

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

3-1-1988

### The Covenantal Significance of Remembrance as it is Used in Luke 22:19

Mark Steiner  
m.g.steiner@cox.net

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Steiner, Mark, "The Covenantal Significance of Remembrance as it is Used in Luke 22:19" (1988). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 26.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/26>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

THE COVENANTAL SIGNIFICANCE OF  
REMEMBRANCE AS IT IS USED IN  
LUKE 22:19

---

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty  
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,  
Department of Exegetical Theology  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Master of Sacred Theology

---

by  
Mark G. Steiner  
March 1988

Approved by Erich Kiehl Advisor

Wayne Schmidt Reader

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
Chapter	
I. COVENANT.....	8
Biblical Covenant	
Hittite Treaties	
Old Covenant and New Covenant	
II. HEBREW FESTIVALS.....	21
Pilgrim Festivals	
Passover	
Contemporary Observance of Passover	
Preparation	
Christian Observance of Passover	
III. REMEMBRANCE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.....	36
Remembrance and Deliverance	
Remembrance in the Psalms	
IV. REMEMBRANCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.....	50
V. THE LAST SUPPER AND PASSOVER.....	58
A Different Calendar?	
A Different Meal?	
A Different Theology?	
VI. TEXT AND CONTEXT.....	67
Is Remembrance Genuine?	
Luke and Paul	
Luke's Account	
Majority Text	
VII. WHO IS TO REMEMBER?.....	77
Joachim Jeremias	
"Believing Reflection"	
"True Exercise of Faith"	
VIII. REMEMBRANCE AND REAL PRESENCE.....	86
No Synthesis	
The Lutheran Confessions and "Remembrance"	

IX. THE DIDACTIC DIMENSION.....	92
Proclamation	
The Old Testament and the Didactic Dimension	
The Early Church and Instruction	
CONCLUSION .....	99
APPENDIX	
A. The Festivals of Israel.....	104
B. A Table Setting.....	106
C. The Order.....	107
D. Proposed Account of the "Last Supper".....	108
E. Textual Comparison.....	111
F <u>Didache</u> .....	113
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	114

## INTRODUCTION

The title of the thesis attempts to set the stage for this study by concentrating its efforts on the command Jesus gave when He instituted the Lord's Supper, "This do in remembrance of me," Luke 22:19. The title of the thesis also suggests that covenant, remembrance and the text of Luke 22:19 will be of primary importance. Indeed, the purpose of this study is to assert that remembrance, as it is used by Christ in the Words of Institution, has covenantal significance. The writer acknowledges that much could be written concerning the idea of covenant and just as much could be written concerning the Lord's Supper. However, this writer has chosen to limit this study to the manner in which remembrance is employed in Luke 22:19.

The very fact that people are incessantly reminding each other to remember proves that people have an amazing propensity toward forgetfulness. This is illustrated in Genesis 40 when Joseph was in prison. Joseph interpreted the dream of the chief butler and asked him זָכַרְתָּ לִּי<sup>1</sup> (you remember me) and וְזָכַרְתָּ לִּי (and you mention me) in Gen. 40:14.

<sup>1</sup>A. Alt, et alii, ed., Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (Stuttart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967/77). This and all subsequent references from the Masoretic Text (MT) will be taken from this source.

Unfortunately for Joseph, the chief butler לֹא זָכַר (did not remember) and, in fact, אֲבָל שָׁכַח (but he forgot him) in Gen. 40:23. It was not until two full years later, when Pharaoh himself had a dream that the chief butler finally said, אֲנִי זָכַרְתִּי אֶת כָּל אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ לִּי (My faults I am remembering) in Gen. 41:9.

Remembrance, even in the situation of the chief butler and Joseph, is more than a casual reflection. What Joseph meant when he said, "You remember me," was, "Help me get out of here!" "Do something!" He obviously meant something more than, "Think about me as you feast sumptuously." Joseph wanted something to be done about his predicament. That "doing something" quality or active sense of remembrance is really the first step in being able to appreciate the variegated nature of remembrance. For example, remembrance, as it is used in Scripture, is often more pregnant with meaning than the following question: "Do you remember when grandpa caught that big fish?" The response to such a question would be affirmative, negative or dubious. As the Words of Institution are carefully examined, one will note that there is a vast difference between the use of remembrance in the Words of Institution and the question which starts out, "Do you remember . . . ?"

Furthermore, 1 Cor. 10:16 expresses that there is something infinitely more going on in and with the Lord's Supper

than a mere casual reflection. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" In addition, there are other examples of remembrance being used in more than just a casual reflection, such as the relationship between God and Noah.

In Gen. 8:1, God remembered (MT: זָכַר אֱלֹהִים and LXX: ἐμνήσθη)<sup>2</sup> Noah. And again in Gen. 9:15 and 16, God said that He would remember (MT: זָכַר אֱלֹהִים and LXX: μνησθήσομαι) His covenant. God would see the rainbow and remember (MT: זָכַר אֱלֹהִים and LXX: μνησθήσεται) His everlasting covenant (MT: זָכַר אֱלֹהִים and LXX: διεθήκειν αἰῶνιον).

God remembered Noah but forgot the wicked. Here we begin to see remembrance being used forensically. Remembrance, as it is employed in the interaction between Joseph and the butler is an example of its use between men. Remembrance, as it is used in the relationship between Noah and God, is much deeper. It is to be understood in a spiritual sense. For example, at the time of Noah the human race had become wicked. "And because of their wickedness God wiped them away

<sup>2</sup>Alfred Rahlfs, ed., Septuaginta (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979). This and all subsequent references from the Septuagint (LXX) will be taken from this source.

and blotted out their memory and with them even destroyed the earth and everything that was therein."<sup>3</sup>

The word remembrance is used frequently enough in Scripture to provoke consideration of its relationship to the Old Covenant and to the New Covenant. Furthermore, this writer contends that a closer examination of remembrance will increase our understanding of Covenant. It is this writer's thesis that remembrance has covenantal significance. Word studies, as well as contextual studies will underscore this position. Specifically, this thesis will examine the covenantal significance of remembrance as the term is employed within the context of the Lord's Supper in Luke 22:19. There are those who have interpreted the word variously. Therefore, the task of this writer will be to examine the range of research concerning Covenant and Remembrance on the one hand, and, Passover and the Lord's Supper on the other hand. The goal of this study is to demonstrate that remembrance does have covenantal significance as it is used within the context of Passover and the Lord's Supper.

Since covenant is central to this study, this term will be examined first. The word itself, as it is used in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, will be examined. What covenant conveys will also be discussed. The similarities

---

<sup>3</sup>Alfred M. Rehwinkel, The Flood (Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1951), p. 54.

between the covenant of Scripture and the Hittite treaties will be demonstrated in order to appreciate more fully the individual parts of the Scriptural covenant. However, the transition from the Old Covenant to the New Covenant is of particular interest because it is at this point that the relationship between covenant and remembrance will manifest itself more fully.

Since the Lord's Supper was instituted by Christ within the context of the Passover celebration, the three Pilgrim Festivals will be analyzed with regard to their time of celebration and their specific commemorative value. Although the contemporary observances of Passover by Jews, on one hand, and by Christians, on the other, are ancillary in this study, an analysis of the same will assist in determining the main emphases of such observances then and now.

Remembrance has been variously defined and interpreted. It should be of no great surprise to the reader that it is often interpreted along denominational lines. Nevertheless, the word remembrance will be studied etymologically and contextually through its use in the Old Testament (paying particular attention to its use in the Psalms) and in the New Testament. This exercise will underscore that remembrance has various nuances. An examination of such nuances will assist in determining how remembrance is to be understood in Luke 22:19. For example, is remembrance to be understood

vicariously or merely as a memorial? Is there an element of proclamation involved? Could there be a didactic dimension in the background? Such questions form an integral part of this study.

Since the command to remember is not used in the Matthean and Markan accounts of the Lord's Supper, some raise questions as to whether or not Jesus explicitly said, "this do in remembrance of me." Secondly, did Jesus celebrate the Last Supper during the Passover? Various views will be examined regarding the Last Supper Jesus had with His disciples. Thirdly, Luke and Paul have a number of features in common. This has led some to conclude that Luke is dependent upon Paul. Therefore the text and context will be considered in light of the other accounts of the Lord's Supper and the weight of the Majority Text.

Remembrance, depending upon its subjects and objects, can have condemnatory as well as salvific ramifications. Secondly, there is not total agreement on who the subject of remembrance is in the Words of Institution. For some, God was intended to be the subject of the remembering rather than the disciples. The strengths and weaknesses of this position will be weighed.

Finally, a concluding word is in order. The purpose of this study is to present evidence which would support the thesis that remembrance does indeed have covenantal sig-

nificance. Consequently, if the word has covenantal significance, then more attention must be paid to it so that it is not treated as if the word had only slight significance.

There are implicit dangers with any study dealing with the meaning of a particular word. The temptation to philosophize about a text, rather than to perform exegesis of a text, is difficult to avoid. Thus it becomes all the more important to let Scripture interpret Scripture. The challenge of such a study is to discover and shed light on the particular nuances without sacrificing the integrity of the study.

It is the position of this writer that Lutheran theology has contributed to a more accurate understanding of the word remembrance via its use in the Lutheran Confessions and in the Lutheran Liturgy. After all, it is one thing to maintain a doctrinal position, but the implementation of that doctrinal position is where the flood gates are opened to all sorts of inconsistencies. Hence, the goal is to interpret and not strain or overextend its meaning.

## CHAPTER I

### COVENANT

#### Biblical Covenant

Covenant (ברית) is a word not without importance in the Old Testament. For example, there are covenants between men; between a monarch and his subjects; marriage covenants; and covenants between friends.<sup>1</sup> A study of the word would suggest that covenant is synonymous with law and commandment<sup>2</sup> over against the idea that it is a mutual agreement. Originally, covenant carried with it the ideas of commitment and oath. The scenario of a suzerain "cutting a covenant" for his vassal would support the understanding of covenant as a command or an obligation. In addition, the fact that covenant implies peace and fidelity accentuates the significance of the word.<sup>3</sup> The idiom, "to cut a covenant"

---

<sup>1</sup>Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, ed., A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, reprinted (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 135.

<sup>2</sup>G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, ed., Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, 4 vols., (hereafter cited as TDOT), trans. John T. Willis (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975), s.v. ברית, by M. Weinfeld, 2:255.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 256-261.

stems from the action of cutting an animal during the covenant making ceremony. An example of this procedure is recorded in Genesis 15. Abram took the designated animals and, with the exception of the birds, cut each in half. Thus, "to cut a covenant" meant to enter into and establish a relationship.<sup>4</sup>

The covenant of the Old Testament is unlike modern contracts because covenant has a twofold commitment. There is an external commitment which has specific outward obligations associated with it. There is also an internal commitment or loyalty which has a spiritual quality attached to it. The force of this internal loyalty is put into effect by a faithful God, who keeps His promises to those who love Him.<sup>5</sup> More precisely, God is the One who always initiates. A strict understanding of reciprocity is not to be found. God, as the Lord of heaven and earth, always does the initiating in establishing relationships with man in grace and not vice versa. Man is not God's equal.

God made a covenant with Noah after the Flood and the rainbow was the sign of that covenant in Genesis 9. God made His covenant with Abraham as recorded in Genesis 12 and re-

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 260.

<sup>5</sup>James Hastings, ed., Dictionary of the Bible, rev. ed. Frederick C. Grant and H. H. Rowley (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), s.v. "Covenant," by James Barr, pp. 183-185.

peated it a number of times in succeeding chapters. Abram's name was changed to Abraham and the sign of the covenant was circumcision in Genesis 17. The covenant made with the Hebrews was a covenant based on blood and communicated by Moses in Exodus 24. Exodus 19-20 underline that it was a covenant of grace. The covenant with God's covenant guidelines as the emphasis becomes more explicit in Deuteronomy. This emphasis is heightened in 1 Kings 8 where the tables of the law are to be stored in the Ark of the Covenant.<sup>6</sup> God's covenant with David in 2 Samuel 7 is also a covenant of grace. The response on the part of the king was to be obedience and faithfulness.

Crucial for this study are the idioms employed for observing and violating the covenant between God and Israel. To remember the covenant is to observe and keep it (Gen. 9:15; Ex. 2:24; 6:5; Lev. 26:42; Ezek. 16:60; and Amos 1:9). The Lord wants the response of man to proceed from faith and not from the desire to placate Him as if He were an angry God (Micah 6:5-8). In contrast, to forget the covenant is to violate it and show the most blatant contempt for God and His Word (Deut. 4:23; 4:31; and Prov. 2:17). These idioms are also attested to in Akkadian, Aramaic, and Assyrian literature.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>TDOT, 2:260-262.

Hittite Treaties

The event of establishing an oath or treaty between two parties was not unique to the Hebrews. As the international scene is taken into consideration, ancient treaties between nations have been found which contribute to the understanding of God's Covenant with Israel. The treaty between a superior nation and an inferior nation was known as a "suzerainty treaty."<sup>8</sup> A basic pattern with common elements is a salient feature of the ancient Hittite treaties. The following elements are typical of the treaty-text: the preamble; the historical prologue; the stipulations; provisions for deposit of the text and for public reading; a list of the divine witnesses to the treaty; blessings and curses. Some treaties may deviate somewhat from the basic pattern. Other treaties may omit one or more of the elements.<sup>9</sup>

The following portions extracted from two Hittite treaties will demonstrate the similarity between the Hittite treaties and the covenants recorded in the Old Testament:

Preamble: These are the words of the Sun Mursilis, the great king, the king of Hatti land, the valiant, the favorite of the Storm-god, the son of Suppiluliumas, the great king of the Hatti land, the valiant. [TREATY BETWEEN MURSILIS AND DUPPI-TESSUB OF AMURRU] (Compare Ex. 19:4; 20:2 and Ex. 34:6 and 7).

Historical Introduction: When your father died, in accordance with your father's word I did not drop you.

---

<sup>8</sup>Delbert R. Hillers, Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea (Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins Press, 1969), pp. 28-29.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

Since your father had mentioned to me your name with great praise, I sought after you. To be sure, you were sick and ailing, but although you were ailing, I, the Sun, put you in the place of your father and took your brothers (and) sisters and the Amurru land in oath for you. (Compare Ex. 20:2; 19:4; Joshua 24:3-13; and 1 Sam. 12:8-12).

Future Relations of the Two Countries: So honor the oath (of loyalty) to the king and the kings kin! And I, the king, will be loyal toward you, Duppi-Tessub. . . Do not turn your eyes to anyone else! Your fathers presented tribute to Egypt; you [shall not do that!] (Compare Ex. 20:3-17 and Deut. 5:7-21-6:25).

Provisions for the Deposit of the Treaty and Re-readings of the same: A duplicate of this tablet has been deposited before the Sun-goddess of Arinna, because the Sun-goddess of Arinna regulates kingship and queenship. In the Mitanni land (a duplicate) has been deposited before Tessub, the lord of the Kurrinnu of Kahat. At regular intervals shall they read it in the presence of the king of the Mitanni land and in the presence of the sons of the Hurri country. [THE TREATY BETWEEN SUPPILULIUMAS AND KURTIWAZA] (Compare Deut. 4:13-14; 6:1-8; 16:16-17; 31:9-13; and Ex. 34:23-24 and 24).

List of divine witnesses: Whoever will remove this tablet from before Tessub, the lord of the Kurinnu of Kahat, and put it in a hidden place, if he breaks it or causes anyone else to change the wording of the tablet - at the conclusion of this treaty we have called the gods to be assembled and the gods of the contracting parties to be present, to listen and to serve as witnesses; The Sun-goddess, . . . (Compare Deut. 4:26; 30:19; and 31:28)

Curses and Blessings: If you, Kurtiwaza, the prince, and (you) the sons of the Hurri country do not fulfill the words of this treaty, may the gods, the lords of the oath, blot you out, (you) Kurtiwaza and (you) the Hurri men together with your country, your wives and all that you have . . . If (on the other hand) you, Kurtiwaza, the prince, and (you), the Hurrians, fulfill this treaty and (this) oath, may these gods protect you, Kurtiwaza, . . . and your children's children and together with your country. May the Mitanni country return to the place which it occupied before, may it thrive and expand.

(Compare Ex. 23:20-33; Lev. 26:3-46; Deut. 27:15-26; and 28:1-6).<sup>10</sup>

The structure of the Hittite treaties and the Scriptural Covenant demonstrate that the superior party took the initiative in establishing the relationship with an inferior party. As the inferior party responded with loyalty or obedience, it would be rewarded with the continuance of the relationship and other benefits by the superior party. What happened when the inferior party responded with disloyalty and disobedience? Such a display of impudence would test the authority of the superior party. Israel found out on more than one occasion that God was serious about the covenant. Israel's incessant lapses into insolence drew sharp rebukes, "covenant lawsuits" from the prophets. The "covenant lawsuit" is like a court trial in which God takes His people to court. The prophet acts as God's spokesman who invokes the terrestrial and celestial elements as witnesses against Israel for the covenantal breach (See Deuteronomy 32; Isaiah 1; Micah 6 and Jeremiah 2).<sup>11</sup>

Both loyalty and disloyalty to the covenant proved God's veracity. If His people were loyal, He would protect and bless them. If His people were disloyal, He would punish them. The covenant was God's way of dealing with His people.

---

<sup>10</sup>James B. Pritchard, ed., Ancient Near Eastern Manuscripts, 3rd ed., with supplement (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1969), pp. 203-206.

<sup>11</sup>Hillers, pp. 124-127.

Israel broke the covenant. God continued His relationship with man by establishing a New Covenant. As will be demonstrated in the following section, the New Covenant bears a distinct similarity to the Old Covenant. The "peculiar treasure" of Ex. 19:5 (the Old Covenant People) is reiterated with the "peculiar people" of 1 Peter 2:9 (the New Covenant People). God is the Author of both covenants and therein lies the unity.

#### Old Covenant and New Covenant

The Old Testament is replete with references to covenant or covenantal imagery. Almost as soon as Yahweh made His formal covenant of grace with Israel (Exodus 19-20), Israel broke the covenant (see Exodus 32). A covenant renewal followed in Exodus 34. The history of Israel may be summarized with the word, apostasy. The book of Deuteronomy records what happened in the covenant renewal before Israel crossed the Jordan to take Canaan, the covenant land. It is with Jeremiah that Yahweh speaks of a "New Covenant" (see Jer. 31:27-34). This portion of Scripture is to be understood proleptically, since Jeremiah looked beyond the Old Covenant to the New Covenant. John Bright captures the impact that the New Covenant has in the place of the Old with the following:

Guard these words of Jeremiah well! You will hear them again. You will hear them in a little upper room; you will hear them when next you sit about the Lord's table: "This cup is the New Covenant in my blood" (1 Cor.11:25;

Luke 22:20). And again: "Drink ye, all, of it" (Matt. 26:27).<sup>12</sup>

Jeremiah is a transition point between the Old and the New. Israel's nationalistic arrogance was dealt a major blow with the Exile. Jeremiah had the unenviable task of correcting covenantal misconceptions and proclaiming a New Covenant or a New Israel. This New Covenant takes on greater dimensions as it is developed and fulfilled in the New Testament.<sup>13</sup> There is a great deal of similarity between Jer. 31:31-34 and 2 Cor. 3:6 and 14.

Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant (2 Cor. 3:6) καινης διαθηκης with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant (2 Cor. 3:14) παλαιας διαθηκης that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD: But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more. Jer. 31:31-34.

It is διαθηκη that conveys the sense of ברית in the New Testament. It has been argued that neither "testament" nor "covenant" convey the import of διαθηκη. The use of διαθηκη in the Septuagint would suggest that

<sup>12</sup>John Bright, The Kingdom of God (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1953), p. 126.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., pp. 127-146.

"disposition" is a word which is more appropriate and fitted to the task of relating God's gracious will. God is the initiator and what He initiates has absolute validity and authority. He is the Author of two covenants but He has one Will. That Will is gracious and militates against a legalistic interpretation such as that of the Jews.<sup>14</sup> According to Joachim Guhrt, δικαθῆκη conveys an unalterable decree. Hence, δικαθῆκη is not synonymous with συμβήκη, a reciprocal agreement.<sup>15</sup> Deut. 7:7-8 underscores that God was the Author of the Old Covenant and that Covenant was based on grace:

The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because you were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people: But because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hands of Pharaoh king of Egypt.

Grace cannot be overemphasized with reference to the Covenant. The Covenant was not based on legalism. To perceive the Covenant as a legalistic invention would be myopic, to say the least. David, in 1 Chron. 16:7-36, praises the

---

<sup>14</sup>Gerhard Kittel, ed., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols., hereafter cited as TDNT) trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), δικαθῆκη, by Johannes Behm, 2:124-134.

<sup>15</sup>Colin Brown, gen. ed., The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, 3 vols., (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1971), s.v. "Covenant, Guarantee, Mediator," Joachim Guhrt, 1:365.

LORD for His Covenant of grace beginning with Abraham and continuing throughout the generations. "Remember (יָדָדְיָ) his marvellous works," in 1 Chron. 16:12 and, "Be ye mindful (יָדָדְיָ) always of his covenant;" in 1 Chron. 16:15. This portion of Scripture serves to remind the people of the Covenant and its history. Unfortunately, as will be shown, Judaism did not remember the Covenant as a grace-event.

It has been suggested that covenants were religious and legal.<sup>16</sup> Unfortunately, the post-exilic Jews placed the covenant into a legalistic framework, and, on the basis of Gen. 17:10, made circumcision the pride of that covenant.<sup>17</sup> Instead of circumcision retaining its function as a "sign" after the covenant had been entered into and established, it became an obligation.<sup>18</sup> This legalistic understanding resulted in what they thought was a fence around the Torah. Moses and Ezra were prominent figures being used by God in the process of creating and preserving a nation of the Torah.<sup>19</sup> For the Jew, the Torah was Law. For the Jew,

---

<sup>16</sup>George Arthur Buttrick, gen. ed., The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 5 vols., (hereafter cited as IDB) (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1962), s.v. "Covenant", by George E. Mendenhall, 1:714-723.

<sup>17</sup>TDNT, 2:129.

<sup>18</sup>IDB, s.v. "Covenant," by Mendenhall, p. 718.

<sup>19</sup>Isaac Unterman, ed., Pirke Aboth (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1964), pp. 27-29.

covenant was synonymous with the Law. The covenant was that which made the Jewish nation the people of God. "Judaism knows of no other than the old Sinaitic covenant."<sup>20</sup> The Qumran community even went beyond the idea of a nation built around the Law to a community built upon an oath to abide by the Law. They called themselves "people of the new covenant."<sup>21</sup>

After examining the Jewish understanding of covenant, there is a temptation to view the Old Covenant and the New Covenant as two disparate or opposing covenants. That is, the Old Covenant was one of works and the New Covenant is one of grace. However, a study of the covenant in the Scriptures underlines that this is not the case. Some have even come to hold that the Old Testament proclaims a God of wrath, while the New Testament proclaims a God of love. Bright clarifies the relationship of the Old Covenant to the New Covenant with the following:

But we cannot dismiss the relationship of the Testaments by saying that Christ came to replace a covenant of works with a covenant of grace, as though we had to do with two dispensations in which God dealt with his people in two essentially different ways. In spite of the powerful argumentative force of this contrast of the two covenants,

---

<sup>20</sup>Isidore Singer, ed., The Jewish Encyclopedia, 12 vols., (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1912), s.v. "Covenant," by Kaufmann Kohler, 4:32.

<sup>21</sup>Leonard Goppelt, Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New, trans. Donald H. Madvig (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982), pp. 110-116.

one reading, for example, of Deuteronomy would be enough to convince one that the old covenant was itself regarded precisely as a grateful response to the unmerited grace of God. [cf. Chap. I, p. 28: "The Old Testament covenant was thus always properly viewed, like the New, as a covenant of grace."]22

If grace is the basis for both the Old Covenant and the New, then grace must be considered as the controlling principle for remembrance. The same dynamic which is at work in 1 John 4:19, "We love him, because he first loved us," also regulates remembrance. We remember God, because He first remembered us. For God to remember His covenant (Ps. 105:8-4), and to remember our sin no longer (Jer. 31:34), is for Him to remember us (Ps. 115:12). Through the Spirit's work, our response to God's remembrance of us is to remember Him by remembering His covenant of grace (Psalm 111). This "New Covenant" is the blood of Christ which was foreshadowed in the Old Covenant and first promised in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 3:15). Covenant and remembrance have redemptive power only as they are connected to grace.

The Old Covenant and the New Covenant are misunderstood if they are not connected to grace. The function of remembrance is that of a response. God made a covenant with man in the Old Testament but man's response was inappropriate. Man may have outwardly gone through the motions of worshipping God and observing festivals but his heart was not in it (see Jer. 9:25-26). It will be shown in the following chap-

---

<sup>22</sup>Bright, Kingdom of God, p. 195.

ter that the Hebrews did not do well at keeping the sacred festivals inwardly or outwardly. As a matter of fact, the Hebrews did the best at observing festivals when their hearts were genuinely set on worship (2 Chron. 30:15; 31:5,12,20-21; 35:17-19). These changes of heart, or times of remembering again spiritually, were brought about by spiritual reformations.

Hence, repentance comes into the picture as part of the remembering response that man is to have in His covenantal relationship with God (See 2 Chron. 7:14 and Isaiah 1:16-20). Yet, repentance was missing by far the majority of time as God dealt with His "peculiar treasure."

God intended for man to respond to His covenant with loyalty and fidelity and through His Spirit empowered them to do it. The worship life of Israel indicates that Israel responded to God's covenant with forgetfulness rather than remembrance. The following chapter will make inquiry into one area of Israel's worship life, namely, the pilgrim festivals. One pilgrim festival in particular, Passover, will be studied in detail. Such a detailed study of the Passover is necessary because the visible elements as well as the spoken Haggadah bring into view that God intended for Israel to respond with remembering to His love. The issue of who is to be the subject of the remembering in the Lord's Supper becomes particularly acute in Chapter VI. The following chapters will lay the foundation as to how that issue will unfold.

## CHAPTER II

### HEBREW FESTIVALS

#### Pilgrim Festivals

The festivals which were celebrated by the children of Israel provide a key which opens up the door to a more precise understanding of remembrance (See Appendix A, The Festivals of Israel). In particular, three festivals known as the Pilgrim Festivals enjoyed special consideration. Passover (originally associated with first-fruits of barley harvest) פסח ("passing over"), a one-evening festival followed by the Feast of Unleavened Bread, a 7-day festival, commemorated Israel's deliverance from Egypt. This festival was celebrated Nisan 14-21 and is recorded in Exodus 12-13 and Leviticus 23.<sup>1</sup> The Feast of Weeks or Pentecost was actually a harvest festival (first-fruits of the wheat harvest) and recognized God as the source of agricultural fertility. This festival was celebrated on the sixth of Sivan and is recorded

---

<sup>1</sup>George Arthur Buttrick, gen. ed., The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 5 vols., (hereafter cited as IDB) (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1962), s.v. "Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread," by J. Coert Rylaarsdam, 3:663-668.

in Leviticus 23 and Deuteronomy 16.<sup>2</sup> The Feast of Tabernacles or Booths סך יסוּן אַן אַן (booths made from branches which were woven together) was also a harvest festival and commemorated the wanderings in the wilderness. This festival was celebrated Tishri 15-21 and is recorded in Leviticus 23. Since this study is concerned with the significance of remembrance, the Wellhausenian hypothesis that Israel borrowed these festivals from Canaan will not be discussed here.<sup>3</sup>

#### Passover

Of the three Pilgrim Festivals, Passover is the closest parallel to the Lord's Supper. As will be shown later, there is strong evidence to support that the Lord's Supper was instituted at the last Passover meal Jesus ate with His disciples. Thus, this writer will outline first the observance of the Passover and its observance by contemporary Jews in order to establish that remembrance is not just an afterthought. On the contrary, remembrance will function as that which perpetuates a certain festival and also that which points to the content of that festival. Put simply, remembrance calls for regular and proper observance.

---

<sup>2</sup>IDB, s.v. "Weeks, Feast of," by J. Coert Rylaarsdam, 4:827-828.

<sup>3</sup>IDB, s.v. "Booths, Feast of," by J. Coert Rylaarsdam, .1:455-458.

The first Passover was actually two commemorations in one. The Passover itself was to be a commemoration of the Angel of Death "passing over" and sparing the Israelites while destroying the firstborn of man and beast of the Egyptians (Ex. 12:12). The Feast of Unleavened Bread, a 7-day festival, which immediately followed the Passover, was to commemorate the actual exodus from Egypt (Ex. 12:17). Its purpose was to remind the Israelites of their hurried departure from Egypt, not waiting for the leavened bread to rise and be baked (Exodus 12 and Deuteronomy 16).

The Passover lamb was the main item, and, as such, most of the stipulations centered around the selection and preparation of the lamb. There was one lamb per house (Ex. 12:3). The lamb was to be a male, of sheep or goats, without blemish and a year old (Ex. 12:5). It was to be killed on the evening of the fourteenth day of Abib (Ex. 12:6). The blood of the lamb was to be smeared on the lintel and on the door posts (Ex. 12:7). The lamb was to be roasted whole and no bones were to be broken. It was to be eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Nothing was to be left over until the morning. It was to be eaten in haste, that is, people fully clothed and ready to leave (Ex. 12:8-11). Until the twenty-first day of the same month they were to eat unleavened bread (Ex. 12:18).

The observances of Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread were to be annual occurrences. Both were to be for "a memorial" זִכְרוֹן (Ex. 12:14 and 13:9). The command to "remember this day" זִכְרוּ (Ex. 13:3) and the designated answers which anticipate the questions of the children (Ex. 12:26 and 13:14) provide the clues to the understanding of remembrance. The response to the inquiring youth was a recital of Israel's deliverance out of Egypt by the Covenant God (Ex. 12:27 and 13:14-15). Thus, the visible elements found in the Passover are accompanied by the spoken Word, the recitation of God's act of deliverance. In this respect, the similarity between the Passover and the Lord's Supper becomes more conspicuous.

#### Contemporary Observance of Passover

Passover is the first and the greatest of all Jewish festivals. Passover is the festival of deliverance.<sup>4</sup> The Hebrews apparently adopted the Babylonian calendar as a result of the Exile. Thus, the Canaanite Abib was replaced by the Babylonian Nisana.<sup>5</sup> Passover, as all Jewish festivals and fasts, is not just a commemoration but a living experience. The Jewish Passover is continuous. It is a festival

<sup>4</sup>Hayyim Schauss, The Jewish Festivals: From Their Beginnings to Our Own Day, trans. Samuel Jaffe (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1938), p. 38.

<sup>5</sup>IDB, s.v. "Calendar," Simon J. DeVries, 1:483-488.

in which all Jews in all times and in all places participate. Commitment and loyalty are embodied in this festival. Passover is not just recollection or reminiscence. On the contrary, it epitomizes continual deliverance of all Jews everywhere and of all ages from bondage.<sup>6</sup> It also involves vicarious participation in the event of the Exodus centuries ago. For the Jew, Passover has vertical and horizontal elements. The vertical is the relationship to God and the horizontal is that communal relationship with all Jews (especially with those involved in the initial event). The Jew who neglects to observe the Passover has cut himself off from his people.<sup>7</sup>

It is the Seder which calls the people to their commitment by creating the ambiance for self-identification with the past.<sup>8</sup> The Seder is the ritual or order of procedure for the Passover night.<sup>9</sup> The Haggadah is a collection of passages and rituals used for the Seder. The Haggadah is based on Ex. 13:8, "and you shall tell your son." The head of the

---

<sup>6</sup>Theodor H. Gaster, Festivals of the Jewish Year (New York: William Sloane Associates Publishers, 1953), pp. 19-20.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>8</sup>Morris Silverman, ed., Passover Haggadah (Hartford, Connecticut: Prayer Book Press, 1959), p. 2.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. viii.

household recites the story of the Exodus.<sup>10</sup> The Seder is conceived of as a vicarious experience rather than a mere recitation.<sup>11</sup> The Haggadah "is the script of a living drama," which fosters not only an act of remembrance but also of identification.<sup>12</sup> The command to teach the meaning of the Passover cannot be overemphasized. "Telling your son," was the means of passing on the festival and its meaning to future generations. Passing on the meaning of Passover to future generations was and is an intimate part of the role of remembrance. The performance of the ritual was not enough. It was necessary to communicate vividly the reason for the ritual to the audience. Through instruction the ritual and the reason for the ritual were to be perpetuated throughout the generations. (More will be said about this in Chapter IX.)

The Exodus is recognized as the birth of the Jewish nation. Passover serves to remind the Jewish nation of its liberation. The past is connected to the present through remembrance.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, the Passover celebrated by the Jew

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p.x.

<sup>11</sup>Gaster, Festivals of the Jewish Year, p. 42.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>13</sup>Philip Birnbaum, A Book of Jewish Concepts (New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1964), pp. 192-194.

reminds the Jew of his responsibility as a social being in the present as the following quotation underlines:

That is why the Passover festival should not be called the "Jewish Easter." The philosophies of the two festivals are completely antithetical. Easter is Christianity's holiday to symbolize its preoccupation with the other-worldly salvation of the individual. Passover, on the other hand, is Judaism's festival par excellence to symbolize the role of religion in this worldly social amelioration. It is to evoke a moving regard for human suffering and a burning passion for the liberation of the oppressed. Indeed, our sages exclaimed (Tal. B., Taanith 7a), that the Torah has little to say to the individual living in solitude. It addresses itself primarily to man as a social animal.<sup>14</sup>

Indeed, the Christian Easter and Jewish Passover are antithetical. How each understands the Old Testament prophecies accentuates that antithesis. In contrast to the Jewish position on remembrance, which interprets remembrance and Passover according to its understanding of the Jewish people as a nation, Christianity interprets remembrance according to the Words which Christ spoke on that night in which he instituted the Lord's Supper.

#### Preparation

As Joachim Jeremias points out, it is difficult for people raised in the "fast-food" western society to appreciate the meaning that table-fellowship has for those raised in the Near-East. "Table-fellowship is evidence that peace, trust,

---

<sup>14</sup>Leon D. Stitskin, ed., Studies In Torah Judaism (New York: Yeshiva University Press, Ktav Publishing House Inc., 1969), p. 68.

brotherhood and forgiveness are granted. To eat together is to belong together."<sup>15</sup> This unique understanding of table-fellowship, with its stress on the intimate relationship of those who belong to the same ethnic group and share the same religious faith, is the first step in being able to comprehend all of the parts which contribute to making the Passover.

The Passover, from its preparation to its conclusion, contains rituals which are not to be taken as being meaningless. Rather, the rituals are to symbolize events in Jewish history that have significance for the present and the future.<sup>16</sup> The careful preparation of the home along with the foods, dishes, and utensils heighten the sense of sanctity for the occasion. The home becomes a Passover sanctuary, meaning that hametz (all leaven and leavened food) must be removed.<sup>17</sup>

Even in the twentieth century, the Passover food serves a particular function, namely, to heighten the vicarious nature of the feast [See Appendix B, Plate Arrangements]. The

---

<sup>15</sup>Joachim Jeremias, "'This is My Body . . .,'" The Expository Times 83 (October 1971 - September 1972):196.

<sup>16</sup>Mordell Klein, ed., Passover (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1973), p. 50.

<sup>17</sup>Morris Silverman, ed., Passover Haggadah (Hartford, Connecticut: Prayer Book Press, 1959), p. 13.

three pieces of matzah represent the two loaves set out in the original Temple and the extra matzah is symbolic of the Passover [See Appendix C, The Order]. The roasted shankbone (originally, the whole lamb) is to symbolize the ancient sacrifice of the Passover. The green herbs represent springtime and the hope of renewal. The maror, the top part of horseradish root, brings to mind the bitterness which the forefathers tasted while in Egypt. The haroset (fruits, nuts, and dates made into a puree) is the mortar which the forefathers used while they toiled under the domination of the Pharaoh as state slaves. The roasted egg is the hagigah (festival offering) and symbolizes the victory of life over death. The Elijah Cup anticipates the coming of the Elijah, who will come to every Jewish home to taste of the wine set aside for him. An empty chair denotes those Jews who are forbidden to celebrate the Passover in foreign lands. Hiding the afikoman (the half matzah set aside earlier in the Seder) is to heighten the curiosity and interest of the children.<sup>18</sup> In this manner, the command in Ex. 12:24-27 is thought to be fulfilled.

There are also various rhetorical devices employed in the Jewish Passover to ensure greater anticipation and participation on the part of the people involved, especially the

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 15-16.

children. These rhetorical devices are parts of the liturgy and their purpose is to transcend space and time. The Four Questions are a popular device and bridge the gap between Jews divided by space and time. The children are trained to ask the following Four Questions and the head of the household responds to them:

1. For on all other nights we may eat hamez and mazzah: on this night only mazzah? To symbolize that at the Exodus they had to eat in haste (See Ex. 12:11).
2. For on all other nights we may eat all kinds of vegetables: on this night we must eat bitter herbs? To symbolize the bitterness of the bondage in Egypt (See Ex. 12:8).
3. For on all other nights we do not dip (our vegetables) even once: on this night we dip twice (the karpas into salt water, and the bitter herbs into haroset)? To symbolize how the Lord relieved them of their suffering (See Ex. 12:27).
4. For on all other nights we may eat either sitting up straight or reclining: on this night we all recline? [This question was added later.] Now they have freedom (See Ex. 12:11).<sup>19</sup>

The preceding questions insure the idea of personal identification. Just as there are Four Questions, there are also Four types of children or people who ask the questions, namely, the wise; the wicked; the simple; and the one unable to ask.<sup>20</sup> The Questions, as do the food and accompanying

---

<sup>19</sup>Klein, Passover, p. 69.

<sup>20</sup>Herbert Bronstein, ed., A Passover Haggadah, rev. (New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1975), pp. 30-32.

rituals, assist in telling the story of deliverance.<sup>21</sup> Interestingly enough, some of the rituals or parts of various rituals came into being even as late as the fifteenth century.<sup>22</sup> Nevertheless, the desire to make Passover more than the proverbial "trip down memory lane," is also evident in the Passover liturgy. The Songs,<sup>23</sup> the designated Scripture readings (especially from the Song of Solomon),<sup>24</sup> and the Hallel Psalms 113-118<sup>25</sup> connected with the rituals intensify the belief that the Jew of today is able to share the Passover with his ancestors. The liturgy concludes proleptically as all Jews hope to celebrate Passover in Jerusalem.<sup>26</sup>

#### Christian Observance of Passover

Due to the fact that early Christians celebrated Christ's resurrection every Sunday, and, in addition, celebrated pascha on the fourteenth of Nisan (a festival which looked forward to the second coming of Christ), some argue in

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>22</sup> Gaster, Festivals of the Jewish Year, p. 44.

<sup>23</sup> Bronstein, ed., A Passover Haggadah, pp. 93-94.

<sup>24</sup> Horace D. Hummel, The Word Becoming Flesh (Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1979), p. 387.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 412.

<sup>26</sup> Bronstein, A Passover Haggadah, p. 6.

favor of a Christian observance of the Passover. History points out that there was no unanimity in celebrating Easter. There was disagreement over whether Easter should be celebrated with the Jewish observance of Passover (Nisan 14) or always on the Sunday following. The Council of Nicaea (A.D.325) accepted the Alexandrian practice of placing Easter after the vernal equinox.<sup>27</sup>

The observance of the Passover was a gauge indicating the level of spirituality of the Old Testament covenant people. The Old Testament does not give many detailed references to the direct observance of Passover. For example, prior to the Babylonian captivity, only a few observances of the Passover are recorded (Num. 9:15; Joshua 5:10-12; 2 Chron. 30:1; and 2 Chron. 35:18). After the Babylonian captivity, the Passover was celebrated by the exiles who returned to Jerusalem.<sup>28</sup>

As stated above, the Hebrews did not seem to have a history of celebrating the Passover. Jeremiah 9 portrays the Hebrews as people whose hearts were not into worshipping God. If they did worship God, or observe festivals, their hearts

---

<sup>27</sup>Samuel Macauley Jackson, gen. ed., The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 13 vols. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1952), s.v. "Easter," by Carl Bertheau, 4:43-47.

<sup>28</sup>Isidore Singer, ed., The Jewish Encyclopedia, 12 vols., (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1905), s.v. "Passover," by Emil G. Hirsch, 9:548-550.

were not in it. They broke the Covenant which God made with them and God gave them a "bill of divorce" (Jer. 3:8). It is possible, of course, that the Hebrews celebrated Passover more often than is indicated by Scripture. However, references such as 2 Chron. 30:5 and 2 Chron. 35:18 point out that the Hebrews did not celebrate Passover annually as it was intended to be celebrated (see Ex. 12:25). The Jews of the New Testament era, on the other hand, seem to have been more rigorous with their observance of Passover (see Luke 2:41-"passover"; John 2:13-"passover"; John 5:1-"a feast"; John 6:4-"passover"; and John 13:1-"passover"). Since the New Covenant is in effect now, there is no longer a Divine mandate to celebrate the Passover. There is an explicit Divine mandate to celebrate the Lord's Supper (Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 11:24-25). The Passover was perceived as the meal of the Old Covenant but the Lord's Supper was perceived as the meal of the New Covenant (see Luke 22:20 and Heb. 9-10).

The Old Covenant anticipated the New (Jer. 31:31). The blood of Christ in the New Covenant is superior to the blood of beasts in the Old Covenant. The blood of beasts functioned proleptically pointing to the blood of Christ shed for the sins of man. The New Covenant is the final word of com-

plete deliverance from sin (Hebrews 8-10).<sup>29</sup> Therefore, a Christian observance of the Passover must not overemphasize the Passover with the result that the unique character of the Lord's Supper is lost sight of.<sup>30</sup> Only the future will determine whether the present effort to encourage a Christian observance of the Passover will experience wider acceptance or become a temporary fascination.

In summary, both the Passover and the Lord's Supper are meals of remembrance. Both meals involve vicarious participation. Both meals have the theme of deliverance. Both have the element of anticipation. God instituted both meals. Man, as the recipient, was to respond with repentance and faith. Man was to partake of the meals that God gave him. Not only was man to partake of the meals but he was to instruct the uninitiated concerning them (Ex. 12:26 and 1 Cor. 11:23a). Hence, the didactic dimension is not to be taken lightly (1 Cor. 11:29). Other nuances of remembrance will be seen in the following chapters which analyze its etymological heritage. More specifically, the relationship between covenant and remembrance will become more clear. In

---

<sup>29</sup>Commission on Theology and Church Relations: The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, Theology and Practice of the Lord's Supper (Saint Louis, Missouri: N.p., 1983), p. 6.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 32.

addition, it will be shown that depending upon the particular context, God or man can be the subject of remembering.

## CHAPTER III

### REMEMBRANCE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

#### Remembrance and Deliverance

Since this writer's thesis is that remembrance has covenantal significance, it is necessary to study the word remembrance to determine how often it has covenantal overtones. The following questions are essential to ask before a study of remembrance is undertaken: How frequently is remembrance used in the Old Testament? How is it used in the Old Testament? Does remembrance have covenantal overtones apart from the specific context of the Passover? These questions will form the basis of this chapter.

The verb זָכַר "to remember" occurs 169 times in the qal form, 41 times in the hiphil, and 19 times in the niphal. The noun זִכָּרוֹן "memorial sign" occurs 22 times in the singular, 2 times in the plural, and once in the Aramaic cognate. The noun שֵׁם "name" occurs 23 times. The occurrence of זָבַח זִכָּרוֹן "memorial offering" is infrequent. There are also a few proper names formed from

זכר: Zaccur in Num. 13:4; Zichri in Ex. 6:21; Zecher in 1 Chron. 8:31; and Zechariah 1 Chron. 9:21.<sup>1</sup>

An examination of zkr reflects the following: zkr is dkr in Ugaritic. The word for male, also zkr, is not of the same root. The hiphil carries the causative, namely, "to cause remembrance." The noun means "memorial."<sup>2</sup> Frequently found with the phrase to remember is the phrase "not forget."<sup>3</sup> There is an active ingredient in zkr. Zkr is not just concerned with the past. God remembers men and His covenant. God remembers with His forgiveness. Man, in response, is to remember God by remembering His acts of deliverance.<sup>4</sup> Secondly, the hiphil carries with it the idea of proclamation, that is, God's acts of deliverance are brought to remembrance and these acts of deliverance are proclaimed.<sup>5</sup> Man has life

<sup>1</sup>Brevard Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel (Chatham, Great Britain: W. & J. Mackay & Co., 1962), p. 9.

<sup>2</sup>G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, ed., Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, 4 vols., (hereafter cited as TDOT), trans. David E. Green (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980), s.v. זכר, by H. Eising, 4:65.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 66-67.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 74.

because God remembered man. In response, through the Spirit's work, man remembers God's remembrance of him.<sup>6</sup>

Zkr can be positive or negative: that is, the word can be used to express the remembrance of someone for good or for evil. It is not confined solely to the remembrance of something or someone from the past. On the contrary, it is also employed for the present and the future.<sup>7</sup>

The objects of זכר are the following when man is the subject: past sins; past experiences; the works of the LORD; other individuals and their deeds; the words of the prophets; the commandments; God's covenant; and the observance of particular days.

The objects of זכר are the following when God is the subject: certain individuals beneficently; other individuals punitively; His oppressed servants; the supplication and fidelity of His people; His mercy; the sins of people; someone's name; and His covenant. Remembrance can have a positive result when it is used as a negative, and vice versa. For example, when God does not remember the sins of His people, it is definitely to their advantage. However, when God

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

<sup>7</sup>Francis Brown, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, ed., Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, reprinted (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 270.

remembers the sins of the people, it is to their detriment.<sup>8</sup> Consequently, a comparison between the subjects and objects of the verb ָּוָּ reveals that God remembered the covenant, but Israel did not. In fact, Israel more often than not forgot the covenant.<sup>9</sup>

Remembrance can also carry with it the aspect of action. This is implied when ָּוָּ is employed to enjoin the observance of the Passover in Exodus 20.<sup>10</sup> To focus in more clearly on remembrance, it must be underscored that Israel was motivated toward the response of remembering by God's redemptive activity and ordinance. Secondly, God prescribed the appropriate response, namely, the type of sacrifice to be offered so that nothing would be left up to Israel's fickle and capricious nature. Israel was to remember God and the redemptive acts which He wrought for Israel.<sup>11</sup>

Israel's downfall was its incessant inability to remember God and His acts of grace. Israel was incorrigible and repeatedly incurred God's wrath and God's rebuke via the

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel, p. 46.

<sup>10</sup> TDOT, 4:68.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 82.

prophets. Deuteronomy and Ezekiel are examples of how Israel was castigated for not remembering.<sup>12</sup>

Remember, and forget not, how thou provokedst the LORD thy God to wrath in the wilderness; from the day that thou didst depart out of the land of Egypt, until ye came unto this place, ye have been rebellious against the Lord. Deut. 9:7

Therefore thus saith the Lord God; Because thou hast forgotten me, and cast me behind thy back, therefore bear thou also thy lewdness and thy whoredoms. Ezek. 23:35.

Such language is reminiscent of Hosea when God said, "you are not my people, and I am not your God" (Hos. 1:9). Forgetting to remember God's acts of deliverance of Israel was synonymous with apostasy or spiritual adultery.<sup>13</sup> Fortunately though, for Israel, God's love was greater than Israel's. God remembered Israel in spite of Israel's forgetfulness. God remembered Israel by loving and saving him.<sup>14</sup> God's remembrance of Israel far exceeds Israel's propensity to forget. At this juncture, Willy Schottroff's observation that לֹא־שָׁכַח must be examined in light of לֹא־שָׁכַח, לֹא־שָׁכַח, לֹא־שָׁכַח is significant. לֹא־שָׁכַח is not merely a command, 'Don't forget the covenant.' On the contrary, according to Schot-

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 68.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>P. A. H. De Boer, Gedenken und Gedächtnis in der Welt des Alten Testaments (Stuttgart: S. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1962), p. 49.

troff, נ'ג'ג'ג'ג'ג'ג' is the renewed reception of the circumstances of the covenantal relationship.<sup>15</sup>

Remembering and forgetting are ideas employed frequently in the Old Testament. A concordance study of the preceding words leads this writer to form the following maxim: when God remembers the sin, He forgets the sinner; when God forgets the sin, He remembers the sinner. That is, when God remembers the sin, or takes the sin into account, He punishes the sinner by forgetting him and wiping away any remembrance of him (Ps. 109:14-16; Jer. 14:10; Ezek. 21:23-24; 21:32; Hos. 8:13; and 9:9).<sup>16</sup> However, when God forgets the sin, He remembers the sinner. That is, He does not take the sin into account. In this respect, God's remembrance of the sinner is synonymous with the sinner's deliverance (Ps. 25:7; 79:8-9; Is. 43:25; 64:9 [64:8]; and Jer. 31:34).<sup>17</sup> There is a life-giving force associated with remembrance when God is the subject and the sinner is the object. Especially in Is. 64:9 [64:8], when the sinner pleads with God not to remember his iniquities forever. "May the Lord's anger be temporary, not

---

<sup>15</sup>Willy Schottroff, "Gedenken" im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964), pp. 209-210.

<sup>16</sup>The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament, 5th ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970), pp. 385-387.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

eternal, final!"<sup>18</sup> Indeed, the Lord's remembrance is "active and certain".<sup>19</sup>

Remembrance, as synonymous with "deliverance," clearly demonstrates that the Scriptural use of remembrance is anything but anemic or passive. Remembrance is so intimately associated with covenant that the two cannot be separated (Ex. 6:5; Ps. 105:8; 136:23).<sup>20</sup> Remembrance, as synonymous with "deliverance," is accented in the New Testament. Luke 23:42 is an example of this because the thief on the cross said, "Remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." This plea is similar to that of Joseph in Gen. 40:14. Joseph wanted to be delivered from his earthly prison. The thief wanted Jesus to remember him so that he would be delivered from his spiritual prison. This will be taken up in greater detail in the next chapter.

When Israel is the subject of remembering or forgetting, the degree of covenantal fidelity comes into clear focus. The exhortations to not forget and the results of forgetting are common in the Old Testament (Deut. 4:9, 23, 31; 6:12;

---

<sup>18</sup>August Pieper, Isaiah II, trans. Erwin Kowalke (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Northwestern Publishing House, 1979), p. 657.

<sup>19</sup>D. J. Wiseman, gen. ed., The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1973), Psalms 1-72, by Derek Kidner, p. 116.

<sup>20</sup>The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament, pp. 385-387.

8:11, 14, 19; Job 8:13; Ps. 44:20; Jer. 3:21; 13:25; 18:15; 23:27; Hos. 2:13; 4:6; 8:14).<sup>21</sup> Israel's forgetting is synonymous with rejecting God. If Israel forgets God and His Law, then it rejects God and His Law. If Israel forgot and rejected God, then God would forget and reject Israel.<sup>22</sup>

Deuteronomy is replete with exhortations to Israel to remember God and how He brought Israel out of Egypt (5:15; 8:2; 15:15; 16:12; 24:18, and 22).<sup>23</sup> Unfortunately, Israel did not remember and its failure to remember became synonymous with apostasy (Judg. 8:33-34). When Israel forgot God, God forgot Israel. Fortunately for Israel, God's wrath did not last long (Ps. 30:5) and He again and again remembered Israel (Ps. 105:8, and 42). In summary, Israel's fidelity to the covenant was measured by whether or not it remembered God.

#### Remembrance in the Psalms

Some Psalms can be classified as Remembrance Psalms because the psalmist often praises the LORD for remembering His

---

<sup>21</sup>William Wilson, Old Testament Word Studies (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1978), p. 174.

<sup>22</sup>C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, Commentary on the Old Testament, 10 vols., rep. ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978), vol. 10: The Twelve Minor Prophets, by C. F. Keil, trans. James Martin, Part I, p. 77.

<sup>23</sup>The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament, p. 385.

covenant and enjoins God's people to remember the LORD. For example, some Psalms (such as, 77, 78, 103, 105, 106)<sup>24</sup> hark back to the origin of the covenant people, thereby providing a concise history lesson for the audience. However, the main feature of this section is to reflect how the Psalms at times make God the subject of the remembrance, and at other times make man the subject of remembrance. This fact will be particularly useful in the discussion to be taken up in Chapter VI.

Some Psalms, which have God as the subject of remembering, tend to give remembrance a gracious quality. The God of the universe is also the God of grace and compassion. That grace and compassion are attributes of God is communicated in Psalms 78; 98; 103; 105; and 136.<sup>25</sup>

The first part of Psalm 78 sets the stage by admonishing the future generation not to forget God's works (78:7) as their ancestors had done (78:11). God punished the ancestors (78:34). They "returned" and "remembered" (78:34-35). God, "being full of compassion," "remembered" them (78:38-39). However, their repentance lasted only a brief moment before they lapsed again into not remembering (78:42). In Psalm 98:3, the gracious direction is evident as God "remembered

---

<sup>24</sup>Robert Young, Analytical Concordance to the Bible, rep. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982), s.v. "Remember."

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

his mercy." In Psalm 105:8, God "remembered his covenant for ever." In Psalm 105:42, God "remembered his holy promise." In Psalm 136:23, God "remembered us in our low estate."<sup>26</sup>

Remembrance, as a thankful response, is man toward God. The response of thanksgiving and praise is reflected in the following Psalms: 42:4 "When I remember these things, I pour out my soul in me:"; 77:11 "I will remember the works of the LORD: surely I will remember thy wonders of old." In this sense, man is the subject of the remembering and God's gracious love is the intended object. Man's sacrificial response is to remember God's love.<sup>27</sup>

Negatively, there are Remembrance Psalms which are condemnatory and judgmental. The judgmental Remembrance Psalms are characterized by the refusal on the part of the Hebrews and enemies of God to remember. For example, Psalms 50; 78; 106; 109; and 137 give specific references to forgetting God. "Now consider this, ye that forget God," 50:22; "They remembered not his hand," 78:42; "They forgat God their savior," 106:21; "Because that he remembered not to shew mercy," 109:16; "Remember, O LORD, the children of Edom in the day of Jerusalem; who said, Rase it, rase it," 137:7. Forgetting God is synonymous with apostasy. God responded to man's forgetfulness with His judgment: Psalm 9:17 "The wicked shall be

---

<sup>26</sup>Ibid.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid.

turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." His judgment was to remember man's sin (See Ps. 109:14) and forget, or no longer remember man for salvation (See Ps. 88:5).

Beyond this, Remembrance Psalms can be further subdivided into requests to God that He would remember man salvifically (Ps. 25:6-7); requests to God that He would remember His judgment where enemies are concerned (Ps. 74:18 and 22); testimonials of how God remembered man (Ps. 105:8); testimonials of how man remembered God (Ps. 77:11); and the exhortation from the psalmist for man to remember God (Ps. 105:5).

The observation by Marjorie Sykes regarding the weight attached to memory and name by the Hebrews is particularly relevant here. Sykes points out that a name embodied the totality of one's character. Consequently, to remember a man's name was to remember his total character. Furthermore, the Hebrew was not to mention or remember other gods. To do so would be considered an attempt to acknowledge the existence of other gods. Finally, the Hebrew did not want the LORD to forget his name. If the LORD did not hold man's name in remembrance, man would be reduced to nonexistence.<sup>28</sup>

Upon closer examination of the Psalms, the remembering which takes place is not strictly bilateral. It could be more appropriately described as unilaterally cyclical. By

---

<sup>28</sup>Marjorie H. Sykes, "The Eucharist as 'Anamnesis,'" The Expository Times 71 (October 1959 - September 1960):115-116.

this, the writer means that the source of the beginning of the circle is God and moves toward man, from which it goes back to God. God gives man His grace and man responds to that grace by loving God. It is not bilateral, nor is it a relationship founded upon the principle of reciprocity.

"Bilateral" and "reciprocity" are terms which connote equality between the two parties. Such equality is nowhere to be found in the Psalms. The force of the grace-circle originates with God. Man, more often than not, breaks the circle. Apropos is Psalm 78, in which Israel forgot God and God remembered their sin. In 78:38-58, God remembered Israel with His mercy. In 78:59-64, God punished Israel for apostasy. In 78:65-72, God conquered the enemies and chose Judah to be the object of His love.

Certain Psalms, a brief history lesson is given, in which the reader is reminded of Israel's infidelity in the wilderness. Psalm 136 has perhaps the most elaborate outline pertaining to the history of God's work in the world. Ps. 136:1-4 starts out with a general thanksgiving because of God's mercy. In 136:5-9, there is specific reference to God's creative power of and in the world. In 136:10-16, there is specific reference to the Exodus. In 136:17-24, special mention is made of God's power over foreign kings and enemies. In 136:25-26, the Psalm concludes with God's preservation of all flesh. Strangely enough, Jude seems to use a similar approach by exhorting his audience to remember

the history (Jude 5-23). Jude reminds his audience of past lapses into apostasy and the decisive need to remember the Word of Christ.

A fitting summary of the Remembrance Psalms would be Psalm 111. In 111:1-3, praise is ascribed to the LORD because of His works. In 111:4, God's intention was that His words would indeed be remembered. In 111:5-9, God's integrity is proved by the fact that He remembers His covenant, that is, He stands by it. Finally, in 111:10, the wise one will live in obedience to Him, that is to say, living in genuine remembrance of Him.

God's intention then, according to the Psalms, is to remember man with His grace. God also wants man, in response to that grace, through the Spirit's work, to remember His Word and Work. Man's forgetfulness is punished. Nevertheless, through His Word and Work, God wakens and empowers man from his reverie to faithful remembrance.

Remembrance does have covenantal overtones apart from the specific context of the Passover. God's remembrance of man is active with mercy and forgiveness as the salient features (Psalm 25:6-7). Mary praises God for remembering to show mercy to His people in Luke 1:46-55. Man's remembrance of God is also active with repentance, faith and faithfulness as the salient features. It is the Holy Spirit actively working within man through the Word (Isaiah 55:11) to bring about repentance and fidelity (Psalm 51). Remembrance,

within the framework of the Covenant, is not mere casual reflection or recollection. God remembered man by actively working out his redemption (Gal. 3:13). When man does not reject the Holy Spirit (Matt. 12:31) or frustrate God's grace (Gal. 2:21), then his remembrance of God will be actively worked out by the Spirit through repentance and faith (Acts 2:38; 3:19 and 20:21).

Justification and sanctification are two words that are particularly useful at this point. St. Paul presents both facets in Romans. Rom. 3:21-26 proclaims Christ as the sacrifice for the sins of man and hence, the instrument of justification. Rom. 8:15-39 describes how justification gives redeemed man the privilege of sonship. Rom. 12:1 is an exhortation to justified man to live as a "living sacrifice," hence, a life of sanctification. Justification is nothing less than God coming to man and sanctification is nothing more than spiritual man living to God.

## CHAPTER IV

### REMEMBRANCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The role of remembrance as found in the Old Testament is also reflected in the New Testament. This is demonstrated by the Greek works which are cited in this chapter. In addition, the confessional and kerygmatic dimensions of remembrance will become clear. The extent of Greek influence on the word must also be examined. Although remembrance is not found as often in the New Testament as it is in the Old Testament, it will be understood to carry the same force.

Ἀνάμνησις comes from ἀναμνησκω and means "calling to one's mind" or "reminiscence."<sup>1</sup> It also means "remembrance" or "recollection."<sup>2</sup> There is an active element associated with ἀνάμνησις such that when man engages

<sup>1</sup>Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, comp., A Greek-English Lexicon, new rev. ed., by Sir Henry S. Jones, et al. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), p. 113.

<sup>2</sup>Gerhard Kittel, ed., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols., (hereafter cited as TDNT), trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), s.v. ἀνάμνησις, Johannes Behm, 1:348.

in recollection, man recollects in his consciousness, by word or by act.<sup>3</sup>

Ἀνάμνησις is found in Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24 and 25; and Heb. 10:3.<sup>4</sup> Ἀνάμνησις is also found in Lev. 24:7 [LXX] and Num. 10:10 [LXX].<sup>5</sup> In both cases "memorial" can be used to render the Greek. Whereas in references previously cited from the New Testament, "remembrance" seems to be the more accepted translation.<sup>6</sup>

Certain light is shed on ἀνάμνησις from its use in Greek literature. Various shades of meaning are the following: to remind oneself of something, memory, and recollection. The Platonic significance of ἀνάμνησις is the ability to grasp the "idea" of things. Homer calls Hades the place of forgetfulness, that is, the place where there is no remembrance.<sup>7</sup> This is strangely similar to what is written

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, ed., Concordance to the Greek Testament, 3rd ed., reprinted (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1953), p. 61.

<sup>5</sup>Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint, 3 vols., reprinted ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1983), 1:81.

<sup>6</sup>Walter Bauer, William Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 57.

<sup>7</sup>Colin Brown, gen. ed., The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, 3 vols., (Grand Rapids, Michigan:

in Ps. 6:5, "For in death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave who shall give thee thanks?"

To make mention in prayer; to proclaim; to believe; and to confess are some of the Scriptural usages for remembrance.<sup>8</sup> Remembrance also appears in the writings of Qumran. The meaning of the word appears to be positive, namely, that God would remember the sons of light over against the sons of darkness.<sup>9</sup> Used in this sense, remembering carries with it the idea of deliverance.

The Exodus event underscores the idea of deliverance. According to Martin Scharlemann, subsequent references to the Exodus event, especially Joshua 24:16-18, support the position that when man is the subject of remembrance, a process of "actualization" takes place,<sup>10</sup> that is, contemporary man identifies with the deliverance of his ancestors. The Passover, and its subsequent celebrations, incorporated contemporary man with his ancestors. Those partaking of the Passover in succeeding generations participated vicariously in the events of the first Passover and subsequent events.

---

Zondervan Publishing House, 1971), s.v. "Remember, Remembrance," Karl-Heinz Bartels, 3:231.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 232-233.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 233.

<sup>10</sup>Martin H. Scharlemann, "The Secret of God's Plan: Studies in Ephesians--Study Four," Concordia Theological Monthly 41 (July-August 1970):418.

The Passover meal was a meal of deliverance. The Lord's Supper is the meal of deliverance par excellence.<sup>11</sup>

This kind of thinking is behind Jesus' instruction pertaining to the Lord's Supper, "This do in remembrance of Me." By taking part in this sacrament we incorporate ourselves, so to speak, into the sequence of God's redemptive acts. In Rom. 6:3-6 Paul applies all this to Baptism. By that sacrament we are incorporated into the crucifixion and resurrection of our Lord. We are taken back to the event.<sup>12</sup>

According to I. Howard Marshall, the remembrance of the Lord's Supper has no relationship to the memorial meals held on behalf of the dead in Hellenism.<sup>13</sup> On the contrary, the remembrance of the Lord's Supper has confessional and kerygmatic elements. Remembrance entails belief in the deliverance brought about by Christ. The deliverance wrought by Christ was anticipated in the first Passover. The Passover was to be a regular annual celebration (Deut. 16:1-8). The Lord's Supper is to be a regular celebration (1 Cor. 11:26). The One Who was crucified between two malefactors (Luke 23:33) wants to be regularly in the midst of His people (Matt. 18:20). Since He gave His promise to be present in the Lord's Supper (Matt. 26:26-28), we have not a mere memo-

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 419.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque, ed., The New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), Commentary on Luke, by I. Howard Marshall, p. 805.

rial meal on behalf of the dead but a meal of celebration and vicarious remembrance instituted by the Son of the living God (Matt. 16:16; 22:32; 1 Cor 10:16-17 and 11:24-28).

Luke 23:43 serves to illustrate that when God is the subject, remembrance is almost synonymous with deliverance. The thief on the cross believed Jesus to have the power of deliverance, when he said, "μνησθητί μου ὅταν ἔλθῃς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου."<sup>14</sup> This takes on even greater proportions as the Old Covenant is compared with the New Covenant. The shedding of blood ratified the Sinaitic Covenant. The shedding of Christ's blood sealed the New Covenant (Heb. 9:11-14). The Old Covenant was through the blood of oxen, but the New Covenant was through the blood of Christ.<sup>15</sup> Deliverance is brought about because of Christ and man is to believe in that deliverance.

For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away. Heb. 8:10-13.

---

<sup>14</sup> TDNT, παράδοσις, by Joachim Jeremias, 5:770-773.

<sup>15</sup> Henry Chadwick, ed., Black's New Testament Commentaries, 2d ed. (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1971), A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, by Charles Kingsley Barrett, p. 269.

Man is also to proclaim that deliverance until the Lord comes. As the Hebrews were to recall their freedom from bondage in Egypt in the Passover and also in their daily lives (Ex. 12:42; 13:3-10; 19:5-6), Christians are to recall their freedom from bondage to sin by proclaiming it (1 Peter 2:9). Charles Kingsley Barrett contends that just as there is a certain narrative quality to the words spoken at the Passover meal, there is also a narrative quality attached to the words used in the Lord's Supper.<sup>16</sup> In both cases there is a heilsgeschichtlich recital taking place. It is no surprise that the Corinthians drew a sharp reprimand from Paul for profaning rather than properly observing the Lord's Supper. The Corinthians obviously forgot the vicarious nature of remembrance (see Romans 6 and 1 Corinthians 10 and 11). Nor did they comprehend the life-giving impact of the Lord's Supper ["for many for the remission of sins." Matt. 26:28].

To summarize, ἀνάμνησις has more than a superficial relationship with ἔσθ. When God is the subject, remembrance is equivalent to God's power to judge and deliver. When man is the subject, "remembrance" is almost synonymous with faith. God wants man to respond with faith to His Word and Work (Hab. 2:4). If man believes, then confession and proclamation will proceed from faith. God wants the external loyalty, but only if it proceeds from the internal

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 270.

loyalty (1 Sam. 15:22 and Hos. 6:6). As Peter Brunner points out, Jesus injected eschatological anticipation into the Lord's Supper at the time of institution.<sup>17</sup> Anticipation functions as a bridge connecting the present to the future. The element of anticipation of the coming Messiah played a major role in the Passover celebration.<sup>18</sup> As man partakes of the Lord's Supper, he not only remembers vicariously the crucial past event, Christ's vicarious atonement, but also yearns for the Lord to come in His glory. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come" 1 Cor. 11:26.

Remembrance, as it is examined within the context of the Old Covenant and the New Covenant, can be summarized as follows:

- I. Remembrance, depending upon the context, can have God or man as its subject.
- II. When God is the subject of remembrance, man will either be delivered or damned.
- III. When man is the subject of remembrance, man will either repent and believe or reject and forget.

---

<sup>17</sup>Peter Brunner, Worship in the Name of Jesus, trans. M. H. Bertram (Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), p. 171.

<sup>18</sup>Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, zweiter Band: Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und Die Apostelgeschichte, zweite, unveränderte Auflage (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1956), p. 256.

- IV. Both Passover and the Lord's Supper are meals of remembrance, namely, they are vicarious and anticipatory.
- V. Remembrance, as it is implemented throughout Scripture, can be described with the following words: didactic, kerygmatic, confessional, encomiastic and penitential when applied to man as subject. Forensic, salvific and condemnatory when applied to God as subject. This point will prove particularly meaningful as the position of Joachim Jeremias is discussed in Chapter VI.

## CHAPTER V

### THE LAST SUPPER AND PASSOVER

Much has been written concerning the Last Supper which Jesus observed with His disciples. Was that Last Supper celebrated at a Passover meal or not? This question stems from some alleged discrepancies between the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel according to John. Is there a contradiction involved or is it possible to harmonize the Synoptics and John? Some would support the view that Jesus followed a calendar different than the traditional one employed by Judaism. Others would suggest that the meal Jesus ate with His disciples was not a Passover but some other type of meal.

According to Joseph Fitzmyer, the alleged discrepancy would understand the Synoptics to have Jesus instituting the Last Supper at Passover, and John to have Jesus instituting the Last Supper the day before the Passover.<sup>1</sup> Therefore the purpose of this chapter will be to survey the prevailing theories regarding the time of the Last Supper and consider their relative merit. This writer will first survey the calendaric proposals. Secondly, some would solve the alleged

---

<sup>1</sup>Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV), The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1985), p. 1378.

discrepancy between the Synoptics and John by proposing that Jesus celebrated some sort of religious meal with His disciples but not necessarily the Passover. These proposals will also be surveyed and considered.

The date of the Last Supper is of major importance for this thesis. If there is enough evidence to support that the Last Supper was held at Passover, then more weight can be attached to remembrance as a word which has covenantal overtones. If it can be reasonably established that the Last Supper was held during the Passover, then remembrance can be understood as a sort of bridge between the Old Covenant meal and the New Covenant meal.

#### A Different Calendar?

Some have attempted to solve the problem of the date of the Last Supper by proposing that Jesus used a different (Pharisaic or Galilean) calendar than the official (Sadducean or Judean) calendar used by the Jewish priests.<sup>2</sup> However, as Joseph Fitzmyer points out, such proposals tend to be more theoretical rather than demonstrable.<sup>3</sup> In addition, there is no real textual evidence to support such speculation.

A solution which initially gained acceptance was that put forth by Annie Jaubert. It was Jaubert's contention that

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 1379-1380.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

Jesus was familiar with and employed a solar calendar (of 364 days) by the Essenes which was different from the official (lunar) calendar. Jaubert based her conclusion on traces of an ancient solar calendar found in the Book of Jubilees.<sup>4</sup> According to Jaubert, "Jesus celebrates the Pasch on Tuesday evening, the eve of the Pasch, according to the old priestly calendar. He is arrested in the night between Tuesday and Wednesday. He dies on Friday, 14 Nisan, the eve of the Pasch, according to the official calendar."<sup>5</sup>

The calendaric proposals seem rather attractive for some until other pertinent facts are considered. For example, Pierre Benoit points out that according to the testimony of the Synoptics (particularly in Matt. 8:4 and 23:2-3) Jesus was loyal to the established religious order. It would have been unlikely, according to Benoit, for Jesus to have followed the Essenes over against Judaism.<sup>6</sup> This writer would tend to agree with Benoit's assessment. Christ came to fulfill the Law and the Prophets, not to destroy (Matt. 5:17). It is unlikely that Jesus would have deviated from a custom

---

<sup>4</sup>Annie Jaubert, The Date of the Last Supper, trans. Isaac Rafferty (Staten Island, New York: Society of St. Paul, 1965), pp. 15-21.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 97.

<sup>6</sup>Pierre Benoit, Jesus and the Gospel, vol. 1, trans. Benet Weatherhead (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1973), pp. 92-93.

he grew up with and which was the standard calendar for all but the Essenes (Luke 2:39-52).

#### A Different Meal?

Some have suggested that the meal Jesus ate with His disciples was not a Passover but some other type of religious meal. Joachim Jeremias examined some of the suggested meals: Kiddus; Haburah; and Essene. Jeremias demonstrated the weaknesses of all three. The Kiddus, said Jeremias, was simply a blessing and not a meal. Jeremias stated that, although the Haburah was a meal with perceived religious overtones, any meal that had grace spoken over it was solemn and religious. Finally, regarding the Essene meal, Jeremias maintained that there is no evidence to support that the meal Jesus ate with His disciples was influenced by the Essenes.<sup>7</sup>

Positively, Jeremias offers his own evidence in favor of Jesus celebrating the Last Supper at Passover. That the Last Supper took place in Jerusalem (Mark 14:13 and John 18:1) favors the Passover because the Passover lamb had to be eaten within bounds of Jerusalem. The availability of a well-furnished upper room for the meal favors Passover (Luke 22:12 and Mark 14:13-15), since owners were not to charge pilgrims. The meal was held at night (1 Cor. 11:23; See also Ex. 12:6), whereas the norm was to have a slight meal at 10 AM and a

---

<sup>7</sup>Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. Norman Perrin (London: SCM, 1966), pp. 26-36.

meal late in the afternoon. Passover was always eaten in the evening. Jesus celebrated the Last Supper with twelve in the evening (Mark 14:17 and Matt. 26:20). The Passover company had to consist of at least ten people but not more than twenty so that all would have plenty to eat.<sup>8</sup> At regular meals people sat, whereas at this meal they reclined (ἀνέκειτο, Matt. 26:20; ἀνέπεσεν, Luke 22:14). Reclining at Passover was the symbol of the freedom with which God blessed His people through the Exodus event. That Jesus broke bread, later on during the course of the meal (Mark 14:18) also documents the Passover, since it was only at Passover that all partook of a preliminary dish, the haroset, before the bread to be eaten during the main part of the meal was blessed, broken and then handed out to all. Wine was consumed at the Last Supper and St. Paul notes that the institution of the cup of wine was the third cup (1 Cor. 10:16). The singing of a hymn in Matt. 26:30 and Mark 14:26 fits in with the custom of ending the Passover with the Hallel Psalms (See Appendix D).<sup>9</sup> Jeremias offers other evidence to support his position but the preceding points are compelling and serve to demonstrate that there is strong evidence to support the Last Supper being celebrated at Passover.

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., pp. 41-62.

A Different Theology?

While some argue for discontinuity between the Synoptics and John on the basis of the text, others argue for discontinuity on the basis of theology. Therefore, the issue of the alleged difference in theology between the Synoptics and John need to be examined. Evidence to support harmonization between the Synoptics and John will also be noted.

According to Robert Wilson, John was "following a different tradition."<sup>10</sup> Hence, for some the entire issue is reduced to a difference in theological themes. For example, Mark has Jesus making the Passover meal into an even more special meal, namely, the Lord's Supper. John, on the other hand, has Christ as the Lamb of God being crucified at the same time the Passover lambs were sacrificed in the Temple.<sup>11</sup>

However, overlooked in all this is the fact that the term Passover is used in the narrow and the wide senses. John 18:28 would be an example of Passover being used in the wide sense where it applies to the first day of Unleavened Bread, a 7-day festival, which began right after the Passover. Alfred Edersheim underscores this point by saying, "We can therefore quite understand that, not on the eve of

---

<sup>10</sup>Matthew Black, gen. ed., Peake's Commentary on the Bible, rep., rev. and reset (Hong Kong: Thomas Nelson, 1981), p. 818, "Mark," by Robert McL. Wilson.

<sup>11</sup>I. Howard Marshall, Last Supper and Lord's Supper (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980), p. 73.

the Passover, but on the first Paschal day, the Sanhedrists would avoid incurring a defilement which, lasting till the evening, would not only have involved them in the inconvenience of Levitical defilement on the first festive day, but have actually prevented their offering on that day the Passover, festive sacrifice, or Chagigah."<sup>12</sup> Edersheim points out that a second Chagigah was offered and eaten after the Passover on the 15th of Nisan, the first day Unleavened Bread.<sup>13</sup> Hence, John 18:28 need not be viewed as a proof against Jesus eating the Passover with His disciples.

In spite of such arguments for alleged discontinuity, there are some rather convincing arguments for continuity. For example, five references have become the proverbial bones of contention in this issue between John and the Synoptics: John 13:1 and 2; 13:29; 19:14; and 19:31.<sup>14</sup> The following have been offered as credible rejoinders:

1. John 13:1 is a statement which summarizes all events from John 13:2 through John 21. John 13:2ff. relates what happened during the Passover Jesus ate with His disciples. It does not follow that this has to be an argument in favor of another night for Jesus' last meal with His disciples.

---

<sup>12</sup>Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, 2 vols, 8th ed., rev. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912), 2:568.

<sup>13</sup>Idem, The Temple, new rev. ed. (New York: James Pott, Publisher, 1881), pp. 217-218.

<sup>14</sup>A. T. Robertson, rev., A Harmony of the Gospels, based on the Broadus Harmony in the Revised Version (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1950), p. 281.

2. The word 'feast' in John 13:28 can have a broader meaning which might refer to the feast as a whole, namely, Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread rather than just Passover.
3. The word 'preparation' need not point to any other day than Friday. The day of preparation was the day immediately preceding the Sabbath (In this case the very important Sabbath following the Passover). The word 'preparation' in John 19:14 here means the Friday of Passover week or the 15th of Nisan.
4. 'High day', can mean the first day of the feast; the last day; or the Sabbath of the feast. There are some who have argued that as used in John 19:31, 'high day' means that the first day of the Passover festival coincided with the regular Sabbath. However, 'high day' has a broad enough meaning that it need not be confined in this manner.<sup>15</sup>

Arguing for discontinuity on the basis of a Gospel writer's supposed theology results in a hypothetical rather than an historical treatment. Careful scholarship requires reckoning with the fact that the term Passover was used in the narrow and the wide senses. This requires carefully checking the context in which the term is used. In addition to the above responses to discontinuity, it is important to acknowledge two possible methods of computing time prevalent in the Gospels. The Synoptic Gospels employ the so-called Jewish method of time computation. The Jewish method has the day beginning and ending at sunset. In contrast, there is a strong possibility that John used a Roman method of time reckoning. The Roman method began the day at midnight and

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., pp. 282-284.

ended at midnight.<sup>16</sup> This fact is often overlooked and results in suggesting discontinuity.

On the basis of the preceding, it can be reasonably established that the Last Supper took place at the Passover. That some argue for the utilization by Jesus of an ancient solar calendar leads to unnecessary speculation. To contend that a different meal, other than the Passover, was observed by Jesus tends to obscure the issue even further, since the factual evidence for this has been found to be totally lacking. Finally, to contend that a different theology or tradition was being used seems to make disharmony a pre-ordained conclusion. Alleged discrepancies begin to fade as textual and historical evidence is examined and permitted to speak.

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

## CHAPTER VI

### TEXT AND CONTEXT

#### Is Remembrance Genuine?

Did Jesus really utter the phrase, "In remembrance of me," when He instituted the Lord's Supper or was it added on by one of the writers? This question has a major impact on this writer's thesis, since the thesis stands or falls with regard to how this question is answered. Of course, there are other related questions, such as: Why do Matthew and Mark omit the command to remember while Luke and Paul have the command?; Did Luke add the command because Paul had it in 1 Corinthians?; Did Paul add the command to remember simply because of the abuses of the Lord's Supper which were taking place in Corinth (1 Cor. 10:21 and 11:30-34)? These questions will be dealt with in this chapter. However, some of these questions will remain unanswered due to the fact that Scripture does not specifically address all of these questions in detail.

#### Luke and Paul

Briefly stated, the Gospel according to Luke has been traditionally assigned to Luke. Luke, "the beloved physician," was a Gentile companion and co-worker of Paul (Col.

4:14). The usage of the first person plural ("we") in Acts 16:11 and 2 Tim. 4:11 is also strong proof of Luke's close relationship to Paul. Secondly, the so-called "we-sections" give evidence to support that Luke was with Paul during the latter's Caesarean imprisonment (See Acts 21:7-28:31). It is not possible to establish the exact date and place of authorship. Nevertheless, the early sixties seems to be the most probable date.<sup>1</sup>

According to an early tradition, Luke was a native of Syrian Antioch and was converted to Christianity. Since Luke was not an eyewitness of Jesus' ministry, he set about the task of searching out the eyewitnesses of Jesus' ministry and also servants of the Word in order to write a systematic account of the Christ (Luke 1:1-4).<sup>2</sup> Luke's stated purpose of writing "an orderly account" and a carefully researched account (Luke 1:3-4) via the eyewitnesses can serve as a caveat against trying to overemphasize the influence of Paul on Luke.<sup>3</sup> Since Luke and Paul are the only ones who have the

---

<sup>1</sup>Donald Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, 7th American printing (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1978), pp. 101-115.

<sup>2</sup>Bruce Manning Metzger, The New Testament (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 97.

<sup>3</sup>Richard C. H. Lenski, Commentary on the New Testament, 12 vols. (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961), The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel, pp. 5-20.

command to "remember" as found in the Words of Institution, and since Paul's wording of the institution of the Lord's Supper is more symmetrical than Luke's, the temptation is great to overemphasize Luke's dependence upon Paul.

Since Paul's account is the most symmetrical and complete of all four references, is it right to contend that Paul introduced new terminology into the institution of the Lord's Supper? The Corinthians apparently turned the Lord's Supper into a celebration of forgetfulness rather than of remembrance. That is, they forgot the crucial religious nature and content of the Lord's Supper. Paul set out to correct this blatant and intolerable miscarriage of the Corinthians' observance of the Lord's Supper. According to Charles Kingsley Barrett, Paul "deals with the situation (so far as it is to be dealt with by letter; see verse 34) by recalling the words and acts of Jesus at the Last Supper--recalling, for he had already communicated this material to the Corinthians."<sup>4</sup> Paul has explicit references to ΠΟΛΕΙΝ, ἀνάμνησιν, and καταγγέλλειν.<sup>5</sup> However, this does not mean that these words were not explicit going back to the first celebration of the Lord's Supper.

---

<sup>4</sup>Charles Kingsley Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968), p. 264.

<sup>5</sup>Edward H. Peters, "St. Paul and the Eucharist," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 10 (July 1948): 248.

Luke's Account

Whereas, Mark (14:1-2, 10-11) and Matthew (26:1-5, 14-16) give exact time information with reference to the Passion, Luke does not follow in chronological order. Therefore, the following outline of events immediately preceding and subsequent to the Lord's Supper assists in establishing the context in chronological order:

Luke 22 begins with the agreement between Judas and the chief priests on Tuesday evening after Jesus was anointed by Mary at the dinner in Bethany (Matt. 26:1-5, 14-16; Mark 14:1-2, 10-11); this assisted the chief priests in planning Jesus' arrest (Luke 22:1-6). On Thursday morning Peter and John are sent to prepare the Passover meal (Luke 22:7-13). In the evening Jesus arrives with the 10 disciples who then contend over greatness as they sought to recline next to Jesus prior to reclining for the meal (Luke 22:24-30).

Jesus begins the preliminary course with His opening words (Luke 22:14-18; See A. 1 of Appendix D). Seemingly the footwashing occurred at the time of the washing of the right hand (See John 13:2-20). Jesus announces His coming betrayal (Luke 22:21-23; See B. The Passover Liturgy of Appendix D), foretells Peter's denial (Luke 22:31-34), and instructs His disciples in how Scripture is about to be fulfilled in Him (Luke 22:35-34). Judas probably left at this time.

During the main meal, Jesus speaks the Words of Institution as the meal progresses as indicated in Appendix D (Luke

22:19-20). Ending with drinking the third cup, Jesus then spoke the words of comfort (John 14-17). After singing the final Hallel Psalms, He leaves with His disciples to go to Gethsemane on the slopes of the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-46). After the agony in Gethsemane (Luke 22:39-46), He is arrested and forsaken by His disciples (Luke 22:47-53). Taken to the high priestly palace, He is mocked and interrogated (Luke 22:63-65) and denied by Peter (Luke 22:54-62). At dawn He is formally tried and condemned (Luke 22:66-71).<sup>6</sup>

A number of salient features in the text merit consideration. Even more questions become inevitable when Luke 22:17-20 is compared with the accounts from Matthew, Mark, and Paul. For example, the Lukan sequence of cup-bread-cup at first may be puzzling when compared with Matthew, Mark, and Paul [See Appendix E, Textual Comparison]. It must be remembered that Luke in verses 14-18 records Jesus' words and actions at the blessing of the first cup. Secondly, and of particular interest to this study, is the addition of the command to remember by Luke and Paul which Matthew and Mark omit. The command to remember becomes particularly enigmatic, since Luke has a single command to remember rather than Paul's double command to remember. Incidentally, the Di-

---

<sup>6</sup>Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans., Norman Perrin (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1966), pp. 96-100.

didache omits the command to remember [See Appendix F, Didache].<sup>7</sup> Matthew and Mark have Jesus' statement of farewell after the Words of Institution but Luke has this utterance before the Words of Institution (See Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25; and Luke 22:15-16 and 18). Finally, both Luke and Paul have "new covenant," whereas Matthew and Mark just have "covenant."

#### Majority Text

The Majority Text supports the inclusion of the command to remember. However, manuscript D completely omits the command.<sup>8</sup> This fact does not necessarily militate against the inclusion of remembrance, since the Western Text-Type is known for its longer or shorter additions and often rather conspicuous omissions.<sup>9</sup> The Majority Text, which follows, demonstrates the unique order of Luke. Secondly, when the Lukan account is compared with those of Matthew, Mark, Paul, and the Didache, the aforementioned salient features become readily apparent.

---

<sup>7</sup>Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (XXIV), The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1985), pp. 1397-1398.

<sup>8</sup>Bruce Manning Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, corrected ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1975), p. 175.

<sup>9</sup>Idem, The Text of the New Testament, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 213.

Majority Text

17. καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστίας εἶπεν,  
Λαβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτοὺς.
18. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν  
ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ  
βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.
19. καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστίας ἔλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν  
αὐτοῖς λέγων, τοῦτο ἔστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ  
ὑμῶν δεδόμενον τοῦτο παῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.
20. καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δεσπνῆσαι, λέγων,  
τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι  
μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον 10

Why is it that D, a Western type, would have omitted the command to remember? A plausible explanation is offered by Burton Throckmorton who pointed out that D could have omitted the command to remember because of the confusion caused by the cup-bread-cup sequence. As a result, the second cup would have been dropped out.<sup>11</sup> The usual rule of textual criticism is that the shorter and more difficult reading is normally considered to be the correct reading. In general, the shorter reading is usually to be preferred. But the

<sup>10</sup>Idem, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, p. 175.

<sup>11</sup>Burton H. Throckmorton, "The Longer Reading of Luke 22:19b-20," Anglican Theological Review, 30 (January 1948): 55.

added provision of the rule that the more difficult reading is to be preferred. This at times requires that the longer text is to be accepted.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, a strong case could be made for the authenticity of the longer reading, if the intention of D was to alleviate confusion by omitting the phrase. Secondly, p75 (the Bodmer papyrus which is the earliest known copy of the Gospel according to Luke) includes the command to remember and the weight of such a witness cannot be overlooked.<sup>13</sup> Hence, this writer is in favor of the authenticity of the command to remember.

There are some who account for the similarities between Luke and Paul by conjecturing that Luke was familiar with the liturgical practices of the Pauline churches.<sup>14</sup> The impossibility of testing that conjecture notwithstanding, if Luke were thus influenced by Paul, why would Luke differ with respect to the order of cup-bread-cup; the single command to remember; and finally, with respect to the manner in which Luke introduces the Lord's Supper? According to William Arndt, the cup-bread-cup sequence is best understood as Luke 22:14-18 referring to the First Cup in the Passover celebra-

---

<sup>12</sup>Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, p. 209.

<sup>13</sup>Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Some Features of Our Oldest Text of Luke," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 24 (1962): 174-175.

<sup>14</sup>Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, pp. 176-177.

tion.<sup>15</sup> Luke 22:20 then, would refer to the Third Cup ("the cup of blessing" 1 Cor. 10:16).

In summary, the similarities between the accounts of Luke and Paul should not result in an overemphasis of Paul's influence on Luke. On the other hand, the dissimilarities between Luke/Paul and Matthew/Mark should not result in labeling the two as irreconcilable. As the doctrine of inspiration is set forth in Scripture, it does not deny the uniqueness of the individual writers (See 2 Tim. 3:16 and 2 Peter 1:21). Neither similarities nor dissimilarities between writers of Scripture militate against the doctrine of inspiration. Each writer has a particular audience in mind and has specific emphases to convey to that audience.

Finally, some questions remain unanswered. For example, why do Matthew and Mark omit the command to remember? Since Matthew has traditionally had a Jewish audience,<sup>16</sup> one could possibly surmise that the command was omitted because it was already understood by the Jew within the context of the Passover. However, that type of speculation loses force as one studies Mark, a Gospel traditionally assigned to a non-

---

<sup>15</sup>William F. Arndt, The Gospel According to St. Luke, rep. ed. (Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1981), p. 440.

<sup>16</sup>Martin H. Franzmann, The Word of the Lord Grows (Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1961), p. 182.

Jewish audience.<sup>17</sup> Since a characteristic of Mark is to explain Jewish customs (Mark 7:3), why would he not include the command to remember? Therefore the omission of the command by Matthew and Mark remains a puzzle. Nevertheless, the evidence weighs in favor of the authenticity of the command to remember in Luke.

---

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 185.

## CHAPTER VII

### WHO IS TO REMEMBER?

#### Joachim Jeremias

According to Joachim Jeremias, the phrase, "to remember" in the Lord's Supper means that God would remember the Messiah. To support this position he offers as proof a Jewish Passover prayer which points to the coming of the Messiah at the parousia. "Consequently the command for repetition may be understood as: 'This do, that God may remember me': God remembers the Messiah in that he causes the kingdom to break in by the parousia."<sup>1</sup> He contends that the meal prayers of the Didache are eschatological in character. If this were to be true, God would be the subject of the remembering instead of the disciples.<sup>2</sup> In addition, the words Jesus used would of necessity be interpreted more as a prayer rather than as a Gospel proclamation to the disciples.

Jeremias has reduced the discussion over the remembrance phrase to the difference between the Hellenistic and Palestinian interpretations. The latter is preferred by Jeremias.

---

<sup>1</sup>Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. Norman Perrin (London: SCM Press, 1966), pp. 253-254.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 252-254.

When remembrance is interpreted according to the Palestinian background, God is the subject and the intended meaning is eschatological.<sup>3</sup> If, on the other hand, the interpretation of remembrance was influenced by Hellenism, then the command to remember would mean a meal or festival to commemorate the dead.<sup>4</sup>

Jeremias offered the following criticisms against such an Hellenistic interpretation:

1. Εἰς ἀνάμνησιν is virtually absent from the ancient Greek endowment records.
2. Whereas the early Christian practice, with regard to the Eucharist, was daily or weekly; the Hellenistic practice was similar to a birthday celebration held annually to honor the dead.
3. The Hellenistic commemoration was observed sporadically due to religious and familial indifference.<sup>5</sup>

On the basis of references to remembrance in the Old Testament and in Judaism during the time of Jesus, Jeremias supports his thesis that God is the subject of the remembering.<sup>6</sup> God's remembrance manifests itself in mercy or in judgment. "That God May Remember Me," is taken by Jeremias to mean that the petition is brought before God to remember

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 254-255.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 239.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 241-243.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 247.

that the work of salvation is not complete until the parousia.<sup>7</sup> Jeremias sums up his position with the following:

The proclamation of the death of Jesus is not therefore intended to call to the remembrance of the community the event of the Passion; rather this proclamation expresses the vicarious death of Jesus as the beginning of the salvation time prays for the coming of the consummation. As often as the death of the Lord is proclaimed at the Lord's Supper, and the maranatha rises upwards, God is reminded of the unfulfilled climax of the work of salvation 'until (the goal is reached, that) he comes'.<sup>8</sup>

There are certain facets of Jeremias' thesis which deserve underscoring. First of all, the majority of references to remembrance in the Old Testament and in the various editions of the Passover Haggadah are with God as the subject. Secondly, Luke 22:18, "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come," supports the eschatological emphasis of Jeremias. Nevertheless, conspicuous by its absence from Jeremias' method of argumentation is any real significance attached to the resurrection.

In his quest to determine with certainty what he felt Jesus actually said and did, Jeremias disallowed any words and actions which did not fit his particular view. Together with others of the critical school of thought, anything that was miraculous, such as Jesus' resurrection, is automatically a later addition. Jeremias developed a number of principles, against which, in his view, every saying or event in the life

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., pp. 249-252.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 253.

of Jesus must be judged. Jeremias wanted to separate what he considered later embellishments from what he felt are actual sayings and true deeds of Jesus.<sup>9</sup> He also developed ten "laws of transformation" which, in his view guides one to know exactly what Jesus actually did.<sup>10</sup>

Whereas, there are some like Jeremias who consider the accounts of the resurrection to be later embellishments, there are others who even assign a "secondary role" to the resurrection in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.<sup>11</sup> Such a position would argue that the death of Christ, and not the resurrection, is the "dominant motif" in Christ's institution of the Lord's Supper.<sup>12</sup> This writer maintains that the Lord's Supper celebrates both the death and the resurrection of Christ. The Apostle Paul attests to this fact in 1 Cor. 15:12-14:

Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain.

---

<sup>9</sup>Joachim Jeremias, New Testament Theology, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), pp. 301-311.

<sup>10</sup>Idem, The Parables of Jesus, 2d rev. ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972), pp. 113-114.

<sup>11</sup>Samuele Bacchiocchi, From Sabbath to Sunday (Rome: The Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977), p. 80.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 78.

According to Hermann Sasse, the Christian Church remembers both when she celebrates this sacrament: "In this sacrament he gives us the same as he gave to the Twelve at the Last Supper. He gives us his true body, which was sacrificed on Calvary and raised from the dead at Easter. This makes us not only contemporaneous with him, but unites us with him in a way that transcends everything that we otherwise call remembrance."<sup>13</sup> The vicarious satisfaction of Christ is the object of the remembering (see Rom 6:1-11).

#### "Believing Reflection"

Just as we are baptized once into the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ (Rom. 6:1-11), we also proclaim the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ whenever we partake of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11 and 15). Thus, when Christ says, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' we are called to believe in His death and resurrection. We are called to remember His death and celebrate His resurrection. We are called to proclaim His death and resurrection.<sup>14</sup> The remembrance of Christ in the Lord's Supper is not some sterile or merely cerebral function. C. F. W. Walther said that genuine

---

<sup>13</sup>Hermann Sasse, This Is My Body, rev., Australian ed. (Adelaide, Australia: Lutheran Publishing House, 1977), p. 308.

<sup>14</sup>C. F. W. Walther, The Proper Distinction between Law and Gospel, reproduced by W. H. T. Dau (Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing, 1981), p. 353.

remembrance of the Savior is the "believing reflection"<sup>15</sup> of the one who partakes. Remembrance has no significance apart from the death and resurrection of Christ. The Lord's Supper is "pure Gospel"<sup>16</sup> because of what Christ has done for us. God has already remembered man by sending His Son to die for man and rise again (1 John 4:10). The Spirit works in man to bring to remembrance all things concerning salvation (John 14:26). The Spirit works in man so that man believes in Christ; confesses Christ; and dwells in Christ (1 John 4:13-16). Man loves and remembers Him because he first loved and remembered man (1 John 4:19). Spiritually, man is in the same condition as the thief on the cross who said, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into your kingdom" (Luke 23:42). Christ, who is the resurrection and the life, remembers man as He resurrects man to life. Careful remembering is believing the salvation we have in Christ and all this is the work of the Holy Spirit (John 11: 25-26).

#### "True Exercise of Faith"

That believing is synonymous with remembering was also maintained by Martin Chemnitz. Chemnitz called the loss of faith forgetfulness, and genuine remembrance the evidence of

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

<sup>16</sup>Francis Pieper, Christian Dogmatics, 4 vols. (Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1953), 3:293.

a faith aroused to life.<sup>17</sup> "Therefore Christ, our true Samaritan, in addition to the ministration of and meditation on the Word, has instituted against this dangerous forgetfulness this most efficacious antidote, namely, the Communion of His very body and blood in the Supper."<sup>18</sup> According to Chemnitz, remembrance signified a "true exercise of faith."<sup>19</sup> In addition, remembrance is not confined to a past event. Nor is it relegated to a mere intellectual exercise of recalling something now absent. On the contrary, remembrance is frequently employed when things are immediately present. Thus, remembrance is not an argument for a symbolical interpretation to the Words of Institution.<sup>20</sup> In summary, the phrase, "Do this in remembrance of me," is a call to believe and proclaim the Lord's work of redemption (1 Cor. 11:26).

As has been shown, the work of redemption culminating in the resurrection is the content of the remembering. Walther and Chemnitz, in contrast to Jeremias, understood man to be the subject of the remembering in the Lord's Supper. Sec-

---

<sup>17</sup>Martin Chemnitz, The Lord's Supper, trans. J. A. O. Preus (Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1979), p. 192.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 193.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 112.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., pp. 262-263.

only, Walther and Chemnitz understood the resurrection to be of primary importance in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the meal of the New Covenant.

Remembrance is certainly related to Covenant, both Old and New. God is the Subject and Author of both; man is the recipient of both; and faith is the means of appropriation in both. Faith clings to the vicarious satisfaction, Christ's work of redemption, which is proclaimed in the Word (Gal. 2:20). Faith grows as it is reminded of the vicarious satisfaction. The Holy Spirit is the One Who, through the Word, does the reminding (John 14:26).

In summary, Jeremias' position that God is the subject of the remembrance in the Words of Institution weakens the word as it is studied within the context of the Old Covenant. As pointed out in Chapter III, there are numerous instances of man being the subject of remembrance with respect to the covenant. God certainly remembered man by giving him salvation but man was to respond to that salvation by remembering, by believing God. Even though Christ instituted the Lord's Supper during Passover, which, in itself made the Lord's Supper and Passover similar, that does not mean every element in the Passover will be parallel to every element in the Lord's Supper. Jeremias seems to overemphasize the significance of the Passover prayer in attempting to establish that Christ meant for God to do the remembering. He overlooks the inherent uniqueness of the Lord's Supper. Christ did something

new and different when he instituted the Lord's Supper. The remembrance of the Lord's Supper is properly understood when those who partake of the Lord's Supper are also the subjects of the remembering.

"He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was in Galilee, Saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. And they remembered his words, And returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest." Luke 24:6-9

The passage above is another proof that Jesus intended for His disciples to do the remembering. This demonstrates the major weakness in the position of Jeremias. When Jeremias introduces a prayer from a Passover Haggadah as a major piece of evidence for his position, he introduces something that is not found in Scripture. Scripture itself should be allowed to determine the intended meaning of a particular text.

## CHAPTER VIII

### REMEMBRANCE AND REAL PRESENCE

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the impact that remembrance has on the understanding of the Lord's Supper. Is there a relationship between remembrance and the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper? In previous chapters, it has been pointed out that remembrance in the Passover was vicarious and anticipatory. How are the qualities of anticipation and vicariousness expressed via the doctrine of the Real Presence? Does remembrance undergird the doctrine of the Real Presence? These questions will be considered because it is important to establish that the relationship of remembrance to the doctrine of the Real Presence is real and not imagined. Remembrance will be shown to be in agreement with and not in contradiction to the doctrine of the Real Presence.

#### No Synthesis

David Friedrich Strauss said that the controversy between different ways of interpreting τοῦτο ἔστι is "obsolete" and "founded on a misplaced distinction."<sup>1</sup> For

---

<sup>1</sup>David Friedrich Strauss, The Life of Jesus, trans. George Eliot (New York: MacMillan & Co., 1898), p. 632.

Strauss, it was not essential that Christ knew far in advance that he would die or that He would institute the Lord's Supper.<sup>2</sup> However, Werner Elert stated that, "The gulf which separates Christologies also separates the doctrines of Holy Communion. The doctrine of Holy Communion is the test for the genuineness of our belief in the incarnation."<sup>3</sup> Strauss wanted to create a synthesis between the various doctrinal positions concerning the Lord's Supper. This present writer would disagree with such an attempt to produce a synthesis. With Elert's position, a synthesis is not possible. As one believes concerning the Lord's Supper, so one believes concerning Christ.

The Lutheran Liturgy, beginning with Luther, has conveyed the belief in the sacramental presence of Christ. In the explanation of the Deutsche Messe of 1526, Luther said, "he is apprehended only by faith; for we cannot see how Christ gives his body and blood for us and even now daily shows and offers it before God to obtain grace for us."<sup>4</sup> In his explanation of "The Sacrament of the Altar" in the Small Catechism, Martin Luther explained the function of God's Word

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 632-634.

<sup>3</sup>Werner Elert, The Lord's Supper Today, trans. Martin Bertram, Contemporary Theology Series (Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1973), p. 37.

<sup>4</sup>Martin Luther, Luther's Works, 55 vols. The American ed., vol. 53: Liturgy and Hymns, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann, et al. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), p. 82.

in the Lord's Supper. "It is not the eating and drinking, indeed, that does them, but the words which stand here, namely: Given, and shed for you, for the remission of sins."<sup>5</sup> From the preceding, it is clear that Luther was consistent as he communicated his understanding of the Lord's Supper through liturgy and catechetical instruction. Secondly, as was stated above, not only is one's understanding of Christ communicated through one's understanding of the Lord's Supper, but one's understanding of remembrance becomes clear also.

#### The Lutheran Confessions and "Remembrance"

Article XXIV of the Augsburg Confession defines remembrance by saying that it is not just remembering history.

But Christ commands us, Luke 22, 19: This do in remembrance of Me; therefore the Mass was instituted that the faith of those who use the Sacrament should remember what benefits it receives through Christ, and cheer and comfort the anxious conscience. For to remember Christ is to remember His benefits, and to realize that they are truly offered unto us. Nor is it enough only to remember the history; for this also the Jews and the ungodly can remember.<sup>6</sup>

Johannes Quenstedt offered a two-fold definition of remembrance, namely, to remember and to commemorate the death

---

<sup>5</sup>Concordia Triglotta: The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Historical Introduction by F. Bente (Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), p. 557.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 67.

of Christ and the benefits received through Christ. According to Quenstedt, one remembers in thought and commemorates in words.<sup>7</sup> Wherever the Confessional Lutherans expound on remembrance the emphasis is on what Christ has done for man. Remembrance is not just recalling the past event of Christ's death but recalling that past event through the eyes of faith. Hermann Sasse echoes this belief:

The 'presence' in this Sacrament, however, is not the presence of an event or an action which occurred in the past (passio Christi, the suffering of Christ), but it is rather the Presence of Christ's body and blood, of his true humanity and true divinity (Christus passus, Christ who suffered for us). It is this Real Presence of the crucified and risen Lord, who gives us his true body, and blood to eat and to drink that lends to the remembrance of his death a reality and actuality such as we do not find otherwise in the recollection of a historical event.<sup>8</sup>

The Lutheran Confessions witness to the covenantal significance of remembrance by proclaiming the death and resurrection of Christ. The key to understanding remembrance is found in the words which Jesus spoke as he instituted the Lord's Supper.<sup>9</sup> The Lutheran Confessions are faithful to Scripture and follow in the path of Luther who proclaimed Christ as the cause and content of remembrance.

---

<sup>7</sup>Heinrich Schmid, The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, 3rd rev. ed., trans. Charles A. Hay, et al. (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1899), p. 581.

<sup>8</sup>Sasse, This Is My Body, pp. 309-310.

<sup>9</sup>Concordia Triglotta: p. 755.

Both Baptism and the Lord's Supper proclaim the death and Resurrection of Christ. Rom. 6:4 states that, "we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Likewise, 1 Cor. 11:26 says, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." It is the Word that makes a sacrament. It is the Word that interprets remembrance to be the confession and proclamation of the crucified and risen LORD. In baptism man is buried with Christ and raised to new life. In the Lord's Supper man partakes of His body and blood and receives the spiritual benefits of forgiveness and the hope of eternal life. Peter Brunner said: "We must retain the far-reaching anamnesis-arc of the administration of Holy Communion. Indeed, act and act, redemptive act of Jesus there and then and act of worship here and now, merge mysteriously in the celebration of Holy Communion by virtue of Jesus' institution."<sup>10</sup>

Man's spiritual condition is similar to that of the thief on the cross who cried out, "remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom" (Luke 23:42). By the gracious working of the Holy Spirit, the Word of Christ is brought to man's remembrance (John 14:26). The New Covenant, bought

---

<sup>10</sup>Brunner, Worship in the Name of Jesus, p. 172.

with the blood of Christ takes on an added dimension when the command to remember is given with it.

Remembrance does undergird the doctrine of the Real Presence. Remembrance, with its qualities of vicariousness and anticipation, is articulated in the doctrine of the Real Presence. The Lord's Supper, as the meal of the New Covenant, proclaims Christ's work of redemption and points redeemed man to the Second Coming. Just as the world was created by the Word of God (Heb.11:3 and John 1:1-3), man has a new beginning through the Word (John 1:14 and 1 John 1:1-4).

## CHAPTER IX

### THE DIDACTIC DIMENSION

Sometimes overlooked in a discussion of the Lord's Supper is the emphasis on instruction. Proclamation is of major importance in the Lord's Supper but if there is no instruction, then the meaning of the Lord's Supper becomes obfuscated. This chapter will set forth how instruction cannot be separated from the Lord's Supper and that remembrance embraces the idea of instruction. Not only is it necessary to proclaim but also to teach. Through careful instruction the understanding of remembrance becomes more refined (Acts 2:42). As remembrance in the Lord's Supper is properly understood, the Lord's Supper is properly discerned (1 Cor. 11:17-34).

#### Proclamation

In 1520, Luther drew a parallel between the children of Israel and the Christian Church with regard to remembrance. The children of Israel remembered their exodus from Egypt wrought by God and Christians remember their deliverance

wrought by Christ.<sup>1</sup> Luther in 1526, understood remembrance as synonymous with proclamation. To remember Christ means to proclaim him.<sup>2</sup>

The content of the proclamation is the vicarious atonement of Jesus Christ. Christ died once and through His death bought forgiveness for man. The distribution of the Lord's Supper takes place again and again. However, there were some who wanted to confuse the finality of Christ's death with the frequency of the Lord's Supper. In so doing, the Lord's Supper was turned into a repetition of Christ's death. Luther responded as follows:

If now I seek the forgiveness of sins, I do not run to the cross, for I will not find it given there. Nor must I hold to the suffering of Christ, as Dr. Karlstadt trifles, in knowledge or remembrance, for I will not find it there either. But I will find in the sacrament or gospel the word which distributes, presents, offers, and gives to me that forgiveness which was won on the cross. Therefore, Luther has rightly taught that whoever has a bad conscience from his sins should go to the sacrament and obtain comfort, not because of the bread and wine, not because of the body and blood of Christ, but because of the word which in the sacrament offers, presents, and gives the body and blood of Christ, given and shed for me. Is that not clear enough?<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Martin Luther, Luther's Works, 55 vols., The American ed., (hereafter cited as AE), vol. 36: Word and Sacrament II, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann, et al. (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 331.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 349.

<sup>3</sup>AE, Church and Ministry II, 40:214.

The element of proclamation is certainly a major thrust of the Lord's Supper. Immediately following the command to remember in 1 Cor. 11:25, Paul has a statement of proclamation in 1 Cor. 11:26. One remembers in the Lord's Supper first by partaking in faith, then by proclamation. In addition, to the element of proclamation with remembrance, there is also a didactic dimension. This didactic dimension is prevalent in the Old Testament. The people of God were often called to instruct and teach future generations as will be shown in the next section.

#### The Old Testament and the Didactic Dimension

The LORD wanted the story of how He rescued the Hebrews from the land of Egypt taught to future generations (see Ex. 10:2; 12:26-27; 13:14-15; Deut. 6:20-25). The LORD did not want His people to forget that act of deliverance. He wanted the people to remember. Therefore, He exhorted them to instruct their children and their children's children regarding their history. The LORD even gave them prescribed ways of communicating the covenant history (See Deut. 26:5-9). These prescribed methods of worship instructed the Israelites by making it possible for them to identify with their forefathers (See Deut. 4:10-14).

The Israelites, under the direction and protection of the LORD, frequently found themselves threatened by enemy nations or natural elements. The pattern is predictable. The

Israelites were threatened; the LORD would rescue them; they were to remember being rescued by the LORD. The Song of Moses in Exodus 15 is an example of how Yahweh defeated an enemy and controlled the forces of nature to save Israel. Joshua 3 and 4 relate how God divided the waters of the Jordan so that the Hebrews could pass through. The Hebrews were to remember this miraculous occasion by setting up stones as a memorial.

And Joshua said unto them, Pass over before the ark of the LORD your God into the midst of Jordan, and take you up every man of you a stone upon his shoulder, according unto the number of the tribes of the children of Israel: That this may be a sign among you, that when your children ask their fathers in time to come, saying, What mean ye by these stones? Then ye shall answer them, That the waters of Jordan were cut off before the ark of the covenant of the LORD; when it passed over Jordan, the waters of Jordan were cut off: and these stones shall be for a memorial unto the children of Israel for ever. Joshua. 4:5-7.

The preceding quotation sheds even more light on the word remembrance. There is a didactic dimension to the word. One remembers the mighty acts of the LORD by teaching them or passing them along through the generations. This emphasis on teaching is also evident in the early church as the next section will underscore.

#### The Early Church and Instruction

The Great Commission given by Christ in Matt. 28:19-20 is further evidence of the fact that Christ wants His Church to be engaged in teaching, that is, in faithfully transmitting His Word to the world. The salvific or the spiritually

healing character of the sacrament is of primary importance because of its relationship to the proclamation of the Word. However, the didactic dimension should not be overlooked nor understated. As the Christian Church teaches, it is only following the example of Christ's ministry on earth. Christ taught, preached, and healed (Matt. 4:23). The early church followed this example, at least from the middle of the second century as reported by Justin. Before the Lord's Supper was distributed in a worship service, only the initiated could stay in the assembly.<sup>4</sup> "The gathering for worship in the early church was not a public but a closed assembly, while the celebration of the Eucharist was reserved for the saints with the utmost strictness."<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, there was a prevailing attitude which sought to protect the Christian Church from schism and division. True confessional oneness is that which safeguards the koinonia. Since the Lord's Supper has a vertical, as well as a horizontal relationship, it is vital that the church strive for ongoing integrity (see 1 Cor. 10:16-17 and 1 John 1:6-7). To do otherwise, "would do in-

---

<sup>4</sup>Werner Elert, Eucharist And Church Fellowship In The First Four Centuries, trans. N. E. Nagel (Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1966), p. 75.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 76.

jury to the koinonia and so to the unity of the body of Christ."<sup>6</sup>

Although baptism is a prerequisite for being invited to the Lord's Supper, not everyone who is baptized is invited to the sacrament. There are confessional, as well as personal reasons for excluding people from the sacrament. Both doctrinal disunity and personality conflicts work against, rather than in favor of koinonia.<sup>7</sup> There are also moral reasons for excluding people from the sacrament. If a person, who is considered a Christian, becomes confirmed in a sinful way of life and is living contrary to the commandments, then he must be excluded from the sacrament.<sup>8</sup>

Perhaps Paul provides the best example for the church to follow when he says in 1 Cor. 11:23, "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you," (See also 1 Cor. 15:3). The overarching concern is to administer the Lord's Supper as it has been entrusted by Christ through His Word. The ministry of Christ was three dimensional. He taught, preached, and healed. The content of Christ's ministry is also present in the sacrament. The Lord's Supper is spiritually healing. The benefits of that spiritual healing are taught and proclaimed. The whole of Christ's ministry is

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 80.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., pp. 80-81.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 84-101.

communicated in the sacrament as His body and blood are distributed. Hence, His Word and His Work are the cause and content of the sacrament. His Word and His Work are the cause and content of the remembrance. The written Word of God reminds Christians to remember the sacrifice of Christ (See Luke 24:8; John 2:22; and 12:16). Hence, the need for careful instruction. If the meaning of the Lord's Supper is not taught, then the Lord's Supper is not rightly discerned.

## CONCLUSION

This writer began with the thesis that remembrance, as it is used in Luke 22:19, has covenantal significance. In order to establish that remembrance has covenantal significance, it was necessary to examine both the Old Covenant and the New Covenant. Secondly, a discussion of the Hittite treaties was beneficial in isolating the salient features of the Biblical Covenant.

The Passover was examined because it was the meal of the Old Covenant and held the unique status of being one of the three pilgrim festivals. Passover was shown to be proleptic and vicarious. Passover is the Old Covenant meal of remembrance and has vertical, as well as horizontal overtones.

Studying remembrance as it is used in the Old Testament and in the New Testament brought to light various shades of meaning. Depending upon the context, God or man might be the subject of remembrance. If God is the subject, man will be remembered for his salvation or his damnation. If man is the subject, God will be believed or rejected, remembered or forgotten. Most crucial to this study is the frequent use of remembrance within the covenantal framework.

As with any thesis, there are certain questions which must be addressed. Depending upon how those questions are

answered will determine how much strength the thesis will eventually muster. Will the answers to those questions bolster or weaken the thesis? There are three questions which must be addressed in this thesis.

First of all, since the objective of this thesis was to establish covenantal significance for remembrance, it had to be reasonably demonstrated that Jesus celebrated the Last Supper (the New Covenant meal) during the Passover (the Old Covenant meal). In spite of the alleged discrepancies, there is decisive evidence to answer affirmatively the question, "Did Jesus celebrate the Last Supper at the Passover?"

Secondly, is the command to remember in Luke 22:19b authentic? Matthew and Mark do not have the command to remember. D, a Western text of Luke, omits the command. Nevertheless, there is strong evidence in favor of its authenticity. Even though some questions still remain regarding the dissimilarities among Matthew, Mark, Luke and Paul, these cannot be used as conclusive evidence against the inclusion of the command to remember.

Thirdly, who is the subject of the remembering in Luke 22:19b? Joachim Jeremias championed a view that God is to be understood as the intended subject of the remembrance. Although, the Old Testament frequently has God as the subject, it also has frequent references where man is the subject. In the opinion of this writer, Jeremias does not marshal conclusive evidence to support his position.

In addition to the preceding questions, consideration was given to the relationship between remembrance and the doctrine of the Real Presence. Again, remembrance is the call to believe the Real Presence, the partaking of Christ's body and blood. The remembrance is also a call to proclaim the all-atoning sacrifice of Christ which sealed the New Covenant. The Heavenly Father remembered man by making a New Covenant. Man is to respond with faithful remembrance.

It was also demonstrated that remembrance has a didactic flavor. The LORD intends for His people to instruct future generations regarding His Word and Work. Instruction is something that obviously has to take place in order that Christians do not fall into the same error as the Corinthians. Or, if Christians do fall into such chronic forgetfulness, instruction functions to remind Christians concerning the purpose of the Lord's Supper.

Therefore remembrance and covenant cannot be separated. The LORD manifested His power when He brought the Hebrews out of land of Egypt into the promised land. This was a major event in the Old Testament because God proved His fidelity to the covenant He made with Abraham by delivering the Hebrews. Psalm 105 functions as an abbreviated history lesson to illustrate this very point. Since the Exodus event anticipates ultimate deliverance won by Christ on the cross, God's people are reminded again and again of its significance. The Passover lamb of Exodus 12 anticipates "the Lamb of God,

which taketh away the sin of the world" in John 1 and "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," in Revelation 7. Paul undercores this ultimate act of deliverance won for man by Christ in 1 Cor. 15:3-8:

For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures: And that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.

Man is called to remember that victory in the Lord's Supper. Man remembers by believing and by confessing. It is uncertain how much the disciples understood as Jesus instituted His Holy Supper. It is certain that Jesus taught His disciples and gave them the command to teach. Jesus promised and sent the Holy Spirit to remind the disciples of what had been taught (John 14:26). Later they understood (Luke 24:6-8). The Holy Spirit teaches man now through God's Word. By this, the true covenantal significance of remembrance is understood.

Although Christ ascended into heaven (Acts 1:4-11), He is with His disciples in the Lord's Supper. This anticipates the time when Christ will come again and be present with His followers forever in heaven. Remembrance is like a key because, when it is rightly understood, it opens the lock to a fuller appreciation of covenant. "Do this in remembrance of

Me," is more than a mere mnemonic device. Jesus gave the Great Commission in Matthew 28. Christ told the disciples to proclaim the Gospel and teach people the Word of God (Matt. 28:19-20). At the end of the Great Commission, Christ promised that He would be with the disciples (Matt. 28:20). Christ is with all of His disciples in a special way, in the Lord's Supper. Christ's blood is what made the New Covenant possible. The Holy Spirit is the One Who makes us remember and believe the promises of God (John 14:26). Remembrance had significance with the Old Covenant and now it has significance with the New Covenant. It is within the New Covenant that the redeemed man lives (Heb. 8:13) and redeemed man's response to that New Covenant will be remembrance.

## APPENDIX A

### The Order (In Present Use)

- KADDESH - A benediction over a goblet of wine, sanctifying the day.
- REHAZ - Wash the hands without reciting a benediction.
- KARPAS - Dip a vegetable, such as potato, radish, celery or parsley, into some salt water, and eat it.
- YAHAZ - Break the middle mazzah, and hide half of it for the afikoman.
- MAGGID - Tell the story, and sing praises to the Lord over second cup of wine, which will be drunk at the end of this part.
- RAHZAH - Wash the hands before the meal, with a benediction.
- MOZI MAZZAH - Recite the usual benediction for bread, and the additional benediction for mazzah; eat a piece of the upper mazzah and of the remaining part of the middle mazzah.
- MAROR - Eat bitter herbs dipped in haroset.
- KOREKH - Eat a sandwich of the bottom mazzah and bitter herbs dipped in haroset.
- SHULHAN OREKH - The festive meal.
- ZAFUN - Eat the hidden piece of the middle mazzah, the afikoman.
- BAREKH - Grace after meals over the third cup of wine.
- HALLEL - Sing further songs of praise, after which the fourth cup of wine is drunk.

NIRZAH - "Acceptance" - God has found the actions performed acceptable, and appropriate hymns are recited.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Mordell Klein, ed., Passover, (Philadelphia:Jewish Publication Society of America, 1973), p. 51.

## APPENDIX B

### Table Setting (In Present Use)

The special plate for the Seder is placed in front of the leader. The plate arrangement is as follows:

Three separate pieces of matzah - two are symbolic of the traditional loaves set out in the Temple and the third is symbolic of Passover.

Roasted shankbone - symbolic of Passover sacrifice.

Parsley or green herbs - symbolic of hope.

Top part of horseradish root (maror) - symbolic of bitterness experience in Egypt and of those still enslaved.

Haroset - symbolic of mortar used in labor under Pharaoh.

Roasted egg - hagigah (festival offering) is symbolic of life.

Elijah cup - symbolic of Prophet Elijah.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Herbert Bronstein, ed., A Passover Haggadah, rev. ed. (New York:Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1975), pp. 14-15.

## APPENDIX C

### The Festivals of Israel

Nisan	14 (March-April)	Passover
	15-21	Unleavened Bread
	17(?)	Firstfruits
Siwan	7(?) (May-June)	Feasts of Weeks (Pentecost)
Ab	9 (July-August)	Fast for Destruction of Temple
Tishri	1 (Sept.-Oct.)	New Year (Feast of Trumpets)
	10	Day of Atonement
	15-22	Sukkot (Tabernacles, Booths)
Kislew	25 (Nov.-Dec.)	Hanukkah (Dedication)
Adar	14-15 (Feb.-March)	Purim <sup>1</sup>

It was customary to read the Megilloth for the five major festivals. The Song of Solomon was read for Passover; Ruth for Weeks (Pentecost); Lamentations for Tish 'a b' Ab (commemorating Fall of Jerusalem); Ecclesiastes for Booths; and Esther for Purim.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>F. F. Bruce, New Testament History (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1969), p. 151.

<sup>2</sup>Horace D. Hummel, The Word Becoming Flesh, (Saint Louis, Missouri:Concordia Publishing House, 1979), p. 387.

## APPENDIX D

### Proposed Account of the "Last Supper"

#### A. Preliminary Course:

1. Word of dedication (blessing of the feast day [kiddus] and of the cup) spoken by the paterfamilias over the first cup (the kiddus cup). The washing of the right hand.
2. Preliminary dish, consisting among other things of green herbs, bitter herbs and a sauce made of fruit puree.
3. The meal proper (see C) is served but not yet eaten; the second cup is mixed and put in its place but not yet drunk.

#### B. Passover Liturgy:

1. Passover haggadah (Ex. 12:26-27 in Aramaic) by the paterfamilias
2. First part of the Passover Hallel ( Ps. 115-118 in Hebrew).
3. Drinking of second cup (haggadah cup).

#### C. Main Meal:

1. Grace spoken by the paterfamilias over the unleavened bread.

2. Meal, consisting of Passover lamb, unleavened bread, bitter herbs (Ex. 12:8), with fruit puree and wine.
3. Grace (birkat hammason) over the third cup (cup of blessing).
4. Third cup of wine passed around; no more eating after this.
5. The words of comfort (John 14-17).

D. Conclusion:

1. Second part of the Passover Hallel (Ps. 115-118 in Hebrew).
2. Praise over the fourth cup (Hallel Cup) [Seemingly later on a fourth cup was added.<sup>1</sup>

Joachim Jeremias does supply some interesting details which assist in establishing the cultural milieu of that time. For example, the minimum number of participants to eat a Passover meal was ten and the maximum was probably twenty. Jesus and His disciples made up a complement of thirteen. Based on the conjectured number of animals sacrificed at the temple and the average number of people to share in the meal, there could have been about 125,000-150,000 pilgrims in Jerusalem (This depended on whether the Passover fell early or late in Spring when the sailing season opened.).

Jerusalem, with its Temple, was looked upon as a place of

---

<sup>1</sup>Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. Norman Perrin (London:SCM Press, 1966), pp. 85-86.

great religious expectation. The Roman Procurator came with a substantial military escort from Caesarea to Jerusalem to thwart any potential revolts (usually thought to consist in tripling the forces in Jerusalem). This involved the growing messianic expectations to be realized at a Passover. It should also be noted that of the three annual pilgrim festivals (Deut. 16:1-16), Passover was the most important festival of the New Testament day.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Idem, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, 4th printing (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), pp. 75-83.

APPENDIX E

Textual Comparison [Matt. 26:26-29;

Mark 14:22-25; and 1 Cor. 11:23-26]

Matt. 26:26-29

26. Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογῆσας  
ἔκλασεν καὶ δούς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν λάβετε φάγετε,  
τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.
27. καὶ λαβῶν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς  
λέγων πίστε ἕξ αὐτοῦ πάντες,
28. τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τοῦ  
περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν  
ἁμαρτιῶν.
29. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίνω ἀπ' ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου  
τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας  
ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν  
τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

Mark. 14:22-25

22. καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβῶν ἄρτον εὐλογῆσας  
ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν λάβετε, τοῦτό  
ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.
23. καὶ λαβῶν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν  
αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἕξ αὐτοῦ πάντες.

24. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς  
 διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.
25. ἅμην λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ  
 γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης  
 ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

1 Cor. 11:23-26

23. Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα  
 ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρέδίδοτο  
 ἔλαβεν ἄρτον
24. καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν τοῦτό μου ἐστίν  
 τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τοῦτο ποιεῖτε  
 εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.
25. ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δεσπνῆσαι,  
 λέγων τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καλῆς διαθήκης  
 ἐστίν ἐν τῷ ἑμῷ αἵματι τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὅσάκις  
 ἂν πίνετε, εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.
26. ὅσάκις γὰρ ἂν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ  
 τὸ ποτήριον πίνετε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ  
 κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ.

1

<sup>1</sup>Kurt Aland, ed., *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*  
 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1976), pp. 436-437.

## APPENDIX F

### Didache

The following is a modified literal translation by this writer of Didache 9, 1-5:

Concerning the eucharist, in this wise give thanks:  
First concerning the cup - We give thanks to you, our Father, for the holy vine of Your son David, which You made known to us through Jesus, Your Son. To You be the glory forever.  
Concerning the bread - We give thanks to You, our Father, for the life and knowledge, which you made known to us through Jesus, Your Son. To You be the glory forever. Just as this bread was scattered over the mountains and gathered together, thus Your church was assembled from the ends of the earth for your kingdom. Because Your glory and power through Jesus are forever. Let no one eat nor drink from Your eucharist, but those baptized in the name of the Lord. You have spoken concerning this, Lord: "Do not give what is Holy to the dogs."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Kurt Aland, ed., Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1976), p. 437.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources and Tools

- Aland, Kurt, ed. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1976.
- Alt, A., O. Eissfeldt and P. Kahle, ed. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967/77.
- Arndt, William F. The Gospel According to St. Luke. Reprinted edition. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1981.
- Bacchiocchi, Samuele. From Sabbath to Sunday. Rome: The Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977.
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968.
- Bauer, Walter; William Arndt; and Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Benoit, Pierre. Jesus and the Gospel. Vol. 1. Translated by Benet Weatherhead. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1973.
- Birnbaum, Philip. A Book of Jewish Concepts. New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1964.
- Black, Matthew., gen. ed. Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Reprinted, revised and reset. Hong Kong: Thomas Nelson, 1981.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes and Helmer Ringgren., ed. Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. 4 vols. Translated by John T. Willis. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975.
- Bright, John. The Kingdom of God. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953.

- Bronstein, Herbert., ed. A Passover Haggadah. Revised. New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1975.
- Brown, Colin., gen. ed. The International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1971.
- Brown, Francis; S. R. Driver; and Charles A. Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Reprinted with corrections. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.
- Brown, Raymond E. The Gospel According to John (XIII-XXI). The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1970.
- Bruce, F. F. New Testament History. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1969.
- Brunner, Peter. Worship in the Name of Jesus. Translated by M. H. Bertram. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1968.
- Buttrick, George Arthur., gen. ed. The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 5 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Chadwick, Henry., gen. ed. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1971. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, by Charles Kingsley Barrett.
- Chemnitz, Martin. The Lord's Supper. Translated by J. A. O. Preus. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1979.
- Childs, Brevard S. Exodus: A Commentary. London: SCM Press LTD, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Memory and Tradition in Israel. Chatham, Great Britain: W. & J. Mackay & Co., 1962.
- Commission on Theology and Church Relations: The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. Theology and Practice of the Lord's Supper. Saint Louis, Missouri, 1983.

- Concordia Triglotta: The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Historical Introduction by F. Bente. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.
- DeBoer, P. A. H. Gedenken und Gedächtnis in der Welt des Alten Testaments. Stuttgart: S. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1962.
- De Vaux, Roland. Ancient Israel. 2 vols. Vol. 2: Religious Institutions. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.
- Edersheim, Alfred. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. 2 vols. 8th ed., rev. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Temple. New York: James Pott, 1881.
- Elert, Werner. Eucharist And Church Fellowship In The Four Centuries. Translated by N. E. Nagel. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Lord's Supper Today. Translated by Martin Bertram. Contemporary Theology Series. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1973.
- The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament. 5th ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV). The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1985.
- Franzmann, Martin H. The Word of the Lord Grows. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1961.
- Gaster, Theodor H. Festivals of the Jewish Year. New York: William Sloane Associates Publishers, 1953.
- Goppelt, Leonard. Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New. Translated by Donald H. Madvig. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982.
- Guthrie, Donald. New Testament Introduction. 7th American printing. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1978.

- Hastings, James., ed. Dictionary of the Bible. Rev. ed., by Frederick C. Grant and H. H. Rowley. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963.
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath. A Concordance to the Septuagint. 3 vols. Reprinted edition. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1983.
- Hillers, Delbert R. Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.
- Hummel, Horace D. The Word Becoming Flesh. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1979.
- Jackson, Samuel Macauley, gen. ed. The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. 13 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1949-1957.
- Jaubert, Annie. The Date of the Last Supper. Translated by Isaac Rafferty. Staten Island, New York: Society of St. Paul, 1965.
- Jeremias, Joachim. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Translated by Norman Perrin. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. 4th printing Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. New Testament Theology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Parables of Jesus. 2d rev. ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972.
- Keil, C. F., and F. Delitzsch. Commentary on the Old Testament. 10 vols. Reprinted edition. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978. Vol. 10: The Twelve Minor Prophets, by C. F. Keil. Translated by James Martin.
- Kittel, Gerhard, ed. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.
- Klein, Mordell, ed. Passover. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1973.
- Laetsch, Theodore, ed. The Abiding Word. 3 vols. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1960.

- Lenski, Richard C. H. Commentary on the New Testament. 12 vols. The Interpretation of St. Lukes's Gospel. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott., comp. A Greek-English Lexicon. New rev. ed., by Sir Henry S. Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Luther, Martin. Luther's Works. The American Edition. 55 vols. General Editors, Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehmann. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House and Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1955-.
- Mann, C. S. Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1986.
- Marshall, I. Howard. Last Supper and Lord's Supper. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.
- Marshall, I. Howard and W. Ward Gasque ed. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Commentary on Luke, by I. Howard Marshall. Reprinted. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979.
- Mendenhall, George E. Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East. Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquim, 1955.
- Metzger, Bruce M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. Corrected edition. New York: United Bible Societies, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The New Testament. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- Moulton, W. F., and A. S. Geden ed. Concordance to the Greek Testament. 3rd ed., reprinted. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1953.
- Pieper, August. Isaiah II. Translated by Erwin Kowalke. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Northwestern Publishing House, 1979.
- Pieper, Francis. Christian Dogmatics. 3 vols. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1953.

- Pritchard, James B., ed. Ancient Near Eastern Manuscripts. 3rd ed., with supplement. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Rahlf's, Alfred., ed. Septuaginta. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
- Rehwinkel, Alfred M. The Flood. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1951.
- Robertson, A. T., rev. A Harmony of the Gospels. Based on the Broadus Harmony in the Revised Version. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1950.
- Rosen, Ceil and Moishe Rosen. Christ in the Passover. Chicago: Moody Press, 1978.
- Sasse, Hermann. This Is My Body. Revised Australian Edition. Adelaide, Australia: Lutheran Publishing House, 1977.
- Schauss, Hayyim. The Jewish Festivals: From Their Beginnings to Our Own Day. Translated by Samuel Jaffe. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1938.
- Schmid, Heinrich. The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. 3rd rev. ed., trans., by Charles A. Hay. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1899.
- Schottroff, Willy. "Gedenken" im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964.
- Silverman, Morris., ed. Passover Haggadah. Hartford, Connecticut: Prayer Book Press, 1959.
- Singer, Isidore., ed. The Jewish Encyclopedia. 12 vols. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1905-1912.
- Stitskin, Leon D., ed. Studies In Torah Judaism. New York: Yeshiva University Press, Ktav Publishing House, 1969.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Billerbeck, Paul. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. Zweiter Band: Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und Die Apostelgeschichte. Zweite, unveränderte Auflage. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1956.
- Strauss, David Friedrich. The Life of Jesus. Translated by George Eliot. New York: MacMillan & Co., 1898.

- Unterman, Isaac., ed. Pirke Aboth. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1964.
- Walther, C. F. W. The Proper Distinction between Law and Gospel. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1981.
- Wilkinson, John. Jerusalem as Jesus Knew It. Reprinted. London: Thames and Hudson, 1978.
- Wilson, William. Old Testament Word Studies. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1978.
- Wiseman, D. J., gen. ed. The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Psalms 1-72, by Derek Kidner. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1973.
- Young, Robert. Analytical Concordance to the Bible. Reprinted. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982.

#### Journal Articles

- Bahr, Gordon J. "The Seder of the Passover and the Eucharistic Words." Novum Testamentum 12(1970):181-202.
- Box, G. H. "The Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist." The Journal of Theological Studies 3(1902):257-369.
- Cooper, John C. "The Problem of the Text Luke 22:19-20." The Lutheran Quarterly 14(February, 1962):39-48.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Some Features of Our Oldest Text of Luke." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 24(1962):170-179.
- Higgins, A. J. B. "The Origins of the Eucharist." New Testament Studies 1(1954-1955):200-209.
- Howard, J. K. "Passover and Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel." Scottish Journal of Theology 20(1967):329-337.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "'This is My Body . . .'" The Expository Times 83(October 1971-September 1972):196-203.

- Jones, Douglas. "Ἀνάμνησις In the LXX and the Interpretation of 1 Cor. XI. 25." The Journal of Theological Studies 5(1954):183-191.
- Kosmala, Hans. "Das Tut Zu Meimen Gedaechnis." Novum Testamentum 4(1960):81-94.
- Peters, Edward H.. "St. Paul and the Eucharist." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 10(July 1948):247-253.
- Petuchowski, Jakob J. "'Do This in Remembrance of Me' (I Cor. 11:24)." Journal of Biblical Literature 76(1957):293-298.
- Scharlemann, Martin H. "The Secret of God's Plan: Studies in Ephesians--Study Four." Concordia Theological Monthly 41(July-August 1970):410-420.
- Sykes, Marjorie H. "The Eucharist as 'Anamnesis.'" The Expository Times 71(October 1959-September 1960):115-118.
- Throckmorton, Burton H. "The Longer Reading of Luke 22:19b-20." Anglican Theological Review 30(January 1948):55-56.