

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

3-1-1971

A Study of Matthew 3:13-17 – The Baptism of Jesus

Werner Boos

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_boosw@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), and the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Boos, Werner, "A Study of Matthew 3:13-17 – The Baptism of Jesus" (1971). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 880.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/880>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

A STUDY OF MATTHEW 3:13-17--

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the course EN-200

by

Werner Boos

November 1970

Approved by:

Victor Barling
Adviser

Reader

2-2-71
gift
V. Battling

84967

BT
350
B6

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. TEXT	2
III. LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS . .	11
IV. STRUCTURE AND FORM	16
V. MEANING.	22
VI. CONCLUSION	54
FOOTNOTES	55
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	67

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The fact that Jesus came to John the Baptist in order to be baptized by him fascinates and puzzles many Christians. The event evokes many significant questions: What was the exact nature of the baptism administered by John the Baptist? Why did Jesus submit himself to such a baptism? What significance did the baptismal event hold for Jesus' subsequent ministry? What did it mean to the evangelists and to their original audiences? How did it influence the Christian sacrament of baptism? These and similar questions prompt the present study--a study which takes as its exegetical point of departure the most detailed account of the incident, St. Matthew 3:13-17.

Much has been written regarding this subject; much diversity of interpretation has resulted. Our paper is offered in the hope that it can pull these various interpretation together into a meaningful presentation so that the sharpness of diversity might melt into the richness of unity.

CHAPTER II

TEXT

The following Greek text of St. Matthew 3:13-17 forms the basis for our discussion:

¹³ Τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην
 πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. ¹⁴ ὁ δὲ διεκώλυεν
 αὐτὸν λέγων· ἐγὼ χρεῖαν ἔχω ὑπὸ σοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ σὺ ἔρχῃ
 πρὸς με; ¹⁵ ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν· ἄφες
 ἔρει· οὕτως γὰρ πρέπει ἔστιν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πάντα δικαιολύτην.
 τότε ἄρτήσιν αὐτόν. ¹⁶ βαπτισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εὐθὺς ἀνέβη
 ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεώχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ
 εἶδεν πνεῦμα Θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περὶ στερᾶν, ἐρχόμενον
 ἐπ' αὐτόν. ¹⁷ καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα
 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.

This text, with the exception of the words πρὸς αὐτόν in verse 15, is that of Nestle-Aland.¹ Our substitution of πρὸς αὐτόν for Nestle-Aland's αὐτῷ does not create a difference in translation but probably represents the more original reading.² In any event, the text can be rendered into English as follows:

- ¹³Then Jesus arrived at the Jordan from Galilee, and came to John in order that he might be baptized by him.
¹⁴But John tried to prevent him, saying, "I should be baptized by you; and you are coming to me?" ¹⁵And Jesus answered him, "Let it be so now, for in this way we properly fulfill all that God requires." Then John consented. ¹⁶After Jesus was baptized, he immediately came up from the water, and, behold, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove, coming to rest upon him. ¹⁷And, behold, there was a voice from the heavens which said, "This is my Son, the Beloved, on whom my favor rests."

The grammatical and syntactical justification for this translation must now be given. We will follow the pericope verse by verse, indicating key considerations along the way.

Verse 13

a. The chief verb of this verse, *παράγινεται*, is a third person, present, indicative; however, the context demands that it be translated in the past tense. One might dub such an awkward present tense a "historical present," cite it as an example of colloquial usage, or conjecture with Stendahl that it is a deliberate stylistic tool utilized by Matthew to alert the reader to something important.³

b. In translating *παράγινεται* we have adopted the wording of the New English Bible, which renders this single Greek verb through two English verbs, "arrived" and "came." We have done this in order to express more clearly the nuances of the Greek prepositions *ἐπὶ* and *πρός*, as they describe the relationship of Jesus to the Jordan River and to John the Baptist.

c. The phrase *ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας* is more likely to be a designation for Jesus' terminus a quo prior to the baptismal event than an anarthrous appositive modifying *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* or *τὸν Ἰορδάνην*. If it were an appositional phrase modifying *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* . . . it would be a *ἄπαιβ λεγόμενον* which Blass-Debrunner does not list under the classification of anarthrous appositives with preposition.⁴ On the other hand, if it were an appositional phrase modifying *τὸν Ἰορδάνην*, the locus of John's baptizing activity would be thrust north into Galilee and

would no longer coincide with that locus given in Matt. 3:1-- the wilderness of Judea, located some 30-50 miles south of Galilee.⁵ In order to avoid this contradiction and to be in harmony with Blass-Debrunner, we have chosen to translate it as a prepositional phrase describing the starting point of Jesus' journey to John.

Verse 14

a. The interpolation of the name *Ἰωάννης* between the words *ὅδε* and *διεκώλυεν* of the Nestle text is supported by all manuscripts except the fourth century Codex Vaticanus, the fourth century original manuscript version of Codex Sinaiticus, the second or third century Sahidic translation, and the citation of the Church Father Eusebius. It is also supported by von Soden's text, where a different reading in the first apparatus is of equal value. The Nestle text, as it stands, is no doubt the correct original reading, since its supporting manuscripts are older and thus more reliable. The interpolation can readily be explained as an attempt to achieve a clearer, purer syntax. The Nestle text contains two ambiguous pronouns--one in the verb form as subject, and one as the object. This being the case, one is compelled to look ahead in the text to discover the subject and the object of the speaking. To avoid these gymnastics and to eliminate the ambiguity, the interpolation has been retained in the translation above.

b. *διεκώλυεν* is a conative imperfect, indicative, active

of *διακωλύω* and may be translated "wanted to prevent," "tried to prevent," "would have prevented," since such an imperfect denotes an attempted but incomplete action.⁶

c. *χρεῖαν* from *χρεῖα* with a form of *ἔχω* means to "be in need."⁷ In this verse the combination can best be rendered colloquially by "should."

Verse 15

a. The familiar formula, *ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν*, reflects the same thought with two verb forms. It is best translated by allowing the chief verb to introduce the quotation, and by using the subordinate verb as a form of quotation marks.⁸

b. The fourth century Codex Sinaiticus, the fifth century Codex Ephraemi, The Koine text recension (Byzantine Family), most witnesses, Tischendorf's latest text, and a Westcott and Hort marginal reading substitute *πρὸς αὐτόν* for the word *αὐτῷ* of the Nestle text. The Nestle text is supported by the fourth century Codex Vaticanus and Ferrar's Caesarean type of text from "Family 13." In this instance we feel that the variant reading is to be preferred to the Nestle text, since it has a greater number of early witnesses. There is no difference in translation. The point is that the Nestle text does not always have the most original reading.

c. *ἄφες ἄρτι* is an aorist, active, imperative of *ἀφίημι*, coupled with an adverb meaning "now."⁹ Matthew has the habit of placing adverbs after imperatives.¹⁰ The hortatory

subjunctive in the first person, singular ("Let me") is here demonstrated by the second person, singular, aorist, imperative ἄφες. This is the typical Hellenistic Greek usage from which the Modern Greek usage stems. (The latter has ἄς and the first and third person, subjunctive express an imperative.)¹¹ It shows that here an invitation is being extended to John to let Jesus, the speaker do something.

d. Πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῶν can literally be translated by "It is fitting; proper; right for us."¹² Moulton and Milligan in their Greek lexicon include the following two examples under the general meaning of πρέπω--"fitting," "becoming": 1) τὰ γὰρ οὕτω πρέπει ρήθεν--"For that is perhaps the proper expression" (The Oxyrhynchus Papyri--late second century); 2) οὐκ ἐπαιτάμηντα πρέποντα γέινεσθαι ὑπὸ τέκνων γονεῦσι ἀναπαιρούμενα--"I was assiduous in performing what is owing from children to parents" (Publicazio della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto: Papiri Greci et Latini).¹³ The Oxyrhynchus Papyri moreover have a specific example of πρέπον ἐστὶν in a fourth century letter from Hermias to his sister. The letter refers to some misfortune that has befallen Hermias, asks that some one be sent to help him, and admonishes: τὰ κατὰ σὲ δλοκήτωνεὺς πρέπον ἐστὶν, μὴ τέλειον ἀνατραπῶμεν --"See that matters are properly conducted on your part, or our disasters will be complete."¹⁴ In the light of these examples our translation of πρέπον ἐστὶν . . . is justified. The construction is clearly packed with the idea of divine necessity, for πρέπει is one of six ways

in which the idea of "ought" or "must" can be expressed in the Greek language. (The other five ways are the use of *χρη*, *δεῖ*, *ὀφείλει*, *ἀνάγκη ἔστω*, and *ἔχει*.)¹⁵

e. *πληρώσατε πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην* is literally rendered "to fulfill all righteousness" in the sense of fulfilling divine requirements. Such requirements were included by the Father in His plan to effect righteousness among men.¹⁶

f. We have translated *τότε ἀφίηεν αὐτόν* with "then he (John) consented."¹⁷ We have re-inserted John's name in the translation for greater clarity and have avoided an overly literal, archaic translation of "then he suffered him."

g. At the conclusion of verse 15, manuscript "a" of the Itala--an Old Latin manuscript of the fourth century, the ninth century Old Latin manuscript g¹ (which has but slight variations from the manuscripts of "a" in accentuation, word separation, and punctuation), and a noteworthy rejected reading in the small edition of Westcott and Hort's text insert the following words: et cum baptizarentur, lumen ingens circumfulsit de aqua, ita ut timerent omnes qui advenerant-- "And when Jesus was baptized, an enormous light encompassed the water so that all who were there were afraid."¹⁸ Since this variant is supported only by a fourth and a ninth century Latin manuscript, it is without a doubt not from the original Greek text. The insertion is essentially a Western reading and tells something about the Western Church--its desire to elaborate and dramatize.

Verse 16

a. $\etaνεώχθησαν$ is an aorist, passive, indicative of $\acute{\alpha}\nuοίγω$ and should be translated "were opened." This word is used in connection with closed places, whose interiors are made accessible.¹⁹

b. After $\etaνεώχθησαν$ the fifth century Codex Ephraemi, the Koine text recension (Byzantine text of the eighth to tenth century), most witnesses, and a marginal reading in Westcott and Hort's text (small edition) interpolate the word $\acute{\alpha}\nuοίγω$. The witnesses for the text as it stands (without $\acute{\alpha}\nuοίγω$) are the fourth century Codex Vaticanus, the original fourth century manuscript version of Codex Sinaiticus, and both the fourth or fifth century palimpsest and the fifth century "Cureton" edition of the Syriac translation. The interpolation probably is not the original reading, since the best and oldest manuscripts witness for its absence. The weight of the sources that witness to the interpolation, however, does point out that there was a question in the early church about whether the opening of the heavens was a public or a private event. The insertion of $\acute{\alpha}\nuοίγω$ would seem to favor the latter and would agree with the description of the event in St. Mark.²⁰

c. At first glance $\acute{\alpha}\nuοίγω$ appears as a somewhat strange construction. One would expect $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ instead of $\acute{\alpha}\nuοίγω$ in classical Greek usage, but, perhaps, $\acute{\alpha}\nuοίγω$ had the same force in Koine Greek.²¹

Verse 17

a. After λέγουσ^α, the fifth-sixth century Codex Bezae Cantabr., all or a greater number of the Itala (the Old Latin witnesses of the fourth to twelfth century), and both the fourth-fifth century palimpsest and the fifth century "Cureton" edition of the Syriac translation interpolate the words πρὸς ^{τὸν} ^{θεόν}. This interpolation suggests that the heavenly voice spoke only to Jesus and was not heard by John or any others in the vicinity. Since it is supported exclusively by witnesses from the Western and Caesarean families and not by any from the Hesychian, it probably is not part of the original reading. It may be interpreted as an attempt to harmonize the Matthean account with that of St. Mark.

b. Directly after λέγουσ^α the Nestle text has οὗτος ἐρεῖ. For this the fifth-sixth century Codex Bezae Cantabr., the fourth century Old Latin translation "a", both the fourth-fifth century palimpsest and the fifth century "Cureton" edition of the Syriac translation, and the Church Father Irenaeus substitute ^{τὸν} ^{θεόν} ^{εἰς}. This substitution by these Western and Caesarean texts once more shows their claim that the heavenly voice addressed Jesus only. It also shows the influence of the Marcan and Lukan accounts, which use these substituted words. Again we have an attempt at Gospel harmonization. Following the general rule that the Hesychian texts are the most reliable, we have chosen to reflect the Nestle reading of οὗτος ἐρεῖ.

c. In a marginal reading of Westcott and Hort's small edition the editors have placed a comma after μου and have dropped it after ἀγαπητός : ὁ υἱὸς μου , ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα. This variant attempts to explain the two definite articles in the phrase and lends weight to our translation.

d. εὐδόκησα is an aorist, active, indicative, which may be translated, "be well pleased, take delight with or in someone."²² The aorist tense is very difficult to understand. Is it used as a historical aorist with the specific event of the baptism by John as referent? Is it a comprehensive aorist of Jesus' life up to that point? Or is it an aorist whose meaning has merged with the perfect force of completed action, whose effects are still being felt?²³

e. Literally ἀγαπητός means "beloved." The term inclines strongly toward the meaning of "only beloved."²⁴

Having considered the text of our pericope, we are now prepared for a discussion of the literary and historical background of the same.

CHAPTER III

LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In order to trace the origin of our Matthean pericope we will have to engage in a bit of Gospel history. We will have to look to a time prior to the evangelist Mark, for he is commonly regarded as the first person to crystalize oral Gospel tradition into written form.

During the years which immediately followed the resurrection, the first Christians preserved verbal cycles of connected reminiscences associated with the various centers of Jesus' ministry. Within these cycles appeared stories about John the Baptist--his ministry and his work. One of these stories undoubtedly dealt with Jesus' baptism at the hands of John.¹ All such oral tradition originated and circulated from the time of Jesus' ascension until 45-50 A.D., when it was placed into a more meaningful structure for didactic purposes and was enriched by the sayings of Jesus in some instances.² Only after a time of some twenty years, during the period of 65 A.D. until the close of the century, did full-length Gospel compilation take place. The Gospel according to St. Mark, the first such Gospel, appeared in ca. 67-70 A.D.³

The author of this first written Gospel presumably was raised in Jerusalem, and he probably witnessed the time when Jesus appeared there and died.⁴ He placed the pericope of

Jesus' baptism into chapter one of his Gospel, verses 9-11, inserting it between his description of John the Baptist's ministry and his account of Jesus' temptation in the wilderness. It is interesting to note that he did not include any hesitation on John's part when Jesus asked to be baptized (Matt. 3:14-15), nor did he have the heavenly voice say "οὗτος ἔστιν ὁ υἱός μου"; rather he recorded a second person address, "τὸ ἐγὼ ὁ υἱός μου." Even more interesting, however, is the manner in which he used the baptismal pericope as a whole. He placed it directly into the stream of his theological framework--a framework constructed to proclaim Jesus' Messianism via secret revelations to Gentile Christian readers. Through such a framework, he sought to explain the puzzle of Jewish unbelief and the grace of God's call to the Gentiles.⁵

That he pictured Jesus' baptism as one in a series of events that fit his "secrecy motif" is supported by the fact that Jesus alone saw the heavens "split" (εἶδεν σχιζομένου τοὺς οὐρανοὺς --verse 10) and the Spirit descending upon him (verse 10); he alone heard the divine voice proclaiming his sonship (verse 11). One might well conclude that in the Gospel according to St. Mark the baptismal pericope appears remotely similar to a vocation or call story, and that the temptation story which follows it serves as a description of Jesus' deliberation in making the decision to accept the divine call to be the son.⁶

This basic Marcan pericope with its immediate preceding and subsequent context was utilized by St. Matthew for his Gospel, which presumably was set into writing between 80 and 100 A.D.⁷ St. Matthew was a Greek-speaking Jewish Christian, who possibly had rabbinic knowledge. It seems that he was bound to a form of the "Jesus tradition" that assimilated the sayings of Jesus to Jewish views. Nevertheless, he endeavored to proclaim the meaning of Jesus' Messiahship to both Jews and Gentiles,⁸ and thus to address the church of all nations.⁹

As one might expect, such a broad theological purpose caused certain new features to be added to the original Marcan pericope. These new features were the John--Jesus dialogue (verses 14-15), the change from εἶδεν σχεζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς to ἤνεψχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί (verse 16), and the heavenly voice's public proclamation of Jesus' sonship to those present at the baptism (οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ υἱός μου; not σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου--verse 17). The first feature attempted to explain why Jesus came to John; the latter two changes tried to give cause for public knowledge of Jesus' sonship through an epiphany given John and the baptismal audience. Thus the author of St. Matthew's Gospel attempted to come to grips with theological problems prevalent in the early church--something which Mark's Gospel had not done.¹⁰

The author of the Gospel according to St. Luke followed St. Matthew's example insofar as he incorporated St. Mark's basic baptismal pericope into his theological framework (Luke 3:21-22), and insofar as he pictured the opening of heaven

to be a publicly observable event (Ἐγένετο δὲ . . . ἀνεψυχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν --verses 21-22). However, he differed markedly from St. Matthew in the alterations which he made. He, a Gentile Christian writing for Gentile Christians¹¹ between 70 and 90,¹² wished to describe the history of Jesus as the preparation for the activity of the disciples after Easter.¹³ Consequently, he cut the details of the event to a minimum. He mentioned the baptism only in a passing genitive absolute in order to emphasize the chief event of the Jordan River episode, i.e., the Holy Spirit's anointing of Jesus (cf. Acts 2 for the disciples' anointing). In contrast to St. Matthew's account, St. Luke maintained the Marcan report of the heavenly voice's second person address. In contrast to both St. Matthew and St. Mark, he stressed prayer in connection with the event; he inserted Πνευματικῆ εἶδος in reference to the dove, therefore, turning this part of the baptismal event into a revelation of the Spirit, viewable by others besides Jesus¹⁴ (cf. Acts 2, where the Spirit's coming is also visible in epiphany); and he interpolated the Jesus-to-Adam "son of God" genealogy (Luke 3:23-38) between the baptism and temptation accounts. What is more, he de-emphasized the person of John the Baptist as the agent of Jesus' baptism, since, in his opinion (Luke 16:16; 4:21), John was part of the past era of salvation history. (In Luke 3:20, John's imprisonment takes place before Jesus' baptism is reported; in the other Synoptic Gospels John's imprisonment comes after Jesus' baptism!)¹⁵

Whereas both St. Luke and St. Matthew modified St. Mark's

account, St. John in his non-Synoptic Gospel of the 90's A.D.¹⁶ did not utilize it at all. In fact he never explicitly portrayed a baptism of Jesus per se. That he presupposed it, however, John 1:30-34 makes abundantly clear. According to these verses John the Baptist, in the context of his baptizing activity, had seen the Holy Spirit descend on Jesus as a dove and remain on him. John knew that this descent of the Spirit was the sign of him "who would baptize with the Holy Spirit" (verse 33)--the sign of him who was the son of God (verse 34).

In summarizing the historical development of the baptismal pericope, we wish only to re-emphasize the following:

- a. All four Gospels unanimously give witness to the anointing of Jesus by the Holy Spirit in the context of John the Baptist's baptizing activity.¹⁷
- b. The Gospel according to St. Matthew is unique in its description of the event, in that it records John the Baptist's deliberation when Jesus came requesting baptism from him (Matt. 3:14-15).¹⁸
- c. St. Matthew's Gospel is unique in presenting the content of the heavenly voice's speech as public proclamation (Matt. 3:17).

Having concluded our discussion on the literary and historical considerations of St. Matthew 3:13-17, we now turn to a description of this pericope's structure and form.

CHAPTER IV

STRUCTURE AND FORM

Form Criticism

According to the form-critical method of Biblical interpretation, our pericope can be classified into several related categories. Vincent Taylor fits it into the category "Stories About Jesus,"¹ while E. Basil Redlich files it under the general heading of "Formless Stories."² Such stories can be divided into two groups, Legenda and Mythen--groups which are often translated into English by legend and myth respectively. These English terms are often understood to designate those stories which are unhistorical. This need not be. When these designations are used in the sense in which Martin Dibelius uses them, they can be quite helpful.

For Dibelius a legend is a religious story about a saintly man or woman; a myth is a story which introduces supernatural beings.³ Using these definitions, Dibelius places the Marcan account of Jesus' baptism into the category of myth. He does so because this account shows the revelation from heaven to be intended only for Jesus and not for John the Baptist or anyone else. In contrast, he points out that St. Luke turned the Marcan myth into a personal legend, while St. Matthew pictured it as an epiphany--a divine revelation to others.⁴ According to Dibelius, then, the form-critical term that characterizes our Matthean pericope is myth pictured as epiphany.

In contrast to Dibelius, Hermann Gunkel and H. Gressmann classify the basic, composite account of Jesus' baptism as a "Call-to-Kingship Saga." They do so on the basis of the dove-symbol used in the account. According to them the appearance of the dove fits a motif frequently found in Märchen, in which the choice of a king is decided by some bird which selects the right aspirant from a whole row of candidates.⁵ Rudolf Bultmann rejects this classification and pronounces it invalid in the case of Jesus, because there is nothing in the early Christian tradition that indicates that the choice of Jesus to be Messiah was in any way a problem.⁶

Bultmann himself proposes another solution. He classifies the Marcan account of Jesus' baptism as a legend,

certain though it is that the legend started from the historical fact of Jesus' baptism by John. It is told in the interest not of biography but of faith, and it reports Jesus' consecration as Messiah. It originated in the time when Jesus' life was already regarded as having been messianic

For Bultmann legend obviously means something quite different than it does for Dibelius; it describes a historical narrative which is untrustworthy as history because it has been shaped and developed by the faith of the church. Bultmann contends that the baptismal pericope originated in the cult of the Hellenistic Christian Church, which also further developed it. Accordingly, it came to serve as the edifying basis of the Christian rite of baptism, and thus became a cult legend in the strict sense. Bultmann says:

As happens elsewhere in the history of religion, the cultic mystery rests upon a first experience of it by

the cult deity, is founded in his story; and as that is true of the Synoptic presentation of the Lord's Supper, so in the early Church the story of Jesus' Baptism was soon conceived of in this sense as a cult legend.⁸

According to Bultmann then, Jesus was the first to receive the baptism of water and the Spirit. By that very act of reception he introduced water and Spirit baptism as an efficacious rite for his followers of the first century as well as for his followers of all centuries to come.

To further strengthen his position, Bultmann rejects all proposals that would make of Jesus' baptism a "vocation story" or a "call story." He rejects them because St. Mark's account differs so radically from all such stories in the Scriptures: Isaiah (Is. 6:1-13), Jeremiah (Jer. 1:5-19), Ezekiel (Ezek. 1-2), Saul (Acts 9:1-9), Peter (Luke 5:1-11), and John (Rev. 1:9-20). It differs in these ways:⁹

- a. There is not a word about the inner experience of Jesus.
- b. There is no commission given to the person called.
- c. There is no answer from the person called.

Therefore, Bultmann claims, the pericope deals not with the bestowal of a special calling upon Jesus--a calling to preach repentance unto salvation; rather, it deals with his Messiahship--his consecration as Messiah--and, therefore, is not basically a biographical, but a "faith legend."¹⁰

Bultmann may, however, have oversimplified and overstated his case. Edmund Schlink, for one, thinks so. He, in effect, says that Jesus did give an answer to an inner call experienced at baptism through his subsequent manifestation

of authority:

Ausser dem Faktum dieser Taufe steht jedoch fest, dass Jesus alsbald danach mit einem Anspruch aufgetreten ist, der ihn von allen Propheten, auch von Johannes, erst recht aber von den Schriftgelehrten unterschied. Er verkündigte nicht nur in Auslegung der Schrift wie die Rabbinen, auch gab er nicht ein zuvor vernommenes Gotteswort weiter wie die Propheten ("so spricht der Herr"), sondern er begegnete dem Volk in der unmittelbaren Vollmacht des "ich aber sage euch." So liegt die Annahme nahe, dass sich die historische Bedeutung von Jesu Taufe nicht auf die Übernahme der Busse beschränkte, sondern dass hier ein Jesu weiteres Wirken bestimmendes und auslösendes einzigartiges Offenbarungs-Ereignis stattgefunden hat.¹¹

According to Schlink, then, there are sufficient grounds for asserting that our pericope's Sitz im Leben need not reside in the Hellenistic Church at all. These grounds rest on Jesus' own delayed, but sustained, reaction to his baptism-- a reaction that was preserved in a genuine portion of oral tradition and handed down by the evangelists.

Literary Criticism

We may safely conclude that the boundaries of our Matthean text are those represented by verses 13 and 17. The inner margin of the Nestle text indicates that this pericope formed division 15 of the Codex Vaticanus (B), although the actual number 15 did not appear in this manuscript. That it was indeed paragraph 15, we can be sure, for it ranked as the third paragraph after the explicitly marked paragraph 12, and it appeared immediately before the explicitly marked paragraph 16. Thus the present text of our pericope is intact. As in St. Mark's Gospel the section on the preaching of John the

Baptist immediately precedes it; the temptation account of Jesus in the wilderness immediately follows. Hence it is clear that we are dealing with a legitimate literary unit and not merely a fragment of a larger unit.

The outline of thought in this unit is easily followed. It is sequential in both time and space. The only apparent inconsistencies in the time sequence are the present tense of the first verb and the aorist tense of *προβιβαίνειν*--problems which we have already mentioned.¹² The outline appears to be the following:

- a. *Τότε* --Jesus came from Galilee to the Jordan River with the defined intent of having John the Baptist baptize him.
- b. *ὁ δὲ* --When he made known his purpose to John, the latter was stricken with an inferiority complex. He felt that Jesus, being the "mightier one" who would baptize with the Holy Spirit (verse 11), should do the baptizing.
- c. *ἀποκρίθεις δὲ* --Jesus understood John's bewilderment, but he gave adequate reason for proceeding according to his wish: Both John and he were under divine necessity to fulfill all the plans of God, which would result in righteousness for mankind.
- d. *Τότε* --Then John consented to baptize Jesus.
- e. *βαπτισθεὶς δὲ* --The actual baptism is not described; rather, the events immediately after the baptism are. As Jesus came up from the water,¹³ the heavens opened for all to see, but only Jesus saw God's Spirit descend on him as a dove.¹⁴
- f. *καὶ ἰδοὺ* --Here is a change of perspective--a move from the subjective Jesus, and what he saw, to those present at the event, and what they heard, i.e., the heavenly voice saying, "This is my Son, the Beloved, on whom my favor rests."

Having outlined the pericope here, and having compared this pericope with its archetype in St. Mark earlier,¹⁵ we may

conclude that the passage is basically a composite of St. Mark's account with the addition of items b and c. Thus we have the Marcan stratum (altered in thought unit f) and the Matthean stratum combined to produce the most comprehensive account of Jesus' baptism. Its boundaries are very narrow and clearly defined; its action takes place within a matter of minutes and within a single geographical location.

In order to show the thought progression of the above outline in a more connected fashion, we offer this concluding paraphrase:

Jesus came from his home territory of Galilee to the place on the Jordan River where John the Baptist was baptizing, in order that he also might be baptized. Of course, when John recognized the identity of the one who thus petitioned him, he naturally refused to perform the baptism. After all, this was he whose way John was preparing! Nevertheless, Jesus persuaded him to change his mind, telling him that it had to be so if both of them were to properly fulfill all that God required in his plan for mankind. And so John did baptize Jesus. After the event, as Jesus came up from the water, he suddenly received a revelation of God. This consisted of his seeing God's Spirit descending as a dove upon him. Accompanying Jesus' revelation was an epiphany for the sake of the Baptist and whatever audience he may have had. This epiphany consisted in opened heavens, from which came the voice that said, "This is my Son, the Beloved, on whom my favor rests."

CHAPTER V

MEANING

The Baptism of John

In order to understand what transpired when Jesus came to John seeking baptism, we must first have a clear vision of John the Baptist's work. From the immediate context that precedes our pericope we know that he was called βαπτιστής (3:1); that people flocked to him to receive baptism in the River Jordan (3:6); and that his baptism was one with water (3:11). A detailed etymological discussion of βαπτίζω need not detain us here; suffice it to say that John's baptism was a washing--a cleansing--with water. Since ritual washings or ablutions were in existence before the time of John, we must investigate whether or not they had possible influence upon John's water baptism.

John Reumann lists several water baptisms that were practiced before and during John's time. They include

- a. various washings and ablutions required of Old Testament priests and worshippers (Ex. 29:4; Lev. 16:4, 24ff.; Numb 8:7; cf. Heb. 9:10);
- b. symbolic actions of the Old Testament prophets, which presupposed a washing of the people (Ezek. 36:25);
- c. Jewish proselyte baptism, which served to initiate converted pagan men and women into the life of Israel;
- d. Qumran community washings.¹

These washings will be discussed in the following pages as possible sources for John's water baptism. They will be

divided into two groups: those that were historical precedents within Israel (a,b,c), and that one which served as a historical precedent outside of the mainstream of Israel's religion (d). The first group will be subdivided into two headings; Old Testament washings and the promise of eschatological cleansing (a,b,), and Jewish proselyte baptism (c).

Historical Precedents within Israel

Old Testament Washings and the Promise of Eschatological Cleansing

Both the descriptive title *βαπτισμῶν*, given to John by St. Matthew's Gospel, and the historical evaluation of John's work, given by the Jewish historian Josephus, suggest that John extricated his water baptism from baptismal practices and ideas already prevalent within Israel. Regarding the former, Schlatter says,

Die Benennung des Johannes als *βαπτισμῶν* stammt von der Judenschaft, nicht erst von der Christenheit. Neben Mrk. *Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτισμῶν* gibt Mat. mit *βαπτισμῶν* das Palästinische.²

In reference to the latter, Josephus' brief description of John's work

sees in it nothing beyond a religious purification, a reform movement wholly within the limits of contemporary Judaism.³

If John did take his cue from prevailing baptismal practices within Israel, he could, first of all, have looked to the various washings and ablutions required of Old Testament priests and worshippers. References to such water rites

may be found in Lev. 6:20; Lev. 11-15; 17:15; and Num. 19⁴ in addition to the passages cited by Reumann above. These rites formed the backdrop against which the prophets cast their message of repentance: ". . . your hands are full of blood. Wash yourselves; make yourselves clean" (Is. 1:15f.);⁵ "Oh Jerusalem, wash your heart from wickedness, that you may be saved" (Jer. 4:14). These prophetic imperatives were intended to impel God's people to a spiritual washing of their whole life:

. . . remove the evil of your doings from before my eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do good; seek justice, correct oppression; defend the fatherless, plead for the widow" (Is. 1:16-17).

When most of Israel did not respond to this call to repentance as the faithful worshiper in Ps. 51:4-9 did, the prophetic message went on to announce the coming of an eschatological washing which would be both an act of judgment (Is. 4:4) and an act of divine salvation (Ezek. 36:25-27; 47:12; Zech. 13:1).⁶ However, instead of prompting true repentance of heart and life, this eschatological proclamation spawned the widespread use of ritual washings as mechanical, legalistic means of ushering in the End time:

Im Rahmen der Radikalisierung der Bemühungen um Gesetzeserfüllung und um Reinigung als Bedingung für die erwartete göttliche Heilstat bleiben die Washungen nicht auf besonderen, vom Gesetz ausdrücklich erwähnten Fälle beschränkt, sondern sie werden von allen Juden gefordert, und ihre häufige Wiederholung wird verlangt. . . Die Reinigungen sind primär als Akte der Erfüllung göttlicher Gesetzesvorschriften verstanden worden, somit als Taten des menschlichen Gehorsams, nicht als vergebende Tat Gottes am Menschen.⁷

Perhaps John's thought was shaped by a reaction to such.

Jewish Proselyte Baptism

On the other hand, John's thought may have been shaped by the practice of Jewish proselyte baptism. Although this rite of initiating Jewish converts is nowhere mentioned in the Old Testament or Apocrypha,⁸ and although it does not appear in any other pre-Christian Jewish literature,⁹ most modern scholars favor a pre-Christian origin for it.¹⁰ Its roots must have reached back to an earlier time, since "it is in the highest degree improbable that Judaism adopted a practice which had already become an essential practice of Christianity."¹¹

According to the Talmud, those Gentiles who sought membership in Israel's covenant were required to submit to circumcision and baptism; they also were obligated to bring an animal sacrifice. Prerequisites for the baptismal requirement included a confession of faith in one God and the knowledge of at least the most important commandments of the law. The baptism ceremony itself required that Jewish witnesses be present while the candidate immersed himself in flowing water.¹² Such baptism made the candidate ceremonially pure and gave him access to a new life in a new community through a once-and-for-all act.¹³ John's baptism was likely by immersion; it took place in flowing water; and it marked the start of a new life in a new community through a once-and-for-all act.¹⁴ Perhaps the similarities are more than a coincidence.

Historical Precedent in the Qumran Community¹⁵

The initial discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls at Khirbet-Qumran in 1947, and the subsequent discoveries in that locale have given Biblical scholars great insight into thought patterns and practices of a presumably Essene, semi-priestly community which existed there from ca. 150 B.C. to 70 A.D.¹⁶ The scrolls reveal that this community practiced certain forms of water baptism in harmony with its belief that it, in contrast to the Jerusalem priesthood and temple cult, was God's true eschatological community, which would usher in the End time of the Spirit and fire--the time of the Messiah of Aaron and the Messiah of David¹⁷--by repentance, asceticism, and a rigorously disciplined communal life:

Die Essener hatten sich von dem Jerusalemischen Tempelkult und seiner Priesterschaft, die manchen Juden seit der Hasmonäischen und vollends seit der Hadrianischen Zeit fragwürdig geworden war, getrennt, um sich in der Wüste--unter Berufung auf Jesaja 40, 3: "in der Wüste bereitet dem Herrn den Weg . . ."--darauf zuzubereiten, als "das Haus Israels," als die "heilige Pflanzung" nach den endzeitlichen Kriegen zwischen den "Kindern des Lichts" und den "Kindern der Finsternis" den priesterlichen Dienst im gereinigten Tempel Gott darzubringen. Diese Zubereitung geschah durch Busse, Askese und strengste Disziplin des gemeinsamen Lebens, wobei Reinigungsrituale eine grosse und zwar selbst im Vergleich mit dem Pharisäismus gesteigerte Rolle spielten.¹⁸

These baptismal rites were ritual symbols which pledged participants to a life of repentance. As such they were an intensification of the Old Testament levitical washings in the context of the prophetic preaching. They did not procure forgiveness or the grace of God per se, but they initiated

participants into and repeatedly sustained them in the community, where forgiveness and grace were believed to reside.¹⁹

Attempts have been made to connect the baptism of John the Baptist with these Essene community washings at Qumran. These attempts point out the geographical proximity of John's baptizing locus--at the point where the Jordan River (Matt. 3:16) met the wilderness of Judea (Matt. 3:1)--and the wilderness community of Qumran:

. . . der Ort der Wirksamkeit des Täuflers, der sich im unteren Jordangraben, unweit der Einmündung des Flusses in das Tote Meer, befand, war nur wenige Kilometer von der Niederlassung der Qumran-Mönche entfernt und nur durch die Nordwestecke des Meeres von ihr getrennt.²⁰

Among the boldest of such attempts is that of John A.T. Robinson, who takes as his point of departure not only this geographical proximity, but also the hypothesis that John became an adopted child of the Qumran community at the death of his parents.²¹ Wright and Fuller support him in this basic view.²² His hypothesis rests basically on the following considerations:

- a. On the basis of biographical information supplied by St. Luke's Gospel, one could postulate an early death of John's parents, at which time the child John was sent to be reared in the desert discipline of Qumran. (Luke 1:80--". . . and he was in the wilderness till the day of his manifestation to Israel.")
- b. The Qumran community had a considerable following among priestly families from the hill country of Judea, which opposed the Sadducaic priesthood. Zechariah was a non-Sadducaic priest; Elizabeth was a daughter of Aaron. They lived in the hill country of Judah (Luke 1:5; 39-40).
- c. Membership in the Qumran community could explain John's

great opposition to the Jerusalem priesthood (Matt. 3:7; 21:32; Mark 11:27-33).

- d. The location of Qumran is not far from John's home and it is nearer still to the point of John's re-emergence in the Judean wilderness (Matt. 3:1).
- e. The Community Rule of Qumran (1QSa 1, 4-18) makes provisions for the training of those who came for instruction as children and for their assimilation as adult members. If Qumran was indeed Essene in character, then a remark of Josephus (Bell. Jud. 2, par. 120) regarding a customary Essene practice of adoption becomes noteworthy: "They adopt other men's children, while yet pliable and docile, and regard them as their kin, and mould them in accordance with their own principles."
- f. John's asceticism and his raison d' être, "to prepare the way of the Lord" in the wilderness (Is. 40:3, quoted in Matt. 3:3; Mark 1:3; Luke 3:4; and John 1:23) is a common point of comparison with Qumran beliefs.²³

Robinson's analysis does not, however, convince John Reumann or J. Gnilka. The former says that it is very doubtful that John the Baptist lived at Qumran.²⁴ The latter is more forceful. He says, "Es ist so gut wie ausgeschlossen, dass Johannes nichts von der Existenz der Qumran-Leute gewusst hat."²⁵ He argues from the following points:

- a. John the Baptist was not a priestly figure; his person and the geographical location of his work must be understood prophetically in terms of Elijah:

Elias galt als Teufel. Das alte Teise lag achtzehn kilometer östlich vom Jordan. Später war er in Gilgal, das ebenfalls in der Jordansenke zu suchen ist. Wenn Johannes das Jordangebiet zur Stätte seiner Wirksamkeit macht, dürfen wir vermuten dass er bewusst an das Vorbild dieses grossen Propheten anknüpft. Elias war ein grosser Bussprediger, der mit seinen Worten beim Volk einen ausserordentlich starken Eindruck hervorrief; das gleiche lässt sich vom Täufer sagen.²⁶

- b. John directed his work to the whole of Israel; he did not share the separatistic, exclusionistic, rigoristic Heilsgedanke of Qumran.

- c. Membership in the circle of John's disciples was loosely structured; that in Qumran was bound by strict oaths.
- d. John chose the wilderness location not because of a rejection of Jerusalem and of the Temple, but for a different reason:

Dass er gerade die Wüste zu seinem Aufenthaltsort wählte, ist nicht verwunderlich, denn die Wüste galt nach einer verbreiteten Vorstellung als der Ort, an dem der Messias erscheinen werde. Wollte man ihm begegnen, müsse man ihn in die Wüste entgegengehen.²⁷

Whatever John's direct physical relationship to the Qumran community may have been, the fact remains that his thought may still have been influenced by the community's ideas about baptism.

The Uniqueness of John's Baptism

It is difficult to ascertain the degree of influence which Old Testament washings in prophetic contexts, Jewish proselyte baptism, and Qumran washings may have had upon the formation of John's baptism. Nevertheless, one thing is certain: John's baptism stood out as unique with respect to all three of these precedents. It differed from the Jewish ritual washings even when these were placed in prophetic contexts, in that it was not repeatable; it was not self-administered; and it was inextricably connected with the radical call to repentance, issued in the face of the imminent judgment of God.²⁸ It differed from proselyte baptism in a number of ways as well:²⁹

- a. The proselyte baptized himself, whereas John alone administered his baptism to others.
- b. Proselyte baptism was intended only for Gentiles;

John called on the Jews to submit to his rite; he treated them like pagans who had no claim on God. ("God is able from these stones to raise up children of Abraham."--Matt. 3:9)

- c. Proselyte baptism was regarded primarily as a rite of ceremonial purification; John's baptism was the enactment of an ethical and moral cleansing requiring "fruits that befit repentance." (Matt. 3:8)
- d. Proselyte baptism lacked the urgent eschatological element of John's baptism. ("Even now the axe is laid to the root of the trees His winnowing fork is in his hand"--Matt. 3:10,12)

Finally, John's baptism also differed from the washings of Qumran. Qumran's washings were repeatable, had only a ritual character, and were intended for only a select circle of the population. John's baptism, on the other hand, was administered but once, had a radical eschatological, moral, and ethical character, and was directed towards all of Jewry.³⁰

Where shall we find cause for John's uniqueness as Baptist? We will find it in John's person as the singular eschatological prophet, whose baptism was "acted prophesy"--a prophesy that expressed and in some cases effected a spiritual renewal in preparation for the fulfillment of Israel's eschatological hope.³¹

John was the messenger of the New Covenant, who in Mal. 3:22 is called Elijah (cf. Matt. 11:14). He even looked like Elijah in outward garb (Matt. 3:4; cf. 2 Kings 1:8). According to Mal. 4:5 f. it was the task of Elijah to "turn the hearts of the fathers to their children and the hearts of the children to their fathers." In other words, the task of Elijah was to re-constitute the nation of Israel in

preparation for the coming of Jahweh.³² This task fit the blueprint of wilderness theology with its emphasis on a new exodus:

Hosea foretold a new exodus, which would have as its starting point a sojourn in the wilderness (2:14 ff.). There God would again tryst with His bride, Israel, as He had done in the days of her youth. Ezekiel, on the other hand, described the wilderness wanderings as a time of punishment for Israel, and for him, the new exodus would begin with another such experience in the wilderness (20:35-38). The Second Isaiah proclaimed that the new exodus would involve not only a new wilderness existence (35:6; 41:18-20; 43:19 f.; 49:10), but also a repetition of the wonders of the first exodus.³³

John came preaching in the wilderness, and thus fulfilled these prophetic words and those of Is. 40:3. Isaiah had proclaimed that the new exodus would begin with the appearance of a voice that cried, "In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord." John the Baptist appeared as a voice crying in the wilderness, "Prepare the way of the Lord." The time for the new exodus had arrived.

John led God's people through the waters of the Jordan into the wilderness, where they would soon meet the "mightier one" (Matt. 3:11 and parallels), who would dispense the "complete baptism"—a baptism toward which his baptism only pointed. This "other" would baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire.³⁴

Die Vorstellung von der Feuertaufe knüpft an die uralte Idee vom Weltenbrand an, nach der die Welt durch Feuer zugrunde gehen wird und die sich in der spätjüdischen Literatur und auch in den Qumran-Rollen vielfältig belegen lässt³⁵

The baptism of fire would destroy sinners, giving them over

to the unquenchable inferno, in which the godless would experience horrible punishment. The baptism of the Spirit, however, would be given to those who repented:

Wer aber der Forderung des Täufers entspricht, umkehrt und in den Fluten des Jordan zur Busse untertaucht, wird vom Feuer verschont werden. Das fliessende Wasser des Stromes symbolisiert den bevorstehenden furchtbaren Feuersturm, der in Bälle über die Erde herumbrechen wird. Wer aber dem Feuer entkommt, wird den Geist empfangen. Es entspricht alter prophetischer Vorstellung dass am Ende der Tage Gott seinen Geist über die Menschenkinder ausgiessen wird und dass diese durch den Geist die letzte Läuterung erfahren und zur Vollendung geführt werden.³⁶

The "mightier one" who would dispense this double baptism was none other than God himself:

John the Baptist announced and expected that a repentant Israel, returned to the wilderness would meet God. He did not anticipate their meeting a Messianic Person wearing sandals. The phrase "whose sandals I am not worthy to carry," (Matt. 3:11) is a mistranslation. What John means as Matthew tells it, is, "I am not worthy of Him, to wear sandals." It is the high expectation of a meeting with God³⁷

Within this framework of John's person and message, lies the uniqueness of his baptism.

John's Baptism and Christian Baptism

There yet remains for us the task of relating John's baptism to that of the later Christian Church. In what ways was it similar? John's baptism was an eschatological action which initiated men into a fellowship or community where there was an ethical demand. All these points characterize Christian baptism.³⁸ Wherein then lie the differences? There have been some who have claimed that no differences exist between

the two. M. Leimer maintains that

Es ist damit ausgesagt, dass die Taufe Johannis Vergebung der Sünden, den Heiligen Geist und auch die ewige Seligkeit darreichte und mitteilte.³⁹

Quoting Georg Stöckhard he re-affirms this point:

Die Taufe, mit welcher Johannes taufte auf ausdrücklichen Befehl Gottes, war ein gültiges, kräftiges Sakrament, welches denen die Sünden bekannten und der Predigt Johannes glaubten, Gnade und Vergebung der Sünden mitteilte⁴⁰

He even cites Franz Pieper's claim that John's baptism was a veritable Gnadenmittel, in order to assert his conclusion: The difference between the baptism of John and that of the Christian Church is one of time only; "Nur dieses Zeitverhältniss, vor und nach Christi Tod, bleibt als Unterschied stehen."⁴¹

There is, without a doubt, evidence to show that Leimer and his predecessors have overstated the case. It is first of all difficult to prove that John's baptism bestowed the forgiveness of sins.⁴² For a fact, St. Matthew replaced St. Mark's comment on John's message, "preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins," (Mark 1:4), with "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." (Matt. 3:2).⁴³ For St. Matthew, therefore, "Die Kraft der Sündenvergebung hat nicht die Taufe des Johannes, sondern erst das Blut Christi [3:11; 26:28]; seine Taufe ist ein *Βάπτισμα εἰς ἠετίαν*."⁴⁴ Moreover, even St. Mark's comments in 1:4 need not be interpreted in such a way which would make the baptismal act the agent of forgiveness. It can be understood to mean that true repentance, sealed by the act of baptism,⁴⁵ was the reason

for forgiveness, in view of the "mightier one" who was to come:

Indem der Mensch bereit ist, die Johannestaufe auf sich zu nehmen, bezeugt er, dass er willens ist, die von Johannes geforderte Umkehr zu leisten, und er empfängt dafür die Sündenvergebung. . . . Die umstrittene Frage besteht darin, ob die Sündenvergebung an das elementare Wasser gebunden ist oder nicht. Im Lichte der Qumran-Schriften werden wir anzunehmen haben, dass Gott dem Umkehrenden unmittelbar die Vergebung für seine Umkehr schenkte, so dass nicht die Taufe die Sünde tilgte.⁴⁶

When viewed in this manner, John's baptism had no sacramental value per se.

His baptism also did not convey the gift of the Spirit as Christian baptism does. Acts 19:1-7 reveals that a dozen followers of John in Ephesus, who had undergone John's baptism, were completely ignorant of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁷ Not until Paul made the distinction between John's baptism of repentance and the baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus did they submit to the latter and receive the Holy Spirit. John's baptism could not convey the gift of the Spirit nor the status of divine sonship, for these elements could only be transferred through Christian baptism, which had its source in Jesus' submission to John's rite. It is this submission to which we shall now turn.

The Baptism of Jesus by John

Purpose: To Fulfill All Righteousness

"Few facts about Jesus' career are historically more certain than that he was baptized by John."⁴⁸ All four

Gospels describe or allude to it, as we have said earlier,⁴⁹ and the kerygma of the early church gives witness to it as well (Acts 10:37). That Jesus was baptized by John, is a closed issue. Why he was baptized by John is a more open issue. Although St. Matthew singularly gives the reason for Jesus' coming to John in verse 15, οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῶν πληρῶσαι πάντων δικαιοσύνην, interpreters differ as to the meaning of this phrase. Some regard it as the ipsissima verba Jesu, and feel that verses 14 and 15 are a historical description of a John--Jesus dialogue. Hence they interpret it from the stance of Jesus' Messianic consciousness. Others regard the phrase and its context in verses 14 and 15 as the work of St. Matthew's editorial hand, strategically inserted in order to assert a theological point to his reading audience. We shall discuss both views.

Jesus' Messianic Consciousness

Regarding Matt. 3:14-15 J.K. Howard says that

the historicity of this conversation has been questioned by a number of writers. It does not appear in the Markan tradition nor in Q, but this does not give us any ground for concluding that Matthew was using sources less reliable or accurate than these, and we see no valid reason, no genuinely historical reason, to doubt the trustworthiness of the record.⁵⁰

If the exchange between John and Jesus is regarded as historical, then Jesus' remark in verse 15 about "fulfilling all righteousness" is an indication of his Messianic consciousness. Jesus' coming to John may then be interpreted as a response to a call for ministry, which he heard in and through John's

preaching.⁵¹

It is possible that Jesus went to John in the hope that baptism would be in his case anointing, and that John was to stand to him in the relation of Samuel to David or Elijah to the Messiah. The very shape of the encounter between the two men suggests the possibility that Jesus acted with messianic intent.⁵²

Alan Richardson agrees with this viewpoint and takes it one step farther when he claims that Jesus had already accepted his role as suffering Servant-Messiah prior to his journey to see John.⁵³ If this claim is correct, Jesus must have communicated his self-understanding to John at the start of his pre-baptismal interview (verses 14-15). This would explain John's earnest and perhaps repeated (δυσκώλυεν) protests against baptizing Jesus and would set the stage for Jesus' reason for doing so anyway--obedience. What Jesus seemed to say to the Baptist was this:

John, I do not dispute the truth of your assertion. I am not in need of baptism for Myself; you are right also in your feelings of inferiority. Ordinarily we should be exchanging place. But now, in this present circumstance, your baptism, which God commanded you to bestow on all the people, must be applied to Me. Both of us have a mission to perform; yours, to prepare the way for the Messiah; Mine, to be the Messiah. Therefore, you must do your job in baptizing Me, and I must do Mine by being baptized. "Permit now, for in this way it is the right, the fitting thing (πρέπον) for us to fulfill all righteousness."⁵⁴

This understanding of obedience (πληρῶσαι πάντων δικαιοσύνην), presupposes a soteriological rather than an ethical definition of δικαιοσύνη.⁵⁵ Although δικαιοσύνη has a wide range of meaning from the more definite idea of justice to a more general thought of moral integrity, in this context it means not merely "what is right," but also "what God requires,"--specifically, what

God requires of the Servant-Messiah (Is. 53:11). What is it that God demands from him? He demands obedience, witness, and suffering, in order that His redemptive purpose for Israel and the world may be carried out.⁵⁶

The chief advocate of this soteriological understanding of *σκηνοῦν* is Oscar Cullmann. It is only fitting that we list some of his remarks:

The baptism of Jesus is related to *σκηνοῦν*, not only his own, but also that of the whole people. The word *πάντων* is probably to be underlined here. Jesus' reply, which exegetes have always found difficult to explain, acquires concrete meaning: Jesus will effect a general forgiveness.⁵⁷

He will effect such forgiveness by being the obedient Servant, by offering his life as a ransom for many (Mark 10:45). Thus his baptism points forward to his death:⁵⁸

For Jesus "to be baptized" from now on meant to suffer, to die for his people. This is not a pure guess; it is confirmed by each of the two sayings in which Jesus uses the word *βαπτίζωμαι*: Mark 10:38 and Luke 12:50. In Mark 10:38, "can ye be baptized" means "die." See also Luke 12:50: "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how I am constrained till it be accomplished." Here also "be baptized" means just "die."⁵⁹

Meaning for the Evangelist Matthew

In contrast to the view of Cullmann et. al., which sees verses 14-15 as a historical account and as an occasion for the display of Jesus' Messianic consciousness, there is another view that regards these verses as an interpretation of the evangelist. This view operates from the premise that

we have not the means of penetrating to the inner personality of Jesus, and we discern only dimly--if indeed we can discern at all--the manner in which he apprehended

his relationship to the Father. Of development in his personality, or in his understanding of his mission, or in his apprehension of his relationship to God, we cannot speak at all; and we should be reluctant to give free play to our imaginations.⁶⁰

This view does not attempt to give details of Jesus' conscious motive as he came to John, but seeks to discover the kerygmatic meaning of that encounter, as it is presented by the evangelist. Accordingly, verses 14-15 were inserted by St. Matthew into the Marcan framework for apologetic reasons. Such reasons were necessary, first of all, to explain the embarrassing situation of the "mightier one" (3:11) subordinating himself to his inferior herald.⁶¹ Secondly, they could have been given in reaction to John's followers (Acts 19:1 ff.) who, because of exploitation or misunderstanding of the baptismal event, may have subordinated Jesus to John during the time of St. Matthew.⁶² It is less likely that they were given to combat the contention that Jesus was sinful and in need of a baptism *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*,⁶³ for this terminology is avoided by St. Matthew in 3:2, as we have already shown.⁶⁴ But most likely, they were given by St. Matthew to express his theological understanding of Jesus' entire life and ministry: It "fulfilled all righteousness." We must discuss this point in greater detail.

There are only three instances in the New Testament where *πληρῶν* is used in the active voice.⁶⁵ All three occur in St. Matthew's Gospel:

- a. *πληρῶνται πάντα δικαιούμην* (3:15);
- b. *πληρῶνται τὸν νόμον-τοὺς προφῆτας* (5:17);

c. ὑμεῖς πληρῶντε τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν (23:32).

This being the case, the use of πληρῶ in 3:15 will best be understood by its usage in the other two instances. πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον τοῦς προφήτας suggests that δεκαλοῦνῃ may be translated by an equivalent αἱ γραφαί. If this is the case, Jesus in effect said, "It is fitting for us to fulfill all Scriptures." Nevertheless, we still have not come to grips with the term πληρῶ itself. What does it mean that the Scriptures or righteousness has been filled-full or full-filled? The answer to this question lies in 23:32, where πληρῶ means to "fill up a vessel."⁶⁶ The specifics of the passage are these:

- a. Something called a "measure," a container with a fixed capacity, is to be filled up.
- b. This filling is to be done by sons.
- c. The container belonged to and was prepared by their fathers.

The textual context shows that the container to be filled is that of false sonship to God; the false sons are the Scribes and Pharisees, who by their stubborn resistance to Jesus are filling this container, which their fathers built and partially filled, when they killed the prophets.⁶⁷ Thus Matt. 23:32 through the use of an extended metaphor describes a Father-son relationship, which is the perverted opposite of what God desires. God the Father wants His metaphorical vessel, "the law and the prophets" (αἱ γραφαί) and "righteousness" to be filled full by a son (sons), so that the proper son-Father relationship of true obedience might be manifested. Therefore,

when Matthew speaks of "fulfillment"

he has in mind not so much specific predictions that now come to pass, but rather the intention and purpose of God for His son which pervades the entire Old Testament. What God wanted when He called Israel to sonship out of Egypt was a son who would truly be His son, not in name only but in all trust, love, character, and willing service. The history of Israel is one long record of divine frustration, however, for the people fail to express in their lives that purpose of The Father. In contrast to the son Israel, who has not fulfilled all righteousness and with whom God is not well pleased, stands Jesus. He is Israel, the true son, the full realization of God's intention, and therefore the instrument of the divine purpose for Israel.⁶⁸

When Matthew speaks of "fulfillment," he means nothing less than this: Jesus' biography not only repeats but corrects the biography of Israel. This is clear in chapters one and two, where he compares the beginnings of Jesus with the beginnings of Israel through Moses;⁶⁹ in chapter three, where he demonstrates the similarity between the baptism of Jesus and the pattern of events prefigured in Israel's Reed Sea baptism (cf. 1 Cor. 10:2); in chapter four, where he pictures Jesus' post-baptismal wilderness temptations as a corrective for Israel's post-baptismal wilderness wanderings; and in chapter five, where he presents the Sermon on the Mount as a replacement for the giving of the law at Mt. Sinai. He makes it very clear that Jesus is the true son, who stands fully in the proper relationship to the Father--a relationship described as *Σκηνωσις*.

From this discussion it is obvious that the Matthean use of *Σκηνωσις* is to be understood in an ethical sense and not in a soteriological sense.⁷⁰ For Matthew *Σκηνωσις* means

complete obedience to every ordinance of God (almost as if *δικαιοσύνη* were meant).⁷¹ Therefore, *δικαιοσύνη* denotes conduct which is right and pleasing before God--conduct which fulfills His will (5:6, 10, 20; 6:1, 33; 21:32).⁷² Jesus established such *δικαιοσύνη* (*ἰσχυρῶς*)⁷³--filled full the container of God's righteous sonship--when he voluntarily attached himself to John's prophetic work through baptism.⁷⁴ John helped to establish this *δικαιοσύνη* by administering the baptism (verses 15b-16a). Together (*ἵνα* --verse 15) they initiated the new exodus and chartered the new covenant of God's people, promised beforehand in the Old Testament.⁷⁵

The Post-Baptismal Events

Having discussed the baptism of John and the reason for Jesus' participation in such, we now move to a discussion of the post-baptismal events. In doing so we are justifiably slighting a treatment of the actual baptism, since the text gives us no certain information other than that John administered the rite.⁷⁶ The text, however, tells us much about what happened after the event. It claims that as soon as Jesus came up from the water

- a. the heavens were opened;
- b. Jesus saw the Spirit of God descending and coming to rest on him;
- c. the Spirit appeared as a dove;
- d. there was a voice from the heavens, which identified Jesus as God's son, the Beloved, on whom His favor rested.

It will be our task in the next several pages to interpret these four items in greater detail.

The Heavens Were Opened

In order to understand the significance of *ἡνεώχθησαν οὐρανοί* (verse 16) we must keep in mind that for the Jew of Jesus' time God was the completely Transcendent One, the "wholly Other." The prophetic consciousness of God's immanence was all but lost. When this attitude was coupled with the silence of the prophetic voice it basically meant that God no longer communicated; that He no longer dealt directly with His people.⁷⁷ Consequently, the Jewish hope was that God would break the silence and make Himself known through a mighty act of deliverance (Ps. 18:9 and 144:5).⁷⁸ This hope was expressed in the words, "O that Thou wouldst rend *[ἀνοίξῃς]* the heavens and come down" (Is. 64:1). When the lack of present fulfillment projected the Jewish hope into the future, apocalyptic literature picked up the theme. It pictured the End-time (*ἔσχατον*) as a time when God's voice would be heard again as it appointed a Champion to the task of deliverance. The following are two examples from such literature: "The heavens shall be opened . . . with the Father's voice as from Abraham to Isaac . . . and the Spirit shall rest upon him. . . . Sin shall come to an end . . . and Beliar shall be bound by him," (Test. Levi 18:5-12); also "The heavens shall be opened to him, to pour out the Spirit, even the blessing of the Father," (Test. Judah 24:2). Thus the opening of the heavens after Jesus'

baptism was seen as a prelude to a divine announcement, marking the beginning of the Messianic deliverance of the End-time.⁷⁹ St. Matthew presents this opening of the heavens in his own unique way:

Nach der Taufe Jesu Öffnen sich die Himmel; das ist nicht wie bei Markus ein Gesicht Jesu, auch nicht wie Lukas die ihm auf sein Gebet hin wiederfahrende Antwort Gottes, sondern es wird als Ereignis erzählt, das auch den Täufer angeht (vgl. Joh. 1:32-34). Die sich Öffnenden Himmel enthüllen dem Täufer Jesus als den Kommenden, als den er ihn erkannt hat (V. 14).⁸⁰

The Spirit Descended and Came to Rest

While St. Matthew pictures the opening of the heavens as a public event, he shifts perspectives to report that Jesus saw the Spirit of God descending . . . coming to rest upon him." The significance of this descent of the Spirit can be found in a brief historical sketch regarding the matter. In the Old Testament the Spirit of God was the trademark of the man of God. It could rest on anyone, e.g., on a craftsman (Ex. 31:3), on a leader of Israel (Judg. 6:34), but above all upon a prophet (Mic. 3:8). Of course, the Spirit would rest upon the Messiah (Is. 11:2-4) and on the Servant of Yahweh (Is. 42:1; cf. 61:1). In later times it became part of the message of the New Age that all Israel would possess the gift of the Spirit (Joel 2:28; Is. 32:15; 44:3; 59:21). In this historical light the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus, is the sign that he is appointed by God for ministry.⁸¹

This appointment for ministry must, however, not be viewed as something essentially new or different in Jesus' life, since

both St. Matthew and St. Luke picture Jesus to be a Spirit-man from his very inception (conception).⁸² Rather, it must be viewed as the inevitable translation of the Spirit's residing power into dynamic action. This thought, coupled with the idea that the Spirit came "to rest on him," shows Jesus' whole course of life to be marked by the authority, the approval, the commission, and the power of God.⁸³

Jesus' appointment can be viewed in terms of anointment. In fact Acts 10:38, "an authentic early tradition,"⁸⁴ puts it just that way: "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power." This passage opens vast areas of the Old Testament and Intertestamental literature, in which the Spirit of God is linked with the act of anointing. Some of the passages are 1 Sam. 10:1-13; 16:13-14; 1 Kings 19:16-21; 1 Enoch 49:3; Test. of Levi 18:2-14; and Test. of Judah 24:2f.⁸⁵ This background raises the natural question, "To what specific ministry or task was Jesus anointed?" The most likely answer, of course, would be the ministry or task of Kingly Messiah ($\text{מָשִׁיחַ} - \text{Χριστός}$),⁸⁶ since Messiah means "Anointed One," and Is. 11:2-4 speaks of the Spirit of Yahweh resting on the Davidic King. But another answer could be the ministry of Yahweh's Servant ($\text{עַבְדְּיָהוָה} - \text{Παῖς}$), on the basis of Is. 42:1, which is loosely quoted by St. Matthew in 12:18-21:

Behold, my servant whom I have chosen,
my beloved with whom my soul is well pleased.
I will put my Spirit upon him,
and he shall proclaim justice to the Gentiles.
He will not wrangle or cry aloud,
nor will anyone hear his voice in the streets;

he will not break a bruised reed
 or quench a smoldering wick,
 till he brings justice to victory;
 and in his name will the Gentiles hope.

The question is, how does St. Matthew understand the ministry of the Isaianic Servant--in terms of suffering (Is. 53:4 ff.),⁸⁷ or in terms of something else? The context of Matt. 12:18-21 gives us our answer.⁸⁸ St. Matthew sees the incidents from Jesus' life, which he reports in chapters 8-12, to be the fulfillment of the Isaianic Servant words:

- a. Jesus' refusal to argue with his enemies (12:15) fulfills the words "He will not wrangle . . ."
- b. Jesus' order to those whom he had healed "not to make him known," (12:16) fulfills the line, "nor will anyone hear his voice in the streets."
- c. In 8:17 Matthew quotes Is. 53:4--"He took our infirmities and bore our diseases." This is fulfilled in various miracles of Jesus in Matt. 8:1--9:33.

Therefore, Jesus does fulfill the Servant role in St. Matthew's Gospel, but only in these ways. He is not seen as the suffering Servant explicitly.⁸⁹

The Spirit as a Dove

In seeking the significance of the dove, past interpreters have looked to the characteristics of the dove and have used these as the Ansatz for the Spirit's activity.⁹⁰

For example:

- a. The dove is meek, simple, and amiable; the Holy Spirit coming to Jesus as a dove means that Jesus too had these qualities.
- b. The dove is a bird that seeks companionship; the Holy Spirit causes the union of all the faithful with Jesus.

- c. The dove is the most innocent, gentle, and guileless of creatures; it corresponds to the lamb among beasts, and Jesus is called the Lamb (John 1:29, 36).

Interpreters have also tried to explain the dove symbolism

a) from the ideas of Philo, who allegorizes the dove as Wisdom and Logos;⁹¹ b) from the ideas of comparative religions, which view the dove as either the incorporation of the near East dove goddess Ishtar (Atargatis), who adopts a man as her son and chooses him for her lover,⁹² or as the Persian and Egyptian representation of divine power which fills kings;⁹³ and c) from general references in Jewish literature to God's bird-like actions, eg., the wings of God give the religious man security (Ps. 17:8; 36:7; 57:1; 61:4; 91:4), the wings of the Shekinah protect the Gentile convert.⁹⁴ Under source c) some scholars cite Genesis 1:2, where the Spirit of God is pictured as "brooding" over primeval chaos to create the universe.⁹⁵ They say that just as the Spirit "brooded" there over the old creation, so here, at the new creation, on its "first day," so to speak, the Spirit again "broods" over the waters (Jordan) to establish the first-born of many brothers.⁹⁶

Other interpreters prefer to find the meaning of the dove symbolism in the Old Testament's explicit references to doves:⁹⁷

- a. People are pictured as fleeing like doves (Ps. 55:6 f.; Jer. 48:28; Hos. 7:11).
- b. The People of God in general and individual believers in particular are symbolized by the dove (Ps. 74:19; Hos. 11:11; Is. 60:8; 4 Esdras 5:26).
- c. The Beloved of the King in Song of Solomon is called a dove (2:14; 5:2; 6:9; cf. 1:15; 4:1).

d. People's moaning is compared to doves' moaning (Is. 38:14; 59:11; Ezek. 7:16; Nah. 2:7).

e. A dove is sent out from the ark by Noah (Gen. 8:8-12).

This evidence is striking in that it not once compares the Spirit of God to a dove. (Strack-Billerbeck points out that the same is true of the older Jewish literature: "Jedenfalls gibt es in der Älteren Literature keine Stelle, in der die Taube klar u. deutlich ein Symbol des Heiligen Geistes ware.")⁹⁸ But it is also striking in that it connects the dove with people--God's people--in no less than four out of five situations. This connection, made often in rabbinical literature,⁹⁹ suggests that the dove is a symbol for Israel, the people of God. While we may legitimately see in the fifth point a peace symbol between God and man repeated at Jesus' baptism,¹⁰⁰ or perhaps a reminder of the world's baptism via the flood,¹⁰¹ the other four points convince us that the gift of the Spirit at Jesus' baptism prefigures the great manifestation of the Spirit at Pentecost, and thus appears as the goal and outcome of the Anointed One's work: the New Israel--the Christian Church.¹⁰² This interpretation fits exceptionally well into St. Matthew's New Exodus--New Covenant theology, discussed earlier.¹⁰³

The Voice Spoke

The heavenly voice's proclamation is to be understood in connection with the eschatological opening of the heavens.¹⁰⁴ Some have suggested that in this voice we have a phenomenon

known in rabbinic literature as the Bath-Qol (בַּת-קוֹל -- "daughter of the voice")¹⁰⁵ which was thought to be an echo of the divine voice originating in heaven. Such an echo was not needed as long as the prophets were alive, for they received their Word directly from the Holy Spirit; however, when the prophets disappeared from Israel's historical horizon, the Bath-Qol emerged to replace their word.¹⁰⁶ But since this Bath-Qol was regarded as inferior to the prophetic word, it seems highly unlikely that the evangelists have it in mind.¹⁰⁷ Matthew and the other Synoptists certainly do not describe an inferior substitute of divine communication. Instead, for them

. . . the baptism of Jesus marks the beginning of the Messianic era. The opening of the heavens shows that God has broken His long silence and entered into a direct communication with man, and this is contrary to the type of revelation implied in the Bath-Qol. We have the actual voice of God, coupled with the descent of His Spirit.¹⁰⁸

It will be our task to analyze the various parts of this divine communication¹⁰⁹ in the next several pages. The parts to be considered are a) the declaration of sonship, b) the title "Beloved," and c) the statement, "on whom my favor rests." $\text{Ὁυτος ἐστιν υἱός μου}$ are the first words spoken by the heavenly voice. They declare Jesus to be God's son. How is this to be understood? Reumann cites three possible ways in which it might be misunderstood:¹¹⁰

- a. People outside of the church might think of it in crass, physical terms. They might recall old pagan myths about the gods begetting offspring of human mothers.

- b. People within the church, who are accustomed to reciting the creeds, might think of Jesus' sonship in metaphysical terms like "substance," "essence," etc., which come from the categories of Greek philosophy.
- c. Moderns might interpret Jesus' sonship from the platitudinal notion that all men everywhere are by nature sons of God.

Reumann then suggests that the proper understanding of the New Testament usage, "son of God," lies in the Semitic background of the Old Testament and not in the Greek world.¹¹¹

In the Old Testament the title "son of God" is applied

- a. to the nation Israel (Ex. 4:22-23; Hos. 11:1);
- b. to the king as leader and symbol of the nation Israel, who was anointed as ruler and adopted as son through an ancient royal coronation formula ("You are my son; today I have begotten you."--2 Sam. 7:14; Ps. 89:19-20; 26-29; Ps. 2:7);
- c. to other figures as well--figures who had some special commission, status, or task (angels--Dan. 3:25,28; Job 1:6; 38:7).

As can readily be seen, the Semitic usage is entirely devoid of ideas of physical begetting; has nothing to do with "being" or "substance" or any other category of Greek metaphysics; rather, it always refers to a moral--an ethical--relationship. The term "son of God" is completely functional in that it refers to a nation's or an individual's functioning in a close, personal relationship with God:

. . . to be designated "son of God" means being chosen or elected to a task, thus participating in the work of God; it implies also obedience, the obedience of a son to a father. Such filial obedience unfortunately is what at times the nation of Israel and its kings, and at times even the angels lacked. Jesus did exhibit such obedience, and every time the term "son of God" is applied to him in the New Testament the idea is nearby that he was obedient.¹¹² To be son of God means to obey the Father's will.¹¹²

In this light, the most natural Old Testament cross-reference for St. Matthew's third person, public declaration would be Exodus 4:22-23, ^{לֵךְ אֲנִי לְךָ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל} (LXX-- υἱὸς πρωτότοκος μου Ισραηλ; Matt. 3:17-- ^{Οὗτος ἔστι υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός}).¹¹³

This reference, taken from the context of ancient Israel's exodus experience, has much in common with new Israel's exodus experience in Jesus' baptism:¹¹⁴

- a. Both mark the start of a divine activity.
- b. Both include a divine pronouncement, a word of grace, through the conferring of the name, "my son."
- c. In both the name "my son" is spoken not merely by words, but by a water event.
- d. Both show the movement into the wilderness following the dedication to sonship to be a period of testing (40 years--40 days).

The difference between the accounts lies in this: Jesus proved himself to be son through his obedience; ancient Israel did not.¹¹⁵

Other cross-references which have been associated with the heavenly voice's declaration of sonship are Is. 42:1 and Ps. 2:7. We have already mentioned the first of these passages in reference to the Spirit's descent,¹¹⁶ and have concluded that it sheds light on Matthew's depiction of Jesus as obedient Servant. If this passage is to be considered as the basis for the voice's declaration of sonship in St. Matthew, then we will have to overcome the difficulty that lies in the fact that the LXX has ^{παῖς}, whereas Matthew has ^{υἱός}; the LXX has ^{ἐκλεκτός}, whereas Matthew has ^{ἀγαπητός}; and the LXX has ^{προτεδεδέξατο}, whereas Matthew has ^{εὐδόκησεν}.¹¹⁷ This difficulty

can be overcome only by saying that Mathew uses an unknown or a private translation of Is. 42:1 (as in 12:18)¹¹⁸ and by assuming that υἱός comes in under the influence of Ps. 2:7.¹¹⁹ If such is the case, then, and only then, can the heavenly saying be interpreted as giving Jesus the role of מְשִׁיחַ דָּוִד via υἱός. But this does not mean an automatic transference to the suffering Servant of Is. 53, as Cullmann and others presuppose.¹²⁰

The second person address given by the voice in St. Mark and St. Luke is reminiscent of Ps. 2:7. In fact, the royal inaugural formula, "You are my son; today I have begotten you," is found verbatim in manuscript D of Luke's reading.¹²¹ This passage (along with Is. 11:1) via St. Mark may have affected the way that Matthew's υἱός was understood, and could have caused Messianic enthronement overtones to be superimposed upon Son-Servant motifs:

Dem Bild des Sohnes, wie es die Evangelien zeichnen und wie es in der Taufperikope sichtbar wird, eignet eine einmalige Verbindung von einzigartiger Hoheit und demütiger Gehorsam, die in einem einmaligen Verhältnis zu Gott begründet ist.¹²²

We now move from the declaration of sonship to the title "Beloved"-- ο ἠγαπητός. In line with the Matthean emphasis on Jesus as the new Israel, we might point out that God's old Israel was called υἱός ἠγαπητός in Jer. 28:20 (LXX). We might also quote Hos. 11:1, where God says He loved (ἠγάπησα) Israel, whom he called out of Egypt as son.¹²³ In addition, C.H. Turner's comments open another possibility:

The assertion may be safely hazarded that when

is used in connection with υἱός, θυγάτηρ, παῖς, or similar words, no Greek of pre-Christian times would have hesitated in understanding it of an "only child," or would for a moment have thought of any other meaning as possible.¹²⁴

Therefore, we can add Ex 4:22-23 to our list of ἀγαπητός references, since υἱός πρωτότοκός μου equals υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός. These examples plus St. Matthew's own substitution of ἀγαπητός for ἐκλεκτός (Matt. 12:18) make it certain that the Old Testament referent is Israel--God's unique son, who is called upon to serve.

Some interpreters also see in the term ἀγαπητός a clear reference to Abraham's only son Isaac in Gen. 22:2, 12 (LXX: τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν);¹²⁵ the sacrificial overtones in that context and the comment in 22:8, "God will provide the lamb for the burnt offering," may merit some consideration as a possible influence on the baptismal word, and may vaguely be a link to St. John's use of ἀγνός (1:29, 36).¹²⁶ The question, however, must be asked: How could this passage give rise to a tradition so firmly and widely established as that of the voice from heaven without leaving its mark more clearly in other places?¹²⁷

Of what significance is εὐφραδία εὐδοκία? It is an exclamation of paternal delight in the achievement of a goal, in the realization of a long-thwarted purpose.¹²⁸ It reminds us of the LXX's rendition of Is. 42:1-- προεβόησεν ἑαυτὸν ἡ ψυχὴ and Theodotion's ὃν εὐδοκίησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου. These phrases describe the character of God's Servant in marked contrast to anything that Israel of old ever was. What was

it that God wanted of His son? He wanted him to fully realize his $\tau\eta\upsilon$ quality. In Jesus, he did. Thus, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \omega\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\acute{o}\kappa\eta\tau\alpha$ defines singularity of the son who is called $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$. He is unique in his obedience; unique in full conformity with the Father. This implies a contrast with the other son, Israel, with whom God was not well pleased: "This is my son, the Beloved, on whom my favor rests; not that son, who though boasting of his relationship to me, refuses really to know or serve me."¹²⁹

In summary, all three components of the heavenly voice's message-- $\acute{\upsilon}\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, and $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\acute{o}\kappa\eta\tau\alpha$, when taken together, shape a concept which in the Old Testament applies to God's people Israel.¹³⁰ When in the baptismal accounts these components form the declaration about Jesus, they designate him as Israel reborn, regenerated--the new creation of God. When viewed through the eyes of Christian sacramental participation and anamnesis ($\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$), these component terms designate us as part of God's reborn Israel, and they challenge us to obedience.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

In the foregoing pages we have attempted to come to an understanding of Jesus' baptism by John, as it is recorded in the Gospel according to St. Matthew. We have sought to present the meaning of this pericope in terms of St. Matthew's text and in the light of his unique theological perspective. This method has forced us to slight some considerations which are legitimately a part of Christian baptismal theology (Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-16; John 3; Acts 2:38; 22:16; Rom. 6; 1 Cor. 12:12-13; 2 Cor. 1:22; Gal. 3:26-27; Eph. 1:12-13; 4:30; 5:25-26; Titus 3:5-6; and 1 Peter 3:18-22), but it has granted us a fresh point of view from which to interpret all these considerations. May God be glorified through our efforts!

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER II

¹Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland (ed.), Novum Testamentum Graece (25th edition; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963), p. 6.

²Infra, p. 5.

³Krister Stendahl, "Matthew," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, edited by Matthew Black and H.H. Rowley (London: Thomas Nelson Ltd., 1964), p. 773.

⁴F. Blass and A. DeBrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 133-134. Hereafter this work will be referred to as BD.

⁵George Adam Smith, Atlas of the Historical Geography of the Holy Land (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915), p. 142.

⁶BD, p. 169.

⁷Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and revised by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 893. Hereafter this work will be referred to as BAG.

⁸Notes of Regular Class Session, March 21, 1968, The Techniques of Biblical Exegesis (E-101), St. Louis, Missouri (in my personal files).

⁹BAG, p. 125.

¹⁰BD, p. 250.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 183-184.

¹²BAG, p. 706.

¹³James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1952), p. 534; emphasis mine.

¹⁴Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, Greco-Roman Branch, 1898), I, 186-187; emphasis mine.

¹⁵C.D. Buck, A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949), p. 456.

¹⁶BAG, pp. 195, 677.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 125.

¹⁸The Ebionite Gospel has a similar commentary; see Kurt Aland (ed.), Synopsis Quattor Evangeliorum (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964), pp. 26-27.

¹⁹BAG, p. 70.

²⁰Aland, pp. 26-27.

²¹Nigel Turner, Grammatical Insights Into the New Testament (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1965), p. 29.

²²BAG, p. 319.

²³Class Notes, March 21, 1968; see also Infra, p. 152.

²⁴BAG, p.6.

CHAPTER III

¹Vincent Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1935), p. 169.

²Ibid., p. 175.

³Paul Feine and Johannes Behm, Introduction to the New Testament, re-edited by Werner Georg Kümmler and translated by A.J. Mattill Jr. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 71. Hereafter this work will be referred to as FBK; see also John Reumann, Jesus in the Church's Gospels (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), p. 29.

⁴FBK, p. 69.

⁵Ibid., p. 67.

⁶Other views will be mentioned on this point, Infra, pp. 18-19.

⁷FBK, p. 84.

⁸Ibid., p. 81.

⁹Ibid., p. 86.

¹⁰Willoughby C. Allen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1957), pp. 27-29. Specifics on this statement will be treated later, Infra, pp. 37-41.

¹¹FBK, p. 105.

¹²Ibid., p. 106.

¹³Ibid., p. 100.

¹⁴In St. Matthew's account the opening heavens and the speaking voice are publicly perceivable, while the Spirit's manifestation as a dove is restricted to Jesus alone (Καὶ ἔδωκε πνεῦμα ὄψω. . .).

¹⁵Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, translated from the German by Geoffrey Buswell (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), p. 21; cf. also pp. 22-26.

¹⁶FBK, p. 175.

¹⁷The inner margin of Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland (ed.), Novum Testamentum Graece (25th edition; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963), p. 6, makes this point through its reference to Eusebian canon 10, pericope 13.

¹⁸Ibid. This point is made through a reference to Eusebian canon 1, pericope 14.

CHAPTER IV

¹Vincent Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1935), p. 152.

²E. Basil Redlich, Form Criticism (London: Duckworth, 1939), p. 180.

³Ibid., p. 181.

⁴Ibid., p. 195.

⁵Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, translated from the German by John Marsch (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963), p. 248.

⁶Ibid., p. 249.

⁷Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 26-27. For similar remarks see also History, p. 247.

⁸Bultmann, History, p. 252.

⁹Ibid., p. 247.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 248.

¹¹Edmund Schlink, "Die Lehre von der Taufe," Leitourgia, edited by Karl Ferdinand Müller and Walter Blankenburg (Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1970), V, 659-660. For similar thoughts check Reginald H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), pp. 116-118. He cites genuine sayings of Jesus regarding John, which indicate what he felt about his own baptism.

¹²Supra, p. 3, 10.

¹³No case can be made for the mode of baptism from either ἵπτο or its classical Greek counterpart ἐκ.

¹⁴Supra, p. 14, note 14.

¹⁵Supra, pp. 12-13.

CHAPTER V

¹John Reumann, Jesus in the Church's Gospels (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), p. 317.

²Adolf Schlatter, Der Evangelist Matthäus (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1963), p. 53.

³B.W. Bacon, "New and Old in Jesus' Relation to John," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVIII (1929), 40.

⁴Edmund Schlink, "Die Lehre von der Taufe," Leitourgia, edited by Karl Ferdinand Müller and Walter Blankenburg (Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1970), V, 650-651. For a catalogue of such passages see Carl E. Zahrte, "The Significance of the Baptism of Jesus" (unpublished Master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1961), p. 32.

⁵All English Biblical quotations outside of our text are from the Revised Standard Version.

⁶Schlink, p. 651.

⁷Ibid., p. 652.

⁸Zahrte, p. 33.

⁹George W. Nickelsburg, "The Theological Background of the Marcan Account of the Baptism and Temptation of Jesus"

(unpublished Master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1967), p. 48.

¹⁰C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), p. 31.

¹¹H. H. Rowley, "Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John," Hebrew Union College Annual, XV (1940), 313.

¹²Schlink, p. 654.

¹³Nickelsburg, p. 51.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 48.

¹⁵For a thorough description of Qumran's baptismal practices see Walter R. Wifall, "Baptism in the Intertestamental Period with Special Emphasis on the Qumran Community" (unpublished Master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1961).

¹⁶G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962), pp. 11-13.

¹⁷G. Ernest Wright and Reginald Fuller, The Book of the Acts of God (Garden City: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1960), p. 242.

¹⁸Schlink, p. 653.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰J. Gnilka, "Der Täufer Johannes und der Ursprung der christlichen Taufe," Bibel und Leben, IV (1963), 39.

²¹J. A. T. Robinson, "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community," Harvard Theological Review, L (July 1957), 176.

²²Wright and Fuller, p. 242.

²³Robinson, p. 176.

²⁴Reumann, p. 317.

²⁵Gnilka, p. 39.

²⁶Ibid., p. 41.

²⁷Ibid., p. 42.

²⁸Schlink, p. 657.

²⁹Geoffrey W. H. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit (2nd edition, London: S.P.C.K., 1967), p. 24 f.

³⁰Schlink, p. 657.

³¹R. V. Sellers, "Our Lord's Baptism and Ours," Church Quarterly Review, CLXI (1960), 402.

³²Nickelsburg, p. 45.

³³Ibid., p. 37.

³⁴Some scholars think that John actually looked for the coming of two Messiahs like the Qumran community did. One Messiah would be the "mightier one" who would baptize with fire (Matt. 3:11). He would correspond to Qumran's Messiah of David, the military figure. The other Messiah would baptize with the Spirit. He would correspond to Qumran's Messiah of Aaron, the priestly figure. Christian tradition identified both Messianic figures with Jesus, thus combining them into one. (Wright and Fuller, p. 242.) This view is perhaps more likely than Rudolf Bultmann's, which asserts that John announced only the fire baptism of judgment and not the Spirit baptism--the latter being a construction of the early church. (Gnilka, p. 47.)

³⁵Gnilka, p. 47.

³⁶Ibid. See also Barrett, p. 28.

³⁷Paul G. Bretscher, "Matthew's Concept of the Son of God in the Context of Jesus' Baptism and First Temptation" (unpublished Master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1964), pp. 144-145.

³⁸Reumann, p. 318.

³⁹M. Leimer, "Die Taufe Johannis des Täuferers in ihrem Verhältniss zu Christi Taufe," Concordia Theological Monthly, XIV (1943), 198.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹Ibid., pp. 202-203.

⁴²Zahrte, p. 46.

⁴³J. C. Fenton, The Gospel of Saint Matthew, Vol. I of The Pelican Gospel Commentaries, edited by D. E. Nineham (4 vols.; Baltimore: Pelican Books, 1963), p. 54.

⁴⁴Wolfgang Trilling, "Die Täufertradition by Mattäus," Biblische Zeitschrift, III (1959), 286.

⁴⁵Schlink, p. 656.

⁴⁶Gnilka, p. 46.

⁴⁷T. Barnes, "The Baptism of John: Its Place in New Testament Criticism," The Expositor, Fifth series, VI (1897), 139.

⁴⁸Reumann, p. 318.

⁴⁹Supra, p.15.

⁵⁰J. K. Howard, "The Baptism of Jesus and its Present Significance," Evangelical Quarterly, XXXIX (1967), 132.

⁵¹F. E. Lownds, "The Baptism of our Lord," Expository Times, LXII (June 1951), 274.

⁵²J. C. O'Neill, "The Silence of Jesus," New Testament Studies, XV (1968-69), 163. For more information on Jesus' Messianic consciousness see Robert Mackintosh, "The Dawn of the Messianic Consciousness," Expository Times, XVI (1905), 157-158, 211-215, 267-270.

⁵³Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1958), p. 179.

⁵⁴Herbert J. A. Bouman, "The Baptism of Christ with Special Reference to the Gift of the Spirit," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXVIII (January 1957), 4-5. See also J. T. Mueller, "Zur Bedeutung der Taufe Jesu," Concordia Theological Monthly, VI (February 1935), 97-98, and John W. Voorhis, "The Baptism of Jesus and His Sinlessness," Evangelical Quarterly, VII (1935), 40-41.

⁵⁵F. D. Coggan, "Note on Saint Matthew 3:15: Ἄφης ἄρτι οὕτω ἵδὼν πρεπιον ἐπεὶ ἡμῶν πληρῶτα πλου δικαιοσύνην," Expository Times, LX (1948-49), 258.

⁵⁶Howard, "Baptism," p. 133.

⁵⁷Oscar Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, translated from the German by J. K. S. Reid (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961), p. 18.

⁵⁸Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), p. 18.

⁵⁹Cullmann, Baptism, p. 19. Strongly against the entire emphasis on this matter is Albrecht Oepke, "βαπτω, βαπτίζω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel and translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), I, 538-539.

⁶⁰Frank W. Beare, The Earliest Records of Jesus (New York: Abingdon Press, 1964), pp. 40-41. For similar thoughts see also Fenton, p. 60, and Reumann, p. 319.

⁶¹O'Neill, p. 163, points out that this embarrassment was real enough to cause two apocryphal Gospels, the Gospel of the Ebionites and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, to attempt an explanation as well.

⁶²D., R. Griffiths, "St. Matthew 3:15: *Ἄφες ἄρα· οὕτω γὰρ πρέπειν ἐσθλὴν ἡμῶν πρῶτον ἀκαλοῦνται*," Expository Times, LXII (1950-51), 156.

⁶³Walter Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, Vol. I of Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1968), p. 96, n. 2.

⁶⁴Supra, p. 33.

⁶⁵Bretscher, "Matthew's Concept," p. 79.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 144.

⁶⁷Ibid., pp. 79-80.

⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 141-142.

⁶⁹Fenton, p. 58, gives specific verses: 2:15--"Out of Egypt have I called my son," (Hos. 11:1); also 2:20--"Those who sought the child's life are dead," (Ex. 4:19).

⁷⁰Griffiths, p. 156.

⁷¹Barrett, p. 35, n. 1.

⁷²Reumann, p. 238.

⁷³Schlatter, p. 89.

⁷⁴John's work is characterized as being part of the way of righteousness (Matt. 21:32); his baptism is described as being "from heaven," (Matt. 11:27-33).

⁷⁵Nickelsburg, pp. 10-20, lists Old Testament references that speak of the new exodus and new wilderness experiences: Hos. 2:14f.; Micah 7:15; Jer. 16:14f.; 23:7; Ezek. 20:34-38; Is. 4:5; 10:24-26; 11:15ff.; 40:13; 43:16-21; 60:1ff., 19f. He includes the following under new covenant references: Hos. 2:16-23; Ezek. 26:25, 33; Jer. 31:31-34; 32:38-40; 38:20; II Is. 40:1, 9, 11; 43:6 20f.; 45:18-25; 50:1; 54:1-9f.; 55:3; 56:3ff.; 59:21; 61:8; 66:23; Mal. 3:1. On pages 70-72 he gives II Isaiah Servant passages related to the exodus motif (44:1f.; 49:10; 42:6; 49:8) and passages dealing with the Messiah-exodus motif (Is. 11:1; Hos. 2:14-23; Ezek. 34:23ff.; 37:24f.).

⁷⁶We have mentioned before that there is no profit in speculating about the modes of baptism, Supra, p. 58, n. 13. However, in our discussion of Jewish proselyte baptism we did cite a common opinion on this matter, Supra, p. 25.

⁷⁷Howard, "Baptism," p. 134.

⁷⁸Morna Dorothy Hooker, Jesus and the Servant; The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament (London: S.P.C.K., 1959), p. 68.

⁷⁹Howard, "Baptism," p. 135.

⁸⁰Grundmann, Matthäus, p. 98.

⁸¹Hooker, p. 68.

⁸²Schlink, p. 659, and Reumann, p. 329. To see how this thought is explained in terms of Messianic consciousness see Melancthon Williams Jacobus, "Die Taufe Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Matthäus 3:14-15," Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, XL (1929), 52-23.

⁸³Howard, "Baptism," p. 136, and Lampe, p. 35.

⁸⁴Lampe, p. 34.

⁸⁵Eric J. Lott, "Anointing and Ministry in the New Testament," Indian Journal of Theology, XVI (1967), 141f.

⁸⁶Bouman, p. 9; see also Rudolf Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, translated from the German by John Marsh (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963), p. 250.

⁸⁷This is the view of Joachim Jeremias, "Παύς," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel and translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967), V, 701-702.

⁸⁸Reumann, pp. 284-285.

⁸⁹Ibid.

⁹⁰Robert Siebenbeck, "The Baptism of Jesus Dove as Epiphany," Worship, XXXV (January 1961), 98.

⁹¹Nickelsburg, p. 78.

⁹²Cited as Gressmann's view in Bultmann, History, p. 250.

⁹³Ibid. This is Bultmann's view; it causes him to see Jesus' baptism as an instalation to Messiahship.

⁹⁴Nickelsburg, pp. 79-80.

⁹⁵Barrett, p. 38 and Richardson, p. 181. Siebenbeck, p. 101 and Nickelsburg, pp. 83-84 tie this passage up with Deut. 32:11, where God is pictured as an eagle, giving birth to Israel.

⁹⁶Richardson, Ibid.

⁹⁷Especially Siebenbeck, pp. 100-101, and Nickelsburg, pp. 81-82.

⁹⁸Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922), I, 125.

⁹⁹Ibid., I, 123-124.

¹⁰⁰Siebenbeck, p. 99.

¹⁰¹Richardson, p. 181.

¹⁰²Nickelsburg, pp. 82-83.

¹⁰³Supra, pp. 40-41.

¹⁰⁴Supra, pp. 42-43.

¹⁰⁵Bacon, "New and Old," pp. 59-60; Richardson, pp. 179-180; C. E. B. Cranfield, "The Baptism of our Lord--A Study of Mark 1:9-11," Scottish Journal of Theology, VIII (1955), 58; and Krister Stendahl, "Matthew," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley (London: Thomas Nelson Ltd., 1964), p. 773.

¹⁰⁶Nickelsburg, p. 61.

¹⁰⁷Ferdinand Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel; ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), p. 338; G. H. P. Thompson, "Called, Proved, Obedient: A Study in the Baptism and Temptation Narratives of Matthew and Luke," Journal of Theological Studies, XI (1960), 9; Walter Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Markus, Vol. II of Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968), p. 32; also Nickelsburg, p. 62.

¹⁰⁸Nickelsburg, Ibid.; Thompson, Ibid. emphasizes that St. Luke and St. Matthew in particular stress the importance of the heavenly voice. He feels that these evangelists had the book of Deuteronomy in mind--a book that lays special emphasis on the voice of Yahweh speaking to His people, and on the need of Israel to listen to it.

¹⁰⁹There are seven basic texts for this communication: Mark 1:11--repeated in Luke 3:22; Matt. 3:12--paralleled in 17:5; Mark 9:7--paralleled in Luke 9:35 (except ἁγίου is replaced with ἐκλεκτός); and 2 Peter 1:17 (which is very similar to the Matthean citations in form).

¹¹⁰Reumann, pp. 286-287.

¹¹¹Ibid., pp. 288-289.

¹¹²Ibid., p. 290.

¹¹³Paul G. Bretscher, "Exodus 4:22-23 and the Voice from Heaven," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVII (September 1968), 305-306. Bretscher, "Matthew's Concept," pp. 24-27, links πρωτόκοσ with ἁγίου.

¹¹⁴Bretscher, "Matthew's Concept," pp. 12-17.

¹¹⁵Thompson, p. 10; Bretscher, Ibid., p. 134.

¹¹⁶Supra, pp. 44-45.

¹¹⁷Bretscher, "Exodus 4:22-23," p. 303. Of course, St. Mark and St. Luke have the same three words different as well. Perhaps all three Synoptists used a Greek translation of Is. 42:1 that is no longer extant. (Hooker, p. 70.)

¹¹⁸Hooker, Ibid. Bretscher, "Matthew's Concept," pp. 32-40.

¹¹⁹Stendahl, p. 773; Cullmann, Baptism, p. 17, tries to see an earlier πυλς behind Matthew's υἱός. This is highly speculative and would cause problems with the temptation account, which presupposes a declaration of sonship--not servanthood. See also Howard, "Baptism," p. 135, and Cranfield, p. 61. Marshall I. Howard, "Son of God or Servant of Yahweh?--a Reconsideration of Mark 1:11," New Testament Studies, XV (1968-69), 335, feels that υἱός is to be regarded as a Messianic title in the Jewish-Palestinian church.

¹²⁰Cullmann, Baptism, pp. 17-21, Christology, p. 66; Jeremias, pp. 701-702; Lampe, p. 38; and J. M. Ross, "Saint Matthew 3:15," Expository Times, LXI (October 1949), 31, support the view of suffering Servant. Against this view are Hahn, pp. 281-282; Hooker, pp. 67-73; Heinz Eduard Tödt, Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1959), pp. 143-161; Hans Conzelmann, An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament, translated from the German by John Bowden (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969), p. 85; Reginald H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament

Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 117; and E. L. Wenger, "The Words at Jesus' Baptism," Indian Journal of Theology, XV (1966), 58-59.

121 Stendahl, p. 773. Primary Sources

122 Grundmann, Markus, p. 34.

Aland, Kurt (ed.). Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964.

123 Nickelsburg, pp. 75-77.

124 C. H. Turner, "Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ," The Journal of Theological Studies, XXVII (January 1926), 117. Hooker, p. 70, agrees.

125 Richardson, p. 180; also mentioned in Bretscher, "Exodus 4:22-23," p. 304.

126 Bretscher, Ibid.

127 Ibid., p. 305.

128 Bretscher, "Matthew's Concept," p. 51; B. W. Bacon, "On the Aorist ἐξεδόξα in Mark 1:11 and Parallels," Journal of Biblical Literature, XVI (1897), 137-138, makes this point clear by translating the phrase by "whom I have chosen."

129 Bretscher, Ibid., pp. 52-53.

130 Hooker, pp. 72-73.

Nestle, Erwin and Kurt Aland, (ed.). Novum Testamentum Graece, 25th edition. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.

Rabika, Alfred (ed.). Septuaginta, 7th edition, 2 Vols. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1962.

Schmoller, Alfred. Handbuch der Griechischen Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.

Turner, Nigel. Grammatical Insights into the New Testament. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963.

B. Secondary Sources

Allen, Willoughby C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

- Aland, Kurt (ed.). Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and revised by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Blass, F. and A. DeBrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Buck, C. D. A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949.
- Grenfell, Bernard P. and Arthur S. Hunt. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, Graeco-Roman Branch, 1898.
- Moulton, James Hope and George Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1952.
- Nestle, Erwin and Kurt Aland, (ed.). Novum Testamentum Graece, 25th edition. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.
- Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.). Septuaginta, 7th edition, 2 Vols. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1962.
- Schmoller, Alfred. Handkonkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.
- Turner, Nigel. Grammatical Insights into the New Testament. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1965.

B. Secondary Sources

- Allen, Willoughby C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1957.

- Bacon, B. W. "New and Old in Jesus' Relation to John," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVIII (1929), 40-81.
- "On the Aorist *εὐδοκῆται* in Mark 1:11 and Parallels," Journal of Biblical Literature, XVI (1897), 136-139.
- Barnes, T. "The Baptism of John: Its Place in New Testament Criticism," The Expositor, Fifth series, VI (1897), 139-153.
- Barrett, C. K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London: S.P.C.K., 1954.
- Beare, Frank W. The Earliest Records of Jesus. New York: Abingdon Press, 1964.
- Bouman, Herbert J. A. "The Baptism of Christ with Special Reference to the Gift of the Spirit," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXVIII (January 1957), 1-14.
- Bretscher, Paul G. "Exodus 4:22-23 and the Voice from Heaven," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVII (September 1969), 301-311.
- "Matthew's Concept of the Son of God in the Context of Jesus' Baptism and First Temptation," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1969.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey W. "The Baptism of Jesus," Christianity Today, IX (March 12, 1965), 599-600.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. The History of the Synoptic Tradition, translated from the German by John Marsh. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963.
- Theology of the New Testament. Vol. I. Translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- Caird, C. B. The Apostolic Age. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1955.
- Coggan, F. D. "Note on Saint Matthew 3:15: *Ἄφες ἄρα· οὕτω γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πάντων δικαιωμάτων*," Expository Times, LX (1948-49), 258.
- Conzelmann, Hans. An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament. Translated from the German by John Bowden. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. "The Baptism of our Lord--A Study of Mark 1:9-11," Scottish Journal of Theology, VIII (1955), 53-63.

- Cullmann, Oscar. Baptism in the New Testament. Translated from the German by J. S. K. Reid. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961.
- The Christology of the New Testament. Translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.
- Feine, Paul and Johannes Behm. Introduction to the New Testament. Re-edited by Werner Georg Kümmel and translated from the German by A. J. Mattill Jr. New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- Fenton, J. C. The Gospel of Saint Matthew. Vol. I of the Pelican Gospel Commentaries, edited by D. E. Nineham. Baltimore: Pelican Books, 1963.
- Fuller Reginald H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.
- Gnilka, J. "Der Täufer Johannes und der Ursprung der christlichen Taufe," Bibel und Leben, IV (1963), 39-49.
- Good News for Modern Man. New York: The American Bible Society, 1966.
- Griffiths, D. R. "St. Matthew 3:15: ἄφες ἄρα· οὕτω γὰρ πρέπει εἶναι ἡμῶν πληρωθῆναι πάντα δικαιούμεν," Expository Times, LXII (1950-51), 155-157.
- Grundmann, Walter. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Vol. I of Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968.
- Das Evangelium nach Markus. Vol. II of Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968.
- Hahn, Ferdinand. Christologische Hoheitstitel; ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
- Hooker, Morna Dorothy. Jesus and the Servant; The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament. London: S.P.C.K., 1959.
- Howard, J. K. "The Baptism of Jesus and its Present Significance," Evangelical Quarterly, XXXIX (1967), 131-138.
- Jacobus, Melancthon Williams, "Die Taufe Jesu. Eine Untersuchung zu Matth. 3:14-15," Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, XL (1929), 44-53.

- Jeremias, Joachim. "Ταΐς," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. V. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967. Pp. 700-717.
- Johnson, S. Lewis Jr. "The Baptism of Christ," Bibliotheca Sacra, CXXIII (1966), 220-229.
- Lampe, Geoffrey W. H. The Seal of the Spirit. Second edition. London: S.P.C.K., 1967.
- Leimer, M. "Die Taufe Johannis des Täuflers in ihrem Verhältniss zu Christi Taufe," Concordia Theological Monthly, XIV (1943), 197-206.
- Lott, Eric J. "Anointing and Ministry in the New Testament," Indian Journal of Theology, XVI (1967), 137-152.
- Lownds, F. E. "The Baptism of our Lord," Expository Times, LXII (June 1951), 274-275.
- Mackintosh, Robert. "The Dawn of the Messianic Consciousness," Expository Times, XVI (1905), 157-158; 211-215; 267-270.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "Son of God or Servant of Yahweh?--A Reconsideration of Mark 1:11," New Testament Studies, XV (1968-69), 326-336.
- Moule, C. F. D. The Birth of the New Testament. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962.
- Mueller, J. T. "Zur Bedeutung der Taufe Jesu," Concordia Theological Monthly, VI (February 1935), 93-102.
- The New Testament in Four Versions. Washington: Christianity Today Edition, 1965.
- Nickelsburg, George W. "The Theological Background of the Marcan Account of the Baptism and Temptation of Jesus." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1967.
- Oepke, Albrecht. "βαπτω, βαπτίζω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. I. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964. Pp. 538-539.
- O'Neill, J. C. "The Silence of Jesus," New Testament Studies, XV (1968-69), 153-167.
- Redlich, E. Basil. Form Criticism. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1939.

- Reumann, John. Jesus in the Church's Gospels. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
- Richardson, Alan. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1958.
- Robinson, John A. T. "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community," Harvard Theological Review, L (July 1957), 175-192.
- Ross, J. M. "Saint Matthew 3:15," Expository Times, LXI (October, 1949), 30-31.
- Rowley, H. H. "Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John," Hebrew Union College Annual, XV (1940), 313-334.
- Saint Louis, Missouri. Notes of Regular Class Session of the Course, "The Techniques of Biblical Exegesis" (E-101), March 21, 1968.
- Schlatter, Adolf. Der Evangelist Matthäus. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1963.
- Schlink, Edmund. "Die Lehre von der Taufe," Leiturgia. V. Edited by Karl Ferdinand Müller and Walter Blankenburg. Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1970. Pp. 648-661.
- Sellers, R. V. "Our Lord's Baptism and Ours," Church Quarterly Review, CLXI (1960), 402-409.
- Siebenbeck, Robert. "The Baptism of Jesus Dove as Epiphany," Worship, XXXV (January 1961), 97-102.
- Smith, George Adam. Atlas of the Historical Geography of the Holy Land. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915.
- Stagg, Frank. "The Christology of Matthew," Review and Expositor, LIX (October 1962), 457-468.
- Stendahl, Krister. "Matthew," Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson Ltd., 1964.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. Five vols. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922-28.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1935.
- Thompson, G. H. P. "Called, Proved, Obedient: A Study in the Baptism and Temptation Narratives of Matthew and Luke," Journal of Theological Studies, XI (1960), 1-12.

- Tödt, Heinz Eduard. Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1959.
- Trilling, Wolfgang. "Die Täufertradition bei Matthäus," Biblische Zeitschrift, III (1959), 271-289.
- Turner, C. H. "Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ," The Journal of Theological Studies, XXVII (January 1926), 113-129.
- Vawter, Bruce. The Four Gospel: An Introduction. Vol. I. New York: Image Books, 1969.
- Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962.
- Voorhis, John W. "The Baptism of Jesus and His Sinlessness," Evangelical Quarterly, VII (1935), 39-53.
- Wenger, E. L. "The Words at Jesus' Baptism," Indian Journal of Theology, XV (1966), 57-59.
- Wifall, Walter R. "Baptism in the Intertestamental Period with Special Emphasis on the Qumran Community." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1961.
- Wright, G. Ernest and Reginald H. Fuller. The Book of the Acts of God. Garden City: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1960.
- Zahrte, Carl E. "The Significance of the Baptism of Jesus." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1961.