

not believe. If he believed, it is almost inconceivable that he should never call Him by His father's name, especially when it was the custom of the country to do so. It becomes still more inconceivable when we remark that he uses the phrase 'Son of God' seven times, 'Son of Man' fourteen times, and 'Son of David' four times.

But if he held that Jesus Christ was not the Son of Joseph, but the Son of God, although the Son of Mary, the whole of his witness becomes clear.

VINCENT McNABB.

I PETER v 9.

ψ ἀντίστητε στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει, εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων τῆ ἐν κόσμῳ ἡμῶν ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελείσθαι.—R.V. text.

Whom resist steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world.—A.V.

Whom withstand steadfast in your faith, knowing that the same sufferings are accomplished in your brethren who are in the world.—R.V.

If I venture to question the correctness of our English versions, I must shelter myself in the first instance behind the authority of Dr Bigg, who writes:—'Almost every word of this rendering is open to serious objection. εἰδὼς followed by an infinitive means "knowing how" to do a thing; cf. Luke xii 56, Phil. iv 12, Krüger's *Greek Grammar* lvi 7, 9; Blass, p. 227. "Knowing that" is εἰδὼς ὅτι.'

But besides the grammatical objection, there is an even more serious moral one. Surely it is far too low a note for St Peter to end his great Epistle on—'You are not alone in your sufferings; all Christians have the same burden to bear.' It was just the amount of consolation which Buddha gave to his disciples, according to the well-known story. To the young mother whose child had died he said, 'Get me a handful of mustard seed from a house where no son, husband, parent, or slave has died.' And so she learns that suffering is the common lot, and extracts from the knowledge such comfort as she can. But is this all that Christianity has to teach us?

'That loss is common would not make
My own less bitter, rather more:
Too common! Never morning wore
To evening, but some heart did break.'

And we too have felt how 'common is the commonplace' when we have tried to draw upon it for the consolation of ourselves or others. To suppose that St Peter would inflict it on us as the climax of his

Epistle of Hope, is to suppose that Christ has no better remedy than Buddha for the sorrows of the world.

But the case is not much improved if we adopt Dr Bigg's own rendering, which he adopts from Hofman : ' Knowing how to pay the same tax of suffering as your brethren in the world.' Admitting that the words might possibly mean this, is it likely that *ἐπιτελεῖν*, which occurs some thirty times in the LXX, and in ten other places in the N.T., always in the sense of ' finish ' or ' accomplish ', should have such a far-fetched meaning here ?

Does not the whole difficulty arise from not seeing that *ἐπιτελείσθαι* may be middle and transitive, instead of passive ? Lightfoot's note on Gal. iii 3 runs as follows :—' *ἐπιτελεῖσθε* is perhaps the middle voice rather than the passive, as in Clem. Rom. § 55 *πολλὰ γυναῖκες ἐνδυναμωθείσαι . . . ἐπετελέσαντο πολλὰ ἀνδρεία*, and frequently in classical writers, e. g. Plato, *Phil.* 27 c *κάλλιον ἂν καὶ τὴν κρίσιν ἐπιτελεσαίμεθα*. A comparison of the parallel passages 2 Cor. viii 6, Phil. i 6, seems to point to a transitive verb.' It is true that Lightfoot adds, ' On the other hand, the middle voice is not found elsewhere in the LXX or N.T.,' but perhaps he had not considered this passage which is the only other place in the N.T. where the form is other than active. If his interpretation of the verse in Galatians is correct, the two passages would support each other.

Lightfoot also says that *ἐπιτελεῖν* is used of religious ceremonials, and it is possible that the idea of a sacrifice may underlie its use in Galatians (referring to Herod. ii 63 ; iv 186). May not that also be the case here ?

Thus the whole verse would run : ' Whom withstand stedfast in your faith (or the faith), knowing how to bring to (sacrificial) perfection, for (the benefit of) your (whole) brotherhood which is in the world, the same things in the way of sufferings (as they bear).' The underlying thought is the same as that of Col. i 24.

The reason why the verb is middle instead of active is probably that the active belongs to God ; *ὁ ἐναρξάμενος . . . ἐπιτελέσει* (Phil. i 6). He is the only true Agent in our salvation ; we are only agents in a secondary sense, *perfecting in ourselves* that which He perfects.¹

With this agrees the emphasis laid on the Divine power in the next two verses, which are practically the conclusion of the Epistle. ' Looking over the whole field, our suffering is small in proportion to its effect—which is Restoration, Security, Strength—for Eternity.'² There is no

¹ Are there not other cases where the recognition that the middle may have an active sense would relieve us of a difficulty ? e. g. 2 Cor. iii 14 (*ἀνακαλυπτόμενον*). In 2 Cor. iii 16 *περιαιρέται* is almost certainly transitive as in Ex. xxxiv 34 LXX. See Winer iii 38. 6.

² Archbishop Benson *Christ and His Times* p. 214.

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 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