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THE JOHANNINE SACRAMENTARY

BRUCE VAWTER, C.M.
Kernick Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

EXEGETES, theologians, and plain readers of the NT owe to Professor C. H. Dodd for his crowning work on John's Gospel a debt not likely to be repaid in this generation by anything that will surpass it. We have the feeling, in fact, that Dodd has done much which need never be done again, and that he has established some sureties which will remain and on which it is only necessary to build. Among these I would instance the fixing of the sacramental character of John, at which Dodd has long been at work, together with Oscar Cullmann and others. The preoccupation with the sacraments is by no means confined to John: Cullmann has made a convincing case for the interpretation of Mk 10:13–16 and parallels in the Synoptic Gospels as (in addition to the original historical sense of the passages) a kind of didescri plina et cimanc inculcating infant baptism, and there are other evidences that John had been anticipated in his "spiritualizing" of the gospel kerygma. But it is certainly in the fourth Gospel that this tendency has come to full term and the gospel form has become a viademecum for the faithful rather than a proclamation of the good news of salvation.

This fact is to be explained by the Church's developed knowledge of its own destiny. The Pauline Epistles are eloquent testimony that the earliest days of Christianity were lived in expectation of an imminent parousia, and the Gospel of Mark, which has most faithfully preserved the primitive catechesis, in general holds to this perspective by

1 The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: University Press, 1953).
5 As to whether Paul shared this notion, cf. L. M. Dawelly, O.P., and B. Rigaux, O.F.M., Les ecrits de saint Paul aux Thessaloniciens (Paris: du Cerf, 1954) p. 24: "Avec l'Eglise primitive, il a vécu dans l'attente. Il a certifié que le jour du Seigneur n'était point arrivé. Mais il a tenû compte de la vraisemblance d'une parousie prochaine... Il a teinté son message des couleurs de son espérance... Proclamer une espérance n'est point porter un jugement ni enseigner une erreur."
The Johnnian Sacramentary

Theological Studies
parallels), be a deliberate accommodation, a reminder of the power of the keys in the Church? That the Apostles are “other Christs” is part of the catechesis, and it is a commonplace of theology that one aspect of the Incarnation is the exemplary value of our Lord’s life.

Only by an uncritical sacrifice of tradition and sound judgment can the Gospels become simply the projection of the aspirations and imagination of the early Church. Their authorship and historical trustworthiness are, if anything, more assured today than ever before. Yet we must recognize that for their authors history as such was secondary to something far more important, that they were not written principally to provide texts for the tract De ecclesia. They are first and foremost—and here John is only the enlargement of a tradition already found in the Synoptics and in the oral catechesis underlying them—theological treatises. They are theology in the grand Semitic tradition of which the Pentateuch and the Book of Chronicles are earlier examples. They are, in their own manner, Heils geschichte. This means that they are selective history, history with a purpose, that their omissions may be more important than what they include. To explain away the divergences of the Synoptics by the plea that they are “in substantial accord” is to miss the whole point, since discord was in some cases what the evangelist wanted to achieve. The Synoptic and Johannine “questions” are quite as important to exegesis and theology as they are to criticism.

To make an end of it, what the evangelists mean by the use of the pericopes they have chosen is often of greater importance than the original sense of the narrative or saying recorded. Mk 10:13-16 can serve as a proof, if we need one, that our Lord loved children. It means more when we understand it as a parable in action concerning the spirit of the true disciple. It means still more—and I do not believe that this added meaning is of any less importance—if we can understand it as Cullmann does, as containing a liturgical formula used in baptism: a passage, then, which had been shaped to the needs of the Christian community without the sacrifice of any of its other values. No one who believes in the inspiration of Scripture can afford to make light of this meaning of the Gospels and of the research necessary to get at it. If it is what the evangelist intended to put there, it is his literal sense and therefore the teaching of the Holy Spirit. It is, in David Stanley’s words, “the induction into the sensus plenior of the kerygma.”

The realization that there is in John so much of this quality, which Dodd is pleased to call the “Johannine irony,” concealing as it does spiritual teaching under the apparently trivial details of a story, has led to the restoration of a rule of interpretation that has always remained cardinal with Catholics, that of the analogia fidei. It is frankly acknowledged that the fulness of John’s meaning is to be seen only against the background of the belief and worship of the Church that brought it into being. And it is precisely for this reason that there is a need for Catholic scholars to interest themselves in this study. Men like Dodd and Cullmann, whose insights and erudition are prodigious, nevertheless belong to a religious tradition which has considerably obscured the origins of Christianity. That they have found so much is a tribute to their honesty and scholarly integrity, but the fact remains that men for whom the religion of the early Church can be summed up as “the two sacraments of primitive Christianity” will not find all that John has put into his Gospel.

In the following pages I wish to offer a couple of suggested lines along which I believe a study could be made to reveal the complete sacramentary of the Church for which John was writing. They are suggestions only, and I offer them with all diffidence as ideas rather than as conclusions. This will not be an excursion into exegesis. We know that the determination of “seven sacraments, neither more nor less” is a development of doctrine centuries later than the NT. When Cullmann concludes from his analysis of Jn 9:1-39, for example, that “in the earliest days of Christianity the act of Baptism was bound up

David M. Stanley, S.J., “Didache as a Constitutive Element of the Gospel-form,” Catholic Biblical Quarterly 17 (1955) 345. The entire article is recommended to the reader who wishes a clear concept of the Gospels as “teaching” (didache) in addition to “preaching” (the kerygma proper).

2 That the early Christians had a sacramental Church and a rather developed liturgy has been largely a Protestant discovery, as far as the NT evidence is concerned. Here again is the curious paradox that while Protestant authors readily recognize that the great Christological poems of Col 1:15-20, Phil 2:5-11, and Eph 1:3-14 are primitive Christian liturgy (for example, cf. Charles Masson in Commentaire du NT [Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé] 10: Colossiens [1950] 104 ff.; 9: Ephésiens [1953] 148 ff.), we often look in vain in Catholic sources even to find the matter considered, apparently from a misplaced determination to preserve Pauline “originality.”
and Mary is identified as the woman who anointed the feet of Jesus, as recorded in John 12:3. In the Synoptic Gospels, the anointing is described as a symbolic preparation of Jesus for death. In John, the anointing is associated with the raising of Lazarus, which is mentioned in John 11:2-44. The Synoptic Gospels record that Jesus anointed the feet of Simon the Leper, whereas John refers to the anointing of Jesus by Mary Magdalene.

With the laying on of hands and the washing of feet, the double act of the laying on of hands and the washing of feet, as described in the Gospels, becomes a central theme in the early Church. In the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 13:3-5), Peter and John are given the power to lay hands on the sick and to wash the feet of others, which is consistent with the practice of anointing. The practice of anointing and the laying on of hands were integral to the early Christian community, providing a means of spiritual healing and a symbol of the grace of God.

Theologians, such as Peter Lombard, have noted the importance of the act of anointing in the lives of the early church. Lombard, in his commentary on the Gospels, states that the anointing of Jesus is a symbol of the grace of God, and that the laying on of hands is a means of bestowing that grace upon others. The act of anointing is thus seen as a means of bringing the grace of God into the lives of believers, and as a symbol of the healing power of the Church.

The practice of anointing is also seen as a means of strengthening the bonds of fellowship within the church. The laying on of hands and the washing of feet were performed in a communal setting, and the act of anointing was often accompanied by the reading of scriptures and the singing of hymns. These practices served to reinforce the unity of the church and to strengthen the bonds of community among its members.

The practice of anointing and the laying on of hands were thus integral to the early Christian community, providing a means of spiritual healing and a symbol of the grace of God. The act of anointing was seen as a means of bringing the grace of God into the lives of believers, and as a symbol of the healing power of the Church.

In the Johannine tradition, the story of the anointing of Jesus is told in a different way. Instead of being told in the context of the passion story, the anointing is described as an event that takes place two days before the crucifixion. This is in contrast to the Synoptic account, in which the anointing occurs on the evening of the passover. In the Synoptic account, the anointing is described as an event that occurs on the evening of the passover, and it is linked to the coming betrayal of Judas. In the Johannine account, the anointing is described as an event that occurs two days before the crucifixion, and it is linked to the raising of Lazarus.

The anointing of Jesus is thus seen as a symbolic preparation of Jesus for death, and as a sign of the grace of God. The laying on of hands and the washing of feet are seen as means of bestowing that grace upon others. The practice of anointing and the laying on of hands is thus seen as an important part of the early Christian tradition, and as a symbol of the grace of God and the unity of the church.
raising of Lazarus had already anticipated the present one by referring to Mary as the one who anointed the Lord's feet (11:2). The raising of Lazarus is a sign of the divine life which comes through faith in Christ (11:25 f.), a manifestation of the glory of God (11:4, 40). So, I believe, is the anointing at Bethany.

Dodd hesitantly takes the anointing as a symbolic burial or designation of Jesus for burial. But while it is this in the Synoptics, it seems that John excludes precisely this idea. "In pouring this ointment on my body she has done it for my burial," writes Mt 26:12. According to Mk 14:8, "She has by anticipation anointed my body for burial." But John has our Lord say (v. 7): "Let her keep it for the day of my burial." (hina eis tên hēmeran tou entaphiasmou mou tērēse auto.)

The meaning of this we must try to see in a moment.

The anointing is of Christ's feet. The washing of feet in Jn 13:1–20 is a sign of at least certain aspects of the Eucharist, and Higgins may be right in saying that "the answer of Jesus, 'He who has bathed has no need to wash, except his feet, but is wholly clean', means that baptism washes away sin and cannot be repeated, but that from time to time purification from post-baptismal sins in the Eucharist is necessary." That any such meaning is intended here, I doubt. I rather think that the anointing of the feet, whether it is a tradition contaminated by Lk 7 or deliberately connected with it by the author, has been preserved for the reference to the woman's wiping the feet dry with her hair, which in turn is the explanation for the seemingly irrelevant statement, not found in Lk, that "the house was filled with the odor of the ointment" (v. 3: hé de oikia eplerōthē ek tēs osmēs tou myrou).

In Jn 12:41 the author cites Is 6:1 in summing up the "Book of Signs" and explaining why Christ was rejected. Isaías saw His glory, but the Jews loved the glory of men rather than the glory of God (v. 43). The glory of God, which is the glory of Christ, He has manifested by His signs. Is 6:1 (cf. Ez 43:5; 44:4) is, if the symbolism I suggest is correct, in parallel with Jn 12:3: tērēs ho oikos tēs doxaos autou. There may also be an allusion to Jer 25:10 (LXX), which lists among the things to pass away with the Babylonian captivity the osmēn myrou; in Jn 6:45 and elsewhere Jeremias' prophecy of restoration is seen fulfilled in Christ's presence (Jer 31 [LXX 38]:34). The anointing, then, or indeed the ointment, is a σημεῖον of the glory of Christ, related to His resurrection, or pointing to it. Like wine, water, and the laying on of hands, it has a relation to the grace and truth which come through Jesus Christ, not through the Law.

"Let her keep it for the day of my burial." While the word tērēs is not exclusively Johannine, it is preeminently so. When placed on the lips of the Lord it always has reference to the Johannine "realized eschatology" (ordinarily with entolōs or logon mou as object). This is an additional reason to see the ointment as meaningful for the Christian life, a means of divine grace. "For the day of my burial" obviously does not refer to our Lord's physical burial; for John—alone of the evangelists—is careful to point out that such could not have been the case (quite apart from the fact that the oil was now in Mary's hair). While the Synoptics seem to presuppose that the Lord's body was simply wrapped in a linen cloth in view of His hasty burial, with the proper use of spices and ointments reserved for later, which was however precluded by the resurrection (cf. Mt 27:57 ff. and parallels), John stresses that Joseph of Arimathaea and Nicodemus did first prepare the body with a mixture of about a hundred pounds of myrrh and aloes (migma smyrnēs kai aloēs hōs litras hekaton), and consequently that everything was done properly "as is the custom in Jewish burials" (19:40). The ointment that Mary was to keep was not for Jesus' "Jewish" burial, but that burial which is described in the following 12:23 ff., the burial of the seed which is the font of life, the hypsōsis (v. 32 f.) which is both death and resurrection: the burial (taphē) of the Servant of the Lord (Is 53:9) which is His exaltation and glorification (52:13, hypsthēsetai kai doxasthēsetai). The day of Christ's burial is the day of the Church.

We already know, of course, that anointing with oil was a practice of the primitive Church. Mk 6:13 describes the Apostles anointing, evidently as an adjunct to miraculous healing, and Jas 5:14 f. wit-

16 Fourth Gospel, p. 370.
17 The textus receptus has tērēken, an obvious harmonization with the Synoptics.
18 The Lord's Supper, p. 84.
19 Cf. R. Schnackenburg, Die Johannesebriefe (Freiburg: Herder, 1953) p. 87. John (if 1 Jn and Ap are included) uses the word more often than all the other NT writers together.
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mother of Jesus, mother of the living as mother of Life, he has suppressed his own name throughout his Gospel to make himself the "ideal" disciple, the sign of all the living. He is always "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (13:23; etc.), even as "the Father loves the Son" (3:35; 10:17; 15:9; etc.); love is the sign of true discipleship (8:42; 13:34; etc.) and the principle of the divine life shared by Christians (14:21; 23; etc.). It was "the disciple whom Jesus loved" who "was reclining on Jesus' bosom" (13:23: anakeímenos en to kálpō tou Iēsou), even as "the only-begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father, has revealed Him" (1:18: ho ὁν εἰς τὸν κόλπον του πατρὸς). By precisely the same process which the Synoptics use to present the Baptist as a second Elias, or Christ as a new Moses, John has shown our Lady to be the new Eve, mother of those born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

Following a somewhat different tack (beginning with the "woman" of Ap 12;23), Cerfaux-Cambier have arrived at a very similar conclusion. They note the prevalence of Genesis throughout this scene, though as always, of course, the Apocalypse has mingled with it allusions to a variety of OT, apocalyptic, and midrashic themes. The "woman" of Ap 12 depends evidently on the picture in Is 66:7 ff., for the woman is the new Sion. Her child is given the messianic attributes of Ps 2:9. But the oracle of Gn 3:14 f. is the central theme of the vision. The woman is in pain at giving birth (v. 2; cf. Gn 3:16; the description of the woman's cry, however, is from Mi 4:10, of the thygater Sion); in v. 9 the dragon who is the devil and Satan is identified with the ophis (ho archaitos) of Gn 3, and in v. 17 he is at war with "the rest of her seed" even as in Gn 3:15. The Apocalypse has seen this text of Genesis as the beginning of a messianic theme carried throughout, as Genesis continually parallels blessings and curses and submits the one accrued to the one blessed. One might add that the picture of the woman fleeing into the desert, "into her place," where she is nourished after her Son is taken up into heaven (vv. 6, 14), while it contains an unquestioned allusion to Israel's desert wandering and Is 66, has some affinity with Gn 21:14–21, the protection of Abraham's seed.

Certainly the woman of Ap 12 is the Church, the new Israel, bringing forth Christ as the first-born of many brothers. But in the Apocalypse an image is not exhausted by a single application.28 One has only to recall the problem of the personality of the angels, or the symbolism of the stars in that book. The woman is the mother of the Christ, and the Apocalypse does see her against the background of Gn 3.29 We cannot be persuaded that the application of the figure which has been so obvious to subsequent generations, and to which the author himself has contributed the foundation, was hidden from him alone.

The gynē of the Apocalypse who is the mother of the Christ is likewise the bride of the Lamb (19:7; 9; 21:2, 9 ff.; 22:17). This OT typology is found also in the Synoptics and in John. It is at a marriage feast that Mary first appears in John, a feast in which John sees a symbol of our Lord's whole life-work, in which the water of Judaism is replaced by the new wine of Christ. It is the first of Jesus' signs, and Mary, whom He addresses as gynai, assists at the inauguration. It is she who presents the petition that begins the sign. The ordinary interpretation of the scene regards our Lord's answer as only an apparent refusal, which Mary evidently recognizes as no refusal at all. Michl, by interpreting the second clause as a second question, would have us shift the emphasis of the refusal to the necessity of Mary's petition rather than place it on the substance.30 In either case, her

29 M. Meinsert, *Theologie des NT* 2 (Bonn: Hannstein, 1950) 329, n. 3, will allow only an applied reference to Mary. "Denn die Farben sind eben nicht von der geschichtlichen Maria entnommen, vielmehr müssen sie erst anders geringen, d.h. das Bild muss so gedeutet werden, dass es bei der Beziehung auf Maria gekünstelt wirkt." But there are some "Marienfarben" present. The horned Lamb of 5:6 ff. is a composite of several OT and apocalyptic figures; but because it has been taken whole and entire from no single one of these does not mean that it does not refer to them all.
30 Michl, op. cit. supra n. 24, p. 506: "Was brauche ich deinen Hinweis, Frau? Ist denn meine Stunde noch nicht gekommen?" This interpretation is not new. In *L'Evangile selon saint Jean* (8th ed.; Paris: Lecoffre, 1948) p. 556, Lagrange opposes it (addenda to the 5th ed., 1936) with the objection that oupē cannot have this meaning. Nevertheless, some
The more we understand the Johannine literary forms, and the more we penetrate the subtleth of the evangelist's mind—which must surely have been remarkable for its depth and breadth—we begin to understand more fully the nature and significance of John's teaching. The author of the Fourth Gospel, who wrote the Epistle of James and saw the whole of the Christian world as a people of faith, false and true, saw the world as a place of struggle and conflict, and in his Gospel he sought to show how this struggle could be overcome. The Gospel, therefore, is a story of the conflict between the Kingdom of God and the forces of evil, and the ultimate victory of the Kingdom. The Gospel is a story of love, of self-sacrifice, and of the power of love to overcome all difficulties. The Gospel is a story of the triumph of the Kingdom of God over the forces of evil, and of the ultimate victory of the Kingdom of God over the forces of evil. The Gospel is a story of the triumph of the Kingdom of God over the forces of evil, and of the ultimate victory of the Kingdom of God over the forces of evil.
to Rome, how little he accounts Christianity who would confine it to a book, how subordinate is the letter to its spirit, how adaptable and how little fettered it is by the circumstances of one or another time, and—in a word—how like is Christianity, the Christianity of the NT, to the faith we have inherited from our fathers.

CURRENT THEOLOGY
NOTES ON MORAL THEOLOGY

GENERAL MORAL

It would be extremely difficult these days for a moralist to indulge in complacency either in his own total adequacy or in that of the discipline he professes. Unlike Baltasar, he sees not one hand but many writing his Morte, Theci, Phares. Donald Weist, O.F.M.Cap.,1 after summarizing the criticisms leveled against the current status of moral theology, suggests that “the remedy for these deficiencies lies in a return to the method and approach of the golden ages in scholastical and moral theology. Speculative moral theology treating the entire field of human Christian conduct according to the order of the virtues, as St. Thomas Aquinas did, should be restored to its position of prominence.” Thereupon Fr. Weist proposes a graduate curriculum, preferably of four years’ duration, which would include obligatory courses in dogmatic, moral, pastoral, ascetical, and mystical theology, and provide auxiliary courses in psychology, psychiatry, medicine, law, economics, sociology, etc. Thus, he suggests, might moral theology “fulfill its mission of being the science of Christian conduct according to the Gospel in all its phases.”

None would challenge Fr. Weist’s contention that a moral theologian cannot be properly so called until after prolonged concentration on the broader aspects of his subject. And perhaps some improvement at the graduate level of studies would facilitate that process. But many would feel, I think, that in outlining his proposed plan, Fr. Weist overestimates to some extent both the necessity and the efficacy of multiplied courses and additional hours in the lecture hall. Even these will not of themselves produce the finished theologian he envisions. I would prefer to think that

Editor’s Note.—The present survey covers the period from June to December, 1955.

1 In recent years various new approaches to moral theology have been proposed by theologians. For an evaluation of these methods as they apply to the teaching of undergraduate theology, cf. M. Zaiba, S.J., “Exposición de la moral cristiana. Sobre la acomodación al tiempo presente,” Estudios eclesiásticos 29 (Jan.–Mar., 1955) 65–80. Fr. Zaiba acknowledges most generously the value of the alternatives suggested. But these methods, he firmly maintains, cannot be substituted in our seminary classrooms except with detriment to our primary and essential purpose of training competent confessors and directors of souls.
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