

## IV. *The Johannine Sacramentary*

*Raymond E. Brown*

THE question of sacramentality through symbolism is one which deeply affects the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Yet, in approaching this question, one encounters two very different scholarly evaluations. On the one side, there is the antisacramental (or at least nonsacramental) school led by Bulmann and most of the German scholars. On the other, there is a type of ultrasacramentalism which sees a symbolic reference to some sacrament or other in virtually every chapter of Jn. This view is championed by Cullmann<sup>1</sup> and by many of the French and British scholars. To see how far this trend has gone, the reader need only consult the list that we have placed at the end of our essay, a list of the Johannine passages that have been interpreted sacramentally.

Our purpose in this essay is to reexamine the methodological principles behind the theory of Johannine sacramentality and, in particular, to distinguish relatively well-founded examples of sacramentality from the less defensible suggestions. We believe that there is true sacramental symbolism in Jn; nevertheless, unproved applications of this symbolism have served only to bring the whole principle of symbolism into disrepute.

We recognize, of course, that in pursuing such an investiga-

<sup>1</sup> His *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*, which appeared in 1944, has had tremendous influence through its translations. We shall cite it as *Early Christian Worship*, tr. by A. S. Todd and J. B. Torrance (London, 1953). Cullmann's pupil, L. Bouyer, has popularized a sacramental view in *Le quatrième évangile*, 3 ed. (Tournai, 1956).

tion we are to some extent dealing in categories and precisions that may be foreign to Jn. Whether we confine our study to baptism and the Eucharist, or include the complete sacramentary, we may be overprecise in the questions we are asking, namely, are there references to the sacraments in Jn? For would the author of Jn have distinguished precisely between sacraments and sacramentals?<sup>2</sup> His was a general insight that the life-giving power of Jesus was effective through the material symbols employed in the deeds and discourses of the public ministry.<sup>3</sup> Now we know that in the course of time some of those material symbols were recognized by the Church as permanently valid signs communicating Christ's grace (the sacraments), while others were recognized as having only a lesser or temporary significance. We shall take advantage of this distinction and confine ourselves to the sacramentary in the strict sense; yet we must recognize that this precise delineation is more our own than the Evangelist's.

### The Nonsacramental View of Jn

Those scholars who see a minimal sacramental interest in Jn have based their case on literary criticism. Bultmann<sup>4</sup> finds in Jn three clearly sacramental passages: 3:5 with its reference to water, 6:51b-58, and 19:34-35 (passages referring respectively to baptism, Eucharist, and to both sacraments together). Otherwise Jn does not mention the institution of the sacraments, and places all emphasis on a personal union with Jesus. For Bultmann,<sup>5</sup> then, Jn basically ignores the sacraments and serves as a

<sup>2</sup> Henri Clavier, "Le problème du rite et du mythe dans le quatrième évangile," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, 31 (1951), 287, thinks that in Jn we have a generalization of sacramentalism in the direction of sacramentals. He thinks that the Evangelist did not want to confine sacramental references to two particular rites like baptism and the Eucharist.

<sup>3</sup> The Johannine concept of miracle as a "sign" borders closely on this. If men could really see and believe the revelation of Jesus portrayed in a material "sign," they could receive life eternal.

<sup>4</sup> *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 16 ed. (Göttingen, 1959). See also *Theology of the New Testament*, 2, tr. by K. Grobel (London, 1955), 3-14.

<sup>5</sup> *Das Evangelium*, 360: "Although the Evangelist tolerated the Church's use of baptism and the Eucharist, he remained suspicious of it because of the misuse to which it was subject, and therefore he did not speak of it. In truth the sacraments were superfluous for him."

corrective to that tendency in the early Church which would see the sacraments as a means of salvation. The three sacramental passages are additions made by the ecclesiastical redactor, a censor postulated by Bultmann who made corrections in the Gospel to conform it to the Synoptic tradition and Church usage.

While many have rejected Bultmann's view of Jn as basically antisacramental, there has been a wider acceptance of at least a nonsacramentality or of a peripheral sacramentality. Eduard Schweizer<sup>6</sup> doubts whether or not one can prove that the three sacramental passages are redactionary. In any case, their sacramentality is merely anti-Docetic and only helps to show the reality of the Incarnation. In Jn there is no stress on the sacraments in themselves, but only as witnesses to Jesus, and sacraments are not a central thought. Helmut Köster<sup>7</sup> maintains that even if 6:51b-58 and 3:5 ("water") are secondary, there is already a cultic and sacramental element in the other parts of Chaps. 6 and 3. Yet the Evangelist is interested in sacramentality only insofar as it leads back to the reality of Jesus. In Jn there is nothing like the metaphysical viewpoint that characterizes the sacramentality of Ignatius of Antioch.<sup>8</sup> Eduard Lohse<sup>9</sup> agrees with Bultmann that the three sacramental passages are redactionary and that the original Gospel had no sacraments. But this does not mean that the Evangelist was antisacramental. Rather the Evangelist's interest was centered on *martyria*: he wished to emphasize contact through witness with Jesus, and this main purpose did not call for any sacramental stress.

<sup>6</sup> "Das johanneische Zeugnis vom Herrenmahl," *Evangelische Theologie*, 12 (1952-1953), 341-363.

<sup>7</sup> "Geschichte und Kultus im Johannesevangelium und bei Ignatius von Antiochien," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 54 (1957), 56-69.

<sup>8</sup> Gunther Bornkamm, "Die eucharistische Rede im Johannes-Evangelium," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 47 (1956), 161-169, maintains, on the other hand, that the interpolation 6:51b-58 is much more sacramental than the rest of chap. 6 and much more Ignatian. Wilhelm Wilkens, "Das Abendmahlszeugnis im vierten Evangelium," *Evangelische Theologie*, 18 (1958), 354-370, tries to refute Bornkamm's arguments and to show that the passage is truly Johannine and not an interpolation. Yet he agrees with E. Schweizer on the anti-Docetic, peripheral character of Johannine sacramentality.

<sup>9</sup> "Wort und Sakrament im Johannesevangelium," *New Testament Studies*, 7 (1960-1961), 110-125.

Despite certain disagreements, most of the above-mentioned discussions<sup>10</sup> are focused on the three sacramental passages singled out by Bultmann. The question of wider sacramental symbolism is, for the most part, regarded as unproved and almost unworthy of detailed rebuttal. The underlying methodological principle seems to be that if the Evangelist had intended sacramental significance, he would have expressed it more clearly.

### The Ultrasacramental View of Jn

This school approaches Jn from another standpoint. Albert Schweitzer<sup>11</sup> maintained that the exegete had to consider the whole New Testament ethos. The theory that Old Testament prophecy had a fulfillment in the New Testament created a sensibility to typology. Therefore, it was natural for Jn to present Jesus' words and actions as prophetic types of the Church's sacraments, and the significance of these types would be easily recognizable to the Christian readers of the Gospel. Schweitzer began a trend; it was for Cullmann to go through Jn in detail and establish the case for sacramentality. Cullmann stresses that we know something of baptism and the Eucharist as essential parts of early Christian worship. Therefore, he maintains, both the Evangelist and his audience must have been familiar with these sacraments. Since the Evangelist's purpose was to ground the community's faith in the historic Jesus, what more natural than for him to show a basis for the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist in Jesus' words and works? Of course, this sacramental reference would be understood only in the postresurrectional period in which the Evangelist and his audience were living. As Cullmann proceeds through Jn incident by incident, he seeks to find some internal indication that sacramental symbolism was intended by the Evangelist.

<sup>10</sup> Köster, *art. cit.*, 66-67, treats of the possible sacramental significance of (a) the foot washing in chap. 13, in which he sees no baptismal significance but only a symbol of unity through love—the failure of Judas shows that there is no magical union with Jesus by sacramental means; (b) the vine passage of chap. 15. Here there may be Eucharistic significance, but the primary unity with Jesus is still a moral one (15:7, 10).

<sup>11</sup> *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus* (Tübingen, 1930), 345 ff.

In fact, however, he often seems to fall back on the principle that since a passage could have been understood sacramentally, it was intended sacramentally. His treatment was answered incident by incident by Wilhelm Michaelis,<sup>12</sup> who maintained that in virtually every case Cullmann had not proved the existence of sacramental symbolism.

The Swedish scholar Alf Corell<sup>13</sup> also takes a deeply sacramental view of Jn, although he does not see as many sacramental references as Cullmann does. Corell believes that just as there is a strong influence of the Jewish festal liturgy on Jn (in the direction of replacement), so there is influence of the Christian sacramental liturgy, i.e., baptism and the Eucharist. As Protestants, Cullmann and Corell would confine the sacramental references to just two sacraments; the Catholic scholar Bruce Vawter<sup>14</sup> would enlarge the sacramentary. He suggests the possibility of a reference to a sacramental anointing, similar to extreme unction, in the anointing of the feet (Jn 12), and to matrimony in the Cana scene (Jn 2).

The British commentaries on Jn have tended to be more prosacramental than the German. Edwyn Hoskyns<sup>15</sup> presents some interesting researches into Church history and liturgy to back up the sacramental interpretations of the narratives of the healing of the blind man (Jn 9) and of the washing of the feet (Jn 13). Even the more critical commentary of C. K. Barrett<sup>16</sup> states "... there is more sacramental teaching in John than in the other Gospels." He traces this to several Johannine categories of thought which are favorable to sacramentalism,

<sup>12</sup> *Die Sakramente in Johannesevangelium* (Bern, 1946). This excellent work, since it appeared in mimeographed form due to postwar conditions, never got the attention in American circles that it deserved. A similar skeptical view of Cullmann's arguments was taken by Philippe-H. Menoud, *L'Évangile de Jean* (Neuchâtel, 1947), 53-56: "In its details, this exegesis of O. Cullmann is not convincing."

<sup>13</sup> *Consummation Est* (Swedish ed., 1950; English ed., London, 1953).

<sup>14</sup> "The Johannine Sacramentary," *Theological Studies*, 17 (1956), 151-166. David M. Stanley, S.J., has also shown himself very favorable to ultrasacramentalism in his series of articles in *Worship*, 32-35 (1957-1961).

<sup>15</sup> *The Fourth Gospel*, 2 ed. (London, 1947), esp. 363 and 443. R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel* (Oxford, 1956), also accepts much sacramental symbolism in Jn.

<sup>16</sup> *The Gospel according to St. John* (London, 1958), 69.

e.g., symbolism and emphasis on the material circumstances of Jesus.<sup>17</sup>

Paul Niewalda<sup>18</sup> has given us the most recent and complete defense of sacramental symbolism in Jn. He frankly admits that by the ordinary tools of exegesis one cannot prove that the Evangelist intended to refer to the sacraments by means of material symbols. And so he suggests a different exegetical approach. Niewalda shows that a dependence on some type of symbolism or deeper meaning was in vogue in all types of literature at this time, and that our earliest Christian records (liturgy, Church art, the Fathers) witness to the use of fixed symbols for the sacraments. Therefore, he maintains that when these traditional symbols are encountered in the New Testament and, in particular, in Jn, they should be interpreted as references to the sacraments. The author of Jn was a child of his time: symbolism would have been part of his literary technique, and he would have used the same symbols as his contemporaries. Rudolf Schnackenburg<sup>19</sup> objects to this principle on the grounds that most of the early Christian witnesses are later than Jn and may represent a more developed symbolism. Water, for instance, certainly plays a more symbolic and sacramental role in Tertullian than it does in Jn. Schnackenburg, who is a moderate sacramentalist, has his own method of procedure; first he studies the clearly sacramental texts in Jn and establishes from them an estimate of the sacramentality of the Evangelist with which to approach the more obscure texts.

#### Consideration of the Methodology of These Views

The study of all the arguments for and against Johannine sacramentality suggests that a balance may be achieved through a better methodological appreciation on both sides.

First, the literary criticism of the nonsacramentalists should

<sup>17</sup> Clavier, *art. cit.*, 287, has the same view; for, he asks, how could Johnine thought ignore sacramentalism (i.e., the use of exterior forms as a means of grace) when it makes a fulcrum of the Incarnation?

<sup>18</sup> *Sakramentsymbolik im Johannesevangelium* (Limburg, 1958).

<sup>19</sup> "Die Sakramente im Johannesevangelium," *Sacra Pagina*, 2 (Paris, 1959), 235-254.

not be neglected. This pertains chiefly to the three definitely sacramental passages stressed by Bultmann: 3:5; 6:51b-58; 19:34b-35. Too often, if we take Jn 6 as an example, supporters of the sacramental position satisfy themselves by proving that the chapter is a unity. Against Bultmann, and quite correctly, they point out Eucharistic indications in the earlier part of Chap. 6.<sup>20</sup> To some this would prove that the Eucharistic section belongs to the rest of the chapter. Yet why could it not have been added to the chapter by someone desiring precisely to clarify the Eucharistic undertones of the rest of the discourse? The unity could be purely a literary or logical one.

What the recognition of Eucharistic elements in other parts of Chap. 6 does prove is that Bultmann's concept of the ecclesiastical redactor is false. There is every evidence that the sacramental section has a certain harmony with the rest of the discourse and was not simply superimposed by an act of ecclesiastical censorship to make Jn conform to sacramental ideas.<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, while we may rule out such a theory of arbitrary redaction, we cannot exclude editorship in the history of the composition of Jn. E. Schweizer and Ruckstuhl,<sup>22</sup> by the use of stylistic characteristics, have devastated the source theory of Jn as posited by Bultmann and others. There is too much literary homogeneity in Jn to posit the simple combination of totally distinct sources. Yet this homogeneity cannot rule out subsequent editorship within the Johannine tradition. The Last Discourse is, perhaps, the best example of this: it is all quite Johannine, but it certainly shows signs of editorial modifications.

With this in mind, we cannot dismiss the possibility that some sacramental sections in Jn (e.g., 3:5 and 6:51-58) are editorial additions of Johannine material, designed to bring out

<sup>20</sup> This is admitted by Bornkamm, *art. cit.*, 162, and Köster, *art. cit.*, 62, and is a commonplace among Catholic writers. For an excellent summary of Catholic views, see Cyril Vollert, S.J., "The Eucharist: Quests for Insights from Scripture," *Theological Studies*, 21 (1960), 404-415.

<sup>21</sup> Clarence T. Craig, "Sacramental Interest in the Fourth Gospel," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 58 (1939), 32, pointed this out a long time ago. He stressed that we cannot discover a redactor's addition by isolating ideas that seem to us to contradict the main position of the Evangelist. "It is quite another thing to demonstrate that they were contradictory to him."

<sup>22</sup> Eduard Schweizer, *Ego Eimi* (Göttingen, 1939); Eugen Ruckstuhl, *Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums* (Freiburg, 1951).

the real sacramental undertones already present.<sup>23</sup> This would account for the surface unity of the sections, and yet allow for the startlingly deeper sacramentality of the specific additions. Thus there would be truth in the remarks of the nonsacramentalists that certain specific sections do have clearer sacramental emphasis than the rest of the Gospel. In our view, this theory weakens Schnackenburg's criterion of using the clearly sacramental sections as a canon for judging the sacramental symbolism and interest of the rest of the Gospel.

Second, we must discuss the claim of the nonsacramentalists that Johannine sacramentality is of a peripheral character, or introduced only as part of anti-Doceist apologetic. This peripheral sacramentality is contrasted with "Hellenistic" or "Ignatian" sacramentality, which gives independent value to the sacraments.

Here, too, there is a methodological difficulty. Most of those who hold this view (see above) have confined their study to the three so-called clearly sacramental passages of the Gospel and to 1 Jn 5:6-8. Now there probably is an anti-Doceist emphasis in 1 Jn 5:6-8 and in Jn 19:34b-35;<sup>24</sup> the author is stressing the bloody death of Jesus as the Christ. The water and blood bear witness to the humanity of Jesus. Another section, 6:51b-58, may have some claim to be considered as anti-Doceist, although this seems less clear to us.<sup>25</sup> Yet it is only in these two or three sacramental passages that there is any emphasis on the connection between anti-Doceism and sacramentalism. The many other sacramental passages claimed

<sup>23</sup> We have given a preliminary sketch of our personal views on these sections in our pamphlet commentary on Jn in the *New Testament Reading Guide*, 13 (Collegeville, Minn., 1960). Also see Chap. V below.

<sup>24</sup> See E. Schweizer, *art. cit.* (*Synopta*, n. 6), 344-352. The two passages, however, do not have exactly the same emphasis in their sacramental symbolism. As Schnackenburg, *art. cit.*, 249, points out, the blood and water of 19:34 stress the origins of the Eucharist and baptism in the death of Christ, whereas the water and blood of 1 Jn stress the place of baptism and the Eucharist in the work of the Church. Thus, even here the anti-Doceist element is not the exclusive sacramental interest.

<sup>25</sup> The stress on "feeding on" Jesus' flesh may help to prove His humanity, but 6:55 ("My flesh is a real food, and my blood a real drink") seems to put more emphasis on the true nourishing value of the flesh and blood, rather than on any anti-Doceist motif. There is nothing particularly anti-Doceist about 3:5.

by Cullmann, Niewalda, and others have no such particular bent. Thus, if any truth can be granted to even a part of the claims of the ultrasacramental school, this very specialized aspect attributed to Johannine sacramentality would disappear, and anti-Doceism would become merely one aspect of a larger sacramental picture.

As for "peripheral sacramentality" in general, a great deal depends on the definition of terms. No exegete with a sense of history expects to find a fully developed Scholastic sacramentalism in Jn. And it is probably true that even between the time of Jn and that of Ignatius of Antioch there was some development of sacramental theology.<sup>26</sup> Yet, in evaluating Johannine sacramentality, we must remember that the purpose of the Evangelist was different from that of an author like Ignatius. The Evangelist cannot treat of the sacraments as such, but only inasmuch as they are reflected in the words and works of Jesus.<sup>27</sup> Therefore the claim that in Jn the sacraments are emphasized only insofar as they help unite the Christian to the historical Jesus is a bit naïve. What other role could the sacraments play in *a gospel*? Any reference to the role of the sacraments in the postresurrectional Church can only be through prophetic typology or some other secondary sense, if the author is to maintain his purpose of telling the significance of what really happened between the baptism of Jesus and His resurrection. Thus, most of the exegetes who interpret Jn sacramentally are quite correct methodologically in seeing any sacramental reference as the second of a twofold meaning present in the words and works of Jesus. For example, if we posit some historical tradition behind the Nicodemus incident, then we must allow a primary, nonsacramental meaning to Jesus' words, a meaning which Nicodemus could have understood. The refer-

<sup>26</sup> The picture is not totally clear. The reason for the rejection of the three sacramental passages is because often they are regarded as Ignatian rather than Johannine (so Bornkamm). Yet Köster distinguishes carefully between the sacramentality of these passages and that of Ignatius.

<sup>27</sup> Schnackenburg, *art. cit.*, 253-254, says that for Jn the sacraments take the work of salvation once performed by Jesus, re-present it, and apply it to all believers after the coming of the Spirit. The self-revelation of Jesus as the source of truth and life stands in the foreground of the Gospel; the Church and the sacraments stand in the background as a continuation of that work.

ence to Christian baptism can only be secondary, at least chronologically. Johannine sacramentality fits into the Gospel's oft-repeated confession that the deeper meaning of these things was not understood until afterward. In this sense, then, Johannine sacramentality is "peripheral," but such a description tends to be misleading.

Nor does the fact that Jn omits the institutions of baptism and the Eucharist mean that the Evangelist was not interested in the sacraments. That Jesus Christ instituted the sacraments is a dogma of the faith. But there is nothing of faith about when He instituted baptism. St. Thomas connects the institution of baptism to Jesus' own baptism in the Jordan, a scene which Jn does not narrate but at least implies (1:33). Estius connects the institution of baptism to the Nicodemus scene (3:5), in which case Jn would be the only one to have recorded the institution. More frequently, perhaps, theologians follow Tertullian and Alexander of Hales in connecting the institution of baptism to Mt 28:19, "Go . . . baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," words not recorded by Jn (nor by Mk, nor by Lk — are these also nonsacramental?). Many scholars today, however, suggest that the Trinitarian formula as given by Mt came into the Gospel from liturgical usage.<sup>28</sup> Therefore, in not connecting the institution of baptism to any precise words, but in seeing references to baptism in many of the words and works of Jesus, Jn may be representing the original, imprecise outlook of the earliest Christian theology.

The Eucharist presents a more complicated problem. Tradition places the institution of the Eucharist at the Last Supper. But did the early Church preserve the precise words of Jesus as words of institution? Behind the four accounts in Mt, Mk, Lk, and 1 Cor, scholars see two basic traditions, that of Paul (Lk) and that of Mk (Mt), both with claims to antiquity.<sup>29</sup> And while Jn does not record the scene of institution at the Last Supper, the words of 6:51, "The bread that I shall give is my own flesh for the life of the world," may stand quite

<sup>28</sup> For example, D. M. Stanley, S.J., in his pamphlet commentary on Mt in *New Testament Reading Guide*, 4 (Collegeville, Minn., 1960), 92.

<sup>29</sup> For bibliography see Vollert, *art. cit.*, 416 ff.

close to the Semitic original of Jesus' words at the Last Supper, since many claim that Jesus probably spoke of His flesh rather than of His body. Thus the argument against Johannine sacramentality from the failure to record institutions is not as impressive as might first seem, and probably reflects more of modern theological interests than of those of antiquity.<sup>30</sup>

*Third*, we must consider the methodology of the sacramentalists and answer the fundamental question: Is it necessary to have some internal indication that the author himself intended a symbolic reference to the sacraments? As we have said, most of the ultrasacramentalists approach the problem from the viewpoint of what the Evangelist's audience could have understood. Yet that is a very delicate instrument of exegesis, or rather an instrument that is used with much more ease in eisegesis.

A few considerations seem in order. We grant that we cannot approach Jn with the idea of accepting only the symbolism that is clear to us today. Certainly Niewalda is correct in pointing out that some type of symbolism (typical sense, secondary sense, *sensus plenior*, or whatever hermeneutical tag we may give it) was in more general vogue in New Testament times than it is in our own. And there are indications all through Jn that the author was prepared to carry his symbolism quite far. Who would have dared to interpret 21:18 and its vague reference to Peter's stretching out his hands as a symbol of his crucifixion, if the sacred writer did not make it specific? Or, if one prefers to avoid chap. 21, the same may be said of the equation of the Temple and the body of Jesus (2:21), and of the Spirit and water (7:39).<sup>31</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Barrett, *op. cit.*, 71, says that Jn never refers explicitly to sacramental institutions because the sacraments do not hang from any one moment but from the whole fact of Christ. This is an attractive explanation, but we suspect that the whole problem is a modern creation, as Craig holds, *art. cit.*, 33-34. Of course, if one is really interested in finding institutions in Jn, the Council of Trent (*DB* 894) says that the principal institution of the sacrament of penance was in the scene recorded exclusively in Jn 20:22-23. (Probably this does not mean that penance is the exclusive object of the verse. The power to forgive sins through the reception of the Spirit is a wide power exercised in baptism — see Lk 24:47; Acts 2:38 — and in penance.)

<sup>31</sup> We might add the comparison of the crucified Christ to the brazen serpent (3:14), of the multiplication of the loaves to the gift of manna (chap. 6), and the symbolism of 12:32-33. See Vawter, *art. cit.* (*supra*, n. 14), 165.

Now it may be objected that these symbols show that the Evangelist can and does explain symbolism when he employs it, and that therefore we should confine ourselves to just those symbols that he explains. But is there anyone who believes that "the Lamb of God," which Jn does not explain, does not have some symbolic reference, whether it be to the Suffering Servant or to the paschal lamb, or both? And since the water-Spirit equation is not specified until chap. 7, are we to believe that in none of the earlier passages water refers to the Spirit?<sup>32</sup> Thus it might be more precise to say that the symbols that the Evangelist explains are precisely the very difficult ones that might otherwise have been overlooked. To confine the Gospel's symbolism to them would be arbitrarily to prejudice our exegesis.<sup>33</sup>

Niewalda's investigation of the symbols used in the early Church for the sacraments can serve as a negative criterion in exegeting Jn. If there is no clear indication in the Gospel itself that a passage has symbolic reference to a sacrament, and if there is no evidence in the early Church that the passage was understood sacramentally, then we may well rule out a sacramental exegesis. A sacramental symbol that the Evangelist intended to be easily understood without explanation should have left some trace in art or in liturgy or in the writings of the Fathers. Without such assurance, we may suspect that we are dealing with modern imaginative eisegesis.

Let us consider, for instance, Cullmann's<sup>34</sup> interpretation of the foot-washing scene in chap. 13 as a symbol of the Eucharist. Jesus specifically holds up the foot washing as an example of humble and loving service to one's brethren (13:15). Nevertheless, in this scene many have seen a symbolic reference to a sacrament or sacraments. Verse 10 reads: "He who has bathed

<sup>32</sup> We do not suggest that every mention of water refers to the Spirit; but since the Spirit gives life (6:68), we would find difficulty in dissociating the "living water" of chap. 4 from the Spirit.

<sup>33</sup> This is the basic objection that we would bring against Michaelis' work (*supra*, n. 12). Many of his objections against Cullmann are perfectly valid, but on the whole he seems to demand from the Evangelist a type of indication that we might expect in a twentieth-century writer. This is to narrow overly the symbolic import of Jn.

<sup>34</sup> *Op. cit.*, 105-109.

does not need to wash, except for his feet." The first clause, says Cullmann, "can surely have only this meaning; he who has received Baptism, even when he sins afresh, needs no second Baptism." While we would not attribute to this exegesis the certainty that Cullmann gives it, we believe that some symbolic reference to baptism is solidly probable, and it was well known in antiquity.<sup>35</sup> But Cullmann goes on to maintain that the clause "except for his feet," which is of doubtful authenticity,<sup>36</sup> is a symbol of the Eucharist, a sacrament which is meant to be repeated. This is a view shared by Goguel, Loisy, W. Bauer, and Macgregor, who point out the connection between the washing of the feet as a symbol of love and the Eucharist as the sacrament of love. Now antiquity may have seen a reference to penance in this text, but not to the Eucharist. The lack of external support makes the exegesis suspect, especially since foot washing is scarcely a natural symbol for the Eucharist. The statement in v. 14 that the disciples must wash one another's feet would be an exceedingly strange form of a command to repeat the Eucharist. And so, on the basis of our criteria, we would reject this interpretation.

<sup>35</sup> In our pamphlet commentary (*supra*, n. 23), 67-68, we have listed our reasons for seeing a reference to baptism. But this symbolism must be interpreted loosely (we certainly do not mean that this scene is the baptism of the disciples). It is a secondary symbolism, perhaps gained by the fusion of two accounts; in the primary significance we have an example of love, and that is what must be repeated. But the washing, considered as bathing (v. 10), also symbolizes baptism in the sense that it flows from the power of Jesus (compare 13:3 with Mt 28:18-19) and is necessary if we are to have a share with Him in the next life (13:8). The arguments against all sacramental symbolism proposed by Johann Michl, "Der Sinn der Fusswaschung," *Biblica*, 40 (1959), 697-708, fail to appreciate any subtlety in the proposed symbolism. Schnackenburg's treatment, *art. cit.*, 249-251, is much more nuanced.

<sup>36</sup> See M.-E. Boismard, *Revue biblique*, 60 (1953), 353-356. Verse 10 should probably read: "The man who has bathed has no need to wash; he is clean all over." The excision of a reference to the feet delivers us from the exegesis proposed by H. von Campenhausen, "Zur Auslegung von Joh 13, 6-10," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 33 (1934), 259-271, and championed by Craig, *art. cit.*, 37. These authors have suggested that the idea in v. 10 is that foot washing is valid baptism and that one need not wash the whole body (perhaps a polemic against the disciples of the Baptist). For completeness, we might add that E. Lohmeyer, "Die Fusswaschung," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 38 (1939), 74-94, saw in the foot washing a symbol of apostolic ordination.

