

Matthew 28:19 and the Triune God:

A Response To O.S. Asaolu (Part Two)

By

Osamagbe Lesley EGHAREVBA | Lagos, Nigeria

osamagbelesley1@gmail.com

12th January, 2022

I am delighted to respond again to the arguments of Brother Olumuyiwa Asaolu presented in his second rejoinder on the above subject. His second rejoinder was released on the 10th of January, 2022 and those who have been following this discussion from the beginning would understand that Asaolu is yet to realize the absurdity of his position. It is my desire to address the arguments as he has presented them. His inconsistencies and summersaults on this subject are increasing as he continues to write. This will be made clear in this piece. Again, a little reflection on his argument (in my opinion) reveals the fact that the arguments are neither Scriptural nor logical.

Does The Definite Article Really Nullify The Names?

It is interesting that Asaolu finds solace in the definite article (the) to disprove that Father, Son and Holy Spirit are names in Matthew 28:19. In his words;

*Lesley's view of Mt 28:19 would be correct if Christ had said: "baptizing them in the names of Father, Son and Holy Spirit." However, Christ used the definite article to indicate roles "of **the** Father & of **the** Son & of **the** Holy Spirit." In Mk 14:36, Jesus used "Father" as a name not just as a relationship. He said, "Father, all things are possible unto thee" NOT "The Father, all things are possible unto thee."*

Because the definite article (the) does not appear before the name "Father" in Mark 14:36, Asaolu agrees the usage of "Father" in that verse is a name but because the definite article appears before "Father", "Son" and "Holy Spirit" in Matthew 28:19, he says they are not names but just indicating roles. If this is true, how come the name that Asaolu gave to us ("*the Lord Jesus Christ*") which must be pronounced at baptism by the baptizer has the definite article in it? At least, there are three occasions where Asaolu reiterated that the name into which one must be baptized is "***the*** Lord Jesus Christ." In page 16 of his 33paged write-up, he said; "***The Lord Jesus Christ***" is "***the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.***" And then on page 2 of his first rejoinder, he said that "*the Lord revealed a single name to his apostles to use in baptizing converts. That name is ***the*** Lord Jesus Christ" as evident in Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5, etc." And in page 4 of his second rejoinder, he said; "It is true that I wrote that the name revealed for baptism is ***the*** Lord Jesus Christ."*

Notice that in all of these three instances, Asaolu has the definite article ("the") before "Lord Jesus Christ." If the definite article before "Father," "Son" and "Holy Spirit" disqualifies them to be names, how come he conveniently has it before "Lord Jesus Christ" and that qualifies as a name? Notice that in page 4 of his second rejoinder, he agrees that there are varying examples of the name. One of such variations is "the Lord" (Acts 10:48). If "the Lord" is accepted as a name, why will "the Father" not be accepted as a name? Did he even realize that the Bible passage (Hebrews 11:9) from which he brought out the so-called single name for Abraham, Isaac and Jacob has the definite article before the word "heir" which he called their correct and common name? Hebrews 11:9 reads; "***...the heirs*** with him of the same promise" and not "*...heirs with him of the same promise.*" He claims "the Father" is not a name yet he believes "the heirs" is a name. More than once in his rejoinder, Asaolu removed the definite article before the word "heir" in Hebrews 11:9 in other to confuse the readers and insists that "*a Bible verse exist that branded Abraham, Isaac and Jacob **with a common name**, which referred to them as heirs*" (p.1) and that "*Heb 11:9 reveals that...the single name*

applicable to both Jacob and his fathers is “heir” (p.2). What happened to the definite article? He removed it!!! Honestly, I am embarrassed to have to debate a man who keeps making rules that would not be consistent even for a second.

What Does Name Mean?

Asaolu falsely accused me when he said; “*It is in your rejoinder you aver that “name” refers to three distinct names yet posit it refers to authority.*” I never said that the meaning of “name” as used in Matthew 28:19 refers to “three distinct names” (and I challenge him to produce my very statement where I said that). In page 6 of my erstwhile response to him, I showed clearly that “name” refers to authority, citing Greek scholars and passages of the scriptures to prove it. I mentioned A.T. Robertson (1934, p. 740) and said that he cites the use of *onoma* in Matthew 28:19 as an example where “name” “has the idea of ‘the authority of.’” I do not know where Asaolu got the impression that I said that the word “name” as used in Matthew 28:19 refers to 3 distinct names.

The truth is: Asaolu does not appreciate real meaning of “name” in this verse. Even when he is not schooled in Greek, he disagrees with Greek authorities and lexicographers on what they said the word “name” means here and substitutes with his own meaning. He has been the one insisting that its usage in that verse refers to ONE SINGLE LITERAL NAME and then requests that I produce the three names if I disagree it is in reference to one name. I mentioned that Father, Son and Holy Spirit are names (using his own definition of what a name is) and that the three names in Matthew 28:19 are Father, Son and Holy Spirit. That is not to say that I have interpreted “name” as “three different names.” We can have the sentence construction in a different way and I will still argue that three names are mentioned there. For example, if we have “*Baptizing them in the authority of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.*” We still have three names in the verse even when we replaced the word “name” with “authority.” It does not matter whether the word “name” is there or not, we still have three names regardless. It is not the word “name” in Matthew 28:19 that makes it three names; rather, it is the mentioning of Father, Son and Holy Spirit that makes us arrive at three names.

In I Samuel 25:9, some people brought greetings to Nabal “*in the name of David.*” There is only one person mentioned here which is David. I did not come to the realization of that because the word “name” is mentioned but because “David” is mentioned there. So also, there are THREE people mentioned in Matthew 28:19 and I did not come to the realization of that because “name” is mentioned but because the three people are mentioned separately.

Is Genesis 48:16 And Matthew 28:19 Not Really Parallel?

Asaolu said that Lesley “*assumes that the constructs of Mt 28:19 and Gen 48:16 are same but that is not true.*” Is it not interesting that Asaolu claims that the construction of Matthew 28:19 and Genesis 48:16 are not the same, yet he applied the same rule and produced a single name IN BOTH PASSAGES? What exactly is his position? If he actually believes that the two constructions are not the same, how is he able to produce a single name in Matthew 28:19 and in Genesis 48:16. I am even more amazed that after telling us that there is a single name for the three in Genesis 48:16, Asaolu still admitted that “*it amounts to two names.*” (p.2). Why such inconsistency? The truth is: whatever he is going to say, Genesis 48:16 sinks his whole argument about “the name” and he cannot help but contradict himself.

He still has nothing to refute Genesis 48:16. The sentence reads; “*the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac.*” The word “name” is singular and we have plural persons mentioned alongside with it; the same thing in Matthew 28:19, “*the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit*” we have the singular “name” used with three distinct people. Asaolu says because of the singular “name,” it means the three people in Matthew 28:19 have one name. If that is true, then Genesis 48:16 should have one name too. That is the simple parallel he has refused to admit. He insists it must read like Matthew 10:2 and Revelation 21:14 (*the names of the apostles*) before one can argue for more than one name. Genesis did not read “*the names of my fathers*” but the “*name of my fathers.*” Brother Asaolu cannot eat his cake and have it at the same time. Up

until now, he has not made up his mind on whether Genesis 48:16 has a single name or not. In one place, he will admit there is a single name and in another place, he would admit there is more than one. He should please make up his mind quickly and let us know.

In page 1-2, he brought up some grammatical statements as a condition for a parallel to exist between Genesis 48:16 and Matthew 28:19. He said “*If Jacob had stated: Let my name **and of** my father Abraham **and of** my father Isaac be named upon them... this would be exact with the construction of Mt 28:19 and **indicate a single name was invoked.**” He also cited Mark 15:40 in an effort to support that statement. Well, Jacob did not say so and he did not have to say so to be parallel to what Christ said. Observe carefully: in Mark 2:18, we have the following words; “...*the disciples of John **and of** the Pharisees used to fast...*” Would Asaolu argue that the “*disciples of John **and of** the Pharisees*” are one and the same (single) **set** of disciples? In his 3rd example on page 2, he said a government could say; “*I bring greetings in the name of the President and of the Petroleum Minister*” and concludes that “*this is a reference to two entities which share a single name; Buhari.*” I would like to know what would be wrong with the sentence if he replaces “Petroleum Minister” with “Governor!” Would the sentence be grammatically incorrect? If yes, how? And if no, would it still refer to two entities which share a single name, using the same Nigerian context and characters that he used?*

Is This Really The Truth One Should Concede?

He asks me if I still deny or I now concede “*this truth*” that “heir” is the one name for Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. I am amazed at what he calls “truth.” This so called truth is a perverted one as he did not even quote it correctly by omitting a word. Every sound Bible scholar in the world knows that “the heirs” is not being used as a name in Hebrews 11:9. Brother Asaolu must be saying this out of desperation. Even his modern “Oneness colleagues” will most likely disagree with him on that (I know of a Oneness Pentecostal advocate that believed the single name of the trio in Genesis 48:16 is Israel)! It would be a poor reflection on my part to admit this gross error that “*the heirs*” is the name of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Has he ever taught on the book of Hebrews since he became a member of the Lord’s church? If yes, I wish to know if he had ever taught a class while reading Hebrews 11:9 that the single name for Abraham, Isaac and Jacob is “the heirs” or he just realized it during this discussion. Asaolu is only perverting this passage to have his way on this issue but it will not work.

Smart Attempt To Dismiss And Get Away From Jude 1:4

On Jude 1:4, Asaolu said that “*Rather than admit it teaches that Jesus Christ alone is the Lord God Almighty, LE sought for translations that render it as “only Sovereign.” Nevertheless, the import remains that Christ as the only potentiate is our Lord and God.*” It is amazing that despite the Greek analysis I did on that verse, the only thing Asaolu saw was that I sought for translations that render it as “only sovereign.” That is sad! I stated that the phrase; “*the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ*” as rendered by the KJV appears in Greek thus: *ho monos despotes kai kurios ego Iesous Christos*. And when translated in English, what we have is: *ho (the – g3588) monos (only – g3441) despotes (Master, Lord, etc. – g1203) kai (and – g2532) kurios (Lord – g2962) ego (of us – g1473) Iesous (Jesus – g2424) Christos (Christ – g5547)*. It simply reads; **the only Master and Lord of us Jesus Christ**. The Greek word for God (*theos*) is absent in that verse and what we have is “**the only Master and Lord of us Jesus Christ**” The definite article appears once before the first noun (Master) and is not repeated before the second noun (Lord) and that clearly shows it refers to one person. He did not disprove it but ignored it. To further strengthen my point, I quoted two different translations of that verse and encouraged readers to check other translations and see that they are in agreement with what I said but Asaolu ignored all of these efforts and made false claims.

It is a standard in polemics that a person may refer his audience to check other rendering of a particular text by translators in order to justify a point, and my doing so is not in any way out of place. Brother Asaolu has referred people to [Bible Hub](#) and used different translations of the Bible to prove his point at different times during Bible discussions. He did not consider such as inappropriate but because he has found himself in a predicament, using other translations to support a point is now a crime. His KJV Bible has the word “Easter”

in Acts 12:4 but he would not teach that it is a correct rendering; however, he wants to marry and stick to the KJV Bible in Jude 1:4 because he thinks it support him. Well, I am willing to take away other translations but I request that he disprove the Greek analysis above. He should not pretend that he agrees with me on that verse. If he did, he would not complain that Lesley “*sought for translations that render it as ‘only Sovereign’ rather than admit it teaches that Jesus Christ alone is the Lord God Almighty.*” He actually brought it to dismiss the relevance of the Grandville Sharp’s Rule and to prove the error that God the Father and the Son is one single individual and that was why he dared me to apply the rule to the text. He had a completely different and wrong interpretation of that verse and thought I would not accept the ramifications as it relates to the GSR. Because of the rendering in KJV, he was seeing TWO ENTITIES in this verse which was fused together as ONE SINGLE PERSON like he has been erroneously doing with other verses. He did not know that the verse is talking about Jesus Christ alone. He assumes that the verse refers to God, the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ as ONE SINGLE PERSON. That has been his position from the beginning and his baptismal formula doctrine of mentioning the name of the Lord Jesus Christ at baptism is an offshoot of that false idea. He tries to paraphrase the Grandville Sharp’s Rule by all means just to prove his point. But I do not understand why he must twist the simple rule before he can apply it.

Inconsistent Grammatical Principle

Asaolu said; “*Like uninspired Granville Sharp, I could equally highlight a grammatical principle but for English language.*” Well, even if brother Asaolu highlights a grammatical rule or principle in English language, such rule will have to go through scrutiny and be adjudged as correct, before it becomes a generally accepted principle. Unlike uninspired Asaolu, uninspired Grandville Sharp was a Greek language scholar and that was why he was qualified to set forth the Grandville Sharp’s rule and till date, the principle still holds water; it has been tested and proven to be true. Asaolu is neither a Greek nor an English language authority and he is absolutely UNQUALIFIED to propose or highlight a grammatical principle without citing an English authority that agrees with him. The problem with the principle he proposes is that **it does not work when applied to other parallel statements in the Bible and even with his own very examples that he gave.** His principle in his own words is that “*If a sentence is in the form “U of A and of B and of C...” where A, B & C are singular nouns then the principal attribute in U applies simultaneously to A, B and C.*”

This self-made principle of Asaolu means that if you have a statement such as in Revelation 22:1: “*proceeding out of **the throne of God and of the Lamb***”, since “throne” is in the singular and not “thrones,” it means that God and Lamb must have one throne. Or if as we have in Colossians 2:2: “*acknowledgement of **the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ,***” what it means, according to Asaolu is that both the Father and Christ has a single mystery. That is the essence of all the passages he quoted such as John 3:5, Mark 15:40, Acts 3:13, Ephesians 5:5, etc. We would come to those passages later but let us first of all apply this principle to Matthew 28:19 and see how reliable it is. In that verse, we have; “*baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.*” According to Asaolu’s grammatical rule, since name is singular, it means Father, Son and Holy Spirit share ONE SINGLE NAME. But what is this single name? Asaolu gave about THREE to FOUR variations of name yet, he says it is a single name. In fact, in page 4 of his rejoinder, he confessed; “*I gave at least four VARYING examples of such in each of my articles*” and yet, he says it is a single name. His grammatical rule states that Father, Son and Holy Spirit should have one single name, but he claims he gave four variations of names. If Matthew 28:19 would allow for **three or four variations of the same name**, then other passages he brought up should allow for different variations of the subject involved. Let us now apply this rule to other passages he brought up as seen in the table in the next page:

S/N	Bible Passages Cited By Asaolu For His Rule	Questions Showing Asaolu's Rule Is Faulty
1.	John 3:3: "...Except a man be <u>born of water and of the Spirit...</u> "	Does water and spirit amount to three or four variations of birth?
2.	Mark 15:40: <i>There were also women looking on afar off: among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary <u>the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome</u></i>	Did James and Joses have three variations of one mother?
3.	Revelation 22:1: " <u>proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb</u> "	Do God and the Lamb have three variations of one throne?
4.	Ephesians 5:5: <i>For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom <u>of Christ and of God.</u></i>	Do Christ and God have three variations of one kingdom?
5.	Genesis 48:16: " <u>the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac.</u> "	Did Abraham, Isaac and Jacob have three variations of the same name?
6.	James 1:1: <i>James, a servant <u>of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting.</u></i>	Do God and the Lord Jesus Christ have three variations of the same servant, James?
7.	Col 2:2 " <u>...acknowledgement of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ.</u> "	Do the Father and Christ have three or four variations of the same mystery?
8.	Acts 3:13: <i>The God <u>of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go.</u></i>	Did Abraham, Isaac and Jacob have three variations of God (the Father)? Notice that this passage mentions God and His Son Jesus. So there ought to be 3 or 4 variations of God (the Father) according to Asaolu.

It would only be consistent if Asaolu will correctly apply his rule and produce three variations of each of the subject discussed in the above passages he has brought up. The "name" in Matthew 28:19 cannot have more than one variation using his rule and he would not produce the variations in other passages brought up.

On James 1:1, Asaolu said; "*One James introduced as a servant of God, was concurrently a servant of Christ. He served the Lord Jesus and God. Since his name is stated, Lesley cannot argue that "servant" refers to two distinct persons.*" I did not argue that "name" in Matthew 28:19 means "three distinct persons" and I would not argue that "servant" would refer to one or two persons. James is mentioned here and that tells me it is one person. The three distinct persons in Matthew 28:19 were mentioned separately from the word "name" and that tells me that they are three distinct persons.

Why Deny And Accept Your Baptismal Formula At The Same Time?

Asaolu denied ever saying that what to be mentioned by the baptizer at baptism is "the Lord Jesus Christ" and challenges me to bring his statement where he said those exact words must be said. I knew that was the only way for him to get out of such predicament – he has to simply deny that he said so! Well, I will be glad to provide his statement again. In page 2 of his first rejoinder, he said; "*the Lord revealed a single name to his apostles to use in baptizing converts. That name is "the Lord Jesus Christ." I looked up the word "single" on Google and it means "only one." If the Lord reveals only one name and that name is "the Lord Jesus Christ," then there cannot be another name. If there are variations as he supposedly agrees, then the Lord did not reveal A SINGLE NAME.*

In page 17 of his 33paged write-up, he said "*Neither of them (i.e. the baptizer and the candidate to be baptized) SHOULD FAIL to say THE NAME*" (emphasis L.E.). In page 5 of his second rejoinder, he said;

*“To minister unto and baptize a person, **without mentioning the name of Jesus Christ** would be unacceptable.”* What name did Asaolu said the Lord revealed to be used in baptism? The name is “the Lord Jesus Christ.” And he said that “neither of them SHOULD FAIL TO SAY THE NAME.” And if the baptizer FAILS TO SAY THE NAME, Asaolu says it is UNACCEPTABLE! He wants **these very words** to be said by both the baptizer and the one being baptized. That was why he was displeased with those saying something different from “the Lord Jesus Christ” while baptizing a penitent. This is a set of exact words that he wants people to say during baptism and I showed it is a formula.

Interestingly, on page 5, Asaolu was talking about what to be said at baptism by the baptizer and he wrote; *“Whether we say “in the name of Jesus Christ” or “in the name of the Lord Jesus” or “in the name of Christ,” such is valid...Each of the statements refer exclusively to the same Saviour...;”* If THESE THREE STATEMENTS refer to one person, then the three statements cannot be A SINGLE NAME. He has three names here and he is still insisting on a single name. Besides, is he also aware some were baptized “in the name of the Lord” without “Jesus” or “Christ” mentioned (Acts 10:48)? Why did he not include it as part of his new variations? If “the Lord” is an acceptable name, why can we not have “the Father,” “the Son” and “the Holy Spirit” as acceptable names?

The truth is: whether Asaolu insists that what to say while baptizing is “in the name of Jesus Christ” or “in the name of the Lord Jesus” or “in the name of Christ,” **It is still a formula and he admitted this fact** in his writing as we shall see in a moment. We are not talking about mathematical formula here. Asaolu should have done a little job by looking up the word “formula” in the dictionary or Google. I looked it up and it gives me FIVE different meanings. One of the meanings I got is “a mathematical relationship or rule expressed in symbols” but this is not the meaning intended in this discourse; hence, his reference to the quadratic equation formula is a straw man and it only landed him into more trouble as we shall see in the next paragraph. Another meaning of formula is “a set form of words, especially one used in particular contexts or as a conventional usage” and the various synonyms brought under this definition include; *form of words, set of words, set expression, phrase, saying, etc.* and this is the meaning intended. One of the ways Merriam Webster defines formula is “a set form of words for use in a ceremony or ritual.” All of the variations he claims are available are “set of words...that neither of them SHOULD FAIL TO SAY” during baptism.

Initially, in page 4 of his erstwhile rejoinder, he said that *“Faithful members of the Lord’s church, do not insist on “a particular formula” or set of exact words to be said when baptizing anyone.”* When it was proven to him that the name he gave to us to be used in baptism is a formula, he recanted and said *“formula may take different forms at certain times though the same system is under consideration”* and he used the quadratic equation formula to prove that a formula may take different forms. He now admits that what he is teaching is a baptismal formula but the only thing is that the formula should take different forms or variations. Faithful members of the Lord’s church do not insist on a particular formula to be used when baptizing, yet, at the same time, they can insist on a particular formula provided the formula takes different forms or variations. His inconsistencies and shifting positions are so glaring for readers to see and these amaze me greatly.

He said *“The essence of using **one name** in baptism is to acknowledge that the Godhead is fully manifest in **Christ** (Col 1:19; 2:9). Furthermore, when one is immersed into that name, “the name of Christ is named upon the person” and, such becomes a **Christian**”* **No Bible passage teaches that the essence of using one name in baptism is to acknowledge that the Godhead is fully manifest in Christ (and I challenge him to give us a passage that says that). The Bible references he cited do not teach so. Please read Colossians 1:19 and 2:9 and you would see that it says NOTHING about the essence of using one name in baptism. This is another error embedded in Asaolu’s view.** Besides, he did not show us **one name** but **three to four variations of names**. Furthermore, what is “the name of Christ” that is named upon the person? Is it Christ? Or is it Jesus? Or is it Lord? Or is it ALL OF THE ABOVE? All of these (Lord, Christ and Jesus) have different meanings and I do not understand how they translate to ONE NAME.

“Repent” Is Also “In The Name Of Jesus Christ” (Acts 2:38)

In my first rejoinder I asked that

“If baptizing in the name of Jesus means calling the name of Jesus over the one being baptized, remember that in Acts 2:38, Peter said they should “Repent...in the name of Jesus Christ.” “Repent” is also “in the name of Jesus Christ.” Let Asaolu tell us HOW the penitent SHOULD “repent... in the name of Jesus Christ.”

In response, Asaolu said; *“Lesley is trying to inject his opinion into scripture. The inspired text does NOT state “Repent in the name of Jesus Christ” rather it says “Repent and **be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.**”*

I am amazed that he does not understand the usage of conjunction in English sentence, yet he wants to propose a new grammatical principle in English! When the Bible says **“Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ,”** it means repent in the name of Jesus Christ and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, just like Asaolu would admit that the verse is also saying repent for the remission of sins and be baptized for the remission of sins. Asaolu has not answered this point – he should tell us why he does not say *“you repent in the name of Jesus Christ”* when he baptizes someone.

In Mark 16:16, Jesus said; *“He who believes and is baptized shall be saved”* Asaolu understands this to mean that belief + baptism will give you salvation. Some have argued that only belief is necessary to give you salvation but we have correctly understood this to mean belief and baptism will give you salvation because of the conjunction “and” that connects or joins belief plus baptism. In Acts 2:38, Peter said *“Repent **AND** be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.”* What they are to do “in the name of Jesus Christ” is “Repent and be baptized.” There is absolutely no way Asaolu would dismiss this!

“Even If” Means I Agree With You?

Asaolu said on page 5;

*Rather than affirm outright as false “the one name argument,” Lesley repeatedly avers: “**even if it is true** it does not prove that they are the same person.” This suggests that the view is reasonable but the larger implication makes it difficult for him to accept the mounting scriptural evidence that the Godhead bears one special name.*

He does not have to tell people that his view is “reasonable” before they will see it. If it is reasonable, people will know without him telling them. He tries to pick up on my statement “even if” and assumes that suggest I appreciate his position to an extent but I would not just accept it. That is false. My whole endeavor from the beginning of this discourse is to show that the oneness doctrine is false. My use of “*even if*” only shows how flexible I am and the incongruity of his position. Sometimes, we grant certain things for the sake of argument but that does not mean we are in agreement with what we have granted. I do not actually believe that “name” as used in Matthew 28:19 refers to either one or more names. But Asaolu’s WHOLE argument is dependent on “name” in that verse. I told him that even if he is able to prove (that does not mean he has proven it) that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit have one name, that does not mean they are one single individual. He did not disprove it (and that does not mean that I believe that the three have one name). I could as well say *“even if Abraham, Isaac and Jacob have one name, that would not prove that they are the same person.”* This statement would not mean that I agree that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob have one name which brother Asaolu called “heir”. I am only granting it for the sake of argument; I do not believe it for a second!

Why Is “Heir” Not A Single Name For God’s People?

He claims that the single name for God’s people today is “Christians” but he would not claim the single name is “heir” even though we are heirs like Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Romans 8:17; Galatians 3:29). On what basis did he give the three men the name “heir” and would not give us? Notice that the word “**heirs**” as used for God’s children in both Galatians 3:29 and Romans 8:17 is without the definite article “*the*,” the text does

not say we are Abraham's seed and **"the heirs."** Rather it says we are Abraham's seed and **"heirs."** Since the definite article is missing, that should very well be fitting for a name according to Asaolu's argument. Why does Asaolu have to insist that **"The single name that we bear worldwide is "Christians"** (p.6) when he claims "heir" is also a name and we are called by that? Is "heir" a variation of our single name?

My question to him was **"How in the world is it consistent to insist for a single name for any or all of the three and it makes no sense to insist for a single name for the church?"** And he prefers to explain something else from what I asked. There is no passage that states **"this is the one single name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit"** and no single passage states **"this is the one single name for the church."** Asaolu looked for a single name for the three; he should also look for a single name for the church. If he cannot produce a single name for the church because there is no passage that states there is one single name, then why does he have to argue over a single name for the Father, Son and Holy Spirit even when there is no single passage that clearly says so?

"In The Name Of" – Does It Mean "Say The Following Words"?

He asks; **"Do you baptize a penitent in the names of God such as "the Holy One of Israel, the everlasting Father and the Spirit of Truth?"** I do not believe that baptizing **"in the name of"** means you have to say the name. That is Asaolu's view! **If "in the name of" means "say the following words," Matthew 28:19 contradicts Acts 2:38 because what they are to say differs in BOTH TEXT!** By what rule did he interpret "in the name of" in Acts 2:38 as "say the following words" on those baptized, yet comes to Matthew 28:19 to say "in the name of" means "one single name." If it means "say the following words" in Acts 2:38, it will definitely mean "say the following words" in Matthew 28:19. And if that is correct, that will be a contradiction in the Bible on what to say during baptism! He also asks if I **"insist that the EXACT phrase: "in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" MUST be pronounced?** No. My magazine article states that God did not tell us what to say or be pronounced while baptizing and I cannot insist on saying a particular thing like Asaolu is insisting.

He said; **"Lesley threw in verses such as Col 3:17, Exo 5:23 & Acts 3:16 to propound that name refers to authority in Mt 28:19. That is inadequate."** Asaolu disagrees with the Greek scholars that said "name" means "authority." I cited A.T. Robertson, Vine, etc. to show this. These are Greek authorities and if he dismisses their lexicons because the men are uninspired, we could as well dismiss his own! The truth is: the word "name" in Matthew 28:19 and the four passages in Acts refer to authority. The passages are talking about names – Father, Son, Holy Spirit, and Jesus, but they are not teaching "say the name" but do it by the authority of that person. For example, if I say the **"USA secretary of state negotiated in the name of the President,"** I would not be talking about what the secretary said but what he did – he negotiated by the President's authority acting as his representative. And the name referred to could be "President" or "Biden" – either one of those are names. President is used as a role and a name (just like "Father").

Why Not Produce The Passage?

I asked him to produce a CLEAR PASSAGE that reveals the EXCLUSIVE SINGLE NAME of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit and then he cites Titus 2:13 and II Timothy 1:2 **but none of these passages tells us what is that name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.** He did not have trouble citing Matthew 10:2 and showing us that **"the names of the twelve apostles are these: ..."** He does not need to explain to anyone what the names of the apostles are; they are clearly stated in the text. Since he is insisting on a single name for the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Asaolu should give us a clear passage that clearly states **"this is the name..."** just like Matthew 10:2. Up till now, he is still not sure if it is a single name or three to four different variations of names.

The Godhead Is Excluded When Jesus Said “All Authority Is Given To Me”

He said “*Peter never commanded people to be baptized in the name of a Trinity or in the authority of a Trinity. Christ need not instruct: “baptizing them in the authority of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost” since he just declared that all authority is vested in himself!*” Brother Asaolu needs to understand that when Jesus said “**all authority is given to me**” in Matthew 28:18, the Godhead is excluded. In I Corinthians 15:27 we have these words; “*For he ‘has put everything under his feet.’ Now when it says that “everything” has been put under him, it is clear that **this does not include God himself, who put everything under Christ***” (NIV). The New Living Translation renders it thus: “*For the Scriptures say, “God has put all things under his authority.” (Of course, when it says “all things are under his authority,” that does not include God himself, who gave Christ his authority.)*” And the NKJV puts it this way: “*For ‘He has put all things under His feet.’ But when He says “all things are put under Him,” it is evident that He who put all things under Him is excepted.*” I truly wish that brother Asaolu understands this, that when Christ says all authority has been given to Him, the Godhead is EXCLUDED! The first import of Matthew 28:18 is that a distinct person gave Jesus all authority. This confirms that the Godhead consists of more than one person.

Other Questions

He asks if Lesley is positing that “*Penitents must be baptized in three literal names: Father, Son & Holy Spirit?*” Father, Son and Holy Spirit are three literal names. We are baptized by their authority – which is one and the same.

He also asks if Lesley is saying that “*Jesus means baptizing them in three distinct authorities of the Father & the Son & the Holy Spirit? [If it is not a common name then it can’t be a common authority! Presently, who has all authority?]*” It is all one and the same authority. That is the very reason why Matthew 28:19 does not contradict Acts 2:38. The two verses are teaching the same thing – baptize (or be baptized) because God told you to. If the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit all possess the same nature of Divinity, surely they will have common authority.

He asks if “*In Gen 48:16, Jacob meant: “let my authority be authorized upon them and the authority of my fathers Abraham and Isaac...”*”? It is irrelevant what Genesis 48:16 means since it is not talking about baptism. The point from this verse is that it conclusively demonstrates Asaolu’s false argument that the singularity of the word “name” in Matthew 28:19 proves the verse is only talking about one name. I have told brother Asaolu that I am not interested in his commentary on this verse and I will pay no single attention to it but he still wants to divert my attention from why this verse was brought up by asking for an explanation of the verse; that is exactly what he is trying to do here and I would not allow him do it.

Why The Complaints?

He said; “*If LE really believed that existing works **sufficiently address** my position, he would not devote any effort to write on the subject or do rejoinders! His two Magazine articles were supposedly to confront “false doctrine” which “not until very recently” had he ever known is propagated by “some “amongst us.”*” My statement was that I believed there are enough materials already available which masterfully did justice to his work; hence, I did not consider it necessary to do a rejoinder to his 33-paged work as he was desperately looking for. But what I do not understand is this: so because there are existing works on *infant baptism* for instance, I should not discuss or write about it in my magazine? I did not say that I had no time to write in my magazine. I said I had no time to devote to doing a rejoinder to his work! I can correct errors without necessarily doing a rejoinder to a work and that was exactly what I did. Brother Asaolu should know I am not afraid of debating. I already told him in November, 2021 that we can formally engage in the discussion by writing if he wants and that is what we are doing now, yet he would not stop complaining about me refusing to rebut his work.

Asaolu further said of Lesley; “*He declined to privately discuss his views on Mt 28:19 based on Gen 48:16 which he raised after the MOG discussion. Seems he preferred a public avenue to seek to address “the old*

arguments” which “Asaolu somewhat tried to make in a different way.” Brother Asaolu can continue to assume and make untrue suppositions. When I introduced Genesis 48:16 to him privately and ask that he tells me the one name of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob based on the argument he made on Matthew 28:19 in his 33paged write-up, Brother Asaolu **could not tell me the single name** (he could not even tell me it was “heir” as he now argues). Rather, he was explaining Genesis 48:16 and giving me his commentary on the verse. He even referred me to [Bible Hub](#) to see other people’s commentaries and translations; the same thing that is now unacceptable for me to do. I became uninterested in the discussion since he could not answer my question and I reiterated to him that I will address the issue clearly in my magazine. Why is he still complaining? Well, like I mentioned in my erstwhile response, those who are bold and confident of what they teach should teach it publicly and not rehash their points privately and complaining and accusing people of not commenting.

He said; “*It is what the New Testament teaches that is important not necessarily what some modern Churches of Christ teach and practice now. The apostles’ doctrine in the Lord’s church is evident in Acts 2:38f.*” I did not mention “**modern churches of Christ.**” He deliberately inserted the word “modern” in my sentence to distort my statement just as he has been doing with the Bible passages.

Contradictions He Is Silent About

1. Is there one single name in Genesis 48:16 or MORE THAN A SINGLE NAME?
2. Did God reveal A SINGLE NAME for baptism or FOUR VARIATIONS of name?
3. Why is “the Lord” (Acts 10:48) a name and “the heir” (Hebrews 11:9) a name but “the Father” (Matthew 28:19) is not a name?
4. Why would faithful members of the church of Christ not insist on a set of words to be said while baptizing but you insist on a set of words to be said?
5. Is “*the Lord Jesus Christ*” a set of words or not?
6. Do you have a baptismal formula or not?
7. Is the statement; “*the Lord Jesus Christ*” a formula or not?
8. Does a formula have to contain mathematical symbols for it to be a formula?
9. Is Genesis 48:16 And Matthew 28:19 Not Really Parallel? If yes, why did you apply same rule and arrive at same conclusion in both texts?
10. As God’s children today, is “heir” a variation of our single name? If not, why?
11. Why would “in the name of Jesus Christ” in Acts 2:38 means “say the name of Jesus Christ” and “in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” in Matthew 28:19 would not mean “say the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit”?

To Download Brother Asaolu’s First Rejoinder, Please Click:

https://lajosint.com/download/faith/A_rejoinder_to_Mt_28_19_And_The_Triune_God.pdf

To Download O. Lesley Egharevba’s First Response, Please Click: https://www.unmaskingsophistry.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Matthew_28_19_And_The_Triune_God_Rebuttal_To_Asaolu.pdf

To Download Brother Asaolu’s Second Rejoinder, Please Click:

https://lajosint.com/download/faith/A_rejoinder_to_Mt_28_19_And_The_Triune_God_2.pdf

To Download **Unmasking Sophistry Magazine** (January – March, 2022, Volume 2, Number 1), Please Click https://www.unmaskingsophistry.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Unmasking_Sophistry_January-March_2022.pdf

To Download Brother Asaolu’s 33paged Write-up Titled “*Is God one or three,*” Please Click: https://lajosint.com/download/faith/Is_God_one_or_three.pdf