

Matthew 28:19 and the Triune God:

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

By

Osamagbe Lesley EGHAREVBA | Lagos, Nigeria

osamagbelesley1@gmail.com

2nd March, 2022

This is a response to Brother Olumuyiwa Asaolu's third and final rejoinder on the issue of *Matthew 28:19 and the triune God* which was released on the 14th of January, 2022. In my opinion, Brother Asaolu's final response is the weakest of all his rejoinders as it seems more like an emotional appeal. He contradicted himself again at different times and left certain points unanswered. It appears he has exhausted all his arguments on the matter and would not want to continue so as to "avoid repetition and wrangling" (p.8). Well, my desire in this piece is to further show his inconsistencies. I hope that he would realize that his position and arguments on this issue are neither scriptural nor logical.

Do You Know What Was Said By The New Testament Baptizers?

Brother Asaolu went back to a statement which I made in my very first article where I said that "*Not a single New Testament passage tells us what was said at the point of baptizing an individual and it would be wrong to insist on a particular formula to be said when baptizing a person.*" And in response, he said;

"It is necessary for a baptizer to affirm that the subject is therefore being translated into the domain of the same Jesus. That one is immersed in the name of Jesus Christ is pretty clear in Acts 2:38 since the core of the message was for that audience to know assuredly that Jesus of Nazareth 'is both Lord and Christ' -Acts 2:36. Other pertinent scripture are given in Table 1."

The "other pertinent scriptures" that were given in the table by brother Asaolu are; Acts 10:48; Romans 6:3-4 and I Corinthians 1:12-15. Brother Asaolu thinks that to be baptized "in the name of Jesus Christ" means to "say the name of Jesus Christ" by the one doing the baptism. I have showed severally that if that is correct, then baptizing "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" would also mean to say the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. It amazes me greatly that brother Asaolu interprets the statements; "in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38), "in the name of the Lord" (Acts 10:48) and "in the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts 19:5) to mean that the baptizer mentioned these very words while baptizing the individuals involved; yet comes to Matthew 28:19 and insists that "in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit" would not mean "say the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit." By what rule did he make such distinction? He was completely silent on this. None of the passages he cited actually tells us WHAT WAS SAID by the baptizer at the point of baptism and he cannot prove that such was the exact name or phrase that was mentioned. The truth is: DOING SOMETHING "in the name of" someone is not the same thing as SAYING SOMETHING or repeating a formula of words. In I Samuel 25:5-9, we find these words;

David sent ten young men; and David said to the young men, "***Go up to Carmel, go to Nabal, and greet him in my name. And thus you shall say to him*** who lives in prosperity: 'Peace be to you, peace to your house, and peace to all that you have! Now I have heard that you have shearers. Your shepherds were with us, and we did not hurt them, nor was there anything missing from them all the while they were in Carmel. Ask your young men, and they will tell you. Therefore let my young men find favor in your eyes, for we come on a feast day. Please give whatever comes to your hand to your servants and to your son David.'" So when David's young men came, ***they spoke to Nabal according to all these words in the name of David***, and waited.

This passage clearly shows that doing something in the name of someone is different to saying a particular thing except there is a different command telling you what to say. It also proves that what is to be done is different to what is to be said. Here, David told them **what to do** and **what to say**. They were to (1) Go up to Carmel, (2) Go to Nabal and (3) Greet Nabal. These three things were to be done **“in the name of David.”** The men were not expected to go about and say “we are going to Carmel in the name of David” for the command to be obeyed. Neither were they mandated to get to the house of Nabal and start saying; “We have come to Carmel in the name of David” before they will obey the command. David clearly told them **what to say** when they get there. According to Asaolu, the men MUST say *“We have come to Carmel and to you Nabal and to greet you in the name of David”* before they would obey the command. But this is not so. It only means that their going to Carmel to meet Nabal was by the authority of David. In other words, they went to Carmel, to Nabal and greeted him **because David asked them to go!** Similarly, people are to be baptized today **because God asked them to!** **What we are To DO is to BAPTIZE but what we are To SAY while baptizing is not stated.**

Do You Have To Draw A Table To Tell Us What Was Said?

Brother Asaolu had to draw a table and explain his “pertinent scriptures” to prove that a particular name was mentioned by the baptizer at baptism, yet we cannot find anything in the text to indicate such. If after drawing a cat on the board and one still needs to write beside it “This Is A Cat” before the viewers (e.g. high school students) can recognize that it is a cat, then the person is a poor artist. We cannot find in the texts what was said by the baptizer but brother Asaolu had to draw and explain WHAT WAS SAID at the point of baptism for us to know. We knew what the young men said when they got to the house of Nabal in I Samuel 25:5-9 without drawing a table and explaining anything, but we cannot know what was said by the baptizer in Acts 2:41 and other “pertinent scriptures” of brother Asaolu without his table and explanations.

Why Classify Me With Others?

Brother Asaolu said that Lesley *“indirectly posits that nothing may be said “at the point of baptizing an individual.”* And went further to say that *“The ‘say nothing at baptism philosophy’ is also advanced by those who claim that it is unnecessary for a baptizer to believe in or utter the name of Jesus Christ so Atheists and Satanists could baptize someone.”* This is a straw man! What I have been teaching is that it is wrong to insist on a particular formula or set of words to say while baptizing. I have never advocated that atheists and Satanists should baptize one into Christ and brother Asaolu knows my view on this subject. Thus, to classify me in the same group with those who advocate such, is incongruous. By his own reasoning, I could as well group him with the Jewish exorcists who believe that calling the name of the Lord Jesus over those who had evil spirits is what is necessary to cure them. In Acts 19:13, we read; *“Then some of the itinerant Jewish exorcists took it upon themselves to call the name of the Lord Jesus over those who had evil spirits, saying ‘We exorcise you by the Jesus whom Paul preaches.’”* Brother Asaolu’s teaching is that you have to call the name of the Lord Jesus over the one you are baptizing for the person’s sins to be washed away. Meanwhile, this is exactly what the Jewish exorcists believed; that when you call the name of Jesus over one with an evil spirit, then that would drive the evil spirit away. However, this is not true as evident in verses 14-15 of Acts 19. Brother Asaolu could very well be classified with the **Oneness Pentecostals** since his rejoinders regurgitate the failed arguments of the oneness doctrine. His doctrine also suggests that there is only one single name for God which he called the Lord Jesus Christ. This brings to our minds the Jehovah’s Witnesses who also insist on a particular name for God which they call Jehovah even though their view of the Godhead differs from his.

Your Statement Is What Is Contradictory

In page 2, he said I contradicted myself with his quotation that I cited. No, I did not contradict myself. What brother Asaolu did was to cut my comment and disjointed it to prove his supposed contradiction. He refused to quote my statement EXACTLY as it was written but brought two different phrases made in different sentences to prove his supposed contradiction. However, his statements are the ones that are contradictory. The truth is: Brother Asaolu says “Father” as used in Matthew 28:19 is NOT a name because the definite

article precedes it; but comes to Hebrews 11:9 to argue that “heirs” is the single name for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. I showed that what we have there is “the heirs” not “heirs.” And if he believes that “Father” in Matthew 28:19 is not a name because of the definite article, then he cannot have “heirs” as a name in Hebrews 11:9 since the definite article precedes it. I mentioned that brother Asaolu knows that will be a killing blow on his position and intentionally removed the definite article while quoting Hebrews 11:9. That is the point. Perhaps, brother Asaolu intended to say that he (and not Lesley) contradicted himself.

Why Do You Apply Same Rule To Two “Unparallel” Passages?

Brother Asaolu still insists that Matthew 28:19 and Genesis 48:16 are not parallel but he failed to tell us how and why he was able to provide a single name for the individuals in both passages. He was silent about this yet claims that “The substance of those things he just listed under “*Contradictions He Is Silent About*” has been addressed already.” The reason why I cited Genesis 48:16 was to show that his grammatical argument of “name” in Matthew 28:19 meaning the three persons have one single name, is faulty. If he claims both passages are not parallel, then he should not have been able to apply his rule therein. Another good parallel to Matthew 28:19 is Joshua 23:7. In that verse, Joshua said; “*You shall not make mention of the name of their gods, nor cause anyone to swear by them; you shall not serve them nor bow down to them,*” Here, we have “name” used in connection with plural “gods.” Will brother Asaolu argue that this is just one name for many gods? If yes, what is the one name? It is clear that his grammatical argument of one name for the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is baseless, illogical and does not align with the principle of any Greek or English scholar. Little wonder why he has not cited any Greek or English authority to validate his claim.

He said “*Lesley’s supposition is not rooted in scripture. Note his conditional clause ‘if the trio possess the same...’* He said my supposition is not rooted in the scriptures because I used the word “if.” Well, Asaolu also used the word “if” when he said; “*In Mt 29:19 (sic), Jesus effectively says baptizing them ‘in the name of the Godhead.’ **If** there is a literal name for the Godhead then it must be used.*” (p.7). Note his conditional word “**IF** there is a literal name for the Godhead...” By his own argument, that would mean also, that there is not a single literal name for the Godhead and brother Asaolu’s supposition is not rooted in scripture. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. Besides, if “the name of the Godhead” (Matthew 28:19) means one single name for the Godhead, then “the name of their gods” (Joshua 23:7) should mean one single name for the gods. Let brother Asaolu provide this single name.

You Cannot Get Away From Mark 2:18

Brother Asaolu’s comment on Mark 2:18 is faulty and funny. Perhaps, he does not understand why I introduced that verse. In page 2 & 3 of his second rejoinder, he said if a government official should say, “*I bring greetings in the name of the President and of the Petroleum Minister,*” this would mean that the President and Petroleum Minister share a single name. He also made reference to Mark 15:40 (“*the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome*”) to show that James and Joses have one mother. And then he referred to Acts 3:13 (“*The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob,*”) to show that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob have one God. I introduced Mark 2:18 (“*...the disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to fast...*”) and asked him if he would admit that the “disciples of John and of the Pharisees” are one and the same (single) set of disciples? He tries to explain it away saying that because “the Pharisees” is not a singular noun, it should not be expected that the disciples of John would necessarily be “the same (single) set” of disciples of the Pharisees. But that is beside the point. He was not citing his rule when he made the example of the President and Petroleum Minister.

Besides, I looked up the words “the Pharisees” on Google and I got different definitions from different websites: Each defined “the Pharisees” as (1) **an** ancient Jewish group; (2) **a** religious and political movement of ancient Israel; (3) **a** working-class movement concerned with establishing a clear and consistent Jewish identity; (4) **an** influential religious sect within Judaism (5) **a** Jewish religious sect; (6) **a** Jewish group mentioned collectively or as individuals (7) **a** social movement and a school of thought, etc. If “the Pharisees” is **A GROUP**, then it is singular in that context of Mark 2:18 and so, Asaolu’s excuse of not being able to

apply his rule, is moot. This further shows that his rule is faulty and inconsistent as shall be later seen in this piece.

Do You Really Understand And Accept The Grandville Sharp's Rule?

Brother Asaolu said; **“Lesley is yet to understand that I know and accept the Grandville Sharp's Rule wholeheartedly.”** If brother Asaolu accepts the Grandville Sharp's rule WHOLEHEARTEDLY as he claims, then he would not argue that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are ONE SINGLE PERSON. Grandville Sharp's rule states that you can only argue that they are one single person if the definite article is used once. Brother Asaolu does not accept this rule and he has been arguing that there is only one person in the Godhead. But then again, how come he conveniently describes what he wholeheartedly accepts as “a quibble that backfired”? In page 8 of his third rejoinder, brother Asaolu unequivocally said that the Grandville Sharp's Rule ***“has become a quibble that backfired!”*** How in the world would you accept something wholeheartedly yet conveniently refers to it as a quibble that backfired? If brother Asaolu feels I have misapplied the Grandville Sharp's Rule in any way, he should simply have stated that my application of the rule is the quibble that backfired and not the rule itself. Saying that the GSR is a quibble that backfired shows he does not believe in the rule at all.

He said; *“Interesting Lesley does not accept that the name of God as stated in Tit 2:13 is Jesus Christ though he avers God is three distinct persons. I knew he would not apply Grandville Sharp's Rule to 2 Tim 1:2. GSR has become a quibble that backfired! Lesley also hasn't declared that Jesus is the LORD in the OT.”* Applying the Grandville Sharp's rule to II Timothy 1:2 would not hurt my position one bit. When he asked me to apply it to Jude 1:4, I did, even though he thought I could not do so; and up till now, he has refused to accept my analysis on that verse, yet complains about me not applying it to another passage. I believe that anyone can look up the Greek construction of II Timothy 1:2 to realize that Asaolu is TERRIBLY mistaken about his supposition on that verse. I am glad that he has boldly declared GSR as a quibble that backfired; this is the same rule that he wholeheartedly accepts as correct. I would suggest he takes a look at the “Quibbles that Backfired” section of Unmasking Sophistry Magazine to understand how and when a quibble is said to have backfired. Besides, I am wondering why we have to apply Grandville Sharp's rule to a Bible passage before we can realize that there is a name mentioned there. Did brother Asaolu apply GSR to Matthew 10:2 before he realized what the names of the apostles are? Why do we have to apply it to II Timothy 1:2 before we can see the single name of God? He should please be reminded that the purpose of GSR is not to determine a name in a passage.

What Is The Problem With Jude 1:4?

Brother Asaolu said; *“I brought up Jude 1:4 because applying GSR to that verse will lead to the inescapable conclusion that Jesus Christ is the ONLY Lord God -something which Lesley does NOT believe.”* How many times do I have to explain Jude 1:4 and show to him that I accept what it says? He is the one that has a wrong interpretation of the verse, thinking that the verse speaks of TWO PEOPLE as ONE SINGLE PERSON. It is obvious he loves his KJV so much and would not want to leave it to see other translations. But then, let us examine the verse as rendered by the KJV. Does the phrase; ***“the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ”*** prove that there is only one person in the Godhead? Does it exclude the other two members of the Godhead from being God? Not at all! The words; “only,” “except,” “all” “no one,” etc. are sometimes used in a limited sense and not absolute. For example, in Romans 3:23, Paul says “for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God...” Does the use of “all” here include infants? Does it include Jesus? Of course not! In verse 9, it is written, “there is none righteous, no, not one.” Is Jesus included? No. In John 17:3, Jesus was praying to the Father and He said; “And this is eternal life, that they may know You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You have sent” Brother Asaolu has been arguing that Jesus is the ONLY true God excluding every other; yet Jesus calls the Father the ONLY true God. To sustain his position, he will have Jude 1:4 contradict John 17:3 just as he has been using other Bible passages to contradict Matthew 28:19.

Why Not Produce Your English Professor's References?

He said; *"What I observed is NOT novel, I cross-checked with a Professor of English who concurred and says it is available in Cambridge and Oxford Grammar resources. Based on the Greek/English grammar of Mt 28:19 text, the Godhead has a common name in the NT."* Since we do not know the Professor, why not cite the Cambridge and Oxford Grammar resources so we can all see? Asaolu should provide the English or Greek rule that states that the use of "name" in Matthew 28:19 means that the three have one single name and then tell us the single name for the gods in Joshua 23:7. If Asaolu cannot provide the sources, then the claim is false! If the statement had read this way; *"...in the name of John and of Peter and of James,"* would Asaolu and his unknown English Professor argue that Peter, James and John bear one single name?

Does It Matter What I Address You As?

Brother Asaolu said; *In this discourse, Lesley has variously addressed me as "O. S. Asaolu, Brother Olumuyiwa Asaolu, Bro Asaolu, & Asaolu."* Are these not FOUR variations of my name? Do I have a single name or four? Is he referring to four different persons or I alone? Yet he has the audacity to posit that Jesus Christ, the Lord Jesus Christ, Christ, the Lord, etc. are four names and not alluding to one name or personality! That I have variously addressed him by different terms does not mean that those terms are his names. For example, in my first rejoinder, I called him "Brother" without adding anything else. Would he admit that "brother" is a variation of his one name? I believe that if he is writing his name in any official document, he would probably write "Olumuyiwa Asaolu" and not "Brother Asaolu." I wish that he would forget about the terms by which Lesley has called him and let him tell us if the Lord revealed a single name for baptism or four different variations of names. He has not answered this question.

In page 7, he said *"our Saviour has several names like Emmanuel, Jehovah, etc. but when I refer to his 'single name,' I mean his name relevant for man's salvation today, the most exalted appellation which is 'The Lord Jesus Christ.' Lesley totally ignored Zech 14:9 & Acts 4:12."* My question to him would be why did he not list "Emmanuel" and "Jehovah" as acceptable variations of the name? Would it be acceptable or not if someone mentions the name "Emmanuel" or "Jehovah" or "God with us" while baptizing? Zechariah 14:9 and Acts 4:12 that he said I ignored do not teach that the most exalted name of the saviour is "The Lord Jesus Christ." Acts 4:10 mentions "Jesus Christ of Nazareth" not "The Lord Jesus Christ" and some people were baptized "in the name of the Lord" (Acts 10:48). I am wondering if those ones were not properly baptized since "Jesus" or "Christ" is not mentioned. Brother Asaolu likes to make statements and attribute them to Bible passages that say NOTHING about them. He made a statement about the essence of using one name in baptism in his second rejoinder and attributed it to Colossians 1:19 and 2:9. I pointed that the texts say nothing about the essence of using one name in baptism. But what was his response to it? Nothing! He was so SILENT about it.

You Rule Is Inconsistent Again

In my last rejoinder, I made a table and asked him to tell us the different variations of the subjects in each of the Bible passages he brought up in order to show the consistency of his rule. Then he said; *"Let's be reminded that variation refers to a different description of same U in various Bible passages. Lesley seems to think that the objects A, B & C are the variations of U. He is mistaken."* Based on this, he brought up passages that describe the subject by a different term. But this further puts him into more trouble. For example, in Revelation 22:1 (*"...proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb"*), I asked him if God and the Lamb have three different variations of one throne. He then made reference to Psalm 47:8, Matthew 19:28 and Heb 4:16 wherein the throne is described by different terms. But this is not what he did with Matthew 28:19. In Matthew 28:19, brother Asaolu told us what he thinks the word "name" means and then brought up scriptures that describe what he thinks the name means. He said the name is "the Lord Jesus Christ" and introduced scriptures that describe Jesus by different terms. However, if "variation refers to a different description of same U in various Bible passages," then brother Asaolu should give us the various description of "name" as used in Matthew 28:19 in other passages and not for him to introduce passages that mentions what he thinks the name is. Someone else could come and say the single name in Matthew 28:19 is "Melchizedek" and points to scriptures where Melchizedek was described by different terms (e.g. King of

Salem, etc. – Genesis 14:18; Hebrews 7:1) and he would be as “right” as brother Asaolu. Asaolu’s rule is faulty and he needs to admit this fact.

In page 5, he said; “In John 3:5, born [birth] is U, A is water, B is the Spirit. Clearly, water and the Spirit are two singular nouns. Alternative descriptions of the birth are ‘born of divine will’ and ‘born by the word of God.’ Now, let us fix in Matthew 28:19. In that verse, name is U, A is Father, B is Son and C is Holy Spirit. Clearly, Father, Son and the Holy Spirit are three singular nouns. Alternative descriptions of the name are what? Asaolu only gave us alternative descriptions of what he assumed the name to be but failed to tell us what the alternative descriptions of name are, yet his rule is in line with Cambridge and Oxford Grammar resources.

Why Not Fix The Problem?

I am wondering why he has not fixed the trouble he got himself into. He seems to have intelligently evaded it. Brother Asaolu 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.*” It has been proven to him that the name he gave to us to be used in baptism is a formula. He admitted this and said, well, “*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. He needs to tell us if he truly believes that statement. He cannot be insisting on a particular formula to be used when baptizing, yet, at the same time claiming that faithful members of the Lord’s church would not do so.

“Repent” In The Name Of Jesus Christ

On Acts 2:38, he said “*The reader can verify that it was Lesley who disjointed the phrase in Acts 2:38 and wanted “Repent” to go with “in the name of Jesus” the way some split Mk 16:16 and try to link “Believe” with “shall be saved.” I objected and stated that inspiration uses “Repent and be Baptized” before “in the name of Jesus.” Yet, Lesley has the temerity to accuse me of not understanding conjunction and even cited the denominational mishandling of Mk 16:16 which HE TRIED to replicate.*” Acts 2:38 is clear and I have clearly explained it in my last response. I did not disjoint anything as he claimed and I CLEARLY showed he is the one adopting the denominational approach. I will encourage the reader to take this passage to any English teacher and ask the teacher this simple question; “what were the people expected to do in the name of Jesus Christ? My simple answer would be “they were to repent and be baptized.” Brother Asaolu would not teach that repentance is not necessary “for the forgiveness of sins” as mentioned in the text but he is clearly denying that repentance is not “in the name of Jesus Christ” just because he wants to sustain his position on the baptismal formula. The conjunction ties “repent” and “baptism” but brother Asaolu is the one who has decided to cut repent away from it. I am willing to let the readers decide for themselves.

Do You Really Mean What You Said About “Even If”?

Brother Asaolu is still having issues with my use of “Even If.” He thinks it means I agree with him but that I just do not want to accept. Hence he suggested a common phrase to be used instead (“assuming without conceding”) if I really intended to express that I do not agree with him. I am still very much amazed and wondering if brother Asaolu believes this or he is just trying to argue. In John 8:13-14, we find these words;

The Pharisees therefore said to Him, “You bear witness of Yourself; Your witness is not true.” Jesus answered and said to them, “**Even if** I bear witness of Myself, My witness is true, for I know where I came from and where I am going; but you do not know where I come from and where I am going.

Here, we find the Pharisees saying to Jesus that His witness is not true because he bears witness of Himself. In response, Jesus said that **even if** he bears witness of Himself, His witness is true and He went further to prove that there are other witnesses. According to brother Asaolu, the use of “even if” by Jesus would mean that Jesus agrees with the Pharisees or that there is some sense in what the Pharisees said. That is ridiculous! Interestingly, brother Asaolu released an article on the 18th of January, 2022 titled “*Statement of purpose the*

scriptures require from a baptizee and from a baptizer” and on page 4-5, he was addressing Colossians 3:17. Interestingly, he comes up with a new interpretation of the verse different to the simple and general interpretation of it. After giving his explanation, he said *“Even if Col 3:17 is construed as doing things (by the Lord’s authority) rather than giving thanks (by praising His name), it would still be expedient to mention His name on such occasions...”* Here is brother Asaolu, after condemning my use of “even if” and implied that it means I agree with him, went ahead to release an article and used the same words that he complains about. May I conclude like him, that his use of “even if” means that he agrees with everything I have been saying but he would just not want to accept it? I am amazed that brother Asaolu is never consistent for a second with his own very arguments. If there is one thing I have learned in this discussion, it is the fact that the more a person tries to uphold error, the more trouble he will get into.

How Come You Do Not Know The Baptismal Formula Is An Offshoot Of The Oneness Doctrine?

In my last response, I said that my whole endeavor from the beginning of this discourse is to show that the oneness doctrine is false; and Asaolu responded by saying that *“Indeed, with the mindset Lesley just admitted to, it is clear why he hardly discerns some of my statements. He is engrossed with dispelling Oneness doctrine about divine personalities while we discuss the “name” of a trio in Mt 28:19.”* It is sad that brother Asaolu is oblivious of the fact that the baptismal formula doctrine that he now advocates is an offshoot of the oneness doctrine. And when I said my endeavor from the beginning is to prove that the oneness doctrine is false, it encompasses both the personalities in the Godhead and the baptismal formula of mentioning the name of Jesus while baptizing.

Why Did You Ignore I Corinthians 15:27?

He wants me to provide a passage in the book of Acts or afterwards that says we should be baptized in the name or authority of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Does that suggest he is taking Matthew 28:19 as a spurious verse as some take Mark 16:16? If Matthew 28 tells us that, why should anyone look for it elsewhere before he can believe it? Besides, I Corinthians 15:27 tells us clearly that the authority of Christ is the same with that of the Father. I noted that when Jesus said “all authority is given to Me,” the One who gave Him this authority is EXCLUDED. I made this point very clear but what did brother Asaolu say about this verse in his third rejoinder? NOTHING! He was completely silent, yet claims he has addressed all my points.

How Did I Agree With You?

He said *“Lesley unknowingly agrees with me on how to act as the President’s representative. The official would need to mention a variant of his boss’ name at the meeting (e.g. the President, President Biden, Biden, Joe Biden, President Joe Biden, etc.) while explaining why he was there and in what capacity.”* I am not sure he read my statement well. I never said to act in the President’s name means to mention his name. In fact, I used that example to prove that doing something in a person’s name means to act by his authority and not to say the name. Where did Asaolu get the notion that I said the official would need to mention a variant of his boss’ name and concluding that I agreed with him unknowingly? I made that illustration to show a parallel to Matthew 28:19, Acts 2:38, 10:48, etc. The statement, *“the USA secretary of state negotiated in the name of the President,”* does not refer to 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. Similarly, *“baptizing in the name of the Lord”* or *“baptizing in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit”* does not mean say the name; it simply means to act by the authority; and the names referred to could be Lord or Father, Son, Holy Spirit. That is simply the point.

Do You Not Realize A Word Is Different From A Phrase?

He said; *“Lesley posits that name is ‘authority’ in Mt 28 but won’t reproduce that notion in Gen 48. Can someone please remind Lesley of his statement on Page 2 of his first rebuttal, on how he discussed remission of sin with a denominational pastor, and insisted on consistent application of the phrase?”* Is “name” a phrase? I never said that anywhere the word “name” appears in the Bible, it must mean authority. What I have been affirming is that the phrase “in the name of” means “in the authority of.” And so, when you see “name”

used in the phrase “in the name of,” it refers to “authority” and I have consistently applied this to ALL the passages that have been brought up in this discussion where the phrase “in the name of” is used. This is consistent with my statement regarding my discussion with the denominational pastor. I insisted that “for the forgiveness of sins” must mean the same thing, both in Matthew 26:28 and Acts 2:38 just as “in the name of” must mean the same thing in all the passages introduced in this discussion so far. Brother Asaolu is the one saying that the word “name” means a literal name which he called “the Lord Jesus Christ” and he tries to defend it by saying that the word “name” is singular and is used in connection with the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; so it must mean the three have one name. That was the essence of citing Genesis 48:16 to prove that such grammatical rule is faulty. My argument on authority is not based on the word “name” but on the phrase “in the name of;” and so, he is actually diverting my attention by asking me to explain what “name” means in Genesis 48:16. I am amazed that up till now, brother Asaolu does not understand why I introduced Genesis 48:16.

Were The Accusations Really Unproven?

He further said; “Lesley’s second rebuttal is laden with unproven accusations/insults. How come that asking if he would do a rebuttal to an article he disagrees with, is restated as ‘Asaolu desperately seeking a rebuttal for his 33-page work’”? If brother Asaolu considers my statement of him desperately seeing for someone to rebut his work as “an insult”, then I would apologize for that as I do not intend to insult him; I do not even consider such as an insult. However, for him to have consistently complained about me not refuting his work shows he is desperate in my opinion. In his first rejoinder, he complained of Lesley keeping quiet and not participating in the WhatsApp group discussion. In his second rejoinder, he complained about Lesley declining to privately discuss his views on Matthew 28:19. He also complained about Lesley quoting his 33-page article and not refuting the whole work. Why are all these necessary in his writing if he really does not need someone to refute his work or engage him in a discussion?

Why Not Agree You Were Wrong?

He said; “*I have the freedom to contrast modern COCs with the New Testament [churches] so it is unfair for Lesley to claim that I twisted his statement. I offered my own opinion, and did not state LE said so and so, misrepresenting him via a quote or attribution. Obviously, Lesley just wants to attack me.*” Brother Asaolu’s accusation of me wanting to attack him is false. Everyone can go back to read his statement where he said “*It is what the New Testament teaches that is important not necessarily what some modern Churches of Christ teach and practice now.*” That statement was made in response to my statement when I said churches of Christ are not known to teach the doctrine that he now advocates. He should have proven to the audience that I am wrong by telling us just one congregation of the Lord’s church that he knows that advocates or advocated the oneness doctrine. Rather, he said what is important is what the New Testament teaches and not what “modern churches of Christ” teach. He is obviously implying that I am referring to modern churches of Christ. Everyone can see this and he does not have to quote me word for word for anyone to understand that. After all, he even misquoted me at least once when he attributed a statement to me that I said “*if the trio possess the same...*” That was not my exact statement as seen in page 9 of my last response but he attributed it to me and I did not complain.

Is There Any New Insight?

He said; “*That certain COC preachers have debated denominational pastors on this subject does not mean new insights may not come from within.*” Any new insight that is contrary to God’s word must be rejected (Galatians 1:6-9). Besides, I have repeatedly told brother Asaolu that what he is advocating is not new at all. He has not made any new argument on this issue so far in my opinion. I have read a few debates on this issue and I can confidently say that brother Asaolu is only regurgitating the old Oneness Pentecostal doctrine. And so, there has been no new insight from brother Asaolu on this issue so far in this discussion or any I have seen lately from the Oneness doctrine advocates.

Will You Submit To The Superior Arguments That You Have Seen?

He said; “Let’s study diligently and humbly submit to superior scriptural reasoning whenever such is presented.” I truly hope that brother Asaolu will diligently study and humbly submit to the superior scriptural reasoning that has been presented to him. I have no doubt in my heart that this debate has unmasked all his sophistries and revealed his inconsistencies. If he would not stop advocating the false doctrine of the Oneness Pentecostals, let him be rest assured that we would not be tired of exposing those false doctrines as God gives us the strength. I appreciate him for taking the bold step to begin the discussion by writing the first rejoinder. I hope and pray that we understand and do God’s will in Jesus name. Amen.

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

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

https://lajosint.com/download/faith/A_rejoinder_to_Mt_28_19_And_The_Triune_God_3.pdf

To download brother Asaolu’s Article Titled “Statement of purpose the scriptures require from a baptizee and from a baptizer”, Please Click

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