

# Sacraments Are for Evangelicals; Evangelicals Are for Sacraments

By Dimitri Sala, OFM

## Introduction

No Christian would disagree that a way of experiencing the Holy Spirit is through worship. For liturgical churches, one way that worship and the Spirit merge is in the sacraments. Yet the very subject of sacraments has also driven an ecumenical wedge between those churches and much of Protestant Evangelicalism. On the one hand, a classic position of the latter group is that sacraments are merely works which humans do, and therefore they have no real role in one's salvation. The contrasting position of the historically older churches tends to emphasize that grace is available to us through the mediation of sacraments, and thus sacraments have a very important role to play in our ultimate salvation. And there the battle lines have been drawn. Ecumenical connection via worship and the Spirit can seem to halt at the sacraments.

Some in either camp have taken stances not quite so combative. But what we have not yet hammered out, however, is a sacramental theology built intentionally and solidly on the foundation of the *kerygma* – one demonstrating that sacraments do have a rightful place even in an ecclesial context where the Message of Salvation is stressed as foundational. Indeed, Evangelical Protestants (who claim such a context) articulate a challenge worthy of response – that the rituals of liturgy and sacraments (like so much of what can be called the historical tradition of the Church) can seem disconnected from the experience and message of New Birth. But what if we could demonstrate that sacraments can make perfect biblical sense even to an Evangelical claiming salvation by faith in the gospel – that “sacraments are for Evangelicals”... and so Evangelicals can be “for” (rather than against) sacraments?

This article proposes to do just that.

## Reframing the Picture

Our first task is to reframe and carefully define the word “sacraments” in order to see how sacraments and the original contexts of the biblical corpus work together as one. Much of the critique by Evangelical Protestants has to do with experiences in which sacraments have seemed to veer off that biblical foundation. Was there an originally designed and intended sacramental experience in the Bible, and if so, what was it about? The clearest answers to those questions can be found by exploring the world of biblical prophets and biblical worship.

One cannot read the Old Testament corpus of the prophets without apprehending that prophets not only spoke the Word

of the Lord but also engaged in actions which demonstrated the Word of the Lord. One of the most dramatic encounters with this phenomenon in the writings of the prophets is found in Isaiah 20, where God instructs the prophet to walk around naked and barefoot as “a sign and a portent against Egypt and Ethiopia” (20:3), acting out, if you will, God's word about their fate. Other examples include Jeremiah 27:1-15, Ezra 4:1-17 and 5:1-17, and Hosea 1:2-9; Agabus in Acts 21:10-11 provides a New Testament instance.

*One cannot read the Old Testament corpus of the prophets without apprehending that prophets not only spoke the Word of the Lord but also engaged in actions which demonstrated the Word of the Lord.*

Likewise, when we take in the experience of worship as described in the Old Testament, we encounter a religion replete with symbolic actions which use symbolic things in symbolic places. The prescriptions for liturgy in the desert Tabernacle (and later the Temple) are the most direct examples. Meals, blood, incense, purifications, repeatable actions, colors, numbers of days... the list goes on and on. Even before Moses received the Law, we see the biblical giants operate in a world in which altars, sacrifice, and ritual seemed to be a given. And after the exile, the first priority on Israel's agenda was to restore its center of symbolic life, the Temple. The book of Revelation, which describes both

*continued on page 21*

*Fr. Dimitri Sala, OFM, is a Franciscan friar based in Chicago, IL. He has a full-time apostolic ministry combined with a life of prayer. The ministry has brought him into relationship with many Evangelicals, and into grassroots efforts of reconciliation in different countries between Evangelicals and Catholics. He has authored publications on themes of evangelization and ecumenism, including his book **The Stained Glass Curtain: Crossing the Evangelical-Catholic Divide to Find Our Common Heritage** (2010; also available in Spanish, and soon in French).*

prophetic vision and the heavenly worship, exemplifies the same proclivity in the New Testament.

And yet, the tone of the biblical texts makes clear that these sacred actions were more than what today we would call mere “ordinances” which in fact do nothing. It was clear, for example, that the various rites of atonement actually accomplished what they symbolized, as in the conclusion of the directives for Yom Kippur: “...until he [Aaron] comes out *and has made atonement* for himself and for his house and for all the assembly of Israel...” (Leviticus 16:17, italics mine).

When we turn again to the realm of the prophetic, we likewise see actions which not only demonstrate, but have real effects. In 2 Kings 13:14-19, Elisha the prophet instructs Joash, King of Israel, to strike the ground with the arrows over which Elisha had prophesied; what the king *did* in response *determined* the future outcome of his campaign against the Arameans. These types of actions, as explained by the Evangelical(!) theologian G. R. Beasley-Murray, have the features of expressing the will of the Lord, and hence, of being an instrument of His action and *setting in motion* the action they represent.<sup>1</sup>

As we cross into the New Testament, we find the same reality. John the Baptist not only preached a prophetic message, he also called people into an experience which acted out and set in motion their response. If the Word were all-sufficient, why would John have baptized at all? The answer is that John, like his prophetic predecessors, operated in the classic biblical religious and psychological outlook behind prophetic acts. And as Beasley-Murray so aptly put it: “The chief element in that outlook would be the belief that the word of the Lord can be *performed* as well as spoken,” adding in a footnote in which he quotes H. Wheeler Robinson: “The prophet might equally well have said, ‘Thus doth Yahweh,’ of his own prophetic act, as he does say, of his own spoken word, ‘Thus saith Yahweh.’”<sup>2</sup>

So, although the Old Testament nowhere specifically prescribed baptism, it makes excellent “biblical sense” in

*John the Baptist not only preached a prophetic message, he also called people into an experience which acted out and set in motion their response. If the Word were all-sufficient, why would John have baptized at all?*

the context of the ritual acts we do see in the Scriptures. One can say the same about Jesus’ disciples anointing with oil for healing (Mark 6:13), and about Jesus’ gestures such as putting his fingers in a deaf man’s ears, which is not an ordinance (or even exemplified!) in the Old Covenant. The early Church took up the same posture, even with regard to the mysterious baptism on behalf of the dead (1 Corinthians 15:29); whether Paul looks favorably on the practice is irrelevant to our point, since he uses to his polemical advantage the fact that its adherents are convinced of its efficacy.

Finally, we can even make a case that in biblical religion there is a sense that, when not prohibited, we *must* sacramentalize. For example, the effecting power of Jeremiah’s “acting out” a Word from God could potentially be undone only by another action in relation to it: Hananiah did not rest with a verbal contradiction of Jeremiah’s word but was compelled to break the yoke off of Jeremiah’s neck as a *prophetic counter-act*, with *its* intended effect (Jeremiah 28:1-11). And the gospel of Mark, as do the other gospels, ends with the Great Commission; but here, salvation will come to the one who believes “*and is baptized*” (Mark 16:16, italics mine). We will automatically rule out here an unbiblical, purely legalistic necessity of sacramental actions, which borders on magic.<sup>3</sup>

Nevertheless, our evidence constitutes a strong witness to a biblical context for sacraments. And it is this witness that led Beasley-Murray, the Evangelical theologian, to comparably strong positive conclusions about sacramental actions, at least in regard to baptism: in first century Christianity, to question the need for baptism would have sounded as strange as asking if it is necessary that a sinner converted by the gospel join the Church.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, the assertion, “Unless you become baptized, you cannot be saved” would have sounded like, “Unless you believe and are Christ’s, you cannot be Christian.”<sup>5</sup>

### A Larger Picture

If we view sacraments within their original context and intentions – that is, as symbol-laden gestures that “perform” the Word of the Lord – both the Old and New Testaments frame them as something valid for any Christians who claim to draw their life from the Bible. Yet there is another arena in which sacraments make sense – that of the human psychology of ritual and symbol. Everyday human experience validates the significance of our “ritual actions,” even with otherwise common objects. The typical American child would be supremely disappointed if all that happened on his or her birthday was a greeting sans party-complete-with-gift-giving-and-birthday-cake-ritual (which we often faithfully fulfill even with adults!). The absence of these actions does not alter the historical fact that a particular date

*continued on page 22*

is one's birthday, but the actions undoubtedly *say* "Happy Birthday" in a way that the verbal wish alone does not.

More significantly, a wedding ring is clearly nothing less than a sacramental symbol. Though it is physically only metal, it is treated with the respect given to something invested with the weight of much greater meaning. If one were to take a sledgehammer and randomly destroy that wedding ring, more than silver or gold substance would be affected, and only an unfeeling person would respond, "Oh well, it was nothing but a piece of metal." Objects that have become "sacred" to us, and the actions associated with them, affect our ordinary lives every day.

Finally, it is a generally accepted educational principle that the more senses are kinesthetically involved in an endeavor, the greater the learning. Sacramental action, in this sense, takes into account that "doing" can be just as important as reading, seeing, hearing, or speaking: the greater the combination of these when it comes to the things of God, the greater impact on us.

The "stuff" out of which sacraments are made is taken from simple physical phenomena because human life testifies that, as creatures, we are naturally oriented to the symbolic nature and ritual use of everything our senses apprehend. Every human being is, in that sense, *homo religiosus*. Sacramental thinking takes seriously the fact that the visible world is designed to make known the invisible things of God – not only do the heavens declare the glory of God (Psalm 19:1), but *the whole earth* is full of His glory (that is, reveals the weight of His Presence, as in Isaiah 6:3). The universe is not mute but is itself a self-revealing "word" spoken by God. Sacraments, then, employ this fact to construct experiences in which God's Presence and action manifests Itself. The power of truth, which in our Western culture has been so often confined to the verbal alone, can also be legitimately expressed by the non-verbal. As the anthropologist of religion, Bronislaw Malinowski, puts it: "The deep philosophic query propounded by Faust, as to the primacy of the word or the deed, appears to us fallacious."<sup>6</sup>

### "Prophetic Gestures"

There are bible-believing Evangelicals in the Church today who readily take up this posture. "Prophetic gestures," for example, are a well-accepted reality in Pentecostal intercessory and prophetic movements. When one attends a meeting of such groups, it is common to see people "perform" what they are praying, proclaiming, or prophesying – they point, they stamp, they parade, they may blow a shofar, extend hands, pound stakes with Scripture written on them into the ground, et cetera; often the leader of such a meeting will call upon the whole assembly to carry out a particular action together. The belief is that such actions, like those we have already

*Sacramental thinking takes seriously the fact that the visible world is designed to make known the invisible things of God – not only do the heavens declare the glory of God (Psalm 19:1), but the whole earth is full of His glory (that is, reveals the weight of His Presence, as in Isaiah 6:3).*

explored in the Bible, activate faith and put into motion what they portray, when used as a tool or extension of faith.

For example, some Christian colleagues of mine found out that their local public high school had one of the highest per-capita suicide rates in the country. The leadership of the city's Kingdom Transformation movement (which included its Evangelical Catholic mayor) invited the intercessors of the movement to "get busy." But these folks did not simply sit around and pray. They "prayer-walked" the halls after hours, laid hands on lockers, anointed the school grounds with oil, and spoke out prophetic declarations. The combination of faith and sacramental gestures was indeed "effective" in the full sense of that word: it brought about the *effect* that the suicide rate fell to zero, and there it stayed for the entire tenure of this mayor!

Interfacing with these phenomena at Christian meetings, "holy gestures" were, of course, nothing new to me. What surprised me was that these Evangelical Christians – the vast majority of whom were Protestant – were employing them just as much as, if not more than, traditionally "sacramental" Christians! It was here that I first began to grasp that sacraments epitomize the same effective composite of gestures and symbols... such that sacraments could be for Evangelicals as well, and Evangelicals could be "for" sacraments.

The "case closed" for me, as it were, when I read a report by Chuck Pierce (a key leader in his particular stream of Protestant Evangelicalism), written to his intercessors. In it he related the results of a ministry trip in Europe which included stops for prophetic activity. One of the sites in the trip was Rome: "Finally," he writes, "we went and prayed at the door of St. Peter's Cathedral. This is one of four doors in Rome that are only opened during the Holy Years. It is believed that if people walk through this door during the Holy Year, their sins will be forgiven." "*Uh oh,*" I thought.

*continued on page 23*

“Here it comes. A prophetic chastisement.” But the very next words were not what I expected: “I believe in prophetic acts.”

How then to understand a seasoned Protestant Evangelical leader’s recognition that such a “sacramental” gesture – even one as marginal as this – has validity as a prophetic gesture? Pierce adds: “But when they are aligned with superstition, rather than reconciliation through the blood of Jesus Christ, and a full repentance and change of mind, they really add more bondage to a person’s life than their spiritual freedom.”<sup>7</sup> Mature Catholic leaders would offer the same caveat.

Chuck Pierce’s words were a delightful surprise, which put to rest any further doubts I might have had about the connection: what liturgical churches call “sacraments” is wholly aligned with what an Evangelical believer can mean by the term “prophetic acts.” And if this is so, we now have lenses through which to see a response for the legitimate challenge Evangelicals make to sacraments as commonly practiced, and to explore a foundation for sacraments in light of the gospel. If this exploration proves successful, we can then discover sure ground for saying that “sacraments are for Evangelicals.”

### The Kerygma-Connection

Having considered the biblical foundations of sacramental action, let us now ask how sacraments might have a rightful place in Evangelical Christianity, founded purposefully and intentionally on a personal response to the Gospel Message (*kerygma*). We know that the Message of Salvation is the ultimate “Thus saith the Lord”; is there also a place for a “thus doth the Lord”? And if some Evangelicals can engage in the prophetic acts described above, why not the other prophetic acts which have historically and traditionally been part of the Church? First, let us rule out how these prophetic acts are *not* defensible: Evangelicals will agree with Roman Catholics that *sacramental expression is no replacement for the inner content of faith*. As the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* teaches: “What faith confesses, the sacraments communicate.”<sup>8</sup>

But how is that faith generated? The *Catechism* continues: “For these are sacraments of faith, and faith is born of the Word.”<sup>9</sup> *The Word* is the originating source of grace; sacraments are prophetic gestures which simply act out the mysteries of our Christian life that are revealed in the Word of God. If there is no Word-basis producing an inner response of adherence (namely, “faith”), the sacraments have nothing to “communicate”! The sacraments “presuppose faith.”<sup>10</sup>

So, preliminarily, Bible-believing Evangelicals can be assured that sacraments are prophetic acts by which Christians engage exclusively in response to the saving realities

*The Word is the originating source of grace; sacraments are prophetic gestures which simply act out the mysteries of our Christian life that are revealed in the Word of God. If there is no Word-basis producing an inner response of adherence (namely, “faith”), the sacraments have nothing to “communicate”! The sacraments “presuppose faith.”*

of faith revealed in the Word, and it is only in this context that God effects what we enact. But since Evangelicalism distinguishes itself by emphasizing not just the Word in general, but the foundation of the *kerygma* and a personal conversion through it, a more precise Evangelical definition would be to call sacraments *the prophetic acts of a person as a faith-response to the present and future promises of the Gospel, in which God effects what we enact*.

The first part of the definition already applies to the actions which Protestants presently accept as ordinances. Baptism “performs” prophetically the realities of a conversion into which the Message of Salvation invites us: cleansing from the inclination to Sin, death to the old man, resurrection into a new life. Communion “acts out” the many dimensions of persevering in that New Covenant: revisiting, and once again partaking in, the saving mystery of the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus; experiential communion with Jesus and with his Body the Church; setting our sights on the Banquet that will transpire when he comes again. Already we have an even richer understanding as to why Christians should honor these gestures as ordinances. To the question, “Why do we do them?” the classic Evangelical response has been, “The Lord commanded it.” If one goes further to ask (as we are right to do), “But why did he command it?” the answer is: “They prophetically ‘act out’ and involve us in what they signify.”

We now have an Evangelical context within which to entertain the notion that the sacraments actually put into effect what they express (the second part of our definition). We have already seen that in biblical religion, prophetic acts set in motion what they represent. Can we not say the same for the Protestant ordinances which are biblically

*continued on page 24*

commanded responses to being “born again”? And not only for those officially recognized ordinances, but for other gestures or rituals in which they engage as part of the New Life? And not for them alone, but for those gestures which the liturgical churches have called “sacraments”?

Here again let us use marriage as a case study. Whether or not a particular church communion calls it a sacrament or even a creation ordinance (as some do), we would be hard pressed to say that the actual ritual of Christian marriage itself “does nothing.” Regardless of what the spouses feel, we all agree that the proper execution of the ritual transfers them both from the single state to the married state, ordinarily consummated by sexual union. After Christians get married, whatever the rite honored by one’s Christian group, there is never a discussion about whether the two are “really married or not.” We automatically understand that a proper wedding *effects* marriage. Secondly, as one or both of the partners begin to feel that effect experientially – whether at the very moment, as many do, or later “as it hits them,” or both – they hardly remain unchanged. More strikingly, the act of speaking vows can seal and propel mutual love forward; when conflict comes, many a marriage has been preserved by (and at times *only* by) the experience which left a stamp on the soul: “I stood at the altar with you before God and humanity, and promised....” Now this is scarcely a ritual that “does nothing”!

If this is indeed so with marriage, why not also with baptism and communion? Is it not consistent to say not only that baptism *expresses* a New Covenant decision of faith, but also that something about the prophetic experience of confessing salvation and going under the water *propels a person forward* in that New Life? Can a person really remain unchanged by such a kinesthetic experience, regardless of their emotions or lack of them? The New Testament talks at times about the saving effect of baptism without direct reference to the saving faith it expresses. 1 Peter 3:21 and Titus 3:5 portray baptism as an instrument of salvation

(and the former mentions no other!), though both texts obviously imply that saving faith is the other side of the same coin. When understood as a prophetic act (as we have been describing it) which expresses a personal response to the *kerygma*, this makes thorough sense.

So too, the very act of partaking in communion, when done with the proper disposition of faith, actually impresses upon our emotions and spirit what it represents, and thereby imparts and increases that grace within. Are we not “learning” something by involving our senses in this act? Can it not thereby bring about an internalization anew of the events of salvation that an Evangelical Christian has already accepted (not unlike how Jews experience their own saving event at the Passover meal)? Can it not cause the individual to re-experience a personal intimate communion with Jesus (as does the contact of a kiss or a warm touch, for example, in any relationship)? And can it not even increase the unity of the Body (as do *entre-nous* tokens of love, for example, in a healthy marriage)?

With this mindset it is not hard to extend the same understanding to the other “traditional” sacraments of liturgical churches. The ultimate historical selection of seven is not our concern here; the point is that such gestures can be legitimate ways for even Evangelical Christians to *live out* and *connect with*, in an ongoing way, the life received only through a response to the *kerygma*. Confirmation, then, is the baptism in the Spirit of a saved person at the laying on of hands by an apostle (an understanding with which Pentecostal Evangelicals can easily feel at home),<sup>11</sup> thus completing full incorporation into the Church (Acts 8:14-17, 1 Corinthians 12:13). The Sacrament of Reconciliation (formerly known as “confession”) enacts a ministry that all Evangelical believers need, especially when struggling with “the sin that clings so closely” (Hebrews 12:1) – the need to “confess your sins to one another and pray for one another, so that you may be healed” (James 5:16), and to receive the reconciliation and forgiveness of the whole community. Ordination commissions and imparts a gift to those Evangelical leaders set apart for office within the Body of Christ – “the gift of God that is within you through the laying on of my hands,” so real that it becomes an effect “to rekindle” (2 Timothy 1:6). Even Matrimony can be viewed as a covenant not only between two Evangelical Christians who are in love, but as a covenant *of* the two *with* the rest of the Church to fulfill the “great mystery” (Ephesians 5:32) of what their marriage prophetically portrays – Jesus’ relationship of fruitful love with his Bride, the Church.<sup>12</sup> And of course the Sacrament of the Sick is nothing less than a literal fulfillment of the healing by elders called for in James 5:14-15 on behalf of believers.

*We have already seen that in biblical religion, prophetic acts set in motion what they represent. Can we not say the same for the Protestant ordinances which are biblically commanded responses to being “born again”?*

*continued on page 25*

This same understanding can serve us for any other sacramental or liturgical gestures. Signing the head with ashes, waving palms, processions, incense – all can have a place as outward expressions of the inward dynamics of the Evangelical Christian life. Chuck Pierce even validated a walk through the “Holy Door” – as a prophetic act and that alone.

### Seeing Through New Lenses

This fresh, restored understanding is what I propose as a new lens through which to view sacraments, resting solidly, intentionally, and exclusively on the foundation of the *kerygma*. As such, they are a “Thus doth the Lord” after people hear “Thus saith the Lord.” And as such, they are not a work of man to “give grace” apart from the working of God, but a participation by humans in God’s intentions expressed in His Word, “performing” them as did John the Baptist and so many other New Testament figures. Beginning with baptism and extending all through the Christian life, sacramental actions are nothing less than prophetic gestures on the part of people who have received Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior by the preaching of the gospel (that is, saved through faith in the gospel) – *or they are nothing*.

These lenses also help us to see that the problem in the history of Christianity was not so much the sacraments themselves, or sacramental experience, but rather the way sacraments morphed into something other than that for which they originated. When disconnected from personal conversion unto the New Life, when used by people who have yet to hear, understand, and respond to the Message of Salvation, sacraments are indeed abused – that is, used for one’s own designs rather than for their intended purposes.

And so, these lenses do not negate the valid Evangelical response to sacraments as they are regrettably administered in many liturgical churches. Indeed, as G. R. Beasley-Murray wrote, “criticism of any purely materialistic estimate of religious objects and actions is constitutive for the Bible from the days of the prophets.”<sup>13</sup> Using baptism as an example, he explains why this very criticism began to visit the Christian Church in history:

It is only because in the development of the Church the whole complex of baptism – faith – confession – Spirit – Church – life – sanctification has been torn asunder that the question has been forced upon us as to the relationship between baptism as an act and that which it represents....<sup>14</sup>

Rest assured, the official teachings of the thoroughly liturgical Catholic Church, in agreement with the constructive criticism by Reformation brethren, include ample warnings about sacraments when disconnected from the Word which they are to express. It is possible to receive them “in vain”;<sup>15</sup> and, while not denying that believers can count on

*Beginning with baptism and extending all through the Christian life, sacramental actions are nothing less than prophetic gestures on the part of people who have received Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior by the preaching of the gospel (that is, saved through faith in the gospel) – or they are nothing.*

God to manifest Himself in these rituals, “the fruits of the sacraments also depend on the disposition of the one who receives them.”<sup>16</sup>

Notice the similarity of thought to Church of Scotland theologian H.J. Wotterpoon on the proper place of sacraments in the life of faith:

The sacraments are central to the life of grace – they are its shrine and core; but they are contained, embraced and supported by faith in that which they ‘signify, seal and apply.’ Their place can be spiritually supplied, as in the case of ‘baptism of blood,’ or a quest for baptism which is frustrated by intervening death, or of the spiritual communion of such as die beyond the reach of ministry: but nothing save the gift of faith can supply the lack of faith.<sup>17</sup>

Moreover, though negative reaction to the sacraments because of their abuse is understandable, these lenses also challenge us to focus any valid critique of sacraments only on how they have abandoned legitimate biblical Christianity. The message of the prophets was not “Stop doing these rituals altogether,” but rather, “Stop doing them improperly.” In other words, the goal is not “no ritual” but “properly restored ritual.”


### Conclusion

The bottom line for all of us, whether our ecclesial disposition is liturgical or non-liturgical or moderately liturgical, is this: at the root of any legitimate dispute about sacraments today is the question of the *kerygma*; it alone is the pivot on which sacraments turn, one way or the other.<sup>18</sup> But if we can refrain from throwing the baby out with the bathwater (as Chuck Pierce avoided doing), if we can redirect our criticism to the *way* sacraments are used (or *abused*, as it were),

*continued on page 26*

and if we can build a sacramental theology intentionally and solidly on the foundation of the *kerygma* and all it brings into our lives, we can indeed view sacraments not as works we do, but as a performing of the Word about our New Life from beginning to end, with all the prophetic power and effects these actions can bring. If sacramental experiences originate only in the Message of Salvation, and if they are an expression exclusively of its ongoing effects in the life of one converted by it, they are just as biblical as the Message itself – and therefore are decisively “for Evangelicals.”

Finally, therefore, sacramental experience and theology can provide another true ecumenical link for the Body of Christ today. It is not hard to imagine how restoring the sacramentally-experienced dimension of the New Life could enhance our common worship. Certainly among Spirit-filled believers, worship experiences have historically been an effective ecumenical rallying point and unity-engine. Far from ecumenical connection through worship coming to a halt at the sacraments, or the sacraments remaining an ecumenical wedge between liturgical and evangelical communions, what even broader spiritual connections might the Holy Spirit set in motion – as He does with all legitimate prophetic acts? This agreement can also provide yet another middle-meeting point for dialogue, especially as a platform by which to demonstrate the primacy of the *kerygma* (as this article has done), and thereby to challenge liturgical churches which are not clear about that foundational Message and its place in the Christian life.

Is the Spirit waiting for us all to grasp that “*Sacraments are for Evangelicals*” and that “*Evangelicals are for* (not only not against, but also created-to-benefit-from) *Sacraments*”? 

## Notes

1. G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), 43.
2. Ibid.
3. The clearly liturgical Catholic Church integrates this principle into its teachings. Cf. United States Catholic Conference, *Catechism* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1994), 320; and Walter M. Abbott, SJ, ed., *The Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1966), 345-346.
4. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament*, 297.
5. Ibid., 298. Beasley-Murray likewise addresses the issue of the specific relationship between the sacraments and the faith they are meant to signify and effect; we will return to this later.
6. Bronislaw Malinowski, *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays* (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1948), 123.
7. Chuck Pierce, e-mail message to author et al., May 17, 2003.
8. United States Catholic Conference, *Catechism*, 421.
9. Abbot, *The Documents of Vatican II*, 540.
10. Ibid., 158.
11. And I have heard testimony in the Catholic Church that this is exactly what can happen when ministers teach those who have personally responded to the *kerygma* what to expect! Cf. Kilian McDonnell, OSB, and George T. Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Spirit* (Collegeville: Michael Glazier, 1991).
12. John Paul II taught that everything about Christian marriage is a prophetic act (General Audience, Jan. 19, 1983, 1-2), including sexual union (General Audience, Aug. 22, 1984, 2 & 4), and that married life “becomes in a certain sense liturgy”! (General Audience, July 4, 1984). John Paul II, General Audiences, accessed January 8, 2016: [http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/it/audiences/1983/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_aud\\_19830119.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/it/audiences/1983/documents/hf_jp-ii_aud_19830119.html), [http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/it/audiences/1984/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_aud\\_19840822.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/it/audiences/1984/documents/hf_jp-ii_aud_19840822.html), [http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/it/audiences/1984/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_aud\\_19840704.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/it/audiences/1984/documents/hf_jp-ii_aud_19840704.html).
13. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament*, 300.
14. Ibid., 298.
15. Abbot, *The Documents of Vatican II*, 143.
16. United States Catholic Conference, *Catechism*, 292.
17. H. J. Wotherspoon, *Religious Values in the Sacraments* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1928), 119-120.
18. Cf. Dimitri Sala, OFM, *The Stained Glass Curtain: Crossing the Evangelical-Catholic Divide to Find Our Common Heritage* (Lake Mary: Creation House, 2010), 107-118.

***Certainly among Spirit-filled believers, worship experiences have historically been an effective ecumenical rallying point and unity-engine. Far from ecumenical connection through worship coming to a halt at the sacraments, or the sacraments remaining an ecumenical wedge between liturgical and evangelical communions, what even broader spiritual connections might the Holy Spirit set in motion – as He does with all legitimate prophetic acts?***