

# 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

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	<b>6</b>
Baptize in Whose Name? .....	6
Matthew 28:19 .....	9
Baptism—Roles of God, Jesus, & the Holy Spirit.....	12
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	<b>16</b>
Matthew 28:19 Is Added Text—Historical Proof.....	16
Matthew 28:19-20 Corrected.....	17
Shem Tov Hebrew Matthew .....	18
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>19</b>
Modern Greek Matthew 28:19 is Corrupted.....	19
Concerned About Your Baptism? .....	20
<b>APPENDIX A</b>	<b>22</b>
Baptism Covenant Ceremony .....	22
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	<b>25</b>
Matthew 28:19-20—Greek Historical Sources.....	25
<b>APPENDIX C</b>	<b>44</b>
Matthew 28:19-20— Hebrew Historical Source.....	44

# 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

Baptism is required to receive the Holy Spirit. It is a very special ceremony with deep meaning. However, for decades, the formula used for baptism has been Matthew 28:19:

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,**

This is the only verse in the Bible that mentions God the Father and the Holy Spirit as part of the water baptism ceremony. All other Scripture consistently requires a person to be baptized only in the name of Jesus Christ. Why would that be the case? If Matthew 28:19 is truly the words of Jesus Christ, then the apostles either failed to make accurate records of baptisms throughout the New Testament or the verity of Matthew 28:19 comes into question.

It may be surprising, but there is a collection of historical literature and writings that throw serious doubt on the origins of the phrase “into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,” and much of it suggests that Matthew 28:19 has been corrupted by the Catholic Church.

Because baptism is absolutely required for spiritual salvation, understanding whether or not Matthew 28:19 should be used as the formula in the baptism ceremony is quite essential.

# CHAPTER 1

## ***Baptize in Whose Name?***

Baptism symbolizes a Believer being joined into the death, burial, and resurrection of the Savior for the remission of sin<sup>1</sup>:

COLOSSIANS 2:11-12 In Him [*Jesus Christ*] 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.

The physical ceremony of baptism portrays a Believer being conjoined into the sacrifice of Jesus Christ; that is, to be “buried with [*Jesus Christ*] in baptism” is to be “baptized into Christ.” This requires the ceremony to be dedicated to, and in full recognition of, the name of Jesus because He was the One who was sacrificed. An act performed in the name of someone establishes it in accordance with, and authorized by, the one who has supremacy over the matter.

### **DEFINITION:**

Baptism means to fully immerse in water. It portrays the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ who died for the remission (cancellation) of the penalty of death for sin.

In the case of baptism, the proclamation of every New Testament Scripture (excluding Matthew 28:19) is only in the name of Jesus Christ. Notice the consistency and exclusivity of all those verses:

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Acts 2:28; Rom. 6:3-5; 23.

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.

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 [it] 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.

These verses confirm 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.”**

Baptism comes from a personal desire and willingness to put to death the old life of sin in order to live as a new creation reconciled

to God<sup>2</sup>. Only the blood of Jesus Christ covers sin; therefore, baptism is only associated with His sacrifice. Being “baptized in the name of Jesus Christ” is a physical act in which a Believer is symbolically joined into His death:

ROMANS 6:4-7 Therefore we were buried with Him [*Jesus Christ*] 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 the name of the person *performing* the baptism over the name of Jesus who actually *died* for sins:

1 CORINTHIANS 1:11-13 For it has been declared to me [*Paul*] 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?**

Obviously, Paul was not crucified for the salvation of the Corinthians, so none of the Corinthians were (or could be) baptized into Paul's name. Even if this were the case, he said that “Christ” would be divided! Divided how? The Corinthians emphasized baptisms in accordance with the names of the men who *performed* them—men such as Paul, Apollos, and Cephas—above that of Jesus who was *sacrificed* for them. The Corinthians wanted bragging rights according to *who* baptized them as they vied for status and recognition among themselves. Their pride put men

---

<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. 5:17-18; Eph. 4:20-24.



## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

before Jesus. Clearly, they failed to recognize the meaning, purpose, and authority behind baptism. God the Father proclaimed that Jesus Christ is His **ONLY** Son and the **ONLY** name through which we receive eternal life<sup>3</sup>:

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. Except for Matthew 28:19, nowhere else does the Bible state that baptism is performed in the name of anyone except Jesus Christ and even God the Father and the Holy Spirit are never mentioned.

### ***Matthew 28:19***

There is one verse in the Bible—and only one—that specifies baptism to be performed other than “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**,

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

Some, who insist that this particular verse was part of the original manuscript, attempt to justify it by saying that *name* only refers to the phrase “of the Father” but does not pertain to either the Son or the Holy Spirit. However, the rules of grammar (Greek *and* English) requires that “name” apply equally to the phrases “of the Son” and “of the Holy Spirit” because the conjunction *and* (Gk. *kai*) connects and extends the noun “name” to all three. The rules of

---

<sup>3</sup> Also John 1:18; Heb. 11:17; 1 John 4:9.

grammar require the verse be interpreted as: “in the name of the Father, **and** [*in the name*] of the Son, **and** [*in the name*] of the Holy Spirit.” This is clear in this example: “Please ask John to record the name of the principle and of the teacher and of the student.” The conjunction *and* connects *name* to all three—the principle, teacher, and student. Otherwise, what is there to record “of the teacher” or “of the student?” It only makes sense to write down the names of the principle, teacher, and student.

Another problem with ‘naming’ all three is that Father, Son, 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 exactly are the appropriate **names** for God the Father and the Holy Spirit? Scripture does *not* specify them.

There are also additional issues with the Holy Spirit<sup>4</sup> mentioned in Matthew 28:19. The first is that it is not an independent living being so it has no personalized 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 Holy Spirit given a name. The Holy Spirit is the power of God; as such, 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.”

The Holy Spirit does have a part to play but it is AFTER baptism. It is sent by God the Father in the name of Jesus Christ when the elder lays hands on the person following baptismal immersion:

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.**

---

<sup>4</sup> 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/>.

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

ACTS 8:18 And when Simon saw that **through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Spirit was given**, he offered them money,

Why is the Holy Spirit sent in the name of Jesus? Again, “there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved” than Jesus Christ<sup>5</sup>. While baptism is for the remission of sin, the Holy Spirit begets eternal life<sup>6</sup>; therefore, it is also necessary for salvation but has a different purpose. Still, it is sent by God the Father in the **name** of the Savior Jesus Christ.

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

Baptizing in the name of the Holy Spirit (if there were such a thing) would be saying something to the effect: “I baptize you in the name of Jesus and in the name of the Holy Spirit, which is sent in the name of Jesus Christ.” This is a meaningless statement that obscures the only name that brings salvation.

Another distinction 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, a separate act 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 [it] 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,

---

<sup>5</sup> Acts 4:10-12.

<sup>6</sup> John 6:63; Rom. 8:10; 2 Cor. 3:6; Rev. 11:11.

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.

Mentioning the Holy Spirit in ANY form makes absolutely no sense because it serves no purpose or function in baptism.

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

It is important to understand the roles of God the Father, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit with regards to baptism. First of all, baptism portrays the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ who shed His blood for the remission (cancellation) of the penalty of death for sin:

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]**.

HEBREWS 13:12 Therefore **Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood**, suffered outside the gate.

**DEFINITION:** Remission of sin is the cancellation of the death penalty for transgressions against 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 Christ<sup>7</sup>:

---

<sup>7</sup> Also Acts 2:38.

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

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 an independent living being! There was only One who was made to be sin—Jesus Christ:

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 [Jesus Christ].

Being baptized into any name aside from Jesus Christ, including that 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 symbolically dying for our personal sins, through a momentary burial in a watery grave, followed by a ‘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 sins. Therefore, baptism is only in the name of Jesus Christ—and no other.

Baptism in the name of Jesus Christ establishes ALL 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 cancels the death penalty for sin is that of Jesus Christ.

Once a person is baptized into the death of Jesus Christ, their sins are covered by His shed blood. This allows God the Father to **forgive** those sins:

MATTHEW 6:14-15 “For if you forgive men their trespasses, **your heavenly Father will also forgive you.** 15 “But if you do not forgive men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

EPHESIANS 4:32 And be kind to one another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even **as God in Christ [that is, through His sacrifice] forgave you.**

God the Father forgives sin, but even He can only forgive sin that has been covered by the blood of the sacrifice for sin; that is, Jesus Christ. And that requires baptism.

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 people with eternal life. It has a completely different purpose from baptism:

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

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

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**.

The Holy Spirit is the spiritual seed of begetting to eternal life. This is why receiving the Holy Spirit is separate from baptism. While baptism depicts *dying* for one's sins, the Holy Spirit is the seed of *life*. It is a separate act from water baptism. It is a type of baptism, but the Holy Spirit is sent by Jesus Christ who baptizes **WITH** the Holy Spirit, not "by" or "into" it<sup>8</sup>:

MATTHEW 3:11 "I [*John the Baptist*] 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 (pictured by the watery grave of baptism) at the same time—they conflict with one another. Either a person is under the penalty of death or has the seed of life by the Holy Spirit.

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. The baptismal formula in Matthew 28:19 conflicts with **ALL** Scripture that requires **baptism into the name of Jesus Christ ONLY**. References to the Father and the Holy Spirit in Matthew 28:19 are not consistent with the sacrifice of Jesus Christ or with all other Scripture.

---

<sup>8</sup> Also Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5; 11:16.

## 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 it 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 1973<sup>9</sup>:

“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.**”

Grzegorz Kaszyński has gathered many Bible translations and works of scholars on his website, including a compilation of **105 other versions** of Matthew 28:19 that do not include the triune phrase at all<sup>10</sup>. Matthew 28:19 is nothing less than a false Trinity doctrine added to Scripture as proved by the mountain of historical evidence (refer to APPENDIX B).

One example of such is from Eusebius of Caesarea who was an early historian who lived from circa 260/265 to 339AD. His own early writings<sup>11</sup> omit the Trinity text of Matthew 28:19. It is important to 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”:

---

<sup>9</sup> *Bible Catechism*, Rev. John C Kersten, S.V.D., Catholic Book Publishing Co., N.Y., N.Y.; 1973, p. 164.

<sup>10</sup> [https://www.trinitytruth.org/matthew28\\_19bible-translations.pdf](https://www.trinitytruth.org/matthew28_19bible-translations.pdf).

<sup>11</sup> Prior to the Council of Nicea in 325AD. Later writings of Eusebius 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.



## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

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 of Jesus Christ when he says, “with one word and voice **He [Jesus Christ] said.**” While Eusebius’ later writings included the Trinity 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 especially given that the controversial Quartodeciman ruling of the Council of Nicea supported Easter instead of the traditional Nissan 14 Passover occurred during his lifetime.

It is also a fact that some use Eusebius’ writings to prove that the Trinity wording in 1 John 5:7 is added text while they then claim his writings are unsubstantiated when it comes to Matthew 28:19. This is nothing less than inconsistent at best.

### ***Matthew 28:19-20 Corrected***

Given the evidence of historical documents that Matthew 28:19-20 contains corrupted and added text, the next question is what *was* the text originally penned by Matthew? First of all, note the corrupted text (shown in brackets):

MATTHEW 28:19-20 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.

The consensus of historical documents record that the early Greek manuscripts of Matthew 28:19 were 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.” From this and historical records, a correct rendering of these verses can be constructed:

**CORRECT:**

MATTHEW 28:19-20 Go, make disciples of all nations in My [*Jesus Christ*] name, 20 teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, *even* unto the end of the world. Amen.

Even though the Greek text infers baptism in the phrase, “make disciples of all nations in My [*Jesus*] name,” it is now in agreement with all other Scripture that specifies the name of Jesus only.

### ***Shem Tov Hebrew Matthew***

Another source that at least confirms that modern Greek sources contain added or corrupted text is the Shem Tov Hebrew book of Matthew. In it, there is no mention whatsoever of baptism or the triune text. In fact, it does not include any of the traditional Greek text in verse 19 except the word “Go.” The Shem Tov Hebrew records:

[SHEM TOV] MATTHEW 28:19-20 Go 20 and [*teach*] them to carry out all the things which I [*Jesus Christ*] have commanded you forever.

Because the assignment of verses occurred *after* the corrupted text was added to the manuscripts, verse 19 only contains the single word “Go” in keeping with the modern verse demarcations. It is interesting that, without the added text, there is no mention of baptism at all—nothing follows after the verb “Go” until verse 20. Devoid of any mention of baptism in Matthew 28:19, the Hebrew, like the Greek, also eliminates the contradiction with all other Scripture so the unified formula for baptism is that it is to be done in the one name of Jesus.

For more information about the Shem Tov Hebrew book of Matthew, refer to APPENDIX C.

## CONCLUSION

### ***Modern Greek Matthew 28:19 is Corrupted***

Matthew 28:19 has been corrupted by the Catholic influence of the trinity. The main evidence for this is the body of New Testament Scripture itself, which repeatedly commands baptism to 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 or mention of God the Father or the Holy Spirit with baptism. On Scripture alone, the modern translations of Matthew 28:19 can only be considered an illegitimate corruption.

Alongside the scriptural evidence is substantial historical literature and writings 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 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. 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 elsewhere commonly mentions these three in different roles, these two verses in particular are an obvious portrayal of the false Trinity doctrine invented and promoted by the Catholic Church.

Both also have similar scriptural and historical difficulties that clearly question their legitimacy. Given that 1 John 5:7 is widely recognized as added text, promoting a false Trinity doctrine, it is concerning 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 to 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,”<sup>12</sup> and in His name alone.

In the final analysis, it is obvious that Matthew 28:19-20 was corrupted and the correct rendering should be:

CORRECT:

MATTHEW 28:19-20 Go, make disciples of all nations in My name, 20 teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, *even* unto the end of the world. Amen.

### ***Concerned About Your Baptism?***

In light of this, some may question the validity of a baptism that was performed according to the corrupted Matthew 28:19 instructions. The reality is, in this modern era, many if not most of the modern *ekklesia* were baptized in this manner. In all those cases, God is merciful toward the ignorance of the innocent<sup>13</sup>. Paul told the Romans, “whatever *is* not from faith is sin” (Rom. 14:23). The righteousness of God is by faith. This is a primary principle of salvation because the righteousness of God is to us by the faith of Jesus Christ<sup>14</sup>.

---

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

<sup>13</sup> Acts 17:30; 1 Tim. 1:12-13.

<sup>14</sup> 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

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

Those who were baptized according to the corrupted text of Matthew 28:19 are still legitimately and legally baptized. It is by the grace of God the Father that any and all baptisms are acceptable:

ACTS 20:24 "... to testify to the gospel of the grace of God.

ROMANS 5:1-2 Therefore, having been justified by faith [in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ], we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, 2 through whom also we have access by faith into this grace in which we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

ROMANS 5:15 But the free gift *is* not like the offense. For if by the one man's offense many died, much more the grace of God and the gift by the grace of the one Man, Jesus Christ, abounded to many.

The grace of God is extended to all who are baptized according to personal faith, not the works or deceptions of men:

COLOSSIANS 2:11-12 In Him [*Jesus Christ*] 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 in baptism, in which you also were raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead.

EPHESIANS 2:8 For by grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God,

We saved through faith by the grace of God, and that includes His grace upon those who were baptized according to the formula in Matthew 28:19.

# 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 vows prior to baptism, both as a reminder of the responsibilities under the New Covenant as well as swearing of the required oaths.

### **COVENANT VOWS**

- Do you **believe** that Jesus is The Christ and the Firstborn Son of God? (Acts 8:37; Col. 1:13-18)
- Do you **accept** Jesus Christ as your only Lord, Master, Savior, and King in this life and the Kingdom to come? (Matt. 23:10; John 13:13; Titus 1:4; 2 Pet. 1:11; 3:18)
- Do you **believe** that Jesus is only name by which your sins are forgiven? (Acts 4:12)
- Do you **seek** to be buried with Jesus Christ through baptism into His death for the remission of your sins? (Acts 2:38; Rom. 3:25; 6:2-11)
- Have you **repented** to God of your sins, which are transgressions of His Law? (Acts 2:38)
- Do you **acknowledge** the blood sacrifice of Jesus Christ for the cleansing of your sins? (Rev. 1:5)
- Do you have **faith** and believe that God has forgiven your sins? (Rom. 3:25)
- Have you counted the **cost** of bearing your cross—the afflictions and trials that test the hearts of all who are called to be children of God? (Luke 14:28; Matt. 10:38; 16:24; Acts 14:22; Rom. 8:17; 2 Thess. 1:5; 2 Tim. 2:12; 3:12)

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

- Do you **swear**<sup>15</sup> to strive to **obey** the Law of God—His commandments, statutes, judgments, testimonies, and precepts? (John 14:15, 21, 23; 15:10; 1 John 5:3)
- Do you **swear**<sup>15</sup> to strive to **love** God and Jesus Christ with all your heart, mind, soul, and strength; to love your fellow saints 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 now **commit** your life to serving God the Father and the Lord Jesus through the ministry of Good Works unto all, but especially those of the household of God, as you have the means and opportunities? (Matt. 5:16; 2 Cor. 9:8-14; Gal. 6:10; Eph. 2:10; 2 Tim. 3:17; Titus 2:14; 3:8, 14; Heb. 10:24; 1 Pet. 2:12)

### **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 vows you have just made. I now baptize you, not into any sect, denomination, or organization of the world, but in the **name of Jesus**<sup>16</sup> who is The Christ and the Son of the Living God (Matt. 16:16; Acts 2:38).

### **<PERFORM BAPTISM>**

I now 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) who places you into the Body of Christ with

---

<sup>15</sup> Matthew 5:34 omits a crucial word and should read "... do not swear **[falsely]** at all ..." (Lev. 19:12; Deut. 6:13; 10:20; Heb. 6:13, 16). All biblical covenants are established by the swearing of an oath. An affirmation is a concept of man's legal systems and is not supported.

<sup>16</sup> The statement "... baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" in Matthew 28:19 is added text. Jesus is the only name by which one must be baptized in accordance with all other Scripture (Acts 2:38; 4:10, 12; 8:12, 15-16; 10:48; 19:5; 22:16; Rom. 6:3-4).

the promise of eternal life to you and to all who belong to our Lord and Savior. I do this in the name, authority, and power of Jesus Christ (Matt. 28:18; 1 Cor. 15:27; Eph 1:20-22; Phil. 2:9-10).

**<LAYING ON OF HANDS & PRAYER>**

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



## APPENDIX B

### ***Matthew 28:19-20—Greek Historical Sources***

The following is a considerable compilation of sources from trinitytruth.org<sup>17</sup> that highlight the preponderance of evidence for the corrupted text contained within Matthew 28:19 in modern Bibles. 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 controversy in Rome and Africa about 254, as the anonymous tract De rebaptismate (“On rebaptism”) shows.”

#### **Edmund Schlink, The Doctrine of Baptism, page 28:**

---

<sup>17</sup> [https://www.trinitytruth.org/matthew28\\_19addedtext.html](https://www.trinitytruth.org/matthew28_19addedtext.html).

“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...”

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

### **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:**

"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."

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

### **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:**

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:**

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

"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."

"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



## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

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; Riggenbach, 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 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.

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

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 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

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

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:**

“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)

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

### **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 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



## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

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 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 or infusion on the head are outlined. This triple immersion is also attested by Tertullian (Adversus Prax

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

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 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)

# APPENDIX C

## ***Matthew 28:19-20— Hebrew Historical Source***

One recent discovery is a Hebrew version of the book of Matthew, which was preserved as an appendix in a 14th century Jewish polemical attack 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<sup>18</sup>. Much of his evidence for a Hebrew original of Matthew is captured in his book *The Hebrew Yeshua vs. The Greek Jesus*.

These are in the form of seeming contradictions to Old Testament Law found in Greek translations that are, by contrast, upheld in the Shem Tov version. Since it, along with the other historical evidence, confirms the corruption of Matthew 28:19, it is reasonable to establish its credentials.

To that end, Nehemiah Gordon provides two major points (among others) to support the accuracy of the Hebrew writing of the book of Matthew. He begins by establishing that both Matthew and Luke confirm 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.

However, a couple of Greek translations in the book of Matthew appear to contradict the Old Testament writings. These are clarified in the Shem Tov Hebrew translations, which eliminates a

---

<sup>18</sup> Nehemiah Gordon’s book *The Hebrew Yeshua vs. The Greek Jesus* can be found by going to <https://sabbathreflections.org/resources/books-references/> or <https://sabbathreflections.org/resources/documentaries/>.

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

couple of presumptive omissions contained within the Greek translations. The following discusses the two cases:

- 1) In Matthew 23:2-3, the Greek narration seems to command believers to obey all that the **scribes and Pharisees** observe and do, who themselves 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 do not do according to their works; for they say, and do not do.

But this directly 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:

[SHEM TOV] MATTHEW 23:2-3 "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."

The Hebrew text clearly records that Jesus was *not* telling believers to observe every judgment of the scribes and Pharisees who consistently contradict the Law of Moses. **He was, instead, commanding the disciples NOT to follow the "reforms and ... precedents" of the scribes and Pharisees but to 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. The correct Greek translation then becomes:

MATTHEW 23:2-3 saying: "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. 3 "Therefore whatever [he] [referring to Moses] tells you to observe, *that* observe and do, but do not do according to their *[the scribes and Pharisees]* works; for they say, and do not do.

- 2) Matthew 5:33-37 is another apparent 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 "But let your 'Yes' be 'Yes,' and your 'No,' 'No.' For whatever is more than these is from the evil one.

This translation 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 to God and that all oaths are to be made by swearing in His name. In contrast, the Greek text says "do not swear at all." The Shem Tov Hebrew clarifies the Greek translation by including a single critical word:

[SHEM TOV] MATTHEW 5:33-37 "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. 34 But I say to you, that you must not swear by anything falsely, not by heaven which is the throne of God, 35 nor by the earth which is His footstool, nor by Jerusalem which is His City, 36 nor by your head because you cannot make one hair

## BAPTIZE IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST

white or black, 37 But let your yes be yes and your no, no. Anything added to this is evil.”

Instead of forbidding swearing all oaths, the command of Jesus was not to swear FALSELY. He also said that it does not matter to what or to whom the vow is sworn, a vow must be kept. In other words, **Matthew 5:33-37 only prohibits the swearing of FALSE oaths.** While the Greek translation is correct, the reading is easily mistaken by assuming it refers to *all* oaths; however, context shows it is clearly referring to *false* swearing. Notice in verse 33 that the subject is swearing **falsely**. This is carried into verse 34. A proper understanding can be rendered as:

MATTHEW 5:33-34 “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 [falsely] at all:** neither by heaven, for it is God’s throne;

Jesus clearly forbids all FALSE swearing. He did not contradict the Law of Moses, which directs all sworn oaths to be done in the name of God, who requires them to be performed accordingly.