fear rather flagrant, in the prosody of some passages quoted, e. g. that the α in ἀθάνατος and the ι in καλ(λ)ίων are always long. He adds: 'I should think that any writer, who wrote in rhythm, observed the same prosodical rules: a vowel which may be elided *must* be elided, a long vowel (or diphthong) before a vowel must be shortened.' This would affect some of the instances quoted above. 'But', he adds, 'on the other hand the number of correspondences may be increased almost in importance, although I doubt whether rhythms are (as in other writers) *continually* employed. The text is not in a very good condition.'

NOTE ON MATT. XX 23 AND MARK X 40.

In the First Gospel our Lord is reported to have said to the sons of Zebedee—

τὸ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου.

The parallel passage in the Second Gospel runs—

τὸ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἢ ἐξ εὐωνύμων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται.

Vv. ll. are not important. In the former passage CDΔ &c. insert τοῦτο after δοῦναι.

The familiar English of A. V. is—

'To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared of my Father.'

The rendering of St Mark is similar, with 'and' for ἤ and with the omission of 'of my Father'.

For this the R. V. of 1881 substitutes:—

'To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but *it is for them* for whom it hath been prepared of my Father', and so for St Mark with the same variation as in A. V.

Do these translations convey the sense of the original? The importation of the words in italics, it will be observed, makes a material change in the force of the sentence. Why were they introduced?

'To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but for whom it is prepared' is clumsy English, but intelligible English. If we draw out the force of the relative, and make it contain the antecedent, as the construction requires, we may render 'but to them for whom it is prepared'.

Here the English, in accordance with a very common use of our *but* (*but* = *be out*), implies that the privilege of sitting on the Lord's right hand and on His left hand is His to give, but His to give to none but

fit recipients: i. e. not His to give save or except to those for whom it is prepared. A. V. and R. V. on the contrary imply that this privilege is not His to give, but that, in some way not specified, it shall be given to, or is reserved for, those for whom it is prepared.

For which of these two statements did the writers of the Gospels intend to make the Speaker responsible? Did they wish to describe our Lord as here asserting, or as repudiating, the power to assign high places in His Kingdom which is claimed in Rev. iii 21? Is there anything about their Greek original text necessitating the interpolation of an explanatory clause involving a change of meaning so important?

'Yes', say the translators and commentators represented by A. V. and R. V., 'there is. ἀλλά *never equals* εἰ μή'. So in the most popular manuals of Greek Testament exegesis is to be found the solemn dictum reverently propounded: ἀλλά never = εἰ μή. So the Cambridge Bible St Matthew; so the Cambridge Bible St Mark; the annotators in each case supporting their position by reference to Winer § 566. Even the last important commentator on St Mark, Dr Swete, apparently hesitates to deviate from this supposed grammatical orthodoxy.

But is not this reputed unimpeachable canon really arbitrary and baseless? So far from ἀλλά never equalling εἰ μή, such a use is to be found in every age of Greek literature. It is true that Blass in his *Grammar of N.T. Greek* ignores it. It is, however, enough to quote:—

Odyssey xxi 70

Οὐδέ τιν' ἄλλην
μύθου ποιήσασθαι ἐπισχεσίην ἐδύνασθε
ἀλλ' ἐμὲ ἱέμενοι γῆμαι θέσθαι τε γυναῖκα:

Soph. *O.T.* 1331

Ἔπαισε δ' αὐτόχειρ νιν οὔτις ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τλάμων:

Arist. *Eth. Nic.* x 5. 10 Ἡδέα δ' οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλλὰ τούτοις καὶ οὕτω διακειμένοις:

and last, but not least in significance,

St Mark ix 8 οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον, where to insist upon interpolating a second εἶδον would surely be a puerile pedantry. Even the cautious and halting R.V. so far forgets itself as here to preserve the familiar 'save'.

St Paul's οὐκ ἐμὲ λελύπηκεν ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μέρους (2 Cor. ii 5) may be another N.T. example, but, if R.V. is here right, and the antithesis is really between ἐμέ and ὑμᾶς, it cannot be adduced.

The Greek then does not seem to furnish any ground for a rendering as awkward as it is erroneous, though, curiously enough, it was not till their latest issues that Liddell and Scott gave due prominence to an employment of ἀλλά long recognized and admitted by scholars.

What is the origin of the gloss?

The Vulgate has 'non est meum dare vobis sed quibus paratum est a Patre meo'. Here the interpolation of *vobis* makes 'sed' follow naturally rather than 'nisi', but does not tell against 'quibus' standing for 'iis quibus' after 'dare', and so preserving the Saviour as the Giver. In St Mark Wordsworth and White omit 'vobis', but it was in f., which may have represented the text corrected by Jerome.

Erasmus unfortunately went astray with 'iis continget quibus'. Beza objected to 'continget' and introduced 'dabitur', with the remark that, as it was understood in Greek, he expressed it in Latin. Of the great English Versions, Wicklif followed the Vulgate:—

'To sit at my riȝt half or left half it is not mine to ȝeve to you, but to whiche it is made redi of my fadir.'

Tyndale accurately renders the Greek:—

'To syt on my ryght hond and on my lyft hond is not myne to geve, but to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.'

Cranmer infelicitously reproduces the 'continget' of Erasmus:—

'To syt on my right hande and on my left is not myne to geve, but it shall chaunce unto them that it is prepared for of my Father.'

The Geneva Bible first shews the present 'it shall be geven'.

The Rheims Version, like Wicklif, follows the Vulgate. The error, therefore, appears to have been imported into English by Cranmer and the Genevan translators from the Latin of Erasmus and Beza.

Bengel, at all events, did not regard our Lord as denying His prerogative: 'hac sive oppositione sive exceptione (nam res eodem recidit) non negat Iesus suum esse dare (vide Apoc. iii 21) sed limitat, declaratque subiectum cui daturus sit et tempus ordinemque'.

Had readers of the fourth and fifth centuries understood the Greek in the sense of the gloss of the Dutch, French, and English reformers, it is easy to imagine what a Megiddo ground of controversy it might have become, like the famous Prov. viii 22 of the LXX, or John xiv 28. So far as my own reading has gone, I do not know of its being ever quoted quite in the sense of A.V. There is, indeed, an interesting note on Matt. xx 23 in St Basil's fourth book against Eunomius, but St Basil cites the verse, without a suspicion that any one would regard it as more than a limitation of the prerogative of the Son to assign the thrones, and only to point the need of active goodness on the part of disciples. 'He is able to give, though the request be unjust.' A similar hortative use of the passage is to be found in the fifth Festal Letter of Athanasius, § 3, and in the twenty-seventh Oration of St Gregory of Nazianzus, § 14.

St Chrysostom's treatment of the passage in his eighth Homily against the Anomoeans and his sixty-fifth Homily on St Matthew is curious. He takes ἀλλά to mean *sed*, not *nisi*, but the antithesis is between the

Lord who is not a giver—at least not a mere giver—and the fighters in the battle of life, on whose conduct the result depends:—*Δείκνυσιν ὅτι οὔτε αὐτοῦ οὔτε τοῦ πατρὸς ἀλλ' ἑτέρων τινῶν. . . . τίσι δὲ ἡτοίμασται; τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων δυναμένοις γενέσθαι λαμπροῖς. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ εἶπεν "Οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι ἀλλὰ τοῦ πατρός μου", ἵνα μὴ ἀσθενεῖν μηδὲ ἀτονεῖν αὐτὸν φαίη τις πρὸς τὴν ἀντίδοσιν· ἀλλὰ πῶς; "οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν ἀλλ' ἐκείνων οἷς ἡτοίμασται".* Theophylact's comment on the passage in St Matthew is *οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι κατὰ χάριν τὸν στέφανον ἀλλ' ᾧ ἡτοίμασται, τουτέστι τῷ δραμόντι καὶ νικήσαντι.* On St Mark, where the Latin version and the punctuation in Migne's edition indicate the editors' adoption of the reading preserved in R.V., the Greek is *οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμοῦ τοῦ δικαίου κριτοῦ τὸ δοῦναι ὑμῖν κατὰ χάριν τὴν τιμὴν ταύτην, οὐ γὰρ ἂν δίκαιος εἴην· ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀγωνισάμενοις, ἐκείνοις ἡτοίμασται ἡ τιμὴ αὕτη.*

The true sense of the original is well put by Bishop Walsham How in the S. P. C. K. Commentary, and is admitted by Alford and by the Speaker's Commentary.

BLOMFIELD JACKSON.

THE ORIGINAL HOME OF CODEX CLAROMONTANUS (D PAUL).

ON deciding to examine the character of the text used by Ambrosiaster as the basis of his commentaries on the Pauline epistles, I consulted Mr F. C. Burkitt about the best way to study it. On his advice, I collated first the text found in all the Pauline quotations in Lucifer of Cagliari and the text in Ambrosiaster with the Vulgate; second, the text used by Cyprian's *Testimonia ad Quirinum* (codex Lauresha-mensis) in all its quotations and that of Ambrosiaster with the Latin of Codex Claromontanus (d_2). Having, on the completion of my work, submitted the results to Mr Burkitt, I was advised to add 'd_2' to such variations from the Vulgate as appeared in the first apparatus, and '*vg*' to those differences from d_2 which were noted in the second. He kindly started this double work for me by noting several instances of agreement and called my attention to some agreements between Lucifer and d_2. I have since noted that he refers to this kinship in his important article in the *Encyclopedia Biblica*.

I make this personal explanation, because any truth there may be in the *theses* about to be propounded is ultimately due to Mr Burkitt's advice, while, if the theories should be decided to be erroneous, he may be entirely absolved from responsibility.