



COVENANT
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Electronic Thesis & Dissertation Collection

J. Oliver Buswell Jr. Library
12330 Conway Road
Saint Louis, MO 63141

www.covenantseminary.edu/library

This document is distributed by Covenant Theological Seminary under agreement with the author, who retains the copyright. Permission to further reproduce or distribute this document is not provided, except as permitted under fair use or other statutory exception.

The views presented in this document are solely the author's.

A Who's Who of Eucharistic Memory:
How Old Testament Memorials Help Delineate
the Actor of the Remembering of
Ἀνάμνησις in 1 Corinthians 11:24–25

By
Owen Brown

A Project Submitted to
the Faculty of Covenant Theological Seminary
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Biblical & Theological Studies.

Saint Louis, Missouri

January 2025

A Who's Who of Eucharistic Memory:
How Old Testament Memorials Help Delineate
the Actor of the Remembering of
Ἀνάμνησις in 1 Corinthians 11:24–25

By
Owen Brown

A Project Submitted to
the Faculty of Covenant Theological Seminary
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Biblical & Theological Studies.

Graduation Date January 15, 2025

Dr. Robert Yarbrough
Faculty Advisor

Dr. David Chapman
Second Reader

Dr. David Chapman
Director of MABTS Program

Mr. Steve Jamieson
Library Director

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to ascertain whose remembering is indicated by ἀνάμνησις in 1 Cor. 11:24–25. Four options have been presented by past scholarship for the subject/actor of ἀνάμνησις: God the Father, the church, Jesus, or some mixture of these three options. This study adjudicates between these options by considering the ἀνάμνησις of 1 Cor. 11:24–25 in light of six semantically relevant Old Testament cultic memorials—the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread in Ex. 12:14 and 13:9; the memorial stones on Aaron’s garments in Ex. 28:12, 29 and 39:7; God’s memorial name in Ex. 3:15; the memorial stones from the Jordan in Josh. 4:7; the memorial portion of the grain offerings in Lev. 2:2, 9, and 16; and the memorial Psalm headings of Ps. 38:1 [37:1] and 70:1 [69:1]).

Each memorial is first considered in its Old Testament context and then compared with the letter of 1 Corinthians to evaluate its relevance in delineating the subject/actor of Paul’s ἀνάμνησις. The resulting determination is that while connections with the Passover were the strongest for Paul, the memorials sampled can meaningfully inform the discussion of who remembering Paul had in view through his portrayal of the Eucharist. The conclusion reached is that the connections between these relevant memorials to Paul’s ἀνάμνησις demonstrate that he conceived of a twofold if not a threefold remembrance in the Supper with God, man, and potentially even Jesus all as actors who remembered through the ἀνάμνησις of 1 Cor. 11:24–25.

Contents

Abbreviations	vi
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Ανάμνησις in Modern Scholarship.....	4
Actualization	4
Eschatology	7
The Object of Ανάμνησις.....	8
The Role of Εἰς	10
State of Scholarship	13
Historical Survey	13
Potential Options.....	15
First Corinthians Commentaries	17
Other Publications.....	25
Chapter 3 The Old Testament Memorial Texts	30
Delimiting the Semantic Range	30
Exodus 12:14; 13:9	35
Exodus 28:12, 29; 39:7 [LXX 36:14]	41
Exodus 3:15	47
Joshua 4:7.....	52
Leviticus 2:2, 9, 16.....	59
Psalms 38:1 [LXX 37:1]; 70:1 [69:1]	66
General Observations Concerning OT Memorials	73
Chapter 4 OT Memorials & Paul’s Eucharistic Ανάμνησις	75
The Subject of Paul’s Ανάμνησις	92

Chapter 5 Conclusion	95
Appendix Memory in the Old Testament	97
God Remembers.....	99
Israel Remembers.....	103
The Old Testament Conception of Memory	107
Bibliography	108

Abbreviations

BDAG	Bauer, Walter. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Revised and edited by Frederick William Danker, 3rd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BDB	Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. <i>The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon</i> . 1906. Reprinted, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010.
ESV	English Standard Version
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NETS	A New English Version of the Septuagint
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament

Chapter 1

Introduction

The meaning of ἀνάμνησις within Paul's repetition of the words of institution has been widely discussed within scholarly literature over the past seventy-five years. Since Joachim Jeremias's first presentation of the argument that this phrase referred to God's memory, there has been no scholarly consensus as to the subject/actor of ἀνάμνησις.¹ The phrase subject of ἀνάμνησις will be used in this study as a synonym to the phrase actor of ἀνάμνησις to refer to the one doing the remembering, not to the one being remembered. This phraseology is being employed to distinguish between the subject of memory (the rememberer) and the object of memory (the one remembered). This distinction of terms parallels the technical distinction in Greek as well as English grammar between a subjective genitive (where the genitive is the subject of the verbal noun) and the objective genitive (where the genitive is the object of the verbal noun).² It is my goal to determine whether the one doing the remembering of ἀνάμνησις in 1 Cor. 11:24–25 was God, man, Jesus, or some mixture of these three options through setting Paul's phrase εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν within the semantic realm of the Old Testament text.³

¹ Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 3rd ed., trans. Norman Perrin (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1966), 237–255.

² For the categories of subjective and objective genitive, see Daniel Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 112–119. As such phrases such as human memory, human remembrance, and the like appear throughout this thesis, they always refer to the nominal adjective, in this case human, as the one doing the remembering not as the one being remembered.

³ Throughout this study, I will use the terms humans, Christians, the church, God's people, and the Corinthians synonymously when speaking of potential subjects for remembrance. When referencing the NT, to stay consistent with scholarly usage of terms, God will be utilized to refer to the Father rather than Jesus. This is by no means a denial of Jesus's divinity or Jesus's, two doctrines to which I firmly hold.

In my first chapter, I will contextualize this pursuit within broader scholarly discussion regarding ἀνάμνησις in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. I will first consider other debated issues regarding ἀνάμνησις before summarizing the history and state of my question. This will be followed by a survey of how English language First Corinthians commentaries in the past fifty years conceive of the subject of ἀνάμνησις. This survey will evidence a pervasive consensus among commentators to see man as the actor of ἀνάμνησις. By exploring recent publications that have challenged this consensus, I will attempt to demonstrate that it needs to be reconsidered. At the same time, I will seek to show how these publications, while insightful in re-raising the question, invite a more detailed exploration into the OT text such as the one this study will provide.

In my second chapter, I will and analyze OT texts where ἀνάμνησις and its common synonym, μνημόσυνον, refer to cultic memorials. There are good reasons for this move to situate Paul's ἀνάμνησις within an OT background. It is scholarly well-attested.⁴ It makes semantic sense as the phrase εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν bears strong correlation to OT memorial formulations.⁵ Furthermore, it fits with Paul's pervasive use of the OT canon in his writings. Even so, it is beyond the scope of my work to prove such a context. Moreover, I am by no means seeking to deny the possibility that other contexts could also be salutary in the determination of ἀνάμνησις's subject. My goal is to extrapolate the implications of, rather than to prove, an OT background for the subject of ἀνάμνησις.

⁴ Robert A. D. Clancy, "The Old Testament Roots of Remembrance in the Lord's Supper," *Concordia Journal* 19, no. 1 (Jan 1993): 35–50; David Gregg, *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, GLS 5 (Bramcote, Nottinghamshire: Grove Books, 1976), among others.

⁵ Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, SPS 7 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 428; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 32 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 440. Collins and Fitzmyer both assert that this phrase was a modification of an OT memorial formula.

Rather than looking at each cultic OT memorial in detail, I sort OT memorials into six broad categories, selecting one text from each category for examination. I will study each of these six texts in turn, looking at them in both the MT and the LXX. I will have two goals as I consider these passages: first, to determine who was being prompted to remember through each memorial; and second, to set forth the context of each memorial so as to be able to understand its possible connections to Paul's ἀνάμνησις. After surveying the selected texts, I will briefly summarize a few of their shared characteristics before considering their individual relationships to 1 Corinthians.

In the final chapter, I will look at the relationship between each OT memorial sampled and 1 Cor. 11:24–25's ἀνάμνησις in light of the broader context of the letter. With each memorial, I will consider potential implications for whose remembering was referred to by Paul's use of ἀνάμνησις. After each memorial has been considered, I will summarize my findings and offer my conclusion as to the actor of Paul's ἀνάμνησις. My thesis is that the OT memorial backdrop of Paul's ἀνάμνησις demonstrates that he conceived of at least a bipartite action of remembrance with God and man remembering, if not a tripartite remembrance with God, man, and Jesus all as actors in the ἀνάμνησις of 1 Cor. 11:24–25.

Chapter 2

Ἀνάμνησις in Modern Scholarship

Ἀνάμνησις scholarship, especially since the middle of the last century, has swirled around issues of actualization, eschatology, the role of εἰς, the object of ἀνάμνησις, and the subject of ἀνάμνησις. As these are complicated and at times interrelated issues, a survey of scholarship on each issue will be given before narrowing in on the scholarship pertaining to the central question for this thesis, namely, who is the subject/actor of ἀνάμνησις. Hopefully this lay of the land will help readers contextualize the relation of what scholars believe on this issue to broader ἀνάμνησις scholarship.

Actualization

By far the most discussed topic when it comes to ἀνάμνησις is that of actualization. In his influential monograph *Memory and Tradition in Israel*, Brevard Childs argued that through remembrance, the past events of salvation history were made present to Israel.¹ As with God's own being, God's great past acts of deliverance could not be constrained to remain in the annals of history but dynamically confronted every subsequent generation.² While the historical particularities of the original event retained their once-for-all character, the "redemptive realities" of these events were experienced afresh by new Israelites.³ When Israel remembered the salvation that Yahweh wrought for them, they did not merely return to or identify with the

¹ Brevard S. Childs, *Memory and Tradition in Israel*, Studies in Biblical Theology 37 (London: SCM Press, 1962), 85.

² Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 83–84.

³ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 85.

past but encountered it in the present as a new event.⁴ For Childs, this actualization could be experienced either through memory or the cult, even being viewed by him as the goal of Israel's cultic life.⁵

Since the publication of *Memory and Tradition in Israel*, Childs' theory of actualization has won widespread acceptance.⁶ It has been applied quite readily by a plethora of scholars as a lens not only for understanding Israel's cult but also for conceptualizing the eucharistic ἀνάμνησις.⁷ This consensus has extended beyond mere scholarship into the halls of the church where it has served as a bridge for unprecedented ecumenical agreement regarding the meaning of the Supper.⁸ Both *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* and the Anglican-Roman Catholic *Agreed Statement* affirm that in the eucharistic memorial there is a true actualization of the past rather than a mere recollection or commemoration.⁹ Still, actualization in the Eucharist is not without

⁴ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 84.

⁵ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 76.

⁶ It should be noted that actualization or representation did not originate with Childs. It finds an earlier advocate in the work of Gregory Dix. See his *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 2nd ed. (London: Dacre Press, 1945), 161, and *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome, Bishop and Martyr*, 3rd ed., rev. Henry Chadwick (London: Routledge, 1992), 73.

⁷ The mapping on of "actualization" to ἀνάμνησις in the Eucharist is so widespread in scholarship since the 1960's that Clancy ("Roots of Remembrance," 35–36) even terms it "monolithic." Commentators who support actualization in 1 Cor. 11:24–25 include Paul Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2018); Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 32 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 441; Alan F. Johnson, *1 Corinthians*, IVPNTCS (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2004), 207; George T. Montague, S. M., *First Corinthians*, CCSS (Grand Rapids, MI: Backer Academic, 2011), 196.

⁸ Allen Verhey, "Remember, Remembrance," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman, (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 5:669.

⁹ "Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine 1971," Anglicancommunion.org. 1971. https://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/105215/ARCIC_I_Agreed_Statement_on_Eucharistic_Doctrine.pdf, section 5; *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Faith and Order Paper 111 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982), II.B.7; 1. My understanding of both the *Agreed Statement* and *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* is echoed in Paul Bradshaw, "Anamnesis in Modern Eucharistic Debate," in *Memory and History in Christianity and Judaism*, ed. Michael Alan Signer (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 79; Clancy, "Roots of Remembrance," 35–36; and Julie Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist: Contemporary Anglican Approaches* (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 14–18.

its challengers. Aelred Arnesen claims that such a theory has no basis in the semantics of ἀνάμνησις nor in its Semitic usage at the time of the New Testament's composition.¹⁰ Clancy likewise asserts that such a concept is absent from the biblical text and is more the product of modern imagination.¹¹ This is still very much a live debate with reputable scholars falling on both sides of the divide.¹²

While actualization has been the most dominant question in scholarship when it comes to Paul's employment of ἀνάμνησις in 1 Corinthians 11:24–25, it is only tangentially related to an attempt to determine the subject of ἀνάμνησις. For one, actualization has been variously conceived in ways that are amenable to a human subject, a divine subject, or a dual subject of ἀνάμνησις. For some, actualization refers to representing a past event such that it causes the effects of that event to become present to God. In this way, God is induced to remember His people and act on their behalf.¹³ For others, the emphasis is on the past event of salvation becoming present to God's people through a new redemptive encounter with them.¹⁴ Scholars that hold to this schema generally see God's people, and not God, as the subject of the Supper's remembrance.¹⁵ Still others conceive of actualization as the cultic occurrence wherein the

¹⁰Aelred Arnesen, "The Myth of Anamnesis," *Theology* 105, no. 828 (Winter 2002): 439.

¹¹ Clancy, "Roots of Remembrance," 49.

¹² Just consider the dissent of two of the biggest names when it comes to memory in the Old Testament, Childs, who is for actualization, and Willy Schottroff, who is against it. See Willy Schottroff, "זכר to remember," in *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, rev. ed., ed. Ernest Jenni and Claus Westermann, trans. Mark E. Biddle (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 1:387.

¹³ See Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 161; Jacek Froniewski, "Theological and Biblical Basis for Construing Eucharist as a Memorial to the Sacrifice of Christ," *Wrocławski Przegląd Teologiczny*, 29 no. 1 (2021): 152–153; *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry*, ILB.5; 7–8. It should be noted that this is directly contrary to Childs articulation. For Childs, there is no actualization when God is being prompted to remember events since all events are ever present to God (*Memory and Tradition*, 74).

¹⁴ This is Childs classic articulation (see, e.g., *Memory and Tradition*, 81–85).

¹⁵ See Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 440–441.

worshipper experiences God's acceptance of their sacrifice and His presence with them, culminating in "sacrificial communion with the deity."¹⁶ Indeed, this is only a small sampling of the wide diversity when it comes to what is meant by actualization.¹⁷ If any progress is to be made, therefore, into determining the subject of ἀνάμνησις, the issue of actualization will have to be left for future study.

Eschatology

Propositions regarding the eschatology entailed within the twofold repetition of ἀνάμνησις within 1 Cor. 11:24–25 are equally complex. It is widely recognized how integral the eschatological nature of God's remembrance of Jesus was for Joachim Jeremias's schema.¹⁸ For Jeremias, the point of the ἀνάμνησις of Jesus was to remind God of "the unfulfilled climax of the work of salvation" such that he would bring the parousia.¹⁹ Even so, some of those who have accepted his thesis that God is the one doing the remembering reject the eschatological connections he attached to it.²⁰ On the other hand, many have welcomed his eschatology while denying the possibility of God remembering in 1 Cor. 11:24–25.²¹ This is to say nothing of the

¹⁶ H. Eising, "זָכַר," in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, trans. David E Green (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980), 4:82.

¹⁷ Bradshaw ("Anamnesis in Modern Eucharistic Debate," 79–81) makes a similar point.

¹⁸ Bradshaw, "Anamnesis in Modern Eucharistic Debate," 79; D. B. Capes, "The Lord's Table: Divine or Human Remembrance?," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 30, no. 2 (Summer 2003): 201–202; Robert W. Jenson, *Visible Words: The Interpretation and Practice of the Christian Sacrament* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1978), 72.

¹⁹ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 251–255.

²⁰ Jenson (*Visible Words*, 72) believes that the reason Jeremias's argument for God as the one remembering has fared so poorly is because of the eschatology attached to it. Throughout this paper, phrases such as "divine remembrance," "divine memory," and "God remembering" are used to refer to God the Father as the one doing the remembering, not Jesus Christ. This is in no way to deny Christ's deity but rather is to align with the typical usage of terms in scholarship.

²¹ C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1968), 271.

diverse range of eschatological connections with remembrance that have since been proposed by more recent scholars.²² While such propositions are interesting and worthy of full consideration, the diverse responses to Jeremias's eschatology show that the eschatological schema adopted will not be determinative in answering the question at hand. As this issue has no direct correlation, therefore, with adjudicating who is doing the remembering in Paul's exposition of the Supper, it falls outside the scope of this study.

The Object of Ἀνάμνησις

Another issue, often related to those of actualization and eschatology, is what all about Jesus was being remembered when Paul used the term ἀνάμνησις. In the phrase Paul uses, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, the Greek possessive pronoun ἐμὴν is generally understood as being used in the place of an objective genitive.²³ Thus, this would make ἐμὴν (in English, "me") the object of the verbal noun ἀνάμνησιν that Paul employs.²⁴ Whether this is the correct way to understand ἐμὴν or whether it is being as a possessive adjective, likewise not necessary to delineate for this present inquiry.²⁵ In either case, the subject of memory should still be understood as Christ. But

²² See for example, Philip Kariatlis, "The Notion of Memorial and its Centrality for a Proper Understanding of the Eucharist," *Phronema* 13 (1998): 58–61; Menahem R. Macina, "The Jewish Background of the Eucharistic Memorial (Anamnesis)." Academia, trans. Peter Hocken, Academia, September 4th, 2021, https://www.academia.edu/4613409/The_Jewish_Background_to_the_Eucharistic_Anammnesis_Update_09_04_21_?auto=download, originally published as "Fonction liturgique et eschatologique de l'anamnèse eucharistique (Lc 22,19; 1 Co 11,24.25): Réexamen de la question à la lumière des Ecritures et des sources juives," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 102, no. 1 (1988): 10–18; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000) 880–881.

²³ Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, rev. and ed. Frederick William Danker, 3rd ed. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 323, §12.

²⁴ This is argued by Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 251 as well as Timothy A. Brookins and Bruce W. Longenecker, *1 Corinthians 10-16: A Handbook on the Greek Text*, BHGNT (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), 53.

²⁵ This alternate view, that is a possessive adjective, is expressed by Chenderlin, "Do This as My Memorial," §452–464.

while interpreters almost universally agree that Jesus and his salvific work is the object of the memory in view, there is disagreement regarding which aspects of his work should be considered.²⁶ Many want to extend this beyond Jesus's death alone to include at least his resurrection, if not his fuller salvific ministry.²⁷ For some, the memory of his institution of the cultic ritual of the Supper is also included alongside the memory of his death.²⁸ Arsenen, as well as Roy Ciampa and Brian Rosner, advocate that even more than being about the memory of Jesus's death, the Eucharist brings to remembrance Jesus Himself. Since Jesus is the resurrected Lord, eucharistic memory therefore would always include the resurrection.²⁹ On the other hand, it is still quite common to conceive of the primary object of memory as the event of Jesus's death even if his resurrection may still be in the periphery.³⁰ While this is an important issue, it unfortunately falls beyond the scope of the present inquiry. For the current purposes, it will suffice to say that the object of memory is Jesus himself and his salvific work, leaving open for discussion whether his death alone or his fuller salvific work is in view. This discussion should not be construed to exclude Jesus's people as a potential secondary object of remembrance. After

²⁶ Some have thought that Joachim Jeremias conceived of the object of memory as something other than Jesus. Im Seok Kang, for example, claims that Jeremias saw God's own judgment as the object of remembrance: "Meaning of Remembrance of Me in 1 Corinthians 11:23–27 in Light of Bakgolnanmang; A Korean Concept of Honor," *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 21, no. 1 (Feb 2018): 58. Timothy A. Brookins and Bruce W. Longenecker state that Jeremias believed that ἐμὴν was being used in place of a subjective genitive and thus made Jesus the subject of memory and humanity the object, *1 Corinthians 10–16: A Handbook on the Greek Text*, BHGNT (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), 53. But these are both misreadings of Jeremias. Jeremias clearly articulates that he believes ἐμὴν is being used in place of an objective genitive and argues definitively that Jesus is the object of memory (*Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 251).

²⁷ See, for example, Froniewski, "Eucharist as a Memorial," 158.

²⁸ Ellen Bradshaw Aitken, "τα δρώμενα και τα λεγόμενα: The Eucharistic Memory of Jesus's Words in First Corinthians," *Harvard Theological Review* 90, no. 4 (October 1997): 370.

²⁹ Arsenen, "The Myth of Anamnesis," 441; Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010), 551.

³⁰ Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 512; David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003), 548; Richard Hays, *First Corinthians*, IBCTP (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1997), 198–199.

all, since Jesus died for his church, when he and his death are remembered, it would make sense that the church for whom he died may be remembered through such remembrance.

The Role of Εἰς

The role of εἰς in 1 Cor. 11:24–25 is one final issue that should be noted. There are three general propositions for its role that have been set forth. The first, and perhaps the most common, is that it expresses purpose.³¹ The second, and probably the least common, is that it signifies manner.³² The final option is that it connotes the use for which an action is being performed or an object is being set forth.³³ This final option includes a subset wherein εἰς refers to the initial appointment of an action or object for a new use or end.³⁴

The first option, εἰς as expressing purpose, would limit the meaning of the noun ἀνάμνησις to the action of remembering. In the words of Clancy, if εἰς is taken as indicating purpose, the force would be “‘to make remember,’ even if the person remembering is ambiguous.”³⁵ If the second option is taken and εἰς denotes manner, the emphasis of ἀνάμνησις would again be on remembering. In this case, however, the subject of ἀνάμνησις would necessarily be limited to those performing the action.³⁶ This would restrict the subject of remembering to the human partakers of

³¹ BDAG, 290, §4e, f. Clancy, “Roots of Remembrance,” 46; Ellingworth and Hatton, *Translator’s Handbook*, 230–231; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 244–255.

³² Clancy, “Roots of Remembrance,” 46–47.

³³ BDAG, 290, §4d. Such an understanding seems to run throughout the work of Chenderlin, “‘Do This as My Memorial.’”

³⁴ One advocate of this particular view is Francis Giordano Carpinelli, “‘Do This as My Memorial’ (Luke 22:19): Lucan Soteriology of Atonement.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 61, no. 1 (1999): 77. It should be noted, however, that Carpinelli is dealing with the Lukan appearance of εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν rather than the Pauline one.

³⁵ Clancy, “Roots of Remembrance,” 46. Note that Ellingworth and Hatton (*Translator’s Handbook*, 230–231) hold to this option while arguing for a human subject for ἀνάμνησις whereas Jeremias holds to the same option (*Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 244–255) but opts for a divine subject.

³⁶ Clancy, “Roots of Remembrance,” 46–47.

the Supper. The final alternative, εἰς for use or end, would connote that the actions of the Eucharist were being performed for an ἀνάμνησις, that is as a memorial. This would in no way diminish the action entailed within said memorial (remembering), even if it would allow for a meaning of ἀνάμνησις that includes potential additional nuances. For the purposes of this study, it will not be necessary to delineate the best option for εἰς. Rather, what must be determined is whether being used to indicate manner (the second option) as opposed to being used either for purpose (the first option) or for use/end (the third option). As long as εἰς is being used in either to express purpose or use/end, any subject of memory is possible and the exploration can continue. However, if it is being used to indicated manner, this would necessarily make the church the subject of ἀνάμνησις, thus closing the question.

The evidence to support εἰς for manner is surprisingly slim. While εἰς for manner is attested in BDF, it is not even presented as an option in BDAG.³⁷ If this was the intended meaning, it would be odd that ἐν was not employed instead.³⁸ Clancy, one of the few proponents of this option as a real possibility, notes that it has a Semitic parallel in the role of the Hebrew preposition לְ.³⁹ Yet Clancy cites no instance where the לְ is employed in conjunction with the Hebrew terms that can be connected with ἀνάμνησις where this would be a possible meaning.⁴⁰ Indeed, one would be hard pressed to interpret any of these texts in this way. Parallels with the OT's usage of the לְ

³⁷ Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Revision of the ninth–tenth German Edition Incorporating Supplementary Notes of A. Debrunner*, trans. and ed. Robert W. Funk (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1961), §206 (1).

³⁸ BDAG, 330, §11.

³⁹ Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (1906; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010), 516, §51b; Clancy, “Roots of Remembrance,” 46–47.

⁴⁰ Clancy, “Roots of Remembrance,” 46–47. For the reasoning behind this selection of terms (זָכַר, זִכְרוֹן, and אֶזְכְּרָה), see pp. 26–30.

heavily weigh in favor of the final option, εἰς for use/end with the rendering of *for* or *as*.⁴¹ BDB itself notes how this usage parallels with the Greek εἰς.⁴² Such a rendering also maps far more naturally onto most of the OT semantic parallels to εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.⁴³ Furthermore, BDAG notes that ποιέω is one of the verbs that this usage of εἰς regularly occurs with, even listing 1 Cor. 11:24 as an example of such usage.⁴⁴

The evidence for the first option, εἰς for purpose, likewise is much stronger than that of εἰς for manner. BDAG cites the Lukan appearance of εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν as an example of such usage as well as two of the three instances of εἰς μνημόσυνον in the NT (Mt 26:13; Mk 14:9).⁴⁵ In each of these cases, BDAG suggests that what is indicated is an action done “*in memory of someone*.”⁴⁶ This would fit quite well with the context in 1 Cor. 11:24–25. Indeed, even parallels with OT memorial texts are stronger for this option than for manner, as there are three texts where a parallel usage of the ἵ can be found.⁴⁷ In summary, the NT textual considerations, the OT semantic parallels, and the secondary literature all weigh heavily against taking εἰς as denoting manner. It would appear, therefore, that in 1 Cor. 11:24–25 εἰς either indicates purpose or use/end.

⁴¹ Carpinelli, ““Do This as My Memorial,”” 77.

⁴² BDB, 512, §4.

⁴³ For the reasoning behind the selection of OT parallels, see pp. 26–34. Interestingly, this usage of the ἵ appears in the MT in seven of these important OT texts (Ex. 12:14; 13:9; 28:12, 29; 30:16; Lev. 24:7; Josh. 4:7). In six of these seven, the LXX lacks the preposition εἰς. This perhaps could indicate that εἰς is indeed optional in such memorial texts where a memorial is being appointed. This potentially further justifies my decision to include as part of the list of texts for exploration OT passages where εἰς is not present.

⁴⁴ BDAG, 290, §4d.

⁴⁵ BDAG, 290, §4f.

⁴⁶ BDAG, 290, §4f.

⁴⁷ Namely, ἵ with the infinitive construct to denote purpose (BDB, §7a). These cases are Ps. 37:1 (38:1); 69:1 (70:1); Isa. 66:3.

This means that the question of whose memory ἀνάμνησις refers to cannot be answered through reference to the preposition which precedes it.

State of Scholarship

Only now that these necessary questions have been answered and clarifications made can an approach be made to the main problem for consideration. A brief tour through historical scholarship on this issue will help set the stage from which the state of its current scholarship can be best understood.

Historical Survey

In the early twentieth century, it was commonplace for scholars to assume a solely human subject of ἀνάμνησις in 1 Cor. 11:24–25.⁴⁸ That notion was challenged, however, by a few influential publications in the late 1940's. The first of these was Gregory Dix's *The Shape of the Liturgy*, wherein Dix first made the proposition that the remembrance of the Supper had a divine subject.⁴⁹ Just one year later, Nils Dahl gave a lecture at Oslo University in 1946, since published in English as "Anamnesis: Memory and Commemoration in Early Christianity," which proposed that ἀνάμνησις in the Supper had a twofold meaning.⁵⁰ The first of these was that Christians were to remember Jesus through the Supper, in line with mainline thinking at the time.⁵¹ The

⁴⁸ John Reumann, *The Supper of the Lord: The New Testament, Ecumenical Dialogues, and Faith and Order on Eucharist* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1985), 27–28.

⁴⁹ Gregory Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, 243.

⁵⁰ Nils Alstrup Dahl, "Anamnesis: Memory and Commemoration in Early Christianity," in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976), 22–23.

⁵¹ Dahl, "Anamnesis," 22.

second, however, was that the Supper recalled and proclaimed the sacrifice of Christ before God.⁵² Dahl's assertion here can reasonably be interpreted as a suggestion that the Supper stimulated dual remembering, divine and human.⁵³

Still, it was a third publication, that of Joachim Jeremias's *Eucharistic Words of Jesus* in 1949, that truly changed the landscape of this question. Jeremias situated εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν within a Palestinian context, arguing that it fit into an established category of Palestinian memorial formulae.⁵⁴ He sought to demonstrate this connection linguistically on the basis of the parallel relation of εἰς ἀνάμνησιν with εἰς μνημόσυνον as well as with the Hebrew לְזָכְרוֹ.⁵⁵ He found evidence of memorial formulations in Jewish literature with the phrases εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, εἰς μνημόσυνον, and לְזָכְרוֹ in the areas of the cult, liturgy and prayers, ritual language, tomb inscriptions, and donations connected to the synagogue and the temple.⁵⁶ In his survey of each of these areas, he discovered a preponderance of evidence for a divine subject of remembrance in OT literature in comparison to texts with a human subject.⁵⁷ Within the LXX, Jeremias argued that while in secular contexts a human subject for memory was somewhat common, within religious contexts God was most often the subject.⁵⁸ In these cases, the intended effect was that

⁵² Dahl, "Anamnesis," 22–23.

⁵³ While Dahl does not use make explicit the divine remembering with regards to the Eucharist, it seems likely that he is implying it. A case for such a reading is strengthened significantly when considering that early in this same essay, he explicitly mentions Hebrew cultic ceremonies, festivals, and rituals as having the function of invoking dual act of remembering with God and Israel as actors ("Anamnesis," 14). Throughout this paper, when used in the context of the Eucharist, the phrase "dual remembering" refers to the memory God the Father and man, and, when used in the context of the OT, it refers to the memory of Yahweh and man.

⁵⁴ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 244–245.

⁵⁵ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 246.

⁵⁶ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 244–246.

⁵⁷ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 244–246.

⁵⁸ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 247.

Israel would represent something to God so that God would remember them mercifully.⁵⁹

Jeremias saw analogues of such a formulation in the usage of the New Testament, most particularly in Paul's exposition of the Supper in 1 Corinthians.⁶⁰ For this reason, he proposed that the sole subject of ἀνάμνησις in 1 Cor. 11:24–25 was God, even translating εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν as “that God *may* remember me (italics original).”⁶¹

Potential Options

Many since have taken issue with Jeremias's selection of texts and the methodology of his study.⁶² Still, the impact of his work is undeniable.⁶³ In many ways, it is a live question whose memory ἀνάμνησις has in view. Martin Soards presents three options: Christians remember Jesus, God remembers Christ, or Christ remembers his disciples.⁶⁴ Charles Talbert expands this list to four: humans remembering Jesus's death, God remembering Jesus's death, Christ remembering his own death, or some mixture of each of these earlier three.⁶⁵

John Reumann offers an accurate assessment of the state of scholarship when he says, “the meaning of anamnesis... in biblical studies... hovers between the two senses exhibited in

⁵⁹ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 248.

⁶⁰ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 251; 255.

⁶¹ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 255.

⁶² Carpinelli finds his selection of texts and analysis of them inadequate (“Do This as My Memorial,” 75). Alan R. Millard believes that while Jeremias's argumentation is founded on an analysis of זָכַר, Jeremias's has errors in his methodology and his findings: “Covenant and Communion in First Corinthians,” in *Apostolic History and the Gospel*, ed. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970), 245–246.

⁶³ Bradshaw, “Anamnesis in Modern Eucharistic Debate,” 74; Capes, “The Lord's Table,” 204; John Reumann, *Supper of the Lord*, 29.

⁶⁴ Martin Soards, *1 Corinthians*, NIBC (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999), 240. Soards abstains from voicing his own opinion on the topic.

⁶⁵ Charles Talbert, *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (New York, NY: Crossroad, 1989), 77–78.

Psalm 111: (a) God ‘has caused his wonderful works to be remembered’ *in his congregation* where thanks and praise are given, and (b) ‘*He* is ever mindful of His covenant’ (111:4–5) (italics original).”⁶⁶ Such a bipolarity, however, is perhaps unwarranted. Reumann himself seems to indicate that there might be a possibility of reconciling these two meanings.⁶⁷ Paul Bradshaw goes further, deeming such a harsh alternative between two exclusive poles “a false dichotomy.”⁶⁸

Indeed, while the majority still favors a solely human remembering, a minority trend has grown of scholars who eschew such exclusivity regarding the subject of ἀνάμνησις in favor of a dual remembering (God’s and man’s).⁶⁹ This new movement in scholarship has tended to highlight God’s remembrance, rather than Christ’s, as it is a still far smaller minority of scholars who see Jesus as a valid subject for ἀνάμνησις.⁷⁰ Jeremias’s own position wherein God alone is viewed as the subject has also been surpassed in numbers by this new minority.⁷¹ This leaves four camps into which scholars can be grouped: the majority camp, who take ἀνάμνησις as referring to man’s remembrance alone, the growing minority, who see in it connotations of dual

⁶⁶ Reumann, *Supper of the Lord*, 33.

⁶⁷ Reumann, *Supper of the Lord*, 33–41.

⁶⁸ Bradshaw, “Anamnesis in Modern Eucharistic Debate,” 76.

⁶⁹ Examples of scholars within this new movement include those listed in the following sections, “First Corinthians Commentaries” and “Other Publications,” as well as John H. McKenna, “Eucharist and Memorial,” *Worship* 79, no. 6 (Nov 2005): 504–522; Ray Carlton Jones Jr., “The Lord’s Supper and the Concept of Anamnēsis,” *Word & World* 6, no. 4 (1986): 434–445.

⁷⁰ For the lack of traction of Jesus as the one whose remembering ἀνάμνησις refers to, one needs to look no farther than the lack of mention of this position in both Reumann (*Supper of the Lord*, 27–34) and Bradshaw (“Anamnesis in Modern Eucharistic Debate,” 75–76). Kang (“Remembrance of Me,” 59) and Talbert (*Reading Corinthians*, 77–78) are the only examples I came across of scholars who clearly articulated Christ a subject of ἀνάμνησις. It is also possible to see this interpretation in Macina (“Eucharistic Memorial,” 7) and Sykes (Eucharist as Anamnesis, 117–118) but it is less definite in their cases.

⁷¹ While I found many sources advocating for dual remembrance, the only scholars I discovered after 1965 who affirmed Jeremias’s initial proposition was Capes, “The Lord’s Table,” 209.

remembering (God's and man's), those following Jeremias, who see God as the sole subject of ἀνάμνησις, and the small minority, who include Jesus as an actor of ἀνάμνησις, some of whom advance a tripartite subject of memory (God's, Jesus's, and man's).

First Corinthians Commentaries

Those in favor of a human subject remain the dominant majority despite the considerable advancement of alternative propositions.⁷² A survey of English commentaries on First Corinthians in the past fifty years will make this evident.⁷³ There seem to be two main reasons that commentators interpret ἀνάμνησις in vv. 24–25 as human remembrance, namely its perceived Passover background and the surrounding context of the passage, particularly the reference to proclamation in vv. 26–27. It is common, however, to assert that the church is the subject with no consideration of another alternative.

Roy Harrisville and David Garland are perfect examples of assuming a human subject of memory as neither mentions the possibility that the actor of the ἀνάμνησις could be anyone but the church. They both presume a human subject, each classifying ἀνάμνησις in terms of imitating and participating in Christ's self-giving death.⁷⁴ Leon Morris likewise asserts that ἀνάμνησις speaks of the people of God calling to mind Christ, putting the emphasis on Christ's suffering.⁷⁵

⁷² Kariatlis, "The Notion of Memorial," 56; Soards, *1 Corinthians*, 240.

⁷³ The selection of only First Corinthians commentaries, thus excluding any scholars working in the parallel Lukan text, has been selected given the narrow goal of this project to only determine whose remembering was referred to by ἀνάμνησις in 1 Cor 11:24–25 and not in Lk 22:19.

⁷⁴ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 548; Roy A. Harrisville, *1 Corinthians*, ACNT (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1987), 198. It should be noted that Garland mentions the work of Jeremias when it comes to the object remembered. Garland argues that what is remembered is Christ's crucified body, which he asserts is "contra Jeremias" (548). He does not make clear, however, what he thinks Jeremias views as the object.

⁷⁵ Leon Morris, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC 7, Old Series (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1985), 158.

For each of these three commentators, their perception of the human action in memory is strengthened significantly by its potential connection with καταγγέλλετε in v. 26.⁷⁶ Unlike Harrisville and Garland, Morris does hint at an awareness of proposals for divine memory in his discussion of καταγγέλλετε in which he denies that proclamation could refer to any presentation of Jesus to God.⁷⁷

Such a connection is equally central for PHEME Perkins in her description of ἀνάμνησις as a human commemoration of Jesus's death.⁷⁸ Citing Joseph Fitzmyer, she claims that the proclamation of the Lord's death interprets Paul's twofold repetition of ἀνάμνησις.⁷⁹ She also provides further reasoning for interpreting ἀνάμνησις as the Corinthians' memory by noting that they "might have understood the remembrance as the institution of a cultic meal honoring the Lord."⁸⁰ Perkins does not make clear whether she is referring to a Hellenistic cultic meal or a Jewish one, but the former seems more likely.

Other commentators reach the conclusion of a human subject through connections with Jewish and Old Testament backgrounds. Victor Furnish, for example, arrives at a human subject of ἀνάμνησις by placing it within the category of actualization (which he finds paralleled in the cult of ancient Israel).⁸¹ He identifies the ἀνάμνησις of the Supper as the community's remembrance of Christ's death which causes the effects of the past to become present.⁸² This, per

⁷⁶ Harrisville, *1 Corinthians*, 199; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 548; Morris, 159.

⁷⁷ Morris, *1 Corinthians*, 159.

⁷⁸ PHEME Perkins, *First Corinthians*, PCNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012), 144.

⁷⁹ Perkins, *First Corinthians*, 144.

⁸⁰ Perkins, *First Corinthians*, 144.

⁸¹ Victor Paul Furnish, *The Theology of the First Letter to the Corinthians*, NTT (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 82.

⁸² Furnish, *First Letter to the Corinthians*, 82.

Furnish, is intimately linked to its proclamation of Christ's death through the eating and drinking of the ritual meal.⁸³

Many other commentators are even more explicit in situating their perceptions of the human subject of ἀνάμνησις within the context of the Passover as a memorial meal. This is the case both with commentators that see the function of memory as actualization, as with J. Paul Sampley, Alan Johnson, and George Montague, as well as those like Ciampa and Rosner who define it in terms more of meditation and proclamation.⁸⁴ Paul Gardner, for example, calls the Passover memorial “a time for remembering,” placing the focus only on Israel's remembrance.⁸⁵ As the Passover is the context for the Supper, Gardner believes this makes the church the subject for ἀνάμνησις in 1 Corinthians as well.⁸⁶ Thomas Schreiner likewise identifies ἀνάμνησις a regular remembrance of Jesus's death by his disciples in the same vein of Israel's remembrance of the Passover.⁸⁷ It is notable that Schreiner also cites Lev. 24:7 and Num. 10:10 in support of his interpretation, even though both of these passages are places where God's remembrance is in view.⁸⁸ Schreiner is not the only commentator who expands ἀνάμνησις's OT background beyond the Passover. Indeed, Montague, Gardner, and Andrew Naselli all include the covenant renewal meal as another backdrop.⁸⁹ Still, this neither excludes their perception of the Passover's

⁸³ Furnish, *First Letter to the Corinthians*, 83.

⁸⁴ Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to the Corinthians*, 551; Johnson, *1 Corinthians*, 207; Montague, *1 Corinthians*, 196–198; J. Paul Sampley, “The First Letter to the Corinthians,” in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, ed. Leander E. Keck et al., 10 (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2002), 935.

⁸⁵ Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 510.

⁸⁶ Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 510–511.

⁸⁷ Thomas R. Schreiner, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC 7, New Series (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2018), 244–245.

⁸⁸ Schreiner, *1 Corinthians*, 244–245.

⁸⁹ Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 447–449; Montague, *1 Corinthians*, 196–197; Andrew David Naselli, “1 Corinthians,” in *The ESV Expository Commentary*, Volume 10: *Romans–Galatians* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2020), 324; 327–328.

centrality nor deters them from interpreting ἀνάμνησις's subject as Christians.⁹⁰ This can be seen explicitly in Naselli, who claims that in Paul's exposition of the Eucharist as a covenant meal, ἀνάμνησις refers to the church remembering the exodus accomplished by Jesus just as Israel before them remembered the initial Exodus.⁹¹ None of these particular commentators mention the possibility of a divine or dual subject for ἀνάμνησις, even though Gardner relies on the work of Jeremias for the Supper's Passover context and Montague for eschatology.⁹²

Fitzmyer, who also asserts that the Passover was the conceptual backdrop for the Paul's ἀνάμνησις, is more explicit in his rejection of divine remembrance. In his words, "the purpose of the *anamnēsis* directive is not a reminder for God, but for human beings."⁹³ It is worth mentioning that Fitzmyer argues for the Passover as the exclusive conceptual backdrop over against Old Testament memory language in general, Hellenistic memorials, and Jewish prayer formulas.⁹⁴ Still, he adds that there is also a semantic background to be considered, finding in the LXX's εἰς ἀνάμνησιν (Lev 24:7; Ps. 37:1; 69:1; Wis 16:6) a strong linguistic parallel to εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.⁹⁵ Like Schreiner, however, he does not draw out the implications of this in his exegesis. In his final analysis, Fitzmyer claims that ἀνάμνησις in vv. 24–25 entails representation and proclamation as its two key elements, both of which should be viewed in human terms.⁹⁶

⁹⁰ Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 510; Montague, *1 Corinthians*, 196–198; Naselli, "1 Corinthians," 324; 327–328.

⁹¹ Naselli, "1 Corinthians," 324; 327–328.

⁹² Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 510; Montague, *1 Corinthians*, 197–198.

⁹³ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 440.

⁹⁴ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 440.

⁹⁵ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 440.

⁹⁶ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 441; 445.

Fitzmyer is not the only commentator who is explicit in his refutation of a divine subject. Jerome Murphy–O’Conner mentions Jeremias’ interpretation directly and rejects it as “without foundation,” citing an earlier work by Douglas Jones.⁹⁷ He argues that while Jeremias could not conceive of the disciples forgetting Jesus, the remembrance in view is not a mere recollection but an incorporation into the present and future missiological work of Christ.⁹⁸ As such, Paul’s call for human memory was indeed necessary.⁹⁹ Paul Ellingworth and Howard Hatton are equally forthright. While they hold that ἀνάμνησις has the sense of “a memorial or reminder,” they deny the possibility of such a reminder having a Godward referent.¹⁰⁰ They even go so far as to suggest translating εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν as “to make you remember me,” directly contrary to Jeremias’s earlier proposed translation.¹⁰¹

Hans Conzelmann, like Hatton and Ellingworth, holds that Jeremias’s case for a divine subject of ἀνάμνησις “is in contradiction to the plain wording” of the text.¹⁰² He finds the passages mentioned by Jeremias thoroughly unconvincing, especially in light of the works of Douglas Jones and Hans Kosmala.¹⁰³ Anthony Thiselton also disallows divine remembrance, largely on the basis of Conzelmann’s examination of Jeremias’s thesis.¹⁰⁴ Thiselton finds later

⁹⁷ Jerome Murphy–O’Conner, *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2009), 210; Douglas Jones, “Ἀνάμνησις in the LXX and the Interpretation of 1 Cor. XI. 25,” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 6, no. 2 (Oct 1955): 183–191.

⁹⁸ Murphy–O’Conner, *Keys to First Corinthians*, 210.

⁹⁹ Murphy–O’Conner, *Keys to First Corinthians*, 210.

¹⁰⁰ Paul Ellingworth and Howard Hatton, *A Translator’s Handbook on Paul’s First Letter to the Corinthians: Helps for Translators* (New York, NY: United Bible Societies, 1985), 230.

¹⁰¹ Ellingworth and Hatton, *Translator’s Handbook*, 230.

¹⁰² Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, trans. James W. Leitch, ed. George W. MacRae, S. J. (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1975), 198–199.

¹⁰³ Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 199.

¹⁰⁴ Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 882.

works such as Chenderlin's which advocate for the possibility of dual remembrance to be similarly unconvincing.¹⁰⁵ He prefers instead to view remembrance as a human activity whereby Christians identify with Christ and his work on the cross.¹⁰⁶ While this does involve an acknowledgment of guilt for Jesus's death which has some aspect of invoking God's memory, this would only happen in a derivative sense.¹⁰⁷

Simon Kistemaker and Richard Hays are two commentators that are less emphatic in their rejection of divine remembrance. Kistemaker allows for an "objective and subjective" interpretation of the ἀνάμνησις command.¹⁰⁸ Objectively, it is a prayer for God to remember Christ, his messiah, while subjectively it is a call for the church to remember Christ's death.¹⁰⁹ Hays notes that it is much debated whether ἀνάμνησις refers to the memory of Jesus coming up before God or the church remembering Jesus.¹¹⁰ He even goes so far as leaving both possibilities open in the Lukan usage of the phrase.¹¹¹ However, when it comes to 1 Cor. 11:24–25, Hays rejects a divine subject for remembrance and Kistemaker is noncommittal. Hays especially ties his repudiation of divine remembrance to the proclamation in vv. 26–27. For him, the goal of the Supper as an ἀνάμνησις was to remind the gathered worshipers of Jesus through proclaiming his death.¹¹² This too, Hays claims, is consonant with the Passover wherein the emphasis is on

¹⁰⁵ Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 881.

¹⁰⁶ Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 880–881.

¹⁰⁷ Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 881.

¹⁰⁸ Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993), 395.

¹⁰⁹ Kistemaker, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 395.

¹¹⁰ Hays, *First Corinthians*, 198.

¹¹¹ Hays, *First Corinthians*, 198–199.

¹¹² Hays, *First Corinthians*, 198–199.

human remembrance.¹¹³ Gordon Fee presents a similar case for a human subject based on its context within Corinthians, noting that its setting in Paul's letter is quite different than that of in Jesus's original words in Luke.¹¹⁴ In this way, each of these commentators is like the older commentator C. K. Barrett who allowed for ἀνάμνησις including an element of divine memory in an earlier stage of the tradition but found it lacking in Paul.¹¹⁵ It is also worth mentioning that Fee identifies Old Testament memorials as a background for Paul's ἀνάμνησις. He understands the point of said memorials to have been for Israel to erect some physical object that would aid in their continual remembrance of a past event.¹¹⁶ Even so, Fee does not exclude divine remembrance completely from 1 Cor. 11:24–25 as do most other commentators, though he only includes it in a subsidiary role.¹¹⁷

It would appear that within the English language commentaries of the past fifty years surveyed, Charles Talbert and Raymond F. Collins are the only commentators who truly present alternatives to an exclusively human subject for ἀνάμνησις.¹¹⁸ After laying out the three main potential subjects (God, man, or both), Talbert remarks that all three have backgrounds in Jewish and Christian writings.¹¹⁹ Unlike many other commentators, he believes that the mention of proclaiming Jesus's death in the immediate context (v. 26) does not necessitate an exclusively

¹¹³ Hays, *First Corinthians*, 199.

¹¹⁴ Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, rev ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2014), 613.

¹¹⁵ Barrett, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 271.

¹¹⁶ Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 612.

¹¹⁷ Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 612.

¹¹⁸ The intention of this survey is to provide all the major English language commentaries. Yet, even so, it would be too bold to say that there could have been no other major English language commentaries on 1 Corinthians than the ones listed here.

¹¹⁹ Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 76–78.

human subject.¹²⁰ For these reasons, Talbert thinks that viewing ἀνάμνησις as a reminder with a tripartite subject is preferable (Jesus, God, and man).¹²¹ Raymond F. Collins, in his case for dual remembrance, sets the Lord's Supper in the Jewish tradition of memory as a cultic ritual with Palestinian roots.¹²² In this tradition, remembering was first a human remembering of God's saving events which in turn was a remembering of God Himself.¹²³ Yet, such human remembrance always also had the function of providing a reminder to God.¹²⁴ In this way, the subject of remembrance in Israelite worship was equally God and man. Since this is what Collins considers the background for Paul's ἀνάμνησις, it is no surprise then that when it comes to 1 Corinthians, Collins locates the subject of remembrance as both God and man.¹²⁵

One final commentator is worth citing. William Baker attempts to take a different tack, identifying ἀνάμνησις as a reference to an objective ritual that is both the remembrance and proclamation of the Supper.¹²⁶ While the Supper would promote human recollection of Christ's suffering, for Baker the eucharistic reenactment of breaking the bread and drinking the wine constituted the remembrance.¹²⁷ Even still, since Baker makes no mention of the possibility of divine remembrance as part of this objective ritual, it seems his position is somewhat similar to that of those who advocate for Christians as the subject of ἀνάμνησις.

¹²⁰ Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 78.

¹²¹ Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 78.

¹²² Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 428.

¹²³ Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 428.

¹²⁴ Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 428.

¹²⁵ Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 428.

¹²⁶ William Baker, "1 Corinthians," in *Cornerstone Biblical Commentary*, ed. Philip W. Comfort, et al., 15 (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 2009), 156.

¹²⁷ Baker, "1 Corinthians," 156.

A few observations can be drawn in reviewing this examination of First Corinthians commentaries over the past fifty years. It is perhaps surprising that none of the commentators considered take Jeremiah's original approach of identifying God as the exclusive subject for ἀνάμνησις. Indeed, only two commentaries truly hold to alternative presentations of its subject. Seven commentaries are explicit in their rejection of an alternate subject of memory (God or Jesus), whereas eleven do not even mention it as an option.¹²⁸ Fourteen commentaries are adamant that the background of the phrase comes from the Jewish milieu.¹²⁹ Many of them place peculiar emphasis on the OT writings, especially regarding the Passover, as the most important Jewish context for Paul's remembrance language. Finally, ten commentators make the probability of a manward direction for proclamation in v. 26 definitive of the subject of ἀνάμνησις in vv. 24–25. Taking these results together, it is manifest that the consensus in First Corinthians commentaries over the past fifty years is that subject of ἀνάμνησις refers to God's people and not to God.

Other Publications

While outside of a few exceptions, commentaries from the past half-century view the subject of ἀνάμνησις as the church, over the same period a handful of journal articles and one PhD thesis have advanced the possibility of the inclusion of God as a subject for ἀνάμνησις in 1 Corinthians. A significant number of these articles found their arguments on the connection

¹²⁸ Gordon Fee, C. K. Barrett, Leon Morris, and William Baker's commentaries are all excluded from this reckoning. Fee's, since he does not totally exclude divine remembrance even if he heavily favors human remembrance, Barrett's, since he does not fit within the given timeframe, Baker's, since he does not strictly hold to a human subject, and Morris's, since he hints at divine remembrance as an alternative but does not explicitly mention it.

¹²⁹ This count does not include commentators such as Baker, who see the Passover or other such Jewish rites as the background for the Supper in general but fail to tie it to the meaning of ἀνάμνησις in their analysis.

between Paul's usage and references to memorials within Jewish literature, particularly the Old Testament. These publications highlight an opportunity to revisit the general scholarly consensus regarding the subject of ἀνάμνησις through a further exploration into the memorial theme. A brief survey of the methodologies and conclusions of a few of these sources will elucidate this opportunity with even greater clarity.

Fritz Chenderlin, in his 1982 PhD thesis, argues that the best translation for εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν is "Do this as my memorial."¹³⁰ He prefers such a translation in that it leaves open all the potentialities of memorial connotations in understanding the phrase while leaving the subject of remembrance ambiguous.¹³¹ For Chenderlin, God's remembrance is just as in focus in 1 Cor. 11:24–25 as is human remembrance. He reaches this conclusion through an exploration of the memorial material available to Paul, including the LXX, Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Greek literature, Qumran writings, and other New Testament texts.¹³² After exploring the context of 1 Corinthians, Chenderlin concludes that ἀνάμνησις in 11:24–25 is distinctly cultic and can be seen in light of Jewish cultic memorials.¹³³ He notes the paschal sacrifice, the ἱλαστήριον, the sin-offering, and ransom as various analogues for Jesus's death, each of which he expounds as having memorial significance.¹³⁴ His exploration covers the broad scope of memory in the Jewish tradition, spending time on conceptual rather than linguistic analogues for εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. The results of his study are quite insightful in expounding the implications of setting

¹³⁰ Fritz Chenderlin, *"Do This as My Memorial": The Semantic and Conceptual Background and Value of 'Ανάμνησις in 1 Cor. 11:24, 25*, *Analecta Biblica* 99 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982), §3.

¹³¹ Chenderlin, *"Do This as My Memorial,"* §6; 466.

¹³² Chenderlin, *"Do This as My Memorial,"* §179–335.

¹³³ Chenderlin, *"Do This as My Memorial,"* §449.

¹³⁴ Chenderlin, *"Do This as My Memorial,"* §390–413.

ἀνάμνησις against a memorial backdrop for determining its subject. Given his broadness in scope, however, Chenderlin is often quite brief when it comes to his exegesis of key passages and exploration of OT linguistic connections to Paul's ἀνάμνησις. While he mentions that Jewish cultic memorials are often signaled in the LXX by the term μνημόσυνον, he does not explore this connection directly.¹³⁵ Much of this is perhaps only natural, since Chenderlin's methodology is a conceptual one rather than a linguistic one.¹³⁶ While this should not be considered a flaw in his study, it surely leaves a gap in scholarship. Thus, while the results of Chenderlin's thesis are quite promising, they invite a tailored semantic exploration into Jewish memorial literature as a necessary next step.

A glance at scholarly work since Chenderlin's thesis exhibits that such a semantic exploration is still necessary. Some more recent studies have reached similar conclusions regarding the meaning of ἀνάμνησις but have been too brief in their treatment to further his research. Philip Kariatlis, for example, posits that the Eucharist was the culmination of the Jewish tradition of memorial meals.¹³⁷ Given this background, he affirms Jeremias's proposal that ἀνάμνησις includes a divine subject.¹³⁸ Like Chenderlin, he goes on to reject the exclusivity of Jeremias's proposal, arguing for an equal balance of divine and human remembrance in the Eucharist.¹³⁹ Yet Kariatlis is too brief to do any real exegetical work in the text.

Other articles, such as those by Froniweski and Clancy, do provide a real advancement of scholarship while by no means comprehensive and thus underlining the need for a more detailed

¹³⁵ Chenderlin, *“Do This as My Memorial,”* §449.

¹³⁶ Carpineli notes this as well (*“Do This as My Memorial,”* 79–80).

¹³⁷ Kariatlis, *“The Notion of Memorial and its Centrality for a Proper Understanding of the Eucharist,”* 55.

¹³⁸ Kariatlis, *“The Notion of Memorial,”* 56.

¹³⁹ Kariatlis, *“The Notion of Memorial,”* 56–57.

approach.¹⁴⁰ Jacek Froniewski argues that זָכְרוֹן is the Hebrew semantic equivalent to the Greek ἀνάμνησις.¹⁴¹ He briefly reviews a few relevant appearances of Old Testament memorials within the cult, before zeroing in on the Passover.¹⁴² For Froniewski, the Passover was a memorial wherein the past of the Exodus becomes present to both God and his people as a place where God meets man.¹⁴³ He posits that Paul's eucharistic ἀνάμνησις came from this tradition and refers to the institution of such a memorial.¹⁴⁴ He holds that a dual subject for remembrance is part and parcel to ἀνάμνησις being a memorial, stating that Jeremias was right to point out that God remembers in vv. 24–25 while adding that the church remembers as well.¹⁴⁵ That Froniewski puts more stress on divine remembrance, however, becomes quite clear when he goes on to compare ἀνάμνησις in Heb 10:3 with 1 Cor. 24–25.¹⁴⁶ He concludes that both refer to sacrifices which were reminders to God.¹⁴⁷ While these arguments are helpful, Froniewski's exegetical work in the OT is quite brief. If his discussion of the Passover were to be excluded, his survey of OT memorial references would come to less than half a page. Moreover, Froniewski's aim is not to delineate the subject of ἀνάμνησις but to draw theological conclusions

¹⁴⁰ Clancy, "The Old Testament Roots of Remembrance in the Lord's Supper," 35–50; Froniewski, "Theological and Biblical Basis for Construing Eucharist as a Memorial to the Sacrifice of Christ," 137–162.

¹⁴¹ Froniewski, "Eucharist as a Memorial," 141–142.

¹⁴² Froniewski, "Eucharist as a Memorial," 143–144.

¹⁴³ Froniewski, "Eucharist as a Memorial," 144–145.

¹⁴⁴ Froniewski, "Eucharist as a Memorial," 147–153.

¹⁴⁵ Froniewski, "Eucharist as a Memorial," 150–151; 153.

¹⁴⁶ Froniewski, "Eucharist as a Memorial," 154–157.

¹⁴⁷ Froniewski, "Eucharist as a Memorial," 157.

regarding the nature of Christ's sacrifice and ever-present intercession.¹⁴⁸ As such, his article points to the place in scholarship for a more detailed discussion of the OT texts themselves.

Even those articles that do more direct exegetical work in the OT, such as Robert Clancy's, highlight the promise further study could hold. Clancy overviews some of the Old Testament texts where *זָכַר*, *אָזְכָּרָה*, and *זָכָר* appear with an eye towards understanding *ἀνάμνησις* in 1 Cor. 11:24–25.¹⁴⁹ In the sacrificial portion of the *אָזְכָּרָה* (Lev 2:2, 16, 19, 5:12, 6:8, 24:7; Num 5:26) he finds a twofold remembrance—God's remembrance of His promise to forgive and the offerant's remembrance of God's forgiveness.¹⁵⁰ His survey of appearances of *זָכַר* concentrates on Ex. 12:14 and 13:9. In each, he finds the emphasis on Israel's remembrance of what God did for them. This is followed by a brief overview of OT's usage of *זָכַר* and the New Testament's usage of *ἀνάμνησις* and other related words.¹⁵¹ At every step of the way, Clancy draws out implications for the Eucharist. Regarding the subject of *ἀνάμνησις* in 1 Cor. 11:24–25, his final conclusion is that while there is a double remembrance, Paul's emphasizes the human subject far more than the divine.¹⁵² Clancy's scholarship underscores the connection between the Old Testament texts and the eucharistic formula used by Paul. Considered together with the work of Froniewski, Kariatlis, and Chenderlin, among others, it becomes clear that a semantic exploration into the OT textual backdrop of *ἀνάμνησις* could be key to ascertaining its subject. This exploration is what this thesis hopes to provide.

¹⁴⁸ Froniewski, "Eucharist as a Memorial," 157–159.

¹⁴⁹ Clancy, "Roots of Remembrance," 35.

¹⁵⁰ Clancy, "Roots of Remembrance," 39.

¹⁵¹ Clancy, "Roots of Remembrance," 40–41; 45.

¹⁵² Clancy, "Roots of Remembrance," 47; 49–50.

Chapter 3

The Old Testament Memorial Texts

Our discussion in the previous chapter leads naturally to the question of which texts are to be selected for survey by this thesis. Once these are determined, a detailed study of each text can be employed. Once done, this will form a framework from which to understand the potential OT memorial backdrop for the writing of Paul in 1 Corinthians.

Delimiting the Semantic Range

In the first place, this exploration will limit itself to the OT canon. This is not in any way to weigh in on the debate regarding a potential Hellenistic backdrop for the Eucharist as a memorial. The case for such a background, first advanced by Hans Lietzmann, is still a much-debated topic with no clear resolution.¹ Nor is it an attempt to judge the validity of the minority report which has advanced a Gnostic background for the Supper's ἀνάμνησις.² While both such possibilities are not being ruled out, when it comes to determining the subject of Paul's ἀνάμνησις, most scholars draw on its Jewish background rather than a possible Greek one. This was the case with Joachim Jeremias and has remained the case since, as demonstrated by the brief survey of scholarship given. Therefore, it is to a Jewish background that this exploration will go.

¹ A Hellenistic background is completely rejected by Gardner (*1 Corinthians*, 447–449) and Fitzmyer (*First Corinthians*, 440). Those who include it as a possibility but still make it subsidiary to the Jewish background include Raymond F. Collins (*First Corinthians*, 428) and Chenderlin (*“Do This as My Memorial,”* §451).

² Such a possibility is mentioned and rejected by in *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*, s.v. “μνησκόμω,” ed. Moisés Silva, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2014), 3:307–318. None of the commentaries surveyed advocated for a Gnostic background.

The focus on the OT is not a denial that there is other Jewish literature which could provide valid pathways for inspection. Jeremias himself explores not only the LXX but also the Pseudepigrapha and Jewish tomb inscriptions.³ Fritz Chenderlin likewise surveys the OT, the OT Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha, and the Qumran writings.⁴ Yet an exploration of that range would leave no opportunity for sufficient depth. While explorations into the Pseudepigrapha, the Apocrypha, and the Qumran writings could be relevant in shining light on 1 Corinthians, this research will be limited to the OT.

This leads to the question of what the exact scope of the semantic background for Paul's ἀνάμνησις within the OT itself. The term occurs four times in the LXX's translation of the OT canonical books; twice in Psalm headings translating הִנְיָר, the Hiphil infinitive construct of נָר (Ps. 39:1; 70:1 [LXX 38:1; 69:1]); once in Num. 10:10 translating נִרְוֹן; and once in Lev. 24:7 translating אֶרְרָה. It also appears once in the Wisdom of Solomon 16:16 with no corresponding Hebrew term, as well as rendering the Hebrew נָר three times in the later translations of the OT produced by Symmachus (Ex. 3:15; Ps. 6:6) and by Aquila (Ps. 135:13).⁵ This makes Num. 10:10; Lev. 24:7; Ps. 37:1; 69:1; and potentially Ex. 3:15; Ps. 6:6; 135:13 a preliminary list of texts for exploration.

This list can be further expanded in light of the connection between ἀνάμνησις and μνημόσυνον. Μνημόσυνον occurs seventy-five times in the LXX, forty-three of which are in the canonical books. In the canonical books, it translates נִרְוֹן sixteen times, נָר thirteen times, אֶרְרָה

³ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 244–245. Of all the commentators surveyed, only Perkins argues for a human subject of ἀνάμνησις because of a proposed Hellenistic context (144).

⁴ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 244–247.

⁵ This was first drawn to my attention by Marjorie H. Sykes, “The Eucharist as Anamnesis,” *The Expository Times* 71, no. 4 (Jan 1960): 115 and Macina, “Eucharistic Memorial (Anamnesis),” 3.

six times, and the Hiphil of זָכַר once, while not having any directly corresponding Hebrew term seven times. Douglas Jones, one of the most important early opponents of Jeremias, sees ἀνάμνησις and μνημόσυνον as “virtually interchangeable.”⁶ This not only aligns with the work of Jeremias himself but also with the work of more recent scholars such as Chenderlin, Clancy, Francis Carpinelli, and others.⁷ For this reason, it seems that occurrences of μνημόσυνον should be included in this semantic survey. Thus, the suggested semantic background for 1 Cor. 11:24–25 can be found in texts containing ἀνάμνησις or μνημόσυνον. Yet the question arises, which of these should be selected as more relevant.

Given that μνημόσυνον and ἀνάμνησις combined appear forty-seven times in the canonical books of the LXX and with a broad range of meanings, a full survey will be impossible here. There are several instances when μνημόσυνον refers to something clearly unconnected to the meaning of ἀνάμνησις in the Eucharist such as when it refers to a written record of a court document in the book of Esther (Est 2:23). Given the distance between such contexts and that of 1 Cor. 11, these can be left aside as not relevant for this line of inquiry. Indeed, the whole reason for seeking a semantic background of ἀνάμνησις within the OT is the widespread conviction expressed by scholars that Paul’s Eucharistic memory has its backdrop within Israel’s cult.⁸ For this reason, instances that occur outside of the context of Israel’s cult will be left outside the scope of this

⁶ Douglas Jones, “Ἀνάμνησις in the LXX,” 190.

⁷ Chenderlin, “*Do This as My Memorial*,” §449; Clancy, “Roots of Remembrance,” 37; Carpinelli, “*Do This as My Memorial*,” 75.

⁸ See Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 428; Froniewski, “Eucharist as a Memorial,” 158; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 247.

exploration.⁹ Isaiah 57:8, which refers to the cult of false religions not of the Israelite worship, will also be excluded from the study due to space concerns.

It could be tempting to further limit this study to those few occurrences where the preposition εἰς occurs, given its presence in 1 Cor. 11:24–25. However, this will not do. After all, the central contentions of the debate concern those texts where μνημόσυνον and ἀνάμνησις occur in connection with the cult with God as the subject of memory, most of which do not contain εἰς (Ex. 28:12, 29; 30:16; 39:17; Num. 10:10; 31:54). It is samplings from these texts that are central to Jeremias' proposition for divine remembrance.¹⁰ They are equally central to Millard's contention against divine remembrance in 1 Cor. 11:24–25. From these texts, Millard contends that whenever God is the subject of memory in the LXX, this is made quite explicit by the context.¹¹ On this grounds, Millard concludes that since 1 Cor. 11:24–25 does not make a divine subject explicit, this is not a feasible line of interpretation.¹² The significance of these texts for scholars on both sides makes them a piece of the semantic backdrop which cannot be ignored.

These texts do not exhaust the cultic usages of μνημόσυνον and ἀνάμνησις. Within the canonical books, there are two cultic texts where μνημόσυνον has in view human memory (Num. 16:40 [LXX 17:5] and Josh. 4:7). To truly provide a balanced survey, these cannot be ignored, as

⁹ Passages for μνημόσυνον excluded because they do not pertain to the cult include: Deut 32:26; Est 2:23, 6:1, 9:27, 9:28, 9:32, 10:2; Job 2:9 (LXX only), 18:17; Ps 9:6, 34:16, 109:15, 112:6; Isa 23:18; Hos 14:8; Mal 3:16.

¹⁰ Millard, "Covenant and Communion," 245–246.

¹¹ Millard, "Covenant and Communion," 246. See also Reumann (*Supper of the Lord*, 29–30) who makes a similar point.

¹² Millard, "Covenant and Communion," 245–246.

they are by Jeremias. After all, human memory is by no means out of the question as a possible meaning for the term ἀνάμνησις, as Wisdom 16:6 exhibits.¹³

Then also there are those cultic instances where the subject of μνημόσυνον or ἀνάμνησις is less clear. The first main group are texts where μνημόσυνον seems to be tied to some type of memorial offering, often with serving as a translation of זָכַר (Lev 2:2, 9, 16; 5:12; 6:15; 24:7; Num. 5:15, 18, 26; Isa. 66:3). The second group of these are references to the name, memory, or memorial of Yahweh (Ex. 3:15; Ps. 101:13; 135:13; Hos 12:6; 14:8). Next, there are three texts where μνημόσυνον comes in connection with cultic festivals (Ex. 12:14; 13:9; Lev. 23:34). Finally, there are the two appearances of ἀνάμνησις in the Psalm headings (Ps. 39:1; 70:1 [38:1; 70:1]).

Given the brevity of this study, not every text listed can be explored. A sampling of texts will be considered with one passage from each majority category. From the cultic festivals, the institution of the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread will be chosen; from the memorials before God, the memorial stones on the priestly garments (Ex. 28:12, 29; 39:7 [36:14]); from God's memorial name, its revelation in Ex. 3:15; from memorials to prompt human memory, the stones from the Jordan in Josh. 4:7; from references to the זָכַר, the memorial portion of the grain offerings in Lev. 2:2, 9, and 16; and finally, the Psalm headings (Ps. 39:1; 70:1 [38:1. 69:1]) will be considered together.¹⁴

¹³ While Wis 16:6 is also likely significant for exploration (see Douglas Jones, “Ἀνάμνησις in the LXX,” 187), it falls outside the scope of this study given that it is not within the canonical books.

¹⁴ Connections between Paul's presentation of the Supper and other references to the זָכַר (Lev. 24:7; Num 5:26) have been noted by a few scholars. Raymond F. Collins ties the judgment of Paul's Supper to Num. 5 (*First Corinthians*, 439). Chenderlin connects Lev. 24:7 to the Supper (“*Do This as My Memorial*,” §418). While these connections are pertinent, given the likely representative nature of Lev. 2's presentation of the זָכַר and the restriction of only sampling one text from each category, I have opted to leave these texts for further study.

Exodus 12:14; 13:9

The Passover narrative contains two of the most important references to memorials in the OT, with both the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread being termed as memorials (Ex. 12:14; 13:9). While most scholars assume that the remembrance prompted by the Passover commemoration in Ex. 12:14 refers to human memory, an examination of the context of ch. 12 reveals more ambiguity than is generally recognized.¹⁵ However, considering its connection with the memorial in 13:9 instituted to prompt human memory, it seems likely that both of these memorial references should be seen as primarily prompts for human remembrance. Even so, divine remembrance need not be completely ruled out as a function of the Passover memorial.

While the modifying phrase “for you” (לְכֶם; לְכֶם) in 12:14 is often interpreted as specifying Israel as the one remembering, this is not necessarily the case. After all, almost identical datival constructions can be found in passages wherein divine memory is foregrounded (see Ex. 28:12). There are three general grammatical options for interpreting the לְ preposition: that the Israelites were the recipients of the memorial, that the Israelites were the beneficiary of the memorial (*dativus commodi*, i.e., dative of advantage), or that the Israelites were the content of the memorial.¹⁶ Content can be ruled out by context, as what was remembered in the Passover celebration was the exodus God wrought, not the Israelites themselves. If Israel were the recipient of the memorial, the connotation would be that Israel was the one to perform the rite. This interpretation would not exclude divine memory since those who performed a ritual often

¹⁵ For the widespread belief that the Passover memorial is for human memory, see my discussion of 1 Corinthians commentaries in ch. 1.

¹⁶ Paul Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, trans. and rev. T. Muraoka (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006), §130; BDB, 516, §51bβ; 516, §51bγ.

were not those whose memory was prompted by said ritual.¹⁷ If Israel was the beneficiary of the memorial, one potential connotation would be that Yahweh's remembrance of the Israelites was prompted by the memorial commemoration for their benefit. Such an expression can be found in some texts where the ל is paired with a verbal form of זָכַר (e.g., Jer. 2:2; Ps. 137:7) with the result that Yahweh acted in the favor of or against those he remembered on account of his remembrance of them.¹⁸ On the other hand, there is the possibility that Israel could be seen as having benefited from the memorial by their performance of it prompting their own memory. If this were the case, there could even be some semantic overlap between ל as denoting recipient and as denoting beneficiary since Israel would receive benefit from the memorial only inasmuch as they were the recipient of it. Thus, one must look to the broader context in which the Passover is described as a memorial to determine whose remembrance was intended.

In the immediately preceding context, Israel performed the rite of painting the doorposts of their houses with blood (v. 7). Even though this sign-act was performed by Israel, the goal was that upon seeing it, the Lord's memory would be prompted (v. 13).¹⁹ As a result of the physical sign (σημεῖον; אֹת) of the blood on Israel's houses, Yahweh would remember Israel and act on their behalf by not letting the destroyer enter their houses.²⁰ Both in the LXX and in the MT, the appointment of the sign in v. 13 (καὶ ἔσται τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐν σημεῖω; לָאֵת לָכֶם לְזָכָר) closely parallels that of the memorial in v. 14 (καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἡμέρα ὑμῶν αὕτη μνημόσυνον; הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה לְזָכָר). Here in v. 13, לָכֶם is even more ambiguous than in v. 14 as reasonable arguments

¹⁷ See, for example, Ex. 28:12, 29; 30:16; 39:7 [LXX 36:14]; and Num. 31:54.

¹⁸ BDB, 516, §51bγ.

¹⁹ Eising, “זָכַר,” 4:77.

²⁰ For the role of remembrance as being prompted by physical objects, see the appendix, “Memory in the Old Testament,” 97–99. For remembering as involving acting on one's behalf, see the appendix, “Memory in the Old Testament,” 99.

could be made for Israel being the content, the recipient, or the beneficiary of the memorial. This lexical ambiguity does not obscure the point of the text, however, which is that God remembered his people when he saw the blood on the doorposts. Given that this was the immediate context in which the Passover memorial was given, some element of divine remembrance in the memorial seems likely. However, as many scholars will point out, this need not have been the primary goal of the memorial just because it was that of the sign-act.²¹

In what follows (vv. 21–27), there is a description of the hypothetical interchange between father and son that would be prompted by the keeping of the Passover statute. As the people kept the yearly service, the son would ask them what it meant (v. 26). His father would then proclaim to him the salvation God accomplished on Israel’s behalf presumably so that the future generation would remember Yahweh’s past salvation of the people of which they were a part (v. 27). The explanation of this interchange indicates that an integral function of the continuance of the Passover rite was to spark remembrance of the Exodus event in the later generation.²² Such remembrance would be instilled both by the performance of the rite itself and by the accompanying verbal explanation.

Another interesting facet to evaluate in determining the subject of the Passover remembrance is the statement in v. 42, added almost as an addendum, that the Passover was “a vigil of night for the Lord so that he would lead them out from the land of Egypt.”²³ Here, as with v. 13, it is evident that during the original Passover night, God kept vigil, remembering the

²¹ Eising, “זִכָּר,” 4:77–78.

²² John D. Currid, *A Study Commentary on Exodus* (Auburn, MA: Evangelical Press, 2000), 1:252.

²³ My translation of the LXX.

Israelites and bringing them salvation.²⁴ Yet quite interestingly, in v. 42b that night was appointed as a vigil for the Israelites for every future generation (ἐκείνη ἡ νύξ αὕτη προφυλακὴ κυρίῳ ὥστε πᾶσι τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ εἶναι εἰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν; וְלַיְלָה־בָּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְדֹרֹתָם; הַלַּיְלָה לַיהוָה שְׂמֵרִים לְכָל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עַד־דֹּרֹתָם). Given that the parallel datival constructions framing the sons of Israel and the Lord (both with the ל in the MT), the agent of the watching could be Yahweh, as in v. 42a (νυκτὸς προφυλακὴ ἐστὶν τῷ κυρίῳ; הַלַּיְלָה לַיהוָה שְׂמֵרִים הוּא לַיהוָה), or the sons of Israel.²⁵ If the latter were the case, these subsequent vigils would be ones kept by the Israelites, wherein they remembered Yahweh because he remembered them in the original Passover event.²⁶ However, it is also plausible that these subsequent vigils were kept by Yahweh as times when he remembered the Israelites in a distinct way.²⁷

When it comes to the Feast of Unleavened Bread (13:3–10), the focus is squarely on Israel’s memory.²⁸ In 13:3, the Israelites are explicitly commanded to remember “this day.” Furthermore, on every future Passover day (“on that day”), they were to proclaim (ἀναγγέλλω) to their sons the story of the Lord’s deliverance (13:8). The continual memory of this story, as in 12:26–27, served as a prime reason for their observance of the Passover. Here, the description of the memorial is modified by the phrase “before your eyes” and further clarified to be “a sign on your hands” (13:9).²⁹ This clear intimation of human memory serves as the counterpart to

²⁴ John I Durham, *Exodus*, WBC 3 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 173.

²⁵ The parallel structure of the two halves of the verses is noted by William Johnstone, *Exodus 1–19*, SHBC (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2014), 240. However, Johnstone takes this to mean that Israel is the agent in both halves of the verse, rather than that Yahweh is the agent.

²⁶ Durham, *Exodus*, 173; Douglas K. Stuart, *Exodus: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture.*, NAC 2 (Nashville, TN: Holman Reference, 2006), 306.

²⁷ Such a view, however, is not well-attested by commentaries.

²⁸ T. Desmond Alexander, *Exodus*, AOTC 2 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2017), 250.

²⁹ Alexander, *Exodus*, 256–257.

descriptions of memorials before God, such as those in Ex. 28. The Passover here is pictured as something that the Israelites were to remember so distinctly that it was as if it was physically before their eyes and on their hands.³⁰ This goal of this remembrance was Israel's covenantal obedience to the Law, as the purpose clause "that the law of the Lord might be in your mouth," in v. 9 makes explicit (13:9).³¹

Parallels abound between 13:3–10 and 12:14–27. Both sections describe commands regarding the Feast of Unleavened Bread, speak of it as a statute (12:14, 17; 13:10),³² and command that it be kept upon entrance into the land (12:25; 13:5). Both refer to "this day" (12:14, 17; 13:3)³³ and speak of performing "this service" (12:25–26, 13:5) This last connection is even more significant when considering that the word for service in the LXX (λατρεία) is only attested in the canonical books five times and only appears with the demonstrative pronoun in these three instances in Ex. 12–13 (12:25, 26; 13:5).³⁴ Given these close semantic ties between 13:3–10 and 12:14–27, it would be natural if at least some of the emphasis of Israel remembering through the Passover memorial in 13:9 could be imported into 12:14. Such a point is further underscored when considering that the motif of the Passover as an opportunity to tell to the future generation God's past acts of deliverance is already present in 12:25–26.³⁵

³⁰ It seems best to understand the Passover as a sign before their eyes metaphorically rather than literally. See for example, R. Alan Cole, *Exodus: An Introduction and Commentary*, TOTC 2 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1977), 89.

³¹ This translation comes from *NETS*.

³² Although the words are slightly different in the LXX (νόμιμος in 12:14, 17 and νόμος in 13:10).

³³ This is not changed by the fact that in the LXX the case is accusative in 13:3, whereas it is nominative in 12:14 and dative in 12:17.

³⁴ Interestingly, whereas in 12:25–26 only certain elements of the Passover celebration are referred to as this service, in 13:5 it appears that the antecedent to the Passover day itself.

³⁵ Currid, *Exodus*, 2:252.

At the same time, there should be caution in taking the memorial reference (μνημόσυνον; זָכָרֹן) in 12:14 solely as prompting human memory just because this is the emphasis in 13:9.

After all, the memorial of 12:14 is immediately preceded by the giving of a sign that prompted God's memory. Furthermore, the description of the Passover as a night of vigil quite possibly is intended to refer to its function every year in sparking divine remembrance of Israel. Even if this context is not germane to the memorial reference (μνημόσυνον; זָכָרֹן) in 13:9, they cannot be ignored in the context of 12:14.

In summation, then, the Passover is described as a memorial twice in chapters that are closely tied together. In Ex. 12:14, the subject of memory is ambiguous. There are surrounding references to God's memory which could indicate that God should be seen as the subject of memory. Yet, at the same time, the paschal sacrifice of the Passover memorial serves the function of ensuring continued memory of God's past acts into future generations. In Ex. 13:9, the subject of memory is Israel. The Israelites are enjoined to remember the Passover, to proclaim God's deliverance to their sons, and to keep the Passover before them as if it were a sign on their hand and a memorial before their eyes.³⁶ Taking these two references together, the Passover is a memorial with the primary goal of human memory. This in no way precludes later writers, such as that of the book of Jubilees, seeing it as a memorial prompting divine

³⁶ Stuart, *Exodus*, 315.

remembrance.³⁷ Indeed, a dual remembrance, albeit with a focus on human memory, appears already present within Ex. 12–13.³⁸

Exodus 28:12, 29; 39:7 [LXX 36:14]

The description of Aaron’s garments in Exodus 28 contains two sets of stones engraved with the names of the sons of Israel, one on the ephod and one on the breastpiece.³⁹ By wearing the priestly ephod with these stones, Aaron is said to bear (נָשָׂא) the names of the Israelites. Each set of stones are said to be “for a memorial” (לְזִכָּרוֹן; μνημόσυνον), with the first set being further specified as “memorial stones” (אֲבִנֵי־זִכָּרוֹן; λίθοι μνημοσύνου). To properly understand these memorial references, they must be set in the broader context of the role of the priestly garments, which in turn were given so that Aaron could fulfill his priestly duties. Through this context, it becomes apparent that the primary role of these stones was to prompt Yahweh to remember the names of the people of Israel. Even so, there may have been a subsidiary role of the stones inviting Aaron to recollect the people of Israel.

Aaron’s primary role was to mediate relationship between God and Israel. He served as a representative for all Israel interceding on their behalf before Yahweh and bringing their cares and concerns to his mind.⁴⁰ As the one who officiated sacrifice, Aaron would cleanse the people

³⁷ See Jub 49:10. This is made much of by Chenderlin, “‘Do This as My Memorial,’” §389. While beyond the scope of this thesis, it would be an incredibly worthwhile endeavor to examine early Jewish interpretations of the act of remembering as part of the Passover, particularly in Philo, Josephus, Rabbinic writings, and the Pseudepigrapha.

³⁸ Chenderlin, “‘Do This as My Memorial,’” §389–391; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 428; Max Thurian, *The Eucharistic Memorial*, vol. 1, *The Old Testament*, trans. J. G. Davies, ESW 7 (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1960), 39. This is admittedly a minority view within scholarship.

³⁹ I am choosing not to discuss the relation between Aaron’s garments and those of future High Priests. For simplicity, I refer to Aaron in my exegesis throughout, rather than to the High Priest.

⁴⁰ Terrene E. Fretheim, *Exodus*, IBCTP (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), 276–277.

from their guilt and would cause the sacrificial animal to ascend into Yahweh's presence, symbolizing Israel's acceptance before Yahweh. On the other hand, Aaron received the blessings and teachings of Yahweh and shared these on Yahweh's behalf with the people.⁴¹

There are several ways in which the garments Aaron wore enabled him to fulfill this function. First, they sanctified him, covering his own impurity so that he could approach God (Ex. 28:35). Second, they set him apart in the sight of the people so that no Israelite would be tempted to presume to have the same level of access that Aaron had in his priestly role.⁴² Finally, they equipped Aaron to be the representative of the entire nation. This final role was the primary one which the stones of memorial accomplished.⁴³

By carrying the Israelites' names on his clothes, Aaron was set apart as the representative for Israel. When Aaron wore the priestly ephod and the breastpiece of judgment, he no longer acted on his own behalf but on behalf of the people.⁴⁴ Every time he entered the Holy Place in this garb, every Israelite came into God's holy presence.⁴⁵ This representation had a mediatorial aim. Aaron brought the people before Yahweh to intercede for them.⁴⁶ The stones themselves had an intercessory role as a "symbolic prayer to God for each of the tribes of Israel."⁴⁷ Whether

⁴¹ Thomas Joseph White, *Exodus*, BTCB (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2016), 256.

⁴² Currid, *A Study Commentary on Exodus*, (Auburn, MA: Evangelical Press, 2001), 2:209.

⁴³ Duane A. Garrett, *A Commentary on Exodus*, KEL (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2014), 590.

⁴⁴ Fretheim, *Exodus*, 276–277.

⁴⁵ Cole, *Exodus*, 145.

⁴⁶ Victor P. Hamilton, *Exodus: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011), 486; Thurian, *Eucharistic Memorial*, 1: 57.

⁴⁷ Thurian, *Eucharistic Memorial*, 1:57.

or not Aaron also bore their names through verbal prayers, the stones themselves were liturgical prayers, given as “a mute but effective memorial.”⁴⁸

By bearing Israel’s names before God, Aaron was invoking God to remember his covenant people and act on their behalf.⁴⁹ This is how most commentators interpret the twofold repetition of לְזָכְרוֹן in verses 12 and 29.⁵⁰ The stones served as “reminders to God” of the nation he had chosen, as signs given to prompt his remembrance.⁵¹ The goal of these cultic objects, as with many of the other cultic memorial rites before God, was to guarantee the Lord’s remembrance of the covenant.⁵² The preciousness of the stones as well as their place over Aaron’s heart indicated the value that God placed upon the nation of Israel with whom he had covenanted himself.⁵³ Israel’s sons’ names were covenant witnesses and legal signatures that reminded Yahweh of His covenant obligation to Israel.⁵⁴ When God remembered this covenantal obligation, he would not merely become mentally cognizant of it but would act upon it.⁵⁵ Thus, through the wearing of the memorial stones, Aaron was interceding for Israel, asking Yahweh to bless them on the basis of his covenant.⁵⁶

⁴⁸ Thurian, *Eucharistic Memorial*, 1:58. Thurian argues that there was no verbal prayer accompanied with the stones. Hamilton, on the other hand, believes that Aaron would pray for each of the tribes inviting Yahweh to remember them, arguing that such verbal proclamation is incumbent within the language of bearing (*Exodus*, 486).

⁴⁹ Martin Noth, *Exodus: A Commentary*, trans. J. S. Bowden, OTL (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1962), 221; Thurian, *Eucharistic Memorial*, 1:57.

⁵⁰ See, for example, Fretheim, *Exodus*, 276–277; Hamilton, *Exodus*, 486; William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB (New York, NY: Doubleday, 2006), 438; Thurian, *Eucharistic Memorial*, 1:57.

⁵¹ Hamilton, *Exodus*, 485.

⁵² Hamilton, *Exodus*, 486.

⁵³ Alexander, *Exodus*, 587; Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 443.

⁵⁴ Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 438.

⁵⁵ See the appendix, “Memory in the Old Testament,” 99.

⁵⁶ Hamilton, *Exodus*, 486; Thurian, *Eucharistic Memorial*, 1:58.

This idea is conveyed by the writer with a datival construction that is similar to the one found in Ex. 12:14. In Ex. 28:12, the memorial is said to be “for the sons of Israel” (τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραηλ; לְבָנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל). Interpreting the ל preposition as referring to the recipient of the memorial can be ruled out based on the context as Aaron, not Israel, was the one who received the memorial stones and performed the associated ritual. This means that the ל either places the sons of Israel either as the content or the beneficiary of the memorial. If the ל denotes the content, this would indicate that the sons of Israel were what was remembered in the memorial, a fitting possibility as the names of Jacob’s sons representing the twelve tribes were engraved on the memorial stones. On the other hand, if the ל denotes the beneficiary, the idea would be that Israel benefited from the memorial because it invited God’s favorable remembrance of them. Thus, whether the ל preposition denotes content or beneficiary, this prepositional phrase only solidifies the role of the memorial stones as prompts for Yahweh’s memory of Israel resulting in his action on their behalf.

God’s remembrance in Ex. 28 also has a specifically spatial and temporal element to it. Temporally, God’s remembrance arose not spontaneously but when Aaron prompted it by wearing the ceremonial attire as a memorial. Spatially, it was when Aaron carried Israel’s names into the Holy Place, bringing them before Yahweh, that his remembrance was prompted. Similar language speaking of memorials before Yahweh or before God are found in parallel passages such as Ex. 30:16 and Num. 31:54, when God was reminded by the atonement money, and Num. 10:10, when the blowing of the trumpets was a reminder for Yahweh.⁵⁷ This has even caused some scholars to argue that the language of “before Yahweh” is necessary when speaking of

⁵⁷ Hamilton, *Exodus*, 485.

God's remembrance being prompted by a memorial.⁵⁸ However, such a supposition does not hold up in view of the later reference to the memorial stones in Ex. 39:7 [LXX 36:14]. In this later description, these stones are once again called memorial stones for the sons of Israel (אֲבִי־בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל לִזְכָּרוֹן; λίθους μνημοσύνου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ), calling readers back to their already established function as reminders to Yahweh of his people. Yet any language of their being “before God” is absent. While this is far too little to indicate that the usage of לִזְכָּרוֹן or μνημόσυνον as memorials for God's remembrance was an established formula, as Jeremias argues, it at least opens the possibility that a modifying prepositional phrase is not always necessary to denote God's remembrance.⁵⁹

While this all puts the onus of memory squarely on Yahweh's shoulders, invoking human remembrance was not excluded from the role of the priestly garments, even if it was not the role of the memorial stones. This becomes clear when considering the mnemonic potentialities of the other items Aaron wore, especially as interpreted by other Jewish texts. The inscription on Aaron's headband, “Holy to Yahweh,” likely served as a threefold reminder, reminding Aaron of the people he represented, the people of Aaron's consecrated status, and Yahweh of the acceptableness of the sacrifices Aaron brought on the people's behalf.⁶⁰ The interpretation of Zech 6:14, which also describes the crown as a memorial (לִזְכָּרוֹן; εἰς ψαλμὸν), is likewise

⁵⁸ Millard, “Covenant and Communion,” 246; Reumann, *Supper of the Lord*, 29–30. Both Millard and Reumann cite the linguistic work of Willy Schottroff as evidence for their arguments, noting particularly his work *Gedenken im alten Orient und im Alten Testament: Die Wurzel zākar im semitischen Sprachkreis*, 2nd ed, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967). Unfortunately, given my inability to read German, I was unable to consult Schottroff directly.

⁵⁹ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 248.

⁶⁰ Propp discusses these first two functions (*Exodus 19–40*, 524), whereas this third function comes from Peter Enns, *Exodus*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 2000), 531.

ambiguous.⁶¹ The bells Aaron wore also probably had a mnemonic function, whether to announce Aaron's presence to God, as a reminder to Aaron of the proper attitude of reverence needed for his representation of the people of Israel, or to bring the worshippers' attention to the ritual.⁶² The apocryphal book, Sirach, describes these too as a memorial (לְזִכָּרוֹן; εἰς μνημόσυνον) with the effect that the people of Israel would remember the rite as Aaron performed it.⁶³

Indeed, some commentators argue that even the memorial stones, which the text primarily frames as reminders to God, could have also had a mnemonic function for God's people, whether reminding Aaron of the people he represented or reminding the Israelites of their covenantal obligations to Yahweh.⁶⁴ The text surely hints at Aaron's remembrance as a subsidiary function of the memorial stones since by carrying their names on his clothes, he would almost surely be invited to remember the people of Israel. Still, nothing in either 28:12 or 28:29 can be taken as a reference to the stones prompting Israel's memory. While the stones role as a memorial before God reminding him of his covenant would not necessarily exclude them also reminding God's people (as with other items of Aaron's clothing), that was not the role the writer of Exodus emphasized. The only clear prompting of human memory evidenced in the text is that of Aaron's memory of the Israelites.

Tying it all together, the main purpose for which the memorial stones were given was to bring Israel to God's merciful remembrance whenever Aaron entered the Holy Place wearing the

⁶¹ It could refer to a reminder to Helem, Tobijah, Jedaiah, and Hen (as with the translation of the *ESV*) or as a reminder to Yahweh on their behalf (Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 244).

⁶² Nahum M. Sarna, *Exodus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation Commentary*, JPSTC (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 1991), 183.

⁶³ Thurian, *Eucharistic Memorial*, 1:70–71. Thurian argues that such an interpretation is not present in Exodus itself.

⁶⁴ For the function of reminding Aaron, see Durham, *Exodus*, 386; Sarna, *Exodus*, 179. For the function of reminding Israel, see Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, 438.

cultic attire. As their representative and mediator, Aaron invoked Yahweh to remember the cares of his covenantal people and act on their behalf. This does not exclude, however, a subsidiary function in which Aaron was called to remember the people as he bore their names cultically as a memorial.

Exodus 3:15

Exodus 3 describes how God revealed himself to Moses and indeed to his whole people by his proper name, Yahweh.⁶⁵ God asserted that this was not only his name but also his זָכָר or his μνημόσυνον.⁶⁶ זָכָר/μνημόσυνον here parallels שֵׁם/ὄνομα as semi-synonyms with the same referent, namely, Yahweh.⁶⁷ It adds, however, the nuance that Yahweh is not just God's name but is his memorial name in a cultic setting.⁶⁸ For this reason, "memorial name" is probably the best translation of both the MT and the LXX.⁶⁹ The question then becomes in what sense was the name Yahweh a memorial? Was his name a memorial since it was to be that by which Israel remembered him or was it the name by which he was invoked causing him to remember his worshippers? A careful study of Ex. 3:15 will reveal that the answer is most likely both.

⁶⁵ Stuart, *Exodus*, 120.

⁶⁶ In Symmachus, his ἀνάμνησις.

⁶⁷ Currid, *Exodus*, 1:92; William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 1–18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1999), 205. For a work that argues against such a proposition, see Ellen J. van Wolde, "Not the Name Alone: A Linguistic Study of Exodus 3:14–15," *Vetus Testamentum* 71, no. 4–5 (Oct 2021) 784–800. She makes a detailed argument that זָכָר and שֵׁם have two different referents, with שֵׁם referring to God's name, Yahweh, whereas זָכָר refers to his actions in the past. In light of the close parallel being these two terms throughout the OT (see the work of Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 71), van Wolde's argument does not seem wholly persuasive. As most scholars in the past have seen these terms as semi-synonyms, it will be interesting to see how Van Wolde's proposal is received by scholarship in the coming years.

⁶⁸ Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical Theological Commentary*, OTL (Louisville, KY: The Westminster Press, 1974), 76–77; Currid, *Exodus*, 1:92.

⁶⁹ This translation of the MT is employed by Currid (*Exodus*, 1:92). This translation appeared in the earlier NASB translations (NASB77 and NASB95) as well as in the Legacy Standard Bible and the Amplified Bible. The NKJV, KJV, and ASV all translated this as "memorial."

God's name in the OT had a particular cultic function as the means by which his people both remembered and invoked him.⁷⁰ It was connected to proclamation, praise, invocation, and confession.⁷¹ On the one hand, his people would call upon the name of Yahweh (קָרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה) as a means of petitioning him to remember them and act on their behalf (1 Kings 18:24).⁷² On the other hand, they would call upon his name (קָרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה) as a means of worship, remembrance, and public proclamation of his acts (Ps. 80:19; Isa. 12:4).⁷³ These two possible meanings are each connected with the verbal root of זָכַר at various places in the OT, demonstrating the possibility of dual remembrance when God's name was called upon (Isa. 12:4; Amos 6:10).⁷⁴ In many ways, the entire OT system of worship was reliant upon the access Israel had to God through being able to call upon his name.

In Ex. 3, the people of Israel are portrayed as having lost the knowledge of God that their forefathers once had.⁷⁵ One commentator, Stuart, argues that they had assimilated to Egyptian polytheism to the extent that they had even forgotten the name of their God.⁷⁶ Whether we go that far or not, they undoubtedly needed a restored knowledge of God and, in particular, of his name so that they could reestablish communion with him.⁷⁷ Happily, a renewed relationship with

⁷⁰ Childs, *Exodus*, 77; A. S. van der Woude, “שֵׁם *šēm* name,” in *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, ed. Ernest Jenni and Claus Westermann, trans. Mark E. Biddle. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997, 3:1359–1360.

⁷¹ For the relation of proclamation with human remembrance, see the appendix, “Memory in the Old Testament.”

⁷² van der Woude, “שֵׁם,” 3:1359–1360.

⁷³ van der Woude, “שֵׁם,” 3:1359–1360.

⁷⁴ Eising, “זָכַר,” 4:74.

⁷⁵ Stuart, *Exodus*, 120.

⁷⁶ Stuart, *Exodus*, 120.

⁷⁷ Stuart, *Exodus*, 120.

and knowledge of God was exactly what he gave to Israel by voluntarily revealing his name to them.⁷⁸

Throughout the OT, God's name signified his being and his personal presence.⁷⁹ Both in the very act of naming himself to them and by the name he chose, Yahweh was declaring that he would be present with his people.⁸⁰ One of the primary means of this presence would be his cultic communion with them. The result of the revelation of the name Yahweh was a renewal of the cult.⁸¹ Israel could once again engage in proper worship now that they knew the name of the God on whom they were to call.⁸² In Israel's cult henceforth, Yahweh's name would be the means by which his people had access to him, a role often also accomplished by images in other ANE cults (Deut 4:15–18).⁸³ In a similar manner, legitimate worship of Yahweh could only occur at sites where God had declared his presence by proclaiming his name.⁸⁴ When seen in this light, it becomes clear that one of the primary goals of God's actions in the entire narrative of Ex. 3 was a reestablishment of a proper cultic relationship with his people.⁸⁵ It is for that reason that he set up Sinai as a holy site where he would be present with his people and they would worship

⁷⁸ van der Woude, “שֵׁם,” 3:1358.

⁷⁹ Eising, “זִכָּר,” 4:76; Jebamony Jebasingh, “A Theological Appraisal of זִכָּר (Remembrance),” *Bangalore Theological Forum* 46 no. 2 (2014): 79–80.

⁸⁰ For the revelation of God's name as a declaration of presence, see Gerhard Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 1, *The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962), 183. For God's name itself as a promise of presence, see Alexander, *Exodus*, 89.

⁸¹ Childs, *Exodus*, 77; Stuart, *Exodus*, 120.

⁸² Childs, *Exodus*, 77; Stuart, *Exodus*, 120.

⁸³ Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 1:183.

⁸⁴ van der Woude, “שֵׁם,” 3:1359.

⁸⁵ Childs, *Exodus*, 77.

him (Ex. 3:5, 12, 18) and it is for this reason that he disclosed his name to them.⁸⁶ From here on, Israel's worship would be centered around God's memorial name.⁸⁷

This leads naturally to the issue of the mnemonic function of God's memorial name. The context of its revelation in Ex. 3:15 can shed light on this question. In Ex. 2:23–4:17, two realities become evident: that the people needed to remember Yahweh and that the people needed to (and would) be remembered by Yahweh. As this provided the setting for God's giving of his name as a memorial, it would seem logical that this memorial would address each of these needs.⁸⁸

In the first place, God's people needed to be reminded of him. While enslaved in Egypt, they may have even forgotten him and forgotten his name (Ex. 3:13).⁸⁹ Even as they cried out in deep distress, it is uncertain how much they even knew about the God to whom they cried (Ex. 2:23).⁹⁰ Not only did they need to be reminded of Yahweh so as to be brought into proper worship of him, but in their affliction they needed to know that he would rescue them. By revealing his name to them as "I will be who I will be" or "I am who I am," God was reassuring the Israelites of His nature and what He would do (Ex. 3:14).⁹¹

⁸⁶ For the establishment of Sinai as a holy place where God would reside, see Hamilton, *Exodus*, 49; for the goal of the revelation of God's name as the reestablishment of proper cultic worship, see Childs, *Exodus*, 76–77.

⁸⁷ Childs, *Exodus*, 76–77.

⁸⁸ This does not preclude his covenant functioning in a similar way. See Jebasingh, "זכר," 83.

⁸⁹ Stuart, *Exodus*, 120.

⁹⁰ Stuart, *Exodus*, 103. Hamilton (*Exodus*, 42) even goes so far as to say that they were not crying out to God at this point. This interpretation, however, cannot be squared with Deut. 26:7.

⁹¹ There is ample debate over the proper translation of these phrases as a perusal of any commentary, such as Alexander, *Exodus*, 89. Many commentators, such as James K. Bruckner, put the emphasis on Yahweh's actions in his deliverance of the people, Bruckner, *Exodus*, UBCS (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2008), 45. For Bruckner, Yahweh revealed himself in this way because he desire to be remembered by what He accomplished in the Exodus, see Bruckner, *Exodus*, 45. Macina draws similar emphases but puts them in the past, pointing to Yahweh's desire to be remembered by his covenantal faithfulness with the fathers, see Macina, "Eucharistic Memorial (Anamnesis)," 7.

The promises of presence and the signs God gave further underscore the people's need to remember (Ex. 3:12, 17; 4:1–10). The signs given would serve as encouragements to their faith since there was a real possibility that Moses or the people would doubt (Ex. 3:12; 4:1–9).⁹² This encouragement for faith in Yahweh can be seen as related to the encouragement for memory of Yahweh, as faith falls in the same semantic realm as remembrance when God is the one remembered.⁹³ The tying of God's memorial name to signs given to induce human memory, seen also in passages such as Ex. 13:9 and Josh. 4:7, cements its purpose as a means of sparking human memory.

Yet this in no way contradicts the pervasive theme of God's remembrance in the surrounding context.⁹⁴ Twice it is repeated that God heard, saw, and knew his people's suffering (Ex. 2:24–25; 3:7). Since God's covenant people called out for help, even though they did not call on his name properly, God remembered his covenant with their forefathers and saved them (Ex. 2:23–24).⁹⁵ Part of his salvation for them was his establishment of a proper means for them to call upon him in prayer.⁹⁶ Henceforth, whenever they were in distress, they could invoke him through petitions made in his name.⁹⁷ His giving of a name functioned as a promise that made in that name would be efficacious means of prompting his remembrance and action, even if they

⁹² Stuart, *Exodus*, 119; 129. Stuart (*Exodus*, 119; 129) argues that while the future-oriented sign of the worship of God on Mt. Sinai was intended to bolster Moses' faith along with the people's, the signs in ch. 4 were less for Moses and more for the people.

⁹³ See the appendix, "Memory in the Old Testament," 101.

⁹⁴ Hamilton, *Exodus*, 42.

⁹⁵ Stuart, *Exodus*, 103.

⁹⁶ Stuart, *Exodus*, 120.

⁹⁷ Macina, "Eucharistic Memorial (Anamnesis)," 7.

would not work magically.⁹⁸ This demonstrates the crucial role that God's establishment of his name as a memorial played in creating a way for his people to called upon remember them.

Dual remembrance, both God and Israel's, was vital to the purpose of Yahweh as God's memorial name. In revealing his name to his people, God was reestablishing relationship with his people by restoring proper cultic worship. Henceforth, God's people were to call upon the name of Yahweh as a means of remembering and proclaiming his greatness, as well as of petitioning his remembrance through prayer. These two elements of the cultic memorial were both indispensable to God's disclosure of his memorial name in Ex. 3:15.

Joshua 4:7

The stones of Josh. 4:7 are a prime example of a memorial, μνημόσυνον, that was intended primarily to cause humans to remember. Joshua instructed the Israelites to take twelve stones from the Jordan river as both part of and a commemoration to Yahweh's bringing them across the river on dry ground (Josh. 4:1–7). The stones from the river bottom, which were then set up in Gilgal, would serve as an enduring physical reminder to this great act of God (Josh. 4:19–24). This reminder was for the people, for future generations, and even for the surrounding nations (Josh. 4:22–24). Even so, while the memorial was most directly intended to affect Israel and the nations, canonical connections with Ex. 28 hint at divine remembrance as a probable secondary aim.

⁹⁸ For invocation of God's name as promise that his name would be an efficacious means of prayer, see Macina, "Eucharistic Memorial (Anamnesis)," 7. For the non-magical role of invoking God's name, see van der Woude, "חַיָּה," 3: 1358; see also my comments regarding the attitude of the worshipper in relation to God's mnemonic response in the appendix, "Memory in the Old Testament," 98.

According to Josh. 4:6a, the reason the stones were taken out of the Jordan was so that they could be a sign among the people (לְמַעַן תִּהְיֶה זֹאת אוֹת בְּקִרְבָּכֶם; ἵνα ὑπάρχωσιν ὑμῖν οὗτοι εἰς σημεῖον κείμενον διὰ παντός). Their role as a sign (אוֹת; σημεῖον) was specifically physical—they would be a visible object that symbolized the past event of the Jordan crossing.⁹⁹ The chiasmic structure of Josh. 4:6–7 identified by Richard Hess parallels the establishment of these stones “as a sign” in 4:6a and “as a memorial” (לְזִכָּרוֹן; μνημόσυνον) in 4:7b.¹⁰⁰ This suggests that these two terms are being employed hyponymously.¹⁰¹ Through seeing this physical pile of stones Israelites henceforth would remember the Jordan crossing.¹⁰²

These stones would thus function not only as a visible reminder but also as an enduring one.¹⁰³ While “God would not always perform such dramatic miracles,” these stones would always be there to remind Israel of God’s past miracles.¹⁰⁴ The text even goes so far as to call them “a memorial forever” (עַד-עוֹלָם; ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος). While this may be a slight hyperbole, it demonstrates that the stones were to stand as a reminder for generations to come.

Yet as twelve uninscribed stones, they could not perform this function merely through their physicality alone.¹⁰⁵ To be a reminder of the Jordan crossing, they had to be explained.¹⁰⁶

⁹⁹ Robert L. Hubbard Jr., *Joshua*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009), 157–158.

¹⁰⁰ Richard S. Hess, *Joshua: An Introduction and Commentary*, TOTC 6 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1996), 119.

¹⁰¹ Hess, *Joshua*, 119.

¹⁰² Hubbard Jr., *Joshua*, 162.

¹⁰³ Thomas B. Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 6B (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015), 292.

¹⁰⁴ Howard Jr., David M. *Joshua: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*, NAC 5 (Nashville, TN: B & H Publishing Group, 1998), 135.

¹⁰⁵ Hubbard Jr., *Joshua*, 158.

¹⁰⁶ Hubbard Jr., *Joshua*, 158.

As in the case of the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, this would be accomplished through the explanation of a father to his sons (Josh. 4:6–7, 21–24; Ex. 12:26–27; 13:14–16).¹⁰⁷

As each new generation of fathers performed this ritual, the symbolic role of the stones would be kept alive for their sons who had not witnessed the event. This demonstrates that the stones' memorial role was not merely for the present generation. Rather, it was future oriented with the intention that even once every Israelite who had crossed the Jordan was dead, this significant event in Israel's history would still be remembered.¹⁰⁸

It should be noted that these memorial stones likely had a cultic and ritual context.¹⁰⁹ In the first place, they were stones associated with the priests, as they were taken from the place the priests stood (Josh. 4:3).¹¹⁰ They were then erected at Gilgal, an important cultic site for early Israel (Josh. 4:19–20).¹¹¹ Moreover, the crossing itself took place around the time for Passover in the beginning of April, the high point of the Jewish ritual calendar (Josh. 4:19).¹¹² As in the case of the Passover, the hypothetical father-son exchange here likely included a structured teaching ritual.¹¹³ This leads some commentators to suppose that there would have been a ceremonial festival linked to these stones, perhaps with a reenactment of the Jordan crossing.¹¹⁴ While such

¹⁰⁷ Howard Jr., *Joshua*, 135.

¹⁰⁸ For the future-oriented goal of the memorial, see Richard D. Nelson, *Joshua: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 69; Pekka M. A. Pitkänen, *Joshua*, AOTC 6 (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press), 2012.

¹⁰⁹ Trent C. Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 2nd ed., WBC 7a, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2014), 307–310; Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 291; Hess, *Joshua*, 119–120; Hubbard Jr., *Joshua*, 158.

¹¹⁰ Hess, *Joshua*, 120.

¹¹¹ Hess, *Joshua*, 120.

¹¹² Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 309.

¹¹³ Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 306–307; Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 291.

¹¹⁴ Hubbard Jr., *Joshua*, 158.

a supposition may be stretching the case, the cultic context for these memorial stones is textually well-supported.¹¹⁵

These stones can thus be said to have been a perpetual physical and cultic reminder, explained for future generations. Yet what was the intended effect of this reminder? As in Ex. 12:14 and 28:12, the reference to these stones as a memorial is modified by a datival construction with the preposition ל in the MT, as this memorial was said to be “for the sons of Israel” (לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל; τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραηλ). The ל here likely introduces a *dativus commodi*, indicating that Israel was the beneficiary of the memorial by the continual memory that it sparked for them.¹¹⁶ Israel also did in a way receive the memorial, even if it was not, like the Passover, a ritual they had to regularly perform. This means that understanding the ל as denoting the recipient of the memorial is also possible.¹¹⁷ The potentiality that the ל is being used to describe the content of the memorial also cannot be wholly ruled out as it could be in Ex. 12:14.¹¹⁸ After all, the Israelites were to select twelve stones in accordance with the number of the twelve tribes of Israel (Josh. 4:4–5, 8). By memorializing the crossing of the Jordan with twelve stones, the event’s foundational role in unifying the nation of Israel around the identity of being Yahweh’s people would have been displayed.¹¹⁹ In this way, the content of the remembrance invited by the twelve memorial stones perhaps extended beyond just God’s action to include the nation of Israel

¹¹⁵ See Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 307–310; Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 291; Hess, *Joshua*, 119–120; Hubbard Jr., *Joshua*, 158.

¹¹⁶ See BDB, 516, §5ibβ. Proponents of this interpretation include Hamilton (*Exodus*, 485) and Howard (*Joshua*, 135).

¹¹⁷ See JM, §130.

¹¹⁸ See BDB, 516, §5iby.

¹¹⁹ Nelson, *Joshua*, 67; 69.

itself.¹²⁰ Indeed, it is quite plausible that the *ל* preposition in Josh. 4:7 contains all three nuances discussed (*dativus commodi*, recipient, and content) to varying degrees.¹²¹

The stones were to retell the story of the Jordan crossing to keep the memory of it alive.¹²² As Ex. 2:23–4:17 demonstrated, the loss of an enduring memory of God’s acts was a consistent danger for the nation of Israel.¹²³ The stones recited the narrative of God’s covenant history with his people so that they would not forget it.¹²⁴ Yet this recitation would not stop with that history but would go beyond to remind the Israelites of Yahweh himself.¹²⁵ These two objects of memory (God’s acts and God’s being) were intimately tied to each other and should not be pitted against each other, as Dozeman does.¹²⁶ The commemorative memorial of the Jordan crossing would produce an ever-fresh knowledge of Yahweh and of his might (Josh. 4:21–24).¹²⁷ Such a knowledge was not be limited to Israel but also spread to the surrounding nations (Josh. 4:24–5:1).¹²⁸ While the nations received such knowledge in part through the Jordan crossing itself, they also received it through the Israelites’ retelling of the Jordan crossing centered around the memorial stones (Josh. 4:21–5:1).¹²⁹ Indeed, both the event itself and the

¹²⁰ A. Graeme Auld, *Joshua: Jesus Son of Nauē in Codex Vaticanus*, SCS (Boston, MA: Brill, 2005), 114. Nelson (*Joshua*, 67; 69) appears to also be a proponent of this position but is less clear than Auld in his affirmation of it.

¹²¹ Auld (*Joshua*, 114) holds together at least the nuances of *dativus commodi* and content.

¹²² Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 306.

¹²³ Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 306. Butler makes this same point but references the book of Judges rather than Ex. 2:23–4:17.

¹²⁴ Nelson, *Joshua*, 69.

¹²⁵ Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 310.

¹²⁶ Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 295. For the intimate tie between memory of God and memory of his acts, see the appendix, “Memory in the OT.”

¹²⁷ Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 310–311.

¹²⁸ Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 311.

¹²⁹ Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 311.

memorial stones were signs to the Israelites and to the watching world of Yahweh's miraculous power.¹³⁰ Thus, the event itself and its memorial had the same mnemonic intent.¹³¹

Yet the effects of the memory they produced in their twofold audience were quite different. While remembering God's power left the Canaanites with a sense of dread, it instilled within the Israelites a reverent sense of worship (Josh. 4:24–5:1).¹³² This difference resulted, in large part, because unlike the Canaanites, the Israelites' identity was formed around the history of God's covenant fidelity to them. By taking them from Egypt across the Red Sea and across the Jordan into the Promised Land, Yahweh made the Hebrews into a nation.¹³³ As each new generation looked upon the stones at Gilgal, they were invited to remember this great event and to view it as their history.¹³⁴ Through this shared history that spanned the length of God's dealings with his people, the Israelites henceforth could identify themselves as the people whom God brought across the Jordan on dry ground.¹³⁵ This identity in turn would shape their conduct and result in action that was pleasing to God.¹³⁶ In this way, Israel's remembrance was crucial for their conduct—as they remembered God's deeds because of the memorial stones, how could they not obey his law?¹³⁷

While this covers the primary mnemonic aims of the memorial stones in Josh. 4, a discussion of them cannot be complete without exploring connections the narrator of Joshua

¹³⁰ Hess, *Joshua*, 128.

¹³¹ Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 311; Hess, *Joshua*, 128.

¹³² Hubbard Jr., *Joshua*, 162.

¹³³ Nelson, *Joshua*, 67–68.

¹³⁴ Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 310.

¹³⁵ Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 310.

¹³⁶ Hubbard Jr., *Joshua*, 166–167.

¹³⁷ Pitkänen, *Joshua*, 138.

makes to other memorial texts. This passage is full of echoes to the Passover memorial. As already mentioned, the Jordan crossing happened at the time of the Passover.¹³⁸ These two miraculous water crossings are explicitly linked by the text (Josh. 4:24). As in the Passover narrative, God's salvation was commemorated by a memorial and a sign. As it did there, here also the memorial was primarily directed at human memory with the catechesis of future Israelites as a core element of this.¹³⁹

This text also deliberately parallels Ex. 28.¹⁴⁰ In both passages, there are twelve memorial stones for the twelve tribes of Israel that are carried upon someone's shoulders (Ex. 28:12, 21; Josh. 4:5, 7).¹⁴¹ Just as in Ex. 28, these twelve stones here likely symbolized the nation of Israel.¹⁴² As hinted at already, this could mean that Israel itself was a secondary object of memory incited by these stones. This raises the question, "Who was to remember Israel here in Josh. 4?" On the one hand, the stones could have incited the Israelites to remember themselves and their newfound status as a nation.¹⁴³ Even so, given the connections with Ex. 28, perhaps it could be possible that these stone were also a means by which Yahweh remembered his people.¹⁴⁴

While this claim has found limited support in scholarship, the enigmatic reference in Josh 4:9 to a potential second set of stones could provide a way to develop this argument further. If

¹³⁸ Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 309.

¹³⁹ Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 306–307.

¹⁴⁰ Auld, *Joshua*, 114.

¹⁴¹ Auld, *Joshua*, 114. There is some difference, however, as in Ex. there are only two stones carried upon Aaron's shoulders, whereas the twelve stones are upon Aaron's breastpiece.

¹⁴² Nelson, *Joshua*, 69.

¹⁴³ Auld, *Joshua*, 114.

¹⁴⁴ Auld, *Joshua*, 114.

these stones were different twelve different stones (ἄλλους δώδεκα λίθους, LXX) than the twelve mentioned earlier—a point that is debated among commentators—they must have been set up for someone to see and then presumably to remember something.¹⁴⁵ This raises the question, who could see stones placed at the bottom of the river. A solution to this conundrum would be to see these stones as a parallel set of memorial stones, set up not to invite Israel to remember but to invite Yahweh to remember. While such an interpretation is by no means certain nor is its acceptance necessary to this thesis, exploration into this would be surely fruitful.

From this exposition, it is evident that the memorial stones in Josh. 4 primarily aimed at shaping human memory and inciting human conduct. These memorial stones would ensure an enduring memory for future Israelites of God’s act of salvation and his miraculous power which in turn would produce worship and obedience. This memorial added an element of proclamation to outsiders of Yahweh’s power, something not mentioned in references to the memorials of the Passover or of God’s name. Even so, given the connections between Ex. 28 and Josh. 4, divine memory cannot be completely ruled out as an aim of the memorial stones erected at Gilgal.

Leviticus 2:2, 9, 16

Leviticus 2’s description of the grain offering is one of the most intriguing memorial passages in the entire OT. After the grain offering was prepared with oil, frankincense, and salt, only a portion of it (its מִנְחָה; μνημόσυνον) would be burned upon the altar as a food offering to

¹⁴⁵ There are two basic positions: the first that these stones refer to the same stones as mentioned in vv. 6–9, which is represented by commentators such as Hess, *Joshua*, 120. This position is supported by the NIV translation, “Joshua set up the twelve stones that had been in the middle of the Jordan.” The other position is that the stones refer to different stones, as is attested by the LXX. The second is that these stones were different stones placed at the bottom of the river. This is supported by commentaries such as J. Gordon McConville and Stephen N. Williams, *Joshua*, THOTC, (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010), 23. Noteworthily, they argue that these stones had a different function but also a memorial function, *Joshua*, 23. Perhaps this different function could be to cause Yahweh to remember since Yahweh alone could see these stones.

God while the majority of it would be set aside for the priests.¹⁴⁶ The Hebrew term, *זִכְרָה*, has an uncertain meaning which has led to a wide variety of proposals regarding its mnemonic import.¹⁴⁷ To determine the memorial function of the *זִכְרָה*, it will be necessary to consider the term's definition and its canonical usage in addition to its role in Lev. 2.¹⁴⁸ Through this exploration, it will become evident that the *זִכְרָה* served a covenantal function and was intended to spark the memory of both Yahweh and his people.

There have been three proposed main meanings for the term itself: a memorial to the offeror of the sacrifice, the invocation portion over which God's name was pronounced, and the token portion (or memorial portion) which represented the whole sacrifice.¹⁴⁹ The idea of the token portion is that while the entire sacrifice was owed to Yahweh, only a portion of it, its *זִכְרָה* (*μνημόσυνον*) was offered.¹⁵⁰ The rest was given not to God but to the priests for sustenance. Thus, it has been proposed that this first portion served as a token of the entire offering such that when the token portion was burned on the altar it would be accepted as if the entire grain offering had been consumed.¹⁵¹ Within this schema, the reason the token portion is described in mnemonic terms (*זִכְרָה*; *μνημόσυνον*) is because it served as a representative reminder of the

¹⁴⁶ John E. Hartley, *Leviticus*, WBC 4 (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1992), 30.

¹⁴⁷ Mnemonic is being used here, not as in a mnemonic device, but merely as an adjective meaning referring to memory.

¹⁴⁸ The term appears seven times in the canon: Lev. 2:2, 9, 16; 5:12; 6:15; 24:7; Num. 5:26. In six of these instances, it is translated by the LXX as *μνημόσυνον*, with Lev. 24:7 standing as the only exception, where it is translated as *ἀνάμνησις*. While in general this thesis has been focusing on both the Greek and the Hebrew, given the rather specialized usage of this Hebrew term, special attention will be paid to it.

¹⁴⁹ Clancy, "Old Testament Roots," 37. Two other options, the burnt portion and the fragrant portion, are also listed by Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3 (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1991), 181–182. However, these positions are both not well represented and each have their share of significant exegetical difficulties.

¹⁵⁰ Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 182; Gordon J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), 68.

¹⁵¹ Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 182; Wenham, *Leviticus*, 68–69.

entire offering.¹⁵² While this reminder could be conceivably for God or for the Israelites, most interpreters who favor such a position put the emphasis on human memory.¹⁵³

It seems that the purpose of such an arrangement would be to teach the Israelites the lesson of first fruits.¹⁵⁴ The token portion would remind the worshipper that while the whole offering belonged to Yahweh, he was gracious to accept only a part of it.¹⁵⁵ The grain offering, thus, represented mankind's tribute to God.¹⁵⁶ Just like a vassal paid a tribute to his overlord from which he ostensibly received everything, so the Israelites would pay tribute to their divine overlord from whom they had inherited every good blessing.¹⁵⁷ In doing so, they would fulfill their covenantal obligation to Yahweh and renew their covenantal commitment to him.¹⁵⁸ The token portion would serve as both a personal reminder for the offeror and as a public declaration from him that everything he owned came from God.¹⁵⁹

Such an interpretation makes good exegetical sense given the covenantal function of the grain offerings symbolized by the salt of the covenant (Lev 2:13).¹⁶⁰ It was crucial for the Israelite to remember his loyalty to Yahweh as his sovereign and to represent it by bringing salt with his offerings. Even the need to command the inclusion of salt in the offerings betrays how

¹⁵² Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 182.

¹⁵³ Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 182; Wenham, *Leviticus*, 68.

¹⁵⁴ Wenham (*Leviticus*, 68) lists this as a role of the grain offering in general. This lesson would be taught quite readily by the memorial portion.

¹⁵⁵ Wenham, *Leviticus*, 68.

¹⁵⁶ Wenham, *Leviticus*, 69.

¹⁵⁷ Wenham, *Leviticus*, 69.

¹⁵⁸ Wenham, *Leviticus*, 69–70.

¹⁵⁹ Wenham, *Leviticus*, 70.

¹⁶⁰ For salt as a symbol of the enduring covenantal relationship between God and Israel, see Hartley, *Leviticus*, 32; Nobuyoshi Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, AOTC 3 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2007), 72; Wenham, *Leviticus*, 71.

easy it was for Israel to forget their God.¹⁶¹ The grain offering further reminded the Israelites of God's blessings as the offering ordained for the bringing of first fruits (Lev 2:11–16). When the first fruits were offered, God would surely be remembered as the source of all good gifts.¹⁶² Deuteronomy 26:1–11 paints a vivid picture of such an offering where the worshipper was to publicly recite God's salvation history as he brought his grain offering of first fruits to the Tabernacle.¹⁶³ This proclamation would remind not only himself but also the whole congregation of Yahweh's role as the source of all blessing.

While scholarly support of the token portion interpretation is considerable, it is by no means universal. The theory that *אֶזְכָּרָה* should be seen as a technical reference to an invocation portion over which Yahweh's name was pronounced is equally well attested.¹⁶⁴ In such a view, the term is seen as deriving its meaning from its verbal root, *זָכַר*, particularly in its Hiphil usage where it often referred to an appeal to a name.¹⁶⁵ While the place of the appeal to God's name in the sacrificial offerings was never specified, 1 Chron. 16:4 indicates at least that it was likely part of the Levites' regular duties.¹⁶⁶ As with the appeal to the divine name already discussed in the section "Exodus 3:15," there are two possible mnemonic functions such a ritual could have served: to extol God's name in praise or to invoke God's name such that he would be invited to

¹⁶¹ Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 72.

¹⁶² Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 74.

¹⁶³ Hartley, *Leviticus*, 31.

¹⁶⁴ Erhard S. Gestenberger, *Leviticus: A Commentary*, trans. Douglas W. Scott, OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 42; Eising, "זָכַר," 4:80; Lanuwabang Jamir, "The Concept of Anamnēsis in First Corinthians 11:23–26," *UBS Journal* 1, no. 2 (Sep 2003) 38; Schottroff, "זָכַר," 1:382; Mark A. Seifrid, "Gift of Remembrance: Paul and the Lord's Supper in Corinth," *Concordia Journal* 42, no. 2 (Spring 2016): 126.

¹⁶⁵ Schottroff, "זָכַר," 1:382. Even those who oppose the invocation portion theory, such as Clancy ("Old Testament Roots," 37), do recognize that *אֶזְכָּרָה* comes from the Hiphil of *זָכַר*.

¹⁶⁶ Eising, "זָכַר," 4:80.

remember.¹⁶⁷ While the evidence for the invocation portion is sparse in Lev. 2, linguistic and thematic ties between Lev. 2 and Isa. 66:3 as well as Num. 5:11–31 make such a proposition worth consideration.¹⁶⁸

Isaiah 66:3 describes a worshipper who offers a grain offering with frankincense in two parallel phrases (מַעֲלֶה מִנְחָה; ὁ δὲ ἀναφέρων σεμίδαλιν and מִזְבִּיר לְבִנָּה; ὁ διδούς λίβανον εἰς μνημόσυνον). In this passage, the sacrifice of the grain offering is described as “making frankincense to be remembered” or “giving frankincense as a memorial.”¹⁶⁹ Given the formulized use of the Hiphil for verbal invocation, it could reasonably be argued that the way the worshipper gave the sacrifice as a memorial (εἰς μνημόσυνον) was by invoking God’s name (מִזְבִּיר) over it.¹⁷⁰ This is by no means definitive, however, as מִזְבִּיר in Isa. 66:3 could just as easily be either a denominative form of מִזְבֵּחַ or a reference to the sacrifice itself, rather than any verbal invocation, leading to remembrance.¹⁷¹

Numbers 5:11–31 depicts a particular type of grain offering, the grain offering of jealousy, which would be brought as an offering of memorial (מִנְחָה זָכָרֹן; θυσία μνημοσύνου) in the case of a woman caught in adultery. In 5:15, the grain offering itself is modified by a Hiphil participle (מִזְבֵּחַת; ἀναμυμνήσκουσα) which is taken by some commentators to reflect a juristic

¹⁶⁷ Eising (“זָכָר,” 4:80) argues that this invocation had the role of proclamation inviting human remembrance whereas Gestenberger (*Leviticus*, 42) favors invocation as a means of inviting Yahweh’s remembrance.

¹⁶⁸ Eising, “זָכָר,” 4:80.

¹⁶⁹ My translations of the MT and LXX, respectively.

¹⁷⁰ While Eising (“זָכָר,” 4:80) does not spell out such an argument, it clearly underlies his thinking.

¹⁷¹ Childs (*Memory and Tradition*, 14) argues that this should be seen as a denominative form of מִזְבֵּחַ. Young believes that it was the physical incense the sacrifice produced, not any verbal invocation, that invited God’s remembrance. Edward J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*, vol. 3, *Chapters 40–66*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972), 520–521.

usage of זָכַר for accusation.¹⁷² This juristic accusation entailed a verbal element as the woman's case was brought before God through the swearing of an oath (5:18–22). Given the close connection between this juristic invocation of Yahweh's name and the burning of the offering's אֶזְכָּרָה, it could be reasonably conceived God's name would be invoked once more as the אֶזְכָּרָה was being offered.¹⁷³ It should be noted, however, that while this may support the idea that God's name was pronounced over the offering of the אֶזְכָּרָה in Num. 5, there is no textual evidence that a similar invocation happened in the grain offerings of Lev. 2 or any of the other offerings where the אֶזְכָּרָה was present. Even so, given the linguistic and intertextual evidence, the possibility that God's name was pronounced over the אֶזְכָּרָה of Lev. 2 cannot be ruled out, even if such a theory remains speculative and cannot be definitively proven.

The final interpretive option and perhaps the most straightforward is that the usage of אֶזְכָּרָה in Lev. 2 is that it indicates that the portion burned on the altar would be a memorial to the offeror.¹⁷⁴ Within the Levitical system, offerings were given so that God would look upon the offeror with favor (Lev 1:3).¹⁷⁵ When God received a sacrifice, he would accredit it in the worshipper's favor and remember him with delight.¹⁷⁶ The repeated phrase, “a pleasing aroma to Yahweh” (רִיחַ־נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה; ὁσμή εὐωδίας τῷ κυρίῳ), appearing in Lev. 2:2, 9, indicates that

¹⁷² Timothy R. Ashley, *The Book of Numbers*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993), 127–128; Schottroff, “זָכַר,” 1:385.

¹⁷³ Interestingly, Ashley (*Numbers*, 134) argues that הִנִּיף, usually translated as to wave, more properly means “to dedicate.” If this is correct, it would indicate that immediately after the woman and the priest invoked God's juristic presence through the oath, they would have dedicated the grain offering to God and then burned its אֶזְכָּרָה.

¹⁷⁴ Clancy, “Old Testament Roots,” 38–40.

¹⁷⁵ Jay Sklar, *Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary*, TOTC 3 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2014), 90.

¹⁷⁶ Baruch A. Levine, *Leviticus ויקרא: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation Commentary*, JPSTC, (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 6.

securing the favor of Yahweh was just as much the role of the grain offering as it was of every other offering.¹⁷⁷ This phrase, closely tied to the *זֶבֶחַ תְּמִנָּה*, likely defines its meaning.¹⁷⁸

The offeror, naturally a sinner, was an object of wrath and needed to produce an aroma that soothed God.¹⁷⁹ The burnt incense of the memorial portion accomplished just that.¹⁸⁰

Through its ascension into heaven, the incense of the *זֶבֶחַ תְּמִנָּה* entered into the place where God dwelt (heaven) as a memorial.¹⁸¹ As with the memorial stones in Ex. 28, the bringing of a memorial before God's presence was to remind him of the Israelites and of his covenantal relationship with them.¹⁸² The covenantal function of such a memorial was also on display through the salt of the offering, symbolizing the eternity of God's covenant with Israel (Lev 2:13).¹⁸³ Even as Israel remembered their covenantal obligations to Yahweh, so he would remember his covenantal commitment to them.¹⁸⁴ Indeed, even the institution of the sacrificial system itself can be seen as a gracious provision of God whereby he chose not remember his people's sins but instead to remember mercifully his covenant with them.¹⁸⁵

It is quite likely that in Lev. 2, the *זֶבֶחַ תְּמִנָּה* of the grain offering served as a memorial not only to the rest of the sacrifice (as a token portion) but also to the offeror who brought the

¹⁷⁷ Sklar, *Leviticus*, 92. Sklar is making this point about food offerings in general, but it applies equally to the grain offerings of Lev. 2, each of which included a food offering.

¹⁷⁸ Clancy, "Old Testament Roots," 38.

¹⁷⁹ Clancy, "Old Testament Roots," 39; Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 73.

¹⁸⁰ Clancy, "Old Testament Roots," 39; Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 73; Levine, *Leviticus*, 7.

¹⁸¹ Young, *Isaiah*, 3:520–521.

¹⁸² For the incense ascending as a reminder to God of the offeror, see Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 72–73; Young, 520–521.

¹⁸³ For the salt as a picture of God's eternal covenant, see Wenham, *Leviticus*, 71.

¹⁸⁴ Wenham, *Leviticus*, 71.

¹⁸⁵ Clancy, "Old Testament Roots," 39.

sacrifice.¹⁸⁶ As such, it had a dual mnemonic function. When the worshipper faithfully remembered his covenantal obligations by bringing the appointed sacrifices, he was assured of his good standing before God and of God’s continual merciful remembrance of him.¹⁸⁷ If God’s name was called upon before the *אֶזְכָּרָה* was consumed, this would have further solidified its role in producing a dual remembrance. As Yahweh’s name would have been pronounced over the *אֶזְכָּרָה*, Yahweh would have been invoked to remember his people while the congregation would have been reminded of their God. Even if such a pronouncement never occurred, it can still be confidently asserted that the *אֶזְכָּרָה* in Lev. 2 was a memorial with a dual function, calling upon both God and Israel to remember.

Psalms 38:1 [LXX 37:1]; 70:1 [69:1]

The two memorial references in the Psalm headings (Ps. 38:1; 70:1 [37:1; 69:1]) are sometimes considered too vague to be interpreted.¹⁸⁸ Yet, while the terms used, particularly *לְהִזְכִּיר* of the MT, have some uncertainty to them, the content of the Psalms over which the headings appear provides ample grounds for determining their meaning.¹⁸⁹ To delineate the intended effects of these memorials, we will consider the three primary conjectures for these terms’ meanings, weighing their potential validity by the content of the Psalms themselves. This

¹⁸⁶ Sklar, *Leviticus*, 97.

¹⁸⁷ Wenham, *Leviticus*, 69; 71.

¹⁸⁸ Douglas Jones (“*Ἀνάμνησις* in the LXX,” 187) is one scholar who holds to such an interpretation. There are many others also, who while offering potential meanings for the term, recognize that its meaning is ultimately uncertain. See Amos Hakham, *Psalms*, BJC (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 2003), 1:297; Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1–59: A Commentary*, trans. Hilton C. Oswald (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988), 411.

¹⁸⁹ Megan I. J. Daffern, “Prayers for Remembering,” (PhD diss., University of Oxford, Exeter College, 2014), 132, https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:b9f845c8-c271-4eb6-8a3c-e9acf75929f1/download_file?file_format=pdf&safe_filename=THESIS01&type_of_work=Thesis.

will lead to the conclusion that these headings were included to mark the petitions of these psalms as memorials which called upon God to remember his people.

There are three main proposals that have been made regarding what it means for these Psalm headings to have been for a memorial (לְהִזְכִּיר; εἰς ἀνάμνησιν): that this indicated that these Psalms were recited at the sacrifice of a memorial offering (typically conceived as the grain offering with its אֶזְכָּרָה), that they were intended as reminders for God of his people, and that they were recited to invoke God's name in praise. The proposal that these Psalms were recited over a memorial offering, whether the אֶזְכָּרָה of the grain offerings or of the Shewbread, has widespread scholarly support.¹⁹⁰ Proponents of this theory argue that הִזְכִּיר and ἀνάμνησις are being used essentially as equivalents to אֶזְכָּרָה.¹⁹¹ This is surely not out of the realm of possibility. הִזְכִּיר in these Psalm titles could easily be a denominative form of אֶזְכָּרָה. Nor would these be the only instances of such a construction, as seen in the brief exploration of Isa. 66:3 in the previous section.¹⁹² Adding weight to this theory, the same exact Greek phrase used in these two headings, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, appears in Lev. 24:7 as a translation of לְאֶזְכָּרָה.¹⁹³ While this does not make ἀνάμνησις a technical equivalent to אֶזְכָּרָה, it demonstrates that translating אֶזְכָּרָה is within the semantic range of possibilities for the Greek term.¹⁹⁴

¹⁹⁰ Gerstenberger, *Leviticus*, 42; Froniowski, "Eucharist as a Memorial," 142; Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 29; Konrad Schaefar, O.S.B., *Psalms*, BO (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2001), 168.

¹⁹¹ Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 29.

¹⁹² Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 14; Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 29.

¹⁹³ John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*, SCS 44 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 391.

¹⁹⁴ Takamitsu Muraoka and G. B. Caird both argue against the meaning of ἀνάμνησις as "a memorial sacrifice." While they are right to note that this is not what the term always means, they are likely wrong, however, to exclude such a meaning from the term's semantic range, given Lev. 24:7. G. B. Caird, "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint I," *Journal of Theological Studies* 19, no. 2 (Oct 1968), 458. Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2009), ἀνάμνησις.

Interpreters who consider such a possibility tend to highlight how the *אֶזְכָּרָה* was a memorial to the offeror, inviting God’s gracious remembrance of him.¹⁹⁵ Amos Hakham goes even so far as to say that the Psalm itself could have been a substitute for the grain offering causing God’s remembrance in a similar manner.¹⁹⁶

While this is a viable possibility, it does not align perfectly with the content of these psalms. It is true that these songs were pleas that God would remember his people and act (a role of the *אֶזְכָּרָה*). Yet the cries of these psalms appear in a quite different setting than the offerings of the *אֶזְכָּרָה*. The *אֶזְכָּרָה* was a joyous offering that would be brought at times of remembering God’s goodness as the source of all life.¹⁹⁷ Such joy contrasts sharply with the desperation and misery from which the psalmist brings his pleas in Ps. 38 [37] and 70 [69]. Furthermore, there is little in either psalm that indicates that they had a usage within the sacrificial cult.¹⁹⁸ While these observations do not rule out the potential recitation of these psalms over the *אֶזְכָּרָה*, they give one pause on seeing this as the meaning of the psalm headings. Before considering the other two propositions, one potential textual connection between the *אֶזְכָּרָה* and the headings should be mentioned. The LXX’s heading for Ps. 37 [MT Ps. 38] adds the phrase “concerning the Sabbath” (*περὶ σαββάτου*).¹⁹⁹ While the grain offerings had no special sabbatical connection, the *אֶזְכָּרָה* of the Shewbread was offered every Sabbath (Lev 24:8). Although this is not definitive, it could

¹⁹⁵ Hakham, *Psalms*, 1: 297; Marvin E. Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, WBC 20 (Dallas, TX: Thomas Nelson, 2000), 203.

¹⁹⁶ Hakham, *Psalms*, 1: 297.

¹⁹⁷ Hartley, *Leviticus*, 30; Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 74.

¹⁹⁸ Daffern, “Prayers for Remembering,” 133.

¹⁹⁹ This addition, while not present in every edition of the LXX, is seen as original by Rahlfs’ critical edition.

lend weight to arguments for a tie between the Psalm headings and the *אֶזְכְּרָה* of the Shewbread.²⁰⁰

The theory that these Psalms were recited as part of the Levitical task of invoking God in praise, while less prominent than the first, has gained scholarly traction.²⁰¹ This theory rests much of its weight on the use of the Hiphil of *זָכַר* for the invocation of God as a form of praise. Since such a task was part of the Levites duties in Temple Worship, it is argued, it would explain these difficult Psalm superscriptions by giving them a setting within such Temple Worship.²⁰² On a cursory reading of these Psalms, such an interpretation makes sense. Both Ps. 38 [37] and Ps. 70 [69] are bracketed by calls upon God's name.²⁰³ In each Psalm, he is addressed as both God and Yahweh (Ps. 38:1, 21 [37:2, 22]; 70:1, 5 [69:2, 6]).²⁰⁴ While it is only natural to see these as invocations of God, it may be asked for what purpose is God being invoked? Is he being invoked as a form of praise or called upon to remember?

In both Psalms, the answer seems to be the latter. Psalm 38 [37] was a plea, a desperate call for the Lord to remember and intervene (38:21–22 [37:22–23]).²⁰⁵ As part of his application for God's intervention, the psalmist pointed to his own faithfulness to God (38:15, 20 [37:16, 21]), his frailty and suffering (38:8–11, 17 [37:9–12, 18]), and the wickedness of his enemies (38:12, 19–20 [37:13, 20–21]). On the other hand, he asked Yahweh to not act against him on

²⁰⁰ In support of this connection, see Thurian, *Eucharistic Memorial*, 1:51; Froniweski, "Eucharist as a Memorial," 142.

²⁰¹ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 14; Eising, "זָכַר," 4:80; McComiskey, "זָכַר," 1:242.

²⁰² Eising, "זָכַר," 4:80; McComiskey, "זָכַר," 1:242.

²⁰³ For this observation regarding Ps. 38 [37], see John Eaton, *The Psalms: A Historical and Spiritual Commentary with an Introduction and New Translation* (New York, NY: Continuum, 2005), 167–168; for it regarding Ps. 70 [69], see Schaefer, *Psalms*, 168.

²⁰⁴ The LXX of Ps. 69:2 is not a direct address to God and will be discussed later in this section.

²⁰⁵ Schaefer, *Psalms*, 95–96.

account of his sins, or in other words, to not remember his sins (38:1 [37:2]). Psalm 70 [Ps 69 in LXX] contains a similar list of objects based upon which God is asked to act, including the worshipper's frailty (70:5 [69:6]), the good deeds of the worshipping community (70:4 [69:5]), and the evil deeds of the wicked (70:2–3 [69:3–4]). Every one of the objects mentioned here is a common object for God's remembrance in the OT.²⁰⁶ While neither of these psalms include the זָכַר root outside of their headings, the mnemonic undertones are undeniable. They are both pleas for God to remember his people and act on their behalf because of his remembrance.²⁰⁷ Thus, while these Psalms did invoke God, they invoked him not as a means of praise but as a petition that he would remember.²⁰⁸

This leads naturally to the final option: that the headings indicated that God was being called upon to remember his people.²⁰⁹ This explanation is almost certainly the right one. It alone makes sense of the content of the psalms which each display a supplicant crying out to God to remind God of his plight in his time of affliction.²¹⁰ As with so many other OT figures, this supplicant knew that his only hope in distress was to call upon God to remember and save him. Such an invocation is exactly what is reflected in the heading for Psalm 69 in the LXX [=Ps. 70 MT].²¹¹ The LXX converts the first line of the body of the MT into an extension of the psalm heading, thus making the entire heading read, “For completion. To David for remembrance in

²⁰⁶ See the listing of objects of God's memory in Schottroff, “זָכַר,” 1:386.

²⁰⁷ For this point regarding Ps. 38 [37], see Derek Kidner, *Psalms 1–72: An Introduction and Commentary*, TOTC 15 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1973), 171.

²⁰⁸ Eaton, *Psalms*, 167–168.

²⁰⁹ Scholars who support this interpretation include Daffern, “Prayers for Remembering,” “Prayers for Remembering,” 132–135; Eaton, *Psalms*, 167–168; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 247; Kidner, *Psalms 1–72*, 171; Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 203.

²¹⁰ Daffern, “Prayers for Remembering,” 132.

²¹¹ Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 203.

order that Yahweh would save me (εἰς τὸ τέλος· τῷ Δαυὶδ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, εἰς τὸ σῶσαί με κύριον).”²¹² This purpose clause (εἰς τὸ σῶσαί με κύριον) demonstrates how the LXX translator understood the role of the ἀνάμνησις: as a prompt for God’s memory so that God would save the psalmist.²¹³ While these pleas expressed in the words of the psalm could have been accompanied with an offering of an עֹלָה (whether of an ordinary worshipper’s grain offering or the priest’s eating of the Shewbread on behalf of Israel), such a sacrificial ritual was not necessary for the prayer of the psalm.²¹⁴ As Derek Kidner points out, those who see this title merely as a reference to a memorial offering confuse a potential secondary meaning “with what is primary” (the cry for God to remember and act).²¹⁵

While the initial referent of this plea was the psalmist’s own suffering, the act of writing his plea into a song and its incorporation into the Psalter broadened its scope, giving it an enduring “communal significance.”²¹⁶ As these prayers were regularly sung by new generations even after the initial writer was gone, Yahweh would be reminded again and again to save his covenant people from their afflictions.²¹⁷ What’s more, given these psalms’ Davidic connection, whenever God heard them, he would be called to remember his covenant with David as a reason to save the Israelites for all generations.²¹⁸ In this way, the prayers themselves were no longer

²¹² My translation of the LXX.

²¹³ Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 203. This aligns well with Muraoka’s interpretation of ἀνάμνησις as a denominative noun indicating the idea of bringing to remembrance.

²¹⁴ Daffern, “Prayers for Remembering,” 133.

²¹⁵ Kidner, *Psalms*, 171.

²¹⁶ Daffern, “Prayers for Remembering,” 133–135.

²¹⁷ Daffern, “Prayers for Remembering,” 133–135.

²¹⁸ Daffern, “Prayers for Remembering,” 134–135. As Daffern notes, this point holds true whether David was the original author.

isolated pleas for God's remembrance in individual instances of affliction. Rather, they had become memorials, reminding God for all time of his people on the basis of the initial suppliant, David.²¹⁹

The primary aim of these memorials was to induce God to remember and save his people.²²⁰ Even so, the inclusion of these songs within the Psalter would have reminded the people of their need to remind God.²²¹ Israelites who sung these would have recollected David, the great exemplar of one who called upon God to remember him in his times of distress.²²² As they sung, they would be urged to remember and remind God, just like David did.²²³ This human remembrance was not separated from God's memory but would have been accomplished by Israel's singing, that is, by the very act whereby they invoked God to remember.²²⁴ This was indeed all part of a covenantal arrangement set forth by Yahweh. Israel was covenantally obligated to remember Yahweh and they did this by inviting him to remember.²²⁵ He in turn would remember them and act on their behalf whenever they fulfilled their covenantal obligation by reminding him of them.²²⁶ Thus, it should not be framed as if these Psalms had two disparate goals: inviting God to remember and inviting Israel to remember. Rather, through the singing of

²¹⁹ Daffern, "Prayers for Remembering," 132–135. Even if David was not the original suppliant, his canonical portrayal as such would have produced the same effect (see Daffern, "Prayers for Remembering," 133). This interpretation of the Psalms as memorials probably goes beyond the linguistic backdrop Muraoka argues for. Another scholar who argues for the words of the Psalms themselves as memorials is Seifrid, "Gift of Remembrance," 129.

²²⁰ Daffern, "Prayers for Remembering," 132–133; Seifrid, "Gift of Remembrance," 129.

²²¹ Daffern, "Prayers for Remembering," 133–135.

²²² Daffern, "Prayers for Remembering," 134–135.

²²³ Daffern, "Prayers for Remembering," 134–135.

²²⁴ Daffern, "Prayers for Remembering," 134–135.

²²⁵ Daffern, "Prayers for Remembering," 134.

²²⁶ Daffern, "Prayers for Remembering," 135.

the memorial, Israel would remember God by invoking God to remember them, the people of David.²²⁷

It is commonly supposed that the headings of Ps. 38 [37] and 70 [69] are too cryptic to have any memorial import. However, an examination of the content of the psalms over which they appear demonstrates that these headings were intended to classify the psalms they were associated with as memorials. While the main goal of these memorials was to remind God to save his afflicted people, they likely had a secondary aim of inviting Israel to remember God. This secondary goal of Israel remembering should not be seen as disconnected from inviting God to remember but rather as a means by which inviting God to remember could be accomplished.

General Observations Concerning OT Memorials

Given the diverse range of memorials examined, the similarities in their function are striking. While the primary subject of memory (God or his people) differed for each memorial, every single memorial considered had some element of dual remembrance attached to it. Two memorials (the זִכְרוֹן of the grain offerings and God's memorial name) balanced evenly the demands for God and his people to recall; two memorials (the Passover and Joshua's memorial stones) highlighted human recollection while at the same time affirming the people's need for Yahweh to remember them; and two memorials (the Psalm headings and the memorial stones on the priest's garments) underlined Yahweh's remembrance of his people while not excluding the

²²⁷ Daffern, "Prayers for Remembering," 135. This was likely the function of many, if not all of the Psalms (see Daffern, "Prayers for Remembering," 135). The rarity of this inscription formula should not dissuade us from such an interpretation as these superscriptions are no rarer than other equally programmatic superscriptions, such as "a psalm of thanksgiving," which only appears in Ps. 101:1 (Daffern, "Prayers for Remembering," 135).

people and their mediator's (David and Aaron) need to remember Yahweh. Indeed, a dual subject of the action of remembrance was perhaps embedded in the OT concept of memorial.

This dual remembrance likely flowed from the covenantal nature of memory and memorials. God and Israel were bound together by covenant. As part of this covenant, both parties were required to recall their covenantal obligations and their commitment to the other party.²²⁸ Within this system, memorials served to prompt memory so that neither party would forget these covenantal realities. The covenantal nature of memorials was readily on display in every memorial surveyed, from the stones at Gilgal (which solidified the people's covenantal identity and reminded them of their covenantal history) to the memorial portion of the offering (which operated as a reminder to both parties of the covenant within the structure of worship ordained by Yahweh). Thus, while different memorials focused on prompting the memory of one party or the other, in broader terms memorials operated as reminders to both parties of the covenant which they shared.

With these realities in mind, we will now turn to the context of 1 Corinthians to consider how each of the six representative memorials sampled could shed light on the subject of Paul's ἀνάμνησις. Connections between each memorial and Paul's presentation of the Supper will be weighed in turn before bringing these multi-faceted backgrounds together to help delineate the subject of ἀνάμνησις in 1 Cor. 11:24–25.

²²⁸ Jebasingh, “זכר,” 83–84. McKenna (“Eucharist and Memorial,” 521) sees the Supper's ἀνάμνησις in this same vein, as a covenantal memorial prompting dual remembrance.

Chapter 4

OT Memorials & Paul's Eucharistic Ἀνάμνησις

Out of all the OT memorials considered, the Passover memorial is the one most often tied to Paul's depiction of the Supper by 1 Corinthians commentaries.¹ Such an association is not without reason. In the earlier portions of his letter, Paul tied Christ's sacrifice to the Passover meal, insisting that Christ himself was the Passover sacrifice (1 Cor. 5:7).² Here in chapter 11, right before the pronouncement of the debated words εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, he reminded his Corinthian readers of the night of Jesus's betrayal (1 Cor. 11:23). This rhetorical move would have called to mind the historical elements of Jesus's final meal, thus setting the origin of the Supper as the original Passover meal celebrated by Jesus and his disciples.³ Even if, as some commentators argue, this was a way for Paul to link the Eucharist to other historical elements of Jesus's death, such as Judas's betrayal, the connection to Jesus's final Passover cannot be avoided.⁴ While some dissenting scholars argue that the meal Jesus and his disciples originally celebrated was not the Passover, this is a minority position and an argument against it would be beyond the scope of this exploration.⁵

The Passover context for Paul's depiction of the Supper is solidified by the content of the words and actions that Paul ascribed to Jesus. In the first place, Paul referred to the original

¹ See my earlier discussion on p. 17–25.

² Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 233; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 405.

³ Chenderlin, “‘Do This as My Memorial,’” 389; Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 509.

⁴ Contra Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 431–432. Collins sees this phrase as linking the Supper to the great salvific events of Jesus's passion, going so far as to explicitly deny that this phrase indicates Jesus's original Passover meal in any way. Thiselton (*First Corinthians*, 869–870) understands this phrase as a pointer to Jesus's self-giving death as it was facilitated by the betrayal of Judas, while still seeing the Supper as a Passover meal.

⁵ For a strong argument for the original Supper as a Passover meal, see Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 41–62.

Supper as a meal eaten at night (1 Cor. 11:23). While no normal Jewish meal took place in the evening, it was customary for the Passover to be eaten then.⁶ Furthermore, the interpretation of the bread and wine by the host of the meal was a Passover ritual—albeit now modified in light of Jesus’s impending death (1 Cor. 11:24–25).⁷ While more data could be given, this alone is enough to conclude alongside a variety of commentaries that Paul aimed to portray the Eucharist as a Passover meal.⁸

Even so, the Passover backdrop for the Supper was not all consuming for Paul. His mention of the cup of blessing in 10:16, while potentially a reference to the Passover cup, could just as easily be tied to an ordinary Jewish meal.⁹ In chapter 5, when Paul linked Christ’s sacrificial death to the Passover, references to the Supper were absent.¹⁰ His encouragement to the Corinthians that they keep the festival (ἐορτάζωμεν), while seen by some as an allusion to the Eucharist, is probably best understood as a metaphor for the purity required for the Christian community (5:8).¹¹ Paul’s passing use of the Passover analogy for Christ’s death does not make it the final metaphor by which he saw either the Supper or Jesus’s death.¹² On the other hand, this need not lead us as far as Raymond F. Collins or Hans Conzelmann, who deny a Passover

⁶ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 44–46.

⁷ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 55–61.

⁸ Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 266; Ciampa and Rosner, *First Corinthians*, 549–550; Fee, *First Corinthians*, 608; Schreiner, *1 Corinthians*, 244.

⁹ For a commentary that ties this phrase to the Passover, see Ciampa and Rosner, *First Corinthians*, 474. For a commentator who argues against such a tie, see Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 379.

¹⁰ Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 197; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 431–432.

¹¹ Ciampa and Rosner, *First Corinthians*, 215.

¹² Chenderlin, 392–393.

setting for Paul's presentation of the Supper altogether.¹³ It is better rather to say that while the paschal setting for Paul's Supper is evident, it is not exclusive.¹⁴

This leads naturally to seeing the memorial of the Passover as a backcloth for the Supper's ἀνάμνησις.¹⁵ Thus, it comes as no surprise that in the vein of the Passover memorial Paul emphasized the proclamatory nature of the eucharistic remembrance.¹⁶ Whenever the Corinthians ate the Supper, they were to remember the narrative of Jesus's salvific death and to proclaim (καταγγέλλετε) it to those around them (11:26).¹⁷ While some commentators argue that this proclamation was directed towards God, καταγγέλλω both in the NT and 2 Maccabees consistently was used for proclamation to humans, rather than to God.¹⁸ This aligns well with the depiction of commemorative proclamation in Ex 12:26–27 and 13:8 (ἀναγγέλλω) where an Israelite father was to proclaim to his son the significance of the Passover event. In fact, Paul's employment of καταγγέλλετε was likely modelled in part on these passages, especially Ex. 13:8 where its cognate ἀναγγέλλω was used by the LXX.¹⁹ On a side note, this connection likely sheds light on the highly contested issue of whether the proclamation referred to the act alone or

¹³ Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 197; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 431–432.

¹⁴ Chenderlin, "Do This as My Memorial," 389.

¹⁵ This opinion is supported by Ciampa and Rosner (*First Corinthians*, 551) and Fitzmyer (*First Corinthians*, 441), among others.

¹⁶ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 441; Hays, *First Corinthians*, 199.

¹⁷ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 444–445.

¹⁸ Collins, 13; Morris, *1 Corinthians*, 159–160.

¹⁹ Clancy, "Old Testament Roots," 41; Millard, "Covenant and Communion," 243–244. While many commentators, such as Barrett (*First Corinthians*, 270) and Fitzmyer (*First Corinthians*, 441), tie the proclamation of the Supper to the Passover, they tend to not explicitly tie it to the proclamation of father-to-son in the Passover narrative.

involved a verbal element as well.²⁰ While the act itself would be part of the proclamation, it is likely that just as with the Passover, a verbal recitation of the passion narrative would be included alongside the Supper ritual.²¹

Yet while this element drawn from the Passover remembrance points to human memory, other connections with the Passover indicate divine remembrance.²² The blood of Christ, drunk by the church for remembrance (εἰς ἀνάμνησιν) in 1 Cor. 11:24–25, paralleled the blood of the Passover lamb, painted on the lintels of the doorposts as a sign (ἐν σημείῳ) in Ex. 12:13.²³ Just as the sign of the blood had caused the exodus generation to be passed over, so now Christ's blood resulted in judgment passing over those who drank it.²⁴ Whoever drank Christ's blood was now included in the covenant and would be remembered by God. Thus, the Passover setting highlighted the role of the drinking of the cup εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, both as a reminder to God of the people's covenantal inclusion effected by Jesus's blood, as well as a reminder to the church of the narrative of his sacrificial death.

With the Passover background thus appropriately framed, the other OT memorials which informed Paul's presentation of the subject of eucharistic memory can be considered. While the

²⁰ Commentators who support the spoken word include Barrett, *First Corinthians* 270; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 425. Scholars who argue for the act alone include Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 512; Jenson, *Visible Words*, 72; Morris, *1 Corinthians*, 159.

²¹ Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 270; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 444–445.

²² Talbert (*Reading Corinthians*, 78) notes that the element of proclamation should not be seen as the only deciding factor in determining the subject of ἀνάμνησις.

²³ Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 234; 510; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 180; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 406.

²⁴ Both Gardner (*1 Corinthians*, 234) and Thiselton (*First Corinthians*, 406) tie the function of Christ's blood and the blood of the Passover lamb as protecting the people from destruction. However, neither goes so far as to connect the blood on the doorposts as a sign of covenantal inclusion with the drinking of Christ's blood as a sign of covenantal inclusion. As with its connection to the Supper, the Passover's connection to Jesus's death should be viewed as one among many Pauline images for Christ's death rather than as exhaustive of its meaning. For example, in Rom 3:21–26 Paul uses Day of Atonement imagery, calling Christ's death a ἱλαστήριον, a concept that would be missed if OT allusions to Christ's death were only sought in the Passover.

memorial stones on Aaron's garments have the weakest connections to Paul's ἀνάμνησις, a few resonances between the two can still be found. For one, both the Eucharist and the memorial stones were covenantal in nature. As part of this schema, both memorials symbolized the unity the people experienced under their representative before God.²⁵ Just as the Israelites were united through sharing in Aaron their representative, so 1 Cor. 10:17 asserted the church was bound as one because they all participated in Christ (κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐστίν).²⁶ Under the old administration this reality had been symbolized by the memorial stones worn by Aaron with Israel's names. In the new, it was pictured by the one loaf from which they all partook (10:17).²⁷ Through their participation in it, the bread which symbolized Christ's body (11:23) analogically came to stand for the people who partook of it (10:17).²⁸

Within the Mosaic covenant, the chief mnemonic aim of these memorial stones was to bring the people, represented by Aaron, to God's merciful remembrance.²⁹ If theological parallels to Paul's writing are appropriate here, this could point to a potential function of the bread (the body) not only bringing Christ to God's mind but also his people (the body). When Aaron came before God, he came not alone but bore the people of Israel with him through the memorial stones. When considering Paul's use of ἀνάμνησις, one must ask whether it would be a

²⁵ For this reality in relationship to the memorial stones, see Stuart, *Exodus*, 608–609. For the covenantal nature of the participation in the body and blood representing the oneness of the people, see Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 514.

²⁶ Thiselton (*First Corinthians*, 767) notes that the ground of the church's oneness was their communal participation in Christ rather than in the oneness of the bread per se.

²⁷ Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 234; Fee, *First Corinthians*, 518. Fee (518–519) notes that this unity did not come into existence by their participation in the loaf but rather was symbolized by it.

²⁸ Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 518.

²⁹ This does not exclude, however, the danger of remembrance bringing judgment if the attitude of the worshipper was unfaithful.

stretch to claim that when the body of Christ came before God it represented not only Christ and his sacrifice (his body), but also in a subsidiary way, his people (his body).

A look at the context surrounding 11:24–25 will help answer this question.³⁰ In 11:29, the Corinthians were called to discern the body, for if they do not, they will fall into judgment. This discerning of the body did not refer to recognizing Christ’s presence in the bread but rather to realizing that in the eating of the Supper a new political and social reality was being created, namely the church.³¹ If the Corinthians failed to realize this, the church would come under God’s judgment for in doing so, they would be despising the sacrifice of Christ.³² In the OT, God’s judgment was frequently a direct result of His remembering His people.³³ These two concepts, the sacrifice of Christ and the reconstituted body can be drawn together under the concept of the memory of a new reality. In the Supper, two realities were remembered: the primary reality, Christ’s sacrifice and the secondary reality, the body of Christ brought into existence because of his sacrifice. God’s remembering of these realities can be paralleled to his remembering of the stones.³⁴ Like the stones memorialized Israel so that they would be remembered and either not judged or judged depending upon their relationship to their covenant, so now Christ’s body the church was memorialized secondarily. As such, they would be remembered by God and judged depending upon their relationship to the primary object of memory, namely, Christ himself and his sacrifice.³⁵ We must be cautious, however, of making too much of this connection as it is not

³⁰ Thurian, *Eucharistic Memorial*, 1:58–59.

³¹ Charles Campbell, 191–193.

³² Preben Vang, *1 Corinthians*, TTTCS, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2014), 154.

³³ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 33; Eising, “זָכַר,” 4:66.

³⁴ This concept is clearly implied by Charles L. Campbell, *1 Corinthians*, BTCB, (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2018), 191–193, although he talks of it in terms of proclamation not memory.

³⁵ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 553; B. J. Oropeza, *1 Corinthians*, NCCS, (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2017), 95.

a parallel Paul is explicitly making. Rather it is a theological parallel we can see when considering the exegetical context of 1 Corinthians 11 as it relates to memory and the OT. What is more, even if this backdrop were valid, it would by no means preclude the need for human remembrance as Paul clearly saw it necessary for the Corinthians to remember their unity through their participation in the bread (10:16–17; 11:33–34).³⁶

Connections with the next memorial surveyed, God’s memorial name in Ex. 3:15, take us to the beginning and end of this letter to the Corinthians. Paul’s letter was framed by a “liturgical inclusio,” beginning with his reference to “all who call upon the name of the Lord” (1:2) and ending with the invocation, “Maranatha!” (16:22).³⁷ A similar calling upon Christ’s name governed the Corinthian assembly such that the church was defined as those who evoked Jesus’s name (5:4).³⁸ In each case, calling upon Jesus’s name involved a recognition of his covenant lordship and thereby a subjecting of his people to covenantal blessings and curses in accordance with their fidelity to him.³⁹ In the case of the sexually immoral man in ch. 5, this meant that the Corinthian congregation who appealed to Christ’s name now bore the authority for judgment (or salvation) signified by his name as they both judged and saved the sinner in their midst (5:4–5).⁴⁰ When they cried, “Maranatha!”, it meant that their covenantal lord would come to save those who relied on him while declaring the verdict of anathema over those who disobeyed.⁴¹

³⁶ Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 518.

³⁷ Victor C. Pfitzner, “Proclaiming the Name: Cultic Narrative and Eucharistic Proclamation in First Corinthians,” *Lutheran Theological Journal* 25, no 1 (May 1991): 16.

³⁸ Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 211; Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 229.

³⁹ For the recognition of covenant lordship, see Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 58. For covenantal blessings and curses as a result of the appeal to Jesus’s name, Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 751–752; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 774.

⁴⁰ Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 229; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 166–167.

⁴¹ Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 751–752.

When Paul spoke of the Supper, he foregrounded Christ's role as covenant lord with the authority to bless and to judge.⁴² As participants in his body and his blood (10:16–17), those who ate the Eucharist entered into a “binding covenant relationship” and could expect his presence either as a blessing or a curse.⁴³ Paul enjoined the Corinthians not to provoke Jesus's wrath either by eating pagan sacrifices (10:19–22) or by dishonoring the oneness of his body (11:17–22, 27–34).⁴⁴ To irreverently partake of the Eucharist was a matter of grave danger since it brought a partaker under Christ's covenantal judgment, paralleling perhaps the danger brought on those in the OT who invoked Yahweh's name with an attitude of irreverence (Amos 6:10).⁴⁵

While these reflections draw a strong theological connection between God's memorial presence judging and saving the people in the OT with his judging and saving the Corinthians, an explicit connection would require some linguistic or contextual link between Ex 3:15 and 1 Cor 11:23–26. The parallel declaration, “this is my” (τοῦτό μου ἐστίν) in 1 Cor 11:24 and Ex 3:15 (LXX) provides just that. While the referent of this is God's name in Ex 3:15, it is Christ's body in 1 Cor 11:24. Each of these statements are followed by a clause clarifying that what has been given is a memorial (μνημόσυνον in Ex 3:15, LXX; ἀνάμνησις in 1 Cor 11:24). The fact that 1 Corinthians speaks of the need for something to be done, namely, the Supper ritual, as a memorial should not blur this connection. In Exodus, also, something had to be done for the

⁴² Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 455.

⁴³ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 481.

⁴⁴ Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 455; 514; 519.

⁴⁵ On the danger of participating in the Supper, see Ciampa and Rosner (*First Corinthians*, 554–557) and Gardner (*1 Corinthians*, 513–520), among others.

memorial to work, that is, Yahweh's name had to be called upon.⁴⁶ In both cases, the passages display a covenantal self-giving of God to his people. In Exodus, God gave himself through his name. In 1 Corinthians, Jesus gave himself not only through his name but even through his body which could be eaten. This contrast well displays the increased closeness that the people of God have with him in the new covenant.

In both cases, this giving of God to his people was mediated by a man. In Exodus, Moses was given the covenant memorial and told to give it in turn to the Israelites. In 1 Corinthians, Paul was given the covenant memorial and gave it in turn to the Corinthians.⁴⁷ It could also be argued that in both cases what was being given was a means of communicating with God and inviting his presence. As already discussed, God's memorial name was a way whereby his presence would be invoked as a means of blessing and judgment.⁴⁸ Given the covenantal context already discussed, could it be that Jesus was giving his body as a means by which his people could invite his his presence and power. After all, when the Corinthians partook, they were submitting themselves to Christ's judgment.⁴⁹ Is it such a stretch to say that the way they submitted to this judgment was by inviting Christ to remember them, either to bless them or

⁴⁶ This is why the Jewish conception that Yahweh's name should never be spoken is so contrary to the entire thrust of their own Scriptures, the Hebrew Bible, that is the OT. With the transition into the New Testament, instead of calling upon the name of Yahweh to be saved, Christians call upon the name of Jesus to be saved (Rom 10:7–8).

⁴⁷ Obviously, Paul was not there at the institution of the Supper. But, as he says in 11:23, the Supper is portrayed as something "he received from the Lord."

⁴⁸ For calling upon the name of the Lord as a parallel to God's memorial name, see Thurian, *Eucharistic Memorial*, 1:111.

⁴⁹ For Christ as the subject of Eucharistic judgment, see Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 519.

curse them?⁵⁰ On the basis of this, it seems entirely possible to see Christ as a potential subject/actor of ἀνάμνησις, himself being invited to join in remembering by the memorial.

Another quick aside into the object, that is the person remembered, is fitting here. As with God the Father's remembrance as well as the people's remembrance, the primary object of Jesus's memory in the Supper was his own sacrifice which instituted a new covenant with his people and caused them to be objects of God's favor.⁵¹ However, secondarily Christ would remember his people and their covenantal obligations, which if they failed to perform, would bring judgment.⁵² This structure paralleled the use of God's memorial name in the OT, wherein God would first be invited to remember his covenant with his people as a basis for his favor upon them, before secondarily remembering his people's attitude towards his covenant and its obligations.⁵³

If one is convinced that Christ remembers through his own memorial would not exclude the need for the Corinthians to remember. Even viewing ἀνάμνησις within the frame of God's memorial name, it would be important for the people to call upon Christ's name as a means of acknowledging him as their covenantal lord.⁵⁴ Moreover, God's memorial name is not the only frame from which to view Paul's depiction of eucharistic memory. The memorial stones from the

⁵⁰ For the invitation of Christ's power and presence through the Eucharist, see Ciampa and Rosner, *First Corinthians*, 551; Sykes, "Eucharistic Anamnesis," 117. For the Eucharist as a calling upon Jesus's name, see Macina, "Eucharistic Memorial (Anamnesis)," 7; Sykes, "Eucharistic Anamnesis," 117.

⁵¹ Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 78.

⁵² Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 519.

⁵³ While not drawing connections to the ἀνάμνησις, Gardner (*First Corinthians*, 517) points out that even the intent of Christ's judgment was ultimately to bring their salvation by disciplining them so that they would not be judged with the world (11:32). This is also apparent earlier on in ch. 5, where the immoral man was cast out so that he could be saved in the day of the Lord (5:5).

⁵⁴ Gardner (*1 Corinthians*, 57–58) though Gardner does not tie this to the Eucharist but to calling upon the Lord in general.

Jordan in Josh. 4 supply an equally insightful backdrop.⁵⁵ When viewed through the lens of Josh. 4, the Supper's human memory becomes foregrounded, the Father's becomes peripheral, and Christ's fades from view.

While not denying that the Supper's proclamatory character was derived in part from the Passover ritual, it should be recognized that this element also parallels Joshua's description of the verbal recitation surrounding the memorial stones (Josh. 4:6–7, 20–24, ἀναγγέλλω in the LXX in v. 22).⁵⁶ The commemorating of the miraculous Jordan crossing would keep the event ever-present in the minds of Israel.⁵⁷ This played a critical function for a people in constant danger of forgetting the mighty acts which their God had wrought on their behalf.⁵⁸ An even graver danger faced the Corinthians—forgetting what Jesus's work on the cross actually accomplished.⁵⁹ Throughout his letter, Paul had to remind the forgetful Corinthians of the traditions they received from him (11:2), the gospel he preached to them (15:1), and the conduct to which the gospel impelled them (1:12). It is no surprise, then, that Paul gave them a tradition by which the event which shaped these realities, Jesus's sacrificial death, would be regularly proclaimed unto them.

The aim of such mnemonic presentation—namely, to remind God's people of their shared covenantal history which shaped them into a unified body—further links these two

⁵⁵ See David G. Firth, *Joshua*, EBTC (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Academic, 2021), 112; Hess, *Joshua*, 120; Hubbard Jr., *Joshua*, 169–170.

⁵⁶ Firth, *Joshua*, 112; Hubbard Jr., *Joshua*, 169–170.

⁵⁷ Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 310–311.

⁵⁸ Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 306.

⁵⁹ Hubbard Jr., *Joshua*, 169; Millard, "Covenant and Communion," 245. Millard consciously puts himself directly contra Jeremias (*Eucharist Words of Jesus*, 251) who believed that it was not a possibility that Jesus would be forgotten by his disciples. Millard ("Covenant and Communion," 245) is right that this was a real danger for the disciples. Moreover, if it was a danger for the disciples, it be even more so for the Corinthians.

memorials. When Paul insisted on the use of a memorial to remember the marvelous acts of God's dealings with his people, he was acting in line with an already established tradition witnessed to by this passage in Joshua, as well as by Ex. 12–13. As with these OT memorials, Paul understood this central event and its memorial to bind the people together as one covenantal entity.⁶⁰ In Joshua's time, the unification had been commemorated by twelve stones which witnessed to one nation comprised of twelve tribes.⁶¹ In Paul's time, the one loaf signified one body made up of many members (1 Cor. 10:17).

These resonances between the memorial stones of Josh. 4 and Paul's presentation of the Supper highlight the Corinthians' role as the subject of the Supper's ἀνάμνησις. In both cases, the people remembered and proclaimed a mighty act of God whereby he both delivered his people and formed them into a single body. Even so, this does not exclude a secondary remembrance in which God was reminded of the people who now constituted the one body in a similar way to how the stones from the Jordan may have reminded him of the newly constituted nation of Israel. This underlining of human memory provides an interesting contrast with the role of the next memorial in shaping Paul's conceptual image of ἀνάμνησις, namely the אֶזְכָּרָה offering of Lev. 2.

When combined with the lexical parallels between Lev. 2 and 1 Cor. 11, Paul's framing of the Lord's Supper as a sacrificial meal shared with God's covenantal people (10:1–4, 15–18; 11:25) is more than sufficient to establish a theological tie between Paul's ἀνάμνησις and the אֶזְכָּרָה of the grain offerings.⁶² For Paul, the Israelites who ate the portion of the sacrifices not

⁶⁰ Ciampa and Rosner, *First Corinthians*, 476.

⁶¹ For the memorial stones as a witness to the nation's unity accomplished by the Jordan crossing, see Auld, *Joshua*, 114; Nelson, *Joshua*, 69; 71.

⁶² For Paul's framing of the Lord's Supper as a sacrificial meal shared with his people, see Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 477; Jeffrey J. Meyers, *The Lord's Service: The Grace of Covenant Renewal Worship* (Moscow, ID: Canon Press,

consumed on the altar became “participants in the altar” and came to share in fellowship with God (10:18).⁶³ While this statement has been understood by some as a reference to Israel’s idolatrous sacrifices in the wilderness, given the use of the present tense participle it seems more likely that Paul was referring to a gnomic principle rather than a specific historic event.⁶⁴ Whether the sacrifices in view were the ones from which only the priests ate (such as the grain offering) or from which the people were allowed to participate, it seems that in Israel’s consumption of the sacrifices in Yahweh’s presence Paul saw a potential analogue to the Supper meal.⁶⁵

For Paul, these rituals were also linked by their covenantal implications. By partaking of the Christian sacral meal, the people came into covenantal communion with Christ’s death and received a share in the blessing that he had earned on the cross (10:16–17).⁶⁶ In an analogous manner, an Israelite worshipper or priest who offered a sacrifice (such as the grain offering with its אֲזִיקָה) would experience not only the benefits of his sacrifice but also its efficacy before God.⁶⁷ Whether the sacrifice that had been offered was Jesus’s body or an Israelite ritual

2003), 84–85. For the אֲזִיקָה as a background to the Supper’s ἀνάμνησις, see Clancy, “Roots of Remembrance,” 38–40; Eugene H. Merrill, “Remembering: A Central Theme in Biblical Worship,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 43, no. 1 (2000): 35–36.

⁶³ Schreiner, *1 Corinthians*, 211.

⁶⁴ Ciampa and Rosner, *First Corinthians*, 477. While Ciampa and Rosner also mention the possibility the sacrifices referred to were those at the Jewish Temple contemporary with Paul’s writing, but this seems unlikely. See the discussion of the present participle in Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 516–533, noting especially p. 523. For scholars who argue for this as a reference to the idolatry in the wilderness, see Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 579; Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 453.

⁶⁵ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 392. For a commentator that argues for this as the priest’s participation primarily, see Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 380. For examples of commentators who view this as sacrifices of which the people were allowed to eat, see Fee, *First Corinthians*, 519; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 392. For commentators who leave unspecified the sacrifices referred to, see Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 172; Schreiner, *1 Corinthians*, 211.

⁶⁶ Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 232; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 171. For the covenantal nature of this, see Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 450.

⁶⁷ Ciampa and Rosner, *First Corinthians*, 478.

sacrifice, this benefit only accrued to those who ate from the altar because in their eating they became identified with what had been offered as well as with the Lord of the altar.⁶⁸ Thus in one sweeping move those who ate of an altar both were bound in covenantal fellowship with the Lord and became beneficiaries of the Lord's sacrifices.⁶⁹ It can also be stated that both under the old and the new administrations, this process came to be through sacrificial bread, as within the Levitical laws, every food offering was referred to as bread (לֶחֶם) (Lev 21:6, 8, 17, 21–22).⁷⁰

More than tying the Supper to the sacrificial system in general, Paul's sacrificial framing related εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν directly to the אֶזְכָּרָה of the grain offerings.⁷¹ After all, the mnemonic role of the אֶזְכָּרָה parallels the covenantal function of the eating of the sacrifices. On the one hand, as a memorial portion, the אֶזְכָּרָה prompted Yahweh's remembrance of the sacrifice.⁷² Because the worshipper had become identified with the offering's אֶזְכָּרָה, when God was reminded of the sacrifice, he granted to the worshipper its benefits and efficacy.⁷³ Indeed, God's merciful remembering of the sacrifice meant that in a subsidiary way he remembered the worshipper who offered it as well.⁷⁴ On the other hand, through its function as a token, the אֶזְכָּרָה invited human memory. Every time the worshipper offered the אֶזְכָּרָה of his grain offering, he

⁶⁸ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 392.

⁶⁹ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 392; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 477; Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 452.

⁷⁰ Meyers, *The Lord's Service*, 84–85. Interestingly, the LXX renders לֶחֶם in Lev. 21 consistently with δῶρον.

⁷¹ Clancy, "Roots of Remembrance," 38–40; Eugene H. Merrill, "Remembering: A Central Theme in Biblical Worship," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 43, no. 1 (2000): 35–36. See also for Paul's framing of the Eucharist in sacrificial terms, Gregg, *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, 15.

⁷² Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 73.

⁷³ For this point in regard to the offerings in general, see Ciampa and Rosner, *First Corinthians*, 478; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 392.

⁷⁴ Sklar, *Leviticus*, 97.

remembered Yahweh and affirmed his covenantal allegiance to him.⁷⁵ These connections with the *אָנְכָרָה* highlight both God and humanity's remembrance as crucial to the Supper's *ἀνάμνησις*. The covenantal participation in the Eucharist established between God and his people required both parties to remember each other through the meal which commemorated Christ's sacrifice.⁷⁶ On the part of God's people, they were required to remember Jesus, what he had done, and the covenant he inaugurated.⁷⁷ In doing so, they were to affirm and renew their covenantal commitment to God.⁷⁸ God's part then was to remember Jesus's sacrifice as the foundation of his covenant with his people and, in a subsidiary way, to remember his covenantal people whom Jesus's sacrifice had purchased.⁷⁹ Thus, just as the *אָנְכָרָה* facilitated covenantal fellowship through God and Israel's remembrance, so now covenantal communion required both God and his people to remember Christ's sacrifice through the eucharistic *ἀνάμνησις*.

This leaves the Psalm headings as the final memorials to be considered. While they are occasionally discounted as a background for 1 Cor. 11:24–25 due to the supposed vagueness of their meaning, our earlier discussion demonstrated that their mnemonic intent can be deciphered.⁸⁰ This brings these texts back into play. The question then becomes, what parallels are there between prayers of David for God's remembrance instantiated as ritual songs to be repeated by the Israelite congregation and Paul's exposition of the Supper in 1 Corinthians.

⁷⁵ Wenham, *Leviticus*, 69–70.

⁷⁶ McKenna, "Eucharist and Memorial," 521.

⁷⁷ Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 77–78. McKenna, "

⁷⁸ McKenna, "Eucharist and Memorial," 521; Millard, "Covenant and Communion," 241–248.

⁷⁹ McKenna, "Eucharist and Memorial," 521; Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 77–78.

⁸⁰ Douglas Jones, "Ἀνάμνησις in the LXX," 187.

By portraying Jesus's prayers of thanks and blessing, Paul underlined that Jesus was one who offered up prayers to God. While these prayers would facilitate Jesus's relationship with God, they were also prayers on behalf of his people. After all, Jesus was fulfilling the role both of the head of a household who presided over the meal and as the covenantal mediator of a new covenant.⁸¹ Indeed, Paul portrayed the whole of Jesus's actions and words as given for the people, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (11:24).⁸² The covenantal and mediatorial function of Jesus's actions in someways parallels what David the psalmist did as a mediator, offering up his psalms of prayer, firstly on his own behalf and secondly on behalf of the people.

Paul's inclusion of Jesus's words of institution developed also the theme of Jesus as the initiator of a cultic tradition.⁸³ In the vein of David whose words became rituals (that is, ritual songs) by which the people approached Yahweh, Jesus's words and deeds were preserved by Paul as a new means by which the church would enter God's presence. As David's words had been repeated regularly as part of corporate worship, so too now were Jesus's words.⁸⁴ This ritual worship was of course covenantal. While the Psalms had been part of a system with the central aim of maintaining the covenantal relation between God and his people, Jesus's words formed a rite of covenantal renewal between God and his people.⁸⁵ Thus, just like David's words, Jesus's words did not exist merely for the hour of his supplication but were recorded for

⁸¹ For Jesus's role as the head of the household, see Ciampa and Rosner, *First Corinthians*, 549. For Jesus as the mediator of a new covenant, see Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 397; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 884–885.

⁸² Gardner (*1 Corinthians*, 510) and Garland (*1 Corinthians*, 547) underline the vicarious sense of these words as central to Christ's actions.

⁸³ Aitken, "Eucharistic Memory of Jesus's Words," 369–370.

⁸⁴ Aitken, "Eucharistic Memory of Jesus's Words," 366–370; Ciampa and Rosner, *First Corinthians*, 551.

⁸⁵ For the institution of the Eucharist as a means of covenant renewal, see Aitken, "Eucharistic Memory of Jesus's Words," 366–370.

the congregation as a memorial. It should be noted that Paul emphasized the actions (giving thanks, breaking bread, etc.) and the objects (bread and wine) associated with the remembrance as well as the specific words.⁸⁶ While this emphasis differed slightly from Psalms 38 [37] and 70 [69]’s focus on the role of David’s words themselves, the canonical context of these words is intriguing when it comes to the meaning of Paul’s use of ἀνάμνησις. While this should not be viewed as the primary element Paul had in view, it should not be completely written off, especially when the frequency with which Paul presented Jesus as the Davidic Messiah is considered (Rom. 1:3; 15:12; 2 Tim 2:8).⁸⁷

In light of this theological parallel, it would seem quite possible to see Jesus’s institution of this new memorial as intended to invoke God’s remembrance.⁸⁸ Just as David’s prayers had served as a pattern whereby Israel invited God to remember David, so now Jesus’s prayers, words, and actions gave a pattern for the church to follow so that God would remember the new Davidite. This would lead seamlessly into God also then remembering his people on the basis of the new covenant which he had made with them through this new Davidite.⁸⁹ Thus, as argued earlier, when the Corinthians partook of the meal, they reminded God not only of Jesus but also of the people Jesus represented.⁹⁰ Yet, as with the memorial Psalms, this process did not preclude

⁸⁶ Ciampa and Rosner (*First Corinthians*, 551) as well as Gregg (*Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, 15) include all of Christ’s actions, including his prayers, his serving of the meal, and the actual words of institution as part of what would be done for a remembrance.

⁸⁷ Thomas Schreiner, *Romans*, BECNT, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2018), 44. This motif is by no means contrary to Paul’s presentation in 1 Corinthians, where he referred to Jesus as Χριστός 64 times.

⁸⁸ Jamir (“The Concept of Anamnēsis,” 46–47) argues for this point through tying it to memorial prayers in general rather than the Psalms.

⁸⁹ For the theme of God’s remembrance of his covenant with his people which was founded upon Christ’s sacrifice as leading to the blessing of his people, see Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 397. Daffern (“Prayers for Remembering,” 132–135) establishes this pattern well when it comes to the memorial Psalms.

⁹⁰ This theme is quite prevalent in Jeremias’ work (*Eucharistic Memory of Jesus*, 252–255). For Jeremias, Jesus was the Davidic Messiah who represented his people and caused God’s favorable remembrance of them.

the people's need to remember the Davidic figure. Indeed, Jesus's very command to "do this (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε)" required that they remember him by performing the ritual handed down by him.⁹¹ When they did so, they would be sparking God's memory while also being reminded of Jesus as the instituter of a tradition by which God's remembrance would be kindled.⁹² Analogies with the memorial Psalms thus draw to mind multiple layers of memory, even if they foreground divine remembrance of Jesus.

The Subject of Paul's Ἀνάμνησις

From this exploration of the context of Paul's ἀνάμνησις, it is evident that Paul's portrayal of eucharistic memory bore strong resemblances to five of the six OT memorials sampled (with the stones on Aaron's garments as the one exception). Ties to the Passover memorial, while the strongest, did not overshadow other memorial associations. Rather, our study has illustrated that four of the other memorials had thematic and linguistic connections to the ἀνάμνησις of 1 Corinthians. As such, the study of the subject/actors who remembered through these memorials has a real potential relevance to helping understand who it was that was remembering through the memorial of the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians.

If the insights from these various memorials are believed, the multifaceted nature of the subject of Paul's ἀνάμνησις would become apparent. On the one hand, there is a wide palette of potential OT allusions in 1 Cor 11 that lend credence to understanding the Corinthians as an actor in eucharistic memory. Through the Passover and the memorial stones from the Jordan, a

⁹¹ Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 397.

⁹² For the remembrance of Jesus as the instituter of a tradition, see Aitken, "Eucharistic Memory of Jesus's Words," 369–370.

picture can be seen of God's people as those who had an obligation to remember Jesus and the great salvation he worked. Similarly, the one loaf causing the Corinthians to remember Jesus their mediator who unified them in his body can be connected to the stones on Aaron's garments causing the Israelites to remember Aaron their mediator. Through a parallel of Christ's body (Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα, 1 Cor 11:24) to God's memorial name (τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν ὄνομα, Ex 3:15, LXX) the need to remember Jesus by calling upon him and by performing the supper can be seen. Through the overlap with the אֶזְכָּרָה of Lev. 2's grain offerings, the church's need to remember Jesus, the covenant he inaugurated, and the obligations requisite to that covenant come into view. Then, finally, through linguistic and liturgical connections to the Psalm headings, an obligation to remember Jesus as the instituter of a cultic tradition by performing the ritual he established is demonstrated.

On the other hand, viewing Paul's ἀνάμνησις through this same amalgamation of texts can display a picture of God as the subject of remembrance, that is, the one who remembers. As in the Passover, the blood of the sacrificial lamb was given as a sign to prompt God's remembrance, so also the drinking of Jesus's blood can be seen as a sign so God would remember the sacrifice Jesus provided. In connection with the אֶזְכָּרָה, the Eucharist can be viewed as a memorial sacrifice before God so that God would remember Jesus's offering and bless his people because of it. Relying on the Psalm headings, Jesus can be portrayed as the new Davidite, instituting a means of ritual worship by which the people of God would ask God to remember Jesus as the mediator of a new covenant. It can even be argued that through the one loaf and its parallels with the stones of both the Jordan and Aaron's garments, God was invited to remember his people who had been unified as one body through Jesus's mediatorial act of salvation. It should be noted as far as this connection though that not only is this concept is weaker in these

two OT texts than some of the other texts but also its tie to Paul's ἀνάμνησις could be similarly debated. Finally, in a perhaps surprising twist, through Ex. 3:15 and God's memorial name, especially in concert with the theme of Christ's eucharistic judgment, Christ himself can be argued to be a subject of ἀνάμνησις, remembering his own people when they call upon him through his memorial meal.

These connections demonstrate that the subject/actor of Paul's ἀνάμνησις can be understood well through its connects to a diverse range of OT memorials. As such, it can be reasonably argued that ἀνάμνησις is a complex term with an OT memorial background which has at least a dual subject of those who remember if not a tripartite one. By its strong connections with memorials that emphasized Israel's memory, Paul's ἀνάμνησις should be seen as prompting the church to act and remember. By its reliance upon memorials that stressed Yahweh's remembrance, Paul's ἀνάμνησις should be seen as having God as its subject, that is, displaying God as the one who remembers. Finally, by depicting Jesus as the covenantal lord upon whose name his people called, it is quite feasible that Paul was placing Jesus as a third subject for ἀνάμνησις. Thus, it can be concluded that in light of connections with OT memorials, the subjects who remember through Paul's ἀνάμνησις to at least include God the Father and the church with Jesus as arguably a third subject of the action of remembering.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

The OT semantic backdrop of Paul's ἀνάμνησις provides a key to resolving the elusive issue of its subject. When framed against this backdrop, its threefold subject comes into focus. This is evidenced by the parallels between the six memorials sampled and Paul's eucharistic ἀνάμνησις. Within their OT context, these memorials, while diverse, pointed to the necessity that both God and Israel remember their covenantal commitments to one another. Some of them emphasized God's need to remember and others, the people's. By understanding how these multi-faceted memorials were a background to Paul's portrayal of eucharistic memory, it becomes clear that Paul characterized God and men as subjects/actors of the ἀνάμνησις, with Christ as a potential third subject who also remembered.

This conclusion runs contrary to the consensus among 1 Corinthians' commentators that the ἀνάμνησις solely had the church's remembering in view. It also differs greatly from Jeremias' initial proposal that God's memory alone was in view in 1 Cor. 11:24–25. It aligns far more closely to the steadily growing minority of scholars who have advanced a dual eucharistic remembrance. Yet it adds a wrinkle even to this interpretation by the potential inclusion of Jesus as a third subject.

Further research would be beneficial to supplement the current study given its limitations. A consideration of the OT cultic memorials not chosen in my sampling would be a natural next step. As a few scholars have noted ties between Num. 5:15–26 and Lev. 24:7 with Paul's presentation of the Supper, an exploration of these two texts could be particularly fruitful. Furthermore, due to the extensive focus on the ἀνάμνησις, a future work connecting the broader context of 1 Cor. 11:23–26 (new covenant, sacrificial imagery, etc.) with OT themes likely

would prove quite revealing. These new areas of research could perhaps add to all the revelations this study has already provided.

Placing Paul's ἀνάμνησις within an OT semantic context has proved elucidating in the quest for deciphering its subject. It has challenged the majority consensus and given support to the growing minority position while introducing a few changes of its own. While further study holds promise, the memorials already explored provide strong grounds for the conclusion that God the Father, the Corinthians, and quite possibly even Christ himself were all subjects for the ἀνάμνησις of 1 Cor. 11:24–25.

Appendix

Memory in the Old Testament

A cursory overview of the broader theme of memory in the OT will help to properly contextualize this exploration into OT memorials. Memory is a foundational theme in the OT canon, with the verb alone (זָכַר) occurring over two-hundred times in the MT.¹ זָכַר is a broad term with the most common meaning of “to remember.”² While it most often indicates a recollection of the past, it is not uncommon for the object of memory to be a present or future reality.³ Thus, it seems that what is most central to OT memory is the bringing to mind of a reality whether that reality is a past event or a present truth.⁴

While such remembrance refers to an internal cognitive state, it almost always goes beyond a simple thought process and bleeds into the world of action.⁵ For the OT writers, to remember constitutes an “active relationship with the obj. of memory” whereby one realized the object’s present significance and acted upon it.⁶ While in most cases the cognitive state indicated by “to remember” is not identical with the subsequent actions, memory can never be divorced from the actions to which it leads.⁷ Such a tie is further underlined by instances when “to remember” is used metonymically to refer another action, such as in 1 Sam. 25:31 when David’s

¹ 225 times precisely: 173 of these being in the Qal stem, 32 in the Hiphil and 20 in the Niphal.

² Schottroff, “זָכַר,” 1:383.

³ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 10.

⁴ Eising, “זָכַר,” 4:66–67.

⁵ Eising, “זָכַר,” 4:65–66.

⁶ Schottroff, “זָכַר,” 1:383; “ἀναμνησκειν,” 3:309.

⁷ This is what is most likely behind Childs statement that “memory is not identical with action, but it is never divorced from it” (*Memory and Tradition*, 33).

remembrance of Abigail equates with his marrying of her.⁸ For this reason, the OT writers could speak of remembering something either on someone's behalf or against them (Ps. 132:13; 137:7).⁹ In such cases, by their recollection of a given reality, the rememberer would be induced to action towards another bringing about either their good or their ill (Neh. 5:19; Jer. 2:2).¹⁰ In this way, memory in the OT almost always produced an effect in the world.

Mnemonic language is widespread throughout the OT and cannot be limited to merely the cultic realm.¹¹ Even so, it cannot be denied that the זָכַר root has a particular preponderance in religious contexts.¹² Yet more broadly, memory functioned as a covenantal reality that bound God and the people of Israel together both within and outside of the context of the cult.¹³ Instances where the subject of זָכַר is either God, Israel, or some individual from the corporate body of Israel far outnumber any other usages.¹⁴

While remembrance could come about spontaneously, it could also be induced. Sometimes this was done verbally, through pleas and prayers which caused God to remember (Ps. 74:2, 18, 22), or through recitations of commands and history, causing Israel to remember (Deut 9:7; 16:12; 24:9). Other times, it was done ritually, as various festivals, sacrifices, and physical signs were given to invite both God and man to remember (Ex. 13:9; 28:12, 29;

⁸ Verhey, "Remember, Remembrance," 5:668.

⁹ Schottroff, "זָכַר," 1:383. This includes both instances speaking of remembering according to or on account of someone (with עַל or כִּי), as well as for or against someone (with the preposition לִי). Childs notes that the construction with the לִי preposition occurs most frequently when God is the subject of memory (*Memory and Tradition*, 31).

¹⁰ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 31–32.

¹¹ Schottroff, "זָכַר," 1:383.

¹² Eising, "זָכַר," 4: 66.

¹³ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 41–44; 50–65.

¹⁴ God appears as the subject of the Qal 73 times (Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 31), whereas Israel appears as the subject 94 times (Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 45).

30:16).¹⁵ Names also functioned as a way of keeping memory alive, finding frequent occurrence in conjunction with both the passive and causative stems of זָכַר. In conjunction with the causative stem, a deity's name often was either invoked, potentially inviting the remembrance of the one named (Josh. 23:7; Amos 6:10), or proclaimed, with the aim of spreading the praise of the one named (Ps. 6:6; Isa. 12:4).¹⁶ In conjunction with the passive stem, names referred to that by which a human was remembered, such that no longer having a name was equated with one's memory being wiped from the earth (Jer. 11:19).¹⁷

Tying these insights together, the primary function of memory was to produce a mindfulness of the significance of the object remembered. This, in turn, generally lead to action. While this occurred in all spheres of life, the most significant sphere for the OT writers is the relationship between God and Israel.¹⁸ It is germane, therefore, to consider in more depth both God's and Israel's memory.

God Remembers

Reference to God's memory in the OT can be grouped into three categories: pleas that God would remember (Judg 16:2; Neh. 5:19; Ps. 74:2), God's own descriptions of his remembrance (Gen. 9:15–16; Lev. 26:42, 45; Hos 7:2), and third-person descriptions of God's remembrance (Gen. 30:22; Ps. 115:12).¹⁹ Pleas for God to remember were offered throughout the

¹⁵ Eising, “זָכַר,” 4:77–78.

¹⁶ Thomas McComiskey, “זָכַר zākar,” in *Theological Word Book of the Old Testament*, ed. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1980), 1:242; Schottroff, “זָכַר,” 1:385.

¹⁷ Eising, “זָכַר,” 4:73.

¹⁸ Eising, “זָכַר,” 4:66.

¹⁹ Childs (*Memory and Tradition*, 35) groups instances where Yahweh is the subject of memory into two grammatical categories: “the imperative or jussive form of the verb imploring Yahweh to intervene (Pss. 74.18; 79.8)” and “the finite verb in which confidence is expressed that Yahweh has already acted (Ps. 105.42), continues

OT both by individuals and the people at large with a wide variety of objects, including God's covenant (Jer. 14:21), his people (Ps. 74:2), the patriarchs (Ex. 32:13), his own good character (Ps. 25:6; Hab. 3:2), human frailty (Ps. 89:48), worshippers' past positive actions (2 Kings 20:3 = Isa. 38:3), and the scoffing of enemies (Ps. 74:18, 22).²⁰ Yet, there was also something that God was repeatedly asked not to remember, namely, sins.²¹ Whatever the object, the call for God to remember was a call for him to act, whether this was remembering his covenant with Israel and saving them because of it (Ex. 32:13), punishing the complainant's enemies (Neh. 6:14), or having mercy on humans because of their frailty (Jb 7:7).²² In cases where the object was the complainant's or the community's sin, the goal of the plea was not that God would no longer have mental cognition of sin (an impossibility for the OT writers given Yahweh's omniscience) but rather that he would not bring punishment on account of it (Ps. 25:6–7; 7:8).²³

God's descriptions of his own memory often are focused upon his response to such pleas for memory. At times, his response shockingly was that he would remember Israel's sin and would visit (פָּקַד) it upon them (Hos. 7:2; 8:13).²⁴ In other cases, God promised to remember Israel and his covenant with them, which in turn caused him not to remember their sins (Jer.

to act (Ps. 8:5), or will surely act in the future (Hos. 8:13).” He sees counterparts to said grammatical forms in Israel's worship in the complaint psalm and the hymn (35). While I agree with his general division, it seems to me that a third category must be added to account for the plethora of instances in which God describes his own remembrance. Within Childs' categorization, these are seen as a prophetic subset of the complaint psalm, wherein the prophets depict Yahweh's response to his people's pleas (39–40). This does not seem to adequately account for the variety of instances in which God describes his own memory that are not responses to pleas and occur outside of the prophets (Gen. 9:15–16; Ex. 6:5; Lev. 26:42, 45).

²⁰ See Childs (*Memory and Tradition*, 35–39) and Schottroff (“זָכַר,” 1:386) for similar lists.

²¹ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 35.

²² Childs discussion of the complaint Psalm makes this clear (*Memory and Tradition*, 35–38).

²³ Childs (*Memory and Tradition*, 32) notes that in remembrance of one's sins, disfavor is always implied.

²⁴ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 39–40.

31:20, 34 [LXX: 38:20, 34]). Thus, while God visits his people based on his remembrance of them these visits are drastically different, either for good or for destruction, depending on the situation and heart attitude of the worshipper.²⁵ Third-person depictions of God as one who remembers tended to emphasize more this merciful connotation of God's remembrance. A similar range of objects is featured as in the pleas for God's remembrance, though with a particular emphasis on the covenant (Ps. 105:8; 1 Ch 16:15).²⁶ Strikingly, in the prophets, God is pictured not only as remembering his covenant, but also as establishing a new covenant on the basis of his merciful remembrance of Israel and his previous covenants with her (Jer. 31:20, 34 [38:20, 34]; Ezek. 16:60).

One of the most peculiar features that comes out in the OT's description of God's memory is his willingness to be reminded. Whereas the reminding-God motif is rare in ancient Greek literature, in the OT Yahweh is pictured as being repeatedly reminded.²⁷ While this reminding of God could be accomplished by the pleas of his people, God himself also instituted various signs to prompt his merciful remembrance (Gen. 9:13–16; Ex. 28:12, 29; Num. 10:9–10).²⁸ These signs included physical objects in God's creation, as well as various rituals, festivals, and sacrifices performed by Israel. There are even times when the causative stem of זָכַר is used in a juristic sense to refer to humans invoking God to remember guilt (Num. 5:15; 1 Kings 17:18; Ezek. 21:28, 29).²⁹

²⁵ In the words of Hamilton, *Exodus*, 62, "When God visits, he visits for weal or for woe."

²⁶ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 41.

²⁷ Chenderlin, "Do This as My Memorial," §298.

²⁸ Eising, "זָכַר," 4:78.

²⁹ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 14; Schottroff, "זָכַר," 1:385.

Israel could rely upon God to remember because his remembrance was based upon his character.³⁰ They knew that even when they sinned Yahweh was a merciful God and so they could implore him to remember his mercy (Hab. 3:2). Furthermore, they knew that he was a covenantal God who had promised to be faithful to his people on the basis of his covenant with them (Ex. 2:24; 6:5).³¹ Such an affirmation lay behind both second-person appeals for and third-person descriptions of God's remembrance.

While God's remembrance of his people generally was one of mercy, his attitude was based upon the attitude of the worshipper. If an Israelite tried to invite God's merciful remembrance through a plea (Jer. 14:9–12), an invocation of his name (Isa. 48:1), or a sacrifice (Ps. 20:3 [19:3]; Isa. 66:3), they were not guaranteed success.³² If they were obstinate and faithless, God would remember their sins, not their sacrifices, and visit (פָקַד) them with judgment (Isa. 66:3; Jer. 14:9–12; Hos 7:2). Only if they were faithful and reliant upon him would these appointed means for prompting gracious remembrance be accepted. Even though at times God's remembrance is depicted as rewarding good deeds and punishing sins, attitude even trumped merit as a determinative for God's action towards his people.³³ Ezekiel repeatedly insists that if someone turned from their past sinful ways to rely upon God, he would forget their past wickedness and remember only their present faithfulness (and vice versa) (Ezek. 3:20; 18:22, 24; 33:13, 16).

³⁰ Eising, “זָכַר,” 4:72.

³¹ Eising, “זָכַר,” 4:72. Covenant was the object of remembrance in eleven instances (Eising, “זָכַר,” 4:70).

³² Examples of זָכַר being used to refer to the invoking of the name of the deity include in Josh. 23:7; Amos 6:10; Isa. 48:1; Ps. 20:8 (Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 13–14). Isaiah 48:1 & Ps. 20:8 are debated, however. Schottroff, for examples, sees Isa. 48:1 as an example of a confession of Yahweh's name rather an invocation of it (“זָכַר,” 1:385).

³³ Eising draws out examples of remembrance as a means of reward and punishment (“זָכַר,” 4:70).

God's ability to act in such a way stemmed from his merciful character and commitment to his covenant. Any worshipper who aligned himself from the heart could supplicate God's remembrance of his covenant, their sacrifices, or the patriarchs and expect God's favor in response (Ex. 32:13; Lev. 26:42, 45; Ps. 20:3). Any worshipper who shunned God's covenant in their heart could expect no such mercy (Isa. 66:3; Hos 8:13).

It should be noted that God's memory always entailed action.³⁴ For God to remember a given object (such as someone's sins or his own promises) meant that he would perform some act on the basis of said object. Particularly when people were the object of his memory, the result was always his visitation of them whether in mercy or judgment depending on their attitude (Jer. 14:9–12; 15:15; Ps. 8:4; 106:4).³⁵ When his covenant, promises, or character was the object, the result was always salvation and favor (Ex. 32:13; Deut. 9:27; Lev. 26:45; Ps. 119:49; Hab. 3:2).

Overall, Yahweh is depicted as the God who is willing to be reminded of his covenant with his people and to act on their behalf. While the theme of judgmental remembrance is present in the OT, the emphasis is on God's covenantal grace. Even when they were in exile because of their sins, if his people turned in true repentance, they could trust that Yahweh would remember them and visit them again, this time in mercy and not in judgment (Lev 26:42, 45).

Israel Remembers

As with God's memory, OT descriptions of human memory aim at more than mental cognition.³⁶ Especially in cases where God, his actions, or his law are the object, memory

³⁴ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 33.

³⁵ Eising notes the connection with פָּקַד ("זָכַר," 4:66) as does Childs (*Memory and Tradition*, 33). In Jeremiah 14:9–12, the object of memory is the people's sins, not the people themselves, but the effect is the same.

³⁶ Jamir, "The Concept of Anamnēsis," 38.

typically is seen as something that will shape one's heart posture and result in action.³⁷ When God himself is the object of remembrance, remembering often contained the connotations of faith, reliance, and even worship (Deut 8:18; Isa. 26:13).³⁸ For Israel to fail to remember God was not a mere lapse in memory but was apostasy and covenant infidelity (Jdg 8:34).³⁹ Such forgetfulness is always seen as resulting in idolatry (Deut 8:19). Idolatry itself is likewise pictured with mnemonic language as the remembering of the names of other gods (Ex. 23:13). Thus, when God said he would cause the names of the Baals to no longer be remembered in Israel, he was describing a widespread religious revival more than a change in recollection of facts (Hos. 2:19 [LXX, MT: 2:17]).

Similar effects are present when Israel remembered Yahweh's great acts in redemptive history. Sometimes, Israel was called to remember God's deeds, particularly the Exodus, to in turn produce confidence in God's character (Deut 5:15; 15:15).⁴⁰ Yet such remembrance went beyond producing merely psychological effects (confidence) to inculcating obedience to God's commandments (Deut 16:12; 24:9).⁴¹ Often, Israel's remembrance of a specific event in salvation history would serve as the basis for a later command such as the destruction of the Amalekites (Deut 15:15; 25:17).⁴² Indeed, the theme of remembering covenant history as a source of obedience is far more prevalent than that of remembering the Law itself (e.g., Mal.

³⁷ Eising, "זָכַר," 4: 67; Verhey, "Remember," 5:668.

³⁸ "ἀναμνησκόμενοι," 3:309.

³⁹ Verhey, "Remember," 5:668.

⁴⁰ Eising, "זָכַר," 4:67.

⁴¹ Ray Carlton Jones Jr., "Concept of Anamnēsis," 435; Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 50; Schottroff, "זָכַר," 1:387.

⁴² Schottroff, "זָכַר," 1:387.

4:4).⁴³ Remembrance of God and his acts often also entailed public proclamation to the congregation, especially when the causative stem of זָכַר is present (Ps. 71:16; Is 62:6; 63:7).

While these are rendered more literally with μνησκόμαι in the LXX, the immediate context of the contains verbs of proclamation, such as ἐξαγγέλλω and ἀπανγγέλλω, confirming such an interpretation (Isa. 12:4; Jer. 4:16).⁴⁴

From this overview, it is evident that human memory in the OT had a constituting function. While this was true of individuals, it was even more so of the people of God as a whole. It was Israel's memory of their common covenantal history with Yahweh that constituted them as a single people.⁴⁵ Every new generation of Israel shared in God's redemptive actions in the past since Israel itself was one ontological unity with a memory that spanned history (Deut 5:15; 9:7; 24:18, 22).⁴⁶ By mnemonically participating in this story, each Israelite found his or her place within the people of God.⁴⁷ Through their corporate memory, the present nation situated itself within the ongoing covenantal agreement between God and Israel.⁴⁸ The greatest danger to the community's identity then, was forgetfulness (Deut 8:11, 19).⁴⁹

⁴³ Eising ("זָכַר," 4:68) and Verhey ("Remember," 5:668) both note the comparative rarity of the Law as an object of memory compared to the acts of Yahweh in history.

⁴⁴ "μνησκόμαι," 3:310.

⁴⁵ Verhey, "Remember," 5:668.

⁴⁶ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 51.

⁴⁷ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 61.

⁴⁸ Childs, *Memory and Tradition*, 51.

⁴⁹ Verhey, "Remember," 5:668.

The ability of memory to shape conduct further solidified Israel's identity.⁵⁰ Israel was to remember Yahweh, his acts, and his Law to encourage obedience.⁵¹ They were to be the people who had confidence and faith in God and offered their service to him. Memory was so foundational to such confidence and trust that at times "to remember" is used in place of words for faith, service, and obedience.⁵² To recall the story of God's actions meant to live within the people of God and to worship Yahweh alone.

Perhaps this is why it was so crucial for the people's memory to be prompted in various ways. Individuals were to bring God to remembrance in the context of covenantal worship. That is, they were to proclaim his works and deeds so that others would remember Yahweh (Isa. 12:4; 62:6). Moreover, God instituted festivals, rituals, and signs that would incite Israel to remember him (Ex. 13:8).⁵³ The mnemonic function of such rituals is perhaps most explicit in Deut. 16:3, when the Festival of Unleavened Bread is said to be given "in order that you would remember."⁵⁴ It could even be argued that a mnemonic function was built into the warp and woof of the entire system of Israelite worship.⁵⁵

Clearly, Israel's memory served a covenantal role, constituting them as a people and setting them in relationship with God. The prime objects Israel was to remember were God and his great acts of salvation.⁵⁶ By doing so, their identity would be shaped, and they would be

⁵⁰ Jebasingh, "זכר," 85.

⁵¹ Schottroff, "זכר," 1:385.

⁵² "μνησκεισθε," 3:310.

⁵³ "μνησκεισθε," 3:310.

⁵⁴ Childs (*Memory and Tradition*, 53) makes this point. This is my translation of the Hebrew.

⁵⁵ "μνησκεισθε," 3:310; Jebasingh, "זכר," 79–81.

⁵⁶ Verhey, "Remember," 5:668.

prompted to actions of obedience and worship. In this way, Israel's memory of God functioned as a close counterpart to God's memory of her with every remembrance binding the two together in covenantal fellowship.

The Old Testament Conception of Memory

The basic purpose of memory in the OT is to call to mind the implications of a given event or reality such that one would act upon it in the present. This is equally true of God's memory, whereby he acted on behalf of Israel, and Israel's memory, whereby they recalled to mind God's redemptive dealings with them prompting their obedience to his Law. Memory was the covenantal glue that bound God and Israel together, uniting them around the history of God's mighty deeds accomplished for his people. This basic function underlies most, if not all, OT memorials.

Bibliography

- Alexander, T. Desmond. *Exodus*. Apollos Old Testament Commentary 2. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2017.
- Anglican - Roman Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission. "Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine 1971." Anglican Communion. 1971.
https://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/105215/ARCIC_I_Agreed_Statement_on_Eucharistic_Doctrine.pdf.
- Aitken, Ellen Bradshaw. "τα δρώμενα και τα λεγόμενα: The Eucharistic Memory of Jesus' Words in First Corinthians." *Harvard Theological Review* 90, no. 4 (October 1997): 359–370.
- Arnesen, Aelred. "The Myth of Anamnesis." *Theology* 105, no. 828 (Winter 2002): 436–443.
- Ashley, Timothy R. *The Book of Numbers*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- Baker, William. "1 Corinthians." In *Cornerstone Biblical Commentary*, edited by Philip W. Comfort, et al., 15:1–264. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 2009.
- Faith and Order Commission. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*. Faith and Order Paper 111. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1968.
- Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Revised and edited by Frederick William Danker, 3rd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Blass, Friedrich and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Revision of the ninth–tenth German Edition Incorporating Supplementary Notes of A. Debrunner*. Translated and edited by Robert W. Funk. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Bradshaw, Paul. "Anamnesis in Modern Eucharistic Debate." In *Memory and History in Christianity and Judaism*, edited by Michael Alan Signer, 73–84. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- Brookins, Timothy A. and Bruce W. Longenecker. *1 Corinthians 10-16: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. 1906. Reprinted, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010.
- Bruckner, James K. *Exodus*. Understanding the Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2008.

- Butler, Trent C. *Joshua 1–12*. 2nd ed. Word Biblical Commentary 7a. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2014.
- Caird, G. B. “Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint I.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 19, no. 2 (Oct 1968): 453–475.
- Campbell, Charles L. *1 Corinthians*. Belief: A Theological Commentary on the Bible. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2018.
- Capes, D. B. “The Lord’s Table: Divine or Human Remembrance?” *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 30, no. 2 (Summer 2003): 199–209.
- Childs, Brevard S. *The Book of Exodus: A Critical Theological Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville, KY: The Westminster Press, 1974.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Memory and Tradition in Israel*. Studies in Biblical Theology 37. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- Ciampa, Roy E. and Brian S. Rosner. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010.
- Clancy, Robert A. D. “The Old Testament Roots of Remembrance in the Lord’s Supper.” *Concordia Journal* 19, no. 1 (Jan 1993): 35–50.
- Chenderlin, Fritz, S. J. “*Do This as My Memorial*”: *The Semantic and Conceptual Background and Value of Ἀνάμνησις in 1 Cor. 11:24, 25*. Analecta Biblica 99. Rome, Lazio: Biblical Institute Press, 1982.
- Cole, R. Alan. *Exodus: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 2. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1977.
- Collins, C. John. “The Eucharist as Christian Sacrifice: How Patristic Authors Can Help Us Read the Bible.” *Westminster Theological Journal* 66, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 1–23.
- Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. Sacra Pagina 7. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Leitch. Edited by George W. MacRae, S. J. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Currid, John D. *A Study Commentary on Exodus*. 2 vols. Auburn, MA: Evangelical Press, 2000–2001.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. “Anamnesis: Memory and Commemoration in Early Christianity,” in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church*, 11–29. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976.
- Daffern, Megan I. J. “Prayers for Remembering.” PhD diss., University of Oxford, Exeter College, 2014. <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:b9f845c8-c271-4eb6-8a3c-e9acf75929f1>.
- Dix, Gregory. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. 2nd ed. London: Dacre Press, 1945.

- Dix, Gregory, eds. *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome, Bishop and Martyr*. 3rd ed. Revised by Henry Chadwick. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Dozeman, Thomas B. *Joshua 1–12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Yale Bible 6B. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015.
- Durham, John I. *Exodus*. Word Biblical Commentary 3. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Eaton, John. *The Psalms: A Historical and Spiritual Commentary with an Introduction and New Translation*. New York, NY: Continuum, 2005.
- Eising, H. “זָכָר *zākhar*.” In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, translated by David E Green, 4:64–82. Cambridge, Cambridgeshire: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.
- Ellingworth, Paul and Howard Hatton. *A Translator's Handbook on Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians*. Helps for Translators. New York, NY: United Bible Societies, 1985.
- Enns, Peter. *Exodus*. The NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 2000.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Rev. Ed. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2014.
- Firth, David G. *Joshua*. Evangelical Biblical Theology Commentary. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Academic, 2021.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Yale Bible 32. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Fretheim, Terrene E. *Exodus*. Interpretation: A Biblical Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010.
- Froniewski, Jacek. “Theological and Biblical Basis for Construing the Eucharist as a Memorial to the Sacrifice of Christ.” *Wrocławski Przegląd Teologiczny*, 29 no. 1 (2021): 137–162.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. *The Theology of the First Letter to the Corinthians*. New Testament Theology. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Gardner, Paul. *1 Corinthians*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2018.
- Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003.
- Garrett, Duane A. *A Commentary on Exodus*. Kregel Exegetical Library. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2014.
- Gestenberger, Erhard S. *Leviticus: A Commentary*. Translated by Douglas W. Scott. The Old Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- Gittoes, Julie. *Anamnesis and the Eucharist: Contemporary Anglican Approaches*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.

- Gregg, David. *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*. Grove Liturgical Study 5. Nottingham: Grove Books, 1976.
- Ḥakham, Amos. *Psalms*, vol. 1, *Psalms 1–57*. The Bible with Jerusalem Commentary. Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 2003.
- Harrisville, Roy A. *1 Corinthians*. Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1987.
- Hamilton, Victor P. *Exodus: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Hartley, John E. *Leviticus*. Word Biblical Commentary 4. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1992.
- Hays, Richard. *First Corinthians*. Interpretation: A Biblical Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1997.
- Hess, Richard S. *Joshua: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 6. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1996.
- Howard Jr., David M. *Joshua: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*. The New American Commentary 5. Nashville, TN: B & H Publishing Group, 1998.
- Hubbard Jr., Robert L. *Joshua*. The NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009.
- Jamir, Lanuwabang. “The Concept of Anamnēsis in First Corinthians 11:23–26.” *UBS Journal* 1, no. 2 (Sep 2003): 37–49.
- Jebasingh, Jebamony. “A Theological Appraisal of זכר (Remembrance).” *Bangalore Theological Forum* 46 no. 2 (2014): 75–88.
- Jenson, Robert W. *Visible Words: The Interpretation and Practice of the Christian Sacrament*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1978.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. 3rd ed. Translated by Norman Perrin. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Johnson, Alan F. *1 Corinthians*. The IVP New Testament Commentary. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2004.
- Johnstone, William. *Exodus 1–19*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2014.
- Jones, Douglas. “ἀνάμνησις in the LXX and the Interpretation of 1 Cor. XI. 25.” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 6, no. 2 (Oct 1955): 183–191.
- Jones Jr., Ray Carlton. “The Lord's Supper and the Concept of Anamnēsis.” *Word & World* 6, no. 4 (1986): 434–445.
- Joüon, Paul. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated and Revised by T. Muraoka. Roma, Lazio: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006.

- Kang, Im Seok. "Meaning of Remembrance of Me in 1 Corinthians 11:23–27 in Light of Bakgolnanmang; A Korean Concept of Honor." *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 21, no. 1 (Feb 2018): 49–65.
- Kariatlis, Philip. "The Notion of Memorial and its Centrality for a Proper Understanding of the Eucharist." *Phronema* 13 (1998): 53–64.
- Kidner, Derek. *Psalms 1–72: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 15. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1973.
- Kistemaker, Simon J. *Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993.
- Kiuchi, Nobuyoshi. *Leviticus*. Apollos Old Testament Commentary 3. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2007.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 1–59: A Commentary*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988.
- Levine, Baruch A. *Leviticus ויקרא: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation Commentary*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989.
- Macina, Menahem R. "The Jewish Background of the Eucharistic Memorial (Anamnesis). Academia." Translated by Peter Hocken. Academia. September 4th, 2021. https://www.academia.edu/4613409/The_Jewish_Background_to_the_Eucharistic_Anamnesis_Update_09_04_21_?auto=download. Originally published as "Fonction liturgique et eschatologique de l'anamnèse eucharistique (Lc 22,19; 1 Co 11,24.25): Réexamen de la question à la lumière des Ecritures et des sources juives." *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 102, no. 1 (1988): 3–25.
- McComiskey, Thomas. "זָכַר zākar." In *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke, 1:241–243. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1980.
- McConville, J. Gordon and Stephen N. Williams. *Joshua*. The Two Horizons Old Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010.
- McKenna, John H. "Eucharist and Memorial." *Worship* 79, no. 6 (Nov 2005): 504–522.
- Merrill, Eugene H. "Remembering: A Central Theme in Biblical Worship." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 43, no. 1 (2000): 27–36.
- Meyers, Jeffrey J. *The Lord's Service: The Grace of Covenant Renewal Worship*. Moscow, ID: Canon Press, 2003.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 3. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1991.
- Millard, Alan R. "Covenant and Communion in First Corinthians." In *Apostolic History and the Gospel*, edited by W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin, 242–248. Exeter, Devon: Paternoster, 1970.

- Montague, George T., S. M. *First Corinthians*. Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture. Grand Rapids, MI: Backer Academic, 2011.
- Morris, Leon. *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, vol. 7. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1985.
- Murphy–O’Conner, Jerome. *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Naselli, Andrew David. “1 Corinthians.” In *The ESV Expository Commentary*, vol. 10, *Romans–Galatians*, 209–394. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2020.
- Nelson, Richard D. *Joshua: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- Noth, Martin. *Exodus: A Commentary*. Translated by J. S. Bowden. The Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1962.
- Oropeza, B. J. *1 Corinthians*. New Covenant Commentary. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2017.
- Park, Wongi. “Her Memorial: An Alternative Reading of Matthew 26:13.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 136, no. 1 (2017): 131–144.
- Perkins, Pheme. *First Corinthians*. Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Pfitzner, Victor C. “Proclaiming the Name: Cultic Narrative and Eucharistic Proclamation in First Corinthians.” *Lutheran Theological Journal* 25, no 1 (May 1991): 15–25.
- Pietersma, Albert and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title*. New York, NY: Oxford Press, 2007.
- Pitkänen, Pekka M. A. *Joshua*. Apollos Old Testament Commentary 6. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2012.
- Propp, William H. C. *Exodus 1–18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1999.
- Propp, William H. C. *Exodus 19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible. New York, NY: Doubleday, 2006.
- Reumann, John. *The Supper of the Lord: The New Testament, Ecumenical Dialogues, and Faith and Order on Eucharist*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Sarna, Nahum M. *Exodus שמות: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation Commentary*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 1991.
- Schottroff, Willy. *Gedenken im alten Orient und im Alten Testament: Die Wurzel zākar im semitischen Sprachkreis*, 2nd ed. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.

- Schottroff, Willy. “זכר *zkr* to remember.” In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, זכר-אב, edited by Ernest Jenni and Claus Westermann, translated by Mark E. Biddle, 1:381–388. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.
- Sampley, J. Paul. “The First Letter to the Corinthians.” In *The New Interpreter’s Bible*, edited by Leander E. Keck et al., 10:771–1003. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2002.
- Schaefer, Konrad. *Psalms*. Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2001.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 7. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2018.
- Schreiner, Thomas. *Romans*, 2nd ed. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2018.
- Seifrid, Mark A. “Gift of Remembrance: Paul and the Lord's Supper in Corinth.” *Concordia Journal* 42, no. 2 (Spring 2016): 119–129.
- Silva, Moisés, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Rev. ed. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2014.
- Sklar, Jay. *Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 3. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2014.
- Soards, Martin. *1 Corinthians*. New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999.
- Stuart, Douglas K. *Exodus: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*. New America Commentary 2. Nashville, TN: Holman Reference, 2006.
- Sykes, Marjorie H. “The Eucharist as Anamnesis.” *The Expository Times* 71, no. 4 (Jan 1960): 115–118.
- Talbert, Charles. *Reading Corinthians: A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. New York, NY: Crossroad, 1989.
- Tate, Marvin E. *Psalms 51–100*. Word Biblical Commentary 20. Dallas, TX: Thomas Nelson, 2000.
- Taylor, Mark E. *1 Corinthians: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*. The New American Commentary. Nashville, TN: B & H Publishing Group, 2014.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.
- Thurian, Max. *The Eucharistic Memorial*, vol. 1, *The Old Testament*. Translated by J. G. Davies. Ecumenical Studies in Worship 7. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1960.
- van Wolde, Ellen J. “Not the Name Alone: A Linguistic Study of Exodus 3:14–15.” *Vetus Testamentum* 71, no. 4–5 (Oct 2021) 784–800.

- van der Woude, A. S. “שֵׁם šēm name.” In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, edited by Ernest Jenni and Claus Westermann, translated by Mark E. Biddle. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997, 3:1348–1367.
- Vang, Preben. *1 Corinthians*. Teach the Text Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2014.
- Verhey, Allen. “Remember, Remembrance.” In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, edited by David Noel Freedman, 5:667–669. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1992.
- Von Allmen, Jean-Jacques. *The Lord’s Supper*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1969.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 1, *The Theology of Israel’s Historical Traditions*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.
- Wallace, Daniel. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.
- Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 44. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *The Book of Leviticus*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979.
- White, Thomas Joseph. *Exodus*. Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2016.
- Young, Edward J. *The Book of Isaiah: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*, vol. 3, *Chapters 40–66*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.