

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

hopelessness of any solution being reached on the basis of materialistic science. 'So far from true is it that science can take the place of religion as the sovereign guide of life, that we have to safeguard ourselves through religion from the perils of our scientific achievements, lest they become the instruments of man's doom instead of the means of his emancipation and enrichment. The gift of *Power*—who shall teach us to use it ethically? The gift of *Wealth*—who shall teach us to make it humanely, to distribute it justly, to use it nobly? The gift of *World-wide intercourse*—who shall teach us how to attain a Great Society that is rich in human benefit, and not a mere dangerous welter of suspicious and contending groups and races?

The gift of *controlling the Life-force*—who shall spiritualize for us this perilous power, so as to conserve and develop the best potencies of the race, and help us to realize the higher evolution of the "man that is to be"? Science is the switchboard of life, and shows us how to direct and control its currents, but she cannot ensure that the energies thus released shall be wisely and sanely used. Religion alone can do that. And, therefore, Man needs religion more to-day than ever, just because the New Knowledge has increased man's power for mischief as well as good. Only by the inspirations and restraints of religion can science hope to make the Future of man the climax and glory of his troubled Past.'

The Baptism of Jesus.

BY PROFESSOR F. C. BURKITT, F.B.A., D.D., CAMBRIDGE.

IN Lk 3²², where the Voice from heaven at the Baptism of Jesus is reported, there is an important 'various reading.' Instead of 'Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased,' Codex Bezae and most of the Old Latin MSS. have the words of Ps 2⁷, 'Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee,' and it was in this form that the verse seems to have been known to Justin Martyr (*Trypho*, § 88 end). Modern scholars, notably Harnack, have been inclined to see in this Psalm-quotation the genuine text of S. Luke's Gospel, and to suggest that the Evangelist derived it from the mysterious and elusive source Q, about which if we do know anything at all it is that it was Luke's source for the substance of the Baptist's preaching and for the story of the Temptation of Jesus, which come respectively just before and just after the story of the Baptism.

The object of the following paper is, among other things, to defend the ordinary text, or rather to show that it is a mere question of the way S. Luke edited his sources. But to explain how I regard the text it will be convenient to approach the textual question by a very roundabout route. Let us consider the Baptism of Jesus in itself and as an element of early Christian tradition.

We begin with Mark, undoubtedly the earliest written 'Gospel,' by which I mean a biographical sketch of the career of Jesus as distinct from good news about a way to escape 'the wrath to come.' We read first that John appeared in accordance with ancient prophecy, and every one went out to him to be baptized in the river Jordan, confessing their sins. Among the rest came Jesus: He was baptized by John, and as He, Jesus, came up from the water He saw the heavens split open and the Spirit coming down into Him like a dove, and there was a Voice from heaven, 'Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.' That Spirit then forthwith sends Jesus into the wilds, where He stays for forty days tempted by Satan. That, according to Mark, was the preparation of Jesus for His career.

We are so familiar with this story that it has ceased to sound strange to our ears. But it must have seemed rather disconcerting to some early Christians. Not, of course, that the heavens should split open, or that the Spirit should come down in a visible form, or that angels should minister to the Son of God: all that was what might be expected. What was so disconcerting was that Jesus should be baptized, that He should,

so to speak, receive something which looked like absolution or ordination from John the Baptist. Accordingly we find that in the second edition of Mark, *i.e.* the document that we call the 'Gospel according to Matthew,' the Baptism of Jesus is explained away. John here is represented as knowing very well that he ought rather to be baptized by Jesus, but Jesus explains that it is all right, that He must 'fulfil all righteousness,' a vague phrase that apparently means 'all that a pious Jew ought to do.' Further, if 'he saw' in Mk 1¹⁰ and Mt 3¹⁶ refers in each case to the last-named nominative singular, *i.e.* if we interpret the words naturally, the opening heavens and the dove are in Mark seen only by Jesus, in Matthew by John. What had been a private experience has become a public event.

Passing by for a moment the account in Luke, let us turn to the Fourth Gospel. It may be said in general that in all ages careful writers introduce at least their principal characters to their readers as they appear, or at the earliest convenient moment afterwards. But the way that 'Jesus' is mentioned in Jn 1²⁹ is most peculiar. John the Baptist is formally introduced to us in 1⁶, 'Jesus Christ' is so named at the end of the Prologue (v.¹⁷), where the Evangelist is, as it were, interpreting the whole Gospel. Even here the 'witness' of John—to whom, as I say, we have been introduced—precedes the mention of Jesus Christ, and indeed it is not certain that the whole passage from $\delta\ \delta\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\omega\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ to $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\eta\gamma\eta\gamma\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$ (vv.^{15b-18}) is not intended to be John's own utterance. In any case up to v.²⁹ the Individual called later on (v.⁴⁵) 'Jesus, Joseph's son from Nazareth,' has not been really introduced to the readers of the Gospel. He just appears, as it were, casually; we do not know who it is, but then John, an approved personage, who has been already introduced to us as a true witness, tells us it is the Lamb of God. And why? John knows that too, for he tells us that on this Jesus he, John, had seen the Spirit coming down and abiding: this was a sign of which he had been miraculously warned. So John testifies to us that Jesus is the Chosen of God, $\delta\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (v.³²⁻³⁴).¹ In other words, John does not baptize Jesus—nothing is said in the Fourth Gospel to imply this—but he is the Witness of the Incarnation.

I have not yet used the long and ugly word 'Adoptionism,' but here I cannot do without it. It is used in a general way to denote those forms of Christology which regard Jesus as having become

¹ This is no doubt the true reading (so $\kappa^* e$ Syr. SC), not $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ (as most documents).

the Son of God by adoption at some definite point of time, not as being Son of God 'naturally.' In other words, the opposite of Adoptionism is the Catholic phrase 'begotten of the Father.' Adoptionism is not, properly speaking, an early Christian heresy, but rather an early and inadequate Christian theory about Jesus Christ, which was abandoned because it was felt to be inadequate. As used by modern writers on the Gospels there is sometimes, I think, a confusion of thought in the use of the word, or its equivalents. I am sure I have come across writers who have regarded Adoptionist doctrine as anti-Trinitarian. As for the Gospels, Mark is generally recognized as Adoptionist, Jesus becoming the Son of God at baptism; but in the Fourth Gospel it is usually supposed that as the Word of God is set before us as existing from before the beginning of time, therefore the Evangelist must have regarded Jesus as having been the Son of God from birth. I do not think the words of the Fourth Gospel really point in that direction. The Logos is eternal; but it became incarnate in time, at a certain time. Adoptionism is one answer to the question When? I venture to maintain that the Fourth Evangelist was in this sense an Adoptionist, and that he regarded the Incarnation of the Divine Logos in the man Jesus as taking place in John the Baptist's sight. That is the importance of John the Baptist in the Evangelist's eyes: not that John baptized Jesus, but that he was the accredited witness of the Incarnation. The event in the Jordan Valley was thus transformed. The Christians' Lord did not, according to the Fourth Evangelist, undergo the humiliating rite of baptism at John's hands: what had really happened was the actual Incarnation of the Divine in the man Jesus, who was henceforth the Incarnate Logos. And by a special providence John, the acknowledged Prophet of God, was there to witness it.

Before going on to S. Luke let me retell another story of the Incarnation, a story which puts the great event a few years earlier. In the curious Egyptian book called *Pistis Sophia*, Jesus is represented as teaching the disciples secret lore after the Resurrection. At a certain moment (at the end of the First Book) He bids Mary His mother explain what was prefigured by the Psalmist in 'Mercy and Truth are met together.' Mary answers: 'When thou wast little, before the Spirit had come upon thee, while thou wast with Joseph in a vineyard, the Spirit came from on high and came to me in my house, looking like thee, and I had not recognized it and I thought it was thou. And the

Spirit spoke to me, "Where is Jesus, my brother, that I may meet him?" And when it said this to me I was perplexed and thought it was a phantasm to tempt me. But I took it and bound it to the foot of the bed that was in my house till I could go out to you, to thee and Joseph, in the field, and I found you in the vineyard where Joseph was working. But it was so that when thou didst hear me tell the thing to Joseph, thou didst understand and rejoice, and say, "Where is he, that I may see him? For I expect him in this place." But when Joseph heard thee say these words he was troubled, and we went together and entered the house and found the Spirit bound upon the bed, and we looked at thee and saw thou wert like him. And he that was on the bed was unbound, he embraced thee and kissed thee, and thou didst kiss him, and ye became One.'

A naïve tale! But not more naïve than the descent of a πνεῦμα from the heavens and entering into a man.

The Apostles' Creed has a different Christology, as we all know. According to that document Jesus Christ is born—really born—of the Virgin Mary, who had conceived from Holy Spirit. It is not only because this idea is more familiar that it is more satisfactory to us: I venture to think it is also more 'rational,' if I may be allowed the word in this connexion. Nowadays it is the Virgin-birth itself, the physical wonder-tale, that is the stumbling-block. But it was not such a stumbling-block to the Christians of the first and second centuries. They had little idea of the uniformity of natural processes, and the example of Paul of Samosata, who practically rejected the Godhead of Jesus Christ while accepting the Virgin-birth, shows that this belief is not an infallible touchstone of orthodoxy. But I do think that the Christians came to feel the difficulty of believing that any human being could become Divine during his lifetime. Apotheosis might indeed take place after death, but there was always something monstrous in the idea that any mundane event, even the fact of becoming Emperor, could work such a miracle—at least to those who still believed, as Jews and Christians did, in the Living God.

Very well, then, Jesus was always Divine, from the very moment that He became human. But where shall we find this view in the New Testament? Here let me answer, with the editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* (ii. 200), to whose very important discussion of the subject I must refer my readers, 'there is no other document than

Luke which treats the divine sonship of Jesus as beginning with his birth of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary.'¹ I should add that Professors Foakes Jackson and Lake point out that by 'Luke' they mean both Acts and the Third Gospel. We have come round to Luke by a circuitous route, but we come with the conviction that Luke is the most anti-Adoptionist of the Evangelists, if not of all the New Testament writers. I think this fact, for it is a fact, should give us pause before we regard the true reading of Lk 3²² (whichever alternative we choose) as a corner-stone of Adoptionist doctrine. The third Evangelist was a most capable writer: he had S. Mark's work before him, and we may be sure that if he decided to alter this to suit his new Gospel, or to choose another account altogether, it will not be more Adoptionist, but less Adoptionist, than the narrative of Mark. If on critical grounds we prefer a form of the text which substitutes Ps 2⁷ for Mark's version of the Voice from heaven, we must regard it as in Luke's judgment a safer, more 'orthodox' form.

This, indeed, is what he has done elsewhere. He substituted 'Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit' (= Ps 31⁵) for the mysterious and disquieting 'Why hast thou forsaken me?' of Mk 15³⁴. And it is especially to be noted that Justin Martyr (*Trypho*, § 88), who is the earliest witness for treating the Voice at the Baptism as identical with Ps 2⁷, regards it as non-Adoptionist in meaning, and as a further proof that what happened during the earthly career of Jesus had been already foretold by David. The fact that 'to-day' had been so long ago uttered by David showed that this 'begetting' had long been foreordained.

With an 'orthodox' interpretation the famous Western reading becomes less alluring—I had almost said less alarming. The argument 'this is the less conventional, it must be genuine,' which I venture to think is at the back of much of its modern acceptance, loses its force. On the plain literary question I feel that the fact that the Old Syriac does not support Codex Bezae here is a strong argument for the ordinary text. But these things may be left to specialists: I am content here to indicate my reasons for thinking that either reading means the same thing.

But you will say, is it not likely that the Western reading, whether S. Luke adopted it or not, was the reading of Q? If the account of John the Baptist came from Q, and the account of the

¹ No doubt this view is also present in the Gospel of Matthew, a work which clearly expresses the difficulty felt in the fact of the Baptism of Jesus by John.

Temptation came from Q, and there is a notable various reading in between, differing from the account of the Baptism in Mark, must not the various reading also come from Q?

Of course, we must begin by remembering how uncertain and shadowy any detailed reconstruction of Q must be. But now we have shown that the various reading with Ps 2⁷ is quite innocuous, a mere literary equivalent for the common text which agrees with Mark, we must go on to consider the improbability that Q ever contained any account of the *Baptism* at all. Is it not likely that Q told the tale of the visit of Jesus to John more in the manner of the Fourth Gospel? The actual Baptism, as we see from the narrative in Matthew, was a stumbling-block. It is very lightly passed over in Luke's account: you have only to cut out βαπτισθέντος καί from Lk 3²¹ and the Baptism disappears. I cannot regard Lk 3^{21, 22} as anything else than St Luke's rewriting of Mk 1⁹⁻¹¹: I see no sign in those two verses of any extraneous source. And therefore I doubt very much whether Q ever included any account of our Lord's Baptism, though it undoubtedly did contain the story of His three Temptations.

That Jesus really was baptized by John I do not doubt: the critical result of what I have been here bringing forward is that we owe it to Mark, and to Mark alone, that this remarkable historical fact has been preserved in the Christian tradition. As I view the matter, it is one of the most signal proofs how near the sources used by Mark were to the actual events: you cannot imagine any Christian inventing the tale. And where did Mark get it from? No doubt from S. Peter, but I cannot accept as historical the picture in the Fourth Gospel which represents Peter as a disciple and confidant of John the Baptist. I cannot believe either that our story of the Baptism comes from John the Baptist. If it had come from that source, how can we believe that he would have later sent his doubting message to Jesus? Rather I would think that both the story of the Temptation and the story of the Baptism together with the Voice from Heaven come from our Lord Himself. We shall get little by detailed examination of the story, except that I feel it futile to regard it as 'parabolic.' I feel sure He regarded the Voice from heaven as real. We know the impression that John made upon Jesus—'no one born of woman greater than John'—and somehow contact with this inspired man together with the bath in Jordan, which at least signified a new start, revealed Jesus to Himself. He had gone down to the Valley with the rest,

with the crowd: as He comes out of the water He realizes He is different from the rest, Son of God in some other more individual sense than that in which He and His brothers and His friends had said *Abinu*, 'Our Father,' Sabbath after Sabbath. He must go away by Himself and think it out, and when He is alone the thought comes, 'If you are the Son of God—what then?'

It is a wonderful drama of personal development, and we see it all as from a distant height far-off and in a haze. But it does hang together, as we say; it is not inhuman, or self-contradictory. It is like biography and history, not myth. We may feel that we have inherited a more thoughtful Christology than that which is implied by the narrative of Mark, as it stands, for that which we call in our fellow-men 'genius' and 'personality' is innate and not acquired. Nevertheless I feel sure that but for the phase of nascent Christology which is called Adoptionism we should never have had transmitted to us the historical fact that our Lord was actually baptized by John.

DETAILS OF THE VARIOUS READINGS IN LK 3²².

- (i) σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.
 NB and Greek MSS. generally, Latin *vg* (also *e* and *fq*, see below), all Syriac texts (*hlat. Syr. C*), all Coptic and Armenian, etc.
- (ii) υἱὸς μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγεννηκάσθαι (= Ps 2⁷).
 D Lat. *a b c f f l r* Justin Clement Methodius Tyconius Juvencus Faustus (*ap. Aug.*, very expressly).

Justin Martyr twice refers to the Voice (*Trypho*, 88 and 103), each time equating it with Ps 2⁷. Clement of Alexandria does the same but adds ἀγαπητός to εἶ σὺ, perhaps by a lapse of memory. The most contentious point in the Latin evidence is the value of *e*, which has *tu es filius meus dilectus in te bene sensi*. This MS., which is the best surviving authority for the old African Latin text in Luke and John, has been occasionally revised and assimilated to later texts. Here *in te bene sensi* sounds like genuine 'African' (so *k* in Mt 12¹⁸): the Vulgate has *in te complacuit* (sic) *mihi*. On the other hand, *dilectus* (for *dilectissimus*) is un-African: *e* has it here and in Lk 9³⁵, but they are the only instances in the Gospels where an 'African' text has *dilectus*, and in 9³⁵ it is almost certainly a correction for *electus*.

It should be added that Cyprian (*Test.* ii. 8) quotes Ps 2⁷, followed by Lk 1^{11f.} to prove that the

eternal Son of God must be generated again according to the flesh. It is not likely therefore that he took an Adoptionist view of Lk 3²².

The external evidence is therefore very equally balanced. The fact that no Syriac text supports D may be explained away by the known tendency

of the Sinai Palimpsest and other early Syriac authorities to the harmonization of parallels. It is worth notice that there is no tangible evidence for Ps 2⁷ in Matthew or Mark, only in Luke, which might seem to suggest that D here preserves the true Lucan text.

Literature.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Two large books on the same subject have just been published, and the subject is the present condition and future prospects of the English Church. The first is the work of one hand only: *The English Church: A Retrospect and a Forecast*, by the Right Rev. J. E. C. Welldon, D.D., Dean of Durham. The second is from a number of hands: *The Future of the Church of England*, a volume of essays, by the Dean of Winchester, the Bishop of Manchester, Canon Cunningham, the Bishop of Liverpool, the Bishop of Plymouth, the Bishop of Winchester, and others. Dr. Welldon's book is published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton, and costs 12s. 6d. net. The other comes from Messrs. Longmans, is edited by that indefatigable anthologist, Sir James Marchant, and costs 9s. net.

Dr. Welldon's volume has the advantage of being the product of one mind, and that a mind of singular clearness and sanity. He discusses frankly the religious situation as he sees it, and gives us his judgment on the measures which he considers necessary to ameliorate it. He seems to occupy a somewhat detached position so far as any school or party is concerned. Each of the three sections into which the Anglican Church can be divided at present is reviewed in turn and its strength and weakness fairly estimated. Dr. Welldon would seem to be neither High nor Low, nor even Broad. Perhaps he would claim to belong to a fourth school, which a famous person once named the Deep Church. Dr. Welldon has a generous judgment to pass on the status and the religious value of Non-conformity. And on the question of re-union, which he discusses at length, his verdict is one that, if accepted on both sides, would almost certainly lead to an understanding. He admits that the demand from the Episcopal side for reordination of

Free Church ministers is an impossible demand, if for no other reason than that it will not be yielded. It has already, indeed, been definitely declined. Dr. Welldon, however, suggests that a better way would be to acknowledge the orders of the present ministers on the condition that all future ordination would be Episcopal. He is not, indeed, enthusiastic about re-union. His thought travels rather in the direction of a confederation of Churches. On other disputed points Dr. Welldon is moderate. He recognizes that the case for Apostolic Succession in the fullest sense is weak, but he contends that history (in the broad interpretation of it) lends strong support to the value of Episcopacy. The only point on which he is not moderate is his attitude to Romanism, of which there is a scathing exposure in one of the early chapters.

In the final chapter we have Dr. Welldon's forecast of the future of his Church. It is rather a statement of what he thinks ought to be if the Church is to hold and increase its influence on the national life. His points may be summarized in a few sentences. The age of authority is past, and the religious life of the future will be governed by the principle of the Reformation. The problem of to-morrow is the reconciliation of liberty and Christianity. If this is to be done successfully the Creed will require to be simplified. This in turn will lead to an approximation between the Church of England and other Churches. But this is not the only or most urgent demand. The Church must show herself worthy of confidence by her practical service and particularly by her concern for the social well-being of the people. Finally, the whole question of the place of women in the Church has to be decided. Dr. Welldon on this question is very 'advanced.' He contemplates, with approval, the ordination of women to the ministry on the same terms as men. On this note the book closes, and one leaves it with a warm