# "For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you . . ." (1 Cor. 11:23)

*Joel Schmidt, Conrad Grebel University College*

Among the heirs of the Anabaptist movement, discussions on the role of "tradition" in the life of the church have tended to be framed in antagonistic terms. The polemic of Scripture over against tradition has deep historical roots in our movement, and continues to exert an influence in discussions of ethics, worship, and christology. The passage 1 Cor. 11:23-26, from which the excerpt above is quoted, may help to bring into focus a number of relevant variables related to a contemporary discussion of the role of tradition in Anabaptist worship and theology.

**The Relationship between Scripture and Tradition**

In the sixteenth century, there were at least two alternatives available within Protestant circles for imagining the relationship between Scripture and tradition. On the one hand, Andreas Karlstadt argued that faithfulness to the biblical word of God demanded the rejection of all inherited ecclesiastical traditions not explicitly affirmed in Scripture. On the other, Martin Luther argued that all those traditions not explicitly condemned in the Bible were lawful for Christian faith and praxis. Karlstadt and Luther parted ways due to disagreement over the use of traditional forms of worship in non-Roman churches. The liturgical ramifications of this decision can today be observed by comparing most Lutheran and Anabaptist worship services.

In opposition to all variations on the Protestant theme of *sola scriptura*, the Roman Catholic Church articulated a quite different understanding of the significance of its inherited ecclestiastical traditions. In opposition to the strenuous Protestant assertion of the sufficiency of Scripture, at the Council of Trent the Roman Church formulated what later came to be interpreted as a "two source" theory of divine revelation. In this understanding (which has frequently been rejected by contemporary Roman Catholics as a distortion of Trent's teaching), in addition to the explicit words of Scripture, there exists within the church a fund of information that is either undocumented or documented in non-canonical sources, upon which the hierarchy may later

draw to promulgate authoritative doctrines. Within Roman Catholicism there was a formal acknowledgement that the two sources could not contradict each other, but to many watching Protestants by means of this position the Roman Church seemed simply to issue itself a *carte blanche* to develop new traditions in whatever direction required by the exigencies of power politics, Aristotelian philosophy, or Marian piety.

More recently, the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches (WCC) has come up with its own description of the nature of Christian tradition. According to the 1963 WCC document "Scripture, Tradition and Traditions," debates about the authority of tradition are best framed in terms of "Tradition," "traditions," and "tradition." In the first case, "Tradition" refers to "God's revelation and self-giving in Christ, present in the life of the Church."[1] This "Tradition" may be understood to be substantially equivalent to the revelation in Christ provided in Scripture; or, as in the case of the Orthodox, it may also include the tangible forms by which the Christian faith itself has been passed down through time.[2] Later we read that "the content of Tradition cannot be exactly defined, for the reality it transmits can never be fully contained in propositional forms."[3] In contrast to the "Tradition" are those "traditions" which, in the diversity of forms of expression found in different communions, to varying degrees faithfully transmit the "Tradition."[4] Finally, "tradition" refers to the traditioning process *per se*, the means by which particular traditions, and through them aspects of the "Tradition," are transmitted from generation to generation.

In terms of contemporary Anabaptist reflection, John Howard Yoder's view of the role of tradition deserves mention. As Yoder recognizes, the question of tradition cannot be resolved by a simple rejection of any post-biblical development in Christian self-understanding, such as biblicism in a Karlstadtian mode, since the Bible itself affirms the reality of ongoing revelation in the Christian community (John 14:12-26; 16:7-15), and gives evidence of the attempts of first-century congregations to manage this reality (1 John 4:1ff; 1 Cor. 12:1ff.). Yoder affirms that

> There can very properly be forms of change to which the "biblicist" would not object, if they have about them the organic quality of growth from seed, faithful translation, or fecundation. . . . What is at stake is not whether there can be change but whether there is

such a thing as unfaithfulness.[5]

Yoder uses the image of a vine to assert the adequacy of Scripture to adjudicate the faithfulness of later developments in Christian tradition. Just as a vine may have branches growing in different directions, so too can there be legitimate diversity in the post-biblical development of Christian traditions. If, however, these branches are allowed to grow in whatever direction they please, the result is a choking of the vine and a reduction in its fruitfulness. Scripture may thus be asserted to be the root by which the church is able to judge when and where the pruning of a branch of tradition is necessary. "This renewed appeal to origins is not primitivism, nor an effort to recapture some pristine purity. It is rather a 'looping back,' a glance over the shoulder to enable a midcourse correction."[6] By taking this position, Yoder does not assume that the church will at any point exhaust the import of the Scriptures for the church's life. Rather, as new questions are raised and put to Scripture, the texts yield new perspectives. Yoder cites the development of liberation theology as one example of how posing new questions to the biblical texts allows "the same old data" to disclose new information.

This paper takes Yoder's understanding of the role of Scripture in adjudicating the faithfulness of ongoing revelation as its starting point, and seeks to apply this method to contemporary Mennonite understandings of the Lord's Supper in light of 1 Cor. 11:23-26. Since Yoder's approach requires discernment in each particular instance of the tradition's faithfulness to biblical concepts and trajectories, we shall try to determine whether new questions being raised in biblical studies confirm or problematize contemporary Mennonite eucharistic understanding.

**Contemporary Mennonite Perspectives on the Lord's Supper**

What, then, is the "contemporary Mennonite understanding" of the Lord's Supper? There is no such unified position, nor could we reasonably expect one, given the absence of a unified ecclesiastical authority in the Mennonite churches.[7] For our purposes it is adequate to note two opposing tendencies within contemporary Mennonite eucharistic theology.

Probably the most prevalent understanding of the "traditional" Mennonite position on the Lord's Supper may be summed up as "Zwinglian memorialism." A number of sixteenth-century Anabaptists argued strenuously against any notion

of a "real presence" in the Supper. Some did so on the basis of Ulrich Zwingli's exegesis (adopted from Cornelius Hoen) of the words of institution to mean "This signifies my body," while others leaned more heavily on the observation that, according to the biblical record, Jesus in his post-resurrection humanity is seated at the right hand of God. The memorialist view finds a contemporary analogue in the article on communion in the *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, where one reads that "communion . . . has always had only a symbolic meaning for the Anabaptists and Mennonites. . . . It was a memorial to the death of Christ and a means of the closest fellowship of the believers in Christ."[8] As in the sixteenth century, the article supports this interpretation of the Supper with the claim that it restores "the Biblical practice" of communion, presumably in contradistinction to the "un-Biblical" eucharistic views of the Roman Catholics, Orthodox, Anglicans, and Lutherans, among others.

A different contemporary view, existing in considerable tension with the one just expressed, is found in the 1995 *Confession of Faith in a Mennonite Perspective* published by the now unified Canadian General Conference Mennonite Church and the Mennonite Church in North America. While the memorial view remains represented within the twelfth article of this confession, one also finds the assertion that believers "relive" the event of Jesus' death and resurrection by celebrating a common meal together. Furthermore, the claim is made that "the supper re-presents the presence of the risen Christ in the church."[9] Surprisingly, no biblical rationale is provided to support this concept of the Supper "re-presenting" the presence of Christ.

Of course, it has been commonplace within certain ecclesial traditions to assert the reality of such a Christic presence in the Supper, based on a literal exegesis of Jesus' words of institution and on some of the post-resurrection experiences of Jesus experienced by his disciples, e.g., the road to Emmaus story. In Mennonite circles, however, the phrase "do this in remembrance of me" found in 1 Cor. 11:23-26 and Luke 22:15-20 has generally been seen to provide a kind of trump card in discussions of the "real presence" (or rather absence) of Jesus in the Supper. It is precisely on this point of intersection between the claim for Jesus' "real presence" in the Eucharist, and the apparently biblical view of the celebration of communion in psychological "remembrance" of Jesus Christ, that the role of Scripture and tradition will now be examined.

**"Do this in remembrance of me . . ."**

In 1 Cor. 11:24-25 the word generally translated as "remembrance" is the Greek word *anamnesis*, which word in turn is related to the Hebrew noun *zikkaron*, derived from the root *zkr*. As one commentator has observed, "there is probably no other single Hebrew word which has engendered so much debate among Christian sacramental and liturgical theologians in the second half of the twentieth century as the noun *zikkaron*, or rather its Greek equivalent, *anamnesis*."[10]

The groundwork for the important role which the term *anamnesis* has recently acquired in ecumenical and scholarly reflection was laid by a number of authors, especially Joachim Jeremias among biblical scholars and Gregory Dix among liturgiologists, but French Protestant theologian Max Thurian was chiefly responsible for its entry into ecumenical discussion through his influential book, *L'eucharistie: mémorial du Seigneur*, published in 1959. According to Thurian, *anamnesis* does not refer to a merely psychological act of remembering, such as seems presupposed in the framework of Zwinglian memorialism, but it is rather a term loaded with theological significance. In his view, *anamnesis* is used to describe a phenomenon by which past events are actualized in the present for the benefit of contemporary believers. For the Jewish people, this is what occurs during the Passover celebration and is the reason why in the modern seder one is told that "Every man in every generation is bound to look upon himself as if he personally had gone forth from Egypt."[11] It is this word, generally translated "memorial" by biblical scholars, that gives both the Passover seder and the Christian Eucharist their distinctive meanings. In the seder, the meal is given the meaning of an "actualization" of the deliverance of the people of God; in the Eucharist, it is Christ's sacrifice which is "actualized," with the result that Christ himself is made present in his sacrifice.[12]

Thurian's work has received fairly widespread support from biblical specialists such as P.A.H. de Boer, Willy Schottroff, and Brevard Childs. For example, Childs defines actualization as "the process by which a past event is contemporized for a generation removed in time and space from the original event."[13] This does not mean that Israel again experiences the Exodus, for this was a once-for-all event, but rather that by means of her tradition Israel is able to enter "the same redemptive reality of the Exodus generation. . . .

Because the quality of time was the same, the barrier of chronological separation was overcome."[14]

It is just this notion of "actualization," (or "re-presentation" as noted in the Mennonite *Confession* above), that has been enthusiastically embraced by a great many scholars and church leaders from a variety of denominations, and that was very influential in formulating the 1982 *Baptism, Eucharist, Ministry* (BEM) document by the WCC's Faith and Order Commission. As a result, the notion of "memorial" articulated by scholars such as Thurian and Childs has already played a large role in overcoming ecumenical impasses concerning the relationship between Christ's sacrifice and the Eucharist. Furthermore, a conviction exists that if agreement can be reached that the memorial of the Supper is "the living and effective sign of [Christ's] sacrifice," then there is hope that a shared understanding of the nature and significance of Christ's presence in the Eucharist may yet be possible. This is an extremely ironic turn of events for churches adhering to a "memorialist" understanding of the Lord's Supper, as they find that the passage and terminology they have been using to protect against a notion of the "real presence" have become the means by which other traditions are affirming just such a presence.

Nevertheless, the view of memorial actualization first presented by Thurian has not achieved universal acceptance within the scholarly community. Robert Brawley has questioned it for several reasons, including his doubting that the Lord's Supper was actually instituted during a Passover meal, and that in the LXX *mnemosunon* rather than *anamnesis* is used to translate *zikkaron*.[15] Thus, Brawley does not dispute the notion that in certain contexts *zkr* may involve actualization of the past, e.g., in the context of the Passover seder, but he does dispute claims for such an understanding of *anamnesis* in the New Testament accounts of the Lord's Supper. In addition, he rallies Markus Barth[16] in support of his skepticism of an apparently too-easy, and politically-driven, consensus on the meaning of *anamnesis*.

Unfortunately, the critiques of Brawley and Barth lose their force in light of observations by their colleagues. First, a large number of scholars affirm the significance of the Passover as a setting for understanding the significance of the Lord's Supper, quite apart from any direct historical linkage.[17] Also, even without a direct link to the Passover, *anamnesis* could carry a notion of actualization within the NT institution texts due to the cultic nature of the Supper, and the association of the actualization concept with

cultic acts in the OT in general. Second, it is not significant that in the Septuagint *mnemosunon* rather than *anamnesis* is used to translate *zikkaron* with reference to the commemoration of the Exodus, since the terms seem to function as synonyms.[18] Finally, Barth's arguments against a conviction in the "real presence" fail to engage the specific arguments of those linking the notion of "actualization" with that of *anamnesis*, and do not present a developed alternative to such an understanding of this term.

In this regard, the Jewish scholar Lawrence A. Hoffman presents a greater challenge to the "actualization" interpretation of *anamnesis* than do either Brawley or Barth. On the basis of an involved examination of post-biblical rabbinical, and to a lesser extent OT, writings, Hoffman establishes a carefully argued alternative to the view proposed by Thurian. Hoffman's view may be summarized as follows. The word normally translated as "remember" is better rendered as "to point out," and God's memory is thus actually God's attention being drawn by a variety of pointers, some of them liturgical.[19] From the human side and in the context of a liturgical celebration, these pointers remind the gathered congregation of God, his nature, and his deeds of salvation. From the divine side, they function as reminders for God, signposts to direct God's attention back toward God's own essentially merciful nature, and the promise of salvation implied therein.[20] Hoffman uses the charming simile of humanity being like children in a busy household, who use the liturgy as a means of obtaining and directing the attention of their busy parent. The end result of drawing God's attention in this way are effects in line with God's gracious nature, namely salvation and deliverance.

Hoffman draws the implications of his view for the Christian celebration of the Lord's Supper. In his view, Jesus' "Do this in memory of me" are words meant to accompany a ritual act, which as a whole functions as "a pointer to a pointer." Eating the bread and wine in remembrance of Jesus points to Jesus, who is himself the primary pointer, directing God's way toward merciful redemption. In the celebration of the Supper, Hoffman finds liturgy "as the Rabbis understood it, liturgy as *zikaron*, liturgy as memory, or better, as pointer, drawing God's attention to what matters."[21]

Roman Catholic scholar Fritz Chenderlin focuses on the meaning of the phrase "Do this in remembrance of me," or as he renders it, "Do this as my memorial." He argues that this phrase carries a sense of "reminding God," as well as reminding people. Very similar to Hoffman, he states that

one aspect of meaning of "memorial" is "that of a symbol — a word or thing or act — that is so said or placed or done as to attract the attention of the one who is meant to read it and thus turn his attention to the matter symbolized."[22] In the biblical texts cultic memorials are indeed thought to exert a "pressure" on God to act, but this is not magic or theurgy but "reminders of pressures God was thought to have put on *himself*, as by covenant."[23]

Thus, in the central cultic act of the Christian faith, the elements of the Lord's Supper must be seen to have the aspect of "reminding God" that the term "memorial" carries throughout the biblical narrative. The elements of the Supper remind God of his promises in Jesus Christ, who is portrayed in Paul's writings with concepts such as ransom, martyrdom, *akedah*, mercy seat, scapegoat, and sacrifice.[24] All of these images would be suitable ways of articulating the "reminding God" aspect of the Supper, but in the later tradition this Godward aspect came to be expressed exclusively in terms of sacrifice. This development represented a narrowing of the biblical concept of "memorial" and a reduction in the number of options available to the liturgical imagination by which to obey the Lord's "memorial" command.[25]

Chenderlin also addresses Thurian's concept of "actualization," apparently accepting Childs' definition of actualization as the "contemporization and making relevant older traditional materials."[26] Thus, there are forms of literary actualization in which one generalizes from the original biblical stories and makes the lessons from the original situation applicable in the present.[27] This kind of actualization can be safely assumed and universally recognized in contemporary Jewish and Christian communities, and in the biblical texts themselves. Therefore, the reality of the concept of actualization is not the issue. Rather the question is whether, apart from more commonly accepted forms of actualization such as literary actualization, the Scriptures provide evidence that "the later cult in Israel was not actualizing in any specially "cultic" way."[28]

Chenderlin suggests at least four kinds of cultic actualization may be supported by appeals to the biblical witness: (1) a "merely experiential" form, whereby humans are reminded of God's power, previous involvement, and promises, and these are made relevant to a contemporary situation; (2) a "faith-engaging" form, whereby God is reminded of his previous covenant promises, and implored to implement here and now his commitment to save; (3) a "faith-producing" form, namely the neo-orthodox concept of the Divine enkindling of faith, "which thereby manifests in its very being the saving power the text

proclaims"; (4) a "reality-producing" form, which further engages and specifies the content of salvation, "recognizing that we are speaking here of realities other than that of any ontological reality faith itself might be seen to constitute."[29]

The main point of interest here is that Chenderlin found it necessary to affirm a view of "memorial" *both* as actualization *and* as a "pointer" to God. Thus, these two positions may not represent competing options but may rather be complementary perspectives on the single, multi-faceted reality of the biblical concept of "memorial."

**Future Directions in a Mennonite Theology of the Lord's Supper**

What conclusions may be drawn about the significance of post-biblical traditions for understanding the Lord's Supper?

To begin, the controversial notion of the Supper being a "sacrifice" will deserve another look by Anabaptist theologians, when seen in light of Hoffman's view of the Supper functioning as a "pointer" to Jesus Christ. According to his notion of liturgical pointers, it would be entirely appropriate to speak of the elements of the bread and wine "re-presenting" the sacrifice of Jesus Christ to God, with a view to reminding God of his own essentially merciful nature, and beseeching that the mercy publicized in Jesus' sacrificial death be made effective in the here and now. This would in no sense constitute a repeated sacrifice — Christ's death was once and for all. But it would constitute a memorial to that sacrifice, which is seen to have an important role in the personal approach of the believer to God, at the very least by providing a request to which God desires and is able to respond.

In addition, the notion of the "real presence" of Christ in the Supper will require further reflection. Scholarly opinion is admittedly not unanimous in supporting Thurian's equation of the biblical concept of memorial with "actualization" or "re-presentation." Even for scholars who grant the validity of actualization in explicating the biblical concept, questions may remain about what it was the memorial actualized — a past event, an encounter with God, the promise of salvation, or something else.

Nevertheless, the possibility that the Lord's Supper "re-presents the presence of the risen Christ in the church" cannot be definitively excluded. If the symbolism of the Supper is seen to represent both Jesus Christ and the prayerful yearning of the congregation for union with its Lord (along lines

alluded to in the "bread of heaven" discourse in John 6); and if, as Chenderlin states, a central feature of "memorial" in both the OT and the NT is a personal approach to God[30]; and if the memorial of the Supper is a memorial to the living Lord and not a dead hero, it becomes very unclear why one would *not* speak of encountering Christ in the Supper. At the very least, the phrase "Do this in memorial of me" may not be understood to preclude the possibility of such a presence. Furthermore, once one affirms an encounter with Christ in the Supper, the questions of the nature of this presence and the relationship of this presence to the elements of the Supper are unavoidably raised. Does the resurrected Christ retain his humanity, and if so, can it ever be spoken of as separated from his divinity? If not, one must then affirm that any encounters with Christ in the Supper are an experience of the whole Christ, human and divine. Is it then possible to speak of Christ's glorified but still human flesh and blood being present in the Supper?

**Future Directions in the Role of Tradition in Mennonite Scholarship**

I affirm *both* the value of disciplined theological reflection *and* the necessity of this reflection to move, both linguistically and cognitively, beyond the content of the biblical texts themselves while remaining rooted in and accountable to them. This is what I believe the majority of authors within the history of the Christian "tradition" have sought to do, and it behooves us as Anabaptist-Mennonite scholars to become much more familiar with the avenues of questioning they have pursued. However, this affirmation raises the issue of distinguishing between faithful and unfaithful forms of tradition.

In discussing the reversal of opinion within the Christian church on the issue of violence around the time of Constantine, Yoder had this to say about identifying faithful tradition:

> A change has taken place which must be described as a reversal rather than an organic development. This case shows that when the issue is whether change has been faithful or unfaithful, *then* the reason the reformers challenge some usage or idea is not that it is not in the Scriptures, but that it is counter to the Scriptures; not that it is an ancient idea insufficiently validated by ancient texts, but that it is a later introduction invalidated by its contradicting the ancient message.[31]

In the instance examined in this paper, it appears as though that strand of Mennonite eucharistic theology which has understood "memorial" solely in terms of its horizontal aspect represents just such a later introduction, one that is invalidated by its contradicting an ancient biblical message. In this case, it seems that the "tradition" has preserved important biblical insights about the role of Jesus' self-instituted memorial for the community of faith.

But if the tradition of the church can sometimes function to preserve, rather than obfuscate, important biblical perspectives, how are we as Anabaptists to understand the role of tradition in our theological reflection? Karlstadt's view represents a denial of the Bible's own witness to ongoing revelation, and as such is inadequate. The WCC proposal is good as far as it goes, but fails to define criteria for distinguishing between faithful and unfaithful tradition. What of the Tridentine two source theory of revelation? Does the retention, in this particular case, of a version of the biblical understanding of memorial in the church's liturgy lend credence to the notion of a repository of orally-transmitted truths within the "apostolic" churches?

To this I would say no. However, I wonder whether there is not a need to take the reality of ecclesial cultures and traditions much more seriously, and the undocumented "information" such cultures and traditions may carry.

In the present case, it is widely acknowledged that the *lex credendi* of eucharistic theology was determined by the *lex orandi* of the liturgy, itself shaped by patterns of thought and worship inherited from Jewish and Hellenistic sources. Of course, the biblical materials themselves are the product of tradition, but perhaps in this instance the liturgy of the church retained a sense of the significance of the Lord's Supper which only now has become available to the tools of contemporary biblical scholarship.

**Conclusions**

I would largely affirm Yoder's grapevine "root and branch" model as an appropriately Anabaptist approach to tradition. It preserves the Anabaptist concern to be "a biblical people" without rejecting the possibility either of ongoing revelation or that ecclesial cultures may preserve important biblical perspectives by means of their accumulated traditions.

Consequently, what is required in the future of Anabaptist-Mennonite scholarship is a self-conscious commitment to seek to integrate the resources

of our own, and other, Christian traditions in our contemporary theological reflection. To some extent, this may require a shift from fundamental suspicion of non-Anabaptist ecclesial traditions to openness — perhaps even an openness limned with optimism. Such an openness requires a commitment to becoming thoroughly familiar with the resources which have been handed down to us, both within and outside of our particular movement. If space permitted, it would be fascinating to explore here the potential for fruitful interaction between the writings of sixteenth-century Anabaptists whose works point to something beyond a strictly "memorialist" understanding of the Supper, and those within the Roman Catholic Church who wrote of a "real presence" from within the symbolist stream of eucharistic theology. In these and other areas, only if we are familiar with the accumulated theology and liturgy of our own and other Christian communions shall we be able to gauge which branches of tradition need to be pruned, and which ones may be left as faithful, organic developments from the root of Scripture.

## Notes

[1] Günther Gassmann, ed., *Documentary History of Faith and Order: 1963-1993* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1993), 11.
[2] *Ibid.*, 13-14.
[3] *Ibid.*, 16.
[4] *Ibid.*, 11.
[5] John H. Yoder, "The Authority of Tradition," in *The Priestly Kingdom: Social Ethics as Gospel* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984), 67.
[6] *Ibid.*, 69.
[7] John Rempel, in *The Lord's Supper in Anabaptism* (Waterloo, ON: Herald Press, 1993), has provided a relatively detailed review of contemporary Mennonite articulations of the significance of the Lord's Supper; see esp. 205-209.
[8] Harold S. Bender, and C. Henry Smith, ed., *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, vol. I (Scottdale, PA: Mennonite Publishing House, 1955), 651.
[9] General Conference Mennonite Church, and Mennonite Church, *Confession of Faith in a Mennonite Perspective* (Waterloo, ON/Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1995), 50.
[10] Paul Bradshaw, "Anamnesis in Modern Eucharistic Debate," in Michael A. Signer, ed., *Memory and History in Christianity and Judaism* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 73.
[11] Theodor Gaster, *Passover: Its History and Traditions* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1962), 63. For the original see Mishnah, Pesah 10.5.

[12] Max Thurian, "The eucharistic memorial, sacrifice of praise and supplication," in Max Thurian, ed., *Ecumenical Perspectives on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1983), 91.
[13] Brevard S. Childs, *Memory and Tradition in Israel* (London: SCM Press, 1962), 74.
[14] Childs, 74-5.
[15] Robert L. Brawley, "Anamnesis and Absence in the Lord's Supper," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 20 (Winter 1990): 140-41.
[16] Markus Barth, *Rediscovering the Lord's Supper* (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1988).
[17] Ray C. Jones, "The Lord's Supper and the Concept of Anamnesis," *Word and World* 6.4 (1986): 441; R. T. Beckwith, "The Jewish Background to Christian Worship," in Cheslyn Jones et al., ed., *The Study of Liturgy* (London: Oxford University Press, 1992), 77; Fritz Chenderlin, *"Do This As My Memorial"* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982), 185; Richard J. Ginn, *The Present and the Past* (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1989), 24.
[18] Chenderlin, 121; Ray C. Jones, 435; and Robert A. D. Clancy, "The Old Testament Roots of Remembrance in the Lord's Supper," *Concordia Journal* 19 (January 1993): 37.
[19] Lawrence A. Hoffman, "Does God Remember? A Liturgical Theology of Memory," in Michael A. Signer, ed., *Memory and History in Christianity and Judaism* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 42.
[20] *Ibid.*, 53.
[21] *Ibid.*, 66.
[22] Chenderlin, *"Do This As My Memorial,"* 116.
[23] *Ibid.*, 71. [24] *Ibid.*, 198. [25] *Ibid.*, 240. [26] *Ibid.*, 248. [27] *Ibid.*, 261. [28] *Ibid.*, 248.
[29] *Ibid.*, 252. (For both of the immediately preceding quotations.)
[30] *Ibid.*, 92.
[31] Yoder, *The Priestly Kingdom*, 76.