

Statement of purpose the scriptures require from a baptizee and from a baptizer

Olumuyiwa *Asaolu* (asaolu@yahoo.com)

Lagos, Nigeria (Jan 18, 2022)

This treatise is about the nature of the dialogue the bible expects between the subject and the administrator of water baptism. If any two persons approach a body of water to dip themselves therein or plunge without any religious conversation indicating a spiritual significance of their actions, it is mere play or exercise. Baptism is an immersion in water for the remission of sins so such solemn activity must be recognized and declared as such for the benefit of the participants and probable witnesses. The person about to be baptized (baptizee) is expected to be a penitent, which is someone who has heard the gospel of Christ and is accepting with a repentant heart. The one to administer (baptizer) is a disciple or a believer in Christ. Baptism is commanded by the Lord Jesus Christ in the following passages.

Matthew 28:18 *And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. 19 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, **baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit:** 20 Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.*

Mark 16:15 *And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. 16 **He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.***

The gospel being the good news of the death, burial and resurrection of the Son of God (Jesus Christ of Nazareth) must be obeyed from the heart. The sinner must hear it, have godly sorrow for his sins and thus, a change of heart to want to begin to please God via a change of his conduct.

1 *Corinthians 15:1 Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; 2 By which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. 3 For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; 4 And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.*

Having heard the gospel, one is expected to indicate that he believes and the natural means is **via verbal confession of faith**. This is NOT confessing ones sins but rather professing either of the following:

1. ***“Jesus is the Christ (Messiah); the Son of the living God”*** as done by Peter -Mt 16:16
2. ***“Jesus Christ is the Son of God”*** as done by the Ethiopian Eunuch –Acts 8:34
3. ***“Jesus Christ is Lord.”*** This is based on the following passage:

Romans 10:9 *That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.*

10 *For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. 13 For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.*

Since only believers may be baptized according to Mk 16:16, it is imperative that a prospect communicate his belief orally or if speech-impaired, communicate via writing or sign-language. Only rational candidates who have reached the age of accountability may so indicate. Those who reject the gospel in unbelief or deny Jesus will equally be rejected by the Lord on the Day of Judgment.

Matthew 10:32 *Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. 33 But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.*

The baptizee’s confession of Christ is a necessary condition to be met before the immersion may

proceed. While some may call it a creed or formula, the wording does not have to be exact as stated above but the essence or core must be to declare belief in Jesus as Lord/Christ. Likewise, the baptizer proclaims unto what the subject is about to be baptized, by stating some words to the effect that the subject is ***“baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.”*** This is **implied** in the NT as shown below.

Recall, Jesus said: *“baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit”*

On the day of Pentecost, the inspired apostles reiterated this as they concluded the first gospel sermon.

Acts 2:38 Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. 39 For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. 40 And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation. 41 Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.

On other occasions, the following records are given.

Acts 8:16b (...only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.)

Acts 19:5 When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Did Peter, Phillip, Paul and other apostles misunderstand, disobey or contradict the commandment of Jesus? No! Aside Heb 1:4, the grammar of Mt 28:19 allude to a single name. Inspiration revealed unto the apostles that **Jesus Christ is the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit**. Recall that *“in him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily”* -Col 2:9, Isa 9:6, 2 Cor 3:17. Anyone immersed in the name of Jesus Christ is baptized into Christ to become the Lord’s possession and a child of God.

Galatians 3:26 For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

27 For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

Baptism initiates a relationship between one and the Godhead; the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit begins to dwell in the new disciple (John 14:23, Rm 8:9-11) by faith through the word that dwells in him (Eph 3:17, Col 3:16). We are baptized into ‘The Lord Jesus Christ’ regardless of the variant in which His name is uttered: Christ Jesus, the Lord Jesus, etc. None should scorn it as ‘varying formula.’ Like us, the inspired writers did not consider it mandatory to always write ‘the Lord Jesus Christ’ in full.

Baptism into Christ saves, that is how God designed it -1 Pet 3:21. In the Great Commission, the Lord actually instructed that believers be baptized **‘in the name of’** of the Godhead. Which idea does this phrase really convey: “By the authority of who bears the name” OR “Calling the literal name over”?

I – The authority

Christ is the one with all authority as he declared in Mt 28:18. He is the one who instructed that people be enlisted into his kingdom via baptism as they obey the gospel. Thus, immersion can only be done by His authority. For that to be evident, His name must be pronounced to back the act. The only way to manifest that He is the sender being obeyed is for the emissary (baptizer) to pronounce in whose stead he is basing his action. Indeed, Christ used the Greek work for ‘name’ not the one for ‘authority’ in Mt 28:19. The Lord instructed that repentance and remission of sins be preached in His name -Lk 24:47. This requires that we proclaim that Jesus Christ of Nazareth is both Lord and Christ or the Lord of all – Acts 2:36; 10:36. Preaching Christ involves teaching about the name of Jesus and His kingdom -Acts 8:5,12. The Lord informed Ananias that Paul would be an apostle, *“to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel.”* For the world to hear about, recognize or submit to Christ’s authority, His name and His person must be preached while His kingdom rule must be explained. Recall:

Zechariah 14:8 And it shall be in that day, that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea: in summer and in winter shall it be. 9 And the LORD shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one LORD, and his name one.

Romans 10:13-14b *Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?...*

Acts 4:10 *Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that **by the name of Jesus Christ** of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. 11 This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. 12 **Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.***

Acts 10:48 *And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord...*

The apostles did not say: “we preach by the authority of the Son but will not mention any name.” The religious rulers warned them to stop uttering that name (Acts 4:18; 5:40) but they refused and continued to testify about the grace of God. They were persecuted and received threat to their lives, yet...

Acts 5:42 *And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach **Jesus Christ.***

II Name Invocation

John’s baptism was unto repentance not into a person and the subjects were ‘*confessing their sins*’ (Mt 3:6-11) while the New Covenant baptism is into the Christ whom we confess. We are “*buried with Him in baptism*” (Col 2:12). To say “in the name of” carries the idea of uttering a name. Paul showed that a name was pronounced at baptism to assign the subject as a disciple or servant of the bearer of that name.

1 Corinthians 1:12 *Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. 13 Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? **or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?** 14 I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; 15 **Lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name.***

Romans 6:3 *Know ye not, that **so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?** 4 Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. 5 For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.*

At the Jerusalem meeting, James quoted the prophecy of Amos:

Acts 15:17 *That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, **upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things.***

When was Christ’s name called upon the Gentiles? It was originally at the baptism in Cornelius house and subsequently when each converted Gentile is immersed into Christ. It was after Gentiles conversion that the prophecy of Isaiah was fulfilled that God’s people would be called by a new name.

Isaiah 62:1 *For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth. 2 **And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory: and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the LORD shall name.***

Acts 11:26 *And when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch. And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people. And **the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch.***

Our new name was not a societal tag pronounced in derision or admiration, it was given by inspiration. Christians glorify God, since we are called by His name, let us be holy -1 Pet 4:16, Jms 2:7, 2 Tim 2:19.

OBJECTION ADDRESSED

Some aver that the name of Jesus Christ need not be pronounced during water baptism. They argue that: **‘to do something in the name of Jesus Christ’ means ‘to do that thing by His authority and NOT to mention His name while doing that thing.’** Someone made such claim in a video post on a WhatsApp Group for brethren, citing Exo 5:23, 1 Sam 25:5-9, Col 3:17, etc. It attracted the following comments.

[14:01, 1/12/2022] Elijah Abire, Ev: I keep wondering how a small weak boy will come to me and threaten to take my property without mentioning the name of the one that sent him. The name of the one that sent him is the authority. For example, ‘President Buhari says I should take your land.’ This is authoritative. He has the power.

David said to Goliath, I come in the name of the Lord. Peter said to the man at beautiful gate; silver and gold have I none, what I have I give to you, *“in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise and walk”* -Acts 3:4. Peter mentioned a name not just authority. The authority is behind the name. When I say I baptize you in the name of Christ, I mean that I am doing this baptism not by my authority (power) or authority of Satan (power) but that of Christ.

So when I am praying I should say nothing at the end? We just mention all the things we need, ask for our daily bread and forgiveness and walk away? We can’t end it “in Jesus Name” since Name is authority and no one’s name should be mentioned? Or is it only in baptism, that we should be muted regarding Christ’s Name?

I hope silent baptism is not a way of removing Christ from baptism? Some may be initiating people silently into a cult or another god.

How can a command “baptize them in the name of Jesus Christ” become mute baptism? But the command pray in Jesus Name is not a muted prayer, we always end the prayer in Jesus Name. Brethren let us look well ooo.

[14:17, 1/12/2022] Asaolu Olumuyiwa: After Moses spoke to Pharaoh in God's name, the ruler replied: *Who is the LORD that I should let Israel go?*

That means Moses mentioned an actual name in Pharaoh’s presence. The authority of his God was proclaimed by mentioning the name of who sent him.

Likewise, when the young men spoke to Nabal in David's name and delivered a message, Nabal said: *Who is David or the son of Jesse...?*

Again it shows a name was pronounced or uttered before Nabal.

Authority may only be recognized if the name behind it is declared.

John said: *"Master, we saw one casting out demons in thy name; and we forbade him because he followeth not with us."*

John did not believe the that fellow was authorized because he wasn't one of the known disciples. Yet with faith, the fellow uttered the name of Jesus Christ and expelled demons.

Let us now examine Colossians 3:17

King James Bible - *And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, [do] all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him.*

Literal Standard Version - *and all, whatever you may do in word or in work, [do] all things in the Name of the Lord Jesus - giving thanks to the God and Father, through Him.*

The second “do” in the verse was inserted by the translators just as the punctuation.

The literal version shows that what Paul actually wrote is: *“whatever you may do in word or in work all things in the Name of the Lord Jesus giving thanks to the God and Father through Him.”*

This means that we are to give thanks for everything we do by verbally mentioning the name of Jesus as

we express appreciation to God. The real focus of the verse is ‘giving thanks’ NOT ‘doing things’ as many presume! There is a parallel passage in Ephesians after Paul just highlighted praises via vocal music. The two epistles are similar in some respects.

Young's Literal Translation Colossians 3

16 *Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing each other, in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, in grace singing in your hearts to the Lord;* 17 **and all, whatever ye may do in word or in work, [do] all things in the name of the Lord Jesus - giving thanks to the God and Father, through him.**

Young's Literal Translation Ephesians 5

19 *speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord,* 20 **giving thanks always for all things, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to the God and Father**

A similar thought is found in Young's Literal Translation 1 Thessalonians 5

16 **always rejoice ye;** 17 *continually pray ye;* 18 **in every thing give thanks, for this [is] the will of God in Christ Jesus in regard to you.**

Even if Col 3:17 is construed as doing things (by the Lord’s authority) rather than giving thanks (by praising His name), it would still be expedient to mention His name on such occasions because the passage is addressed to the church and is thus about spiritual-related activity. It is not about what an individual does in private cum secular activities. Thus, whether the church does Communion or Collection or Benevolence or Evangelism or Edification or Prayer, the name of Jesus Christ should be pronounced and honoured to appreciate his authority and glorify God for the opportunity and ability.

The phrase “in the name of” often carries the idea of invocation as evident in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Passages containing “*in the name of*” that depict a Name not just Authority

Passage	Import	Comparative Passage
1 Kings 18:32 <i>And with the stones he built an altar in the name of the LORD: and he made a trench about the altar, as great as would contain two measures of seed.</i>	He built an altar and named it after God by invoking deity’s name thereon.	Genesis 28:16 <i>17 And he was afraid, and said, How dreadful is this place! this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven. 18 And Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone that he had put for his pillows, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it.19 And he called the name of that place Bethel: but the name of that city was called Luz at the first.</i>
Deuteronomy 18:7 <i>Then he shall minister in the name of the LORD his God, as all his brethren the Levites do, which stand there before the LORD.</i>	He mentions the name of God over the people to invoke a blessing not a curse -2 Kg 2:24	2 Samuel 6:18 <i>And as soon as David had made an end of offering burnt offerings and peace offerings, he blessed the people in the name of the LORD of hosts.</i>
Deuteronomy 18:22 <i>When a prophet speaketh in the name of the LORD, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the LORD hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.</i>	False seers mention God’s name [“Thus says the LORD...”] whereas He did not send them; they were not authorized by Him at all –Mt 7:22-23.	Jeremiah 14:14 <i>Then the LORD said unto me, The prophets prophesy lies in my name: I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, neither spake unto them: they prophesy unto you a false vision and divination, and a thing of nought, and the deceit of their heart.</i>

Deuteronomy 25:6 <i>And it shall be, that the firstborn which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not put out of Israel.</i>	Not by the dead man's authority but by Mosaic law, the firstborn shall be surNAMED after the deceased.	Matthew 22:24 <i>Saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother.</i>
1 Samuel 17:45 <i>Then said David to the Philistine, Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield: but I come to thee in the name of the LORD of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied.</i>	Confident of the one he trusts and depends upon, he expressly identifies same as the Lord for the listeners to know who exactly he refers unto.	Acts 3:6 <i>Then Peter said, Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk.</i>
1 Samuel 20:42 <i>And Jonathan said to David, Go in peace, forasmuch as we have sworn both of us in the name of the LORD, saying, The LORD be between me and thee, and between my seed and thy seed for ever. And he arose and departed: and Jonathan went into the city.</i>	This is a charge or an oath in which the very name of the Lord is mentioned.	1 Corinthians 5:4 <i>In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ</i>
Acts 5:28,40 <i>Saying, Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us. ...And to him they agreed: and when they had called the apostles, and beaten them, they commanded that they should not speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go.</i>	How would anyone know 'the name' in which the apostles preached if they did not mention an actual name? They spoke on behalf of Jesus by first introducing that it was His message they bear.	Acts 9:27 <i>But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus.</i>
Acts 2:38 <i>Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.</i>	The name saves because of the person behind it –Mt 1:21, Prov 18:10	1 Corinthians 6:11 <i>And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.</i>

That invocation is involved in baptism is evident in Acts 22:16.

New King James Version - *And now why are you waiting? Arise and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on the name of the Lord.*

Literal Emphasis Translation - *And now why do you delay? Having arisen, be baptized and wash away your sins, having called upon His name.*

Here, it appears as though it is the baptizee required to invoke but it could actually be otherwise. The words, “baptize,” “wash,” and “call” in Acts 22:16 are in the “causative (permissive) middle voice” in Greek. “Causative middle” means to GET something done to you (Daniel Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Pg. 423). Same author notes: “The permissive middle is also like a passive in that the subject is the RECEIVER OF THE ACTION.” (Pg. 426). Majority of Greek experts attest to this fact. Therefore, Saul of Tarsus was the recipient of the commands of Acts 22:16. Hence, the imperative is: ‘...get yourself baptized, get your sins washed away, **GET CALLED UPON** you His Name.’

Statement of purpose the scriptures require from a baptizee and from a baptizer –Part 2

Olumuyiwa *Asaolu* (asaolu@yahoo.com)

Lagos, Nigeria (March 4, 2022)

No one has disputed that the baptizee must confess Jesus as Christ/Lord/Son of God. That is wonderful! It is however remarkable that some still reject Act 2:38 as the inspired application of Mt 28:19. Such persons deny that the Lord Jesus Christ is the embodiment of the fulness of the Godhead hence, deny the necessity for a baptizer to call upon the Lord's name while conducting water baptism.

https://www.lainosint.com/download/faith/Statement_of_purpose_the_scriptures_require_from_a_baptizee_and_from_a_baptizer.pdf - Click link to download Part 1

This second article briefly examines with the scriptures, some alternate arguments being canvassed aside the two major Objections previously addressed.

[https://www.lainosint.com/download/faith/A_dual_exchange_on_Mt_28_19_And_The_Triune_God_between_EgharevbaOL_and_AsaoluOS.pdf - Click link to download detailed exchange prior to this file.]

III. What is the common name of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in Genesis 48:16?

The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth.

Jacob was blessing Joseph's sons – Ephraim and Manasseh. Jacob was not merely praying that his name (Israel) and the name of his forebears (Hebrew) should be upon the boys since that is naturally bestowed rather he was adopting both. [The descendants of Jacob are known as Israelites and Hebrews (Exo 5:1-3); terms derived from alternate names of Jacob (Gen 32:28) and Abram (Gen 14:13)]. Jacob prayed: Let these two sons of Joseph be regarded as my direct offspring who shall walk before God and partake of the ancestral benediction. This entreaty was foreshadowed in Gen 48:3-5 and sanctioned by God as evident in Psalms 60:7. Clearly, Hebrews 11:8-9 states that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were *the heirs of the same promise*; to be father of multitude and inherit Canaan. Their common name is '**heir**.' Each of the patriarchs cannot be called '**the heir**' while co-sojourning since the trio independently received the same promise -Gen 17:1-8; 26:1-4; 28:10-15. In Gen 48:16, Jacob was praying that Joseph's sons be 'inheritors and fathers of multitude' as well. God heard that prayer. When *the tribes of Israel* inherited the land of Canaan (Joshua 16-18), Manasseh and Ephraim were allotted portions -Joshua 14:4; 16:4.

[Some even point to Joshua 23:7, and ask: what is '*the name of their gods*'?

The term "gods" is translated from Elohim, plural of El or Eloah and in the context of this Joshua passage refers unto idols which are representation of devils (Deut 32:17, 1 Cor 10:19-20). Most Bible scholars should be aware that numerous gods have the common name 'Baal' (1 Kings 18:19-24-26)]

Interestingly, those who reject that Mt 28:19 alludes to a common name refuse to accept the obvious about Jacob's pronouncements. Yet, they will not explain Gen 48:16 or what **name** means in the verse. When pressed, such assert that their argument is not about "name" but about "in the name of."

If the argument is really over the phrase "*in the name of*" rather than the word "*name*" then why bring up Gen 48:16 which do NOT contain the phrase "in the name of"? Is that not mischief or a deliberate attempt to conflate issues and confuse the undiscerning?

In Part 1 of this article, it was established that to do something "*in the name of*" does not only refer to authority but sometimes mean to utter an actual name. Table 1 (Part 1 Page 5-6) gave a list of examples across both testaments. Recall, to 'preach in the name of Jesus' is to mention the name of 'Jesus Christ and proclaim His kingdom' (Acts 28:31). While speaking in the sender's name; Moses mentioned the LORD's name unto Pharaoh (Exo 5:1-2) and David's emissaries uttered his name unto Nabal (1 Sam 25:5,9-10). Even some lying prophets speak in the name of the LORD (2 Chro 18:9-22, Jere 23:25).

IV. Does not the Granville Sharp's Rule (GSR) distinguish between the Father and the Son?

'When the copulative KAI connects two nouns of the same case, if the article HO or any of its cases precedes the first of the said nouns or participles, and is not repeated before the second noun or participle, the latter always relates to the same person that is expressed or described by the first noun or participle; i.e., it denotes a further description of the first-named person.' (A Manual Of The Greek New Testament, Dana & Mantey, p. 147)

Granville Sharp's rule was formulated to proclaim the divinity of Christ **not** to deny it! Daniel B. Wallace has restated GSR in order to explicitly state all the restrictions and improve its clarity:

"In native Greek constructions (i.e., not translation Greek), when a single article modifies two substantives connected by kai (thus, article-substantive- kai-substantive), when both substantives are (1) singular (both grammatically and semantically), (2) personal, (3) and common nouns (not proper names or ordinals), they have the same referent." Wallace even itemized major critiques of the rule in his detailed work available at <https://bible.org/article/sharp-redivivus-reexamination-granville-sharp-rule>

The GSR is commonly applied to the translation of Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 as evident is NASV

- *Looking for the blessed hope and the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior, Christ Jesus.*
- *...to those who have received a faith of the same kind as ours, by the righteousness of our God and Savior, Jesus Christ.*

It removes ambiguity, and indicates that one person is being referenced or named, compared to KJV

- *Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*
- *...to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*

Applying GSR to Mt 28:19 to show that repetition of definite article "the" in the verse distinguishes the personalities of the Godhead is fine but such does not look at the totality of the evidence. One should **also apply GSR on Jude 1:4 & 2 Timothy 1:2 using the Greek text** [void of insertions by translators]. These verses distinctly state that Jesus Christ is the ONLY Lord God or true God as well as the Father, in harmony with **1 John 5:20 & Isaiah 9:6**. Indeed, John 17:1-3 teaches that possession of eternal life is to know that the Father is *'the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He sent.'*

I noted a Corollary to the GSR: *If a sentence is in the form "U of A and of B and of C..." where A, B & C are singular nouns then the principal attribute in U applies simultaneously to A, B and C.*

This applies to Mt 28:19 and grammatically establishes that a common name is implied therein.

I enumerated several other examples, and posed the following pending queries:

- John 3:3,5 - Does the passage allude to one birth (born again) or several births (born again and again)?
- Mark 15:40 - James the less and Joses, are both siblings or not?
- Revelation 22:1 – Do God and the Lamb occupy different thrones or the same throne?
- Ephesians 5:5 – Is the kingdom of Christ principally that of God or is the verse referring to two distinct kingdoms?
- Genesis 48:16 – Is the verse referring to a common name or their different names?
- James 1:1 – Does 'servant' refer to two distinct persons or a single individual in this verse?
- Colossians 2:2 – Does a single mystery pertain to the Godhead or several different mysteries?
- Acts 3:13 - Is the same God known by the patriarchs or 'a different God for each'?

Rather than answer the above questions, it was wrongly posited that the Corollary violates Mark 2:18. When someone refuses to acknowledge that "Asaolu's rule" **like the GSR is premised on singular nouns**, such would make wrong application or see non-existent inconsistencies in either rule.

In Mark 2:18, it should not be expected that the disciples of John would necessarily be the “the same (single) set” of disciples of the Pharisees.

Asserting that ‘the Pharisees’ is singular is untenable and has unintended consequences. By neglecting the singularity premise of the rules, one would imagine that in Mt 3:7, the Pharisees are called Sadducees, or posit in Mt 16:6 that the false teaching (leaven) of ‘the Pharisees’ is exact in detail with that of ‘the Sadducees’! Such misapplication of GSR in Acts 11:1 would likewise suggest that the apostles and brethren refer to same entity while in Act 9:41 it would suggest that the saints are widows.

[Interestingly, even when ‘name’ is **unnecessarily** substituted with ‘authority’ in Mt 28:19 by someone, such inadvertently is compelled by the indisputable validity of the Corollary to aver that the subject is baptized in ‘*the common or same authority*’ of the personalities of the Godhead! However, Jesus means a common name; he deliberately used ‘name’ in vs 19 after stating that He has ‘all authority’ in vs 18]

The purpose of GSR is to ascertain whether one or several distinct entities are referenced in a passage while the Corollary highlights the principal attribute of an entity that may apply to many objects. The GSR and the Corollary are language rules that do not invalidate the word of God but seek to elucidate it. Teachers use illustrations, for example via the drawings or photos of animals so that learners (e.g. *Illiterates or Primary School Pupils or High School Students or even University students*) can easily identify each animal. Oftentimes, a teacher or illustrator would state the name of an animal for a depicted image. It is the same reason why one typically expounds a verse of the scripture aside quoting it. If one introduced use of Tables in a written exchange, it would be self-indicting for him to later ridicule the use of a Table by another! *That and misapplication of GSR* are the quibbles that backfired.

V. Is a particular name used for baptism in the NT given the numerous variations recorded?

Curiously, some make an issue of the variations of the wording of the unique name recorded for baptisms in the book of Acts, asking which variation is ideal. They say that is another reason for declining to pronounce the name of the Saviour when immersing penitents. Such pretend as if they do not understand that Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5; 22:16 all refer to portions of the name for a single person. Their argument is inconsistent since their own writings employ variations of the Saviour’s name such as “*the Lord, Christ, Jesus Christ, the Lord Jesus, the Lord Jesus Christ, etc.*” Such even refer to me in their writing as “**O. S. Asaolu, Brother Olumuyiwa Asaolu, Bro Asaolu, & Asaolu**” yet acknowledge that I am one person with a known name not several persons with distinct names!

The name into which one is baptized matters just as how one is addressed; names have purposes, and meanings. To controvert the name for acceptable baptism today is akin unto contesting whether Pilate had an accusation written over the crucified Christ. It is well-known that some dispute the validity of that inscription based on the argument that the gospel writers gave variants or non-identical renditions.

Let us carefully examine the inscription that was placed on the tree when Jesus was crucified:

(Mat 27:37)	This is Jesus	the king of the Jews
(Mark 15:26)		the king of the Jews
(Luke 23:38)	This is	the king of the Jews
(John 19:19)	Jesus of Nazareth	the king of the Jews

Evidently, each writer recorded some part of the inscription but when the whole is put together, we get:

This is Jesus of Nazareth the king of the Jews

If we now look at water baptism to find out the correct name to pronounce, we see from inspired Peter:

(Acts 2:38)	...be baptized in the name of	Jesus Christ
(Acts 10:48)	...be baptized in the name of	the Lord

Either verse varies slightly, and omits a phrase that is supplied by the other but harmonization gives:

...be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ

Considering Paul’s statements on baptism (Acts 19:5, Rm 6:3, Gal 3:27) likewise yields the same result.

Note also that Paul's habit was invariably to give Jesus his full name, "*the Lord Jesus Christ*," in the introduction to every epistle that he wrote (Romans 1:3; 1:7; 1 Corinthians 1:3; 2 Corinthians 1:2; Galatians 1:3; Ephesians 1:2; Philippians 1:2; Colossians 1:2; 1 Thessalonians 1:1; 2 Thessalonians 1:1-2; 1 Timothy 1:1-2; 2 Timothy 1:2; Titus 1:4; Philemon 3). Having clearly established whom he was referring to, he could then use variations of this throughout his letters without any ambiguity.

It is deducible that under the New Covenant, the Messiah's full name which is above all names is called upon the penitent at baptism so as to put such into Christ and bring the new disciple under His dominion. The reason **some evade analyzing 1 Corinthians 1:12-15 is simply because** the passage identifies that a name was actually mentioned by a baptizer when each of those Corinthians Christians was immersed!

VI. Why Not Produce Your English Professor's References?

It is not surprising that some doubt my claim that **a professor of English concurred with the observed Corollary to GSR**. I expect such persons to consult other linguist professors and online resources rather than aver that the claim is false. Though I could provide culled screenshots of my conversation of 13/01/2022 with a Fellow of a prestigious academy on the matter, I choose not to for now.

In stating: 'If the statement had read this way; "...in the name of John and of Peter and of James," would Asaolu and his unknown English Professor argue that Peter, James and John bear one single name?' ...it becomes obvious that such person is yet to understand that GSR and its Corollary applies to common nouns, **excluding proper names**. One may search but will not find the hypothetical construct in the NT.

VII. Other Arguments...

In John 3:3-5, the U [*born*] in itself was not really modified in the new birth, rather its description is varied [from 'born of water/of the Spirit' to 'born of the divine will/of the word of the word of God.']. Since "variation refers to a different description of same U in various Bible passages," it means we need to find alternate renditions/descriptions, for a term depicting/alongside 'name' while reporting the baptism of a gospel believer under the New Covenant. The supposition that 'Someone else could come and say the single name in Matthew 28:19 is "Melchizedek"' is ridiculous because no NT passage states that anyone was "baptized *in the name of* Melchizedek."

To project how I would write my name in any official document, is akin to recognizing how one's dad would state his name in any official document and invariably concede how even God would state His name officially; a combination of relevant title in the dispensation with a personal and family name!

It is unfortunate any "gospel preacher" could deny the implied truth of Zech 14:9, Acts 4:10-12, Phil 2:9-10 & Tit 2:13 that *the Lord Jesus Christ* is the most exalted and relevant name of God in this era, based on a rejection of variants such as 'LORD, Jesus Christ of Nazareth, Jesus & Jesus Christ.'

It was stated that Asaolu: "comes up with a new interpretation of the verse [Col 3:17] different to the simple and general interpretation of it."

Is that an admission that Asaolu's explanation is not a regurgitation of familiar arguments? Why not simply refute his 'new interpretation' of that literal verse alongside the corresponding parallel passages (Eph 5:20 & 1 Thess 5:18)? Is it impossible for the general or popular interpretation to be flawed?

My position is that Acts 2:38 is the fulfillment of Mt 28:19 not that the latter is a spurious verse. This is akin to 1 Tim 3:15 which indicate that 'the church of God' is the actualization of 'the house of God' foretold in Isa 2:1-3. Should anyone now contest the fact that the church of Christ is the LORD's house?

It is posited that: '1 Corinthians 15:27 tells us clearly that the authority of Christ is the same with that of the Father.'

Based on the referenced verse alone, that claim is neither expressly stated nor a **necessary** inference! Since the one who gave Christ all authority is EXCLUDED, it follows that such personality is higher hierarchically (1 Cor 11:3) OR inherently has greater authority (John 10:29; 14:28). After all, such could later recall the authority given unto the Son, so as to end the universal rule of the man Jesus and execute judgment upon creation as the great God.

The authority of Christ would be the same with that of the Father WHEN it is the same deity that manifests as the Son and as the Father; [simultaneously operating in various offices just as Muhammadu Buhari presently functions as both the Nigerian President and the Minister of Petroleum.]

Hence, Christ could deliver dominion unto Himself in another capacity to terminate the Son's rule and emerge in the glory of the Father as He really is before the incarnation.

We need to understand what a representative, envoy or ambassador is. One **cannot** truly function in that capacity without first expressly announcing or naming who the principal being represented is!

As stated in Part 1 Page 4, "Authority may only be recognized if the name behind it is declared."

The following remark of mine has received interesting reactions: "*It is what the New Testament teaches that is important not necessarily what some modern Churches of Christ teach and practice now.*"

Firstly, it was wrongly referred to as "distort my statement just as he has been doing with the Bible passages." Secondly, it was tagged a "response" in which I supposedly was "implying" that another was referring to modern churches of Christ.

There is no need for baseless charges just because I expressed my candid opinion on a presented matter. I have shown that the church of the NT as seen in the book of Acts teach and practice baptism 'in the name of Jesus Christ.' There is no scriptural evidence that the body of Christ including the inspired apostles recited the phrase in Mt 28:19 as a baptismal formula, as some do today. An internet search by any interested person would list congregations in different centuries and places that conduct baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Since my conversion over three decades ago, whenever privileged to conduct a baptism, I immerse the penitent into Christ not into a Trinity.

Also, I expect any reader to know the difference between an acceptable paraphrase (such as *trio* for the Father, the Son & the Holy Spirit) in 'single quotes' and an exact quotation in "double quotes."

Likewise, "even if" differs from "assuming without conceding"; the latter explicitly rejects a possibility.

[Is it necessary to make self-vaunting claims?] A calm and studious person can discern whose sophistry and false doctrine is being continually exposed! Due to unwarranted attacks on my person and near repetition, I stopped issuing formal Rejoinders to some particular person's work. It does NOT mean that I could not resume writing on the subject. Whenever the need arises [e.g. if fresh claims are advanced or someone makes new enquires that should be clarified], and I have an opportunity, I may release another follow-up in this article series. It does not warrant that any interested party willing to engage in the discourse or to follow it be tagged as "desperate." It takes both maturity and humility to participate in a personal or group debate, successfully. Besides, whenever necessary, apologies should be offered by any party in sincerity not with prevarication and innuendo.

It is not a trivial matter that any 'believer' would deny that Jesus Christ is the one Lord or Jehovah of the Old Testament; the Almighty God manifest in the flesh, and that penitents should be baptized into Christ by having His name called over such in faith after confessing Him.

No wonder inspired Paul wrote: *Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.* (2 Tim 2:19)

Statement of purpose the scriptures require from a baptizee and from a baptizer –Part 3

Olumuyiwa *Asaolu* (asaolu@yahoo.com)

Lagos, Nigeria (March 22, 2022)

This sequel is to provide more information and to address points that are alleged to be unanswered.

Whose Sophistries Are Unmasked?

Some modern “gospel preachers” decline to utter the Lord’s name in baptism. Despite repeated invitation unto such to analyze certain germane passages (Zech 14:9, Heb 1:4, Acts 4:10-12; 10:48, Rm 6:3, 1 Cor 1:12-15, Mt 24:5), such have refrained. Rather than refute the obvious and implied facts from these texts, someone disregarded the points I enumerated but complained that I used a Table to state passages in one column and the import with remarks in other columns. That was a dodge and sophistry!

Globally, true worshippers ‘**call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord**’ as individuals and as a church (1 Cor 1:2). To be gathered together in His name (Mt 18:20, 1 Cor 5:4), is to assemble by His authority for His cause. The early Christians **uttered** the name of the Lord Jesus Christ when teaching/preaching (Acts 4:18-19; 5:40-42; 8:12; 9:27; 28:31), baptizing (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5), healing the sick or casting out devils (Acts 3:6; 16:16-18, James 5:14), praying (Jn 16:23, Acts 4:24-30, Heb 13:20), praising God (Eph 5:20, Col 3:17, Heb 13:15, 1 Pet 2:5, 9) and breaking bread (1 Cor 10:16; 11:23-26).

Yet today, someone is proud to proclaim: "**What I have been teaching is that it is wrong to insist on a particular formula or set of words to say while baptizing.**"

[Note: By formula, he means the name of “The Lord Jesus Christ.”

What or ‘who’ actually instigates a ‘preacher’ to oppose uttering the saving name - Jesus Christ, when a penitent is intended to be delivered from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God’s dear Son? He contends over variants of the name recorded for baptism in the Book of Acts. In Part 2, I established that this particular argument is inconsistent and diversionary. It parallels that of skeptics on variations in the gospel accounts of the inscription upon the tree on which Christ was crucified. Unqualified variant in a Bible-book refers to the same person –The Lord Jesus Christ, previously introduced by the writer.]

It is disingenuous for him to state that ‘**Acts 4:10 mentions “Jesus Christ of Nazareth” not “The Lord Jesus Christ”**’ in an attempt to insinuate that both renditions refer unto different persons or names.

When he variously addressed me as “O. S. Asaolu, Brother Olumuyiwa Asaolu, Bro Asaolu, Asaolu, brother,” he knew in his heart that he refers to one person not many, regardless of whatever he avers with his keyboard about variations of a name used for baptism in the NT! He even wrote:

“**That I have variously addressed him by different terms does not mean that those terms are his names.**”

He invariably posits that “Jesus, Christ, The Lord, Christ Jesus, The Lord Jesus, Jesus Christ of Nazareth, and The Lord Jesus Christ are NOT the name of the Saviour! Perhaps he doesn’t know what a title or name or alias is else he would know that ‘*it matter what i address you as.*’ “Brother” is a relevant description in our dialogue. (He is quite aware that I have titles such as Engr., Dr., Chairman, etc. which are appropriate in different fora.) He used ‘brother’ or ‘Asaolu’ for brevity AFTER initially stating my broad name in his introduction so readers would know it is I, that he alludes to, and not another. Paul was referred to as ‘brother’ by a fellow apostle (2 Peter 3:15) and by the elders of the church at Jerusalem (Acts 21:18-20). Even Paul addressed each of his fellow workers as ‘brother’ (1 Cor 16:12, 2 Cor 1:1; 2:13, Eph 6:21, Phil 2:25, Col 4:9, Philem 1:7) in conformity with Christ’s teaching (Mt 23:8)

I discuss invoking the Lord’s name in faith as commanded in his word, NOT in vain or deceit, as evident with those aspiring Jewish exorcists at Ephesus (Acts 19:10-17). Should anyone call upon God’s name in disrespect or presumptuous speak “in the name of the Lord,” God will hold such accountable for the unauthorized speech/conduct. Firstly, it is noteworthy that even the seven sons of Sceva realized the

necessity of uttering ‘the name of the Lord Jesus’ to attempt to evince His power. The evil spirit acknowledged Jesus as well as Paul but did not submit to the charge of the sons of Sceva. Why? Those men were vagabond Jews, not saints. They lacked divine authorization and anointing of the Spirit for the work of an apostle or a Christian on whom the apostles had laid hands to perform wonders. Secondly, the evil spirit in the possessed man did not bother about which variant of the name was pronounced. Since the men said: “*by Jesus whom Paul preacheth*”, that evil spirit knew it is our unique Saviour who may be addressed as the Christ, Jesus of Nazareth, Christ Jesus, the Lord Jesus or the Lord Jesus Christ!

He asserts that: ‘...people are to be baptized today because God asked them to! What we are To DO is to BAPTIZE but what we are To SAY while baptizing is not stated.’

[Note: Jesus is the God who asked people to be baptized today (Mt 28:18-20, Mk 16:15-16, 1 Tim 3:16). **If we cannot INFER what to say (from Christ’s command and how the apostles later obeyed it) then we can’t utter a word when baptizing.** But we CAN infer what to say! Many merely recite “*in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit*” while few maintain that nothing need be said, and posit that an Atheist or Satanist could baptize a penitent. We are to tell sinners to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and invoke His name in baptism (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 15:14, 17)]

That writer also asserts: “**DOING SOMETHING “in the name of” someone is not the same thing as SAYING SOMETHING or repeating a formula of words.**”

[He claims that doing something in someone’s name merely refers to being authorized and does not require that an actual name be uttered before the ones unto whom the messenger is sent to do that thing. His views are wrong since every envoy first declares his source or principal, before faithfully executing other duties as a representative in a remote location.]

Let us examine two Old Testament passages that have been repeatedly misused by the said writer.

Exodus 5:22-23 And Moses returned unto the LORD, and said, Lord, wherefore hast thou so evil entreated this people? why is it that thou hast sent me? For since I came to Pharaoh to speak in thy name, he hath done evil to this people; neither hast thou delivered thy people at all.

It is posited that Moses spoke by God’s authority before Pharaoh without invoking God’s name or repeating God’s words. However, that is NOT true! Inspiration clearly states in Exodus 5:1-3

And afterward Moses and Aaron went in, and told Pharaoh, Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, Let my people go, that they may hold a feast unto me in the wilderness. And Pharaoh said, Who is the LORD, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not the LORD, neither will I let Israel go. And they said, The God of the Hebrews hath met with us: let us go, we pray thee, three days’ journey into the desert, and sacrifice unto the LORD our God; lest he fall upon us with pestilence, or with the sword.

Evidently, Moses mentioned God’s name; “the LORD” (Exodus 3:15; 15:3; 33:19 & 34:5-6) and proclaimed Him as ‘the God of Israel, the God of the Hebrews, and the LORD our God.’ An actual name was uttered before the Egyptian ruler who queried same but chose to remain ignorant of that name. Besides, the words that Moses uttered unto Pharaoh were **God-given** (Exodus 4:10-12, 22-23)

1 Samuel 25:5-9 David sent ten young men; and David said to the young men, “Go up to Carmel, go to Nabal, and greet him in my name. And thus you shall say to him who lives in prosperity: ‘Peace be to you, peace to your house, and peace to all that you have! Now I have heard that you have shearers. Your shepherds were with us, and we did not hurt them, nor was there anything missing from them all the while they were in Carmel. Ask your young men, and they will tell you. Therefore let my young men find favor in your eyes, for we come on a feast day. Please give whatever comes to your hand to your servants and to your son David.’” So when David’s young men came, they spoke to Nabal according to all these words in the name of David, and waited.

It is insinuated that David's emissaries paraphrased their master's request before Nabal without first identifying their master. However, a careful reading reveals that the young men accurately conveyed the message of David unto Nabal. Diligent scholars will neither overlook the mentioning of 'David' in verse 8 and the import of verse 9 nor fail to read down to verse 10.

*And Nabal answered David's servants, and said, **Who is David? and who is the son of Jesse?** there be many servants now a days that break away every man from his master.*

It is evident that the emissaries while 'greeting Nabal in David's name,' impliedly stated that they brought felicitations from 'David, the son of Jesse' NOT from an anonymous person or any other David dwelling in the land. The messengers invoked or uttered the name of their boss so that Nabal would know assuredly under whose authority they were acting. Yet, Nabal refused to acknowledge their master who had even been protective of his (Nabal's) flock and shepherds. Ultimately, the LORD avenged for David just as He avenged Himself on Pharaoh.

Resolve of Alleged Pending Questions

1. Is there one single name in Genesis 48:16 or MORE THAN A SINGLE NAME?

The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth.

ANSWER: It was earlier shown that in this verse, Jacob prayed unto the LORD for Joseph's sons - Ephraim and Manasseh: **let my name** [Israel, Father of multitude/Heir] **be named on them, and the name** [Hebrew, Father of multitude/Heir] **of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude** [to inherit the promised land] **in the midst of the earth.**

The phrase 'named' has dual application unto both the distinct names (Israel & Hebrew) as well as unto the shared name (Father of multitude/Heir) for Jacob and his fathers. [Every descendant of Abraham (via the promise) bears the name 'Hebrew'.] I expected everyone to grasp this fact from the beginning when I stated: **By using "name" twice in his expression, the possibility exists that Jacob might be referring to just one or more than a single designation (if his name is not same as that of his ancestors).**

2. Did God reveal A SINGLE NAME for baptism or FOUR VARIATIONS of name?

ANSWER: God revealed one Saviour whose prime name for our water baptism is "the Lord Jesus Christ" irrespective of the variants recorded in conversion cases in the NT.

Sincere believers know that variations in narration such as 'Jesus Christ, the Lord, Christ, the Lord Jesus, Jesus of Nazareth,' etc. all refer to the unique name of the same already identified person.

3. Why is "the Lord" (Acts 10:48) a name and "the heir" (Hebrews 11:9) a name but "the Father" (Matthew 28:19) is not a name?

ANSWER: 'The Lord' is part of the fullname of the Savior, and there is one Lord.

I explained that "the heir" is **not** a name but "heir" is used as a name (Heb 11:9, Rm 8:17, Gal 3:29). 'The heir' refers to 'one single heir' whereas 'the heirs' refers to 'heirs collectively.' With the trio dwelling together, each of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob could not be independently addressed with **the** definite article, being recipients of the same promise. Neither can any of us today be called 'the [sole] heir' or 'the Christian,' we are heirs as children of Abraham.

"The Father" is a descriptive name just as "the Son" and "the Holy Spirit." **The Everlasting Father is Counselor, Wonderful, etc. but He used the proper name Jesus Christ when he lived on earth.** Even your dad has a proper name which he would state in a formal document, he won't write 'daddy or father.'

4. Why would faithful members of the church of Christ not insist on a set of words to be said while baptizing but you insist on a set of words to be said?

ANSWER: Faithful members of the church of Christ do not insist on a unique phraseology to accompany the Lord's name in the confession by a baptizee or the calling upon His name by a baptizer. We merely affirm in line with scripture that the Saviour's prime name must be uttered.

Hence, we don't make it an issue when a penitent says any of the following {P}:

- i. I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God
- ii. It is acknowledged that Jesus is the Christ of God
- iii. I confess that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of the living God
- iv. From the heart, I believe and make the good profession that Jesus is both Lord and Christ

Neither do we protest should a baptizer say any of the following {B}:

- i. You are immersed in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ
- ii. Be dipped by the authority of Christ Jesus our Lord
- iii. I baptize you in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, the Lord of all
- iv. You are now baptized into Jesus Christ our Lord

None of the above declarations by a baptizee or a baptizer is legislated to be said while baptizing. Nevertheless, it is glaring that each set of statements {P} & {B} respectively allude to the same core message about 'the Lord Jesus Christ' as Saviour. Such pronouncement or words to same effect are required to make an immersion a gospel baptism; otherwise two people are merely playing in water!

5. Is "the Lord Jesus Christ" a set of words or not?

ANSWER: It is a set of words divinely given for human salvation on earth. It is very interesting that **you have something against these "set of words" [name]** and would forbid its invocation at baptism!

6. Do you have a baptismal formula or not?

ANSWER: Not in the sense that a particular complete sentence must always be pronounced but YES in the sense that the Saviour's name must be uttered. **Do you not have a baptismal formula, or you merely always take people to water and dip them without ever uttering some 'set of words'?**

7. Is the statement; "the Lord Jesus Christ" a formula or not?

ANSWER: It is a declaration and expresses a relationship. Any name is a designation [of identity] or formula; such maps a person unto a verbal or written tag regardless of whether it is stated in full or shortened. **Do you use a baptismal formula or not? If 'Yes', which phrase? If 'No', why not?**

8. Does a formula have to contain mathematical symbols for it to be a formula?

ANSWER: Not necessarily. Various equations for roots in the quadratic formula depicted a solution through variant expressions. Addressing me with my title or surname or fullname is also formula usage.

9. Is Genesis 48:16 And Matthew 28:19 Not Really Parallel? If yes, why did you apply same rule and arrive at same conclusion in both texts?

ANSWER: It was demonstrated that the texts are not parallel though certain similarities exist. Thus, Gen 48:16 admits dual solutions ['name' occurs twice] unlike Mt 28:19 which admit a unique fullname.

10. As God's children today, is "heir" a variation of our single name? If not, why?

ANSWER: It was proven that “Heir” is one of our names BUT is not our prime name. Terms such as ‘Heir, Saint, Brother,’ etc. are not peculiar to us or restricted to the Bible alone. It was established from scripture that our unique name in this dispensation is ‘**Christian**,’ the name derived from Christ; an inspired term revealed after the righteousness of God was manifested unto both Jews and Gentiles.

11. Why would “in the name of Jesus Christ” in Acts 2:38 means “say the name of Jesus Christ” and “in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” in Matthew 28:19 would not mean “say the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit”?

ANSWER: **Simply because Jesus Christ is a personal name unlike a role descriptor or common noun. Acts 2:38 states the actual shared name which was indicated in Mt 28:19.**

Previously, I used “the house of the Lord” or “the house of God” as illustration, let me amplify that. Isaiah (2:1-3) foretold that in the last days, ‘God’s house’ would be established via a new Law from Jerusalem. The scriptures state that Jesus Christ preached that the kingdom of God was near (Mark 1:14-15; 9:1) and promised to build His church (Mt 16:16-20). It also teaches that Christ who is truly God (Rm 9:5) purchased the church with His own blood (Acts 2:22-47; 20:28), the house of God is the church of the living God (1 Tim 3:15) and, Christ operates as a son over His own house (Heb 3:6). Consider someone that now insists that God’s people **must** be addressed as ‘*the house of God*’ and **not** as ‘*the church of Christ*’ or *Christians*. He points backward to Isaiah’s prophecy but disregards its fulfillment in the book of Acts, and ignores cogent passages in the epistles (Rm 16:16, 1 Cor 1:2, Acts 11:26, 1 Pet 4:14-16). Will it be right for such individual to vehemently reject mentioning Christ’s name while describing God’s children or congregation in this gospel era? No! That individual’s mind is veiled (2 Cor 3:14) due to a fixation upon the shadow of the Old Law which has been done away in Christ at the enactment of the New Covenant. Such person is being imitated by whosoever insists on reciting the baptismal phrase in Mt 28:19 rather than adopting its inspired fulfillment in Acts 2:38.

A child bears the father’s name. When a lady marries she would henceforth be addressed “in the name of the husband” and not “of her father.” But, in calling my wife, nobody should say “**in the name of the husband.**” Rather people who know/perceive she is married ought to enquire what her husband’s actual name is, and thereafter address her “**in the name of Asaolu.**” Hence, if my wife and I should give birth to a baby [or adopt a son], according to the custom that a man’s name be called upon his new child which, gave rise to the government recognized policy that a child be registered or named after the father, the boy’s birth certificate or name declaration document will be issued by any Registry official, “**in the name of Asaolu**” and **not literally bear** “**in the name of the father.**” Thus, people will mention or write the name – Asaolu, when referring to either myself or my wife or my son **because each family member wears a common name**. The point is, we ought to discern when applying a directive and, supply the value for a placeholder. To be baptized as per Matthew 28:19 is not to “say in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.” Rather, it is to “say in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.”

Historical Testimony on Baptismal Formula

Historical sources attest that the early church did not use a threefold baptismal formula but invoked the name of Jesus Christ in baptism well into the second and third centuries.

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics (1951). II, 384, 389: "The formula used was "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ" or some synonymous phrase; there is no evidence for the use of the trine name... The earliest form, represented in the Acts, was simple immersion... in water, the use of the name of the Lord, and the laying on of hands. To these were added, at various times and places which cannot be safely identified, (a) the trine name (Justin)..."

Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (1962), I 351: "The evidence... suggests that baptism in early Christianity was administered, not in the threefold name, but 'in the name of Jesus Christ' or 'in the name of the Lord Jesus.'"

Otto Heick, A History of Christian Thought (1965), I, 53: "At first baptism was administered in the name of Jesus, but gradually in the name of the Triune God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."

Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible (1898). I, 241: "[One explanation is that] the original form of words was 'into the name of Jesus Christ' or 'the Lord Jesus,' Baptism into the name of the Trinity was a later development."

Williston Walker, A History of the Christian Church (1947), page 58: "The Trinitarian baptismal formula", was displacing the older baptism in the name of Christ."

The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge (1957), I, 435: "The New Testament knows only baptism in the name of Jesus... which still occurs even in the second and third centuries."

Canney's Encyclopedia of Religions (1970), page 53: "Persons were baptized at first 'in the name of Jesus Christ' ... or 'in the name of the Lord Jesus'... Afterwards, with the development of the doctrine of the Trinity, they were baptized 'in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.'"

Encyclopedia Biblica (1899), I, 473: "It is natural to conclude that baptism was administered in the earliest times 'in the name of Jesus Christ,' or in that 'of the Lord Jesus.' This view is confirmed by the fact that the earliest forms of the baptismal confession appear to have been single-not triple, as was the later creed."

Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed. (1920), II 365: "The Trinitarian formula and trine immersion were not uniformly used from the beginning... Baptism into the name of the Lord [was] the normal formula of the New Testament. In the 3rd century baptism in the name of Christ was still so widespread that Pope Stephen, in opposition to Cyprian of Carthage, declared it to be valid."

Difference between “Baptized Unto” and “Baptized Into”

In Part 1, it was stated that: *John's baptism was unto repentance not into a person and the subjects were 'confessing their sins' (Mt 3:6-11) while the New Covenant baptism is into the Christ whom we confess.* The Israelites were “*baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea*” (1 Cor 10:2). Since Moses led them through the vast escorting cloud and the sea during their sojourn from Egypt, and they promised to obey all what he instructed them from the Lord, they were described as being baptized **unto** Moses. John the Baptist was “*preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.*” (Lk 3:3) When the people of Israel came unto him in repentance, he immersed them in water hence, they were baptized unto John. On such occasion, John said: “*I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance...*” (Mt 3:11a). Those who heeded and followed him were described in scripture as “*the disciples of John.*” Such followers were ready to be committed **unto** his pioneering teachings.

The twelve men whom Paul met in Ephesus were unaware that the Christ had poured out the Holy Spirit and established His church. They were called disciples because they were expectant of the kingdom and had been subject ‘*unto John's baptism.*’ Paul had to baptize them in the name of the Lord Jesus for them to be put **into** Christ [become Christians] and then receive an impartation of spiritual gifts (Acts 19:1-5). To become a follower of Jesus Christ, one must believe in His name and acknowledge that He is the Son of God (Jn 3:16-18, Acts 8:35-38). While on earth, Jesus taught people about the gospel of the kingdom but did NOT personally immerse anyone, rather His disciples **baptized on His behalf** -Jn 4:1-2. This practice continued after His resurrection based on His commandment. When a disciple of Christ is about

to immerse a penitent, such baptizer ought to pronounce that he is immersing by the authority of Christ since he is baptizing as a representative of the Lord Jesus. Moreover, the baptizer is not promoting his own teaching but the teaching of Christ. Thus, it becomes necessary for such baptizer to clearly state that the subject is “*baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.*” The declaration would make the baptizee a new disciple of Christ rather than a follower of the baptizer. This significance is evident in Paul’s message to the divisive Corinthians brethren. Thus, based on the directive of Christ, one is baptized in order to get associated benefits such as remission of sins, salvation, justification, sanctification, etc. promised by the Lord. **It is required to use the Saviour’s name in baptism so as to be “baptized into Christ” or put on Christ, and thereby become a child of God (Rm 6:3, Gal 3:27).** We are “*baptized in[to] the name of Jesus Christ*” because of what the name means and who He is (Mt 1:21, Lk 2:11).

Scriptural baptism is preceded by a mutual calling upon ‘the Lord Jesus Christ’ by both the baptizee and the baptizer. Since the name of Christ is invoked on a new disciple at baptism, such thereby partakes of the new birth into the house of the Lord, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named (Eph 3:15). Baptism is part of our initiation into the New Covenant. It signifies our spiritual circumcision; divine cutting off or remission of our sins. It also symbolizes dying with Christ and being raised with Him (Col 2:11-13). Under the Old Covenant, a male child officially received his name at his physical circumcision (Gen 17:12, Lk 1:59-63; 2:21). The event was sacrosanct even if it fell on a Sabbath day (Jn 7:21-23). Water baptism is the spiritual circumcision occasion when our new name [**Christian**] is bestowed. Neither Moses nor John the Baptist was the Messiah; each could only point towards Christ. Their followers looked ‘unto them’ but could not really be ‘in[to] them’ or be secured in them as God’s finality on salvation. However, the disciples of Christ acknowledge Him as God’s final spokesman and know that our lives are hid **in Christ** with God (Heb 1:1-3, Col 3:3). He redeems across all eras.

Granville Sharp’s Rule (GSR) on 2 Timothy 1:2 and Jude 1:4

In Part 2, the robust Granville Sharp’s Rule was stated as clarified by Daniel B. Wallace.

Applying GSR for the translation to the above passages yields:

2 Timothy 1:2 *to Timothy, beloved child: Grace, kindness, peace, from God the Father and our Lord, Christ Jesus*

Jude 1:4 *for there came in certain men stealthily, having been written beforehand to this judgment long ago, impious, perverting the grace of our God to licentiousness, and denying our only Sovereign and Lord - Jesus Christ.*

Paul refers to benediction from the Lord our God, not from two separate divinities. Contextually, Jude teaches that the Lord God who saved the Israelites from Egypt is the one who the wanton now deny.

More on the Corollary to GSR

If a sentence is in the form “U of A and of B and of C...” where A, B & C are singular nouns then the principal attribute in U applies simultaneously to A, B and C. Stated formally with **preconditions** as:

- i. In English constructions, a single article modifies something listed for two (or more) substantives connected by “and of”,
- ii. The substantives are (1) singular (both grammatically and semantically), (2) and common nouns (not proper names or ordinals),
- iii. ‘The something’ or its common property applies concurrently; such is distributed across the connected substantives.

When these restrictions are considered, there are no exceptions to be noted. The Corollary applies to passages having the stated construct e.g. Acts 3:13, James 1:1, Matthew 28:19, etc.

Acts 3:13 *The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go.*

The verse attests to the truth that a common God was known unto and worshipped by Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Hence, Peter immediately referred unto that God as ‘*the God of our fathers.*’ It is not the case that each of the patriarchs served a distinct god. Who would dare deny this truth just to defend a dogma?

James 1:1 *James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting.*

James, introduced as a servant of God, was concurrently a servant of Christ. It is one person that herein send greeting unto the foreign-based believers. Nobody can successfully argue that “servant” refers to two distinct persons. Besides, was James serving two distinct Masters? No! If GSR was applied in the translation of the verse, it would be obvious that James served one named entity as shown below.

James, a servant of God and Lord - Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes in the dispersion, greetings.

385 [e]	2316 [e]	2532 [e]	2962 [e]	2424 [e]	5547 [e]	1401 [e]	3588 [e]	1427 [e]	5443 [e]	3588 [e]	1722 [e]	3588 [e]	1290 [e]	5463 [e]
Iakōbos	Theou	kai	Kyriou	Iēsou	Christou	doulos	Tais	dōdeka	phylais	tais	en	tē	Diaspora	Chairein
Ἰάκωβος	, Θεοῦ	καὶ	Κυρίου	Ἰησοῦ	Χριστοῦ	δοῦλος	, ταῖς	δώδεκα	φυλαῖς	ταῖς	ἐν	τῇ	Διασπορᾷ	: Χαίρειν
James	God	and	Lord	Jesus	Christ	a servant	To the	twelve	tribes	-	in	the	Dispersion	Greetings

Matthew 28:19 *Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*

One wrote: **What I have been affirming is that the phrase “in the name of” means “in the authority of.”** However, Christ used ἐξουσία (exousia) {authority} in [verse 18](#), ὄνομα (onoma) {name} in [verse 19](#). **The plain reading is admissible.** There is no need for anyone to substitute ‘name’ with ‘authority’ in verse 19 → *‘baptizing them in the authority of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.’* Yet the Corollary would **constrain** such to aver that each of the trio has the same authority! If so, why should anyone use the formula: “I baptize you in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit?” Why not simply SAY ANY of the following:

- “Be baptized in the authority of the Father”
- “Be baptized in the authority of the Son”
- “Be baptized in the authority of the Holy Spirit”

I am not aware anyone makes such pronouncement when baptizing. Perhaps such people think that:

- The ‘separated authority’ is somehow lesser than the ‘collective authority’ of the Godhead
- The command to baptize was given by the Son who died for us, not by ‘the Father or the Spirit’
- Passersby who overhear may not know which ‘father or son’ is intended, if the trio isn’t referenced

Interestingly, he also asserts: “baptizing in the name of the Lord” or “baptizing in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” does not mean say the name; it simply means to act by the authority; and the names referred to could be Lord or Father, Son, Holy Spirit.

He maintains that we are NOT told WHAT to say in baptism. He has not given an example of what could be said. Hence, he probably won’t even say: “I baptize you in the authority of the Lord.”

How does the baptizee and onlookers know in WHOSE authority such baptizer is acting when he declines to “say the name”?

How could ‘the names referred to be Lord or Father, Son, Holy Spirit’ in **muted** baptism?

It is honest, simple and safe to accept that Mt 28:19 means exactly what it plainly says!

The Corollary to GSR is applicable to the passage and indicates that a common name exists for the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

However, some reject that conclusion although they consider the Godhead to be a divine family.

In the natural family, **the Surname is the name of the husband, and of the wife, and of the child[ren].** Just as Asaolu is the common name in my own home. Some may protest: “you are not your wife or your

son, your First names are different, how can three personalities have one fullname?” They need to accept the fact that generally, one individual operates as multiple personalities in most national governments.

In Nigeria, **General Muhammadu Buhari is the name of the Head of State, and of the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, and of the Chief Executive Officer of the Federation.** For now, it is assuredly **the name of our President and of the Minister of Petroleum Resources.** One person occupies these roles!

The Corollary is valid despite protestations. I was asked about the “name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac” referenced by Jacob (Gen 48:16). It was shown to be ‘**Father of multitude - Heir.**’ When asked, what is “the name of their gods” (Joshua 23:7), I equally provided from scripture: **Baal.**

If every saint under the New Covenant [including John, Peter, and James] bear one common name – **Christian**, why is it inconceivable for someone to accept that the Godhead has a name?

Since penitents who were to ‘be baptized in the name of the Godhead’ (Matthew 28:19) **were told** to ‘be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ’ on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:38), it implies that the name of the Godhead is the name of Jesus Christ! This is evidently true because:

1. The name of the Lord Jesus was thereafter used in baptism (Acts 8:16, 1 Cor 1:12-15, Rm 6:3).
2. After His resurrection, the Lord opened the understanding of the disciples in Lk 24:44-47 about Mt 28:19 that, to ‘*make disciples of all nations baptizing them in the name of the Godhead*’ is to ‘*preach repentance and remission of sins in his name among all nations.*’
3. The Lord Jesus Christ is **expressly identified** as the Father (Isaiah 9:6), the Son (Mark 1:1) and the Holy Spirit (2 Corinthians 3:17).
4. Since Titus 2:13 states that the great God our Saviour is Jesus Christ, it means that this is the name of the Godhead because numerically, there is one God (Mark 12:29, 1 Corinthians 8:4-6).

Refutation of Misapplication of the Corollary

Why did Sharp, Wallace, etc. introduce preconditions to the GSR? It was to ensure it is accurate as well as be accurately applied. Failure to grasp this will make some see apparitions of fault and inconsistency. Before proposing the Corollary, the initial illustrations I made about a government official’s statement involved singular nouns – Head of State, the President, Commander-in-Chief, Governor and Petroleum Minister. Thereafter, I affirmed: *If a sentence is in the form “... the A and B and C...” where A, B & C are singular nouns then the principal attribute in U applies simultaneously to A, B and C.*

Who could fail to see or understand the singularity clause therein?

Supposed inconsistency of the Corollary, due to a critic’s misapprehension is refuted below.

Mark 2:18 *And the disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to fast: and they come and say unto him, Why do the disciples of John and of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not?*

In the expression, U ≡ ‘the disciples’, A ≡ ‘John’, B ≡ ‘the Pharisees’

‘The Pharisees’ is plural. Failure to admit this would lead to misapplication of both the Corollary and even GSR in numerous NT passages as pointed out in the Part 2 article.

Thus, ‘*it should not be expected that the disciples of John would necessarily be “the same (single) set” of disciples of the Pharisees.*’ This is not “beside the point” but is actually the main point! Reasons are:

- i. It was the disciples that fast not the relations, neighbours, etc. In this case, ‘discipleship’ is the principal attribute not the respective identity of persons who constitute those disciples.
[Recall it was the commitment of the disciples of Jesus that was being queried, as per fasting, not who exactly were His followers]
- ii. In this passage, ‘the disciples’ is plural and listed relative to ‘John’ (singular) and ‘the Pharisees’ (**plural**). John had disciples (set X) and the Pharisees also had disciples (set Y).
Such sets may or may not be intrinsically linked to each other.
[Many of the Pharisees went to John’s baptism. They were rebuked by him (Mt 3:4-7). The

Pharisees rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him (Lk 7:30). It is uncertain whether John as a prophet had secret disciples among the Pharisees since they largely believed in angel, spirit, and resurrection unlike the Sadducees which did not believe in such. Recall that the Pharisees equally rejected Christ who nevertheless, had secret disciples amid them (Mt 12:14, Lk 13:31, Jn 3:1-2; 7:31-52; 19:38-39)]

iii. U necessarily refers to **the combination** of John's disciples AND the Pharisees' disciples; the entire discipleship referenced in the statement.

[I expected readers to discern this ab initio since I was trying to be concise with pagination so that many might be encouraged to read.]

Consider a case where both substantives are plural

Matthew 16:6,12 *Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees... Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.*

It was the combination of the human traditions, erroneous and hypocritical teachings of the two sects that Christ warned His followers against. *Though each sect had its own doctrine, the common attribute was corruptive influence described as leaven.*

Indeed, the Corollary is all-encompassing, once the principal attribute can be properly identified.

Testimony of English Grammar parallels the Corollary

In English language, a phrase of the form "U of A and of B" means 'U of A and U of B' or 'U of A being U of B' [1], such construct is for emphasis to remove any form of ambiguity [2]. The principal attribute in a merger is recognized [3] and states thus: 'In every merge of two items A and B, some features of A and of B must or may project to the mother; while other features of A and of B might not project. We assume the 'inclusiveness' condition, and we also take it that merge is only licensed if at least one feature is discharged.'

1. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language. London: Longman. Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985.*
2. <https://ell.stackexchange.com/questions/278120/what-do-and-of-meaning-in-the-following-sentence>
3. https://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/publications/WPL/05papers/cormack_smith.pdf

Conclusion

Grammatically and theologically, it was shown that the name of the Father is also the name of the Son and is the name of the Holy Spirit. "The Lord Jesus Christ" is the shared name referred to in Mt 28:19. Inspired preachers used that name when baptizing converts in the first century church. It is hypocritical for anyone to profess that 'necessary inference and apostolic examples also establishes authority' if he has no regard for such when it comes to 'baptismal formula.' The scriptures expressly state that "**God is one**" so the doctrine which affirms His Oneness is true. Historical sources attest that usage of the literal name in baptism declined after many embraced the Trinitarian doctrine, a post-apostolic innovation. Rather than voiced Trinitarian immersion(s) or muted baptism, penitents should be baptized as gleaned from the book of Acts of the Apostles and other epistles - in the uttered name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Click to download [Part 1](#)

https://www.lainosint.com/download/faith/Statement_of_purpose_the_scriptures_require_from_a_baptizee_and_from_a_baptizer.pdf

Click to download [Part 2](#)

https://www.lainosint.com/download/faith/Statement_of_purpose_the_scriptures_require_from_a_baptizee_and_from_a_baptizer_2.pdf

Statement of purpose the scriptures require from a baptizee and from a baptizer –Part 3B

Olumuyiwa *Asaolu* (asaolu@yahoo.com)

Lagos, Nigeria (March 26, 2022)

This is to address some remarks including a new argument by an advocate of ‘three-distinct-gods’ in Trinity. When I issued Part 3 of this series, I foreknew that:

1. Only that section on Historical Testimony from my last three releases would receive ANY attention, and be misrepresented as appealing to "authorities" by those who charged that I did NOT cite "language authorities" in a written exchange. It turned out exactly so. I correctly anticipated that the person who has repeatedly cited A.T. Robertson, Miller, Moulton and Milligan, John Eadiem, etc. would suddenly state: "we have to go by the Scriptures, not by men."
2. Discerning people will appreciate that the issue is NOT whether "in the name of" could refer to "by the authority of" but whether it sometimes denote or require mentioning of an actual name. My article: Statement of purpose the scriptures require from a baptizee and from a baptizer (Part 1, 2 and 3) has addressed the matter with scripture and answered all the "Contradictions" I was allegedly "Silent About."

However, it is gratifying that many are embracing the truth. God is praised and glorified through Jesus our Lord! On the Leadership Platform WhatsApp Group, Brother Elijah Abire, a preacher noted:

“Let us not be ashamed in mentioning the name of Christ, as our Lord and Saviour in all that we do such as prayer, baptism, confession, name of Church, Christians, etc. To say David’s servants did not mention His name is a wrong hermeneutics unless David wrote his name in the letter like the one he sent to Joab through Uriah. Joab complied because he saw that the letter was signed with the name of David. If the letter was without a name, do you think Joab would have obey the instruction? How can a law be effective when it is not signed with the name of the President?”

Below are my few observations on the Trinitarian’s new submission.

How could an uninspired person who lived in 3rd Century quote Paul correctly about a baptism which the NT did NOT record? The previous quote from Origen by the video maker disproved his earlier claim that three distinct divine persons have same authority. That one may simply say he is baptizing: “in the authority of the Father” OR “in the authority of the Son” OR “in the authority of the Holy Spirit.”

Origen – *“the authority and dignity of the Holy Ghost is so great that saving baptism cannot be conferred except by the authority of all the Persons of the most exalted Trinity, that is, through the mention of the Father and Son and Holy Ghost.”* (Treatise De Principiis 801, 3, 2: CBXXII, 50, 5 ff). Without realizing the import of Origen’s statement, Justin’s statement on First Apology that ‘God has no proper name’ is now being quoted and venerated. I actually previously wrote that perhaps these folks think that, “**The ‘separated authority’ is somehow lesser than the ‘collective authority’ of the Godhead.**” Besides, if Justin Martyr acknowledged that God is “**the Father and Lord of all things**”, he neither knew that **one Lord** (Mk 12:29, Acts 10:36, 1 Cor 8:6) nor His proper name (Jesus Christ) as God our Saviour (Titus 2:13). If one believes Justin that an alleged belief of some people is “incurable madness,” then why should such now expend energy on ‘dissolving their Aspirin’ or attempt to ‘teach or pray for them’? What an inconsistency!

The fellow inverted 1 Cor 1:12-15. He wonders that: ‘if Paul mentioned a name then someone who was neither deaf nor imbecile in Corinth should not have become sectarian.’ They did become sectarian regardless of what Paul said. Inspiration gave 1 Cor 1:12-15 and Rm 6:3 which respectively imply AND affirm that believers are immersed into Jesus Christ. **The main issue is what Peter said in Acts 2:38.** He did not literally say: *Repent and be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.* Rather, he said: *Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ!* Peter understood and clarified Mt 28:19. This necessarily implies that ‘Jesus Christ’ is the name of the Godhead.

The fellow previously boasted that one cannot find a shared name in the Bible where singular name is used for multiple entities. He stated that my view of Mt 28:19 would be correct if such exists. However, he remains silent on the fact that I showed from scripture that **Baal** is “*the name of the gods*” of the heathen; that **Hebrew** [Father of Multitude / Heir] is the common name of Abraham and Isaac, that professors of English language have been cited on the plausible means of the construct ‘U of A and of B’, that all disciples wear the name **Christian**, etc. It is very convenient to be **silent over my answer** in his subsequent outputs and to rehash the refuted argument unto any undiscerning person in the audience!

Before Peter said “*Tabitha, arise*” in Acts 9:40, he PRAYED... unto whom or in whose name? In Acts 14:8-18, when Paul healed a cripple via a command to stand up, did he not afterwards preach about Jesus Christ to indicate it was not by his own power he did that miracle? Those who have read my recent article on “[in the name of](#)” can his needless misrepresentations. My submission was that whenever a name was required or mentioned by the apostles, it was ‘Jesus Christ’ NOT a descriptive phrase. It is the rejection of pronouncing the name of Jesus in baptism by a “gospel preacher” that I described as unacceptable. Just as I once described the action of those who promote Atheist and Satanist as baptizers as unacceptable.

In his characteristic way of jumping onto something else once an issue is addressed, his NEW argument is singularity in Isaiah 9:6. He ought to realize this confirms rather than disprove my affirmation. Will he contend that ‘*The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace*’ are DISTINCT persons? Before God incarnated in the flesh, **the actual personal name** which He would use on earth was unknown. Only descriptive terms were stated by the prophets. In Luke 1:35, angel Gabriel told Mary that he “*shall be called the Son of God.*” We all know that ‘Son of God’ is a descriptive name, NOT a proper name. It was later revealed unto Joseph, the foster-dad who would name the baby: “*thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins.*” -Matthew 1:21

Thus, the enumeration of descriptive phrases in Isaiah 9:6 simply lists some attributes of **His name**.
For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and JESUS CHRIST shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

Above recast is true since our Lord of the New Testament is the LORD of the Old Testament. **Jesus Christ means** “Jehovah is salvation –the anointed” or “Jehovah saves – Messiah.” In Isaiah, God stated:
“...no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour... Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else... My glory I will not give to another.”

1 Jn 3:1-5 teaches that **the Father was manifested** to take away our sins. Paul wrote that without controversy, God was manifest in human form. Rev 22:3-4 describes God and the Lamb **in the singular** while verse 6 & 16 identifies the Lord God of the holy prophets as Jesus. It is unfortunate some do not yet perceive that it is *the Holy One of Israel* who was came in the flesh and not another spirit. Reminds me of our Lord saying: “*If you had known me, you would have known my Father also.*” No wonder the disciple whom Jesus loved was the one who most understood and wrote extensively on His divinity.

TO DOWNLOAD ALL PARTS as a single file, Click
https://www.lainosint.com/download/faith/A_follow_up_on_Mt_28_19_Statement_of_purpose_the_scrip_tures_require_from_a_baptizee_and_from_a_baptizer_123files_compressed.pdf

To download an article about “*in the name of*”, Click
https://www.lainosint.com/download/faith/What_it_means_to_do_something_in_someones_name.pdf