

ONENESS

PENTECOSTALISM

(Modes That Don't Biblically Line Up)

by
Brian Allen

The Heresy of Oneness Pentecostal

In the world that we live in today, there are many Christians that have never heard of the term “Oneness Pentecostal,” and yet support and follow people who teach this heretical doctrine. For example, two very prominent teachers today that hold this viewpoint are T.D. Jakes and Noel Jones. They have huge followings and can be seen regularly on the largest “so-called” Christian television network in the world today on the Trinity Broadcasting Network (TBN). It is ironic how a Christian station that has the name “Trinity” in it, support individuals who deny that very doctrine. What we are going to do is define the Oneness Pentecostal doctrine, look at it’s history, determine if their teaching is heretical, and finally determine if this group is to be considered a cult.

Defining the Terms

One of the issues that make the Oneness doctrine extremely dangerous is the fact that it’s teaching is very close to that of the Trinity, which is probably why many people get caught up in this heretical teaching. One could make a strong case that many of those who believe this doctrine are honestly confused about it when comparing it to the orthodox teaching of the Trinity. The Oneness doctrine teaches that there is only one God, it teaches the belief in the Deity of Jesus as well as the belief in the Deity of the Holy Spirit. Unlike the Mormons or the Jehovah Witnesses, they do not use any outside references. In an article by Robert Bowman, he describes the Oneness position as “the doctrine that God is absolutely one in numerical value, that Jesus is the one God, and that God is not a plurality of Persons. God is generally said to be neither one “person” nor three,

on the assumption that the term “person” is applicable only to individual human beings; the incarnate Jesus, though is agreed to be one person. The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three “manifestations” of the one God, who is not, though, limited to these three manifestations.”¹ Another issue that needs to be acknowledged is that most Oneness groups hold the belief that once you are saved, the receiving of the Holy Spirit is evidenced by speaking in tongues which is a Pentecostal belief, hence you get “Oneness Pentecostals.” To give a simple doctrinal summary of Oneness Pentecostal teaching, God is only one person (Unitarianism). Jesus is the one true God who exists in different modes as the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It is taught that the Trinity is a satanic “doctrine of demons,” while salvation is by faith and works through water baptism in the name of Jesus only, with the evidence of speaking in tongues. Later, we will look at these claims and compare them to what Scripture teaches.

The History Behind this Teaching

Ecclesiastes 1:9 reads: “That which has been is that which will be, and that which has been done is that which will be done. So there is nothing new under the sun.” Like many cults, the Oneness doctrine is nothing new. It was a false teaching that crept into the early church and was an issue that the early church had to contend with. This occurred in the late second and early third centuries and historically speaking, this teaching or theology would fall under a term known as Monarchianism. This term comes from the word monarchy, which in Greek means single principle. It emerged in the Asia Minor and then flourished

¹Robert M. Bowman Jr., *Oneness Pentecostalism and the Trinity: A Biblical Critique* (1985), p.23

in the West. “The name “Monarchian” is applied to groups that sought to stress a fundamental biblical and Christian truth, namely, the conviction that God is one, the sole monarch of the universe. The monarchians rejected the duality or the plurality of gods taught by Marcion and the Gnostics.”² “Monarchianism stresses the absolute unity of the Godhead. The term monarchians were applied to two different approaches as it pertains to God’s monarchy. “The Monarchians were also called Patripassians by their opponents, because they taught in effect that the Father (Latin, *pater*) suffered (Latin, *passus*) as the Son.”³ The approach of Monarchianism that we will be discussing was known as “modalistic monarchianism” or by the term known today as modalism. Modalism was the most popular form of Monarchianism where the Persons of the Godhead are temporal “modes” or expressions of the one true God such as we see in the Oneness Pentecostal movement. As Harold O.J. Brown puts it, “ modalism upholds the deity of Christ, but does see Him as a distinct Person vis-à-vis the Father. It holds that God reveals Himself under different aspects or modes in different ages – as the Father in creation and in the giving of the Law, as the Son in Jesus Christ, and as the Holy Spirit after Christ ascension.”⁴ Even though the three designated terms of the Godhead (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) are modes or expressions of the one true God, that one true God is known as the “Father” in the teachings of early modalism and “Jesus” in the teachings of modern day modalism. “It is important to understand that even though the terms “Jesus” and “Father” are used, they do not refer to the manifestations or aspects or offices by

² Harold O.J. Brown, *Heresies, Heresy and Orthodoxy in the History of the Church* (Hendricks Publication, 1998), p.95

³ Dr. Tim Dowley, Editor, *Introduction to The History of Christianity* (Lion Publishing, 1990), p.113

the same name. Thus in early modalism, although the one true God is “the Father,” that Being also has a manifestation as “the Father” in Scripture... Today, the modern Oneness Pentecostal movement believes this one true Person of the Godhead is Jesus. They believe it is Jesus who expresses Himself by the Scriptural designations Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In other words, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as we have them revealed in the Scriptures are temporary modes or aspects of the true one Person of the Godhead, who is Jesus.”⁵

The first known person who taught modalism was a gentleman named Praxeas. This was a man who at one time confessed his faith in Jesus Christ, but later began to teach heretical doctrine by identifying Christ not merely with deity but with the Father and later taught that God the Father was born in time. He then went on to teach that not only did Jesus reveal the Father, but also in fact that He was the Father. He taught that the Father Himself had to suffer and die on the cross and later on resurrected Himself. This teaching was attacked in Rome by Hippolytus and Novatian, in Alexandria by Origen and in Africa by Tertullian. Tertullian, who was a strong proponent of the Trinity, wrote against the teachings of Praxeas to expose and refute his teachings in his writing “Against Praxeas.

Another strong supporter of modalism came about in the early 3rd Century by a gentleman named Sabellius. Because of his teachings, Monarchians was also known as Sabellians. Sabellius taught the strict unity of the godhead: one

⁴ Brown, p.99

⁵ John Ankerberg & John Weldon, *Encyclopedia of Cults and New Religions* (Harvest House, 1999), p.368

person, three names. “The different names, Father, Son, and Spirit, merely describe different forms of revelation; the Son revealed the Father as a ray reveals the sun. Now the Son has returned to heaven, and God reveals himself as the Holy Spirit.”⁶ In Hilary of Poitiers masterpiece treatise, *On the Trinity* (12 Books), he often singled out Sabellius in this treatise. Hilary makes this statement “ Let Sabellius, if He dare, confound Father and Son as two names with one meaning, making of them not Unity but One Person. He shall have a prompt answer from the Gospels, not once or twice, but often repeated. “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (Mt 17.5). He shall hear the words, “The Father is greater than I” (Jn 14.28), and “I go to the Father” (Jn14.12), and “Father, I thank thee” (Jn 11.41), and “glorify me, Father” (Jn 17.5), and “Thou art the Son of the living God” (Mt 16.17).⁷ These Scriptures that Hilary is quoting, as well as many others, are Scriptures that today’s Oneness Pentecostal have to contend with. It was all of these Scriptures in the New Testament where the Father and Son dealt with each other that put an end to Sabellianism.

Oneness Pentecostalism and The Trinity

As mentioned earlier, in the article by Robert Bowman, Jr., he defines the teaching of Oneness Pentecostal’s as “the doctrine that God is absolutely one in numerical value, that Jesus is the one God, and that God is not a plurality of Persons. God is generally said to be neither one “person” nor three, on the assumption that the term “person” is applicable only to individual human beings;

⁶ Brown, p.103

⁷ Edmund J. Fortman, *The Triune God, A Historical Study of the Doctrine of the Trinity* (Reproduced by permission of

the incarnate Jesus, though is agreed to be one person. The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three “manifestations” of the one God, who is not, though, limited to these three manifestations.” If we look at the Biblical definition of the Trinity, we will see that there is a distinct difference between the two teachings.

The Trinity is defined as follows: Within the nature and essence of the one eternal God subsist three (3) Persons: Father, Son and Holy Spirit, co-equal, co-eternal. They all share the same essence, substance, glory and Their nature is divine. They are essential in quality but not in personal identity. The Trinity can also be defined as: God is a Tri-unity (Father, Son and Holy Spirit), with each Person of the Godhead equally and fully and eternally God. Each is necessary, each is distinct and yet all are one. If we break down the first part of the definition of the term Trinity, it says that “ Within the nature and essence of the “ONE” eternal God.... The question that needs to be asked is: If there is only one God, does the Bible teach this, and if so, is that one God a person? The Bible does in fact explicitly teaches that there is only one God. Duet. 6:4 reads: "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is one!" This Scripture was known as the Shema. You will also see in Mark 12:29 where Jesus quotes this very passage (Duet. 6:4). Listed are other Scriptures that will verify that there is only one God: Isaiah 44:6,8,24; 45:5,18,21-22; and James 2:19. Clearly we see that the Scriptures teach that there is only one God, which the Oneness groups and Trinitarians would not disagree. An important question that needs to be asked is in any of these passages or any others; does the Bible ever say that God is *one*

person? I would strongly argue that the Scriptures are clear when they say that God is one, but they never make any reference whatsoever to God as *one person*.

Continuing on with the definition of the Trinity, “within the nature and essence of the one eternal God subsist three (3) Persons: Father, Son and Holy.” In this definition, it is saying that the one God subsist in three persons. That is the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three separate distinct persons that make up the one Godhead. Unlike the doctrine of Oneness Pentecostalism, it teaches that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three “manifestations” of the one God, who is not, though, limited to these three manifestations.” To put it simply, the Father at one point manifest into Jesus, Jesus then manifest into the Holy Spirit and finally the Holy Spirit manifest itself back into the Father. The problem that stands in the face of this teaching are the numerous Scriptures in the New Testament that clearly show the Father and Son communicating with one another making it impossible for them to be the same person.

The Father and Son as “Two” Separate Persons

OP site a few Scriptures to validate their argument for the position they hold. Before the examination of these Scriptures, I have chosen not to expound on these passages just yet, but rather take an offensive position and examine the Scriptures that clearly teach, without question, that Jesus and the Father are two separate persons. The passages that I will be discussing are the ones used in Hilary of Poitiers treatise. Following the discussion of these Scriptures, I will

then discuss the errors and fallacies of the passages OP uses to defend their position.

The first Scripture to be examined is Matthew 17:5, where we see that Peter is speaking with Jesus, and while Peter was still speaking, a voice out of the clouds said, "This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased; listen to Him!" The fact that the voice calling Jesus His beloved "Son" would mean that it was His Father. It is understood that sons call their father's "father," and fathers call their son's son. One must remember that when this voice was speaking to Jesus from the clouds, Jesus was still on earth speaking with Peter. According to Oneness doctrine, this passage would mean that we have a god who talks to Himself. Let's analyze what would have had to occur if we are to hold to the oneness teaching. First, Jesus would be speaking to Peter, from there, he would have to go into the clouds (but still deceive Peter and make him think that He is still on earth with Him), manifest Himself into the Father, speak, then manifest back into Jesus who would then listen to the words that He just spoke to Himself. This form of reasoning is absurd and at best... ridiculous. The Trinitarian addresses this passage by simply stating that God the Father was speaking to God the Son who is Jesus.

The next Scripture that one can make a strong argument against the OP teaching would be John 14:28. In this passage, we see another situation that totally collapses the teaching of OP. Jesus is speaking in this passage and He is responding to a question that Judas (not Iscariot) had asked. In the latter part of verse 28, Jesus says ..." I am going to the Father," for the Father is greater than I.

If God were only one person and manifest himself into different modes, this passage would not make any sense in a couple of ways. First of all, it would not make any sense for Jesus to say, "I am going to the Father" if in fact they were the same person. If this passage were to be consistent with Oneness teaching, Jesus would of said, "I am going *to become* the Father" not "I am *going to* the Father." This brings me to my second point where Jesus says "My Father is greater than I." It is quite clear that in this passage Jesus makes the claim that His Father is greater than Him. If a person makes the remark that someone is greater, stronger, smarter, taller, or shorter than them, it would be obvious and logical that the person has to be speaking about someone other than himself. A comparison is being made between Jesus and His Father. My question is "How can a person compare Himself against Himself. Once again, we see Scripture flying in the face against the teachings of OP.

Staying in the Book of John in chapter 14, verse 12, we see almost a similar passage as in verse 28. Jesus is answering a question Phillip had asked and as a part of His response, Jesus says that the Father will do greater works than Him because He will go to His Father. If I tell you that I am going to my father at the store or at his job, it is a far-gone conclusion that I was speaking about another person, that being my father. I might be admitted to a sanitarium if I went around saying that I was really talking to myself because I knew I would become my father once I manifested myself.

In John 11:41-42, right before Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead, He said " Father, I thank You that You have heard Me. And I know that You always hear

Me, but because of the people who are standing by I said this, that they may believe that You sent Me.” Here we have a powerful Scripture that sends the Oneness doctrine of God to the bottom of the abyss. Here, Jesus literally thanks His Father for hearing Him and makes the point that He always hears Him. It should be noted that when anyone thanks someone for any reason, it is always to another person. I have yet to ever see anyone thank him or herself. Without question, you have one person speaking to another person and then makes a comment about hearing Him, (not later on), but at that specific point in time. Again, Jesus then makes the point that His Father had sent Him. Jesus is in actuality speaking to His Father, right then and there, which one would have to conclude is another person.

Moving on to John 17:5, we see Jesus praying to His Father, and in this prayer there are two concrete statements that will solidify the fact that Jesus and the Father are two different persons. When Jesus says” glorify Me together with (or literally *alongside*) yourself” and “with the glory I had with you...” the only fair and honest conclusion one can come up with is that Jesus was praying to another person, that being His Father. Using the same line of reasoning as in the earlier passage, when someone is praying, they are in actuality praying to someone else or another person. One does not pray to him or herself just like one does not thank him or herself. The only conclusion one can come up with is that Jesus was praying to another person (His Father) just as the passage reads. The other clause in that same passage reads “glorify Me alongside Yourself.” Again, it

is an impossibility for someone to be alongside him or herself, which clarifies that two (not one) persons are involved.

The final passage that I will use to make my case is found in Matthew 16:17. The last clause in this Scripture reads “...for flesh and blood did not reveal this to you, but My Father who is in heaven. Jesus makes a strong statement by saying that His Father revealed it to him (Simon Peter), and then finishes His statement by referencing where His Father is located, which is in heaven. Jesus did not say “my Father *who is going to be* in heaven,” but rather My Father who is in heaven.” This again means that Jesus is on earth making a statement and then referencing His Father who is in another location, which one can only conclude that the Father is a separate person than the Son. After reviewing the Scriptures just discussed and examining them in their proper context, if OP are to be honest with the text, there is no other conclusion that they could come up with except that Jesus and the Father are two separate persons and are both God.

The doctrine of the Trinity is very important in many aspects. “If the Trinity is false and modalism true, many great biblical doctrines are rejected, such as Jesus’ pre-existence and intercession (Hebrews 7:24-25; 1 John 2:1), the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit, the church as the Body of Christ (union with Christ) and the incarnation and the atonement.”⁸ If Christ was not truly a distinct person from the Father, how could He pay the price for our sins on the cross since He could not represent us to the Father? Not only could Christ not

⁸ Ankerberg & Weldon, p.372

⁹ Brown, p.99

¹⁰ Ibid p.100

represent us, it would be an impossibility for Him to address the Father as well as intercede on our behalf. Harold O.J. Brown makes a strong observation by stating, “Logically, modalism makes the events of redemptive history a kind of charade. Not being a distinct person, the Son cannot really represent us to the Father. Modalism must necessarily be docetic and teach that Christ was human in appearance only; the alternative, on the basis of modalistic pre-suppositions, is that God himself died on the cross. Since such an idea is considered absurd—except by death-of-God theologians—the normal consequence is the conclusion that while Christ was fully God, he only appeared to be man.”⁹ Dr. Brown hits it out of the park when he makes the statement “If the Son is not a real Person who can stand before the Father and address Him, then the later Christian concept of substitutionary satisfaction, which holds that Christ takes our place and pays our debt to the Father, becomes at best a symbol, not a reality. Where modalism prevails, the concept of substitutionary satisfaction, or vicarious atonement, will necessarily be absent, and so modalism is sometimes adopted by those who object to the doctrine of vicarious atonement. More commonly, however, it simply arises as an attempt to reduce the mystery of the Trinity to a more understandable concept, even at the cost of the true humanity of Jesus and the doctrine of substitutionary satisfaction.”¹⁰

A Refutation of the Oneness Teaching

In OP, as in many other cults, passages of Scripture are taken out of context to make a case for their belief. One of the text that OP like to use to prove that Jesus is the Father can be found in Isaiah 9:6 where it calls Jesus the Eternal Father. One point that needs to be pointed out is that Scripture interprets Scripture and we see that Jesus considers the Father as someone other than Himself more than 200 times in the New Testament. Also, over 50 times in the New Testament, we see the Father and Son are seen to be distinct within the same verse. The phrase in question literally means “Father of Eternity.” In regards to the term “Everlasting Father” Gleason Archer makes this point: “But the basis for so doing is very dubious, since the Hebrew reads ^a *bi* *’ad*, which literally means “Father of Eternity.” It is true that both *’ad* and *’olam* are often used as constructs in an adjectival sense and might be so construed here, were it not for the context. The preceding portion of the verse stresses His sonship in terms suggestive of His incarnation, in such a way as to make an assertion of His paternity status within the Godhead seem quite incongruous. For this reason we should understand this phrase in the most literal way, that He is father of (that is, the author of) *’ad*, a term meaning “perpetuity,” used at least nineteen times in connection with *’olam* (“age,” “eternity”). It usually points to the indefinitely continuing future and is often used to imply “eternal” or “everlasting,” in much the same way as *’olam* is. In other words, *’ad* and *’olam* seem to be nearly synonymous and even be substituted for each other without any change in

meaning... it seems reasonable to understand the phrase *‘a bi ‘ad* as “Father of Eternity” in the sense of “Author of Eternity.”¹¹ Some suggest that this phrase is used in accordance with the Hebrew mindset that says that he who possesses a thing is called the father of it. The father of knowledge means “intelligent, and the father of glory means “glorious.” In Isaiah 9:6, the common usage of “Father of eternity” is eternal. Rob Bowman Jr. points this out by stating: “Thus *Abialbon* (2 Sam. 23:31), “father of strength” means strong”; *Abiasaph* (Exodus 6:24), “father of gathering,” means “gatherer”; *Abigail* (1 Chronicles 2:16), “father of exultation,” and so forth. Evidentially, then, “Father of eternity” in Isaiah 9:6 means that Jesus is eternal.”¹²

John 14:6-11 is another passage that OP quote where Jesus makes the statement “ He who has seen Me has seen the Father.” This passage is simply saying that the Father and Son are one in being, not that they are one person as OP tries to maintain. A very important point that needs to be brought out is that in verse 6, Jesus clearly makes a distinction between Himself and the Father by saying “no one comes to the Father, but through Me.” The words *to* and *through* would not make any sense at all if Jesus and the Father were the same person. This passage could only mean that they are distinct persons. Jesus is making the point that He is the mediator between us and the Father (see 1 Timothy 2:5). Also when Jesus says “ ...the Father in Me,” it is not saying that the deity (“Father”) dwells in the humanity (“the Son”) as OP argues, but rather that the human nature of Jesus dwells in deity. OP also forget the first part of this

¹¹ Gleason L. Archer, *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties* (The Zondervan Corporation, 1982) p.268

¹² Bowman pp. 23-24

passage when Jesus says “I am in the Father” which according to OP reasoning would mean that the human nature of Jesus dwells in deity, which is the total opposite of what they believe.

Another Scripture that OP take out of context is John 10:30 where Jesus says, “I and the Father are one.” According to OP, they believe this verse means that that Jesus is God the Father. When Jesus made this statement, He used the first person plural *esmen*, which is translated “we are.” The passage technically reads, I and the Father *we are* one. The first person plural implies two persons, not one as OP teaches. Another point that needs to be brought out is that the Greek word for one is *hen* (hen) . In this verse it does not mean personal unity but rather unity of nature and essence meaning that the Father and Son have the same divine nature not that they are the same person.

Looking at another favorite passage from OP is John 5:34 where Jesus says, “I have come in My Father’s name, and you do not receive Me.” Here OP teaches when Jesus says “...in My Fathers name,” that is to mean that Jesus name is the Father’s name i.e., Jesus is the Father. The word or use of the word “name” in this verse has to do with authority. It carries the meaning “in the authority of.” An example of this would be a police officer telling someone to “stop in the name of the law.” Law is not the name of a person but it is by the authority in that name that allows the police officer to have such authority and privileges. What Jesus is saying is that He does not come in His own authority but in the authority of His Father. This verse is saying the exact opposite of what OP teaches, which is the fact that this verse leads once again to the distinction between the Father

and Jesus. Once again Rob Bowman Jr. states: “However, the expression “in the name of” here clearly means “in the authority of”; thus the person whom Jesus warned would come “in his own name” will come with “no credentials but his own claim.” To receive someone who comes “in his own name” is therefore, according to Jesus, a foolish act. This contrast between “My Fathers name” and “his own name” proves beyond question that Jesus did *not* come “in his own name.” Therefore, “Jesus” is not the Father’s name, and so Jesus is not the Father.¹³

The Issue of Salvation

With this teaching of modalism in the OP comes another heretical doctrine that deals with the issue of one’s salvation. In J. Gordon Melton’s Encyclopedia of American Religions, “The Oneness Pentecostals deny the Trinity and uphold the oneness of God. ... Salvation is by repentance, and water baptism is considered an essential part of salvation. Baptism is by immersion in the name of Jesus only (Acts 2:38).”¹⁴ Ankerberg and Weldon point to a OP tract which states, “The tract is titled “New Testament Salvation-Acts 2:38.” It states three conditions for salvation, but not one of them is faith. “First, we must repent, turning our back on all sin. Second we must be baptized (immersed) in the Name of Jesus Christ [not of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit]...[and] speaking in other tongues ... is the third step and it takes all three to completes God plan of Salvation for the church as given in the New Testament, as Jesus told

¹³ Bowman p.24

Nicodemus.”¹⁵ As with all Scripture, one needs to look at the proper context of Acts 2:38. First of all, if we can prove biblically and in its proper context, that people were saved before they were baptized, then this teaching that one has to be baptized to be saved will prove to be false. In verse 38, it reads “... Repent, and let each of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sin.” The phrase “in the name of” in biblical times offend carried out the meaning of “in the authority of.” What this verse is saying is that these people are to be baptized according to the authority of Jesus Christ, not just the name of Jesus. We see in Acts 4:7, it reads, “ ... by what power, or in what name, have you done this?” We also see this in Acts 4:7, 4:18; and Matthew 10:41. We see in Acts 3:6 and 16:18 where Jesus’ authority, “in the name of Jesus,” is used for a healing and an exorcism. It is not the formula which accomplishes these things, because in Acts 19:13, when the Jewish exorcists invoked the “name of Jesus,” and it did not mean anything because they did not have the authority of Jesus. The baptismal formula was not in the name of Jesus only but rather by His authority.

As for one having to be baptized to be saved, we will go to Acts 10:44-48 to demonstrate that the Gentiles were saved *before* they were baptized. If we look in verse 44, it says that “While Peter was still speaking these words, the Holy Spirit fell upon all those who were listening to the message.” At this point we see in verse 44 that these people (the believing Gentiles) have become saved. Verse 45 tells us that the circumcised believers who had come with Peter were amazed because the gift of the Holy Spirit *had been* poured out upon the Gentiles. When

¹⁴ J.G. Melton, The Encyclopedia of American Religion, Vol. 1(McGarth Publishing House, 1978) p.288

¹⁵ Ankerberg & Weldon, p.370

we see “had been” we know that this was something that had occurred in the past. Verse 46 goes on to say that they (the circumcised believers) heard them speaking with tongues and exalting God. Now in verse 47, Peter asks a question regarding baptism. He says that “Surely no one can refuse the water for these (again the believing Gentiles who have already accepted Jesus) to be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit just as we did, can he? Again we see that the Holy Spirit “*had been*” poured out (verse 45) to the believing Gentiles who are “*to be*” baptized (verse 47). Verse 48 states that Peter ordered them (the believing Gentiles who have already accepted Jesus) to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. Since we have demonstrated through the Scriptures that people were saved before they were baptized, one must make a choice to determine if they are going to listen to what the Word of God says or to what man says.

Another passage that needs to be dealt with is found in 1Cor. 1:17. Here Paul is saying that Christ did not send him to baptize, but to preach the gospel. If baptism was mandatory for ones salvation, Christ would of definitely told Paul to preach the gospel as well as to baptize people. My final point on this matter deals with the thief on the cross. If baptism was a requirement for someone to be saved, why did Christ tell the thief on the cross that he would be with Christ in paradise? There is no evidence of any kind that says that the thief was baptized.

My final comments have to do with one speaking in tongues as evidence of ones salvation. Just because the Scriptures share with us situations where people spoke with tongues after they were saved does not mean that everyone who is saved must speak in tongues. Tongues are only one of the gifts of the Holy Spirit

and as we see in 1Cor. 12:11, it says that Spirit works all these gifts (including tongues) as He wills. Nowhere in Scripture does it teach that everyone who became saved spoke in tongues.

We have seen and dealt with the heretical teaching of OP. We have seen how this teaching came into the church in the 2nd century. We have heard the arguments of OP, that being the denying of the Trinity, the baptism in Jesus name only, the baptism being a requirement of salvation and the speaking in tongues as evidence of ones salvation. This teaching of OP is very dangerous and as Christians, we need to do what Tertullian and other church leaders did in the early church. That is to speak out against this teaching and share the true gospel to those who follow this teaching. Those who do not have the correct Jesus are just as lost as those who don't believe in any Jesus. OP denies one of the cornerstone essentials of the Christian faith, that being the Trinity. If anyone denies any of the essentials cannot be a Christian. It is one thing to be confused about a doctrine, but it is another thing to outright willfully deny a doctrine. I will conclude by saying as Christians, we need to love and pray for those caught up in OP. Christians need to continually be in prayer, prepared to give answers and truly contend earnestly for the faith.