The codex is an Alexandrian text @-@ type manuscript written in the 4th century in uncial letters on parchment. Current scholarship considers the Codex Sinaiticus to be one of the best Greek texts of the New Testament, along with that of the Codex Vaticanus. Until the discovery by Constantin von Tischendorf of the Sinaiticus text, the Codex Vaticanus was unrivaled.

The Codex Sinaiticus came to the attention of scholars in the 19th century at Saint Catherine 's Monastery in the Sinai Peninsula , with further material discovered in the 20th and 21st centuries . Although parts of the Codex are scattered across four libraries around the world , most of the manuscript is today vested in the British Library London , where it is on public display . Since its discovery , study of the Codex Sinaiticus has proven to be extremely useful to scholars for critical studies of biblical text .

While large portions of the Old Testament is missing, it is assumed that the Codex originally contained the whole of both Testaments. Approximately half of the Greek Old Testament (or Septuagint) survived, along with a complete New Testament, the entire apocrypha plus the Epistle of Barnabas and portions of The Shepherd of Hermas.

# = = Description = =

The codex consists of parchment , originally in double sheets , which may have measured about 40 by 70 cm . The whole codex consists , with a few exceptions , of quires of eight leaves , a format popular throughout the Middle Ages . Each line of the text has some twelve to fourteen Greek uncial letters , arranged in four columns ( 48 lines in column ) with carefully chosen line breaks and slightly ragged right edges . When opened , the eight columns thus presented to the reader have much of the appearance of the succession of columns in a papyrus roll . The poetical books of the Old Testament are written stichometrically , in only two columns per page . The codex has almost 4 @,@ 000 @,@ 000 uncial letters .

Almost regularly, a plain iota is replaced by the epsilon @-@ iota diphthong (commonly if imprecisely known as itacism), e.g. ??????? instead of ???????? instead of ????????, etc.

Each rectangular page has the proportions 1 @.@ 1 to 1, while the block of text has the reciprocal proportions, 0 @.@ 91 ( the same proportions, rotated 90  $^{\circ}$  ). If the gutters between the columns were removed, the text block would mirror the page 's proportions. Typographer Robert Bringhurst referred to the codex as a " subtle piece of craftsmanship " .

The folios are made of vellum parchment primarily from calf skins , secondarily from sheep skins . ( Tischendorf himself thought that the parchment had been made from antelope skins , but modern microscopic examination has shown otherwise . ) Most of the quires or signatures contain four leaves save two containing five . It is estimated that about 360 animals were slaughtered for making the folios of this codex , assuming all animals yielded a good enough skin . As for the cost of the material , time of scribes and binding , it equals the lifetime wages of one individual at the time .

The portion of the codex held by the British Library consists of 346  $\frac{1}{2}$  folios , 694 pages ( 38 @.@ 1 cm x 34 @.@ 5 cm ) , constituting over half of the original work . Of these folios , 199 belong to the Old Testament , including the apocrypha ( deuterocanonical ) , and 147  $\frac{1}{2}$  belong to the New Testament , along with two other books , the Epistle of Barnabas and part of The Shepherd of

```
Hermas . The apocryphal books present in the surviving part of the Septuagint are 2 Esdras , Tobit , Judith , 1 & 4 Maccabees , Wisdom and Sirach . The books of the New Testament are arranged in this order : the four Gospels , the epistles of Paul ( Hebrews follows 2 Thess . ) , the Acts of the Apostles , the General Epistles , and the Book of Revelation . The fact that some parts of the codex are preserved in good condition , while others are in very poor condition , implies they were separated and stored in several places .

= = The text of the codex = =

The text of the Old Testament contains the following passages :
Genesis 23 : 19 ? Genesis 24 : 46 ? fragments
Leviticus 20 : 27 ? Leviticus 22 : 30
Numbers 5 : 26 ? Numbers 7 : 20 ? fragments
1 Chronicles 9 : 27 ? 1 Chronicles 19 : 17
Ezra @-@ Nehemiah ( from Esdr . 9 : 9 ) .
```

Book of Psalms? Wisdom of Sirach Book of Esther

**Book of Tobit** 

Book of Judith

Book of Joel ? Book of Malachi

Book of Isaiah

Book of Jeremiah

**Book of Lamentations** 

1 Maccabees ? 4 Maccabees

The text of the New Testament lacks several passages:

Omitted verses

Gospel of Matthew 12:47, 16:2b @-@ 3, 17:21, 18:11, 23:14, 24:35;

Gospel of Mark 7: 16, 9: 44, 9: 46, 11: 26, 15: 28, 16: 9? 20 (Long ending of the Gospel Mark, referring to the appearance of Jesus to many people following the resurrection)

Gospel of Luke 17:36

Gospel of John 5: 4, Pericope adulterae (7:53?8:11) (see Image "John 7:53?8:11"), 16: 15, 20: 5b @-@ 6, 21:25

Acts of the Apostles 8:37;15:34;24:7;28:29;

Epistle to the Romans 16:24

Omitted phrases

Matthew 15:6?????????(?????) ( or ( his ) mother );

Matthew 23: 35? ??????????? (son of Barachi 'ah) omitted; this omission is supported only by codex 59 (by the first hand), three Evangelistaria (? 6, ? 13, and ? 185), and Eusebius.

Mark 1:1? ????? " the Son of God " omitted .

John 4:9??????????????????????????????????( Jews have no dealings with Samaritans), it is one of so @-@ called Western non @-@ interpolations; omission is supported by D, a, b, d, e, j, copfay, it was supplemented by the first corrector ( before leaving scriptorium );

Some passages were excluded by the correctors:

Matthew 24: 36? phrase?????? (nor the Son) the first corrector marked as doubtful, but the second corrector (b) removed the mark.

In Luke 11: 4 ???? ???? ???? ??? ??? ??????? (but deliver us from evil ) included by the original scribe, marked by the first corrector (a) as doubtful, but the third corrector (c) removed the mark.

Christ 's agony at Gethsemane ( Luke 22 : 43 ? 44 ) ? included by the original scribe , marked by the first corrector as doubtful , but the third corrector ( c ) removed the mark .

Luke 23: 34a, "Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do "? it was included by the first scribe, marked by the first corrector as doubtful, but a third corrector removed the mark.

These omissions are typical for the Alexandrian text @-@ type.

### = = = Interpolations = = =

Matthew 8:13 (see Luke 7:10)

Matthew 10:12 (see Luke 10:5)

It reads ??????? ?????? ?????? ( say peace to be this house ) after ????? . The reading was deleted by the first corrector , but the second corrector restored it . The reading is used by manuscripts : Bezae , Regius , Washingtonianus , Koridethi , manuscripts f 1 , 22 , 1010 ( 1424 ) , it , vgcl .

Matthew 27:49 (see John 19:34)

## = = = Unique and other textual variants = = =

Matthew 7: 22? It has additional word????? (numerous): "and cast out numerous demons in your name?". It is not supported by any other manuscript.

Matthew 8: 12? It has ?????????? (will go out) instead of ???????????? (will be thrown). This variant is supported only by one Greek manuscript Uncial 0250, and by Codex Bobiensis, syrc, s, p, pal, arm, Diatessaron.

 Curetonian Gospels.

Luke 1:26? "Nazareth" is called a city of Judea.

Luke 2:37????????? (seventy), all manuscripts have ????????? (eighty);

John 1: 28? The second corrector made unique textual variant ???????? . This textual variant has only codex 892, syrh and several other manuscripts.

John 1:34? It reads????????? (chosen one) together with the manuscripts <formula>5, <formula>106, b, e, ff2, syrc, and syrs instead of ordinary word???? (son).

John 2:3? Where ordinarily reading " And when they wanted wine ", or " And when wine failed ", Codex Sinaiticus has " And they had no wine, because the wine of the marriage feast was finished " (supported by a and j);

John 6: 10? It reads????????? (three thousands) for ????????????? (five thousands); the second corrector changed into????????????.

Acts 11: 20? It reads?????????? (Evangelists) instead of????????? (Hellenists);

In Acts 14:9, the word "not "inserted before "heard"; in Hebr. 2:4 "harvests "instead of "distributions"; in 1 Peter 5:13 word "Babylon" replaced into "Church".

2 Timothy 4: 10? it reads ??????? for ????????, the reading of the codex is supported by along with Ephraemi Rescriptus, 81, 104, 326, 436.

= = = Witness of some readings of " majority " = = =

It is the oldest witness for the phrase ?? ?????????? ( do not defraud ) in Mark 10:19. This phrase was not included by the manuscripts: Codex Vaticanus ( added by second corrector ) , Codex Cyprius , Codex Washingtonianus , Codex Athous Lavrensis , f1 , f13 , 28 , 700 , 1010 , 1079 , 1242 , 1546 , 2148 , ? 10 , ? 950 , ? 1642 , ? 1761 , syrs , arm , geo . This is variant of the majority manuscripts .

In Mark 13: 33 it is the oldest witness of the variant ??????????? ( and pray ) . Codex B and D do not include this passage .

In Luke 8: 48 it has ???????? (daughter) as in the Byzantine manuscripts, instead of the Alexandrian ???????? (daughter), supported by the manuscripts: BKLW?.

= = = Orthodox reading = = =

= = = Text @-@ type and relationship to other manuscripts = = =

For most of the New Testament , Codex Sinaiticus is in general agreement with Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1209 and Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus , attesting the Alexandrian text @-@ type . A notable example of an agreement between the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus texts is that they both omit the word ???? ( ' without cause ' , ' without reason ' , ' in vain ' ) from Matthew 5 : 22 " But I say unto you , That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgement "

In John 1:1?8:38 Codex Sinaiticus differs from Vaticanus and all other Alexandrian manuscripts . It is in closer agreement with Codex Bezae in support of the Western text @-@ type . For example , in John 1:4 Sinaiticus and Codex Bezae are the only Greek manuscripts with textual variant????????????( in him is life ) instead of ???????????( in him was life ) . This variant is supported by Vetus Latina and some Sahidic manuscripts . This portion has a large number of corrections . There are a number of differences between Sinaiticus and Vaticanus; Hoskier enumerated 3036 differences:

Matt ? 656

Mark ? 567 Luke ? 791 John ? 1022 Total ? 3036.

A large number of these differences are due to iotacisms and variants in transcribing Hebrew names . These two manuscripts were not written in the same scriptorium . According to Hort Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were derived from a common original much older source , " the date of which cannot be later than the early part of the second century , and may well be yet earlier " .

Example of differences between Sinaiticus and Vaticanus in Matt 1:18?19:

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 .

Between the 4th and 12th centuries , seven or more correctors worked on this codex , making it one of the most corrected manuscripts in existence . Tischendorf during his investigation in Petersburg enumerated 14 @,@ 800 corrections only in the portion which was held in Petersburg ( 2 / 3 of the codex ) . According to David C. Parker the full codex has about 23 @,@ 000 corrections . In addition to these corrections some letters were marked by dots as doubtful ( e.g. ?? ) . Corrections represent the Byzantine text @-@ type , just like corrections in codices : Bodmer II , Regius ( L ) , Ephraemi ( C ) , and Sangallensis ( ? ) . They were discovered by E. A. Button .

Little is known of the manuscript 's early history . According to Hort , it was written in the West , probably in Rome , as suggested by the fact that the chapter division in the Acts common to Sinaiticus and Vaticanus occurs in no other Greek manuscript , but is found in several manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate . Robinson countered this argument , suggesting that this system of chapter divisions was introduced into the Vulgate by Jerome himself , as a result of his studies at Caesarea . According to Kenyon the forms of the letters are Egyptian and they were found in Egyptian papyri of earlier date . Gardthausen Ropes and Jellicoe thought it was written in Egypt . Harris believed that the manuscript came from the library of Pamphilus at Caesarea , Palestine . Streeter , Skeat , and Milne also believed that it was produced in Caesarea .

```
= = = Date of the codex = = =
```

The codex was written in the 4th century. It could not have been written before 325 because it contains the Eusebian Canons, which is a terminus post quem. " The terminus ante quem is less certain, but, according to Milne and Skeat, is not likely to be much later than about 360."

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 ) . This hypothesis was supported by Pierre Batiffol , Gregory , and 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 .

Frederic G. Kenyon argued: "There is not the least sign of either of them ever having been at Constantinople. The fact that Sinaiticus was collated with the manuscript of Pamphilus so late as the sixth century seems to show that it was not originally written at Caesarea."

```
= = = = Scribes and correctors = = = =
```

Tischendorf believed that four separate scribes ( whom he named A , B , C and D ) copied the work 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 worked in the 6th and 7th centuries . It is now agreed , after Milne and Skeat 's reinvestigation , that Tischendorf was wrong ? scribe C never existed . According to Tischendorf , scribe C wrote the poetic books of the Old Testament . These are written in a different format from the rest of the manuscript ? they appear in two columns ( the rest of books is in four columns ) , written stichometrically . Tischendorf probably interpreted the different formatting as indicating the existence of another scribe . The three remaining scribes are still identified by the letters that Tischendorf gave them : A , B , and D. Correctors were more , at least seven ( a , b , c , ca , cb , cc , e ) .

Modern analysis identifies at least three scribes :

Scribe A wrote most of the historical and poetical books of the Old Testament, almost the whole of the New Testament, and the Epistle of Barnabas

Scribe B was responsible for the Prophets and for the Shepherd of Hermas

Scribe D wrote the whole of Tobit and Judith , the first half of 4 Maccabees , the first two @-@ thirds of the Psalms , and the first five verses of Revelation

Scribe B was a poor speller , and scribe A was not very much better ; the best scribe was D. Metzger states : " scribe A had made some unusually serious mistakes " . Scribes A and B more often used nomina sacra in contracted forms (?????? contracted in all occurrences , ?????? contracted except in 2 occurrences ) , scribe D more often used forms uncontracted . D distinguished between sacral and nonsacral using of ?????? . His errors are the substitution of ?? for ?, and ? for ?? in medial positions , both equally common . Otherwise substitution of ? for initial ?? is unknown , and final ?? is only replaced in word ?????? , confusing of ? and ?? is very rare . In the Book of Psalms this scribe has 35 times ?????? instead of ????? , while scribe A normally uses an abbreviated form ??? . Scribe A 's was a " worse type of phonetic error " . Confusion of ? and ?? occurs in all contexts . Milne and Skeat characterised scribe B as " careless and illiterate " . The work of the original scribe is designated by the siglum ? \* .

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 . Readings which they introduced are designated by the siglum ?a . Milne and Skeat have observed that the superscription to 1 Maccabees was made by scribe D , while the text was written by scribe A. Scribe D corrects his own work and that of scribe A , but scribe A limits himself to correcting his own work . In the 6th or 7th century , many alterations were made (?b) - according to a colophon at the end of the book of Esdras and Esther the source of these alterations was " a very ancient manuscript that had been corrected by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphylus " (martyred in 309). If this is so, material beginning 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 . The pervasive iotacism, especially of the ??

# = = = Discovery = = =

The Codex may have been seen in 1761 by the Italian traveller, Vitaliano Donati, when he visited the Saint Catherine 's Monastery at Sinai in Egypt. His diary was published in 1879, in which was written:

" In questo monastero ritrovai una quantità grandissima di codici membranacei ... ve ne sono alcuni che mi sembravano anteriori al settimo secolo , ed in ispecie una Bibbia in membrane bellissime , assai grandi , sottili , e quadre , scritta in carattere rotondo e belissimo ; conservano poi in chiesa un Evangelistario greco in caractere d'oro rotondo , che dovrebbe pur essere assai antico " .

In this monastery I found a great number of parchment codices ... there are some which seemed to be written before the seventh century , and especially a Bible ( made ) of beautiful vellum , very large , thin and square parchments , written in round and very beautiful letters ; moreover there are

also in the church a Greek Evangelistarium in gold and round letters, it should be very old.

The "Bible on beautiful vellum "may be the Codex Sinaiticus, and the gold evangelistarium is likely Lectionary 300 on the Gregory @-@ Aland list.

German Biblical scholar Constantin von Tischendorf wrote about his visit to the monastery in Reise in den Orient in 1846 (translated as Travels in the East in 1847), without mentioning the manuscript . Later , in 1860 , in his writings about the Sinaiticus discovery , Tischendorf wrote a narrative about the monastery and the manuscript that spanned from 1844 to 1859. He wrote that in 1844, during his first visit to the Saint Catherine 's Monastery, he saw some leaves of parchment in a waste @-@ basket. They were "rubbish which was to be destroyed by burning it in the ovens of the monastery ", although this is firmly denied by the Monastery. After examination he realized that they were part of the Septuagint, written in an early Greek uncial script. He retrieved from the basket 129 leaves in Greek which he identified as coming from a manuscript of the Septuagint . He asked if he might keep them, but at this point the attitude of the monks changed. They realized how valuable these old leaves were, and Tischendorf was permitted to take only one @-@ third of the whole, i.e. 43 leaves. These leaves contained portions of 1 Chronicles, Jeremiah, Nehemiah, and Esther. After his return they were deposited in the Leipzig University Library, where they still remain. In 1846 Tischendorf published their contents, naming them the 'Codex Friderico @-@ Augustanus ' ( in honor of Frederick Augustus and keeping secret the source of the leaves ) . Other portions of the same codex remained in the monastery, containing all of Isaiah and 1 and 4 Maccabees.

In 1845, Archimandrite Porphyrius Uspensky ( 1804 ? 1885 ), at that time head of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem and subsequently Bishop of Chigirin, visited the monastery and the codex was shown to him, together with leaves which Tischendorf had not seen. In 1846, Captain C. K. MacDonald visited Mount Sinai, saw the codex, and bought two codices ( 495 and 496 ) from the monastery.

In 1853, Tischendorf revisited the Saint Catherine 's Monastery to get the remaining 86 folios, but without success. Returning in 1859, this time under the patronage of Tsar Alexander II of Russia, he was shown the Codex Sinaiticus. He would later claim to have found it discarded in a rubbish bin. (This story may have been a fabrication, or the manuscripts in question may have been unrelated to Codex Sinaiticus: Rev. J. Silvester Davies in 1863 quoted "a monk of Sinai who ... stated that according to the librarian of the monastery the whole of Codex Sinaiticus had been in the library for many years and was marked in the ancient catalogues ... Is it likely ... that a manuscript known in the library catalogue would have been jettisoned in the rubbish basket. "Indeed, it has been noted that the leaves were in "suspiciously good condition "for something found in the trash.) Tischendorf had been sent to search for manuscripts by Russia 's Tsar Alexander II, who was convinced there were still manuscripts to be found at the Sinai monastery. The text of this part of the codex was published by Tischendorf in 1862:

Konstantin von Tischendorf : Bibliorum codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus . Giesecke & Devrient , Leipzig 1862 .

It was reprinted in four volumes in 1869:

Konstantin von Tischendorf, G. Olms (Hrsg.): Bibliorum codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus. 1. Prolegomena. G. Olms, Hildesheim 1869 (Repr.).

Konstantin von Tischendorf , G. Olms ( Hrsg . ) : Bibliorum codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus . 2 . Veteris Testamenti pars prior . G. Olms , Hildesheim 1869 ( Repr . ) .

Konstantin von Tischendorf, G. Olms (Hrsg.): Bibliorum codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus. 3. Veteris Testamenti pars posterior. G. Olms, Hildesheim 1869 (Repr.).

Konstantin von Tischendorf , G. Olms ( Hrsg . ) : Bibliorum codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus . 4 . Novum Testamentum cum Barnaba et Pastore . G. Olms , Hildesheim 1869 ( Repr . ) .

The complete publication of the codex was made by Kirsopp Lake in 1911 (New Testament), and in 1922 (Old Testament). It was the full @-@ sized black and white facsimile of the manuscript, "made from negatives taken from St. Petersburg by my wife and myself in the summer of 1908 ".

The story of how Tischendorf found the manuscript, which contained most of the Old Testament and all of the New Testament, has all the interest of a romance. Tischendorf reached the

monastery on 31 January; but his inquiries appeared to be fruitless. On 4 February, he had resolved to return home without having gained his object:

On the afternoon of this day I was taking a walk with the steward of the convent in the neighbourhood , and as we returned , towards sunset , he begged me to take some refreshment with him in his cell . Scarcely had he entered the room , when , resuming our former subject of conversation , he said : " And I , too , have read a Septuagint " ? i.e. a copy of the Greek translation made by the Seventy . And so saying , he took down from the corner of the room a bulky kind of volume , wrapped up in a red cloth , and laid it before me . I unrolled the cover , and discovered , to my great surprise , not only those very fragments which , fifteen years before , I had taken out of the basket , but also other parts of the Old Testament , the New Testament complete , and , in addition , the Epistle of Barnabas and a part of the Shepherd of Hermas .

After some negotiations , he obtained possession of this precious fragment . James Bentley gives an account of how this came about , prefacing it with the comment , " Tischendorf therefore now embarked on the remarkable piece of duplicity which was to occupy him for the next decade , which involved the careful suppression of facts and the systematic denigration of the monks of Mount Sinai . " He conveyed it to Tsar Alexander II , who appreciated its importance and had it published as nearly as possible in facsimile , so as to exhibit correctly the ancient handwriting . In 1869 the Tsar sent the monastery 7 @,@ 000 rubles and the monastery of Mount Tabor 2 @,@ 000 rubles by way of compensation . The document in Russian formalising this was published in 2007 in Russia and has since been translated .

Regarding Tischendorf 's role in the transfer to Saint Petersburg, there are several views. The codex is currently regarded by the monastery as having been stolen. This view is hotly contested by several scholars in Europe. Kirsopp Lake wrote:

Those who have had much to do with Oriental monks will understand how improbable it is that the terms of the arrangement , whatever it was , were ever known to any except of the leaders .

In a more neutral spirit, New Testament scholar Bruce Metzger writes:

Certain aspects of the negotiations leading to the transfer of the codex to the Tsar 's possession are open to an interpretation that reflects adversely on Tischendorf 's candour and good faith with the monks at Saint Catherine 's Monastery . For a recent account intended to exculpate him of blame , see Erhard Lauch 's article ' Nichts gegen Tischendorf ' in Bekenntnis zur Kirche : Festgabe für Ernst Sommerlath zum 70 . Geburtstag (Berlin , c . 1961 ) ; for an account that includes a hitherto unknown receipt given by Tischendorf to the authorities at the monastery promising to return the manuscript from Saint Petersburg ' to the Holy Confraternity of Sinai at its earliest request ' .

#### = = = Simonides = = =

On 13 September 1862 Constantine Simonides, skilled in calligraphy and with a controversial background with manuscripts, made the claim in print in The Guardian that he had written the codex himself as a young man in 1839 in the Panteleimonos monastery at Athos . Constantin von Tischendorf, who worked with numerous Bible manuscripts, was known as somewhat flamboyant, and had ambitiously sought money from several royal families for his ventures, who had indeed funded his trips. Simonides, whose name may be a synonym mocking Tischendorf, had a somewhat obscure history, as he claimed he was at Mt. Athos in the years preceding Tischendorf 's contact, making the claim at least plausible. Simonides also claimed his father had died and the invitation to Mt. Athos came from his uncle, a monk there, but subsequent letters to his father were found among his possessions at his death . While the word ' forgery ' has been bandied about among scholars regarding the claims on the Sinaiticus by Tischendorf, perhaps a more accurate rendering would be recollation and 'adjusted 'restoration as Simonides, an expert on hieroglyphics which are represented throughout the Sinaiticus. Simonides claimed the false nature of the document in the Guardian in an exchange of letters among scholars and others, at the time. Henry Bradshaw, a British librarian known to both men, defended the Tischendorf find of the Sinaiticus, casting aside the accusations of Simonides . Since Bradshaw was a social ' hub ' among many diverse scholars of the day, his aiding of Tischendorf was given much weight. Simonides died

shortly after, and the issue lay dormant for many years.

Tischendorf answered in Allgemeine Zeitung ( December ) , that only in the New Testament there are many differences between it and all other manuscripts . Henry Bradshaw , a scholar , contributed to exposing the frauds of Constantine Simonides , and exposed the absurdity of his claims in a letter to the Guardian ( 26 January 1863 ) . Bradshaw showed that the Codex Sinaiticus brought by Tischendorf from the Greek monastery of Mount Sinai was not a modern forgery or written by Simonides . Simonides ' " claim was flawed from the beginning " . The controversy seems to regard the misplaced use of the word ' fraud ' or ' forgery ' since it may have been a repaired text , a copy of the Septuagint based upon Origen 's Hexapla , a text which has been rejected for centuries because of its lineage from Eusebius who introduced Arian doctrine into the courts of Constantine I and II .

Not every scholar and Church minister was delighted about the codex . Burgon , a supporter of the Textus Receptus , suggested that Codex Sinaiticus , as well as codices Vaticanus and Codex Bezae , were the most corrupt documents extant . Each of these three codices " clearly exhibits a fabricated text ? is the result of arbitrary and reckless recension . " The two most weighty of these three codices , ? and B , he likens to the " two false witnesses " of Matthew 26 : 60 .

# = = = Later story of the codex = = =

In the early 20th century Vladimir N. Beneshevich ( 1874 ? 1938 ) discovered parts of three more leaves of the codex in the bindings of other manuscripts in the library of Mount Sinai . Beneshevich went on three occasions to the monastery ( 1907 , 1908 , 1911 ) but does not tell when or from which book he recovered . These leaves were also acquired for St. Petersburg , where they remain to the present day .

For many decades , the Codex was preserved in the Russian National Library . In 1933 , the Soviet Union sold the codex to the British Museum ( after 1973 British Library ) for £ 100 @,@ 000 raised by public subscription ( worth £ 6 @.@ 4 million in 2016 ) . After coming to Britain it was examined by T. C. Skeat and H.J.M. Milne using an ultra @-@ violet lamp .

In May 1975, during restoration work, the monks of Saint Catherine 's Monastery discovered a room beneath the St. George Chapel which contained many parchment fragments. Kurt Aland and his team from the Institute for New Testament Textual Research were the first scholars who exclusively were invited to analyse, examine and photograph these new fragments of the New Testament in 1982. Among these fragments were twelve complete leaves from the Sinaiticus, 11 leaves of the Pentateuch and 1 leaf of the Shepherd of Hermas. Together with these leaves 67 Greek Manuscripts of New Testament have been found (uncials 0278? 0296 and some minuscules).

In June 2005, a team of experts from the UK, Europe, Egypt, Russia and USA undertook a joint project to produce a new digital edition of the manuscript (involving all four holding libraries), and a series of other studies was announced. This will include the use of hyperspectral imaging to photograph the manuscripts to look for hidden information such as erased or faded text. This is to be done in cooperation with the British Library.

More than one quarter of the manuscript was made publicly available at The Codex Sinaiticus Website on 24 July 2008. On 6 July 2009, 800 more pages of the manuscript were made available, showing over half of the entire text, although the entire text was intended to be shown by that date

The complete document is now available online in digital form and available for scholarly study . The online version has a fully transcribed set of digital pages , including amendments to the text , and two images of each page , with both standard lighting and raked lighting to highlight the texture of the parchment .

Prior to 1 September 2009 , the University of the Arts London PhD student , Nikolas Sarris , discovered the previously unseen fragment of the Codex in the library of Saint Catherine 's Monastery . It contains the text of Book of Joshua 1 : 10 .

The codex is now split into four unequal portions: 347 leaves in the British Library in London (199 of the Old Testament, 148 of the New Testament), 12 leaves and 14 fragments in the Saint Catherine 's Monastery, 43 leaves in the Leipzig University Library, and fragments of 3 leaves in the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg.

Saint Catherine 's Monastery still maintains the importance of a letter , handwritten in 1844 with an original signature of Tischendorf confirming that he borrowed those leaves . However , recently published documents , including a deed of gift dated 11 September 1868 and signed by Archbishop Kallistratos and the monks of the monastery , indicate that the manuscript was acquired entirely legitimately . This deed , which agrees with a report by Kurt Aland on the matter , has now been published . Unfortunately this development is not widely known in the English @-@ speaking world , as only German- and Russian @-@ language media reported on it in 2009 . Doubts as to the legality of the gift arose because when Tischendorf originally removed the manuscript from Saint Catherine 's Monastery in September 1859 , the monastery was without an archbishop , so that even though the intention to present the manuscript to the Tsar had been expressed , no legal gift could be made at the time . Resolution of the matter was delayed through the turbulent reign of Archbishop Cyril ( consecrated 7 December 1859 , deposed 24 August 1866 ) , and the situation only formalised after the restoration of peace .

Skeat in his article " The Last Chapter in the History of the Codex Sinaiticus " concluded in this way .

This is not the place to pass judgements, but perhaps I may say that, as it seems to me, both the monks and Tischendorf deserve our deepest gratitude, Tischendorf for having alerted the monks to the importance of the manuscript, and the monks for having undertaken the daunting task of searching through the vast mass of material with such spectacular results, and then doing everything in their power to safeguard the manuscript against further loss. If we accept the statement of Uspensky, that he saw the codex in 1845, the monks must have worked very hard to complete their search and bind up the results in so short a period.

## = = Impact on biblical scholarship = =

Along with Codex Vaticanus , the Codex Sinaiticus is considered one of the most valuable manuscripts for establishing the original text (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 . With only 300 years separating the Codex Sinaiticus and the proposed lifetime of Jesus , it is considered to be more accurate than most later New Testament copies in preserving superior readings where many later manuscripts are in error .

For the Gospels , Sinaiticus is generally considered among scholars as the second most reliable 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 reliable witness of the text . In the Book of Revelation , however , its text is corrupted and is considered of poor quality , and inferior to the texts of Codex Alexandrinus , Papyrus 47 , and even some minuscule manuscripts in this place ( for example , Minuscule 2053 , 2062 ) .

## = = = Text of the codex = = =

Constantin von Tischendorf , Fragmentum Codicis Friderico @-@ Augustani , in : Monumenta sacra inedita ( Leipzig 1855 ) , vol . I , pp. 211 ff .

Constantin von Tischendorf : Bibliorum codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus . Giesecke & Devrient , Leipzig 1862 .

Lake, Kirsopp (1911). Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus: The New Testament, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Scrivener, Frederick Henry Ambrose (1867) [1864]. A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus with the Received Text of the New Testament (PDF) (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Deighton Bell.

Anderson, H. T. (1918). CODEX SINAITICUS: The New Testament translated from the Sinaitic Manuscript. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company.

= = = Introductions to the textual criticism of NT = = =

Gregory, C. R. (1900). Textkritik des Neuen Testaments (in German) 1. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs? sche Buchhandlung. Retrieved 18 March 2010.

Metzger, Bruce M. (1991). Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Palaeography. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 76? 79. ISBN 978@-@0@-@19@-@502924@-@6.

Metzger, Bruce M.; Ehrman, Bart D. (2005). The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration (4th ed.). New York? Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 62? 67. Scrivener, Frederick Henry Ambrose; Edward Miller (1894). A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament 1 (4 ed.). London: George Bell & Sons. p. 342.

Streeter, Burnett Hillman (1924). The Four Gospels. A Study of Origins the Manuscripts Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates. Oxford: MacMillan and Co Limited.

#### = = = Other works = = =

Anderson, H. T. (1910). The New Testament Translated from the Sinaitic Manuscript Discovered by Constantine Tischendorf at Mt. Sinai. The Standard Publishing Company.

Böttrich, Christfried (2011). Der Jahrhundertfund. Entdeckung und Geschichte des Codex Sinaiticus (The Discovery of the Century. Discovery and history of Codex Sinaiticus). Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt. ISBN 978 @-@ 3 @-@ 374 @-@ 02586 @-@ 2.

Gardthausen, Victor (1913). Griechische paleographie 2. Leipzig. pp. 119?134.

Jongkind, Dirk (2007). Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus. Gorgias Press LLC.

Kenyon, Frederic G. (1939). Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts (4th ed.). London. pp. 121? 128.

Peter M. Head (2008). "The Gospel of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus: Textual and Reception @-@ Historical Considerations" (PDF). Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism.

Magerson, P. (1983). "Codex Sinaiticus: An Historical Observation". Bib Arch 46: 54? 56.

Milne, H. J. M.; Skeat, T. C. (1963) [1951]. The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus. London.

Milne, H. J. M.; Skeat, T. C. (1938). Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus. London: British Museum.

Parker , D. C. ( 2010 ) . Codex Sinaiticus . The Story of the World ? s Oldest Bible . London : The British Library . ISBN 978 @-@ 0 @-@ 7123 @-@ 5803 @-@ 3 .

Porter, Stanley E. (2015). Constantine Tischendorf. The Life and Work of a 19th Century Bible Hunter. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark. ISBN 978 @-@ 0 @-@ 5676 @-@ 5803 @-@ 6.

Schick , Alexander ( 2015 ) . Tischendorf und die älteste Bibel der Welt - Die Entdeckung des CODEX SINAITICUS im Katharinenkloster ( Tischendorf and the oldest Bible in the world - The discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus in St. Catherine 's Monastery - Biography cause of the anniversary of the 200th birthday of Tischendorf with many unpublished documents from his estate . These provide insight into previously unknown details of the discoveries and the reasons behind the donation of the manuscript . Recent research on Tischendorf and the Codex Sinaiticus and its significance for New Testament Textual Research ) . Muldenhammer : Jota . ISBN 978 @-@ 3 @-@ 935707 @-@ 83 @-@ 1 .

T. C. Skeat , A four years work on the Codex Sinaiticus : Significant discoveries in reconditioned ms . , in : T. C. Skeat and J. K. Elliott , The collected biblical writings of T. C. Skeat , Brill 2004 , pp. 109 ? 118 .

Schneider, Ulrich Johannes (ed.) (2007). Codex Sinaiticus. Geschichte und Erschließung der "Sinai @-@ Bibel ". Leipzig: Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig. ISBN 978 @-@ 3 @-@ 934178 @-@

72 @-@ 4.

Tischendorf , Constantin von ( 1870 ) . Responsa ad Calumnias Romanas . Leipzig : F. A. Brockhaus .

Tischendorf, Constantin von (1871). Die Sinaibibel ihre Entdeckung, Herausgabe, und Erwerbung. Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient.

Tischendorf , Constantin von ( 1865 ) . Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst ? . Leipzig : J. C. Hinrichssche Buchhandlung .

Tischendorf, Constantin von (1866). When Were Our Gospels Written?, An Argument by Constantine Tischendorf. With a Narrative of the Discovery of the Sinaitic Manuscript. New York: American Tract Society.

= = = Facsimiles of Codex Sinaiticus = = =

Codex Sinaiticus at the Center for the Study of NT Manuscripts (JPG)

Turn the pages of the Codex Sinaiticus online (British Library interactive)

Codex Sinaiticus: A Facsimile (ISBN 9780712349987), due to be published by the British Library in conjunction with Hendrickson Publishers on 6 January 2011

= = = Articles = = =

Differences between the Sinaiticus and the KJV

Codex Sinaiticus at the Encyclopedia of Textual Criticism

Codex Sinaiticus page at bible @-@ researcher.com

Earlham College facsimile of Codex Sinaiticus

Codex Sinaiticus page at the British Library website

A real @-@ life Bible Code: the amazing story of the Codex Sinaiticus

Joint project managed by ITSEE for digitizing the codex

E. Henschke, The Codex Sinaiticus, its History and Modern Presentation

Who Owns the Codex Sinaiticus Biblical Archaeology Review Library

Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus 1862 (one from 120 facsimile @-@ examples)

The Codex Sinaiticus and the Manuscripts of Mt Sinai in the Collections of the National Library of Russia The National Library of Russia, 2009

Codex Sinaiticus, the world 's oldest Bible, goes online The Telegraph