

WHAT DOES MATTHEW WANT TO TELL US ABOUT THE BAPTISM NARRATIVE

Eric Kun-chun WONG

The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Department of Cultural and Religious Studies
KKL 311, CUHK, Shatin
Hong Kong
e-mail: kunchunwong@cuhk.edu.hk
telephone: +852 9757 5476

Abstract

The present paper aims to analyze the plot of baptism narrative in Matthew. Generally, scholars discuss theological or ecclesiastical aspects of this narrative. They pay less attention to what the plot wants to tell. In fact, any narrative in a text has multiple layers, which are embedded in the text itself and can be observed. We shall try to illustrate that Jesus' character does have his own humanity in the narrative plot, including thoughts and experience. This humanity of Jesus is more hidden in Mark. Matthew redacts the text of Mark, so that this humanity of Jesus is made visible. If our discussion is accepted, Matthew does have a specific direction in crafting baptism narrative. Even though this paper limits itself to a discussion of this particular plot, we can still discover much detail of this Jesus' inner world.

Keywords: *Matthew; Baptism; narrative; Jesus' humanity; redaction*

1. Introduction

The present paper aims to analyze the plot of baptism narrative in Matthew (Mk 1:9-13 // Mt 3:13-17). We will discuss the main character Jesus in the plot. We note that this character may well differ from that of the 'Jesus of history' who actually lived in first quarter of the first century CE. However, 'Jesus of history' is not the direct concern in this paper. Based on the redaction by the author Matthew, we find that Matthew creates a new plot to the baptismal narrative: Jesus' character does have his own humanity in this narrative plot, including thoughts and experience, apart from his divinity.¹

¹ Although the humanity of a person belongs to modern psychology, we are not going to apply any specific psychological model or perspective in establishing our hypothesis. Examples of applying psychological models to understanding Jesus include, Fritz Kunkel, *The Creation Continues – a Psychological Interpretation of the Gospel of Matthew* (New York: C. Scribner's, 1946). He applies Jungian psychology to interpret Jesus' baptism and temptation in Matthew. See also John A. Sanford, 'Kunkel's Psychology and the Bible', in Sanford ed.: *Fritz Kunkel: Selected Writings -- edited with an Introduction and Commentary* (New York/ Ramsey: Paulist,

Generally, scholars discuss theological or ecclesiastical aspects of this baptism story. They pay less attention to what the plots want to tell.² In fact, any narrative of a text has multiple layers, which are embedded in the text itself and are awaits for discovery.

In comparison to the same scene in Mark, one can observe that Matthew makes some redaction changes and interpolations. Based on these observations, we discover that Matthew does have a specific direction in crafting baptism narrative. By using Baptism narrative, Matthew wants to tell us: going to Jordan is Jesus' own decision; Jesus has close relationship with God; and Jesus has his own conception about baptism. Even though this paper limits itself to a discussion of these plots, we can still discover much detail of this Jesus' inner world. And we shall discuss them one by one.

2. Going to Jordan is Jesus' own decision

Matthew exemplifies Jesus Christ as a human being in the baptismal narrative by articulating Jesus' own decision to leave Galilee and to go to the Jordan for baptism. This disclosure is evident if the two narratives in Mark and Matthew are compared.

Mark 1:9 simply connects two events with the conjunction (καί): Jesus' departure from Galilee and his baptism by John at Jordan (ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦςκαὶ ἐβαπτίσθη). Mark merely reports that there were two events. Whether they are chronologically connected is unclear, and there is no reference to causality. The very high frequency of occurrence of this καί (79x) in chapter one does not suggest any specific or concrete meaning in connecting the two events. Jesus' purpose in leaving Galilee is sparingly seen in this narrative of Mark. As a result, the character of this Jesus in Mark's literary presentation is plain and flat.³

Matthew follows the topographical structure of Mark, from Galilee to Jordan.⁴ But if we consider Mark and his report of the action of Jesus' leaving Galilee, we could not assert from Mark's text that Jesus' action necessarily leads to his arrival at the Jordan, both topographically and chronologically. Matthew now redacts καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη of Mark and

1984), 333-352.

² For examples, Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus I* (EKK; Düsseldorf, Zürich & Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger & Neukirchener, 1985-2002), 54f, relates the need of retelling the Jesus' story to the self-understanding of the Matthean Church (ecclesiastically). W. D. Davies & D. C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew I* (ICC 1,1; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), 321-323, present eight theological interpretations.

³ Jack D. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story* (Philadelphia: Fortress, ²1988), 9-12, distinguishes the characters in a story into three types: "round, flat, stock", possessing "all, few, one" traits of a person respectively. According to Kingsbury's model, Matthew's Jesus is relatively "round", and Mark's Jesus is then "flat".

⁴ The place Nazareth in 3:13 omitted (// Mark 1:9) is to be understood as Jesus grew up there before going to the river Jordan (2:23).

changes it to τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ in Mt 3:13, which is now constructed as the Greek articular infinitive, expressing the purpose of the subject.⁵

In so doing, Matthew elucidates Jesus' decision to leave Galilee, with the purpose of going to the Jordan to receive John's baptism. Such an elucidation implies three dimensions about Jesus' journey from Galilee to the Jordan:

1. Jesus' departure from Galilee has a clear destination: the Jordan. He does not simply wander around Galilee or Palestine.
2. Jesus' departure from Galilee has a well-defined purpose: Baptism. His trip is not a part of random behavior.
3. Jesus' arrival at the Jordan has a definite target: John. He does not randomly pick up anybody as his mentor, and/or baptizer.

From these three considerations above, we may conclude that Matthew presents this Jesus in terms of human characteristics. Matthew introduces the idea that Jesus is the decision maker with regard to his path ahead. We could further assert that Jesus would probably have heard of John and his teaching before his trip. This provides a hint to us that there would be some kinds of relation between Jesus and John, even prior to the baptism.

3. Jesus has close relationship with God

The whole baptismal scene includes a heavenly voice, announcing God's sonship of the newly baptized Jesus in all three Synoptic Gospels.⁶ We simply call this heavenly phenomenon an adoption.⁷ In Mark, this adoption seems private to Jesus alone. Scholars nowadays seem agreed that this event is a private one in Mark.⁸ Matthew redacts and converts it into a public event, so that all people recognize Jesus' adoption by the heavenly voice.

The baptismal scenes in Mark and Matthew, except for some wording, are basically the same: after Jesus has received John's baptism, he sees the heaven open and hears a voice there from (Mt 3:16f // Mk 1:10f). However, there are three redactional changes that Matthew

⁵ Blass, F. and A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ¹⁴ 1976), § 390: 'The infinitive of purpose'. (1) In the NT it has become common again (from Homer) in a wide sphere with a variety of verbs of motion, and is the equivalent of a final clause.

⁶ The Gospel of John (1: 29-34) does narrate the baptismal scenery, but without the baptism.

⁷ We do not intend to enter into the Christological debate of the Arian Adoptionism.

⁸ For example, a recent work on the historical Jesus makes the same statement without given any discussion. Bartosz Adamczewski, *Hypertextuality and Historicity in the Gospels* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2013), 18.

makes to Mark. They are: ἰδοὺ from εἶδεν; ἰδοὺ as insertion; and οὗτός ἐστιν from σὺ εἶ. We shall analyze these redaction changes one by one.

3.1 (ἰδοὺ ... εἶδεν) from (εἶδεν ... εἶδεν)

Mk: εἶδεν ... τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα

Mt: ἰδοὺ ... οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ εἶδεν τὸ πνεῦμα

While Mark uses the aorist εἶδεν once for both seeing the heavens and the spirit descending, Matthew preserves the same aorist only in the second part of the sentence, and inserts its imperative form ἰδοὺ for the first part.

After Jesus comes out of the water, the heavens are open / are torn apart. At this point, Mark describes that Jesus saw (third singular aorist) the heavens torn apart prior to the voice from heaven addressing him directly; and he saw the spirit descending into (εἰς) him. From the literary perspective, the third singular verb says merely that the subject, Jesus, sees; it does not tell us whether the primary readers in the story see or not.⁹ Yet, the focus remains on the subject.

Matthew introduces ἰδοὺ, which is regarded as a non-Greek element often with Semitic origin, to express his ‘solemn and dignified style’. Therefore it functions as ‘an interjection with acute accent’ in Matthew’s baptismal scene.¹⁰ It could hardly make sense to say that this ἰδοὺ is designed merely for Jesus, or both Jesus and John exclusively.¹¹ The very nature of this verb is to arouse the attention of the readers, no matter be it in the level of the primary, intended, or interested readership, which correspond to the characters in the story, to the first audience of the Gospel, or to the audience today respectively. Therefore, all the audience notes the heavens are opened; and εἶδεν τὸ πνεῦμα could not exclude them from seeing the spirit descending on Jesus.

3.2 ἰδοὺ as insertion in Mt 3:17

Next, Mark introduces a voice out of the heavens (φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν) with this Semitic expression occurring before the content of what the voice said is given. Matthew now inserts again the same ἰδοὺ prior to the voice of the heavens. This solemn

⁹ Nevertheless, some still want to say that the characters in Mark do not know about the descent of the Spirit at this point. Werner H. Kelber, *Mark's Story of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 18-19.

¹⁰ Blass & Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, §4 and §101 under ὀρώω.

¹¹ We must note that ἡμῶν is referring to both Jesus and John in its context. However, it can also be understood as referring to the audience in the story or even to the general or any interested readers today.

imperative functions in the same way to arouse the attention of all the surrounding characters in the story. Mark's version does not intend to convey any information whether the audience hears the voice or not; Mark simply introduces its appearance. Following this plot, Jesus in Mark hears the heavenly voice, which could be derived from the previous aorist (he saw). However, all the characters in Matthew's story are drawn by this voice which comes out of the heavens. All people including Jesus are presented as listening to this heavenly witness.

3.3 οὗτός ἐστιν from σὺ εἶ

According to the Gospel of Mark, Jesus hears the voice from heaven, 'you are (σὺ εἶ) my beloved son' after emerging from the water. This is a direct speech addressing him, declaring his sonship of God, whose status will be tested in the following narrative of the Temptation.¹² Matthew changes this direct speech to an indirect speech, 'this is (οὗτός ἐστιν) my beloved son', whereas Luke keeps Mark's direct speech. An indirect speech has an introductory function and purpose. The Matthean redaction clearly conveys the message that now heaven announces and introduces Jesus as the beloved son of God.¹³ In this vein, we may regard this event a public theophany or testimony to Jesus.

William Wrede (1901) interprets this direct speech at the beginning, which connects to but contrasts with Mark 9:7 and 15:39, as the start of the whole literary construction of the Messianic secret in Mark. Mark keeps the inner world of Jesus Christ to himself, in particular, his messiahship or sonship of God, especially at the beginning of the narrative. The basic framework of Wrede's classical theory, however, cannot be maintained here in Matthew.¹⁴ Matthew further emphasizes this sonship of God through Jesus' obedience and submission to God, which will be shown in the Temptation.¹⁵ The private and direct address to Jesus in this statement in Mark is now made public in Matthew.¹⁶

¹²Birger Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son. (Matt. 4: 1-11 & Par.): An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash* (Coniectanea Biblica, NT Series 2:1; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966), 19. Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, U. K.: W. B. Eerdmans, 1999), 138, even puts "God's calling must be tested" as a sub-title.

¹³ So, both Ulrich Luz's and Davies & Allison's extensive commentaries on Matthew note that this change of the speeches 'makes the event more public' (Davies & Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 339), particularly, 'to John the Baptist and to the crowd', and consequently to the Christian community behind the Gospel of Matthew' (Luz, *Matthew I*, 214). Luz further explains that the subtle change of introductory speech in Matthew corresponds to a theme in Matthew, 'God with us' (Matt 1:23; 28:20).

¹⁴ William Wrede, *The Messianic Secret* (J. C. G. Greig transl.; Cambridge/ London: James Clarke, 1971; German original 1901).

¹⁵ This is the idea that Luz, *Matthew I*, 144, advocates firmly.

¹⁶ At this point, it is interesting to note the position of Jack D. Kingsbury, [*Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 13f.], who firmly maintained that Jesus' baptism was a 'private affair', but not a public one. The main clue he presented was the use of τότε (then) right at the beginning of Mt 3:13. He

In short, all these three redactions of Jesus' baptism show that Matthew intends to create a new scene: this Jesus is not alone when the heavens open and the spirit descends as in Mark, and Jesus no longer hears the heavenly voice speaking directly to him alone. Matthew's insertion of the imperative 'behold' twice and the alteration of the heavenly voice into introductory speech now make this previously private event a public one, or as some suggest, a public theophany.¹⁷

To sum up, Matthew makes these three redactional changes in the baptismal scene. Although the changes are relatively slight at the literary level, their combined meaning is significant. This redaction builds up a public announcement of Jesus' sonship in Matthew: Mark's Jesus seems to be alone to see, to hear and to receive the direct speech of the heaven. If Wrede is correct, this vision applies to Jesus' private event in Mark. With his redactional changes, Matthew publicizes this 'private event', not simply to the primary readers in the story level, but more important to the intended readers.

4. Jesus' conception about baptism (Mt 3:14f)

Among all the canonical Gospels, only Matthew allows Jesus to explicate himself by interpolating a dialogue of Jesus with John before the baptism. In the dialogue, John first

believed that this temporal adverb functioned to remove this narrative chronologically from its previous one; the crowd surrounded John was no longer present during Jesus' baptism. And there was also no reference to the audience at all in the entire text of Mt 3:13-17. As he himself also admitted that the use of τότε is imprecise, we can also deliberately and differently say that Jesus appears in the Jordan while John is just in the midst of completing his work as Matthew describes previously in 3:1-12. Similarly, there can also be no time lapse between the two events. If the phrase, 'in those days' (3:1), does signify a separation of the present text from the previous one chronologically, then the τότε in 3:13 is a relative mild conjunction for the purpose, and is not to be over-emphasized for its clear cut distinction here.

J. H. Moulton, *Grammar of the New Testament Greek 3* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963), 341, with Aramaic origin usage; Matthew uses this adverb 90 times while the sum of the other three canonical Gospels is only 52 times. Blass & Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, § 105 and §459 (2): the main function of this adverb of time is 'zur Einführung des zeitlichen Nachfolgenden', which is slightly different from the English version.) Besides, we can also interpret the use of παραγίεται both for John's and Jesus' appearance in the river Jordan as creating a similar and parallel atmosphere for both events, but there must not necessarily be any chronological implication at all. Yes, Kingsbury is correct in noting that there is no reference to the audience in Jesus' baptism. However, the lack of mentioning does not necessarily mean that there is no audience at all (an argument from silence). Above all, Matthew follows Mark's plot, narrating Jesus' baptism in John's sermon to the people. If there is no special obvious literary signal, one cannot simply assert Jesus and John are suddenly alone in the river Jordan. If the main clue, the (τότε), has other interpretations, then Kingsbury's assertion of no other audience behind the scene of Jesus' baptism may not be sustained.

¹⁷ Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 134; John P. Meier, *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel-Theological Inquiries* (New York: Paulist, 1979), 58. Adamczewski, *Hypertextuality and Historicity in the Gospels*, takes it for granted that Mark's is a public event, 18-19. There are nevertheless different voices as to whether the audience did see and hear the vision, see for examples, C. B. E. Cranfield, 'The Baptism of Our Lord – A Study of St. Mark 1.9-11', *Scottish Journal of Theology* 8 (1955), 53-63, here 58. Marcus J. Borg, *Jesus: A New Vision – Spirit, Culture, and the Life of Discipleship* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), 41, n.19. Ben, III Witherington, *The Christology of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990), 150f.

expresses his unworthiness to baptize Jesus; their seniority is to be reversed instead. Only after Jesus' insistence could John baptize him.¹⁸ Jesus replies, 'ἄφες ἄρτι, οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πάσαν δικαιοσύνην'.

Previously, scholars mainly focus on two major issues arising from the accounts of Jesus' baptism: (1) the reasons for Jesus' baptism¹⁹ and (2) Christians' ethical behavior relating to Jesus' fulfilling all righteousness.²⁰ We will discuss some literary devices in Matthew's dialogue that disclose Jesus' conception of baptism

4.1 John the Baptist's Unworthiness

John is a famous teacher at the Jordan, whose pupils include Pharisees, Sadducees and the Jerusalemites before Jesus' request for baptism. He has already been an established teacher in the desert, probably with some charisma. Now, in Matthew, John expresses special respect for Jesus, saying that Jesus should baptize him instead. At this point, the status of John and Jesus is to be reversed. This reversal of the teacher-pupil relationship is a strange phenomenon. It makes room for us to assert that, for Matthew, John has some understanding about Jesus prior to Jesus' request. John should also regard Jesus as a respectable person.

John's unworthiness to baptize Jesus shows that Jesus is not an ordinary person. This saying of John harmonizes well with the Q tradition in the previous baptismal scene, where he says prior to Jesus' arrival: 'I am unworthy to untie the sandals of the one who comes behind me', and 'I baptize you with water; he will baptize you with holy spirit and fire' (Mt 3:11 // Lk 3:16).²¹ On the narrative level, Matthew discloses John's thought with regard to Jesus'

¹⁸ Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 1. London: SCM Press, 1950), 18-20, further thinks that Jesus' baptism typified his death (Mark 10:38 and its parallel).

¹⁹ See for examples, Eric K C Wong, "Was Jesus Without Sin? An Inquiry into Jesus' Baptism and the Redaction of the Gospels". *Asia Journal of Theology* 11 (1997), 128-139. He tries to establish that the question "whether Jesus was without sin" existed when the Gospel of Matthew was composed. Craig A. Evans, 'Historical Jesus Studies and the Gospel of Matthew' in: *Methods for Matthew* (Methods in Biblical Interpretation; Cambridge et al.: CPU, 2009), 118-154 does use Jesus' confession during baptism as the concrete example illustrating the Criterion of embarrassment for critically evaluating the authentic Jesus of history, 140. Kunkel, *The Creation Continues*, 33-35 (German edition) thinks that Jesus did confess during his baptism, which is marked as the turning point of his life.

²⁰ John P. Meier, *Law and the History in Matthew's Gospel* (AnBib 71; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976), 76-80, who examines all the 16 occurrences of the word 'fulfil' in Matthew and comes to this result. Davies & Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 325-327, give a brief summary of some six understandings of 'fulfilling righteousness' in Matthew. For a detailed discussion on these two possible but opposite interpretations of Jesus' fulfilling all righteousness, see For further discussion on the concept of 'fulfillment', see Eric K C Wong, *Interkulturelle Theologie und multikulturelle Gemeinde im Matthaevangelium - Zum Verhalten von Juden- und Heidenchristen im ersten Evangelium* (NTOA 22; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Freiburg Schweiz : Universitaetsverlag, 1992), who advocates for a double possibility of these two polarized interpretations, which belongs to the intercultural theology of Matthew.

²¹ Some scholars believe that this valuation by John was probably established in the post Easter period, after people had recognized Jesus' significance and role as superseding John's. Martin Dibelius, *Jesus* (C.B. Hedrick

status. Now, he uses John's mouth to describe John's thought, and we expect the same applies to the main character, Jesus.

4.2 Allow Me Now

In response to John's objection, Jesus insists on being baptized by him, replying with ἄφες ἄρτι (allow me now). It is an idiom of permission.²² Matthew conveys a clear message to the readers that John could baptize Jesus only with Jesus' permission to do so. Jesus is in no way submissive to John. And this action is also said to be within the present moment ἄρτι. Nevertheless, Jesus receives John's baptism, with the rationale, 'it is fitting for us to fulfill all righteousness'.²³

This shows us three hidden pieces of information:

- (i) Jesus determines to be baptized by John, which reinforces his decision to leave his home in Galilee. This supports our suggestion above relating to Jesus' "Decision Disclosure".
- (ii) Jesus' reply demonstrates one of his traits: he insists on what he thinks should happen, even in the face of objections. This event is not an individual case. This trait appears all along in his ministry when confronting the Jewish authorities.
- (iii) Meanwhile, this shows also that John may not understand or may have some misunderstanding about why Jesus wants the baptism. Therefore, Jesus needs to explain it with the following sentence.

4.3 It is appropriate for us to fulfill all righteousness

Now Jesus explains to John that, 'it is appropriate for us to fulfill all righteousness', where Jesus' conception about baptism are further perceived.

- (i) The pronoun ἡμῖν in the dialogue between Jesus and John primarily refers to both Jesus and John.²⁴ Jesus' use of word ἡμῖν makes an impression to the readers that John will also participate in fulfilling all righteousness. This ἡμῖν

& F. C. Grant transl; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1949), 77; compare further Davies & Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 323; Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament*, 71-80.

²² DBF § 364:1-2. Matthew favors putting adverbs after imperatives, see DBF § 474:3, see 5:13; 1:18; 18:16; 19:20; 26:53, 65; 27:42f. Cf. Davies & Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 324.

²³ Davies & Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 321-323, gather eight possible solutions to the problem that Jesus submitted to John's baptism.

²⁴ So Davies & Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 325.

makes them become companions. Jesus is willing to incorporate John in such an action.

In the past, most scholars regarded ἡμῶν as purely a Matthean redaction. They discussed it but found it difficult to understand at the story level. This leads many commentaries to consider and to accept its alternative meaning, which then refers to the intended readers. Matthew redacts it and makes Jesus as a model for the readers, that is, the Christians in the next generations.²⁵ However, in doing so, commentators have overlooked the immediate meaning of ἡμῶν in the story.

Now our interpretation offers not only an alternative for understanding ἡμῶν at the story level, but also implies that Jesus' relation with John is extremely deep.

- (ii) Jesus' answer suggests that he has not yet fulfilled all righteousness before his baptism, so he determines to leave Galilee for baptism at the Jordan by John. As a Jew, he should have been practicing all religious rules and rites. Obviously, he knows that he has missed something, and he now finds his satisfaction from John.
- (iii) Jesus is not a conformist, but rather dares to oppose John's conception of baptism. Indeed, Jesus boldly replaces John's "forgiveness of sins" by "fulfilling all righteousness".

If the nature of John's baptism aims at forgiving sins as in Mark, Matthew redacts the baptismal scene. First, Matthew obliterate the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (for the forgiveness of sins), the predicate of John's baptism as in Mk1:4, and relocates it to the context of the Eucharist in Mt 26:28, attiring it with some mystical color. Such a literary change does eliminate any possible allusion or association relating to Jesus' sinfulness arising from John's baptism in Mark's version.

Second, Matthew interpolates the dialogue to lay down the practice of Christian baptism, as a criterion for joining the community behind the Gospel of Matthew in terms of sociological function. This is especially clear when the

²⁵ Similarly, Luz, *Matthew I*, 142f. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Matthaeus*, 50-51, thinks that Jesus did not alone fulfil all righteousness in the baptism, but the baptism was rather an example of Jesus' fulfilling righteousness. Also G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (FRLANT 82; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 180.

risen Lord commissions the eleven to baptize all nations in order to make them disciples (28:18-20).

Among the canonical Gospels, Matthew is the only one that chooses to allow Jesus to explain himself and his action in the narrative. Apart from theological disputes on “fulfilling all righteousness”, this interpolated dialogue additionally discloses Jesus’ understanding about baptism.

5. Conclusion

If our discussion above is accepted, Matthew does have a specific conception and direction in crafting Jesus’ character. Even though this paper limits itself to a discussion of Jesus’ baptism, which is only one text in Matthew that we have discussed as an example of Matthew’s literary art, we can still discover much detail of this main character Jesus’ inner world: his experience, thoughts and traits. Matthew articulates Jesus’ humanity, apart from his divinity. These human characteristics include Jesus’ decision, Jesus’ relationship with God and Jesus’ conception about the baptism.

Through the character analysis of Jesus given in this paper, we discover that Matthew’s specific crafting gives us a new image of Jesus Christ. To what extent this new image of Jesus is creative or historical, is to be discussed further. If more information about this character Jesus is found embedded in the Gospel of Matthew, this could perhaps open another door to investigating the Jesus of history implicitly.

References

- [1] ADAMCZEWSKI, BARTOSZ. *Hypertextuality and Historicity in the Gospels*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2013.
- [2] BLASS, F. and A. DEBRUNNER. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ¹⁴ 1976.
- [3] BORG, MARCUS J. *Jesus: A New Vision – Spirit, Culture, and the Life of Discipleship*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.
- [4] CRANFIELD, C. B. E. ‘The Baptism of Our Lord – A Study of St. Mark 1.9-11’, *Scottish Journal of Theology* 8 (1955): 53-63.
- [5] CULLMANN, OSCAR. *Baptism in the New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 1. London: SCM Press, 1950.
- [6] DAVIES, W. D. & D. C. ALLISON. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* 1. ICC 1,1; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.
- [7] DIBELIUS, MARTIN. *Jesus*. C.B. Hedrick & F. C. Grant transl; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1949.
- [8] EVANS, CRAIG A. ‘Historical Jesus Studies and the Gospel of Matthew’. In: *Methods for Matthew*. Methods in Biblical Interpretation; Cambridge et al.: CPU, 2009, 118-154.
- [9] GERHARDSSON, BIRGER. *The Testing of God's Son. (Matt. 4: 1-11 & Par.): An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash*. Coniectanea Biblica, NT Series 2:1; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966.
- [10] GUNDRY, ROBERT H. *Matthew – A commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1982.
- [11] KEENER, CRAIG S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, U. K.: W. B. Eerdmans, 1999.
- [12] KELBER, WERNER H. *Mark's Story of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- [13] KINGSBURY, JACK D. *Matthew as Story*. Philadelphia: Fortress, ²1988.
- [14] KINGSBURY, JACK D. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- [15] KUNKEL, FRITZ. *The Creation Continues – a Psychological Interpretation of the Gospel of Matthew*. New York: C. Scribner's, ²1946.
- [16] LOHMEYER, E. *Das Evangelium des Matthaeus*. KEK, Sonderband; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958.

- [17] LUZ, ULRICH. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus I*. EKK; Düsseldorf, Zürich & Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger & Neukirchener, 1985-2002.
- [18] MEIER, JOHN P. *Law and the History in Matthew's Gospel*. AnBib 71; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976.
- [19] MEIER, JOHN P. *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel-Theological Inquiries*. New York: Paulist, 1979.
- [20] MOHRLANG, R. *Matthew and Paul – a Comparison of Ethical Perspectives*. Cambridge: CUP, 1984.
- [21] MOULTON, J. H. *Grammar of the New Testament Greek 3*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963.
- [22] SANFORD, JOHN A. 'Kunkel's Psychology and the Bible'. In Sanford ed.: *Fritz Kunkel: Selected Writings -- edited with an Introduction and Commentary*. New York/ Ramsey: Paulist, 1984, 333-352.
- [23] STRECKER, G. *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit*. FRLANT 82; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- [24] WITHERINGTON, BEN, III. *The Christology of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990.
- [25] WONG, ERIC K C. "Was Jesus Without Sin? An Inquiry into Jesus' Baptism and the Redaction of the Gospels". *Asia Journal of Theology* 11 (1997): 128-139.
- [26] WONG, ERIC K C. *Interkulturelle Theologie und multikulturelle Gemeinde im Matthaesevangelium - Zum Verhaeltnis von Juden- und Heidenchristen im ersten Evangelium*. NTOA 22; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Freiburg Schweiz : Universitaetsverlag, 1992.
- [27] WREDE, WILLIAM. *The Messianic Secret*. J. C. G. Greig transl.; Cambridge/ London: James Clarke, 1971; German original 1901.