

[A Tale of Two Constantines: Rethinking Codex Sinaiticus , Part 5](#)

Archaic Mark: A Category One Forgery & Which Part is Scripture?

Transcript

Pastor Bryan Ross

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

July 2, 2017

I want to start out by talking about a few things of what we've seen so far:

- Hermas
- Epistle of Barnabas
- History of the Codex
- Forensic Evidence
- Mark 16

...and laying out three things that I want to get through today:

- Odds and Ends
- Archaic Mark (2427)
- Not Best

I started out in the first lesson by talking to you about Hermas and why the Shepard of Hermas included in the end of the Codex is a big deal; I just want to touch upon what we've already looked at.

In the second lesson we talked about the epistle of Barnabas and why that's important as far as Simonides publishing that in **1843** and then it showing up in the Codex.

So just to recap: Hermas and Barnabas are both published independently before Tischendorf discovers the bulk of the Codex in **1859**. We've talked about why that's a problem for the age of the Codex.

We talked about the history of the Codex in lesson three, and I introduced you to some of the forensic evidence; so we talked about the fact that it is not known to have existed until **1844**; we talked about people all the way into the **1740's** had been to St. Catherine's Monastery, had seen the library, said there was nothing, and then all of a sudden, boom, in **1844** this thing is there.

We talked about how Simonides has a story to account for that even though most people seemingly don't believe him. So, in lesson three we looked at the history of the Codex and we touched on forensic evidence.

Last Sunday in lesson four we looked at some more forensic evidence and I talked to you the bulk of the hour about Mark 16.

Today what I want to talk to you about is some odds and ends first; just some different things that I think are important for you to know that don't necessarily really fit into any clear category. Then I want to talk to you about Archaic Mark (or manuscript 2427) and why that's important. At the end I want to spend some time talking to you about why even if this were the oldest – let's say that this was old, why it is certainly not the best.

So, to get started here on the odds and ends, last Sunday I was talking to you about Mark 16 and I told you that I thought Tischendorf altered the end of Mark 16 in Codex Sinaiticus through a cancel sheet to make it match Codex Vaticanus. I found this [holds up paper] this week, it is dated from 1801; this is a printing of a critical apparatus of Codex Vaticanus. I've started here at Mark 16 (you can see Roman numerals Mark 16), then if I go to verse 8 then all of this material underneath [3:10] is a discussion in Latin of the fact that the end of Mark 16 is missing. The reason I'm bringing this up to you is to show you beyond doubt, was it a known fact as early as **1801** that Codex Vaticanus did not have Mark 16:9-20 in it?

I'm just telling you that because it is my belief that Tischendorf has that altered once he discovers he has a problem because of Hermas and Barnabas; we went over all of that last week – so has Mark 16 altered because it is the quickest way to make it agree with Codex Vaticanus, which he needs to have that agreement.

I also found from **1864** [3:53] from the magazine *The Homilist*; on page 158 there are reproduced two lengthy letters (remember I told you that Tischendorf received commendation from the Pope and praise and adulation from the Pope when he found this thing); so there's a short one and a long one. I'm going to read you the short one:

“The following is part of a letter which Tischendorf received from the Pope in the spring of **1862**, ‘We do not doubt that your researchers and laborers are destined to be of great value to scholars of the Catholic persuasion as you are enriching the sacred sciences with new treasures. We congratulate you that the celebrity you deservedly enjoy has been still more increased by this new work, especially as your noble sentiments separate you very widely from those who as you have well remarked rejoice in their contempt for religion over the shipwreck of faith, the decay of Christianity.’”

So, these guys view all this as going to save Christianity from, you know in the new modern era of modernism and science and in higher criticism and all this stuff, so I just share that with you, there's more on that.

So still on the topic of odds and ends – **January 28, 1863**, *The Guardian* newspaper printed an open letter from Simonides to Tischendorf, and it said:

“Again, I seriously assert that I wrote the Codex and that Tischendorf has given the names of Frederico Augustanus and Sinaiticus, and I challenge him to produce these codices in London and in a public meeting of literary men assembled for the purpose it shall be once and forever decided whether he or Simonides has spoken truly.”

So, what is Simonides doing there? He’s basically throwing the gauntlet down to Tischendorf, said I’m going to be here in London, you bring the Codex and we’ll have this thing out here in public and we’ll see what’s going on here.

In first edition **1893**, *Books in Manuscript* by Falconer Madan, he’s got on page 142 in a section of literary forgeries; he has an interesting section about this that’s pertinent to what I just said:

“After Simonides appeared only once with any prominence before the public when in **1862** he boldly asserted that he himself had written the whole of Codex Sinaiticus which Tischendorf had brought in **1859** from (*that’s a typo, that’s not right, it should be 1859*) the monastery of St. Catherine’s Mt. Sinai. The statement was of course received with utmost incredulity, but Simonides asserted not only that he had written it but that in view of the probable skepticism of scholars he had placed certain private signs on particular leaves of the Codex.

When pressed to specify these marks he gave a list of the leaves on which were to be found his initials and other monograms. The test was a fair one and the manuscript which was at St. Petersburg was carefully inspected. Every leaf designated by Simonides was found to be imperfect at the part where the mark was supposed to have been found; but many thought that the wily Greek had acquired through private friends a note of some imperfect leaves in the manuscript and had made unscrupulous use of the information.”

So, they’re accusing him of having insider information and saying that he did these things again, so can Simonides do anything right? No.

I told you about his friend Kallinikos. This is from *The Journal of Sacred Literature* in a letter dated **November, 1861**. Kallinikos says the following:

“This Codex, my son, I saw several times, and particularly three of the acrostics which thou showest me at Athos when I overlooked thee in the pleasant writing room of thine. The first thus...”

So, he gives three acrostics or three statements that Simonides put in the text to indicate that he wrote it.

“...I also saw the fourth and the fifth but do not remember them now and also calligraphic symbols, and especially the numerous corrections again of thine and annotations both of thyself and of thy uncle.”

So, is this guy saying that he saw Simonides put these distinguishing marks into the Codex? I don't have time to read it to you but there's another section where Simonides talks about that he put initials in, and that the initials that he put in to identify what he had been copying in that particular section, and according to all of the evidence all these places that Simonides said that he did this have now been removed. One of the biggest ones seems to be in Genesis 24. I want to show you Genesis 24 because if my memory is correct, Genesis 24 is one of those pages that I showed you that had uneven or unnatural wear on it; remember I showed you that page last time that was cut at almost an exact right angle, and we talked about the difference between natural and unnatural wear?

One of the sources that I've read, and I've been over, this stack of stuff is just growing, it's just ridiculous, but I was back through trying to find exactly where I read it and I couldn't find it exactly, but I do remember reading something about Genesis 24, so I'm going to go there and I think if my memory is correct you're going to see that this is one of the examples of unnatural wear in the section of the Codex for Genesis 24.

So, while that loads, the bottom line here is Simonides claims to have done this; Kallinikos is seemingly confirming it; he challenges Tischendorf to a debate to produce the Codex, and does Tischendorf show up?

It's not the right angle one, but you can see does this page have heavy mutilation on it? [11:33] something's been done to Genesis 24, which again if my memory is correct is one of the chapters that he said he put one of these marks on the page. He says, this is from *The Journal of Sacred Literature* a few months later; Simonides writes:

“The real test of the genuineness of Codex Sinaiticus is neglected. The public were assured in May Tischendorf was to be in London armed with a portion at least of his great Codex. I've waited in England hoping to have the opportunity of meeting him face to face to prove him in error, but May has come and gone and “the discoverer” has not appeared. Would the favorers of the antiquity of the manuscript persuade him to come at once and brave the ordeal or else forever hold his peace?”

So, is Simonides really calling Tischendorf out here? He's calling him out. There's one bulleted section I wanted to read from the book by Sorensen (which by the way I should say I do believe now to have some pretty significant issues, but I don't have time to get into all that):

“In his original letter to the Guardian of **September 3, 1862** Simonides wrote of credulity. The context was his claim of writing Sinaiticus. He was speaking of being accustomed to being defamed as a forger and the accompanying derogatory comments about him. The poignant irony is that the one document he claims to have produced, Sinaiticus, was disclaimed while he was routinely accused of having forged just about every other document that he ever touched.”

So, he's accused of forging every other thing that he's ever had anything to do with except that one.

“He openly said that he produced Sinaiticus but the establishment frantically denied it.”

So those are just some of the odds and ends.

Q: The letter from the Pope – some are challenging Christianity or something like that, was that close to the time of the Reformation?

A: No, this is a letter from the Pope addressed to Tischendorf in 1862 after he has found the remaining portion of the Codex and taken it back to St. Petersburg.

Q: I wonder if he's thinking it will help slow down the Reformation.

A: That's a good question; I think that he may have thought that because the Catholic Church, I don't have this document with me today, but one of the Popes put out just an excoriating piece against the Protestant bible societies, in the early half of the 1800's, that were sending copies of the KJB all over the known world.

A: It seems like the biggest challenge was the Reformation to the Catholic Church.

A: Yeah, the Pope views what Tischendorf is doing as favorable to Catholicism, so it is beyond my ability to comprehend how supposedly Protestant Christians can think and function and operate with this idea that none of this stuff matters and that it's just six of one, half a dozen of another. I cannot wrap my mind around that because even the Pope thinks that what Tischendorf is doing is going to benefit Catholicism.

I'm just going to mention this – this stack right here I just got this week [15:43]; this entire stack is about the controversy over when Simonides died. There's not even agreement about when this guy died. He was last seen in Britain in October, 1865. By 1867 there are reports that he died in Cairo from leprosy in 1867. In 1869 he's seen, in all places, in St. Petersburg working on a project. There are sources here that I have that literally say that he faked his death and that he didn't really actually die until 1890. How I got turned onto that, I was just wondering, because I had questions about what we're going to talk about next (Archaic Mark), and I'm like when did Simonides die, and I went to the internet and the very Wikipedia entry on Simonides, it gave one date of 1867 and another date of 1890; so, they can't even agree in that piece on Simonides when the guy actually died.

In the Nestle-Aland critical text, the 27th edition (There is now out a 28th edition); there is a manuscript out there that goes by the number of 2427 and it is a manuscript of the book of Mark. All it is, is the book of Mark. I'm reading from my notes:

“This was viewed as an important textual reading and it is rated by Kurt and Barbara Aland as a category one manuscript.”

Let me tell you what that means – so in the text of the NT published in **1985** by Kurt and Barbara Aland, they say the following (they rate Mark 2427 as a category one manuscript and this is how they define a category one manuscript); they say:

“It is a manuscript of a very special quality which should be considered in establishing the original text – example: the Alexandrian text belongs here. The papyri and uncials up to the **3rd and 4th Century** belong here almost automatically because they represent the text of the early period.”

Would Codex Sinaiticus by that definition be a category one manuscript? They’re also saying that 2427 is a category one manuscript. I already told you that this is only of the Gospel of Mark. The thing about this is that this particular manuscript is dated from the **14th Century**, or the 1300’s If it’s dated from the 14th Century, the 1300’s, how is it that it’s a category one manuscript?

The reasons for that is that it is almost completely the same as the text of Codex Vaticanus, so because Codex Vaticanus is an ancient uncial 4th Century manuscript and it’s category one, and this one is almost identical with it [19:43] then this one [14th Century] also has to be category one by the “so-called” rules that these guys have established for textual criticism.

As I said, it is almost completely the same text as Codex Vaticanus in Mark, so it was viewed as a...it [2427 Mark] was also called “Archaic Mark” [20:19], and it was largely viewed as a primitive text of Mark. So in other words, this 1300’s manuscript was a copy of an older manuscript that was representative of this particular set of readings that are found in here, and it just so happens that Archaic Mark is almost identical with Codex Vaticanus [20:54]; so since Codex Vaticanus is a category one manuscript and this one [1300’s] is almost identical with that one [2427 Archaic Mark], therefore this one has to be a category one manuscript.

“It seemed like a more primitive text of Mark and text scholars said it might be the closest thing we have to what Mark originally said.”

I need to pause here and give credit to David W. Daniels from Chick Publication for the content I’m sharing with you right now about this particular document.

Problems start in **1989**. In 1989 a scientist named Orna (I forget her first name) recognizes what she believes to be Prussian blue ink in Archaic Mark [21:57]. The problem is that Prussian blue ink was not invented until **1704** and it was not sold commercially until the **1720’s**; so now our **4th Century** manuscript that is supposed to be Archaic Mark can’t be any older than [1720’s].

The first known provenance of Archaic Mark is **1917** when it shows up in the collection of a tax collector in Athens, Greece [22:45]; so this text was not known to exist before 1917.

In **2006** a woman at University of Chicago named Margaret Mitchell did digital photographs for the first time of Archaic Mark, or 2427, and sent a piece of the Codex out to be tested chemically and scientifically. Here's what she found:

In 2006 there's a chemical test of manuscript 2427 or Archaic Mark. It uncovers:

1. Prussian blue was the original ink, so in other words it was not touched up later on with a different ink.
2. There is a second blue coloring called synthetic ultramarine blue. Synthetic ultramarine blue did not come onto the market until the **1820's**. [24:16] So now the first known existence of this is **1917**; now based upon a chemical forensic analysis of the ink it could not have been written before **1820**.
3. It also uncovered zinc white which was a pigment that was not available until **1825**.
4. It also uncovered zinc sulfide pigment which was not available until **1874**.

Here's a document that by all the text scholars, Kurt and Barbara Aland, all these people who are supposed to know what they're talking about, is rated in the critical apparatus of the 27th edition of the Nestle-Aland Greek text as a category one manuscript and the thing was a complete fake the whole time, and it was created at some time between **1874** and **1917**, but yet this is supposed to be this great category one that's an original witness to the book of Mark.

So, the **1300's** witness to Vaticanus was a **19th Century** forgery, clearly demonstrated to be such by the forensic analysis of the pigments of the ink. Remember I've already told you that in 2015 the British Museum cancelled the forensic tests on Codex Sinaiticus.

Now here's the thing, what you could say is that doesn't matter because whoever made it after 1874 still could have been copying something that was old. Well a guy named Carlson wanted to know about this, and so in Archaic Mark there are three distinct readings: Stephen Mark 6:2, 8:11 and 14:14. So Stephen Carlson reasons as follows, he goes, "Well if I can find a manuscript that matches in these three readings I will have found the source document for Archaic Mark."

So this guy searched and searched and searched until finally he hit upon an **1860** edition of the Greek NT by a guy named Philip Buttmann and he has the exact same wording and mistakes in those same three verses that are found in Archaic Mark; so that means that Archaic Mark was produced after **1874** and before **1917** using a copy of Vaticanus that was put forth by Philip Buttmann in **1860** going off the one by Cardinal Mai from **1857**; this thing is copied and creates this particular document.

That University of Chicago still has this document in their possession (Archaic Mark) and they use it now as a case study to the text forgeries. The so-called experts that are trying to recover and restore for us the NT, that tell us what God actually said by taking a critical approach are completely fooled by a 19th Century forgery that can be demonstrated to be such done off of a

copy of Vaticanus by Philip Buttmann from 1860; and yet this was for years a category one witness to how Mark should read.

In this issue here with Archaic Mark there is no known provenance, let me say it this way, there are three tests that you could use:

1. The test of provenance, where did the thing come from?
2. The test of chain of custody, how did it get to us today?
3. A chemical forensic analysis of the Codex.

With Codex Sinaiticus we're just supposed to take whose word for it? Tischendorf's. Is there any clear chain of custody and has the thing ever been tested chemically? The reason I'm talking to you about Archaic Mark is because here is a prime example of where the so-called experts are completely fooled by a forged manuscript that was created in the 19th century and they want to tell you on the basis of this how your bible should read.

I'm sorry but does that sound like preservation? Does that sound like what we observed when we studied the doctrine of preservation over the last nine months? It doesn't sound like it to me. But this is the point; there were some points of tension where If you're going to go with the experts, this is what you're going to get. If you're going to go with God's word, God's word would never lead you to think about things like this. God's word would teach you to think about it the way I laid out: Multiplicity of copies that are available and that are in use.

Codex Sinaiticus is not used by a single bible-believing Christian before 1844 because it wasn't even known to have existed, and yet they're telling you that that is the true NT. I'm sorry but that's just beyond my ability to comprehend that. [31:14]

By the way, all this is happening in roughly the last ten years. I personally believe that somebody at the British Museum or somewhere else is scared to death to have that Codex tested because they're afraid that it will be proven that Simonides was telling the truth.

So far we've been talking about why Codex Sinaiticus is not old; now I want to do some things with you talking about why it's nowhere near the best either; so get two passages: Get I Chronicles 19:17 in one hand, and get Ezra 9:9 in the other.

1 Chronicles 19:17 *And it was told David; and he gathered all Israel, and passed over Jordan, and came upon them, and set the battle in array against them. So when David had put the battle in array against the Syrians, they fought with him.*

Ezra 9:9 *For we were bondmen; yet our God hath not forsaken us in our bondage, but hath extended mercy unto us in the sight of the kings of Persia....*

Why do you think I had you skip from I Chronicles 19:17 to Ezra 9:9? That Codex right there skips the entire portion of the OT. It goes from I Chronicles 19:17 all the way to Ezra 9:9, and

the same scribe does it. [34:24] Here it is [Codex on projector]; here is I Chronicles 19:17 and then, boom, it goes straight to Ezra 9:9 and it does right on that line without stopping, without noting a mistake, without missing a beat it just jumps over all of the rest of I Chronicles, 2 Chronicles and the first part of Ezra, and goes straight to Ezra 9:9 and just leaves it out, never fixes it, never corrects it, never puts it back in. And this is supposed to be “the best”.

I’m telling you, if my students did that they’d get an F in my class. If they gave me the introduction and jumped straight to the conclusion, “And in conclusion, Mr. Ross, here you go”, because you can’t just leave out a section. Right there on that line in that Codex it jumps from I Chronicles 19:17 all the way to Ezra 9:9, never tells you it, never notes it, never corrects it, never fixes it; the scribe just keeps going and it’s the same scribe that did it.

The same scribe is the same one who takes out the woman taken in adultery in John 7 and the beginning of John 8. It’s the same scribe. Go to Luke 2:33:

Luke 2:33 *And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.*

Sinaiticus says ‘His father’; it takes out *Joseph* and switches it with *father*. The same guy that leaves out the end of I Chronicles, all II Chronicles and the beginning of Ezra, is making these types of changes as he is copying the text. Are there modern versions today in print that will change the reading of Luke 2:33 and call Joseph the father of Jesus? And we’re just supposed to accept that this doesn’t affect any doctrine. I’m sorry, but where did the reading come from? It came from that Codex and it came from the same scribe, so what scribe in this Codex is the one that’s actually giving you scripture? Is it scribe A? Is it Scribe D, the boss corrector? Is it scribe B1 who wrote the Major Prophets, or is it scribe B2 who wrote the Minor Prophets and Hermas?

Let’s look at a couple of things. Ecclesiastes 4:3 [on Codex 37:25]. Notice they left out the entire verse and wrote it in the margin. At least this time they correct the mistake.

I’m going to go to the beginning of Isaiah. You see all this stuff up here at the top of the page? [37:44] See how this has been overwritten and at the top of the page it has a bunch of scribbles and stuff? They’re debating here how the beginning of Isaiah should read.

This is a video from David W. Daniels from Chick Publication [38:21]; look at this page. What on this page is scripture? What exactly is scripture? [Pointing to scribbled notes all over the page] They’re omitting (I think this is from Nehemiah) verses 22, 39 through 42; they’ve got to put it there. There’s another mistake here – they erased over and then rewrote chapter 22 verse 47; they omitted verse 38 and had to reinsert it up there; so what is scripture here and what isn’t scripture, and this is supposed to be “the best”, one of the best manuscripts available to reconstruct the text.

[Pulls up video of David W. Daniels with closed caption] Look at that page. What is scripture on that page? [39:27] Who’s going to tell me what is? Is James White going to tell me what’s scripture and what isn’t? Is Daniel Wallace going to tell me? Are Kurt and Barbara Aland going

to tell me? Who's going to tell me what's scripture on that page and what isn't? Is the Catholic Church going to tell me? Who's going to tell me? Who gets to decide how that should read?

You know what this has the marks of to me? This has the marks of a rough draft. This has the marks of exactly what Simonides said they were doing – correct it all up, get it how you want it and then rewrite it. Who is going to tell me which one of those corrections is scripture and which one isn't? They run the length of the whole page, and this is supposed to be “the best” copy of the bible that we have....this is so ridiculous...they are going to use this manuscript to change the text of the Protestant Reformation. Unbelievable!

Let me ask you a question: Has changing the bible from the traditional Received text and its translations in the vernacular languages to this new and so-called improved text based upon older and better manuscripts and all this sort of stuff, has it increased biblical literacy in the body of Christ? Has it led to a clear articulation of dispensational truth? Has it led to more people having confidence in the word of God or has it spawned more doubt in the word of God? How could it not spawn doubt when you just look at the thing, how are you supposed to know what's scripture and what isn't?

I've got a few more things here and then I've got some stats. There's another one. What's scripture on this page [Codex on projector 41:57]? Who's going to tell me what it is? Which marginal corrections, who's doing it, how are we even going to know what it is?

Q: Most ministers are being trained with this kind of teaching and system, and so many of them in pulpits today don't really teach the authority of scripture and don't stand on the fundamental doctrines of the faith.

A: Correct, because there's a domino effect, and this is what I was trying to get at. Remember around Christmas time, the first of the year I was talking about why preservation matters, and I talked to you about how Protestant bibliology was changed after 1860 and I went over what those forces were that changed it? That's exactly what we're seeing here and why they made this change; and the impact of the change was not positive.

Q: So, they're coming out of seminary not even having any confidence in the authority of scripture.

A: Until recently they came out of seminary never even having seen that thing a day in their life. They're just taking someone else's word for it, and it's not God's word, it's what Kurt and Barbara Aland or what Bruce Metzger, or Nestle said, or the United Bible Society or whoever else; they're taking their word for it about what it should be, when these guys are taking a book like Archaic Mark and telling us it's a category one manuscript when it is a complete fake, proven to be a fake, admitted by the University of Chicago (the institution that possesses the manuscript in their collection) now uses it in a case study in forgery; but it was a category one manuscript in the 27th edition of the Nestle-Aland Greek text. So that's why we got to put out a 28th [edition] because the text is never settled. If the text is ever settled these guys don't have a job. Sorry but that's true.

Q: So the guy who wrote it, Simonides, he wrote it, so how did we get to this [?] doing all this other stuff then?

A: What you see here is completely consistent with the process he described. He talked about himself, his uncle Benedict and the scribe Dionysius going over his work and making corrections to it. This completely smacks of something that was done in a relatively hurried fashion. How do you skip from I Chronicles 19:17 to Ezra 9:9 like nothing ever happened and don't even tell anybody and seemingly not even realizing that you [messed up. There are three crosses in the margin with a note acknowledging the blunder but the text is never corrected.].

Let me ask you a question: If this is the so-called "oldest and best" (here's the inconsistency of all this stuff here), why do you have II Chronicles in your bible at all if it's not in Sinaiticus, because aren't they leaving the end of Mark 16 out because it's not in two of them?

Another thing, this OT is in what language? This is the Septuagint; this is a Greek OT, but now it's supposed to be "oldest and best"? I thought we couldn't trust translations as category one witnesses. Uh-oh. Do you see what you are left with if you are going to believe what these guys are saying over the way God would have you think about it in his word? Now I'm getting a little bit fired up here, I'll admit it ... but this is an important deal.

The body of Christ has been duped. The body of Christ has been sold the biggest bill of goods related to what their bible is and they have bought it and they think that people like you and I that take the position that we hold are a bunch of uneducated hillbillies and backwards bumpkins who just don't want to enter the modern world. But I'm not done.

Sinaiticus is missing:

- All but four chapters of Genesis
- All of Exodus
- All but three chapters of Leviticus
- All but 12 chapters of Numbers
- All but five chapters of Deuteronomy
- All but three chapters of Joshua
- All but seven chapters of Judges

The following are missing altogether:

- Ruth
- 1 and 2 Samuel
- 1 and 2 Kings
- It has parts of Chronicles twice
- All of 2 Chronicles
- It skips from 1 Chronicles 19:17 all the way to Ezra 9:9
- The entire book of Lamentations after chapter 2 verse 20.
- All of Ezekiel

- All of Daniel
- All of Hosea
- All of Amos
- All of Micah

It's missing 11 entire books and most of six more – ¼ of the bible is not found in Sinaiticus, but it's "oldest and best". You should trust it to fundamentally rewrite what the bible is.

What's equally telling is what it does have. So it's missing all of that but it conveniently has:

- Tobin
- Judith
- 1 and 4 Maccabees
- Wisdom
- And Sirach

It has apocrypha in it; but it's missing canonical books in the OT. We already know that in the NT it has:

- Barnabas
- Hermas

Barnabas teaches baptismal regeneration; the Epistle of Barnabas teaches that Jesus wasn't God until his baptism, but we should trust Sinaiticus, and we should trust the scholars to interpret what on that page is actually scripture and what isn't.

Here's the thing ... the average Christian listens to all this and they read the marginal notes and they have no concept of what's even being said. There are 23,000 corrections in Sinaiticus; that averages out to 30 corrections per page – this is the most corrected biblical manuscript known to exist and yet we're supposed to accept it as "the best".

These are just factual statements about the Codex. There are other things that we could get into about how it just makes the most blatant silly kind of mistakes. Remember last week we talked about how it said the difference between Galilee and Judea, Nazareth to Judea vs. Nazareth of Galilee, and how there's a 70 mile difference between those two things and how the Codex Sinaiticus got it wrong and how it's the only manuscript in the whole [world] to even read that way because they're trying to stuff it in there on that cancel sheet for Mark 16.

There is all of this stuff and frankly we could go on and on and on going through stuff here on this website, but at some point I'm going to have to beg your patience because this will probably be discussed in the future in more detail. These six studies have just been sort of an overview of things.

Q: Just a clarification – so if Chronicles all the way to Ezra has been left out of the original document, and there are current bibles based upon that translation, how do these fit back into those bibles?

A: In that case what they have to do is disregard their own rules; and so, what they end up doing is having an arbitrary thing. In Mark this one's a category one, but in 2 Chronicles it's not a category one, it's a category two. You look at the critical apparatus and you're like, how is that, how is it the case that in one case it's a category one (the same manuscript) and in another case it's a category two or three ... other than the fact that that's what the text critic is telling you. They are the authority now telling people what the bible should say and how it should read. That is not the approach that observes what God said, that he preserved what he said, and we should be able to locate in some fashion what he preserved for us. It is a completely, totally opposite approach.

Q: Based on the same question but with a comment, if the translators can't use their "oldest and best" to produce a whole bible, they have to bring in...

A: Correct, they absolutely cannot do that.

Q: ...they have to bring in other manuscripts in order to...

A: They have to bring in other manuscripts and other witnesses, so you will see if you look at the critical apparatus you will see (and somebody will say, what are you talking about?), if you look at a page of the Nestle 28th edition, at the bottom of the page there's a bunch of footnotes and it's got a bunch of letters and numbers and stuff – all of those different things represent different manuscripts. It will show what manuscripts speak to a particular disputed reading.

In one case you're going to have, well in the 27th edition Archaic Mark was a category one manuscript; now it's a known forgery, so what do we have to do? We have to make a new edition, but even beyond that, if you go through each section of it you are going to see that they are not consistent in how they rate....in one verse they'll give a weight of a category one to one text, which in the same page or in a different part they're now going to say that's a category three, and you're like well why and they don't really ever tell you, you just have to take their word for it; so the whole thing is always being juggled around.

I don't think it's the oldest. It is certainly not the best, and this particular Codex along with the one that had belonged to the Vatican were the primary manuscripts that were used to fundamentally change the bible, and since that time, I don't want to say all, I will say most all, virtually all translations have come off of that text.

This 28th edition of the Nestle-Aland text is a modern update of essentially the same thought process that was started by Westcott and Hort that they got from Tischendorf that was assembled in the late 19th Century. I would say to you that it does not create maximum certainty, it creates maximum doubt.

If you read some of the stuff we were going through in the last term – if you read W. Edward Glenny's work, if you read Combs' work, if you read Daniel Wallace's work, they will get upset with Textus Receptus and King James advocates for saying they just want maximum certainty. Well, duh! Don't you need to know what God said? Either God preserved what he said or he didn't, and if he did then should we be able to find what it is and is it in a manuscript that was

buried in a monastery until 1844 that has every mark of not only *not* being old, but potentially being in the same category as Archaic Mark, but also secondly *not* being anything close to “the best”?