saints which slept arose (Matthew), being aroused by the preaching of the Lord in Hades (Peter).

16. Pilate, having granted the guard (Matt. xxvii. 63), disappears from canonical history, leaving Christian curiosity unsatisfied on two points: Did tidings of the resurrection reach him? and what effect had the tidings upon him? "Peter" answers both questions; Pilate was informed at once, and proceeded to throw the blame of the crucifixion on the Jews. St. Matthew's account, that the high priests were first told, is doubtless older and more historical. To them the matter was of life and death, to Pilate a troublesome business of which he had washed his hands.

17. In nothing, however, does the Petrine Fragment show more clearly that it depends on the Synoptic narrative, than in its account of the visit of the Magdalene and her friends to the sepulchre. St. Mark and St. Luke tell us that the women went bearing spices to anoint the body of the Lord. But what could they do with unguents if, as was to be expected, the stone was still in the way? The Petrine writer, feeling this difficulty, suggests the solution that the women would leave their offerings at the door. Further, because he felt that spices and unguents were inappropriate gifts when deposited outside the tomb, he has avoided direct mention of them, and makes the women speak merely of the "things which we bring."

So deeply, however, is truth stamped on the Synoptic account, that no such explanatory defence is needed. It is the old story, known from the foundation of the world, of womanly love and reverence starting to do a dangerous and difficult work, without ever caring for or looking at the difficulties in the way. Near the tomb, hard, everyday doubts arise: Who will roll us away the stone? Yet love carries them on to the end, and they discover that, while their spice-bearing is in vain, their love has reached through death a life beyond.

Throughout this comparison of the Petrine with the Synoptic narrative, I have avoided any discussion of the question whether the details given by "Peter" are historical or imaginary. It does not seem fair to pronounce a verdict while as yet only a part—perhaps a small part—of the gospel lies before us. But it may be pointed out that the Fragment is sober and reserved in tone, and contains none of the wild fancies in which the thoroughgoing Gnostics indulged.

So faint, indeed, are the traces of heretical teaching, that it is quite possible for us, judging from our present Fragment, to conclude that the Gospel was a perfectly honest narrative, adopted by a Gnostic sect rather because it did not contradict, than because it was written in support of their doctrine.

One word, however, must be said. The "Gospel according to Peter" was not one of the Four Gospels of the authority of which Irenæus spoke in such clear tones, writing in Gaul about A.D. 190; nor has any one claimed for it a place among "the Four Gospels delivered to us," which Clement of Alexandria writes of, circ. A.D. 200; nor again did Tertullian at Carthage, writing a few years later, say anything about it when discussing the apostolic authority of the Evangelic Document (*i.e.* the Four Gospels regarded as one volume), by means of which he tells us "John and Matthew implant faith in us, and Luke and Mark refresh it." The Petrine Gospel occupied a lower room than these.

1 Timothy iii. 15.

By Professor the Rev. W. F. Slater, M.A., Manchester.

The rendering of the latter part of this verse in the Revised Version is, "That thou mayest know how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." For this we venture to propose the following translation: "That thou mayest know how to behave thyself in a house of God, which indeed is a church of the living God, a pillar and ground of the truth."

Some have thought that the last clause—"a pillar and ground of the truth"—ought to be connected with the first clause of the following verse: "And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness." This view gains some plausibility from the

καὶ at the beginning of the latter phrase, and has been maintained by Bengel and others, but is now generally rejected.

Others, again, have applied the phrase—"a pillar and ground of the truth"—to Timothy. Conybeare and Howson (also Stanley and Farrar) defend this application of the words on the ground that St. Paul (Gal. ii. 9; cf. Rev. iii. 12) speaks of James and John as "pillars." This is an old interpretation, but it has not received a very wide acceptation.

If we turn to the first of the three parts of the passage under consideration, it is not difficult to find reasons for rendering ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ by "in a house of God." One is that this is the most literal translation. The article is not in the original, and should not be inserted in a translation unless demanded by idiomatic considerations. Again, supposing that the author had wished the expression to be indefinite, he could scarcely have used another form of speech.

It is allowed that in the New Testament the article is omitted in some cases where the expression must be regarded as definite. It is as well known that the usage is varied and difficult to bring under exact rules. On this very passage, Bishop Ellicott says: "οἴκῳ is anarthrous, either owing to the preposition or the anarthrous genitive which follows." This is an admission of uncertainty. The fact is, that the rule that a noun following a preposition shall be without the article even when definite is very precarious. Then, with respect to the defining genitive, Dr. Moulton remarks that Winer's law on the subject has been "less cordially received by the best expositors than any other given by" that learned grammarian. That such rules are not absolute may be shown by the following instances taken from the Revised Version:—

The Authorised Version translated ναὸς θεοῦ (1 Cor. iii. 17; 2 Cor. vi. 16) by "the temple of God," but the Revised Version gives the indefinite article. The same version gives also "a spirit of fearfulness" in 2 Tim. i. 7, and "a teacher of Gentiles" in 1 Tim. ii. 16. In Acts xx. 28, one would expect "the church of God" for τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, but why is ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ (1 Cor. xii. 27) rendered "ye are the body of Christ"? If a preposition had power to suppress the article, why have we yet "of a woman" and "under law" in Gal. iv. 4? In Gal. vi. 1 the Revised Version has once more rejected the Authorised Version, and reads "in a spirit of meekness."

It may be granted that the phrases "house of God," "the house of David," and "the house of Israel" may occur in the original without the article, in imitation of the Hebrew idiom which uses no article with the construct. But all these phrases occur also with the article: consequently no absolute rule can be affirmed.

In the interpretation of such passages much, of course, will depend on the context and general meaning. It is important, therefore, to remember the sense in which ἐκκλησία, and other designations for the Christian community, are to be taken. The Pastoral Epistles belong to a time when "a church" usually meant "a congregation." The bishop was the superintendent of a congregation and not of a diocese. In 1 Tim. iii. 6 it is asked concerning a bishop, "How shall he take charge of a church of God?" The Revised Version translates here ἐκκλησία θεοῦ by "the church of God," as though the bishop was already a provincial or a metropolitan.

In support of their version, "in the house of God," the Revisers have found it necessary to change the subject of the infinitive (which is not expressed) from σέ to ἀνθρώπους. They thus read, not "how thou oughtest to behave" (A.V.), but "how men ought to behave themselves." Against this change it may be urged, and successfully, we think, that σοί, πρὸς σέ, and ἵνα εἰδῇς made the expression of the subject of the infinitive unnecessary. The apostle wished Timothy himself to know how he should proceed in the management of a congregation of believers. To attribute to St. Paul at this time the design of forming an ecclesiastical precedent, which the universal Church should follow through all future ages, goes beyond the mark. It will not be difficult to maintain the apostolic origin of the Pastoral Epistles if their ecclesiastical allusions are not strained too much for the simplicity of the first period.

The following phrase—ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος—appears in the Revised Version as, "Which is the church of the living God." Here we are met with a similar instance of the omission of the article. For the reasons given above, we prefer "a church" to "the church," even if θεοῦ ζῶντος be taken as "the living God." But what is the use of ἥτις in this place?

Here we have a fairly consistent rule to guide us. Winer (*Gramm. of New Testament*, xxiv. 1) tells us that the relative pronoun ὅς is never ὅστις in the New Testament. There are a few cases, perhaps, in which it would be scarcely possible to render in English the difference between the two. Unfortunately, the Revisers have too often overlooked the distinction altogether, and they have, therefore, frequently left the text in shadows out of which they might have extricated it. Occasionally an ingenious phrase has assisted them, such as, "the which if they should be written" (ἅτινα, John xxi. 25, A.V.). In Mark xv. 7, "men who in the insurrection had committed murder," is an improvement. But 1 John i. 2, "The life which—ἥτις—was with the Father"; and John viii. 53, "Abraham which—ὅστις—is dead," remain as they were.

It would have helped us to understand the character of the woman who came to our Lord (Luke vii. 37) if it had been said that she was "such an one as was in the city, a sinner." In Gal. iv. 24, ἅτινα ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα means, according to Lightfoot, "which class of things," and not "which particular things," but the Revised Version is content with "which things." From 2 Tim. i. 5, "the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice"; we might infer that the "faith" had been conveyed by natural descent. But the ἥτις of the apostle guards us against any mistake. It was a faith "such as" theirs which Timothy possessed. As Bishop Westcott says, "It is not the simple relative, but the qualitative"; and Alford, "Not the individual, but the species." Of Timothy, again, the apostle says (Phil. ii. 20), "I have no man likeminded such as (ὅστις) will care truly for your souls"; but the Revised Version has "who will care," etc. In James iv. 14 the Authorised Version has held its ground, happily, for οἵτινες οὐκ ἐπίστασθε refused to be reduced to "who do not know," and stands as "whereas ye know not."

We need not continue this examination of passages in which the indefinite relative occurs. There are few cases in which its difference from the definite relative might not be represented in translation. In the case before us, where theological and ecclesiastical theories of the highest importance are made to depend on the dictum of an apostle, it is very desirable to know what he really said. If he said that "the church" is "the pillar and ground of the truth," they who build on authority and tradition may be encouraged in their opinions. But if he said only that a church or congregation "*may be regarded as* a house of God," and "as a pillar and ground of the truth," we are presented with a very different idea.

To return to the usage in regard to nouns without the article, we may observe that the law upon which Middleton (*Doctr. of Gr. Art.* p. 61) lays so much stress, which is that where propositions "merely affirm or deny existence," the name of the person or thing is without the article, is not a safe guide. In 2 Cor. iii. 3, ἐστὲ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ, notwithstanding the substantive verb and the genitive, the Revised Version has changed the definite article (A.V.) into the indefinite, "Ye are an epistle of Christ."

Contributions and Comments.

Nympha.

In Col. iv. 15, Westcott and Hort read Νύμφαν καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίαν, without a margin, following B. To this reading Lightfoot objects that a "Doric form of the Greek name here seems in the highest degree improbable." But is it Doric? Why not simply Νύμφᾰν, gen. Νύμφης, in the ordinary Attic declension? In Homer we have the phrase νύμφᾰ φίλη, where the ᾰ is the solitary feminine survivor of the old vocative. A phrase like this was very likely to give birth to a pet name; and a new nominative would spring out of the unfamiliar vocative, just as μητίετᾰ, ἵπποτᾰ, and a number of other masculine nominatives did in Homer, and as many feminine nouns in -ᾰ did in the Æolic dialect. This is hardly the place to elaborate the philological argument, but one of the confirmations of my suggestion has independent interest. There is a *possible* occurrence of νύμφᾰν in a poem attributed to Erinna, the friend of Sappho (Pomtow, *Poet. Gr. Lyr.* i. 118). It is an epitaph of a certain Baucis—(Νύμφας Βαυκίδος ἐμμί, the companion poem begins); and