

Tale of Two Constantines: Rethinking Codex Sinaiticus, Part 2

Review & Discussion of the Epistle of Barnabas

Transcript

Pastor Bryan Ross

[Grace Life Bible Church](#), Grand Rapids, MI

June 11, 2017

We're going to continue doing what we did last Sunday, and that was looking at some things related to Codex Sinaiticus. I did think of a title for this and I've decided to call it *A Tale of Two Constantines: Rethinking Codex Sinaiticus*, so this would be Part 2. So again, we're going a lot more informal than we normally do, I just have hand-written stuff to myself as far as things that I want to remember to talk about, but I want to just start with a review of some things.

Last Sunday we started talking about some things that I've learned about Codex Sinaiticus since April 1, so it's only been about 2 ½ months that I've been looking at this. The first thing I want to do is review some basic facts about Codex Sinaiticus.

The definition of a codex: A codex is basically an early form of a book. It's called Codex Sinaiticus because of where it was found; it was found at St. Catherine's Monastery at Mt. Sinai. There's a monastery there, it's called St. Catherine's Monastery, it's located at Mt. Sinai. The reason it's called Codex Sinaiticus is because of where it's found.

Some other distinguishing features:

- It is a four-column codex. That means there are four columns of printed text. (You can kind of see it up here in the picture [[1:57](#)]).
- It is an uncial codex. An uncial codex means that it is all capital letters; that's different from what is called a miniscule codex which means it's written in all lower-case letters.
- It has part of the OT, not a complete OT, but it has parts of the OT.
- There is a complete NT in it. We saw last time that it included the epistle of Barnabas and that it also included the Shepard of Hermas. (We talked about that last time; we'll review that in a minute.)
- We saw that this was "discovered" for the first time in 1844 (first known finding) by Tischendorf, and he finds the first part at St. Catherine's Monastery at Mt. Sinai.

I want to show you something about that last point. I have right here James Farrer's book from 1907 called *Literary Forgeries*, and as I told you last time, he has an entire chapter about Constantine Simonides and Codex Sinaiticus.

He says the following: "The fact that no visitor to the monastery at Mt. Sinai before 1844 had ever seen or heard of such a work as belonging to the monks." So, he's identifying the fact historically that no one before 1844 had ever before reported seeing this codex at St. Catherine's Monastery at Mt. Sinai, so this is the first known sighting of it.

Pastor Bryan Ross

GRACELIFEBIBLECHURCH.COM

We talked last time at the beginning about how Mark 16, Matthew 5 and other passages are altered in the English bible as a result and based on the authority of this singular Codex. The result of all of this is that it has been largely believed that this is the oldest bible in history, and some people date the thing from the Council of Nicaea at 325 [A.D.], that it is that old, that it is a 4th Century codex and that the thing dates from 325 and, therefore, this would make it one of the oldest bibles in history.

And of course, I also said to you at the beginning last time and I want to make sure that I say this again, it doesn't matter to me whether the thing is an ancient fake or a modern fake. It doesn't matter to me because I've already rejected the Codex based upon a scriptural analysis. When we studied preservation, we ended by talking about a multiplicity of copies, the fact that it is available and the fact that it is in use.

If this is true that this is the first known existence of this thing [1844], that means was this thing ever copied? No. Was this thing ever in use? No. Was this thing available to the church throughout the history of the dispensation of grace? No. So from a scriptural analysis of the Codex for me I would reject it based upon that alone. It doesn't matter to me whether it is an ancient fake or a modern fake; it doesn't matter to me along those lines.

And I'll say it again, if however, it is a modern creation from the 19th Century, it would be absolutely catastrophic to the critical theory because the critical theory is based upon this one and Codex Vaticanus and we'll talk more about that maybe in a future lesson. So that's just some factual things.

I want to review also a few important facts from last week.

1. In 2009 the British Museum in conjunction with the Royal Library of Russia and Leipzig University, they digitized Codex Sinaiticus in 2009 and they put it all online for somebody to look at. I pointed this out to you last time, that those are the partner institutions that were involved in that process.
2. In 2012 Chris Pinto did a video called *Tares Among the Wheat* where he basically brought forward some things about Farrer and a few other things that had been said about the Codex, so that started the conversation in 2012.
3. In 2013 Pinto debated James White on a radio program. James White obviously has taken the exact opposition position; we'll get into that maybe more next time.
4. There was also in 2013 a post-debate exchange between Pinto and White.
5. In 2014 the University of Vienna hosted an entire weekend conference or symposium on this Constantine Simonides fellow.
6. Beginning in December 2015 and running into 2016 David W. Daniels of Chick Publications began a 36-part vlog series entitled *Something Funny about Sinaiticus*.
7. In 2016 William Cooper wrote the Kindle book *The Forging of Codex Sinaiticus* [Now available in paperback.].
8. Earlier this year, and again this was my first introduction into this topic, Dr. David Sorenson published *Neither Oldest Nor Best*.

So, I say all that to tell you that this is not just some King James Only crackpot theory here; this was something that was debated – here are the journals again; this is only one journal [8:38]; this is *The Journal of Sacred Theology and Literature*. This appeared in *The Guardian* newspaper, *The Literary*

Churchmen and three or four other papers in the 1860's for over a three-year period debated the authenticity and the age of the Codex.

I already mentioned J. A. Farrer's 1907 book that has an entire chapter in it regarding the age and antiquity of Codex Sinaiticus, so this is not just some new thing, some crackpot King James Only scheme here; this is an old debate that went away and has now resurfaced, and I do believe that one of the things that has led to the resurfacing of this debate is the fact that they have digitized the entire Codex and made it available online.

Now, all that being said, I also said to you last time that all these resources that have been made available, they're fairly good as far as their information is concerned, but they have one glaring weakness in my opinion, and that is they are far too conspiratorial; and so I told you that I was going to take a real factual approach to just laying some things out about this.

What I want to do is review some things from last week and draw the timeline back up here by way of review and then what I want to do after that is talk (I got some questions this week about who this Simonides guy is), so I want to share a few things with you about him and then I want to end with what I didn't finish last time about the epistle of Barnabas.

We're going to start with **1844**. This is when Tischendorf "discovers" at St. Catherine's Monastery the first 43 leaves of the Codex – so that's this date right here [**10:54**], the first known finding that I just read to you from Farrer. Farrer said that nobody before this time ever reports having seen or uncovered this thing.

I told you last time that when Tischendorf finds the first 43 leaves he takes them back with him to Germany; he gives them to the King of Saxony who financed his trip, he gives them to him as a gift; and he publishes them in something that he calls CFA (Codex Frederico-Augustanis) named after the King of Saxony. So, this is what academic people do when there's some butt kissing and stuff like that that needs to go on, they name things after the people that finance the trip. That is the first known existence, but he only takes 43 leaves of the Codex at that point. We're not going to get into all the details right now about why.

In **1853** Tischendorf goes to St. Catherine's Monastery again and he finds nothing. We'll talk about why that might not be probably next week.

Two years after that, **1855/56**, a different Constantine, a guy named Constantine Simonides, shows up in Leipzig, Germany with a Greek copy of the Shepard of Hermas. Now remember from last week – nobody before this had ever seen a Greek copy of the Shepard of Hermas; they knew it had originally been written in Greek, but the only thing that was known to have survived time and history was Latin copies of the Shepard of Hermas. This is received with great favor by two professors at Leipzig University in 1855 and they quickly moved to publish this Shepard of Hermas in Greek complete with a critical apparatus written by Simonides himself, and they do that in 1856 [Steven Avery says this occurred in Dec., 1855].

That same year [**1856**] Tischendorf comes forward (the same guy that found 43 leaves of the Codex in 1844), the other Constantine, Constantine Tischendorf, comes forward and he says that that copy of Hermas is a fake and that it is a modern work or a modern creation, and that was for a few reasons:

1. There are Modern Greek words in it; the Greek contained in it is not ancient Greek.
2. There are issues with the grammar, which are too complicated for me to try to explain to you right now.
3. There are Latinisms: examples of where the base text was the Latin text and they translated from Latin into Greek. Tischendorf would have known all this because his first claim to fame was a translation of Jerome's Latin Vulgate into Greek, so he would have known and would have been able to identify Latinisms.

A few years after that, **1860**, [holds up a copy of] ... Tischendorf's analysis, and it contains his analysis of the Simonides Greek Heras and you can see him signing off here at the bottom of this [14:54] in July, **1856**. So this is his review of Simonides Greek Heras where he says it's a modern creation based upon these 3 basic points: Modern Greek, grammarm and Latinisms.

In **1859** Tischendorf goes back to St. Catherine's Monastery, he recovers the remaining 315 leaves, he takes them to St. Petersburg because he's there on the auspices of the Czar of Russia and he publishes them as Codex Sinaiticus. Contained in this, as I already said, are a Greek Heras and a Greek Barnabas.

The problem is the Greek of Heras matches this Greek here [Simonides' Heras from 1856] that he's already said is fake. I talked to you about him backtracking. This is from 1860 [holds up a paper [16:26]]; this is by Constantine Tischendorf; this is from 1860 the year after he finds [Codex Sinaiticus]. Has he already said that this Greek Heras produced by Simonides is a fake, a modern fake, right?

But what does he find when he examines Codex Sinaiticus? He finds a Greek copy of Heras that matches the Greek of [Simonides' Heras] that he's already pronounced to be a fake, so he has to backtrack.

This is in 1856, this is in Latin, but with the help of Google Translate I've been able to reproduce at the bottom what he's saying here. I'm going to read it to you in English:

"I am glad to communicate that the Leipzig text (that's this one [Simonides' Heras from 1856], the only he's already said is a fake) is derived not from middle Ages studies, but from the old original text."

Now why does he have to do that? Because he finds bound hard to [Codex Sinaiticus], he finds almost the identical Greek that he's already declared to be a fake [Simonides Heras from 1856].

So here he is in **1860**, Tischendorf recants what he already said about the Greek previously in 1856. This one's from 1856, this one's from 1860 [two papers written by Tischendorf] and he's being forced to backtrack what he already said in 1856 because he knows that if [what he said in 1856] is allowed to stand, it means [Codex Sinaiticus] has to be a modern creation too. I'm going to read the whole thing again:

"I am glad to communicate that the Leipzig text is derived not from Middle Ages studies, but from the old original text. My opposite opinion is proved to be correct insofar as the Leipzig is disfigured by many corruptions....."

So all he says is, ‘This is just my opposite opinion’, and he moves on as though there was never any greater significance to all this. **1863**, Tischendorf does the same thing in *Nuevo Testamemtum Sinaiticum*, which is Latin for the New Testament of Sinaiticus.

Also in **1860**, Simonides ends up in Liverpool, England. The reason he’s in Liverpool is to review a collection of manuscripts by a guy named Joseph Mayer who has retrieved and purchased a set of manuscripts from ancient Egypt talking about, a lot of it has to do with Egyptian history and that kind of thing, and he hires Simonides to go through these. So this is how he gets to England in 1860.

That same year, Plymouth Brethren theologian and former associate, interestingly enough, of John Nelson Darby (dispensational connection to the history here), B.W. Newton, shows him a facsimile copy of Tischendorf’s Codex Sinaiticus, while he is in Liverpool in 1860 [Steven Avery thinks this is a reference to John Newton a surgon of Liverpool]. He immediately says that that’s not an old Codex; I wrote it.

July 27, 1861 a British newspaper runs the following story.

“We understand that in literary circles a rumor prevails that the manuscript now publishing by the Russian government under the direction of Mr. Tischendorf purporting to be a manuscript of the bible from the 4th Century is not an ancient manuscript, but is in its entirety a modern production written by a gentleman now alive who will shortly take measures to establish his claim as to the authorship. The manuscript is known as Codex Sinaiticus and has attracted a large amount of attention throughout Europe. Should the rumor be proved correct, as we believe it will; the disclosures that will follow must be of the greatest interest to archeology.” That’s July 27, 1861.

So Simonides shows up in Liverpool in **1860**, is shown a facsimile copy by B.W. Newton and immediately says, ‘That’s not old; I created it.’ This percolates around until the middle of **1861** when a paper picks up on it and runs the story that there’s a rumor going around that somebody is claiming to be the modern author of Codex Sinaiticus which Tischendorf discovered in 1859 and is now in the process of getting published under the auspices of the Russian government.

The following year, **1862**, and I do need to correct one date from last week – this is **September, 1862** – Simonides writes *The Guardian* newspaper to share his side of the story.

In *The Journal of Scared Literature*, this is from **October, 1862** – the Journal picks up on the article written by *The Guardian* a month before. This is long; this goes page after page after page of Simonides giving his account of the Codex, so let me just summarize a couple of key points for you about this:

1. He claims that he [Simonides] does it in 1839 through 1840.
2. He claims that it was a three-person job; that it was he and his uncle Benedict, who was the leader of the monastery at Mt. Athos, Greece, and another guy named Dionysius who was the calligrapher at the monastery.
3. They claim that the goal was to create a gift for the Czar of Russia in the hopes that the Czar would give the monastery a printing press.

So let me just read a few lines:

“About the end of the year 1839 the venerable Benedict, my uncle, spiritual head of the monastery and holy martyr, Panteleemon in Mt. Athos, wish to present to Emperor Nicholas the First of Russia some gift from the sacred mountain in grateful acknowledgement of the presents which had from time to time been offered to the monastery of the martyr. Not possessing anything which he deemed acceptable, he consulted with the head Procopius and a Russian monk, Paul, and they decided upon a copy of the Old and New Testaments written according to the ancient form in capital letters and on parchment. This together with the remains of seven apostolic fathers, Barnabas, Hermas, Clement Bishop of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papius, Dionysus the Arrogite, the proposed should be bound in gold and presented to the Emperor by a common friend.

“Dionysus, the professional calligrapher at the monastery was then begged to undertake the work but he declined saying that the task was exceedingly difficult, and he would rather not do so. In consequence of this I myself determined to begin the work especially as my beloved uncle seemed earnestly to wish it. Having then examined the principle copies of the Holy Scriptures preserved at Mt. Athos I began to practice the principles of calligraphy and the learned Benedict taking a copy of the Moscow edition of both testaments published and pressed by Greek to illustrate.....collated from ancient one....”

And he's basically saying that he created it and the intended reason why they created it was to give to the Czar of Russia as a gift with the hopes of receiving a printing press in return. So he is claiming that there is a stash of manuscripts at Mt. Athos that are ancient, that are important, that are significant and they want to get them out by getting a printing press, and so this is what he is claiming the story was.

Let me just share a couple more things about Simonides. This is a quote from *The Homilist* paper/journal, and this is what they say about Simonides:

“Dr. Simonides is Greek by birth and he speaks and writes the classical language of his forefathers with fluency, purity and eloquence. He was born in the Island of Hydrangea in the year 1824 being descended (and I think that date is a misprint) on his father's side from many Bishops and Archbishops of the Greek Church. In early life he studied under the learned Benedict, the uncle of his mother who was actually his great uncle, in the monastery at Rhodes on Mt. Athos.

“From this uncle Simonides thoroughly acquired the art of paleography and became so great a proficient therein that few surpass him either in the practice of it or in the diagnosis of manuscripts.

“He has moreover travelled much in Egypt and the East and has made important antiquarian discoveries.”

So they're saying that he's basically unmatched as far as his ability to analyze manuscripts. I told you last time that this guy's almost like an Indiana Jones figure.

This is from *The Bath Chronicle*, a newspaper from Thursday **March 13, 1862**, and it says just in part:

“In Macedonia (*talking about Simonides*) his native country, he was only at the time on a visit, he succeeded in getting upon a very pretty little insurrection among his countrymen, and in conjunction with a few choice spirits who joined him in the leadership of the patriot bands, he one fine morning fell on a detachment of Turkish soldiers, drove them into the river and destroyed some 150 of them before breakfast. In this interesting transaction he received a spent ball on his chest.”

So, he was actually shot and he had the musket wound to prove it. So, this guy is a Greek patriot, he's fighting the Ottoman Turks, he's an expert in calligraphy and paleography and he's doing all of these things. He's literally like I said to you last week, sort of like an Indiana Jones type figure.

In **1864** an English scholar named Donaldson publishes a book called *A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine* and in it he talks about Hermas, and he makes the connection that Greek of Hermas in Codex Sinaiticus is virtually identical to the Greek in the one that Simonides published in 1856. Now we know over here [in *The Guardian*] Simonides claims to have written Codex Sinaiticus. So Donaldson says, “The second class includes but one codex, Codex Palatius of 1500 in the Vatican library; it belongs to the 14th Century.”

You know what that tells you right there, that tells you that if he's right at all, that even if you don't believe Simonides did it in 1840, that what he copied was something that dated from the 14th Century. So that would mean that the oldest it could possibly be is a 14th Century manuscript because it's copying something in its Greek Hermas that is known to have existed then. So he goes on and talks about all of this stuff; I went over that last Sunday, I'm not going to do it again.

In **1874** Donaldson produces an updated copy that contains further information and not so favorable information about Tischendorf – talking about that his story about how he finds all of this and stuff like that is very unbelievable and fanciful, and he makes the same points again in 1874.

Now, the point is that by **1871** the Revision Committee is already meeting to revise the KJB and what ultimately happens, as you know, is they replace it with an entirely new text and so forth. From *The Saturday Review* from **1875**, where they rip on Donaldson because of what he put for the year before in **1874** noting the connection between the Greek Hermas in Codex Sinaiticus with the Greek of Hermas that was already published in **1856**.

Now remember, has Tischendorf already flip-flopped on this? Yes, and so what Donaldson is doing is pointing out there's a connection here and he says that the arguments that are made for the recentness of the Greek Hermas in Codex Sinaiticus are ten-fold stronger when you compare them to what was in Hermas [1856]. So that was *The Saturday Review*; they rip on him and they go on starting at this line, the whole rest of the page, all the way down the back page to the top of the column here, saying what a creep and an idiot Donaldson is.

Just wanted to share with you something about Donaldson:

“Donaldson was elected as a Fellow to the Royal Society of Edenborough in 1867, and he became in 1881 a Professor of Humanity at the University of Aberdeen, and in 1890 he was a Principal of the University at St. Andrews, and he was knighted by Edward the Seventh in 1907 (*so this guy's a real idiot*), by the University of Glasgow an Honorary Doctor of Divinity by the

University of Aberdeen in recognition of his work in church history. (*Well what are the two books I just showed you about?*)

“His principle works include A Modern Greek Grammar for the Use of Classical Students, The Anti-Nicene Christian Library, The Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine, From the Death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council, Lectures on the History of Education in Prussia and England, Expository and Substitutionary Sacrifices of the Greeks, The Westminster Confession of Faith.....” (*But this guy is a complete idiot apparently.*)

Donaldson writes this in **1874**, talking about the connection between the Greek in Hermas and all this sort of stuff. So, he writes that in 1874. **1876**, *The Athenian Journal of Literature, Science and Art* – January to June 1876. They are reviewing a copy of *The Apostolic Fathers*. You will notice that the title of Donaldson’s book is *The Apostolic Fathers*. They are reviewing in this article a copy of *The Apostolic Fathers* that had not been written by Donaldson; they’re reviewing a different man’s edition; but that does not stop them at the bottom of page 53 from going after Donaldson. So listen to what they say:

“The editors are puzzled by an assertion in Donaldson’s *Apostolic Fathers* (*and again, they’re not even reviewing Donaldson but they’re putting this in here for a reason*) on which we are able to throw some light. Dr. Donaldson mentions an edition of the epistle of Barnabas printed by Simonides and containing the text as found in the Sinitic Codex bearing a date of 1843.”

Uh-oh. Donaldson’s saying that in 1843 Simonides produced a Greek copy of Barnabas. Now just think about that. What are two of the distinguishing features of Codex Sinaiticus? Barnabas and Hermas. I told you last week that Simonides already published a Greek copy of the Shepard of Hermas that matched almost identical what was in Codex Sinaiticus. Low and behold, what has he also published? Barnabas. Now think about that. The guy who’s claiming to have written Codex Sinaiticus has already published, before Tischendorf finds anything in 1859, he has already published in Greek two of the distinguishing features of that Codex before anybody has ever even seen that Codex; and the Greek that he publishes for Barnabas, guess what, it matches the Greek Barnabas that’s [in Codex Sinaiticus]. Uh-oh.

Now you think about that. How is that possible?

“....bearing the date of 1843 and the place of publication, Smyrna, the editors put out a query (*So that’s the editors of the Athenian; they put out a query as to the date 1843*) the date given notwithstanding is an apparent improbability is given correctly and the edition of Barnabas is one of the most curious and many fabrications with Simonides devised.”

So, what is the Athenian saying? They’re saying that Simonides made it up.

“The Greek Simonides went to the trouble of printing at his own expense an addition of the epistle of Barnabas for the very purpose of putting the date 1843 upon it.”

You understand what they’re saying? They’re saying that Simonides went out and that at his own expense printed a Barnabas and backdated it to 1843.

“He wished to make people believe that he had had manuscripts of the entire Barnabas before Tischendorf found his famous Codex.”

So, Simonides is a liar and a forger.

“The title page of this strange document states that the text of Barnabas is based on seven manuscripts and this copy which Simonides gave to the writer...” (*It talks about having made some corrections in the Preface.*).

So, they first accuse him of doing what? Well first they’re mad at Donaldson for even bringing it up. Then they accuse Simonides of printing Barnabas in Greek and backdating it to 1843. Then they say:

“Simonides was not content with printing the text, he produced an attestation of its genuineness and date of an addition of a newspaper of Smyrna published in 1843 containing a long review of his work.”

So now what they’re saying is he wasn’t content to just backdate a copy to prove he was being legitimate he actually produced a copy of a newspaper article from a newspaper of Smyrna, Turkey containing a review of it dated 1843. So, he didn’t just print it and backdate it, he produced a fake newspaper article to prove that he...

“The paper and the print of the newspaper looked uncommonly fresh and on subsequent inquiries at Smyrna it was found that no such newspaper had ever existed.”

So now they’re saying he invented the whole newspaper.

“...no such newspaper ever existed and that the printer whose name appeared at the bottom was also entirely unknown. Simonides had taken the trouble to fabricate his newspaper as well as the date of his [Barnabas].”

What are they accusing him of?

1. Printing it and backdating it.
2. Saying that the newspaper never existed.
3. Forging an entire copy of it to prove it.

The book *Report on Smyrna* – **1856**, page 40

“Of the educational development of the middle class any population the character of their favorite journals may be taken as tolerably good indication are three Greek and one French. Of the three Greek one, *The Amalthea*, is a journal of considerable pretensions and the other two, *The Star of the East*. . .”

Did you notice that they never told you in here the name of the newspaper? Why do you think they didn’t tell you that? If they told you the name of the newspaper could you have figured it out and checked for yourself? So, are they totally expecting you to take their word for it and that Donaldson is an idiot, and that Simonides is this gross massive liar and forger? 1856 – Does this prove that that paper existed?

1836 – *Travels in Greece and Turkey*:

“Smyrna seems the headquarters of the missionaries who have established here a religious newspaper called *The Star of the East*.”

The Anti-Nicene Fathers from **1907** – they list a date of the epistle of Barnabas; they note one by Simonides published in 1843. So why is this important? [43:47 – manuscript on projector]

We're going to go to *See the Manuscript*. We're going to go to *Barnabas*. Now it's big enough so you can see it. This is the end of the book of Revelation [first column]; this is the beginning of the epistle of Barnabas [2nd column]. You will notice that the epistle of Barnabas is bound hard to the end of the book of Revelation; so do these have the same origin and provenance then? So, whatever you want to say about the NT in Sinaiticus, you also have to say about the epistle of Barnabas in Sinaiticus because it is bound hard to the end of the book of Revelation and they share the same page.

So *The Athenian* has said that he [Simonides] backdated it and so forth and lied about it; they don't give you the name of the newspaper; they call Donaldson an idiot, and they do all this stuff. So I wrote to the University of Aristotle in Thessaloniki, Greece two weeks ago and I received a PDF copy of the **1843** publication of the epistle of Barnabas by Simonides in 1843. So, what did *The Athenian Journal* say about that? They said that he printed it and that he backdated it.

Then to prove that he wasn't lying what did Simonides produce? He produced a newspaper from *The Star of the East* – a newspaper that they said was not real. There's the title page from *The Star of the East* from **1842** [46:14] proving that the paper did exist.

Then they said, not only did he make up the newspaper, but that he also forged the editorial reviewing his epistle of Barnabas from 1843, and that he lied and that he never did it.

I wrote to a university in Athens, there's the article right there [46:47]. At the bottom of the corner is the beginning of the review of Simonides' *The Shepard of Hermas* from *The Star of the East* dated from 1843. So is Simonides' story checking out according to the relevant facts?

Let me go to a different page in Barnabas (I think it's page 20.), so this is the main text of Barnabas [47:50]. You see these marginal corrections? So why do we have to make all this stuff up about Simonides? Because if you take this base text of the epistle of Barnabas and add the handwritten marginal corrections, guess what they equal – the standalone 1843 publication of the epistle of Barnabas in Greek by Simonides in 1843 before Tischendorf found anything. Then that means that two of the biggest distinguishing features of Codex Sinaiticus are completely explainable by standalone copies of Barnabas and Hermas written by the very guy and published by the very guy who claimed he wrote it in 1840. Now that's a lot to swallow, I know, because I've been trying to swallow it now for 2 ½ months.

So why do we have to invent all this story about what he did in **1843** as not being real? Because somebody knows that Donaldson is on the verge of letting an extremely big cat out of a very big bag that nobody wants anybody to know about. Because when Donaldson writes his second one in **1874** and *The Athenian* response in **1876**, are we way into the process now of that Revision, and are they completely revising the bible based upon that Codex that they think is a 4th Century codex from the year **325**?

And now this guy [Simonides] comes forward and in demonstrable fashion can say, 'I wrote it, it's not old', and two of the very distinguishable features of it that nobody had ever seen before – an entire copy of the epistle of Barnabas in Greek along with Greek Hermas, he has already published and produced in standalone editions before the majority of the thing is found by Tischendorf in **1859**.

That is either the most fanciful coincidence ever in world history, or Simonides is telling the truth. You could still take the position I suppose that he's lying but if you're going to have to explain these extremely improbable oddities if he is not telling the truth.

Let me back up. In **February of 1843** a friend of Simonides, a monk named Kallinikos, says that he saw Simonides at Mt. Athos with a copy of Codex Sinaiticus, going over it. Two months later in **April, 1843** he publishes in Greek the epistle of Barnabas. What do you think he was doing in February of 1843? He was taking this [epistle of Barnabas] along with the corrections and collating them into a standalone [edition].

Now you say, 'Why would he only do Barnabas and Hermas'? Well think about it. If the whole thing is intended to be a gift for the Czar of Russia in the first place, then the only two parts of this thing that would even be legitimate or of interest to anybody in his mind would be the two unique parts, which would be a Greek Barnabas that nobody's ever seen before and a Greek Hermas that nobody's ever seen before. And, oh by the way, if he's doing this in 1843 and he's doing this in 1856 [52:28], then are there, as he claimed in his writing, unique manuscripts at Mt. Athos, Greece that nobody had ever seen before? And his text proves it.

You got to think about this stuff because this is a lot of historical moving around and who's doing what, where, when and why.

Q: Most of these individuals that you're talking about here....with the exception of Donaldson, are they basically Roman Catholic or associated with the Catholic Church or Greek Orthodox?

A: Tischendorf is officially a Lutheran; he's from Germany. Simonides is basically a Greek Orthodox dude who was raised in that family so he's not really...I would consider him to be a Greek Orthodox kind of a believer. And the rest of them in England are all various...the fact that there's a dispensational touchpoint in all this with B. W. Newton just blew me away. B. W. Newton is friends with Tregelles who attacked Simonides, and B. W. Newton was a former associate of John Nelson Darby before they split camp over dispensational [dis]agreements. So the whole thing is just an amazing story.

What I've started with here to me are the two biggest smoking guns in this whole discussion. So if we were lining up dominoes and the question was whether or not we believe Simonides and whether or not he's telling the truth, the Hermas and Barnabas to me, once those two dominoes fall, all the rest of the dominoes fall in favor of Simonides, the rest of the bits of the story. Because you can attach him to independently producing two of the most distinguishing features of this Codex before Tischendorf had seen any of it.

Think about Tischendorf! When he finds that thing in 1859, the remaining portion of it [Codex Sinaiticus] and he realizes that Hermas is in that thing and he realizes that, "Uh-oh, I've already said this, I've got to now I've got to retract, I've got to backtrack or else what I said about this will apply to this and then there goes my whole apple cart [55:47]. All of that is extremely telling about what's going on here, not to mention the fact that all of this is happening – remember, how many times in the class have I stressed that time period from 1860 to 1900?

And then they try to skewer Donaldson in the press and they make up this story and you can prove that the paper did exist, there are existing copies of it – there's the one from the library in Greece and there's

the 1843 Barnabas. Now if all you had was the 1843 Barnabas I guess you could say well maybe he did publish it and backdate it, but when you have the review of it published in 1843, now you're like well then he must be telling the truth.

Q: Is it fair to say that the skewering that you call it.... modern day tactics haven't changed a lot?

A: No they haven't changed a lot and the two biggest objections to him telling the truth are:

1. His age – that Simonides would have been about 20 years old when he did this.
2. Where did he get the readings from?

If you get over the question of age, the second and seemingly more confrontational question would be where did he get the readings from. If he had these readings when he created it, then he obviously had access to readings at Mt. Athos that nobody else had. So that goes out the window. And now the only thing you're left with is could a 20-year-old have done this? I don't know. I see the art that 16, 17 18-year olds produce at my school and I can't do it, so if that's all you have now because you're evaluating this not based on some conspiracy theory, but based upon the facts and what Simonides has access to it, and I should probably write up here that he's claiming that he produced the Codex in 1840.

Q: So people have a problem with a Greek 20 year old being able to write in Greek text?

A: Yup, and one of them is James White; he's got a problem with it. Now, I think Chris Pinto when he debates James White he makes some pretty basic mistakes and James White gets him all bogged down in this big discussion about whether Chris Pinto has ever collated any Greek manuscripts, which Pinto has to obviously answer no, but the question isn't whether or not Pinto or anybody else has ever collated Greek manuscripts, it's has James White seen every Greek manuscript on Mt. Athos? And if his answer is obviously no then he cannot say beyond the possibility of doubt that there are not things at Mt. Athos that he's never seen before (or weren't), maybe there aren't now, but weren't. Because I can show you pretty much it seems beyond reasonable historical doubt that he had access to readings at least in terms of Barnabas and Hermas that nobody had ever seen before he published them.