

ἐναντι τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts viii. 21), can no longer be confined to biblical Greek (as Grimm) is proved by its occurrence in the translation of a Roman senatus consultum, *Syll.* 300⁵² (ii/B.C.) περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγματος ὕστερον ἐναντι Γαῶν Δοκρετίου βουλευσασθαι ἔδοξεν: cf. also for imperial times OP 495⁵ (A.D. 181-9), ἐναντι Πέλα. Wackernagel, *Hellenistica*, p. 1 ff., shows that the word came into the Κοινή about 300 B.C. from Cretan, Delphian, or a like dialect, helped by the fact that the Attic ἐναντίον had this sense.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "EXPOSITOR."

SIR,—

I am much perplexed by a statement which "X" has made in his interesting paper published in the December number of the EXPOSITOR, p. 535. He says:

"We meet the same contradictory phenomenon in the recently discovered *Syr.-Sin. Palimpsest*, which reproduces a codex of the earliest date, worked on in all probability by a thoroughly heretical scribe; so much so indeed as to require very drastic treatment at the hands of the orthodox librarian, even to erasure with a knife."

Does this refer to the self-contradictory passage in Matthew i. 16?

I may safely say that no one has studied the Sinai palimpsest for a longer time, nor examined it more carefully than I have done. In 1895, on my third visit to Sinai, I filled up most of the gaps in the published text, which, for want of time, had been left by the three decipherers of 1893 (the larger portion of these having been left by the late Professor Bensly). They naturally occurred in the most illegible por-

tions of the MS. I examined all difficult passages again and again during my subsequent visits to Sinai in 1897, 1902, 1903 and 1906, working at it eight hours a day for ninety-six days. And I have at the present moment a new and more complete edition of the whole text in the Press. It will be published next year by Messrs. Williams and Norgate.

I am, therefore, in a position to state :

I. That the page containing Matthew i. 16 shows no signs of scraping or erasure, but that it is distinctly legible throughout. It is one of the best preserved pages in the whole MS.

II. That, while several other pages have been scraped as with a knife, this scraping has been done impartially, with the sole apparent purpose of getting a clear surface whereon to write the "Stories of Holy Women," edited in the seventh or eighth century by John of Beth-Mari.

III. I have never observed any case of an erasure in the interests of orthodoxy or the reverse. Nor has any rumour reached me that such a case has been noticed by one of the other decipherers.

I do not now enter on the question of the peculiar reading in Matthew i. 16. I am concerned only to correct a misstatement, due probably to "X" having put together, in his own mind, the fact of an apparently heretical reading existing on a very legible page, and the fact of a knife or some other sharp instrument having been used, in the seventh or eighth century, *on some other pages*. It is curious that so serious a misapprehension should have arisen with regard to a document which actually exists in our own time, and has been open to inspection by any Syriac scholar who may have visited the Convent of St. Catherine since its text was first published in 1894.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

AGNES SMITH LEWIS.