

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Acts 8:37 not in the Oldest and (best?)

Acts 8:37 not in the Oldest and (best?) - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/10/24 0:10

Many evolutionist mock at Creationist because of zealots like kent hovind and by doing so try to stereotype all creationist likewise. It does not matter how fanatical or embarrassing or untruthful or misinformed someone is that teaches creationism, It does not discredit the reality of Creationism. But by stereotyping all who hold this view with someone whom may not be 100% accurate is a very effective debate tactic but a very dirty unfair one though.

What I am saying is I Could care less of what Riplinger, Ruckman, Gipp and the like teach they are not whom have instilled conviction in me nor most people Whom believe that Inspiration includes the scriptures of today rather than some non existing original manuscript.

The oldest and Best text argument has done nothing except confuse and Give the liberals a strong arm over the inerrantist.

ask your self inspired or counterfeit

KJV

Acts ch 8 v 37 And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

NIV Acts ch 8 v 37 ???

Not in the oldest and best?? What is the outcome of taking it out?? Here is some liberals conclusion to it not being in the oldest and so called best.

COB messenger OCT.2012

///After Philip's explication of the scripture, the eunuch declares, Look here is water! What is to prevent me from being baptized?" No further questions, no further elaborations! The Chariot stops, they go down into the water, and the eunuch is baptized. Now this quick acceptance was too hasty for some traditions, so certain texts add And Philip said, 'If you believe with all your heart, you may.' And he replied, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.' However, the oldest tradition holds that his request is enough. No confession of faith, no confession of sin, no cross examination by Philip the desire to be baptized is enough.///

The apostate Artical will then go on and compare the eunuch to today's Homosexuals and how the church needs to embrace them in their sin into fellowship.

Do not worry about what riplinger and so on believe meditate and study the fruit of the modern critical eclectic text.

Edit PS this artical is not intended to slander kent hovind but I believe even he would agree that he is considered an extreme conspiracy theorist and differs sharply in views of many other creationist

Re: Acts 8:37 not in the Oldest and (best?), on: 2012/10/24 9:20

This man was an adherent to the Judaic Scriptures, and was seeking understanding. Phillip gave the man what he was searching for, and pointed him to Christ.

Why would he asked to be baptized if he didn't believe in Christ after Phillip had explained things to him? Who's name do you think Phillip would have baptized him in if the man didn't believe in Christ?

Remember that originally Luke and Acts were one book, and at the end of Luke Jesus told the disciples (including Phillip) in Luke 24:47 that "repentance for forgiveness of sins would be proclaimed in His name to all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem." I would assume that this verse was within the context of all Gospel messages about Christ preached by the apostles in the book of Acts, as this was the mandate from Christ to them.

In the end these are strawman arguments you're bringing up. Even if you had the original copy written by Luke in your hand, and, those who would desire to pervert the truths about Biblical repentance and saving faith would find a way to do so, just like they did in the time of the apostles. The inclusion of this man's statement of faith in Christ will not dissuade the liberal from trying to prove that this or that sin is acceptable and that we need to accept everyone, as there is no mention of repentance included in the verse either way. They're just desperate for ammo, as they've done this since the beginning, all throughout the history of the church's existence. Sinful man will always try to circumvent God's order and both hold on to, and approve of sin. This is nothing new.

The original manuscripts (or in this case, the earliest we have available) speak fine for themselves, even without what some (including myself) view as later inclusions. I can show quite easily with the NASB, or ESV, or NIV (as long as it's not one of the twisted "inclusive versions") that something like homosexuality is an abomination to God, in both testaments, and must be repented of.

This is not a liberal conspiracy. I respect the translators who have the guts to stick by their convictions to add nothing to the Word of God despite the backlash they receive for doing so.

Re: EverestoSama - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/10/24 23:21

Hi EverestoSama,

RE: EverestoSama wrote ///In the end these are strawman arguments you're bringing up.///

I would think of a strawman argument more of being what you wrote in the Fasting and contemporary translations thread with this quote ///and many who have studied it out objectively without giving heed to nutcase claims by the likes of Ruckman and Riplinger,/// https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=47115&forum=36&6

That is the kind of argument that I would understand as a strawman argument.

What I typed in this thread, is not what I would understand as a strawman argument, in that, in no way am I implying that the extreme Liberal take on these verses are the consensus of people who use modern translations.

My point is that the Liberal has an arm up on us when we give into the eclectic critical text, The liberals Historical-Critical method is championed by Constantine von Tischendorf.

Another book by an extreme Liberal "Toward a mature faith: does biblical inerrancy make sense" by Clayton Sullivan copyright 1990 by Warren Clayton Sullivan

p.4

///Numerous scholars in the nineteenth century dedicated their professional lives to historical-critical studies of the Bible. One of my favorites is Constantin Von Tischendorf (1815-1874), a German scholar of astonishing physical vitality. While a student at the University of Leipzig, he developed an interest in the Greek New Testament. Studying the Greek New Testament in meticulous detail became his life's consuming passion.///

The historical-critical method is one of the major foundation stones for liberal Christianity, historical critical studies have been applied to construct the eclectic critical text

EverestoSama a book that I would highly recommend to you and anyone else who is interested in the historical critical method is by Eta Linnemann a former student of Rudolf Bultmann, she is not KJV only, it is actually a German book translated into English but it is a very insightful book into the world and perspective of the historical critical methodology and how it objects to faith. She was saved out of this awful poison.

Historical Criticism of the Bible: Methodology or Ideology: Reflections of a Bultmannian Turned Evangelical

http://www.amazon.com/Historical-Criticism-Bible-Methodology-Reflections/dp/082543095X/ref=la_B001K1Z92M_1_2?ie=UTF8&qid=1351134286&sr=1-2#_

RE: EverestoSama wrote ///This is not a liberal conspiracy. I respect the translators who have the guts to stick by their convictions to add nothing to the Word of God despite the backlash they receive for doing so///

Everestoma, Do you believe that we should throw out the woman caught in adultery "The Pericope Adulterae" john 7:53-8:11 out of our bible ??

Everestoma, Do you believe that we should include the Letter of Barnabas and Shepherd of Hermas in our Bibles??

Why have these deeply convicted translators not done these things??

Edit reworded to make more clearly my thoughts