

# The Son of God

Mark 1:1

By Martin A. Shue

Everyone reading this post has either heard about or has experienced for themselves the footnotes in the modern versions. Now, while I am not entirely opposed to footnotes I am opposed to inaccurate information being portrayed as truth in footnotes. This is the major problem I have with the footnotes in the modern versions. If they cannot remove the Biblical text from the actual verse itself they will very subtly (Gen. 3:1) remove it with a doubtful footnote. In this brief post I want to demonstrate just how the average Christian reader is being lied to and doesn't even know it.

When we look at Mark 1:1 we find that nearly all translations read "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God;" or something to that effect. To my knowledge the only translation that reads otherwise is the New World Translation. It omits the phrase "the Son of God". Other than this translation all others I checked included this phrase. This is well and good until your eye catches the little footnote number attached to "the Son of God" in most modern versions. For instance, the New Living Translation gives this footnote "Some manuscripts do not include the Son of God." The NIV and NASV both say "Some manuscripts do not have the Son of God." The RSV and NRSV both have "Other ancient authorities omit *the Son of God*". This is disturbing because we have all too often seen passages that have been questioned in the footnotes entirely removed in subsequent translations. In fact W-H bracketed this phrase as 'doubtful' and the N-A 25th edition omitted the phrase all together; however, it has since been replaced in the 27th edition. And so goes 'scholarship Onlyism'.

The *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (Third Edition)* defines "some" as

1. Being an unspecified number or quantity: some people; some sugar.
2. Unknown or unspecified by name: Some man called.
3. Logic. Being part and perhaps all of a class.
4. Informal. Remarkable: She is some skier.

*pron.*

1. An indefinite or unspecified number or portion: We took some of the books to the auction. See Usage Note at every.
2. An indefinite additional quantity:

Notice how many times they used "unspecified" and "indefinite". By "some" one would reasonably believe that it was a pretty good quantity. More than two for sure or else it would stand to reason that they would've said "two ancient authorities....." More than a "few" or else they would have clearly stated "a few manuscripts...." I would remind you that "few" is defined as "Amounting to or consisting of a small number". So we gather that these authorities/manuscripts are larger than just a "small number"; in other words "some".

The only problem with their footnotes is that nothing could be further from the truth than to say

"some manuscripts.....". It is certainly no 'some'. The truth is only **four** (maybe five) manuscripts omit this phrase. As usual we find as their leader Sinaiticus (N). N is joined by **only** one other uncial, viz. Θ. Two cursives (i.e. 28, 2211) for sure join them and possibly a third. **That is it!** I would scarcely call four manuscripts "some". I wouldn't even call four MSS. a "few". They have purposefully misrepresented the facts surrounding this verse. And since the average Christian reader doesn't have the means nor the will to verify their false claims they continue to get by with them. "For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ."

Some facts: EVERY other MS. contains the phrase, as does ALL of the Latin. All the ancient versions contain the phrase. Numerous Fathers quote the phrase without question.

Irenaeus writes,

The Son of God was made the Son of Man, in order that by Him we might obtain the adoption: Man carrying, and receiving, and enfolding the Son of God. Hence, Mark says,-  
-"The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as it is written in the prophets (lib. iii cap. xvi).

Irenaeus is joined by Porphyry, Cyril, Augustine, Ambrose and many others. As for the Fathers who are reportedly opposed to the phrase Dean Burgon reduced the list to only one, viz. Origen. Of the others, Burgon stated that under examination they prove "to be all a mistake".

With such undisputable evidence one has to wonder why the margin of modern versions is 'encumbered after this discreditable fashion'. It is reprehensible to even have a footnote attached to this clause much less a footnote that is nothing more than a lie.