

Proof that the source documents are a forgery.

A time line of the Sinaiticus showing it has to be a forgery

I am grateful to David Daniels and his fellow researchers who have scoured the world examining historical documents of the time to find the following facts about the codices used as a basis for modern bible translations. Some of the following information is also from research into the topic of this talk.

Investigations have proved that the two main codices used as the basis for the Critical Greek text that forms the basis of modern translations are forgery and that modern translations are incorrect as they are based on codices men wrote to back up their incorrect theology and these codices were written much later than they were supposed to be written.

A catalogue of books in the Monastery the Sinaiticus was found in was made in the very early 1800's. There were three codices of the Bible found. The Sinaiticus was not one of them.

There is no record in the monastery of the Sinaiticus being received from elsewhere. If it has been there would be two records:

That of the monastery or person giving it

The monastery receiving it and possible celebration because of having received it.

There is no such record which would have been expected when such a valuable codex was transferred. The Lewis sisters and a Serbian theologian saw the Codex Sinaiticus describing it as white and clean (implying no corrections).

Simonides (one of the greatest 18TH Century forgers of antique documents) claims to have forged the manuscript. His claim was verified by someone who saw him do it. He was such a good forger they had to ask him for a list of his forgeries.

Tischendorf saw the codex and sent pages to King Frederick. These are white and have no corrections or parts of pages cut or missing. (Corrections would have made it like the Vaticanus implying a connection of age).

Tischendorf said he found the manuscript of the New Testament in a basket waiting to be burned. (See comments later about this lie of his)

Tischendorf obtained the New Testament manuscript in its white state without corrections and parts of pages missing

He was seen by a witness cleaning the pages with lemon juice which also happens to darken it and it was also the way of aging documents at that time. He gave it to the Czar of Russia (who sent soldiers with Tischendorf to forcibly take it which from the monastery it was in which is why the Czar compensated the monastery for its loss with a payment of 9,000 roubles).

Tischendorf said the monks loaned it to him then why was the head monk of the monastery punished by the fellow orthodox brethren for allowing Tischendorf to have it.

Pages, were found later in the 1990's in the monastery and the library in Russia it was first sent too, were white without corrections. However, when the manuscript was published in photograph form all the pages, including the white ones, had the same colour as if they had been doctored to remove the whiteness from the pages.

Problems with the basket theory:

Codices were stored in baskets and Tischendorf knew this so for him to say the baskets were for manuscripts waiting to be burnt was a deliberate lie.

He claimed it was waiting to be burned. Vellum was too expensive to burn and was made into a Palimpsest. You also did not burn vellum as it was animal hide and smelled to high heaven

The monks claimed He stole after it was lent to him,

The King of Russia compensated the monastery 9,000 roubles for the loss of the codex implying they had it taken from them by force (which it was as Tischendorf and soldiers from Russia came there to get it).

Tischendorf lied through his teeth over how he obtained it. He asked to borrow it and never returned it.

Questions

Why were so many lies told by Tischendorf about the Sinaiticus and how it was obtained unless he had to hide something like the fact it was a forgery and he knew.

Why was such a valuable document in separate parts with pages not bound with the main body of it so that they were separated? Maybe it was not considered sufficiently valuable to be cared for properly which is why it was able to have parts separated from it without an concern for this which is strange if it was a very old document.

It was said to have a book binding in the monastery when viewed by The Lewis sisters and the Serbian Theologian so that it could not have been separated like Tischendorf said. And he did not present it to the world with a book binding.

When confronted by three witnesses that it was a forgery, why did Tischendorf ignored them?

When the monastery said it had been stolen why were they ignored. If it had not been stolen, then why did the Czar of Russia compensate them for it being stolen from them by his soldiers?

What about Codex 2472 used to alter The Gospel of Mark?

This was found to be a forgery. It was copied from a translation by a Catholic priest from the Vaticanus. It cannot have been written before 1860 because the ink used in it was not available till the 1850.s so it has to be a forgery. All the changes to the Gospel of Mark it made (81 changes) should be ignored.

What about the Vaticanus?

This was considered to be a category 1 document (4th century so was not one of The Bibles Constantine had made to be distributed throughout the Roman world). However, it is not a category 1 document as its format used was only used for a brief period of time in the 5th Century (between 446 and 464. There is also the problem that it uses capitals which did not come into use until the middle of the middle ages as well as the use of Latin Vulgate names for people even though it was supposed to have been written by a Greek writer!

Another major problem is that there are over 3000 differences between the two codices(Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) and you have to wonder how they worked out what to use as they had no codex to reference too. There was the Syriac Peshitta which is more accurate than the King James, but they made up an unbelievable excuse to ignore it.

You do not need to be concerned how the modern translations change the text of the King James Bible. As you can see there is no real foundation for modern Bible translations to do this so they can be dismissed as the work of man and ignored for Bible translation purposes and study purposes. This leaves the King James and the Syriac Peshitta as the only translations of worth.