

# CONTROVERSY: MATTHEW 28:19 AND THE TRINITARIAN PHRASE - PART 1

Copyright 1994 - 2025 Bill's Bible Basics

Published On : March 13, 2025

Last Updated : May 18, 2025

Matthew 28:19 Controversy, Definition Of Spurious Text, KJV Bible Extremists Protests, My KJV Dedication, Manipulation Of The KJV Bible By Religious And Political Entities, Heated Authenticity Debate Has Raged For Centuries, The Trinitarian Phrase, I Arrived At Same Conclusion, Matthew 28:19 Contains Spurious Text, A Simple Test And Important Question, Apostles Did Not Baptize Using Trinitarian Phrase In A Single Verse Of Scripture, Did Apostles Simply Forget Jesus' Command?, Fifty Days From Passover To Pentecost, Apostles Always Baptized In Jesus' Name Only, Our Christian Beliefs Should Be Based Only On The Scriptures, Beware Of False Doctrines And Traditions Of Men, Jesus Emphasized "In My Name", A Choice: Follow Only The Scriptures Or Follow The Traditions Of Men, A Change In Baptismal Practice Occurred During 2nd Century, Catholicism Becomes Legal Religion In Roman Empire During Fourth Century, Four Scholastic Sources Which Challenge Roman Catholic Claim That Jesus Used The Trinitarian Phrase Or Baptismal Formula

While scanning my Facebook news feed, I came across a post where the discussion centered around the question of whether or not Matthew 28:19 constitutes spurious text, and if not that, at the very least, slightly altered text. For those of my readers who may not be familiar with the phrase, spurious text refers to text in a manuscript -- such as the Bible -- which is falsely attributed to a particular author, or which is falsely presented as being genuine or authentic. In other words, it is basically a fabrication or a falsification. It constitutes a piece of writing which simply lacks legitimate origin or veracity.

Now, no doubt certain KJV Bible extremists are surely going to start screaming and shouting "How dare you to associate that phrase with our beloved KJV Bible! The KJV Bible is the perfect, inspired and inerrant Word of God!" My friends, I'm not going to get into a protracted discussion here regarding this issue, because I have already addressed this issue in my article called "Is the KJV Bible the Inerrant Word of God?".

For now though, for the sake of such people who may protest, let me simply state the following. For the record, I've been a dedicated KJV Bible reader since 1971. That is fifty-four years. So that fact alone should tell you how much I enjoy reading the KJV. The KJV is in fact my Bible of preference.

However, over this same long period of time, contrary to the view which is embraced by the KJV Bible extremists, through many thousands of hours of in-depth studies, I have learned that similar to quite a number of other historical documents whether religious or secular in nature, the KJV Bible has in fact been the object of manipulation by both religious and political entities, both of which had their own particular agendas. I don't know why this should come as a surprise to anyone. After all, isn't it still being manipulated today? What do you think the NKJV is, if not more manipulation?

Furthermore, while the KJV Bible extremists may not know it, -- or perhaps they simply choose to reject it -- the simple, historical truth of the matter is that the authenticity and validity of certain verses which are found in the KJV Bible has been strongly debated for literally centuries. Not only that, but said authenticity continues to be debated to this very day as well. It just so happens that Matthew 28:19 is one of the verses which is in question. The verse states as follows:

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:"

Matthew 28:19, KJV

It's the latter half of this verse -- which I will refer to as the trinitarian phrase -- which has come into question. In other words, did Jesus actually say "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"? Now, I am sure that if I were to ask a Roman Catholic this question, they probably would not hesitate to respond "Yes! Of course Jesus said that! After all, it is in the Bible, and that is how Roman Catholics are baptized." In fact, many people who belong to other denominations would probably respond in a very similar fashion. Right? But is this really true?

It may interest you to know that many years ago, I wrote a multi-part series entitled "Roman Catholicism, Water Baptism and the Holy Trinity" in which I likewise discuss this issue concerning Matthew 28:19 potentially being spurious text. It

may also interest you to know that similar to other scholars and Bible students, I likewise arrived at the conclusion that Matthew 28:19 has indeed been altered by some unknown person or entity somewhere along the historical line, so that today it appears to support the trinitarian doctrine, which itself is an invention of the Roman Catholic Church.

While Bible scholars use a wide variety of methodologies in order to ascertain whether or not a verse is true Scripture or spurious text, or slightly altered text, for the sake of brevity, I am going to show you a very easy way to determine that the aforementioned trinitarian phrase was in fact put into our Lord's mouth by someone else. In other words, I am quite convinced that Jesus never really said "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Now if I recall correctly, I used the very same test when I wrote my 2009 series "Roman Catholicism, Water Baptism and the Holy Trinity" so long ago.

My dear friends, please ask yourselves this simple question. If Jesus really told the Apostles to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, then how and why is it that in the entire Book of Acts where we learn about the growth of the First Century Church, we do not find one single verse where any of the Apostles -- including the Apostle Paul -- baptized in this particular manner? Did they simply forget, even though merely ten days had passed since Jesus had returned to Heaven?

Or by not using the trinitarian phrase, is it possible that the Apostles were simply being stubborn and disobedient, and for some odd reason just decided to do things their OWN way, instead of carefully following Jesus explicit instructions? Yes, I am being a little silly here in order to make a point. I do not really believe that at all. I am sure that they did exactly as the Lord had commanded them to do. Oh, and by the way, in case you are wondering why I said ten days a moment ago, it is because as I explain in my article called "Fifty Days Which Changed the World", from the time of the Passover when Jesus was crucified, to the Day of Pentecost when the Apostles were filled with the Holy Spirit, was one jubilee of days. That is to say,  $7 \times 7 = 49 + 1$  which was the Day of Pentecost.

We know that following His resurrection from the dead, Jesus spent forty more days on the Earth before returning to His Father. That means that He ascended ten days before the Day

of Pentecost. We also know that right before Jesus ascended, as they stood together on the Mount of Olives, He informed His followers that they would receive the wonderful gift of the Holy Spirit "not many days hence", meaning just ten days later. Following is Biblical proof for those of you who may require it:

"To whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God: And, being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost NOT MANY DAYS HENCE."

Acts 1:3-5, KJV

To continue then, my dear friends, while certain doubtful and legalistic naysayers can argue and debate about this issue as much as they want, nevertheless, the fact still remains that it appears that the Apostles ALWAYS, without fail, baptized in the name of the Lord only. We NEVER see them baptizing in any other way. Period. Consider a few sample verses where we discover that this is indeed so:

"Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Acts 2:38, KJV

"(For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.)"

Acts 8:16, KJV

"Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days."

Acts 10:47-48, KJV

"When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."

Acts 19:5, KJV

My friends, as some of you will know, I have long taught that our Christian beliefs should only be based on what is clearly defined in the Scriptures, and NOT on anything else, and most

certainly NOT on the misguided false doctrines and erroneous traditions of men which have been invented over the centuries by organized religion, which has its own agenda. As some of you will know, there are so many Bible verses which warn us about this danger. Following are just a few of them for your consideration:

"And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

1 Corinthians 2:4-5, KJV

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."

Colossians 2:8, KJV

"For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables."

2 Timothy 4:3-4, KJV

"But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction."

2 Peter 2:1, KJV

So tell me then, my friends. Are you convinced now that the Apostles never used the trinitarian phrase? Let me also add that if you carefully conduct a New Testament study of the phrase "in my name", you will quickly come to understand why the Apostles baptized in the name of Jesus, and NOT by using the full trinitarian phrase. Jesus in fact told them to do all things, and to ask the Father for all things, in what? In His name only. Allow me to share some sample verses with you for your consideration:

"And whoso shall receive one such little child IN MY NAME receiveth me . . . For where two or three are gathered together IN MY NAME, there am I in the midst of them."

Matthew 18:5, 20, KJV

"Whosoever shall receive one of such children IN MY NAME,

receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me. And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us: and we forbad him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle IN MY NAME, that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is on our part. For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink IN MY NAME, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward."

Mark 9:37-41, KJV

"And these signs shall follow them that believe; IN MY NAME shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."

Mark 16:17-18, KJV

"And Jesus, perceiving the thought of their heart, took a child, and set him by him, And said unto them, Whosoever shall receive this child IN MY NAME receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me receiveth him that sent me: for he that is least among you all, the same shall be great."

Luke 9:47-48, KJV

"And whatsoever ye shall ask IN MY NAME, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing IN MY NAME, I will do it."

John 14:13-14, KJV

"But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send IN MY NAME, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."

John 14:26, KJV

"Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father IN MY NAME, he may give it you."

John 15:16, KJV

"And in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father IN MY NAME, he will give it you. Hitherto have ye asked nothing IN MY NAME: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full."

These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs: but the time cometh, when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall shew you plainly of the Father. At that day ye shall ask IN MY NAME: and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you: For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God."

John 16:23-27, KJV

Now isn't that just interesting! In every single one of the previous examples, Jesus says "IN MY NAME". Not one single time does He say "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost". So again, that is why in the Book of Acts, we discover that the Apostles continued the practice of always baptizing ONLY in the name of the Lord. I'll tell you folks, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" in Matthew 28:19 is really looking quite lonely now, don't you think? I wonder why that is. [sarcasm intended].

So, my dear friends, those are the Scriptural facts. Thus, we each have an important choice to make. We can either let ourselves be deceived by the false doctrines of men such as those misguided traditions which are promoted by the Roman Catholic Church and many of the other church denominations, or else we can embrace the Scriptures for what they actually say. To reiterate my key point, the fact that the Apostles never once used the trinitarian phrase anywhere in the pages of the New Testament is strong evidence that the Lord never really said it in Matthew 28:19. As we have clearly seen, in the Gospels, Jesus never told them to use it either, except in that one questionable verse, meaning Matthew 28:19.

As I mentioned earlier, we do not know exactly when, or even exactly by whom, Matthew 28:19 was altered. Please note that when I say "whom", I am referring to the actual person who made the textual change. However, considering the historical evidence that we have, it is certain that this change in the baptismal act itself had been put into practice by the Second Century AD. Furthermore, we know that it was promoted by the early progenitors of the Catholic Church, who are commonly referred to as the so-called "Church Fathers".

For those of you who may be wondering, I refer to the Church Fathers as the progenitors, because historically-speaking, Roman Catholicism didn't become a legally recognized religion -- or "religio licita" -- in the Roman Empire until the Edict

of Milan was signed by Roman Empire Constantine I in the east, and by Roman Emperor Licinius in the west, in 313 AD. However, it was not until almost seventy years later, in the year 380 AD during the reign of Emperor Theodosius I, that it came into absolute power as the only legitimate religion of the entire Roman Empire, under the threat of persecution if one refused to yield.

At any rate, regarding my previous statement, there exist a number of scholastic sources which all state that Matthew 28:19 was altered by the progenitors of the Roman Catholic Church sometime during the Second Century AD. Below are five sources which I was able to find online for your personal consideration. In fact, if you want to read the full text of the excerpts I share below, you can download all of the volumes of each of these encyclopedia sets in PDF format on the Internet. One good place to start is at the URL below. It is the Noor Library, which claims to be the largest Arab electronic library in the Middle East:

<https://www.noor-book.com/en/>

01. Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th Edition, 1910-1911,  
Volume 3, pages 82, 364-369:

Under the topic "Baptism" beginning on page 364, we're given an in-depth history of the practice. In section 5 called "The Baptismal Formula", it states that the trinitarian phrase was NOT always used, and that there was conflict due to different forms being used. However, it notes that baptizing in Jesus' name only was the NORMAL FORMULA, as we see by this excerpt:

----- Begin Quote -----

"The trinitarian formula and trine immersion were not uniformly used from the beginning, nor did they always go together. The Teaching of the Apostles, indeed, prescribes baptism in the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, but on the next page speaks of those who have been baptized into the name of the Lord -- the normal formula of the New Testament. In the 3rd century baptism in the name of Christ was still so widespread that Pope Stephen, in opposition to Cyprian of Carthage, declared it to be valid. From Pope Zachariah (Ep. x.) we learn that the Celtic missionaries in baptizing omitted one or more persons of the Trinity and this was one of the reasons why the church of Rome anathematized [meaning cursed or condemned] them; Pope



Nicholas, however (858-867), in the "Responso ad consulete Bulgarorum", allowed baptism to be "valid tantum in nomine Christi", as in the Acts. Basil, in his work "On the Holy Spirit" just mentioned, condemns "baptism into the Lord alone" as insufficient. Baptism "into the death of Christ" is often specified by the Armenian fathers as that which alone was essential."

----- End Quote -----

As you can clearly see, the Roman Catholic Church purposely and rather forcefully pushed out baptizing in the name of Jesus only, and in fact condemned the practice, preferring instead to use the trinitarian phrase. Equally enlightening is the fact that on page 369, we find this interesting info where we are told that Eusebius Pamphili -- a.k.a. Eusebius of Caesarea or Eusebius Pamphilus -- who was a third and fourth century Christian historian who became the bishop of Caesarea Maritima, replaced the words "baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" with "in My Name". Now why would he do that, unless he knew that the trinitarian phrase was wrong? Consider this excerpt:

----- Begin Quote -----

"There remain two texts in which the injunction to baptize is attributed to Jesus, namely, Mark xvi. 16 and Matt. xxviii. 18-20. Of these the first is part of an appendix headed "of Ariston the elder" in an old Armenian codex, and taken perhaps from the lost compilations of Papias, as to the other text, it has been doubted by many critics, e.g. Neander, Harnack, Dr Armitage Robinson and James Martineau, whether it represents a real utterance of Christ and not rather the liturgical usage of the region in which the first gospel was compiled. The circumstance, unknown to these critics when they made their conjectures, that Eusebius Pamphili, in nearly a score of citations, substitutes the words "in My Name" for the words "baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," renders their conjectures superfluous. Aphraates also in citing the verse substitutes "and they shall believe in Me" -- a paraphrase of "in My Name." The first gospel thus falls into line with the rest of the New Testament."

----- End Quote -----

So what this excerpt seems to be saying is that by replacing

the trinitarian phrase with "in My Name", it makes Matthew's Gospel agree with what we actually see happening in the Book of Acts, which is that the Apostles baptized in Jesus' name only.

02. Encyclopedia of Religions - Maurice Arthur Canney, 1921, page 53:

This is an actual quote taken from Maurice Arthur Canney's "Encyclopedia of Religions" which clearly states that the verse at the end of Matthew's Gospel was in fact altered by some unknown entity:

----- Begin Quote -----

In Matthew xxviii. 19. he is represented as saying to his disciples when he appeared to them after his crucifixion: "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost"

In Mark xvi. 16 we are told that he said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be damned."

But there is evidence that the passage in Matthew's Gospel HAS BEEN EDITED, and the passage in Mark's Gospel belongs to the last twelve verses which are widely recognised now to be a later addition.

----- End Quote -----

03. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics - James Hastings, 1908-1921, Volume 2, pages 377-378, 389:

Under the topic of "Baptism", on page 377 in Section 3 which is entitled "The Baptismal Formula" we are informed that the practice of baptism was administered only using the words, "In the name of Jesus." Furthermore, we are informed that it was done in this manner so as to emphasize that the Believer became the property of Christ, as we see by the following excerpt:

----- Begin Quote -----

"All this is present in germ in Peter's words (Acts 2:38-40), 'Repent, and let each of you get himself baptized in the name

of Jesus Christ unto remission of sins,' etc. The phrase 'in the name' now calls for closer consideration. It is clear from contemporary usage (e.g. Acts 1:15, Rev. 3:4, 11:13) that 'name' was an ancient synonym for 'person.' Parallels, moreover, from the colloquial Greek of the time show that the expression 'in the name' was itself widely used, especially in solemn or formal connexions, and with special reference to proprietorship. Thus a payment is made 'into so-and-so's account'; a petition is presented 'to the king's person'; and, still more significantly in our connexion, soldiers swear 'in the king's name' (Rendtorff, op. cit. p. 9f.). Such solemn invocation of the king's name in token of personal allegiance answers exactly to one marked aspect of baptism (cf. 2 Timothy 2:3). which was further developed in Christian thought after the Apostolic Age, in the notion of the "militia Christi" (see Harnack's monograph so entitled). Only, in primitive Christian baptism, 'the name,' possibly as sum of the Divine perfections (cf. Ps 115:1 where 'mercy' and 'truth' are elements of God's name), was invoked, in the first instance, for mercy and protection. In any case the formula 'in the name of,' with or without associations from OT usage, came to have in all Christian circles -- though with different shades of thought, as between typical Jews and others the pregnant sense of identification between the baptized and Him in whose name baptism took place. The one became thereby the personal property of the other, as part of the people of peculiar possession (with other synonyms in 1 Peter 2:9, Titus 2:14) and the 'bondservant' of the true Lord (see 2 Corinthians 4:5), as all NT writers agree in putting it. That this was the essence of the matter appears from the very title, 'the Lord Jesus,' usual among Gentile converts, just as 'the Christ' or 'Christ Jesus' was in more Jewish circles."

----- End Quote -----

Having explained why water baptism was specifically done in the name of Jesus Christ -- because we become owned by Him -- as we continue reading on page 378, likewise under the topic of "Baptism", we are informed that the use of a trinitarian formula of any sort was NOT suggested in early Church history, as we see by the following excerpt:

----- Begin Quote -----

"But did the formula used in baptism, (Acts 8:16, 19:5, 1 Corinthians 6:11), embrace more than this distinctive

element, having, for instance, such explicit reference to the unity of God as must have been the heart of proselyte baptism? This is suggested not only by 1 Corinthians 8:6 (Ephesians 4:5), but also by the constant dual form of Apostolic salutations and benedictions (cf. Revelation 14:1 'having his name and the name of his Father written on their foreheads'). The use of a Trinitarian formula of any sort is NOT similarly suggested, in spite of 2 Co 13:14."

----- End Quote -----

Lastly, on page 389, likewise under the topic of "Baptism", we are again informed that baptism was always in name of the Lord Jesus until the time of Justin Martyr when the Triune formula began to be used.

----- Begin Quote -----

"The information given as to the practice of baptism is, as a rule, incidental, and never quite explicit; yet the main features are fairly clear. As might have been expected, THE RITE GRADUALLY BECAME MORE AND MORE COMPLICATED. The earliest form, represented in the Acts, was simple immersion (not necessarily submersion) in water, THE USE OF THE NAME OF THE LORD, and the laying on of hands. To these were added, at various times and places which cannot be safely identified, (a) THE TRINE NAME (JUSTIN), (b) a moral vow (Justin and perhaps Hermas, as well as already in the NT in 1 Peter), (c) TRINE IMMERSION (JUSTIN), (d) a confession of faith (Irenaeus, or perhaps Justin), (e) unction (Tertullian), (f) sponsors (Tertullian), (g) milk and honey (Tertullian)."

----- End Quote -----

04. Dictionary of the Bible - James Hastings, 1909, page 83:

Under the section "Baptism" on page 83, the Dictionary of the Bible likewise indicates that the inclusion of the trinitarian phrase in Matthew 28:19 has been challenged on both historical and textual grounds. In addition, it states that the threefold name -- triune name -- of Matthew 28:19 does not appear to have been used by the Early Church, but rather "in the name of Jesus", or "Jesus Christ" or "Lord Jesus", as we can easily determine by the following excerpt:

----- Begin Quote -----

"It has been customary to trace the institution of the practice 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 'the Lord Jesus': Acts 2:38, 8:16, 10:48, 19:5; cf. 1 Corinthians 1:13, 15), without reference to the Father or the Spirit.

That baptism was 'in the name of Jesus' signifies that it took place for the purpose of sealing the new relationship of belonging to, being committed to, His Personality."

----- End Quote -----

Please go to part two for the conclusion of this article.

Written by Bill Kochman

wordweaver777@gmail.com

<https://www.billkochman.com>

Continuing our discussion from part one, we now turn to our fifth and final source of information which again challenges the Roman Catholic Church's claim that Jesus actually said "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" in Matthew 28:19. Furthermore, this final source also demonstrates again that the Apostles never once baptized using the trinitarian phrase.

05. New Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge - Schaff-Herzog, 1951, Volume 1, page 1019:

On page 1019 of the New Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, under the title "Baptism", within Section I called "Biblical Doctrine", and under the subsection "Origin and Practice", we again see an argument regarding why Jesus could not have said "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

----- Begin Quote -----

"Conybeare has tried to prove that the original text of Matt. xxviii, 9 did not contain the baptismal command or the Trinitarian formula, which were interpolated, according to him, at the beginning of the third century. But since the investigations of Riegenbach, the ordinary reading may be considered the original. JESUS, HOWEVER, CAN NOT HAVE GIVEN HIS DISCIPLES THIS TRINITARIAN ORDER OF BAPTISM AFTER HIS RESURRECTION; FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT KNOWS ONLY BAPTISM IN THE NAME OF JESUS (Acts ii, 38; viii, 16; xix, 5; Gal. iii, 27; Rom. vi, 3; I Cor. i, 13-15), WHICH STILL OCCURS EVEN IN THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES, WHILE THE TRINITARIAN FORMULA OCCURS ONLY IN MATT. XXVIII, 19 and then only again Didache vii, 1 and Justin, Apol., i, 61. It is unthinkable that the Apostolic Church thus disobeyed the express command of the Lord, which it otherwise considered the highest authority. Occurrences like those of Acts xix, 1-7 ought to have shown that THE PRESCRIBED FORMULA OF BAPTISM COULD NOT HAVE BEEN SHORTENED TO "THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS," if the character of baptism was to be retained as commanded. Judging from I Cor. i, 14-17, Paul did not know Matt. xxviii, 19; otherwise he could not have written that Christ had sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel. Moreover, had it been known at the Apostolic Council, the missionary spheres could not have been so separated that Peter was recognized as the apostle of the circumcision, Paul and Barnabas as apostles of the heathen (Gal. ii, 7-8); rather would the original apostles have claimed the universal apostolate for themselves. Finally, THE DISTINCTLY LITURGICAL CHARACTER OF THE FORMULA MATT. XXVIII, 19 IS STRANGE; IT WAS NOT THE WAY OF JESUS TO MAKE SUCH FORMULAS. Nevertheless this baptismal command contains the elements which constitute Christian baptism; for the activity of the Son in baptism implies the immediate cooperation of the Father; and from the beginning Christian baptism has been considered the mediating agency of the Holy Spirit. Therefore WHILE THE FORMAL AUTHENTICITY OF MATT. XXVIII, 19 MUST BE DISPUTED, it must still be assumed that the later congregations recognized as the will of their Lord that which they experienced as the effect of baptism and traced it back to a direct word of Jesus.

IF MATT. XXVIII, 19 CAN NOT BE CONSIDERED AS A BAPTISMAL COMMAND, WE HAVE NO DIRECT WORD OF JESUS WHICH INSTITUTES BAPTISM; for Mark xvi, 16 belongs to the spurious appendix of the Gospel and is dependent upon Matt. xxviii, 19. But from the very beginning the Christian Church has universally practised baptism (Acts ii, 38; viii, 36, 38; x, 48; I Cor.

xii, 13; Gal. iii, 27; Eph. iv, 5; John iii, 5), and must therefore have been convinced that it was acting according to the will of the Lord."

----- End Quote -----

Thus, we have now seen five sources which dispute the claim of the Roman Catholic Church, and which clearly reveal that using the trinitarian phrase -- or baptismal formula -- was something that was forced upon Christians by the same church, which viewed itself, and continues to view itself, above the very Word of God.

Concerning Justin Martyr -- who is known as a saint to Roman Catholics -- he was born at Flavia Neapolis -- which was a city in the Roman province of Palestine -- in about the year 100 AD. He is believed to have converted to the Christian faith around the year 130 AD. As an apologist, he taught and defended the Christian faith in Asia Minor -- which is today a part of Turkey -- and at Rome, where he suffered martyrdom in about the year 165 AD. While Justin was a prolific writer, only three of his works have survived to this day in a single manuscript, of which there is also a copy of the same. These works include two of his treatises -- which are referred to as "Apologies" -- and his "Dialogue with the Jew Tryphon". In his dedication in the First Apology, Justin writes as follows:

----- Begin Quote -----

"To the Emperor Titus Ælius Adrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Caesar, and to his son Verissimus the Philosopher, and to Lucius the Philosopher, the natural son of Caesar, and the adopted son of Pius, a lover of learning, and to the sacred Senate, with the whole People of the Romans, I, Justin, the son of Priscus and grandson of Bacchius, natives of Flavia Neapolis in Palestine, present this address and petition on behalf of those of all nations who are unjustly hated and wantonly abused, myself being one of them."

----- End Quote -----

Further down in "The First Apology" -- which is believed to have been written around 150 AD -- we arrive at Chapter 61 which is called "Christian Baptism". In it, Justin Martyr describes the practice of baptism, where he states that this practice involved naming the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, as we see by the following excerpt:

----- Begin Quote -----

"I will also relate the manner in which we dedicated ourselves to God when we had been made new through Christ; lest, if we omit this, we seem to be unfair in the explanation we are making. As many as are persuaded and believe that what we teach and say is true, and undertake to be able to live accordingly, are instructed to pray and to entreat God with fasting, for the remission of their sins that are past, we praying and fasting with them. Then they are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated. For, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water. For Christ also said, "Unless you be born again, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." John 3:5 Now, that it is impossible for those who have once been born to enter into their mothers' wombs, is manifest to all. And how those who have sinned and repent shall escape their sins, is declared by Esaias the prophet, as I wrote above; he thus speaks: "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from your souls; learn to do well; judge the fatherless, and plead for the widow: and come and let us reason together, says the Lord. And though your sins be as scarlet, I will make them white like wool; and though they be as crimson, I will make them white as snow. But if you refuse and rebel, the sword shall devour you: for the mouth of the Lord has spoken it." Isaiah 1:16-20

And for this [rite] we have learned from the apostles this reason. Since at our birth we were born without our own knowledge or choice, by our parents coming together, and were brought up in bad habits and wicked training; in order that we may not remain the children of necessity and of ignorance, but may become the children of choice and knowledge, and may obtain in the water the remission of sins formerly committed, there is pronounced over him who chooses to be born again, and has repented of his sins, the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe; he who leads to the laver the person that is to be washed calling him by this name alone. For no one can utter the name of the ineffable God; and if any one dare to say that there is a name, he raves with a hopeless madness. And this washing is called illumination, because they who learn these things are illuminated in their understandings. And in the name of



Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and in the name of the Holy Ghost, who through the prophets foretold all things about Jesus, he who is illuminated is washed."

----- End Quote -----

In the online version of the Catholic Encyclopedia which can be found at <https://www.newadvent.org>, under the entry called "Baptism", under the section called "Matter and Form of the Sacrament" and under the subsection called "Form", it states in part the following:

----- Begin Quote -----

"In addition to the necessary word "baptize", or its equivalent, IT IS ALSO OBLIGATORY to mention the separate Persons of the Holy Trinity. This is the command of Christ to His Disciples, and as the sacrament has its efficacy from Him Who instituted it, we can not omit anything that He has prescribed. Nothing is more certain than that this has been the general understanding and practice of the Church. Tertullian tells us (On Baptism 13): "The law of baptism (tingendi) has been imposed and the form prescribed: Go, teach the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." St. Justin Martyr (First Apology 1) testifies to the practice in his time. St. Ambrose (On the Mysteries 4) declares: "Unless a person has been baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, he can not obtain the remission of his sins," St. Cyprian (Epistle 72), rejecting the validity of baptism given in the name of Christ only, affirms that the naming of all the Persons of the Trinity was commanded by the Lord (in plena et adunata Trinitate). The same is declared by many other primitive writers, as St. Jerome (IV, in Matt.), Origen (De Principiis I.2), St. Athanasius (Against the Arians, Oration 4), St. Augustine (On Baptism 6.25). It is not, of course, absolutely necessary that the common names Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be used, provided the Persons be expressed by words that are equivalent or synonymous. But a distinct naming of the Divine Persons is required and the form: "I baptize thee in the name of the Holy Trinity", would be of more than doubtful validity."

----- End Quote -----

Please notice that this section specifically states "it is

also obligatory to mention the separate Persons of the Holy Trinity." In Volume 2 of the Catholic Encyclopedia, it says the very same thing, as we see by the following excerpt:

----- Begin Quote -----

"THE REQUISITE AND SOLE VALID FORM OF BAPTISM is: "I baptize thee (or This person is baptized) in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." This was the form given by Christ to His Disciples in the twenty-eighth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, as far, at least, as there is question of the invocation of the separate Persons of the Trinity and the expression of the nature of the action performed."

"The mind of the Church as to the necessity of serving the trinitarian formula in this sacrament has been clearly shown by her treatment of baptism conferred by heretics. ANY CEREMONY THAT DID NOT OBSERVE THIS FORM HAS BEEN DECLARED INVALID."

----- End Quote -----

So as you can plainly see, while the Apostles themselves are never shown a single time in the Scriptures to baptize using the trinitarian phrase, the Roman Catholic Church has taken it upon itself to enforce this rule, and to make it mandatory and obligatory. They in fact claim that any baptism which is not performed using the trinitarian phrase is invalid. Thus, by their own tradition, they have invalidated what we clearly see being done in the Book of Acts. As I said earlier, they have in effect put themselves above God's Word.

At this point, allow me to now address the hardcore KJV Bible extremists. My friends, I have just given you a clear example where the KJV Bible has been manipulated. Are you still going to deny it? In conclusion, as has been my longtime practice for many years now, I have provided you with the Scriptural evidence. Now it is up to you to determine what you want to believe. It is my hope that you will each choose Scriptural truth over the misguided traditions of men.

With these thoughts, I will bring this article to a close. It is my hope that you've found it informative and enlightening, and I pray that it has been a blessing in your life as well. If you have an account with Facebook, Twitter, Tumblr or with any other social network, I would really appreciate if you'd

take the time to click or tap on the corresponding link that is found on this page. Thanks so much, and may God bless you abundantly!

For additional information and further study, you may want to refer to the list of reading resources below which were either mentioned in this article, or which contain topics which are related to this article. All of these articles are likewise located on the Bill's Bible Basics web server. To read these articles, simply click or tap on any link you see below.

Are You Flexible?

Are You Just a Baby Huey?

Cardinal Ratzinger's Rebellion

Churchianity or Christianity: Which Do You Practice?

Fifty Days Which Changed the World

Have You Read The New Scriptures Yet?

History Of The Authorized KJV Bible

Is the KJV Bible the Inerrant Word of God?

Lies and Deceptions of the Roman Catholic Church

Lying Wonders of the Endtime

Mary Worship, Christianity and Roman Catholicism

Our Pagan World: The Easter Myth Exposed

Pontifex Maximus: Pagan High Priest to Roman Catholic Pope

Rise of the False Church

Roman Catholicism, Water Baptism and the Holy Trinity

Sol Invictus and the Birth of Christ

St. Malachy Prophecies and the Death of Pope Francis

Striving for Perfection: Are You a Sinless Saint?

To Pray or Not to Pray? That is the Question

Tradition or Truth? Old Wine or New Wine?

Understanding the Bible in Context

Written by Bill Kochman

[wordweaver777@gmail.com](mailto:wordweaver777@gmail.com)

<https://www.billkochman.com>