

[A Tale of Two Constantines: Rethinking Codex Sinaiticus, Part 3](#)

History of the Codex & Forensic Evidence

Transcript

Pastor Bryan Ross

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

June 18, 2017

The last two Sundays we've been talking about Codex Sinaiticus, the reasons we're doing that, (I've kind of gone over the back story; I don't really want to spend a lot of time on that necessarily today.) and we've been looking at things related to the age of the Codex, whether the Codex is really a 4th Century codex, and so what we've done so far is basically looked at two major points.

I've laid out a timeline for you and I'm going to do that again but add some different stuff to it this time in a little bit; but we basically have looked at two points of significance and that is the Shepard of Hermas and the Epistle of Barnabas, so what we've seen so far just really quick is:

In **1844** Tischendorf supposedly first finds the first 43 leaves and he takes them back with him to Germany and those become known as Codex Frederico Augustanus named after the King of Saxony that finances the trip.

Tischendorf goes back to Mt. Sinai in **1853** and he finds nothing.

We've seen that in **1855/56** Simonides publishes a Greek copy of Hermas; Constantin Simonides publishes a Greek copy of Hermas.

In **1859** Tischendorf goes back to St. Catherine's Monastery and he retrieves the remaining 315 some odd leaves and this becomes known as Codex Sinaiticus.

We've seen last week that in **1860** Constantin Simonides ends up in Great Britain to analyze some manuscripts that had been purchased by a guy named Joseph Mayer, and it's at that point he's shown by B. W. Newton a copy of what Tischendorf is fixing to publish. He says, "I wrote that in 1862."

In **September, 1862** Simonides writes to the British newspaper *The Guardian* and says that he claimed to have written Codex Sinaiticus all the way back here in **1839/1840** at Mt. Athos, Greece as part of a project sponsored by his uncle Benedict.

We know that he publishes a standalone copy of Hermas in **1856**. We saw last time, in **1843** he publishes a standalone copy of Barnabas, and so Simonides is responsible for two highly significant printings. Hermas and Barnabas are two of the distinguishing features of Codex Sinaiticus and Simonides has published both of them before Tischendorf discovers anything.

So all of that is review; this is the third time you've seen this basic timeline stuff. What I want to talk to you about today is essentially two things assuming we have time to do it and that is I want to talk to you

about some more details related to this, and then I want to start getting into some forensic evidence about the Codex itself.

Two weeks ago, Bud Chrysler handed me this booklet; this was put out by the British Museum in **1934** [5:52]. This is the second edition of a booklet that they put out shortly after they acquired the Codex from the Russians. Remember I told you that the cash-strapped Soviet Union sells the Codex to the British Museum in the 1930's. So, when they got it they put out a couple of pieces of literature sort of talking about it a little bit.

So, before I read that to you I want to remind you about something that James Farrer said about this in **1907** in his book *Literary Forgeries*. He says:

“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 what Farrer is saying is that before Tischendorf supposedly discovers the first 43 leaves in 1844, is there any known record of anybody seeing this thing, of it being entered into the logs of the library at St. Catherine's Monastery, is there any known record of this Codex existing before Tischendorf “sees it for the first time” supposedly in 1844? Farrer says no; he says there's no known record of that happening.

Back to the British Museum's piece from 1934.....there are a couple of lines in here that I want to read to you comparing Sinaiticus with Vaticanus:

“Whereas Vaticanus has remained safe for a period during the Napoleonic wars in the security of the Vatican Library since the 15th Century and the Alexandrinus [7:45] ever since it was presented in 1627 to Charles the First of England..... It is indeed likely, though not certain (so this is referring to Codex Sinaiticus), that it had been seen nearly a century before by the Italian traveler, Valentino Donato, but it remained totally unknown to the world at large until in May, 1844 the great German scholar Constantin Tischendorf during a visit to the Monastery at St. Catherine's found 129 leaves in a waste paper basket about to be consigned to the furnace in which two other basketfuls, so told him by the librarian, had already been consumed. Forty-three of these leaves had been obtained as a gift and afterwards presented by him to the King of Saxony.”

So, Farrer says there's no record of anybody seeing it before 1844. This piece put out by the British Library said that this Italian guy, Valentino Donato says, ‘... may have though not certain’, he may have seen it 100 years before that.

Dr. Daniel Wallace from Dallas Theological Seminary... This is put out by Chris Pinto, this is the guy who made the documentary that got all this conversation started back in 2012; but he put out a piece answering Dr. Daniel Wallace on *Codex Sinaiticus and the Simonides Affair*, and he also talks about this explorer and it says here:

“Italian explorer of 1761”, perhaps the most significant point made by Dr. Wallace is the assertion that an Italian explorer mentions seeing Codex Sinaiticus in the year 1761 after a visit to St. Catherine's Monastery. Dr. Wallace tells us,

“In 1761 an Italian explorer, Valentino Donato visited St. Catherine’s and described a manuscript he saw there that matches Sinaiticus to a T.”

So, is he making a much stronger claim about this than what the British Museum made in 1934? So, he’s saying this guy saw it, he described it to a T.

“This was 79 years before Simonides forged it and 59 years before Simonides was born.”

Then Pinto responds and he says:

“If this were true it would shatter the story of Simonides with a single stroke, but did the Italian explorer describe Codex Sinaiticus to a T as Dr. Wallace asserts? An examination of Donato’s journal entry reveals the contrary. Thankfully the specific words he wrote are recorded by the British Library on their website under the History section of the Codex.”

Now this is interesting because do I already have an historical piece that was put out by the British Museum in 1934? The website says:

“The first written record of Codex Sinaiticus *may be* (emphasis mine) identifiable in the journal of an Italian visitor to the monastery in 1761. In it the naturalist, Valentino Donato, reported having seen at the monastery a Bible comprising leaves of handsome, large, delicate and square-shaped parchment written in a round and handsome script.”

Notice that the scholars at the British Museum tell us this *may be* (emphasis mine) a reference to Sinaiticus. They are not quite as confident as Dr. Wallace, this is because Donato’s description is relatively vague and can scarcely be as precise or to a T as Dr. Wallace has asserted. Donato writes about the bible he saw in terms that might also apply to 1,000 other works depending upon how a person identifies what it means to be ‘handsome’ in the world of manuscripts. We should also consider that there are currently more than 3,000 manuscripts at St. Catherine’s Monastery and there may have been more back in 1761.

And then he goes on to say that this guy Donato, if he saw anything, he does not mention that it is a four-column codex. He does not mention the 2,300 marginal corrections. He does not mention the ending of the Gospel of Mark being missing from the Codex, and he does not mention the including of Hermas and Barnabas in the Codex. So, in other words, whatever this guy saw is it not clear at all that he saw Codex Sinaiticus based on his own description of what he saw?

In the five-minute clip of James White, he’s talking about this incident here where the monks are burning the parchment like we read about in the piece from the British Museum and Tischendorf is like, “What are you guys doing?” and starts looking through these so-called rubble bins of stuff they’re about ready to burn and he finds this thing that he considers to be this ancient codex, and what ends up happening is he makes a big deal about this and then all of a sudden suspicion is raised that oh, maybe we’re about ready to burn this big valuable thing, and then the monks change their position, and this is the story according to Tischendorf. But what James White says in the video is that the monks aren’t used to having this strange European Protestant dude in the library.

So, I was doing some research and I came across a book called *Traveling through Sinai*, and there's a whole section in this book entitled The Library of the Convent, so these are descriptions of the library of Mt. Sinai. There is an entry here by a guy....it says, The Library 1815 – so this would be over here before any of this stuff [timeline on board beginning with 1839/40] – this is by a guy named William Turner, and he says:

“To my inquiries after manuscripts and a library the priest answered that they had only three bibles and I took their word the more readily, as Pollock states they had no rare manuscripts.”

So, this guy in **1815** asks in the library about manuscripts; they say they have three bibles, and he believes them because of something that another guy, Pollock, stated. So, I went back and I found Pococke [holds up printed sheets **15:27**]. This is from a book called *The Description of East and Other Countries, Vol. I, Observations on Egypt*, and this thing is dated from **1743**, 100 years before this thing happens in 1844.

So, as I'm looking at this, he's got an entire chapter on Mt. Sinai. He's got drawings of the topography of the Mt. Sinai region where St. Catherine's Monastery is. He's even got the position of the monastery laid out [**16:15**] and marked out for you as where it's at in relationship to the surrounding countryside. He's got maps of where it is. He's even got a map in here of the layout of the monastery [**16:34**]. So, this is all from 1743, 100 years before Tischendorf discovers anything.

I want to go to page 153 at the top of this paragraph – listen to what he says: “When pilgrims arrive at the convent...”

Now that is a very important statement. Why is that an important statement? Why is the statement, “When pilgrims arrive at the convent” a very important statement? This establishes that this a religious pilgrimage site 100 years before Tischendorf discovers anything? So when James White talks about these monks not being used to outsiders being present in their midst does he know what he's talking about? Let me read more:

“When pilgrims arrive at the convent a caloyer or lay-brother is appointed to attend on them, to prepare their provisions in a place apart which is served in their chamber. They are shown all the chapels and offices of the convent.”

So, a pilgrim to St. Catherine's monastery, now think about that just for a minute – in the religious world why would I want to go to St. Catherine's Monastery? This is where Moses supposedly got the Ten Commandments, and I could drink from the well of Moses and I could do all this stuff that religious pilgrims would want to do. So, what this is establishing is that St. Catherine's Monastery has a long history of:

- a. Pilgrims coming to it.
- b. People being assigned to the pilgrims to not only see to their needs but also give them tours of the monastery.

“They are shown all the chapels and offices of the convent, the library where there are a few manuscripts, but I saw none that were rare.”

So, here's a guy 100 years before Tischendorf saying that he went there, he got a tour of it, he looked around the library, asked in the library and he didn't see any manuscripts in that library that are rare.

Tischendorf describes the Codex sitting out in the middle in a storage container for anybody to see. So, this guy says this in **1743**. Now I'm going to go back to the piece by Turner – in **1815** he said again:

“To my inquiries after manuscripts and a library, the priests answered that they had only three bibles and I took their word the more readily as Pococke states that they had no rare manuscripts.”

So again, that's this guy right here that I just read to you.

“But Mr. Banks (*and he's referring to a William John Banks who visited in 1813, so two years before this guy is describing his visit in 1815.*), by preserving and rummaging, found out a library of 2,000 volumes.”

So, the guy in **1813**, he's poking around in there and he assesses that there are 2,000 volumes.

“...2,000 volumes of which three quarters were manuscripts and of these nine tenths were Greek, the greater part were theological but some were interesting. Mr. Banks brought away a thick manuscript containing Hespriato on Greek matters...” (*And all this stuff that's not necessarily even related to the bible it's just ancient Greek philosophy and writing.*)

So, is a guy there 100 years before Tischendorf? Yes. Is he shown the library? Does he see anything rare or startling or out of place? Is a guy there in **1813** and another guy there in **1815** that are able to spend enough time to know roughly what's in that library, how many volumes they have and all of that? And what do they report finding? Nothing. Do they have three bibles? Could this Italian guy have seen something when he went in **1761**? Yes, but does that guarantee that he actually saw Codex Sinaiticus?

In **1845** a Russian Orthodox Archimandrite goes to St. Catherine's Monastery. So, this is the year after Tischendorf finds the first 43 leaves in 1844. Have there been people here and a long history of pilgrims coming to the monastery and is there anything of any value or significance reported of having been found as far as rare, ancient biblical manuscripts? No.

Tischendorf finds what he finds in **1844**; the next year a Russian Archimandrite named Porphyry Uspensky shows up and he writes about this:

“Russian Orthodox Porphyry Uspensky described the Sinaiticus manuscript in his 1856 book detailing his 1845 visit.”

So, he writes a book in **1856** about when he went in 1845. This is all written in Slovak but it has been translated into English, let me read to you what he describes, pay attention to the details:

“The best Greek manuscripts are stored in the Prior's cells. There are only four of them.”

Now the other guys before him in 1813 and 1815 said there were three, now there are four.

“There are only four of them and they are very precious for their antiquity, rarity and handwriting features, their content, the elegance of the beautiful faces of the saints and their entertaining drawings and paintings.

“The first manuscript containing the OT which was incomplete and the entire NT with the epistle of St. Barnabas and the book of Hermas was written on the finest white parchment in four columns of a long and wide sheet.”

What is he describing? He is describing the Codex Sinaiticus; has anybody before that point right there [1843/44] [24:44] ever described seeing it? Have there been centuries of people coming and going out of the monastery and has anybody ever said there's a really valuable thing down there, you've got to go check it out?

So Uspensky in 1845, he's describing looking at whatever he [Tischendorf] didn't take with him when he left in May 1844; so now in 1845 is there definitely something there? Now there's a couple of things you need to notice about that.

1. They're described as being locked in the Prior's cells.

Why do you think that is? Where did [Tischendorf] describe it as being? Even in his story does he say that when he expressed interest in what they had he aroused the suspicion of the monks? So now do the monks believe that they've got something? And so instead of just keeping it out where everybody can see it now they start locking it in the Prior's cells. Now this helps explain why when he [Tischendorf] comes back in 1853 he doesn't find anything because it's not where it used to be, they've moved it.

2. Now there are four bibles, when back here in 1813 and 1815 there were only three bibles.

Were their manuscripts there in 1761 for the Italian explorer to have found or seen? Yes, but that doesn't necessarily mean they were Codex Sinaiticus. Does Uspensky describe the particular details of exactly what we've observed as being contained in Codex Sinaiticus? And the other thing he says is that it's on finest white parchment.

Q: So, in 1845 it was bound....1844....

A: That's if you believe Tischendorf.

Q: Tischendorf must have taken something.....

A: It's my personal opinion that he's not telling the truth and that he cuts out 43 leaves; he cuts it out and takes it with him.

Q: So, he takes out some of the OT then?

A: Yeah, he takes out 43 leaves of the OT. Now the OT was never complete to begin with and there's a lot of stuff we could get into about that, but we don't have time at the moment to do that.

Q: Is that the same thing as vellum?

A: Yes, parchment is vellum.

So what Uspensky describes seeing in 1845 matches exactly with what we've observed as being the key distinguishing features of the Codex: it's four columns, it's on parchment, it contains part of the OT, all of the NT, Hermas and Barnabas.

One more thing about Uspensky: after all of this and Tischendorf getting the rest of it and coming back and it all starting to be printed.....

“After the publication of Imperial Edition in 1862, a Russian Archimandrite Porphyry Uspensky who had seen the manuscript at Sinai between Tischendorf's second and third visits to St. Catherine's, but who had been unable to make use of the manuscript then published a pamphlet entitled *Opinion of the Archimandrite Porphyry* regarding the Sinitic manuscript which contains the OT incomplete and the whole of the NT and the epistle of the holy apostle Barnabas and the book of Hermas which attacks the orthodoxy of the Codex.”

So, here's a Russian Archimandrite saying that the orthodoxy of the Codex should be called into question because it contains Barnabas and Hermas. And is he describing exactly what's in it? But then he goes on and he makes this really interesting statement:

“One can appreciate that Porphyry had reason to be chagrined that Tischendorf had succeeded in obtaining the manuscript when he had been unable to remove it from Mt. Sinai....”

So, the author of this book, J.K. Elliott, is saying the reason why he's writing this is because he's just ticked that he didn't get to take it with him. [29:54]

“...unable to remove it from Sinai, but again it is the tone of his criticism which is of interest, showing that there were certain features about Codex Sinaiticus, in this case its text differing as it does so often from the Byzantine manuscripts.”

So, this Russian Archimandrite is calling into question the authenticity of the Codex because of the wide, variant readings that differ from the Byzantine text, and he's saying that it is therefore fake; it's not the true text. Then he goes on and he says:

“These relics have been exposed in the sight of the whole people of the capitol for the space of two weeks and this people looked affectionately on the relic of Sinitic antiquity and kissed it devoutly knowing nothing of its heretical origin, neither perceiving any foul odor from it, I expect that Tischendorf knowing well how dangerous this relic is for us, laughed in secret at our blissful ignorance.”

That's interesting! Remember when we were discussing the originals and the attitude people would have if the originals still existed and how they would kiss them and worship them and do all this stuff? What are the Russian people doing when this codex is put on display in public? They're doing exactly the thing that you would expect sinful men to do.

So that's 1845. **1846**, Lord Lindsey, another British guy, he says:

“In the Archbishop’s apartment now used as the treasury we were shown a most beautiful manuscript of the Gospels in Greek on vellum in uncials of capital letters of gold..... I thought it good that this were in the British Museum....”

He talks about the illuminations and so on and so forth; I don’t think he’s talking here directly about Codex Sinaiticus because Codex Sinaiticus has no illuminations in it or drop caps, but the point I want you to get is again, he describes these things as now being kept in the Archbishop’s apartment.

So, the shenanigans of Tischendorf in 1844, has it caused the monks at the monastery to change their practice in how they’re dealing with this stuff? So when he comes in 1853 he finds what? Nothing. When he comes again in 1859 he has to almost cajole it out of them before they show it to him, and when they show it to him, guess where they take him to show it to him according to Tischendorf? They take him into the Prior’s apartment where he pulls it off the shelf and shows it to him.

I’m going to go back to Simonides’ own account because I was asked some questions this week about how does the Codex get from Mt. Athos, Greece where he and Benedict and the calligrapher Dionysius, how does it get from Mt. Athos to Sinai? I’m quoting from what Simonides wrote to the British paper *The Guardian*; he says:

“I therefore took possession of the book and prepared it by taking out the leaf containing the discourse....”

What he’s talking about here is, remember that the goal is to prepare a gift for the Czar of Russia, so what Simonides claims is he went through the monastery at Mt. Athos and he found a fairly large codex that was relatively blank that only had a couple of things written on it, and so he cut that out and he started with a book that had blank sheets in it already and then he transcribes onto that what becomes the Codex Sinaiticus. So, he says:

“I therefore took possession of the book and prepared it by taking out the leaf containing the discourse, and by removing several others injured by time and moths, after which I began my task. First I copied out the Old and the New Testaments, then the epistle of Barnabas, the first part of the pastoral writings of Hermas in capital letters or uncial characters in a style known in calligraphy as (*some fancy Greek word*).

“The transcription of the remaining apostolic writings, however, I declined because the supply of parchment ran short and severe loss which I sustained in the death of Benedict induced me to hand the work over to one of the binders of the monastery for the purpose of replacing the original covers made of wood and covered with leather which I had removed for convenience, and when I had done so I took it into my possession.”

So, before he’s done he runs out of parchment, number 1, and number 2 his uncle dies. So, if the whole goal of this was for the uncle to get a printing press so he could print stuff and now the uncle’s gone, this sort of throws this whole thing into question.

“Some time after this, having removed to Constantinople, I showed the works to the patriarchs Anthimus and Constantius.”

One thing I want you to notice here, if he's lying does he include a lot of details here that he could be checked on? Most of the time when people lie do they do this? No! So, he says he goes to Constantinople and he shows it to Anthimus and Constantius and communicates to them the reason for the transcription. So, he tells them what's going on.

“Constantius took it and having thoroughly examined it, urged me to present it to the Library of Sinai which I accordingly promised to do.”

So, when he takes the thing when he's done from Athos to Constantinople; he shows it to these two Greek Orthodox churchman and they tell him to take it to Sinai.

“Constantius had previously been Bishop of Sinai.”

So, this guy here had previously been the Bishop of Sinai. I've got a note here: “Constantius the First of Constantinople was Bishop of Sinai from 1805 to 1830.” Simonides shows it to him. For 25 years this guy has been Bishop of Sinai and when he sees it what does he say? ‘Simonides, how did you get our Codex from Sinai? You thief!’ He's never seen it before and he tells him to put it there.

“... [Constantius was] Imperial Patriarch from 1830 to 1834.”

Anthimus was Bishop of Constantinople from 1840 to 1841 and then again from 1848 to 1852.

“Constantius having previously been Bishop of Sinai and since his resignation of that office had again become Perpetual Bishop of that place. Shortly after this I was placed under the protection of the illustrious Countess Entlag and her brother, A. S. Strausus, by the companion of two patriarchs, but before departing for Odessa I went over the Island of Pillages to visit Constantius to perform my promise of giving up the manuscript to the library of Mt. Sinai.

“The patriarch, however, was absent from home and I consequently left the packet for him with a letter. On his return he wrote me the following answer: “My dearly beloved son in the Holy Spirit Simonides, grace be with you and peace from God. I receive with unfeigned satisfaction your truly valuable transcription of the Holy Scriptures, namely the Old and New Testaments together with the epistle Barnabas and the first part of the pastoral writings of Hermas bound in one volume, which shall be placed in the Library of Mt. Sinai according to your wish, but I exhort you earnestly if ever by God's will you should return to the sacred Mt. Athos to finish the work as you originally designed it and he will reward you. But with me of the third of the next month I may give you letters...””

But this explains how the thing gets from Athos to Sinai. Then he goes on and he talks about all these different people, places, and things; he talks about where he was; he talks about all these different things that happened to him.

Q: To my thinking it's significant that they define it as the finest white parchment and it's supposed to be a century old.

A: You're anticipating nicely where I want to go next. So from the same letter to *The Guardian* newspaper from September 1862, Simonides says:

“In 1852 I saw it there myself and begged the librarian to inform me how the monastery had acquired it but he did not appear to know anything of the matter, and I for my part said nothing; however I examined the manuscript and found it much altered, having an older appearance than it ought to have.”

Now remember, 1845 Uspensky said it was the finest white parchment. What does Tischendorf do? He separates these 43 leaves from the rest of them and takes it back with him to Leipzig, Germany and presents them as a gift. Why is that important? Fred, you actually brought up a great point that I want to get into and use the internet for [42:55]. This is what I was talking about, getting into some forensic evidence. On the left [Codex website image on projector 43:12], these are photographs of the 43 leaves from 1844 Codex Frederico Augustanus, they are still to this day, white.

These leaves are from the 1859 St. Petersburg section [43:33]. Are they the same color? They are not the same color. When Uspensky describes this in 1845 he says that it's snow white parchment, and this is after Tischendorf took the first 43 leaves. Now all of a sudden when they show up over here they look yellow.

Now if that's not enough for you let's look at a couple other things. Look at this [44:16]. This is a photograph of every leaf in the whole Codex. What do you see? You see how all of these are a lighter color than the rest of them? All these light ones are the 43 leaves that Tischendorf took in 1844. They're still white. The first ones Tischendorf takes are still white. The ones that he takes later on are now all of a sudden mysteriously a different color.

Check it out, just so you can see, here are contiguous pages [45:05], so if you were looking in a book, this is the way this would lay in the book. This page is one color; the very next page is a different color. This one's even more visible. [45:23] This is one of the ones he cut out [on the left]; this is one of the ones he left [on the right], so physically from a forensic analysis, the thing is not aged in a way that is even remotely....if this [page on the right] is aged to this degree why would the page immediately adjacent to it not be aged accordingly? Unless these things had been separated from each other and somebody had messed with it. There are two or three more examples of these contiguous pages that are not the same color.

This is from **1913**, *New Textual Criticism It's History and Results* by James Alexander M'Clymont page 44 in a footnote:

“When we read of Constantine... (*That's talking about Emperor Constantine back in the day. I'm just going to cut to the chase for the sake of time.*) The latter was rescued from oblivion nearly 50 years ago having been found in the Monastery St. Catherine's Mt. Sinai by the famous critic Tischendorf and now lies in the Library of St. Petersburg; it was written on snow white vellum supposed to have been made from the skin of antelopes.”

He says it depends upon which portion of it you saw. If you saw the part that was in Germany it was white. If you saw the portion of it that was in Russia for a time it wasn't white. When Uspensky saw it in 1845 he described the whole thing. He sees it after he takes the first 43 leaves and he says that the whole thing is still white, and later on you see the obvious funny business that's happened to the Codex. Somebody took that thing and aged it to make it look old.

Simonides says that when he saw it again in 1852 that it didn't look like it should have looked, that it looked like somebody had messed with it to make it look aged. Who do we know had their hands on it during that time frame? The only two people that we know that had their hands on it during that time frame, well maybe three, were Tischendorf, Uspensky and the monks at Sinai. Now you tell me who you think the most likely culprit is for who did something to it.

A couple other things from a forensic standpoint: In its April, 1863 edition, *The Christian Remembrancer* editorial asks a question which Elliott considers a telling amusing point against Simonides and the question is this, "Are the worm-eaten holes through the letters, or do the letters avoid the holes?"

If the thing is old and it was aged in a consistent way and moths got into it and worms got into it, they would have just eaten through the page and they didn't care what they would have eaten through. So even this question is being raised in **1863** by *The Christian Remembrancer*. This is becoming an important point.

[Back to projector – Quire 12, Folio 6] I want to draw your attention to this [50:30]. *The Christian Remembrancer* raised this point in 1863. Notice how these two lines [50:40] all of a sudden bend upward and the letters all of a sudden get shorter so they can miss [wormhole]. The wormhole was already in the parchment when the scribe put the text on the parchment. Does that match the story? What did Simonides say? He said that he found a codex of largely blank parchment; he said he cut out a little bit of writing and he cut out some leaves that had obvious damage on them, that were so damaged he couldn't use, and that he wrote on that parchment.

So whoever the scribe was, are they writing around the wormhole? You understand why that's important because if a worm got into this after the fact, would the worm have just gone through that page without any consideration whatsoever for what was written on that page? So whoever put the text on the page, did they clearly avoid the wormhole on purpose?

If you go to the same section on the reverse side [Codex website on projector 52:24], that this word (this would be the opposite side), this word is spelled and spaced out so that it misses the wormhole. We could go on and on with this kind of thing. I have time to show you one more example. I'm going to go to quire 38 and folio 1 and the verses side....do you see why putting this thing online has reopened a whole thing here? Now the whole world can see what was actually going on in this particular Codex.

I want column 4...do you see that on this line there's some kind of blemish right here? [53:33] do you see that the scribe stopped this line short to avoid the blemish? One more, this one's hilarious. I'm going to go to quire 42, folio 6, column 2. While we wait for that.....

You see we have a lot of different things going on here: you have the distinguishing features of the Codex, you have the things that people have said about it; literally does it appear that this thing just drops out of the clear blue sky in 1844? The only credible story to explain how this thing exists is the fact that Simonides made it. The distinguishing features are in it.

See they know I'm looking at it so they shut it down [website].

In the middle of all this a friend of Simonides named Kallinikos writes the British papers to try to exonerate his friend Simonides. Have we already seen the British newspapers making a lot of stuff up

and telling lies about Donaldson and *The Star of the East* newspaper and about all these things that could have been corroborated? So they publish a letter from a guy named Kallinikos of Sinai and he says the following (He's talking about being the librarian of the monastery):

“... having been so from the year 1841 to 1858 assured me, belonged to the library of the monastery and was marked in its ancient catalogues.”

So here's a guy claiming that the monastery at Mt. Sinai has a catalogue and in the catalogue from ancient times they have marked that they have possession of this Codex. Now why is this important? There's one real easy way to prove Simonides is lying – just bring forth the catalogue and prove that it was there. This catalogue was never produced. Not only that, Simonides himself doesn't waste an opportunity; he says in a later letter:

“I emphatically deny that the Codex Sinaiticus was inscribed in an ancient catalogue for the good reason that no ancient catalogue exists. There was none there whatever until I made a catalogue during my visit from the patriarch of Constantinople who was Bishop of Mt. Sinai.”

So here's the point – if you want to disprove Simonides, just go get the catalogue and [show it], but instead they have to make stuff up, lie about him, say that he's forging all of this stuff. Just think about that just for one minute. They paint Simonides as the great, brilliant forger that's forging everything except the one thing that he's claiming to have actually done. Just think about that.

When Kallinikos writes to the British papers to corroborate his friend's story, they immediately accuse him of making up Kallinikos and forging the letters as Kallinikos, even though they had the appropriate postmarks from Alexandria, Egypt.

In **1895** Spyridon Lampros did a catalogue of Greek manuscripts on Mt. Athos, volume 1. In volume 2 in 1900 he did the second volume of Greek manuscripts at Mt. Athos, and right here on page 454 is a record that Benedict, Simonides and Kallinikos were all on Mt. Athos together working on a manuscript in **1841**.

So he did exist, he was real and he was there when Simonides and he said they were there. Independent corroboration of the point.

Q: How much did the museum pay for that...?

A: I don't know that factoid off the top of my head but it was a few million bucks at least. It was a lot of money, and that's in the Depression that they're buying it.

Man in class: \$500,000

A: Yeah, something like that; I don't know what that equates to in Russian money, but it was significant.

Man: They don't want to see that thing turn into a fake.

A: That's why, and they even say, I've got the article here but we don't have time to get into it, but they even say that the inks, the parchments, they've never been forensically tested, they've never subjected them to forensic analysis. They [Leipzig University] supposedly had a test scheduled in like 2015 and cancelled it.