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FOREWARD TO THIS FIRST EDITION.

There has been so much debate about this one verse, that, since not many have had the temerity to fully investigate it, using the real words in the Greek, but we have most of us been hitting only the surface lightly in defeating the persons, who have stood for Baptismal Salvation, and especially those of the last three centuries, who have used as their foundation our common version of the Bible, which was literally forced into the mold of the English Church by the King of England, under whose rule the translation was made: I thought it only a profitable thing to go into all the data and historical facts I could find, to make this little book. I hope my brethren will not find it too prosy nor too technical in the many quotations from the Greek text, which I have been compelled to use in such a work.

I am indebted to many authors and to a few men, the authors I wish to complement with this debt are all men who have gone to their rest, John A. Broaddus, Alvah Hovey, Henry G. Weston, A. T. Robertson, then there are those Lexicographers for the last fifteen hundred years. Of these men that are living, there is on who has made helpful suggestions in the present work having experience in more religious discussions, than any living man, Dr. Ben M. Bogard. He suggested the diagrams and some of the matter in the book. I laid out the matter and put it in my own terminology. He also suggested the sale price for the book. I was going to reduce the price by half when he suggested, that since there was nothing like it in all polemics, and the scholarship of it could not be criticized, even by him, who knows debating, that the book should be listed as it is. So, as it stands today I am dedicating this booklet to Dr. Ben M. Bogard, my fellow and helper in the Missionary Baptist Institute, housed in Antioch Baptist Church, of which he is pastor.

J. Louis Guthrie, Pres. M. B. I.

Price 50 cents.
INTRODUCTION

This much controverted subject should be discussed from every angle, for the good it will do our own brethren, and perhaps keep some who are not settled in their faith from going into wrong belief concerning these two subjects herein stated, of the Greek preposition "εἰς" (eis) and the scriptural exposition I shall give to Acts 2:38 in the light of similar verses, which I wish to make a part of this small article. We shall not convince some who hold this error, about which we are now writing, for they have believed that heresy too long to make any difference with them, regardless of what we may say or write about it. Primarily this book is for our own Baptist brethren, and also some others who have not yet become imbued with an utter indifference to truth with reference to the heresy of Baptismal Salvation, or salvation by Grace without baptism. We may save some of them from the error of going into the belief of Baptismal Salvation. Then for our own brethren, to strengthen them in their faith, and to help the former class, we shall enter into this discussion of the subject. We shall not make use of a sophist's trick or any "argumenta ad homines" merely stating the case of the preposition and the something like 1700 uses of it in the New Testament to show the meaning in Acts 2:38.

Recently, the statement has been called to my attention that most of the translators, those of the authorized version, forty seven of them, and those of the two revisions, the English and the American Standard, another hundred of them, and many more have translated the words "εἰς τὴν αφορμήν" in Acts 2:38 as "for remission" to show purpose. Also, that some of these translators are Baptists. This puts the whole weight of the verse on the preposition "for". This means nothing, for the English "for" has many uses and purpose is the least of it. A definition of "for" in the English in any dictionary, Webster for instance, is about two hundred years or so too late to get the meanings of the controversy that was raging, even when the Authorized Version of the Bible came out. A short history of this is put in the booklet "A Short History of Baptismal Salvation" by the author. Our modern dictionaries use the words from the usages in vogue right at the time of definition, so no one can prove by a modern dictionary just what the meaning of many words was two or three hundred years ago. In our Authorized Version there have been something like 350 words and more changed their meanings to the reverse in the last three and one quarter centuries since that version was presented to the king and printed.

CHAPTER 1  Dictionaries.

Let us here give the meanings of "for" from our present High School and College Webster's dictionary. "FOR", prep. (A. S. for, fore.) In most general sense, indicating that with reference to which anything is done, is, or takes place; as: 1. before (ObS), 2. With reference to (something) as an end of goal; in connection with (something) as to use, being, etc. 3. Instead of; in requital of. 4. In behalf of; in support of; in honor of. 5. Used with an object followed by an infinitive to form an idiomatic equivalent of a noun clause; as, "for him to submit = (that he should
submit) would be shameful. 6. As being, as, to take for granted. 7. Because of: on account of; also, because of lack of, as to be pinched for room. 8. Notwithstanding, in spite of, usually with "all". 9. For fear of; sometimes, after words of prevention, from. (archaic) 10. In equality or proportion to. 11. As regards; concerning; as far as concerns, as, so much for that. 12. During, throughout. Conjunction, because.

Synonym, See because, for and, and also. These are all the definitions.

Since all these definitions give the Baptismal Salvationists no grain of comfort in Acts 2:38, yet they are not conclusive, because they tell only from the late English definitions, and that far short of the time of the print of the Authorized Version, these definitions fail to give the exactness of the English words of the three and a quarter centuries ago. However, these words have reflected their original meanings, and in the case of "for" there is not a single trace of the meaning in order to. This meaning was injected without right or authority by those Baptismal Salvationists who needed that violation of truth to bolster their pernicious heresy. Now, if we could, and we cannot hold to any modern English dictionary, for they are too late in their definitions, having derived their meanings from the current uses of words. In our Authorized Version, there are something like three or four hundred words that have in 300 years radically changed their meanings.

It is not the purpose of this book to discuss either repentance or faith, but just as they incidentally bear on the subject. Before we give any kind of discussion on Acts 2:38, it is proper to take up the Greek word "eis" (etc) a preposition. The original meaning of the Greek preposition was never the equivalent of "for" an Anglo-Saxon preposition. I am speaking this as a comment on these languages long after the New Testament was written and the Anglo-Saxon became a written language. Therefore, it could never mean "for" in present English. A definition of the word in the Classic first is needed, because the word is found in Classic Greek before the New Testament was ever written. The oldest Greek in the world that we have any written record of today is that of Sappho. This and Homer are the foundation of the written Greek language. The writings are not ancient, but the poems are older than the writings.

I have here a lexicon, which is used entirely with these ancient writings, and the only meanings in this for "etc" are; into, to, until. It is defined as an adverb and a preposition and is used sometimes with a genitive case explaining an ellipsis (something left out). In Liddell and Scott, classic lexicon, the case is used and put relating to usages up to within 200 years before at the writing of the New Testament. Then the lexicon takes up the meanings of the "Koine" or Alexandrian of the time of the writing of the New Testament. The definitions are "direction towards, motion to, on, or into. This above is of place. From Homer downwards, with all verbs implying motion or direction. With a previous motion is noted, then with all verbs of rest, etc. 2. Of time arrived at, or during when; until, within or during. 3. The end or purpose, this only is figurative. Romans 9:28 has it exactly. "All things work together for good". This use always has a dative of indirect object with it, or a direct object of the action of the verb. "He will arm me for war". 4. With numbers, "Two or three agree together" = "agree into one". 5. With reference or
relation. Matt. 3:11, Luke 3:3, and Mark 1:14 all have this. Definition. "In composition, "εις" is read with its chief signification "into".

In Grove's Greek-English lexicon, and the book does not waste space in giving comments, but merely definitions, it is defined as follows; "εις or ες" a preposition governing the accusative case, in, into, to, unto, until; among, at, before, in presence of, at, on, upon, into towards, against, as to, in respect of, concerning, through, by, for, to, in order to, to the end that, so that. These definitions are grouped in Grove's and the last group hardly shows purpose.

Now we take up a Greek-Latin lexicon, which is a classic, they are out of print. This lexicon has been copied in the Greek-Latin of the Middle ages for hundreds of years. The copies I have are reprints of the 22d edition, 1825. The names of the copyists are so foreign it is useless to give them. A short sentence in the Latin introduction reads. "But if in certain things we have added rather difficult etymology, yet certainly we have done nothing of that without time, which was done by the most learned etymologists, and yet none the less, I am to show the various literature changes, even may we make it firm, with brevity, which the order of the work first prohibited". This states it to be a copying of many hundred years back.

The definition of εις from the lexicon are; "εις vel ες" ad, in, item erga, contra, super, post, propter apud, per, inter, de pre, acc, soli junctur, in compositione, in, ad, intra, ex jungitur et quibusdam adverbis temporis, ubi ferre vacat, sic eis aei pro aei, eis aurion, pro aurion, cras, semper cum pro aei, eis apax, pro apax; semel, eis ta malista, pro malista, maxime, eis ti, quosum? Hinc eiso in, intra".

Translating all this, it becomes "eis or es", toward, in, into, likewise, therefore, against, above, after, on account of, among, through, between, concerning, in the presence of. It is joined to the accusative alone, in composition; in, unto, within, out of. It is joined to certain adverbs of time, where its meaning is almost empty, as always, early, at the same time, especially great, why? Inside, in, within". Thus, not a single one of the Latin equivalents are given to show purpose. This is very significant, because of the centuries of this copying of this Greek-Latin lexicon, which is given with evidence of having been used, or the basis of it used, in Anglo-Saxon times, when Greek and Latin were the only languages in which the New Testament existed at that time in the West. I have the 22d printed edition of this lexicon. No hope to the baptizers for salvation in it.

I have another lexicon by our enemies here in a dictionary by Parkhurst. The lexicon is the sixth printing in the year 1812. This man Parkhurst took his degree of M.A. in Cambridge, an English university, in the year 1752, and began immediately his work on a Greek-English lexicon. He consulted many others before his time and his work is an emendation of many older works. This lexicon defines "εις" as follows. He gives 15 definitions of "εις". A preposition, generally implies motion into, to, towards govern the accusative case. 1. into, he entered into the house. to, unto, Matt. 15:24. 3. Among, Luke 24:47. 4. on, upon, Luke 15:22. 5. at, on, 11:32. 6. toward, with respect to. 7. before, in the presence of, Acts 22:30. 8. for, on account of, Mark 1:4. 9. of, concerning, Acts 2:25. 10. against, Matt. 18:21. 11. through, by, Acts7:53. 12. in order to, Romans 1:17. 13. of time for, 1 John 2:17. 14. it is used for in, at, Matt 2:33. 15. for, as, 1. Cor. 4:3. Only one or two of these
definitions show purpose and they were written by this man Parkhurst, who quotes the Authorized version and believed in the doctrine of baptismal salvation with repentance. All his examples are taken from the authorized Version, for he had no other English version, but he was an Episcopal, but did not mention Acts 2:38 as having any connection with "εὐθεῖα" or baptismal salvation.

Now, let us come to the uses of "εὐθεῖα" the most of the times it is used in the New Testament. In the last three and a quarter centuries, and a little more, the majority of the translators have by sheer force of the majority they have had, made figurative meanings of such scriptures literal. There have been many such who numbered into the hundreds, but most of them have not been really translators. They have been merely revisers of former translations. There are three bibles in English as standard bibles; the Authorized Version, American Standard, and the English Revision. They differ. Some of them cannot hold exactly to the Greek and Hebrew text. What shall we do about it? We can literally do nothing about it, educate our young ministry in the "Koine" Greek of the New Testament, and then debate out the differences. Neither the Authorized version nor American Standard, nor English revision are exact up to date translations in the English. They are partially revisions of former bibles and partially translations of a group of former translations of the Greek and Hebrew into other languages not English. They are also partial translations from the Greek and Hebrew. All translations of modern times have been influenced very much by former translations and revisions, consequently by the religious prejudices of the men who translated and revised. Most translations read in Acts 2:38, "Baptized for the remission of sins", because of this predilection to baptismal salvation of most of the translators, and those who did not believe this were ridiculed off the translating councils, as trying to change the Bible. It is a rare occasion, when any one would stubbornly go directly against popular traditional and superstitious prejudice, because they choose rather to win by comment and explanation, than to brave the ire of the translators and the public which has been so long influenced by the men who are said to be scholarly, that they have given us the Bible in our own language. However, I should like to ask a question just here. Who has the right by divine authority to translate the Bible into a foreign tongue? Is there a man on the face of the earth, or was there ever one, to whom God gave a divine commission to translate the Bible into the English language? Now, when we can get that answer, we shall all have to abide by his decision. This ridicule that has been heaped on men who differ with the scholars is mere sophistry and is very unworthy of any semblance of intelligence. Another question I should like to ask. To whom does God now give the inspiration or the revelation privilege? Has not one man as much right to translate as another, especially, if he is able to do so and has prepared himself for the task?

Most translators fear the stigma of popular criticism. They are unwilling to have the popular ideas run counter to their better knowledge in this matter. Another thing is true, that most of the translators of the Bible have been believers in baptismal salvation. A few who did not have been on recent revising councils, but they did not have much weight in the decision of the revision council. Therefore, when they put out their findings such a clamor arose, that they were changing the
word of God, that they did not dare to translate as their ideals and scholarship
directed, so there was little chance that they got a hearing. What they in any way
could do, must be done later in comment and marginal notes on the verses in
question. Then their own class of religionists were the only ones that ever read
their notes and comments. We might declare here the believers in baptismal
salvation. The first were the people calling themselves, “The Holy Catholic Church”
after them came “Roman” and “Greek” of the catholic kind, then a great body of
“Protestants”, then the recent body of “Materialists” and “Culturists”, who all refuse
to believe salvation is wholly by grace, given on a man’s accepting this grace. Many
now imitate all these offbrand religionists, who are imitators of paganism.

Now, in the last few years, perhaps 25, archaeologists are very busy in
getting “ostraca”, “graffiti”, “monumenta”, “papyriii”, and the many other things they
are digging up to learn the meanings of the “Koine” or common Greek of a whole
civilized world at the time of the writing of the New Testament. This age of
uncompromising study to find truthful meanings of these words, is reaping rich
harvest in this field, so, that we are coming to find that much of the so-called
scholarship of the last five centuries has been built into the traditional and
superstitional religious ideals of the last 1600 years, or about so, to the present from
250 to 400 A.D. This group of men, who are tirelessly working to get the exact
meanings of that language which was becoming a changed language by tradition and
superstition, which governed religion in the darkest ages the world ever saw, the
middle ages, these archaeologists have tons of evidence and are classifying and
translating these things to clear primarily the Bible. In those middle ages, filled with
witchcraft, superstition, degraded religious sentiment, physical ideals for spiritual,
and in fact, these ages were prey to everything, that could be called unscriptural,
ungodly, and vicious and wicked in the extreme, most of our religious notions of this
day holding popular acclaim come to us from their origins there, so we need the
leveling influence of this scholarship, too slow for most of us, it seems, yet, we are
getting a clear view today of that field, where we have a sure ground into which we
may walk without fear of hindrance.

Properly the Greek “ετος” is translated in our common version of the New
Testament more than 500 times as “into”. Most of these are correct, for they all
mean from the outside into something or some place. This is strong. Not a single
instance is used here but the meaning is literally into. There is not a case into which
the going is expressed, but the thing entered is there to be entered. Every case
means from without into. The literal meaning of “ετος” over 500 times is into. Here
the translators have all been compelled to the original meaning. Once in a while “in”
or “to” is used in these places or some other word with the same meaning, but every
case shows that “into” is the meaning.

The word is used another five hundred and fifty times as “to” “unto” and
sometimes “into”. Nearly all of these translations could be rendered “into” without
any damage to the sense in any amount whatever, making at least 1100 times the
meaning is “into”. An illustration of this is found in Matt. 2:1. “There came Magi
from the East “to (into)” Jerusalem”. This occurs so many times in our common
version of the Bible, that we are astonished at the frequency of it. But, when we
remember the rule of King James, that he gave to the men translating the Authorized Version, "Use different words to vary the English and keep it beautiful", we immediately see why the different renderings of "εἰς" and it may be given as "into" without marring the sense in the least. Already a great majority of them as "into".

The word is also translated "toward" twenty-seven times. Most of these cases can be rendered as "unto" or "into" better than "toward". I shall give a few cases here to show that they can better be rendered as "unto". Matt. 28:1 "As it begun to dawn unto the first day of the week". Acts 1:10 also better, "And they turned their attention unto the heaven, while he was going--". The word translated, "looked steadfastly" is from the Greek, (ἐπιθετομένος) which is the base from which those English words like attention come. Heaven here is singular, rare for this in the Greek. The word must mean God's Heaven on this account, because they were looking unto where Jesus was going. He went up = through the material heavens unto the heaven, where God dwells. Acts 20:21, “Witnessing (διακονοῦντες = witnessing through) to both Jews and Greeks repentance unto God and trust into the Lord of us, Jesus Christ". This rendering is much more effective than that given in the common translations of the Bible.

The word is translated but five times in purpose clauses, to show purpose in the whole of the English version. This peculiar usage of the preposition is one unlike that in any other language. It is a peculiar use of the preposition in the Greek before the infinitive to show purpose. This is a figurative way of expressing in Greek, a more figurative language, than any other excepting the Hebrew, that there is an ideal and these are all used is Acts 7:19, as that ideal was in the mind of Pharaoh "unto the babies not to be parented living". Further, this explains the death of these babes, that they were to be killed as their births were accomplished, by trickery, so it would look to the mothers that they were still born. A very similar expression is used in Exodus 1:16, "As you assist at birth to the Hebrew women and view the bearing, if a son he is, ye will kill him". Paul in Romans 1:11 shows his purpose is to impart some spiritual gift to the Romans, "into the making you stand fast". Romans 4:16 has a similar purpose in its construction with this purpose figure in the word "εἰς [εἰς]". For it is of faith, it may be in accord with grace, "into the promise to the entire seed to stand firm". Another figurative purpose with "into" carrying the clause, 1 Cor. 10:16. "Now these became types to us "into" us not to become lusters". 1 Thess. 3:13. "Even as we also unto you, "into the hearts of you to stand fast". Since I have here before me the copies of the three oldest Greek manuscripts in the world of the New Testament. I have given the only five uses in the book of "εἰς [εἰς]" used in purpose and all of these are very highly figurative language.

The word "εἰς [εἰς]" is used 24 times in our Authorized Version as, "upon". These 24 times are not always with the best meanings, as we now understand our English of today and since it has been over three and a quarter centuries since the version came out, the English has made many changes in that time. Most of these renderings for "upon" will be cleared in meaning by a clearer meaning for the word. Rev. 16:3-4 are better in sense as "into" and the others are all "upon" in connection with the pouring out of the bowls. Verse 2 has "into". Matt. 26:10 has a better translation as, "She has done a good work 'unto' me". Acts 3:4 is better as, "Look 'at"
us”. The same in Acts 11:6 and 22:13. Both are better as “into and at”. Romans
gives better sense as “into”. 5:18 so. We find in our idiomatic English of today, that
we think most of these meanings noted in this paragraph as being not up to date
English, and one may find other such in a good concordance to the scriptures, so we
can get the best meanings for our Bible. These meanings from the context always
give better meanings rendered as “to”, “on” “into”, “at”. Our English language
continually grows.

In our Authorized Version the word is translated six times as “through”,
“throughout”. In every one of these places, the word “into” is better for the context,
because the Greek language has peculiar syntax principles and words for “through,
throughout” and “ἐν” was never used for either, and those expressions are entirely
lacking in these six verses. All these six uses here are derived from old Anglicisms,
and cannot be exact, being idioms of several hundred years ago. The English
language is continually changing as every living language does, and the idioms of the
Authorized Version have in that manner changed. This is no argument against the
Bible, but we can truthfully declare that the scholarship of the men of so long ago
did not fix the language into a God-standardized-English Bible! We might as well
had it 200 years before in English that long before in which nobody can now read,
by that argument. That is a ridiculous position to which some come in their
thinking. People generally think, that because a King of England, Ireland, Scotland,
France, and a lot of other titles, worthless pretenses, with a lot of nominal places,
said the certain Bible he was having translated and revised should be the standard
Bible for all English people for all time, and nothing else should be read in the
assembling of the churches. From this one would think that God had originally had
the Bible written in English. So many people get static in their thinking, when they
wish to bolster up their religious teachings. God did give us a Bible in Hebrew and
Greek, and our business from now is to go back there and dig up those meanings as
at that time they used the words and accepted them commonly and not quibble
about meanings injected into them many hundred years too late to gratify whims of
heretics.

We come now to the translation “for” of the Greek preposition “ἐν”. This
usage is found 83 times in the Authorized Version. We could go through them each
and give a better rendering, than the version gives, if this article were extended to
unnecessary length. We could also give the meaning of “for” for this preposition in
many other places with as much authority as “for” is in most of these passages and
with equal right and effect. Many of these places would break down the hobby of
the materialists that Repentance precedes Baptism. There are several of these
verses that, when the translation “for” as given would make Repentance depend on
Baptism and follow it.

Just a few verses rendered better than “for” will be given here to illustrate
this truth. In every one of the 83 times the preposition can be given as “as” “unto”
and “into” with a few case of “for”, which mean nothing of purpose, but with an
idiomatic “for” in English, of which there is no purpose in it. Acts 2:38 is in this list
of 83. It can be translated “unto or with respect to” or an idiomatic “for” that has no
purpose in it. The idiom does not then mar the doctrine of grace only to a person,
who wants to make Salvation depend on Baptism. Every one of these translations in the Authorized Version is figurative and not literally motion into, but is a pattern of literal motion into. Let any one person not in a prejudiced mood toward Baptismal Salvation view carefully these 83 scriptures and he would immediately see the figurative uses of the verses. Robert Young states this in his Analytical Greek Concordance to the New Testament. He was a great scholar of the past century and did not let religious prejudice warp his judgment.

A few cases can now be shown, that are identical with the language construction of Acts 2:38. Let us quote these all here. Matt 3:11. “I indeed baptize you “εἰς” [unto] [for] repentance”. Surely no Baptismal Salvationist wants it this way. It would ruin him, but the Roman Catholic and Episcopal would welcome this. They believe in Baptismal repentance. Mark 1:4. “John came baptizing in the wilderness and preaching the baptism of repentance “εἰς” [unto, for] the remission of sins”. Every grammarian knows, that repentance describes the baptism on which it depends and which it modifies. Here we have remission of sins and repentance modifying successive to baptism, with remission of sins following repentance. If we follow Acts 2:38, we must here make remission follow repentance, for in that verse with “for” follows baptism. In Matt. 3:11 there is an exact equivalent in language construction with Acts 2:38. But the same preposition is used in both. “εἰς” governs ‘remission’ in Acts 2:38 and repentance in Matt. 3:11. It also governs remission in Luke 3:3. Now where are we? Are repentance and remission both after baptism? If we give as the meaning of “εἰς” in these three cases, which are identical in language principal, we must say so without a doubt. Then both repentance and remission of sins are successive to and depend on baptism. Any modern Baptismal Regenerationist excepting Roman Catholic and Episcopal would scoff at that since all they with these two exceptions declare “repentance” precedes baptism.

If “εἰς” is really “for” as Catholics and modern Baptismal regenerationists declare, then the Catholics and Episcopal are RIGHT, for they baptize babies without repentance. It cannot be said that they have not yet committed sins, for sins of commission do not enter into this question. The question is, “Does Repentance Precede Baptism, or does it not?” Modern Baptismal regenerationists are not all agreed, for the Chrestadelphians do not believe that babies ever come into life, because they have not taken these steps which the elder people can and have done. Now Matthew 3:11 in transliteration is, “Baptizo humas eis metanoian” and Acts 2:38 reads. “Baptistheto hekastos humon en (or epi in other manuscripts) to onomati Yesou Christou eis apheсин ton hamartion humon”. Now let us take the two expressions “eis metanoian” and “eis apheсин” and lay them down side by side. They are the same grammatical construction exactly. Let Acts 2:38 mean “eis apheсин” after Baptism and the rule will force “eis metanoian” after baptism and there is no escape from it. BUT THIS WILL NOT DO, for them, who are modern Baptismal regenerationists, for they must have repentance before baptism. Now if Acts 2:38 and Luke 3:3 mean “in order to”. There is no escape from it. Now I have forced this issue to a “reductio ad absurdum”, and our friends will not permit that. Then why read “in order to” into any of the three?
Now let us go to an ancient authority to see what he had in mind concerning these three scriptures. Matthew 3:11 in the Latin Vulgate of Jerome, reads in this version, "Ego quidem batizó vos in aqua in poenitentiam". A translation of which is verbatim, "I indeed baptize you in water into repentance". [In] in the Latin with the ablative case means location, so "in" water, but "in" with the accusative case NEVER MEANS IN ORDER TO. Just so with Luke 3:3 and Acts 2:38. In remissionem pecatorum, this must mean according to the Latin of Jerome, who knew both Greek and Latin, and the man who set forever the New Testament in the Latin Vulgate, "Into remission of sins". Now we have ancient authority about 350 to 400 A.D. for NO MEANING LIKE "IN ORDER TO". This authority is much better than the 47 Ex-Roman-Catholic-Episcopal Bishops of 1611! Now who is the scholar of the New Testament? All Latin scholars will agree that "in" never means "in order to". That is a purpose expression in the Latin and is so put in a purpose expression. The truth now stands from this one ancient authority, who knew both the great languages of the early Church, that "in order to" is a late addition to the word "εἰς" in these passages. Jerome, although baptismal salvation was taught during his time by some Christians, knew enough not to put this blunder into the New Testament, although a Bishop of the Church at Rome asked him to make a translation of the Bible into the common Latin dialect of the west.

There are some other cases in which "εἰς" is translated "for", such as Matt. 5:13 "good for nothing" means "good like nothing is good", Matt. 8:4, "offer a gift for a testimony", means offer a gift "as a testimony", Matt 26:13, "gospel shall be preached for a witness", means "gospel preached as a witness", and thus for about thirtyfour of the eighty cases of the Greek of "εἰς" where translated as "for" in the Authorized Version. Very few if any of these eighty cases can be given the meaning of "in order to" with any sense whatever. Romans 4:9 and Galatians 6:3 both can be given the meaning of "instead of" for "εἰς". Col. 1:16 in the better translation is thus for "εἰς"; "All things were created through him and into him. Titus 3:14 in a better rendering with clearer sense, "let those who are ours be learning of the fine works to set them forward into the necessary needed things, in order that they may not be unfruitful". Very few of these "for" translations have purpose in them. There are very many more arguments that are used and they are about five to one to show that the writers did not have "purpose" in mind, when they wrote these eighty-four cases of "εἰς" into the Greek.
CHAPTER 2. Parsing and Diagramming.

Now we properly come to Acts 2:38. Let us translate and transliterate the expression here rendered in the Authorized Version, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins". As we transliterate and translate, we shall parse every word in this expression, and then diagram it in English, the transliteration, and the Greek all in the same diagram. There are two manuscript forms in this verse. The Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, dated about 330 A.D. have "en" before Jesus, and the Alexandrinus manuscript has "epi" before the same. With this single exception all three of the earliest manuscripts are identical. However, the Alexandrinus manuscript is dated about 450 A.D. So from that we are sure that "en" is the manuscript reading.

The following two pages are full parsings and diagram of Acts 2:38. The first line on top is the Greek, the second line is the transliteration into English letters, the third line is the exact English translation.
The parsing of this verse is very significant as it also is very important. Work of this kind shows the relation of each word in the sentence to the other words connected closely with it in its etymological use in that sentence. Words are used in various cases in language relation to each other. Thus sentence meaning is determined very much by this case relation of words. What a word means is often shown by its relation to other words in the same sentence, and the use as such in the sentence. Parsing words, as we have done it here in the Greek and in translation and transliteration is clear.
Diagram of Acts 2:38.

[Ye]  
μετανοήσατε  
repent  
καὶ  
and  
ἐκατός  
each  
βαπτίσθητω  
be baptized  
see note [ο] below  
eἰς [ο]  
unto  
ἀφεσίν  (see note [ι] below)  
remission  
ʽαμαρτίαν  
(of) sins  
pνιν  
your  
ἐν  
in  
oνοματί  
name  
τῷ  
the  
Ἰησοῦ  
Christ  
χριστοῦ  
of  

Notes.

Note [ο]. Dr. A. T. Robertson, late professor of Greek New Testament in Louisville Seminary says in his Greek Grammar, the greatest ever written in English, that the Greek preposition is not a purpose word at all and naturally has no such meaning. In his comment on this verse says that the meaning of this is that we are baptized upon the name, authority, of Jesus with reference to our remission of sins. He refers to this verse at least five times in this summary I have given.
Note [19]. The subject of repentance in this command of Peter here in the verse is explained in Acts 11:18, last clause, a copy of which in the Greek, and a literal translation are here attached "ερωτά και τοις εὐνοιοι τῷ θεῷ την μετανοείν εἰς ἔσοδον, therefore, even to the races, the God gives repentance into life". Let the reader read his common version of the Bible and compare the readings and he will get the idea that only repentance given of God brings life from God through this grace of repentance.

Now, the discussion is to the effect that this Greek preposition means purpose in so few cases in the New Testament, that we cannot declare that is the real meaning in any very definite case. The greater number of arguments by far, so far that there are very few, only about thirty out of seventeen hundred cases, can be translated with the idea of purpose and make anything like reasonable sense. The word is always rendered in the Latin Vulgate by the Latin preposition with the accusative of its object, and it is never translated with the meaning of anything sensible in purpose. The Latin has purpose clauses to care for that always. Prepositional phrases in Latin are not expanded into purpose clauses, because there is a peculiar Latin idiom, which takes the work of purpose. Purpose uses of the preposition suit only the Baptismal Salvationists, and they claim more than a hundred translators, who so translate the preposition, but the religious prejudice of these more than a hundred so-called scholars leaned to Baptismal Salvation. The men who would translate otherwise, and they have been hundreds throughout the centuries were never in the majority in the translating councils, for the Baptismal Salvationists saw to it they did not have anything like a majority in the councils.

CHAPTER 3 Translations, letters, comments.

A review of the rules of James I of England will show here what he did to the council. He went into the council to rule that no doctrine or no ritual of the English Church should be changed by translation. For this reason seventeen passages of the common Authorized Version of the Bible never did translate properly the matter of baptism. Many more passages also retained peculiar wordings of the English Church. There are numbers of transliterated words in the Bible, that had become stock doctrinal and ritualistic words of the Roman Catholic Churches, and they were never brought into plain English. These very words become ritualistic and doctrinal fetishes to the people who read and who had heard them defined into the terms of the English and Roman churches.

Many authorities who have disregarded the ritualistic and doctrinal trend of the many years that these rituals and doctrines have been forced upon the people by kings, church officers, translations, law and every other conceivable way, until most people think it an awful heresy to even consider any other thing than what the regular idea is, these scholars have tried to comment on passages, which they have feared to change, and were consequently held up to ridicule, as persons who were trying to change the Bible, when the real truth is they are, and were, only trying to give the true interpretation of the Bible to the people. Brave is the man indeed, who dares the disapproval of the masses.
The Lexicographer, Thayer, does just what the Classic and Koine lexicographers do, i.e., states that when the Greek preposition "εἰς" really means motion toward or into so translates it, but when the meaning is in any measure figurative, he translates it with reference to or some other equivalent with a very few mentions of the other meanings in his lexicon. A peculiar trick with most men who contend for anything, and especially so with the Baptismal salvationists is to warn their opponents against putting in a schoolboy trick, "one passage of Scripture against another", when they do the very same trick of putting one interpretation of scripture against another. In 1 Peter 1:20 we are admonished about any one verse of scripture being used for its own peculiar interpretation. For this purpose, I have given the summary of this whole of the Greek Preposition "εἰς" to show, that when we sum up the whole number of the uses of the preposition, about seventeen hundred of them, and take out one and declare it to be a peculiar interpretation in itself, we have violated the real principle of the Bible interpretation, that Peter gave us. This is no schoolboy trick, for a man under inspiration wrote the rule out for us. No schoolboy trick in that!

CHAPTER 4 Manuscripts.

In a recent valuable work, in which the three Ancient Manuscripts are reduced to print in the very forms, as near as possible, to make them as they were in the manuscripts, under a copyright of 1936, there has been given to men, who wish to study them these three manuscripts, as they are found in the manuscript form and they have been reduced to a printed form now, so any person, who wishes, can read and study the Ancient Manuscripts. This is the first time anything like this has been done. The man who did it, took twenty-five years to do so, and cut the matrices with a file and a nail set for this valuable work. In this work there is a peculiar wording, which I shall give here as his, not as my own. In Acts 2:38, this version in a sublinear translates the wording there in this way. "After mind (reverse mind) ye, and let be being baptized each of you on the name of Jesus Anointed, into from letting (sending away) the misses (sins) of you". Now I did not do this, he did it. I will be glad to give the information where this book can be had, but I do not do it here for reasons, that it is never best to do this in the text of a book. This peculiar sublinear of the Ancient Greek text, he has given following all three of the Ancient manuscripts. He uses the Vaticanus manuscript, the Sinaiticus manuscript, and the Alexandrian. Two of which are now in English possession. This man spent twenty-five years studying the ancient text of these three manuscripts and he certainly knows much about them and the ancient text of the New Testament.

Let me give here his comments on this very verse. "38. Repentance and baptism lead to a probationary pardon, which may be withdrawn. This pardon is extended by Christ as king. Its operation is illustrated by the parable of the ten thousand debtor (see Matt. 18:27-34), whose debt was remitted. But who refused to remit the smaller sum, which a fellow debtor owed him. Hence, the remission of his debt was cancelled. So it is with Israel in this chronicle. Many of those, who in the beginning, received the pardon of their sins, refused to share the pardon with
other nations, objecting to proselytes like Cornelius, raising a riot on the supposition that an alien has entered the sanctuary, seeking to kill Paul even though he brought alms to Jerusalem, they finally fell away, (Heb. 6:4-6—10:26-28), where there is no longer any room for repentance, but a fearful prospect of judgment. This pardon is, however, in sharp contrast with our justification, or acquittal, which comes from the judge on the sole ground of grace and faith and from which there is no fall, as it places us beyond the sphere of judgment. Conciliation (Romans 5:11) is immeasurably beyond any pardon, as it places us in the unclouded favor of God's grace."

I give this to show that this man, who set the Ancient manuscripts in type since 1936, a thing never before done, after twenty-five years of work, has given us his consideration of Acts 2:38. I DO NOT GIVE THIS AS MINE, BUT GIVE IT DIRECT FROM HIS COMMENTS TO SHOW THAT HE DOES NOT THINK BAPTISM HAS THE least thing to do with pardon and conciliation under grace. This man is a great student of the original manuscripts. He thinks and makes the statement otherwheres in his comments, that Israel as a race received this probationary pardon, only while the early part of the work of Christianity was in formation, and then, when they rejected it, they were put into blindness until the fullness of the Gentiles should come in. He declares this in keeping with the Old Testament Law. I give this merely to show that the verse Acts 2:38 in this man's estimation has nothing to do with Baptismal Salvation. Then in contrast to this Israelite racial affair, he clearly shows in the textual and sublinear translation, that we, as individuals, do not receive remission from Baptism after belief and repentance, but that remission is before Baptism on repentance and faith.

This same author, after long study has a characteristic comment on Mark 16:9-11 to the close of the chapter. "Both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus manuscripts omit the closing of the last twelve verses of Mark, chapter 16. But Alexandrinus tacitly admits a longer closing to Mark, by spacing out the text of the last four pages, and by the fact, that at least four pages are "cancel leaves", written by a different scribe. The original conclusion of Mark was torn out, and a shorter one was substituted for it. Likewise, Vaticanus admits a longer conclusion by leaving a blank column after verse eight, the only blank column in the whole manuscript. Our text is from the Alexandrian manuscript. The reason for these omissions is plain from the character of the narrative. Failing to see the proper place of this commission, and the record itself says, that it was fulfilled (16:20), the proclamation was found to be impracticable, hence to them was spurious. Those who took this commission on themselves found that they could not cast out demons, take up serpents, drink poison, or raise the dead, though they might seem to speak new languages, or to help the ailing. This commission is for all creation. It is not confined to Israel, or mankind, but is directed to men as a part of the wider realms of creation. Originally, Adam was on close terms with the lower creatures. This commission will be restored in the Kingdom. This man, who has given us the original manuscripts in print gave us these comments. THEY ARE NOT MINE, BUT THEY ARE HIS. I give them to you for what they are worth, and if the reader wishes to argue about them, I will be glad to give the name and the man and his location.
At least the author of the Concordant Version of the New Testament does not think baptism has a part in Salvation, but refers to the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus, as the Gospel of Salvation. Now, I shall give you a copy of a letter from H. J. Milhikie, Assistant Curator of the manuscripts mentioned in this work. However, only a photostatic copy of the Vaticanus Manuscript is in the British Museum, where Mr. Milhikie is assistant curator. You cannot now get a letter from him, for they have recently refused correspondence of this kind. The letter which I give here created a great deal of letter writing to Mr. Milhikie and his associates and they found they had to refuse correspondence of this kind.

(Address) W. M. Tooman, Hydro, Okla. U. S. A.
(Postmark) London, W. C. Feb. 27, 6:15 P.M. 1931 C.

(CONTENTS OF LETTER)

Department of Manuscripts, British Museum,
Motto, "National Scheme for disabled men"
Feb. 27, 1931.

Dear Sir:

Our Oldest Manuscript, the codex
Alexandrinus, of the fifth century, contains
the verses you mention. On the other hand
two earlier manuscripts, the Codex Vaticanus
at Rome, and the Codex Sinaiticus, at Leningrad,
do not contain these verses.

Yours faithfully,
Heiler J. Milhikie
Assistant Curator of Manuscripts.

Since that time February 1931, I think it was in 1933, the British Museum did buy the Sinaiticus Manuscript from Leningrad, Soviet authorities for 100,000 Lb Sterling, almost $500,000.00 in American money. In March 1931, W. M. Tooman wrote the British Museum a request to know if the oldest manuscripts to the New Testament had the verses in Mark 16th chapter verses 9 to the close of the chapter. This is the letter of Heiler J. Milhikie to him. I have the letter now in my possession, Brother Tooman gave it to me. A bit of explanation. The Alexandrian manuscript is dated about 450 A. D. and the older manuscripts, Sinaiticus, and Vaticanus are dated a hundred years earlier, before 350 A. D. They do not contain the verses, therefore the scripture as we have it in the Authorized Version was known to be spurious then, by the copyist of the Manuscripts that early.

Thus we know on the testimony of the curator of the manuscripts in the British Museum, who certainly knows, that the earliest manuscripts do not have the verses as our Authorized Version. Now, I did not say that. A man who was the OLDEST EXISTING NEW TESTAMENTS RIGHT BEFORE HIM, said it and if men want to argue about this let them go to the British Museum and have it out with Heiler J. Milhikie. I am glad I did not have to say it, and that the man who knows said it and
he knows. Now, let us take Source authority for the scriptures and not sayings of men. When our Authorized Version was given the English people through the King of England, there were but four manuscripts of the New Testament known and not one of them went back before the 10th to the 11th century. Since that time 1500 of them have been uncovered and five or six of them go back to 330 A.D.

Now we can know that the British Museum has two of the oldest manuscripts of the New Testament, that the verses from 9 to the close of Mark 16: do not contain these verses and Mark 16:16 is in this list. I did not put it out. It was not there until after the fourth century. I simply refer to the author of the Concordant version of the scriptures, and the British Museum as authority on this. Mark evidently did not consider Baptism as any part of salvation. He was too close to Peter and Paul, who did not write any such thing in their writings. When we get to the proper translation of the verses in their writings said to teach that doctrine, and not take the authority of 47 Ex-Roman-Catholic-Episcopal bishops who believed it and tried to put the doctrine in the English Version of the Bible, the enemies of Salvation by Grace will have to accede to the truth of the Word.

Chapter 5 Evidence and Commands

What the original closing of Mark was we do not know on the authority of the men who know these manuscripts. We shall have to wait until the Ostraka, the Graffiti, the Papyri, and the other copyings of parts of the New Testament are before we will ever be able to tell. In the writings of men who knew the apostles, as yet we have found nothing that will warrant the idea that Baptism as taught by modern Baptist Salvationist has the place these modern interpreters give it. The men who knew the apostles, we may know and we have much of their writings. They are Polycarp, Ignatius, Barnabas, Mathetes, Papias, Tatian, and some say Aristides. Some say Hermas, and a few others, the writings of whom we have but a few quotations. These men did not appear to give Baptism any stronger place than a mere symbol of Salvation.

Some quote Barnabas on this subject, but the whole quotation, which will be found in my booklet on "The History of Baptist Salvation", and he does not refer to baptism at all in the passage. The whole quotation taken together speaks of the spirit cleansing of the spirit of man and does not mean baptismal salvation. Now coming to Acts 2:39. This is figurative salvation and should have the whole meaning of the passage given to the meaning of the word "

This surely cannot mean "in order to" (I. e. purpose of Baptism), as from our study of the Greek preposition "

"we must now determine that the word "

" or "for" in the Authorized version and in the thirty or perhaps forty other versions we have in English. They are being multiplied every day now and most of the men who translate the word "FOR", as being in order to, have taken up traditional notion that salvation comes succeeding faith, repentance, and baptism. This is the very thing that the greater part of the translators believe, i. e. that salvation cannot be secured until the material act of Baptism has been carried out. However, when we take up the Baptists and the translations of the men who believe wholly in Salvation by
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Grace, their comments on this verse make it clear they believe that the word means "with reference to" salvation.

Baptism is figurative of salvation from sin, and shows for the death burial and resurrection of Jesus, the death to sin of the sinner, his burial to it and his rising to walk in new life. It also prophesies of the resurrection of his body from the grave in the resurrection of the saints. Many years ago, E. Y. Mullins was asked to preach at a gathering of the Christian Churches of a great portion of the nation. He showed throughout that tract that Baptism was figurative in the seventeen or more uses in the New Testament, which scriptures are so often used to prove baptismal salvation. That tract has never been refuted, for in it he showed that every time the expression was used, that it was used to Hebrew peoples, who were very fond of ceremonies and symbols. These Hebrews recognized the symbolic meaning of baptism. In the booklet, "The History of Baptismal Salvation" I have shown the figurative use of every one of these seventeen verses of scripture from which the idea of Baptismal Salvation primarily came.

From some kind of substitution for the finished work of Jesus, this doctrine has arisen. The first statement of it is found in Acts chapter fifteen. Paul brought the great question of whether the keeping of the law was a part of salvation. That doctrine of law keeping was ruled out of the early Church, by the council at Jerusalem recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Acts. Judaizers taught that men must be circumcised and must keep the law to be saved. When Paul and his fellows brought that to Jerusalem, the church at Jerusalem, and the men there who were apostles were given the truth of salvation by grace wholly. The apostles there gave their vote and their influence to the doctrine of salvation by grace and no substitution of anything for the finished work of Jesus in his death burial and resurrection. If the Old Testament law had no power to save men, surely nothing that man could substitute for Jesus has any efficacy to take away sin. So then, nothing that was brought instead of Jesus could take away sin. This is just what the Baptistical Regenerationists do, they substitute for Jesus something that is merely symbolical of what Jesus does and what he did for the salvation of human beings.

When any man gives to Acts 2:38 the interpretation of Baptism being one of the steps in the Salvation process, as he thinks it is a process instead of an instantaneous work of grace, depending on the free and sensible acceptance of the sinner, when he takes Jesus the Christ as his substitute, then we have again the SACRAMENTALISM of Roman Catholics, who have entirely substituted Jesus Christ out of the picture of salvation and have made it depend wholly on SACRAMENTALISM and OBEDIENCE to the so-called Roman Church. There exists a wonder that these modern Baptistical Salvationists have not gone the whole route, and taken up with the sacramentalism of the Roman Catholics. To be logical they ought to do it.

A bit of summary here will show that Baptists have all the opposites in the teachings of the Bible. Baptists believe in salvation wholly by grace, Catholics believe in salvation wholly by works. Baptists believe in local church autonomy. Catholics believe in the hierarchy as the church. Baptists believe in the church having no power to save and keep saved. Catholics believe in the church having the complete power in salvation. Baptists believe in no universal church on the earth.
Catholics believe in a Universal Church and this is the Catholic Church. Baptists believe in baptism as being a symbol of salvation. Catholics believe it takes away the Adamic sin. Baptists believe in eternal security to the saved, and Catholics believe in apostacy. Baptists believe in separation of Church and State. Catholics believe the opposite. Baptists believe that men can be saved in Jesus Christ. Catholics believe that nobody is saved but by the church. IN TRUTH, sum every opposite doctrine of Baptists and Catholics and then arrange every other church on the face of the Earth, and every SINGLE ONE of them will find his doctrines either in the Baptists or the Catholics. The Baptists and the Catholics are on the two extremes of doctrine and practice and every other church on the face of this earth is in the middle ground between the two extremes they represent.

Now for a summary. Seventeen scriptures only can be found which appear to teach salvation by baptism. Several score, even hundreds teach the opposite. The doctrine of "εἰς" meaning "in order to" in Acts 2:38, was never taught for two and a half centuries after Jesus. See "History of Baptismal Salvation". Then certainly, the doctrine, as in Acts 2:38, to mean purpose to secure Baptismal salvation must fall from History, from the discussion of the Greek preposition "εἰς", from figures of salvation, from consistency to the apostolic teaching, from everything, that God does to save men. Then must it become purely a symbol of what God has done to redeem mankind from sin, and a symbol of what salvation has done to man, and a symbol of what God will do in the future, to lift man out into the complete fellowship of man with God, by raising his body out of death into the bodily eternal life. When he is saved in this life, that is entirely a spiritual thing, and then God asked man to submit to a symbol of that, then he set the great thing of Christian Education in his church, and promised to complete the whole business of salvation in the body in the resurrection. Baptism is symbolic of all three. First, in a symbol of Spiritual death to sin, burial to it and raising from out of it, then symbolic of the washing of the minds of men, who grow in grace and in the knowledge of the truth, then symbolic that the body will come out of a burial into eternal life. Why God set this symbol, I do not know except that he wanted men taught by symbol and example, as well as by word and deed. Baptists believe and still cling to the symbolic meaning of this ordinance of the Church of Jesus, as one of the two great teaching ordinances of that Church, the body of Jesus.

May this little book go to my Baptist brethren and cheer them in its journey. Brethren, since our belief has been age long, since the time of our Lord Jesus Christ, we should rejoice because the faith once delivered to the saints is ours, and we have a godgiven right to defend that faith.

CHAPTER 6 Conclusion

We come now to the conclusion of this whole sum of the arguments and the Greek syntax and the principles of language, together with historical data we have given in this book. Acts 2:38 is the shibboleth of modern Baptismal Salvationists. The whole discussion of this book, together with every seeming departure from the subject in hand gets round to that one thing finally. We have given without any
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prejudice or malice the whole subject as language, both Greek and English, in their etymology, syntax, and vocabulary, has been laid out throughout the centuries in the universal principles, which all languages have. Also we have given some historical data which the average person has no means at hand of getting or even interpreting. This has led us into some queer corners of scholarship and investigation. This has compelled us to go to the copies of the oldest manuscripts of the New Testament extant. We have gladly and freely given this data, for the benefit of our brethren. At the present time we need to defend the faith once given to the Saints, as at no other time, and if we can be used as the poor instrument to do this, we shall rejoice in the opportunity.

A new argument will be allowable, since this is a debate and I am not compelled to abide by the rules of a debate. There are no such rules in writing. As new matter comes to hand it is permissible to state it. Just here reviewing a universal principle of language, which may be called a permissive clause. All clauses of that type have either the words “permit”, “allow”, “let”, or some other equivalent expression. These expressions are both logical and grammatical. One such clause so represented in the 3rd person imperative in Greek, and it can in such a case as Acts 2:38 be rendered with the best of results both logical and grammatical. These clauses are always followed by an infinitive with or without “to” in the English. This makes the very finest sense in Acts 2:38. Repent ye, and “permit, allow, let” each one of you (the ones repenting) to be immersed in (upon) the name of Jesus Christ because of remission of your sins”. Making the last clause a permissive with an infinitive in the English gives us the finest English meaning of this sentence in Acts 2:38. This does no violence to the language principles enumerated in this article, nor to the historical data, nor to the teaching of the Word, only for the Baptismal Salvationists.

Usually a majority of the beliefs of men are used to prove points. The statement is made that most of the so-called Christians in the world, perhaps 600,000,000 of them believe in baptismal salvation. This corresponds to the saying of Jesus Himself, when he said, “The whole world lieth in wickedness”. This is the surest method to defeat the truth of any doctrine, i.e., to state that most men believe it. Jesus told His disciples that they were unpopular with the world. A strange thing about the doctrine of salvation by ceremony and ritual and by religious acts is, that that does not separate Christianity from Paganism. The religious SYSTEM OF WORKS is Pagan, and that is the surest way to know that anything like that is not a DIVINE SYSTEM. Paganism is fond of ceremony, ritual, human deeds, and all the other fanfare of public applause, so why put Salvation into the ranks of all these by declaring that a ritual or a ceremony in which men are the actors, is the method that God chose to save men.

The subject of Dictionaries and Lexicons is one that causes men to fall at once in line with the lexicon quoted. We shall determine just how lexicons are made, especially in our own time. The present usages and meanings of words as they are found in the literature in a general way is put into the meanings of dictionaries in any language. Meanings reverse their nature in a very few years in the use of a language. In the time of men who have not lived so long, and whom we know at the present time, the current meanings of our own words have shifted right to the
reverse. This is so in any living language and our present lexicons are therefore not reliable for 300 years ago even in English. Then in Biblical languages the present current rituals, ideals, and ceremonies make people interpret them in the light of the present word meanings of the foreign language into which the Biblical language was translated that language being utterly foreign to the language in which the Bible was written. In our interpretation of scriptures now, we must never lose sight of this principle. Then decidedly our business is to go back and arrive at the meanings of the language then in use. We have brought out in the book all these principles. Now when someone suggests a new modern use and meaning for Acts 2:38, which has been injected into it by the heresies of Pagan Ages, we become again sure that this interpretation is not the right one for our purpose. This thought again cheers our SALVATION BY GRACE PROTAGONISTS.

Fitis

J. Louis Guthrie

March, 1940