

In Lieu of Jesus

by G.W. North

Baptizing in the name of Jesus only is wrong because it excludes the Father and the Holy Ghost, who are part of the triune God.

Scripture: Matthew 28:19, John 14:16, Acts 2:38

Topics: "Baptism", "Trinity"

Description

G.W. North emphasizes the importance of understanding the full nature of God in baptism, arguing that baptizing in the name of Jesus alone is inadequate and potentially dishonoring to the Father and the Holy Spirit. He explains that while this practice was acceptable in the early days following John's baptism, it is now essential to recognize the triune nature of God in the sacrament of baptism. North asserts that any omission of the Father and the Holy Spirit, whether intentional or not, undermines the significance of the act and should be corrected. He stresses that baptism should reflect the complete revelation of God post-Pentecost, where the administrant acts in lieu of the Lord Himself. The sermon calls for a deeper understanding and respect for the full Godhead in the practice of baptism.

Transcript

In the closing days of the age preceding this present one, that is following John's baptism, people were baptised in the name of Jesus only, because then the disciples did not know the Father and the Holy Ghost. But during this age of greater revelation, people must be baptised into the name of the triune God; Jesus is but one person of the triune Being of God. Therefore to baptise people in the name of Jesus only, with or without the deliberate intention of excluding the Father and the Holy Ghost, is reprehensible to say the least. If the omission is deliberate it is sin. If it is unintentional or has been practised without full knowledge, it is a mistake which should be rectified.

If on the other hand it has been done with full intention to include the Father and the Holy Ghost, then the whole practice is meaningless, for why exclude all reference to them if they are meant to be included? And if it all means the same, why are the Father and the Holy Ghost so dishonoured?

The whole thing has become farcical if not done with sincere intention. What it could be made to mean at the most is unthinkable. 'In the name of Jesus' only is pre-Calvary and pre-Pentecost; it was the way people were baptised during the period between the decline of John's baptism and the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ; an interim period only; it was right then, it is wrong now.

Since Pentecost, the administrant, when baptising, is to be understood as doing the work in lieu of the Lord, that is, as though it were the Lord Himself doing it. That is the true purpose of and reason for doing it in Jesus' name.

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/gw-north/in-lieu-of-jesus/>

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net