

Mark 6:22

By Martin A. Shue

At Mark 6:22 we find another, all too familiar, gross blunder in the 'oldest and best manuscripts'. Allow me to state clearly that the Traditional Text reads

"της τηγατροσ αυτης της Ηρωδιαδος". This could literally read "the daughter her of the Herodias". Biblically, as well as historically, speaking we know that this is precisely the person that came in and danced before the king, viz. 'the daughter of Herodias'. This young dancer is identified in other resources as Salome. That she danced before the king and requested John's head 'in a charger' is beyond speculation. However, when we look at N (Aleph) and B we are met with a most **"monstrous figment"**. These two codices, along with 3 other uncials and a couple of cursives, agree in reading "της τηγατροσ αυτου Ηρωδιαδος". Literally rendered this would read "the daughter his Herodias". In more plain English this would read "his daughter Herodias". Do you now see the total absurdity of N and B in this verse?

Instead of the unquestionable truth of the Traditional Text we are expected to believe, according to these two lying witnesses, that the young dancer was Herod's daughter "Herodias"!!!! This is so outrageous that Burgon refers to it as "the foulest blot of all". This preposterous reading is rejected by Griesback, Lachmann, Tregelles, Scholz, Alford and even Tischendorf. However, despite the ridiculousness of the reading Westcott and Hort adopt it as their own. Remarkable as it may seem the N-A/UBS Greek texts blindly follow W-H in this utterly stupid reading. Thankfully, I have not been able to find one translation that agrees with either Aleph, B, W-H, or N-A/UBS. Not YET anyway but you never know what the future holds with the Alexandrian crowd.

Again, we are looking at Mark 6:22. We saw above just how absurd the reading of N and B and a few others was. Yet W-H, N-A and the UBS Greek texts all adopted their ridiculous reading. They ignored the overwhelming majority of manuscripts. In addition, they ignored *every* other Greek text that had been before them.

There are two other examples that I want us to look at in this one verse. A few words past our last example we read in our AV that Herodias' daughter danced "and pleased" Herod and those that sat with him. If you will look at the mvs you will read "she pleased" instead of the correct "and pleased". The reason for this you ask? Once again, primarily because "ηρεσεν" (she pleased) is the reading of N and B as you probably imagined. Again, they have ignored the Traditional reading even though it is the Majority reading. Among the notable manuscripts that read "και αρεσασησ" (and pleased) are A, C D W and perhaps most notable p45. This I say because p45 dates to the 3rd century, nearly one hundred years before the two false witnesses of N and B. So, yet AGAIN we find that the mvs don't follow the "oldest" reading nor do they follow the "best" reading which they frequently boast about. We proceed.

Our next variant involves the phrase "the king said". In 'the Greek' (to quote an Alexandrian

cliche) we read "ειπεν ο Βασιλευσ". This is the Traditional reading and is most certainly what Mark wrote. It is likewise the reading of N-A 27th and UBS 4th; however, W-H and Nestle's 25th read "ο δε Βασιλευσ ειπεν". As I said at the outset I want to show you just how utterly stupid modern scholarship is. The reason W-H and Nestle adopted the reading οφ ∇ο δε Βασιλευσ ειπεν" ('and the king said' or 'then the king said') is no doubt because N and B read this way. Now, our modern Greek texts (e.g. N-A 27th/UBS4) have rejected this minority reading in favor of the Majority and Traditional reading.

Do you see the stupidity? In the first reading they adopt a reading that is patently false based almost exclusively on the witness of N and B (his daughter Herodias). Then in the second variant they again adopt the minority reading which is based on N and B and a few others (she pleased). Then in this last example they abandon their two 'best' MSS. and follow the Traditional text which they just rejected in our two previous examples. This kind of scholarship does not even deserve to be called 'scholarship'. It is certainly not 'scholarly' by any stretch of the imagination. But yet we still have people coming into this and other clubs day after day defending this kind of stupidity and the absolutely corrupt books that are based on their work.