

# 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 *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## Supplementary Note on the Aorist *εὐδόκησα*, Mark i. 11.

PROF. BENJ. W. BACON, D.D.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

THE proper rendering of the Voice from heaven to Jesus at his baptism is of such fundamental importance that I feel justified in offering certain evidence additional to that adduced in my article on this subject in this JOURNAL, XVI. (1897) p. 136-139, and tending in the same direction; viz. that we should render, "Thou art my Son, the Beloved, upon thee (or *αἰς ὃν*, on whom) my choice hath fallen."

1. The treatment of *ὁ Ἀγαπητός* as appellative, "my Son, the Beloved," not merely "my beloved Son," was supported by the use of Is. 42<sup>1f</sup> in Matt. 12<sup>19</sup>, *Ἴδού ὁ Παῖς μου ὃν ἠρέτισα ὁ Ἀγαπητός μου ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου· θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν*; and something was made of the appellative used by Paul in the epistle most largely occupied with apocalyptic christology, *ὁ Ἁγαπημένος* (Eph. 1<sup>6</sup>). Reference was also made to the appellative *ὁ Ἐκλελεγμένος* (Luke 9<sup>35</sup>), which alternates in the texts with *ὁ Ἀγαπητός*, and to 2 Pet. 1<sup>17</sup>, the Voice at the Transfiguration being clearly intended to convey the same sense as that at the Baptism.

I should have added the important variant in 2 Pet. 1<sup>17</sup>, accepted by Westcott-Hort and Weiss, *ὁ Υἱός μου, ὁ Ἀγαπητός μου*, where the appellative sense is unmistakable. It is unfortunate that the Revisers in this case should have seen fit to depart from their admirable guide in questions of text. They would in consistency have been obliged to use the capital letter, "my Beloved," as in Eph. 1<sup>6</sup>.

Perhaps it would have been more convincing if I had adduced the practice of the Christian writer who adds to the Ascension of Isaiah the Vision of Isaiah, an apocalypse closely related to that of 2 Thessalonians. This author's uniform and stereotyped designation for the Messiah is *Ἀγαπητός*, a title certainly not unconnected with Is. 42<sup>1f</sup>. This has since been better done than my knowledge would have

permitted by Canon J. Armitage Robinson, *s.v.* "Isaiah, Ascension of," in Hastings' *BD.*, where early Christian use of the title in both forms, Ἀγαπητός and Ἁγαπημένος, is abundantly illustrated. Side by side with this very early Christian practice should be placed that of the unknown Enoch fragment quoted in Barnabas 4<sup>3</sup>, as well as the Ethiopic Enoch (cf. Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, Introd. p. xxiii, and Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, note on En. 38<sup>3</sup> and 40<sup>5</sup>), one of whose favorite titles for the Messiah is ὁ Ἐκλεκτός, as in Luke 23<sup>35</sup>, ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ Ἐκλεκτός. This, as Charles informs us, is also based on Is. 42<sup>1</sup>.

We can hardly escape the conclusion that ὁ Ἀγαπητός and Ἁγαπημένος, ὁ Ἐκλεκτός, and Ἐκλελεγμένος applied to Christ in the New Testament are appellatives, technical designations of the Messiah, and should in all cases receive the capital initial, as in Eph. 1<sup>6</sup>.

2. The use of εὐδοκῆν in some cases, if not the majority, to signify the gracious *placuit* of God, was also shown. The particular application was to the adoption of those whom God makes his sons, a "choice" not to be explained by any other consideration than his sovereign purpose of grace antedating the creation itself.

That such is the sense of εὐδοκία in the fundamental passage Eph. 1<sup>4-9</sup> I endeavored, perhaps inadequately, to show, connecting with this passage (the same in which Christ is designated ὁ Ἁγαπημένος) Luke 2<sup>14</sup> ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας αὐτοῦ.

Paul's doxology in Eph. 1<sup>4-9</sup> is for the gracious εὐδοκία of God who chose us in Christ (made us ἐκλεκτοί as he is the Ἐκλεκτός)<sup>2</sup> before the foundation of the world (cf. Luke 10<sup>20</sup> Heb. 12<sup>23</sup> Rev. 21<sup>27</sup>); for he foreordained us unto an adoption to himself as sons through Jesus Christ according to his εὐδοκία in the grace wherewith he accepted us in the person of the Ἁγαπημένος. I do not think that the collocation of these terms εὐδοκία and Ἁγαπημένος employed in the Voice from heaven to Jesus in the Baptismal Vision, and repeated in Eph. 1<sup>4-9</sup>, can be accidental. Paul is simply applying the doctrine of the foreordination (preëxistence) of Messiah and his people to that

<sup>1</sup> It is noteworthy that the writer (Luke) who employs all these Isaian technical designations of Messiah, ὁ Ἀγαπητός, ὁ Ἐκλελεγμένος, ὁ Ἐκλεκτός, ὁ Παῖς θεοῦ (Acts 3<sup>18</sup>, 26 4<sup>27</sup>, 31) agrees also with Enoch in using the title ὁ Δίκαιος (Acts 3<sup>14</sup> 22<sup>14</sup>) and is of all New Testament writers most eager to connect the career of Jesus with fulfilment of the prophecies of Isaiah.

<sup>2</sup> Thus in Enoch we are called by Professor Charles to "observe that as the members of the kingdom are 'The righteous,' so the Messiah is 'The Righteous One'; cf. 'The elect,' 'The Elect One'" (Charles, *Enoch*, p. 112). Cf. Barn. 3<sup>6</sup> ὁ λαὸς ὃν ἠγάπησεν ἐν τῷ Ἁγαπημένῳ αὐτοῦ with Eph. 1<sup>6</sup>.

fundamental narrative of the gospel. God chose (*εὐδόκησεν*) Christ as his Son, the Beloved, before the foundation of the world.<sup>3</sup> But he also chose us Jews and Gentiles together, as a *περιποίησις*, a *νίοθεσία* with and in him. We *ἐκλεκτοί*, who were chosen and preordained by God together with his *Ἐκλεκτός*, whose names are written in his register of citizenship kept in heaven, are the *ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας* as he is the *Ἄνθρωπος εὐδοκίας*. Hence the ordinary rendering of Mark 1<sup>11</sup>, which I gave in Professor Gould's language: "The aorist *εὐδόκησα* [in Mark 1<sup>11</sup>], *I came to take pleasure*, denotes the historical process by which God came to take pleasure in Jesus during his earthly life," is misleading. If we bring to bear Eph. 1<sup>4-9</sup>, we shall see that Professor Gould's statement must be inverted. The aorist *εὐδόκησα*, *I chose*, denotes the *prehistoric decree* of God (*τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ*), "the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 3<sup>11</sup>), foreordaining us as an adoption of sons to himself in the person of Jesus Christ (Eph. 1<sup>5</sup>).

I feel justified in making this fuller development of my former very brief mention of Paul's reference to the *εὐδοκία* manifested in the *ἤγαπημένος*, because I have now an item of textual evidence to add, on the question whether *εὐδόκησα* should be rendered "have chosen" or "came to take pleasure." The *β* text of Acts 9<sup>22</sup> adds after the words *συμβιβάζων ὅτι οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός* the relative clause *εἰς ὃν ὁ θεὸς εὐδόκησεν*. Shall we translate "proving that this is the Christ in whom God came to take pleasure"? or "the Christ whom God elected"?

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the Rabbinic teaching "The soul of Messiah is laid up in Paradise from the beginning of creation," and the like.