

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: List of omissions in modern bible translations****List of omissions in modern bible translations - posted by narrowpath, on: 2020/5/1 19:09**

This post is not to promote KJV only, but to check the background of modern bible translations.

The arguments between textcritical and Textus Receptus proponents are ongoing.

I found a document that puts those in a chart and at first glance even an unlearned Christian reader can discern that the differences clearly follow a pattern.

You can find it when you google

"Amazing Westcott and Hort Magic Marker Binge"

The TR includes stronger statements on the deity of Christ, the trinity, the blood, eternal judgement and other fundamental truths, whereas the textcritical translations omit or weaken these.

The Comma Johaneum is the most striking one and the last verse of the Lord's prayer another one.

This is no small matter, and it seems that many popular bible teachers promote these modern versions, especially the reformed ones.

I prefer the KJV and NKJV over many modern versions, and there are good TR based bible versions in other languages.

May God give us wisdom and discernment.

**Re: List of omissions in modern bible translations - posted by narrowpath, on: 2020/5/2 14:07**

Here is a link:

<https://av1611.com/kjbp/charts/themagicmarker.html>

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2020/5/2 17:35**

Good grief.

**Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2020/5/3 1:10**

Hi narrowpath,

I started with the NIV and switched to the NASB. Most of these omissions are actually also in the NASB but with the notation that they were not in earlier manuscripts or that they were included in a few late manuscripts and versions.

Anyway, HOW have these omissions corrupted the gospel message?

Quote:

----- The TR includes stronger statements on the deity of Christ, the trinity, the blood, eternal judgement and other fundamental truths, whereas the textcritical translations omit or weaken these. -----

It is not the stronger statements of the TR but the power of the Holy Spirit that counts.

1 Cor. 2:4-5

NKJV â€

And my speech and my preaching were not with persuasive words of human wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, that your faith should not be in the wisdom of men but in the power of God.

NASB â€

and my message and my preaching were not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, so that your faith would not rest on the wisdom of men, but on the power of God.

John 16:13-14

NKJV â€

However, when He, the Spirit of truth, has come, He will guide you into all truth; for He will not speak on His own authority, but whatever He hears He will speak; and He will tell you things to come. He will glorify Me, for He will take of what is Mine and declare it to you.

NASB â€

But when He, the Spirit of truth, comes, He will guide you into all the truth; for He will not speak on His own initiative, but whatever He hears, He will speak; and He will disclose to you what is to come. He will glorify Me, for He will take of Mine and will disclose it to you.

Blessings

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2020/5/3 13:59**

The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, and He will never compromise or overrule the written word.

I am not a New Testament Scholar, but I believe it though the Greek TR has stronger statements not because someone edited them to make them stronger but rather the Alexandrian texts were weakened according to gnostic influences the scribes were under.

They call those texts that they base the new translations on majority text and claim that because they are earlier manuscripts, they are more likely to be original.

This does not convince me.

Here are some striking examples, check for yourself:

Mark 1:2 King James Version (KJV)

2 As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.

Mark 1:2 English Standard Version (ESV)

As it is written in ISAIAH THE prophet,  
â€œBehold, I send my messenger before your face,  
who will prepare your way,

This is actually a citation from Mal 3:1, not Isaiah

-----

and the Lord's Prayer in Luke 11:2-4

King James Version (KJV)

2 And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth.

3 Give us day by day our daily bread.

4 And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil.

Luke 11:2-4 ESV - cut out a lot:

2 Father, hallowed be your name.

Your kingdom come.

3 Give us each day our daily bread,

4 and forgive us our sins,

for we ourselves forgive everyone who is indebted to us.

And lead us not into temptation.

---

Matthew 20:16 King James Version (KJV)

16 So the last shall be first, and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen.

Matthew 20:16 English Standard Version (ESV)

16 So the last will be first, and the first last.

---

and as far as references to the Old Testament are concerned, they are missing in Mk 15:28, Mt 27:35 and Mk 13:14

and last not least the textcritical Westcott-Hort text does not include Mark 16:9-20 but most new translations still keep it in the text body and only mention that they are not included in majority Greek texts.

Though most passages are more or less identical, but there are important missing pieces.

It is like a coat with many holes. It is still 99% coat, but would you wear it for business, in winter or to protect yourself from rain?

Certainly not!

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2020/5/3 15:32**

//This is actually a citation from Mal 3:1, not Isaiah//

Actually it's both. Mal. 3:1 and Is. 40:3.

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2020/5/3 15:48**

The verses are similar, but the citation is definitely from Mal 3:1.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2020/5/3 16:15**

Funny that Matthew Henry, who I assume used the Authorized KJV, disagrees with you.

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2020/5/3 16:48**

Matthew Henry mentions first Malachi, and then Isaiah, so he does not disagree with me, you can reference the bible verses for yourself.

[https://www.blueletterbible.org/Comm/mhc/Mar/Mar\\_001.cfm?a=958002](https://www.blueletterbible.org/Comm/mhc/Mar/Mar_001.cfm?a=958002)

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2020/5/3 19:11

Right- itâ€™s both. So it is not correct to say that versions which mention Isaiah are inaccurate.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2020/5/4 10:15

Hi narrowpath,

Quote:  
----- It is like a coat with many holes. It is still 99% coat, but would you wear it for business, in winter or to protect yourself from rain?  
Certainly not!  
-----

The only coat with no holes is the original text which no longer exists.

Quote:  
----- The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, and He will never compromise or overrule the written word.  
-----

Are you claiming that the TR contains the whole truth and nothing but the truth and God has preserved His whole truth in it? If so, you must give concrete evidence (not opinion) to substantiate your claim.

The fact is: The TR is based on late manuscripts. It is not the original text. Because the original text no longer exists, it cannot be proven that the omissions were in the original text

Quote:  
----- the Alexandrian texts were weakened according to gnostic influences the scribes were under.  
-----

Is this fact or opinion?

Quote:  
----- and last not least the textcritical Westcott-Hort text does not include Mark 16:9-20 but most new translations still keep it in the text body and only mention that they are not included in majority Greek texts.  
-----

Again, as the original text no longer exists, we just do not know whether this is in the original text or not.

The issue here is the TR vs. Westcott and Hort. I still cannot see how the critical truths of Christianity have been corrupted by the omissions listed.

Blessings

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2020/5/4 12:16**

//The issue here is the TR vs. Westcott and Hort. I still cannot see how the critical truths of Christianity have been corrupted by the omissions listed.//

They haven't been. In many cases especially in the synoptic gospels what KJ only proponents say is missing in one gospel actually shows up in the parallel passage in another gospel.

The story of the woman caught in adultery is also not in the oldest manuscripts. Doesn't mean it didn't happen (I believe it did) but it does deserve a footnote, which translations like the ESV or NASB provide.

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2020/5/4 14:01**

Hi BranchingVine

You need to read through the comparative chart yourself to make up your mind.

-----  
The only coat with no holes is the original text which no longer exists.  
-----

I believe the TR is the unadulterated version of the NT. The KJV is the best English translation available, but not free from small translation errors. You can never get a 100% accurate translation from one language into the other. Every translator knows that.

If God managed to preserve his word through thousands of years without fail, he will also succeed to preserve his word throughout the church age, regardless of library fires and efforts to falsify the gospel.

Question back to you: Do you believe that God was unable to provide the church with a proper text?

I am not KJV only, though the KJV is my English bible of choice and we use the NKJV with our family. I would embrace new bible translations in more contemporary language, as long as they are very close translations of the TR. I use TR based bibles in Chinese and German, too. We have an excellent contemporary TR based German Bible, called Schlachter2000, published in the year 2000 that is better than Luther's translation.

-----  
The fact is: The TR is based on late manuscripts. It is not the original text. Because the original text no longer exists, it cannot be proven that the omissions were in the original text  
-----

Earlier manuscripts do not necessarily mean more accurate.  
Also, ever wondered why the critical text differences follow a pattern?

When a text is copied again and again by hand through many hands, it is much more likely that things go missing, not added.

Pour exactly one gallon of water into a bucket. Pour it into another empty bucket - and another. Repeat it several times and take measurements. It will be definitely less than a gallon.

So I conclude the shorter critical text must have suffered more subtraction due to more hands copying and editing it.

-----  
Todd wrote  
They haven't been. In many cases especially in the synoptic gospels what KJ only proponents say is missing in one gospel actually shows up in the parallel passage in another gospel.  
-----

Thank God we have four gospels, so that even if the manuscripts are corrupted to a degree, they still render a reasonable

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: List of omissions in modern bible translations**

More accurate translations with the ESV and NASB. Thank God, those translations do not dare to completely leave out the footnote references to the TR, but I fear they will do so in future versions.

As for me and my house, we will follow the TR :)

**Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2020/5/5 3:46**

Hi narrowpath,

Quote:  
-----Pour exactly one gallon of water into a bucket. Pour it into another empty bucket - and another. Repeat it several times and take measurements. It will be definitely less than a gallon.

So I conclude the shorter critical text must have suffered more subtraction due to more hands copying and editing it.

-----  
Equally, pour exactly one gallon of water into a bucket. Pour more water into it. Repeat it several times and it will definitely be more than one gallon.

Therefore the longer text could contain more text due to more hands copying and adding to it.

Quote:  
-----You need to read through the comparative chart yourself to make up your mind.  
â€œâ€œâ€œâ€œ  
Question back to you: Do you believe that God was unable to provide the church with a proper text?

-----  
I have made up my mind. In my view, the omissions have in no way corrupted the critical truths of Christianity. Both the early and late manuscripts contain the essential text to lead us to the Lord Jesus who Himself is the Way the Truth and the Life. And the message of repentance, of the cross and the resurrection, and of eternal life in Christ Jesus, have been preserved in both the early and late manuscripts.

You have chosen the KJV and NKJV. That is good. These are literal and reliable translations. The NASB has been my preferred choice through my years of personal Bible Study. It is also a literal translation and a reliable text

God has not promised us a flawless written text, but God has promised to send us the Holy Spirit to guide us into all truth.

The scribes had the best (i.e. the original) written text yet they were blind and rejected the Saviour.

Quote:  
-----As for me and my house, we will follow the TR :)  
-----

Jesus said, "Follow ME.â€œ

And He can be found in all Bible translations when our eyes are opened by the Holy Spirit to see Him only.

**Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2020/5/7 9:31**

Good morning everyone. It has been a long time since I have posted anything, but I felt like I could add to this discussion.

Before I make any other comment, I want to say that I am primarily a KJV guy, not because I am sold on its accuracy or believe that it is based upon superior texts. I just grew up with it and like it. As a result, I am pretty underwhelmed with every other version I have ever read. I am nearing 50 and all of those years have been spent in the church. This debate about texts and versions has been going on for all of my life. So, from 42 years of following Christ and being in the church world, here is what I have learned.

In 1 Corinthians 2, Paul tells the church that when he ministered to them, he did not come with his own intellectual understanding of scripture, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. He did this so that their foundation would not be on a man but on God. He went on to say this, "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth, not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man."

The written word of God cannot be understood apart from the Holy Spirit. The natural mind of man cannot receive the things of the Spirit of God. The Jews had Bible Scholars of the highest quality and degree. Yet Jesus showed them over and over again that they had totally missed the entire point of the law and the prophets. They were angry with Him and labeled Him a false prophet. They were trying to understand a written text with the natural mind and the spiritual message that it conveyed was foolishness to them.

In Hebrews, we read that the word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword and that it is able to divide between what is of the soul and what is of the Spirit in our lives. At that time, the recognized written word of God was only what we now know as the Old Testament. So if the verse is speaking of the Bible, then we would have to say that it is the law and the prophets that divides between soul and Spirit. But that is not at all what this verse is saying. It is saying that when God speaks to us, His word cuts deep and reveals to us what is of us and what is of the Spirit of God.

The purpose of the word of God is to transform our lives. It is to conform us into His image. This is a spiritual process, not an intellectual one. If the Holy Spirit does not reveal the written word of God to us, then we will miss the point and the purpose of the Bible. Granted, there are Bible versions out there that are obviously to be avoided. Many are paraphrases that do not even purport to be accurate translations and there are those that were written with the purpose of pushing a false message. But I am not even considering those when I say that the version you read is not nearly as important as we have made it, and the entire argument over those versions is a vain and empty pursuit. I know that some hard-core apologists will gasp, shake their heads, and reject that last statement and then label me, but it is the truth. The Holy Spirit is the interpreter of the word of God, not my own understanding and intellect. If I am seeking God for truth, the Holy Spirit will make me to properly understand what I read regardless of the version I am reading from.

You see, what we must realize is that people in nations where the Bible is not available are coming to Christ through direct visitation of the Holy Spirit upon their lives. He is teaching them. What is amazing is that what they are being taught by the Holy Spirit, apart from contact with the written word, is in complete agreement with the written word. Why? Because it is the author who is teaching them.

So the version and what original text comes from is not very important at all. The fact that we spend time in communion and intimacy with God and allow the Holy Spirit to reveal the word to us is what is important. The purpose of Bible study is not to make sure our "i"s are dotted and our "t"s crossed as far as doctrinal exegesis is concerned. It is the fellowship with God and be transformed into His image.