



Matthew 28:19

Deuteronomy 4:2 Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you.

Revelation 22:18 For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book:

We have seen in the books of Paul that every baptism of the early church was performed in the Name of Jesus Christ only, as with the salutations they are only ever Father and Son, which, if the apostles had been taught of three, then they were being very disrespectful.

The Trinity doctrine is a heresy; it is a corruption and a falsification of God's word. Because most of the churches teach it does not make it right, sometimes we are called to make a choice between pleasing man or God as we come into His truths, this was not an easy decision to make but I want to serve and follow the Lord.

The word trinity is not found in the Bible nor is there an apostle that explains this as a doctrine in any epistle, the only two passages of scripture that have sustained a solid proof for this false trinitarian doctrine both fall into this sin and blasphemy of the manipulation of the word of God to sustain a lie and misinterpretation of God's word. The first is Matthew 28:19:

Matthew 28:19

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

Eusebius (c. 260—c. 340) was the Bishop of Caesarea and is known as “the Father of Church History.” Although he wrote prolifically, his most celebrated work is his *Ecclesiastical History*, a history of the Church from the Apostolic period until his own time. Today it is still the principal work on the history of the Church at that time. Eusebius quotes many verses in his writings, and Matthew 28:19 is one of them. He never quotes it as it appears today in modern Bibles, but always finishes the verse with the words “in my name.” For example, in Book III of his History, Chapter 5, Section 2, which is about the Jewish persecution of early Christians, we read:

But the rest of the apostles, who had been incessantly plotted against with a view to their destruction, and had been driven out of the land of Judea, went unto all nations to preach the Gospel, relying upon the power of Christ, who had said to them, “Go ye and make disciples of all the nations in my name.”

In the name of Jesus only.

We also have an interesting statement from a Catholic cardinal, this cardinal was later made Pope, Pope Joseph Ratzinger, he makes this confession as to the origin of the chief Trinity text of Matthew 28:19. "

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." **The Trinity baptism and text of Matthew 28:19 therefore did not originate from the original Church that started in Jerusalem around AD 33.** It was rather **as the evidence proves a later invention of Roman Catholicism completely fabricated. Very few know about these historical facts.** Introduction to Christianity, The 1968 Edition: By Joseph Ratzinger. page 82-83.

Catholic Encyclopaedia Volume 8

Justin Martyr was one of the early Fathers of the Roman Catholic Church.“Justin Martyr was one of the early Fathers of the Roman Catholic Church who helped changed the ancient baptism of “in the Name of Jesus Christ” to the titles of Father, Son and Holy Ghost” formula. With regard to the form used for baptism in the early Church, there is the difficulty that although Matthew 28:19 speaks of the Trinitarian formula which is now used...

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

Hastings Encyclopaedia of Religion Vol 2, Pg 377 Christian baptism was administered using the words “In the name of Jesus”. Vol 2, Pg 378 The use of a Trinitarian formula of any sort was not suggested in early Church history. Vol 2, Pg 389 Baptism was always in the name of Lord Jesus until the time of Justin Martyr when Triune formula was used.

...the Acts of the apostle (2:38, 8:16, 10:48, 19:5) and Paul (1 Corinthians 1:13, 6:11, Galatians 3:27, Romans 6:3) speak only of baptism “in the Name of Jesus”.

Catholic Encyclopaedia, 1967 edition, volume 2, pages 56, 59.

“An explicit reference to the Trinitarian formula of baptism cannot be found in the first centuries.”

Catholic Encyclopaedia, 1913 edition, volume 2, pages 265:

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

Encyclopaedia of Religion & Ethics – Scribner’s, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1924, vol 1 Page 380

“Christian baptism, when connected with the mention of a formula, is alluded to four time in the Acts (2:38, 8:16, 10:48, 19:5)...and the formula is never that of (Matthew 28:19 but is twice in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38, 10:48) and twice in the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts 8:16, 19:5). That this was the usual formula of Christian baptism is supported by evidence of the Pauline Epistles, which speak of being baptised only into Christ or into Christ Jesus (Galatians 3:27, Romans 6:3).

Is it possible to reconcile these facts with the belief that Christ commanded the disciples to baptise in the trine name?

The obvious explanation of the silence of the New Testament on the trine name, and the use of another formula in Acts and Paul is that this other formula was the earlier, and that the trine formula is a later edition. It would require very strong argument to controvert this presumption, and none seem to exist.

Encyclopaedia of Religion & Ethics – James Hastings, Published 1924, vol 2 Pages 377,378, 384, 389: Page 377: “It is clear from the contemporary usage (Acts 1:15; 11:13; Revelation 3:4) that ‘name’ was an ancient synonym for ‘person.’ Page 378: “Whereupon the latter sealed the reception of the candidate into the holy community by invoking ‘the fair name’ of the Lord Jesus upon his head (James 2:7; Revelations 7:3. 9:4; 14:1; 22:4).” Page 384. Page 389: The earliest known formula is, “in the name of the Lord Jesus” or some similar phrase...”

Ursinus, an African Monk A.D. 1284, also asserted that baptism into the name of Christ alone was valid. The formula of Rome is; “I baptise thee in the name of the Father, and Son and holy Spirit” ...

Encyclopaedia Britannica – 1910, 11th Edition, vol 3 Page 366 says...

No record of such use can be discovered in the Acts or the Epistles of the Apostle. The baptisms recorded in the New Testament after the day of Pentecost were administered “in the Name of Jesus Christ”

A Dictionary of the Bible – James Hasting, Scribner’s New York Published 1900, vol 1 Page 241 “the original form of words was ‘into the name of Jesus Christ’ or ‘ the Lord Jesus’. Baptism into the name of the Trinity was a later development”

Moreover there is no mention in the entirety of the gospel any one being baptised in the name of the Father, Son, Holy Ghost.

Hastings Encyclopaedia of Religion- vol 2 Pages 377, 378, 389. “The use of the Trinitarian formula of any sort was not suggested in the early Church history. Baptism was always in the Name of Jesus”

Hastings Dictionary of the Bible – Page 88 “It must be acknowledged that the three-fold name of Matthew 28:19 does not appear to have been used by the primitive church, but rather in the” “Name of Jesus, Jesus Christ or Lord”

Hastings Dictionary of the Bible (1898), I, 241 [One explanation is that] the original form of words was ‘into the name of Jesus Christ’. Baptism into the name of the Trinity was a later development.

Britannica Encyclopedia 11TH edition, Vol 3, Pg 365-366 The baptismal formula was changed from the name of JESUS CHRIST to the words Father, Son, & Holy Ghost by the Catholic Church in the second century.

Britannica Encyclopedia Vol 3, Pg 82 Everywhere in the oldest sources it states that baptism took place in the name of Jesus Christ.

Canney's Encyclopedia of Religion Pg 53 The early church always baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus until development of Trinity doctrine in the 2nd century.

Catholic Encyclopedia Vol 2, Pg 263 Here the Catholics acknowledged that baptism was changed by the Catholic Church.

Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion Vol 2, Pg 377 on ACTS 2:38 NAME was an ancient synonym for "person". Payment was always made in the name of some person referring ownership. Therefore one being baptized in Jesus Name became his personal property. "Ye are Christ's."

New International Encyclopedia Vol 22, Pg 477 The term "Trinity" was originated by Tertullian, a Roman Catholic Church Father.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Encyclopaedia Britannica 11TH edition, (1910), Vol 2, Pg 365 The Trinitarian formula and trine immersion were not uniformly used from the beginning... Bapti[sm] into the name of the Lord [was] the normal formula of the new Testament. In the 3rd century baptism in the name of Christ was still so wide spread that Pope Stephen, in opposition to Cyprian of Carthage, declared it to be valid. The evidence is overwhelming. Baptising in the name of Jesus is obviously the way the apostles baptized in the first Church.

We have seen in the books of Paul that every baptism of the early church was performed in the Name of Jesus Christ only, as with the salutations they are only ever Father and Son, which, if the apostles had been taught of three, then they were being very disrespectful not to mention the third mighty person of the Godhead.

Therefore we clearly see that it is a corruption and a falsification of God's word. The other pillar of the Trinity that people cite is:

With all that said, if we understand the Father and Son truth, we know that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God coming through His Son to us,

Romans 8:9⁹ But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so **be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ,** he is none of his.

So, even if you do not want to believe that this passage has been altered slightly there is no problem with this verse when you have the correct understanding of God and His Son who dwell within us by Their Holy Spirit. We must also remember the important principle that the Bible interprets the Bible.

What this particular passage shows us is that the process of baptism and entering God's family involves the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit of God. It is **not** a description of the **nature** of God and important as it is, baptism alone is not sufficient, we must receive **God's Holy Spirit** which imparts that divine nature to dwell within us.

Note again, that Father, Son and Holy Spirit are all acknowledged as being involved in this process. But that does not mean all three are divine persons in a Trinity. To claim that Matthew 28:19 establishes one God in three persons goes far beyond the actual words of the verse. And other verses show such a notion to be utterly false.



1 John 5:7

1 John 5:7-8⁷ For there are three that bear record in heaven, **the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost;** and these three are one.⁸ And there are three that bear witness in earth, **the Spirit, and the water, and the blood;** and these three agree in one.

This they state is an undeniable Trinitarian statement.

But this verse is known to be an historical fraud, for it is not found in any manuscript before the 16th century. The true 1 John 5:7-8 text as can be read in the oldest known Bibles – The Vulgate Bible – The Codex Sinaiticus – The Codex Vaticanus should read: 7) For there are three that testify: 8) the Spirit, the water and the blood and the three are in agreement.

The change: a Dutch Catholic Christian theologian called Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus (1466 – 1536) in 1522 in his third edition for a new Latin translation from the most Valgate manuscripts he could find inserted a footnote into the original text known as The “Comma Johanneum”. This was perpetrated by the Catholic Church whom seized the opportunity and **pressured this translator to insert this Trinitarian statement that was just a mere footnote** that clearly shows the three persons of the Trinity doctrine.

And so in 1522 this translator being strongly compelled inserted this false Trinitarian statement into his third edition of his Latin translation known today as The Third Edition of The “Textus Receptus” “The Received Text” *The Authorised King James Bible was then translated based solely on this now corrupted Latin “Textus Receptus”; and so binding this total corruption into the Precious Word of God;*

Let’s take another look at 1 John 5:7 and then take a deeper look at verses 10-13 to get the full context of what/who is being spoken of here.

1 John 5:7 ⁷ For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

1 John 5:10-13 ¹⁰ He that believeth *on the Son of God* (*Jesus the only begotten Son, not the trinity*) hath the witness in himself: he that believeth *not God* (*the Father, not the trinity*) hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that *God gave of his Son*. ¹¹ And this is the record that *God* hath given to us eternal life, *and this life is in his Son*. ¹² He that hath the *Son* hath life; and he that hath not *the Son of God* hath not life. ¹³ These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of *the Son of God*; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on *the name of the Son of God*.

Read the whole of 1 John 5, the immediate context is clearly speaking of testifying that Jesus is the Son of God. This testimony is diametrically opposed to the theory of the Trinity doctrine. The rest of First John, as well as the Gospel of John, bears indisputable proof that Jesus is the Son of God. You cannot read more than a few verses without coming back to the theme that Jesus is the Son of God. Notice some of the following verses:

(1 John 4:9) In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent *his only begotten Son* into the world, that we might live through him.

(1 John 4:14, 15) And we have seen and do testify that the Father *sent the Son* to be the Saviour of the world. Whosoever shall confess that *Jesus is the Son of God*, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.

(1 John 5:1) Whosoever believeth that *Jesus is the Christ is born of God*: and every one that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him.

This theme is what we find summarized in John’s Gospel in the following verse:

(John 20:31) But these are written, that ye might believe *that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*; and that believing ye might have life through his name.

Should we then take an interpretation of this text which teaches the very opposite of the immediate context, as well as the context of the whole book?

Should we take an interpretation of this text which teaches the very opposite of the whole reason he tells us that he is writing the book and all of his books?

That would most certainly be wresting the scriptures. Whatever interpretation we take from these verses, it must be in harmony with that obvious purpose of John’s writings – Jesus is the Son of God.

1 John 5:7-8 ⁷ For there are three that bear record in heaven, **the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost**: and these three are one. ⁸ And there are three that bear witness in earth, **the Spirit, and the water, and the blood**: and these three agree in one.

So, why do we focus on these two verses that are so totally different to all the rest of Johns writings?

In verse 8 we are told that there are “three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood and that these three agree in one.” That is, they bear a united witness. The water bears witness and the blood bears witness, yet no one would suggest that the water and blood are persons or much less a trinity.

Why then should we insist that because the spirit bears witness in heaven it must be a separate individual? There are three ways in which witness is borne to the truth in heaven. These witnesses are one because they bear a united witness. It does not mean that they are one person, one being, or one God.

Jesus explained what this oneness means when he prayed that we all might be one as he and his Father are one. (See John 17:22.) Not that we might become one human but simply that we might be in perfect harmony, even as he and his Father are in perfect harmony.

In heaven, God bears witness to the truth and so does Christ and the Holy Spirit! In heaven there are three avenues of witness—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. And we have clearly seen that the Spirit is the Spirit of God the Spirit of Christ.

Romans 8:9 ⁹ But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that **the Spirit of God dwell in you**. Now **if any man have not the Spirit of Christ**, he is none of his.

On the earth there are three—the water, the spirit, and the blood.

Are the three on earth a trinity because they are mentioned in the same breath or agree as one? By the same reasoning we would have to conclude that the Father, the Word, and the Spirit are not necessarily a trinity simply because they bear a united witness in heaven or because they are mentioned at the same time. You have to apply the same logic as you do to 1 John 5:7 as you do with 1 John 5:8.

But how have they borne witness that Jesus is the Son of God?

Father

The Father witnessed that Jesus was the Son of God at his baptism when he spoke from heaven: **“This is my beloved Son.”** (Matthew 3:17)

Jesus

(John 10:36) Christ bore witness when he said, “Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, **I am the Son of God?**”

God's Spirit (Holy)

In (John 10:25) Jesus tells us how the Spirit bears witness: "I told you, and ye believed not: the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me."

(Matthew 12:28) These works which bore witness of Christ, he tells us were performed by the Spirit of God in him. "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you."

It is of interest that most reputable authorities agree that a part of 1 John 5:7, 8 was most certainly added to the Bible during the period known as the "Dark Ages." Specifically, the part added reads, "in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth." If the questionable portion were taken out, the verse would read: For there are three that bear record, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

And so we see that the only two verses that sustain outright statements of the trinity are both completely false, but almost worse than this, it is a known fact by Biblical scholars. The Trinitarians still refer to these as their fundamental pillars of their doctrine. So, if their two pillars are false, so is their doctrine regarding the trinity.

www.Sureword.co.uk