in which *γραφῆ*, *γραφαί* occur in the New Testament, it is the plural form which is employed: and in all these cases except two the article is present,—*αἱ γραφαί* the well-known Scriptures of the Jewish people, or rather of the writer and his readers alike. The two exceptions, moreover, are exceptions in appearance only, since in both cases adjectival definitions are present, raising *γραφαί* to the same height to which the article would have elevated it, and giving it the value of a proper name (*γραφαί ἁγία*, Ro. i. 2, here first in extant literature; *γραφαί προφητικά*, Ro. xvi. 26). The singular form occurs some thirty times, and likewise with the article in every instance except these four: John xix. 37 ‘another Scripture’; II Tim. iii. 16 ‘every

¹² On the significance of the plural *αἱ γραφαί* in 2 Pet. iii. 16, see below, p. 578. There is no justification for attempting to lower the high implication of the term here (e. g. Huther, Spitta, Mayor in loc., Ladd *Doct. of Sacred Scripture*, I. p. 211, note). The inclusion of New Testament books within the category of ‘Scripture’ is witnessed also in I Tim. v. 18, Ep. Barnabas iv. 14, 2 Clem. Rom. ii. 4, and in the later Fathers *passim*. It is as early as literary Christianity.

¹³ See them in Hühn, *Die alttestamentlichen Citate*, 270.

Scripture', or 'all Scripture'; I Pet. ii. 6 'it is contained in Scripture'; II Pet. i. 20 'no prophecy of Scripture'. Here too the exceptions, obviously, are only apparent, the noun being definite in every case whether by the effect of its adjunct, or as the result of its use as a quasi-proper-name. The distribution of the singular and plural forms is perhaps worth noting. In Acts the singular (3) and plural (4) occur with almost equal frequency: the plural prevails in the Synoptic Gospels (Mat. plural only; Mk. plural 2 to 1; Lk. 3 to 1), while the singular prevails in the rest of the New Testament (Jno. 11 to 1; James 3 to 1; Peter 2 to 1, Paul 9 to 5). In the Gospels, the plural form occurs exclusively in Matthew, prevailing in Mark and Luke, and rarely in John, of whom the singular is characteristic. The usage of the Gospels in detail is as follows: αἱ γραφαί Mt. xxi. 42, xxii. 29, xxvi. 34, 56, Mk. xii. 24, xix. 49, Lk. xxiv. 27, 32, 45, Jno. v. 39; ἡ γραφή, Mk. xii. 10, Lk. iv. 21, Jno. ii. 22, vii. 38, 42, x. 35, xiii. 18, xvii. 12, xix. 24, 28, 36, xx. 9; anarthrous γραφή, Jno. xix. 37 (but with ἐτέρα). No distinction is traceable between the usage of the Evangelists themselves and that of the Lord as reported by them. Matthew and Mark do not on their own account use the term at all, but only report it as used by our Lord: in Luke and John on the other hand it occurs not only in reports of our Lord's sayings (Lk. iv. 21, Jno. v. 39, vii. 38, iv. 2, x. 35, viii. 18, xvii. 12), and of the sayings of others (Lk. xxiv. 32), but also in the narrative of the Evangelists (Lk. xxiv. 27, 45, Jno. ii. 22, xix. 24, xix. 28, 36, 37, xx. 9). To our Lord is ascribed the use indifferently of the plural (Mat. xxi. 42, xxii. 49, xxvi. 54, 56, Mk. xii. 24, xiv. 49, Jno. v. 39) and the singular (Mk. xii. 10, Lk. iv. 21, Jno. vii. 38, 42, x. 35, xiii. 18, xvii. 12), and that in all the forms of application in which the term occurs in the Gospels. So far as His usage of the term "Scripture" is concerned, our Lord is represented by the Evangelists, thus, as occupying precisely the same standpoint and employing precisely the same forms of designation, with precisely the same impli-

cations, which characterized the devout Jewish usage of His day. "Jesus", says B. Weiss, therefore, with substantial truth, "acknowledged the Scriptures of the Old Testament in their entire extent and their complete sacredness. 'The Scripture cannot be broken', He says (Jno. x. 35) and forthwith grounds His argument upon its language"¹⁴.

That we may gather the precise significance of ἡ γραφή, αἱ γραφαί, as a designation of the Scriptures, it will be well to attend somewhat more closely to the origin of the term in Greek speech and to the implications it gathered to itself in its application to literary documents. Its history in its literary application does not seem to have been precisely the same as that of its congener, τὸ γράμμα, τὰ γράμματα. Γράμμα appears to have become current first in this reference as the appropriate appellation of an alphabetical sign, and to have grown gradually upward from this lowly employment to designate a document of less or greater extent, because such documents are ultimately made up of alphabetical signs. Although, therefore, the singular, τὸ γράμμα, came to be used of any written thing—from a simple alphabetical character up to complete works, or even unitary combinations of works, like the Scriptures,—it is apparently when applied to writings, most naturally employed of brief pieces like short inscriptions or proverbs, or to the shorter portions of documents such as the clauses of treaties, and the

¹⁴ *Das Leben Jesu*, I. 441-442, E. T. II. 62-63. Cf. Haupt, *Die alttest. Citate in d. vier Evang.* pp. 203, 201-2: "We recognize first what no doubt scarcely requires proof, that Jesus treats the Old Testament in its entirety as the Word of God. Down to the smallest letter and most casual word (Mt. v. 18; Jno. x. 34) it is to Him truth, and that, religious truth." "An isolated expression of precisely the book most subjective in its character in the whole canon is made use of and applied as meeting the case." Cf. also Franke, *Das Alt-Test. bei Johan.* pp. 46, 48; H. Holtzmann, *N. T. Theologie*, I. 115, 45; P. Gennrich, *Der Kampf um die Schrift*, &c. 1898, p. 72: "In this late-Jewish, wholly unhistorical tradition, Jesus himself and the oldest Christian authors were brought up; for them the whole Old Testament literature is already inspired (θεόπνευστος 2 Tim. iii. 16), every word, even those of the Psalms and of the Historical Books, an oracle."

like; although it is also used of those longer formal sections of literary works which are more commonly designated technically "Books". It is rather the plural, τὰ γράμματα, which seems to suggest itself most readily not only for extended treatises, but indeed for complete documents of all kinds. When so employed, the plural form is accordingly not to be pressed. Such a phrase as "Moses' γράμματα" (Jno. v. 47) for example, need not imply that Moses wrote more than one "work"; it would rather mass whatever 'writings' of Moses are in mind into a single 'writing', and would most naturally mean just, say, "the Pentateuch". Such a phrase as *ἰερὰ γράμματα* (II Tim. iii. 15), again, need not bring the Old Testament books before our contemplation in their plurality, as a "Divine library"; but more probably conceives them together in the mass, as constituting a single sacred document, thought of as a unitary whole. On the other hand, *γραφή*, in its literary application, seems to have sprung somewhat lightly across the intervening steps, to designate which *γράμμα* is most appropriately used, and to have been carried at once over from the 'writing' in the sense of the script to the 'writing' in the sense of the scripture or document. Although therefore it of course exhibits more applications parallel with those of *γράμμα* than of any other term, its true synonymy in its higher literary use is rather with such terms as *ἡ βίβλος* (τὸ βιβλίον) and *ὁ λόγος*, in common with which it most naturally designates a complete literary piece, whether "Treatise" or "Book". Each of these terms, of course, preserves in all its applications something of the flavor of the primitive conception which was bound up with it. When thought of from the material point of view, as, so to say, so much paper, or, to speak more respectfully, from the point of sight of its extent, a literary work was apt therefore to be spoken as a *βίβλος* (*βιβλίον*). When thought of as a rational product, thought presented in words, it was apt to be spoken of as a *λόγος*. Intermediate between the two stood *γραφή* (*γράμμα*) which was apt to come to the lips when the work was thought of

as, so to speak, so much 'writing'. As between the two terms, *γραφή* and *γράμμα*, Dr. Westcott (on Jno. v. 47) suggests that the latter 'marks rather the specific form,' the former 'the scope of the record'; and this seems so far just that to *γράμμα* there clings a strong flavor of the 'letters' of which the document is made up, while *γραφή* looks rather to the completeness of the 'scripture'. To both alike so much of the implication of specific form clings as to lend them naturally to national and legislative employment with the implication of the "certa scriptio".¹⁵ To put the general matter in a nut-shell, *βίβλος* (*βιβλίον*) may perhaps be said to be the more exact word for the 'book'; *γραφή* (*γράμμα*) for the 'document' inscribed in the 'book'; *λόγος* for the 'treatise' which the 'document' records; while as between *γραφή* and *γράμμα*, *γράμμα*, preserving the stronger material flavor, gravitates somewhat towards *βίβλος* (*βιβλίον*) while *γραφή* looks somewhat upwards towards *λόγος*. When in the development of the publishers' trade, the "great-book-system" of making books gave way for the purposes of convenience to the "small-book-system", and long works came to be broken up into "Books", each of which constituted a 'volume',¹⁶ these "Books" attached to themselves this whole series of designations and were called alike,—in each case with its own appropriate implications—*βίβλοι*, (*βιβλία*), *γραφαί* (*γράμματα*) and *λόγοι*: *βίβλοι* (*βιβλία*) because each book was written on a separate roll of papyrus and constituted one 'paper' or 'volume'; *γραφαί* (*γράμματα*) because each book was a separate document, a distinct 'scripture'; and *λόγοι* because each book was a distinct 'discourse' or rational work.

¹⁵ We meet the two words in a single context in Strabo, *Geog.* I. 7 (Ed. Didot, p. 5, line 50, *seq.*) where we are told that Hecataeus "left a *γράμμα* which is believed to be his *ἐξ ἄλλης αὐτοῦ γραφῆς*." Here *γράμμα* appears to be used where the mind is on the concrete object, and *γραφή* where it rests rather on the contents: that is, *γράμμα* seems to reach down towards *βίβλος* (*βιβλίον*), *γραφή* upwards towards *λόγος*. Does the singular *γραφή* bear here a plural or "collective" sense (Latin version: *ex ceteris ejus scriptis*)?

¹⁶ Cf. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, 479.

Smaller sections than these "Books" were properly called *περιοχάς, τόπους, χωρία, γράμματα* (which last is the appropriate word for 'clauses'), but very seldom if ever in the classics, *γραφάς*.¹⁷

The current senses of these several terms are of course more or less reflected as they occur in the pages of the New Testament. In the case of some of them, the New Testament usage simply continues that of profane Greek; in the case of others, new implications enter in which, while not superseding, profoundly modify their fundamental significance; in yet other cases, there is a development of usage beyond what is traceable in profane Greek. The passages in which two or more of the terms in question are brought together are, naturally, especially instructive. When we read, for example, in Lk. iii. 4 *seq.* *ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βιβλῳ λόγων Ἰσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου*, we perceive at once that what is quoted is a body of *λόγοι* which are found in written form (*γραφή*: *cf.* I Cor. xv. 54, *ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος*) in a *βιβλος*: the *βιβλος* is the volume which contains the *γραφή*, which conveys or, perhaps better, records the *λόγοι*. So again when we read in Lk. iv. 17 *sq.* that there was delivered to our Lord the *βιβλίον* of Isaiah, on opening which he found the *τόπον*, where a given thing *ἦν γεγραμμένον*, and then closing the *βιβλίον* he remarked *ἡ γραφή αὕτη* is fulfilled in your ears, we perceive that the *βιβλίον* is the concrete volume—a thing to be handled, opened and closed (*cf.* Rev. ii. 3, 4, 5, x. 8, xx. 12), the manner of opening and closing being of course unrolling and rolling (Rev. vi. 14, *cf.* Heb. xii. 2, x. 7, Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, 116); and that the *γραφή* is the document written in this *βιβλίον*; while the various parts of this *γραφή* are formally *τόποι*, or when attention is directed to their essential quality as sharers in the authority of the whole, *γραφαί* (*cf.* Acts i. 16, "The *γραφή* which the Holy Spirit spake through the mouth of" the writer).

¹⁷ *Cf.*, however, Eur. *Hipp.* 1311, where Phaedra is said to have written *ψευδεῖς γραφάς* which may mean "false statements".

As might be inferred from these examples, *βιβλος* and *βιβλιον* retain in the New Testament their current significations in profane Greek. Their application to sacred rather than to secular books in no way modified their general sense.¹⁸ It brought, however, to them a richness of association which prepared the way for that pregnant employment of them—beginning not indeed in the New Testament but in even earlier Hellenistic writings—to designate in its simple absoluteness the sacred volume, from which ultimately our common term "The Bible" is supposed to have descended.¹⁹ Throughout the New Testament the *βιβλος* or *βιβλιον* when applied to literary entities is just the "volume", that is to say, the concrete object, the "book" in the handleable sense. When we read of the *βιβλος* of the words of Isaiah (Lk. iii. 4), or of Moses (Mk. xii. 26) or of the Psalms (Lk. xx. 42, Acts i. 20) or of the Prophets, *i. e.*, of the Twelve "Minor Prophets" (Acts vii. 42), the meaning is simply that each of these writings or collections of writings formed a single volume.²⁰ Similarly when we read of the *βιβλιον* of Isaiah (Lk. iv. 17) or of the Law (Gal. iii. 10), what is meant in each case is the volume formed by the document or documents named. The Gospel of John (Jno.

¹⁸ They may, of course, be applied even in profane Greek to "sacred" books. Thus a magical formula among the Oxyrhynchus Papyri (Grenfell & Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vi. p. 100, &c.) represents itself as an ἀντίγραφον ἱερῶς βίβλου.

¹⁹ Αἱ βίβλοι (ⲁⲓⲃⲓⲃⲗⲟⲓ) used absolutely, for the Old Testament as a whole, occurs in Dan. ix. 2 (*cf.* Driver *in loc.*). Ἡ βίβλος absolutely for the Old Testament as a whole occurs first, apparently, in the *Letter of Aristeas* § 316 (*cf.* Thackeray, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, April, 1903, p. 391). τὰ βιβλία absolutely of the Old Testament as a whole apparently occurs first in 2 Clem. xiv. 2 (*cf.* Lightfoot *in loco*). It has been customary to say that from the time of Chrysostom (*Hom. 9 in Coloss., Hom. 10 in Genesin*) τὰ βιβλία occurs absolutely for the Scriptures as a whole (*cf.* Suicer, *Thesaur. Eccles.* I. 687, 696; Reuss, *Hist. of the New Testament*, § 320, E. T., p. 326). This usage is already found, however, in Clement Alex. and in Origen (*ed. Lommatsch.* i. 607). On the general subject see the detached note at the end of this article on the terms 'Bible', 'Holy Bible' (page 596).

²⁰ *Cf.* Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, 478-481, and especially Jerome, *Praef. Psal.* and *Ep. ad Manet.* as cited by Birt.

xx. 30, xxi 25) and the Book of Revelation (Rev. i. 11, xxii. 7, 9, 10, 18, 19) are spoken of as each a *βιβλίον* again because each existed in separation as a concrete unity. Accordingly *βιβλοι* are things which may be burned (Acts xix. 19); *βιβλία*, things which may be sprinkled (Heb. ix. 19) or carried about (II Tim. iv. 13), and may be made of parchment (II Tim. iv. 13). The Book of Life presented itself to the imagination as a volume in which names may be inscribed (*βιβλος*, Phil. iv. 3, Rev. iii. 5, xx. 15; *βιβλίον*, Rev. xiii. 8, xvii. 8, xx. 12, xxi. 27); the Book of Destiny as a volume in which is set down what is to come to pass (*βιβλίον*, Heb. x. 7, Rev. v. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, x. 8). There is no essential difference in fundamental implication when in Mt. xix. 7, Mk. x. 4 *βιβλίον* is used for a "bill" of divorcement, or in Mt. i. 1, *βιβλος*, under the influence of the LXX, is employed of a genealogical register. In both instances it would be understood that the document in question occupied a separate piece of papyrus or parchment and was therefore an entire "paper".

There is a much more marked enhancement of sense apparent in the New Testament use of *λόγος*. In Acts i. 1, to be sure, it occurs in the simple classical sense of "Book"; Luke merely points to his Gospel as "the first Book" of an extended historical treatise of which Acts is "the second Book"; and there is no implication of deeper meaning. The ordinary usage of *λόγος*, however, in the New Testament, is to express, in accordance with its employment in the Old Testament of the Prophetic word, the, or a, revelation from God, with no, or a very indistinct, reference to a written form. The Divine Word was, however, in the hands of the New Testament writers in a written form and allusion to this could not always fail. In passages like Jno. xv. 25, I Cor. xv. 54, the *λόγος* that is cited is distinctly declared to be written: "that the *λόγος* may be fulfilled that is written in their Law"; "then shall come to pass the *λόγος* that is written"; and with these there may be connected such passages as Jno. xii. 38, (*cf.* Lk. iv. 6): "that the word of Isaiah the prophet

might be fulfilled", since, although it is not expressly stated, this λόγος too was in the hands of the New Testament writers in a written form. In this usage λόγος is a particular passage of Scripture viewed as a divine declaration. In Mat. xv. 6 (if this reading be accepted), Mk. vii. 13 (*cf.* Jno. x. 35, v. 38, Rom. xiii. 9, Gal. v. 14) in accordance with a familiar usage (*cf.* Ex. xxxiv. 28, οἱ δέκα λόγοι), the specific reference is to a divine commandment; but this commandment is thrown up in sharp contrast with "tradition" and is thought of distinctly as a written one. It is only in a passage like II Pet. i. 19 that λόγος comes to mean the entire Old Testament, after the fashion of Philo,^{20a} with the emphasis upon its divine character: that by "the prophetic word" here is meant not the prophetic portion of Scripture but the Scriptures as a whole, conceived in accordance with their nature as "prophetic", that is to say as a body of revelation, is made plain by the subsequent context, where this prophecy is defined by the exegetical genitive as just that prophecy which is Scripture *πάσα προφητεία γραφῆς*). Thus λόγος, under the influence of the Old Testament usage of the "Word of Jehovah," comes to mean in the New Testament specifically a divine revelation, and is applied to the Old Testament to designate it, as written in the Books which constitute it, the revealed Word of God.²¹

The λόγος, now, which was contained in the βιβλος (*βιβλίον*) (Lk. iii. 4), and of course contained in it only in written form, was, naturally, conceived, as truly by the New Testament writers as by Greek writers in general, as a *γραφῆ*, (or in the plural *γραφαί*). There seems to be no reason inherent in the case, accordingly, why *γραφῆ* should

^{20a} *E. g. De Plantat. Noe*, 28, Mangey I. 347: "The prophetic word (ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος) seems to dignify the number four often throughout the *νομοθεσίας*, and especially in the catalogue of the creation of the universe."

²¹ This idea is still more emphatically expressed by the kindred term *λόγια*, Rom. iii. 2, *cf.* Heb. v. 12, Acts vii. 38, the current use of which in this sense by Philo is adverted to above (p. 563, note 6). See *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for April 1900, pp. 217 sq.

not occur in the New Testament in its simple classical sense of a "Treatise" or (as *λόγος* does, Acts i. 1) of a "Book" or formal division of a treatise. It may very properly be considered therefore merely an accident that no instances are found in the New Testament of this general usage of the term without further implications.²² It so occurs in Josephus (*Antt.* III. viii. 10; IV. viii. 44, of books of his own) and in Philo (*De Somniis*, ad init., 'Ἡ μὲν οὖν πρὸ ταύτης *γραφῆ* περιεῖχε—i. e., the preceding Book of the Treatise in hand); and it is repeatedly used in the LXX to designate any piece of writing (*cf.* II Chron. ii. 11, Neh. vii. 64, Danl. v. 1, II Macc. xiv. 22, 48). In point of fact, however, *γραφῆ* (*γραφαί*) appears in the New Testament only in its application to the Sacred Scriptures, and only in its high technical significance of "Scripture" by way of eminence. It may be surmised that the long-established employment of the term as a designation of the Scriptures tended to withdraw it from common use on the lips of those to whom these Scriptures were a thing apart. It may even seem that a certain tendency is observable in the New Testament writers to distinguish between *γραφῆ* (*γραφαί*) and *γράμμα* (*γράμματα*) in favor of the former as the technical designation of the Scripture, while the latter is more freely employed for general uses. Certainly *γράμματα* occurs occasionally in the New Testament for non-sacred writings (Acts xxviii. 21, Lk. xiii. 6, 7) and for sacred writings indeed but without stress on their sacredness (Jno. v. 47, *cf.* vii. 15), while it is only rarely met with in the pregnant sense of Scripture (II Tim. iii. 15 only) and then only in an established phrase which may be supposed to have obtained a standing of its own. There seems also in *γράμμα* a naturally stronger implication of the material elements of the script, which may have formed the point of departure for a depreciatory employment of the term to designate the "mere letter" as distinguished from the "spirit" (*cf.* Rom. ii. 27,

²² *Cf.* Zahn, *Einleitung*, II. 99, 108, note 12.

29, vii. 6, II Cor. iii. 6, 7). On the other hand the free employment by later Christian writers of *γραφή*, *γραφαί* of secular compositions, and of both *γράμμα* and *γράμματα* in the high technical sense of "Scripture", so far militates against the supposition that already in New Testament Greek the former were hardening into the exclusive technical designations of "Scripture". Meanwhile the simple fact remains that in the New Testament while *γράμματα* is used freely, and with a single exception exclusively, without implication of sacredness, *γραφή* and *γραφαί* are employed solely as technical designations of Sacred Scripture and take their color in all their occurrences from this higher plane of usage. Throughout the New Testament the *γραφή* which alone is in question is conceived as rather the word of the Holy Spirit than of its human authors *through* whom merely it is spoken (Acts i. 16), and is therefore ever adduced as of indefectible, because of Divine, authority.

It is somewhat remarkable that even on this high plane of its technical application, in which it designates nothing but the Sacred Scriptures, *γραφή* never occurs in the New Testament, in accordance with its most natural and, in the classics, its most frequent sense of "Treatise", as a term to describe the several books of which the Old Testament is composed. It is tempting, no doubt, to seek to give it this sense in some of the passages where, occurring in the singular, it yet does not appear to designate the Scriptures as a whole; and even Dr. Hort seems for a moment almost inclined to yield to the temptation.²³ It is more tempting still to assume that behind the frequent use of the plural, *αἱ γραφαί*, to designate the Scriptures as a whole, there lies a previous current usage by which each Book which enters into the composition of these Scriptures was designated by the singular *ἡ γραφή*. In no single passage where the singular *ἡ γραφή* occurs, however, does it seem possible to give it a reference to the Book of Scripture to

²³ On I Pet. ii. 6: note the "probably".

which the appeal is made. And the frequent employment in profane Greek of *γραφαί* in the plural for a single document²⁴ discourages the assumption that it, like *τὰ βιβλία*, has reference, when used as a designation of Scripture, to its composite character as a "Divine Library". It is true that in one unique passage, II Pet. iii. 16,²⁵ *αἱ γραφαί* bears a plural signification. But the items of which this plural is formed, as the grammatical construction implies, are not "treatises" (Huther, Kühn) but "passages" (De Wette). Peter says that the unlearned and unstable, of course, wrested the hard sayings of Paul's letters, as they were accustomed to wrest *τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς*, *i. e.*, "the other Scriptural statements",²⁶ due reverence for which should have protected them from such treatment, the implication being that no part of Scripture was safe in their hands. This is a sufficiently remarkable use of the plural, no other example of which occurs in the New Testament; it is, however, an entirely legitimate use of the plural²⁷ and in its

²⁴ *E. g.* of a letter, Euripides, *Iph. in Taur.* 735, "Let him give an oath to me that he will bear *τὰς γραφάς* to Argos"; *Iph. in Aul.* 363 (a line of doubtful genuineness), where Agamemnon is said to be secretly devising *ἄλλας γραφάς*: of a book, Georg. Sync., p. 168 *τὴν ἐκ τῶν Κεφαλίωνος γραφῶν πρὸς τὸν Διόδωρον διαφωνίαν*.

²⁵ On the meaning of this passage, see especially Bigg, *in loc.*, and cf. Chase, Hastings', B. D., iii. 810.

²⁶ For *γραφαί* in the sense of "statements", cf. Eurip. *Hipp.* 1311, where Phaedra is said, under the fear of disgrace, to have written *ψευδεῖς γραφάς*, probably not a "lying tablet" (*γραφαί* in its singular sense as in note 24 above) but "false statements." Cf. also Philo, *De Praem. et Poen.* II. near the end (Mangey, II. 418), where he distributes the contents of the sacred volume into *αἱ ῥηταὶ γραφαί* and *αἱ καθ' ὑπόνοιαν ἀλληγορίαι*, which may perhaps be taken as "literal statements" and "covert allegories". The use of *γραφή* in the sense of a "passage" of Scripture is found in Philo, the LXX and frequently in the New Testament (see below).

²⁷ Accordingly *γραφαί* is quite freely used by the Church Fathers of a plurality of passages of Scripture. The famous words in Polycarp *ad Phil.*, xii. 1 are probably not a case in point: *ut his Scripturis dictum est* here apparently refers back to the *in sacris libris* which just precedes them and not forward to the two passages adduced. From Justin on, however, numerous examples present themselves. Cf. *e. g.* Justin, *Contra Tryph.* 65 (Otto. p. 230): "And Trypho said, Being im-

context a perfectly natural one, which, nevertheless, just because it is a special usage determined by its context, stands somewhat apart from the general technical use of *αἱ γραφαί* to designate the body of Scriptures and cannot guide us to its interpretation. In no other passage where *αἱ γραφαί* occurs is there the slightest hint that its plural form is determined by the conception of the Scriptures as a congeries of authoritative passages; this interpretation of the current plural form may indeed be set aside at once as outside of the possibilities of the case.

If we may not speak quite so decisively of the possibility of the plural form resting on a conception of “the Scriptures” as made up of a collection of Books, it may at least be said that there is nothing in the New Testament use of the term to remove the general unlikelihood of that construction of it. There are indeed two or three passages in which *γραφαί* might appear at first sight to designate a body of documents. Such are, for example, Rom. xvi. 26, where we read of *γραφαὶ προφητικάι*, and especially Mat. xxvi. 56, where we read of *αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν*. In the case of Rom. xvi. 26, however, the very natural impression that here we have mention of the several books which constitute the second of the sections of the Jewish canon, known as “The Prophets”, is almost certainly an error (*cf.* Vaughan *in loc.*). It is very unlikely that the “prophetic writings” with this mention of which this epistle closes are any other than the “Holy Scriptures” of the prophets with mention of which it opens (Rom. i. 2); and it is quite clear that these “Holy Scriptures” are much more inclusive than the writings of the second section of the Jewish canon,— that they embrace in fact the entirety of

portuned by so many Scriptures (*τῶν τοσούτων γραφῶν*) I do not know what to say about the Scripture (*τῆς γραφῆς*) which Isaiah said, according to which God says He will not give His glory to another.” Again, *Cont. Tryph.* 71 (Otto. p. 255, *cf.* note): They have taken away *πολλὰς γραφάς* from the LXX translation. Again, Clem. Alex. *Cohort. ad Gentes*, 14 *ad init.* (Migne, i. 192D), “I could adduce *μυρίας γραφάς* not one of which shall pass away.”

Scripture, thought of here as of prophetic, that is, revelatory, character (*cf.* Meyer, Weiss, Oltramare *in loc.*; Bleek on Heb. i. 1). Nor need the "Scriptures of the prophets" of Mat. xxvi. 56 have any different meaning (*cf.* Swete on Mk. xiv. 49, Morrison *in loc.*). It is quite true that the term "The Prophets" is sometimes in Matthew (v. 17, vii. 12, xxii. 40) and in the other Gospels (Lk. xvi. 16, 29, 31, xxiv. 44, Jno. i. 46) and in the rest of the New Testament (Acts vii. 42, xiii. 15, xxiv. 14, xxviii. 23, Rom. ii. 21) a technical term designating the second section of the Jewish canon; but it is equally true that it is sometimes used much more inclusively. For example in Mat. ii. 23 the reference seems to be quite generally to the Old Testament considered as a prophetic book (*cf.* Meyer *in loc.*); and in Mat. xi. 13, "all the prophets and even the law prophesied," the Pentateuch is expressly included within the prophetic word (*cf.* II Pet. i. 19). Passages like Lk. i. 70, xi. 50 show that by these writers the whole Old Testament revelation was thought of as prophetic in character, while Lk. xviii. 31 is certainly entirely general (*cf.* Acts iii. 24). The most instructive passages, however, are doubtless those which follow one another so closely in Lk. xxiv. 25, 27, 44. It can hardly be doubted that the same body of books is intended in all three of these references, which merely progressively discriminate between the parts which make up the whole. The simple "prophets" thus becomes first "Moses and indeed all the prophets" (*cf.* Hahn *in loc.*)—further defined as the "whole Scripture"—and then "the Law of Moses, and the Prophets and the Psalms." The term "the Prophets" occurs thus in this brief context in three senses of varying inclusiveness, and apparently lends itself as readily to the widest as to the narrowest application. In these circumstances there seems no reason why in Mt. xxvi. 56 "the Scriptures of the Prophets" should be narrowed beyond the inclusiveness of the suggestion of "the Scriptures" of the immediately preceding context (xxvi. 54) or of its own parallel in Mk. xiv. 49. In other words there is every rea-

son to believe that in this passage the defining adjunct "of the Prophets" does not discriminate among the books which make up the Scriptures and single out certain of these as prophetic, but rather describes the entire body of Scripture as prophetic in origin and character, that is to say as a revelation from God.²⁸ *Γραφαί* does not here, then, mean "books" "treatises", but *αἱ γραφαί*, as in verse 54 and in the parallel passage, Mk. xiv. 49, means the one Divine book. That Lk. xxiv. 27, *ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς*, lends itself readily to the same interpretation requires no argument to show. If *αἱ γραφαί* is employed in a singular sense, then *πᾶσαι αἱ γραφαί* means just the whole of the document so designated, and is the exact equivalent of *πᾶσα ἡ γραφή* or *πᾶσα γραφή* (II Tim. iii. 16 taken as a proper noun). The truth seems to be, therefore, that as there is no example in the New Testament of the use of *ἡ γραφή* in the sense of one of the Books of Scripture, so there is no trace in its use of *αἱ γραφαί* of an underlying consciousness of the composition of the Scriptures out of a body of such Books.²⁹ Whether the plural *αἱ γραφαί*, or the singular *ἡ γραφή*, is employed, therefore, the meaning is the same; in either case the application of the term to the Old Testament writings by the writers of the New Testament is the outgrowth of their conception of these Old Testament writings as a

²⁸ On this conception of the whole Old Testament as a prophetic book, cf. Willis J. Beecher, *The Prophets and the Promise*, 1905, pp. 168 sq.

²⁹ In Patristic usage, on the contrary, a very large variety of applications of *ἡ γραφή* and *αἱ γραφαί*, in the sense of Biblical Books or more or less extensive collections of Biblical Books, is found. Thus for example, in Athan. *Epist. Enycl. I ad init.* we meet with *ἡ θεία τῶν Κριτῶν γραφή*: in Eus. *h. e.* III. 11 with *ἡ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου γραφή*; in *ibid.* II. i. 2. with *ἡ ἱερὰ τῶν εὐαγγελίων γραφή*; in Orig. *Contr. Cels.* i. 58, with *ἡ εὐαγγελικὴ γραφή*. In Origen, *Contr. Cels.* vii. 24 and in *Fragments in Prov.* II, we find *ἡ παλαιὰ γραφή*, and in another place (Migne, i. 1365A) the corresponding *νεώτεραι γραφα* where the plural is probably a real plural. This is also the case in, say, Eus. *h. e.* iii. 3 when he speaks of "the acknowledged *γραφαί*" of the New Testament, and (*ad init.*) mentions that II Peter had been used by many *μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων γραφῶν*.

unitary whole, and designates this body of writings in its entirety as the one, well-known, authoritative documentation of the Divine revelation. This is the fundamental fact with respect to the use of these terms in the New Testament from which all the other facts of their usage flow.

In saying this, we are brought at once, however, face to face with what is probably the most remarkable fact about the usage of *ἡ γραφή* in the New Testament. This is its occasional employment to refer, not merely, as was to be expected from its form and previous history, to Scripture as a whole, nor even as, had it so occurred in the New Testament, would have been only a continuation of its profane usage, to the several treatises which make up that whole, but to individual passages of Scripture. This employment finds so little support in profane Greek, in which *γράμμα* rather than *γραφή* is the current form for the ad-duction of clauses or fragmentary portions of documents,³⁰ that it has often been represented as a peculiarity of the New Testament and Patristic Greek. Thus, for example, we read in Stephens' *Thesaurus* (*sub voc.*): "In the New Testament and ecclesiastical books, *ἡ γραφή* and *αἱ γραφαί* are used of the sacred writings which are commonly called 'The Holy Scriptures'. But *γραφή* is sometimes in the New Testament employed peculiarly of a particular passage of Scripture". And Schaefer adds to this merely a reference to a passage in one of the orations of Valckenaer, where commenting on Acts xvii. 2-3, he remarks that, in the New Testament, "passages of the Old Testament such as are also designated *περιοχάς*, *τόπους* and *χωρία* are sometimes also

³⁰ *E. g.* Thucyd. v. 29: "They were angry with the Lacedemonians chiefly because among other things it was provided in the treaty with Athens that the Lacedemonians and Athenians if agreed might add to or take away from them whatever they pleased: this clause (*τοῦτο τὸ γράμμα*) aroused great uneasiness among the Peloponnesians." *Cf.* Philo, *De Congr. erud. grat.* 12 (Mangey i. 527): "There is also in another place *τὸ γράμμα τοῦτο* inscribed"=Deut. xxxii. 8; *Quod Deus Immort.* 2 (Mangey i. 273): *Κατὰ τὸ ἱερώτατον Μωϋσέως γράμμα τοῦτο.*

called *γραφάς*."³¹ The usage does not seem, however, to be peculiar to the New Testament and the Church Fathers: it occurs also, though rarely, in the LXX and Philo, and may claim therefore to be at least Hellenistic.³² It is probably the outgrowth of the habit of looking upon the Scriptures as a unitary book of divine oracles, every part and passage of which is clothed with the authority which belongs to the whole, and which is of course manifested in all its parts. No doubt this extension of *γραφή* from a designation of Scripture as a whole to a designation of any given fragment of Scripture, however small, was mediated by the circumstance that in adducing the authority of 'Scripture' for any doctrine or practice, it was always inevitably not the whole of 'Scripture' but some special declaration of 'Scripture' which was especially in mind as bearing upon the particular point at the moment in hand. The transition was easy from saying "The Scripture says, namely in this or that passage", to saying of this and that passage specifically, "This Scripture says" and "Another Scripture says". When the entirety of Scripture is "Scripture" to us, each passage may readily be adduced as "Scripture" also, because "Scripture" is conceived as speaking in and through each passage. A step so inviting was sure to be taken sooner or later. Whenever therefore *γραφή* occurs of a particular passage of Scripture, so far from throwing in doubt its

³¹*Ti Hemsterhusii Orationes, . . . L. C. Valckenai Tres Orationes, etc. Ludgunum Bat., 1784, p. 395.*

³²IV Macc. xviii. 14: "And he reminded you of τὴν Ἡσαίου γραφήν which says, Though you pass through fire." Philo, *Quis rerum div. her.* 53 (Mangey, i. 511); τὸ δὲ ἀκόλουθον προσεφαίνει τῇ γραφῇ φάσκων ἐρρήθη πρὸς Ἀβραάμ; *De Praem. et poen.* 11 (Magney ii. 418). Cf. *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, XI (April 1900) 245-6 notes. For the possibility of a classical use of *γραφία*="statements" see above p. 578 note 26. Of the ordinary Greek words for "passage" of a writing, neither *γράμμα* nor *χωρίον* occurs in the New Testament; *τόπος* only at Lk. iv. 17 and *περιοχή* only at Acts viii. 32 (cf. Dr. C. J. Vaughan on Rom. iv. 3 and *per contra*, Meyer *in loc.* and cf. 1 Pet. ii. 6 and the commentators there.) The place of all these terms is taken in the New Testament by *γραφή*.

usage of Scripture as a whole, conceived as a unitary Divine authority, it rather presupposes this usage and is an outgrowth of it. It cannot surprise us therefore that ἡ γραφή occurs in the New Testament side by side in the two senses, and designates indifferently either Scripture as a whole, or a particular passage of Scripture, that is, is used indifferently "collectively" as it has not very exactly been called, and "particularly".

It has often, no doubt, been called in question whether both these senses do occur side by side in the New Testament. Possibly a desire to erect some well-marked and uniform distinction between the usage of the plural αἱ γραφαί and the singular ἡ γραφή, has not been wholly without its influence here. At all events the suggestion has every now and then been made that the singular ἡ γραφή bears in the New Testament the uniform sense of 'a passage of Scripture', while it is the plural, αἱ γραφαί, alone which designates the Scriptures in their entirety. The famous Rationalist divine, Johannes Schulthess, for example, having occasion to comment briefly on the words πάντα γραφή Θεόπνευστος, II Tim. iii. 16, among other assertions of equal insecurity, makes this one: "γραφὴ in the singular never means in the New Testament βιβλος, much less the entirety of τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων, but some particular passage"³³ Hitherto it has been thought enough to meet such assertions with a mere expression of dissent. Christiana Sepp, for example, meets this one with equal brevity and point by the simple observation: "Passages like Jno. x. 35 prove the contrary".³⁴ But a new face has been put upon the matter by the powerful advocacy of the proposition "that the singular γραφή in the New Testament always means a *particular passage* of Scripture", by the late Bishop Lightfoot in a comment on Gal. iii. 22 which has on this account become famous. We must believe, however, that it is the weight

³³ *Lucubr. pro divin. discip. ac person. Jesu, &c.* Turici 1828, p. 36 note.

³⁴ *De Leer des N. T. over de H. S. des O. V.*, Amsterdam 1849, p. 69.

of Dr. Lightfoot's justly great authority rather than the inherent reasonableness of the doctrine which has given this opinion the great vogue which it appears to enjoy at present among English-speaking scholars. It was at once confuted, it is true, by Dr. C. J. Vaughan in a note on Rom. iv. 3; and in his own note on this passage Dr. Lightfoot seemed almost (not quite) persuaded to admit a doubt as to the usage of John, while reiterating, with respect to Paul at least, that in the matter of the use of *γραφῆ* in the singular of a single passage of Scripture "practice is absolute and uniform". Dr. Westcott took his stand by Dr. Lightfoot's side (see on Jno. ii. 22, x. 35) and labored to show that John's usage conforms to the canon asserted; and Dr. Hort, though with some apparent hesitation with respect to John and Paul—the only portions of the New Testament, it will be noticed, of which Drs. Westcott and Lightfoot express assurance—inclined on the whole to give his assent to their general judgment (on I Peter ii. 6). With more hesitancy, Dr. Swete remarks merely that "*γραφῆ* is a portion of Scripture", at least "almost always when the singular is used" (on Mk. xii. 10). General agreement in the view in question is expressed also, for example, by Page (Acts i. 16), Knowling (Acts viii. 32), Plummer (Lk. iv. 21), A. Stewart (Hastings' BD. I 286). It is difficult to believe, however, that the reasons assigned for this view are sufficient to bear the weight of the judgment founded on them. They suffice, certainly, to show—what is in itself sufficiently remarkable,—that *ἡ γραφῆ* is repeatedly employed in the New Testament of a particular passage of Scripture. But the attempt to carry this usage through all the instances in which the singular appears involves a violence of exegetical procedure which breaks down of itself. Out of the thirty instances in which the singular, *ἡ γραφῆ*, occurs, about a score prove utterly intractable to the proposed interpretation,—these nineteen to wit: Jno. ii. 22, vii. 38, 42, x. 35, xvii. 12, xix. 28, xx. 9, Acts viii. 32, Ro. iv. 3, ix. 17, x. 11, xi. 2, Gal. iii. 8, 22, iv.

30, I Tim. v. 18, Jas. iv. 5, I Pet. ii. 6, II Pet. i. 20.³⁵ In point of fact, therefore, in some two-thirds of the instances where *γραφί* is employed in the singular, its reference is to the Scripture as a whole, to that unitary written authority to which final appeal was made. In some of these passages it is no less than impossible to take it otherwise. In Jno. ii. 22, for example, there is absolutely no definite passage suggested, and Westcott seeks one to assign the reference to only under the pressure of theory. The same is true of Jno. xx. 9, where the reference is quite as broad as in Lk. xxiv. 45. In Jno. x. 35 the argument depends upon the wide reference to Scripture as a whole, which forms its major premise. In Gal. iii. 22 there is absolutely nothing to suggest a reference to a special text rather than to the general tenor of Scripture, and Lightfoot supplies a special text only conjecturally and with hesitation. The personification of Scripture in such passages as Jas. iv. 5, Gal. iii. 8 carries with it the same implication. And the anarthrous use of *γραφί* in I Pet. ii. 6, II Pet. i. 20, *cf.* II Tim. iii. 16, is explicable only on the presupposition that *ἡ γραφή* had become so much the proper designation of Scripture that the term had acquired the value of a proper name, and was therefore treated as definite without, as with, the article. If anything were needed to render this supposition certain, it would be supplied by the straits to which expositors are brought who seek to get along without it.³⁶ Dr. Hort, for example, after declining to understand *γραφή* in I Pet. ii. 6 of Scripture in general, because he does not find "a distinct and recognized use of this sort", finally suggests that we should ren-

³⁵ *Cf.* Cremer, *sub. voc.*, who gives 17 passages, omitting of those above Jno. vi. 12, xx. 9; T. Stephenson, *Expository Times* xiv. 475 sq. who in a well-classified list gives 18 passages, omitting Jno. xx. 9; E. Hühn, *Die alttestamentlichen Citate* &c., 1900, p. 276, who gives 23 passages, adding Jno. xiii. 18, xix. 24, 36, Jas. ii. 8. On the general question, *cf.* Vaughan, on Rom. iv. 3, Meyer on Jno. x. 35, Weiss on Jno. x. 35, Kübel on 2 Pet. i. 20, Abbott on Eph. iv. 8, Beet on Rom. ix. 17, *Encyc. Bibl.* 4329, Francke, *Das A. T. bei Joan.* p. 48, Haupt, *Die alttest. Citate in d. vier Evang.*, p. 201.

³⁶ *Cf.* Zahn, *Einleitung*, II, 108; Hort on I Pet. ii. 6.

der “simply, ‘in writing’ ”, so that “*περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ* shall be held equivalent to ‘it stands written.’ ” But he is compelled to add: “That the quotation was authoritative, though not expressed, was doubtless implied, in accordance with the familiar Jewish use of the words ‘said’, ‘written’ ”,—apparently not realizing that, if the quotation is authoritative then, “It stands written” is the equivalent of the authoritative employment of this phrase in the adduction of what is specifically Scripture, and therefore means here distinctly not, “It stands written—somewhere”, but “It stands written in the (technically so-called) Scripture.” This seems, therefore, to be only a roundabout way of saying that *γραφῆ* here means and definitely refers to the authoritative Scripture, and not any ‘writing’ indifferently. The same is inevitably true of II Pet. i. 20. It is impossible that by “every prophecy of Scripture” the writer can have meant “every prophecy which has been reduced to writing”.³⁷ He undoubtedly intended the prophecies written in the Old Testament alone (*cf.*, Bigg, Kübel, Keil *in loc.*); and this is but another way of saying that anarthrous *γραφῆ* is to him a technical designation of the Old Testament, or, in other words, that he uses it with precisely the implications with which we employ the term, “Scripture”.³⁸ In the presence of such passages as these there seems to be no reason why we should fail to recognize that the employment of *γραφῆ* in the New Testament so far follows its profane usage, in which it is applied to entire documents and carries with it a general implication of completeness, that it in its most common reference designates the Old Testament to which it is applied in its completeness as a unitary whole.³⁹

³⁷ *Cf.* Zahn, *Einleitung*, II. p. 109.

³⁸ Presumably few will take refuge in the explanation suggested by Dr. E. H. Plumptre (*Smith's B. D.* 2874), which understands the “prophecy” here of New Testament, not Old Testament prophets and renders, Every prophetic utterance arising from, resting on, a *γραφῆ*—*i. e.* a passage of the Old Testament.

³⁹ Precisely the same is true of the usage of the term in at least the earlier Patristic literature, although a contrary impression might be

It has seemed worth while to enter somewhat fully upon this matter, not only on account of its intrinsic interest and the importance given it in recent expositions, but also because the issue throws into a high light what is after all the fundamental fact about the New Testament use of ἡ γραφή, αἱ γραφαί. This is the implication which they bear not only of the uniqueness of the body of religious writings which they designate, entitling them to be spoken of as together, in a supereminent sense, "the Scriptures", or rather "the Scripture", or even "Scripture"; but also, along with this, of their irreducible unity,—as constituting in their entirety a single divinely authoritative "writing". Francke is quite within the limits of clear fact, when he remarks,⁴⁰ "The contemplation of the entire body of Scripture as a unitary word, in all its parts equally resting upon a single authority, and therefore possessing the same authority everywhere, forms the most essential presupposition of the designation of the collection of the written word as the γραφή". It only needs to be added that the same is true of its designation as αἱ γραφαί. What requires emphasis, in a word, is that the two designations ἡ γραφή and αἱ γραφαί are, so far as our evidence goes, strictly parallel; and neither is to be derived from the other. That the application of αἱ γραφαί to the Scriptures does not rest on a previous application of ἡ γραφή to each of the Books of Scripture, we have already had occasion to show. It is equally important to observe that the application to Scripture of ἡ γραφή is not a sub-

—

taken from a remark at the close of Dr. Lightfoot's note on Gal. iii. 22. Ἡ γραφή of a passage of Scripture seems to be the rarer usage in, for example, the so-called Apostolical Fathers. It occurs with certainty, only at 1 Clem. xxiii. 3 (*cf.* xxv. 5), 2 Clem. xxiv. 14, while ἡ γραφή—"Scripture" as a whole, seems to occur at least at 1 Clem. xxxiv. 6, xxxv. 7, xlii. 5; 2 Clem. vi. 8, xiv. 2; Barn. xvii. 11, v. 4, vi. 12, xiii. 2, xvi. 5. (The plural αἱ γραφαί occurs in 1 Clem. xiv. 52, and in the formula αἱ ἱερὰι γραφαί in 1 Clem. liii. 1 [Polyc. xii. 1]). In the later Fathers ἡ γραφή occurs in every conceivable variety of sense and application, but in none more distinctly than of Scripture as a whole.

⁴⁰ *Das A. T. bei Johan.* p. 48.

sequent development resting on a previous usage by which Scripture was known as *αἱ γραφαί*. The contrary assumption is often tacitly made and it is sometimes quite plainly expressed, as, for example, in the concluding words of Dr. Lightfoot's note on Gal. iii. 22, where he tells us that "the transition from the 'Scriptures' to the 'Scripture' is analogous to the transition from *τὰ βιβλία* to the 'Bible' ". Precisely what is meant by the last clause of this statement is perhaps not perfectly clear. It is obvious, of course, that the designation of the Scripture as *τὰ βιβλία* antedates the misunderstanding of this term as a feminine singular, whence arose the Latin "Biblia" and our "Bible" treated as a singular—if this be really the history of the origin of these latter terms; but Dr. Lightfoot can hardly have meant that the use of *ἡ γραφή* as a designation of the Scripture arose similarly through a misunderstanding of *αἱ γραφαί* as a singular. It would seem that he can only have meant that the progress was in both cases from a view of the sacred books which was fully conscious of their plurality to a conception of them which has swallowed up their plurality in a unitary whole. There is no proof, however, that such a movement of thought took place in either case. The fact seems to be that *αἱ γραφαί* was used from its earliest application to Scripture in a singular sense, in accordance with a current usage of the term in profane Greek. And we lack evidence that the Scriptures were known as *τὰ βιβλία* before they were known as *ἡ βίβλος*.⁴¹ These two modes of speaking of Scripture appear to have been rather parallel than consecutive usages. And it is probable that the same is true of the designations *αἱ γραφαί* and *ἡ γραφή* as well. It is true enough that we meet with *αἱ γραφαί*, though somewhat rarely and perhaps ordinarily in the phrase [*αἱ*] *ἱεραὶ γραφαί*, in Philo⁴² and Josephus, whereas *ἡ γραφή* of Scripture in general is said to occur

⁴¹ See above, p. 573, note 19.

⁴² E. g. *De Abrahamo*, 13, (Mangey II, 20, 30) : *αἱ γραφαί* = "the Scriptures."

first in the New Testament.⁴³ But it is not probable that we are witnesses of the birth of a new usage in either case; and the evidence is too meagre to justify a pronouncement on the relative ages of the two forms. And in proportion as we recognize the singular sense of *αἱ γραφαί* and the rooting of both usages in a precedent Jewish mode of citing Scripture as the unitary Law of God, does all the probability of the proposed development pass away. In any event when the New Testament was in process of writing it was much too late in the day to speak of the formation of a sense of the unitary uniqueness of the Old Testament or of the rise of a usage in designating the Old Testament in which that sense would first come to its manifestation. Both that sense and modes of expressing it were an inheritance of the New Testament writers from a remote past, and find manifestation in the whole body of Jewish literature, not merely in the usage of the Rabbis, but in the pages of Philo as well. The truth seems to be that whether *αἱ γραφαί* is used or *ἡ γραφή* or anarthrous *γραφή* the implication is the same. In each case alike the Old Testament is thought of as a single document, set over against all other documents by reason of its unique authority based upon its Divine origin, on the ground of which it is constituted in every part and declaration the final arbiter of belief and

⁴³ Cf. Cremer, ed. 9, *sub voc.* *γραφή* II: "In Philo, and as it seems, also in Josephus, the singular does not occur of the Scriptures as a whole, although the plural does. Cf. *αἱ ἀπογραφαί* 2 Macc. ii. 1, *ἀναγραφαί* verse 14. The use of the singular in this sense seems accordingly to have first formed itself, or perhaps, more correctly to have manifested itself, in the New Testament community, and that in connection with its belief in the Messiah and its appeal to the Old Testament." The use of singular *γραφή* of the Scriptures is in any event not frequent in Philo and Josephus: and Cremer's inference is rash, even if the facts be as represented. It would be well, however, if the statement of fact were carefully verified. Cf. Josephus, *Antt.* III. i. 7, *fin.* where he tells us that a *γραφή* was deposited in the Temple which informs us that God foretold to Moses that water should be drawn thus from the rock. By this *γραφή* he means of course precisely what he elsewhere calls *αἱ ἱεραὶ γραφαί*: but he necessarily speaks of it indefinitely.

practice. We need not, then, seek to discover subtle reasons for the distribution of these forms through the New Testament, asking why truly anarthrous *γραφῆ* is employed only by Peter (*cf.* II Tim. iii. 16); why John and Paul prevailingly use the singular, Matthew uniformly and Mark and Luke prevailingly the plural; and why our Lord is reported as employing the two numbers indifferently. These things are at most matters of literary habit; at least, matters of chance and occasion, like our own indifferent use of 'The Scriptures,' 'The Scripture,' 'Scripture.'

One of the outgrowths of the conception of the Old Testament as a unitary Divine document, of indefectible authority in all its parts and declarations, was the habit of adducing it for the ordinary purposes of instruction or debate by such simple formulas as 'It is said', 'It is written', with the pregnant implication that what is thus adduced as 'said' or 'written' is 'said' or 'written' by an authority recognized as Divine and final. Both of these usages are richly illustrated in a variety of forms and with all high implications, not only in the New Testament at large, but also in the Gospels, and not only in the comments by the Evangelists but also in reported sayings of our Lord. We are concerned here particularly only with the formula "It is written", in which the consciousness of the written form, the documentary character, of the authority appealed to is most distinctly expressed. In its most common form, this formula is the simple *γέγραπται*, used either absolutely, or, with none of its authoritative implications thereby evacuated, with more or less precise definition of the place where the cited words can be found written. By its side there occurs in John the resolved formula *γεγραμμένον ἐστίν*; and in the latter part of Luke there is a tendency to adduce Scripture by means of a participial construction.⁴⁴ These modes of citation have analogies in profane Greek, especially in legislative usage.⁴⁵ But, as

⁴⁴ The various formulas may be commodiously reviewed in Hühn, *Die alttestamentlichen Citate*, pp. 272 sq.

⁴⁵ *Cf.* Cremer ed. 9 *sub voc.* *γράφω*, *fin.*; Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 112,

Cremer points out, their use with reference to the Divine Scriptures, as it involves the adduction of an authority which rises immeasurably above all legislative authority, so is freighted with a significance to which the profane usage affords no key. In the Gospels,—if we may take the Gospels as an example of the whole—of the two forms, *γέγραπται* alone occurs in Matthew (ii. 5, iv. 6 in the narrative; iv. 4, iv. 7, 10, xi. 10, xxi. 13, xxvi. 24, 31 in the report of our Lord's words) and in Mark (vii. 2 in the narrative; vii. 6, ix. 12, 13, xi. 17, xiv. 21, 27 in the report of our Lord's words), and predominantly in Luke (ii. 23, iii. 4, vi. 10 in the narrative; iv. 4, 8, vii. 27, x. 20, xix. 46, xxiv. 46 in the report of our Lord's words), but only once in John (viii. 17 in the report of our Lord's words). In the latter part of Luke the citation of Scripture is accomplished by the aid of the participle *γεγραμμένον* ([cf. iv. 17] xviii. 31, xx. 17, xxi. 22, xxii. 37, xxiv. 44), while in John the place of the formula *γέγραπται* (viii. 17 only) is taken by the resolved form *γεγραμμένον ἐστίν* (ii. 17, vi. 31, x. 34, xii. 14, cf. 16, in the narrative; vi. 45, [viii. 17], cf. xv. 25, in the report of our Lord's words). The significance of these formulas is perhaps most manifest when they are used absolutely, where they stand alone in bare authoritativeness, without indication of any kind whence the citation adduced is derived, the bald adduction being indication enough that it is the Divine authority of Scripture to

250. A good example of the classical mode of expression may perhaps be found in the third Philippic of Demosthenes (III. 41, 42, p. 122): "That our condition was formerly quite different from this, I shall now convince you, not by any arguments of my own, but by a decree of your ancestors (*γράμματα τῶν προγόνων*) . . . What then says the decree (*τὰ γράμματα*)? . . . In the laws importing capital cases it is enacted (*γέγραπται*)" Deissmann calls attention to the fact that Josephus uses *γέγραπτα* infrequently in his references to the Old Testament, preferring *ἀναγέγραπται*; and refers to a passage in which he uses *γέγραπται* of a profane document. The passage is *Contr. Ap.* IV. 18: "For if we may give credit to the Phœnician records (*ἀναγραφαῖς*), it is recorded (*γέγραπται*) in them," etc. It should be observed that this is not an instance of the absolute *γέγραπται*; but yet it is not without an implication of (notarial) authority.

which appeal is made. Instances of this usage are found in the Gospels for *γέγραπται* in Mt. iv. 4, 6, 7, 10, xi. 10, xxi. 13, xxvi. 24, 31, in Mk. vii. 6, ix. 12, 13, xi. 17, xvi. 21, 27, in Lk. iv. 4, 8, 10, vii. 27, xix. 46, xx. 17, xxii. 37; for *γεγραμμένον ἐστίν* in Jno. ii. 17, vi. 31, xii. 14, [16]. In only a single passage each in Matthew and Mark is there added an indication of the source of the citation (Mt. ii. 5, "it is written through the prophet"; Mk. i. 2, "it is written in Isaiah the prophet"). In Luke such defining adjuncts are more frequent (ii. 27, in the law of the Lord; iii. 4, in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet; x. 26, in the law; xviii. 31, through the prophet; xxiv. 44, in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms, *i. e.*, in Scripture, verse 45). In John also such definitions are not relatively rare (vi. 45, in the prophets; viii. 17, in your law; x. 34, in your law; xv. 25, in the law). These fuller passages while they identify the document from which the citation is drawn, in no wise suggest that the necessity for such identification was felt; by their relative infrequency they rather emphasize how unnecessary such specification was except as an additional solemn invocation of the recognized source of all religious authority. The bare "It is written" was the decisive adduction of the indefectible authority of the Scriptures of God, clothed as such, in all their parts and in all their declarations, with His authority. We could scarcely imagine a usage which would more illuminatingly exhibit the estimate put upon Scripture as the expressed mind of God or the rooted sense of its unity and its equal authoritativeness in all its parts.⁴⁶

We should not pass lightly over this high implication of the employment of absolute *γέγραπται* to adduce the Scriptural word, and especially the suggestions of its relative frequency. No better index could be afforded of the sense of the unitary authority of the document so cited which dominated the minds of the writers of the New Testament

⁴⁶ Cf. especially Cremer, *sub voc.* *γράφω*; and A. Kuyper, *Encyclopaedia of Sacred Theology*, pp. 433 sq., 444 sq.

and of our Lord as reported by them. The consciousness of the human authors, through whom the Scriptures were committed to writing, retires into the background; thought is absorbed in the contemplation of the divine authority which lies behind them and expresses itself through them. Even when explanatory adjuncts are added indicating where the words to which appeal is made are to be found written, they are so framed as not to lessen this implication. Commonly there is given only a bare reference to the written source of the words in mind;⁴⁷ and when the human authors are named, it is not so much as the responsible authors of the words adduced as as the intermediaries through whom the Divine authority expresses itself.⁴⁸ In the parallel usage by which the Scriptures are appealed to by "It is said" and similar formulas the implication in question is perhaps even more clear. In Matthew, for example, Scripture is often cited as "what was spoken through (*διὰ*)" the prophets (ii. 23) or the prophet (xiii. 35, xxi. 4), or more specifically through this or that prophet—Isaiah ([ii. 3] iv. 14, viii. 17, xii. 17, *cf.* Jno. xii. 38), or Jeremiah (ii. 17, xxvii. 9) or Daniel (xxiv. 15). In a few passages of this kind the implication is explicitly filled out, and we read that the Scripture is spoken "by the Lord" (*ὑπὸ κυρίου*) through (*διὰ*) the prophet (i. 22, ii. 15, *cf.*, xxii. 31, "Have ye not *read* what was spoken by God *to you*", that is, in their Scriptures; Acts i. 16, "The Scriptures which the Holy Ghost spoke before through the words of David"; xxviii. 35, "The

⁴⁷ "In the law and the prophets and the psalms", Lk. xxiv. 44; "in the law" (of the whole Old Testament), Jno. x. 34, xv. 20, I Cor. xiv. 21; "in the (or your, or their) law", Lk. x. 26; Jno. viii. 17; "in the law of Moses", I Cor. ix. 9; "in the law of the Lord", Lk. ii. 23; "in the prophets", Jno. vi. 45, Acts xx. 14; "in Isaiah the prophet", Luke i. 2; in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet, Luke iii. 4; "in the book of the prophets", Acts ii. 42; in the Book of Psalms", Acts i. 20 (*cf.* Luke xxi. 62, Matt. xii. 36); "in the first Psalm", Acts xiii. 33. The closest definitions of place in the Gospels are probably "at the bush", Mk. xii. 26; and "at the place", Luke iv. 17.

⁴⁸ Matt. ii. 5, "through the prophet"; Luke xviii. 31, "through the prophet."

Holy Ghost spoke through Isaiah the prophet to your fathers"). A similar use of *εἰρημένον* or *εἴρηται* occurs in the writings of Luke, whether absolutely (Lk. iv. 12, [Rom. iv. 18]) or with indication of the place where it is said (Lk. ii. 24, Acts xiii. 40); and here too we find occasionally a suggestion that the human speaker is only the intermediary of the true speaker, God (Acts ii. 16, *διὰ* the prophet Joel). It is possibly, however, not in the Gospels that the general usage illustrated by these passages finds its fullest or most emphatic expression; but rather in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the Scriptures are looked upon almost exclusively from the point of sight of this usage. Its height is perhaps attained in the designation of Scripture as *τὰ λόγια* (Rom. iii. 2, *cf.* Acts vii. 38, Heb. v. 12, I Pet. iv. 11) and the current citation of it by the subjectless *φησὶν* (I Cor. vi. 16) or *λέγει* (Rom. xv. 10, II Cor. vi. 2, Gal. iii. 16, Eph. iv. 8, v. 14), the authoritative subject being taken for granted.⁴⁹ In the Gospels, however, we have sufficient illustration of the same general method of dealing with Scripture, side by side with their treatment of it as documentary authority, to evince that their writers and Jesus as reported by them, shared the same fundamental viewpoint.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ *Cf.* *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, July 1899, p. 472, April 1900, p. 217.

⁵⁰ The *ἐρρέθη* of Mt. v. 21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43 (*Cf.* Ro. ix. 12, 26, Gal. iii. 16) is not a formula of citation,—for which we should have the perfect, *εἴρηκεν* (Heb. iv. 3, x. 9-15, xiii. 5)—but adduces the historical fact that such teaching as is adduced was given to the ancients. J. A. Alexander (on Mt. v. 21) admirably paraphrases: "You have (often) heard (it said by the scribes and leading Pharisees) that our fathers were commanded not to murder, and that consequently he who murders (in the strict sense of the term) is liable to be condemned and punished under the commandment." The subsequent instances, though in verses 27, 31, 38, 43 more or less abridged in the introductory formula, are governed by the full formula of verse 21. In point of fact the commandments adduced, (with additions to the first and last) are all found written in the Mosaic Law. But our Lord does not say that they are found there; He merely says that His hearers had often heard from their official teachers, that they were found there—"Ye have heard that it was commanded . . ." So Spanheim, J. A. Alexander, &c.

ON THE TERMS "BIBLE", "HOLY BIBLE".

The purpose of the following note is simply to bring together what seems to be currently known of the origin of the terms "Bible", "Holy Bible". No attempt has been made to go behind the universally accessible sources of information upon which the general public depends, in order to gather additional material. The object in view is merely to make plain how incomplete the accessible knowledge of the history of these terms is. It is remarkable that terms daily on the lips of the entire Western world should have been left until to-day without adequate historical explanation. The fact is, however, beyond doubt. In a short letter printed in *The Expository Times* a few years ago¹ Eb. Nestle remarks that "nobody as yet knows how the word 'Bible' found its way into the European languages" and represents even Theodor Zahn as declining the task of working out the story.² The account which is ordinarily given is that *βιβλία* was current in Greek in the sense of "the Bible"; that this was taken over into Latin as a feminine singular, "Biblia"; and that this form in turn passed thence into the several Western languages.³ There is no step of this presumed process, however, which is beyond dispute, and a great obscurity rests upon the whole subject.

Th. Zahn⁴ enters a strong denial with respect to the basis of the development which is assumed. "For τὰ βιβλία as a designation of the Old Testament," he says, "no usage can be adduced." More broadly still: "The mediaeval and modern employment of τὰ βιβλία in the sense of αἱ γραφαί, ἡ γραφή, that is 'Bible', is altogether alien to the ancient

¹ 1903-4, Vol. XV. pp. 565-566.

² What Zahn says, *Geschichte des N. T. Kanons* II. p. 944, is: "On the origin and earliest spread of the modern use of 'Bible' among the Western peoples I do not venture to say anything."

³ See e. g. A. Stewart, *Hastings' DB*, sub voc. 'Bible'; W. Sanday, *Hastings' ERE*, sub voc. 'Bible'; Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 30.

⁴ *Geschichte des N. T. Kanons* II. pp. 943-4.

church.” The current representation on the faith of Suicer⁵ that τὰ βιβλία occurs first in the sense of ‘Bible’ in Chrysostom, he continues, is “only a widely-spread error”; the passages Suicer quotes do not support the representation.

To justify this last assertion Zahn examines the three passages which Suicer quotes from Chrysostom in support of his statement that “Scriptura Sacra is called βιβλία simpliciter”, and concludes that no one of them employs the term in that sense. In one of them—*Hom. 1 in Genes.* (Montfaucon, iv. 81) not βιβλία simpliciter, but θεία βιβλία is used. In another—*Hom. 2* on certain passages of Genesis (Montfaucon, iv. 652)—Chrysostom declares that the Jews have no doubt τὰ βιβλία, but we Christians alone τῶν βιβλίων θησαυρός,—they τὰ γράμματα, we however both τὰ γράμματα and τὰ νοήματα—not the Bible but the Pentateuch being in mind and the very point of the statement requiring us to take the “Books” as merely so much paper, as the “letters” as only so much ink. It is on the third passage, however, that Suicer lays most stress, remarking of it, Here “βιβλία is used absolutely and means Sacra Biblia”. It is found in *Hom. ix. in Epist. ad Coloss.* (Montfaucon ix. 391) and runs as follows: “Delay not, I beseech thee: thou hast the oracles (λόγια) of God. . . . Hear, I beseech you, all ye who are careful for this life, and procure βιβλία φάρμακα τῆς ψυχῆς. . . . If you will have nothing else, get, then, the New [Testament: τὴν καινὴν used absolutely as frequently in Chrysostom], the Apostle, the Acts, the Gospels, constant teachers, . . . This is the cause of all our evils,—ignorance of τὰς γραφάς.” Zahn remarks: “It is evident that the anarthrous βιβλία here is not a name of the Bible, but

⁵Credner, *Geschichte des N. T. Kanons*, 1860, p. 229: “Further it is well known that for the collection of the sacred writings in general the name τὰ βιβλία (Bible) occurs first in the usage of Chrysostom (cf. *Suiceri Thesaurus*, sub voc.)” Reuss, *History of the New Testament*, E. T. p. 326 (§320): “From the time of Chrysostom the canonical collection is called simply τὰ βιβλία.” Ersch and Gruber, art. “Bibel” *ad init.* Neither Credner’s nor Reuss’s statement is, however, quite justified by Suicer’s words.

designates the category 'Books', to which, among others, the New Testament belongs; books too can be means of grace and constant teachers."

The average reader will no doubt feel that in his examination of these passages Zahn presses his thesis a little too far.

The contrast in the second passage between the Books and the Treasure hidden in them, between the Letter and the Sense, of course throws the emphasis on the *mere* Books and the *mere* Letter. But this, so far from excluding, presupposes rather, the technical usage of these terms, τὰ βιβλία, τὰ γράμματα, to mean "Bible", "Scripture". The terms are used here certainly with primary reference to the Old Testament. But this is not to the exclusion of the New. In the third passage—in which the rich series of designations of Scripture brought together should be observed: "the Oracles of God", "the New [Testament]", "the Scriptures",—it is clear enough, no doubt, that βιβλία is primarily a common noun. But it does not seem clear that it does not contain in itself a suggestion of its use as a proper noun. Beyond question Chrysostom means by these βιβλία just the Bible; just the "Oracles of God" of which he had spoken immediately before, inclusive of the New Testament of which he immediately afterwards speaks, and constituting "the Scriptures" of which he speaks somewhat further on. He speaks of these Bible books as remedial, and of course he speaks generally without an article. The case is like the anarthrous ἱερὰ γράμματα of II Tim. iii. 16, or the anarthrous 'Bible' when we congratulate ourselves that we live "in a land of an open Bible"; in both of which instances the term is technical enough. When Chrysostom exhorted his hearers to get for themselves βιβλία which will be medicaments for their souls, they caught under the common noun βιβλία the implication of the technical τὰ βιβλία. These passages of Chrysostom, after all would seem then to bear witness to the currency of the term τὰ βιβλία as the synonym of αἱ γραφαί, ἡ γραφή.

But why should we confine ourselves to the passages cited by Suicer? Sophocles defines τὰ βιβλία, if not, like Suicer, as the sacred Books of the Christians, yet, similarly, as “the Sacred Books of the Hebrews”, quoting for his definition the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, I Macc. xii. 9 (τὰ ἅγια), Josephus, *Contr. Apion.*, i. 8; and Clem. Alex. [Migne] i. 66, 8 B, Origen, [Migne] i. 1276, C. The three Jewish citations we may for the moment leave to one side: in any case they do not present us with an absolute τὰ βιβλία, meaning “the Scriptures”. Clement and Origen take us back two hundred years before Chrysostom.

In the passage cited from Clement—it is *Paedagog.* iii. xii. *med.*—Clement is speaking of the goodness of the Instructor in setting forth his salutary commandments in the great variety of the Scriptures. He had adduced our Lord’s great summary of the Law (Mat. xxii. 37-40) and His injunction to the rich young man “to keep the commandments;” and taking a new beginning from this injunction, he enlarges on the Decalogue. “These things,” he remarks, “are to be observed,”—and not these only, but along with them, “whatsoever else we see prescribed for us as we read τὰ βιβλία.” For example there is Isaiah i. 10, 17, 18, and the declaration of Scripture that “good works are an acceptable prayer to the Lord”—whatever the passage may be which Clement may have had in mind when he wrote this. It is scarcely disputable that by τὰ βιβλία here, used absolutely, there is meant just “the Sacred Books,” that is to say, “the Bible”. The immediately preceding reference is to the Decalogue, and the immediately contiguous ones are to the Old Testament. But it seems hardly possible to contend that τὰ βιβλία therefore means here either the Decalogue, or the Pentateuch, or the Old Testament, distinctively. It is altogether more probable that it is equally comprehensive with the αἱ γραφαί of the closely preceding context. We cannot accord with Sophocles’ opinion, then, that τὰ βιβλία here means “the Sacred Books of the He-

brews": it seems to us to mean "the Sacred Books of the Christians."

The passage cited by Sophocles from Origen is *Contra Celsum* v. 60 (Ed. Koetschau, 1899, i. p. 63:22. 23). In it the Hebrew Scriptures are clearly referred to by τὰ βιβλία. It declares that Jews and Christians alike "confess that τὰ βιβλία were written by the Divine Spirit." But it does not follow that τὰ βιβλία means with Origen the Old Testament as distinguished from the New, though Koetschau seems inclined to hold this to be the fact. "The Books of the Holy Scriptures", he writes (*Prolegom.* i. p. xxxii.), "are with Origen generally designated θεῖα βιβλία, γραφή (γραφαί) or γράμματα; those of the Old Testament, βιβλία, παλαιὰ γραφή or παλαιὰ γράμματα". This would seem to say that the absolute τὰ βιβλία with Origen is the synonym not of ἡ γραφή but of ἡ παλαιὰ γραφή, not of τὰ γράμματα but of τὰ παλαιὰ γράμματα. There seems to be nothing in the *Contra Celsum*, to be sure, which will decisively refute this opinion. There we read of "the sacred βιβλία of the Jews" or "of the Hebrews" (Koetschau, i. 304, 26; 305, 6): of "the βιβλία which the prophets wrote in Hebrew" (ii. 208, 22; cf., i. 291, 12), or simply of "the βιβλία of the Jews" (ii. 93, 18); but nowhere else than in v. 60 (so far as Koetschau's confessedly incomplete index indicates) do we meet with absolute τὰ βιβλία in the sense of "The Scriptures".⁶ But what shall we make of a passage like the following from the Fourteenth Homily on Jeremiah (§12: Ed. Klostermann, 1901, p. 117, line 4)? "For thy sins, then, will I give thy treasures for a spoil'. And he gave the treasures of the Jews to us, for they were the first to believe τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, and only after them did we believe, God having taken the λόγια away from them and given them to us. And we say that 'the kingdom shall be taken away from them by God and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof' has

⁶ At II. 120, 2, we read of "the book of Genesis", and at various passages of secular "books" (II. 63, 4; 58, 17; 109, 15; 152, 26; 293,1.)

been said by the Saviour and shall be fulfilled. Not that ἡ γραφή has been taken away from them, but now, though they have the Law and the Prophets they do not understand the meaning that is in them. For they have τὰ βιβλία. But how was the kingdom of God taken from them? The meaning τῶν γραφῶν was taken from them”, etc. It is worth while to pause and note the rich synonymy of “the Scriptures” here. And, noting it, we may well ask whether, if τὰ βιβλία, because it is used here with the eye on the Hebrew Scriptures, is to be taken as meaning distinctively the *Hebrew* Scriptures, this same is not true also of τὰ λόγια and ἡ γραφή and αἱ γραφαί. There is a subtle propriety in the adjustment of these three terms to the exact place in which each appears in the argument. Λόγια emphasizes the divine origin of the Scriptures; βιβλία looks upon them from the point of view of their external form; γραφή, of their significant contents. The terms could not be interchanged without some loss of exactness of speech: βιβλία accordingly stands where it does because it expresses the externalia of the Scriptures, sets them before us as “nothing but books”—so much paper. But in their general connotation the three terms are coextensive, and there is no reason for narrowing τὰ βιβλία to “the Old Testament” because it refers to the Old Testament here, which will not apply as well to τὰ λόγια and to ἡ γραφή, αἱ γραφαί. There is preserved for us in the *Philocalia* (Ch. v., ed. Robinson, 1893, pp. 43-48) a remarkable fragment of the Fifth Book of Origen’s commentary on John (ed. Preuschen, 1903, pp. 100-105), in which Origen, speaking to the text, “Of the making of many books there is no end”, rings the changes on βιβλίον and βιβλία and leaves a strong impression on the reader’s mind that to him τὰ βιβλία would be exactly synonymous with τὰ θεία βιβλία. “But since”, says he (Preuschen, p. 103, 12), “the proofs of this must be drawn from τῆς θείας γραφῆς, it will be most satisfactorily established if I am able to show that it is not in one Book only that it is written among us concerning Christ—taking τὸ

βιβλία in its common sense. For we find it written in the Pentateuch", etc. Origen here, by telling us that τὰ βιβλία has a common sense, tells us also that it has a special sense, and that in this special sense it includes alike the New Testament in which we should expect to find Christ spoken of, and the Pentateuch where also He is spoken of; in a word it is the exact synonym of ἡ θεία γραφή.⁷

If we do not quite learn from Clement and Origen, therefore,—as Sophocles would have us learn—that, because it is used of the Sacred Books of the Hebrews, τὰ βιβλία means distinctively the "Sacred Books of the Hebrews", we do learn what Zahn would not have us learn, that it is used absolutely in the sense of "the Sacred Scriptures." We must now take note of the fact, however, that Zahn's primary object was to deny not that τὰ βιβλία, absolutely used, could mean "the Sacred Books", but precisely that it could mean the Sacred Books of the Hebrews—the Old Testament. His primary statement is that no usage can be adduced of τὰ βιβλία as a designation distinctively of the Old Testament. He is discussing the reading of a clause in II Clemens Rom. xiv. This clause couples together (in the Constantinople MS. followed by Lightfoot) τὰ βιβλία καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, which, as Lightfoot remarks, is a rough designation of the Old and New Testaments. On the testimony of the Syriac version Zahn reads τὰ βιβλία τῶν προφητῶν καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, and to strengthen his position argues that absolute τὰ βιβλία for "the Old Testament" is unexampled. We have already seen enough to prove to us that absolute τὰ βιβλία was quite readily used to designate the Old Testament—because the Old Testament was part of the Scriptures, that is of τὰ βιβλία in their pregnant sense. But whether τὰ βιβλία was used *distinctively* of

⁷ Preuschen indexes the following further occurrences of the plural τὰ βιβλία, (apart from the passage, pp. 100-105) in the Commentary on John: p. 40, 21, τὰ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης βιβλία; 117, 19, δὲ ὅλων τῶν ἁγίων βιβλίων. At p. 9, 24 Origen opens an inquiry as to why ταῦτα τὰ βιβλία—that is the Gospels,—are called by the singular title of εὐαγγέλιον.

the Old Testament—when the Old Testament was set over against the New—is another question.

This question need not wait long, however, for an answer. It cannot be doubted, and it is not doubted, that the Jews called their sacred writings, by way of eminence, “the Books”. As Zahn very exactly declares⁸ the Hebrew ספריים (Mishna Megilla i. 8) certainly underlies the usage of αἱ γραφαί, ἡ γραφή in the general sense of “the Bible”. The antiquity of this phrase may be estimated from its occurrence in Daniel ix. 2: “I Daniel understood by ‘the Books’ . . .”: “that is”, says Driver, commenting on the passage, “the sacred books, the Scriptures” (cf. ספרי in Ps. xi. 8, Is. xxix. 18). The Greek rendering of this passage gives us to be sure αἱ βιβλίοι rather than τὰ βιβλία. But already in I Macc. xii. 9 we have the full phrase of which τὰ βιβλία is the natural abbreviation—τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἅγια, while Josephus gives us the parallel τὰ ἱερὰ βιβλία: and from these phrases τὰ βιβλία could not fail to be extracted, just as γραφαί, was extracted from αἱ ἅγιοι γραφαί, αἱ ἱερὰι γραφαί, and the like. We meet with no surprise therefore the appearance of τὰ βιβλία in II Clem. xiv, as a distinctive designation of the Old Testament. It only advertises to us, what we knew beforehand, that the Old Testament was “the Books” before both Old and New Testaments were subsumed under that title, and that usage, in a community made up partly of Jews, for a time conserved, without prejudice to the equal authority of the New Testament Books, some lingering reminiscence of the older habit of speech. How easily the Old Testament might continue to be called τὰ βιβλία after the term had come to include New Books as well, may be illustrated by a tendency which is observable in the earlier English usage of the word “Bible” (persisting even yet dialectally) to employ it of the Old Testament distinctively—as in the phrase “The Bible and the Testament”,—not, of course, with any im-

⁸ *Geschichte*, etc. I. 87, note 1.

plication of inferiority for the New Testament books.⁹ How long such a tendency to think of the Old Testament especially when the term τὰ βιβλία was heard continued to manifest itself in the early church, it would require a delicate investigation to determine. It is enough for the moment to note that II Clem. xiv witnesses to the presence of such a tendency in the first age, while such phrases as meet us in Melito of Sardis¹⁰—τὰ παλαιὰ βιβλία, τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία—warn us that the new conditions of the New Covenant with its New Books were already requiring a distinction, among the τὰ βιβλία by way of eminence, between the New and the Old Books which made up the whole. Τὰ βιβλία in a word to Jew and Christian alike meant just “the Holy Books”, “the Books” by way of eminence, by the side of which could stand no others; and though ear and lip needed a space to adjust themselves to the increased content of the phrase when Christianity came bringing with it its contribution to the unitary collection, yet the adjustment was quickly made and if the memory of the earlier usage persisted for a while, τὰ βιβλία in Christian circles meant from the beginning in principle the whole body of Sacred Books and rapidly came to mean in practice nothing less.

We cannot agree with Zahn, then, that the usage of τὰ βιβλία in the early church provides no basis upon which the development of our term “Bible” could have taken place. But when we come to take the next step in the development of that term, we are constrained to assent to Nestle’s declaration that nobody knows how the term “Bible” found its way into the European languages. The Latins did not take over the Greek word βιβλία, or its cognate βιβλοι, to designate the Biblical books. They had in their own *Liber* a term which had already acquired a pregnant sense “in religion and public law”—as expressing “a religious

⁹ See the passages from the *Oxford Dictionary of the English Language*, in note 28 below.

¹⁰ Otto: ix. 414.

book, Scripture, a statute book, codex”¹¹; and which therefore readily lent itself to employment as the representative of the pregnant Greek terms which it translates, though it scarcely seems to have attained so absolute a use. Accordingly we find in use in the early church side by side with such Greek phrases as τὰ βιβλία τῆς παλαιᾶς, τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, the Latin phrases, *Libri veteris, novi testamenti, (fæderis)*:¹² and over against the Greek βιβλία κανονικά, the Latin *libri regulares*, or as Rufinus puts it, *libri inter canonem conclusi*.¹³ Jerome gave currency to the very appropriate term *Bibliotheca* as the designation of the corpus of the Sacred Books; and this term became later the technical term perhaps most frequently employed, so that Martianaus in his *Prolegomena in divinam bibliothecam Hieron.* i. §1,¹⁴ speaking “de nomine Bibliothecae Divinæ,” can very fairly say, “among the ancients, the sacred volume which we, at the present time, call Biblia, obtained the name of Bibliotheca Divina.”¹⁵ There is no trace of such a word as “Biblia” in Patristic Latin, and no such word is entered in the Latin Lexicons,—not even in the great Latin *The-saurus* now publishing by the German Universities. We shall have to come to Du Cange’s *Gloss. Med. et Inf. Latin-*

¹¹ Andrews’ *Latin-English Lexicon*, sub *voc.*

¹² Reuss, E. T. p. 308, § 303.

¹³ Reuss, p. 321, § 316.

¹⁴ Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* xxviii. (*Hieron.* vol. 14) pp. 33-34.

¹⁵ M. Kähler, *Dogmatische Zeitfragen*², I. p. 362, writes: “It was very harmlessly intended and was not in contradiction of the usage followed by Christ Himself, when the Holy Scripture was called a Bibliotheca. . . . As, however, that designation ‘Bibliotheca’ never became the dominant one, and the Biblical one, ‘the Scripture’, alone ultimately maintained itself, so the comprehensive name, ‘the Bible’, attained general currency in the West before the ninth century.” On this last point, he had already said, (p. 232 note 1): “As a popular designation ‘Biblia’ was in use long before its earliest provable occurrence in the ninth century,” with appeal to: “Eb. Nestle, *Beit. zur Allg. Z.* 1904, No. 90, p. 117,”—an article to which we have not access, though possibly we have its essential contents in the contemporarily printed note in the *Expository Times*, mentioned at the beginning of this discussion. It can be said that ‘Bibliotheca’ never became the dominant designation of the Scriptures only in contrast with such a designation as “the Scriptures”.

itatis to discover it. And when we discover it we are told very little about it except of its existence in the Latin of the early middle ages, and shortly afterwards in the vernaculars of the West.

There seems to be no serious inherent difficulty in conceiving the passage of a Greek neuter plural into Latin as a feminine singular. The thing appears not to be unexampled, and so might have happened to *βιβλία*. What we lack is clear evidence that *βιβλία* did pass into "Biblia", and exact information of the stages and processes by which the feat was accomplished. And the difficulty of the problem is vastly increased by the circumstances that the time when the transference is supposed to have taken place was not a time when there was rich intercourse between the East and the West, in which borrowing of terms would have been easy and natural; and that there was no obvious need upon the part of the West for such a term, which would render its borrowing of it natural. Yet the term is supposed to have been taken over with such completeness and heartiness as to have become the parent of the common nomenclature of the Scriptures in all the Western languages.¹⁶ The difficulties raised by these considerations are so great that one finds himself questioning whether the origin of the term "Biblia" in Mediaeval Latin and of its descendants in the Western languages can be accounted for after the fashion suggested, and whether some other conjectural explanation of their origin might not wisely be sought for—as, for example, a contraction of the commonly current term "bibliotheca".¹⁷ Some color might be lent to such a conjecture by the fact that "Biblia" and its descendants seem to have been from the first in use not merely in an ecclesiastical but also in a common sense—

¹⁶ Grimm, *sub voc.* "Bibel", enumerates as follows: Italian, *bibbia*, Spanish, *biblia*, French, *bible*, Middle High German, *biblie*, Dutch, *bijbel*, Islandic, *biflja*, Russian and Lithuanian, *biblija*, Polish, *biblia*, Bohemian, *biblĭ*, etc.

¹⁷ The Latin *Thesaurus* tells us that *Bibliotheca* occurs in titles variously contracted: "*Compendia in titulis: by., byb., bybl., byblio., bibliot.,*" and in even completer forms.

as designations, that is, not merely of the Scriptures but of any large book.¹⁸ Appeal might be made also to the ease with which the two terms ‘Biblia’ and ‘Bibliotheca’ took one the other’s place down at least to the fifteenth century.¹⁹ What we need, however, is not conjectures but a series of ascertained facts, and these are at the moment at our disposal in very insufficient measure.

Du Cange can tell us only that the word “Biblia” occurs in the *Imitatio Christi* I i. 3,²⁰ and in the *Diarium Belli Hussitici*, adding a quotation from a Chronicle, at the year 1228, to the effect that “Stephen, archbishop of Canterbury . . . made postils super totam Bibliam.” To this Diefenbach in the *Glossarium* which he published (1857) as a supplement to Du Cange merely adds an intimation that certain fifteenth century glossaries contain “Biblia” in the sense of a “large book”,²¹ as also “Biblie” and “Bibel” (German). Becker in his *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui* is able to cite earlier examples of “Biblia” from old catalogues of libraries. The earliest—from the ninth century—comes from the catalogue of an unknown French library; next in age are two twelfth century examples—one from Monte Cassio and the other from Stederburg in Brunswick. The English Latin catalogues in which he finds it begin with one of the books at Durham, dating from 1266,²² and by that time

¹⁸ See Diefenbach’s addenda to Du Cange, *sub voc.* “Biblia”. The Oxford Dictionary gives English examples from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries: *e. g.* 1377, Lang. *Piers Pl.* B. xv. 87; “Of this matere I mygte mak a long bible”; 1542, Udall, *Erasm. Apophth.* 205a, “When he had read a long bible written and sent to hym from Antipater”. (The quotation from Z. Boyd 1639 does not seem to us to belong here).

¹⁹ This is adverted to in the Oxford Dictionary, *sub voc.* “Bible”. The following citations are given: 1382, Wyclif, 2 *Macc.* ii. 13, “He makyng a litil bible (Vulg. bibliothecam) gadride of cuntress bokis”; c. 1425, in Wr.-Wülcker, *Voc.* 648, *Biblioteca*, bybulle; 1483 *Cath. Angl.* 31, A Bybylle, *biblia, bibliotheca*.

²⁰ Si scires totam Bibliam.

²¹ “Biblia, eyn gross buch.”

²² Cf. Eb. Nestle, *The Expository Times*, xv. pp. 565-566. The citation given in the Oxford Dictionary from an Anglo-Latin occurrence

the word was already in use in English,²³ and of course in French,²⁴ since the English usage rests on the French. How early it appears in the modern European languages we lack data to inform us. The German examples which Diefenbach quotes are from the fifteenth century and those which Heyne gives from the sixteenth,^{24a} while Grimm cites none earlier than the seventeenth. But if the Low-German "Fibel" is really a derivative of "Bibel," the common use of "Bibel" must have antedated the fifteenth century.^{24b} Littré gives no French example earlier than Joinville, who wrote at the beginning of the fourteenth century (1309). Its French usage must go well back of this, however, for as we have seen it had come from French into Middle English by that date. The name in ordinary use of "biblia" in 1095—viz. from the Catalogue of the Lindisfarne books—Nestle shows to rest on an error. This catalogue dates from the fourteenth or fifteenth century.

²³The Oxford Dictionary cites from c. 1300, *Cursor M.* 1900: "As the bibul sais"; from 1330, R. Braune, *Chron.* 290: "The bible may not lie".

²⁴Littré (*Dictionnaire de la Langue Française* I. *sub voc.*) cites only: "HIST. xiii^es.—Un cordelier vint à li au chastel de Yeres [Hières] et pour enseigner le roi, dit en son sermon, que il avoit leu en Bible et les livres qui parlent des princes mescreans, JOINV. 199" To this may be added Joinville, *Histoire de Saint Louis*, Paris, Didot, 1874, p. 310 (cxi. 569): "L'endemain s'ala logier li roys devant la citei d'Arsur que l'on appelle Tyri en la Bible." On p. 320 (cxiii. 583) "Bible" occurs in the sense of "Balista", cf. Du Cange, *sub voc.* "Biblia I." The Century and the Standard Dictionaries both record this usage for English.

^{24a}Heyne, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* I. 1890, tells us *sub voc.* that Bibel is a borrowed word from the Greek neuter-plural Biblia, "Books", which since the late Middle-High-German, as in Middle Latin, has been looked on as a feminine singular, first in a form nearer to the Latin, and afterwards in that now current—with a reference to Diefenbach. His earliest citations are from Luther, who still has (*D. christliche Adel*, 1520) "die biblien, das heilig gotis wort", but elsewhere (*Wider die himlischen Proph.* 1525): "aus meine verdeutschen bibel".

^{24b}Cf. F. Kluge, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch d. deutschen Sprache*, 6^e ed. 1905 *sub voc.* "Fibel", where we are told that it was entered in Low-German Glossaries of the fifteenth century (first in 1419), was used by Luther, and duly registered since Hemisch 1616. Kluge classifies "Bibel" as a Middle-High-German word. |"

throughout the Middle Ages for what we call the "Bible" was "Bibliotheca", and we accordingly find that in Old English (Anglo-Saxon) "bibliothéce" alone occurs in this sense.²⁵ From the fourteenth century on, however, "Bible" takes the place of "Bibliothéce." Chaucer uses it freely in both the ecclesiastical and common senses.²⁶ Purvey uses it as a word well-known in common currency, referring naturally to "the Bible late translated," and to that "simple creature" (as he called himself) "who hath translated the Bible out of the Latin into the English." The rapidity with which the term entered into general usage may be divined from the examples given by Richardson and Murray.

These lexicographers record no example, however, of the occurrence of the compound term, "The Holy Bible." It seems that this combination was somewhat late in establishing itself as the stated designation of the sacred book in English. It first finds a place on the title-page of an English Bible in the so-called "Bishops' Bible," the earliest issue of which dates from 1568: "The. holie. Bible. | conteyning the olde | Testament and the newe."²⁷ It of course

²⁵ The Oxford Dictionary says: "In O. E. bibliotheca alone occurs." Nestle *l. c.* says: "The name commonly used throughout the Middle Ages was Bibliotheca"; and accordingly in O. E. and all mediæval writers this term is used for complete Mss. of Old and New Testaments. The Anglo-Saxons also used "ge-writ" when speaking of the Bible.

²⁶ In the ecclesiastical sense: Canterbury Tales: Prolog. l. 438, "His studie was but litel in the Bible"; Pardoner's Tale, l. 4652, "Looketh the Bible, and ther ye may it leere"; The Wife's Preamble, l. 10729, "He knew of hem mo legends and lyves | Than been of goode wyves in the Bible." In the general sense: Canterbury Tales, Prol. to Canon's Yeoman's Tale, l. 17257, "To tellen al wolde passen any Bible | That owher is"; House of Fame, l. 1334 (Book iii. l. 244), "If all the arms of the people he saw in his dream were described, "men myght make of hem a Bible twenty foote thykke."

²⁷ The *editio princeps* of the English Bible (Coverdale, 1535) bears the title: "Biblia | The Byble: that | is the holy Scripture of the | Olde and New Testament." Matthews' Bible, of 1537, has: "The Byble, | which is all the holy Scrip- | ture: In which are contayned the | Olde and Newe Testament—" Taverner's Bible, of 1539, has: "The most | sacred Bible, | whiche is the holy scripture, con- | teyning the old and new testament." The very popular and frequently reprinted "Genevan Bible" called itself, edition 1560: "The Bible | and | Holy Scriptures | conteyned in | the olde and Newe | Testament."

continues on the title-pages of the numerous subsequent issues of this edition,²⁸ but it does not otherwise occur on the title-page of English Bibles until the appearance of the Douai Old Testament of 1610: "The | Holie Bible |" The Rheims translators, in the preface of their New Testament, published in 1582, had indeed spoken of "the holy Bible" as "long since translated by us into English, and the Old Testament lying by us for lacke of goode meanes to publish the whole in such sort as a worke of so great charge and importance requireth"; from which we may learn that, though the volume of 1610 contains only the Old Testament, the term "The Holie Bible" upon its title is not to be confined to the Old Testament, as sometimes the phrase was confined in its Old English use.²⁹ The adoption of the term "The Holy Bible" for the title-page of King James' version of 1611: "The | Holy Bible, | conteyning the Old Testament, | and the New | ", finally fixed it as the technical designation of the book in English.

It is natural to assume that the current title of the Vulgate Latin Bible with which we are familiar—*Biblia Sacra*—lay behind this English development; but it would be a mistake to suppose that this was by any means the constant designation of the Latin Bible in the earlier centuries of its printing. A hasty glance over the lists of editions recorded in Masch's *Le Long* (iii.) indeed leaves the impression that it was only after the publication of the "authorized" Roman edition of 1590, "*Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis*", that this designation finally established itself as regular; though it was of course frequently employed before that. The original edition of John Fust and Peter Scheoiffer indeed

²⁸ *E. g.* 1573, 1574, 1575 bis, 1576, 1577 bis, 1578, 1584, 1585, 1588, 1591, 1595, 1602.

²⁹ In the *Oxford Dictionary* are found the following examples of this odd usage from the sixteenth century: Rastell, *Bk. Purgat.* I. 1. "Neyther of the bokys of the olde byble nor of the newe testament"; 1589, Golding, *De Mornay*, xxiv. 357, "Certaine bookes which we call the Bible or Olde Testament." It may not be out of place to note that Rastell wrote as a Romanist, Golding as a Protestant controversialist.

is described by LeLong (p.98) as "Biblia Sacra Latina juxta Vulgatam editionem II vol. in folio." And the title of the great Complutensian Polyglot (1514-1517) is given as "Biblia Sacra."³⁰ But these are not the actual titles of these books, and it is not until near the opening of the second quarter of the sixteenth century that "Biblia Sacra" begins to appear on the title-pages of the Latin Bibles which were pouring from the press.^{30a} Osiander's edition (Norimbergae, 1522) has it: "Biblia sacra utriusque Testamenti," (p. 309), and of course transmitted it to its reprints (1523, 1527, 1529, 1530, 1543, 1559, 1564); Knoblauch's contemporary edition, on the other hand, (Argentorati, 1522) has rather: "Biblia sacrae scripturae Veteris omnia" (p. 314).³¹ Among Catholic editions, one printed at Cologne in 1527: "Biblia sacra utriusque Testamenti" (p. 178), seems to be the earliest recorded by Le Long, which has this designation. It seems to have been, however, a Paris edition of the next year (1528): "Biblia sacra: integrum utriusque testamenti corpus completens", (repeated in 1534, 1543, 1548, 1549, 1550, 1551, 1552, 1560) which set the fashion of it. Somewhat equivalent forms appear by its side, such as: "Biblia Bibliorum opus sacrosanctum" (Lugduni, 1532), "Biblie sacre Textus" (Lugduni, 1531),

³⁰ This is the actual title of the Antwerp Polyglot, 1569-1572, and of Walton's Polyglot, 1657; but not of the Paris Polyglot.

^{30a} The *editio princeps* has no title page; and the Complutensian Polyglot no general title page. Cf. Fr. Kaulen, *Geschichte der Vulgata*, 1868, pp. 305-6:—"The first editions contain only the naked text of the Vulgate, together with the Introductions of St. Jerome and the old *Argumenta*, as they appear already in the *Codex Amiatinus*. A proper title is at first not present; and neither the sheets nor the pages show numeration. Instead of the title, the front page bears commonly a heading in large type: *Incipit prologus sancti iheronymi, incipit epistola sciti iheronymi ad paulinam, prologus biblie*, and the like. The folio edition of Basle, 1487, bears as title merely the one word, 'Biblia'. In one edition of 1486, without indication of place of printing, there stands for the first time as title, 'Biblia Vulgata' . . . By far the most common title is 'Biblia Latina', accompanied in later editions by some addition giving the contents."

³¹ Brylinger's edition, Basiliae, 1544 (1551, 1557, 1562, 1569, 1578) has: "Biblia Sacrosancta"—

and especially "Biblia Sacrosancta" (Lugduni, 1532, 1535, 1536, 1544, 1546, 1556, 1562: Basiliae 1547, 1551, 1557, 1562, 1569, 1578). But none of these became fixed as the technical designation of the volume, as *Biblia Sacra* tended to become from the opening of the second quarter of the sixteenth century, and ended by fairly becoming before that century closed.

The Romance languages seem to have followed this growing Latin custom in the designation of their Bibles, although examples of the simple nomenclature persist (*e. g.*, *La Bible qui est toute la sainte esriture*, Geneva, 1622). Among the Teutonic races, other than the English, however, it has been slower in taking root. German Bibles still call themselves "Biblia, das ist: die gantze Heilige Schrift," or in more modern form, "Die Bibel, oder die ganze Heilige Schrift," and Dutch Bibles similiarly, "Biblia, dat is de gantsche H. Schrifture," or more modernly, "Bijbel, dat is de gansche Heilige Schrift." Doubtless "die heilige Bibel" or "de heilige Bybel"—though not unexampled,—would seem somewhat harsh and unusual to Teutonic ears. Strange to say they would take more kindly apparently to such a phrase as "Das heilige Bibelbuch."

Our common phrase, "The Holy Bible", thus reveals itself as probably a sixteenth century usage, which has not yet been made the common property of the Christian world. In its substantive, it rests on an as yet insufficiently explained mediaeval usage, not yet traced further back than the ninth century. This usage in turn is commonly assigned for its origin to a borrowing from the Greek churches of their customary use of $\tauὰ βιβλία$ to designate the Scriptures. Behind this lies a Jewish manner of speech. This appears to be all that can as yet be affirmed of the origin of our common term: "The Holy Bible."

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.