

## **IS IT A SIN TO DOUBT A BIBLICAL TEXT IF THERE IS A GOOD REASON TO DO SO ?**

This Sunday morning I was listening to a preacher on DStv whose programme I usually enjoy, however, I must say that I was quite taken aback when he so boldly proclaimed that he can bear with all types of churches, in other words, Pentecostal, Charismatic, and so forth, but, should a preacher place a question mark over Biblical text/s, declaring that such and such text can be doubted, then the person following Jesus must “run as fast as possible” away from such a preacher – who is then clearly in his eyes nothing but a deceiver.

The reason why I was taken aback is because this very same man, a very knowledgeable, dear Baptist preacher who is acquainted with the full-baptism (for instance), is of course baptised according to Math. 28.19 (the three-fold baptism), meaning that he would naturally reject Acts 2.38 (Peter's baptism in Jesus Name). Now, “rejection”, done for whatever reason, indeed means deletion of the text, for should we regard the one acceptable – showing a preference for the one and not the other – it indeed implies that Acts 2.38 can, with a good conscience, be omitted from the Bible! This is indeed what this type of prejudice boils down to.

So, to cut a long story short, it should be clear to everybody acquainted with Church history, that two traditions have indeed (Biblically) fallen in place, only the original baptismal command conveyed by Peter to the believers in Jerusalem – those who had been privileged to have witnessed the outpouring of Holy Spirit - was of course later set aside by the post-apostolic (first-century) church and who, by then, had established a new order (of which St Ignatius and St Clemens were clearly part and parcel of), that is shortly after the apostles of Jesus had left the scene.

Without going then into the detail of early Christian baptismal history, what is clearly expected of every alert believer and follower of Jesus Christ, is to know that glib directives are sometimes given to Christians who eagerly believe what is being told them, yet not understanding how Paul's directive, namely that “truth would be exchanged for a lie” (Rom. 1.25) - and clearly done by false teachers - must indeed be taken note of for this is exactly where Acts 2.38 versus Math. 28.19 come in.

Fact is, one has to take a stand for either the one or the other, and should one opt for Math. 28.19, preferring it to the so-called “historical” baptismal command given by Peter on Pentecost Day, one will naturally then have to overlook (=delete, rationalize, reject, doubt, remove from Scripture) baptism in the Saviour's Name.

I therefore feel compelled to refer at least to the two baptismal commands (Math. 28.19 and Acts 2.38) we have a record of in the New Testament, for this is something all serious followers of Jesus can indeed research. It is then not fair to ostracise the sincere believer who, for good reasons, rejects e.g. Math. 28.19, preferring Acts 2.38, yet pulling wool over people's eyes, pretending to accept

that the “whole Bible” (from A-Z) is inerrant and therefore accepted in full – which clearly is not the case considering the aforesaid - whilst the one who boldly proclaims the baptism according to Peter's command, is constantly reminded of committing a gross atrocity [removing a portion (a text) from Scripture and in this case of course meaning Math. 28.19].

Let's therefore try to always serve the Lord with a clear conscience, and so that the Name of Jesus Christ, God's one and only Son and Saviour of the world, can be glorified! The Angel indeed said to Mary: “Call Him *Jesus* for He shall save His people from their sins” (Lu. 1). The Apostle Peter, who was appointed by Jesus as first leader of His flock, again gave this command to the Church that was established on Pentecost Day in the Upper Room: “Repent and be baptized in the Name of Jesus the Christ....”

This is then the Name we should apply in baptism! The Math. 28.19 baptism was reasoned and established by man for a post-apostolic audience – and clearly having had come from a movement that did not adhere to apostolic teachings - whereas Peter's command was given by the Holy Spirit to Jesus's “first-fruit” followers. Surely, Peter was drenched with God's Spirit!

I am sure Jesus will not judge me or anyone else for doing what Paul prescribed to the Colossians (3.17): “Whatsoever you do, do ALL in the Name of Jesus and thank God the Father through Him!” Therefore I have a right to reject Math. 28.19, the post-apostolic church's choice.

I invite all open-minded followers of Jesus to download and listen to my audiobook, on this website, “Two Baptismal Commands, the Road to Confusion”. Think and Believe!

Ester Blomerus  
[www.housealtarnetwork.com](http://www.housealtarnetwork.com)  
2019-08-18