

Codex Sinaiticus

In

A Review of the So-Called Better Greek Manuscript,
The Westcott-Hort Text

Introduction: Those who oppose the true I John 5:7, and reject the historic Textus Receptus, the standard New Testament of the Eastern and Western Churches until modern times in the East and the end of the Downgrading Controversy in the West, try to pretend that their New Testament comes from older and better Manuscripts. But does it? You be the judge. Here some facts that most of them do not want you to know about:

1. No less than 9 Scribes helped to develop this so-called older and better Greek Manuscript in its earliest stages;
2. It is the most altered and changed Greek Codex in existence;
3. In its present form it is no older than the 12th century;
4. It was not used by the Eastern Churches and was consigned to a basket for burning materials;
5. *Codex Sinaiticus came from various different New Testament writings used by the Gnostics and then Origen in the third century.*
6. Jerome the Bible corruptor of the fifth century, received it because of his following Origen, and tried to make it into the New Latin Bible; but the true followers of Jesus Christ rejected it, and held to the *older* Latin New Testament that contains the true and proper I John 5:7 containing the Three Heavenly Witnesses.
7. We have given the historical usage of the Three Heavenly Witnesses before the fourth century in several chapters from our work *The Christology of the Textus Receptus*.

The following is taken from our large work, *The Christology of the Textus Receptus*.

Chapter 6

Codex Sinaiticus

Codex Sinaiticus is the main foundation of the entire Westcott-Hort structure. *This is not a Byzantine or Koine Greek text* coming from the Lucian-Antioch influence and tradition. Sinaiticus can be traced back from Egypt to Palestine through Origen. When Origen *fled from Alexandria* he brought his corrupted texts with him. *Codex Sinaiticus is a fruit of Origen's corrupted Egyptian texts.*

Jerome's Reliance upon the Sinaiticus

When Jerome developed his Vulgate he refused to use the Lucian-Antioch textual family. In the process of time the Old Italic and the Vulgate became a mixed text. The Influence of the Old Latin texts forced Jerome to place in his Vulgate many of the disputed passages that the Constantine-Eusebius Bibles omitted. Jerome improved the Sinaiticus. However, the Westcott-Hort researches did not recognize these improvements nor include them.

Should We Reject the Textus Receptus in Favor of the Sinaiticus?

As you read the info about Codex Sinaiticus, please ask yourself *if we should reject the Textus Receptus and its Christology on the basis of Codex Sinaiticus?* Does Sinaiticus present a *higher or lower Christology* than the Greek Textus Receptus and the Latin Textus Receptus? It, like Vaticanus, is a downgrader text receiving accreditation only among those who follow the so-called scientific method during the era of the Great Christian Apostasy. Like Vaticanus, Sinaiticus makes Christ into a Begotten God, omits that His blood is the blood of God, with other omitted statements about Christ's blood, and does not set Him forth as the only Manifestation of God in the flesh.

As you read the following about Sinaiticus, please keep in mind that *this is the most corrupted and re-corrected manuscript of all time!* How can this be a better text than the Byzantine and old Latin Texts? Should we say, because it is older it is better? Well, let us remember that the Old Latin is at least a century older than the Codex Sinaiticus. I will place all the comments about manuscript corrections in *Bold Red*.

The followers of the Westcott-Hort School maintain, falsely, that this Text goes back to near 250 AD. *It does not. The Manuscript, in its present form goes back no further than the twelfth century.*

The followers of the Westcott-Hort textual school *pretend* that this is an accurate representation of the original Greek New Testament Manuscripts. *It is not.* From its birth in about 350 AD in its earliest form, it has passed through at least 9 scribes and correctors into its present form.

The Codex Sinaiticus is one of the most corrected manuscripts in the entire world. These corrections started in its origin in about 350 AD and lasted up to the twelfth century. Should we allow such a Manuscript to replace the time tested and honored Byzantine-Textus Receptus and its Christology?

Please mark well the following points about the Westcott-Hort's better and older (?) Greek Manuscript:

About Codex Sinaiticus

Taken from the site: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Codex_Sinaiticus

B. H. Streeter remarked a *great agreement* between *the codex and Vulgate of Jerome. According to him Origen brought to Caesarea the Alexandrian text-type which was used in this codex, and used by Jerome.*^[19]

Between the 4th and 12th centuries, *nine correctors worked on this codex, making it one of the most corrected manuscripts in existence.*^[20] *Tischendorf during his investigation in Petersburg enumerated 14 800 corrections only in portion which was held in Petersburg (2/3 of the codex).*^[21] *It means all the codex can have about 20, 000 corrections. In addition to these corrections some letters were marked by dots as doubtful (e.g. TH̄). Corrections represent the Byzantine text-type,* just like in codices: *Bodmer II, Regius (L), Ephraemi (C), and Sangallensis (Δ).* They were discovered by Button.^[22]

Early History of Codex Sinaiticus

Little is known of the manuscript's early history. *According to Hort*, it was written in the West, probably Rome. Kenyon, Gardthausen, Ropes and Jellicoe thought it was written in Egypt. *Harris, Streeter,^[18] Skeat, and Milne tended to think that it was produced in Caesarea. It was written in the fourth century. It could not have been written before A.D. 325 because it contains the Eusebian Canons, and it is a terminus post quem. It could not be written after A.D. 360 because of certain references to Church fathers in the margin. It means A.D. 360 is a terminus ad quem.*^[7]

According to Tischendorf, *Codex Sinaiticus was one of the fifty copies of the Bible commissioned from Eusebius by Roman Emperor Constantine after his conversion to Christianity* (*De vita Constantini*, IV, 37).^[22] T. C. Skeat believed that it was already in production when Constantine placed his order, but had to be suspended in order to accommodate different page dimensions.^[13]

The Work of Several Scribes

Tischendorf also believed *that four separate scribes copied the work (whom he named A, B, C and D) and that five correctors (whom he designated a, b, c, d and e) amended portions. He posited that one of the correctors was contemporaneous with the original scribes, and that the others dated to the sixth and seventh centuries. Modern analysis identifies at least three scribes.* Scribe B was a poor speller, and scribe A was not very much better; the best scribe was D.^[7] Scribe A wrote most of the historical and poetical books of the Old Testament, and almost the whole of the New Testament.^{[7][23]} *It is now agreed, after Milne and Skeat's reinvestigation, that Tischendorf was wrong—scribe C never existed.*^[24] According to Tischendorf, scribe C wrote poetic books of the Old Testament. These are written in a different format from the rest of the manuscript — they are in two columns (the rest of books is in four columns) and written stichometrically. Tischendorf probably interpreted the different formatting as indicating the existence of another scribe.^[25] The three remaining scribes are still identified by the letters that Tischendorf gave them: A, B, and D.^[25] *Correctors were more, at least seven (a, b, c, ca, cb, cc, e).*^[1]

A paleographical study at the British Museum in 1938 found that *the text had undergone several corrections.* The first corrections were done *by several scribes before the manuscript left the scriptorium. In the sixth or seventh century, many alterations were made,* which, according to a colophon at the end of the book of Esdras and Esther states, that the source of these alterations was *"a very ancient manuscript that had been corrected by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphylus"* (martyred AD 309). If this is so, material which begin with 1 Samuel to the end of Esther is Origen's copy of the Hexapla. *From this colophon, the correction is concluded to have been made*

in Caesarea Maritima in the 6th or 7th centuries.^[26] The pervasive **iotacism**, especially of the ει diphthong, remains uncorrected.

Eusebian Canons

Eusebian canons or Eusebian sections, also known as Ammonian Sections, are the system of dividing the four **Gospels** used between *late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. The divisions into chapters and verses used in modern texts date only from the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries respectively. The sections are indicated in the margin of nearly all Greek and Latin **manuscripts** of the **Bible**, and usually summarized in Canon Tables at the start of the Gospels (see below). There are about 1165 sections: 355 for **Matthew**, 235 for **Mark**, 343 for **Luke**, and 232 for **John**; the numbers, however, vary slightly in different manuscripts.

The *Harmony of Ammonius* suggested to Eusebius, as he himself tells us in his letter, the idea of drawing up ten tables (*kanones*) in which the sections in question were so classified as to show at a glance where each Gospel agreed with or differed from the others. In the first nine tables he placed in parallel columns the numbers of the sections common to the four, or three, or two, evangelists; namely: (1) Matt., Mark, Luke, John; (2) Matt., Mark, Luke; (3) Matt., Luke, John; (4) Matt., Mark, John; (5) Matt., Luke; (6) Matt., Mark; (7) Matt., John; (8) Luke, Mark; (9) Luke, John. In the tenth he noted successively the sections special to each evangelist.

The usefulness of these tables for the purpose of reference and comparison soon brought them into common use, and from the fifth century the Ammonian sections, with references to the Eusebian tables, were indicated in the margin of the manuscripts. Opposite each section was written its number, and underneath this the number of the Eusebian table to be consulted in order to find the parallel texts or text; a reference to the tenth table would of course show that this section was proper to that evangelist. These marginal notes are reproduced in several editions of **Tischendorf's** New Testament.

Eusebius's explanatory letter to Carpianus was also very often reproduced before the tables. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eusebian_Canons

Hyperspectral imaging

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Hyperspectral imaging collects and processes information from across the **electromagnetic spectrum**. Unlike the human **eye**, which just sees visible light, hyperspectral imaging is more like the eyes of the **mantis shrimp**, which can see **visible light** as well as from the **ultraviolet** to **infrared**. Hyperspectral capabilities enable the mantis shrimp to recognize different types of coral, prey, or predators, all which may appear as the same color to the human eye.

Humans build sensors and processing systems to provide the same type of capability for

application in agriculture, mineralogy, physics, and surveillance. Hyperspectral sensors look at objects using a vast portion of the electromagnetic spectrum. Certain objects leave unique 'fingerprints' across the electromagnetic spectrum. These 'fingerprints' are known as spectral signatures and enable identification of the materials that make up a scanned object.

Codex Sinaiticus

Aleph) or 01) *is a 4th century*) x London, Brit. Libr., Add. 43725; Gregory-Aland n^o)

uncial manuscript of the Greek Bible, written between 330–350. While it originally contained the whole of both Testaments, only portions of the Greek Old Testament or Septuagint survive, along with a complete New Testament, the Epistle of Barnabas, and portions of The Shepherd of Hermas (suggesting that the latter two may have been considered part of Biblical canon by the editors of the codex^[citation needed]). Along with Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus is one of the most valuable manuscripts for textual criticism of the Greek New Testament, as well as .the Septuagint

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Codex_Sinaiticus

Along with Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus is one of the most valuable manuscripts for *establishing the original text -see textual criticism - of the Greek New Testament, as well as the Septuagint*. It is the *only uncial manuscript with the complete text of the New Testament*, and the only ancient manuscript of the New Testament written in four columns per page which has survived to the present day.^[1] *Only 300 years away from the original manuscripts of the New Testament, it is highly important and considered a very accurate copy as opposed to most of the later copies, "preserving obviously superior readings where the great mass of later manuscripts is in error".*^[4]

In the Gospels, Sinaiticus is the second most important witness of the text (after Vaticanus); in the Acts of the Apostles, its text is equal to that of Vaticanus; in the Epistles, Sinaiticus is the most important witness of the text. In the Book of Revelation, however, *its text is corrupted and not good quality; it is inferior to the texts of Codex Alexandrinus, Papyrus 47, and even some minuscule manuscripts in this place (f.e. Minuscule 2053, 2062).*^[7]

<http://www.answers.com/topic/palimpsest>

Eusebius Pamphilus, the Imperil Bible Collector and Corruptor

THE ORATION OF EUSEBIUS PAMPHILUS, IN PRAISE OF THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE

Thus universal is the agency of the Word of God: everywhere present, and pervading all things by the power of his intelligence, he looks upward to his Father, and governs this lower creation, inferior to and consequent upon himself, in accordance with his will, as the common Preserver of all things. Intermediate, as it were, and attracting the created to the uncreated Essence, this Word of God exists as an unbroken bond between the two, uniting things most widely different by an inseparable tie. He is the Providence which rules the universe; the guardian and director of the whole: he is the Power and Wisdom of God *the only-begotten God, the Word begotten of God himself*. For “*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him and without him was not any thing made that hath been made*”; as we learn from the words of the sacred writer? The Post-Nicene Fathers, second series, vol. 1; Eusebius’ Church History pages 891, 892.

And hence we are assured by the clear testimony of the sacred Herald, that the Word of God, who is before all things, must be the sole Preserver of all intelligent beings: while God, who is above all, *and the Author of the generation of the Word*,

*being himself the Cause of all things, is rightly called the Father of the Word, as of his only-begotten Son, himself acknowledging no superior Cause. God, therefore, himself is One, and from him proceeds the one *only-begotten Word*, the omnipresent Preserver of all things. . . While God, who is above all, and the Author of the generation of the Word, being himself the Cause of all things, is rightly called the Father of the Word, as of his only-begotten Son, himself acknowledging no superior Cause. God, therefore, himself is One, and from him proceeds the *one only-begotten Word*, the omnipresent Preserver of all things. Ibid., p. 893.*

Summation of Eusebius's Teaching

Please remember that Eusebius is speaking of the Deity of Jesus Christ, not the Sacred Scriptures. In Eusebius' mind the Word is the Only Begotten of God. It is any wonder then that the Eusebius-Constantine Bibles are so corrupted and present such a downgraded testimony about Jesus Christ, presenting Him as *a Begotten God, in His essential deity*? We would ask *where the Scriptures say that God is the Father of the Word*, speaking of the essential Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ?

Summation of the Codex Sinaiticus

1. Sinaiticus is one of the *most corrected* manuscripts in the world;
2. *At least nine correctors worked on this codex;*
3. *The first corrections were done by several scribes before the manuscript left the scriptorium;*
4. *Tischendorf also believed that four separate scribes copied the work and that five correctors amended portions. He posited that one of the correctors was contemporaneous with the original scribes, and that the others dated to the sixth and seventh centuries.*
5. Critics now say only 3 three original scribes copied this work.
6. *In the sixth or seventh century, many alterations were made these have continued until the twelfth century;*
7. How then can it be the one of the best in the world since it underwent a series of corrections between the years 350 and the end of the twelfth century?

Here is a *pretended* summation of why Codex Sinaiticus is one of the most important Manuscripts for establishing the original Greek Text:

Along with *Codex Vaticanus*, *Codex Sinaiticus* is one of the most valuable manuscripts for establishing the original text -see *textual criticism* - of the *Greek New Testament*, as well as the *Septuagint*. It is the *only uncial manuscript with the complete text of the New Testament*, and the only ancient manuscript of the New Testament written in four columns per page which has survived to the present day.^[1] *Only 300 years away from the original manuscripts of the New Testament, it is highly important and considered a very accurate copy as opposed to most of the later copies, "preserving obviously superior readings where the*

great mass of later manuscripts is in error". [4]

We note the following:

1. This is not an Lucian-Byzantine, but an Alexandrian-Palestinian text type;
2. How do we know it has the complete text of the New Testament? We don't, in fact, it omits several verses of the New Testament;
3. While its origin as a manuscript may be only 300 years away from the original manuscripts of the New Testament, *by the time all the correctors made many alterations on it*, its date in its present and corrected form *reaches no further back than the twelfth century*;
4. So how can it be among the oldest and the closest to the original Greek Manuscripts?
5. It may have been among the oldest in its original and first state, but not now;
6. *In its present state Codex Sinaiticus is no older than the twelfth century.*
7. *We have Latin-Greek manuscripts that reach back to the fourth century and even before.*
8. This is one of the Constantine-Eusebius Bibles.
9. It deserves no more serious consideration as a valid example of the New Testament text than Constantine's *new church* deserves to be considered *as an example of the original Church that Christ built*;
10. Please note this well, Constantine's Codex Sinaiticus no more represents the original Greek Manuscripts than Constantine's new Papal Church represents the original New Testament church;

The most important manuscript in the Westcott-Hort school is no older in *its present and often corrected form* than the twelfth century!

No fewer than *nine (9) scribes and corrections* worked over a period of *nearly 3 centuries, 350-600*, to produce what most consider the most important (?) manuscript in the Westcott-Hort school.

Where does this leave the so-called *important* Textus Sinaiticus? *It is nothing more than the most corrected Biblical Manuscript in the world and dates no further back than the twelfth century in its present form.*

Codex Sinaiticus is a *Palestinian-Alexandrian text type* and downgrades Jesus Christ by teaching that *He is a begotten God, not a begotten Son*, just as all the Palestinian-Alexandrian texts do.

By omission it denies the Divine Blood of Jesus Christ in Acts 20:28, and therefore

denied the Hypostatic Union. *We are taught nowhere in Codex Sinaiticus that Jesus' blood is the blood of God!*

By omission Codex Sinaiticus denies that Jesus Christ is the *Only Manifestation of God in the Flesh!*

Joh 5:39 Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me.

2 John 9 Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.

10 If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into *your* house, neither bid him God speed:

11 For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.