

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

note here or anywhere else in the Epistle of suffering as a thing to be endured because it cannot be cured, while we find our consolation in the sufferings of our brethren. Rather the whole teaching of the Epistle is that which a Christian poet has learnt from it :—

‘Grief should be
Like joy, majestic, equable, sedate ;
Confirming, cleansing, raising, making free ;
Strong to consume small troubles ; to commend
Great thoughts, grave thoughts, thoughts lasting to the end.’

E. F. BROWN.

IN MEMORIAM IOANNIS MILLII, S.T.P.

‘The evil that men do lives after them ;
The good is oft interred with their bones.’

No truer word, it seems to me, can be found to describe the lifework of the man in whose memory the following lines are written, and its fate during the last two centuries.

The designation ‘Mill’s Text’ is still used, though in the latest impressions of the Clarendon Press editions two notes have been inserted to the effect that Mill himself testified that he had only repeated the text of Stephen’s third edition of the year 1550—‘the evil that men do lives after them’ ; and the glory of his work, the Prolegomena, and the apparatus are forgotten :—‘the good is oft interred with their bones.’

They have been reprinted once, it is true, at Amsterdam in the year 1710, but never since ; and nobody, as far as I know, has ever made the attempt to extract from them what would be really ‘Mill’s text’, those readings of the New Testament which he explicitly recognized as the true and genuine readings.

Not even in Sanday’s *Appendix ad Novum Testamentum Stephanicum iam inde a Millii temporibus Oxoniensium manibus tritum* have those readings been marked, which Mill considered genuine. I may quote as an example of these readings the omission of δ βασιλεύς in Mt. i 6. Mill knew but one Greek MS which supported this omission (71 according to our designation) ; and yet he declared this the true reading (prol. 1245 ; 1471, pp. cxxviii, clxi), while Bengel and Wetstein each found a different reason for defending the traditional reading. As far as I am aware, Lachmann was the first to remove it from the text. To-day all critical editions agree with Mill’s judgement, which is supported by the

latest discoveries, the Syriac version from Mount Sinai and the Greek fragment from Oxyrhynchus.

Scrivener (Intro. ii 203) mentions thirty passages (not 'thirty-one', as Gregory counts: for John xiii 30-31 is one variant, as rightly marked by Scrivener), in which Mill's Text does not coincide with Stephen's of 1550. Most of them will be found set out in Hoskier's Collations. The number would amount to more than thirty, if we included *minutiae* like *αὐτοῦ* and *αὐτοῦ* Mt. ii 11; v 2, 22; *ῥαμᾶ* and *Ραμᾶ* ii 18; *ἀλλά* for *ἄλλ'* viii 4; and wrong spellings like *μεριμνᾶτε* vi 25.

But it would be waste of time to collate once more either Mill with Stephen or the repetitions of the so-called Mill with the impression of 1707. I know but one jubilee worthy of the man: *not to print this text any more*; to inter the evil and to revive the good that he has done; to study his Prolegomena. I may be allowed to mention just one point. It was quite a new discovery to me, when I noticed, that each one of the Gospels in the Latin Vulgate was due to a different translator. For from this it seemed to follow, that these translations go back to the most ancient times of the Western church, when the fourfold Gospel had not yet taken such a hold that it was written in one roll or codex: for in that case probably all four Gospels would have been translated by the same hand. It followed further, that the Gospels of the Vulgate must rather range with the so-called *Itala*, the various forms of the Old-Latin being themselves but one form of it, slightly revised by Jerome, while modern criticism of the text of the New Testament is inclined highly to value the 'Old-Latin', and to slight the 'Vulgate'. It was a great surprise to me when I turned to Mill to find that he had made both these observations: that the Gospels were due to different translators (a statement based with him partially on the very same examples which had attracted my attention), and that they were to range with the Old-Latin in value. In some passages the Vulgate Gospels offer even a purer text than some of the 'Old-Latin' witnesses; compare, for instance, Mt. xx 22, 23, where the addition about the baptism is found in the 'Old-Latin' MSS *f, h, q*, but not in a single MS of the 'Vulgate'. But this by the bye.

'Mar. 25, 1707' is the date under the Vice-Chancellor Guil. Lancaster's *Imprimatur* for Mill's edition. A fortnight after its publication, it is said, he died, on the 23rd of June. Whether he was amicable or not as a man I do not know. *Seine Unpopularität als Mensch geht uns hier nichts an*, says Gregory (Prot. Real-Enc. xiii 73), but what the same critic says remains true: His edition was the first really great edition of the Greek Testament, and holds up to the present day a noble and commanding position.

EB. NESTLE.