

TEO, ISSN 2247-4382
99 (2), pp. 182- 224, 2024

The Anamnesis Sacrifice of Christ (1 Cor 11, 23–26) as An Offering to the Father for His Victory in the Battle Against the Devil and for His Glorious Return to Those Gathered in the Cenacle

Wojciech KOSEK

Wojciech KOSEK

Pontifical University of John Paul II, Warsaw, Poland

Email: wkosek10@wp.pl

Abstract

In this article, the primary purpose of in-depth exegetical analyses of the Hebrew and Greek Bible and other sources is to discover the meaning of Eucharistic ἀνάμνησις (1 Cor 11, 24-26). It will be shown that the Eucharistic eating in the Cenacle is linked by anamnesis with this immediate after-celebration time that St. Paul described as a time when Jesus the Lord passes the Abyss (1 Cor 11, 26) and returns (1 Cor 12, 3ff) from the Abyss and gives the Holy Spirit to fill community members with different spiritual gifts, including singing the psalms, hymns, and songs. The main steps of reasoning are:

One proved the expression ποιέω εἰς to mean “transform something into”, especially concerning an animal being transformed by burning into a sacrifice offered to God. Jesus’ words to the Apostles in the Upper Room τούτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (1 Cor 11, 24.25) turn out to mean “Transform this Bread/Wine into My anamnesis sacrifice” by burning it in your bowels, analogically to the הַקֶּזֶב / ἀνάμνησις bread (cf. Lev 24, 7), which was eaten by priests and burned in their bowels into anamnesis sacrifice so God would remember Israel during the battle and grant them victory.

The Father's answer for the anamnesis sacrifice offered by Jesus' disciples present in the Cenacle made Him return to them after the won struggle against the devil. Based on the typological relation between Passover and Eucharist as sacrificial suppers before the Exodus from Egypt/temporality, these disciples are not only the Apostles in the Cenacle two thousand years ago but all participants of every Eucharist to the end of this world.

Eucharistic anamnesis does not mean "remembering/recalling Jesus by men". All Eucharistic participants are really in the Cenacle that night before Jesus' struggle. They are there not to recall past events but to participate in them—to be present with Jesus in His struggle by waiting for His return to them, thanks to the Father's memory of Jesus in the answer for His anamnesis offered by them.

Keywords

Eucharist and Passover liturgies, anamnesis as a sacrifice before the battle, Jesus as Anathema and Kyrios, 1 Cor 11, 24–26 and 12, 3, Lev 24, 7

Introduction

In his letters, St. Paul repeatedly teaches about the necessity of mutual spiritual enrichment of the members of the community both by teaching or revelation but also by singing hymns, psalms, and spiritual songs (cf. 1 Cor 14, 26; Eph 5, 19; Col 3, 16: διδαχή, ἀποκάλυψις, ψαλμός, ὕμνος, ᾠδή). It is worth answering the question: What is the position of these mutual instructions or songs in relation to the Eucharist? Does Paul have in mind psalms or hymns sung during the Eucharist or completely unrelated to its celebration? As we will show, the exhortations to sing psalms, hymns, and spirit-filled songs pertain to the special time of grace (καιρός – cf. 2 Cor 6, 2) that immediately follows the celebration of the Eucharist.

After celebrating the obligatory official Passover ritual, the pious Israelites continue for a long time (even until morning) in prayer, singing, and reflecting on the greatness of the Lord's work in leading their fathers from slavery to freedom. It is because the exit of the Fathers of Israel from out the Abyss of waters took place in the morning (cf. בַּצֵּאת מִן הַיָּם / ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ τῇ ἑωθινῇ – Exod 14, 24). Similarly, Jesus Christ revealed His exit from out the Abyss of Death in the morning (cf. ὀψέ – Matt 28, 1; πρωῖ – Mk 16, 2–9; βαθύς – Luke 24, 1; πρωῖ – John 20, 1). The disciples

of Christ are also called to devote themselves to an analogical long prayer (not necessarily until morning – Passover is celebrated once a year, while the Eucharist is celebrated daily) after the Eucharist.

The parallels outlined here are not coincidental – like Passover, the Eucharist is the making present of the salvific Exodus: Israel's Exodus from Egypt / Jesus' Exodus from the temporal world to the eternal. Each of these liturgies consists of four parts; each successive part makes liturgical participants truly participants in the appropriate successive part of that Exodus.

It is important to emphasize that the liturgical celebration does not vaguely make its participants present in the Exodus – it proceeds as a sequence of four successive making-present acts. An explanation of these four stages of the Exodus will be the subject of the next section of the article. It is also vitally important that it is not a matter of making them present in an imagined way; they are made present in a real way. Namely, the liturgy participants are moved back in time to the events historically past in relation to the time of their celebration; this takes place in a way that is inaccessible to the senses. Since this reality requires faith and is rather widely unnoticed, one of the next sections of the article will be devoted to its discussion.

The primary purpose of the analyses of this article is to show the importance of Eucharistic anamnesis. This issue is related to the time of grace after the Eucharist, about which St. Paul wrote as a time of mutual enrichment of community members through psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs. Jesus, thanks to anamnesis offering, returns to the Eucharistic community, which stays in prayer after the celebration, in the proclamation of His death (cf. 1 Cor 11, 26; 12, 3). Anamnesis is the sacrifice offered before the battle. It is in response to the anamnesis sacrifice offered at the Last Supper/Eucharist that the Father effectively assists Jesus in His struggle against the devil in the Abyss so that Jesus returns to the Eucharistic community, which prays after the celebration.

We will show by analyzing the expression ποιέω εἰς (“to transform into”) that Jesus' command to the Apostles in the Upper Room τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (Do this for My anamnesis – 1 Cor 11,

24.25) should be understood as a command that the Bread and Wine (they being Him in the sacrificial state of dying on Golgotha), become, as a result of consumption, an offering made to God by burning, identical to the אֶזְרָחָה / ἀνάμνησις (cf. Lev 24, 7) in the Old Covenant, eaten by the priests in the holy place. The אֶזְרָחָה / ἀνάμνησις was eaten so God would remember Israel during the battle and grant them victory.

Related to the issue of anamnesis as a sacrifice before the battle is also the question of whether Jesus understood his passage through the Abyss of Death as a battle against the devil. The affirmative answer is provided by the typological¹ relation between the Passover and the Eucharist² as well as between Israel's Exodus (ἔξοδος – Exod 19, 1, Heb 11, 22) as God's judgment on the gods of Egypt (cf. Exod 12, 12), performed during the supper and in the Abyss of waters, and Jesus' Exodus (ἔξοδος – Luke 9, 31) as a judgment on the devil (John 12, 31), performed during the supper and in the Abyss of Death.

Furthermore, one must ask whether the Corinthians, to whom St. Paul addressed his letter on the Eucharist, were at all familiar with the anamnesis as a sacrifice before battle. The Bible, Homer's *Iliad*, and the works of Greek and Roman historians testify to the universality of the military custom of offering a sacrifice before battle and – at least in part³ – of calling this sacrifice “anamnesis”⁴.

¹ Douglas J. MOO and Andrew David NASELLI, “The Problem of the New Testament's use of the Old Testament”, in: Donald A. CARSON (ed.), *The Enduring Authority of the Christian Scriptures*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 2016, pp. 725–730.

² Wojciech KOSEK, *Why does the Last Supper in the Gospel of St. John (13–17) Contain no Words of Consecration?*, transl. Wojciech Kosek, doi:<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4445353>.

³ LYSIAS, *The Orations of Lysias*, transl. Walter Rangeley Maitland Lamb, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA; Heinemann, London, 1967, pp. 50–51: “Funeral Oration”, verse 39. In order to properly understand this text, its logic must be compared with Lysias's texts of similar grammatical construction. To do this, it is worth using the search on page <https://artflsrv03.uchicago.edu/philologic4/Greek/>.

⁴ Cf. Krzysztof ULANOWSKI, *Neo-Assyrian and Greek Divination in War*, coll. *Ancient Warfare Series*, Volume III, CHANE 118, Brill, Leiden, 2021, p. 124; Wojciech KOSEK, “Christ's ‘Anamnesis’ as the Sacrifice Offered Before His Fight Against the Devil”, in: *The Polish Journal of Biblical Research* 16 (2017), pp. 163–176.

I. Basic Passover and Eucharistic terms

I.1. Characterization of the Passover liturgy as making its participants real and not imagined participants in the past historical stages of the Exodus

Passover gives true participation in an event from the past – the Exodus from Egypt.

In the tractate *Pesachim* 10:5 of the Mishnah, the sentence interpreting the crucial understanding of the participation of every Passover participant in the Exodus with the fathers from Egypt reads:

בְּכֹל דּוֹר וָדוֹר חֵיב אָדָם לִרְאוֹת אֶת עַצְמוֹ בְּאֵלוֹ הוּא יֵצֵא מִמִּצְרַיִם

”In every generation, let the man perceive his essence/bone as if he went out of Egypt”.

On the other hand, the English translations vary, and some may lead one to believe that this does not refer to a truly real but only imagined participation in the Exodus from Egypt with the fathers. Namely, when the phrase *הוא באלו* is translated as “**as one who**”, the translation is not misleading, while if it is translated as “**as if he**”, it can be misleading.

An example of a biblical translation that includes the phrase “as if he” to express an illusory condition is ^{DBY} Gen 19, 14, while to express the reality of the condition is ^{NAU} Lev 25, 39–40.

Given these observations, it is necessary to examine the original phrase *הוא באלו* in other places in the Talmud. This task can be carried out using the search function on the webpage:

<https://www.sefaria.org/search?q=בְּאֵלוֹ&tab=text&tpathFilters=Mishnah|Talmud&tvar=1&tsort=relevance&svar=1&ssort=relevance>

Here are some of the sentences found in the Mishnah that contain *בְּאֵלוֹ* to express the reality of the situation: *Sanhedrin* 4:5, *Berakhot* 5a.4–5, *Shabbat* 19:6, *Bava Kamma* 6:4.

The same situation, as in the indicated examples, applies to participation in the Exodus—the participants in the Paschal liturgy were not historically at the time of the Exodus, but through this very liturgy, they participate in the Exodus **as if they were** historically there. This is analogous, for example (see *Sanhedrin* 4:5), to the recitation of the *Shema* by someone who has no sword but is guarded from demons **as if he had** a sword.

I.2. Basic Eucharistic terms, a full explanation of which will follow

It will be helpful to clarify the basic biblical terms concerning the Eucharist right now so one can refer to them in broader analyses.

The demonstrative pronoun τοῦτο present in Jesus' words in 1 Cor 11, 24.25 – τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα and τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι – indicates that the bread is no longer bread but the person, Christ Himself; otherwise, Christ would have said, "This bread is my flesh"⁵. Moreover, "The body *giving forth itself*" (διδόμενον in Luke 22, 19) and "the blood *pouring out itself*" (ἐκχυννόμενον in Matt 26, 28; Mk 14, 24; Luke 22, 20) – they are strict linguistic terms, defining the reality hidden actually in what our senses perceive as Bread and Wine, given by Jesus in the Upper Room to the Apostles. These terms unambiguously indicate that Jesus gave the disciples Himself, existing in the future, i.e., in the hour of His dying on Golgotha. Jesus held Himself from the future tense in His hands. We are not to perceive this Bread and Wine given by Jesus in the third part of Passover/Eucharist liturgy as Him in the final state of glorification⁶ – in this part, Jesus passes through the Abyss of Death to eternal glory as Israel passes through the Abyss of waters to temporal glory in this part of Passover liturgy.

There is a difference between the classes/names of sacrifices. Sacrifices can be classified/named according to what is offered as a sacrificial gift or according to the purpose of the offering. As a sacrificial gift, Jesus gave the disciples not bread or wine but Himself (from the future) in the state of dying for our sins. Where the purpose of the offering is concerned, Jesus told the disciples to make this Gift not a thanksgiving or propitiatory offering but an anamnesis (ἀνάμνησις) offering, i.e., a sacrifice before the battle. Furthermore, as the manner of offering, it is not a sacrifice burned by

⁵ Cf. Pope BENEDICT XVI, "Św. Tomasz z Akwinu (III). Audiencja generalna dnia 23 czerwca 2010 r.", in: *L'Osservatore Romano. Wydanie polskie*, 31 (2010) nr 8–9 (325), p. 54; St. THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa Theologica* III, q. 78, art. 2, ad. 2; III, q. 75, art. 3, 3; Sławomir ZATWARDNICKI, "The Eucharistic Presence and Making Christ Present in the Word of God: A Study Inspired by the Views of Robert Sokolowski", in: *Collectanea Theologica* 91 (2021), p. 119.

⁶ *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1340; John MEYENDORFF, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*, 2nd ed., Fordham University Press, New York, 1976, p. 204.

fire, but a sacrifice burned by eating and digesting it – this Gift, by eating/digesting, is to be burned/offered as a sacrifice, an anamnesis sacrifice of Jesus, i.e., a sacrifice for Jesus' victory in the battle. The prefiguration of such an anamnesis sacrifice burned by eating is אֶזְרָחָה in Lev 24, 7, which the Septuagint translates as ἀνάμνησις.

I.3. Four parts of the Passover/Eucharist liturgy as a covenant-making/renewal ceremony

Already Joachim Jeremias⁷ has noted that the Eucharist had four main parts from the very beginning, as evidenced by St. Luke in Acts 2, 42. There was first the apostolic teaching, then the communion of the ordinary meal, then the “breaking of bread”, i.e., the consecration and administration of Holy Communion, then the prayers.

Here the essential data will be presented, the proof of which has been carried out in the previous works of the author of this article⁸.

Jesus celebrated the Eucharist as Passover modified in the third part⁹. The Passover is the making present of the Lord's great work of leading Israel out of Egypt¹⁰. Since God did it in four stages to simultaneously fulfill the four successive parts of the covenant-making ceremony that was in effect among the nations of the Near East in the 16th-12th century BC, Passover is celebrated from the very beginning as a four-part covenant-making/renewal ceremony, framed by an introduction and conclusion¹¹.

⁷ Joachim JEREMIAS, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, transl. Norman Perrin, SCM Press Ltd, London, 1987, pp. 118–120.

⁸ Wojciech KOSEK, *The Main Website of my Biblical Exegeses in English*, doi:<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4917876> – There is an index of all the works of Wojciech Kosek with active links to HTML files containing the particular work and its doi.

⁹ Wojciech KOSEK, “Чотири чаші Пасхи. Чому чотири?”, in: *Studia Catholica Podoliae* 8 (2014–2015) No. 8–9, p. 106, doi:<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8290181>. English translation of this article: Wojciech KOSEK, *Four parts of Passover and Eucharist. Why four?*, transl. by Wojciech Kosek, pp. 38–39, doi:<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4279907>.

¹⁰ Pesachim 10:5; Ronald HENDEL, “The Exodus in Biblical Memory”, in: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120/4 (2001), p. 601.

¹¹ Wojciech KOSEK, *Pierwotny ryt Paschy w świetle schematu literackiego Księgi Wjścia 1–18*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Papieskiej Akademii Teologicznej, Kraków, 2008, p. 283. English translation of this part of the book: Wojciech KOSEK, *The Literary Scheme of the Book of Exodus 1–18 as the Scheme of the Hittite Treaties*, transl. Wojciech Kosek, 26, doi:<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3272750>.

Each successive part of the four parts of the liturgy makes its participants the participants of the next group of events, which are past events in relation to our historical time. The concept of “making present” should be understood as making the participants of the Eucharist the participants of those events, not the other way around (i.e., making those events present for the participants of the liturgy – as is commonly understood, unfortunately). It is fundamental to the understanding of the Eucharist to name the events made present as “past”, “present”, or “future” in relation to the time of the celebration that Jesus performed in the Upper Room and not to the time of any other celebration, ours for example. The events of Jesus’ Dying and Jesus’ Glory are past events for us, but they were future events for Jesus in the Upper Room – and this is crucial to understanding the Eucharist.

The Passover/Eucharist liturgy makes its participants present in the four-part Exodus and in the simultaneously performed four-part covenant-making ceremony in such a way that makes them present first in the first part, then in the second, then in the third, then in the fourth.

From the literary structure of the law pericope (i.e., Exod 12,1–13,16) and the covenant treaty (i.e., Exod 1–18), it appears that Israel celebrated all four parts of the Passover liturgy before Exodus from Egypt¹² (the 1st part makes the 1st stage of Exodus present; it concerns the past events, namely, the events preceding the Passover supper: the miraculous signs/plagues in Egypt; the 2nd part makes the 2nd stage of Exodus present, i.e., the Passover supper itself; it connects with the event when God gives Israel the law of celebrating the Passover; the 3rd part makes the 3rd stage of Exodus present, namely, the future event of going out from the Passover celebration site and the passage to the sea and between its divided waters; the 4th part makes the 4th stage of Exodus present, namely, the future event of singing a hymn of praise to God after the passage of the sea). After celebrating these four successive parts of the Passover liturgy, Israel went out and historically accomplished these two stages, which were made present as future events. Namely, after leaving the Passover celebration site, Israel went to the sea and between its waters (3rd stage of Exodus) and then sang a hymn of praise to God (4th stage of Exodus).

¹² W. KOSEK, *Pierwotny ryt Paschy...*, pp. 357–378. English translation of this part of the book: Wojciech KOSEK, *The Literary structure of Ex 1–18 and Pericope of Law 12:1–13:16, and Anticipatory Nature of the Passover Supper*, transl. Wojciech Kosek, doi:<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3745629>.

The Passover/Eucharist, and thus the four successive parts of the liturgy, are followed by the historically unique realization of the 3rd stage (Jesus' passage from the Upper Room to the Abyss of Death and through it), followed by the 4th stage (Jesus' exit from the Abyss in the act of Resurrection and glorious return to the Upper Room) – the realization of what was made present as a future event in the third and fourth parts of Passover/Eucharist. It is how it was in the Upper Room. It is so in every Eucharist, as it is a liturgy that transfers its participants to Jesus celebrating the New Passover in the Upper Room before exiting into the 3rd and then 4th stage – just as the Passover liturgy transfers its participants to the Fathers celebrating the Passover in Egypt before exiting from there into 3rd stage (passing through the Abyss of waters) and 4th stage (exiting from the Abyss of waters and singing song of praise to God).

In the third part of Passover, the unleavened Afikoman is consumed. At this point, the participants of Passover become participants of the passage of their Fathers under the leadership of God through the Abyss of divided waters of the Red Sea. In the Eucharist, the unleavened Bread and Wine of Jesus, i.e., the Body and Blood of Jesus in the state of passing through the Abyss of Death, are eaten instead of Afikoman.

II. Jesus' command, "Do this for My anamnesis", concerns offering an anamnesis sacrifice – a sacrifice before the battle

II.1. Anamnesis as a sacrifice before the battle in the Old Testament

II.1.1. The priests' blowing of the trumpets while sacrificing (Num 10, 9–10) as an act for Israel's anamnesis, i.e., God's remembrance of Israel in the future battle and giving them victory

In the Septuagint, the term ἀνάμνησις occurs in only five places. St. Paul's and St. Luke's use of precisely this term, rather than the incomparably more common other words related to remembering, is an essential piece of information for interpreting 1 Cor 11, 24.25 and Luke 22, 19: both

hagiographers used a *verbal allusion*¹³ here so that the reader of their texts would understand ἀνάμνησις in light of these specific five places in the Bible. Therefore, it is necessary to read these passages carefully to see what distinguishes explicitly ἀνάμνησις from other words. We will see that the purpose of the ἀνάμνησις cultic elements is not God's remembrance of Israel in general; it is God's remembrance of Israel fighting the enemy, the result of which is to bestow victory on Israel by God. One will discuss first the meaning of ἀνάμνησις in Num 10, 9–10 and then in Lev 24, 5–9.

Joachim Jeremias¹⁴ and, after him, Fritz Chenderlin¹⁵ and many others failed to note the crucial relationship of Num 10, 10 with the previous verse, which reveals God's remembering about Israel as His help in Israel's struggle against the enemy. These two verses belong to the larger whole concerning trumpets that Num 10, 1–10 is, as evidenced by the occurrence of the exact keywords in them: הַצֹּפְרָה / σάλπιγξ – trumpet (Num 10, 2.8.9.10); תָּקַע / σαλπίζω – blow (Num 10, 3.4.5.6.7.8.10). The connectivity between verses 1–8 and 9–10 is also marked by the use of the verb רָעַע in verses 7 and 9. Namely, God forbids priests in verse 7 to blow alarmingly (וְלֹא תִרְעִיעוּ) when they convene Israel's assembly, while God commands them in verse 9 to blow alarmingly (וְהִרְעִיעֶתֶם) when it is a sign of going Israel to war. Moreover, within Num 10, 1–10, the phrase expressing God's remembrance of Israel is only in verses 9 and 10. This phrase is composed of a word¹⁶ derived from the stem זָכַר and the compound לְפָנַי אֶל־הֵיכָלְךָ “before your God”:

¹³ Jerome T. WALSH, *1 Kings*, coll. *Berit Olam: studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, MN, 1996, pp. 285–286; Bart J. KOET, *Dreams and Scripture in Luke-Acts: Collected Essays*, coll. *Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology* 42, Peeters, Leuven, 2006, p. 52; Dietrich RUSAM, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*, coll. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112, De Gruyter, Berlin – New York, 2003, p. 41; Augustyn JANKOWSKI, *Aniłowicie wobec Chrystusa*, Wydawnictwo Benedyktynów, Kraków, 2002, p. 45.

¹⁴ J. JEREMIAS, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p. 244.

¹⁵ Fritz CHENDERLIN, “Do This as My Memorial”: *The Semantic and Conceptual Background and Value of Ἀνάμνησις in 1 Corinthians 11:24–25*, coll. *Analecta Biblica* 99, Biblical Institute, Rome, 1982, pp. 114–115.

¹⁶ These are the words וְהִרְעִיעֶתֶם and לְזַכְרוֹן. See Francis BROWN, et al., *The Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*, Logos Research Systems, Oak Harbor, WA, 2000: *The Alphabetic Index of Hebrew Derivative Forms*, where it is stated: זָכַר sub. זָכְרוֹן.

9: וַנִּזְכְּרֶתֶם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְנוֹשַׁעְתֶּם מֵאִיְבֵיכֶם ... וַנִּזְכְּרֶתֶם לִפְנֵי

10: וְהָיוּ לָכֶם לְזִכָּרוֹן לִפְנֵי אֱלֹהֵיכֶם in לְזִכָּרוֹן לִפְנֵי אֱלֹהֵיכֶם

The compound וַיְבִיִּים, beginning verse 10, also indicates a connection between this verse and the preceding verse, as can be clearly seen in most of the verses with וַיְבִיִּים: Exod 12, 16; 13, 6; 16, 26; 23, 12; 31, 15.17; 34, 21; 35, 2; Lev 12, 3; 14, 10; 15, 14, 29; 23, 3.39; Num 6, 10; 19, 12.19; 28, 25; 29, 17.20.23.26.29.32; 31, 19; Deut 16, 8; Josh 6, 4; 1 Kgs 2, 26; 2 Chr 20, 26; Ezra 8, 33; Neh 8, 13, 18; Ezek 43,22.

Therefore, the 9th and 10th verses are united by this logic: God will remember you in time of the battle when the priests will alarmingly blow trumpets before going to war, but this will be on the condition that the priests in time of peace will blow on the same trumpets when offering burnt offerings and peace offerings at the appointed time.

The phrase וְהָיוּ לָכֶם לְזִכָּרוֹן in verse 10 should be translated as “and they shall be to you as a reminder”, analogically as the phrase לָכֶם לְזִכָּרוֹן in verse 8 is translated “and they shall be to you as a law”. The words לְזִכָּרוֹן and לְזִכָּרוֹן consist of ל and a noun. The Septuagint often translates such compounds by εἰς with a noun (cf. Lev 25, 45; Josh 20, 3; 23, 13; Judg 2, 3; Ruth 1, 11 for the phrase לְזִכָּרוֹן only), so instead of the translation καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν ἀνάμνησις, present in the 10th verse, it could be καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, which have the same form as Jesus’ words of institution have in 1 Cor 11, 24.25.

Applying the command regarding the trumpets/offerings of anamnesis was particularly vividly shown in King Abijah’s speech in 2 Chr 13, 4–12, especially in vv. 10–12; in 13, 14–15 the chronicler records that when the priests of Judah blew their trumpets (הַצֹּפְרָה / σάλπιγξ) and the army raised a battle cry, God beat the army of their enemies (Jeroboam’s).

It is what God’s remembrance of Israel, expressed by the phrase “for anamnesis”, is all about – God gives His people victory over the enemy on the condition that Israel is faithful in fulfilling those elements of worship that He has commanded as εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, that is, as those to which He will respond with His remembrance. One such element is blowing the trumpets of anamnesis when offering sacrifices at the appointed time – necessarily before the battle against the enemy.

Already Moses used signal trumpets (תְּצוּצְרָה / σάλπιγξ) for the battle: Num 31, 6. He also pointed out to the Israelites that God always wants to grant them victory over their enemies but requires that they believe it, not fear, not murmur against God or His chosen leaders: Deut 1, 30; Deut 20, 1–4. Such a role of trumpets/sacrifices of anamnesis as invoking God's help in battle is affirmed in 1 Macc 4, 40.

Confirmation of this role of the trumpets was also found at Qumran in *The War Scroll (1QM)*, written after 63 BCE¹⁷. The scroll¹⁸, to emphasize that it is God who fights the forces of evil, though He engages His chosen ones in the battle, quotes the text of Deut 20, 2–4 in 1QM X, 2–5 (i.e., column 10, lines 2–5) and Num 10, 9 in 1QM X, 7–8.

The trumpets of remembrance are used immediately before the battle of the army of the chosen people of God against the Kittim, i.e., the evil powers – it is described¹⁹ in 1QM XVI, 2–3:

Afterwards the priests shall blow for them **the trumpets of remembrance** (בַּחצוצרות הזכרון):

ואחר יתקעו להמה הכוהנים בחצוצרות הזכרון

These trumpets are also used immediately prior to the final destruction of the Kittim by God through the army of His chosen people²⁰:

1QM XVIII, 3–5: The priests will sound a fanfare (יריעו) – the same stem ריע as in Num 10, 7.9) (4) on the six **trumpets of remembrance**,

ות הזכרון [בשש הצוצר] יריעו הכוהנים

and all the battle formations will follow their call and spread out against the entire army of the Kittim (5) to destroy them utterly.

Returning to Abijah, we should note that he emphasizes in his speech Judah's faithful fulfillment of God's commands regarding the cultic elements serving for God's remembering them during the battle: the commands regarding not only the trumpets/sacrifices for anamnesis but also the two elements of worship present in the sanctuary: the bread of presence for anamnesis (see Lev 24, 7) and the six-branched lampstand.

¹⁷ Cf. André DUPONT-SOMMER, *The Essene Writings From Qumran*, transl. Géza Vermès, World Publishing Company, Cleveland, OH, 1962, p. 167.

¹⁸ Yigael YADIN, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*, transl. Batya and Chaim Rabin, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1962, pp. 304–305.

¹⁹ Y. YADIN, *The Scroll...*, pp. 334–335.

²⁰ Y. YADIN, *The Scroll...*, pp. 344–345.

Both of these elements reminded Israel of God's intervention by leading them out of Egypt and through the waters of the Red Sea, cut by His breath.

It was the passage that became the irrevocable act of making the covenant, and the six-branched lampstand (cf. Exod 25, 31–40; 37, 17–24) is a reminder of the treaty of making the covenant, which is the text of Exod 1–18. It is because the text is built on the literary structure of the six pericopes, which form a rhetorical unit called a chiasm, A B C C' B' A,' based on the analogy between the main content of pericopes A and A,' B and B,' C and C,' and also on the same quotient of the number of Hebrew words in the forms expressing the past to the sum of the words expressing the past or future in the same pairs of pericopes: 62%, 56%, 35%, (100-34)%, 56%, 62%. These relationships are the same as the relationships between the lengths of the particular branches of the tabernacle lampstand²¹.

Performed between the split waters of the sea, God's irrevocable act for entering into a covenant with Israel was at the same time God's act as Israel's protector, characterizing the essential role God plays toward man or nation in the covenant: God fights Israel's enemies, bestows victory on Israel. It is vividly expressed in the words of the Egyptians, screaming in terror moments before the Lord plunged them into the waters of the Abyss (Exod 14, 25): "Let us flee from the face (מִפְּנֵי / ἄπὸ προσώπου) of Israel, for the Lord is fighting for them against the Egyptians".

The Egyptians were fleeing from the face of Israel because they were fleeing from the face of Israel's God, whose presence was like fire, burning their opponents like straw.

It is indicated by Ps 21, 10 (20, 10 in LXX), which refers to Israel's victory song from Exod 15, 1–21, using the same key terminology as in Exod 15, 7 to characterize God's act against Israel's enemies: consume (אָכַל / κατεσθίω), anger (קָרַח in Exod and קָרַח in Ps / ὀργή). The psalm ties the time of the appearance of God's face to the adversaries with the time of burning them:

Ps 21, 10 You will make them as a fiery oven in the time of your anger / presence (לְעֵת פְּרִיָּהּ / εἰς καιρὸν τοῦ προσώπου σου)

²¹ W. KOSEK, *Pierwotny ryt Paschy...*, p. 394. Wojciech KOSEK, *The Beauty and Logic of Arrangement of Six Pericopes of Ex 1–18 as the Disproving of the Modern Theory of Sources*, transl. Wojciech Kosek, 12–13, doi:<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3756982>.

Occurring in Exod 14, 25, the word מִפְּנֵי is a shortened form of מִן פְּנֵים – before the face. Thus, the Hebrew and Greek text of Exod 14, 25 is related to the twelve loaves, called the bread of face/presence before the Lord (לֶחֶם 1 :הַפְּנִים Sam 21, 7; ἄρτοι τοῦ προσώπου: 1 Sam 21, 7; Neh 10, 34). Their description in Lev 24, 5–9 includes twice the phrase לֶפְנֵי יְהוָה – where לֶפְנֵי is also a form of the word פְּנֵים. The twelve loaves, arranged in two identical piles, visually resembled the passage of the twelve tribes of Israel between the two walls of waters (cf. Exod 14, 22.29; 15, 8). The frankincense, placed at the top of the pile, represents God, who was passing in the sign of the pillar of fire/cloud, thus in a sign resembling burning incense floating upward.

In light of the explanations presented, it is apparent how important it is to read the passage in Lev 24, 5–9 in depth, where God commands the priests to bake twelve loaves of this bread of presence, place them on the special table in the sanctuary for one week, and then eat them there.

II.1.2. A memorial offering (הַרְכָּזָה) in Lev 24, 7 as an anamnesis offering (ἀνάμνησις), offered through eating it by the priests in the holy place to make it a burnt offering

The word אֶזְכָּרָה occurs in seven places: Lev 2, 2.9.16; 5, 12; 6, 8; 24, 7; Num 5, 26; they contain orders regarding meal offerings.

God unequivocally indicated in all of these commands except Lev 24, 5–9 that a portion of the food brought by somebody of the Israelites as his food offering was to be burned on the altar by the priest as a memorial (אֶזְכָּרָה). Furthermore, God commanded in connection with these offerings explicitly in Lev 2, 3; 2, 10; 6, 9 that the remnant (הַנּוֹתֵרֶת) of the brought gift, i.e., the part which was not burned, was to be eaten by Aaron and his sons as the most sacred portion from the offerings burned for the Lord.

In this regard, Lev 24, 5–9 contains a unique decree: God neither commanded here the burning of anything nor specified as “remnant” what is to be eaten by the priests. The entirety of this memorial offering – twelve loaves along with pure incense – is to be eaten by the priests in the holy place (בְּמִקְוֵם קֹדֶשׁ), that is, near the altar of burnt offering (cf. Lev 10, 12–13) in the courtyard of the Tent of Meeting (cf. Lev 6, 9).

The act of eating these loaves by the priests close to the altar – rather than burning them on the altar by fire – is, in this sole instance, an act of offering a burnt offering to the Lord, that is, an act of transforming the bread into a food offering burnt for the Lord.

It is worth noting that the burning of a sacrifice by fire is expressed in Hebrew by the verb *אָכַל*, meaning “to consume” and “to digest”. Thus, what may seem unnatural to us, that the sacrifice eaten by man belongs to the burnt offerings, was natural for the Israelites: both the priest eats the sacrifice, and the fire eats the sacrifice. Because the sacrifice eaten by fire was called “a burnt offering” *אֲשָׁא*, the sacrifice eaten by the priest could also be called “a burnt offering” *אֲשָׁא*. For example, Exod 3, 2 describes a burning bush not consumed by fire, and Exod 22, 5 speaks about the fire that ate a heap of grain.

These loaves with frankincense on them (and salt – as the Septuagint points out, drawing on the law given in Lev 2, 13) were to lie before the Lord for a week on the table of the loaves of presence in the holy place in the Tent of Meeting. According to Lev 24, 8–9, the priests were to offer the loaves with incense and salt every Sabbath; the way of the offering was to eat this whole near the burnt offering altar in the Tent of Meeting courtyard. It was a burnt offering because it was burnt by digestion in the bowels of priests. These loaves with incense and salt are referred to in Lev 24, 7 as *אֲזִכָּרָה* / *ἀνάμνησις*. The effect of an act of eating them, i.e., the act of making them the burnt offering, is expressed in Lev 24, 7 by the wording *וְהָיָה לָהֶם לְאֲזִכָּרָה אֲשֶׁר לַיהוָה* / *καὶ ἔσονται εἰς ἄρτους εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκαίμενα τῷ κυρίῳ* – they will be as bread for a memorial, a burnt offering to the Lord / they will be as bread for anamnesis, set for before the Lord.

Frankincense and salt did not turn the loaves into an offering. Their role was different: God required them as elements to be eaten with the bread, just as He commanded to eat the Passover lamb with unleavened bread and bitter herbs (cf. Exod 12, 8).

This act of offering a sacrifice by burning it through eating is essential for the sacrifice to be referred to as a memorial (*אֲזִכָּרָה*). As in the other orders regarding a memorial (*אֲזִכָּרָה*), here, too, these loaves of bread with incense and salt become a memorial offering after they are burned for the

Lord. The difference, however, is that here it is not a small part but the whole that is burned; it is burned not in the fire on the altar of burnt offerings but in the bowels of the priests by eating near this altar and digesting them.

The explanation of Lev 24, 5–9 presented here is based on an exegesis of Lev 24, 7 employing computer analysis, which will now be presented.

Translation of the Hebrew text Lev 24, 7:

You shall put on this pile pure frankincense, and it [this pile – feminine gender] will be as the bread **for a memorial** (לְאֶזְכָּרָה), a burnt offering to the Lord.

The proof of the validity of this translation is as follows:

The Hebrew ל before the noun can, among other things, mean not only “for/to/on” but also “as”. Thus, לְלֶחֶם can mean not only “for/to/on the bread” (as it is usually translated for Lev 24, 7) but also “as the bread”.

The phrase וְהָיְתָה (will be), which occurs within the pericope Lev 24, 5–9 in verses 7 and 9, refers to something of the feminine gender. Verse nine indicates that it refers to something of the feminine gender, which belongs to Aaron and his sons, and which simultaneously is referred to by the word מִצֵּה of masculine gender as one of burnt offerings (מִצֵּה), which is eaten by them precisely as a burnt offering because the verb וְאָכְלוּהָ (they will consume it) contains a suffix at the end, which indicates eating something of the masculine gender.

In verse seven, the expression וְהָיְתָה (will be) may refer to pure frankincense (לְבִנְיָה זָכָה) since frankincense is of the feminine gender. In that case, the sentence should be translated: You shall put on this pile pure frankincense, and there shall be [this frankincense] for this bread as a memorial (*azkara*), a burnt offering to the Lord. Such a translation would be partially consistent with the role of frankincense as a memorial in the other commands regarding the memorial: burning all the frankincense with a small portion of the sacrificial gift represents the entire offering before the Lord. However, in the pericope Lev 24, 5–9 there is no command to burn frankincense; there is also no command to burn a part of the bread.

In addition, verse nine indicates that Aaron and his sons are to eat this burnt offering. So if the frankincense alone were the burnt offering (and, simultaneously, the memorial – according to verse seven), it would be a

bizarre consumption. Therefore, it is not frankincense as a burnt offering and a memorial about which verses seven and nine are talking.

In the seventh verse, there is another entity of the feminine gender in addition to frankincense: מַעֲרֹקֶת – a pile of loaves. It is this pile that is the memorial, the burnt offering; it consists of loaves of bread that can be eaten, even with incense and salt as spices. It occurs in verse seven as the expression לֶלֶקֶם לְאַזְכָּרָה, which should be understood as ל plus “the bread for a memorial”, which means in a whole “as the bread for a memorial”.

The meaning of this expression can be verified with *BibleWorks* software²² by giving the command “*@n* ל *@n* ל ה for WTM. The command is so because this expression is the grammatical construction consisting of the sequence (written from right to left) noun + ל + noun + ל + ה. The expression in the Bible has ה not represented by the letter ה but by the vowel *pataḥ* underneath ל and *dāgēš forte* in the first consonant of the word.

It is because of the rule²³: If there is an article (ה) ה with *pataḥ* before the word לֶקֶם (bread), then the whole is הֶלֶקֶם (cf. Lev 8, 31). If there is still a preposition ל in front of this whole, then the article is elided, and the preposition ל takes the vowel *pataḥ* of the article.

Research using *BibleWorks* yielded 40 verses, two of which share the same logic as Lev 24, 7 – 2 Chr 8, 9 and Ezek 33, 21.

2 Chr 8, 9: לֹא־נָתַן שְׁלֵמָה לְעִבְדֵי־לְמַלְאכָתָו – Solomon did not put [Israelites] **as slaves for his work**.

In Lev 24, 7, both words of the searched string are in *Status absolutus* and have disjunctive accents, with the second word having *Atnah*; the same is true in 2 Chr 8, 9. The same is also valid in Ezek 33, 21 for the sequence לְהַדָּשׁ לְגְלוּתֵנוּ – for the month of our exile.

The found verses prove that the phrase לֶלֶקֶם לְאַזְכָּרָה, occurring in Lev 24, 7, being the sequence composed of noun + ל + noun + ל + ה, can be understood as “the bread for a memorial” + ל, just like “the slaves for his

²² Michael S. BUSHHELL and Michael D. TAN (programmers), *BibleWorks*. Version 6.0., BibleWorks LLC, Norfolk, VA, 2003. *BibleWorks* is a software program for Biblical exegesis and research in original and modern languages.

²³ See Giovanni DEIANA and Ambrogio SPREAFICO, *Wprowadzenie do hebrajszczyzny biblijnej*, transl. Stanisław Bazyliński, (Towarzystwo Biblijne w Polsce Warszawa, 2001, p. 25 (*Rodzajnik [An article]*), 27 (*Niektóre przedrostki [Some prefixes]*)).

labor” + לֶחֶם or “the month of our exile” + לֶחֶם. “The bred for a memorial” is a whole. So it is not the frankincense, put on the pile of bread, that is alone “for a memorial”. The frankincense with “the bread for a memorial” is for a memorial.

Therefore, the sentence of the seventh verse should be translated as indicated above.

As one can see below, the Septuagint translated this verse almost identically to the now-proven translation. Coming to this conclusion requires a very time-consuming analysis of the Hebrew and Greek text using computer analysis of grammatical structures. Since this has only recently been possible, previous research, including in-depth research, has proven the opposite²⁴.

Lev 24, 7 in the Septuagint:

καὶ ἐπιθήσετε ἐπὶ τὸ θέμα λίβανον καθαρὸν καὶ ἄλα, **καὶ ἔσονται εἰς ἄρτους εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκειμένα τῷ κυρίῳ.**

One should translate it as follows:

And you shall put pure frankincense (masculine) and salt (masculine) on this pile (τὸ θέμα – **neuter**, singular); and **they** [these piles – **neuter**, plural] **will be** (ἔσονται – plural) as loaves for a memorial, **set forth** [προκειμένα – **neuter**, plural] for the Lord.

The explanation for this understanding of the Septuagint translation is as follows:

ἔσονται [...] προκειμένα – is a phrase composed of the plural verb ἔσονται ([they] will be) and the plural neuter participle προκειμένα (being put). Therefore the phrase refers to something of the neuter gender. Thus, it does not concern incense or salt, which are of the masculine gender. Only the pile is of the neuter gender.

Ultimately, one must state that both the Hebrew and Greek texts decree that the expression “for a memorial” does not concern the incense alone but the bread with incense and salt.

For the analysis of Jesus’ words of institution in 1 Cor 11, 24.25, it is significant that the Greek text of Lev 24, 5–9, which is consistent with the

²⁴ F. CHENDERLIN, “Do This as My Memorial”..., p. 118. The author comments regarding Lev 24, 7 in the Septuagint in comparison to the Masoretic text: The term “memorial” is now applied not to the frankincense (which may have been meant to go with a portion of the flour from which the loaves were made), but to the loaves themselves.

Hebrew, indicates that the piles of bread will be/become a burnt offering for anamnesis – εἰς ἀνάμνησιν – thanks to eating them by the priests in the holy place in the courtyard of the Tent of Meeting every Sabbath. Not the frankincense placed on the piles of bread, but eating them with frankincense and salt as spices by the priests near the altar transforms them into a burnt offering for anamnesis.

This understanding is confirmed by the phrase τράπεζα κυρίου (1 Cor 10, 21 – table of the Lord), with which St. Paul described the table where the Eucharist is celebrated and from which believers receive the Body and Blood of the Lord. This phrase is an integral part of 1 Cor 10, 15–21, where the Apostle presents the problem of sacrifices (θυσία) offered (θύω) by Jews and Gentiles on the altar (θυσιαστήριον) and forbids participating in these offerings by those who eat from the table of the Lord. St. Paul's formulation is an abbreviated form of the expression from Lev 24, 6 ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν τὴν καθαρὰν ἔναντι κυρίου – on a clean table before the Lord – which refers to the table-altar of the bread of presence. The expression τράπεζα κυρίου occurs in the Old Testament in only three places besides Lev 24, 6: in Ezek 31, 22; Mal 1, 7.12, and always as the name of the altar (θυσιαστήριον) for animal sacrifices.

It follows from this that St. Paul, calling the Eucharistic table as τράπεζα κυρίου in 1 Cor 10, 21, used a verbal allusion²⁵ to indicate the crucial connection that lies between the believers' eating of the Body and Blood of the Lord and the Old Covenant priests' eating of the loaves of the presence as an anamnesis offering. This table is the altar for offering and eating anamnesis sacrifices.

Jesus' command in the Upper Room to the Apostles as priests of the New Covenant regarding the Bread and Wine given to them to eat has the same meaning: They now, in the Upper Room, are to eat this Bread and this Wine, so that they will become in their bowels a burnt offering for His anamnesis.

²⁵ David J. McCOLLOUGH, *Ritual Water, Ritual Spirit: An Analysis of the Timing, Mechanism and Manifestation of Spirit-Reception in Luke-Acts*, coll. *Paternoster Biblical Monographs*, Paternoster, Milton Keynes, 2017. The author exhaustively shows the use of the allusion technique by hagiographers.

II.2. The relationship between 1 Cor 11, 23–26 and 1 Cor 12, 3 explains Jesus' words "Do it for My anamnesis" as the command to offer a sacrifice before His battle to ask God for His victorious return from the Abyss to the Upper Room

II.2.1. The link between 1 Cor 11, 26 and 12, 3 in light of their correct translations

Crucial to the correct translation of 1 Cor 11, 26 is noting the subjunctive mood of the last verb of this sentence – ἔλθῃ²⁶. This mood requires that we understand the coming of Jesus to the community, which is proclaiming His Death, as the act that causes the end of that proclamation. Thus, it is not about the coming of Jesus at the Last Judgment but about the coming of Jesus to the community whenever it is proclaiming His Death after the Eucharist and waiting for His coming from the Abyss. When Jesus comes from the Abyss as the Risen Lord, the community starts proclaiming His glory since He is with them. The phrase τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε (proclaim the Death of the Lord), present in this sentence, expresses not only the duty to proclaim the Death of Jesus²⁷ but also – from the moment when He came to them – His return as the Lord. If Jesus had not conquered the hitherto ruler of the Abyss, the Devil, and returned from the Abyss as the victor, His death could not be proclaimed as the "Death of the Lord". Thus, two stages from Jesus' life are essential here: Jesus as Anathema, i.e., rejected by the leaders of Israel and condemned to Death, and Jesus as Kyrios, the Lord who overcame the devil as the hitherto lord of the Abyss of Death. The same key pair of terms, Anathema – Kyrios, is

²⁶ J. JEREMIAS, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p. 253; Wojciech KOSEK, "Nakaz głoszenia śmierci Pana «aż przyjdzie» (1Kor 11,26) w świetle porównawczej analizy gramatycznej", in: Waldemar Chrostowski (ed.), *Jak śmierć potężna jest miłość. Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Księdza Profesora Juliana Warzechy SAC (1944–2009)*, Apostolicum, Warszawa – Żabki, 2009, pp. 224–240. English translation of this article: Wojciech KOSEK, *The Command to Proclaim the Death of the Lord 'until He comes' (1 Cor 11:26) in Light of the Comparative Grammatical Analysis*, transl. by Wojciech Kosek, doi:<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4077349>.

²⁷ Christopher BRYAN, "Christ our Passover has been sacrificed: Reflections on the Life of Christ as Represented in the Calendars and Liturgies of the Western Church", in: Warren LEWIS and Hans ROLLMANN (eds.), *Restoring the First-Century Church in the Twenty-First Century: Essays on the Stone-Campbell Restoration Movement. In Honor of Don Haymes*, Wipf & stock, Eugene, OR, 2005, pp. 248–249.

present in 1 Cor 11, 26 and 12, 3. Their mutual complementarity, however, cannot be discerned from the current understanding of this verse as (omitting the introductory “Therefore, I tell you that “) consisting of two sentences (the first of which purportedly speaks of cursing Jesus), rather than as one compound sentence of the type οὐδεις καὶ οὐδεις ... εἰ μὴ. In sentences of this type, the part before εἰ μὴ is a questioning of some truth, which, however, in the part after εἰ μὴ turns out to be true in some unique case. The Apostle Paul used this syntax in 1 Cor 8, 4 and 12, 3.

In 1 Cor 8, 4, St. Paul stated in the segment before εἰ μὴ that there is neither any idol nor any god in the world, while he indicated after εἰ μὴ that there is not unless we are talking about the one and only God – then we must say that there is! The Greek syntax here is concise and precise:

οὐδὲν εἴδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ	There is no idol in the world,
καὶ ὅτι οὐδεις θεός	nor is there [in the world] any god,
εἰ μὴ εἷς.	unless One.

According to analogous grammatical logic, the Apostle expressed the truth about the Holy Spirit and the mystery of Jesus Anathema and Kyrios in 1 Cor 12, 3. Behold, the Holy Spirit of God is the only one of all the spirits of the gods (the spirits causing prophetic inspiration – the pagans also had their “gods” and prophets, influenced by the spirits of these “gods”) who knows the mystery of Jesus as the one condemned to death – here referred to as Anathema – and as the Risen Lord – Kyrios.

οὐδεις ...	No one speaking in any god’s spirit will say, “ <i>Anatema</i> Jesus”,
καὶ οὐδεις ...	and no one [speaking in any god’s spirit] will say “Kyrios Jesus”
εἰ μὴ ...	unless he speaks in the [God’s] Holy Spirit.

As the only one of the spirits causing inspiration, the Holy Spirit gives the grace to understand the fullness of the mystery of Jesus. Thus, when Jesus returns from the Abyss to the community proclaiming His Death,

and thus His mystery as rejected by God's representatives, as Anathema, it is under the influence of the Holy Spirit that the prophets announce His coming as the Lord. The acclamation Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς changes to Κύριος Ἰησοῦς, and μαρانا θα (our Lord, come!) to μαραναθα (our Lord has come)²⁸.

II.2.2. Analysis of the phrase ποιέω εἰς for the correct understanding of τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν in Luke 22, 19 and 1 Cor 11, 24

A significant contribution to the study of Jesus' words in 1 Cor 11, 24.25 was made by Joachim Jeremias. However, not all of his analyses are correct. In particular, the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος, which occurs in 1 Cor 11, 24.25.26, Jeremias confused with the adverb οὕτως²⁹ and analyzed the meaning of the phrase οὕτως ποιέω (to do in this way) in the Bible instead of οὗτος ποιέω (to do something with this). Based on this, he concluded that the phrase **τοῦτο ποιεῖτε**, present in 1 Cor 11, 24.25, is an established means for expressing the repetition of a rite³⁰.

Following Jeremias' thought to check in the Holy Scripture the meaning of the small parts of the phrase 1 Cor 11, 24, such research should be repeated, however, without making his mistake. Nevertheless, a study of the phrase chosen by Jeremias, οὗτος ποιέω, is irrelevant – it is a typical Greek compound of two elements: (1) a verb that represents an action on some object and (2) an object occurring in the accusative. On the other hand, it turns out to be essential to examine the meaning of the verb itself **ποιέω** and the phrase **ποιέω εἰς**. We will see that this phrase very often expresses the act of offering a sacrifice, moreover, the act of transforming the being sacrificed into a specific type of sacrifice offered – especially

²⁸ Johannes P. LOUW and Eugene A. NIDA (eds.), *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed., United Bible Societies, New York, 1988, pp. 139–140 (12.11 μαρانا), p. 193 (15.82 θα).

²⁹ Timothy FRIBERG, Barbara FRIBERG, and Neva F. MILLER, *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*, Baker Books, Grand Rapids, MI, 2000, pp. 288–289: οὗτος, αὐτή, τοῦτο the near demonstrative pronoun; p. 289 οὕτω(ς) an adverb.

³⁰ J. JEREMIAS, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, pp. 249–250. He included Exod 29, 35; Num 15, 11–13; Deut 25, 9.

transformed by eating or burning, where the sacrificed being is transformed into a fragrance pleasing to God.

Research using BibleWorks 6.0 in the BGM database with the command ‘ποιεω εις@pa results in 24 places³¹ from which one should select those with a construction analogous to Luke 22, 19 and 1 Cor 11, 24.25. One must add to this the research of this compound in situations where several words separate ποιέω from εις³².

As we will see in the texts from Scripture presented below, often ποιέω εις describes the act of transforming one thing into another, whether an animal into a sacrifice or wood into an idol or a dwelling room into a prison; Jesus’ injunction in 1 Cor 11, 24 means that those consuming His Bread and Wine are to use the act of consumption /digestion to turn that Gift into a burnt offering/sacrifice to God – to an anamnesis sacrifice.

Let us first see sentences with the phrase ποιέω εις, when it expresses the act of transforming something to something else but not related to sacrifices:

- **Gen 12, 2** I will make you into a great nation – ποιήσω σε εις ἔθνος μέγα – לִיְהִי לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים
- **Exod 39, 5 (LXX): the thousand seven hundred and seventy-five shekels, they formed/transformed into hooks** – τοὺς χιλίους ἑπτακοσίους ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε σίκλους ἐποίησαν εις τὰς ἀγκύλας
- **Deut 9, 14** I will make you into a nation great and strong, and more numerous than they – ποιήσω σε εις ἔθνος μέγα καὶ ἰσχυρὸν καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦτο – וְיִהְיֶה לְךָ רַבְרָבִים וְיִהְיֶה לְךָ אֱלֹהִים
- **Judg 8, 27** And Gedeon made it into an ephod (“it” – a gold – see Judg 8, 26) – καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸ Γεδεων εις εφωθ – וַיַּעַל גִּדְעוֹן אֶת־הַזָּהָבִים אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה לְפָנָיו

³¹ Gen 27, 17, Exod 29, 41; 39, 5; Lev 7, 24; Num 15, 8; 28, 8; Josh 2, 14; Isa 44, 17; Jer 5, 31; 44, 15; Bar 2, 27; Ezek 15, 3; 46, 13, Amos 5, 7; Mal 3, 17; Luke 13, 22; 22, 19; John 5, 29; 15, 21; Acts 24, 17; Rom 13, 14; 15, 26; 1 Cor 11, 24; Eph 4, 16. The εις@pa present in the command makes it possible to distinguish the preposition εις (for) from the adjective cardinal εἷς (one).

³² In this situation, the command for the BGM base in BibleWorks is ‘ποιεω *4 εις@pa. One must know that *4 means that four words are between ποιεω and εις. One can change it for more words, of course. The result is 136 verses from which one must select those that meet the criterion of being analogous to Luke 22, 19 and 1 Cor 11, 24.

- **Isa 41, 18** I will turn the desert into a marshland, and the dry ground into springs of water – **ποιήσω** τὴν ἔρημον εἰς ἔλη καὶ τὴν διψῶσαν γῆν ἐν ὑδραγωγοῖς
- **Isa 42, 16** I will turn darkness into light for them, and crooked things into straight – **ποιήσω** αὐτοῖς τὸ σκότος εἰς φῶς καὶ τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθεῖαν.
- **Isa 44, 17** the residue, *he made/transformed into a graven god* – τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἐποίησεν εἰς θεὸν γλυπτὸν
- **Jer 44, 15** (LXX) this [house], *they turned into a prison* – ταύτην [οἰκίαν] ἐποίησαν εἰς οἰκίαν φυλακῆς
- **Ezek 4, 9** make them into bread for yourself – **ποιήσεις** αὐτὰ σαυτῷ εἰς ἄρτους – **אֶתְלֶךָּ אֶתְלֶךָּ אֶתְלֶךָּ אֶתְלֶךָּ**.
- **Rom 9, 21** Does not the potter have the right **to form/transform** the same lump of clay **into** either a noble vessel or into a common one? – ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος **ποιῆσαι** ὃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν;

Now let us see the sentences with the phrase ποιέω εἰς when it expresses the act of transforming something, associated with making a sacrifice:

The use of the verb ποιέω / πῶψ for the act of sacrifice is evident already in the commands God gave to Israel at Mount Sinai: Exod 29, 38–41 contains four expressions in which ποιέω is without εἰς, and only the last is with εἰς. These are: τὸν ἄμνον ποιήσεις / ἃ ποιήσεις ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου / ποιήσεις εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας κάρπωμα κυρίῳ. Num 28, 3–8 gives, using identical terms ποιέω and ποιέω εἰς, this command of God and points out that it was carried out by the Israelites already at Mount Sinai.

1. **Exod 29, 38** ταῦτά ἐστιν ἃ ποιήσεις ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου – this is what you shall offer (literary: make/transform – **ποιήσεις**) on the altar
2. **Exod 29, 39** τὸν ἄμνον τὸν ἕνα ποιήσεις τὸ πρωὶ καὶ τὸν ἄμνον τὸν δεύτερον ποιήσεις τὸ δειλινόν – You shall offer (literary: make – **ποιήσεις**) one lamb in the morning, and you shall offer (literary: make – **ποιήσεις**) the second lamb in the evening.
3. **Exod 29, 41a** You shall offer (literary: make – **ποιήσεις**) the second lamb in the evening – τὸν ἄμνον τὸν δεύτερον ποιήσεις τὸ δειλινόν

4. **Exod 29, 41b** according to the morning offering and according to its drink offering, you shall offer it for (literary: make it for – ποιήσεις εἰς) a sweet-smelling savor, a burnt sacrifice to the Lord – κατὰ τὴν θυσίαν τὴν πρωινήν καὶ κατὰ τὴν σπονδήν αὐτοῦ ποιήσεις εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας, κάρπωμα κυρίῳ

Thus, the verb ποιέω / πῶ along, when applied to sacrifices, is sufficient to express the act of offering. When ποιέω occurs with εἰς in combination with the next words, it indicates the manner of offering (the type of sacrifice: e.g., a burnt sacrifice offered by burning) or the purpose of offering (e.g., for a pleasing fragrance to the Lord). One of the purposes of offering sacrifices is anamnesis – God’s remembrance of the donor during a future battle (cf. Lev 24, 7; Num 10, 9–10).

In order to correctly understand the sentences related to offering sacrifice, one must take into account that ὀλοκαύτωμα (a whole-burnt-offering, where the animal was to be burnt in a whole) and θυσία (a sacrifice, where the animal was partially eaten) do not only mean an offered being but also a being to be offered, as it is evident in Exod 10, 25, where Moses says to Pharaoh, “You must also grant us holocausts and sacrifices, which we will sacrifice to the Lord our God”. In this sentence, we can also see the meaning of the word ποιέω – it alone, i.e., without other words, can express the act of sacrificing: ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ θυσίας ἃ ποιήσομεν κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν.

In light of it, one must understand the phrase “ποιήσετε ὀλοκαυτώματα εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας” (Num 29, 2) as “you shall make/transform an animal into a sweet fragrance by the act of burning it in a fire”. A translation such as “you shall offer a burnt offering for a sweet fragrance” does not fully convey the specifics of biblical thinking. The same is valid for Exod 29, 41 with ποιήσεις εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας κάρπωμα κυρίῳ and Num 28, 8 with ποιήσετε εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας κυρίῳ.

- **Lev 17, 4** to sacrifice it (literally: transform into – ποιῆσαι αὐτὸ εἰς) for a whole-burnt-offering or peace-offering to the Lord to be acceptable for a sweet-smelling savour [...] – ὥστε ποιῆσαι αὐτὸ εἰς ὀλοκαύτωμα ἢ σωτήριον κυρίῳ δεκτὸν εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας
- **Num 15, 6** For a ram, when you offer it (literally: transform into – ποιῆτε αὐτὸν εἰς) as a whole-burnt-offering or as a meal sacrifice

[...] – τῷ κριῶ ὅταν ποιῆτε αὐτὸν ἢ εἰς ὀλοκαύτωμα ἢ εἰς θυσίαν

- **Num 15, 8** When a bullock from the herd, you sacrifice for (literally: transform into – ποιῆτε εἰς) a whole burnt offering or for a sacrifice to perform a vow or for a peace offering to the Lord [...] – ἐὰν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν βοῶν ποιῆτε εἰς ὀλοκαύτωμα ἢ εἰς θυσίαν μεγαλῦναι εὐχὴν ἢ εἰς σωτήριον κυρίῳ
- **Ezek 46, 13** a lamb of a year old without blemish, he shall offer for (literally: he shall make/transform into – ποιήσει εἰς) a burnt offering – ἄμνὸν ἐνιαύσιον ἄμωμον ποιήσει εἰς ὀλοκαύτωμα

Regarding the expression **ποιέω εἰς**, when the purpose of doing is stated as “a pleasant fragrance for the Lord”, the **object** of the verb in the sentence either indicates the particular **thing** to be offered or/and the type of sacrifice (for example, “burnt offering”, “food offering”, “anamnesis offering”, etc.) into which that **thing** will be transformed to give a pleasant fragrance for the Lord (cf. Exod 29, 41; Lev 17, 4; Num 15, 24; 28, 8, 24; 29, 2). Whereas when the purpose of the act of doing indicates the type of sacrifice, the **object** must indicate the particular **thing** to be offered.

The same is true in 1 Cor 11, 23.24 – Jesus’ command to the disciples in the Upper Room indicates the necessity of transforming the Bread and Wine given to them into an anamnesis offering made by burning in the act of eating and digesting. The object is expressed in these sentences by the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος, which in the context of these sentences as a whole indicates Bread and Wine.

When we compare 1 Cor 11, 23–24 with Exod 29, 38–41, we see that the order of presentation is identical in both texts: (1) God says first what is to be offered, (2) then He says for what kind of sacrifice it is to be offered. The same applies to 1 Cor 11, 25. Thus, both the meaning of the verb **ποιέω** itself and the phrase **ποιέω εἰς**, as well as the order of presentation, prove that Jesus in the Upper Room commanded the Apostles to eat/digest the Bread and Wine given to them with the knowledge that these Sacrificial Gifts in their bowels are transformed into His anamnesis sacrifice.

At the end of these analyses, it is necessary to return to the observation from the beginning of this section of the article: occurring in 1 Cor 11, 24.25.26, the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος Jeremias misread as an adverb οὕτως. As a result, he missed the very unambiguous logic governing the

passage 1 Cor 11, 24–26, in which the pronoun οὗτος occurs as many as five, and in some versions of the text as many as six times, always and exclusively referring to Bread and Wine—Jeremias, therefore, erroneously associated οὗτος with a repeated ritual³³.

In Jesus' sentences, this pronoun is first used to indicate what this Bread/Wine is – this Bread/Wine is My Body/My Blood for your sake. In the second part of each sentence, Jesus specifies what is to be done with it – you should transform it into My anamnesis.

Likewise, in Paul's sentence, this pronoun first points to Bread and (in some versions) Wine – whenever you eat this Bread and drink from this Cup. In the second part of this sentence, there is again an indication of what should be done in the situation described in its first part, i.e., when eating this Bread and drinking this Wine – you should preach the death of the Lord until He comes.

The logic of the use of the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος in 1 Cor 11, 24–26 imposes the following understanding of this text: Every time the community eats this Bread and this Wine, it offers/burns this Gift into Jesus' anamnesis sacrifice and proclaims His Death until He returns to it.

II.2.3. The command to “Do this for My anamnesis” in 1 Cor 11, 23–25 applies to the Apostles in the Upper Room and is not a command to remember Jesus and His past deeds

It is commonly assumed that Jesus' words εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (Luke 22, 19; 1 Cor 11, 24.25) mean “in remembrance”, i.e., that through participation in the Eucharistic liturgy, we, the disciples of Christ, are to remind ourselves of Him, His Passion, Death, and Resurrection. In doing so, it is claimed that this recollection as a liturgical act is perfect – it is not just remembering Jesus but making Him present. However, looking closely at St. Paul's record in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, we see that this view logically contradicts it.

Before moving on to our analysis, it is important to recall what Joachim Jeremias³⁴, whose influence on the modern understanding of Jesus' words is unique, wrote on the subject.

³³ J. JEREMIAS, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p. 250: “the command for repetition uses τοῦτο in reference to a rite.”

³⁴ J. JEREMIAS, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p. 253.

Jeremias rightly pointed out in 1 Cor 11, 26 that it follows from the fact that ἔλαθη is in subjunctive mood that “The death of the Lord is **not** announced at every meal celebration **as a past event**”.

Jeremias, however, erroneously indicated in his reasoning that “in the New Testament ἄχρι οὗ with the aorist subjunctive without ὅν regularly introduces a reference to reaching the eschatological goal”.

In the New Testament, of the seven occurrences³⁵ of the compound ἄχρι οὗ with a verb in the subjunctive, two (1 Cor 15, 25; Rev 2, 25) are strictly eschatological in meaning, two (Luke 21, 24; Rom 11, 25) indicate a time close to eschatology, but without being able to say how close, two (1 Cor 15, 25; Rev 2, 25) refer to the past events (in relation to our time); as for 1 Cor 11, 26, in-depth research shows that it refers to the present time. Moreover, the only occurrence of this grammatical construction in the Old Testament – Job 32, 11 – concerns a past event.

This strenuous focus of Jeremias³⁶ on eschatology has, unfortunately, become the foundation for a misunderstanding of the anamnesis as supposedly aimed at the eschatological completion of Jesus’ work. Jeremias failed to note that it is not about eschatology, but – precisely according to the logic of the Greek syntax of the entire sentence³⁷ and its connection with 1 Cor 12, 3 by the terms expressing the Death of the Lord as *Anathema* and *Kyrios* – about the Lord’s coming into the Upper Room after the Resurrection, a coming in which His disciples participate each time the Eucharist is celebrated, just as each time they participate first in His Dying, Death, Descent into the Abyss.

³⁵ A search was performed in BibleWorks with a command in the BGM database: ‘αχρι ος *4 *@vs*

³⁶ J. JEREMIAS, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p. 160 (about 1 Cor 11, 26), 249 (about Luke 1,72! – “When Luke 1, 72 says that God remembers His covenant, this means that He is now fulfilling the eschatological covenant promise”. When Jeremias calls “eschatology” everything connecting with Jesus’ life, he leads us not to differentiate between eschatology as the reality after the end of temporality and “eschatology” in temporality!), p. 253 (For a critical discussion of this passage in light of the Bible, see slightly above.), pp. 255, 261.

³⁷ W. KOSEK, *The Command to Proclaim the Death...*, pp. 1–14; Wojciech KOSEK, *Jesus as Anathema (1 Cor 12:3) in light of Didache 16:5 in translation by A. Świderkówna*, transl. Wojciech Kosek, 1–15. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3272130>, pp. 14–15.

Beginning our analysis now, we must first focus on what is in 1 Cor 11, 23–26. In the first sentence (verses 23–24), the Apostle conveys according to what was handed down to him (according to the Jewish rule of “*paradosis* – *paratheke*” of the transmission of Tradition)³⁸ that Jesus spoke the words “in remembrance” not as a command binding on us in the future, but as a command that the Apostles were to carry out immediately. Namely, after receiving the Bread from Him, they were to eat it “in remembrance”.

This Bread was called by Jesus “My body for you”, which, taking into account the clause in Luke 22, 19 (τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον), should be understood as “My body giving itself now for you”. Jesus gave the disciples to eat Himself dying on the cross, i.e., giving Himself up for us and our sins. The participle of the present tense διδόμενον unambiguously indicates that Jesus in the Upper Room did not give the Apostles some symbol of His future dying. In the Upper Room, Jesus gave them Himself from a future time several hours distant from when they ate the Bread.

It is impossible for a human being to comprehend how Jesus could hold Himself in His hands and, what is more, Himself from a future moment! However, Scripture instructs us that everything is possible for God (cf. Luke 1, 37). God revealed this particularly vividly at the moment of the Annunciation to the Virgin Mary of Nazareth: the Incarnation of the Son of God, that is, the conception of Him as Jesus in the womb of His Immaculate Mother Mary, took place in a way entirely inconceivable for man, inaccessible to human nature, since without the participation of the seed of man – it took place by the power of the Holy Spirit, by the power of the Divine “overshadowing” (ἐπισκιάζω), mysterious to us: “The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. Therefore, the Holy One to be born will be called the Son of God” (Luke 1, 35).

³⁸ Cf. Augustyn JANKOWSKI, *Trwajcie mocno w wierze (1 Kor 16,13). Wołanie Nowego Testamentu o prawowierność*, Wydawnictwo Benedyktynów, Kraków–Tyniec, 1999, p. 139; Johannes PANAGOPOULOS, “Die urchristliche Prophetie: Ihr Charakter und ihre Funktion”, in: Johannes Panagopoulos (ed.), *Prophetic Vocation in the New Testament and Today*, Brill, Leiden, 1977, p. 19: “Dass das *Kerygma* sehr früh in der Urkirche sich feste Formen angenommen hat, die als Glaubenssätze und Masstab galten, dies bezeugen nicht nur die festen Formulierungen abba Vater (Röm. 8:15; Gal. 4:6) oder *maranatha* (1 Kor. 16:22; Did. 10:6, die griechische Übersetzung in Apok. 22:20), sondern auch Paulus selbst in den klassischen Stellen Röm. 6:17; Gal. 1:8f; 2 Thes. 3:6 u.a., explizit dann vor allem in 1 Kor. 11:23–25; 15:3–5; Gal. 4:4ff; Phil. 2:5–11”.

In the above words of the archangel, the principle is evident, which is essential for the interpretation of the words spoken by God: if God calls someone/something specifically or commands to be called, He determines the essence of that being – for calling the conceived Child “Son of God” does not mean just some free speech, but expresses the same truth, which is conveyed with solemnity and utmost responsibility for the word throughout the entire New Testament, especially St. John, that Jesus is God, the Son of God, the only begotten Son of God (cf. John 1, 1–18).

If, therefore, it was God’s will that the words spoken by Jesus in the Upper Room to describe the Bread and Wine He was giving be rendered as the Greek participle of the present tense as “**body giving itself now**” (*διδόμενον* in Luke 22, 19) and “**blood pouring itself out**” (*ἐκχυννόμενον* in Matt 26, 28; Mar 14, 24; Luke 22, 20), then the meaning of the term must be taken with seriousness in accordance with the grammatical rules that apply in the Greek language: the Bread and Wine given by Jesus are Him from the future time in relation to the moment of the celebration of the Last Supper, He dying on the cross in the **body giving itself now**, in **blood pouring itself out now**. This “now” added here defines the time of Jesus’ historical dying at Golgotha, for only there can Jesus be said to be “**body giving itself now and blood pouring itself out now**”, that is, His entire humanity in a state of the sacrificial process of dying for our sins on the cross. This term does not refer to Jesus in the Upper Room because Jesus was not there in a state of dying but several hours before this dramatic hour in history.

The carried analyses show that it would not make logical sense for such an order from Jesus that His Apostles, who were, after all, by His side, should consume Bread and Wine – that is, Jesus in the state of dying – to remember His Death! Indeed, it was only after leaving the Upper Room that Jesus was to be crucified and die.

One should underscore that logic alone indicates the unreasonableness of the common view that Jesus’ command to do “for My anamnesis” means “for the remembering about Me, about My Death”, or “for to recall Me, My Death”.

While this view emphasizes that this “recollection” is of the highest degree, that is, it is the making present of Jesus in His salvific events, it still involves some recall to the present of what happened in the past.

One should emphasize, therefore, that the Apostles in the Upper Room did not have the ability to recall the Events that Jesus included in the result of doing εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (into My anamnesis), for when Jesus commanded them this doing, they were with Him, who was even before these Events. So indeed, this command is about something other than recalling or remembering these Events.

Moreover, when Jesus included in anamnesis the most critical Events from His life, they had not yet occurred in history, so for this reason, too, Jesus commanding the Apostles “to do as anamnesis” certainly did not want them to recall these Events because it is impossible to recall in memory what had not happened yet.

The view of anamnesis as recollection stems **from a failure to see in 1 Cor 11, 23–26 that verses 23–24 are a record of the words of Jesus’ command that He directly addressed to the Apostles who were with Him in the Upper Room**, and not to the disciples of all times. The form of the phrase is unambiguous: Jesus thus said that night before the Passion to the Apostles who were with Him in the Upper Room, who were with Him at the Passover supper feast.

Moreover – about which below – this very fact is repeated in all true Eucharistic liturgies of the various Churches before saying the words “This is My Body [...] This is My Blood [...] Do this for My anamnesis”. It means that the Tradition referred to by St. Paul at the beginning of verses 23–24, the Tradition giving the Apostolic interpretation to this key celebration of the Lord’s anamnesis within His Eucharist, pointed to this very fact as indispensable for the correct understanding of this anamnesis, an understanding in line with that of the Lord Himself.

To the disciples of all times are addressed the words of St. Paul, recorded in verse 26. Verse 25, lying between verses 23–24 and 26, conveys the words of Jesus spoken to the Apostles being with Him in the Upper Room but extends the scope of the command of the previous verse to all Eucharistic liturgies, celebrated by them at any time after that particular night preceding His Passion. However, why did Jesus in the Upper Room introduce the command to repeat this liturgy? Because the Eucharist is built on the Paschal liturgy, whose inherent logic as a liturgy of covenant renewal is to repeat it every year. It follows from these three

groups of sentences that we celebrating the Eucharist are to understand our participation in the Death and Glory of Jesus in the same way as the Apostles were to understand it when they celebrated the Eucharist at any time after that night on which Jesus was delivered. Moreover, the Apostles were to understand their every celebrated Eucharist exactly as they were to understand it that night before Jesus' Passion, i.e., as if those Events had yet to occur. They were not to remember during the Eucharist that these Events had already occurred in history, and they were now recalling them. They were to participate in them during the Eucharist as they had participated in the Upper Room and, therefore, as if they had yet to happen. This statement is because Jesus makes no difference between the two situations recorded in verses 23–24 and 25. Moreover, verse 26, as St. Paul's explication of the whole of verses 11, 23–25, holds that each time we participate in Eucharist, we participate in the Events of Jesus in the same way that the Apostles who were in the Upper Room the night before the Passion participated, and not as if these Events had already taken place. It is because verse 26, containing the particle γάρ, characteristic for explanations, is an explanation of verses 23–25 and must therefore be based on the content of these verses.

The present analysis should be supplemented with the liturgical testimony of the crucial importance of circumstances in which Jesus spoke the words concerning the anamnesis, i.e., those He spoke to the Apostles that memorable night before the Passion. Behold, during the Holy Mass, before the priest of the Roman Catholic Church says the same Words of Consecration (Words of Institution) that Jesus said in the Upper Room, he says the words of *the Eucharistic Prayer* in one of four or five different forms, but all of them contain the information that Jesus said these words (Words of Institution) **at night before His Passion**³⁹. “On the day before He was to suffer”; “At the time He was betrayed and entered willingly into His Passion”; “On the night He was betrayed”; “When the hour had come for Him to be glorified [...] while they were at supper”.

³⁹ Cf. *The Roman Missal. English Translation According to the Third Typical Edition. For Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America*, Liturgy Training Publications, Chicago, IL, 2011, pp. 639, 646, 651, 658, <https://www.resurrectionparishjohnstown.com/uploads/1/1/4/3/114314907/theromanmissal.pdf>.

The Divine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great⁴⁰ contains a statement analogous to that of the Roman Catholic Church that the words over the bread and cup were spoken by Jesus the night before His Passion:

“And as a memorial of His saving Passion, He has left us these things which we have set forth according to His command. **For when He was about to go forth to His voluntary and ever-memorable and life-creating death; in the night in which He gave Himself up for the life of the world, He took bread** into His holy and all-pure hands; and having shown it to You, the God and Father, having given thanks, blessed and hallowed it, and broken it”.

The emphasis on the fact that Jesus spoke the Words of Institution the night before the Passion, visible in the holy Eucharistic liturgies, is of immense importance. They indicate, together with the record of St. Paul, that the command “make this My anamnesis” has sense only for Jesus before the Passion, not after it. We will see that the same follows from the correct understanding of Jesus’ anamnesis – anamnesis as the sacrifice made in the Upper Room before the battle so that God would remember Him during the battle.

For the sake of reasoning, let us assume for a moment that the command recorded in 1 Cor 11, 24 and 11, 25, “do this εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν” means only “do this for that you remember about Me”. Then it must mean the same in 11, 26 because 11, 26, containing the characteristic particle γὰρ, is an explication of the sentences 11, 24–25.

We are about to show that St. Paul, despite a common understanding, does not teach here only about mentioning/remembering the Lord’s Death and His Resurrection but about actually experiencing/participating in Lord’s Dying and, subsequently, in His return from the Abyss of Death. Now we will base not on an analysis of the syntax of this phrase but only on the role it plays in sentences 11, 23–26. The syntactic analysis will be the subject of the next section of this paper.

⁴⁰ Cf. *The Divine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great*. Published online by St. Volodymyr Cathedral of Toronto: <https://www.stvolodymyr.ca/st-basil-the-great>.

In the first part of sentence 11, 26, the Apostle teaches that believers, while eating the Food of Jesus, are to proclaim His Death. This part is consistent with what Jesus said about this Food in 11, 24 and 11, 25:

- about the Bread: “This is My body for you” – τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν;
- about the cup of Wine: “This is the new covenant in My Blood” – ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι.

Both terms signify Jesus’ giving Himself up to Death, as is evident in their development in St. Luke, Paul’s close collaborator in evangelization (cf. 2 Tim 4, 11). Here we read in Luke 22, 19–20:

- τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον – It is my body *giving itself* for you.
- τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον – This cup is the new covenant in my blood *pouring itself forth* for you.

St. Luke rendered this extraordinary reality of the Body and Blood by participles of the present tense – this Body is now *giving itself*, and this Blood is now *pouring itself forth*. Concerning the Blood, an identical participle was used by St. Matthew and St. Mark – cf. Matt 26, 28; Mar 14, 24.

So in the first part of 1 Cor 11, 26, St. Paul commands those who eat the Bread (i.e., “the Body *giving itself*”) and the Wine (i.e., “the Blood *pouring itself forth*”) to proclaim the Death of Jesus. Could this mean that they are only to remember this Death, which they experience as now taking place through “the Body giving itself” and “the Blood pouring itself forth” they consume? No! Nevertheless, let us assume that these present time-participles do not convince the reader since they are absent in 1 Cor 11, 24–26. So up to now, it would be possible for him to understand “for My anamnesis” as “for remembering and recalling My Death for you”. So let us turn to the last part of 1 Cor 11, 26.

Is it possible to harmonize the understanding of the injunction εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν as “for remembering” with the last part of 11, 26, i.e., “until He comes”? If it were only about mentioning/remembering the event of Jesus’ Death and Resurrection, then the latter part of the sentence would have to mandate the proclamation/remembering of the coming of Jesus as

the Lord, who was admittedly crucified and died – as it was remembering about by the believers while eating Jesus' Food – but who gloriously rose from the dead and returned to the Upper Room to the Apostles.

However, St. Paul did not just write that believers are to proclaim the coming of the Lord, the return of the Lord from Death to life, to proclaim after some time of proclaiming His Death. The Apostle wrote that they are to proclaim the Death of the Lord until the Lord comes to them. Thus, this is not an act of reminiscing but an act of proximity, an event of an encounter with the actual bodily present Jesus Risen from the dead!

So the interpretation of “for anamnesis” as merely remembering breaks down here already. The coming of the Lord is not merely proclaimed but is realistically experienced: The Lord comes. So it is apparent what the Lord Jesus commanded in the Upper Room to the gathered Apostles and all who will ever gather to eat His Body and Blood:

- they, while eating the Body *giving itself* and the Blood *pouring itself out*, are to proclaim/express that they are experiencing complicity in His Death, that they are here and now witnessing His Dying, His passing through the Abyss of Death
- However, at some unpredictable but specific moment in earthly time, the Lord returns to them from the Abyss of Death, coming as the Risen Lord, putting an end to the preaching of His Death. It is necessary to emphasize that this coming of the Lord is not a coming into the Last Judgment but a coming every time the Eucharist is celebrated – this is clear from St. Paul's use of the conjunctive mood ἔλθῃ for the verb *come*. From the moment of His coming to them, it is no longer the Death of the Lord, but His Rising from Death and returning to them to the Upper Room that they preach⁴¹.

The analyses carried out indicate that what historically happened once – the Lord Jesus celebrated the Last Supper in the Upper Room among the Apostles, whom He fed with His Body and Blood so that they would already there participate in His Dying and passing through the Abyss of Death, and so that after three days there, in the Upper Room, they would await His return from the Abyss of Death to them – happens every time the

⁴¹ W. KOSEK, *The Command to Proclaim the Death...*, pp. 2, 6; J. JEREMIAS, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p. 253.

disciples gather to eat His Body and Blood. This repetition of participation in the same sequence of events has been indicated by the presence of the expression ὅσάκις ἐὰν (whenever) in 11, 25 and 11, 26.

However, one should note that these analyses alone do not unequivocally confirm nor deny the erroneous view that the disciples of Jesus experience and realistically participate in His dying and returning from the Abyss to them every time they celebrate the Eucharist because purportedly He in some extraordinary way repeatedly dies and rises again, having transferred Himself and His dramatic events to the time and place of their celebration.

To deny such an erroneous view, it suffices to point out that it is unequivocally stated elsewhere in the New Testament that Jesus died and rose from the Abyss once and for all (ἐφάπαξ – Rom 6, 10; Heb 7, 27; 9, 12; 10, 10; ἅπαξ – Heb 9, 26.28; 1 Pet 3, 18).

The same follows from St. Paul's teaching in 1 Cor 11, 23–26, when one considers what is presented here and in the previous point of the article. Namely, to the disciples, gathered around Jesus on the night preceding His Death and entry into the Abyss, He commands to transform through digestion/burning the Bread and Wine into His anamnesis, into a burnt sacrifice, offered for this purpose, so that the Father will respond to it in a very near future giving the victory to Jesus over the devil and leading Him out of the Abyss into the Upper Room, to the place where the anamnesis sacrifice were offered.

The command to turn the Bread and Wine into an anamnesis sacrifice was fulfilled in human history first by the Apostles, gathered around Jesus the night before His Death. They experienced that actually the Father responded to the anamnesis sacrifice offered in their bowels, a sacrifice that only makes sense to offer before the battle, therefore offered before Jesus went out from the Upper Room to fight against the devil. They experienced that Jesus, through the power of the Father, came out of the Abyss and returned to them into the Upper Room after three days.

The same command of Jesus is heard and fulfilled in the following days, years, and centuries of history by His successive disciples at each Eucharistic celebration. They, consuming/burning His Bread and Wine, transform them into His anamnesis offering, Jesus' sacrifice before the battle. Only once in history was Jesus in a situation before the battle,

before entering the Abyss through Death on the Cross. It follows from this that God moves Jesus' disciples from every place and time of Eucharistic celebration to the historical place and time of Jesus' celebration in the Upper Room on the night before His Death to make it possible for them to transform His Bread and Wine into His anamnesis sacrifice.

The disciples' real (and not barely imagined) participation in His Death/Resurrection takes place not at the place of their celebration but in the Upper Room, to which the disciples celebrating the Eucharist are each time moved in some mysterious, supernatural way.

Since each celebration of the Eucharist moves its participants to Jesus, who celebrates the Passover/Eucharist on the night before His exit from the Upper Room to battle against the devil, Jesus' disciples are to abide on prayer after each celebration, waiting for His return to them. It is according to St. Paul's explanation in 1 Cor 11, 23–26 and 12, 3, along with the entirety of chapters 12–14, where he described the community's prayer after Jesus' coming as the Risen Lord, breathing the Holy Spirit with His gifts, the fruit of His Passion, on those gathered.

Singing psalms, hymns, spiritual songs, instructing each other, and enriching each other with charismata given by the Holy Spirit – these are the characteristics of the prayer of the Eucharistic community, which, in obedience to St. Paul's explanations, abides on proclaiming the Death of the Lord after their celebration until He comes to them.

This eucharistic celebration of theirs is, above all, Jesus' celebration, performed by Him several hours before His struggle against the ruler of the Abyss of Death. So when, after His/their eucharistic celebration, they accompany Him by prayers on His way to the gates of the Abyss of Death, they do so with all His disciples of all places and times. They all have been moved to His place and time of celebrating the Passover/Eucharist and started to announce His Death when He went out from the Cenacle after the celebration. So when He comes to them, it is this His return that took place on the day of His Resurrection, which He renewed on subsequent Sundays to breathe the Holy Spirit into them and enlighten their minds for the understanding of the Scriptures and His work of salvation in which they now participate.

It is apparent from this that it is not the eschatological coming of the Lord Jesus, but the one that took place/is taking place after His Resurrection

and before His Ascension. It is also evident here that the command “Do this for My anamnesis” does not concern the disciples’ remembering Jesus and His past salvific deeds. It concerns their fulfilling with the Apostles in the Upper Room His command to eat/burn the Food of His Body and Blood, to offer Him as an anamnesis sacrifice, a sacrifice for the anamnesis – for the Father’s remembering of Him during His battle against the devil, which will take place immediately after the celebration.

If Eucharistic communities today had this awareness that they are participants in the Passover/Eucharist celebrated by Jesus only once in history, after which He goes out into the battle against the devil in the Abyss, they would abide in the prayer of announcing His Death, out of love for Jesus. These communities would be aware that He, in this historical passage through Death, needed/needs not only the intervention of the Father but also our benevolent attitude towards Him, our co-participation in His, after all, extremely afflictive way of granting us all freedom from being under the authority of the devil in the Abyss of Death. In response to this love for Jesus, these communities would receive the gift of participating with the Apostles in His return to the Upper Room and bestowing upon them the Holy Spirit, whom Jesus breathes not only into the Apostles (John 20, 2) but into them all.

III. Summary of the article. Conclusions on the Eucharistic Devotion

III.1. Summary of the article

The purpose of the article was to show a close relationship between “the proclamation of the Death of the Lord until He comes” (1 Cor 11, 26) in the Eucharist and in the prayers that follow it (see 1 Cor 11–14) and between them and the exhortations that St. Paul made to the believers of various communities to teach one another through psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs during the prayer of the Church (cf. 1 Cor 14, 26; Eph 5, 19; Col 3, 16).

The paper shows that the making-present of the Lord’s Death and Resurrection takes place in the third and fourth parts of every Eucharist and during its immediate continuation in the singing of psalms, hymns,

and spiritual songs, in teaching and doing in the community everything that the Holy Spirit commands. Until the end of the world, there will be many Eucharistic celebrations in many parts of the world; they will be celebrated in different rites by different priests in the presence of different believers. However, all these historically unique celebrations take place as the Last Supper performed in the Upper Room by Jesus before His Death at Golgotha, with the Apostles and all His priests belonging to all places and times until the end of the world. Each Eucharistic celebration is performed in the Upper Room in the presence of all believers, coming there with their priests-celebrants in some inconceivable but genuine (not merely imagined) way from all places and times until the end of the temporality.

One must notice that every Eucharist is not a celebration that repeats the Last Supper but a celebration that Jesus does in the Upper Room as a celebration of the Last Supper – this is the correct way to read the clarifications that St. Paul gave in 1 Cor 11–14 to explain the meaning of the words of the Lord Jesus, recorded in 11, 24.25 as “Do this for My anamnesis offering” – τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

The basis for this interpretation is the well-known practice, not only among the Old Covenant people but also among the peoples of that time, to offer an anamnesis sacrifice immediately before the battle. Just as for their ancient kings and armies, it was natural for the Corinthians, formerly pagans and now addressees of St. Paul’s letters, to consider the gods (and now God) as those who give victory⁴² and to whom people make offerings before a battle, even in a situation where the battle suddenly began⁴³. In light of this view, it was natural for them that Jesus, a real man who had to fight the devil, made such a sacrifice before leaving the Upper Room.

⁴² POLYBIUS, *Histories* 7.9.10–12. In the treaty between Hannibal and King Philip V of Macedon, we read: 7.9.10: “You shall be friends to us in the war ... against the Romans until the gods give us and you the victory” (ἕως ἂν ἡμῖν καὶ ὑμῖν οἱ θεοὶ διδῶσι τὴν εὐημερίαν). 7.9.12: “And when the gods have given us victory (ποιησάντων δὲ τῶν θεῶν εὐημερίαν ἡμῖν) in the war with the Romans ...”.

⁴³ PLUTARCH, “Aemilius Paulus” 19.2 (in: PLUTARCH, *Lives*, translated by Bernadotte Perrin, 11 vols., LCL 98, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA; Heinemann, London, 1959–1968, pp. 404–405): Ὁ δὲ τῶν Μακεδόνων βασιλεὺς, ὡς φησι Πόλυβιος, τῆς μάχης ἀρχὴν λαμβανούσης ἀποδειλιάσας εἰς πόλιν ἀφιππάσατο, σκηψάμενος Ἡρακλεῖ θύειν. See also POLYBIUS, *Histories*, 16.34.7: ἀμυνόμεθα γενναίως, παρακαλέσαντες τοὺς θεοὺς.

The Israelites were to offer an anamnesis sacrifice so that God would remember them during the struggle and grant them victory and a happy return to the place of offering this sacrifice by burning it; its role was the same as of the silver trumpets which the priests sounded when Israel started the way into battle (cf. Num 10, 9–10); some anamnesis offerings were not burned by fire but consumed by the priest Aaron and his sons and their successors (cf. Lev 24, 7–9).

The article shows that the Apostle Paul in 1 Cor 11, 23–26 indicated first that Jesus' command to transform (by burning in the process of eating and digesting) Jesus' Bread and Wine into His anamnesis offering was addressed to the disciples in the Upper Room on the night before His Death, and therefore at a time immediately preceding Jesus' life-and-death struggle against the Devil as the hitherto ruler of the Abyss.

The Apostle went on to explain that Jesus obligated with these words the disciples to eat the Bread and Wine given to them consciously: their eating must be "proclaiming the death of the Lord until He comes to them" (11, 26). It means that the Apostles were obliged to accompany Jesus on His way toward the gates of the Abyss and wait for Him to return to them at the Upper Room, i.e., the place where His anamnesis sacrifice was offered. The Greek syntax used by the Apostle in the phrase 11, 26 indicates that this does not refer to the Lord's return at the end of time (as many commentators assume) but to the Lord's return to the Apostles gathered in the Upper Room – which took place three days after the offering of His anamnesis sacrifice.

What was historically accomplished for the first time in the life of Jesus and His Apostles is accomplished in the same way in the life of Jesus and the Apostles along with the participants of each Eucharist: they all are obliged to do what Jesus commanded the Apostles in the Upper Room. Namely, by eating and digesting the Bread and Wine of Jesus in the third part of the Eucharist, they all have to offer Him in the anamnesis sacrifice. They all have to abide in prayer after the Eucharist, accompanying Jesus on His way to the gates of Death and through the Abyss until He returns to them.

Jesus' command, therefore, obliges all disciples (all gathered from all times and places of the world) in the Upper Room to eat His Gift in such

a way that it is conscious participation in the Lord's Dying, i.e., in His Descent into the Abyss (cf. Acts 2, 27.31; Rom 10, 7; Eph 4, 9; 1 Pet 3, 19) and His struggle against its hitherto ruler, the devil, and to abide in prayerful union with Him until He returns as victorious Lord from the Abyss to them into the Upper Room.

The Gospels' descriptions of the Paschal events of Jesus' life show that after offering the anamnesis sacrifice with the Apostles in the third part of the Eucharist and singing hymns in the fourth part, He left the Upper Room with them and having passed through the Abyss of Death returned as the Risen Lord to them and breathed into them the Holy Spirit. St. Paul presented the same in 1 Cor 11–14: Having concluded his explanation of the Eucharist in 11, 34 with the words, "As for the rest, I will give orders when I come to you", he began his description of what happens after the Eucharist when the Lord comes and bestows the Holy Spirit. The same sequence of events of the third and fourth parts takes place in the Eucharist and the after-Eucharist prayers. It is because the time of each Eucharist is the time of the Last Supper, and the time of the after-Eucharist prayers is the time of the historical accomplishment of those events in Jesus' life that have already become present in the celebration of the third and fourth parts of the Last Supper and every Eucharist.

Jesus returning to the community gives His believers the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit gives them spiritual gifts to pray, sing, teach, and prophesy, and He frees them from the power of the devil and changes their hearts to love God and people. The salvific Work of Jesus takes place in every Eucharist and time of prayers after it.

One should emphasize that the anamnesis sacrifice – a type of sacrifice known from the Old Testament – is offered only before the battle, and not after it. The essential purpose and meaning of this sacrifice are to express a request to God that He will remember in the not-too-distant future the donor who will struggle on the battlefield – that God will remember and effectively intervene on his behalf, endowing him with the strength to prevail over the enemy, endowing him to return in the glory of victory to the place where this sacrifice was made.

Such is the way to understand what Jesus commanded in the Upper Room to the disciples – the Apostles and all those who, as celebrants of the

Eucharist, become truly (albeit in a way that is inaccessible to the senses) participants in the Last Supper, that is, the celebration that Jesus performs before going out to fight the devil.

Many commentators have missed the significance of the subjunctive mood in 1 Cor 11, 26. Joachim Jeremias, who has been commented on here many times, is an important, glorious exception. However, his interpretation of the anamnesis as our participation in the eschatological fruits of Jesus' Death has again prevented us from seeing the essential reality to which Jesus has invited us: we are to be with Him actually in the Upper Room and then in the time and place of His dying on Golgotha and His return to the Upper Room – in His historical time, and therefore in a time far distant from the end time. It is here, in the Upper Room, where He celebrates the Last Supper and all the Eucharistic celebrations of the world, that we are to participate with the Apostles in what they participated indeed in and with us, people of a different historical time than the time of Jesus and theirs.

III.2. Conclusions on the Eucharistic Devotion

“The Eucharistic celebration is not only a commemoration of **the Last Supper**, but also its actualization for each believer who participates in it. And the celebrant does not act in the Eucharist on his own behalf. It is on behalf of Jesus Christ himself that he pronounces the words originally uttered by Christ at **His Last Supper**. And it is Christ himself who administers the sacrament for His followers, not a priest or a bishop”⁴⁴.

“The Church's foundation and wellspring is the whole *Triduum paschale*, but this is as it were gathered up, foreshadowed and «concentrated» for ever in the gift of the Eucharist. In this gift Jesus Christ entrusted to His Church the perennial *making present* of the paschal mystery. With it He brought about a mysterious «oneness in time» between that *Triduum* and the

⁴⁴ Hilarion ALFEYEV, *The Orthodox Understanding of the Eucharist. Presentation by Metropolitan Hilarion of Volokolamsk at the International Eucharistic Congress (Budapest, September 6, 2021)*, <https://mospat.ru/en/news/87972/>.

passage of the centuries. ... The ministry of priests who have received the sacrament of Holy Orders, in the economy of salvation chosen by Christ, makes clear that the Eucharist which they celebrate is *a gift which radically transcends the power of the assembly* and is in any event essential for validly linking the Eucharistic consecration to the sacrifice of the Cross and to **the Last Supper**⁴⁵.

Restoring the Eucharistic communities' practice of prayers after the celebration would be a logical consequence of this teaching, in line with the teaching and practice of the early Church⁴⁶, the Church Fathers⁴⁷, and eminent saints⁴⁸.

⁴⁵ Pope JOHN PAUL II, Encyclical Letter *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, p. 29.

⁴⁶ Cf. *Didache* 10, 1–7, where verse 7 indicates, similarly to 1 Cor 12–14, the significant role of the prophets during the community's prayer after the Eucharist, including their function to recognize how long it should last: τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν. The *Didache* is from around the first century – cf. Frank Leslie CROSS and Elizabeth A. LIVINGSTONE (eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005, pp. 481–482; Aaron MILAVEC, *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, MN, 2003, IX.

⁴⁷ JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *De baptismo Christi*, PG 49, 363–372), especially the passage starting with Βούλεσθε εἶπω τίνος ἔργον ποιοῦσιν οἱ πρὸ τῆς συμπληρώσεως ἀναχωροῦντες, καὶ τὰς εὐχαριστηρίους ᾠδὰς οὐκ ἐπιφέροντες τῷ τέλει τῆς τραπέζης; (49, 370–371). It is precisely translated as follows, “Let me tell you whose work is done by those who leave before the fulfillment and do not raise the thanksgiving hymns to complete the meal”.

⁴⁸ St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI, *Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva. A Collection of Materials for Ecclesiastical Retreats. Rule of Life and Spiritual Rules*, ed. Eugene Grimm, St. Athanasius Press, Potosi, WI, 2009, pp. 222–224. See also Wojciech KOSEK (ed.), *Thanksgiving after Receiving Holy Communion in the Teaching of Church Fathers, Popes of the XX Century, and Saints. An Anthology of Texts*, [https://www.adoracja.bielsko.opoka.org.pl/Texts_of_Church_Fathers.html](https://www adoracja.bielsko.opoka.org.pl/Texts_of_Church_Fathers.html).