

Dissolving A Few Oneness Pentecostal Aspirins (Part Two):

A Written Response To Jason Weatherly

By

Osamagbe Lesley EGHAREVBA | Lagos, Nigeria

osamagbelesley1@gmail.com

13th July, 2022

On March 26, 2022, I published a video on my [YouTube channel](#) titled “*Dissolving A Few Oneness Pentecostal Aspirins*” in which I addressed four major arguments of the Oneness Pentecostals relative to the Baptismal Formula question. An American Oneness Pentecostal preacher and debater by name, Jason Weatherly watched the video which was sent to him by my dear brother and friend, Pat Donahue. And on July 1st, 2022, Jason released [a video on his YouTube channel](#) in response to my video. I received the video from Jason himself via email on July 2, 2022 at 12:21 AM (Nigerian time). Jason is a member of the United Pentecostal Church International, a Oneness Pentecostal denomination in America. It is my desire to respond to his arguments as I believe his position on the issue is unscriptural, unsound and false. Consequently, my response will be in two formats namely; written and video. This is the written response. To access the video response please see the link at the end of this article. Now, let us get down to business.

Am I In The Same Predicament With Jason?

I began my previous video by drawing a parallel between the practice of the Oneness Pentecostals and that of the Roman Catholic Church. Recall that in February, 2022, the Catholic Church invalidated thousands of baptisms conducted by a Catholic priest (Andres Arango) in Arizona, USA simply because the priest supposedly used a wrong word while baptizing. I mentioned that the Oneness Pentecostals are in the same predicament with the Roman Catholic Church in the sense that they both invalidate baptism simply because a particular word or phrase was not mentioned by the baptizer. Jason **did not deny he is in such predicament**. Rather, he responded by saying “*Lesley is in the exact same predicament*” (1:28). He thinks that if he is able to put Lesley in the exact same predicament that he finds himself, that would be a good aspirin to relief his headache. Unfortunately, that puts him **out of the frying pan into the fire** as we shall see. What is the predicament that Jason is trying to put Lesley? Listen to him as he tells us. Lesley is in the exact same predicament because:

*“Church of Christ denomination ministers **all over the world** invalidate baptisms from other denominations such as Baptists and Assemblies of God **because they do not include the phrase for the remission of sins when they baptize**. I have debated church of Christ denomination ministers on the issue of the baptismal formula for almost 30 years now and to this date, **I haven't met one of them that admits that they do not invoke some type of formula of words or a name which includes the phrase for the remission of sins**”*

Indeed, if “*Church of Christ denomination ministers **all over the world** invalidate baptisms from other denominations **because they do not include the phrase for the remission of sins when they baptize**,”* Then Lesley would be in the exact same predicament because he is “*a Nigerian minister in the church of Christ denomination*” (0:26). But then, listen to Jason again and notice how he contradicted himself in the very next minute after he made the above statement;

*“In fact, the very words invoked during baptism **have caused great controversy** and division among the church of Christ denomination. **Some teach** that without the use of the phrase ‘for the remission of sins,’ a baptism is not valid. Otherwise, all denominational baptisms by immersion preceded by faith in Christ would be valid whether the candidate fully understood*

the purpose of for the remission of sins or not and this issue sparked the Austin McGary and David Lipscomb's controversy of the early 20th century. The dispute raged between the gospel advocate and the firm foundation publications of the church of Christ denominations. Others involved in this controversy are J.D. Tant, James Harding, J.W. McGarvey. In fact, some among the church of Christ's denomination question the validity of Alexander Campbell's baptism because the baptizer did not communicate the words for the remission of sins during the ceremony. So, the proper words and vote during baptism is not an issue isolated with Oneness Pentecostals. It is very much an issue among the church of Christ denomination whether Lesley is willing to admit it or not.” (1:35)

Mr. Jason is double-tongued. He claims that church of Christ ministers all over the world teach that the words “*for the forgiveness of sins*” must be uttered by the baptizer, yet in the next minute said that there are only *some* of them who teach this. He even said this issue has caused great controversy and division among the churches of Christ. If the church of Christ ministers all over the world insists that this phrase must be uttered by the baptizer at the point of baptism, how come there is a controversy over it? The very fact that there is a controversy over the issue is an indication that church of Christ ministers all over the world DO NOT all teach this. And if there are *some of them* that proclaim this doctrine, then Lesley is NOT in such predicament because he is not part of the “some” that teaches such absurd doctrine.

But then, Jason never offered any **correct material** to prove some of the things he said in the quotes above. He referenced two materials on this point but the materials say **NOTHING** about churches of Christ ministers all over the word teaching this doctrine. In fact, in one of the books cited by Jason, “*Churches of Christ and Baptism: A Historical and Theological Overview*” by Douglas A. Foster, there is not a single reference to any preacher that taught this doctrine. Foster (2001, p.87), stated that “*the most controverted matter has been that of one’s knowledge at the point of baptism.*” The controversy was not about *what to be said at Baptism* as Jason claimed but about one’s knowledge at the point of baptism. David Lipscomb argued that baptism is valid whether or not a person who is being baptized **has the right knowledge** at the point of his baptism that it was to be done for the forgiveness of sins and so, those from the Baptists Church, etc. do not have to be rebaptized when they come to understand the truth; while Austin McGary insisted that one needs to have the right knowledge at the point of baptism before a baptism is valid and since the Baptist do not have this correct knowledge, it was necessary that those from this denomination and others be rebaptized when they come to the knowledge of the truth and become members of the Lord’s church. Jason is terribly mistaken about what the point of controversy was.

In the second material cited by Jason, “*Baptism And The Restoration*” by Alan E. Highers, there is not one reference made about church of Christ ministers teaching this. Alan Highers cited series of debates in that work between members of the church of Christ and preachers in the denominational Churches but none of the debates has anything to do with mentioning the phrase “*for the forgiveness of sins*” by the baptizer during baptism. What else would one call this if not that Jason has simply told a lie? How then can we even believe anything else he has to say on this matter? There is a statement in the article written by Alan Highers which was attributed to Alexander Campbell’s wife wherein she said in an interview that “*some of the brethren say that because “remission of sins” was not named at his baptism, he was not scripturally introduced into Christ's kingdom. Alexander Campbell was baptized into the full faith of forgiveness of his sins . . .*” This statement was said to have been published in the American Christian Review in 1879, years after the death of Campbell. But this was not the controversy between Austin McGary of Firm Foundation and David Lipscomb of Gospel Advocate and Jason needs to get his facts straight. Besides, we were not told in the article who these brethren were that opposed Campbell’s baptism and for Jason to link it to the McGary – Lipscomb controversy that occurred years later and even extended it to church of Christ ministers all over the world is mischievous.

Jason claims that he has debated “church of Christ denomination ministers” on the issue of the baptismal formula for almost 30 years now and to this date, **he has not met one of them that admits that they do not invoke some type of formula of words or a name which includes the phrase for the remission of sins.”**

Well, this does not tell how successful he has been, it only tells how stubborn he has been. I do not know how many preachers he has debated, but I know that his friend, Pat Donahue, does not teach or insist that a baptizer must say the phrase “for the forgiveness of sins” before a baptism can be valid. Here is Pat’s message to Jason after watching his video:

We do not say baptisms are invalid because the baptizer does not say “for the remission of sins.” Just like with “baptism in Jesus’ name” (Acts 2:38), what is important is what you DO, not necessarily what you say. You are misunderstanding why we think Baptist baptism is invalid. We believe the baptism has to be for that reason, not that you have to say those words. Just like we believe baptism has to be in Jesus’ name, not that you have to say those words. I can debate you on a Bible topic and I can say I am going to debate you on a Bible topic; do you see the difference in those two concepts?

In a YouTube interview with Pat on “[What Should The Baptizer Say While Baptizing An Individual.](#)” I asked Pat if there is anywhere in the scriptures that tells us what a baptizer must say at the point of baptizing an individual. And he said; “*the New Testament never tells us, not one solitary time what the baptizer said when he baptized someone... that's why when we contend for the truth on this issue, we say exactly that – that the Bible never tells us what the baptizer said, so we're not going to try to bind or tell people what they have to say when they baptize somebody.*”

I know that Jason had debated Tommy Thrasher (gospel preacher at North Huntsville church of Christ, Alabama) in the past on different Bible subjects and I know that Tommy does not teach what Jason accused us of teaching. I have studied Tommy’s debate materials on this issue and not one time has he insisted that a baptism is invalid unless the baptizer mentions the phrase “for the forgiveness of sins” while baptizing.

I took my time to reach out to some church of Christ preachers in America and asked them about what they teach on this subject. J.D. Tant (the grandson of the same J.D. Tant that Jason referenced) wrote to me and said; “*...on your question about the one doing the baptizing having to say the phrase "for the forgiveness of your sins." I don't find any Bible passage that dictates a certain formula to be said. The effectiveness of baptism depends on the person being baptized to understand what is being done. According to some, then a mute person who cannot speak could not baptize anyone. Well, I guess he could use sign language. My 87-year-old brain doesn't remember things as well as it used to, but I cannot recall any example in the Bible where the one doing the baptizing repeats the phrase. The record shows what was done and why it was done. Yours and His, David Tant*

I contacted T.M. Roberts (87 years old preacher & Elder at Northside church of Christ in Mansfield, Texas) on this question and he said: “*I have never heard of a gospel preacher demanding ‘for the forgiveness of sins’ as part of baptism.*”

Jeffery Hamilton (Preacher and Elder at the La Vista church of Christ in Nebraska) said to me in a phone conversation that preachers in the churches of Christ do not insist on any formula to be said by the baptizer.

I have read a few debates between our brethren and Oneness Pentecostals on the baptismal formula question and our brethren have correctly maintained that the Bible does not tell us what to say while baptizing anyone. In fact, I have not personally met anyone in the church of Christ that teach this doctrine that Jason accused us of teaching. But even if the claim is true, that some preachers in the church of Christ insist on saying “for the forgiveness of sins” at baptism, that would not put me in the exact same predicament with Jason because **I do not believe nor teach it.** I know some congregations in the United States that go by the name “church of Christ”, yet use instrumental music in their worship. Is Jason oblivious of this? If no, would he make the claim that church of Christ ministers all over the world teaches instrumental music in worship is scriptural simply

because he knows **some** that use it? So, Mr. Jason is in the same predicament as the Roman Catholic Church and Lesley is NOT in such predicament.

The viewer would notice that Jason made reference to Pat's brother-in-law and said that Pat brother-in-law (a member of the church of Christ) believes that to baptize in the name of Jesus means the baptizer must say the name "Jesus" while baptizing. He said the brother-in-law told him this back around 1994. I contacted Pat's brother-in-law (his name is Brent) and asked him about the incident and what is his view concerning this topic is. Here is Brent's response to me via email:

No, I do not believe that a formula of words must be pronounced over someone for their baptism to be valid. I believe that the baptizer could be silent as they baptize someone. A mute person could baptize someone.

I would likely make comments to a person being baptized – referencing statements that they made to me about their repentance and confession of faith, and that their baptism was being done for the forgiveness of their sins. I would do that to reinforce in the mind of the person being baptized, their own beliefs and actions - to help them remember what they had done. And if I quoted a verse, I might even quote both Matthew 28 and Acts 2 at the same time. But I don't believe scripture directs those things to be done for the baptism to be valid.

Concerning the incident Jason reported, Brent said; *"I don't recall that exact scenario – I recall an event that I thought was "during" one of Pat's debates where I commented that I baptized Joy and said the words, "in Jesus' name." (Like as an answer to a question that Pat might have asked me.) Maybe it's all the same event."*

All of this show clearly that Jason only formulated things for himself and started attacking them. Straw man arguments; fake aspirins that would not relief any pain!

Matthew 28:19 and Isaiah 9:6

Based on the grammatical argument of the Oneness Pentecostals that since the word "name" in Matthew 28:19 is singular, that would mean the Father, Son and Holy Spirit have one single name, I cited Isaiah 9:6 and showed that the rule is simply unrealistic. Just exactly as Matthew 28:19, Isaiah 9:6 has the **singular** word "name" in there but it references more than one name. This should prove that such grammatical argument is false. However, the problem Jason has is that he believes that a name could ONLY be proper and not descriptive. Hence, he makes a distinction between proper and improper names. But the truth is: the Bible does not make such distinction. Little wonder why he could not cite any passage to make this distinction. In the Old Testament, when Moses asked God for His name, God's response was descriptive – I AM WHO I AM (Exodus 3:13-14). In Isaiah 7:14 The Divine Son's name is called Immanuel. Immanuel is a proper name. Why does Jason insist on Jesus? He says Jehovah is called the Mighty God and that is supposed to prove Jesus and the Father are the same person. Would Jason and Pat be the same person since they are both called "fathers"? Besides, whether "name" in Isaiah 9:6 refers to proper or descriptive names is irrelevant to the argument that I made from the verse. Jason should simply tell us why the singular "name" is used in that verse, yet, there is more than one name mentioned. His grammatical argument says this would not be possible in English – and that is why Jason insists that Matthew 28:19 MUST have one name.

Grandville Sharp's Rule

In my last video, I made reference to the Grandville Sharp's rule and said that I have used this rule to prove that the argument the Oneness Pentecostals are making on this verse is not true. I expected Jason to go and peruse my materials and see HOW I had used the rule before saying anything, but his response shows that he was not diligent enough to do so, or perhaps he deliberately chose to misrepresent me. He claimed that Lesley does not understand the rule because Grandville Sharp never applied his rule to Matthew 28:19. I challenge Jason to cite any of my materials where I ever said Grandville Sharp applied his rule to Matthew 28:19. Since he accused me of misapplying the rule, I also expected him to have explained the rule and show HOW I have

misrepresented it. He did not do any of these but rather made false claims. In my article published in Page 37-38 of [Unmasking Sophistry, Volume 2, No. 1](#), I wrote that “Two of the New Testament verses associated with the Granville Sharp Rule are **Titus 2:13 and I Peter 1:1**” and I explained them. But how did I use the rule to prove that their argument is false? Here is it:

Basically, Grandville Sharp rule states that when you have two nouns that are describing a person, and the two nouns are connected by the word “and,” and the first noun has the article (“the”) while the second does not, both are referring to the same person. For example, if someone says; “We saw **the** President and Chief Commander in the office.” Since the definite article (the) is only used once, before the first noun (President) and not repeated before the second noun (Chief Commander), according to the Granville Sharp's Rule, this means that the two nouns, joined by “and,” are clearly referring to the same individual. If the statement had read “We saw **the** President and **the** Chief Commander in the office,” since the definite article (the) is used twice before the first and second nouns, **the grammatical construction leaves the question open as to whether the President and Chief commander are one and the same person or two different people and one cannot argue that it refers to one single person.**

Coming to Matthew 28:19, the statement reads; “...baptizing them in the name of **the** Father and of **the** Son and of **the** Holy Spirit,” Notice that the definite article (the) is mentioned three times before each of the nouns (Father, Son and Holy Spirit). According to the Grandville Sharp's Rule, one can correctly argue that it refers to the same person if the definite article is used before the first noun and not repeated before the second and third. And so, the argument of those who claim that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit refer to the same person in this verse and must have one single name is moot. This is how I used the rule and Jason should meet the argument and not dismiss it. The Oneness Pentecostal advocate that I debated in Nigeria is an Associate Professor at the University of Lagos and he confessed that he accepted the rule WHOLEHEARTEDLY after a couple of failed attempts to debunk my application of it to this discussion. The reader can verify this from [my published debate with him](#).

Matthew 28:19 and Joshua 23:7

Joshua 23:7 was another passage I cited to show that the grammatical argument they are making on Matthew 28:19 is false. In Joshua 23:7, Joshua was speaking to the children of Israel and told them; “and lest you go among **these nations**, these who remain among you. You shall not make mention of **the name of their gods**,...” I asked if this was referring to one particular name for many gods; and rather than to give me an answer, Jason danced around the Hebrew meaning of “gods” and said many other irrelevant things without answering my question. He did not do any Greek analysis on Matthew 28:19 but suddenly comes to the conclusion that the use of name in that verse means a single name for the three. Going by that argument, the use of “name” in Joshua 23:7 should be a single name since “gods” is plural! The fact that the word “*elohim*” can have singular or plural translation is irrelevant to my argument. Does it ALWAYS have singular interpretation in every place it appears? Jason should answer the question and tell us if “*the name of their gods*” in Joshua 23:7 refers to ONE SINGLE NAME for many gods of the different nations. He cites I Kings 18:24,26 and said that “*the name of your gods*” in that passage refers to one name because the prophets called on the one name of Baal. But what has that got to do with the question I asked him? In I Kings 18:24&26, Elijah was referring to the prophets of Baal, and Baal was what they worshipped; but in Joshua 23:7, Joshua was referring to the gods of **different nations**. I would like to know if Joshua was referring to **ONLY ONE SINGLE NAME OF MANY GODS!** Jason needs to answer this question. If Jason had actually studied the materials on my website as he claimed, he should know by now that his grammatical argument cannot be applied in other passages. Another good passage I have used was Genesis 48:16 where Jacob used the phrase “*the name of my fathers*.” Here, the singular word “name” is used in connection with the plural word “fathers” and the fathers refer to Abraham and Isaac. Going by the argument of Jason, what is their single name?

Is Matthew 28:19 Not Parallel to Isaiah 9:6 & Joshua 23:7

Jason could not answer my question but claims that the two passages I brought up are not parallel to Matthew 28:19. That is false. He forgets that I was applying their self-made rule of insisting that the “name” in Matthew 28:19 must be singular because it is used in connection with plural people. But that is exactly the case in the passages I referenced. The singular “name” is there and used in connection with plural subjects. If the rule cannot be applied in the same situation as it was used in Matthew 28:19, then it is false. However, Jason claims that the real parallel to Matthew 28:19 that follows the exact grammatical structure is Acts 3:13 where we have the statement in KJV thus: *“The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob,”* and he said:

“Now if Lesley is trying to say that the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is really referring to three names, then he must admit that Acts 3:13, ‘the God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob’ is likewise referring to three Gods and he doesn't admit that at all. I'm sure that Lesley would say that in Acts 3:13, it is the same God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob and that is the similar grammatical structure of Matthew 28:19 which is why Oneness Pentecostals exegete this passage as the same name, the one name...”

The reason why I insist that there are three names in Matthew 28:19 is simply because we can count up to three names there in the verse. It is NOT because of the use of the word “name.” If the word “name” in Matthew 28:19 is replaced with “authority,” even a blind man would still see that there are three different people and three different names in the verse. “Father” is a name, “Son” is a name and the “Holy Spirit” is a name. Even Jason admitted that one of the names that his friend, Pat could be called is “Father,” “Son”, etc. If the sentence had read *“...in the name of John and of Peter and of James,”* would Jason argue that Peter, James and John bear one single name? I do not think so. But we can count up to three names (Peter, James and John) and we know that there are three people there in the sentence. As to the use of the word “name” in the passage, I do not believe that it refers to an actual literal name. We must understand that the term “name” (Greek, *onoma*) must have the significance that it often does in the New Testament. Instead of just referring to a literal name or an appellation, the “name” (*onoma*) can refer to: authority (Acts 4:7; I Corinthians 6:11); reputation (Revelation 3:1; Luke 6:22); person or personality (Acts 1:15; Revelation 3:4), etc. But if one is really looking for actual literal other names for each of the three, then we must let other passages tell us that. For example, the Bible gives us several other names that Christ is called (Matthew 1:21; Isaiah 7:14; Matthew 1:23; Revelation 19:13; 19:16). Also, in Mark 14:36, we find that God is called by the name “Father.” Similarly, in Acts 3:13, there are three names mentioned there because we can clearly see it (Abraham, Isaac and Jacob). As to whether it refers to one or more Gods, I have no problem understanding it is one God because Deuteronomy 6:4 clearly teaches there is one (*echad, united*) God and we see from the Old Testament that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob served the same one (*echad, united*) God.

But if Acts 3:13 is the real parallel to Matthew 28:19, then the real issue would be: Does *“the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob,”* make three of them one PERSON as Jason claims in Matthew 28:19? For Jason to be consistent with his interpretation, he must admit that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob refer to ONE PERSON just as he insists that Father, Son and Holy Spirit refer to ONE PERSON in Matthew 28:19. Furthermore, Jason claims that “the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” refers to one single literal name which he called “Jesus.” But we find another proper name for the Lord in Matthew 1:23 – Immanuel. By what authority did he make it a single name when God revealed TWO names in Matthew 1:21,23?

He cites Luke 24:47 where it is said that *“repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem”* and he jumps to Acts 2:38 to say that the name is Jesus. But the name is also Immanuel. In Colossians 3:17, we were told that whatever we do in word or deed should be done in the name of the Lord. Would this mean that you should call the name of the Lord when you turn on the TV and call the name of the Lord when you turn it off? Jason is terribly mistaken. This goes to show that “in the name of” or “in his name” carries the idea of authority.

What Is The Meaning Of The Phrase “In The Name Of”?

Jason implies that the phrase “in the name of” must mean “say the name” in ALL instances the phrase appeared in the Bible. But consider the following:

Would Colossians 3:17 means to mention the name of Christ every time you do a thing? As a carpenter, each time you drive a nail into the wood, you'll say “I drive this nail in the name of Jesus?” Is that what it means? Would it mean that each time a man is repenting, he would say “I am repenting in the name of the Lord Jesus”?

When a policeman says “stop in the name of the law” Does the law have a name? What is the name of the law?

Would Acts 2:38 teach that one has to call the name of Jesus over the one that is repenting? Note that “repent” is also in the name of Jesus Christ. How does one “repent” in the name of Jesus Christ? These beg for answers

I brought up certain passages where miracles were done but we do not find a record of the one doing it mentioning the name Jesus. One of them is Acts 9:40 where Peter raised Dorcas back to life and Jason assumes that because Peter prayed, then he must have mentioned the name “Jesus.” But that may not necessarily be true. Can we not say a prayer without mentioning the name “Jesus”? Consider this short prayer: *“Our Father in Heaven, we thank you for today, please bless us today and help us to do Your will in Your Son's name we have prayed, Amen.”* Is this not a prayer? Was the name “Jesus” mentioned? Would Jason consider this an improper prayer?

On Acts 14:9-10, Jason finds solace in Adam Clarke's commentary and insists that there are other Bible texts that shows Paul mentioned the name “Jesus” while doing the healing. Suppose we grant the argument, that would not help Jason one bit! Saying you are doing something in the name of Christ and actually doing something in the name of Christ are TWO different things. A Catholic priest may say: *“I baptize you in the name of Jesus”* while sprinkling a little baby. It is obvious that the priest is SAYING that he is doing such in the name of Jesus but he is not actually DOING such in the name of Jesus and Jason knows this. Oneness Pentecostals know that you cannot sprinkle a little baby in the name of Jesus because Jesus never told you to do so. Another good example is this: GOING to the store to buy some groceries and SAYING that you are going to the store to buy some groceries are two different things. You can go the store to buy groceries and not say you are going; and you can say you are going to buy groceries and not actually go. SAYING and DOING something are two different things as clearly indicated in Matthew 7:21, I John 2:4 and John 14:15.

Matthew 7:21 is clear that *“Not everyone who says to Me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of My Father in heaven.”* A person can say *“I love the Lord; I keep His commandments”* and not actually keep God's commandments. And a person can keep God's commandments and not actually say *“I am keeping God's commandments.”* So, while some passages states that a person did miracles in the name of Jesus and adds that he said that he was doing it in the name of Jesus, it clearly indicates TWO things – (1) what was done and (2) what was said. But in the case of baptism, NOT one single passage tells us WHAT WAS SAID by the baptizer when he baptizes. What we only have in all the record is what the baptizer DID and not what the baptizer said. Jason is confused because he thinks that DOING something “in the name of” means to SAY the name. They are not the same.

Does BDAG Lexicon Helps Jason?

I see how much Jason thinks he has found solace in the BDAG lexicon and how he tries to use it to prove that “in the name of” must mean “say the name” in ALL instances the phrase appeared. I wonder why he ignores other lexicons on the matter. He knows that would put him in serious trouble. First class debaters do not just stick to one lexicon and concludes that is all is there to it. The truth is: BDAG lexicon does not say the words “in the name of” MUST mean to say the name. There is a difference between the literal meaning of words and the meaning of a phrase. In English, people often say, *“It is raining cats and dogs.”* The literal meaning is that animals are falling from the sky. The actual meaning of the phrase is that there is a torrential downpour going

on (that sounds like cats and dogs fighting). In the same way, Jason merely gave us the literal meaning of the words “in the name of” (which is what BADG gives) but he did not give the meaning of the phrase. Bauer basically says that in Matthew 28:19, “name” refers to a person's position, thus “those who are baptized become the possession of and come under the dedicated protection of the one whose name they bear.” We typically simplify it to “by that person's authority.”

The Greek word translated “name” in Matthew 28:19 is “*onoma*” (g3686) and when this word is used in the phrase “in the name of” the literal meaning is de-emphasized as most scholars agree it means authority. Please consider the following definitions of the phrase “*in the name of*” as given by other different Greek scholars in their lexicons.

A.T. Robertson cites the use of *onoma* in Matthew 28:19 as an example where “name” “has the idea of ‘the authority of’” — “a common one in the Septuagint and the papyri for power or authority.” (1934, p. 740).

W.E. Vine, English biblical scholar and theologian, defined *onoma* in its use in Matthew 28:19 as “in recognition of the authority of (sometimes combined with the thought of relying or resting on).” He also writes that “name” in Colossians 3:17 means “in recognition of the authority of” (1940, p. 100; cf. Miller, 2007, p.80).

New Testament scholar John Eadie summarized the thrust of Colossians 3:17 thus: “It...strictly means—by his authority, or generally, in recognition of it. To speak in His name, or to act in His name, is to speak and act not to His honour, but under His sanction and with the conviction of His approval” (1884, 4:249).

Joseph Thayer was a biblical scholar, late Professor of sacred literature at Andover Seminary and Professor of New Testament Criticism in the Harvard Divinity School, who served as a member of the American Bible Revision Committee resulting in the American Standard Version, and also produced an influential Greek lexicon at the time. Delineating one usage of *onoma* as “chiefly Hebraistic,” Thayer explains the meaning of Matthew 28:19 as, “by baptism to bind any one to recognize and publicly acknowledge the dignity and authority of one.”

Hans Bietenhard, Swiss Reformed theologian and Professor of New Testament at the University of Bern, noted that “in the name of Jesus” means “according to his will and instruction.”

Similarly, James Moulton, British philologist and professor of Classical Greek and other languages at the University of Manchester, and George Milligan, biblical scholar and Kimmer at Warwick University, made the following remarks concerning Matthew 28:19—The phrase *eis to onoma tinou* is frequent in the papyri with reference to payments made “to the account of any one.... The usage is of interest in connexion with Mt 28:19, where the meaning would seem to be “baptized into the possession of the Father, etc.” Moulton and Milligan also write that “name” refers to “the authority of the person” and cite Philippians 2:9 and Hebrews 1:4 as examples (1930, p. 451).

Seventeenth-century biblical commentator Matthew Poole explained “in the name” as meaning “in the authority, or...into the profession of the trinity of the persons in the one Divine Being...obliging them to worship and serve God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.”

Many other quotations could be cited which convey the same meaning. These are renown Greek authorities and if Jason dismisses their lexicons, 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”). Furthermore, if “*in the name of*” means “*say the following words,*” then Matthew 28:19 contradicts Acts 2:38 because what they are to say differs in BOTH TEXT! By what rule did Jason 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!

On Matthew 18:20, he says it means to mention the name of Jesus when people are gathered together and then cites I Corinthians 1:2 as proof. But I Corinthians 1:2 says NOTHING about a church gathering! Please read it. And then he says he wonders if Lesley ever has church meetings there in Nigeria where they don't call on the name of Jesus. Well, we do not have any law that says whenever we come together, we must say the name “Jesus” before our gathering or worship is acceptable. Whether we say the name Jesus or not is optional just as it is optional for a baptizer to say the name Jesus while baptizing. I showed earlier that even a prayer can be made without mentioning the word “Jesus” in it.

Do All Oneness Pentecostals Practice What They Teach?

Jason referred to my statement where I said most of the people teaching the Oneness Doctrine do not practice what they teach and then said that it was a lie that I made up. He ignores the fact that I was debating a local audience and I stated a fact that I noticed among most of them. I never said Oneness Pentecostals all over the world do not practice what they teach. I referred to “*most of the people teaching this doctrine.*” Sadly, Jason thinks that Oneness Pentecostals all over the world believe and practice what they teach. Again, this assumes he knows all of them. Let me give you some differences between the belief of the Oneness Pentecostals I debated and that of Jason:

Differences Between Oneness Pentecostals I Debated And Jason Weatherly

S/N	Oneness Pentecostal I Debated	Jason Weatherly
1	Are not members of the United Pentecostal Church International	Is a member of the United Pentecostal Church International
2	Believe the single name in Matthew 28:19 has up to 4 or 5 different variations	Believes the single name is “Jesus”
3	Admit “in the name of” does not always suggest “to say the name”	Teaches “in the name of” always suggest “to say the name” based on BDAG Lexicon
4	Accept the Grandville Sharp's Rule wholeheartedly	Does not accept the rule
5	Do not make a distinction between proper and improper names as in Isaiah 9:6	Makes a distinction between proper and improper names as in Isaiah 9:6
6	Do not believe that faithful Christians should insist on a particular formula or set of exact words to be said at baptism	Insists on a particular formula or set of exact words to be said at baptism
7	Based on my argument on Genesis 48:16, some Oneness Pentecostals believe that the single name of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob is “Israel” while some say it is “heir.”	?

Anyone can read through [my debate with a Oneness Pentecostal](#) and confirm all the points I have listed in the table. Now, looking at these differences, how can Jason legitimately deny my claim that some Oneness Pentecostals do not practice what they teach? Jason thinks all Oneness Pentecostals everywhere believe same thing. The truth, which Jason cannot debunk is that I know certain Oneness Pentecostals that he does not know and most of them do not practice what they teach! For Jason to prove me wrong, he must show that he knows all the Oneness Pentecostals in the whole world.

He said the anchor Bible translates Acts 2:38 as “*Repent and let everyone of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ calling upon the name of Jesus Christ...*” While this translation is different to several others, the rendition would only prove that it is the one that is being baptized that must call on the name, not the baptizer. Paul was told in Acts 22:16 to be baptized, calling on the name of the Lord; and this would not prove the baptizer should say the name. Romans 10:13 says it is the one that calls on the name of the Lord that will be saved, not someone else who calls the name over him. This should prove the absurdity of Jason’s doctrine. But what does it mean to call on the name of the Lord? Does it mean to always invoke the literal name? Not at all. It may mean confession of faith in Christ and it may refer to prayer or worship depending on the context.

He cited Jackson and Lake's *The Beginnings of Christianity* to try to prove that Acts 2:38 gives the formula for baptism but that would be “true” of Matthew 28:19 as well.

The Argument On I Corinthians 1:12-15

Jason probably missed the point I made on this verse and his response was way off from my argument. The Oneness Pentecostals I was debating used I Corinthians 1:12-15 to prove that the name of Jesus was mentioned while they were being baptized. I showed that Paul's statement in verse 14 and 15 would make no sense if he was actually mentioning the name “Jesus” while baptizing. Paul said that if he had baptized more people in Corinth aside Crispus and Gaius, there is the tendency of some of those he baptized to say they were baptized in the name of Paul. This argument would not make sense if Paul was mentioning a name. Why should a person who heard Paul during baptism mention the phrase “I baptize you in the name of Jesus” come back later and say “I was baptized in the name of Paul”? It is either the person was deaf (and did not hear Paul mention the name) or the person is an imbecile! Jason did not address the argument!

He said the difference between John’s baptism and that enjoined by Christ is the name that was uttered at the point of baptism but he gives no scripture to verify this.

Argument on Historical Sources

Jason admitted and conceded the argument that we cannot prove a scriptural practice by appealing to history. He then encouraged me to look up Justin Myer’s view on the subject. Well, I did not cite Justin to prove any Bible teaching. I only used it to tell the Oneness Pentecostals what they are suffering from – incurable madness. So, whatever his views are, is irrelevant.

The second quote I referenced (and which Jason completely ignored) was used to prove that if the Holy Spirit wanted to tell us what was said by the baptizer, it is possible to tell us since even humans can convey such idea clearly as seen in the quote: – “*Then Probus...leapt into the water, saying ‘Jesus Christ, Son of God, and everlasting God, let all my sins be taken away by this water.’ And Paul said, ‘We baptize thee in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Ghost.’ After this, he made him to receive the Eucharist of Christ” (Acts of Xantippe and Polyxena 250 AD)*. In this human account of baptism, we were told what the baptizer DID and what he SAID. If God wanted us to know what was said at the point of baptism, it is possible to let us know. But not a single formula was revealed. Jason ignored this quote and rehashed his arguments that “*in the name of*” means to say the name. Why on earth will it not mean to say the name in Matthew 28:19? And why not tell us if the above quote makes no sense?

Is The church Of Christ A Denomination?

Jason repeatedly refers to the “church of Christ denomination” and even said I am a member of such. I do not know where he got that impression from. This shows he does not even know anything about the church of Christ because everyone who is familiar with us know that the church of Christ is NOT a denomination. Perhaps, Jason used it as a mockery as some would call us “Campbellites.” But calling us a denomination or Campbellites would not make us one. This is because we are not like the United Pentecostal Church International that was started by men with earthly headquarters and general superintendent on earth. We are not teachers of human creeds and doctrines; we do not wear human names. We are simply Christians, called by God out of the world into the Kingdom of His dear Son (Colossians 1:13). We have Christ as the head (Ephesians 1:22-23; Colossians 1:18) of His one church (Matthew 16:18) and only follow the New Testament of Jesus Christ in our worship to God (II John 9; James 1:25). I am willing to debate Jason further on this issue if he is willing and able to! If he will affirm that the church of Christ is a denomination, I will gladly deny it!

References

To watch the video version of this written response, Please Click: <https://youtu.be/LCk3Js2Ci-k>

To watch my first video which Jason responded to titled “*Dissolving A Few Oneness Pentecostal Aspirins*”,
Please Click: <https://youtu.be/7zgfeTt1bgY>

To watch Jason’s video response to mine, Please Click: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ML2o3ZbqfzQ>

To Read my debate with a Oneness Pentecostal Advocate in Nigeria, Please Click:
https://www.unmaskingsophistry.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Unmasking_Sophistry_Special_Edition_March_2022.pdf

To Watch the YouTube interview with Pat on “*What Should The Baptizer Say While Baptizing An Individual?*” Please Click: <https://youtu.be/QKv1GyphJUM>

To Download *Unmasking Sophistry Vol.2, No.1*, Please Click: https://www.unmaskingsophistry.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Unmasking_Sophistry_January-March_2022.pdf