

Dict.

A

Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

JOHN A. SELBIE, D.D.

AND (IN THE READING OF THE PROOFS) OF

JOHN C. LAMBERT, D.D.

Paper 431-10

VOLUME II

LABOUR—ZION

WITH

APPENDIX AND INDEXES

*86/65
17/3/08*

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK

1908

authorities. Jesus followed a different plan. He had a message of His own, which He delivered with conviction and enthusiasm, not appealing to authorities, but speaking with the conscious authority of truth. And the substance of His teaching was also very different. He condemned the external, mechanical formalism which they encouraged, and declared that only the inward purity of the heart was of value in the sight of God. See, further, art. PHARISEES, p. 355 f.

4. Later history.—Though it does not properly belong to our subject, it is interesting to note that after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, the authority of the Scribes increased in importance. Under much discouragement they undertook the difficult task of the reorganization of Judaism. Working on calmly and peacefully, they were able to avoid extremes, and were successful in keeping what was left of the nation faithful to the religion of their fathers, and in stimulating hope for the future. The ordinances of the Oral Law were at last written down, and to their careful preservation by the Scribes we are indebted for the Hebrew Scriptures we now possess.

LITERATURE.—The literature on the subject is very extensive. Every History of the Jews, every Life of Christ, every Commentary on the Gospels, deals to some extent with the Scribes. Schürer's *HJP* may be taken as a standard authority; Ewald, Kuenen, and Wellhausen are all important; so are Eldersheim's *LT* and W. R. Smith's *OTJC*. A very full bibliography is given in Schürer. See also artt. in Hastings' *DB* and in the *EBI*.
JOSEPH MITCHELL.

SCRIP.—See WALLET.

SCRIPTURE.—The scope of this article does not permit the discussion in it of the employment of Scripture, or of the estimate put upon Scripture, by either our Lord or the Evangelists. It is strictly limited to the use of the term 'Scripture' in the NT, particularly in the Gospels: and to the immediate implications of that use.

1. The use of this term in the NT was an inheritance, not an invention. The idea of a 'canon' of 'Sacred Scriptures' (and with the idea the thing) was handed down to Christianity from Judaism. The Jews possessed a body of writings, consisting of 'Law, Prophets, and (other) Scriptures (*Kethûbhîm*),' though they were often called, for brevity's sake, merely 'the Law and the Prophets,' or simply 'the Law.' These 'Sacred Scriptures,' or this 'Scripture' (הכתוב) as it was frequently called, or these 'Books,' or simply this 'Book' (הכתיב), they looked upon as originating in Divine inspiration, and as therefore possessed everywhere of Divine authority. Whatever stood written in these Scriptures was a word of God, and was therefore referred to indifferently as something which 'Scripture says' (אמר קרא, or אמר הכתיב, or אמר רהב), or 'the All-Merciful says' (אמר רחמי), or even simply 'He says' (כן הוא אומר) or merely (אומר); that God is the Speaker in the Scriptural word 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 Scripture passage, introduced commonly by one or the other of the formulas 'for it is said' (כשנאמר) or 'as it is written' (ככתוב, or כהכתוב), though, of course, a great variety of more or less frequently occurring formulas of adduction are found. Greek-speaking Jews naturally tended merely to reproduce in their new language the designations and forms of adduction of their sacred books current among their people. This process was no doubt facilitated by the existence among the Greeks of a pregnant legislative use of *γράφω*, *γραφῆς*, *γράμματα*, by which these terms were freighted with an implication of authority. But it is very easy to make too much of this. In

Josephus, and even more plainly in the LXX, the influence of the Greek usage may be traced; but in a writer like Philo, Jewish habits of thought appear to be absolutely determinative. The fact of importance is that there was nothing left for Christianity to invent here. It merely took over in their entirety the established usages of the Synagogue, and the NT evinces itself in this matter at least a thoroughly Jewish book. The several terms it employs are made use of, to be sure, 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. But the application made of them by the NT writers had its roots set in Jewish thought, and from it they derive a fuller and deeper meaning than the most pregnant classical usage could impart to them.

2. To the NT writers, as to other Jews, the sacred books of what was now called by them 'the old covenant' (2 Co 3¹⁴), described according to their contents as 'the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms' (Lk 24⁴⁴), or more briefly as 'the Law and the Prophets' (Mt 7¹², Lk 16¹⁶; cf. Ac 28²³, Lk 16^{29,31}), or merely as 'the Law' (Jn 10³⁴, 1 Co 14²¹), or even, perhaps, 'the Prophets' (Mt 23^{11,13} 26⁵⁶, Lk 17¹⁸ 18³¹ 24^{25,27}, Ac 3²⁴ 13²⁷, Ro 1² 16²⁶), were, when thought of according to their nature, a body of 'sacred scriptures' (Ro 1², 2 Ti 3¹⁶), or, with the omission of the unnecessary, because well-understood adjective, simply by way of eminence, 'the Scriptures,' 'Scripture.' For employment in this designation either of the substantives *γραφῆς* or *γράμματα* offered itself, although, of course, each brought with it its own suggestions arising from the implication of the form and the general usage of the word. The more usual of the two in this application, in Philo and Josephus, is *γράμματα*, or more exactly *γράμματα*; for, although it is sometimes so employed in the singular (but apparently only late, e.g. Callimachus, *Epigr.* xxiv. 4, and the Church Fathers, *passim*), it is in the plural that this form more properly denotes that congeries of alphabetical signs which constitutes a book. In the NT, on the other hand, this form is rare. The complete phrase *ιερά γράμματα*, found also both in Josephus and in Philo, occurs in 2 Ti 3¹⁵ as the current title of the sacred books, freighted with all its implications as such. Elsewhere in the NT, however, *γράμματα* is scarcely used as a designation of Scripture (cf. Jn 5⁴⁷ 7¹⁵). Practically, therefore, *γραφῆς*, in its varied uses, remains the sole form employed in the NT in the sense of 'Scripture,' 'Scriptures.'

3. This term occurs in the NT about fifty times (Gospels 23, Acts 7, Catholic Epistles 6, Paul 14); and in every case it bears that technical sense in which it designates the Scriptures by way of eminence, the Scriptures of the OT. It is true there are a few instances in which passages adduced as *γραφῆς* are not easily identified in the OT text; but there is no reason to doubt that OT passages were intended (cf. Hühn, *Dic alttest. Citate*, 270; and Mayor on Ja 4⁵, Lightfoot on 1 Co 2⁹, Westcott on Jn 7³⁸, and Godet on Lk 11⁴⁹). We need to note in modification of the broad statement, therefore, only that it is apparent from 2 P 3¹⁶ (cf. 1 Ti 5¹⁸) that the NT writers were well aware that the category 'Scripture,' in the high sense, included also the writings they were producing, as along with the books of the OT constituting the complete 'Scripture' or authoritative Word of God. In 20 out of the 50 instances in which *γραφῆς* occurs in the NT, it is the plural form which is used, and in all but two of these cases the article is present—*αἱ γραφαί*, the well-known Scriptures of the Jewish people; and the two exceptions are exceptions only in appearance, since adjectival de-

finitions are present (*γραφαὶ ἄγαι*, Ro 1², here first in extant literature; *γραφαὶ προφητικαί*, Ro 16²⁶). The singular form occurs some 30 times, all but four of which have the article; and here again the exceptions are only apparent, the term being definite in every case (Jn 19³⁷ 'another Scripture'; 1 P 2⁶, 2 P 1²⁰, 2 Ti 3¹⁶, used as a proper name). The distribution of the singular and plural forms is perhaps worth noting. In Acts the singular (3 times) and plural (4) occur almost equally frequently: the plural prevails in the Synoptics (Mt. plural only; Mk. two to one; Lk. three to one), and the singular in the rest of the NT (John 11 to 1, James 3 to 0, Peter 2 to 1, Paul 2 to 5). In the Gospels the plural form occurs exclusively in Mt., prevalently in Mk. and Lk., and rarely in Jn., of which the singular is characteristic. No distinction seems to be traceable between the usage of the Evangelists in their own persons and that of our Lord as reported by them. Mt. and Mk. do not on their own account use the term at all; in Lk. and Jn., on the other hand, it occurs not only in reports of our Lord's sayings and of the sayings of others, but also in the narrative itself. To our Lord is ascribed the use indifferently of the plural (Mt 21⁴² 22⁴⁰ 26⁵⁴⁻⁵⁶, Mk 12²⁴ 14⁹, Jn 5³⁹) and the singular (Mk 12¹⁰, Lk 4²¹, Jn 7^{38, 42} 10³⁵ 13¹⁸ 17¹²).

4. The history of *γραφῆς*, *γραφαί*, as applied to literary documents, does not seem to have been exactly the same as that of its congener *γράμμα*, *γράμματα*. The latter appears to have been current first as the appropriate appellation of an alphabetical character, and to have grown gradually upward from that lowly employment to designate documents of less or greater extent, as ultimately made up of alphabetical characters. Although, therefore, the singular *τὸ γράμμα* is used of any written thing, it is apparently, when applied to 'writings,' most naturally employed of brief pieces like short inscriptions or proverbs, or of the shorter portions of documents such as clauses—though it is also used of those larger sections of works which are more commonly designated as 'books.' It is rather the plural, *τὰ γράμματα*, which seems to have suggested itself not only for extended treatises, but indeed for documents of all kinds. When so employed, the plural form is not to be pressed. Such a phrase as 'Moses' *γράμματα*' (Jn 5⁴⁷), for example, probably ascribes to Moses only a single book—what we call the Pentateuch; and such a phrase as *ἱερὰ γράμματα* (2 Ti 3¹⁵) does not suggest to us a 'Divine library,' but brings the OT before us as a unitary whole. On the other hand, *γραφῆς*, in its application to literary products, seems to have sprung lightly across the intermediate steps to designate which *γράμμα* is most appropriately used, and to have been carried over at once from the 'writing' in the sense of the script to the 'writing' in the sense of the Scripture. Kindred with *γράμμα* as it is, its true synonymy in its literary application is rather with such words as *βιβλος* (*βιβλίον*) and *λόγος*, in common with which it most naturally designates a complete literary piece, whether 'treatise' or 'book.' Where thought of from the material point of view as so much paper, so to speak, a literary work was apt to be called a *βιβλος* (*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 *γραφῆς* (*γράμμα*), which was apt to come to the lips when the 'web of words' itself was in mind. In a word, *βιβλος* (*βιβλίον*) was the most exact word for the 'book,' *γραφῆς* (*γράμμα*) for the 'document' inscribed in the 'book,' *λόγος* for the 'treatise' which the 'document' records; while as between *γραφῆς* and *γράμμα*, *γράμματα*, preserving the stronger material flavour, gravitates

somewhat towards *βιβλος* (*βιβλίον*), and *γραφῆς* looks upward somewhat toward *λόγος*. When, in the development of the publisher's trade, the system of making books in great rolls gave way to the 'small-roll system,' and long works came to be broken up into 'books,' each of which was inscribed in a 'volume,' these separate 'books' attached to themselves this whole series of designations, each with its appropriate implication. Smaller sections were properly called *περιοχαί*, *τόποι*, *χωρία*, *γράμματα* (the last of which is the proper term for 'clauses'), but very seldom, if ever, in classical Greek, *γραφαί*.

5. The current senses of these several terms are, of course, more or less reflected in their NT use. But we are struck at once with the fact that *γραφῆς* occurs in the NT solely in its pregnant technical usage as a designation of the Sacred Scriptures. There seems no intrinsic reason why it should not, like *γράμματα*, be freely used for non-sacred 'writings.' In point of fact, however, throughout the NT *γραφῆς* is ever something 'which the Holy Ghost has spoken through the mouth' of its human authors (Ac 1¹⁶), and which is therefore of indefectible, because Divine, authority. It is perhaps even more remarkable that even on this high plane of technical reference it never occurs, 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 OT is composed. It is tempting, no doubt, to seek to give it such a sense in some of the passages where, occurring in the singular, it yet does not seem to designate the Scriptures in their entirety, and Dr. Hort appears for a moment almost inclined to yield to the temptation (on 1 P 2⁶, note the 'probable'). It is more tempting still to assume that behind the common 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*. But in no single passage where *ἡ γραφή* occurs does it seem possible to give it a reference to the 'treatise' to which the appeal is made; and the common employment in profane Greek of *γραφαί* (in the plural) for a single document, discourages the assumption that (like *τὰ βιβλία*) when applied to the Scriptures it has reference to their composite character. The truth seems to be that whether the plural *αἱ γραφαί* or the singular *ἡ γραφή* is employed, the application of the term to the OT writings by the writers of the NT is based upon the conception of these OT writings as a unitary whole, and designates this body of writings in their entirety as the one well-known authoritative documentation of the Divine word. This is the fundamental fact with respect to the use of these terms in the NT from which all the other facts of their usage flow.

6. It is true that in one unique passage, 2 P 3¹⁶ (on the meaning of which see Bigg, *in loc.*), *αἱ γραφαί* does occur with a plural signification. But the units of which this plural is made up, as the grammatical construction suggests, appear to be not 'treatises' (Huther, Kühn), but 'passages' (de Wette). Peter seems to say 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 Scripture statements (cf. Eurip. *Hipp.* 1311; Philo, *de Praem. et Pen.* § 11 near end)—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 NT; but it is an entirely legitimate one for the NT, and in its context a perfectly natural one. In the Church Fathers the plural *αἱ γραφαί* is formed freely upon *ἡ γραφή* both in the sense of 'book' of Scripture and in the sense of 'passage' of Scripture. But

in the NT, apart from the present passage, there is in no instance of the use of *αἱ γραφαί* the slightest hint of a series whether of 'treatises' or of 'passages' underlying it. Even a passage like Lk 24²⁷ forms no exception; for if *γραφαί* is employed in a singular sense of a single document, then *πάσαι αἱ γραφαί* remains just the whole of that document, and is the exact equivalent of *πᾶσα ἡ γραφή*, or (if *γραφή* has acquired standing as a *quasi*-proper name) as *πᾶσα γραφή* (2 Ti 3¹⁶). Similarly *αἱ γραφαί τῶν προφητῶν* (Mt 26⁵⁶), *γραφαί προφητικαί* (Ro 16²⁶) appear to refer not to particular passages deemed prophetic, or to the special section of the OT called 'the Prophets,' but to the entire OT conceived as prophetic in character (cf. 2 P 1²⁰, Ac 2³⁰, 2 P 3¹⁶).

7. In 2 P 3¹⁶, however, we have already been brought face to face with what is probably the most remarkable fact about the usage of *γραφή* in the NT. This is its occasional employment to refer not merely, as from its form and previous history was to be expected, to the Scripture as a whole, or even, as also would have been only a continuation of its profane usage, to the several treatises which make up that whole, but to the individual passages of Scripture. This employment finds little support from the classics, in which *γράμμα* rather than *γραφή* is the current form for the adduction of 'clauses' or fragmentary portions of documents (cf. e.g. Plato, *Parmen.* 128 A-D, *Ep.* 3 [317 B]; Thucyd. v. 29; Philo, *de Congr. Evul. Grat.* 12, *Quod Deus immut.* 2). It has been customary, accordingly, to represent it as a peculiarity of NT and Patristic Greek. It seems to be found, however, though rarely, in Philo (*Quis verum div. her.* 53, *de Præm. et Pæn.* 11; cf. Enripides, *Hipp.* 1311), and is probably an extreme outgrowth of the habit of looking upon the Scriptures as a unitary book of Divine oracles, every portion and passage of which is clothed with the Divine authority which belongs to the whole and is therefore manifested in all its parts. When the entirety of Scripture is 'Scripture' to us, each passage may readily be adduced as 'Scripture,' because 'Scripture' is conceived as speaking through and in each passage. The transition is easy from saying, 'The Scripture says, namely, in this or that passage,' to saying, of this and that passage, severally, 'This Scripture says,' and 'Another Scripture says'; and a step so inviting was sure sooner or later to be taken. The employment of *ἡ γραφή* in the NT to denote a particular passage of Scripture does not appear then to be a continuation of a classical usage, but a new development on Jewish or Judæo-Christian ground from the pregnant use of *γραφή* for the Sacred Scriptures, every clause of which is conceived as clothed with the authority of the whole. So far from throwing in doubt the usage of *γραφή* pregnantly of Scripture as a whole, therefore, it rather presupposes this usage and is a result of it. So it will not surprise us to find the two usages standing side by side in the NT.

8. It has indeed been called in question whether both these usages do stand side by side in the NT. Possibly a desire to find some well-marked distinction between the usage of the plural and singular forms has not been without influence here. At all events, it has every now and then been suggested that the singular *ἡ γραφή* bears in the NT the uniform sense of 'passage of Scripture,' while it is the plural *αἱ γραφαί* alone which in the NT designates Scripture as a whole. The younger Schulthess, for example (*Lucubr. pro divin. discip. ac pers. Jesu.* 1828, p. 36 n.), having occasion to comment briefly on the words *πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος* of 2 Ti 3¹⁶, among other assertions of equal dubiety makes this one: '*γραφή* in the singular

never means *βιβλος* in the NT, much less the entirety of *τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων*, but some particular passage.' Hitherto it has been thought enough to meet such assertions with a mere expression of dissent: Christiaan Sepp, for example (*De Lecc. des NT over de HS des OV.* 1849, p. 69), meets this one with equal brevity and point by the simple statement: 'Passages like Jn 10³⁵ prove the contrary.' Of late, however, under the influence of a comment of Bishop Lightfoot's on Gal 3²² which has become famous, Schulthess' doctrine has become almost traditional in a justly influential school of British exegesis (cf. Westcott on Jn 2² 10³⁵; Hort on 1 P 2⁶; Swete on Mk 12¹⁰; Page on Ac 1¹⁰; Knowing on Ac 8³²; Plummer on Lk 4²¹). The attempt to carry this doctrine through, however, appears to involve a violence of exegesis which breaks down of itself. Of the 30 instances in which the singular *γραφή* occurs, about a score seem intractable to the proposed interpretation (Jn 2²² 7³⁸ 42 10³⁵ 17¹² 19²⁸ 20⁹, Ac 8³², Ro 4³ 9¹⁷ 10¹¹ 11², Gal 3⁸ 2² 4³⁰, 1 Ti 5¹⁸, Ja 4⁵, 1 P 2⁶, 2 P 1²⁰ [cf. Cremer, *sub voc.*, who omits Jn 17¹² 20⁹; E. Hühn, *Die alttest. Citate.*, etc., 1900, p. 276, who adds Jn 13¹⁸ 19²⁴ 26, Ja 2⁸; and Vaughan on Ro 4³, Meyer on Jn 10³⁵, Weiss on Jn 10³⁵, Kübel on 2 P 1²⁰, Abbott on Eph 4⁸, Beet on Ro 9¹⁷, Mayor on 2 P 3¹⁶; *EBi* 4329; Franke, *Das AT bei Johannes*, 48; E. Haupt, *Die alttest. Citate in den vier Evang.* 201]). In some of these passages it would seem quite impossible to refer *γραφή* to a particular passage of Scripture. No particular passage is suggested, for example, in Jn 2²² or in Gal 3²², and it is sought and conjecturally supplied by the commentators only under the pressure of the theory. The reference of Jn 20⁹ is quite as broad as that of Lk 24⁴⁵. In Jn 10³⁵ the argument depends on the wide reference to Scripture as a whole, which forms its major premise. The personification of Scripture in such passages as Ja 4⁵ and Gal 3⁸ carries with it the same implication. And the anarthrous use of *γραφή* in 1 P 2⁶, 2 P 1²⁰, 2 Ti 3¹⁶, is explicable only on the presupposition that *γραφή* had acquired the value of a proper name. Perhaps the two passages, 1 P 2⁶ and 2 P 1²⁰, are fairly adapted to stand as the tests of the possibility of carrying through the reference of *γραφή* in the singular to particular passages; and the artificial explanations which are given of these passages by the advocates of that theory (cf. Zahn, *Einführung*, etc., ii. 108; Hort on 1 P 2⁶) may stand for its sufficient refutation. There seems no reason why we should fail to recognize that the employment of *γραφή* in the NT so far follows its profane usage, in which it is prevailingly applied to entire documents and carries with it a general implication of completeness, that in its more common reference it designates the OT to which it is applied in its completeness as a unitary whole (cf. Franke, *op. cit.* p. 48). It remains only to add that the same implication is present in the designation of the OT as *αἱ γραφαί*, which, as has already been pointed out, does not suggest that the OT is a collection of 'treatises,' but is merely a variant of *ἡ γραφή* in accordance with good Greek usage, employed interchangeably with it at the dictation of nothing more recondit than literary habit. Whether *αἱ γραφαί* is used, then, or *ἡ γραφή*, or the anarthrous *γραφή*, in each case alike the OT is thought of as a single document set over against all other documents by reason of its unique Divinity and indefectible authority, by which it is constituted in every passage and declaration the final arbiter of belief and practice.

9. It is an outgrowth of this conception of the OT that it is habitually adduced for the ordinary purposes of instruction or debate by such simple formulas as 'it is said,' 'it is written,' with the

implication that what is thus said or written is of Divine and final authority. Both of these usages are illustrated in a variety of forms, and with all possible high implications, not only in the NT at large, but also in the Gospels,—and not only in the comments of the Evangelists, but also in the reported sayings of our Lord. We are concerned here only with the formula, 'It is written,' in which the consciousness of the written form—the documentary character—of the authority appealed to finds expression. In its most common form, this formula is the simple *γέγραπται*, used either absolutely, or, with none of its authoritative implication thereby evacuated, with more or less clear intimation of the place where the cited words are to be found written. By its side occurs also the resolved formula *γεγραμμένον ἐστίν* (peculiar to Jn.; cf. Plummer on Lk 4²⁷), or some similar formula, with the same implications. These modes of expression have analogies in profane Greek, especially in legislative usages; but their use with reference to the Divine Scriptures, as it involves the adduction of an authority which rises immeasurably above all legislative authority, is also freighted with a significance to which the profane usage affords no key. In the Gospels, *γέγραπται* occurs exclusively in Mt. and Mk., and predominately in Lk., but only once in Jn.; most commonly in reports of our Lord's sayings. In the latter part of Lk., on the other hand, the authoritative citation of the OT is accomplished by the use of the participle *γεγραμμένον*, while in Jn. the place of *γέγραπται* (8¹⁷ only) is definitely taken by the resolved formula *γεγραμμένον ἐστίν*. The significance of these formulas is perhaps most manifest where they stand alone as the bare adduction of authority without indication of any kind whence the citation is derived (so *γέγραπται*, Mt 4⁶ 7¹⁰ [11¹⁰] 21¹³ [26²⁴] 26³¹, Mk 7⁶ 9¹² 13 11¹⁷ 14²¹, 27, Lk 4⁴ 8¹⁰ 7²⁷ 19⁴⁶ 20¹⁷ 22³⁷; *γεγραμμένον ἐστίν*, Jn 2¹⁷ 6³¹ 12¹⁴ [16]). The adjunction of an indication of the place where the citation may be found does not, however, really affect the authoritative nature of its adduction. This adjunction is rare in Mt. and Mk. (Mt 2⁵, Mk 1² only), more frequent in Lk. (2²³ 3⁴ 10²⁶ 18³¹ 24⁴⁴ 46) and Jn. (6⁴⁵ 8¹⁷ 10²⁴ 15²⁵); and by its infrequency it emphasizes the absence of all necessity for such identification. When a NT writer says, 'It is written,' there can arise no doubt where what he thus adduces as possessing absolute authority over the thought and consciences of men is to be found written. The simple adduction in this solemn and decisive manner of a written authority, carries with it the implication that the appeal is made to the indefeasible authority of the Scriptures of God, which in all their parts and in every one of their declarations are clothed with the authority of God Himself.

LITERATURE.—Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. et Talm.* (ed. Pitman) xi, xii; Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb. et Talm.* 1732; Surenhusius, *שבעה ביבוסים וסודי כפר* *sive* *βίβλος καταλλαγής*, 1713 (pp. 1-36); Döpke, *Hermeneutik d. NT Schriften*, 1829 (i. pp. 60-69); Edersheim, *LT* i. 187, n. 2; Weber, *Jüd. Theol.* 2 (1897) § 20; H. J. Holtzmann, *NT Theol.*, Index; Weiss, *Theol. of NT*, § 74a, n. 3, § 136b, n. 5, § 152b, n. 4; Sepp, *De Leer des NT over de HS des O.V.*, 1849; Tholuck, *Ueber die Citate der AT im NT*⁶; Turpie, *The NT View of the Old*, 1872; Böhl, *Die alttest. Citate in NT*, 1873; Toy, *Quotations in NT*, 1884; Dittmar, *VT in Nora*, i. 1899; Hübn, *Die alttest. Citate im NT*, 1900; Anger, *Ratio qua loci VT in Evang. Mat. laudantur*, 1801; E. Haupt, *Die alttest. Citate in d. 4 Evang.*, 1871; Clemen, *Der Gebrauch d. AT im NT und speciell in den Reden Jesu*, 1891-1893, *Der Gebrauch der AT in den NT Schriften*, 1895 (full literature, p. 19); Massebeian, *Examen des Citations de l'Ancien Test. dans l'Evang. selon S. Matthieu*, 1885; Swete, *Gospel acc. to Mark*, pp. lxx-lxxiv; Franke, *Das AT bei Johannes*, 1885 (pp. 46-88, 225-281); Lechler, 'Das AT in den Reden Jesu' (*TSK*, 1854, 4); Grau, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, iv. 1887; Barth, *Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu*, ii. 1899 [2nd ed. 1903]; Kautzsch, *de VT locis in Paulo*, 1809; Monnet, *Les citations de S. Paul*, 1874; Vollmer, *Die alttest. Citate Paulus*, 1895.

B. B. WARFIELD.

SEA OF GALILEE.—i. NAMES.—The OT name *Chinnereth* had disappeared, so far as our purpose is concerned, by the time of the Maccabees, and in its place we find a variety of designations. It is then that the familiar name *Gennesaret* first makes its appearance in the *τὸ ὕδωρ Γεννησαρέ* of 1 Mac 11⁶⁷. Josephus uses the forms *λίμνη Γεννησαρέ* (*BJ* III. x. 1), *ὑδάτα Γεννησαρά* (*Ant.* XIII. v. 7), *λίμνη Γεννησαρίτις* (*Ant.* XVIII. ii. 1; *Vita*, 65); Pliny has *Gennesara* (*HN* v. 15). In the Targums and other Jewish writings the name of the Sea appears as *גניני* or *גניני*, these forms supplementing the Heb. *Chinnereth*. But though the word *Gennesaret* was so familiar to contemporary writers, it appears only once in the NT as applied to the Lake, in the *ἡ λίμνη Γεννησαρέ* of Lk 5¹. Following close upon this, however, *ἡ λίμνη* occurs alone in Lk 5² 8²² 23³³. The most popular name in the NT is 'the Sea of Galilee' (*ἡ θάλασσα τῆς Γαλιλαίας*), which occurs five times (Mt 4¹⁸ 15²⁹, Mk 1¹⁶ 7³¹, Jn 6¹). The word 'Sea' (*θάλασσα*) stands alone in Jn 6¹⁷⁻²⁵, and the form 'Sea of Tiberias' (*θάλασσα τῆς Τιβεριάδος*) occurs in John 6¹ 21¹. The modern designation, 'Lake of Tiberias,' does not occur in the NT. It is found for the first time as *λίμνη Τιβερις* in Pausanias (v. 7).

Many explanations have been offered of the origin of the word *Gennesaret*. Lightfoot (and others) sought to derive it from the OT *Chinnereth*, which it was supposed to replace. Such an origin, however, seems very improbable, not only on philological grounds, but because the latter name also remains simply transliterated in the LXX as *χενεσαβ*, and was thus quite familiar to the Hellenistic world. Ritter (*Geog. of Pal.*) suggests that it is derived from *גנין* or *גניני* 'garden of treasure,' which term, of course, he refers to the Plain, deriving thence the name of the adjoining Sea. This process is quite natural, and probably correct, but still we may be permitted to doubt his derivation of the name. G. A. Smith (*HGILL* 443 n.) has also noted that the form points to some compound of *גן* 'garden,' or *גל* valley; and to us this seems indisputable, so that on the whole we must admit that either the explanation given by Caspari (§ 64), *גניני* ('gardens of the [lake] basin'), or that of the older Rabbis (*Ber. Rab* 98), *גניני* ('gardens of the prince'), is most satisfactory. The termination in *Gennesaret* might then be regarded as the Aramaic determinative form, and compared with *Nazareth* from Nazara.

With reference to the name 'Galilee,' it has been said that it originally designated only that small tract of land given by Solomon to Hiram (1 K 9¹¹), and that the name gradually extended till in the days of the Maccabees it included Zebulun and Naphtali, so that only after this took place could the Sea be known by that name. Furrer (*Wanderungen*) has also drawn attention to the other names. He asserts that *Gennesar* or *Gennesaritis* is characteristic of the 1st cent., being found in Josephus, Pliny, and Strabo, while from the 2nd cent. onwards the official designation became 'Sea of Tiberias'; and as proof of this statement he cites the Palestinian Talmud. He then ventures to infer that Jn 2¹ indicates a later date than the rest of the book demands, and at the same time he suggests that Jn 6¹ has been emended. This reasoning, however, seems inconclusive; for, apart from the fact that the Palestinian Talmud contains much that is old, it seems impossible, in view of the conservatism of the Rabbis, that such a name as 'Sea of Tiberias' should be found in their writings, unless it had been in common use for a considerable time. For the history of the district surrounding the Lake see art. GALILEE.

ii. DESCRIPTION.—The Lake presents 'a beautiful sheet of limpid water in a deeply depressed basin' (*BRP*² ii. 380), its average below sea level being 682½ ft.; but with the season of the year the level may vary to the extent of 10 ft. The rise and fall are dependent on the rainy season on the one hand, and, on the other, on the melting of the snows on Hermon as the spring advances; and