

[A Tale of Two Constantines: Rethinking Codex Sinaiticus, Part 6](#)

Codex Vaticanus & Concluding Thoughts

Transcript

Pastor Bryan Ross

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

July 23, 2017

Vaticanus:

- Conventional Wisdom
- Drop Caps
- Inconsistent Handwriting
- Missing Books
- Pagination
- Wormholes and Overwriting
- Concluding Thoughts

...So before this point there is no known historical existence of Codex Vaticanus (**1475**, **0:07**)
 ...[inaudible] ...a little bit from Codex Sinaiticus. Do we have any known record of that Codex existing at all before Tischendorf found something in **1844**? No, we have no record of that historically.

There is an entry into the catalog in the Vatican Library in the year **1475** that this Codex was in the Vatican's possession in that particular year. There's no historical record before that and to this day there is a call number or catalog number on the manuscript that is 1209, that's the same number that they originally assigned to it when they entered it into the log in 1475. So, you understand how libraries work, they have a referencing system so you can locate information in the library.

Erasmus in **1521**...reports differ. I've read some sources that say in 1521 Erasmus went to the Vatican Library and looked at the document. So, in 1521 Erasmus is working on his third edition of the Greek NT, now obviously this is going to be the text that Luther and Tyndall are going to use to translate the bible into German and English.

In 1521 Erasmus either goes to the Vatican himself and looks at it or writes to the prefect, or the head librarian of the Vatican Library and asks about the reading in I John 5:7 [inaudible **2:15**]. This is the famous verse ...go to I John 5:7. So the sources disagree somewhat on whether or not, I'm just saying that for the sake of historical honesty, I would love to be able to tell you right now that I can say for sure that he actually went and looked at it himself but I can't do that at this point; all I can say is that there are conflicting reports about he actually went himself or whether he just wrote to the chief librarian and asked him about this.

But the verse in question is 1 John 5:7 where it says:

1 John 5:7 *For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.*

So, this is a verse on the idea of the Trinitarian God, so modern versions are going to leave that verse out or offset it, footnote it, mark it off and say it's not in the two oldest and best manuscripts because that verse is not in Codex Vaticanus.

Why this is important is for the following reason: It demonstrates does Erasmus know that that Codex exists? Yes, so whatever he thinks of, he clearly does not find it to be a valuable witness because he's going to disregard the witness of Codex Vaticanus and ultimately include I John 5:7 in the Textus Receptus.

So, this document has a known existence and it is known to exist for a while, and in 1521 we have a concrete reference point of somebody seeking it out for a research purpose; in this case it is Erasmus as he is compiling his third edition of the Greek New Testament.

So, this one has a known history. It's known to have existed from **1475**. Erasmus is referencing it in 1521, whether he went himself or just wrote to the librarian, he knows it's there and he's ultimately going to reject a ton of readings that are found in Codex Vaticanus. So that sets it apart differently from Codex Sinaiticus. We're still on point one – *Other Conventional Wisdom*.

Q: Being that Constantinople is involved here wasn't there a debate of two churches, Roman Catholic Church...

A: That's later on. When I say later on it depends upon your point of view. The split between the Eastern Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Church happens before 1475, the exact year escapes me; but yes, there is a definitive point in time where the Roman Catholic Church is going to split from what becomes the Greek Orthodox Church, but that's happening before 1475. That had already happened before Luther's Reformation in 1570.

Q: So, the different codices are not a factor in the two different churches, did not bear on the codices?

A: I would say that's a loaded question because ultimately, they do in the sense that the Roman Catholic Church is going to use what is known as a Western text which is going to follow certain readings that the Latin Vulgate was based on, and the Greek Orthodox Church is going to use what is commonly referred to as the Byzantine text.

The Byzantine text differs from the Alexandrian Western text; so when you set a KJB on the table and when you set a modern version on the table, the reason why those differ in English is because of their Greek text basis – what Greek text are the using to do the translation?

So, the critical text theory is based largely on these two things that we're talking about here: Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. When I say Codex Vaticanus, all I'm meaning to identify is this is a document that is in the possession of the Vatican; the Roman Catholic Church is the holder of this document and still is to this day.

Comment: **1054** [when the two churches split?]

In **1809**, interesting point of history, Napoleon takes Codex Vaticanus to France as a spoil of war; so he conquers in Italy, he takes the Codex back with him to France as a spoil of war.

In **1815** the Codex is returned to the Vatican Library. From **1828 through 1838** it is under the control of Cardinal Angelo Mai who is involved in producing a typographical facsimile; remember we talked about that already; so he is largely the custodian of it for that ten-year period as he's working on assembling the information for the typographical printing.

In **May, 1843**, who saw it? Tischendorf saw Codex Vaticanus. Before he goes on his whirl-wind adventure in **1845**, Tregelles saw the Codex and I want to read you something about that. I'm going to read from Sorenson's book, *Neither Oldest nor Best* and he says the following:

“After his visit to the Vatican in 1845 Tregelles said the following, ‘They would not let me open it without searching my pockets and depriving me of my pen, ink and paper, and at the same time two prefects kept me in constant conversation in Latin and if I looked at any page too long they would snatch the book out of my hand.’”

So, do they [the Catholics at the Vatican] want him necessarily looking at it? Apparently not, so these are the known facts in the conventional wisdom about it. Then in **1857** Cardinal Mai publishes the facsimile.

- So what's the earliest known date of the Codex? **1475**.
- Erasmus is aware of it in **1521**.
- Napoleon takes it to France in **1809**; he returns it in **1815**.
- It's under the control of Cardinal Mai from **1828 to 1838**; he's working on preparing the facsimile.
- Tischendorf is allowed to see it in **May, 1843**.
- In **1845** Tregelles sees it.
- In **1857** the Vatican publishes its facsimile.

Scrivener, in **1861** said the following about it:

“Codex Vaticanus 1209 is probably the oldest large vellum manuscript in existence and is the glory of the Vatican Library in Rome. To these legitimate sources of deep interest must be added to almost romantic curiosity with which has been associated with the jealous watchfulness of its original guardians and whom an honest zeal for its safe preservation seems to have now degenerated into a suspicious capricious willfulness and who will show a strange incapacity for making themselves the proper use of a treasure, they secretly permit others more than to gaze upon it. It is so jealously guarded by the Papal authorities that original visitors see nothing of it but in the red Moroccan binding.”

So, in other words, are they letting anybody see the actual Codex?

In February 2015, so a little more than two years ago, the Vatican digitized the Codex. So this is the Vatican website and this is the digitized version of the Codex Vaticanus [12:44]. So again, February 17, 2015 the Vatican released photos of the Codex online. Before this few Protestant scholars were even allowed to examine it. Westcott and Hort and all these guys when they're doing the Revision, they are not doing it with having the original Codex in front of them; they're doing it based upon typographical

facsimile reprints. And let me just add to that – in the middle 1800’s these facsimiles are not like facsimiles that you and I know today. I have in my library at home a 1560 reprint of a Geneva Bible. So, what they did, they took an original 1560 edition, digitally scanned every page and then printed them out to match exactly with the way that Bible looked in 1560.

In the middle 1800’s when all this is going on, do they have the technology the capacity to do that? No. So, before the year 2015 few Protestant scholars were even allowed to see it, so that means that for 150 years text scholars, including Westcott and Hort, had never actually seen the Codex; they never saw the actual Codex, they were just using transcribed typographical facsimiles. Scholars saw the reproduced text, but they never saw the text of the actual Codex.

At the beginning of every biblical book...so this is the beginning of the book of Ephesians [on projector 14:32]...at the beginning of every biblical book in Vaticanus there is what is known as a *Drop Cap*. You see this fancy lettering? This is a drop cap [14:51]. Look at your bible, what’s the first word of the book of Ephesians? Paul. This right here is the Greek letter for the first letter of Paul’s name, so this is the P, as it were, and then the rest of his name is here on the line. This is a feature that is known as a drop cap. So at the beginning of every biblical book in Vaticanus there is a drop cap or this sort of fancy lettering, and you can see that they’re printed in color – this bar and the drop cap itself, this is all in colored ink, while the rest of the page, and you can see it here in the cutout [15:41], the rest of the page is just black.

The thing you need to understand is that these drop caps are integral to the text. What that means is they were created when the initial manuscript was prepared. So, if I’m writing out Paul’s name, the equivalent would be – there’s the *P* and then on the line I would have *aul*. This would probably be sitting more like this [tail of the P below the line 16:17]. So that’s in English what you’re looking at here in Greek. So, these drop caps in Codex Vaticanus are integral to the text; that means they were created when the initial manuscript was prepared; they were not added at a later date after the fact.

In his book Sorenson says that drop caps are a medieval feature. This is some more information about initials or drop caps [holds up paper 16:52]. It says:

“In an illuminated manuscript initials with images inside of them, such as those illustrated here, are known as historiated initials. They were invented of the insular art of the British Isles in the **8th Century**.”

Does anybody see a problem here? This thing is supposed to be a **4th Century** Codex, yet it has integral drop caps that are indicative of a later medieval practice. The other thing is where did this practice originate? It originated in the British Isles, not in Alexandria, Egypt, but that’s just a technicality, you’re not supposed to pay attention to that.

“The classical tradition was slow to use capital letters for initials at all. In surviving Roman texts, it is often difficult even to separate words as spacing was not used either.”

Now if this is a **4th Century** Codex, would it count as a classical Codex? It would have been written in the **300’s A.D.** What these guys are saying is that the practice of using drop caps or initials was not even a thing until the **7th Century** which would put it at the minimum in the **600’s A.D.**, and the practice was first invented in the British Isles not in Alexandria, Egypt, not in the region that they’re saying this Codex was supposed to have come from.

If you can't see that yourself are you going to be aware of that problem? Probably not. This means one of the following: Either one, it was written during the medieval era; or two, it was modified and rewritten in the medieval era. Either way from an analysis of the Codex itself it would certainly appear that the thing is not as old as they're saying it is. So according to Sorenson the manuscripts dating from the **4th and 5th centuries** had little if any textual artwork. I want to read from page 135; it says the following about this; he says:

“Other ancient manuscripts dating from the 4th and 5th centuries either have no textual artwork whatsoever, or what little there is it is simply (what he calls curly-Q doodles in black ink) almost always at the end of the book when there was little space left over on the parchment. In no other ancient documents of the 4th and 5th centuries that this author has researched, is there colored textual artwork or drop caps...”

Now I've got to be careful here because he certainly hasn't looked at every 4th and 5th century manuscript that's existed, so we have to have some caution here, but he does say:

“In no other ancient documents of the 4th and 5th centuries that this author has researched, is there colored textual artwork or drop caps particularly integral to the text. Full color initial drop caps as a literary device were unknown in a timeframe when Vaticanus was purported to have been produced. Once again the artwork of the initial drop caps in Vaticanus is clearly medieval in character.”

If that's true, what that means is that thing is not as old as they're saying it is.

Inconsistent Handwriting, that's the next point. Portions of the Codex are written in lowercase, miniscule writing, whereas other portions of the Codex are written in uppercase uncial writing.

This is Ephesians; this is all uppercase uncial handwriting. Now compare that with the first half of Genesis. So, here's Genesis 1:1 [on projector [21:54](#)]. Does this handwriting look the same? It doesn't look the same. Why? Because this is lowercase handwriting. The other thing we saw was uppercase handwriting and I want you to also notice something – does this drop cap look the same? [[22:12](#)] There's no color, and is this one far more ornate in its decoration than the other one we looked at just a moment ago?

So, portions of Codex Vaticanus are written in lowercase miniscule writing whereas other portions are in uppercase writing. So, here's what I'm talking about – this is the first half of Genesis. The first half of Genesis is written in lowercase script, whereas the second half is written in uppercase script; so in the middle of the book of Genesis it switches from miniscule lowercase script to now uppercase uncial script halfway through the book of Genesis, and then it remains uppercase all the way until you get to the book of Hebrews, and then Hebrews and Revelation are once again in the lowercase.

Now look at the drop cap in Genesis, and then I just want to show you by way of comparison to the handwriting of the drop cap, we're going to go all the way to Revelation. This is the beginning of the book of Revelation in Codex Vaticanus [[23:20](#)] and you will notice again it has what kind of drop cap, and again the handwriting is in lowercase.

Just for visual comparison purposes again go back to Ephesians; there you have Ephesians again [23:40]. Does the drop cap look the same at all? No. Is the script different? So, this suggests at least, potentially more than one scribe; this suggests a possibly later tampering; this suggests a whole host of things that are currently unanswerable at this point. The point of me bringing it up is just to show you that when the text critics make definitive statements about these things, they're asking you to believe things that have not conclusively been proven at all.

So, you have handwriting issues. So, what this does is it raises basic questions about the integrity of the manuscript because they're suggesting that we should make wholesale...that wholesale changes to the bible needed to be made based upon this Codex because it is supposed to have come from the 4th Century. There is reason to doubt its age; there is reason to doubt its reliability based upon goofy things that are actually going on in the Codex.

Missing Books: Remember how we saw that Codex Sinaiticus was missing – that it cut off in I Chronicles 7:9, or something like that, and then picked up in Ezra 9:9; and it cut out the end of I Chronicles, all of 2 Chronicles and the first portions of Ezra – remember I showed you that in the last lesson.

In this one see if you can figure out what's missing. So, the following epistles start here, and they end here with II Thessalonians [25:31], tell me what's missing [list of books on projector]. So here's the beginning of Paul's epistles, here's the end. What's missing? I Timothy, II Timothy, Titus, Philemon – all missing in Codex Vaticanus. Not there; four of Paul's epistles are not in it. But again, this is supposed to be the “oldest and best” witness to what the NT is supposed to be.

Q: [inaudible] ...translations have the books of the bible in them [26:24]

A: Yeah, very odd that we would leave out whole verses and the end of Mark and other things because they're not in the two so-called “oldest and best”, but yet there are things that are totally missing from the so-called “oldest and best” and yet find themselves in modern versions. The inconsistency is maddening. The inconsistency and application of the so-called “rules” is just extremely frustrating.

Now let's go on to the next one – *Pagination* (Inserted pages and changed pagination): I was talking about later tampering. What's the issue? So, the upper right-hand corner of Ephesians 1, what's the problem? [27:28] Someone has struck through the original page number and what? So somewhere along the line, was something added to the Codex in some way, shape and form to cause the page numbers to be off and some scribe to change the page numbers? Now maybe it was a mistake, it could have been a mistake originally, I don't know the answer to it right now, but the point is when you look at not what...What you start doing is you start building a case here:

- You've got the drop cap issue;
- you've got the different script issue;
- you've got the different style of drop cap issue;
- you've got the missing books issue;
- now you've got page number changes and what seems to be added pages and changing of page number and pagination.

And now you start saying, “Is this thing really reliable, is it really a reliable witness to the OT, and is it really as old as they say it was?” This changing of the page number also happens in the book of Acts and it seems to speak that inserted leaves seem to have confused or muddled or changed the pagination, but it seems to be indicative of some sort of modification or later tampering, although the answer right now is again it is inconclusive.

The fourth one is *Wormholes and Overwriting*: Codex Vaticanus contains natural and unnatural wormholes. Now remember we talked about wormholes when we looked at Codex Sinaiticus. There are examples where the text goes around the wormhole, which again is indicative of a situation where the scribe putting the text on the page is altering the line so that he misses the wormhole. Wormholes are also isolated from each other. So, for example, let’s say there’s a wormhole in this page. Under normal wear should there be a matching wormhole in this page as well as a matching wormhole in this page [consecutive pages in a book]. What ends up happening is there will be a wormhole in that [isolated] page but not the page before or after.

So again, we have puzzling things here with this Codex. There are other places, and I could show you an example, but I don’t remember what reference to look at because I forgot to write it down, where there is clear overwriting where somebody came in after the fact, overwrote something and or added things to the margin just like what we saw with Codex Sinaiticus.

I want to offer *Concluding Thoughts* first on Vaticanus, and then I want to offer a second round of concluding thoughts on all six of these lessons. So, regarding Vaticanus: Codex Vaticanus appears to be a medieval creation not an ancient one. Are there strong reasons to think that this is not as old as they claim? If this is true it is not older. Let’s say that drop caps were invented in the 7th Century; that means the earliest this thing could be is from the 600’s. We know that there is no known record of it existing before 1475; by the way is a medieval date.

Let’s say even if you go with the 600’s are there other manuscripts that speak to the writing of the NT that would be pro-Textus Receptus King James that are that old? So, the point is, if this thing, even if it dates from the 600’s then their whole argument about it being one of the 50 bibles commissioned by Constantine the Great and being a 4th Century Codex, possibly even done in the same scriptorium as Codex Sinaiticus and all the stuff that they say about it is totally bogus.

Did we already look at last time that they were ranking Archaic Mark as a category one manuscript to Mark when the whole thing was a fake the whole time? Indisputable fake, proven by the University of Chicago to be a fake. I printed out 100 pages just this week on the forensic analysis of Archaic Mark. I have a very exciting life.

My point is that this stuff is all speculation; they don’t really know how old this thing is and from its known existence it has been under the express guardianship of the Roman Catholic Church.

So, if it is true that it is a medieval creation, then it is no older than many of the manuscripts supporting the Textus Receptus. So, it could have been done any time from 600’s, any time before 1475. I’m going to say to you, it is clear to me that if you compare these drop caps [Ephesians 1] with the ones in Genesis and the ones in Revelation, someone altered it at some point. They don’t look the same and they’re written in different handwriting.

Point three: Erasmus knew of the existence of the Codex in **1521**, so the idea that this is some new ancient discovery, the idea that this is some new thing that is going to change the way that we fundamentally understand the bible because we were able to go further back in time, make it closer to the original and more accurately reproduce the original because we now have this older manuscript, that whole thing is completely bogus; that thing was known to have existed from **1475** and Erasmus consulted in 1521 in making editorial decisions on the third edition of the Greek NT. So that means all the way through from 1521 all the way to **1881** when the Revised Version came out, was Codex Vaticanus known to have existed? Yeah, so the only so-called real new thing is whether or not Codex Sinaiticus is what?

Now let me say just a few things about that. In the 1800's...so we talked a lot in class about the years **1860 through 1900**, remember we talked about the change in the Protestant interpretation of the bible, that it took place between 1860 and 1900, we went over that in class. In this era no Protestant scholar worth his salt is going to agree to fundamentally change the bible based upon one lone Vatican document. It is only after they now have the other one, its twin sister or its ugly stepsister (Sinaiticus), that now all of a sudden, they feel they have a textual base to change it.

The document Vaticanus has been under Roman Catholic control since its first known existence in 1475, and that Protestant scholars would use it to supplant the text of the Reformation is beyond my ability to comprehend.

I'm going to be teaching a lesson in the conference coming up in October, I just changed the name of it, some of you might have seen it on Facebook; I just changed the name of it to [Pilfering the Power of the Paper Pope of Protestants](#).

You want to know when the Reformation went in the tank – it's when they switched the traditional texts of the Reformation for the "new and improved" texts of textual criticism. I am assembling quote after quote after quote of pro-Roman Catholic scholars hailing the Revised Version of **1881** as the best thing to ever have happened in Christendom, and how it was going to lead to ecumenical return to unity between Catholics and Protestants.

This whole idea that none of the differences matter and all this sort of thing, that is a modern lie. The people that were living back there when that stuff was going on, they absolutely believed there were doctrinal differences between their King James Bible and what was done in 1881. They absolutely believed that.

But my point here is both of these...now the case right now about Vaticanus is much more up in the air; more work has to be done on it because it's a different situation. We know it existed back to 1475, but even if you take that as the earliest known date are there reasons to still doubt the conventional wisdom about it? There are tons of reasons to doubt the conventional wisdom about it.

But you have to understand that the modern critical text is fundamentally based upon the work of Westcott and Hort. When Westcott and Hort did their work they put the majority of the emphasis on what two codices? The Vatican Codex and the Sinaitic Codex. I already told you that when they did that neither one of those guys had ever seen the original documents; all they were working off was typographical reprints and facsimiles; they never handled the actual things, they never saw them themselves.

We can see more about what's going on living in the 21st Century because of internet technology and photographic images that are on the internet than those guys actually saw when they sat down to fundamentally change the bible between **1870 and 1880**.

Now let's talk about the second round of the conclusions.

Codex Sinaiticus:

- Hermas
- Barnabas
- History
- Forensic Evidence
- Mark 16
- Archaic Mark
- Not Best

Does Constantin Simonides claim to have produced Codex Sinaiticus as a gift for the Czar of Russian between **1839 and 1840**? There are three primary objections to that idea. If you listen to James White, if you listen to people that are out there they will raise three primary objections to Simonides having done the Codex in that timeframe:

1. No known exemplars
2. Alexandrian text
3. Not enough time

So, let's take these one at a time; so, these are the primary objections. Objection #1, *no known exemplars* – what that means is that the readings that are in Codex Sinaiticus, some of those readings are not found anywhere else; therefore, what was Simonides copying? (No, he wasn't copying Vaticanus, although Sorenson might make you think that if you read it.) I should just say this, the Sorenson book is what got me into this to start with, but the more I've read this and reflected on it, I think there are major problems with this book. I think its major contribution is actually the stuff he's raising about Vaticanus, not the stuff necessarily about Sinaiticus, because the stuff about Sinaiticus, I can read most of that stuff in other books.

So no known exemplars – that means Simonides couldn't have done it because what was he copying? We don't know what his exemplars were that he was working off of to produce the readings found in Codex Sinaiticus. So, let me just say something about that. Did Codex Sinaiticus include Greek Hermas and Barnabas? Had anybody seen Greek of Hermas and Barnabas before Simonides published it? So, does that mean that he's got stuff in front of him that no one else had ever seen? If he's got Hermas and Barnabas in front of him that no one had ever seen, then is it reasonable to assume that he's got other things in front of him that no one had possibly ever seen?

So, the first thing of no known exemplars falls off the table when you understand what we know for sure is that he had that [Herms and Barnabas] in front of him because he put it in the Codex, and remember that he publishes stand-alone editions of both of these before Tischendorf found them in the Codex. So,

objection #1 about no known exemplars is bogus because whatever he has in front of him that he's copying, is he copying stuff that no one had seen or knew about before he copied it?

#2, *Alexandrian text* – well, what they'll say here is Mt. Athos is an island in Greece, or a peninsula in Greece and the manuscripts that were available were visiting manuscripts not Alexandrian manuscripts so how is it that Alexandrian readings got into this document created in Mt. Athos in **1839** is important. That is making a few pretty significant assumptions; number one, it's assuming that they don't have the Alexandrian readings, which is not a safe assumption based upon what we have already observed about Hermas and Barnabas.

Number two, we have to realize that Simonides, when he does this, is something like 20 years old, give or take. He is working with Uncle Benedict. Let me read to from this...found this this week too with the help of Steven Avery, *A Graphic Memoir of Constantin Simonides* from 1859. (Bibliograph, excuse me.) Page 4:

“Benedict who was a most accomplished scholar and a great linguist; Benedict was a teacher of religion in many parts of Greece as well as so highly esteemed at Capodistrias that he received at his hands an appointment of Professor of Doctrinal Theology.”

The 20-year-old Simonides is largely copying what Benedict is putting in front of him. The school that Benedict is a professor at just so happens to be located in Turkey at the time. He is a professor for 35 years. As he is professor-ing he is assembling and collecting documents. Is it most often the case that the professors are more liberal than their students? The responsibility for the Alexandrian readings in the Codex are fully explainable by the academic career of Uncle Benedict; not to mention, what really is the Alexandrian text? What really is it?

Recall that conventional wisdom holds that Sinaiticus along with Vaticanus and several other old manuscripts were of the Alexandrian textual family. That is the presumption that as they were copied in or about Alexandria, Egypt in the 4th Century; however, the conclusion that codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, Bezae and Alexandrinus are all Alexandrian is a highly subjective opinion.

The so-called Alexandrian text family is highly amorphous, that means not the same and disparate (that means they don't agree), though there is general agreement that Vaticanus was initially produced at Alexandria, it is dissimilar in its textual variations when compared with Sinaiticus.

Dean Burgon, a conservative bible believing textual expert in the 19th Century wrote an entire book on the disparate differences between Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. As you read in the quote below recall that the names Vaticanus was B and Sinaiticus was א [Aleph]. He says:

“It matters nothing that all four are discovered on careful scrutiny to differ essentially, not only in 99 out of 100 of the whole body of extant Greek manuscripts.”

What Burgon is saying is that these two codices, they differ from 99 out of 100 of the entire available number of Greek manuscripts. Then he goes on to say:

“Besides, but even from one another, in the Gospels alone Vaticanus is found to omit at least 2,877 words, to add 536, to substitute 935 words and transpose 2,098 words, to modify 1,132 – in

all 7,578. The corresponding figures for Sinaiticus being 3,455 omitted, 839 added, 1,114 substituted, 2,299 transposed and 1,265 modified – in all 8,972.”

“And if you remember that the omissions, additions, substitutions, transpositions and modifications are by no means the same in both, it is in fact easier to find two consecutive verses in which the two manuscripts differ the one from the other, than two consecutive verses in which they entirely agree.”

And so there you have it folks. Based upon that evidence we’ve changed the whole understanding what the bible is.

So, we’ve dealt with the *No Known Exemplars*; the *Alexandrian Text* is logically and explainable; so then we have the *Not Enough Time*. There is no way that a 20-year-old in a year (**1839-40**) is going to have the time to produce the entire volume. So, I already said up here [50:42] for the Alexandrian text that Benedict’s 35-year career, as a scholar and linguist is responsible for explaining, can explain the Alexandrian text readings in it, whatever that even is (that was the point of reading from Sorenson).

But in **1859** after Tischendorf found the Codex Sinaiticus, in two months, March and April, 1859, with the help of two other Germans, he copied the entire thing – 110,000 lines of text in two months. But Simonides couldn’t have done it himself in only a year, but Tischendorf can copy the whole thing in two months.

Q: Did Simonides write any other material during that time period, so you could actually compare, a handwriting expert could say it looks like he wrote this Codex and he wrote other things?

A: So that’s an interesting question and I’ll answer that when I’m done with the report.

In **1866** Tischendorf was granted access to the Vatican and he’s granted access to Codex Vaticanus for 14 days for three hours a day. So how much time is that, you math geniuses? That’s a total of 42 hours. In 42 hours Tischendorf copied the entire NT of Vaticanus by hand for what he was preparing to publish in **1867**, but there’s no way Simonides could have done Sinaiticus in a whole year when these other guys can accomplish these Herculean feats in 42 hours in two months.

Frederic Kenyon says in his book *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*; he says the following about Tischendorf:

“In 1866 Tischendorf once more applied for leave to edit the manuscript but with difficulty obtained leave to examine it for the purpose of collating different passages. Unfortunately, the great scholar so forgot himself as to copy out 20 pages in full contrary to the conditions under which he had been allowed to access the manuscript and his permission was naturally withdrawn. Renewed entreaty produced in six days longer study making in all fourteen days of three hours each, and by making the most of his time Tischendorf was able in 1867 to publish the most perfect edition of the manuscript which had yet appeared.”

He can do it in 42 hours, but Simonides can’t do the whole thing in one year. So, I’m going to leave you with this: The only reason anybody thinks Codex Sinaiticus, the chief reason why anybody thinks Codex

Sinaiticus is old is because of the paleographical estimation of Constantin Von Tischendorf. It has never been tested; it has never been evaluated, and I told you about the cancelled test and all of that stuff.

My point is who are we going to trust here? Are we going to trust a bunch of text scholars to give us the bible, or are we going to trust that God did what he said in his word and preserved it? Because if we're going to trust what God said in his word that he preserved it then he's given us markers and understanding in his word that helps identify where that preservation is and where that preservation is located. I don't trust what these guys are telling me and I don't think you should either.