

## Acts 8v37 - Why this SHOULD be in the Bible!

*Writer's Note 2016:* The following note was sent to church leadership on August 28<sup>th</sup> 2011 with respect to the validity of Acts 8:37 ***“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”*** which a visiting speaker to the church had impugned from the church's pulpit. No reply was ever received.

Dear \*\*\*\*\*

...I am writing briefly to draw attention to a matter that I noted in Mr \*\*\*\*\*'s message last Sunday, w.r.t. Acts 8:26-40, in particular Acts 8:37.

I appreciate that in a sense, the matter is water under the bridge now but hopefully the brief points that follow will be considered should the above Acts passage, in particular Acts 8:37, be addressed in any future ministry of the church.

Mr \*\*\*\*\* made reference to Acts 8:37 as not being in the oldest manuscripts and not part of 'the original' or words to that effect.

Had he limited his comments to the above statement, I would not have raised this matter. Any speaker can give an incorrect report, depending on the sources he consults. It's happened to me. The simple truth is that Acts 8:37 is scripture, with an unbroken testimony to its validity from the 2nd century AD onwards and God's blessing of Reformation and Revival on the Bibles that contain it, e.g. all those of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation. Even the versions that omit it imply the validity of Acts 8:37, because they don't change the verse numbering system, although it would obviously be very easy to do so in this particular instance, if their editors genuinely believed that Acts 8:37 is spurious\*.

\*Various objections to Acts 8:37 have been raised. I believe that it is possible to answer them all satisfactorily [2016 update: See attached information following this note].

What was real cause for concern to me (and hence this note) was the statement in the message to the effect that the passage loses nothing if Acts 8:37 is cut out because the Ethiopian clearly believed and was saved.

On the contrary, the passage loses everything with respect to Christian salvation if Acts 8:37 is lost.

Significantly, the word "believed" is lost. Without Acts 8:37, it can only be inferred that the individual "believed" anything with respect to salvation (apart from the supposed need for baptism – see comments that follow). It can equally be inferred that belief in the Lord Jesus Christ is not necessary for salvation.

Needless to say, that is a most serious error but it is a possible error if Acts 8:37 is cut out of the account.

Equally significantly, it is known why Acts 8:37 is missing from most Greek manuscripts, including the Catholic manuscripts alluded to but not identified on pages 1024, 1073 of the church bibles [2016 update: 1984 NIVs with reference to Mark 16:9-20, John 7:53-8:11].

Acts 8:37 was dropped from successive copies of Greek manuscripts by the monkish forbears of those who are now Greek Orthodox priests (as well as by the Catholic forbears), such that it is now omitted by most extant Greek manuscripts, for the majority of which the Greek Orthodox Church is the custodian, notably at St Catherine's Monastery at the foot of Mt. Sinai.

The reason is that the Greek Orthodox Church teaches that only baptism and communion are necessary for salvation, not belief on the Lord Jesus Christ. Omission of Acts 8:37 provides this church with the necessary justification for this false teaching (as with the Catholic Church, its members

don't readily "Search the scriptures" John 5:39). Once this false teaching is established, it becomes straightforward to impose infant baptism.

The Greek Orthodox manner of infant baptism is even more heinous than that of the Catholic Church. I think it amounts to ritualistic satanic child abuse. It is likely that the young women in the church who work with children would be moved to tears if they knew the details.

All of this is written up in the book *Hazardous Materials*, by Gail Riplinger, pp 745ff, ISBN 978-0-9794117-6-2.

I fully appreciate that no-one in the church is likely to be led astray by the false doctrines of infant baptism and baptism as part of salvation but, as indicated, I think that it is useful for the church to be informed of the underlying issues.

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ

Alan O'R

2016 Update: The following information on the validity of Acts 8:37 as it stands in the AV1611 has been inserted below.

See [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) 'O Biblios' – The Book p 56.

### Acts 8:37

**“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”** is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Hills [*The King James Version Defended* 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, [wilderness-cry.net/bible\\_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html](http://wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html)] p 201, [*Believing Bible Study* 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition] p 197, explains that the verse is absent from most Greek manuscripts because the practice of delaying baptism following profession of faith had become common before the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century. However, the verse is found in uncial E (6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> centuries), the Old Latin (2<sup>nd</sup> century) and the Vulgate (5<sup>th</sup> century) and is cited by Irenaeus (180 AD) and Cyprian (250 AD). See also Ruckman [*Problem Texts, 2016 update: Now The “Errors” in the King James Bible* pp 333-334] p 331, [*The New ASV - Satan's Masterpiece* Dr Peter S. Ruckman] pp 19-20. Ruckman (*The Book of Acts* p 291) also cites Tertullian (2<sup>nd</sup> century), Pacian (370 AD), Ambrose and Augustine (4<sup>th</sup> century) as knowing of the verse.

Even though the verse is not in the Majority Text, Berry's Greek text supports the AV1611, indicating the familiarity of the 16<sup>th</sup> century editors with the ancient evidence in support of the verse<sup>\*2012</sup>.

<sup>\*2012</sup>Dr Mrs Riplinger in *Hazardous Materials* pp 745ff explains how Acts 8:37 was dropped from successive copies of Greek manuscripts by the monkish forbears of those who are now Greek Orthodox priests (as well as by the Catholic forbears) in order to support their false doctrine of baptismal regeneration, especially with respect to infant baptism.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article [brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm](http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm) *Acts 8:37...Scripture or Not?*

The following material is included from 'O Biblios' – The Book pp 253-255 to show how **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21 **“maketh the judges fools”** Job 12:17 with respect to Bible critics with particular application to Acts 8:37.

### 14.3 Acts 8:37

Our critic's next attack on the Holy Bible is against Acts 8:37, Section 7.3. He states that *“Uncial E of the 8<sup>th</sup> Century is the earliest known Greek MS to include this passage. It is basically a Western addition and is omitted from P45 (early 3<sup>rd</sup> Century) and the earliest uncials. The grammatical construction of the Ethiopian's confession is quite un-Lukan. There is no reason at all why scribes should have omitted this material if it had stood originally in the text. It possibly began as a marginal gloss.”*

Note that our critic gives no evidence for Acts 8:37 being “a Western addition” or originating “as a marginal gloss.” Neither does he explain why, if the reading was false, the NIV etc. retain the verse numbering sequence of the AV1611. He continues *“Prominent among those early Fathers who quote the verse are those whom you describe as the “Founding Fathers of the Roman Church”...The verse is not in the Alexandrian family or even the Byzantine! It found its way into the received text and hence into the KJV via Erasmus who...took the words from the margin of another manuscript.”*

In answer I shall quote first from Dr Hills [[The King James Version Defended 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, wilderness-cry.net/bible\\_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html](http://wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html)] p 201 *“As J. A. Alexander (1857) suggested, this verse, though genuine, was omitted by many scribes, “as unfriendly to the practice of delaying baptism, which had become common, if not prevalent, before the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century.””*

Dr Hills has advanced a good reason “why scribes should have omitted this material,” if they were not Bible believers. Our critic has overlooked this. Dr Hills continues:

*“Hence the verse is absent from the majority of the Greek manuscripts. But it is present in some of them, including E (6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> century). It is cited by Irenaeus (c. 180) and Cyprian (c. 250) and is found in the Old Latin and the Vulgate. In his notes Erasmus says that he took this reading from the margin of 4ap and incorporated it into the Textus Receptus.”* Dr Ruckman [[The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship](http://The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship)] p 316, places E in the 8<sup>th</sup> century but in the 6<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> century in an earlier work [[Problem Texts](http://Problem Texts)] p 331.

Our critic therefore adds little or nothing to the information which I summarised in Section 7.3. The difference is that Dr Hills acknowledges the graciousness of “divine providence” in supplying ALL of the New Testament from several sources, Section 9.6. By contrast, our critic seems ready to reject such providence if it did not see fit to locate a reading in the text with, in his opinion, “better credentials”. See Section 9.3.

As for the lack of the verse in particular “families”, although this classification is often used for convenience [[wilderness-cry.net/bible\\_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter5.html](http://wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter5.html) *The King James Version Defended 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition,*] p 120, it is nevertheless a HOAX, Section 9.4.

In reference to the “un-Lukan” grammar of the Ethiopian's confession, why wouldn't it be “un-Lukan” if indeed it is? The man speaking was an AFRICAN. The man writing the Book of Acts was a JEW! See Romans 3:1-2. Even though our critic is referring specifically to grammar, I am reminded of Dr Hills's statement [[The King James Version Defended 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, wilderness-cry.net/bible\\_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter6.html](http://The King James Version Defended 3rd Edition, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter6.html)] p 158, *“Arguments from literary style are notoriously weak.”* I continue with Dr Ruckman [[The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship](http://The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship)] pp 236-237:

*“Those who first threw (Acts 8:37) out were P45 and P74, followed by the Cult (Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, “C”, the Sahidic, and the Bohairic; and then the Harclean and Peshitta Syriac, after Origen messed with them). It is also missing from cursives 049, 056, 0142, 436, 326, 1241, 1505, 2127, 181, 81, 88 and several others.*

*“To offset this vast array of African scholarship produced by half-baked apostates, we have the verse, in whole or in part, in the works of Irenaeus (190 A.D.), Tertullian (200 A.D.), Cyprian (255 A.D.), Pacian (370 A.D.), Ambrose, uncial manuscript E, Old Latin manuscripts, Old Syriac manu-*

*scripts, plus the Armenian and Georgian translations. It is also found in cursive 629...(from) the dates of the Church Fathers listed above, we find the verse being quoted 100 to 200 YEARS BEFORE SINAITICUS OR VATICANUS WERE WRITTEN.*

*“So, we quote it 100 years AFTER the REVISED VERSION of Hort fell to pieces with the British Empire. (Why give up a good thing just because a destructive critic doesn’t like it?)”*

Why indeed? Dr Ruckman [[Problem Texts](#)] p 331 states that Acts 8:37 “has an unbroken chain of testimony from the Old Latin (second century)...to the present time.” Reviewing the evidence therefore, one finds that Acts 8:37, like 1 John 5:7-8, fulfils at least 5 of Burgon’s 7 tests.

Cursive 629 also has 1 John 5:7-8 in its margin...no doubt also by God’s gracious provision. Our critic again resorts to misrepresentation in attacking this verse. He states **“Once again it has to be said that the idea that challenging the authenticity of this verse is to question the importance of personal salvation is utterly ludicrous.”**

I put forth no such “idea” at all in Section 7.3. What I said was “Note that Luke 23:42, John 9:35, Acts 8:37 and 9:5, 6 are all passages which deal with INDIVIDUAL SALVATION”. FIVE verses were cited, not ONE. (I could have added a sixth, Acts 16:31, where “Christ” is omitted by the DR, RV, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT, Ne thanks as usual to L, T, Tr, A, Section 11.4). If our critic had read my statement carefully and LOOKED AT THE VERSES, he would have seen that they deal with THE SALVATION OF INDIVIDUAL SOULS, two of whom were saved by the LORD JESUS CHRIST HIMSELF!

I was not referring to the “subject” of “personal salvation” in the abstract - of which our critic does not cite even ONE of the “hundreds of statements” in the New Testament that he insists deal with it, according to this section of his document. The critics obviously mutilated verses which gave specific examples of SOUL-WINNING. Whatever their “motives” in so doing - and these may have been as sincere as Eve’s, Genesis 3:6! - their ACTIONS and the RESULTS of those actions are ABOMINABLE!

Our critic then states **“Incidentally some of the manuscripts which have Acts 8:37 also have in v. 39 “the Spirit of the Lord fell upon the eunuch” and poses the question “Why is this not in the KJV?”**

There are at least three good reasons.

1. The AV1611 translators, being much more scholarly than the modern translators and endowed with much greater spiritual wisdom, Luke 21:15, were able to discern between the authentic reading and the false one. Lacking this discernment, the modern translators rejected BOTH readings.
2. The spurious reading in Acts 8:39 no doubt lacks number, respectability, continuity and variety of witnesses. It may also lack antiquity and the context, as defined by Burgon [[True or False? 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition David Otis Fuller, D.D.](#)] pp 264 ff, may be suspect. Typically, our critic does not state which manuscripts contain the spurious addition to Acts 8:39.
3. There are two references in the Book of Acts to the Holy Ghost falling upon individuals, Acts 10:44, 11:15. They deal with incidents in Acts 2:3, 4 and 10:44. In each case there were Jews present and the gift of TONGUES was manifested, magnifying God as a SIGN to these Jews, 1 Corinthians 1:22, Acts 2:5-11, 10:45-46, 11:17-18. In Acts 8:39 NEITHER condition applies and therefore internal considerations mitigate against the reading.

The reading therefore fails 5 TO 7 of Burgon’s tests and is therefore rightly rejected.