

The Two Sacraments Doctrine as a Factor in Synoptic Relationships

David P. Scaer
Concordia Theological Seminary (Indiana)

Abstract

I argue that baptism and the Lord's supper were two closely connected and central notions for the Gospel authors. The way in which baptism was connected to forgiveness also provides clues to interdependencies among the Gospel narratives. Following summary examination of the doctrines in Matthew and Paul, I conclude that Mark and John provide a fully developed doctrine of the two sacraments.

The Sacraments as the Framework for the Gospels

The late Professor Bo Reicke in *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels* introduced the early church celebration of baptism and the Lord's supper as factors in determining the origin of the gospels. He noted that "there is a heavy concentration of context parallel triple traditions upon or around the text units that deal with Christ's baptism and passion" [7, 65]. From this "heavy concentration of context parallel traditions," he concluded that the practice of Christian baptism was the occasion for retelling the story of Jesus's baptism and that the celebration of the Lord's supper was the occasion for rehearsing his suffering. From this oral tradition, as it was preserved in the worship of the early church, the evangelists constructed the gospels. The point of the debate is not whether the synoptics agree in beginning Jesus's ministry with his baptism and concluding it with his passion. Obviously they do. It simply is true that for all the synoptics, Jesus's ministry begins with his baptism and ends with his passion, regardless of how much or how little the intervening materials differ in regard to arrangement, expression, and outline. What one does with this data is the problem, especially when the evidence shows that the synoptics do show a remarkable agreement in placing the baptism and passion narratives at the beginning and end of their gospels.

The supporters of Markan priority have come to a different conclusion from this phenomenon. Mark must be first, so they argue, because only he begins with the baptism of Jesus and ends his passion with an abbreviated Easter account. They have concluded that since Mark begins with the account of Jesus's ministry with his baptism, the infancy narratives were later additions made by Matthew and Luke. The resurrection appearances of Jesus in Matthew and Luke are seen also as later additions, as Mark has only the account of the empty tomb. These arguments are used to support the priority of Mark. Reicke's conclusion that synoptic agreement on the baptism of Jesus and the Lord's supper reflects early church liturgical practice seems as valid as the claims of those who see the infancy and resurrection narratives as later additions to support Markan priority. His position also has the advantage of explaining the prominent place that baptism and the Lord's supper had in the Christian church. "Christian baptism and holy communion served as life settings of traditions that deal with the Lord's baptism and last supper and that represent a great amount of verbal agreement between the synoptic texts" [7, 67].

Reicke does not bring the Fourth Gospel into his thesis, but there is no reason for our not doing so. The Gospel of John also revolves around the centrifugal poles of Jesus's baptism and passion, though the Fourth Evangelist goes about his task in a slightly different way than do the synoptics, as has been demonstrated by Oscar Cullmann in *Early Christian Worship* [3, 37-119]. This will be discussed below. At the baptism of new converts, the church heard the story of Jesus's own baptism by John, and at the celebration of the supper, it heard the account of his suffering, beginning with Palm Sunday and concluding with the burial of Jesus. The baptism of Jesus provided the salvific foundation for the Christians' own baptism and his suffering was concretized for them and their fellow worshipers in the congregation in the celebration of Lord's supper. Thus these two rites provided a structure for early Christian worship and in turn this worship provided definite boundaries on the outward structure of the transmitted oral tradition. Oral tradition was not a random collection of sayings by Jesus and about him, but rather consisted of sayings that grew up within certain liturgical structures connected with baptism and the Lord's Supper. The liturgy preserved certain events from the life of Jesus by repeating them not only by word but by similar actions. These liturgical structures, forming the outward perimeters of the oral tradition, provided the scaffolding for the beginning and conclusions of the gospels. Regardless of the divergent internal contents of the oral tradition as it was preserved in the synoptics, the accounts of Jesus's baptism and his passion were similar, since all the churches were baptizing and celebrating the supper. Baptism and the supper provided the catholic and ecumenical elements of the burgeoning tradition. This is Reicke's theory, as I understand it. With this approach, Reicke excluded himself from the debate with the the Two Gospel Hypothesis and Two Documentary

Hypothesis by seeing each of the gospels drawing from the oral tradition in Palestine independently, a theory not unlike that also held by John A. T. Robinson [9, 33].

Reicke's argument is valid in its recognition of the persuasive role played by tradition in the early church worship and its subsequent influence on the writers, especially as that tradition was connected with the worshipping congregation. It was in baptizing and in celebrating the Lord's supper that the presence of the crucified and now exalted Lord was most keenly felt. If there is a weakness in Reicke's theory, it is that it sees each of the evangelists capitalizing on the oral tradition about the baptism and passion of Jesus in nearly identical ways in regard to their place in the gospels. There is, however, no reason for not capitalizing on Reicke's thesis that baptism and the Lord's supper helped shape and form the synoptics and then proceeding from there. A modified version of Reicke's theory about the prominent place of baptism and the Lord's supper in the gospels can be used to support the order Matthew-Luke-Mark-John.

More plausible than Reicke's view that each of the synoptic evangelists handled the oral tradition of the baptism of Jesus and his passion in the same way is the theory that at least the first evangelist, whoever he may have been, framed his gospel according to the scheme suggested by Reicke, that the second evangelist followed the first, and that the third followed the first and the second. This scheme can be expanded to include John. This is not to deny that the second, third, and fourth evangelists did not independently use oral tradition about Jesus's baptism and passion, as they were acquainted with it in their own congregations; but this is to state that they did not come independently to nearly the same method of beginning and ending the accounts of Jesus's life with his baptism and passion. Only one evangelist 'discovered' the baptism and passion accounts as a framework for a gospel and the others followed his lead. The oral tradition, i.e., the liturgical tradition, as each evangelist encountered it, accounted for the uniqueness of each. In pursuing this line of reasoning, I am indebted to the late Professor Reicke for alerting me to the sacraments as a factor in determining synoptic relationships. Reicke's theory, however, places too much emphasis on the inviolability of oral tradition and completely ignores some sort of mutual interdependency among the evangelists which proponents of both the Two-Gospel Hypothesis and the Two Documentary Hypothesis recognize in spite of their differences.

Inviolability

Church dogma about sacraments and New Testament critical studies come together at the matrix of the early church practices of baptism and the Lord's supper. Apart from the historical critical question of the precise origins of baptism and the Lord's supper, church dogma has placed these two liturgical rites, practiced by the early church, side by side and identified them as sacraments. Though the church has developed other liturgical rites and has attempted to demonstrate their apostolic origin (e.g., ordination), baptism and the Lord's supper are given a place of nearly universal honor in nearly all branches of Christianity which is simply not given to other forms of worship. Divisions occur not over the question of whether or not baptism and the supper should be celebrated, but over their interpretation and effectiveness.

The use of the term 'sacraments' for baptism and the Lord's supper was first made in the middle of the second century by Tertullian and is not of biblical origin, at least in application to baptism and the Lord's supper. This does not preclude the possibility that the rites of baptism and the Lord's supper were seen as having something in common, even before the close of the New Testament era, when there is no evidence that the term was in use for these liturgical practices. Is the doctrine of two sacraments only a post-first century conclusion when the term sacrament was applied to them? Or had this 'dogmatic' conclusion been reached before the end of the first century? And are there signs of these 'dogmatic' conclusions in the New Testament? Reicke's thesis that these rites shaped the synoptics in their beginnings and conclusions would certainly support the view that the early church saw them as resembling one another in some sense, even if the term 'sacraments' arose later in the second century.

This poses a second question: If baptism and the Lord's supper were seen as possessing something 'sacramental' in common, do their relationship or similarity to each other in New Testament writings have anything to say about the interdependency of the New Testament writings, especially the gospels, on one another? Can any sort of 'sacramental' evolution be detected in the New Testament writings which would speak to the issue of the order in which they were written?

Our thesis is that Matthew sees baptism and the supper as salvifically necessary for the life of the church. Luke places them side by side in the resurrection narrative. Mark under Paul's influence brings them together as 'sacraments.' John, for whom baptism and the supper play an important role in determining outline and content of his gospel, is dependent upon Mark for this insight. Throughout this essay the

term 'sacrament' is used as a convenient abbreviation to show the close connection that baptism and the supper have to each other. There is no suggestion that the term was used this way in the first century, as explained above.

"For the forgiveness of sins": Matthew vs. Luke-Mark

One clue in using baptism and the Lord's supper as an indication of the order of the gospels is found in the crucial phrase "for the forgiveness of sins," which is attached by Matthew to the sacrificial blood offered in the Lord's supper (26:28) and by Mark (1:4) and Luke (3:3) to the baptism of John. Assuming for the sake of argument that Mark was first, we must then conclude that Luke followed Mark in attaching forgiveness of sins to baptism and that Matthew made a 'sacramental' alteration in attaching forgiveness to the blood of the supper: "Drink of it, all of you; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sin" (26:27b-8). But is it more likely that Mark and Luke are more original in placing forgiveness with baptism than Matthew in placing this forgiveness as a fruit of Jesus's death with the cup? Or is it more likely that Matthew was first in order of composition, since he, and not Mark or Luke, attaches the phrase "the forgiveness of sins" to the sacrificial blood shed by Jesus, a reference to his death by violent means? This blood is then given in the supper "for the forgiveness of sins". Let's put the argument in another way. Matthew's use of the words "for the forgiveness of sins" actually locates the origin and cause of salvation in the death of Jesus. As M.-E. Boismard says, "the formula 'for the forgiveness of sins' belongs to the primitive theology (Mt 26:28; Col 1:14; Eph 1:7)" [1, 36].

Mark and Luke speak of obtaining this forgiveness through baptism, but make no mention of the death of Jesus as its cause or origin. Before the church could have 'sacraments' through which the forgiveness of sins was available, it seems logical that it would have arrived at some idea of the death of Jesus as atonement. Hence Matthew appears to be more original in the use of this phrase in applying it to the death of Jesus and to the supper than Mark or Luke do in applying it to baptism. It should be noted that the attachment of the forgiveness of sins to John's baptism comes as an editorial comment of Mark and Luke, while in Matthew these words form a logion of Jesus.

The Two Gospel Hypothesis sees Matthew and Luke coming first and then followed by Mark. Even if Matthew can be demonstrated as preceding Mark, is there any evidence in the use of the phrase "for the forgiveness of sins" that Luke preceded Mark? Luke knows of the phrase in 3:3 in connection with John's baptism and in

24:47, but in the latter case makes no explicit reference to baptism: "And that repentance for the forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem." It is hard to escape the conclusion that Luke in 24:47, on the basis of what he has already said 3:3 and what he would later write in Acts 2:38, is speaking of forgiveness through baptism. This is assuming that the author of Luke-Acts intended that these two writings be taken as a whole for purposes of interpretation. It can only be speculated why Luke attaches forgiveness to baptism throughout Luke-Acts and not to the supper as Matthew does. Mark's solitary usage of baptism for the forgiveness of sins (1:4) suggests that he has borrowed from Luke, as this is a characteristic Lukan way of speaking, as pointed out by Boismard [1, 36].

Then there is the matter of the similarity of Luke 24:47, with its implicit command to baptize, to Matthew 28:19-20, with its explicit command to baptism. It seems as if the Luke is providing a clarifying commentary on Matthew.

Consider these points. (1) Matthew provides a command to baptize, but makes no mention of any personal benefits to those who are baptized, as does Luke, who attaches forgiveness to baptism. Matthew's command to baptize is replaced by Luke's preaching of repentance in the name of Jesus. Just as John's baptism required repentance, so would Christian baptism (Luke 3:3). Acts 2:38 does make the connection between baptism and the forgiveness of sins explicit. "Be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sins." (2) Matthew's apparent exclusion of the Jews as fit objects of the church's mission outreach through baptism by his use of the word gentiles, quite literally pagans, with no reference to the Jews, is clarified by Luke's stating that such activity should begin in Jerusalem; and thus the Jews are by inference included. Acts 2:5 explicitly includes Jews. (3) Matthew's trinitarian (Father-Son-Holy Spirit) authorization for baptism is replaced by Luke's "I will send the Promise of my Father," which is his substitute for Matthew's 'Father-Son-Spirit'. While baptism is not presented in clear trinitarian terminology here in Luke, it is there by implication and would be immediately recognizable to a reader or hearer acquainted with Matthew's ending (28:19-20). Joseph Fitzmyer, while not willing to see a dependency of Luke's commissioning on Matthew's does note that, "This passage is remotely related to the finale of the Matthean Gospel (28:19- 20a)... " [4, 1578].

Without Matthew, Luke would have been less than completely clear about what is meant by Jesus sending the Promise of his Father. It does become clear in the light of Acts 1:4,5, and 8, where Jesus promises them the Holy Spirit. Whereas Matthew speaks of God as he is in himself, Luke speaks of God's activity in baptism. Matthew's ontological Trinity (opera ad intra) precedes Luke's economic Trinity

(*opera ad extra*), if we dare introduce dogmatical terminology. Luke can afford to be more homiletical in his description of the final episode in the life of Jesus, because Matthew has provided the clearer dogmatical framework. Without Matthew, Luke would remain less than fully intelligible. Luke's designation of the Spirit as 'Promise' recalls the promise of the Baptist that Jesus would baptize with the Spirit. Thus Luke brings Matthew (3:11) to completion.

The question arises why Mark and Luke explicitly say that John's baptism was "for the forgiveness of sins," but Matthew does not. Is there an explanation for this? The validity of John's baptism had come into question in the church outside of Palestine. Those at Ephesus who had received John's baptism had no knowledge of the Holy Spirit and "were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 19:5). They had heard the Baptist's promise, but they had not experienced it. The question must be raised why the Ephesians were singled out for another baptism and not the disciples of Jesus who had also been baptized by John. Schleiermacher's suggestion, that the personal direct experience with Jesus took the place of baptism, might provide the best possible explanation why the Ephesians needed 'another' baptism and Jesus's disciples did not [10, 622].

There is no indication that the wider circle of Palestinian followers of Jesus who had seen the resurrected Lord were baptized again. The problem of the inadequacy of John's baptism arose only among those who had left Palestine before having a direct confrontation with the resurrected Jesus. Mark and Luke whose audience outside of Palestine had to assure those Jewish-Christians living in the diaspora that even if their baptism did not give the Holy Spirit, it was nevertheless not devoid of salvific significance. It was a baptism for the forgiveness of sins, but the Promise of the Father had not been given. The validity of John's baptism for Matthew's church never came into question, since his audience were either those first Christians who had been baptized by John and had experienced the resurrected Lord or had been baptized by the apostles on and after Pentecost. On that account Matthew did not have to provide for his readers (hearers) any assurance about the validity of John's baptism.

**Baptism and the Supper in the
Resurrection Narratives:
Matthew and Luke**

It cannot be overlooked that, whereas Matthew reports that the resurrected Lord institutes only baptism (28:19,20), Luke reports that he celebrates the supper (24:30-5) and that baptism will be carried out in his name (24:47), and that this is assuming that the preaching of repentance for the forgiveness of sins includes baptism. Such a conclusion, namely that Luke here is referring to baptism by the phrase "the preaching of forgiveness of sins," is suggested by Luke's other uses of the phrase "for the forgiveness of sins." Luke makes a significant addition in the development of a two sacrament doctrine by his including both an implicit command to baptize and a reference to Jesus celebrating supper after the resurrection. Matthew lays the groundwork for a two sacrament doctrine in that for him Jesus promises to maintain his presence with the church in both the supper ["when I drink it anew with you in the kingdom of my Father" (26:29)] and in baptism ["Lo, I am with you to the end of the age" (Matt. 28:20)]. He does not bring them together into the same place, however, as Luke, Paul, Mark, and John would do. Reicke's theory does not involve the Easter narratives, simply because unlike the baptism and passion narratives, they are so diverse that they would not serve his conclusions. The diversity of the Easter narratives is not an obstacle to drawing conclusions about synoptic relationships on the basis of each's handling of baptism and the supper (see [8, 93]).

Working with the conclusion that Matthew and Luke are more likely to complement rather than contradict each other, their Easter narratives do address the issue of the place of 'sacraments' in their churches.

Matthew's Easter narrative can be divided into three sections: (1) the discovery of the empty tomb [Matt. 28:1-10]; (2) the alleged stealing of Jesus's body [Matt. 28:11-15]; and (3) the making disciples out of gentiles by baptizing them [Matt. 28:16-20]. Luke's implicit reference to baptism (24:47) in a certain sense suggests that his congregation already knows of Matthew's ending, where the command to baptize is explicit (28:19,20). Luke makes a subtle shift in attaching the presence of the resurrected Lord to the supper and not only to the practice of baptism, as Matthew does. "Lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age." In Luke the presence of Jesus is maintained in the breaking of the bread (24:35), i.e., the supper. "He was known to them in the breaking of the bread." When the resurrection narratives of Matthew and Luke are placed side by side the shadows of a 'two sacrament doctrine' begins to emerge in Luke. But what was the scenario? Did Matthew note Luke's omission of an explicit reference baptism? Thus Matthew would have been motivated

to conclude his gospel with a command to practice it. Or was the reverse true? Was Luke aware of Matthew's command to baptize and desired to give the supper a position of similar importance to baptism in the accounts of the resurrected Lord? The priority of Matthew is more probable, since baptism, for which he preserves Jesus' command, and not the table fellowship, was the way in which those who were converted associated themselves with the cause which Jesus represented. Baptism was the foundational rite for the early church and the supper the maintenance rite (see [3, 199]).

The supper was intended for those who had already made the commitment connected with baptism. All of the evangelists are agreed in seeing that the baptism of John introduced the converted to Jesus as the Christ. It was not that the baptized came only to an awareness of personal sin which they did not have before. The practice of baptism was continued by Jesus, though not much about this is reported (John 4:1-2). The command of Jesus in Matthew 28:19-20 requires that what John and Jesus did in baptizing repentant persons should be continued in the church. Why no command to celebrate the supper was given in Matthew in the resurrection narrative can only be a matter of conjecture. The evangelist may have thought - and correctly so - that the command to teach all things would also embrace the command to celebrate the supper until Jesus would return. In any event Matthew has no reference to the supper in the Easter narrative and there is nothing here by implication.

Luke's reference to the Lord's breaking of bread with the Emmaus disciples is given in narrative form without a command. Luke has already provided a command in the last supper in connection with the bread: "Do this for the purpose that I should be remembered" (22:19). Matthew in the parallel does not provide a command. Thus Luke added the command because for his purposes Matthew had not been sufficiently explicit about the continued celebration of the supper. Matthew, like Luke, suggests that the supper will be celebrated again. "I tell you I shall not drink again of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom" (Matt. 26:20). The Emmaus supper can be understood as fulfilling the command of Luke 22:19 and the double promises that Jesus will eat of this bread when all is fulfilled in the kingdom of God (22:16) and he will not drink of the cup until the kingdom of God comes (22:18). Luke's Emmaus account can also be seen as fulfilling Matthew's promise that Jesus will drink of the fruit of the vine "with you." The issue is whether Jesus's eating with the disciples at Emmaus is a fulfillment of the prophecies of Jesus in Matthew or Luke or both? Matthew's "with you" points to a personal meal in the future, but he contains no specific fulfillment of this promise. Jesus is the one who fulfills his own promise and performs the act of remembrance, as the two disciples become aware of its significance only when it began to happen (Luke 24:30-1). This is

also true of the baptism, as 3,000 are baptized on Pentecost. Peter baptized those who repented (Acts 2:38), but he is fulfilling no specific command of the risen Lord found in Luke/Acts that such baptizing should take place. Such a command may be assumed in Luke 24:47, but an explicit imperative is missing. The problem of which command is being fulfilled is resolved if the author of Luke-Acts assumes that his readers already knew Matthew and its command that the gentiles should be baptized. Luke's inclusion of the supper in the Easter narrative can also be explained by his interest in the table of fellowship of Jesus with sinners. Out of this table fellowship evolves the last supper, the breaking of bread with the Emmaus disciples, and the continuation of this ritual in the early church, as mentioned in Acts. Luke has attempted and succeeded, in chapter 24, in placing the supper or the breaking of the bread on at least an equal plane with baptism, though they are not interchangeable. He does not bring them together in the same breath as do Mark and John. The Lord who promised to be with his church as they baptized (Matt:28:20) is also the same Lord who now breaks bread with his church (Luke 24:31).

Paul and the Two Sacrament Doctrine

Before showing how Mark gave us a fully developed doctrine of the two sacraments, mention should be made of Paul's own discussion of baptism and the Lord's supper in 1 Corinthians and his possible influence on Mark and perhaps on Luke also. In any event Paul, if he was the mentor of Luke and Mark, as Reicke suggests, becomes a factor in determining synoptic relationships. Paul, in 1 Corinthians, by addressing the problems faced in that congregation, showed the necessity of practicing baptism and that the Lord's supper, and showed that a correct understanding and practice of both were necessary for the church. Martin Hengel, who is firmly committed to seeing Peter's influence in the writing of Mark, could not fail to see that Mark uses the term 'gospel' in a way strongly reminiscent of Paul (see [5]). He could not however bring himself to follow his own evidence to conclude that Paul was also an influence on Mark. The evidence may show that Mark felt Paul's influence both in the matter of his understanding of the gospel and of baptism and the Lord's supper as well.

Paul wrote 1 Corinthians to correct the aberrant liturgical practices in that congregation. This epistle is simply not one of general pastoral admonition for individual personal problems, but one which addressed corporate problems that were surfacing during their worship services, most noticeably in the celebration of the supper. The apostle had spoken of baptism in Romans, Ephesians, and Colossians, but only in 1 Corinthians did he address not only the proper understanding of baptism, but also

its practice, along with a proper understanding and practice of the Lord's supper. Paul did not intend to write systematically on the 'two sacraments'. He spoke of baptism and the Lord's supper throughout his epistle and not simply in one place. The end result, however, was that in going back and forth between baptism and the Lord's supper, he did in effect weave into one fabric a 'two sacraments's doctrine. This allowed Mark to bring them together in one place.

A short summary of Paul's mentioning of baptism and the supper will show how important they were for him. Baptism by different preachers became a cause of division in the congregation (1:10-17). The one baptism establishes the unity of the church, just as participation in one loaf of the supper demonstrates that unity. He anticipates that the congregation will celebrate the paschal festival, i.e., the Lord's supper, and that immoral persons should not participate (5:3-8). Infant or children's baptism may be mentioned in 7:14, especially when taken in connection with 6:11, a reference to baptism in the name of the Trinity, at least in earlier form. ["But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God."] The Israelites were involved in their own baptism into Moses by passing through the sea, and in their own sacramental eating and drinking of Christ (10:1-4). It was not possible to participate both at the tables and the cups of idols and at the table of the Lord. Gluttony at the Lord's supper is not allowed (11:17-34). The Corinthians are having themselves baptized on behalf of those who have already died (15:29). As will be shown below, both Mark and John join baptism and the Lord's supper together, but Paul apparently was the first New Testament writer to place them side by side not only throughout his epistle, but especially in 10:1-22. The two sacraments doctrine was so fully developed for him that he was able to focus his understandings about baptism and the supper back into the Old Testament.

This is not the place to discuss Old Testament sacraments, but it is proper to call attention to Paul's understanding that Israel became God's people by being "baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (10:2). This was followed by the eating the supernatural food and drinking the same supernatural drink (10:3). "For they drank from the supernatural Rock which followed them, and the Rock was Christ" (10:4). Paul follows up with a warning against a participation in the sacrifices offered to pagan idols, if one is to participate in the Lord's Supper. It is clear that he understands baptism and the Lord's supper as a continuation of previous events in Israelite history. There is here not an identification or a complete dissimilarity but a continuation of certain Old Testament events and New Testament rituals. Just as being baptized into Moses was the presupposition of the Israelites eating and drinking the spiritual food of Christ, so baptism for the Corinthians was the presupposition for their

participation in the Lord's supper. This union of baptism and the Lord's supper evidenced in 1 Corinthians 10 finds a reflection in Mark 10:38-9.

The 'Two Sacrament' Doctrine in Mark

Though it is Paul in 1 Corinthians who would place baptism and the Lord's supper side by side as indispensably necessary for the church, it is Mark among the evangelists who preserved a logion of Jesus concerning the two sacrament doctrine. Mark in turn influenced the writer of the gospel of John and 1 John. Mark's 'two sacrament doctrine' expresses itself in 10:38-9, which is part of the pericope of the section in which James and John ask Jesus about greatness in the kingdom (vv. 35-49). Matthew's parallel is less complex (20:22-3): "But Jesus answered, 'You do not know what you are asking. Are you able to drink the cup that I am to drink?'" They said to him, "We are able." He says to them, "My cup you will drink." Mark's rendition of the same episode is longer and more complex and its language recognizable as 'sacramental'. This 'sacramentality' is emphasized by an obvious redundancy (10:38-40). "Jesus however said to them, 'You do not know what you are asking. Are you able to drink the cup that I drink or to be baptized with the baptism which I am baptized?' They said to him, 'We are able.' Jesus then said to them, 'The cup I drink you will drink, you will drink, and the baptism with which I am baptized, you will be baptized with.'" Though C.S. Mann is correct in noting against Lohmeyer that we are dealing with an authentic word of Jesus and not a word of the community [6, 412], it is not unlikely that Mark has given this word of Jesus a sacramental overtone which would have been recognized in a community that was celebrating baptism and the Lord's supper. Mark's use of the terms 'baptize' or 'baptism' as references to the sufferings of Jesus could have been informed or taken over from Luke 12:50: "I have a baptism in which to be baptized, and how hard pressed I am until it is accomplished." Here Luke's use of 'baptize' seems to be devoid of any sacramental significance.

In any case such sacramental significance is less obvious. Luke knows of the word 'baptism' in a sacramental sense and uses it in connection with John's baptism of Jesus, according to which Jesus was 'baptized', i.e., designated for death; however, Luke in 12:50 does not involve others in that 'baptism' or death in the sense that Mark does. For Luke Jesus faces the 'baptism' of his death alone. Mark places the disciples alongside Jesus in his baptism. Jesus, as were his disciples, was baptized into death. With Mark's advanced 'sacramental' thinking about the death of Jesus as a baptism in which the disciples participate, it is less problematical to see him as following Matthew and Luke in time of writing and not preceding them [4, 994].

If Mark was first, one is hard pressed to explain how both Matthew and Luke failed either to follow Mark or even to advance his thinking further, as they, writing later, would be living in a church with a greater sacramental awareness. Such an absence in both Matthew and Luke would be hard to explain. Matthew, who alone has the command to baptize the gentiles (28:19,20), would have inexplicably omitted taking over Mark's reference to baptism in 10:38-40 and missed a golden opportunity to firm up his own position. Luke, if he is the author of Acts, also shows an inexplicable failure in 12:50 in not using Mark's insight in explaining Jesus's death as both a drinking of the cup and a baptism. Luke (22:42), like Matthew (26:39) and Mark (14:36), knew the cup as a synonym for the suffering of Jesus, but has no parallel to the disciples' drinking of the cup in Matthew 20:22-3 and Mark 10:38-9. This becomes the more noticeable, since Luke, if he is the writer of Acts, shows how both baptism and the supper were practiced in the church. His interest in Jesus's table fellowship and the breaking of the bread entitles him to be designated 'the eucharistic evangelist', but still he does not place baptism and the supper side by side. 12:50 would have been the logical place for Luke to present baptism and the Lord's supper side by side, as Mark had. The easiest and best solution to Luke's apparent failure in developing a sacramentology is that Luke preceded Mark and thus did not have him at his disposal. This does not mean that Luke's logion is entirely without sacramental significance.

Mark among the evangelists was the first to recognize this unity between baptism and the Lord's supper and to join them in 10:38-40. Mark exhibits a definite advance in sacramental thinking over Matthew and Luke, which at the same time shows the influence of St. Paul and goes beyond him. Mark's order of placing the cup before the baptism on 10:38-40 should be no more disturbing than Paul placing the cup before the bread in describing the Lord's supper (1 Cor. 10:16). In fact it points to a strong Pauline influence on Mark.

The Two Sacrament Doctrine in the Johannine Writings

A fully developed two sacrament doctrine appears in the Johannine writings. This conclusion presupposes among other things that the bread of life discourse of chapter 6 is eucharistic, a controverted point, supported for example by Raymond Brown [2, 274].

The key to a two sacrament understanding of John's gospel is the First Epistle, where baptism and the Lord's supper are placed side by side in a way resembling Mark. The one who is born of God, i.e., through baptism, overcomes the world and is recognized by his belief in Jesus as the Son of God (1 John 5:4-5). Jesus Christ

is further identified as "he who came by water and blood, Jesus Christ, not with water only but with the water and the blood" (v.6). The commentators are not agreed as whether this passage refers to Jesus's baptism and death or to the Christian sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper. Here Reicke's insight can be helpful in that the recitation of Jesus's baptism occurred at the baptism of catechumens and the recitation of his passion occurred at the celebration of the Lord's supper. It is a situation of 'both-and' and not 'either-or.' A Christian was baptized into Christ's baptism so that he stands with Jesus as he is baptized by John the Baptist. In the supper he received the one whose blood was shed. The event of Christ's death and not the first supper is commemorated in the church's supper.

But if one has to make a choice between the past historical events in Christ's or the church's current sacramental action, the latter would take precedence. The writer of the First Epistle is addressing current problems of the congregation and not writing a historical gospel, though such historical events would be in the back of his mind, as he speaks of the current witness of the Spirit, the water, and the blood. The one who has been born from God (v. 4) has for evidence of that birth the Spirit, his having been baptized, and his reception of the supper. The writer of this epistle has not introduced an entirely new thought in saying that Jesus is present in the church through baptism and the supper, as Matthew taught the presence of Christ with the baptizing church and Luke presented Jesus as present in the breaking of the bread. He has, however, advanced one step beyond the synoptics in associating the Spirit with baptism and the supper. For him pneumatology is sacramentology. He also provides the key in opening up the meaning of the gospel of John, with which the epistle has a close relationship, if not coming from the same author at least from the same school.

1 John 5:6-8 finds a point of comparison with the gospel of John in the flowing of the water and the blood from the side of dead Jesus (20:34). Through the water and the blood, the one who was crucified comes to his church. Though Bultmann does not see any connection with the First Epistle and the gospel, he does follow the patristic exegesis in understanding the event as sacramental. "It can scarcely be other than that in the death of Jesus on the cross the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper have their foundation" (see [2, 678]).

Raymond E. Brown does not have the same difficulty as does Bultmann in seeing 1 John 5:6-8 as the key to understanding John 19:34 [2, 950]. The importance of this event for the evangelist is emphasized by his inclusion of an oathlike affirmation that he is telling the truth (v. 35). Jesus is then identified as the passover lamb whose bones may not be broken (Ex. 12:46; Num. 9:12). This identification of Jesus as the

paschal lamb is not unique to John among the New Testament writers, but was already made by Paul (1 Cor. 5:7). John, in identifying Jesus as the lamb whose bones cannot be broken, resembles Matthew's description of the blood of Jesus which is shed "for the remission of sins." For Matthew the blood given the disciples is the same blood given in the atonement. For John the blood of Jesus is that of the lamb whose bones cannot be broken. Brown compares Jesus, as the lamb whose bones cannot be broken, with the Baptist's proclamation of Jesus as the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world. He also sees 1 John 1:7 as providing an interpretation of the event. "'Here is the Lamb of God who takes away the world's sin.' For this is the hour when, in the words of I John 1:7, 'The blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanses us from all sin'" [2, 953].

The author of the Fourth Gospel uses language which is almost mystical, but still it is easily intelligible to his readers. The cup and baptism language of Mark is replaced with the water and blood language of John. The act of redemption accomplished by Christ, "It is finished," is immediately followed by the pericope of pierced side giving forth water and blood, i.e., baptism and the Lord's supper. Redemption through the two sacraments is now available to the world and through them Jesus still comes to his people (1 John 5:6-8). John is dependent on Mark for seeing that these two rites belong together, but he goes further than Mark by attaching them to the act of crucifixion itself. Mark 10:38-9 sees the cup and baptism as present or future events which Jesus is then enduring or about to endure and in which the two disciples will share. John sees the water and the blood as coming after the fact. Jesus has already drunk his cup and been baptized into death. The idea of disciples undergoing their own drinking of the cup and their own baptism is replaced in John by the slaughtered lamb providing benefits for his church.

John has inherited a two sacrament doctrine and is able to write his gospel as if it were almost a sacrament treatise. The church in and for which the Fourth Evangelist was writing was accustomed to seeing baptism and the supper as having similar purposes. His was a church in which the synoptics and Paul's writings were known. This provided him a literary liberty in making sacramental allusions not allowed to the previous evangelists. Mark's placing baptism and the supper side by side was a large and important step in the development of sacramental thought. Though such sacramental thinking does not permeate Mark to the extent that it does John, Mark's influence on the church made John's approach possible [2, 238].

As pointed out above, Paul wove the two sacraments into the fibre of 1 Corinthians. This he did not do deliberately, since the problems concerning baptism and the supper in that congregation suggested to him an outline for that epistle. John

has a deliberate sacramental outline. He was addressing a church problem which along with its denial of the incarnation was putting a low priority on the sacraments, especially the Lord's supper. They may have grown lax or have given up on the practice altogether. His weaving of the two sacraments can only be briefly outlined.

God's children are those who are born from God (1:12-3), a reference to baptism when taken together with 3:5. John is baptizing with water (1:19-28). Jesus is identified, at his own baptism as the one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit (1:29-34). The marriage at Cana centers around the changing of the water into wine (2:1-10), the sacramental elements, and this provides the occasion for the first manifestation of his glory (2:11). Jesus cleanses the temple during the Passover and identifies himself as God's temple (2:13-25). This has significance for Jesus as the God's true lamb who offers himself in the temple of his own body (v. 19). 3:1-21 is a discourse on regeneration through water and the Spirit and the relation of this regeneration to the atonement. 3:22-3 refers to the baptizing activities of John and Jesus followed by a discourse between John and the Jews on baptism (vv. 25-30). Chapter 4 begins with Jesus deferring to John's baptizing activities by leaving the region of the Jordan. At Jacob's well in Samaria, he gives the discourse on the living water (4:4-15). Chapter 5 puts Jesus at the pool of the sheep gate where the lame man waits to be healed (vv. 1-9). Chapter 6 contains the feeding of the five thousand and the discourse on the bread of life. These references along with others show how the Fourth Evangelist uses events from the life of Jesus to put forth his doctrine of the two sacraments. Chapter 13 provides a unique revision by John of the synoptics' last supper. The synoptics uses the final meal of Jesus before his death as the occasion for the Last Supper. John uses the same scene for a discourse on baptism and not for the institution of the supper (vv. 3-11). From 13:18 it is apparent that this was a meal, but the discourse centers on the value of water and washing for participation in Jesus (v. 9). This moving back forth and forth between baptism and the supper is inaugurated by the changing of the water into wine and culminates in the water and the blood flowing from the Savior's side. Unlike Matthew and Luke who conclude their accounts with Jesus requiring or participating in some sort of sacramental action, John at first glance has none. But we would be suspicious if he did, simply because his approach is never up front, but under the surface, subliminal. The miracle of feeding the five thousand with a few fish and loaves of bread becomes the discourse for Jesus as the bread of life. In John 21 the bread and the fish are again present (v. 9) with the resurrected Lord again as their host. Peter is commanded three times by Jesus to feed his lambs and sheep (vv. 15-18). Here the reference is to a miraculous and not to an ordinary feeding with bread and fish. This miraculous food with which Peter is to feed the church is Jesus himself, who is the bread of life. For doing this Peter must expect death (vv. 18-9). Here John has reverted to Mark's understanding of the cup, which is not only a benefit to the

church, but a pledge of suffering for the disciples. John, as have Matthew and Luke before him, has concluded his gospel with a sacramental reference.

Summary

The New Testament writings set forth teachings on baptism and the Lord's Supper. The later writings, in distinction from the earlier ones, show a gradually developing sacramentalism in regarding baptism and the Lord's supper together. Matthew shows only a casual attachment between the two rites and gives baptism the place of honor by including it among the commands of the resurrected Lord. Luke gives this honor to the supper in the Emmaus account and shows that he is aware of Matthew's command to baptize and wants to provide a more balanced situation. Paul is the first New Testament writer to address a congregation on the basis of its practice of baptism and the supper. Mark is the first evangelist to understand baptism and the supper together as complementary liturgical rites and to place their origin in the suffering of Jesus. He is the first to make mention of them in one logion of Jesus. John takes advantage of Mark's discovery in presenting a gospel which is thoroughly sacramental, and he builds upon the foundations of the earlier New Testament writings.

Bibliography

- [1] Benoit, P., and Boismard, M.-E. *Synopse des Quatre Evangiles*. Paris, 1972.
- [2] Brown, Raymond E. Brown. *The Gospel According To John (I-XII)*, The Anchor Bible. Ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedmann. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1966.
- [3] Cullmann, Oscar. *Early Christian Worship*. Tr. A Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953.
- [4] Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke*, The Anchor Bible. Ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1985.

[5] Hengel, Martin. *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*. Tr. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

[6] Mass, Christopher S. *Mark, The Anchor Bible*. Ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1986.

[7] Reicke, Bo. *Roots of the Synoptic Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

[8] Riley, Harold, and Orchard, Bernard. *The Order of the Synoptics; Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1987.

[9] Robinson, John A. T. *The Priority of John*. Ed. J. F. Coakely. Oak Park, Illinois: Meyerstone Books, 1987.

[10] Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *The Christian Faith*. Ed. H.R. MacKintosh and J.S. Stewart. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.