
New documents on Constantine Tischendorf and the *Codex Sinaïticus*

Ihor Ševčenko

Citer ce document / Cite this document :

Ševčenko Ihor. New documents on Constantine Tischendorf and the *Codex Sinaïticus*. In: Scriptorium, Tome 18 n°1, 1964. pp. 55-80;

doi : <https://doi.org/10.3406/scrip.1964.3197>

https://www.persee.fr/doc/scrip_0036-9772_1964_num_18_1_3197

Fichier pdf généré le 01/04/2018

NEW DOCUMENTS ON CONSTANTINE TISCHENDORF AND THE *CODEX SINAITICUS*

I

The *Codex Sinaiticus* was discovered by the Leipzig scholar Constantine Tischendorf in St. Catherine's Monastery at Sinai. This "incomparable gem for scholarship and the Church," (1) dating from the middle of the fourth century, is one of the two oldest parchment manuscripts of the Bible in existence and, for the New Testament, the more complete of the two.

The discovery of the *Sinaiticus* by Tischendorf occurred in two (1a) stages. In 1844, travelling under the auspices of the Saxon government, he found a part of the manuscript; it contained a portion of the Old Testament, and in all probability amounted to 130 folios (2). He managed to obtain 43 of them, which he took back to Leipzig and offered to the Saxon king Frederick-Augustus II. In 1846 Tischendorf published these 43 folios in facsimile, but he kept their origin secret (3) until his second discovery in February of 1859 (4). At that time Tischendorf, then travelling under the auspices of Tsar Alexander II of Russia, was shown, in addition to a part of the manuscript which he had seen but had not been able to obtain in 1844, additional parts of the Old Testament, the whole New

(1) The expression occurs in Tischendorf's letter to his wife Angelika, Cairo, February 15, 1859. Cf. slide 37 of *Tischendorfs Reise nach dem Sinai*, as in note 10 *infra*.

(1a) We may disregard a small fragment (13 × 7 cm) which Tischendorf found during his second trip to Sinai in 1853. Most recent discussion of this fragment in E. LAUCH, "Etwas vom Codex Sinaiticus," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig*, 3 (1953/54), Gesellsch. -u. Sprachwiss. Reihe, Heft I, p. 5-11.

(2) The earliest mention of the number of folios seen by Tischendorf in 1844 occurs in his *Mémoire sur la découverte et l'antiquité du Codex Sinaiticus*, *Read at a Meeting of the Royal Society of Literature*, February 15, 1865, p. 2. I prefer the number quoted on that occasion (130 folios) to Tischendorf's later information (129 folios). Cf. H. J. M. MILNE and T. C. SKEAT, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (1938), p. 82.

(3) *Codex Frederico-Augustanus... e codice Graeco omnium qui in Europa supersunt facile antiquissimo...* (1846); concerning the origin of his find, Tischendorf spoke of "the East," "disgraceful obscurity," "Egypt or its vicinity," "Lower Egypt." Cf. *ibidem*, title page and p. 5; also, "Die Manuscripta Tischendorffiana," *Serapeum*, 8 (1847), 52.

(4) Tischendorf informs us that before his second trip to Sinai in 1853 he gave his secret away in a memorandum to von Beust, the Minister of Education of the Kingdom of Saxony; cf. *Die Waffen der Finsterniss wider die Sinaibibel* (1863), p. 11 and *Die Sinaibibel. Ihre Entdeckung, Herausgabe und Erwerbung* (1871), p. 5. [This work will subsequently be referred to as *Sinaibibel*.] In 1855, he declared that the 43 folios of the *Frederico-Augustanus* were but a part of what he had seen on his previous trip, but maintained silence as to where he had seen the manuscript: Cf. *Monumenta Sacra inedita. Nova Collectio*, I (1855), p. xxx. However, he waited until March 15, 1859 before admitting in print that the *Frederico-Augustanus* was but a fragment of the manuscript he had found on Sinai. This, he said in a display of deadpan humor, had become clear to him beyond any doubt: Cf. "Ein Brief des Prof. Dr. Tischendorf an den Staatsminister v. Falkenstein," *Leipziger Zeitung*, *Wissenschaftliche Beilage* nr. 31, April 17, 1859, p. 137.

Testament, the Epistle of Barnabas and a part of *Pastor Hermae*. Some months later he was permitted to take the entire 346 folios and a small fragment from the monastery and, in 1862, he presented them to the Russian Tsar, together with a four-volume edition of their contents (5).

The intrinsic value of the *Sinaiticus* and the masterful publication of its text (completed in a record time of three years) accounted for the great admiration—and some envy—bestowed upon Tischendorf by his contemporaries. The *Sinaiticus* secured for him a prominent and permanent place in the history of scholarship. But the circumstances in which the manuscript had been removed from the monastery, offered to the Tsar, and finally obtained by Russia, aroused bitterness among Orthodox hierarchs and, according to travellers' reports, among the Sinai monks. These circumstances also produced some uneasiness among the Russians, the principal beneficiaries of Tischendorf's activities. The rumors, unfriendly to Tischendorf, concerning the legality—or at least the propriety—of the manuscript's transfer, subsided (in Europe at least) only after the monks of Sinai had finally been persuaded to sign the manuscript away to Russia. This official donation occurred in 1869, a decade after Tischendorf's second discovery (6).

Similar rumors were revived about 1933/4, soon after the British Museum acquired the *Sinaiticus* from Soviet authorities. These rumors were soon silenced. In a special pamphlet, the Trustees for the British Museum undertook to show that the £100,000 collected for the purchase of the *Sinaiticus* had not been paid for purloined goods (7). In an article, the German biblical scholar A. Deissmann took upon himself the defense of Tischendorf's honor (8).

The interest in Tischendorf and in the romantic circumstances surrounding his discovery have been revived in recent years. At least three books—two of them written by Tischendorf's relatives—have kept it alive among the German cultivated public (9); a slide travelogue entitled

(5) *Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus... Ex tenebris protraxit in Europam transtulit... Const. Tischendorf*, I-IV (St. Petersburg, 1862).

(6) Cf. documents in C. R. GREGORY, *Prolegomena* to the 8th ed. of TISCHENDORF'S *Novum Testamentum Graece*, III, 1 (1884), p. 351-353; IDEM, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, I (1900), p. 27-28 (some kind of donation by July 15, 1869; definitive donation by November 18, 1869); cf. N. P. Ignat'ev's letters to Archimandrite Antonin, ed. A. A. DMITRIEVSKIJ, *Graf Ignat'ev kak cerkovno-političeskij dejatel' na pravoslavnom vostoce* (1909), p. 23-24 and 28 (donation after March 14, 1869, before January 7, 1870; document of donation forwarded to St. Petersburg about January 1870); N. P. Ignat'ev's letter to Tischendorf, *Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig*, MS 01029 (donation made and rewards in all probability paid to the monks by December 17, 1869). This letter has been (badly) published by FERADZE, *Dokumenty...* (as in note 22 *infra*), p. 149-150, and summarized in *The Mount Sinai Manuscript...* (as in the next note), p. 8.

(7) *The Mount Sinai Manuscript of the Bible* (4th ed., 1935); cf. [H. J. M. MILNE and T. C. SKEAT], *The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus* (2nd ed., 1955).

(8) «Entkräftung eines Kloster-Klatsches. Kampf um den Sinaiticus», *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, nr. 62 (Berlin, February 7, 1934). Much of DEISSMANN'S *Refutation* is a repetition of Gregory's statements.

(9) O. SCHLISSKE, *Der Schatz im Wüstenkloster...* (1953); L. SCHNELLER, *Tischendorf-Erinnerungen. Merkwürdige Auffindung der verlorenen Sinaihandschrift* (1954); H. BEHREND, *Auf der Suche nach Schätzen...* (8th ed., 1960).

“Tischendorf’s Journey to Sinai” has been produced to be shown to interested, primarily religious groups (10), and a Leipzig scholar has devoted much of his recent output to the *Sinaiticus* and its discoverer (11).

These recent publications either repeat or corroborate with new arguments (12) the version of the story that has come to prevail in the literature on the subject ever since C. R. Gregory, the successor to Tischendorf’s chair at Leipzig, cleared Tischendorf of any suspicion of improper dealings (13). In the main, this version—one might call it the “vulgate version”—follows, and sometimes improves upon, Tischendorf’s own story which that tireless scholar reiterated over and over again (14). Its proponents are legion (15), and its pivotal argument is as follows: On September 28, 1859, Tischendorf received the 346 folios of the *Sinaiticus* against a receipt; the manuscript was loaned to him so that he might publish it and officially donate it to the Tsar in the name of the Sinaitic community. Thus the presentation of the manuscript to the Tsar by Tischendorf occurred in accordance with a previous agreement. In any case, an official donation took place in 1869; the Russians acknowledged it by sending nine thousand rubles and some medals to the monks. Thus throughout the *Sinaiticus* affair, Tischendorf’s actions were above reproach and his account true, for “he attempts to conceal nothing.” (16)

The documents about to be presented in this article indicate, to my satisfaction at least, that the vulgate story offers too schematic and partly incorrect a version of the events and that the conventional image painted in that story is not a portrait of the real Tischendorf. Answers to the following four questions are crucial to anyone attempting a plausible history of the *Sinaiticus* in the years 1859-1869; these answers furnish criteria for

(10) H. KUNTZ, ed., *Tischendorfs Reise nach dem Sinai* [= Nr. 182 of the Eichenkreuz-Bildkammer at Kassel-Wilhelmshöhe]; 50 slides and explanatory pamphlet.

(11) E. LAUCH, «Nichts gegen Tischendorf», *Bekennnis zur Kirche, Festgabe für Ernst Sommerlath zum 70. Geburtstag* (1960), p. 15-24, with a list of articles devoted to the *Sinaiticus* by the same author, who also announced (*ibidem*, p. 24) that his *Codex-Sinaiticus-Bibliographie* was in press. I am indebted to Mr. Lauch for providing me with information concerning his writings.

(12) Thus E. LAUCH (as in the preceding note), p. 16, published the draft of the receipt of February 24, 1859, in which Tischendorf promised to return the *Sinaiticus* within a month and a half. This receipt refers to the first loan of the manuscript, to be copied by Tischendorf and aides in the Hôtel des Pyramides at Cairo.

(13) Cf., in addition to the two works by Gregory quoted in note 6 *supra*, the same author’s *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (1909), p. 434-446.

(14) Cf. «Ein Brief...» quoted at the end of note 4 *supra*; *Notitia editionis codicis biblicorum Sinaitici...* (1860), p. 5-7; *Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus... I* (1862), as in note 5 *supra*, p. 1^r-4^v; *Aus dem Heiligen Lande...* (1862), p. 108-372; *Die Anfechtungen der Sinaibibel* (1863), p. 10 ff.; *Waffen der Finsterniss wider die Sinaibibel* (1863), p. 10-12; *Mémoire sur la découverte...*, as in note 2 *supra*, p. 2-14; *Sinaibibel, passim* (this is Tischendorf’s principal work on the subject); cf. also *Codex Sinaiticus — Tischendorf’s Story and Argument Related by Himself* (1934), p. 15-32 (a translation of TISCHENDORF’S *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?*).

(15) They include professional scholars like H. and K. Lake (as in note 25 *infra*), and all those who wrote popular accounts of Sinai—a multitude too overwhelming to be cited here. For the treatment of the Tischendorf story in two of the most recent examples of the latter genre, cf. H. SKROBUCHA, *Sinai* (1959), p. 107-108 and the excellent book by G. GERSTER, *Sinai, Land der Offenbarung* (1961), p. 172-174.

(16) *The Mount Sinai Manuscript...* (as in note 7 *supra*), p. 4.

judging Tischendorf's role in that history : (1) What were the exact conditions under which Tischendorf received the *Sinaiticus* on September 28, 1859? (2) By what authority did Tischendorf offer the *Sinaiticus* to the Tsar in 1862, if the official donation of the manuscript occurred only in 1869? (3) Why did this act of donation require a whole decade to be delivered by the monks? (4) How is one to explain the circumstance that Cyril, the Archbishop of Sinai, who let Tischendorf have the manuscript in 1859, did not issue the act of donation, while Callistratus, his successor and enemy, who had nothing to do with the negotiations of 1859, did? The circumstance is remarkable since Cyril is said to have been eager, in the beginning at least, to make a gift of the manuscript to the Tsar, and was otherwise notorious for squandering the monastery's property, while Callistratus was hailed as a stern guardian of that monastery's possessions.

In answering the first question, the adherents of the vulgate version improved upon Tischendorf's own story, for Tischendorf did not always imply that the intended donation to the Tsar was mentioned in the receipt of September 28, 1859 (17). The second question was not considered by the vulgate version at all. The third was answered by the allegation that all bureaucracies move slowly, and eastern bureaucracies even more slowly than others (18). As for the fourth question, it was treated no more thoroughly than the second; moreover, the reader was not always explicitly informed that two Archbishops of Sinai were involved in the *Sinaiticus* affair (19).

Better answers than those given in the vulgate version could have been obtained from the publications of Uspenskij (20), Dmitrievskij (21), Peradze (22), and Beneševič (23). The views of these authors, all of them unfriendly to Tischendorf, are on occasion exaggerated, and their state-

(17) I find such implications only in *Notitia editionis...* (1860), p. 7, in *Bibliorum Codex... I* (1862), p. 4^v, and in the ingenious wording of *Aus dem Heiligen Lande...* (1862), p. 371. For examples how unambiguously these implications were understood from the very outset, cf. S. P. TREGELLES, *Poscript November 1, 1860*, in T. H. HORNE, *An Introduction to the... Holy Scriptures*, 4 (New ed., ... 1866), p. 776 : "... the MS was put into the hands of Tischendorf, September 28, 1859, to be presented to the Emperor Alexander II," and the anonymous author of *Die Sinaitische Bibelhandschrift, Sächsisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt*, 13 (1863), 249 : Tischendorf managed to get the *Sinaiticus* from the Monastery as the monks' respectful gift for Alexander II.

(18) E. g. C. R. GREGORY, *Textkritik...*, p. 28; cf. IDEM, *Einleitung...*, p. 436.

(19) E. g. GREGORY, *Textkritik...*, p. 28 fails to make the distinction.

(20) Porfirij USPENSKIJ, *Kniga bytija moego*, I-VIII (1894-1902), esp. books VII and VIII, *passim*; *Pervoe putešestvie v Sinajskij monastyr' v 1845 godu* (1856), esp. p. 225-238; *Vtoroe putešestvie arhimandrita Porfirija Uspenskago v Sinajskij monastyr' v 1850 godu* (1856), esp. p. 183; *Vostok Hristianskij. Egipet i Sinaj...* (1857), plates XV and XVI (= facsimiles of the *Sinaiticus*); P. V. BEZOBRAZOV, ed., *Materialy dlja biografii episkopa Porfirija Uspenskago*, I-II (1910), esp. II, p. 626-627; 681-684; 879-885; 912-922; 924-929.—I have not been able to consult USPENSKIJ's polemical pamphlet, *Mnenie o sinajskoj rukopisi, soderžaščej v sebe Vethij Zavet nepolnyj i ves' novyj Zavet...* (1862).

(21) As in note 6 *supra*.

(22) G. PERADZE, *Dokumenty, dotyczące zagadnień odnalezienia i tekstu kodeksu Synajskiego*, *Ελληνικά*, 8, 2 (Warsaw, 1934), 127-151.

(23) V. N. BENEŠEVIČ (Bénéchévitch), *Les manuscrits grecs du Mont Sinai et le monde savant de l'Europe depuis le XVII^e siècle jusqu'à 1927* [= *Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechischen Philologie*, 21 (1937)], esp. p. 33-51.

ments sometimes wrong. But these four writers offer significant information and documentation; it is regrettable that the proponents of the vulgate version have ignored them, garbled them, or shrugged them off (24). The story of the *Sinaiticus* may be "one of the best-known stories in the history of palaeography;" (25) but, like all stories where the heroes and the villains are known in advance, it still remains a story told without too much care for detail.

The material offered in the present article brings us even closer to answering three of the four questions that have just been asked. Whether the vulgate story of the *Sinaiticus* still retains its basic validity in the light of this material is more a matter of opinion than of fact. In my opinion, it does not. But it will, I hope, be generally agreed that the story at least requires some retouching. The new documents also suggest that between

(24) I have no quarrel with those who are influenced by familial piety, professional solidarity, local patriotism, or religious sentiment. My criticism is directed particularly to the two pamphlets published under the auspices of the British Museum in 1935 and 1955 respectively (cf. note 7 *supra*). There Uspenskij's claim to have seen the *Sinaiticus* (and written on it) before 1859 is discounted as the "Usual claim put forward... by someone 'who knew about it all the time'." In reality, one of them states, Uspenskij found (after Tischendorf) "fragments of two leaves... This was in 1845" (*The Mount Sinai Manuscript...*, p. 5, n. 2). Anyone familiar with the works quoted in note 20 *supra* (or even with A. RAHLFS' *Verzeichnis...* [1914], p. 226, no. 259, 2) knows that these statements are just not so. (I will grant that the treatment of USPENSKIJ in *The Codex Sinaiticus...*, p. 6, n. 1 is more equitable.) As for the "alleged admission by Count Ignatiew, in private letters" (and thus presumably of inferior value as testimony) to the effect "that he had 'stolen' the Codex," the pamphlet writes it off as a joke on the part of that astute diplomat (*ibidem*, p. 11). But that "alleged" admission is printed for all to read in Dmitrievskij's work (as in note 6 *supra*), which the authors of the British Museum pamphlet did not directly quote, but of whose existence they were aware. If they took the trouble to read Ignat'ev's correspondence published there, they would have realized that Ignat'ev wrote in dead earnest and that, incidentally, he did not say that *he* had stolen the Codex, but that the Codex had been "stolen by us," i.e., by Russia. On this point, cf. p. 80 *infra*. Benešević is said to have heard from the *skeuophylax* Polycarp in 1908 that the *Sinaiticus* "itself came to light among some rubbish which his predecessor in office had been cleaning out and burning in the bread ovens" (*The Codex Sinaiticus...*, p. 6, n. 1). What a marvelous confirmation of Tischendorf's story! Alas, when we turn to Benešević (*Opisanie greč. ruk. mon. Sv. Ekateriny*, I [1911], p. xvi, n. 1), we read: "Quite recently, in order to get rid of 'rubbish,' they heated the bread oven with old books, among which were very rare editions." Thus the *Sinaiticus* is not mentioned in the passage adduced. What is more, no manuscripts at all are involved in the burning; and Polycarp's pyromaniac predecessor is a misunderstanding. Finally, since the statement is not Polycarp's, but Benešević's (this appears with all clarity from the version of the same story the latter gave in *Les manuscrits grecs...* [as in the preceding note], p. 36), we are in the twentieth century, not in Tischendorf's times. *The Codex Sinaiticus...*, p. 8, reports that the troubles culminating in Archbishop Cyril's deposition in 1867 "were quite unconnected with the gift of the manuscript;" BENEŠEVIČ, *Les manuscrits grecs...*, p. 48, thought otherwise; if not Benešević, then *The Mount Sinai Manuscript...*, p. 8, should have given the authors of *The Codex Sinaiticus* food for thought: Ignat'ev's letter of December 17, 1869, which is summarized there, is explicit on the connection between "troubles" and "gift." *The Codex Sinaiticus...*, p. 8, n. 1 does quote BENEŠEVIČ's *Les manuscrits grecs...* in passing, but only to remark that it unjustifiably questions Tischendorf's veracity; PERADZE's *Dokumenty...* is quoted too (*ibidem*, p. 6, n. 2), as a publication not "adding anything of importance to the facts already known;" not a word is said of the six letters of Archbishop Cyril to Tischendorf which appear therein, and add a few things of importance on the manuscript's donation, one of these being that Cyril politely refused to make such a donation. In his *Text of the Greek Bible* (2nd ed., 1948), p. 78, n. 1, Sir Frederick Kenyon stated that "the fullest and fairest account of the whole [*Sinaiticus*] affair is to be found in the pamphlet *The Mount Sinai Manuscript of the Bible*, published by the British Museum in 1934." It is difficult to subscribe to this view.

(25) The formulation is by H. and K. LAKE, *Codex Sinaiticus...* (Oxford, 1922), p. vii.

1859 and 1869 the affair of the *Sinaiticus* produced repercussions not only beyond the awareness of modern research, but beyond that of Tischendorf himself.

II.

Until recently, the receipt issued by Tischendorf on September 28, 1859 remained unknown to scholars, although it was said that it did exist somewhere either on Sinai or in Cairo (26). The rumor proved to be correct, for when in November of 1960 I discussed the *Sinaiticus* with the then acting *oekonomos* of the monastery Nicephorus, he claimed to have Tischendorf's receipt in his cell. Two days later he produced a sheet of four pages, with f. 1^v and 2^r empty (see Pl. 4). F. 1^r contained the main text of the receipt in Tischendorf's own handwriting; f. 2^v bears remarks by two hands, identifying the document (27). The main text runs as follows :

Ἐγὼ ὁ ὑπογραφόμενος, Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ τοῦ Τισχενδόρφου, ἀπεσταλμένος νῦν εἰς τὴν ἀνατολὴν ἐξ ἐπιταγῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος πασῶν τῶν Ῥωσσιῶν διαμαρτυρῶ διὰ τῆς παρουσίας γραφῆς ὅτι ἡ Ἱερὰ Ἀδελφότης τοῦ ὄρους Σινᾶ κατὰ συνέπειαν ἐπιστολῆς τοῦ ἐξοχωτάτου Πρέσβευς Λοβάνωβ παρέδωκέ μοι λόγῳ δανείου χειρόγραφον ἀρχαῖον τῶν ἀμφοτέρων διαθηκῶν κατέχον φύλλα 346 καὶ κομμάτιόν τι μικρὸν, ἀπόκτημα τοῦ αὐτοῦ μοναστηρίου, ὅπερ θέλω φέρειν μετ' ἐμαυτοῦ ἐν Πετροπόλει πρὸς παραβολὴν τοῦ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ γενομένου ἀντιγράφου πρὸς τὸ πρωτότυπον ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἐκτυπώσεως. Τὸ χειρόγραφον τοῦτο ἐμπιστευθὲν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῇ ῤηθείᾳ ἐπιστολῆ τοῦ Κυρ. Λοβάνωβ ἡμερολογουμένη ἀπὸ 10 Σεπτεμβρ. 1859. ὑπὸ ἀριθμὸν 510. ἐνδιαλαμβανομένους ὄρους ὑπόσχομαι ἀποδοῦναι σῶον καὶ ἀβλαβὲς τῇ Ἱερᾷ τοῦ Σινᾶ Ἀδελφότητι εἰς πρώτην αὐτῆς ἀναζήτησιν.

Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ τοῦ Τισχενδόρφου.

Ἐν Καίρῳ 16/28 Σεπτεμβρ. 1859 (28).

(26) Cf. the hemming and hawing of GREGORY, *Einleitung...* (as in note 13 *supra*), p. 437-38; cf. W. HOTZELT, "Die kirchenrechtliche Stellung von Bistum und Kloster Sinai zur Zeit der Entdeckung der Sinaibibel" *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 74 (1949), 462; E. LAUCH, "Nichts gegen Tischendorf" (as in note 11 *supra*), p. 18 and 22 with notes 28 and 33.

(27) First hand : ἀπόδειξις Τισσενδόρφ διὰ τὸν Σιναϊτικὸν Κώδικα.

Second hand : εὐρέθη ἐν τοῖς ἐγγράφοις τοῦ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Σινᾶ Κυρίλλου τοῦ Στρικίδου [?].

(28) I, the undersigned, Constantin von Tischendorf, now on mission to the Levant upon the command of Alexander, Autocrat of All the Russias, attest by these presents that the Holy Confraternity of Mount Sinai, in accordance with the letter of His Excellency Ambassador Lobanov, has delivered to me as a loan an ancient manuscript of both Testaments, being the property of the aforesaid monastery and containing 346 folia and a small fragment. These I shall take with me to St. Petersburg in order that I may collate the copy previously made by me with the original at the time of publication of the manuscript.

The manuscript has been entrusted to me under the conditions stipulated in the aforementioned letter of Mr. Lobanov, dated September 10, 1859, Number 510. This manuscript I promise to return, undamaged and in a good state of preservation, to the Holy Confraternity of Sinai at its earliest request.

Constantin von TISCHENDORF.

Cairo, September 16/28, 1859.

The receipt found its way into Nicephorus' cell from the archives of Sinai's Cairene dependency. At present, it is exhibited in the visitor's room of the monastery's New Library. Several members of the 1960 Expedition cooperated in having it mounted under glass.

At first glance the text of the receipt is not too favorable to Tischendorf's cause, as it does not allude by single word to the monks' alleged intention of donating the *Sinaiticus* to Alexander II, while it is quite explicit as to the manuscript's restitution which was to be made at the monastery's earliest request. But Tischendorf was a careful negotiator. The *Sinaiticus*—so the receipt states—was to be entrusted to him under the terms outlined in Prince Lobanov's letter of September 10 (29). In this letter, the Russian Ambassador did say that, from what he had heard, the monks intended to present the manuscript to the Tsar. Thus even today an admirer of Tischendorf might rise to the defense of this scholar's occasional hints (30) that a donation was mentioned or implied in the receipt of September 28. However, this defense will be weak indeed. In the same letter, Prince Lobanov goes on to state that the person who had enlightened him in regard to the monk's noble intention to donate the manuscript to Russia was none other than Tischendorf himself, and the monks of Sinai had no reason to be bound by the statements of a Tischendorf concerning their intentions. They could very well let the reference to the "terms of Prince Lobanov's letter" stand in the receipt; the terms *they* had in mind were those by which the Ambassador undertook to restore the manuscript to the community and to assure them that, while on loan, the *Sinaiticus* would remain the monastery's property. That this was the monks' understanding of these terms is evident from their reply, dated September 29, to Prince Lobanov's letter. This reply did not mention a donation; it spoke only of a temporary loan of the manuscript as a gesture of the Community's special devotion to the Russian Imperial House (31).

Thus it must be granted that in 1859 the monks, too, turned out to be careful negotiators. The cautious leaders of Sinai did not commit themselves (in writing at least, their words might have been more encouraging) to any offering of the *Sinaiticus* whatsoever.

III

While sifting through the material—ranging in date from the fifth to the twentieth century—contained in one of the chests which stand along the walls of the monastery's New Library, I chanced upon an envelope inscribed "Ἐγγράφα περὶ τοῦ δανείου τοῦ χειρογράφου τοῦ Σινᾶ. It yielded, among other things, the five documents transcribed and discussed in the following pages :

1. A letter from the monk Germanos to the Archbishop-Elect of Sinai, Cyril, then in Constantinople. Date : Cairo, October 28, 1859.

(29) Text in *Sinaibibel*, p. 22-23, and in BENEŠEVIČ, *Les manuscrits grecs...* (as in note 23 *supra*), p. 45.

(30) Cf. note 17 *supra*.

(31) Cf. French version in BENEŠEVIČ, *Les manuscrits grecs...* (as in note 23 *supra*), p. 46; Greek (original?) version in *Cyril's Draft*, reproduced p. 69-70 *infra*.

Cyril, the Archbishop-Elect of Sinai, was the chief spokesman for the monks in the negotiations with Tischendorf. About October 5, 1859 (32), a week after the conclusion of these negotiations, Cyril left Cairo for Constantinople in order to further his cause at the Oecumenical Patriarchate, at the Sublime Porte, and at the Russian Imperial Embassy. This journey was deemed necessary, since the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who by tradition performed the ordination of Sinai's archbishops, was violently opposed to Cyril. To keep informed of the events and the climate of opinion back home, Cyril enlisted the services of a confidential informant Germanos. Germanos' letter of October 16/28, 1859 (see Pl. 5 and 6) was his very first report to Cyril. After vividly describing the disorders which had erupted in the monastery's Cairene dependency on account of the "accursed wine-bibbing," τὴν ἐπάρατον οἴνοποσίαν, Germanos turned to the subject of Tischendorf, who had left Alexandria on October 9 (33), a few days after Cyril's departure :

[p. 2] Ὁ Tischendorf, ἀπ' ἐναντίας τῶν ὑμετέρων συστάσεων καὶ τῶν ὑποσχέσεών του, ἅμα εἶχε λάβει τὸ βιβλίον εἰς χεῖρας, ἔσπευσε νὰ τὸ διακοινώσῃ εἰς ὅλον τὸ Κάϊρον, εἴτε ἀπὸ ματαιότητα, εἴτε ἀπὸ ἄλλην τινὰ αἰτίαν. ἐμάθομεν δὲ ὅτι ὁ ἴδιος εἶχε καταχωρήσει [sic] ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου τούτου προλαβόντως ἐν ἄρθρον εἰς μίαν Ἀγγλικὴν ἑφημερίδα (34). Καὶ ἐπειδὴ ὁ κόσμος ἐδῶ [sic] δὲν ἔχει ἄλλην ὁμιλίαν ἤδη παρὰ τὰ Σιναίτικα, [p. 3] ἠγέρθη μεγάλη κατακραυγὴ κατὰ τῶν Σιναϊτῶν διότι ἀπεξένωσαν τὸ χειρόγραφον τοῦτο, ἐπειδὴ ὁ Tischendorf διεκλήρυσεν ὅχι ὅτι τὸ ἐδανείσθη, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὸ ἔλαβεν ὀριστικῶς διὰ νὰ τὸ προσφέρῃ εἰς τὸν Αὐτοκράτορα. ὅθεν ἐδῶ [sic] εἶναι γνώμη ὅτι τὴν προσφορὰν ταύτην ἐκάματε ἡ Σεβασμιότης Σῶς διὰ νὰ προσλάβῃτε τὴν ὑπεράσπισιν τῆς αὐτόσε Ρ. Πρεσβείας. Τοῦτο ἤκουσα παρὰ πολλῶν, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Εὐγενίου, ὅστις πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις μοι εἶπεν ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ περιστατικὸν δύναται νὰ φέρῃ σκάνδαλόν τι, διότι βεβαίως οἱ ἐνταῦθα ὑπεναντίοι δὲν θέλουσι λείπει ἀπὸ τοῦ νὰ γράψουν τῷ Ἱεροσολύμων, χαρακτηρίζοντες τὴν πράξιν ταύτην ὅπως τοῖς συμφέρει. Ὁ Σπανόπουλος μᾶς ἐπεσκέφθη καὶ μᾶς εἶπε μὲ ἄλλους λόγους, καὶ μὲ πνεῦμα ἐναντίον, τὰ αὐτά. ἡμεῖς ἠρνήθημεν καὶ ἀρνούμεθα πάντοτε τὴν ἐκδίδοσιν τοῦ χειρογράφου λέγοντες ὅτι τὸ ἀπεστείλαμεν εἰς τὸ Μοναστήριον. Μολαταῦτα ἐνεχρίναμεν νὰ προλάβωμεν διὰ τοῦ ἐσωκλειστοῦ πᾶν ἐνδεχόμενον, δημοσιεύοντες τὸ δάνειον τοῦτο. ἀποστέλλομεν δὲ τὴν ἐσωκλειστον διατριβὴν τῇ Ὑ. Σεβασμιότητι, ὥστε ἂν ἐγκρίνῃ αὐτήν, νὰ τὴν δημοσιεύσῃ. νομίζω ὅτι ἡ δημοσίευσίς αὕτη δύναται νὰ ἀμβλύνη τοῦλάχιστον τὰς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου τούτου προσβολὰς τῶν ἐναντίων, καὶ πρέπει νὰ θεωρήσῃτε τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ταύτην μὲ τὴν ἀνήκουσαν σπουδαιότητα, καθότι ἂν αἱ φῆμαι αὗται φθάσωσιν εἰς τὰ ὅσα τῆς Ρ. Πρεσβείας, θέλουσι τὴν δυσαρεστήσει βεβαίως (35).

(32) Date to be inferred from Document 2, p. 63 *infra*.

(33) Cf. *e.g. Sinaibibel*, p. 25.

(34) This must have been a false rumor. Or did Germanos confuse an English with a German newspaper? Tischendorf, fearing that the *Sinaiticus* might be bought right from under his nose, announced his find in the April 17, 1859 issue of the "Scientific Supplement" to the *Leipziger Zeitung*; cf. end of note 4 *supra*.

(35) Contrary to our recommendations and to his own promises, Tischendorf, as soon as he put his hands on the book, hastened to spread the news throughout the whole of Cairo, either out of vanity or for some other reason. We also learned that he had beforehand published an article on this subject in an English daily. Since by now people here have no other subject of conversation than the affairs of Sinai, a great outcry arose against the Sinaites for having alienated this manuscript, since Tischendorf announced not that he had borrowed it, but rather that he had taken it for the definite purpose of offering it to the Emperor. Therefore people here are of the opinion that this offering has been arranged by Your Eminence in order that you might acquire the protection of the Russian Embassy there. I heard this said by many, and

There is little love for Tischendorf in this report, written only a month after the *Sinaiticus* had been handed over to him. Tischendorf had not kept his part of the bargain, he had been indiscreet, he was vain. Instead of stating that the manuscript had been loaned, he claimed that it was to be donated to the Tsar. This was either not true or at least not the version agreed upon.

But was the manuscript to be donated, or was it not? On this point, Germanos' letter does not afford absolute clarity. Rumor had it that it was, as the price to be paid for Russian support. Cyril's enemies would exploit these rumors; the Russians, too, might be displeased. Therefore Germanos penned a special tract, unfortunately lost, in which these rumors were denied.

2. Tischendorf's note to Cyril. Date : Alexandria, October 4, 1859.

Monseigneur,

Empêché de venir ce matin, comme j'avais annoncé par Mr. le Consul Général, pour vous répéter mes adieux, je m'empresse de vous envoyer ce billet pour le Prince Lobanow, devant accompagner la petite caisse à son adresse. En même temps je me permets de renouveler à Votre Éminence l'hommage de mon dévouement respectueux et de toute ma gratitude. Vous savez que mon cœur vous suivra fidèlement à Constantinople et partout; veuillez bien aussi m'accompagner dans mon long chemin avec vos prières et votre bénédiction.

De Votre Éminence

le tout dévoué serviteur

C. TISCHENDORF

Alexandrie
ce 4. Oct(o)bre
1859

With the *Sinaiticus* in the bag, there was no urgent need to pay personal respects to Cyril, who was on the point of leaving for Constantinople. But Tischendorf was a man of good manners, and hastened to assure Cyril of his gratitude. It would be interesting to know the contents of the "little box" sent to Ambassador Lobanov's address.

particularly by Eugenios. Among other things, he told me that this incident may cause some trouble, since the local adversaries surely will not abstain from writing to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and from characterizing this action in accordance with their purposes. Spanopoulos paid us a visit and told us the same thing, although in other words and in an opposite spirit. We have been and still are denying all along that the manuscript had been given away, saying that we have sent it back to the monastery. Nevertheless, we thought it wise to anticipate all the eventualities in making this loan public by means of the enclosure. We are sending the enclosed essay to your Eminence so that it might be published, should it meet with Your Eminence's approval. I believe that such a publication might at least take the edge off the enemies' attacks in that matter. You should give this affair the serious consideration it deserves, for, should these rumors reach the ear of the Russian Embassy, they will surely cause displeasure there.

3. Letter of Tischendorf to Cyril, with "Tischendorf's Draft," an enclosure written in Tischendorf's own hand (see Pl. 7a and 7b). Date: Leipzig, January 21, 1864.

[p. 1] Monseigneur,

C'est avec une véritable satisfaction que j'ai reçu de Vos nouvelles. Elles n'étaient pas des meilleurs [*sic*]; mais elles me renouvellent Votre amitié, Votre bienveillance : voilà pourquoi j'en suis charmé. Avant tout il faut me plaindre de ce que mes derniers envois à ce qu'il paraît, ont manqué Votre Éminence. Après Votre dernière lettre, remise au mois de Déc(em)bre 1861, je Vous ai adressé une lettre au mois de Mai ou Juin 1862; plus tard je Vous ai envoyé par un missionnaire protestant, qui allait aux Indes un exemplaire de mon ouvrage allemand : "Aus dem heiligen Lande" ("De la terre Sainte") qui s'occupe tant de Votre couvent et de ses affaires, ainsi que de mon vénérable protecteur l'archevêque Cyrille. Plus tard, je pense au mois d'Avril 1863, je Vous ai écrit une longue lettre, en Vous rapportant l'accueil que l'Empereur m'avait fait en recevant la grande édition du Codex (36) et l'entretien que j'avais eu avec S.M.I. sur le MS original. Aussi je vous ai envoyé ma brochure contre Porphyrios—devenu bien doux après—et contre Simonides, intitulée : "Die Anfechtungen der Sinaibibel" (Les attaques contre la bible du Sinai). Enfin au mois de Mai ou Juin 1863 je vous ai envoyé le premier exemplaire du "Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum." (37) Eh bien, serait-il possible que rien de tout cela ne soit parvenu à Votre adresse? Tous les envois de poste étaient cependant "recommandés au [*sic*] soins obligeans du Consulat général de Russie en Égypte." S'ils [p. 2] ont été véritablement perdus, je tâcherai au moins de réparer les deux livres, qui forment une partie essentielle de mes publications "Sinaitiques."

Maintenant passons à Vos nouvelles. Les affaires des Principautés ne me sont pas restées inconnues, et les injustices du Gouvernement relativement au couvents [*sic*], m'affligent extrêmement. Mais dernièrement nos journaux ont rapporté que les Grandes Puissances, notamment la Russie, ont protesté contre ces actes arbitraires du Prince Couza. J'espère avec Votre Éminence, que le bon Dieu fera triompher enfin le bon droit et l'intérêt sacré de l'Église.

Quand [*sic*] au MS. biblique, je plains beaucoup la perte de ma dernière lettre, où j'en avais longuement parlé. Voilà quelques mots de cette lettre, tels qu'ils se trouvent dans mes brouillons :

"Quand [*sic*] à l'original, je l'ai remis, d'après le désir du Ministre, dans les mains de l'Empereur; l'Empereur l'a fait déposer dans les caves du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, garanties contre le feu. Dans l'audience l'Empereur a vivement abordé la question de la donation du MS. La donation ne lui paraissait pas encore toute certaine, et il en était assez peiné; aussi faisait-il mention de l'opposition du patriarche de Jérusalem. Je lui répondis que ce patriarche n'a aucun pouvoir aux affaires du couvent, et que le prince Gortczakoff (38), co(m)me le Ministre m'avait dit quand je dînais chez lui, venait justement de lui envoyer l'ordre d'Alex. Newsky. Quant au couvent même, j'assurais Sa Majesté des meilleurs [*sic*] dispositions pour la donation; je faisais valoir que Vous ne Vous étiez nullement

(36) After this word, a sign refers to the following insertion at the bottom of the page : Tout dernièrement même le Pape m'a écrit une lettre avec les plus grands éloges sur l'édition. Cette lettre, imprimée partout, a fait une grande sensation, aussi à St. Pétersbourg.

(37) A copy of this book is still preserved in the Monastery's Library.

(38) Prince A. M. Gorčakov (1798-1883), the famous Russian diplomat and Minister of Foreign Affairs (1856-1882).

opposé au titre : Codex Sinaiticus *Petropolitanus*—ce qui intéressait particulièrement l'Impératrice—; je lui rapportai aussi les déclarations bienveillantes [p. 3] que Vous aviez faites à cet égard à Mr. de Noroff (39) qui m'avait prié d'en faire part à l'Empereur; je déclarais enfin que d'après mon opinion il *ne fallait plus faire autre chose que m'envoyer au couvent, chargé des présents Impériaux*. L'Empereur ne me dit pas le contraire; mais il a cru devoir avant tout s'en rapporter à son ministre. Celui-ci, Mr. de Golovnine (40), m'a dit qu'il fallait gagner du temps, mais qu'on écrira à Votre Éminence de temps à temps, pour demander Vos résolutions. Voilà une manière d'agir, que je ne trouve pas bonne. En retournant par Varsovie (au mois de Déc. 1862) j'en parlais au Grand Duc Constantin (41), qui a un intérêt tout particulier pour cette affaire; il était parfaitement de *mon avis*, non de celui de Mr. de Golovnine—qui d'ailleurs du cabinet du Grand Duc est passé au Ministère."

Mr. de Golovnine, je n'en doute pas, n'est pas trop de *nos amis*, bien qu'il m'ait fait présent "en marque d'amitié" de ses propres insignes, lorsque l'Empereur m'a revêtu de la première classe (Grand' Croix et Gr. Cordon) de l'Ordre de S. Stanislas, et qu'il m'ait comblé d'attentions pendant ma présence à St. Pétersbourg.

Depuis mon retour à Leipzig je n'ai pas cessé de m'occuper de l'affaire. En envoyant à S.M.I. le "Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum" j'ai écrit à l'Empereur dans le même sens que je lui en avais parlé à Zarsko-Sélo. Mr. le [sic] Golovnine, par lequel j'ai fait transmettre la lettre, n'a pas manqué de dissuader l'Empereur d'exécuter tout de suite mes propos. Mais le Grand Duc Constantin m'a de nouveau fait savoir qu'il est tout d'accord avec moi et qu'il appuiera mes vues et mes propositions.

Voilà donc où nous en sommes. Votre lettre du $\frac{21 \text{ Déc.}}{2 \text{ Janv.}}$, qui ne m'est parvenue qu'hier, doit redoubler mon zèle. Votre Éminence a commencé Sa lettre par les mots : [p. 4] "Je ne puis pas croire que vous m'avez oublié." J'y répons, Monseigneur : Mon cœur n'a jamais cessé d'être tout à Vous; j'aurais honte de pouvoir jamais manquer à mon sincère dévouement envers Votre Éminence et de pouvoir jamais oublier les intérêts de la communauté du Sinai. Eh bien, je Vous prie de regarder l'affaire de notre MS. comme une telle qui attend son règlement. Mais ne différez plus la déclaration que la communauté désire en faire hommage à l'Empereur et chargez moi-même de présenter cette déclaration personnellement à S.M.I. Je prends la liberté d'ajouter à ma lettre une esquisse des termes de cette déclaration; peut-être aura-t-elle Votre approbation. Quand j'aurai ce document dans mes mains, j'irai à St. Pétersbourg. L'Empereur, je n'en doute pas, sera vivement touché d'une telle marque de confiance de Votre part, et je mettrai tout mon zèle, toute mon influence à ce que cette noble donation soit noblement récompensée, en déclarant ouvertement que l'honneur de l'Empereur, l'honneur de la Russie y est engagé. Aussi je ne doute point que je réussirai; les membres les plus influents de la famille Impériale m'ont constamment témoigné leurs vives sympathies; et l'Empereur

(39) A. S. Norov (1795-1869), Russian Minister of Public Instruction (1854-1858), a personal friend and ally of Tischendorf. As an administrator, he was well-meaning but ineffective. This writer, polyglot, and amateur scholar, who was a member of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, had travelled to the Holy Land. He also was an acquaintance of Porfirij Uspenskij.

(40) A. V. Golovnin (1821-1886), energetic and liberal Minister of Public Instruction (1862-1866; dismissed after the attempt at Alexander II's life). In earlier years, Golovnin had been a confidant and protégé of Grand Duke Constantine (see next note).

(41) Constantine (1827-1892), brother of Alexander II, was made Viceroy of the Polish Kingdom in 1862. He resigned—or was made to resign—in the middle of 1863, having refrained from taking harsh repressive measures against the Polish insurrection of that year. In 1863-1864 he undertook a prolonged journey abroad, in the course of which he visited several German principalities.

saura apprécier la justesse des propositions que j'aurai alors le droit formel de faire valoir. Tout prochainement j'irai à Bade, où le Grand Duc Constantin passe cet hiver; je le préviendrai de ces arrangements; ses conseils et sa protection me guideront dans les démarches qui seront à faire. Malgré les affaires si tristes de la Pologne je sais que l'Empereur est resté tout dévoué à Son frère.

Veillez donc croire, Monseigneur, que cette affaire me tient profondément au cœur. C'est avec impatience que j'attends de Vos nouvelles, que j'attends Vos résolutions. En attendant agréez, Monseigneur, l'assurance de ma gratitude inaltérable et de mes sentimens respectueux, ainsi que mes complimens empressés à tous Vos confrères—

Constantin TISCHENDORF
Conseiller du Roi de Saxe et
Professeur à l'Univ. de Leipzig.

[p. 5] Sire,

V.M.I. a gracieusement daigné m'envoyer pour les Monastères du Sinai, qui sont confiés à ma garde, deux exx. de la Bible du Sinai d'après l'admirable publication que Mr. Tischendorf en a exécutée sous les auspices de Votre Maj. Imp. En exprimant à V.M.I. nos remerciemens profonds pour ce don précieux, nous nous félicitons, moi et la communauté, d'avoir avec tout empressement prêté la main à cette publication, par laquelle un trésor unique de notre Sainte foi fut rendu à toute la Chrétienté.

D'après la stipulation, passée entre le Monastère et Mr. Tischendorf le 16/28 Sept. 1859, l'édition achevée, notre communauté a le droit de réclamer l'original. Elle n'a guère l'intention d'user de ce droit. Remplis du plus profond respect et dévouement pour le haut protecteur de notre Sainte Église orthodoxe, nous désirons déposer comme un hommage de piété et de confiance, la Bible du Sinai aux pieds de V.M.I. Qu'elle soit digne d'augmenter la gloire d'Alexandre II., digne aussi d'assurer la grâce et la protection bienveillante à la communauté des Sinaites.

La communauté a confié son précieux MS. à Mr. Tischendorf, lorsque en 1859 la mission, dont il était chargé par V.M.I., l'avait conduit dans notre couvent. Sur sa demande elle le charge maintenant de déposer le même MS. aux pieds de V.M.I. et d'être l'interprète de ses vœux et de sa dévotion auprès de V.M.I.

Nous implorons tous la grâce de Dieu sur la tête sacrée de V.M.I. C'est avec le plus profond respect et dévouement que j'ai l'honneur d'être, Sire,

de V.M.I.
le tr. humble et tr. obéiss. serviteur,

When Tischendorf discussed the *Sinaiticus* with Alexander II, the donation of the manuscript "did not seem quite assured" to the Emperor. Assured indeed! There had been no donation at all, either in September 1859 or by November 10, 1862, when the conversation with Alexander took place, or, finally, by January 21, 1864, when the present letter was written: this is evident from the phrase "do not delay the donation any longer." As a matter of fact, there was to be no donation for as long as Cyril would remain Archbishop of Sinai.

When in his draft of Cyril's address to Alexander II Tischendorf summed up the terms of the agreement of September 28, 1859, he abstained

from mentioning any intended donation; on the contrary, he stated that the community of Sinai had the right to ask for the manuscript's return. He could not have done otherwise: "Tischendorf's Draft" was destined for Cyril, and Cyril would have rejected any other formulation.

In his *Sinaibibel* (42) which appeared in 1871, Tischendorf intimated that the putting of the *Sinaiticus* into the Emperor's hands on November 10, 1862 was his own idea. By 1871, the *Sinaiticus* had been legally donated, and Tischendorf, an honorable man by that time, could afford some boasting. But by 1864 it must have been clear to all, and especially to Cyril, that in 1862 Tischendorf had had no right to put the manuscript into any person's hands. Had Tischendorf felt that he had such right in 1862, he would not have been so eager to repeat the ceremony (with a slight variation) in 1864, this time by putting the *Sinaiticus* at His Imperial Majesty's feet. In the present letter Tischendorf was far from assuming full responsibility for his act of 1862 and attributed it to a Russian minister's prompting.

The words "you were in no way opposed to the title *Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus*" confirm the impression that Tischendorf was on somewhat slippery ground when he appended the attribute *Petropolitanus* to that of *Sinaiticus* on the title-page of his four-volume edition of 1862. By so doing, he implied that the manuscript would find its permanent abode in St. Petersburg. Tischendorf's sole authority for imposing the new adjective was Cyril's silence: Cyril had not answered the letter in which Tischendorf suggested the addition, and thus had not directly opposed the change. In Tischendorf's interpretation this meant that Cyril approved it (43).

The letter's euphemisms did not obscure the aims of both correspondents. Cyril hoped to obtain Tischendorf's support for Sinai's endeavors to retain its Romanian possessions, confiscated by Prince Couza's government in 1863 (44). Cyril's was a vain expectation, for neither Tischendorf nor his pious hopes could change anything in the course of events, especially since the Russians, with whom Tischendorf was reputed to be influential, had no intention of intervening.

Tischendorf's aim was twofold. First, he wanted to see the donation made in due form, and thus to be let off the hook. In exchange, he dangled the promise of a compensation before Cyril. Since this was an affair in which "Russia's honor was at stake," the compensation would be liberal. But Tischendorf had a second goal as well: to have the Russian government send him on one more scholarly and diplomatic trip to the Near East. Already in 1862, he had personally suggested to the Tsar that he should be sent to the monastery in order to bring the *Sinaiticus* affair to a conclusion: through the present letter and through "Tischendorf's Draft" he again

(42) P. 86-87.

(43) Cf. also *Sinaibibel*, p. 86.

(44) Cf. also *Sinaibibel*, p. 88.

offered his services as intermediary. But the Russians were unwilling to incur unnecessary expenses. In 1862, Minister Golovnin was evasive and thus earned Tischendorf's displeasure. In 1868, the Russian Ambassador to the Porte Ignat'ev, who did not mince words, alluded to Tischendorf's proposed scheme and said that the "misunderstandings" connected with the *Sinaiticus* were created by "a German who had wanted to take another joyride to Sinai and Athos at the Government's expense and under the Russian flag." (45)

There is no need to dwell on Tischendorf's own reference to Mr. Tischendorf's admirable publication, or the various passages in which he displays his medals and describes his hobnobbing with the great, for these passages do not directly bear on the history of the *Sinaiticus*.

4. Letter of Tischendorf to Cyril. Date : Leipzig, March 23, 1864.

[p. 1] Éminence,

N'ayant pas encore reçu de réponse à ma lettre du 9/21 Janvier, je commence à craindre que cette lettre ou Votre réponse ne se soit perdue, comme il est arrivé aux envois précédents que j'avais faits à Votre Éminence. Je m'imagine aussi bien que ce n'était pas si simple, si facile d'exécuter incessamment ma proposition. Quoi qu'il en soit, je me résous à Vous adresser ce billet pour Vous dire que S.A.I. le Grand Duc Constantin, chez qui j'ai passé à Bade-Bade quelques jours au mois de Février, s'intéresse toujours le plus vivement à notre affaire et qu'il a pleinement approuvé les démarches que je Vous ai proposées. Il a jugé absolument nécessaire que Votre Éminence adresse une telle lettre à S.M.I. pour qu'on puisse engager S.M.I. à reconnaître hautement la noble libéralité de Votre part et de toute la fraternité envers l'Empereur. Le Grand Duc, [p. 2] par lequel le Ministre de l'Instruction Publique a obtenu son poste et qui n'a pas cessé un instant d'être dans la plus grande intimité avec l'Empereur, veut bien que dans cette affaire je m'attache tout à sa protection et à sa coopération. Voilà une véritable garantie d'un succès parfait. La santé délabrée de la Grande Duchesse le retient encore en Allemagne; mais à pâques (d'après le calendrier Russe) il compte se rendre à St. Pétersbourg. Je serai trop heureux d'y aller en même temps, chargé de Votre dépêche pour l'Empereur.

Je vous prie donc de me faire connaître Vos résolutions à cet égard, et je Vous supplie d'exécuter ma proposition, pour pouvoir enfin m'acquitter moi-même dignement de mes obligations envers Votre Éminence.

C'est avec le plus profond respect que je suis tout à Votre Éminence.

Leipzig ce 11/23 Mars
1864.

Const. TISCHENDORF

This letter adds little to the preceding one : Cyril continued his silence, Tischendorf, his entreaties and promises.

(45) Ignat'ev to Archimandrite Antonin, June 30, 1868, in DMITRIEVSKIJ, *Graf Ignat'ev...* (as in note 6 *supra*), p. 27.

5. "Cyril's Draft": a memorandum, outlining the history of the *Sinaiticus* affair from September 1859 on (see Pl. 8a). Date: after August 1867, perhaps as late as 1869 (46).

The draft is unsigned, but its handwriting is unmistakably Cyril's (47). This document, illegibly scribbled, teems with insertions, deletions and additions. The text given below is essentially a fair copy of the draft; thus, except for the beginning of the text, a continuous narrative has been obtained. The actual situation in the manuscript is given in the *apparatus*.

[p. 1] Ἡ Ἱερὰ Μονὴ τοῦ Σινᾶ Ὁρους κάτοχος οὖσα [sic] παναρχαίου τινὸς χειρογράφου ἀνήκοντος κατὰ τὴν γνώμην τῶν σοφωτέρων κριτικῶν εἰς τὸν β^{ον} ἢ γ^{ον} μετὰ Χριστὸν αἰῶνα καὶ περιέχοντος

- Μέρος τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης
 5 Ἄπασαν τὴν Καινὴν Διαθήκην
 Ἐπιστολὴν Βαρνάβα τοῦ Ἀποστόλου ἀνέκδοτον
 καὶ τινὰ ἄλλα ἀποσπάσματα ἀγνώστων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συγγραμμάτων συνιστάμενον ἐκ
 σελίδων 346 καὶ κομμάτιον τι μικρόν. Τὸ χειρόγραφον τοῦτο τῇ συστάσει τοῦ ἐν Κων-
 10 σταντινουπόλει ἐξοχωτάτου Πρέσβεως τῆς Ῥωσσίας Πρίγγιπος Λοβάνωφ δι' ἐπιστολῆς
 τοῦ πρὸς τὴν Σιναϊτικὴν Κοινότητα μνηολογουμένης 10: Σεπτεμβ. 1859: καὶ Ἀριθ. 510
 ἢ Ἱερὰ Σιναϊτικὴ Κοινότης δια πράξεως τῆς [?] ὑπογεγραμμένης παρ' ὄλων τῶν μελῶν
 αὐτῆς καὶ καταχωρηθείσης ἐν τῷ Κώδικι ὑπὸ Ἀριθ. 6 καὶ ἡμερομηνίαν 16 7βρ. 1859 διαλαμ-
 βανούσης αὐτολεξεί τάδε: "Σήμερον 16 Σεπτεμβ. 1859 ὑπ' ὄψιν λαβοῦσα ἡ Ἱ. Σύναξις
 15 τὴν κάτωθι συναφθεῖσαν ἐνταῦθα ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ ἐξοχωτάτου Πρέσβεως πασῶν τῶν Ῥωσιῶν
 παρὰ τῇ Α. Μ. τῷ Σουλτάνῳ Κ. Πρίγγιπος Λοβάνωφ, δι' ἧς ἡ Α. Ἐ^{της} προτείνει τῇ
 Ἱ. Ἀδελφότητι ἵνα ἐμπιστευθῇ λόγῳ δανείου τῷ Κ. ἱππότη Κ. Τισχενδόρφῳ παλαιὸν τι
 χειρόγραφον περιέχον μέρος τῆς Παλαιᾶς καὶ τὴν Καινὴν Διαθήκην, σκεφθεῖσα πρὸς τούτοις
 20 ὅτι τὸ προσωρινῶς παραχωρούμενον χειρόγραφον τοῦτο θέλει χρησιμεύσει ὡς ὑπογραμμὸς
 εἰς τὴν ἤδη γενομένην [?] ἐκτύπωσιν ἐν Ῥωσίᾳ τῆς Παλαιᾶς καὶ Νέας Διαθήκης καὶ
 δύναται νὰ παρέξῃ οὕτως ὅσπην πλείστην ὠφέλειαν ἅπαντι τῷ χριστιανικῷ πληρώματι διὰ
 τὴν γνησιότητα τοῦ πρωτοτύπου· οὐχ ἦττον δὲ περιποιουμένη νὰ δώσῃ ἰδιάζον τι δεῖγμα
 ἀφοσιώσεως τῇ Α. Μ. τῷ Αὐτοκράτορι Ἀλεξ. β^{ου}, ἀποφασίζει νὰ ἐμπιστευθῇ τὸ χειρόγραφον
 τοῦτο συνιστάμενον ἐκ σελ. 346 τῷ μνησθέντι ἱππότη Κ. Κωνστ. Τισχενδόρφῳ ὑπὸ ἀπόδειξιν
 25 αἰ ὑπογραφαί.

Κατὰ συνέπειαν ἐνεπιστεύθη τῷ Ἱππότη Κυρίῳ Κωνστ. Τισχενδόρφῳ λόγῳ δανείου
 ὑπὸ ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ 16/28 7βρ. 1859 λέγουσαν αὐτολεξεί τάδε καὶ σύμφωνα καὶ μετὰ τοὺς
 ὄρους τοὺς ἐνδιαλαμβανομένους ἐν τῇ ῥηθείσῃ ἐπιστολῇ τοῦ ἐξοχωτάτου Πρέσβεως ὅτι
 μετὰ τὴν ἀποπεράτωσιν τῆς ἐκτύπώσεως νὰ ἐπιστραφῇ αὐθις τὸ πᾶν [?] ἔντυπον [?] χειρό-
 30 γραφον πρὸς τὸ μοναστήριον ὡς ἀναφαίρετος αὐτοῦ ἰδιοκτησία.

Ἐκτοτε καὶ μέχρι τῆς σήμερον οὐκ ἐπεστράφη πρὸς τὴν Ἱερὰν μονὴν τὸ ῥηθὲν
 χειρόγραφον· [p. 2] ἀλλ' οὔτε ἡ σιναϊτικὴ Κοινότης διενόηθη ποτέ, ἢ καθυπέβαλεν ὑπὸ

(46) Reference, towards the end of the Draft, to "men that are at present administering Sinai under the auspices of the Patriarch of Jerusalem" places "Cyril's Draft" subsequent to January 21, 1867 (deposition of Cyril by the monks of Sinai), perhaps after August 30 of that year (ordination of Callistratus, Cyril's successor, by the Patriarch of Jerusalem). Since, however, these present administrators of Sinai have displayed "their most recent behavior with regard to the manuscript," which reveals their baseness of character, we may be as late as 1869, the year of negotiations culminating in the donation of the *Sinaiticus* by Callistratus.

(47) This can be established by comparing the Draft's hand to Cyril's signed letter to the monks of Djvania, dated November 25, 1859 (see Pl. 8b for the letter's last page) and to his autograph letter to Tischendorf, published on p. 73, n. 53 *infra*. Similar comparison shows that the inscription on the envelope containing our documents (cf. p. 60, n. 27 *supra*) is, too, by Cyril's hand.

κοινήν σύσκεψιν [?] ἰδέαν τινά περὶ προσφορᾶς αὐτοῦ ἢ δωρήσεως πρὸς τὴν Αὐτοκρατορικὴν
 35 ῥωσσοικὴν Κυβέρνησιν. ἀπ' ἐναντίας μάλιστα οἱ πλείστοι ἐδυσχεραίνοντο καὶ διὰ τὴν προσω-
 ρινὴν παραχώρησιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὡς [?] ἐκ τούτου εὕρισκον ἀπὸ καιροῦ εἰς καιρὸν αἰτίαν κατη-
 γορεῖν κατὰ τοῦ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου των κυρ. Κυρίλλου, μαθῶν [?] ὁ Πατριάρχης Ἱεροσολύμων
 κυρ. Κύριλλος, μὴ θέλων κατὰ τὸ 1859 διὰ νὰ προαχθῇ ὁ κυρ. Κύριλλος εἰς τὴν Ἀρχιεπι-
 σκοπὴν τοῦ Σινᾶ ἕνεκα τῶν ἰδιοτελῶν σκοπῶν του, πρὸς τὰς ἄλλας ἀνυπάρχτους καὶ ψευδεῖς
 40 κατηγορίας κατὰ τοῦ κυρ. Κυρίλλου, ὡς ἀπεδείχθησαν ἐπισήμως τοιαῦται, ἐκατηγόρησε
 τὸν κυρ. Κύριλλον, ὅτι δῆθεν ἡ Πανιερότης του ἐδωρήσατο τὸ περὶ οὗ ὁ λόγος χειρόγραφον
 εἰς τὴν ῥωσσοικὴν διὰ νὰ προστατευθῇ παρ' αὐτῆς καὶ ἐπιτύχῃ τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν καὶ χειρο-
 τονίαν του εἰς τὴν Ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν τοῦ Σινᾶ. συνεπεία τῆς τοιαύτης κατηγορίας, ἐγένοντο
 τότε παρὰ τοῦ ἀρμοδίου ὑπουργοῦ πρὸς τὸν κυρ. Κύριλλον πικραὶ καὶ αὐστηραὶ παρατη-
 ρήσεις διὰ τὴν ἀποξένωσιν δῆθεν ἐκ τοῦ μοναστ. ἐνὸς τοιούτου πολυτίμου ἀρχαίου κειμηλίου
 45 καὶ παρ' [p. 3] ἄλλων ἐπισήμων ὁμογενῶν. ἡ τοιαύτη διαγωγὴ τοῦ Ἱεροσολύμων ἐπροκάλεσε
 τὸ ὑπὸ ἡμερομηνίαν 1/13 Νοεμβρίου 1859 πιστοποιητικὸν τοῦ Πρίγγιπος Λοβάνοβ
 ὅτι [ὅτι] τὸ χειρόγραφον ἐδόθη τῷ Κ. Τισχεντόρφω προσωρινῶς καὶ ὅτι θέλει ἐπιστραφεῖ
 εἰς τὸ μοναστ. ὡς ἰδιοκτησία αὐτοῦ· καὶ οὕτως ἀπεδείχθη ἡ ἀλήθεια ἀπέναντι τῶν κατηγοριῶν.
 Ἀκολούθως, ὅτε κατὰ τὸ 1865 Δεκεμβ. ἐπανεστήσαν τινὲς τῶν καλογῆρων κατὰ
 50 τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου των κυρ. Κυρίλλου τῇ ἐνπνεύσει [sic?] τοῦ Πατριαρ. Ἱεροσολύμων,
 οὗτοι τῷ 1866 κατα Φεβρ., ὡς ὑπήκοοι Ἕλληνες οἱ πλείστοι, ἀνεφέρθησαν δι' ἀναφορᾶς
 των πρὸς τὸ ἐν Καίρῳ ἑλληνικὸν ὑποπροξενεῖον, καὶ πρὸς τὰς λοιπὰς κατηγορίας κατὰ τοῦ
 ἀρχιεπισκόπου κυρ. Κυρίλλου, ἀνέφερον καὶ ὅτι ὁ κυρ. Κύριλλος ἐπώλησεν ἐν χειρόγραφον
 τοῦ μοναστ. πρὸς τὴν Κυβέρνησιν τῆς ῥωσσοικῆς ἐπὶ ἀμοιβῇ πολλῶν χιλιάδ. καρποβόνων.
 55 ἀκολούθως εἰς τὰ Πρακτικὰ των καὶ εἰς τὰς πρὸς διαφόρους ἀρχὰς ἀναφορὰς των ἀναφέροντες
 ὅτι ὁ Σιναίου κυρ. Κύριλλος ὑπεξήρесе πολύτιμα καὶ βαρῦτιμα κειμήλια ἐκ τοῦ μοναστηρίου
 ἀνεπιστρεπτί, δὲν εἶναι ἀμφιβολία ὅτι ἐννοοῦσι τὸ χειρόγραφον αὐτό. ἐκ τούτων ἀπάντων
 τῶν γεγονότων, καὶ ἐκ τῆς τελευταίας των διαγωγῆς [p. 4] ὡς πρὸς τὸ χειρόγραφον ἕκαστος
 δύναται νὰ κρίνῃ, ὁποίου χαρακτῆρος ἄνθρωποι εἶναι οἱ διέποντες σήμερον τὰ τοῦ Σινᾶ ὑπὸ
 60 τὰς ἐμπνεύσεις τοῦ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ ὑπὸ ποίου πνεύματος ὀδηγούμενοι τεκταίνουσι τὰ
 τοιαῦτα ψεῦδη διὰ νὰ ἐπιτύχῳσι τῶν σκοπῶν των (48).

(48) The Holy Monastery of Mount Sinai, being in possession of a very ancient manuscript, in the opinion of more experienced critics going back to the second or third century after Christ, and containing

A part of the Old Testament

The whole of the New Testament

The unpublished Epistle of the Apostle Barnabas,

and some other fragments of unknown ecclesiastical writings—consisting of 346 folia and a small fragment.—Upon the recommendation of His Excellency the Ambassador of Russia at Constantinople Prince Lobanov, made in the letter dated September 10, 1859, Number 510, and addressed to the Community of Sinai—this manuscript through an Act, signed by all of its members and inserted into the Minutes under Number 6 and the date of September 16, 1859. The text of the Act is *verbatim* as follows: “On this day of September 16, 1859, the Holy *Synaxis*, having considered the letter (appended below) of His Excellency Prince Lobanov, the Ambassador of All the Russias to H.M. the Sultan, by which letter His Excellency proposes to the Holy Confraternity that an ancient manuscript, containing a part of the Old Testament and the New Testament, should be entrusted, as a loan, to *Chevalier* C. Tischendorf; having furthermore considered that this manuscript, ceded *ad interim*, may be of use as a model for the printing, already undertaken [?] in Russia, of the Old and New Testaments, and that it thus may prove of the greatest usefulness for the whole Body of Christendom owing to the authenticity of the prototype; being no less eager to display a special token of its devotion to H.M. the Emperor Alexander II, decides that the manuscript in question, consisting of 346 folia, should be entrusted to the above-named *Chevalier* Const. Tischendorf upon receipt, and in accordance with the terms contained in the letter of His Excellency Mr. Lobanov.” The signatures follow. Consequently, it was entrusted to *Chevalier* Const. Tischendorf as a loan against his receipt of September 16/28, 1859, stating *verbatim* the following, and being consistent with the terms contained in the above-mentioned letter of His Excellency the Prince: that after the completion of the printing the whole [?] ... manuscript should be returned to the monastery as its inalienable possession.

7 post συγγραμμάτων *vocabula* συγκείμενον τὸ δλον τὸ χειρόγραφον τοῦτο *expuncta in ms.* || συνιστάμενον *supra* συγκείμενον *ad l. 7 laudatum.* || 8 post μικρόν *vocabula* τὸ χ αὐτό *expuncta in ms.* || τὸ — τοῦτο *supra vocabula expuncta ad l. 8 laudata.* || 8/9 ἐν Κωνστ. *supra versum.* || 9 post Ῥωσσίας *littera K expuncta in ms.* || 11 ὑπογεγραμμένης — 12 αὐτῆς *supra versum.* || 12 post 1859 *asteriscus, ante διαλαμβανούσης in ms. pag. 4 iteratus.* || 12/13 διαλαμβανούσης — 23 μνησθέντι *ad ms. infimam paginam 4 leguntur.* || 13 1859 *e corr.: 1869 ante corr. ms.* || 23 post μνησθέντι *asteriscus, ante ἰπτότη in ms. pag. 4 iteratus.* || 23 ἰπτότη — 25 ὑπογραφαί *ad ms. mediam paginam 4 leguntur.* || 26 κατὰ συνέπειαν *supra versum, post asteriscum ad l. 12 laudatum.* || 27 λέγουσαν — τάδε *supra versum.* || 29 ἔντυπον] *vocab. lectu difficile;* ἔντυπον *sensu caret, nisi idem hic valeat ac "postquam typis expressum est."* || 29 τὸ πᾶν — χειρόγραφον *supra versum.* || 31 post σήμερον *vocab. δὲν expunctum in ms.* || 32 post ἡ *vocab. ἐπρότεινε expunctum in ms.* || 33 post περί *litt. δω (principium vocabuli δωρήσεως ?) expunctae in ms.* || 34 post μάλιστα *litt. οἱ πλ expunctae in ms.* || post τὴν *vocabb. λόγω δαν (principium vocab. δανέλου ?) expuncta in ms.* || 35 post εὕρισκον *litt. πάντο expunctae in ms.* || 36 post Κυρίλλου *vocabb. ὡς παραδ (principium vocabb. παραδείγματος χάριν ?) expuncta in ms.* || μαθών (*num καθώς?*)] *supra vocabb. ὡς παραδ ad l. 36 laudata.* || δ *e corr.: ὡς ante corr.* || 38 post του *litt. ἑκατηγο expunctae in ms.* || 39 post ἐπισήμως *litt. διε expunctae in ms.* || τοιαῦται *supra διε ad l. 39 laudatum.* || 40 post Κύριλλον *vocabula* πρὸς τὴν Κυρίαρχον Κυβέρνησιν τῆς Α. Μ. τοῦ Σουλτάνου *expuncta in ms.* || post ἐδωρήσατο *vocabula* ἐν πολῦτιμον καὶ ἀρχαιότατον χειρο *expuncta in ms.* || 42 post του *vocabula* εἰς τὴν βω ἀρχαί ὡς *expuncta in ms.* || εἰς τὴν *supra ἀρχαί ὡς ad l. 42 laudatum.* || post Ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν *vocabula* Σινᾶ. διὰ τὴν *expuncta in ms.* || τοῦ Σινᾶ *supra vocab. Σινᾶ ad l. 42 laudatum.* || 43 post τότε *litt. παρ expunctae in ms.* || post τὸν *litt. Ἀρχιεπι expunctae in ms.* || 44 πολυτίμου ἀρχαίου *supra versum.* || 45 ἐπισήμων *supra versum.* || post ὁμογενῶν *asteriscus, ante ἡ τοιαύτη in ms. pagina 3 superiore iteratus; post asteriscum vocabula* ὡστε τότε ἠναγκάσθη ὁ Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος κυρ. Κυρίλλος νὰ ζητήσῃ παρὰ τοῦ ἐξοχωτάτου πρέσβεως Πρίγγιπος Λαπάνοφ ἔγγραφοι ἀπὸς πιστοποιητικῶν *expuncta in ms.* || 45 ἡ τοιαύτη — 47 δτι *in pag. 3 superiore add. ms.* || 46 post Λοβάνοβ *vocab. δι' οὗ expunxit ms.* || 47 δτι' *supra vocabb. δι' οὗ ad l. 46 laudata; post δτι asteriscus ante [δτι] τὸ χειρόγραφον iteratus; vocabula [δτι] τὸ χειρόγραφον sequuntur vocab. πιστοποιητικῶν ad l. 45 laudatum.* || post χειρόγραφον *vocabula* δὲν ἐδωρήθη, ἀλλ' ἐδανείσθη προσωρινῶς, ὅστις καὶ ἀπέλυσε τὸ καὶ τῷ ἐπεδόθη παρὰ τῆς ἐξοχότητός του τὸ ἀπὸ πιστοποιητικῶν ἔγγραφοι, δυνάμει τοῦ ὁποίου ἀπεδείχθη ψευδόμενος ὁ Ἱεροσολύμων *expuncta in ms.* || post δτι² *vocabb. εἶναι παν expuncta in ms.* || post ἐπιστραφεῖ *vocab. ὡς expunctum in ms.* || 47 ἐδόθη — 48 κατηγοριῶν *supra vocabula* δὲν — Ἱεροσολύμων *ad l. 47 laudata.* || 49 κατὰ — Δεκεμβ. *supra versum.* || 50 post τῆ *vocab. προτροπῆ expunctum in ms.* || 51 post ἀνεφέρθησαν *vocab. εἰς expunctum esse videtur in ms.* || 54 post ἀμοιβῆ *vocabb. (δὲν ἐνθυμούμαι) expuncta in ms.* || 55 ἀρχάς — 56 δτι]

From that time until the present day the aforesaid manuscript has not been returned to the Holy Monastery. On the other hand, neither did the Community of Sinai ever contemplated nor did it deliberate in common upon any idea of offering or donating it to the Russian Imperial Government. Quite to the contrary, many <monks> were displeased even with its temporary cession, and from that time forth found the pretext for launching periodic accusations against their Archbishop, Kyr Cyril. Kyr Cyril, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, having learned [?] <of the affair>, and being opposed in 1859, for reasons of his own, to the promotion of Kyr Cyril to the Archbishopric of Sinai, in addition to leveling other vain and false accusations against Kyr Cyril—they were shown to be such after official investigation—also accused Kyr Cyril to the effect that His Grace had allegedly donated the manuscript in question to Russia in order to gain Her protection and to obtain his installation and consecration to the Archbishopric of Sinai. As a consequence of such an accusation as this, the competent <Ottoman> Minister, as well as prominent Greeks, made bitter and severe representations to Kyr Cyril on account of the alleged alienation of such a valuable ancient treasure from the Monastery. Such behavior on the part of the Patriarch of Jerusalem called forth an affidavit of Prince Lobanov, under the date of 1/13 November 1859, to the effect that the manuscript had been given to Mr. Tischendorf *ad interim*, and that it would be returned to the Monastery as its possession. In such a manner, the truth was revealed in face of the accusations.

Subsequently, when in December of 1865 some of the monks rebelled against their Archbishop Kyr Cyril upon the instigation of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, they addressed a report to the Greek Viceconsulate in Cairo in February 1866, inasmuch as most of them were Greek subjects; in addition to other accusations against Archbishop Cyril, they reported that Kyr Cyril had sold a manuscript of the monastery's to the Russian Government in exchange for many thousands in assignations [?]. Consequently, when in their Acts and in their petitions addressed to various authorities they report that the Archbishop of Sinai Kyr Cyril has irretrievably alienated exceedingly valuable treasures of the monastery, they doubtless have in mind the manuscript in question. From all these events, and from their most recent behavior with regard to the manuscript, anyone may judge as to the character of the men that are at present administering Sinai under the auspices of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and as to the spirit that guides them when they concoct such lies in order to reach their goals.

supra haec leguntur sequentia in ms. : τὰς καταφοράς των κατὰ τοῦ κυρ. Κυρίλλου. || 57 *post* ἀνεπιστρεπτεῖ *vocab.* πάλιν *expunctum in ms.* || δέν — στι *supra* πάλιν (*ad l.* 57 *laudatum*) *et supra* ἐννοοῦσι. || *post* ἀπάντων *litt.* δὲ (*principium vocab.* δύναται ?) *expunctae in ms.* || 60 ὀδηγοῦμενοι *e corr.* : ὀδηγοῦνται *ante corr.* || 60 τεκταίνουσι — 61 ψεύδη *supra versum.* ||

“Neither did the Community of Sinai ever contemplate, nor did it deliberate in common upon any idea of offering or donating <the *Sinaiticus*> to the Russian Imperial Government.” The present text is one more proof that Cyril never signed “Tischendorf’s Draft” of 1864. In addition, this text makes abundantly clear that, after November of 1859, an official donation of the *Sinaiticus* had been the last act Cyril was interested in performing.

This is not to say that he acted necessarily out of righteousness. On the contrary, we may surmise that in October and November of 1859, Cyril was corruptible and willing to corrupt, happy to pay a handsome *baksheesh* to anyone who could secure for him the ordination as Archbishop of Sinai, and confirmation to that dignity from the Porte. But discretion was also of great importance. Thus when in November of 1859 his enemies asserted that the *Sinaiticus* had been such a *baksheesh* paid to the Russians, Cyril reacted promptly : On November 13, he obtained a written denial of such slander from Ambassador Lobanov, the same man with whom Tischendorf had engineered the transfer of the *Sinaiticus* about a month and a half earlier. But as the private arrangement had since become a diplomatic affair, Lobanov had no choice but to issue this statement, which he did on November 13. The statement—it has not come to light, but its contents can be reconstructed from three sources (49)—committed the Russian Government to the position that the *Sinaiticus* had merely been loaned, and that no offering to the Tsar was to be expected. This official denial explains the Russian’s subsequent insistence upon an explicit act of donation, to be provided with as many signatures as possible (50).

Lobanov’s statement strengthened Cyril’s bargaining position vis-à-vis Tischendorf and Russia. Unfortunately, from November 1859 on, Cyril was not quite free to bargain—too many eyes, so “Cyril’s Draft” tells us,—were watching his every move regarding the manuscript: first and foremost, his enemies in the Patriarchate of Jerusalem; then the Turkish authorities at Istanbul (the Evkaf?), suspicious of any deal a Christian monastery might strike with Russia; finally, the Greeks from Egypt, Istanbul, and even the Kingdom of Greece, indignant that a Hellenic treasure had been whisked away to the Russian North.

(49) *Cyril’s Draft*, l. 46-48, p. 70 *supra*; Cyril’s letter to Tischendorf (date: December 16, 1859), ed. PERADZE, *Dokumenty...* (as in note 22 *supra*), p. 145-146; Porfirij USPENSKIJ, *Kniga bytija...* (as in note 20 *supra*), VIII, p. 38-39, story told on January 10, 1863 by Isidore, metropolitan of St. Petersburg; in that story correct Isidore’s (or Uspenskij’s) lapse and read “Patriarch of Jerusalem” for “Patriarch of Constantinople.” The complaint of the *δικαῖος* to Brugsch may also have referred to Lobanov’s statement. Cf. note 72 *infra*.

(50) Cf. Ignat’ev to Tischendorf (date: Pera, December 5/17, 1869), ed. PERADZE, *Dokumenty...* (as in note 22 *supra*), p. 150; Ignat’ev to Antonin (date: January 7/19, 1870), ed. DMITRIEVSKIJ, *Graf Ignat’ev...* (as in note 6 *supra*), p. 28.

IV

Cyril was to remain true to the position taken in his "Draft" even on a late, probably even the last, occasion when he dealt directly with Tischendorf. Towards the end of 1867, Tischendorf, anxious to have his name cleared, and probably despairing of Sinai's cooperation, decided to go to St. Petersburg in person in order to spur the Russians into action (51). But before leaving, he made one more attempt to approach Cyril, by then a deposed prelate and a resident of Constantinople. On January 24, 1868, Cyril responded with a long letter (52), in which he gave his account of the quarrel with the Patriarch of Jerusalem and of the gloomy prospects of his own cause. In the course of the letter, the *Sinaiticus* was brought up only once :

It is noteworthy that <among> the accusations contrived against me upon his <i.e., the Patriarch of Jerusalem's> instigation—accusations which he accepted without proof, going so far as to have me deposed—there is also one to the effect that I allegedly have purloined highly valuable treasures; hereby they have in mind the manuscript given to you, as you know, according to the common belief (53).

(51) In fairness to Tischendorf, it must be pointed out that the initiative for reopening the question seems to have been his. He went to St. Petersburg in the spring (before April) of 1868, cf. *Sinaibibel*, p. 89 f.; he met Ignat'ev there. The earliest mention of the *Sinaiticus* in Ignat'ev's correspondence with Antonin is on May 8, 1868, cf. DMITRIEVSKIJ, *Graf Ignat'ev...* (as in note 6 *supra*), p. 26-27. According to Porfirij Uspenskij, however, an inquiry concerning the *Sinaiticus* had been ordered by the Tsar by January 10, 1863, cf. *Kniga bytija...* (as in note 20 *supra*), VIII, p. 38-39.

(52) *Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig*, MS 01030.

(53) I am giving the integral text of the letter. The translated passage is on p. 3/4.

Κωνσ/λις 12/24 'Ιαννου(α)ρ(λου) 1868.

[p. 1] Κύριε!

Ὁ ἐνταῦθα ἀναποκριτῆς σας μοι διακίνησε [sic] τὰ γραφόμενά σας τὰ ἀφορῶντα ἐμέ, καὶ τὴν προσεχῆ μετάβασιν σας εἰς Πετρούπολιν, καθὼς καὶ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν σας τοῦ νὰ μάθετε εἰς ποίαν θέσιν εὐρίσκεται ἡ δυστυχῶς ἀναφύεσσα διαφορὰ μεταξύ ἐμοῦ καὶ τινων Σιναϊτῶν Πατέρων. Πρὸς ἐκπλήρωσιν οὖν τῆς περιεργίας σας σᾶς λέγω ὀλίγα [sic] τινά, ἐξ ὧν δύνασθε νὰ κατανοήσητε τὴν ἀρχικὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ κακοῦ. Γνωρίζετε Κύριε τὰ πρὸ ἡμετέρων ἔτων ἐν καιρῷ τῆς χειροτονίας μου ὡς Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Σιναίου λαβόντα χάραν ἀληθῆ, ἕνεκα τῶν ἰδιοτελῶν σκοπῶν τοῦ Πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων, τοῦ ἀτομικοῦ μου κεκηρυγμένου ἔχθρου, καὶ ὅποια [sic] θεμιτὰ καὶ ἀθέμιτα μέσα μετέλθε τότε διὰ νὰ ματαιώσῃ τὸν διορισμὸν μου. Ἄλλ' ἀποτυχῶν [sic] τότε χάρις εἰς τὰς συνδρομὰς τῶν φίλων τοῦ δικαίου, οὐκ ἐπαύσατο καταδοκῶν τὸν καιρὸν, ὅπως ἐπαναλάβῃ αὐθις τοὺς [p. 2] καταχθονίους σκοποὺς του. ὅθεν καὶ δὲν ἔδυνάμην νὰ ἐνσπεύρῃ ζιζάνια μεταξύ τινῶν ἀπλῶν καὶ εὐπίστων Πατέρων, νὰ ὀδηγῇ αὐτοὺς διὰ τῶν ὀργάνων του τὸν τρόπον τῆς κατ' ἐμοῦ καταφορᾶς, καὶ νὰ ἐμπνέῃ [?] αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀνταρσίας καὶ ἀπειθίας [sic], ἐξ ὧν ἀνεφύη τὸ πολύκροτον τοῦτο ζήτημα· καὶ ὕστερον ἀφ' ὅλα ταῦτα, ἐναντίον τῶν Ἱερῶν Κανόνων, ἐναντίον ὅλων τῶν νόμων τῶν ἐθνῶν, ἀνέλαβεν αὐθαιρέτως καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ δικαστοῦ, ἐν ᾧ εἶναι καὶ κατήγορος, καὶ ἐδίκασεν· ἀπεφάσισε μετὰ πολλῆς βίας, καὶ με κατεδίκασεν ἐρήμην κηρύξας με ἔκπτωτον τῆς θέσεώς μου, ἀντικαταστήσας με δι' ἄλλου τῆς ἀρεσκείας του, παραβάς ἅπαντα τὰ πρόνομια καὶ τὴν τάξιν τοῦ Ἱεροῦ Μοναστηρίου. Εἰς μάτην διαμαρτύρωμαι [sic] κατὰ [p. 3] τῶν παρανομιῶν του τούτων, εἰς μάτην τόσοι Πατέρες Σιναῖται καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐντὸς καὶ ἐκτὸς τοῦ Μοναστηρίου βίγνυσι [sic] τὰ ἱμάτιά των κατὰ τῶν ἐπεμβάσεων τοῦ Ἱεροσολ. καὶ ὁμολογοῦσι τὴν εὐχαριστίαν των ἀπὸ ἐμέ. Εἰς μάτην τὸ οἰκουμενικὸν Πατριαρχεῖον τὸν γράφει ἐγκαίρως τοῦ νὰ μὴ προβῇ εἰς καμμίαν ὀποιανδήποτε πράξιν [sic], διότι ἡ υπόθεσις αὐτῆ δέον νὰ θεωρηθῇ δι' εὐρυτέρας σκέψεως ὑπὸ τῆς καθ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐκκλησίας κατὰ τὰ προλαβόντα πλεῖστα παραδείγματα. Ἄλλ' οὐδὲν τούτων λαμβάνεται ὑπ' ὄψιν ἀπέναντι τῆς ἐμπαθοῦς κακοβουλίας τοῦ Ἱεροσολύμων. Σημειοτέον ὅτι αἱ κατ' εἰσήγησιν αὐτοῦ ἐξυφανθεῖσαι κατ' ἐμοῦ κατηγορίαι, τὰς ὁποίας καὶ ἀβασανίστως παρεδέχθη καὶ ἐπροχώρησε μέχρι τῆς παύσεώς μου, εἶναι μία καὶ αὐτῆ, ὅτι [p. 4] δῆθεν ὑπεξείρισσα [sic] βαρύτιμα κειμήλια ἀνεπιστρεπτι, καὶ με τοῦτο ἐνοοῦσι τὸ πρὸς ὑμᾶς δοθὲν χειρόγραφον, κατὰ κοινὴν γνώμην ὡς γνωρίζετε. Ἐν τούτοις κραυγάζω, ζητῶ δίκην, καὶ δικαστὰς ἀμερολήπτους διὰ νὰ με δικάσωσι· ἐπικαλοῦμαι τὴν δικαιοσύνην τῶν Ἱερῶν Κανόνων, τῶν νόμων ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου· ἡ φωνή μου ἀποδίδει

The passage in the letter is close to the corresponding part of “Cyril’s Draft.” (54) True, since the letter was addressed to Tischendorf, the person most directly involved, the passage is shorter, its language less precise and more moderate. But it says the same thing; it even repeats the “Draft’s” peculiar expressions. The veiled accusation that Cyril has embezzled the *Sinaiticus* “without <hope for its> return” or “irretrievably” (ἀμεταστρεπτί in both texts) is false. That the manuscript was *given* to Tischendorf is only “common opinion;” reality, it is implied, was different.

Cyril’s refusal to state that the *Sinaiticus* had been, or was to be, donated to Russia may have ruined his last chance to be reinstated as Archbishop of Sinai. At the end of his letter, Cyril asked Tischendorf, who “had been useful... <to him> in the past,” to intervene on his behalf in St. Petersburg. Cyril must have lost his touch. After the declaration he had just made on the *Sinaiticus*, Cyril was of no more use. Tischendorf and the Russians dropped him (55). The *Sinaibibel* does not even mention the contact Tischendorf made with Cyril late in 1867, nor does it mention Cyril’s letter of January 1868 (56).

Cyril was not quite candid when he hinted that the accusations of embezzlement leveled against him were nothing more than reproaches for having permitted Tischendorf to take the *Sinaiticus* away. Lists of objects which Cyril was said to have robbed from the Monastery or its *Skeuophylakion* include liturgical vestments, staffs and silverware (57). But in the *Sinaiticus* affair the prevaricating Cyril’s hands remained pure, not only to the very end of his pontificate, but even after his deposition. It was reserved for his

κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον [1 Cor. 13: 1]. Τὸ οἰκουμενικὸν Πατριαρχεῖον μέχρι τοῦδε δὲν ἀνεγνώρισε τὰς πράξεις τοῦ Ἱεροσολύμων, θεωρῶν [sic?] αὐτὰς ἀντικανονικάς. Ἄλλ’ ἴδωμεν ἂν δὲν εἰσχωρήσῃ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἡ ῥαδιουργία τοῦ Ἱεροσολύμων ἐπὶ τέλους.

Ἴδου φίλε ἡ ἀθλία κατάστασις τῶν καθ’ ἡμᾶς πραγμάτων, ἕνεκα τοῦ ὅτι ἐπιλήσιμονες γινόμενοι τῆς ὑψηλῆς ἡμῶν ἀποστολῆς, παραγνωρίζομεν τὰ [p. 5] καθήκοντά μας, καὶ ὑπηρετοῦμεν τυφλῶς τὰ πάθη καὶ τὴν κακίαν μας, ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς περιστάσεως ταύτης ὁ Πατριάρχης τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων. Ἄλλ’ ἔστι Θεός ὁ ἀποδίδων ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. Συγχωρήσατέ με ὅτι σὰς γράφω γραικικά, διότι δὲν εὐρέθη παρ’ ἐμοῦ ὁ γράφων με γαλλικά, καὶ ὅτι σὰς ἐβάρυνα μὲ τὴν πολυλογίαν μου. Ἐλπίζω ὅτι ὡς καὶ ἄλλοτε μοι ἐφάνητε χρήσιμος, καὶ εἰς ταύτην τὴν περίστασιν δὲν θέλετε μ’ ἀρνηθεῖ τὴν συνδρομὴν σας, καὶ μάλιστα μεταβαίνοντες ἤδη εἰς Πητρούπολιν· περαινῶν διαβεβαιῶ ὑμῖν, Κύριε, περὶ τῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὑπολήψεώς μου, μεθ’ ἧς καὶ διατελῶ,

Πρὸς Θεὸν διάπτυρος ἱκέτης

† Ὁ Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Σιναίου Κύριλλος Α [?]

(54) Cf. end of p. 3 of the *Draft*.

(55) The resourceful Ignat’ev (and the central government) strove for a double gain; after all, the dropping of Cyril could be turned to Russia’s advantage precisely in the *Sinaiticus* affair. Letter to Antonin (date : May 8/20, 1868), ed. DMITRIEVSKIJ, *Graf Ignat’ev...* (as in note 6 *supra*), p. 27 : “ Perhaps by promising to recognize the new Archbishop of Sinai [i.e. Callistratus, Cyril’s foe] ... one could get off cheaply, i.e. by means of medals alone ” [and thus obtain the donation]; Letter to Antonin (date : June 18/30, 1868), ed. DMITRIEVSKIJ, *ibidem* : “ Such an operation, i.e. paying for the Bible with our consent to Cyril’s deposition and by offering monies that do not belong to us, was to St. Petersburg’s... great liking.”

(56) The mention of “ continuous correspondence ” between Tischendorf and Cyril (*Sinaibibel*, p. 87) refers to the period shortly after 1862.

(57) Cf. P. NEOKLES, Τὸ κανονικὸν δίκαιον τοῦ πατριαρχικοῦ θρόνου τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Σινᾶ... (Constantinople, 1868), p. 236, 256-257, 304.

successor Callistratus, whose integrity met with the approval of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, to sign away the *Sinaiticus* to Russia (58).

V

A full and fair account of the *Sinaiticus* story is yet to be written. To be complete, this account would have to rely upon all the previously known documents : Cyril's correspondence with Tischendorf, Tischendorf's letters to his wife Angelika (59), Porfirij Uspenskij's utterances concerning Tischendorf and the *Sinaiticus*, Ambassador Ignat'ev's correspondence with Archimandrite Antonin, and the texts published here. In addition, this account would have to draw upon materials that perhaps still slumber in divers archives relating to the affairs of the Near East. The struggle for the *Sinaiticus* was both lay and ecclesiastical; affected as it was by Eastern Mediterranean and Balkan politics in the fifties and sixties of the past century, it must have left some traces in diplomatic or governmental records.

To be fair, an account of the *Sinaiticus* story should stress the following points :

Very soon after his discovery of the *Sinaiticus* on February 4, 1859, Tischendorf, on his own initiative, started suggesting to the monks that they should donate the manuscript to the Russian ruler (60). The "donation," he hinted, would be reciprocated by Imperial liberality; the lavish *baksheesh* (61) which he dispensed among the monks might whet their appetite for things to come.

The monks did not reject Tischendorf's suggestion outright. It may

(58) Cf. a similar observation in W. HOLTZELT, "Die kirchenrechtliche Stellung..." (as in note 26 *supra*), p. 460. Holtzelt rightly connected the *Sinaiticus* affair with the quarrel between Sinai and Jerusalem; his (quite correct) intuition was that problems connected with the *Sinaiticus*' discovery had not yet been solved (*ibidem*, p. 459).

(59) The absence of an edition of these letters is to be regretted. At present, one has to rely upon excerpts appearing in H. BEHREND's book (as in note 9 *supra*), and even on a slide (cf. note 1 *supra*: we have no full text of that letter, written a mere eleven days after Tischendorf's second discovery of the manuscript).

(60) On March 30, 1859, Tischendorf wrote to Angelika from Cairo that he hoped to be able to take the *Sinaiticus* with him, in order to present it to the [Russian] Imperial Majesties. On March 29 "both abbots" of Sinai had confirmed this hope of his. Cf. also Tischendorf to Angelika (date: Alexandria, May 1, 1859), on "new Archbishop" Cyril's "firm promise" that the manuscript would be offered, through Tischendorf, as a gift to the Emperor. Cf. H. BEHREND (as in note 9 *supra*), p. 49. At first, a less subtle approach was tried: "By the way, from the very start and quite overtly, I stated my intention to make acquisitions with [the help of] the Emperor's name and gold": Tischendorf to Angelika (date: February 15, 1859), cf. H. BEHREND, *ibidem*, p. 43.

(61) Tischendorf to Angelika (date: February 15, 1859): "I behaved more like a Russian prince than a Saxon professor. I distributed gifts on every occasion. They often solicited my favors and asked me to intercede for them in Petersburg." Cf. H. BEHREND (as in note 9 *supra*), p. 43.

be assumed that in *pourparlers* they promised, more or less explicitly (62), to follow that suggestion in exchange for favors, among them Russia's aid in having Cyril confirmed as Archbishop of Sinai. But even if there had been an unambiguous *entente* on this point, it was never set down in writing; there was no reference to it at all in Tischendorf's receipt of September 28, 1859.

Cyril's—and Russia's—chances for implementing such a postulated informal understanding were thwarted when Cyril's enemies learned, perhaps through Tischendorf's own boasting (63), of the rumored donation and exploited this information to undermine Cyril's position with the Sublime Porte. In general, the removal of the *Sinaiticus* produced a great deal of excitement and dissatisfaction in high ecclesiastical circles in the Orthodox East (64).

The rumors had to be silenced, the Turkish authorities pacified; Prince Lobanov's statement of November 13, 1859 did just this. Although Tischendorf betrays no sign of having realized it, all his subsequent efforts to obtain an act of donation from Cyril were doomed to failure. Taking the terms of Tischendorf's receipt at their face value, Cyril may even have asked for the restitution of the *Sinaiticus* shortly after the *de luxe* edition of its text had appeared in St. Petersburg in 1862 (65). We know for certain that on other occasions, he either maintained silence or refused to yield to Tischendorf's entreaties, hiding behind the authority of the "Community of Sinai," over which he in fact exercised a despotic rule (66). Not that Cyril seriously desired the return of the manuscript to the monastery, but by deferring a regular act of donation he not only refuted the accusations

(62) Quite explicitly, according to Tischendorf's letter quoted in note 60 *supra*; but cf. Cyril's cautious letter to Tischendorf (date: July 17/29, 1859), ed. PERADZE, *Dokumenty...* (as in note 22 *supra*), p. 146: in answer to a request by Tischendorf for an interview on the subject of the *Sinaiticus*, Cyril agreed to have "une explication ouverte" concerning the manuscript. To my knowledge, this is as close as Cyril ever came to an admission in writing that he was negotiating on the transfer of the *Sinaiticus*.

(63) Cf. Germanos' complaints in the letter published p. 62 *supra*. The Patriarch of Jerusalem Cyril, the mortal foe of our Cyril, was told about Tischendorf's discovery on May 16, 1859, cf. C. TISCHENDORF, *Aus dem Heiligen Lande...* (1862), p. 233.

(64) Cf. Porfirij USPENSKIJ, *Kniga...* (as in note 20 *supra*), VII, p. 223, entry for January 1860: The Patriarch of Constantinople is reluctant to authorize the loan of a manuscript to Porfirij, "knowing how dissatisfied the whole Greek clergy was with Tischendorf's tricks in the East;" cf. *ibidem*, p. 284-286, entry for November 28, 1860: The Patriarch of Alexandria started the discussion on topics that were exciting him at the moment with the *Sinaiticus*: "We think that the Bible taken by Tischendorf from Sinai... should be returned... to its [original] place." Cf. *ibidem*, p. 297-298, entry for December 22, 1860: To Porfirij's question "What is the news of the local Orthodox clergy?" the Secretary of the Russian Consulate in Alexandria answered: "They regret the loss of the Sinai Bible, taken away by Tischendorf, and they curse Couza."

(65) To be deduced from *Sinaibibel*, p. 87.

(66) Cf. Cyril to Tischendorf (date: Cairo, December 20, 1860): "Concerning the affair of that manuscript... I shall have the pleasure of informing you in time of the decision that the community will have taken on this matter." Cyril to Tischendorf (date: Constantinople, [month not indicated] 18, 1867): "Concerning the manuscript of the Bible, I regret... not to be able to pass on to you the intentions of the Community, whose decisions, in accordance with our rule, have always dictated my behavior." Texts in PERADZE, *Dokumenty...* (as in note 22 *supra*), p. 146-147.

of his enemies but was in possession of a bargaining point for other purposes. He could use it for soliciting a counter-gift (through here his, or the monks', appetite seems to have been exaggerated) (67), for obtaining Russian support in staving off confiscation of Sinaitic property in Romania (68), and, finally, for securing through Tischendorf Russian backing in his struggle to maintain his throne at Sinai (69).

The offering of the *Sinaiticus* to the Tsar in 1862 by Tischendorf was an illegal act. That it had no legal value was clear to Russian authorities (70), to Tischendorf himself (71), and, of course, to the monks. In 1865, the monks' dissatisfaction with Tischendorf was revealed to Brugsch. Brugsch, although a friend of Tischendorf's, reported these complaints in print (72) and thus made the European reading public aware of them. Tischendorf's good name was in jeopardy, and for good reason. He knew that he would remain under suspicion as long as no regular act of donation was forthcoming from Sinai. In the spring of 1868, he traveled to St. Petersburg—having failed to budge Cyril, he decided to cajole the Russians into loosening their pursestrings. While there, he may again have offered his services as bearer of Imperial gifts to Sinai, but whatever the nature of his intervention, it seems to have set the Russian official machinery in motion (73). In the end, however, it was this machinery, run by professionals like Count Ignat'ev and the Archimandrite Antonin Kapustin (74), and not Tischendorf's

(67) In his review of the 1862 edition of the *Sinaiticus*, E. von Murlalt reflected opinions as to the manuscript's fate held at St. Petersburg about that time. Whether the *Sinaiticus* would remain in St. Petersburg or would be sent back to Sinai depended, "it is rumored," on whether or not the monks would get, of all things, a steamship.—Let us remember that work on the Suez Canal was proceeding rapidly in 1862-63.—Cf. *Bemerkungen über den Codex Sinaiticus, Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für english-theologische Forschung und Kritik*, V (1865), 193-196 [these pages were printed on May 30, 1863].

(68) Cf. *Sinaiibibel*, p. 88.

(69) Cyril to Tischendorf (date: Constantinople, [month not indicated] 18, 1867): "You know that the Community could not have given a greater proof of its respectful attachment to the Imperial House of Russia than by offering to it the patronage over the publication of this treasure [i.e. the *Sinaiticus*]. As for the rest, since no decision has been taken, you will understand that, given the state of affairs that has befallen the community, this is not the opportune moment to submit to it an affair of this nature. Consequently, I shall not be able to give you any positive information on this matter, until the reestablishment of order permits us to take it up." French original in PERADZE, *Dokumenty...* (as in note 22 *supra*), p. 147. Thus Cyril was holding out as late as 1867. His conditions were simple: if Russian support in the struggle with Callistratus were forthcoming, one could seriously discuss the donation (for the donation is meant by "the rest").

(70) Hence the consigning of the *Sinaiticus* to the vaults of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

(71) Cf. p. 67 *supra*.

(72) H. BRUGSCH, *Wanderung nach den Türkis-Minen und der Sinai-Halbinsel* (2nd ed., 1868; the trip took place in April-May, 1865), p. 47-48: The *δικαῖος* of the monastery was dissatisfied, for the *Sinaiticus* had not yet been returned, although the Russian Ambassador in Constantinople had guaranteed its restitution. Brugsch was sure that Tischendorf had concluded a confidential agreement with the head of the monastery, an agreement by which the *Sinaiticus* "did have a legal owner" by 1865. This was unclear language.

(73) Cf. note 51 *supra*.

(74) On this scholar, director of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Jerusalem, and visitor to Sinai, cf. Archimandrite KIPRIAN (KERN), *O. Antonin Kapustin...* (Belgrade, 1934). On Antonin's mediation in the *Sinaiticus* affair, cf. *ibidem*, p. 138 and DMITRIEVSKIĀ, *Graf Ignat'ev...* (as in note 6 *supra*), p. 27-29.

amateurish attempts, that obtained (by the use of pressures that deserve closer scrutiny) (75) the regular act of donation from the Sinaites.

Callistratus, the Archbishop from whom the donation was finally obtained, continued to write Tischendorf sweet-sounding letters until the latter's death in 1874 (76), for the Archbishop always hoped for Tischendorf's assistance. But these letters are no proof that Tischendorf had been a perfect gentleman, nor even that Callistratus thought he had. Rightly or wrongly his feelings were hostile, for Callistratus, too, felt that the monks had been cheated (77).

VI

It is easier to assess the part played by Tischendorf the scholar in the *Sinaiticus* affair: All one has to do is compare his instant realization of the manuscript's value to the long and irrelevant description of the *Sinaiticus* produced by Porfirij Uspenskij (78), who saw it in 1845 and 1850 and who, on the latter date, was able to study it on Sinai at his leisure (79). Uspenskij's subsequent attacks, occasioned by the alleged heretical traits in the *Sinaiticus*, were merely sour grapes. Until Tischendorf's announcement of 1860, the learned but confused Archimandrite had seen nothing amiss in that manuscript. He had been convinced that it was of importance (80), but he never realized how great this importance was.

(75) In 1867, Ignat'ev had Sinai's holdings in Russia sequestered until clarification of Cyril's status. At that time, it seemed to have been a move on Cyril's behalf. This sequestration was still in force by June 18/30, 1868, when Ignat'ev told Antonin about a report that the Sinaites were willing to "donate the Bible without compensation, provided that Callistratus would be recognized and the Monastery given permission to draw on [its] monies sequestered by us..." The sequestration of Sinaitic property was lifted some time between June 18/30, 1868 and June 10/22, 1870. "I like to push people against the wall," wrote Ignat'ev on March 14/26, 1869, "otherwise you cannot squeeze anything out of the obstinate." This was a footnote to Ignat'ev's information that he was withholding the medals and payment promised for the anticipated donation of the *Sinaiticus*. Cf. DMITRIEVSKIJ, *Graf Ignat'ev...* (as in note 6 *supra*), p. 23, 25-28.

(76) The letter of July 15, 1869, stating that the *Sinaiticus* had been donated (ἐδωρήθη), but complaining that the medals had not yet arrived. Cf. GREGORY, *Prolegomena...* (as in note 6 *supra*), p. 352-53; G. EBERS, *Durch Gosen zum Sinai...* (2nd ed., 1881), p. 588-590; partial German text in *Sinai-bibel*, p. 91-92. A letter of March 12/24, 1874 in PERADZE, *Dokumenty...* (as in note 22 *supra*), p. 148.

(77) Cf. Ebers (as in the preceding note), p. 590, referring to Gardthausen and "other recent travellers": they heard Callistratus' "bitter complaints" against the "purloining" of the *Sinaiticus*.

(78) *Pervoe putešestvie v Sinajskij monastyr' v 1845 godu* (1856), p. 225-238. Porfirij reports on the letter of Barnabas without being aware of the capital importance of the find.

(79) Cf. *Kniga...* (as in note 20 *supra*), VIII, p. 56: "for a long time;" P. V. BEZOBRAZOV, *Materialy...* (as in note 20 *supra*), II, p. 881: "forty days;" this can hardly be true, since it appears from PORFIRIJ'S *Vtoroe putešestvie...* (as in note 20 *supra*), p. 77, 162 ff., 193, that in 1850 he spent a total of 29 days on Sinai, out of which a maximum of four were devoted to the study of the *Sinaiticus* (which Porfirij specifically mentioned on p. 193).

(80) Cf. P. V. BEZOBRAZOV, *Materialy...* (as in note 20 *supra*), II, p. 681-684: reporting to Count A. P. Tolstoj on March 1, 1858, Uspenskij expressed a negative opinion on Tischendorf's intended trip to the Near East (the trip that led to the *Sinaiticus*' discovery). Instead, Porfirij suggested that three Russians should be sent on a mission, and that they should obtain permission from the Eastern Patriarchs to borrow (not without compensation) certain [important] manuscripts for a time, e.g. "the Sinai Septuagint of the fifth century," in other words, the *Sinaiticus*.

It is less easy to evaluate the part played by Tischendorf the man in the *Sinaiticus* affair. He was enough of a scholar never to say an outright falsehood in relating the story of the years 1844-1869 (81), but he was masterfully vague when he narrated some of the points crucial to our judgment of the propriety of his acts. In the quarrel with Porfirij Uspenskij over the priority of the manuscript's discovery, Tischendorf was hardly fair. In 1859/60, poor Uspenskij could—and did—quite sincerely believe that he had been the first to discover and describe the *Sinaiticus*, for he had seen it in 1845. He cannot be held responsible because Tischendorf, who had seen parts of the manuscript in 1844, kept their origin a secret for all practical purposes until 1860 (82).

To see flaws in Tischendorf's behavior is not to impugn the legality of the *Sinaiticus*'s ultimate transfer to the British Museum. This legality is unquestioned (83). Scholars may understandably prefer to see this treasure exhibited in a great Western repository of learning rather than buried in the wilderness of a far country, but this is a poor reason for exculpating Tischendorf. Moreover, to find his actions correct from 1859 onward because ten years later, and after the deposition of the Archbishop with whom Tischendorf had been dealing, another Archbishop of Sinai made a gift of the manuscript to Russia, and made it as a result of pressures with which Tischendorf himself had very little to do, is a procedure the logic of which escapes my understanding.

(81) Our eyebrows tend to rise on only one occasion: Having described a fifteenth-century manuscript (the *Tomos* against Barlaam) which he had acquired on his trip of 1844, Tischendorf copied its curse formula: "the present book belongs... to Mount Sinai. ... whoever removes it from the... monastery, may he be afflicted with the curse of the Holy Fathers and of the Burning Bush." Tischendorf added in brackets, for no apparent reason, "I found these leaves when I was already far away from Sinai."—The reliability of two important points in Tischendorf's own story has been impugned by BENEŠEVIČ, *Les manuscrits grecs...* (as in note 23 *supra*), p. 34-39 and 68-72. The first point deals with the authenticity of the famous basket in which the first portion of the *Sinaiticus* was presumably found in 1844, and with the question of whether that portion was about to be burned; the second, perhaps more interesting, point is concerned with the motivation of Tischendorf's third trip to Sinai in 1859. Was he driven there by an unclear impulse, a "pressentiment dont je ne savais me rendre compte," cf. *Mémoire sur la découverte...* (as in note 2 *supra*), p. 4, or had he gotten wind, as early as the summer of 1857, of the presence of the manuscript's other parts still on Sinai through the publications of Porfirij Uspenskij (1856) and the interview with A. S. Norov (cf. note 39 *supra*)? The documents I have seen clear up neither of these points.

(82) Strictly speaking, until April of 1859, cf. end of note 4 *supra*. For all that, the fact of Tischendorf's priority in having seen a sizeable portion of the manuscript is incontestable. Nonetheless, a recent appraisal of Porfirij Uspenskij states that "the honor of the discovery" of the *Sinaiticus* belongs to the Russian scholar. Cf. M. A. KOROSTOVCEV and S. I. HODŽAŠ, *Vostokovednaja dejatel'nost' Porfiriya Uspenskogo, Bližnij i Srednij Vostok, Sbornik statej* (1962), p. 130.

(83) Ignat'ev saw to it that the donation of November 18, 1869 was made in all due form. All that the authors of the British Museum pamphlets needed to do to make their point was to quote the letter of June 13, 1878 in which the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs replied to C. R. Gregory's inquiries concerning the *Sinaiticus*; cf. GREGORY, *Prolegomena...* as in note 6 *supra*, p. 351; cf. also other works quoted in that note. Attempts to strengthen the case of legality by asserting—incidentally erroneously—that Tischendorf was beloved and revered by the Sinaites after 1859, were superfluous.

The professionals who engineered the legal transfer of the *Sinaiticus* into Russian hands in 1869 were perfectly aware of the nature of their enterprise. In 1868, Ignat'ev wanted to put "an end to the story of the Sinai Bible stolen by us." (84) Of course one could do so by giving Russia's consent to Cyril's deposition and by "offering <Sinai's own> monies that do not belong to us;" but Ignat'ev preferred a more "decorous" course—that of giving the monks any sum, however modest, that would "belong to us, so that it would be possible to say that we had bought the Bible rather than purloined it." (85) As for Archimandrite Antonin, he later spoke of the "long and fairly mixed-up procedure by which we acquired the famous Sinai manuscript." This, he argued, encumbered the Russians with a special obligation to compile a catalogue of Sinai manuscripts (86), and thus, we might add, to perform an act of expiation.

In this "long and fairly mixed-up procedure," Tischendorf appears as a brilliant, erudite, quick-minded, devoted, resourceful person, but also as a vain, cantankerous, and, on occasion, unfair man (87). For years, he was caught in the trap which he had helped to spring by his acts of 1859 and 1862; he was released from it in 1869 by hands more experienced than his own and, incidentally, more interested in securing a treasure for Russia than in saving a German professor's honor. By 1869, Tischendorf was an honorable man. But between 1859 and that date, he can be called honorable only retroactively. This picture of events I find more plausible, and even more worthy of Tischendorf than the prevailing *image d'Epinal*.

New York,
Columbia University.

Ihor ŠEVČENKO

(84) Ignat'ev to Antonin (date: May 8/20, 1868), ed. DMITRIEVSKIJ, *Graf Ignat'ev...* (as in note 6 *supra*), p. 26.

(85) Ignat'ev to Antonin (date: June 18/30, 1868), ed. *ibidem*, p. 27-28.

(86) *Trudy Kievskoj Duhovnoj Akademii* (1873), vol. I, p. 389. Cf. excerpts in V. N. BENEŠEVIČ, *Opisanie grečeskih rukopisej mon. Sv. Ekateriny...*, I (1911), p. xvii, n. 1 and in IDEM, *Les manuscrits grecs...* (as in note 23 *supra*), p. 82.

(87) Cf. on this point S. P. Tregelles' remark of 1860, published in T. H. HORNE, *An Introduction...* (as in note 17 *supra*), p. 753-54: "That he [Tischendorf] always treats other writers fairly, or shows sufficient candour or exactitude in estimating what they have done or written, I shall hardly be expected to admit." Cf. also E. TISSERANT, "Lettres de Constantin von Tischendorf à Carlo Vercellone," *Studi e Testi*, 126 (1946), p. 479-498, esp. p. 498: in these letters Tischendorf appears "passablement orgueilleux et d'un caractère pas trop facile."