

BAPTISM OF JESUS AND THE DOVE

Goran Šušljic



Many take the description of Jesus' baptism, when the holy Spirit descended in the form of a dove on His head, as a "proof" that the holy Spirit is a third Divine Being.

- "And Jesus, when he was baptised, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto Him, **and He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon Him**: And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased." {Matthew 3:16-17}

After a deeper analysis, we can see that the dove didn't speak, but the Father's voice was the one that was heard from heaven. Yet the holy Spirit is called the Spirit of God! The whole Bible speaks about the Father bearing the name of God. The holy Spirit proceeds from the Father!

If we were to accept a trinitarian interpretation of the Bible, the holy Spirit must also be a Father, for it was the holy Spirit who conceived Jesus in Mary's womb:

- "But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for **that which is conceived in her is of the holy Ghost**." {Matthew 1:20}

Actually, it was the Father who, personally through the holy Spirit, conceived Jesus in Mary's womb, otherwise, he could not be a Father. So, even this verse proves that the holy Spirit isn't a third being! Why didn't the Father's voice speak from heaven saying, "this is Our beloved Son"? When we carefully read the words below the truth will become still clearer:

- "And the angel answered and said unto her, **The holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee:** therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." {Luke 1:35}

Who is the Highest according to the Bible? In countless places, the Bible calls God the Father the Highest, certainly not the holy Spirit! Here we clearly read that the holy Spirit represents the Father's presence, Whose power overshadowed Mary. What does the word power mean in this instance? That the Father Himself brought Jesus into Mary's womb! And that the holy Spirit proceeds from Him. That's how, through the holy Spirit, the Father overshadowed the Son! If the holy Spirit is an autonomous being, then it would have been the holy Spirit itself who overshadowed Jesus! We get the same confirmation from the Spirit of Prophecy as well. Why in this instance does the holy Spirit proceed only from the Father and represent only His presence, during Jesus' earthly mission?

Because the holy Spirit, which Revelation describes fully as the seven Spirits, according to that book, proceeds from God on the throne, and then goes to the Lamb, i.e. Jesus, Who sends His holy Spirit to the whole universe. As we have seen in other chapters, Jesus, when He dwelled on Earth, gave up His Divine attributes of power, nature, and omnipresence as the holy Spirit. During that time the holy Spirit proceeded only from the Father. Although we cannot grasp this, it shouldn't be a reason for us to go off into the incorrect interpretation of the Trinity. This theme is further expanded in other chapters.

- "At the **Saviour's baptism**, Satan was among the witnesses. He saw the **Father's glory overshadowing His Son**. He heard the voice of Jehovah testifying to the Divinity of Jesus." {Ellen White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 116.2}
- "Never before had angels listened to such a prayer as Christ offered at His baptism, and they were solicitous to be the bearers of the message from the Father to His Son. But, no! **direct from the Father issues the light of His glory. The heavens were opened, and beams of glory rested upon the Son of God and assumed the form of a dove, in appearance like burnished gold. The dove-like form was emblematical of the meekness and gentleness of Christ.** While the people stood spell-bound with amazement, their eyes fastened upon Christ, from the opening heavens came these words: "This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased." The words of confirmation that Christ is the Son of God were given to inspire faith in those who witnessed the scene, and to sustain the Son of God in His arduous work. Notwithstanding the Son of God was clothed with humanity, yet Jehovah, with His own voice, assures Him of His sonship with the Eternal. In this manifestation to His Son, God accepts humanity as exalted through the excellence of His beloved Son." {Ellen White, *Review & Herald*, January 21, 1873, par. 5}
- "...After Christ was baptised, He bowed on the banks of Jordan, and never before had heaven listened to such a prayer as came from His divine lips.... **The glory of God, in the form of a dove** of burnished gold, rested upon Him, **and from the infinite glory was heard these words, 'This is my beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased.'** The human race is encircled by the human arm of Christ, while with His divine arm He grasps the throne of the Infinite One. The prayer of Christ cleaved right through the darkness and entered where God is. To each of us it means that heaven is open before us. It means that the gates are ajar, that the glory is imparted to the Son of God and all who believe in His name.... Christ entered into the wilderness with the Spirit of God upon Him, to be tempted of the devil.... Satan left the field as a conquered foe. Our Saviour passed over the ground and was victor.... What has He done for the human family? He has elevated us in the scale of moral value. We may become conquerors through our Sufficiency. There is hope for the most hopeless, in Christ.... What did Christ come here for? To represent the Father. What a heart of love and sympathy! ... When God gave His Son, He gave all heaven. He could give no more." {Manuscript 27, 1893, *Temperance*, 283-287}{Ellen White, *Christ Triumphant*, p. 207.4 - 207.6}

In the above quotes, we can discern that the holy Spirit, as the dove, wasn't an autonomous being, but rather a manifestation of God's glory. Simultaneously we can see that Jesus, Who was always a Son, on the earth was clothed in the garb of human nature, i.e. He took the form of human nature unto Himself. God encouragingly confirmed to Jesus that He was still His Son and that He did not lose His Sonship in coming to the Earth. The prophet of God expands the meaning of the title of Son, explaining that Jesus is a heavenly, divine Son of God and that on the Earth He also had the status of the Son of an earthly man:

- "The **only Being who was one with God lived the law in humanity**, descended to the lowly life of a common laborer, and toiled at the carpenter's bench with His **earthly** parent." {Ellen White, Signs of the Times, October 14, 1897, par. 3}
- "The **divine Son of God** saw that no arm but His own could save fallen man. He determined to help man." {Ellen White, Review & Herald, February 24, 1897, par. 33}

MATTHEW 28:18-20 - BAPTISM IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND THE SON AND THE HOLY SPIRIT? CHANGED IN THE YEAR 325

- "And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. **Goe ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the Name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost: Teaching them** to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." {Matthew 28:18-20}

In the book of Acts, the evangelist Luke described the same statement of Jesus from Matthew 28:19.20. But in Acts 1:8 Jesus calls us to proclaim His truth to all nations, without any mention of baptism in the name of the Trinity:

- „But ye shall receive power, after that the holy Ghost is come upon you: and **ye shall be witnesses unto Me** both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and **unto the uttermost part of the earth.**" {Acts 1:8}

Why does this difference exist? Because This verse (Matthew 28:18-20) was changed in the year 325ad to support and introduce the doctrine of the Trinity. We know the following facts: the doctrine of the Trinity" was the basis of many pagan religions alongside "life after death". During the council in Nicea in 325ad, Emperor Constantine ordered that an ecumenical Bible be compiled to unite pagans with Christians. He entrusted this task to the leading Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea, who implemented what Bishop Origen had tried earlier but without success. Interestingly, Bishop Eusebius quoted the above verse differently 17 times in his works before Nicea:

- "Surely none save our only Saviour has done this, when, after His victory over death, he spoke the word to His followers, and fulfilled it by the event, saying to them, "**Go ye and make disciples of all nations in My name.**" {Eusebius: Oration in Praise of Emperor Constantine, Chapter 16, Section 8}
- "But while the disciples of Jesus were most likely either saying thus, or thinking thus, the Master solved their difficulties, by the addition of one phrase, saying they should triumph "**In MY NAME.**" And the power of His name being so great, that the apostle says: "God has given Him a name which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth," He shewed the virtue of the power in His Name concealed from the crowd when He said to His disciples: "**Go, and make disciples of all the nations in My Name.**" He also most accurately forecasts the future when He says: "for this gospel must first be preached to all the world, for a witness to all nations." {Eusebius: Proof of the Gospel, Book III, ch. 7, 136 (a-d), p. 157}

- "Who said to them: '**Make disciples of all the nations in My Name.**'" {Eusebius: Proof of the Gospel, Book III, Chapter 7, 138 (c), p. 159}
- "Relying upon the power of Christ, who had said to them, "**Go ye and make disciples of all the nations in My name.**" {Eusebius: Book III of his History, Chapter 5, Section 2, (about the Jewish persecution of early Christians)}
- "With one word and voice, He said to His disciples: "**Go, and make disciples of all nations in My Name, teaching them to observe all things whatsover I have commanded you**" {Eusebius: Proof of the Gospel, Book III, ch 6, 132 (a), p. 152}

It is not surprising that, after the introduction of the Trinity in year 325, Eusebius suddenly changed the form of those verses, and used the current version of the verses in his writings. The whole Bible only knows baptism 'in the name of Jesus'.

The true Bible certainly does not contradict itself, and Matthew 28:19 directly contradicts all other verses. This is the strongest evidence of the falsification. One is 180 degrees different than the others, and is impossible to have both at the same time. God never contradicts Himself!

- "When they heard this, they were **baptised in the Name of the Lord Jesus.**" {Acts 19:5}
- "But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the **Name of Jesus Christ**, they were **baptised**, both men and women." {Acts 8:12}
- "For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were **baptised in the Name of the Lord Jesus.**" {Acts 8:16}
- "And he commanded them to be **baptised in the Name of the Lord.**" {Acts 10:48}
- "For as many of you as have bene **baptised into Christ, have put on Christ.**" {Galatians 3:27}

Whose name do we call at baptism in order to be washed from sin? A Trinity?

- "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be **baptised** 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." {Acts 2:38}
- "And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and **be baptised**, and **wash away thy sins**, calling on the **name of the Lord.**" {Acts 22:16}

Is there any other name under heaven besides Jesus who can save us?

- "He that believeth and is baptised, shall be saved, but he that believeth not, shall be damned." {Mark 16:16}

Many Theologians are making the claim that baptism should be in the name of Trinity. Actually, baptism and immersion in the water are a symbol of His (and not of a triune) death, His lying in the grave, and His resurrection.

ONLY Jesus died, and through baptism, we show acceptance of His sacrifice for us and thereby become Christians.

- The immersion in the water symbolises the death of Jesus on the cross
- The short stay in the water symbolises the time of Jesus in the grave
- The emergence from the water symbolises the resurrection of Jesus

The apostle Paul clearly emphasises that baptism is only in the name of Jesus and that this is directly connected with the sacrifice of Jesus on the Cross:

- "Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptised in the name of Paul?" {1 Corinthians 1:13}
- "Know ye not, that so many of vs as were baptised into Jesus Christ, were baptised into His death? 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 wee also should walk in newness of life" {Romans 6:3}
- "Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also you are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead." {Colossians 2:12}

Below is the excerpt from Shem Tob's MSS Hebrew Matthew Gospel, Matthew 28th chapter, which comes from a book by Dr. George Howard, a specialist in the Hebrew language. The original of this manuscript is in the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York. This Gospel was saved by Hebrews during the first century and was discovered in the 14th century. In the 14th century, there was no discussion of the Trinity! And in this old original manuscript of the Gospel, Matthew 28:19, there is no trinitarian form of baptism, there is no statement by Jesus in this regard. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew and not in Greek, as most theologians claim today:

- "Matthew also issued a written Gospel among the Hebrews in their own dialect while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome and laying the foundations of the church." {Irenaeus in the second century: Adv. Haer. 3.1.1}

[MT 28:9-20

9 והמה הולכות ויש'ו עבר לפניהם אומר השם ישיעכן. והם
 קרבו אליו ויקדו לו וישתחוו לו.
 10 אז אמר להן יש'ו אל תפחדו אמרו לאחי שילכו לגליל ושמה
 יראוני.
 11 ובעוד שהן הולכות איזה מהשומרים באו לעיר והגידו
 לגדולי הכהנים כל הנעשה.
 12 ויעדו לעצה עם זקני העם. ויתנו ממון רב לפרשים.
 13 ואמרו להם אתם תאמרו שבאו תלמידיו לילה וגנבוהו בעודכם
 ישנים.
 14 ואם זה יבא לאוזן פילאט אנו נדבר עמו בענין יניחכם.
 15 והם לקחו המטבע ואמרו כן כמו שלמדום. וזה הדבר בסוד בין
 היהודים עד היום הזה.
 16 ואחר זה כאשר השנים עשר תלמידיו הלכו לגליל נראה להם בהר
 17 אשר בו התפללו. וכאשר ראוהו השתחוו לו ויש מהם שנסתפקו בו.
 18 ויש'ו קרב אליהם ואמר להם לי נתן כל היכולת בשמים ובארץ.
 19 לכו אתם
 20 ושמרו אותם לקיים כל הדברים אשר ציויתי אתכם עד עולם.

9. As they were going Jesus passed before them saying:
May the Name deliver you. They came near to Him, bowed down to Him, and worshipped Him.
10. Then Jesus said to them: Do not be afraid; tell My brothers that they should go to Galilee and there they will see Me.
11. While they were going some of the guards entered the city and declared to the chief priests all that had happened.

12. They came together for counsel with the elders of the people. Then they gave much money to the horsemen
13. and said to them: Say that His disciples came by night and stole Him while you were sleeping.
14. If this should come to the ears of Pilate we will tell him that he should leave you alone.
15. They took the money and said thus as they instructed them. This is the word [held] in secret among the Jews unto this day.
16. After this when His twelve disciples came to Galilee He appeared to them in the mountain where they had prayed.
17. When they saw Him they worshipped Him, but there were some of them who doubted Him.
18. Jesus drew near to them and said to them:
To Me has been given all power in heaven and earth.
19. **Go**
20. **and (teach) them to carry out all the things which I have commanded you forever.**

The same is also stated in the other 3 Bible translations:

- "Then, coming toward them, Jesus spoke, saying, 'All power has been given me in heaven and on earth. So, go and make disciples in all nations **IN MY NAME**, teaching them to obey all the things that I commanded you. And [Look!] I'll be with you every day until the end of the age.'" {Matthew 28:18-20} Bible 2001
- "Jesus approached and said to them, "All authority has been given to me in heaven and on earth. Consequently, when you go, disciple all nationalities **IN MY NAME**. Teach them to keep everything I commanded you to do. Understand this: I am with you every day until the consummation of the age!" {Matthew 28:18-20} MIT - Idiomatic EN - 2006
- "Yeshua [God is Salvation] drew near to them and said to them: "All power has been given to Me in heaven and earth". "Go and make disciples, of all the nations, to believe **IN MY NAME**" "and teach them to observe all the words which I have commanded you, forever" {Matthew 28:18-20} New Messianic Version Bible

Today's Bible says that the apostles should go and all should baptise in the name of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, which is a contradiction of the rest of the New Testament, where the apostles were all exclusively baptised in the name of Jesus! The true Bible can never contradict itself!

The Catholic Church, which proudly proclaimed a change in the Sabbath, confirms itself that it changed Matthew 28:19

- "The **basic form of our** (Matthew 28:19 Trinitarian) profession of faith **took shape during the second and third centuries in connection with the ceremony of baptism**. So far as its place of origin is concerned, the text (Matthew 28:19) **came from the city of Rome**." {Joseph Ratzinger (pope Benedict XVI): Introduction to Christianity, 1968 edition, pp. 82, 83.}
- "The **baptismal formula was changed from the name of Jesus Christ to the words Father, Son, and holy Spirit by the Catholic Church in the second century**." {Britannica Encyclopedia, 11th Edition, Volume 3, page 365}

- "The passages in Acts and the Letters of St. Paul. These passages seem to point to the **earliest form as baptism in the name of the Lord.**" Also, we find. "Is it possible to reconcile these facts with the **belief that Christ commanded His disciples to baptise in the triune form?** Had Christ given such a command, it is urged, the Apostolic Church would have followed him, and we should have some trace of this obedience in the New Testament. **No such trace can be found.** The only explanation of this silence, according to the anti-traditional view, is this the **short Christological (Jesus Name) formula was (the) original, and the longer triune formula was a later development.**" {The Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C. 1923, New Testament Studies Number 5: The Lord's Command To Baptise An Historical Critical Investigation. By Bernard Henry Cuneo, page 27}

Despite these unbeatable facts, the disarmed bearers of the Trinity doctrine show the works of Tertullian (160-220ad) from Carthage, who wrote about the Trinity much earlier than the council of Nicaea (325ad) happened. Does this mean that if a person wrote their belief prior to the establishment of the doctrine, the teaching has to be true?

According to the method, a few hundred years later, somebody could prove with the books of Dr. Kellogg, that we have believed in the Far Eastern nature of the holy Spirit, or that the Apocrypha were true. But when an Apostasy occurs, it always begins in a small circle and spreads slowly more and more to the larger masses.

If Tertullian really represented the faith of that time, why did the majority of the (Arian) bishops in Nicaea reject the Trinity? Arian teaching is misrepresented by claiming that Jesus is not recognised as a Divine being, which is a lie. True Arian teaching rejects only the Trinity!

All of the old Adventist pioneers, including Ellen White, were (semi) Arians. Why would the Trinity have to be established in the year 381ad, if it was already part of the Christian faith? Why was Prof. Prescott unable to establish a Trinity with the chief leaders of the General Conference in 1919? Why was determined resistance, if we, as a church, had already believed in the Trinity for a while?

Today it is said that James White, known as the GREATEST OPPONENT of the Trinity Doctrine, used the modern version of the verse at a baptism, without any opposition from EGW. If that were the truth, it would mean that James White believed in the One God, but would have practiced the opposite! Do we really have original evidence today that Adventists were really baptised in the name of the Trinity prior to EGW losing her influence to the church in 1888?

What did Ellen White write about baptism? In whose name should it be?

- "But with clearer light, they gladly accepted Christ as their Redeemer, and with this step of advance came a change in their obligations. As they received a purer faith, there was a corresponding change in their life. In token of this change, and as an acknowledgment of their faith in Christ, they were **rebaptised in the name of Jesus.**" {Ellen White AA, p. 285.1}
- "After the wonderful manifestation of the holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost, Peter exhorted the people to repentance and **baptism in the name of Christ**, for the remission of their sins." {Ellen White: Acts 2:38, 39 und GC ix.2}

Then, how is it that there are some quotes from EGW describing baptism "in the name of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit"? In any case, these would contradict the previous quotes, as well as the entire Bible.

There is ample evidence of how many quotes were removed from her books and how many were brought in by infiltrated servants from the other side.

However, we must not be discouraged and reject the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. The simplest criterion for us to be able to recognise in prayer whether a verse or quote is original or not is to see whether it harmonises with the rest of the Bible or Spirit of Prophecy, or if it teaches something that is 180 degrees opposite. Ellen White also announced that her quotes would be under attack:

- "Whatever **wrong construction may be placed** upon my testimony by those who profess righteousness, yet know not God, I shall in humility go forward with my work." {Ellen White: SM1, p.73, and Manuscript 4, 1883}

A Collection of Evidences Against the modern Wording of Matthew 28:19:

The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics:

- "Matthew 28:19: It is the central piece of evidence for the traditional (Trinitarian) view. If it were undisputed, this would, of course, be decisive, but its trustworthiness is impugned on grounds of textual criticism, literary criticism, and historical criticism. The same Encyclopedia further states that: "The obvious explanation of the silence of the New Testament on the triune name, and the use of another (JESUS NAME) formula in Acts and Paul, is that this other formula was the earlier, and **the triune formula is a later addition.**"

Edmund Schlink, The Doctrine of Baptism, page 28:

- "The baptismal command in its Matthew 28:19 form cannot be the historical origin of Christian baptism. At the very least, it must be assumed that the text has been transmitted in a form **expanded by the [Catholic] church.**"

The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, I, 275:

- "It is often affirmed that the words in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost are not the ipsissima verba [exact words] of Jesus, but...**a later liturgical addition.**"

Wilhelm Bousset, Kyrios Christianity, page 295:

- "The testimony for the wide distribution of the simple baptismal formula [in the Name of Jesus] down into the second century is so overwhelming that even **in Matthew 28:19, the Trinitarian formula was later inserted.**"

The Catholic Encyclopedia, II, page 263:

- "The baptismal formula **was changed** from the name of Jesus Christ to the words Father, Son, and holy Spirit by the Catholic Church in the second century."

Hastings Dictionary of the Bible 1963, page 1015:

- "The Trinity.-...is not demonstrable by logic or by Scriptural proofs,...The term Trias was first used by Theophilus of Antioch (c AD 180),...(The term Trinity) not found in Scripture..." "The chief Trinitarian text in the NT is the baptismal formula in Mt 28:19...This late post-resurrection saying, not found in any other Gospel or anywhere else in the NT, has been viewed by some scholars as an interpolation into Matthew. It has also been pointed out that the idea of making disciples is continued in teaching them, so that the intervening reference to baptism with its Trinitarian formula was perhaps a later insertion into the saying. Finally, Eusebius's form of the (ancient) text ("in my name" rather than in the name of the Trinity) has had certain advocates. (Although the Trinitarian formula is now found in the modern-day book of Matthew), this does not guarantee its source in the historical teaching of Jesus. It is doubtless better to view the (Trinitarian) formula as derived from early (Catholic) Christian, perhaps Syrian or Palestinian, baptismal usage (cf Didache 7:1-4), and as a brief summary of the (Catholic) Church's teaching about God, Christ, and the Spirit..."

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. 4, page 2637, Under "Baptism," says:

- "**Matthew 28:19** in particular only canonises **a later ecclesiastical** situation, that its universalism is **contrary to the facts of early Christian history**, and its **Trinitarian formula (is) foreign to the mouth of Jesus.**"

The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge:

- "Jesus, however, cannot have given His disciples this Trinitarian order of baptism after His resurrection; for the New Testament knows only one baptism in the name of Jesus (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:43; 19:5; Gal. 3:27; Rom. 6:3; 1 Cor. 1:13-15), which still occurs even in the second and third centuries, while the Trinitarian formula occurs only in Matt. 28:19, and then only again (in the) Didache 7:1 and Justin, Apol. 1:61...Finally, the distinctly liturgical character of the formula...is strange; it was not the way of Jesus to make such formulas... **the formal authenticity of Matt. 28:19 must be disputed...**" page 435.

The Jerusalem Bible, a scholarly Catholic work, states:

- "It may be that this formula, (Trine Matthew 28:19) so far as the fullness of its expression is concerned, is a reflection of the (Man-made) liturgical usage **established later** in the primitive (Catholic) community. It will be remembered that Acts speaks of baptising "in the name of Jesus,"..."

New Revised Standard Version says this about Matthew 28:19:

- "Modern critics claim this formula is falsely ascribed to Jesus and that it represents **later** (Catholic) church **tradition**, for **nowhere** in the book of Acts (or any other book of the Bible) is baptism performed with the name of the Trinity..."

James Moffett's New Testament Translation:

- "In a footnote on page 64 about Matthew 28:19 he makes this statement: "It may be that this (Trinitarian) formula, so far as the fullness of its expression is concerned, is a reflection of the (Catholic) liturgical usage **established later** in the primitive (Catholic) community, **It will be remembered that Acts speaks of baptising "in the name of Jesus**, cf. Acts 1:5 +."

Tom Harpur, former Religion Editor of the Toronto Star in his "For Christ's sake," page 103 informs us of these facts:

- "All but the most conservative scholars agree that at least the latter part of this command [Trine part of Matthew 28:19] **was inserted later**. The [Trinitarian] formula occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and we know from the only evidence available [the rest of the New Testament] that **the earliest Church did not baptise people using these words** ("in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost") **baptism** was "into" or "in" **the name of Jesus alone**. Thus it is argued that the verse originally read "baptising them in My Name" **and then was expanded** [changed] to work in the [later Catholic Trinitarian] dogma. In fact, the first view put forward by German critical scholars as well as the Unitarians in the nineteenth century, was stated as the accepted position of mainline scholarship as long ago as 1919, when Peake's commentary was first published: "The Church of the first days (AD 33) did not observe this world-wide (Trinitarian) commandment, even if they knew it. The command to baptise into the threefold [Trinity] name **is a late doctrinal expansion**."

The Bible Commentary 1919 page 723:

Dr. Peake makes it clear that:

- "The command to baptise into the threefold name is a late doctrinal expansion. Instead of the words baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost we should probably read simply **"into My Name."**

Theology of the New Testament:

R. Bultmann, 1951, page 133:

- "Under Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church and the Sacraments. The historical fact that the verse Matthew 28:19 was altered is openly confesses to very plainly. "As to the rite of baptism, it was normally consummated as a bath in which the one receiving baptism completely submerged, and if possible in flowing water as the allusions of Acts 8:36, Heb. 10:22, Barn. 11:11 permit us to gather, and as Did. 7:1-3 specifically says. According to the last passage, [the apocryphal Catholic Didache] suffices in case of the need if water is three times poured [false Catholic sprinkling doctrine] on the head. **The one baptising names over the one being baptised the name of the Lord Jesus Christ,**" later expanded [changed] to the name of the Father, Son, and the holy Spirit."

Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church: Dr. Stuart G. Hall 1992, pages 20 and 21. Professor Stuart G. Hall was the former Chair of Ecclesiastical History at King's College, London England. Dr. Hall makes the factual statement that Catholic Trinitarian Baptism was not the original form of Christian Baptism, rather the original was the Jesus name baptism.

- "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the holy Spirit," **although those words were not used, as they later are, as a formula.** Not all baptisms fitted this rule." Dr Hall further, states: "More common and perhaps more ancient was the simple, "In the name of the Lord **Jesus** or, Jesus Christ." This practice was known among Marcionites and Orthodox; it is certainly the subject of controversy in Rome and Africa about 254, as the anonymous tract De rebaptismate ("On rebaptism") shows."

The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles Volume 1, Prolegomena 1 - The Jewish Gentile, and Christian Backgrounds by **F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake** 1979 version pages 335-337:

- "There is little doubt as to the sacramental nature of baptism by the middle of the first century in the circles represented by the Pauline Epistles, and it is indisputable in the second century. The problem is whether it can in this (Trinitarian) form be traced back to Jesus, and if not what light is thrown upon its history by the analysis of the synoptic Gospels and Acts. According to Catholic teaching, (traditional Trinitarian) baptism was instituted by Jesus. It is easy to see how necessary this was for the belief in sacramental regeneration. Mysteries, or sacraments, were always the institution of the Lord of the cult; by them, and by them only, were its supernatural benefits obtained by the faithful. Nevertheless, if evidence counts for anything, few points in the problem of the Gospels are so clear as the improbability of this teaching. The reason for this assertion is the absence of any mention of Christian baptism in Mark, Q, or the third Gospel, and the suspicious nature of the account of its institution in Matthew 28:19: "Go ye into all the world, and make disciples of all Gentiles (nations), baptising them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the holy Spirit." It is not even certain whether this verse ought to be regarded as part of the genuine text of Matthew. No other text, indeed, is found in any extant manuscripts, in any language, but it is arguable that Justin Martyr, though he used the trine formula, did not find it in his text of the Gospels; Hermas seems to be unacquainted with it; the evidence of the Didache is ambiguous, and Eusebius habitually, though not invariably, quotes it in another form, "Go ye into all the world and make disciples of all the Gentiles in My Name." No one acquainted with the facts of textual history and patristic evidence can doubt the tendency would have been to replace the Eusebian text (In My Name) by the ecclesiastical (Catholic Trinitarian) formula of baptism, so that transcriptional evidence" is certainly on the side of the text omitting baptism. But it is unnecessary to discuss this point at length, because even if the ordinary (modern Trinity) text of Matthew 28:19 be sound it can not represent historical fact. Would they have baptised, as Acts says that they did, and Paul seem to confirm the statement, in the name of the Lord Jesus if the Lord himself had commanded them to use the (Catholic Trinitarian) formula of the Church? On every point the evidence of Acts is convincing proof that the (Catholic) tradition embodied in Matthew 28:19 is a late (non-Scriptural Creed) and unhistorical. Neither in the third gospel nor in Acts is there any reference to the (Catholic Trinitarian) Matthaean tradition, nor any mention of the institution of (Catholic Trinitarian) Christian baptism. Nevertheless, a little later in the narrative we find several references to baptism in water in the name of the Lord Jesus as part of recognised (Early) Christian practice. Thus we are faced by the problem of a Christian rite, not directly ascribed to Jesus, but assumed to be a universal (and original) practice. That it was so is confirmed by the Epistles, but the facts of importance are all contained in Acts."

Also in the same book on page 336 in the footnote number one, Professor Lake makes an astonishing discovery in the so-called Teaching or Didache. The Didache has an astonishing contradiction i.e. found in it. One passage refers to the necessity of baptism in the name of the Lord, which is Jesus the other famous passage teaches a Trinitarian Baptism.

Lake raises the probability that the apocryphal Didache or the early Catholic Church Manual may have also been edited or changed to promote the later Trinitarian doctrine. It is a historical fact that the Catholic Church at one time baptised its converts in the name of Jesus but later changed to Trinity baptism.

In the actual description of baptism in the Didache the trine (Trinity) formula is used; in the instructions for the Eucharist (communion) the condition for admission is baptism in the name of the Lord. It is obvious that in the case of an eleventh-century manuscript *the trine formula was almost certain to be inserted in the description of baptism, while the less usual formula had a chance of escaping notice when it was only used incidentally."

The Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C. 1923, New Testament Studies Number 5: The Lord's Command To Baptize An Historical Critical Investigation. By Bernard Henry Cuneo page 27:

- "The passages in Acts and the Letters of St. Paul. These passages seem to point to the earliest form as baptism in the name of the Lord." Also we find. "Is it possible to reconcile these facts with the belief that Christ commanded His disciples to baptise in the trine form? Had Christ given such a command, it is urged, the Apostolic Church would have followed Him, and we should have some trace of this obedience in the New Testament. No such trace can be found. The only explanation of this silence, according to the anti-traditional view, is this the short christological (Jesus Name) formula was (the) original, and **the longer trine formula was a later development.**"

A History of The Christian Church:

1953 by **Williston Walker** former Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Yale University. On page 95 we see the historical facts again declared. "With the early disciples baptism generally was "in the name of Jesus Christ." There is no mention of baptism in the name of the Trinity in the New Testament, except in the command attributed to Christ in Matthew 28:19.

That text is early, (but not the original) however. It underlies the Apostles' Creed, and the practice recorded (*or interpolated) in the Teaching, (or the Didache) and by Justin.

The Christian leaders of the third century retained the recognition of the earlier form, and, in Rome at least, baptism in the name of Christ was deemed valid, if irregular, certainly from the time of Bishop Stephen (254-257).“ On page 61 Professor and Church historian Walker, reviles the true origin and purpose of Matthew 28:19:

- "This Text is the first man-made Roman Catholic Creed that was the prototype for the later Apocryphal Apostles' Creed. Matthew 28:19 was invented along with the Apocryphal Apostles' Creed to counter so-called heretics and Gnostics that baptised in the name of Jesus Christ! Marcion although somewhat mixed up in some of his doctrine still baptised his converts the Biblical way in the name of Jesus Christ. Matthew 28:19 is the first non-Biblical Roman Catholic Creed! The spurious Catholic text of Matthew 28:19 was invented to support the newer triune, Trinity doctrine. Therefore, Matthew 28:19 is not the "Great Commission of Jesus Christ." Matthew 28:19 is the great Catholic hoax! Acts 2:38, Luke 24:47, and 1 Corinthians 6:11 give us the ancient original words and teaching of Yeshua/ Jesus! Is it not also strange that Matthew 28:19 is missing from the old manuscripts of Sinaiticus, Curetonianus and Bobiensis? While the power of the episcopate and the significance of churches of apostolical (Catholic) foundation was thus greatly enhanced, the Gnostic crisis saw a corresponding development of (man-made non-inspired spurious) creed, at least in the West. Some form of instruction before baptism was common by the middle of the second century. At Rome this developed, apparently, between 150 and 175, and probably in opposition to Marcionite Gnosticism, into an explication of the baptismal formula of Matthew 28:19 the earliest known form of the so-called Apostles Creed."

Catholic Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger makes this confession as to the origin of the chief Trinity text of Matthew 28:19:

- "The basic form of our profession of faith took shape during the course of the **second and third centuries** in connection with the ceremony of baptism. So far as its place of origin is concerned, the text (Matthew 28:19) came from the city of Rome."

The Trinity baptism and text of **Matthew 28:19** therefore did not originate from the original Church that started in Jerusalem around AD 33. It was rather, as the evidence proves, a later invention of Roman Catholicism that was completely fabricated. Very few know about these historical facts.

"The Demonstratio Evangelica" by Eusebius:

Eusebius was the Church historian and Bishop of Caesarea. On page 152 Eusebius quotes the early book of Matthew that he had in his library in Caesarea. According to this eyewitness of an unaltered Book of Matthew that could have been the original book or the first copy of the original of Matthew. Eusebius informs us of Jesus' actual words to his disciples in the original text of Matthew 28:19:

- "With one word and voice He said to His disciples: "Go, and **make disciples of all nations in My Name, teaching them to observe all things what's over I have commanded you.**"

That Name is JESUS!

Conclusion:

- None of the disciples baptised: "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Spirit."
- The Scholars quoted all agree that it was not part of the original text but an interpolation.

www.first-commandment-or-trinity.com

