

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

Scriptural Proof & Historical Evidence



by

Steven Greene

Website: <https://sabbathreflections.org>

Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture is from
the *King James Version*.

Contents

INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER 1	6
Baptize in Whose Name?	6
Matthew 28:19 Is Added Text—Scriptural Proof	9
Matthew 28:19—Role of the Holy Spirit	11
Baptism—Roles of God, Jesus, & the Holy Spirit.....	12
CHAPTER 2	17
Matthew 28:19 Is Added Text—Historical Proof.....	17
Shem Tov Hebrew Matthew	18
Discrepancies Between Greek & Hebrew	23
CONCLUSION	25
Greek Matthew 28:19 is Corrupted.....	25
Concerned About Your Baptism?	26
APPENDIX A	28
Baptism Covenant Ceremony	28
APPENDIX B	30
Historical Sources Pertaining to Matthew 28:19.....	30

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

Then Peter said to them, “Repent and be baptized each one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for *the* remission of sins, and you yourselves shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.—Acts 2:38

INTRODUCTION

For decades, Matthew 28:19 has been the formula used for baptism. Most translations record it as:

MATTHEW 28:19 “Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, **baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,**

At issue is a vast collection of historical literature and writings by many church authorities that throw serious doubt on the originality of the phrase “into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit”. There is also a preponderance of Scripture that does not align with this translation because nowhere else is God the Father or the Holy Spirit mentioned in regard to the act of water immersion baptism.

Because baptism is absolutely required for spiritual salvation, the question of the verity of Matthew 28:19 must be answered so that the correct formula for baptism firmly can be established according to the Scriptures.

CHAPTER 1

Baptize in Whose Name?

It is crucially important to understand that baptism symbolizes a joining of the believer into the death, burial, and resurrection of the Savior for the **remission** of sin¹. In order to accomplish that, baptism must be associated with the sacrifice of Jesus Christ:

COLOSSIANS 2:11-12 In Him you were also circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, by putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, **12 buried with Him [Jesus Christ] in baptism**, in which you also were raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead.

GALATIANS 3:27 For as many of you as were **baptized into Christ** have put on Christ.

Baptism is associated with the sacrifice of Jesus Christ; that is, to be “buried with [Jesus] in baptism” is to be “baptized into Christ.” This requires the ceremony to be dedicated to, and in full recognition of, the name of the Savior. An act performed in the name of someone establishes it in accordance with, and authorized by, the one who has supremacy over the matter. In the case of baptism, the proclamation of every New Testament Scripture (excluding Matthew 28:19) is in the name of Jesus Christ:

ACTS 2:38 Then Peter said to them, **“Repent, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ** for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.

¹ Rom. 6:23.

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

ACTS 4:10, 12 “let it be known to you all, and to all the people of Israel, that **by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth**, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead, by Him this man stands here before you whole. ... 12 “**Nor is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved.**”

ACTS 8:12 But when they believed Philip as he preached the things concerning the kingdom of God and **the name of Jesus Christ, both men and women were baptized.**

ACTS 8:15-16 who, when they had come down, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit. 16 For as yet He had fallen upon none of them. They had only been **baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.**

ACTS 10:48 And he commanded them to be **baptized in the name of the Lord.** Then they asked him to stay a few days.

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

ACTS 22:16 ‘And now why are you waiting? Arise and **be baptized**, and wash away your sins, **calling on the name of the Lord.**’

ROMANS 6:3-4 Or do you not know that as many of us as were **baptized into Christ Jesus** were baptized into His death? 4 Therefore we were buried **with Him through baptism** into death, that just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.

It should be noted that, except for Matthew 28:19, **only the name of Jesus Christ is authorized for baptism.** In fact, Scripture specifically excludes all other names, including God the Father and the Holy Spirit:

ACTS 4:10, 12 “let it be known to you all, and to all the people of Israel, that **by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth**, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead, by Him this man stands here before you whole. ... 12 “**Nor is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved.**”

DEFINITION: Baptism by water immersion portrays the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ who died for the remission (cancellation) of the penalty of death for sin.

It is a personal, physical act that symbolizes our desire and willingness to put to death an old life of sin in order to live as a new creation reconciled to God². Only the blood of Jesus Christ covers sin; therefore, baptism is relevant when associated with His sacrifice. “Baptized in the name of Jesus Christ” means the act of water immersion is a likeness of, and a conjoining with, His death.

ROMANS 6:4-7 Therefore we were buried with Him through baptism into death, that just as Christ was raised 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 united together in the likeness of His death**, certainly we also shall be *in the likeness of His resurrection*, 6 knowing this, that **our old man was crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be done away with, that we should no longer be slaves of sin.** 7 For he who has died has been freed from sin.

Paul made this exceptionally clear in his rhetorical response to the Corinthians who were disputing about the importance of name of the person *doing* the baptism over the name of the One who *died* for our sins:

1 CORINTHIANS 1:11-13 For it has been declared to me concerning you, my brethren, by those of Chloe's *household*, that **there are contentions** among you. 12 Now I say this, that each of you says, “I am of Paul,” or “I am of Apollos,” or “I am of Cephas,” or “I am of Christ.” 13 **Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptized in the name of Paul?**

² 2 Cor. 5:17-18; Eph. 4:23-24.

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

Obviously, Paul was not crucified for the salvation of the Corinthians, so none of them were (or could be) baptized into Paul's name. Even if this were the case, then Christ would be divided! Divided how? The Corinthians emphasized baptisms in accordance with the names of the men who *performed* them—men such Paul, Apollos, and Cephas—and this was a matter of pride and putting men before God. They clearly did not understand the meaning, purpose, and authority behind baptism. God the Father³ proclaimed that Jesus Christ is His ONLY Son and the ONLY name through which we receive eternal life!

JOHN 3:16-18 “For God so loved the world that He gave His **only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him [Jesus Christ]** should not perish but **have everlasting life**. 17 “For God did not send His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. 18 “He who believes in Him is not condemned; but he who does not believe is condemned already, because he has not **believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God**.”

Belief in the name of Jesus Christ is required for salvation. Nowhere does the Bible state that baptism is performed in the name of anyone else, including God the Father or the Holy Spirit.

Matthew 28:19 Is Added Text—Scriptural Proof

There is one verse—and only one—that differs from all others that require baptism to be “in the name of Jesus Christ”:

MATTHEW 28:19 “Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them **in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit**,”

³ John 10:30; 17:11, 21.

This is in complete contrast to **all other** New Testament Scripture, which specify the name of Jesus Christ only.

Those who insist that this particular verse was part of the original manuscript attempt to justify it in a few ways. Some suggest that “into the name” only applies to the Father, but not the Son or the Holy Spirit. That is a serious conflict with all other Scriptures that plainly and clearly require baptism into the name of Jesus Christ, NOT God the Father. No other Scripture mentions anything whatsoever about baptizing into the name of God the Father or the Holy Spirit.

The reality is that the grammar of this verse does not allow for *name* to apply only to the Father. It also must include the Son and Holy Spirit because of the conjunction *and* (Gk. *kai*), which connects and extends the noun *name* to all three: “the name of the Father, **and** [*name*] of the Son, **and** [*name*] of the Holy Spirit.” This is obvious in this statement, “Please ask John to record the names of the students and of the teacher.” The conjunction *and* connects “names” to both students and the teacher; otherwise, what is there to record “of the teacher”? It only makes sense to write down the *name* of the teacher.

The problem with naming all three is that “God,” “Father,” and “Holy Spirit” are not actual names; rather, they are titles just as “Christ” and “Savior” are titles of Him whose *name* is Jesus. If baptism is to be performed in accordance with Matthew 28:19, then what are the **names** of God the Father and the Holy Spirit that are required for baptism? Scripture does *not* identify them.

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

Matthew 28:19—Role of the Holy Spirit

There are issues with the Holy Spirit⁴ mentioned in Matthew 28:19. The first is that it is not a living being so it has no name that can be applied to baptism. While it has *functions* that have been made into titles—i.e., Comforter—nowhere in Scripture is the “name” of the Holy Spirit mentioned. As the power of God, it is impossible to baptize in accordance with, or authorized by, the Holy Spirit. That would be like saying, “Baptize in the name of electricity.”

Even if the Holy Spirit had a part in the baptismal formula, it is sent by God the Father **in the name of Jesus Christ!**

JOHN 14:26 “But the Helper, **the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My [Jesus Christ] name**, He will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all things that I said to you.

Why is the Holy Spirit sent in the name of Jesus? Again, “there is no salvation in any other” name than Jesus Christ⁵. While baptism is for the remission of sin, the Holy Spirit begets eternal life; therefore, it is also necessary for salvation. However, it must be sent by God the Father in the **name** of the Savior Jesus Christ.

ORDNANCE: <u>All things</u> (including baptism and the sending of the Holy Spirit) required for salvation MUST BE DONE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST because only His sacrifice makes salvation possible.

⁴ For more information, refer to the booklet “The Holy Spirit—The Power of God” at <https://sabbathreflections.org/the-holy-spirit-the-power-of-god/>.

⁵ Acts 4:12.

Baptizing in the name of the Holy Spirit (if there were such a thing) would require saying something to the effect: “You are baptized in the name of the Holy Spirit sent in the name of Jesus Christ.” This is a ridiculous and meaningless statement that completely obscures the only name that can bring salvation.

Another problem is that the Holy Spirit comes only through the laying on of hands by an ordained elder or minister, *not as a result of the baptism ceremony!* **Receiving the Holy Spirit is, in fact, completely separate from baptism:**

ACTS 8:14-18 Now when the apostles who were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent Peter and John to them, 15 who, when they had come down, **prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit.** 16 For as yet He had fallen upon none of them. They had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. 17 Then **they laid hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit.** 18 And when Simon saw that **through the laying on of the apostles’ hands the Holy Spirit was given,** he offered them money,

ACTS 10:44-45, 47-48 While Peter was still speaking these words, **the Holy Spirit fell upon all** those who heard the word. 45 And **those of the circumcision who believed were astonished,** as many as came with Peter, because the gift of **the Holy Spirit had been poured out [by God the Father] on the Gentiles also.** ... 47 “Can anyone forbid water, that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit just as we *have?*” 48 And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Then they asked him to stay a few days.

Including the Holy Spirit in ANY form makes absolutely no sense because it has no purpose in water immersion baptism.

Baptism—Roles of God, Jesus, & the Holy Spirit

It is important to understand the roles of God the Father and Jesus Christ with regards to baptism. First of all, baptism is for the remission of sin.

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

HEBREWS 9:22 And according to the law almost all things are purified with blood, and **without shedding of blood there is no remission [of sins].**

DEFINITION: Remission of sin is the cancellation of the death penalty for transgressions of the Law of God.

God the Father did not shed His own blood so even God the Father cannot commute the death penalty for someone without the blood of Jesus Christ. Remission of sin is only possible through the One who shed His blood without ever committing sin—Jesus Christ⁶:

MATTHEW 26:28 “For this is **My [Jesus Christ’s] blood** of the new covenant, **which is shed [poured out]** for many **for the remission of sins.**

LUKE 24:46-47 Then He [*Jesus Christ*] said to them, “Thus it is written, and thus it was necessary for the Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, 47 “and that **repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His [Jesus Christ’s] name** to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.

ACTS 10:43 “To Him [*Jesus Christ*] all the prophets witness that, **through His [Jesus Christ’s] name**, whoever believes in Him **will receive remission of sins.**”

God the Father did not die for our sins and the Holy Spirit certainly did not since it is not a living being! There was only One who was made to be sin:

2 CORINTHIANS 5:21 For **He [God the Father] made Him [Jesus Christ]** who knew no sin **to be sin for us**, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.

⁶ Also Acts 2:38.

Being baptized into a name aside from Jesus Christ, including those of God the Father or the Holy Spirit, cannot, does not, and will not bring remission of sin because **only Jesus Christ was made to be sin for us.**

ORDINANCE: **Remission** of sin IS ONLY POSSIBLE BY THE SHEDDING OF BLOOD. Baptism is the symbolic act of death for personal sins, through a momentary burial in a watery grave, and then resurrection out of that grave for the purpose of living a life without sin. Only the shed blood of Jesus Christ through His death, burial, and resurrection covers our sins. Therefore, BAPTISM IS ONLY IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST—AND NO OTHER.

ALL must be baptized into the one and only BODY of Jesus Christ because it was His blood that was shed for the remission of sin:

1 CORINTHIANS 12:12-13 For as **the Body** is one and has many members, but **all the members of that one Body**, being many, **are one Body, so also is Christ**. 13 For by one Spirit we were **all baptized into one Body**—whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free—and have all been made to drink into one Spirit.

EPHESIANS 4:4-6 **There is one Body** and one Spirit, just as you were called in one hope of your calling; 5 **one Lord**, one faith, **one baptism**; 6 one God and Father of all, who *is* above all, and through all, and in you all.

This is why no one is baptized into the body of God the Father.—He did not shed His blood for our sins. The only body and the only blood that can cancel the death penalty is that of Jesus Christ.

In contrast, the Holy Spirit has absolutely nothing to do with the remission of sin especially since it did not—and could not—shed its blood. It is the power from God the Father by which He begets us with eternal life:

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

ROMANS 8:10 And if Christ *is* in you, the body *is* dead because of sin, but **the Spirit is life** because of righteousness.

2 CORINTHIANS 3:6 who also made us sufficient as ministers of the new covenant, not of the letter but of the Spirit; for the letter kills, but **the Spirit gives life**.

GALATIANS 6:8 For he who sows to his flesh will of the flesh reap corruption, but he who sows to the Spirit will **of the Spirit reap everlasting life**.

This is why the receiving of the Holy Spirit is separate from baptism. While water immersion baptism depicts the death and burial of sin and, subsequently, the resurrection to a life without sin, the Holy Spirit is the seed of begetting for eternal life. Baptism is WITH the Holy Spirit, not “by” or “into” it⁷:

MATTHEW 3:11 “I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but He who is coming after me is mightier than I, whose sandals I am not worthy to carry. He [*Jesus Christ*] will baptize you **with** the Holy Spirit and fire.

A person can only be begotten WITH the Holy Spirit for the hope of the resurrection unto **eternal life** if they have also been baptized for remission (cancellation) of the penalty of **death** for sin. One cannot have eternal life and eternal death at the same time—they conflict with one another. Either a person is under the penalty of death or has the seed of the Holy Spirit that begets eternal life.

Scripture plainly shows that remission of sin is only through water immersion baptism, which conjoins a person into the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Baptism is required to be done in the only name of the One whose blood covers sin—Jesus Christ.

⁷ Also Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5; 11:16.

The baptismal formula in Matthew 28:19 conflicts with ALL Scripture that requires **baptism into the name of Jesus Christ ONLY**. Those who use the formula in Matthew 28:19 do not understand the purpose and meaning behind baptism into the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER 2

Matthew 28:19 Is Added Text—Historical Proof

Because Matthew 28:19 seriously conflicts with all other Scripture, the question arises of why and how came to be in the Bible. Simply put, the Catholic Church admitted to adding the triune text “into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” It states in the Catholic work *Bible Catechism* of 1973⁸:

“Into Christ. The Bible tells us that Christians were baptized into Christ (no. 6). They belong to Christ. The Acts of the Apostles (2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5) tells us of baptizing “in the name (person) of Jesus.” -- a better translation would be “into the name (person) of Jesus.” **Only in the 4th Century did the formula “In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit” become customary.**”

In fact, Grzegorz Kaszyński compiled **105 other versions** of Matthew 28:19 that do not include the triune phrase at all⁹. Matthew 28:19 is nothing less than a false Trinity doctrine added to Scripture as proved by the mountain of historical evidence (see APPENDIX A).

One example of such is from Eusebius of Caesarea who was an early historian who lived from c. 260/265 to 339AD. His early writings¹⁰ omit the Trinity text of Matthew 28:19. It is important to

⁸ *Bible Catechism*, Rev. John C Kersten, S.V.D., Catholic Book Publishing Co., N.Y., N.Y.; 1973, p. 164.

⁹ https://www.trinitytruth.org/matthew28_19bible-translations.pdf.

¹⁰ Prior to the Council of Nicea in 325AD. Later writings include the triune phrase, indicating he was “persuaded” by Catholic authorities to adopt their interpretation. This is consistent with the 1973 Catholic *Bible Catechism* which dates the textual changes to the 300s AD.

understand that Eusebius was copying from the earliest manuscripts when he quoted this verse. As a result, his writings simply record the phrase “in My name”:

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 whatsoever I have commanded you.” That “Name” is Jesus.

Eusebius emphasizes that these were the original words (“with one word and voice **He [*Jesus Christ*] said**”) of Jesus Christ. While Eusebius’ later writings include the Trinity (triune god) wording, whatever influenced him to make the changes does not take away from his earlier texts. In reality, the fact that he changed the text of Matthew 28:19 makes his later writings suspect given that the ruling of the Council of Nicea on the quartodeciman controversy supported Easter instead of the traditional 14th Passover.

It is a fact that some use Eusebius writings to prove the Trinity wording in 1 John 5:7 is added text but will then claim his writings are unsubstantiated when it comes to Matthew 28:19. This is nothing less than hypocrisy.

Shem Tov Hebrew Matthew

A recent discovery that has gained recognition is a Hebrew version of the book of Matthew, which was preserved as an appendix in a 14th century Jewish polemical work against Catholic oppression, written by Shem Tov Ibn Shaprut. Research into this particular Hebrew text was done by a Karaite (Hebrew scripturalist) Jew named Nehemiah Gordon who established the likelihood that the

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

book of Matthew was originally written in Hebrew¹¹. Much of his evidence for a Hebrew original of Matthew is captured in his book *The Hebrew Yeshua vs. The Greek Jesus*. In it, he provides two major points (among others) to support the validity of an original Hebrew writing of the book of Matthew.

These are in the form of contradictions to Old Testament Law found in the Greek translations whereas the Shem Tov version upholds the Law. This is an important consideration since Matthew and Luke both affirm that Jesus did not change a single point of the Mosaic Law:

MATTHEW 5:17-18 “Do not think that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets. **I did not come to destroy but to fulfill.**
18 “For assuredly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, **one jot or one tittle will by no means pass from the law** till all is fulfilled.

If the Greek text is a clear contradiction with this statement, it is a serious matter. The fact that the Hebrew version does not conflict gives it the greater validity. The following discusses the two major scriptural contradictions that are corrected in the Shem Tov Hebrew:

- 1) In Matthew 23:2-3, the Greek narration records Jesus directing believers to obey all that the **scribes and Pharisees** command, who contradict the Law of Moses:

MATTHEW 23:2-3 saying: “The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat. 3 “Therefore **whatever they tell you to observe, that observe and do,** but

¹¹ Nehemiah Gordon’s book *The Hebrew Yeshua vs. The Greek Jesus* can be found by going to <https://sabbathreflections.org/resources/books-references/> or the video link at <https://sabbathreflections.org/resources/documentaries/>.

do not do according to their works; for they say, and do not do.

This contradicts with Jesus' condemnation of the scribes and Pharisees in the verses immediately following (Matt. 23:13-39). In fact, Jesus said that their judgments NULLIFY the Law of Moses: "... **you have made the commandment of God of no effect [nullified] by your tradition.**" (Matt. 15:6). If the scribes and Pharisees were so corrupt, then why would Jesus command His disciples to obey everything that they command?

The resolution lies in the Shem Tov Hebrew version which records a slightly different text: "The Pharisees and sages sit upon the seat of Moses. Therefore, all that **he [referring to Moses]** says to you, diligently do, but according to **their [the scribes and Pharisees]** reforms and **their [the scribes and Pharisees]** precedents do not do, because they talk but they do not do" (Shem Tov Matt. 23:2-3).

The Hebrew text clearly records that Jesus was *not* telling believers to observe every judgment of the scribes and Pharisees, which contradict the Law of Moses. He was, in fact, commanding the disciples NOT to keep the "reforms and precedents" of the scribes and Pharisees but only obey the Law as recorded by Moses! Jesus was not contradicting His promise to not change one point of the Law but, rather, He was fulfilling it.

- 2) Matthew 5:33-37 is another contradiction of the Law of Moses in the Greek:

MATTHEW 5:33-37 "Again you have heard that it was said to those of old, 'You shall not swear falsely, but shall perform your oaths to the Lord.' 34 "But **I [Jesus Christ] say to you, do not swear at all:** neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; 35 "nor by the earth, for it is His footstool; nor by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King. 36 "Nor shall you swear by your head, because you cannot make one hair white or black. 37

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

“But let your ‘Yes’ be ‘Yes,’ and your ‘No,’ ‘No.’ For whatever is more than these is from the evil one.

This is in complete disagreement with Deuteronomy 6:13 that states, “You shall fear the LORD your God and serve Him, and **shall take oaths [KJV = swear] in His name.**” The Law of Moses clearly establishes that vows were an acceptable practice and that any vows are to be made by swearing in the name of God. The Greek text records the opposite by saying “do not swear at all.”

Again, the Shem Tov Hebrew shows the Greek is missing a critical word: “You have further heard what was said by the ancients, ‘You shall not swear **falsely** by my name’ [Lev. 19:12] but you must pay your vow to YHWH. But I say to you, that **you must not swear by anything falsely**, not by heaven which is the throne of God, nor by the earth which is His footstool, nor by Jerusalem which is His City, nor by your head because you cannot make one hair white or black, But let your yes be yes and your no, no. Anything added to this is evil.” (Shem Tov Matt. 5:33-37). Instead of forbidding the swearing of a vow, Jesus commanded not to swear FALSELY. He also made the point that it does not matter to what or to whom the vow is sworn, a vow must be kept. In other words, Matthew

Additional evidence for a Hebrew text of Matthew is contained in an historical record from Papias who, along with Polycarp and Irenaeus, were respected followers the apostle John.

Since the book of Matthew was originally intended for the Jews in Judea, the preferred language would have been Hebrew. There is evidence of a Hebrew Matthew text in the writings of Papias of Hierapolis who lived circa 60-130AD. He was described by Irenaeus as “an ancient man who was a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp.” All three, Polycarp, Irenaeus, and Papias, are credentialed as disciples of the apostle John.

Eusebius records this from the writings of Papias: “Therefore **Matthew put the logia [sayings of Jesus Christ] in an ordered**

arrangement in the Hebrew language, but each person interpreted them as best he could.”

Papias said that Matthew wrote all of the “sayings of Jesus” in the *Hebrew* language, which men afterwards translated into other languages “as best [they] could.” According to Nehemiah Gordon, it is likely that the book of Matthew was originally written in Hebrew and the Greek text was later translated either from the Hebrew or from an Aramaic (similar to Hebrew) translation of the Hebrew.

Finally, there is a unique phrase only employed by Matthew in his writings that would indicate the original text was in Hebrew. This comes from the use of a unique phrase exclusive to the book of Matthew—“kingdom of heaven.” All other biblical authors use the phrase, “kingdom of God/Christ.” Given that Matthew wrote to Jews, it is not surprising that he would avoid the use of the Tetragrammaton YHWH/YHVH because the Pharisees prohibited the writing or speaking the name of God.

While the Greek Matthew contains five instances¹² where the phrase “kingdom of God” is used, they are all part of direct quotes of Jesus. It may be Matthew included YHWH specifically in those instances so that the actual words of Christ were accurately maintained. Regardless, the phrase “kingdom of heaven” would likely only be used by a Jew writing in the Hebrew language to avoid being accused of blasphemy for using the Tetragrammaton.

The above four major points provide significant credibility for a Hebrew original of the book of Matthew. When it comes to Matthew 28:19-20, the Shem Tov Hebrew records this:

¹² Matt. 6:33; 12:28; 19:24; 21:31; 21:43.

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

[TOV] MATTHEW 28:19-20:

19 Go

20 and [*teach*] them to carry out all the things which I have commanded you forever.

Compare this to the KJV of the Greek sources where the highlighted portion in verse 19 is absent in the Hebrew:

[KJV+] MATTHEW 28:19-20:

19 Go **{ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:}**

20 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.

Obviously, there is no mention “the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost” in the Shem Tov Hebrew Matthew as is the case in the Greek. In fact, there is no mention of baptism at all—nothing follows after the verb “go” until verse 20.

Discrepancies Between Greek & Hebrew

Historical documents record that the early Greek of Matthew 28:19 was simply, “Go, and make disciples of all nations **in My [Jesus Christ’s] Name,**” which was later changed to “Go ... and baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” The Hebrew text, however, has no mention whatsoever of baptism, much less the triune text. Essentially, it does not include any of the traditional Greek text in verse 19 except the word “Go.”

So, how is this discrepancy to be understood? From a Greek perspective, the extant biblical texts seem to indicate, at the very least, that the baptismal formula (“in His [*Jesus Christ’s*] name”) was originally a part of verse 19. It was only later that the false doctrine of the Trinity was inserted. The latter is unquestionably a corruption as established by Scripture and historical documents where baptism is in the name of Jesus Christ—and no other.

On the other hand, the Hebrew contains no baptismal reference at all. Additionally, the Hebrew also “fixes” two other Scriptures that are obvious errors in the Greek (Matt. 23:2-3; 5:33-37). This lends validity to the Hebrew text of the book of Matthew as the original. In that case, not only was the entire baptismal formula added to the Greek, but it was modified again with the false Trinity doctrine.

However, the question of a Hebrew versus a Greek original is not especially significant when applied specifically to Matthew 28:19. It is indisputable that the original Greek specified baptism in the name of Jesus, which is scripturally correct. The fact that baptism is completely missing in the Hebrew has no effect on the baptismal formula contained in numerous other Scriptures, so nothing is lost. The primary importance in this matter is that baptism is in the name of Jesus Christ. Period.

CONCLUSION

Greek Matthew 28:19 is Corrupted

Matthew 28:19 is a completely corrupted text in the Greek book of Matthew. The main evidence for this is in Scripture itself, which repeatedly commands baptism be performed in the name of Jesus Christ as stated by two independent biblical authors—Luke and Paul. Notwithstanding, Matthew 28:19 also directly conflicts with Acts 4:12, in which both aspects of **salvation** (baptism *and* receiving the Holy Spirit) are only in the name of Jesus Christ, with no attribution of authority to God the Father or the Holy Spirit. On Scripture alone, Matthew 28:19 can only be considered an illegitimate corruption.

Alongside the scriptural evidence is substantial historical literature and writings by many church historians that attribute the source of the deception to the early Catholic Church authorities who do not shy away from admitting their corruption. The extra-biblical evidence alone leaves no doubt that modern translations include a corrupted Matthew 28:19.

In spite of the evidence, many modern organizations use Matthew 28:19 as the formula for baptism while completely ignoring the plain evidence in the other Scriptures. This is quite surprising given that the corruption of this verse is a deliberate attempt to insert the false doctrine of a triune god, something that most of the *ekklesia* rightly reject. There are only two Scriptures that mention all three—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—Matthew 28:19 and 1 John 5:7. While Scripture commonly mentions these three in different roles, these two verses in particular are an obvious portrayal of the false Trinity doctrine.

Both also have similar scriptural and historical difficulties that clearly question their legitimacy. Given that 1 John 5:7 is rejected as added text that promotes the false Trinity doctrine, it is stunning that Matthew 28:19 is considered by any to be legitimate despite the identical triune expression. Even a strictly rational approach

would accept both as either authentic or reject both as illegitimate. Accepting one and not the other is unsound hermeneutics; especially since both verses have widespread attention for the identical issue of a false Trinity doctrine.

At the very least, Scripture and historical writings prove that the Greek Matthew 28:19 is a serious corruption if not a wholesale addition. Eliminating it exposes the unified biblical command that baptism shall be done solely in the name of Jesus Christ.

ORDNANCE: Scripture commands that each believer shall “be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ,”¹³ and in His name alone.

Concerned About Your Baptism?

In light of this, some may question the validity of a baptism that was performed according to Matthew 28:19. The reality is in this modern era, many if not most of the modern *ekklesia* were baptized in this manner. In those cases, God is merciful to forgive the innocent in their ignorance through faith in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ for repentance and forgiveness.

Paul told the Romans, “whatever *is* not from faith is sin” (Rom. 14:23); however, the opposite is true as well: everything that is of faith is righteousness. This is a primary principle of salvation because the righteousness of God is to us by the faith of Jesus Christ¹⁴.

ROMANS 3:22, 24 even **the righteousness of God, through faith in Jesus Christ, to all and on all who believe**. For there is no difference; ... 24 being **justified**

¹³ Acts 2:28; 4:10, 12; 8:12, 15-16; 10:48; 19:5; 22:16; Rom. 6:3-4.

¹⁴ Also Rom. 1:17; 4:5; 9:30; 10:6; Gal. 5:5; Phil. 3:9; Heb. 11:7.

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,

APPENDIX A

Baptism Covenant Ceremony

The following is a guide for performing a baptism. It begins by asking the one being baptized to respond to each of the covenant promises in the affirmative prior to water immersion.

COVENANT PROMISES

- Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God? (Acts 8:37)
- Have you repented to God of your sins, which are transgressions of the commandments and laws of God? (Acts 2:38)
- Do you accept the sacrifice of Jesus Christ for the cleansing of your sins by His blood? (Rev. 1:5)
- Do you affirm Jesus Christ is the only name by which your sins are forgiven? (Acts 4:12)
- Do you desire to be buried with Jesus Christ by baptism into His death for the remission of sin? (Rom. 3:25; 6:2-11)
- Do you promise to love and obey God the Father and Jesus Christ with all your heart, mind, soul, and strength; to love the saints of God as Jesus Christ loves you; to love your neighbor as yourself; and to love your enemies? (John 14:15; 15:12; Matt. 5:44; Luke 10:27)
- Do you affirm Jesus Christ as your Lord, Master, and King in this life and the Kingdom to come? (Matt. 23:10; John 13:13)

BAPTISM & LAYING ON OF HANDS

What is your full name?

<NAME>, you are about to enter into an eternal covenant with God the Father and Jesus Christ based upon the promises you have

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

just made. I will now baptize you, not into any sect, denomination, or organization of the world, but in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38).

I will then lay my hands upon you and pray that God the Father will beget you with His Holy Spirit in the name of Jesus Christ (John 14:17, 26; 1 John 5:1) and place you into the Body of Christ, which brings the promise of eternal life to you and to all who belong to our Lord and Savior. I do this in the name and authority of Jesus Christ.

<BAPTISM>

<LAYING ON OF HANDS PRAYER>

I now commend you into the hands of Jesus Christ and God the Father (Luke 23:46). AMEN!

APPENDIX B

Historical Sources Pertaining to Matthew 28:19

The following is a considerable compilation of sources from trinitytruth.org¹⁵ that highlight the preponderance of evidence against Matthew 28:19 being in the original manuscripts. It is consistent across religious beliefs, bias, and the ages.

Catholic Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger:

“The basic form of our (Matthew 28:19 Trinitarian) 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.” — Joseph Ratzinger (pope Benedict XVI) Introduction to Christianity: 1968 edition, pp. 82, 83

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 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

¹⁵ https://www.trinitytruth.org/matthew28_19addedtext.html.

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

controversy in Rome and Africa about 254, as the anonymous tract *De rebaptismate* ("On rebaptism") shows."

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."

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:..."

James Moffett's *New Testament Translation*:

Footnote, page 64, regarding Matthew 28:19: "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 baptizing "in the name of Jesus, cf. Acts 1:5 +."

New Revised Standard Version:

“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...”

Tom Harpur:

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 [Triune 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 baptize 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 “baptizing 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 baptize into the threefold [Trinity] name is a late doctrinal expansion.”

The Bible Commentary 1919 page 723:

Quote from Dr. Peake: “The command to baptize into the threefold name is a late doctrinal expansion. Instead of the words baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost we should probably read simply “into My Name.”

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume 8:

“Justin Martyr was one of the early Fathers of the Roman Catholic Church who helped change the ancient baptism of “in the Name of Jesus Christ” to the titles of Father, Son and Holy Ghost.”

The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913 edition, volume II, page 263:

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

“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.”

The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913 edition, volume II, page 265:

“The original formula for baptism was in the Name of Jesus, but the pope changed it.”

The Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edition, Vol. 3, Pages 365-6:

“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.”

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 baptize 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 Demonstratio Evangelica by Eusebius:

Page 152, quoting from an early book of Matthew in a library in Caesarea: “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 whatsoever I have commanded you.” That “Name” is Jesus.

The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics:

“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.”

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

“Matthew 28:19 in particular only canonizes 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 Jerusalem Bible (a scholarly Catholic work):

“It may be that this formula, (Triune 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 baptizing “in the name 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 Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, I, page 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.”

Theology of the New Testament:

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

R. Bultmann, 1951, page 133 under Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church and the Sacraments: "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 baptizing names over the one being baptized the name of the Lord Jesus Christ," later expanded [changed] to the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit."

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."

A History of the Christian Church:

Williston Walker former Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Yale University, 1953, page 95: "With the early disciples generally baptism 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)."

Page 61: "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.”

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), baptizing 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 triune 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.”

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

“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 cannot represent historical fact.

“Would they have baptized, as Acts says that they did, and Paul seems 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 recognized (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.”

Page 336: “1. In the actual description of baptism in the Didache the triune (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 triune 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 Anchor Bible Dictionary, Vol. 1, 1992, p. 585:

“The historical riddle is not solved by Matthew 28:19, since, according to a wide scholarly consensus, it is not an authentic

saying of Jesus, not even an elaboration of a Jesus-saying on baptism”

The Dictionary of the Bible, 1947, p. 83:

“It has been customary to trace the institution of the practice (of baptism) to the words of Christ recorded in Matthew 28:19. But the authenticity of this passage has been challenged on historical as well as on textual grounds. It must be acknowledged that the formula of the threefold name, which is here enjoined, does not appear to have been employed by the primitive Church, which, so far as our information goes, baptized 'in' or 'into the name of Jesus' (or 'Jesus Christ' or Lord Jesus': Acts 2:38, 8:16, 10:48, 19:5, 1 Cor. 1:13, 15)”

Peake's Commentary on the Bible, 1929, p. 723:

“The Church of the first days did not observe this world-wide command, even if they knew it. The command to baptize into the threefold name is a late doctrinal expansion. In place of the words “baptizing... Spirit” we should probably read simply “into my name,” i.e. (turn the nations) to Christianity, “in my name,” i.e. (teach the nations) in my spirit”

The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; S. Driver, A. Plummer, C. Briggs; A Critical & Exegetical Commentary of St. Matthew Third Edition, 1912, pp. 307, 308:

“On the text, see Conybeare, Zeitsch. Fur die Neutest. Wissensch. 1901, 275 ff.; Hibbert Journal, October 1902; Lake, Inaugural Lecture; Rigenbach, Der Trinitarische Taufbefehl; Chase, Journal Theo. Stud. Vi. 481 ff. The evidence of Eusebius must be regarded as indecisive, in view of the fact that all Greek MSS. and all extant VSS., contain the clause (S1 and S2 are unhappily wanting). The Eusebian quotation: “Go disciple ye all the nations in my name,” cannot be taken as decisive proof that the clause “Baptizing...Spirit” was lacking in copies known to Eusebius, because “in my name” may be Eusebius' way of abbreviating, for whatever reason, the following clause. On the other hand, Eusebius cites in this short form so often that it is easier to suppose that he is definitely quoting the words of the Gospel, than to invent

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

possible reasons which may have caused him so frequently to have paraphrased it. And if we once suppose his short form to have been current in MSS. of the Gospel, there is much probability in the conjecture that it is the original text of the Gospel, and that in the later centuries the clause "baptizing...Spirit" supplanted the shorter "in my name." And insertion of this kind derived from liturgical use would very rapidly be adopted by copyists and translators. The Didache has ch. 7: "Baptizing in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit": but the passage need not be dependent on our canonical Gospel, and the Didache elsewhere has a liturgical addition to the text of the Gospels in the doxology attached to the Lord's Prayer. But Irenaeus and Tertullian already have the longer clause."

Word Biblical Commentary, Vol 33B, Matthew 14-28; Donald A. Hagner, 1975, p. 887-888:

"The disciples are further told to "baptize" (the second of the participles functioning as supplementary imperatives) new disciples. The command to baptize comes as somewhat of a surprise since baptism is referred to earlier only in chap. 3 (and 21:25) where only John's baptism is described (among the Gospels only in John 3:22; 4:1-2 do we read of Jesus' or his disciples' baptizing others). Matthew tells us nothing concerning his view of Christian baptism. Only Matthew records this command of Jesus, but the practice of the early church suggest its historicity. (cf. Acts 2:38, 41; 8:12, 38; 9:18; 10:48; 19:5; 22:16; etc.). The threefold name (at most only an incipient Trinitarianism) in which the baptism was to be performed, on the other hand, seems clearly to be a liturgical expansion of the evangelist consonant with the practice of his day (thus Hubbard; cf. Did. 7.1). There is a good possibility that in its original form, as witnessed by the ante-Nicene Eusebian form, the text read "make disciples in my name" (see Conybeare). This shorter reading preserves the symmetrical rhythm of the passage, whereas the triadic formula fits awkwardly into the structure as one might expect if it were an interpolation (see H. B. Green; cf. Howard; Hill [IBS 8 (1986) 54-63], on the other hand, argues for a concentric design with the triadic formula at its center). It is Kosmala, however, who has argued most effectively for the

shorter reading, pointing to the central importance of “name of Jesus” in early Christian preaching, the practice of baptism in the name of Jesus, and the singular “in his name” with reference to the hope of the Gentiles in Isa. 42:4b, quoted by Matthew in 12:18-21. As Carson rightly notes of our passage: “There is no evidence we have Jesus' ipsissima verba here” (598). The narrative of Acts notes the use of the name only of “Jesus Christ” in baptism (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5; cf. Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27) or simply “the Lord Jesus” (Acts 8:16; 19:5)”

History of Dogma, Vol. 1, Adolph Harnack, 1958, p. 79:

“It cannot be directly proved that Jesus instituted baptism, for Matthew 28:19 is not a saying of the Lord. The reasons for this assertion are: (1) It is only a later stage of the tradition that represents the risen Christ as delivering speeches and giving commandments. Paul knows nothing of it. (2) The Trinitarian formula is foreign to the mouth of Jesus and has not the authority of the Apostolic age which it must have had if it had descended from Jesus himself. On the other hand, Paul knows of no other way of receiving the Gentiles into the Christian communities than by baptism, and it is highly probable that in the time of Paul all Jewish Christians were also baptized. We may perhaps assume that the practice of baptism was continued in consequence of Jesus' recognition of John the Baptist and his baptism, even after John himself had been removed. According to John 4:2, Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples under his superintendence. It is possible only with the help of tradition to trace back to Jesus a “Sacrament of Baptism,” or an obligation to it ex necessitate salutis, through it is credible that tradition is correct here. Baptism in the Apostolic age was in the name of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. 1:13; Acts 19:5). We cannot make out when the formula in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit emerged.”

The Seat of Authority in Religion, James Martineau, 1905, p. 568:

“The very account which tells us that at the last, after his resurrection, he commissioned his apostles to go and baptize among all nations (Mt 28:19) betrayed itself by speaking in

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

the Trinitarian language of the next century, and compels us to see in it the ecclesiastical editor, and not the evangelist, much less the founder himself. No historical trace appears of this baptismal formula earlier than the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" (ch. 7:1,3 *The Oldest Church Manual*, ed. Philip Schaff, 1887), and the first Apology of Justin (*Apol. i. 61.*) about the middle of the second century: and more than a century later, Cyprian found it necessary to insist upon the use of it instead of the older phrase baptized "into Christ Jesus," or into the "name of the Lord Jesus." (*Gal. 3:27; Acts 19:5; 10:48. Cyprian Ep. 73, 16-18*, has to convert those who still use the shorter form.) Paul alone, of the apostles, was baptized, ere he was "filled with the Holy Ghost;" and he certainly was baptized simply "into Christ Jesus." (*Rom. 6:3*) Yet the tri-personal form, unhistorical as it is, is actually insisted on as essential by almost every Church in Christendom, and, if you have not had it pronounced over you, the ecclesiastical authorities cast you out as a heathen man, and will accord to you neither Christian recognition in your life, nor Christian burial in your death. It is a rule which would condemn as invalid every recorded baptism performed by an apostle; for if the book of Acts may be trusted, the invariable usage was baptism "in the name of Christ Jesus," (*Acts 2:38*) and not "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." And doubtless the author (*Luke*) is as good a witness for the usage of his own time (about 115 A.D.) as for that of the period whereof he treats."

History of New Testament Criticism, Conybeare, 1910, pp. 98-102, 111-112:

"It is clear, therefore, that of the MSS which Eusebius inherited from his predecessor, Pamphilus, at Caesarea in Palestine, some at least preserved the original reading, in which there was no mention either of Baptism or of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It had been conjectured by Dr. Davidson, Dr. Martineau, by the present Dean of Westminster, and by Prof. Harnack (to mention but a few names out of many), that here the received text, could not contain the very words of Jesus? This long before anyone except Dr. Burgon, who kept the discovery to himself, had noticed the Eusebian form of the reading." "It is satisfactory to

notice that Dr. Eberhard Nestle, in his new edition of the New Testament in Latin and Greek, furnishes the Eusebian reading in his critical apparatus, and that Dr. Sanday seems to lean to its acceptance.”

A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, J. Hastings, 1906:

Page 170: “It is doubted whether the explicit injunction of Matt. 28:19 can be accepted as uttered by Jesus. ...But the Trinitarian formula in the mouth of Jesus is certainly unexpected.

“Feine (PER3, XIX, 396 f) and Kattenbusch (Sch-Herz, I, 435 f. argue that the Trinitarian formula in Matthew 28:19 is spurious. No record of the use of the Trinitarian formula can be discovered in the Acts of the epistles of the apostles.” — (The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, James Orr, 1946, p. 398)

The Jerusalem Bible, 1966, p. 64:

“Footnote to Matthew 28:19, It may be that this formula, so far as the fullness of its expression is concerned, is a reflection of the liturgical usage established later in the primitive community. It will be remembered that the Acts speak of baptizing “in the name of Jesus”, Acts 1:5 +. But whatever the variation on formula the underlying reality remains the same.”

The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, 1962, p. 351:

“[Matthew 28:19] has been disputed on textual grounds, but in the opinion of many scholars the words may still be regarded as part of the true text of Matthew. There is, however, grave doubt whether they may be the ipsissima verba of Jesus. The evidence of Acts 2:38; 10:48 (cf. 8:16; 19:5), supported by Gal. 3:27; Rom 6:3, 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.” This is difficult to reconcile with the specific instructions of the verse at the end of Matthew.”

The Philosophy of the Church Fathers, Vol. 1, Harry Austryn Wolfson, 1964, p. 143:

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

“Critical scholarship, on the whole, rejects the traditional attribution of the tripartite baptismal formula to Jesus and regards it as of later origin. Undoubtedly then the baptismal formula originally consisted of one part and it gradually developed into its tripartite form.”

Baptism in the New Testament G.R. Beasley-Murray, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962, p. 83:

“A whole group of exegetes and critics have recognized that the opening declaration of Matt. 28:18 demands a Christological statement to follow it: “All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to Me” leads us to expect as a consequence, “Go and make disciples unto Me among all the nations, baptising them in My name, teaching them to observe all things I commanded you.” In fact, the first and third clauses have that significance: it looks as though the second clause has been modified from a Christological to a Trinitarian formula in the interests of the liturgical tradition.”

Aphraates:

“There is one other witness whose testimony we must consider. He is Aphraates the Syriac father who wrote between 337 and 345. He cites our text in a formal manner as follows:

'Make disciples of all nations, and they shall believe in me.'

“The last words appear to be a gloss on the Eusebius reading 'in my name.' But in any case they preclude the textus receptus with its injunction to baptise in the triune name. Were the reading of Aphraates an isolated fact, we might regard it as a loose citation, but in presence of the Eusebian and Justinian text this is impossible.” — (--Conybeare (THJ) page 107)

Author of De Rebaptismate:

“The anonymous author of De Rebaptismate in the third century so understood them, and dwells at length on 'the power of the name of Jesus invoked upon a man by Baptism.’” — (De Rebaptismate 6.7 Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. i, p. 352)

Clement of Alexandria:

“In the pages of Clement of Alexandria a text somewhat similar to Matthew xxviii. 19 is once cited; but from a gnostic heretic named Theodotus, and not as from the canonical text, as follows: 'And to the apostles he gives the command. Going around preaching ye and baptize those who believe in the name of father and son and holy spirit.' — (Excerpta, cap. 76, ed. Sylb. p. 987; --Conybeare)

Eunomius:

“Exceptions are found which perhaps point to an old practice dying out. CYPRIAN (Ep.73) and the APOSTOLIC CANONS (no. 50) combat the shorter formula, thereby attesting its use in certain quarters. The ordinance of Canon Apostolic 50 runs:

'If any Bishop or presbyter fulfill not three baptisms 'of one initiation, but one baptism which is given (as) into the death of the Lord, let him be deposed.'

“This was the formula of the followers of Eunomius (Socr. 5.24) 'for they baptized not into the Trinity, but into the death of Christ.' They accordingly used single immersion only.” — Ency. Biblica (Art. Baptism)

Justin Martyr:

“Justin Martyr quotes a saying of Christ as a proof of the necessity of regeneration, but falls back upon the use of Isaiah and apostolic tradition to justify the practice of baptism and the use of the trine formula. This certainly suggests that Justin did not know the traditional text of Matthew 28:19.” — (Ency. Rel. and Ethics, p. 380)

“In Justin Martyr, who wrote between A.D. 130 and 140, there is a passage which has been regarded as a citation or echo of Matthew xxviii. 19 by various scholars, e.g. Resch in his *Ausser canonische Parallelstellen*, who sees in it an abridgement of the ordinary text. The passage is in Justin's dialogue with Trypho 39, p. 258: 'God hath not inflicted nor inflicts the judgment, as knowing of some that still even to-day are being made disciples in the name of his Christ, and are abandoning the path of error, who also do receive gifts each

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

as they be worthy, being illumined by the name of this Christ.' The objection hitherto to these words being recognized as a citation of our text was that they ignored the formula 'baptising them in the name of the Father and Son and holy Spirit.' But the discovery of the Eusebian form of text removes this difficulty; and Justin is seen to have had the same text as early as the year 140, which Eusebius regularly found in his manuscripts from 300-340." — (--Conybeare (Hibbert Journal, p. 106)

Macedonius:

"We may infer that the text was not quite fixed when Tertullian was writing early in the third century. In the middle of that century Cyprian could insist on the use of the triple formula as essential in the baptism even of the orthodox. The pope Stephen answered him that the baptisms even of heretics were valid, if the name of Jesus alone was invoked" (However, this decision did not prevent the popes of the seventh century from excommunicating the entire Celtic Church for its adhesion to the old use of invoking the one name). In the last half of the fourth century the text "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the holy Ghost" was used as a battle-cry by the orthodox against the adherents of Macedonius, who were called pneumato-machi or fighters against the Holy Spirit, because they declined to include the Spirit in a Trinity of persons as co-equal, consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father and Son. They also stoutly denied that any text of the N.T. authorized such a co-ordination of the Spirit with the Father and Son. Whence we infer that their texts agreed with that of Eusebius." — (--F.C. Conybeare (Hibbert Journal, p. 107)

Origen:

"In Origen's works as preserved in Greek, the first part of the verse is thrice adduced, but his citation always stops short at the words 'the nations;' and that in itself suggests that his text has been censured, and words which followed, 'in my name,' struck out." — (Conybeare)

Catholic Encyclopedia:

“The threefold immersion is unquestionably very ancient in the Church. ...Its object is, of course, to honor the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity in whose name it is conferred.” — (p. 262)

Conybeare:

“The exclusive survival of (3) in all MSS., both Greek and Latin, need not cause surprise. In the only codices which would be even likely to preserve an older reading, namely the Sinaitic Syriac and the oldest Latin MS., the pages are gone which contained the end of Matthew. But in any case the conversion of Eusebius to the longer text after the council of Nice indicates that it was at that time being introduced as a Shibboleth of orthodoxy into all codices. We have no codex older than the year 400, if so old; and long before that time the question of the inclusion of the holy Spirit on equal terms in the Trinity had been threshed out, and a text so invaluable to the dominate party could not but make its way into every codex, irrespectively of its textual affinities.” — (Hibbert Journal)

“In the case just examined (Matthew 28:19), it is to be noticed that not a single manuscript or ancient version has preserved to us the true reading. But that is not surprising for as Dr. C. R. Gregory, one of the greatest of our textual critics, reminds us, ‘the Greek MSS of the text of the New Testament were often altered by scribes, who put into them the readings which were familiar to them,’ and which they held to be the right readings. Canon and Text of the N T, 1907, page 424.”

“These facts speak for themselves. Our Greek texts, not only of the Gospels, but of the Epistles as well, have been revised and interpolated by orthodox copyist. We can trace their perversions of the text in a few cases, with the aid of patristic citations and ancient versions. But there must remain many passages which have not been so corrected, but where we cannot today expose the fraud. It was necessary to emphasis this point, because Drs. Westcott and Hort used to say that there is no evidence of merely doctrinal changes having been made in the text of the New Testament. This is just the opposite of the truth, and such distinguished scholars as Alfred Loisy, J. Wellhausen, Eberhard Nestle, Adolph

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

Harnack, to mention only four names, do not scruple to recognize the fact.”

“[Nevertheless] there are a number of reasons why we can feel confident about the general reliability of our translations.”
— (Peter Watkins, 'Bridging the Gap' in *The Christadelphian*, January 1962, pp. 4-8)

Encyclopedia Religion and Ethics:

“If it be thought as many critics think, that no MS represents more than comparatively late recessions of the text, it is necessary to set against the mass of manuscript evidence the influence of baptismal practice. It seems easier to believe that the traditional text was brought about by this influence working on the 'Eusebian' text, than that the latter arose out of the former in spite of it.” — (Art. Baptism)

Fraternal Visitor:

“Codex B. (Vaticanus) would be the best of all existing MSS if it were completely preserved, less damaged, (less) corrected, more easily legible, and not altered by a later hand in more than two thousand places. Eusebius, therefore, is not without grounds for accusing the adherents of Athanasius and of the newly-arisen doctrine of the Trinity of falsifying the Bible more than once.” — (Fraternal Visitor, in *The Christadelphian Monatshefte*, 1924, p. 148)

Hammond:

“There are two or three insertions in the NT which have been supposed to have their origin in the ecclesiastical usage. The words in question, being familiarly known in a particular connection, were perhaps noted in the margin of some copy, and thence became incorporated by the next transcriber; or a transcriber's own familiarity with the words might have led to his inserting them. This is the source to which Dr. Tregelles assigns the Doxology at the close of the Lord's Prayer in Matt. 6, which is wanting most of the best authorities. Perhaps also Acts 8:37, containing the baptismal profession of faith, which is entirely wanting in the best authorities, found its way into the Latin text in this manner.” — (Hammond, *Textual Criticism Applied to the NT*, (1890) p. 23)

Hastings Dictionary of the Bible:

“In the Eastern Churches, triune immersion is regarded as the only valid form of baptism.” — (Vol. 1. p. 243 fn)

Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church:

“In the 'Two Ways' of the Didache, the principal duties of the candidates for Baptism and the method of administering it by triple immersion of infusion on the head are outlined. This triple immersion is also attested by Tertullian (Adversus Prax 26). ...The most elaborate form of the rite in modern Western usage is in the Roman Catholic Church.” — (pp. 125, 126)

Robert Roberts:

“Athanasius... met Flaivan, the author of the Doxology, which has since been universal in Christendom: 'Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, etc.' This was composed in opposition to the Arian Doxology: 'Glory to the Father, by the Son, in the Holy Spirit.’ — (Robert Roberts, Good Company, Vol. iii, p. 49)

Smith's Dictionary of Christian Antiquities:

“While triune immersion was thus an all but universal practice, Eunomius (circ. 360) appears to have been the first to introduce simple immersion 'unto the death of Christ' ... This practice was condemned on pain of degradation, by the Canon Apost. 46 (al 50). But it comes before us again about a century later in Spain; but then, curiously enough, we find it regarded as a badge of orthodoxy in opposition to the practice of the Arians. These last kept to the use of the Triune immersion, but in such a way as to set forth their own doctrine of a gradation in the three Persons.” — (Art. Baptism Sec. 50)

Whiston:

“The Eusebians... sometimes named the very time when, the place where, and the person whom they (i.e. forms of doxology) were first introduced... thus Philoflorgius, a writer of that very age, assures us in PHOTIUS'S EXTRACTS that A.D. 348 or thereabouts, Flavianus, Patriarche of Antioch, got a multitude of monks together, and did their first use this public doxology, 'Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and

BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

to the Holy Spirit.” — (Second Letter concerning the Primitive Doxologies, 1719, p. 17)

“We certainly know of a greater number of interpolations and corruptions brought into the Scriptures... by Athanasius, and relating to the Doctrine of the Trinity, than in any other case whatsoever. While we have not, that I know of, any such interpolations and corruption, made in any one of them by either the Eusebians or Arians.” — (Second letter to the Bishop of London, 1719, p. 15)