Towards A Theology of Remembrance
A Basis for Forgiveness and Reconciliation

a thesis
submitted to the Faculty of Theology
Vrije Universiteit

Binsar Jonathan Pakpahan
Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam
Master of Theology
August, 2005
Dr. E. A. J. G. Van der Borght
Prof. Dr. A. van de Beek.
Acknowledgments

In this study, I have gathered a lot of new experiences, insights, and biblical and theological understandings with recent research concerning the idea of remembrance as a way towards forgiveness and reconciliation. This process is not stopping here, it is only a new beginning of the whole process of finding my own basis for theology.

First of all I would like to thank God Almighty, who has given me a shot to make any of these things possible. I have received many assistance and sincere help from many people. I would like to thank Dr. E. A. J. G. Van der Borght for his never-ending spirit to help me right from the start: from the complexity of looking for a place to study until supervising this project. This whole study would seem impossible without his help. I also would like to thank Prof. Dr. A. van de Beek for his insightful classes which still shiver my theological ground until now. My study would not be possible without the scholarship I received from IRTI, which I wish them all the best in the future to assists systematic theologians throughout the world.

I am especially thankful to Okke Postma, for his willingness to check the grammar of this research and his kindness during our stay in Uilenstede. I am also grateful to have such a wonderful class with Martin and Szaszi. I really enjoy our discussions together.

A lot of people have helped me enjoy the Netherlands as my second home, supporting me morally and financially: Anton Westerlaken and family, Rev. Nieke Atmadja, Rev. Verry Patty and family, Rev. Arie Brouwer, Rev. Aart Verburg, Luzan, Willem Jan, Ibu Bep, Mas Hendra, The family of GBI Bethany Hoofddoorp, and many more people I could not mention. I would also like to thank my family in Uilenstede: Mbak Maya, Vita, Rani, Mas Ponco, and Bung Bobby. We have shared a lot of things…. Thank you!

My trip to the Netherlands would not be successful without the support from my tutors back home: Dr. Robert Borrong, Dr. Kadarmanto Hardjowarsito & Ibu Ruth, Drs. Lucien van Liere, Dr. Martin Sinaga, and Jakarta Theological Seminar, and the staffs at the library. My friends: great people in Optimis 98, talented people in d’Metropole, and family in Kos Tambak 32a who always supported me when I am on my lowest. I would also like to thank the Secretary General of HKBP for granting me a study-leave, Rev. W.T.P. Simarmata, my personal tutor Rev. O.H. Sitohang, the family of M.P. Manullang, my friends at the office in Tarutung, Bang Thomson, Bang Fayed, and all my friends in LPP 1 2004.

I would like to thank a great person whom I admire, my dad, and a wonderful mom one could have, and my sister Iyut and my brother Darta who were always there for me. Last but not least, I would also like to thank Oni for her love and patience during my absence and help during my research. And for many more, whom I cannot mention, thank you all!
# Table of Contents

## Chapter 1 Remembrance In The Context of Forgiveness and Reconciliation

1. 1 Introduction 5
1. 2 The Wounds of the past in the Huria Kristen Batak Protestant (Batak Protestant Christian Church or HKBP) 8
1. 3 Forget and Remember: How To Deal With Trauma
   1. 3. 1 Remember to Forgive 10
   1. 3. 2 What is Remembrance 12
   1. 3. 3 The Importance of Storytelling 14
1. 4 The Remembrance of The Two Cases: An Example for Traumatic Experiences 17
1. 5 The example of the Jews and the Holocaust 18
1. 6 The Example of the South African and the Apartheid 21
1. 7 Conclusion 24

## Chapter 2 Remembrance In The Old Testament

2. 1 Introduction 26
2. 2 “Zākhar” as the Central Expression for Remembrance in the Old Testament
   2. 2. 1 Etymology, Occurrences, Context, and Usages 27
   2. 2. 2 Hebrew Psychology of Memory 29
2. 3 Aspects of the Theology of Remembrance in The Old Testament
   2. 3. 1 God Remembers People 32
   2. 3. 2 People Remember God 35
   2. 3. 3 The Cultic Representation of the Past 38
2. 4 A Theology of Remembrance in Connection With Forgiveness and Reconciliation
   2. 4. 1 Hosea: God Remembers Sins 41
   2. 4. 2 Malachi 3:16 The Book Of Remembrance 43
   2. 4. 3 Nehemiah 9:1-37 The Great Confession of Sins 45
   2. 4. 4 Jeremiah 31:34 God Remembers Sins No More 47
2. 5 Conclusion 48

## Chapter 3 Remembrance In The New Testament

3. 1 Introduction 50
3. 2 Anamnēsis as The Central Expression of Remembrance in the New Testament
   3. 2. 1 Etymology, Occurrences, Context, and Usages 50
   3. 2. 2 Anamnēsis in Hebrew 10:3; The Memorial of Sins 52
3. 3 Anamnēsis in The Lord’s Supper 54
3. 3. 1 The Four Text
3. 3. 2 The Lord’s Supper and God Who Remember
3. 3. 3 The Lord’s Supper and The Passover
3. 3. 4 The Lord’s Supper and Sacrificial Act
3. 4 Churches’ View of Remembrance in the Lord’s Supper
   3. 4. 1 Catholic View on the Remembrance in the Lord’s Supper
   3. 4. 2 Ecumenical View on the Remembrance in The Lord’s Supper
3. 5 The Lord’s Supper as a Remembrance of Sins
   3. 5. 1 The Lord’s Supper as Act of Confession
   3. 5. 2 The Lord’s Supper as a Reconciliation Table
   3. 5. 3 The Lord’s Supper and Forgiveness of Sins
3. 6 Conclusion

Chapter 4 Conclusion

Bibliography
Chapter 1
Remembrance In The Context of Forgiveness and Reconciliation

1.1 Introduction

The twentieth century has been wounded by traumatic experiences suffered through genocides, violence, wars, and terrors. Modernization contributes its role to fulfill the potential violent behavior of human. Science and technology has proven their capability and effectiveness in both improving human lives and killing them as well. Act of violence has been a daily digest for people through the advanced tools of mass media. These developments has made possible for us to see the genocide documentaries made in Auschwitz, the 9/11 tragedy, and the live television report of the US invasion to Iraq. Violence has become unavoidable commodity.

Both negative and positive events in history have shaped the identity and relations with others. Negative events in history have always relates to stories of violence, vengeance, and pain that people have to deal with. These stories of violence have become history, which will always put its marks on life. These marks have influenced personal and community's life, either it is them who were directly involved which is the perpetrators and victims, and those who watch and read these stories of violence from afar.

In April 2004, the world was surprised by the videos shown on television screens worldwide, hostages being captive by Mujahedin Brigade in Iraq was shown with a blade on their throat or surrounded by riffle pointed at their heads. The kidnappers’ request was for to pull out the coalition army from Iraq or to watch the hostages being burnt alive. Afterwards, there have been many reported threats of the kidnapping of the citizen from countries that supported the coalition army led by the United States in Iraq to volunteers and reporters from all over the world. This drama has gone bad to worse by the video sent by the al-Zarqawi’s group showing the Italian got shot in the neck, and an American hostage beheaded with the threat for United States to pull out their army from Iraq. Afterwards, there have been more videos sent by the kidnappers showing hostages being killed after their demands was rejected by the hostage’s government. This kidnapping has been an international matter because it raises controversies in the hostage’s country. There were protest rallies in countries such as Italy, Japan, England, and many more, demanding for their government to pull out their troops or their workers from Iraq to help free the hostages. The story of violence is becoming our daily meal. These killings must cause trauma to the hostage,

---

their families, countries, or even anonymous people who watch the videos from television or downloaded them from Internet.

Indonesia also has been documented with poor human rights practice and records during the past regime – the Soeharto administration (1965-1997). There have been many human rights violation cases and many of them were stockpiled. For instance, the 'coup attempt' by the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) responsible for the killing of six army generals and one senior officer, which ended in the great communist massacre in 1965; The Tanjung Priok killings of 1984, the attack on the headquarters of Megawati Soekarnoputri’s Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI) in July 1996 case, until disappearance of activists and the rumored role of state forces in the destruction of some large areas in Jakarta during the 13-15 May 1998 riots. There are also conflicts between groups, communities, and religion’s group in Indonesia – for instance the Moslem-Christian conflict in Ambon from 1999 until 2004; the Madura ethnic cleansing by the Dayak people in Kalimantan (1996-1997, 2001); the burning of churches in Surabaya, Situbondo, Tasikmalaya, and Rengasdengklok in 1996-1997 – that has never been completely reconciled. Some of the problems that have not been completely solved have even lead to the separation movement such as the one in Aceh and Papua. Problems on top of problems were left on the shelf. The stories behind each of these cases are different. Nevertheless, stories as such have one thing in common, they all caused trauma.

4 The quotation mark that the author puts here indicates that there has been debates over the topic itself whether the communist party was really trying to topple down Soekarno’s administration at that time, or was it really an intervention of the outside world who did not like Soekarno’s idea of accepting communist during the Cold War.
5 For a short description of the cases, see See R. E. Elson, “In fear of the people Suharto and the justification of state-sponsored violence under the New Order”, in Freek Colombijn & J. Thomas Lindblad (eds.), Roots Of Violence in Indonesia (Leiden: KITLV Press, 2002), 173. Many consider that these acts of violence were carried out by the state. There are already efforts made to remember the event that happened in the past, for instance the May Riot of 1998, where two books are published and one more to come as a trilogy of remembering the May riot, with the hope that the book will ‘rekindle the interest of the country’s law enforcement agencies in the events given that so little headway has been made in the investigating what happened, even after almost seven years.’ See Headlines, “The May Riots: Remembering the Terror” in Jakarta Post, Monday May 16, 2005, 2.
7 There have been many writings on this topic alone, for instance see Sayadi (ed.), Aceh Jakarta Papua: Akar Permasalahan dan Alternatif Proses Penyelesaian Konflik (Eng: Aceh, Jakarta, Papua: The Root of Problems and Conflict’s Solving Alternative Process) (Jakarta: YAPPIKA, 2001). This book tries to analyze the root of the problem in Aceh and Papua. The problem in Aceh has rooted since the first rebellion group of Hasan Tiro in 1976 as a reaction for the central administration’s centralistic and militaristic point of view (see 56). Now, despite the destructive effect of the Tsunami in December 2004, it is still considered as a military operation area because of the separation movement of Aceh (GAM). On the other hand, the root of the problem in Papua has started since the Papua’s process of integration to Indonesia in 1969, where there has been strong voices to oppose this decision (see 86-87).
8 There have been writings on the topic of why Indonesian tend to forget easily as can be found in Mary S. Zurubuchen (ed.), Beginning To Remember: The Past in The Indonesian Present (Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2005). However, we will not deal with the topic here, we shall discuss it in the bigger research of this topic.
9 Just right after Soeharto stepped down, many people also condemned Golongan Karya (Golkar) Party, the political vehicle of the old regime. They were blamed for every problem Indonesia has to face. Protest after protest flooded their central office. There were political debates whether the party should be dismissed or not. In the 1999 General Election, Golkar came in third place. Surprisingly, in the 2004 election, they won again. Golkar changed their constituents in the 2004
What is trauma? Trauma is “a certain event, force, or mechanism that causes malfunction or severe personal damage.” It may be a result of deep injury, sudden shock, major violence or significance loss. It is the result of physical causes, natural disasters, social unrest, and personal life experience. Trauma has elements of terror, humiliation, impairment and pain. During the traumatic event, the person’s thinking appears to stop and his or her emotions tend to freeze, as if time stands still. Usually fear, disbelief, confusion, hurt, resentment, and marked helplessness engulf the whole system or organism. This means people who suffers trauma will have something bitter to remember, even when she/he does not want to remember it. When the person’s thought and emotions stop during that traumatic event, the whole organism will mark that moment as a frozen event. This frozen event is not stopping as the events stop, it kept coming back as a painful memory, and this could cause a mental breakdown.

Fransisco Budi Hardiman acknowledge trauma as a cut of a negative event in the past. A traumatic experience is not about dealing with the bitter result, but more a matter of how one carries that wound. Trauma lies in the process of being hurt, not the hurt itself. That means events pass by, but trauma stays. Events cause trauma, but trauma is not an event; it is more like a dark side that froze a passed event and exaggerates the negative side of an event and becomes an anti-event. Trauma can be collective as well as personal. A nation, a certain religious community, and groups of people can suffer a collective trauma. This trauma can produce a mass psychosis – as Hardiman puts it – such as hatred towards minority, mass massacre, war among religious followers, etc. In this mass psychosis, individuals submit themselves to their groups. Here, it is not a matter of human against one another; it is a conflict of interests and groups.

Electoral and they claimed themselves a new party with a new platform. Many said that the reason they were winning was that people were not satisfied by the new administration, and that they would rather have the old one. Interestingly, Golkar’s candidate for President and Vice President, General Wiranto and Solaludin Wahid (the younger brother of Abdurrahman Wahid) did not manage to get through to the second phase of president election. For selections of cases in Indonesia between 1997-2000 see Kees van Dijk, A Country in Despair: Indonesia Between 1997 and 2000 (Leiden: KITLV Press, 2001) and Adam Schwarz, A Nation in Waiting (Australia: Allen & Ulwin, 1999).


Fransisco Budi Hardiman, “Melampaui Mengingat dan Melupakan: Sebuah Diskursus atas Detraumatisasi” (Eng: "Beyond Remembering and Forgetting, A Discourse on Detraumatization"), presented in the 68th Jakarta Theological Seminary Dies Natalis, 2002, 2. Author was deeply inspired by this small paper in writing this research.

The thesis of Reinhold Niebuhr is worth while noted here that he noticed a terrible contrast between “moral man and immoral society.” He observed a great distinction between the relatively decent, good behavior of man as an individual and man as society. His analysis of this contrast led him to the roots of the contradiction of human nature. He cogently states, “Individual men may be moral in the sense that they are able to consider interests other than their own in determining problems of conduct, and are capable, on occasion, of preferring the advantages of others to their own . . . But all these achievements are more difficult, if not impossible, for human societies and social groups. In every human group there is less reason to guide and to check impulse, less capacity for self transcendence, less ability to comprehend the need of others and therefore more unrestrained egoism.
1.2 The Wounds of the Past in the Huria Kristen Batak Protestan (Batak Protestant Christian Church or HKBP)

Churches have to deal with trauma too. The author's personal motivation for writing this research is the problem that has caused so much pain and trauma in the church where the author belongs – The Huria Kristen Batak Protestan (shortly: HKBP) or The Batak Protestant Christian Church. HKBP was founded by the Reinische Missionsgesellschaf (RMG – now known as The United Evangelical Mission or UEM based in Wuppertal, Germany) on October 7th, 1861.13 During the Dutch colonial period, the German missionaries led the congregations and preached the Gospel in Tapanuli, particularly the northern part of it, the Toba Batak people. Dr. I. L. Nommensen, who is also known as the Apostle of Batak people, was the first Ephorus (Bishop) of HKBP. Nommensen entered the area of Batak Toba in 1864 and baptized the first converts in 1865. Missionaries started training catechists, evangelists, and ministers by the year 1883.14 However, the independence of HKBP was actually happened in 11th July 1940 during the World War II. The war has made the Dutch Colonial Government arrested German missionaries, because they considered them as enemy. This was the moment when all Batak took over the leadership of the Church. Afterwards the Church expands themselves under the leadership of Batak people, and establishes churches outside Batak land.15 The headquarters of HKBP is in Pearaja, Tarutung, Tapanuli, North Sumatra, Indonesia. According to the church’s last profile of 2004, HKBP have a total member of 3,7 million, 3,017 local churches, and 1062 ministers.16

The story began when there was crisis happened at the HKBP Great Synod in 1992 where the Church had to choose their new Ephorus (the leader of HKBP as a whole). There was no final decision during this Great Synod until the very end of their assembly. Afterwards, the military took over the Assembly and appointed a new transitional Ephorus to be in charge of HKBP to organize a new Great Synod.17 This has caused division within the Church between those who follows the new leader that has been appointed by the Government, and the people who think that this government involvement is outrageous and still loyal to the old Ephorus.18
Protests of sort have been raised against this decision, both from international and national churches. However, government insisted that they are in no position in interfering internal problems within the church. They claimed that the appointment of the new Ephorus was only to help HKBP solving their problems and also to keep the stability in the society. With the government’s recognition, the new Ephorus claimed the church’s assets, which resulted in direct and indirect confrontation within the congregation. Some of the congregations split up. Military often involved in the process of taking over a church, and claimed that the old Ephorus is illegal and therefore government refused to recognized them. The crisis has made many divisions within the Church as a whole and in local congregations. However, this conflict has come to an end through the 1998 Joint Great Synod in Pematangsiantar, North Sumatra.

The official profile of the Church stated this problem clearly, "For about six years (1993-1998) HKBP has undergone a serious crisis, before the reconciliation in 1998. Thank God, HKBP was not fallen apart. However, the crisis had resulted in a number of drawbacks, among others: there are still some congregations which have not yet been in full harmony; there has been no improvement in the ministry as a whole, particularly in terms of preparations for facing the challenges of the 21st century; a number of buildings and other facilities needs repairs or rehabilitations; and ecumenical relations need improvements." For the author, surprisingly, HKBP did not mention anything about the cause of the crisis nor what happened during the past events even though it lasted for 6 years. From the official statement, we can recognize that the problem is enormous, not only buildings and facilities that need to be repaired, ecumenical relations has also been shattered. However, it did not say anything about the victims or the perpetrators. There was nothing mentioned about how the crisis started, what really happened during it, and what will be done afterwards to reconcile. The author thinks that there is a sense of silence to drop the problem and leave it behind.

Actually, the six years conflict has resulted in huge damage within the church. Both ministers and lay people were injured and even killed during the conflict. Many churches has been divided, and even after the conflict refused to go back to the old congregation and preferred to establish their own church within the denomination. Many of the Church’s assets were gone. Many members of the church moved to another denomination and never came back even after the so-called reconciliation. In January 2005, there was still conflict in one of the congregation in Jakarta between the two parties that separate themselves during the conflict. The problem still is still...
connected with the last conflict. This is just one of the case among many, even after the official reconciliation in 1998. The hurt is still there. In brief, the conflict is really too deep to be left behind.

Reconciliation of sorts has been made within the church. However, there are churches that already separate themselves during the conflict and refuses to go back to their old congregation. The questions then, have people really reconciled – especially since 'there are still some congregations which have not yet been in full harmony'? Has forgiveness takes place? How does the church deal with it? What will happen if the church refuses to talk about it? How important is it for the Church to remember and deal with the conflict thoroughly?

In some sense, the church’s decision not to talk about the past trauma seems make common sense because there is nothing positive to be gained from passing the story. It is too painful to tell through generations. The retelling and remembrance of the painful past could rise up hidden anger for hearers and also the people who experienced the conflict. There is also the danger that remembrance can be a form of vengeance. People feared that the remembrance of the case would lead to another dispute on whom to blame in the conflict, and this could also lead to a judicial matter. Those explanations could be the reason for the church to be silent about it.

However, the story might be too important to be silenced. The conflict has stayed deep in the heart of the congregations. Would it not be better to talk and share the stories of both conflicting sides with the spirit of reconciliation instead of forgetting it? How should the church react to the past conflict; is it better to be silent about it or on the contrary, an act of remembering and sharing the story between the conflicting sides will be a better way towards a true reconciliation? How do the church actually deal with trauma? Before we can continue to investigate our questions, we will take a step back and see the relation of remembrance is indeed important to deal with painful past in some cases.

1.3 Forget and Remember: How To Deal With Trauma
1.3.1 Remember to Forgive

In dealing with wounds, many people prefer to forget them. There are many who choose not to talk about past injuries. One of the temptations in forgiveness is the idea of letting go the past by forgetting it. It is the most pain that we tried to forget because it hurt too much to remember. If one cannot forget trauma and hurt because they stay deep, how should they overcome their trauma; is it by forgetting or remembering it?

There are several ways of dealing with the past injuries and hurts. Some will take their way of forgiveness, letting go the pain, accepting the perpetrators, and willing to start a new relationship. However, forgiveness and reconciliation is not as simple as it seems. There are difficulties in practicing and embodying forgiveness. How can one do forgiveness in a social guilt? What about the violence that was done in a system? How can you forgive a system? What about the people who had been injured that has passed away? How can one forgive on behalf of others? Who should forgive the perpetrators?^22 Do victim and perpetrator share the same memory about an


event? If not, how can they have true reconciliation? There are many questions on forgiveness and reconciliation. It is not as simple as saying ‘I forgive you’ or ‘please forgive me’.

In a remembrance of a negative event in the community, some would try to remember and made them as a kind of statue for the future, so that event would not happen again. However, Annemie Bosch said in her paper, “Many of us, however, prefer to forget. There are those of us who believe talking about old wounds will lead to renewed bitterness and retribution. “Blocking out the past” becomes our way of handling the situation.”

She says that many would prefer to forget about past wounds and try to bury the bitter past. Talking about the old wound was the same as repeating the same bitter memories of the past. It could be considered as a way of bringing back the same wound again.

To forget and to remember are ways of dealing with events. Fransisco Budi Hardiman tried to explain the connection of remembering and event through his philosophical analysis. He says that an event is something that happens when people are not the master of themselves and become part what happened. Trauma is a result of negative events. There is something mechanistic about trauma. Victims tend to call again and again their negative experiences, or it could go to the opposite way, they tend to forget it. In trauma, to remember and forget is a part of a physical mechanism that you can never let go. When a victim tries to forget, they are in fact remembering. Remembering and forgetting is a movement in the mind of the victim.

Nicola King, an English professor in England adds, "Reading the texts of memory shows that 'remembering the self' is not a case of restoring an original identity, but a continuous process of 're-membering', of putting together moment by moment, of provisional and partial reconstruction."

In the social sphere, remembering memories is not easy. It has a complex relation of time. What is important to note is that memory is not history. King states, "Memory can create the illusion of a momentary return to a lost past; its operations also articulate the complex relationship between past, present and future in human consciousness."

Dealing with memories means having careful action towards it. In the connection of trauma and forgiveness, to forget is actually not to forgive and to forgive is not to forget. If you totally forget that you were once hurt by someone, you cannot forgive them. Of course you may not need to forgive them since you no longer remember the pain. Of ten though, forgetting isn’t permanent. The memory is not eradicated, and it can be resurrected. In order to forgive, you have to first remember. Perhaps after you have forgiven, you can then forget, maybe permanently. But the two

---

23 Annemie Bosch, “Memory and Forgiveness: Vehicles for Reconciliation” in Thursday Theology # 76, October 1999. This paper was written by a South African missiologist for Thursday Theology on the topic of Mission in the New Millenium – A South African Voice. She wrote her paper based on her feminist missiological point of view.

24 While Culling propose that the opposite of remembering is not forgetting, instead it is dismembering. It is when we ignore our memories, corporate and individual at our peril. See Elizabeth Culling, Spirituality and Remembering (Cambridge: Groove Books Ltd., 1996), 8.

25 Nicola King, Memory, Narrative, Identity: Remembering the Self (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000), 175. King tries to contribute to the growing field of trauma and holocaust studies and to explorations of the workings of memory.

26 See James V. Wertsch, Voices Of Collective Remembering (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 33-66. Wertsch explains more about the difference between remembering and history; and remembering vs. re-experiencing.

27 King, Memory, 11.
processes – to forgive and forget – are distinct, not to be merged. To forget, especially to forget a wrong done to someone else (or to presume the right to forgive a wrong done not to you but to a third party), is considered by many not to be a moral virtue but rather a morally reprehensible condoning of evil. To forget a crime that has been done, especially to a third party, is considered supporting evil.

We shall see a story where remembrance plays an important part towards real forgiveness. Müller-Fahrenholz cites a story about what happened to a group of Germans and Belorussians in 1994. It was a story about a group of Hitler's army veterans who had been in Belorussia during the Second World War. They came back to the country and decided to do something productive. At the end of their stay, they went to see the war memorial at Chatyn. There was something happened at the night upon their return.30

The toasts had all been very personal. Then one man from [the German] group got up and struggled to say a few words. I noticed that he was still overcome by what he had seen in Chatyn. He talked of his own history, that he had been in the war, that he had been in a Russian prisoner-of-war-camp, and then he stopped, and we all sensed that the moment had come at which one could not simply go on remembering – something redeeming might happen. And it happened.

The man excused himself. He said that he felt deeply sorry for what he had done as a person, and for what the Germans had done in Russia. And then he tried to say that this must never happened again, but his voice broke. He had to sit down because he wept so hard. Around him there were young people. They were overcome and they too were weeping. Then an old woman got up, went over to that man – she was a Belorussian woman – and took him into her arms and kissed him.31

The old German allowed himself to remember the past triggered by Chatyn memorial, and somehow have the courage to disarm himself. He remembered. As a perpetrator, he too could have brought his guilt to the grave, but he chooses to admit them and plead that this must never happened again. The old Belorussian woman could have think that it is not possible to embrace a former German soldier who had brought terrible things to her past, nevertheless her kiss and his tears brought down all things to the table. It is a sign of forgiveness and the power that transcends vengeance into a new ground for reconciliation for both of them.

Remember to forgive could be a way towards a real forgiveness. This demands both sides to lay their cards on the table, willing to listen to others and share their stories. This is not easy for the perpetrator and the victim. Nevertheless, it might be an important way to be in the track of forgiveness and reconciliation. An act of remembrance is important towards a real forgiveness and reconciliation.

1.3.2 What is Remembrance

Since memory is an important thing in personal and community, what about remembrance? We shall take a look first at the understanding of the word. According to the Oxford Concise Dictionary, remembrance is: *n.* the act of remembering or process of being remembered; a memory or recollection. While the verb remember means: keep in the memory, not forget; (*also absol.*) bring back into one's thought,

---

call to mind (knowledge or experience etc). The Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology mentions that remember is from the Latin word: Re + memiri, which is to be mindful thought; to exercise memory. Moreover, remembrance is a term used in a very loose way to cover memory, recollection, and retention, or the result of the memory function generally. Memories are active and dynamic component of human nature. When we call something to mind, it is actually to re-member it. We become the member of the memory of a past event by calling them to our mind.

From the understanding of the word, remembrance is derived from the verb remember, and often connected with the word memory. Long before the development of modern social science, Augustine reflected the profound nature of human’s memory. He said that it is like “a great field or a spacious palace, a storehouse for countless images of all kinds which are conveyed to it by the senses…” In her book on memory, Elizabeth Culling, a senior advisor in the Diocese of York, notes that medieval scholars did not separate memory from learning as we have done. In their understanding, memory turned knowledge into useful experience and memory that combined information-turned-experience into what we call ideas and what they termed judgments. Since then, the understanding of memory is developing until now.

There are two types of memories: personal memory and corporate memory. Personal memories are depending on the person who recalls the scene and it is his/her emotional feeling that is part of the memory. While corporate memory helps a group, nation, embrace their identity. Culling says, “Groups share memories of the past, including origins and subsequent events, which make them what they are in the present, in the same way that an individual may have a regular behavioral response which arises from personal memory.” Memory is something important both in personal and community lives.

To remember is also an important thing of dealing with painful events. However, in pop-culture everything tends to go by fast without even remembering what has passed by. It is a culture of the future. Being influenced by this kind of culture, we often set our mind on the future regardless of what kind of past we are having. This so-called ‘bubble-gum’ culture then changes everything so fast that unsolved problems in events are soon forgotten. On the other hand, has the society really forgotten? They have not really forgotten it, they just do not think, and in their thoughtlessness, they try to forget while yet remembering. These memories in a mode of thoughtlessness birth prejudices. Events are passed, matters are forgotten yet not healed, and prejudices arose.

Memory of the past is important to get a hold of the future. As Wiesel puts it, "Memory is a passion no less powerful and pervasive than love. What does it mean to remember? It is to live in more than one world, to prevent the past from fading and to call upon the future to illuminate it. To remember is to revive fragments of existence, to rescue lost beings, to cast harsh light on faces and

---

34 Augustine, Confessions (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961) Book X, 8. See also Culling, Spirituality, 3.
35 Culling, Spirituality, 4.
36 Culling, Spirituality, 5. For a detailed study of collective and social memory see C. Elliot, Memory and Salvation (London: DLT, 1995).
events, to drive back the sands that cover the surface of things, to combat oblivion and to reject death.”

To remember is actually to live and to have your identity or a sense of self through memories. It is a revival of one's existence by preventing the past from disappearing and to call upon the future.

1.3.3 The Importance of Storytelling

Collective memory also shapes the community's identity. It is a high point of any specific group that unifies it after having a certain feeling towards an event. Yael Zerubabel, in his award-winning research on the role of collective memory in the making of the Israeli nation, said that the commemorative narratives of specific events often suggests one's unique character, while their examination within the context of the master commemorative narrative indicates the recurrence of historical patterns in the group's experience. In other words, the events and groups of individuals are influencing each other. Yet, this remembering of one's identity cannot avoid configuring the other in accordance with some model of cognitive apprehension. One's identity always has the tendency of putting others in the construction of her/his memory. Either victims put perpetrators in their memory's framework or it will be the other way around.

Meanwhile, stories told as memory of the past will not always be the same as the real event. Memories of victims will not be the same as those of perpetrators. Victims and perpetrators recall an event differently; yet each thinks that they have the true meaning in their own opinion. This is why an act of remembering by both sides is not only difficult, but also risky. King notes,

"In the case of traumatic memory, this may be a process of repetition with a difference, as we revisit painful or otherwise significant moments of the past with changed and changing emotion and understanding… memories – initially perhaps unbidden, visual, sensory, immediate – became text as soon as we begin to describe them to ourselves and others, to put them into sequence or turn them into stories." Traumatic memories are repeated through stories, while the stories may not be the real history. This narrative experience will become the memories.

Müller Fahrenholz explains that, “Evil acts create chains that lock perpetrators and victims together, usually in unconscious way, producing a double history of effects (Wirkungsgesichte) which must be taken into account in reflecting on the nature of forgiveness.” This means that there is a tendency that the history of the perpetrators is different with those of the victims. Further, he said, “An act of forgiveness must be understood as a complex process of ‘unlocking’ painful bondage, of mutual liberation.” While the perpetrators must be set free from their guilt (and its devastating consequences), the victims must also be liberated from their hurt (and
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its destructive implications). This mutual liberation implies a process of catharsis, and this is the point, which scares most people. Much of they might long to be freed from their bondage; they shy away from entering into this cathartic moment.

David E. Lorey and William H. Beezley explain in the book they edited of *Genocide, Collective Violence, and Popular Memory: The Politics of Remembrance in the Twentieth Century* that at the very center of all these issues of recovery, reconciliation, and looking forward is history – here in particular, is the social processing of memories of genocide and collective violence. All the faces of history are present in this connection: history as imagined; history as practiced by historians, policy-makers and others; history as battleground of ideas, ideals, and ideologies; history as therapy; history as taught in the schools; and history as the patrimony of a society or nation43 memory is like a battle ground for everything.

Inevitably, the memory of events is multi-layered, and often fractured. How they are remembered is influenced by the age, gender, nationality, and political or religious affiliations of the individual or group remembering. Memory is further colored by the circumstances of those remembering, both in the past (for example whether they experienced occupation, served in the armed forces, were the member of the resistance, or an inmate in a concentration camp or death camp), and in the present.44

There is a danger in remembering the past. One could be trapped in romanticizing the past or it could become a sort of vengeance. We must be aware of the danger that memories – and how we remember them – can be manipulated, or even manipulate us. The memories of those who were originally slaves, immigrants, or indigenous peoples and those who colonialized them are somewhat different. The official story of history is usually the story of the people who have the power. History is the story of the winner. This could lead to never-ending prejudices.45

Restoring collective remembrance is central for the work of reconciliation. Therefore, it is important to have the same story of remembrance between victims and perpetrators. The question is, how can we do that? Annemie Bosch suggest that, “We need to remember: Listening to each other’s stories signifies the willingness to remember. Not only must we listen to ‘the other’s story’, but we should also be willing to accept the truth others tell us about ourselves. Since none of us really knows what we did, and are doing, to each other, it is essential that we hear this from outside. That opens a door in us to accept the realities of the past and to appropriate the memories of ‘the other.’ In this way, our histories can become one.”46

Bosch is saying that through encounters, listening to the story of the other, willingness to accept the other version of the event is the ways for us to be able to have a common history. More, she was saying that the concrete Christian reconciliation takes place where, through repentance and forgiveness, we have developed these common memories. The whole process sets us free to start writing the story of our common future – together. Without doubt, she explains, it will be an extremely painful and frustratingly slow process. We can only stay part this process if we remain completely
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dependent on God’s spirit.” This means that we must keep our memories and listen to other stories instead of forgetting the pain that hurts us deep. We must remember to forgive. Remembering here is to be able to move towards the future.

One of the ways of having a ‘shared memory’ is the recognition of each other’s voices. An awareness of these different stories could help the gradual construction of reconciliation. More importantly is to hear the story of the oppressed. Jacques says that “They (the victims) need to know that each of their personal stories will become part of the shared memory of the nation and that they themselves will be cleared of any accusations and restore to the community. This does not mean that the pain will disappear, but at least the anxiety and despair caused by official silences or lies can perhaps give way to calm and healing.” The access to the truth is an essential element of consolation. Charles Villa-Vicencio rightly states the importance of this storytelling,

“We need to tell one another stories. It is perhaps the only basis for recognizing and yet transcending our differences. It is perhaps the only basis for gaining and understanding of both ourselves and the hopes and fears of others. It is the only basis on which different stories, different memories, and different histories can emerge as the basis for an inclusive nation-building exercise.”

Storytelling is a way of remembering the past and sharing it with others so that we can listen to other voices. Exchanging stories through storytelling would become an event where remembrance plays an important role.

The act of remembering has been used extensively by the Jewish families who suffered a great lost in the Holocaust and by the South African in building a new national platform over the old Apartheid system. How can a painful past be remembered, and in what way can it helps towards real forgiveness and reconciliation? In the light of remembrance for forgiveness in Jewish experience, Gregory Jones is right by putting his statement,

“Many Jews have emphasized that we must “Never forget!” the Holocaust, a slogan that rings true to other people who have suffered intensely. At the same time, however, there is also the difficult task of learning to remember well. Simply insisting on the importance of remembering in the past is not enough; we may need to tell about such events, situations, and lives, but to what purpose? Those who suffered from the evils, whose body continue to bear the marks of their suffering and whose souls have been numbed with pain, may actually be condemned to struggle with memories that have a life of their own, making each day’s most serious task that of beating back the past.”

The question is not only ‘how can we do it’, but also ‘what for’? What is the purpose of remembering and telling the story of bitterness to the next generation? What about the victims, do they have to remember their past over and over again? We will see in
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50 L. Gregory Jones, Embodying Forgiveness: A Theological Analysis (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 282. He puts the question, “Is this a story to pass on,” to stress the importance of remembrance for forgiveness, 283.
the following part how the people in the context of forgiveness and reconciliation remember the Holocaust during the World War II and the Apartheid regime in South Africa.

1.4 The Remembrance of The Two Cases: An Example for Traumatic Experiences

There are developments of a growing commitment on the part of international community in protecting human rights. A new impetus for national and international human rights law came at the end of the 20th century, as countries in several regions of the world moved from dictatorship to democracy and began to address their social and cultural legacies of the past regimes of violence. The efforts that have been made includes establishing truth commissions, opening state files, removing officials from office, publicizing the name of the perpetrators and the victims, providing reparations and apologies, providing public services to treat trauma, creating memorials to commemorate victims, and promoting public educational programs to incorporate the experience into the official historical records. The author agrees with David E. Lorey who thinks that these responses gradually created an understanding of the processes of remembering and reconciliation.51

There are two cases that occur in the 20th century that can be made as a good example of the case on remembrance, and how they try to deal with traumatic events. They are the cases of Apartheid in South Africa and the Holocaust in World War II. Both cases has caused trauma to the people who experienced the event and also to those who have watched or hear the stories from afar. Besides witnessing the painful past that haunts the world, we also experiencing efforts that have been made to overcome the trauma. This is what happened to the case of Apartheid in South Africa and the Holocaust.

In the Holocaust during World War II, there are six million Jews that are exterminated systematically. This event has caused deep trauma within the people who suffered and also the Germans themselves. The Jews is repeating their voice to the world to remember the Holocaust so that the systematic killing would not happened again. The same thing happened to the German who experienced difficulties to come to terms with the legacy of their past.

South Africa currently also faces multiple legacies of the painful fifty years of apartheid – a social hierarchy and the associated political structure that systematically privileged white South Africans of European descent over Africans from indigenous social groups. Black South Africans were denied political power and kept in poverty through the use of institutionalised repression and the threat of violence. After the election in 1994 that brought Mandela into power, the situation changed. South Africa faces its new transition into a new beginning. Truth and Reconciliation Commission was established in 1995 to create an opportunity to hear the stories of the victims and perpetrators. They have taken the action of remembering the past event to hear the victim’s voices and let them tell their stories without interruption or expression of scepticism.

The two cases above have left deep hurt inside the people, yet they choose to overcome their trauma by remembering the painful event. They come with the same

way of putting their trauma behind by telling the stories of unimaginable ways of killing and torturing human, or in other words, by remembering. Both cases has different objective in their remembrance. The remembering of the Holocaust is made more to prevent a repetition of the same event in the future, while the South African remembering is meant to start a new reconciled South Africa. Either ways of goals, they have chosen to remember instead of forgetting the painful event of the past. We will see later on, the examples from the two cases in the 20th century that are facing collective traumatic experiences with remembering instead of forgetting.

1.5 The example of the Jews and the Holocaust

For this part we will use the book of Simon Wiesenthal’s *The Sunflower* as an example of how remembrance is done in the story of the Holocaust. It tells the story of the Holocaust from a perspective of a victim and how a repentant perpetrator tells his side of the story of violence to the victim. The author admits that the book of Wiesenthal is actually telling a story of forgiveness instead of remembrance. However, this will become an interesting example for the story of forgiveness where the element of remembrance is very strong in Wiesenthal’s story. We will see those elements within the story itself and also from some of the commentaries on the story.

In the book of the Sunflower, Simon Wiesenthal tells his personal story in the concentration camp of his encounter with a dying German soldier asking for his forgiveness. This story has been told to theologians, political leaders, moral leaders, and writers and asked their responses from their own perspectives to the question Simon asked by the end of his story.

In the preface of the second edition, Bonny V. Fetterman states that even though it has been twenty years since the first edition of the book, the new generations has given their attention to the problem of the Holocaust. The knowledge and awareness of the Holocaust has been increasing through education. He says that, “even those who do not have a living memory of the Holocaust have begun to assimilate what it means for a people to lose one-third of its members to genocide, together with their culture, language, and history.”

In the preface, Fetterman puts an important question, “Is it possible to forgive and not forget? How can victims come to peace with their past, and hold on to their own humanity and morals in the process?” These are important questions for dealing with a painful past.

The experience Simon Wiesenthal had haunted him for years. He was a prisoner in a Nazi concentration camp in Poland. The title ‘the sunflower’ was in connection with his experience. One day he was sent to a ‘Reserve Hospital’ which was actually the Technical High School Simon’s attended few years ago (20-22). They were told to clean up the building that was used to treat injured German soldiers. On the way there, he looked at the military cemetery and see that on each grave there was planted a sunflower. For him, the sunflower has a special meaning of connecting the dead soldiers with the living world, and compared to himself, as Jew, who would not have the same luxury as the soldiers. He thinks about the fate of a Jew being cut off from the real world in the camp and to be buried in mass grave, while even the
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dead German soldiers had a contact with the living world through the sunflower (14-15).

A nurse came over to him and asked him to follow her into the building. He was shown into a room where a man was laying there full of wounds. The man – Karl - was a dying 21-year-old German soldier who wanted to see a Jewish prisoner in his last moment of his life. He wanted to confess a ‘horrible deed’ during his time serving the SS army. Karl confessed his guilt as a Nazi soldier especially on the occasion where the Nazi soldier was given order to finish off the huddled mass of Jews inside a house, including infants with their mother. The house was oiled with petrol and grenades were thrown towards the house with riffles ready aimed towards those who tried to escape. Karl remembered when he shot a family who tried to jump out of the house. He remembered the family’s faces clearly; the child with ‘black hair and black eyes’, the father, and the mother (42-43, 47). Afterwards, this particular event haunted Karl every night, and also his comrades, but no one wants to talk about it. Karl was later on hurt during an attack to Taganrog because the images of the burning family came back to him and made him stand still. As he was standing still, a shell exploded by his side and made him lose his eyesight and had his whole body covered by bandages.

Wiesenthal is interested in the story Karl is telling him because he wanted to hear the story from a Nazi. While telling his story, Karl hold Simon’s hands and Wiesenthal could feel and see the event himself. Wiesenthal was thinking that there was true repentance in Karl’s confession. Wiesenthal felt that, “the way he spoke and the fact that he spoke to me was a proof of his repentance (53).” Nevertheless, Wiesenthal did not say anything to Karl. Karl was asking for Wiesenthal’s forgiveness because he is a Jew and Wiesenthal was feeling ‘helpless and able to do nothing for him’ (55). Finally Wiesenthal made up his mind, he says, “At last I made up my mind and without a word I left the room (55).”

This encounter and his reaction towards it have made Wiesenthal think and had trouble to forget it. His friends noticed that he looked ‘rather depressed’ (60) and not entirely pleased with himself (65). He told the story to his friends to ask their opinion whether he has taken the right decision to leave the man without saying any words of forgiveness. He asked his friends what they would have done if they were in his position. He has never seen the dying SS army again, rather the nurse in the hospital, which in fact a nun, gave him Karl’s last possession in the following day. But Wiesenthal rejected it and asked her to return it to his parents. Later on after the war ended, he still remembers the address of Karl’s mother written on the back of the package that he refused to accept. When he paid Karl’s mother a visit, he did not tell the real story because he did not want to ruin the mother’s belief that Karl was actually a good boy. Eventually, Wiesenthal did think that Karl really confessed his guilt sincerely because of the story of Karl’s mother about his youth. He compared Karl with those in the trial of Nazis in Stuttgart where only one of the accused showed remorse, while the others disputed the truth.

Wiesenthal kept silence when Karl begged for his forgiveness, and kept silent when he met his mother, “rather than to shatter her illusions about her dead son’s inherent goodness (97)”, and wonder whether silence is more eloquent than words while there are many kinds of silence. The question now, was his silence at the bedside of the dying Nazi right or wrong? This is the heart where the question of forgiveness is raised. He says, “Forgetting is something that time alone takes care of, but forgiveness is an act of volition, and only the sufferer is qualified to make the decision (98).” Simon cannot escape the memory of his action at the bedside of the
dying Nazi just as Karl cannot escape the memory of killing the Jew family. They both are haunted by the past. As Jones puts it, “He (Simon) is haunted, perhaps, by the sense that this is not a story to pass on, but that it had nonetheless is a story that needs to be told if we are to be able to have a future that can remember the past well (and, thereby, not repeat the past destructiveness).”

In the end of his story, Wiesenthal put a question for all of us, “You, who have just read this sad and tragic episode in my life, can mentally change places with me and ask yourself the crucial question, “What would I have done? (98)” This question has been well responded by different people from different background. The responses are varied and often the responders connect Wiesenthal’s experience to their own in Bosnia, Cambodia, China, Tibet, and even the survivor of the holocaust. This means that the question is not limited to the past event; it can be shared and experienced by the sharing of such story.

In the light of our investigation, we will not discuss what should we done in Wiesenthal’s place, rather, we would see what he has done – or to be precisely what is the use of remembrance in this story. One thing is obvious, the dying Nazi soldier cannot erase his dreadful memory of killing the Jew family, and neither did Simon can forget his experience encountering the dying Nazi soldier asking for forgiveness from him. They both are haunted by the stories in their past. José Hobday, one of the responder in this book relates the memory that haunted Simon as the need of forgiveness. “Forgetting and forgiveness may seem to be two different things, but I believe that they are of a piece. Every time you remember a wrong you are asked to forgive it. From my experience, wrongs will return to the mind for years and years and years. Each recalls ask for forgiveness, and you stay in the power of that act until you let go…No one, no memory, should have the power to deny us peace. Forgiving is the real power…”

Memory has played an important role in the story of the Sunflower. The story made us realize that there can be true repentance from the perpetrator’s point of view that remembers the event well and beg for forgiveness. Memory can bring a true repentance. Simon was able to share Karl’s memory that haunted him and remember how difficult it is for him for being silent towards Karl’s request for forgiveness. Remembrance also made forgiveness a powerful force of reconciliation by not offering cheap grace. Indeed, Karl was haunted by his memory, as it is with his comrades in their barracks, and it brings him to repent. And the plea for forgiveness has haunted Simon to tell us his story.

Some of the writers who try to answer Simon’s question acknowledge the role of memory in this story. Most of them agreed that this is an important story to remember. Sven Alkalaj says, “It was the images of Eli and the figure of the repentant murderer that remained with Simon. Forgetting the crimes would be worse than forgiving the criminal who seeks forgiveness, because forgetting the crimes devalues the humanity that perished in these atrocities (102).” Matthew Fox sees the importance of forgiveness, but stresses the importance to remember the story. He says, “Forgiving and forgetting are two separate acts. One should forgive – not out of altruism but out of the need to be free to get on with one’s life – but we ought not forget…His (Simon’s) story prevents our forgetting. If we can remember, then maybe we will choose life over death (148).”

Robert Coles points that the main purpose of the story is for us to remember it. He says, “Let us, who are lucky to have been given by fate the safety to read and
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ponder *The Sunflower*, to pose its haunting, provocative, thoroughly challenging moral questions to ourselves, not only struggle for (and with) our various responses, answers, but take to heart what may be, finally, the author’s real intent for us: that we never ever forget what happened to him and millions of others… (129).” This act of remembrance can help us avoid such events to happen again in the future. Simon tells us his story so we can be aware and remember that forgiving does not mean forgetting. The Dalai Lama states this, “I believe one should forgive the person or persons who have committed atrocities against oneself and mankind. But this does not necessarily mean one should forget about the atrocities committed. In fact, one should be aware and remember these experiences so that efforts can be made to check the reoccurrence of such atrocities in the future (129).”

Remembering the event Simon Wiesenthal experienced is the aim of the memorial of the Holocaust. “Never again” is the slogan for the rhetoric of remembrance because it is believed to be the key of preventing repetition of the genocides happened in the Holocaust. The remembrance of Auschwitz plays the role as a warning to future generations. However, how does this remembrance applies as an active remembrance and not just an empty rhetoric who closes eyes to the ethnic cleansing in Rwanda, Bosnia, and other genocides in parts of the world which is happening after the slogan “never again” was cried everywhere? What does remembrance means in terms of the memory of the Holocaust?

The remembering of the Holocaust seems to serve as a war against the culture of silence. The Nazi’s plan was to exterminate all Jews so that there will be no more Jews left to tell the story. When the victims know about this purpose, they made testimonies to record the story of the extermination so that their message can live on even though they would not. According to Isabel Wollaston, these testimonials serves two purposes, first, it was an attempt to inform both the outside world and the future generations of their fate. Second, it was a desperate struggle at self-immortalization, at leaving some human record to defy the degradation and finality of death that surrounded and awaited the writer.\(^{55}\)

In the 60\(^{th}\) year of remembrance of the liberation of the concentration camp in Auschwitz, Chancellor Gerhard Schröder says that he is not only feeling guilty, but also ashamed and ask for forgiveness of the Germans during the World War II. The Germans are now remembering the past deeds the Nazi had committed and feel guilty about it. They remember it well and ask for forgiveness and agree that such things must never happen again. Here, we can see that remembrance plays an important role for the continuation of life towards the future in the event of the Holocaust.

### 1. 6 The Example of the South African and the Apartheid

In the last decades, there are governments who have sought what really happened in their dark times in history by creating truth commissions to find what really happens in the past.\(^{56}\) South Africa is an example of the countries that able to
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56 This kind of commissions has been established in Chile, Argentina, Bolivia, Haiti, Chad, Ethiopia, the former German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Philippines, Uganda and South Africa, see. In May 2005, Indonesia has announced publicly the names that will be selected for the truth and reconciliation commission in Indonesia. The official goals of these truth commissions can be generally summarized in four points: (1) To allow historical clarification of the facts about serious,
overcome their trauma in the Apartheid regime. They established a special commission to note down what really happened during the administration of the Apartheid. The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was officially established on 26 July 1995 for the aim of “the pursuit of national unity, the well being of all South African citizens and peace require reconciliation between the peoples of South Africa and the reconstruction of the society.”

The Commission states their objective,

The objectives of the Commission shall be to promote national unity and reconciliation in a spirit of understanding which transcends the conflicts and divisions of the past by,

a. establishing as complete a picture of the causes, nature, extent of the gross violations which were committed during the period of March 1, 1960, to the cut-off date, including the antecedents, circumstances, factors and context of such violations, as well as the perspectives of the victims and the motives and perspectives of the persons responsible for the commission of the violations by conducting investigations and holding hearings;

b. facilitating the granting amnesty to persons who make full disclosure of all the relevant facts relating to acts associated with a political objective and comply with the requirements of this act;

c. establishing and making known the fate or whereabouts of victims and restoring the human and civil dignity of such victims by granting them an opportunity to relate their own accounts of the violations of which they are the victims, and by recommencing reparation measures in respect of them;

d. compiling a report providing as comprehensive an account as possible of the activities and the findings of the commission…which contains recommendations of measures to prevent the future violations of human rights.57

The objectives of the commission is clear, they are engaging in an exercise of a deep remembering in South Africa in order to promote a national reconciliation. While the commission will have the power to investigate events that happened between 1 March 1960 and 6 December 1993, it will not perform judicial functions.58 Rather, the commission will create a space for remembrance both for victims to tell their stories of being oppressed and for the perpetrators to confess and plea guilty.

In the opening of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Bishop Tutu pray, "We pray that all those people who have been injured in either body or spirit may receive healing…We pray, too, for all those who may be found to have committed these crimes against their fellow human beings, that they come to

57 As noted in Müller-Fahrenholz, The Art, 85-86.

58 The Commission could submit certain findings to the attorney general for further investigation. However, because the committee’s task is also to process the applications for amnesty and indemnity, there has been debates over the connection between amnesty and justice. The question was whether forgiveness is the same with impunity, or it is necessary to bring justice in the account of the perpetrators by leading them into a process of trial instead of granting them amnesty. There is also the problem of renunciation for those who have gained most in the context of reconciliation in South Africa; how to give back the land which the whites has taken over during the apartheid time to be returned to those who have the true rights over the land. For further discussions on this topic, see Jacques, Beyond Impunity; Erix Doxtader, “Chapter 2: Works of Faith, Faith of Works, A Reflection on the Truth and Justification of Forgiveness” in Quest: An African Journal of Philosophy, XVI, 1-2 (2002), 50-60; and Müller-Fahrenholz, The Art, 96-97. However, we will limit ourselves to the problem of remembrance and not to jump into the discussions of this problem.
repentance and confess their guilt to Almighty God and that they too might become the recipients of your divine mercy and forgiveness.”

There has been objection coming from the opponents of the commission; it is feared that the action taken by the commission will undermine the reconciliation process that President Mandela has managed to construct. The opposition was afraid that the commission’s act of facing the past might lead to the destructive acts of vengeance and violence. De Gruchy puts the conflict clearly, that the option is between protecting the infant democracy for a long-term goal or to deal with the past now because otherwise it will haunt the future. The investigation of the past is necessary to prevent the past from repeating itself, and most important to help rebuild the lives of the victims. However, he agrees with the difficult task of the commission of dealing with past by saying that remembering the past might be difficult, but it may be more costly not to remember it.

One of the most important factors brought by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission is the need to listen to the voice of the victims. It is important to listen to the story of the victims, letting their emotions surfaced, so that the process of healing may begin. Müller-Fahrenholz states the importance of this process in the TRC process of healing, “As women and men recall their memories, they are again faced with all the pain and anguish. And yet, as they faced up to their suffering and name it in public, they leave the witness stand with heads held high. They have been recognised in their pain, and this is the beginning of a renewed dignity.”

The idea of story telling already begins in South Africa when the study of Healing of Memories started their workshops in 1995. It is also continued after the TRC has officially ended their works and create spaces for personal memories to speak about the apartheid past through workshops and encounters. The participants of these workshops are encouraged that remembering through storytelling can be a positive power of reconciliation. In its report, the ‘Healing of Memories’ workshops state the main ideas of this storytelling.

“The idea of the concept is to convey a sense of empowerment and affirmation in the participants’ discovery that their life-experiences can be put into narrative form and be witnessed by other South Africans. The corresponding notion is that everyone is worth listening to,’ which also is meant to work in powerful ways to
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promote the basic respect for people’s voices that has been denied to the majority of South Africans under apartheid.  

This kind of storytelling demands remembering of painful memories of the past. It is asking the society to remember their past and opening their big stories to the story of the oppressed. Villa-Vicencio says, “Storytelling builds the bridge of communication, even when forgiveness remains a long way off.” This helps the victims telling their side of the story and restoring their dignities and lives.

The process of remembering in the South African TRC hearings has begun the process of breaking the silences of the past. It has aided the psychological restoration of the victims – although the results are varied from one another – through space for the testimonies, especially in public forum. Some also notice the weakness of this process is the largely neglected perpetrators’ side of the story. This might be caused by the hesitation of the perpetrator to admit their guilt publicly. However, as Brandon Hamber puts it, the TRC has facilitated the remembrance of the painful past through stories for storytelling. A great deal of work remains to be continued, it is just a starting way towards a long way of forgiveness and reconciliation. However, remembrance is clearly a step that has to be taken towards forgiveness and true reconciliation.

1.7 Conclusion

The world has been suffering a lot of negative events that have caused trauma to the people. There are peoples, individually of within a society, who has to live with their hurts of the past. The church cannot escape their hurt of the past as well. They have to live with past wounds and trying to cope with it. These traumas tend to block one from moving forward towards the future and haunted the people who suffer it. Therefore, it is important to deal with this trauma. Forgiveness is a way toward breaking the circle of trauma and vengeance. This important step has to be taken in order to reconcile with one and also with the others. In a collective trauma, forgiveness is often not as easy as we imagined it would be. In a deep hurt of a collective trauma, it will take a lot of efforts to be able to forgive the perpetrators. People have tried to cope with this problem in a collective way.

The examples from the Jewish remembrance and South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission made us realize the importance of remembrance in order to be able to forgive the offender who has done such atrocities. To remember means to have an identity of oneself, to be able to grasp what has happened in the past, and to be able to say ‘never again’ for such violence. Remembering is not always easy, because stories are different and history always takes side on the winner. Exchanging stories through storytelling is important event of remembrance to be able to hear other’s voices and share our painful past. To be able to forgive means to remember what needs to be forgiven and remember the past event. Remembrance is an essential element for both the perpetrators and victims.

66 Villa-Vicencio, “Telling One Another Stories”, 36.
From these explanations, we can see that remembrance is very important in the theme of forgiveness and reconciliation. In fact, it might be a way towards forgiveness and reconciliation. In some sense, our preliminary research has suggested that in dealing with collective traumas and deep wounds, remembrance could be a better way instead of to forget. In the case of HKBP, the act of remembrance could be needed rather than keeping the problem untouched, to resolve the old conflicts and to build a new future. To remember is to build the future. To reject the act of remembrance would cause trauma to stay. This trauma will perpetuate prejudices in the congregation and therefore there is no real forgiveness and reconciliation that has been accomplished. Trauma that has stayed inside will influence the church in every step they take for the future. Therefore, it could important for the church to remember.

This is where we come up to the main question for this research, what are the biblical and theological aspects of remembrance in the context of forgiveness and reconciliation as a way of healing trauma? What is the biblical foundation of remembrance? These are the questions that will be explored further in the next chapters using the methods of biblical theology. The second chapter will look into the idea of remembrance in the Old Testament and the third chapter will look for it in the New Testament.
Chapter 2
Remembrance In The Old Testament

2. 1 Introduction
In the previous chapter, it is clear that remembrance is very important in the theme of forgiveness and reconciliation. In fact, it might be a way towards forgiveness and reconciliation. This chapter will try to look for the biblical foundation in the Old Testament for remembrance, by and large being connected with the theme of forgiveness. We will see whether remembrance is an important theme throughout the Old Testament or not.

The author will use the book of Brevard Childs as the main source for writing this chapter, with the help of biblical dictionaries on the term, especially on the topic of remembrance in the Old Testament. Childs wrote this book following a general attack on the book of Johs Pedersen by James Barr. Child studies the use of the verb ‘remember’ in the setting of the cult, the law court, the prophecy narrative, etc. in the methods of form-criticism. However, the book of Childs only focus on the word ‘remember’, as Barr has warned us, that we must be careful of the complexity of the use of an isolated word-use in languages for they can have different meaning. Childs’ focuses his research as (1) an attempt to find the scope of meaning and understanding of memory in the Old Testament; (2) to discover the meaning of memory through a form-critical analysis of the context within Israel’s life in which memory plays a significant role; (3) to discuss the theological problem of memory and its relation to tradition.

We shall see the use of remembrance in the root of the words in Hebrew to see what is the real meaning of the verb. Therefore, an examination on the term is important. Afterwards, the use of remembrance will be seen upon the connection with sin and guilt. Some main texts and the idea of remembrance of sins will be explored in this chapter to see the biblical foundation for remembrance with the help of biblical theology method. We will see how the terms employed in those texts and see what is the idea behind it. We will also see the use of remembrance in the context of forgiveness, especially how remembrance is important towards it. We will explore some main texts on remembrance in connection with the theme of forgiveness and sin.

2. 2 “Zākhar” as the Central Expression for Remembrance in the Old Testament

---

69 There are four main connotations of this widely interpreted term. They are, (1) a descriptive (‘presuppositionless’) science which seeks only to clarify the themes and ideas encountered in the Bible of in the different books or portion thereof. (2) The attempt to articulate the theological significance of the Bible as a whole. (3) The attempt to build a complete system of theology out of the biblical materials and nothing else, which should result in equating biblical exposition with the whole dogmatics: Karl Barth has essayed this task more consistently than any other theologian in our time. (4) That kind of exposition of biblical books, texts or words, which is based upon the presupposition that there is a common biblical (or Hebraic) viewpoint which is shared by the various authors of the scriptural writings. See J. L. Houlden, “Biblical Theology” in Alan Richardson & John Bowden, eds., A New Dictionary of Christian Theology (London: SCM Press, first published 1983, 11th edition 2002), Houlden prefers to use the fourth connotation as the general meaning of the concept of biblical theology.
In the Old Testament, "Remember!" and "Behold!" are one of its great commands. Craig Dykstra says that Israel is constantly told to remember the day of their freedom from Egypt, to remember that they were once slaves, to remember how God has led them through the wilderness and into the land of Canaan.

"Israel is told to remember that entire law God has commanded them. They are told to remember the covenants and to remember how God has judged and has been merciful. Above all, they are to remember God as God remembers them in steadfast love. And often, they do remember. They remember in times of trouble and affliction. They remember as they seek understanding and a way to live. They remember in the midst of judgment, and they remember while in bondage. They remember in order to interpret what is going on in the world and what it means, and they remember in giving thanks and praise." 70

This means that the order to remember is lived through by Israelites. Israel remembers what God has done for them in all their life. Remembrance is an important thing for Israel, whether as their covenant with the Lord and as their identity as well. God commands Israel to teach and remember the knowledge of faith "when you sit at home and when you walk along the road, when you lie down and when you get up (Deut. 11:19).” The remembrance Israel told to do is lived by them day by day.

2.2.1 Etymology, Occurrences, Context, and Usages

In the Old Testament, the word that translated with remember came from the root (zkr) which is a verb common masculine singular construct, and means to think (about), meditate (upon), pay attention (to); remember, remembrance, recollect; mention, declare, recite, proclaim, invoke, commemorate, accuse, confess. 71 An important differentiation has to be made before we observe the understanding of memory in the Old Testament. Childs concludes his observation on the difference between the meaning of the root zkr in the qal and in the hiphil. He says, “The lexicographical analysis is significant in revealing the complexity of the root zkr and the danger of confusing fundamentally divergent meanings. Two basic meanings can be distinguished: a. to remember, in the qal, b. to utter, in the hiphil. The latter can either be a cultic naming of the name or a juridical accusation of sin.” 72

In six passages zākhar expresses the active intellectual engagement of a person with himself (e.g. Hab. 3:2 prays to God that he will remember to have mercy; see also Lam. 3:20; Job 4:7; 7:7; 21:6; Ps. 22:28). The instances in those passages are showing an intellectual activity. The fact that zākhar has often expresses the idea of the past does not automatically means to limit the meaning only to the basic meaning of the word which is remember in the sense of recall. Easing explains that, “it would be more accurate to say that the nuance of “recollection” springs from intellectual activity with reference to the past.” 73 For instances, Shimei’s plea to David (2 Sam. 19:19) and Abigail’s request that the king will remember her with favor (1 Sam. 23:31) likewise refer to the past experienced by the person being asked to remember.

70 See Dykstra, "Memory and Truth", 159.
71 In Georg Fohrer, Hebrew and Aramaic Dictionary of The Old Testament (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1993), 70, is translated as q. recall, think of, remember; ni. be remembered, mentioned; hi. remind, mention, confess and praise. With vocals, it is translated as memory, mentioning, naming, and invocation. It is interesting to note that Zechariah also named after the same root of zkr.
72 Childs, Memory, 16.
or forget (see Est. 2:1 and 2 Kings 9:25). In Lam. 1:7, 9, recollection of the glorious past is a motif accentuating the affliction of the present. The future can also be the subject of intellectual activity expressed by zākhar (Isa. 47:7).

The verb zkr is often appears in combination with other verbs such as forget. Such parallelism shows that zkr denotes the presence and acceptance of something in the mind. What is remembered is ‘taken to heart’, with the heart is understood to be an expression for the personality as a whole. When zkr is combined with pāqadh, ‘act with visible results’, an element of concrete performance is added (see Ps. 103:18). An interesting sequence can be seen in Numbers 15:39 when Israel sees the tassels in her clothing, they will remember that they are connected with God’s law. This will set her obligation, to act accordingly with the Law. Zkr is often implies an action or appears in combination with verbs or action. In the observation of the context of zkr, it is clear that the verbs used in parallel do not refer to the past only. The interpretation of zkr as ‘remember’ in the sense of recall can hardly represent its basic meaning. We will see the discussion on this in the next part of this chapter.

The word remembrance shows a complex usage in Hebrew of the root from zkr. This verb occurs in all branches of Semitic languages. It appears absolutely or with a verb as complement only in a few passages; in most cases it is combined with the object of the intellectual activity, with (39 occurrences) or without (52 occurrences) the use of ‘eth. It occurs 168 times in the qal form and 20 times in the niphal. The hiphil (31 occurrences), with the causative meaning “bring to remembrance,” exhibits extended usage, as does the noun zēkher (33 occurrences), and zikkārōn (24 times) as a ‘memorial, and the cultic term ‘azkārāh (7 occurrences).

There are some derivations from the root zkr. Eising notes that the niphal form, nizkar functions as a passive of the qal, but a few of its occurrences exhibit characteristic supplementary elements belonging to the meaning of zākhar. Childs says that the verb should be translated “mention” (see Isa. 23:16; 65:17). Meanwhile, the proper causative meaning of the hiphil hizkir should be conceived as ‘bring to remembrance’, ‘make someone remember or be mindful of’ something (see Gen 41:9).

Allen notes that the noun zēkher (23 occurrences) refers to remembrance when it is associated with death. Evil doers and Israel’s enemies suffer the fate of not being remembered at the time of death (see. Exod. 17:14; Deut. 25:19; 32:26; Ps. 9:6), while on the other hand, wisdom teaching promises that the righteous will always be remembered (Ps. 112:6; Prov. 10:7). God has his remembrance because of the way he reveals his name yhvh (Exod. 3:15). The “memory” of God is often praised just as his name (Ps. 30:5). The late psalms also show that the zēkher of God’s name involves an element of proclamation (Ps. 111:4; 145:7). Eising notes, “The fact that there is no remembrance of God in Sheol (Ps. 6:5) can even be the motive for a lament in which the worshippers prays that God will remember him and let him live.

---

75 See Eising, “Zākhar”, 65. We will explore the connection of heart, soul, and remembrance later on in this chapter.
77 See Eising, “Zākhar”, 64-65.
78 See Childs, Memory, 16; and Eising “Zākhar”, 72.
Man lives because God remembers him and is obligated to remember God’s wonder with praise.”

The nom. zikkārôn has at least three meaning. First, it can mean remembrance (Eccl. 1:11; 2:16) second, it is a memorandum, record, or “something to be remembered” in itself (Exod.17:14), such as the scroll of remembrance in Mal. 3:16. The most common sense meaning is “a memorial” or “reminder of something else”. In the Pentateuch, zikkārôn occurs only in P; to the notion of remembering it adds the element of a sign that evokes remembrance. God or human could institute a “memorial” to remind either God or human. The regulations concerning the Passover in Ex. 12:1-20 includes an ‘ôth for God (v. 13) and a zikkārôn for man (v. 14). The blood of the Passover lamb is to be a ‘sign’, while the day of the Passover is explained as a memorial. Jeremiah 17:2 could also bear witness that the sins of Judah were written upon the horns of the altar “as a momento” against them.

The next derivation from the root zkr is ‘azkārāh which is translated as sign-offering or memorial portion. The noun ‘azkārāh which is often translated as anamnesis in the LXX, occurs 7 times in the Old Testament. Averbeck analyses that the noun refers to the part of the regular grain offering that the officiating priest would normally offer to the Lord on the burnt offering altar as a “memorial (portion)” to the Lord (Lev. 2:2, 9, 16; 5:12; 6:15), the “shrewbread” or “bread of the Presence” (Lev. 24:7; cf. Exod. 25:30), and the grain offering for the suspected adulteress ritual (Num. 5:26). It is suspected that the meaning of ‘azkārāh does not move beyond the realm of concept: pronounce, make known, proclaim.

2.2.2 Hebrew Psychology of Memory

In his research, Johs Pedersen has stimulated further research on the topic of memory within the Old Testament. The essence of man is fragile, but through the breath of God, a nepheš, it was transformed into a soul. Man in his total essence is a soul. The soul is a totality of the whole will and volition. Therefore, the relationship between thought and action differs radically from that conceived of by the modern thought. There is no such thing as objective and theoretical thinking that is divorced from the soul as a whole. Childs concludes this theory of Pedersen that “the Hebrew

---

80 Eising “Zākhar”, 77.
81 Allen, “1105”, . Compare to Schottroff who distinguishes several meanings of zikkārôn: “record book” (Est. 6:1; Mal. 3:16; Ex. 17:14; Ezr. 4:15; 6:2); “remembrance” or favorable “consideration” on the part of God (Ex. 30:16; Nu. 31:54; Zec. 6:14; also Ex. 28:12, 29; 39:7; Nu. 10:10); “remembrance on the part of men as a religious and cultic act (Ex. 12:14; 13:9; Lev. 23:24; Nu. 17:5 [16:40]; Josh. 4:7; Isa. 57:8; Neh. 2:20); and “miscellaneous meanings” such as “statements” (Job 13:12) and “the (lasting) remembrance among men that men seek in vain” (Eccl. 1:11; 2:16). See W. Schottroff, ‘Gedenken’ im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament 2nd ed. (1967) 337, as in Eising “Zākhar”, 79.
82 See Schottroff, Gedenken, 299-328, as in Eising “Zākhar”, 77.
85 Averbeck, “‘Azkārāh”, 360.
86 Eising ‘Zākhar’, 80. See Schottroff, Gedenken, 335ff. who put the Akkadian parallels as his basis demonstrates that ‘azkārāh is best rendered “invocation (by name), because the sacrificial portion set aside for Yahweh was concentrated by having his name pronounced over it
understands as thought the process by which an image enters the heart and immediately influences the will. Thought which does not lead to action is a meaningless flash.”

The Israelites considers heart as the soul, “being the organ which at the same time feels and acts.”

The relation between the *nephes* (soul) and *lēbh* (heart) is that the heart is the totality of the soul as a character and operating power. Some particular stress is being laid upon its capacity; “*nephes* is the soul in the sum of its totality such as it appears; the heart is the soul in its inner value.” What about the *ruah* (spirit)? Pedersen explains that the heart is the soul as an operating force, and the same time holds good of the spirit. The spirit is more particularly the motive power of the soul, it is the strength emanating from the soul and reacting upon it. He concludes, “man in his totality is a *nephes*, but he has *lēbh* and *ruah*. The heart and the spirit act upon the center and urge it in certain direction, which is towards an action.”

This is when Pedersen turned his attention to *zākhar* (Pedersen translates this word into: to remember, call to mind, commemorate). What Pedersen understands about ‘remember’ is, “when the soul remembers something, it does not mean that it has an objective memory image of something or an event, but that this image is called forth in the soul and assists in determining its direction, its action... The peculiarity about the Israelite is that he cannot at all imagine memory, unless at the same time an effect on the totality and its direction of will is taken for granted.”

There are four basic ideas in his method that was explored by Childs. In the first place, Pedersen finds that the verb *zkr* appears frequently in direct parallelism with verbs denoting an action, for instance: to bless (Psalm 115:12), to set free (Psalm 136:23), to show favor (Psalm 136:23), to show favor (Psalm 106:4), to punish (Jer. 14:10). In passages where there seem to be no direct parallelism, the act of remembering is closely linked with action of some kind. The second idea is that synonyms, which a modern reader might classify as expressing merely a mental process, are often regarded in the Old Testament as affecting an external event (e.g. for hgh [mutter] which is parallel to zkr in Ps. 63:7, cf. Ps. 115:7).

The third idea Childs proposed has a connection with the antonym of the verb *zkr*, which is *škh* (forget), that appears over 10 times in connection with *zkr*. He says that forgetting “is not a psychological act of having a thought pass from one’s consciousness, but an outward act of worshipping other gods (Deut. 8:19), of forsaking someone (Isa. 49:14), of not keeping the commandments (Deut. 8:11).” However, Childs continues, “The frequent identification of the verb with an action does not eliminate the process of thought which is involved in the act.” The thought and act is often fused because the thought inevitably leads to an act. Lastly, Childs

---

89 Pedersen, *Israel*, 104.
90 Pedersen, *Israel*, 104. Pedersen uses the verse Exodus 35:21 as an example where the heart moved the totality into an action; “and everyone who was willing and whose heart moved him came and brought an offering to the Lord for the work on the Tent of Meeting, for all its service, and for the sacred garments.” In this case, the translation of NIV is not appropriate, compare it to the KJV translation, “And they came, every one whose heart moved him up, and every one whom his spirit made willing, and they brought the Lord’s offering to the work of the tabernacle of the congregation, and for all his service, and for the holy garments.”
develop Pedersen’s idea and considers that the most important idiom for revealing the psychology of memory is formed with verbs that are connected with the heart.

The idea of ‘forget’ is very interesting because it is considered as an act of sin and guilt. Forgetting God, others, and the commandment are considered as sin. This has something to do with the idea of the soul as a whole. A thought arises and enters upon the heart, and it is immediately effects the action. These components are seen as one totality. To remember or to forget means there is an action happened already. One cannot be told that he has forgotten something unless he has done something. One is told that he has forgotten God because he has worshiped other gods.

Pedersen noticed that the word zkr is used in various contexts and often suggest far more than to recall something or to call to mind. To ‘remember’ often have a meaning that we would describe as an action. Childs says that this discovery only reveals that the Hebrew use of the word ‘remember’ is more inclusive than that of English.

However, Pedersen ideas have got an attack from the work of James Barr. Pedersen suggest that because the verb can mean both to think and to act, these two processes are not distinguished in Hebrew mentality. Barr criticizes this idea by stating that no conclusions can be drawn from this use of words regarding different mentalities.

In principle, Childs agrees with Pedersen method and agree that Pederson evidence for zkr has not been conclusive. The verb stand for both a process of thought and an action, however there is no real evidence that demands a semantic identification. Childs agrees with Barr that Pedersen has not been able to show that there is a different mental relationship between memory and action that sets the Old Testament from the modern. However, Pedersen has shown us that the verb zkr has a wider semantic range in which thought and action are both included. In the Theological Dictionary of The Old Testament, Eising says that from the context, zkr reveals that the term used in parallel do not refer for the past only, so that the interpretation of zkr as ‘remember’ in the sense of ‘recall’ can hardly represent its basic meaning. The future can also be the subject of the intellectual activity expressed by zkr. In Isaiah 47:7, it is said that Babylon should have remembered its end. We can see that the intellectual object of zkr constitutes a more comprehensive knowledge than the past. It also implies the consequence for the future.

---

95 See James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London: SCM Press, first published 1961 – third impression 1991). James Barr. In his preface, he says that “one of the greatest dangers to sound and adequate interpretation of the Bible comes from the prevailing procedure which, while claiming to rest upon the knowledge of the Israelite and Greek ways of thinking, constantly mishandled and distort the linguistic evidence of the Hebrew and Greek languages as they are used in the Bible. The increasing sense of dependence upon the Bible in the modern church only makes this danger more serious. The fact that these procedures have never to my knowledge been collected, analyzed and criticized in detail was the chief stimulus to my understanding of this task myself.”

96 See Childs, *Memory*, 20. There are three main objections from Barr on Pedersen ideas. They are: (1) Pedersen attempts to see in the structure of the Hebrew language a reflection of a Hebrew mentality failed to recognize the arbitrary character of words which is a fundamental law of synchronistic linguistics. It also fails to recognize the complexity of establishing a simple connection because of the historical factor. (2) Pedersen fails to examine the Hebrew language as a whole, and treats it in isolation from other relevant linguistic material. (3) Pedersen tries to reconstruct from the Old Testament certain unique categories, which he calls ‘primitive’ on the basis of a theory of prelogical mentality. However, these categories do not arise from the material itself, but are imposed upon it.


Therefore, the meaning of the word *zkr* seems to be more than just a psychological act of recalling something from the past to the mind, as it is understood nowadays. Based on the argumentations above, the author agrees that in the Old Testament, ‘remember’ means something more than just an activity of the mind, or a recollection of the memory. It is an active term in which action and thought cannot be separated.

### 2.3 Aspects of the Theology of Remembrance in The Old Testament

#### 2.3.1 God Remembers People

The word *zkr* is used with God as subject for at least 73 times in the qal. They are widely distributed in the Old Testament; mostly it is the prophets except Hosea and Jeremiah who seldom use it. The largest use of the word is in Psalms and Nehemiah. The word is often used as in: He 'remembers' his covenant and the covenant people, that is, He will 'keep' it and them (see Gen. 9:15-16).

Childs says, “By and large, the preposition maintains its basic meaning of aiming toward a goal. The emphasis falls on remembrance as an action directed toward someone rather than the psychological experience of the subject. Moreover, the preposition has strong forensic overtones which appear both in a positive and negative sense.”

When the verb *zkr* is used with God as subject, then it does not the same with the general sense of remember. It is a technical term that bears a specific juridical meaning: to credit to one’s account. When God remembers it is not merely a psychological experience, it is actually an action. As a response to prayer, God’s remembrance often results in an action. Because God remembered, Rachel (Gen. 30:22) and Hannah (1 Sam. 1:11, 19) were given children; Samson’s was given his strength back (Judges 16:28). God does not forget to avenge the supplicant (Ps. 9:12) and remembers the afflicted (Lam. 3:19). Ps. 89:50 beseeches God to remember how his people are scorned, and Ps. 136:23 can

---

99 Blair is also agrees that remember in the Hebrew understanding of the word is more than just an action in one’s mind to recall something from the past. He says, “In the Bible, memory is rarely simply psychological recall. If one remembers in the biblical sense, the past is brought into the present with compelling power. Action in the present is conditioned by what is remembered.” He gives several examples when ‘memory’ means activity. When Shimei entreats King David not to remember his rebellious insults (2 Sam. 19:19), he obviously wants the King to forgive him. When God ‘remembered’ Hannah (1 Sam. 1:19), God gave her a son. Blair says, “conversely, to forget someone or something, is to let the past fall out of dynamic, conditioning relation to the present.”

100 See Childs, *Memory*, 31-32. Childs puts Nehemiah 5:19 as the request of Nehemiah for God to remember him for good (Compare to the NIV translation who puts ‘remember me with favor’).

101 Childs, *Memory*, 43. To remember is in the perfect tense; the action of the verb continues. Likewise, the psalmist may ask God in his lament to ‘remember’ His covenant. He expects God to do more than thinking about him, for he anticipates God to save him from the foe, as God has promised and has done in the past.

102 Childs, *Memory*, 31-32. Childs gives several examples of these forensic overtones. Nehemiah requests that God ‘remember for good’ all that he has done (Neh. 5:15). The psalmists pleads that God credit to David’s account all his suffering (Ps. 132:1). Similarly, Yahweh remembers in Israel’s favor the devotion of her youth (Jer. 2:2). These are not a nostalgic reflection of Yahweh’s but rather a reckoning of this earlier loyalty to Israel’s account. Childs says that God can also remember in a negative forensic way. It is done against Edom that is participated in the destruction of Jerusalem (Ps. 137:7). The psalmist also prays that the sins of the forefathers be not placed upon his account.
give thanks that God remembered the humiliation of his people. God’s remembrances mentioned above are followed by an action.

There are ideas that God will not forget those who have been faithful to God. People will call on God to remember both themselves and their good work. Jeremiah 2:2 speaks of how Israel loves God in their youth, and asks God to remember and reward it. David is remembered for his hardships he endured for the sanctuary (Ps. 132:1 cf. also Ps. 20:3. King Hezekiah is remembered because he is wailing in the faithfulness before God (2 Kings 20:3; Isa. 38:3). Jeremiah asks God to remember his intercession on behalf of his enemies (Jer. 18:20).

There are some passages where God’s remembrance can be punitive as well (Hos. 7:2; 9:9; 8:13; Jer. 14:10), in which God remembers iniquities and punishes them. When iniquity is threatened by God’s punitive remembrance, the worshippers pray that God will not remember iniquity. Isaiah 64:9 contains the prayer, “do not remember our sins forever.” The fact that iniquity can continue to affect future generations (third and fourth generations: Ex. 34:7) explains why the prayer asks for God not to remember their sins.

In accordance with the remembrance of sin and forgiveness, there are several texts where the idioms that are used to carry the same strong forensic meaning without the use of the preposition. In these texts, one disfavor is presupposed. We will see some of these texts in a deeper exploration later in this chapter; however, we shall take a brief look at them.

Isaiah 43:25 notes the connection of remembering and forgiveness, where God says that he is the one who ‘remembers your sin no more’. It seems that when God is not remembering Israel’s sins it means that it was removed. Eising notes that this correspondent to the article of faith that Yahweh is “…the compassionate and gracious God, slow to anger, abounding in love and faithfulness” (Exod. 34:6).103 Because of God’s own nature, the people ask God not to remember their sins for it is already a punishment to them. In Isaiah 63:9, the people ask God ‘not to remember our sins forever’ because ‘we are all your people’. God remembrance cannot be understood in a psychological terms, it is already an action that makes the people afraid of the consequences.

Isaiah 43:18 seems to be the direct antithesis of remembering when it says, “Forget the former things: do not dwell on the past.” However, here the prophet warns an Israel seeking continuity and meaning in her existence not to turn to former things. God is doing something new that is great enough to overshadow the past completely. This means that Israel must look to the future and experienced God’s redemption rather than looking to the former action God has done.104

The prophet stresses both the continuity and discontinuity in Israel history. God is the main connection of the past and the future. The discontinuity lies in Israel failure to remember. Childs is right when he says, “Israel’s memory is an active response in faith that links her to redemptive action of God’s entrance into history.”105

When Jeremiah prayed for Israel concerning the drought and famine, the LORD says that ‘the LORD does not accept them; he will now remember their wickedness and punish them for their sins.’106 Jeremiah 14 presents one of the most striking examples of prophetic reaction to the tradition of complaint psalm. As we can see, here, God remembrance is already a punishment for Israel because they have

104 See also Isaiah 65:17 where the similar contrast occurs in terms of new heavens.
105 Childs, Memory, 59.
106 Jeremiah 14:10
sinned against God. Verses 2-6 describe the disastrous effect of a drought that calls forth a fast. Then the communal complaints were outspoken in vv. 7-9. Yahweh is addressed in the vocative, and implored to intervene the disaster with intense pleas. They confess their guilt. Then, the cries ‘why’, as any other complaints, arise. Reasons are advanced why Yahweh should help. Israel is the covenant people, ‘we are called by thy name (v. 9). Yahweh has redeemed his people in the past, within a series of saving events: ‘redeemer in time of trouble’ (v. 8). Yahweh dwells in Israel’s midst (v. 9). The complaints ends with a last passionate cry” ‘Leave us not!’

The divine answer comes in the form of an invective and threat (v. 10). Israel’s prayer is not accepted. Her people can only expect judgment, because ‘Yahweh remembers their iniquity’. A younger hand has elaborated on the judgment (vv. 11-12). The time of fasting and offering is over. The prophet must no longer intermediate them, because Israel now faces total destruction.

Hosea 7:2 notes that God ‘remember all their (God’s people) evil deeds. Their sin engulf them, they are always before me.’ This is when the Lord says that every time God restores the communion with Israel, God will always remember their sins. Even when Israel gives sacrifices as an offering for their sins, God will ‘remember their wickedness and punish their sins’.107 Again, God’s act of remembrance is followed by a forensic action, a punishment.

Psalm 25:6-7 shows us a bipolar motive of God’s remembrance.108 “Remember, O LORD, your great mercy and love, for they are from of old. Remember not the sins of my youth and my rebellious ways; according to your love remember me, for you are good, O Lord.” The Psalmist also asks God not to remember the sin of his youth and his rebellious ways in Psalm 25:7. Instead, he asks God to ‘remember O LORD, your great mercy and love,’ and to remember the psalmist according to the Lord’s love for the Lord is good. We will explore these verses further later in this chapter. In fact, the Psalmist expects God to do more than thinking about him, for he anticipates God to save him from the foe, as God has promised and has done in the past. In the praise-psalm, he thanks Yahweh that ‘He remembered’. In the hymns of worship, God is God who keeps his covenant forever (Ps. 105:8; 111:5).

The idea of a forensic and specific juridical meaning is obvious. When God remembers, it is not merely a psychological action in one’s brain, as we understand it in our modern language of memory. Childs says, “frequently the psychological processes involved in remembering are included along with the purely action toward someone. God remembers and forgets and this process stands parallel to a series of psychological descriptions (Jer. 31:20; 44:21).” To remember is already an action which either to bless or punish the people of God. Further he explains, “God’s remembering has not only a psychological effect, but an ontological as well.”109 God’s act of remembering is so important that the people that God does not remember have no existence at all.110 It is important to be remembered by God for it will show

107 Hosea 8:13; 9:9
109 Childs, Memory, 33. He also says that memory is not identical with action, but it is never divorced from it. It is very important to note that Childs suggests, “There can be no dichotomy between God’s thought and action”, 34.
110 See Psalm 88:5. The Psalmist says that he is like the slain who lie in the grave because he is ‘remembered no more’ and ‘cut off from God’s care’.
us his act of love, and in the same time it is important to ask for forgiveness of our sin because God also remembers our sin.

Childs concludes that God’s act of remembering has an implication of a movement, an active movement towards the object of God’s memory. He says, “God’s remembering always implies his movement toward the object of his memory. The action varies in nature, can be physical or forensic. The objective side of memory is accompanied, in differing degrees, by an internal reaction in God’s part. The essence of God’s remembering lies in his acting toward someone because of a previous commitment.”

The idea of an active remembrance of God is clearly shown. God already remembers the object in an action, not merely a psychological act of the mind.

However, God’s memory is not always related to the past event. In the relation with ‘remembering the covenant’, God’s great act continue to meet Israel in their present situation. Israel put their center of praises in God’s faithfulness in remembering the covenant. ‘He has remembered His covenant forever.’ Psalm 111:5 notes that God remembers his covenant forever. We can found similar expression in Psalm 105:8. Therefore, God’s remembering is ‘not conceived of as an actualization of a past event in history; rather, every event stems from the eternal purpose of God…God’s memory is not a re-creating the past, but a continuation of a selfsame purpose.” Further, “God’s memory encompasses his entire relationship with his people. His memory includes both the great deeds of the past as well as his continued concern for his people in the future.”

The heart of remembering when it is used as God’s action is more than a recollection, to call something from the memory, or repeating something from the past; it is actually a complex psychological and ontological action. Therefore, to be remembered by God is an important thing to be able to receive his ongoing action and love. Remembrance is already about God’s action.

To conclude, remembrance is about God who remembers; not only in a passive meaning of remembering, but also in an active continuous manner by which God still can create our remembrance. Child states, “God's memory is not a re-creating of the past, but a continuation of the selfsame purpose… The Old Testament witnesses a series of historical events by which God brought up the people of Israel into existence. These events were placed in a chronological order within the tradition, and never recurred in Israel's history… Redemptive history continues. What does this mean? It means more than that, that later generations wrestled with the meaning of redemptive events, although this is certainly true. It means more than the influence of a past event continues to be felt in successive generations, which obvious fact no one could possibly deny. Rather, there was an immediate encounter, an actual participation in the great acts of redemption. The Old Testament maintained the dynamic, continuing character of past events without sacrificing their historical character as did the myth.”

God has brought Israel into existence and Israel took it as their history. How does Israel remember this covenant and identity? We shall see how Israel remembers in the following section.
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111 Childs, Memory, 34.
112 See Childs, Memory, 41-44. See Psalm 105:8 cf.; 106:45; 111:5; 1 Chron. 16:15.
113 Childs, Memory, 42. In accordance with the covenant, the object of God’s remembering the covenant is either the recipient of the covenant or the covenant itself. The basic of the covenant is God’s promise to Abraham of a people and a land.
114 Childs, Memory, 83-84.
2.3.2 People Remember God

When the word $zkr$ in the qal form is used with Israel as the subject, it occurs 94 times. The distribution of its use is significant because of the concentration of the word in certain areas.\(^{115}\) The objects of the verb falls into different categories, and the most important groups includes the act of God (22 x), God himself (17 x), the commandments (9 x), sins (7 x), special days (3 x).

When ‘remember’ is used with Israel as subject, in most of the times, the subject denotes a basic human psychological act: to recall a past event. This verb appears in narrative as this basic psychological meaning and in the legal material of the Pentateuch to remember to do the commandments. The verb plays a role within two closely allied forms, the trial and disputation. It also appears in the hymn calling forth Israel thankful remembrance acts of the past. It is important to note that Israel disobedience and rebelliousness was often connected because they often did not remember the great acts of God.\(^{116}\) In the book of the Prophets, the verb is used for different meaning.\(^{117}\) However, the varied uses of the verb suggest that, as Childs interprets, “a new and highly theological usage of $zkr$ emerged from Israel’s attempt to reinterpret the significance of her tradition.”\(^{118}\) The understanding of the verb is again more that a psychological meaning.

In reading the Old Testament, we find that there are themes that are brought up again throughout the history of Israel with their own characteristics and purpose. These themes used extensively in one book and mentioned again in the later books. For instance we can find the theme of Exodus mentioned again in the Book of Hosea (Hos. 11:1), Amos (Am. 9:7), Psalms (Ps. 78:12-16; 105:23-42; 106:6-12; and in different context of Nehemiah (Neh. 9:9ff.). The theme of Davidic kingdom can be found not only in the Deuteronomistic historic books, but also in Psalms. The metaphor of husband-wife in the book of the prophets is used in different ways, elaborations, and different purposes.\(^{119}\) The history of Israel is being told again in different ways and different purpose. Remembrance has become an important element in Israelites lives and history.

What Israel remembers is not the same as what modern understood as history. Israel is bound to her history in a completely different way. Von Rad says, “For Israel that interest was not a thirst for knowledge that happened to be concentrated in history; for in history, as nearly every page of the Old Testament affirms, Israel encountered her God.”\(^{120}\) The calling Israel received is not a one-time encounter rather it comes about to every generation of Israel. Von Rad concludes the Old Testament in a great extent as, “nothing but the literary record of a people’s passionate millennium-long conversation about the meaning of its history.”\(^{121}\) Therefore, the command to ‘remember’ for Israel is always related with her encounter

\(^{115}\) See Childs, *Memory*, 45. Israel here can be translated as a people or as a member of a group. The first really significant concentration falls in Deuteronomy with 13 examples. The most frequent use is in the Psalter with 17 examples.

\(^{116}\) We will see them in Psalm 78; 106; Isa. 63:7; Neh. 9:16 ff.

\(^{117}\) See Childs, *Memory*, 49-50. He also notes there are 8 function of remembrance in the book of prophets. They are as warning, invective, taunt, disputation, trial, salvation oracle, promise, and threat.

\(^{118}\) Childs, *Memory*, 50.

\(^{119}\) For more information on the extensive use of the theme of Exodus in the Old Testament, see C. R. North, *The Old Testament Interpretation of History* (London, 1946).


with God. It is always changes and renewed through generations. The Old Testament
is Israel’s testament of their encounter with God. It is committed to talk about this
‘remembrance’ in no particular method or manner. Remembrance is within the
theology of Israel.

The historical acts by which Yahweh founded the community of Israel were
absolute. The sharing of past events does not mean that they will attach in the past.
Each event becomes actual for each subsequent generation. Von Rad says, “this is not
just in the sense of furnishing the imagination with a vivid present picture of the past
events – no, it was only the community assembled for a festival that by recitation and
ritual brought Israel in the full sense of the world into being: in her own person she
really and truly entered into the historic situation to which the festival in question was
related.” The celebrated ritual was actually an actual event of the saving God who
encounters Israel through generations. The past events was taken and experienced as
her history through time.

What is the idea of history in Israel? Israel sees history as the time when God
accompanied her. God establishes the continuity between the various separate events
and who ordained their direction as they followed one another in time. Israel
understanding of history is centered in God saving action. Thus, Israel always renews
their history through generations in the sense of experiencing the past event in a new
meaning. Each event becomes history because Israel feels the saving action of God in
their terms in each subsequent generation.

The Deuteronomy editor had often pointed out of Israel’s history of
disobedience in failing to remember (Deut. 9:7), and use it as a framework of history
(Judges 8:34). The failure to remember could already be called apostasy because it
was not a mere absentmindedness; rather it was unfaithfulness to the covenant.
Therefore, the use of the verb in Deuteronomy goes beyond the general psychological
term. The role of memory is also to link the present commandments as events with the
covenant history of the past. It establishes the continuity between the past covenantal
history and the present.

While in the complain psalm, Childs concludes the use of zkr as,
“The use of memory arises often in terms of separation from God felt by an
individual or the community…In intense struggle to relate to the tradition, Israel
encounters again through the medium of her memory the God of the past. Her
attention no longer focuses on specific historical events, but on the divine reality
who imprinted her history. The vocabulary used to describe the wrestling process
indicates the tremendous internalization which has transpired. To remember is to
grasp after, to meditate upon, indeed, to pray to God.”

Through the historical events in the past, the psalmist remembers God and all his
grace towards Israel. The memory of the past is shared over again as the experience of
the new generations having grace and love of God. This remembrance is already a
prayer to God.

In accordance with the remembrance of sin, Israel prefers God not to
remember their sins. They already have the idea that punishment will follows when
God remembers their iniquities. Israel knows that they have sinned, they remember
their sins, but they did not want God to remember it. Pedersen says, “The Israelite
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constantly asks his God to remember him, but just as often he begs him not to remember his sins; the sins are to pass out of Yahweh’s soul and not to influence his actions.”

The failure to remember was already mean to forsake the covenant (see Isa 17:10 where forgetting means to forsake God for alien gods).

One of the instances where Israel remembers their sins is when Ezekiel focuses his attention on the problem of Israel’s remembering her sins. The phrase of ‘days of her youth’ is used to refer an early condition of Israel so that they who did not remember are ungrateful (16:22). Or the early days can sinful days that are not to be remembered (23:19, 27). When Israel remembers her sinful ways, she despises herself (16:61; 20:43; 36:31). Likewise, the effect of Israel’s remembering God is to loathe the sin into which she has fallen (6:9; 16:63).

When Israel tried to find their identity after the exile, they search for signs of God. They acknowledge their sin when they recall the memory of the past. With this remembrance, they experience a new encounter with the God of their forefathers. Here, memory as the recalling of the past made Israel repents. Through remembrance, the distance past is shared again in the new encounter with God. Remembrance is important to be able to made Israel remember their sin and cry for forgiveness.

Memory also plays an important role in linking Israel to the future. In the post-exilic period, Israel has to establish herself by remembering their history and tradition to be able to move to the future. The people try to connect themselves to the former covenant history by remembering what happened to their forefathers. By relating and remembering the past in memory, Israel becomes the part of the future, because past and future is one in God’s purpose. Therefore, the order to remember is very important in Israel’s life.

2. 3. 3 The Cultic Representation of the Past

Because ‘remember’ is one of the great commandments for Israel, the feasts, ceremonies, and memorial objects of Israel were designed to help the people ‘remember’. Creation in the Sabbath, exodus in the Passover and feasts etc, Easter, is the examples of celebration that is meant for Israel to remember the good act of God. Remembrance in embedded in the religion. Simon J. de Vries says that “Hebrew theology is both concerned with remembrance and expectation, with both origin and eschatology; with beginning and end...Her past and future are indispensable for an understanding of her abiding covenant relationship with God.”

The remembrance of Israel and God has a very important place in the cultic act of Israel’s life. Remembrance is not only mere information about the past; it is an act that deals with the present and even the future. The question then is, how can the past saving events is made present by the later generation? This is the role of cultic memorials (zikkārōn) in Israel’s life, to bring them constantly to God’s attention, which would result in his gracious aid. Allen Verhey notes that through great
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127 For other texts where it shows God’s judgment being connected with Israel’s forgetfulness see Jere. 3:21; 13:25; 18:15; Ezek. 22:12; 23:35; Hos. 2:13; 4:6; Ps. 78:42; 106:7; Neh. 9:17).
128 Simon J. De Vries, “Remembrance In Ezekiel”, in Interpretation vol. XVI, 58-64. We will see later that Ezikiel is a good example of the linkage with the future, because the book ends with a vision of the new temple.
129 Childs, Memory, 74. However Childs notes that, “it is important to recognize that this cultic understanding of God’s memory is not an actualization of the past. The problem of making a past reality contemporary is not involved in God’s memory....The question at the issue in the cult is whether God will continue to act in Israel’s behalf as he did in the past or withdraw his aid because of her disobedience.”
festivals and rituals, the people of Israel participated in both remembering and establishing the meaningful history of Israel and thus understood themselves better in the light of that meaningful past. This is what Blair also says, “Israel’s worship was centered in dramatic re-enactment of the past, which were designed to supply meaning and direction to the present.” After the Exodus, Israelite families must remember the time that God has saved them and entered the covenant. Further, “by remembering a family was made conscious of belonging, and by a sense of belonging it was constrained to be faithful and obedient to the terms of the covenant.” This is the context of the remembrance motif in Deuteronomy. Remembering brings the new nation back to the mountain that they never saw. We may even say, this remembering the mountain is brought into the present where again those who never saw see, and those who never feared the voice of the Lord hear again the voice of the Lord. Israel was asked to be obedient to the commandments in order to remember the redemptive act of God. Childs concludes, “the concept of memory served a significant role in Deuteronomy’s theology in meeting the crisis brought by a reinterpretation of the cult.”

Allen notes that the Passover was a memorial or commemoration of the Exodus (12:14), keeping its memory renewed to each generation. It is a remembrance of God’s deliverance of them from Egypt, and made that story renewed to new generations through rituals and celebration. The feast of Unleavened Bread was celebrated to “remember” the Exodus (13:9), to function in the same way as phylacteries, reminding God’s people to obey his torah. According to Childs, even the observance of the Sabbath is also a cultic remembrance of the Exodus.

Child argues that the festivals celebrated by Israel were to actualize the redemptive acts of the past both to renew the tradition and to participate in its power. In connection with the term used, he says,

“According to the Priestly idiom, the zikkārōn is a ‘memorial for the children of Israel before Yahweh’. One has only to recall the role of the cult for the Priestly writer to recognize the full significance of the phrase. God has established a covenantal relationship with Israel which expresses itself in his eternal ordinances (huqqath ʿōlām, Num. 10:8). Signs and memorials serve within this dispensation of grace both to guarantee and maintain for each generation this eternal relationship. The cultic acts of Israel continually remind God of this eternal covenantal order. The cultic objects and rites act to guarantee that the covenant is not forgotten.”
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131 Blair, “An Appeal”, 44. Von Rad says that when doing and celebrating the festivities, Israel was manifestly doing more than merely remembering the Exodus or any other events in past, she was actually entering into the saving event of the Exodus itself and participating in it in a quite ‘actual’ way. See von Rad, Old Testament Theology, 104-105.
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However, Eising rejects the assumption that the feast of Unleavened Bread and the Sabbath were celebrated to remember the Exodus. He says, “For the feast of the Unleavened Bread, too, its annual observance is important as a remembrance of the original event (Exod. 13:8 f.; Deut. 16:3). The same God who brought the event to pass also ordained its memorial.” While Schottroff is of the opinion that any cultic celebration does not assume any realization of the past, instead, he finds the message was a moral motivation for obedience to the commandments based on recollection of God’s blessing in the past. Both Eising and Schottroff rejected Child’s opinion that the Sabbath and the feast of Unleavened Bread were celebrated to remember the Exodus, in fact Schottroff rejected the idea of re-experienced events that was suggested by Child. Nevertheless the three of them accepted the idea that the celebration of the feast is still an event of remembrance. Israel remembers her past event and God’s salvific action through the cultic representation of the past.

The cult was an important context for remembering for Israel. Memory plays the role of means of actualizing the past in Israel’s cult. Childs says that in time of crisis, when the role of the cult was threatened, Israel’s memory assumed a new significance in renewing her tradition. The point of the actualization of the cult is not just some mysterious way of calling it back to the mind of Israel; rather, it was a continuity of the tradition, the covenant identity and fidelity in a new situation.

After his exploration of the verb, Childs concludes his study on the word ḥasr that, “...the act of remembrance is not a simple inner reflection, but involves an action, an encounter with historical events. Each successive generation in Israel witnessed in faith to a reality which it encountered when remembering the tradition.”

Remembering is not a static, but it always move forward in sequence with the past to get a hold to the future. Further he concludes that, “out of the same verb is used to describe God’s redemptive action toward Israel as well as Israel’s responses in faith to this action...redemptive history is conceived of as resulting from God’s action and Israel’s response.”

Israel history never ceased from God’s redemptive action throughout her ups and downs. It takes both sides to create her history, God’s action and Israel’s reaction. The remembrance of the covenant is the bond between the two that creates Israel’s history.

2.4 A Theology of Remembrance in Connection With Forgiveness and Reconciliation

In the next part, we will explore some main texts where remembrance is connected with forgiveness of sins. There are four main texts that are selected from other texts. These passages do not mean that there are no other texts that are in connection with forgiveness of sins beside the one that are being delve into later on. They have been selected in the cycles of Israel’s apostasy, affliction, repentance and deliverance in the time of the exile.

137 See the discussion in Eising, “Zākhar”, 81. He rejects Child’s opinion that considers the cultic realization has developed in Deuteronomy into moral motivation from the past for observance of the law. Easing thinks that this idea is not clearly enough attested. In Deut. 24:18,22 however, the purpose of the reference is to motivate certain conduct toward slaves, not to account for observance of the Sabbath as a memorial of the Exodus.
138 See Schottroff, Gedenken, 123-126, 339, as in Eising “Zākhar”, 81.
139 Childs, Memory, 80.
140 Childs, Memory, 88.
141 Childs, Memory, 89.
The author chooses Hosea and several texts within the book of Hosea where they clearly state that God remember sins. Hosea based his whole preaching in the saving history of God. It could be said that Hosea might only feels safe when he can base his arguments in history. Therefore, Hosea has a good theme of remembrance in his preaching, which would make him interesting to be observed in the light of remembrance of sins. Afterwards, the book of Malachi, especially in verse 3:16 where God put the records of his people in the book of remembrance will be investigated. Malachi is exclusively concerned with abuses practiced by his community during the completion of the rebuilding of the temple. Malachi sends a warning to Israel in his eschatological message in two of his oracles that God will bring judgment to those who is godless, but will save those who feared the God. We will also take a look at Nehemiah 9 where Israel remembers and acknowledges their sins. Israel was rebuked for not remembering the redemptive action of God in the past. After the warning of the prophet, Israel confessed their sin and remembers all the iniquities. This will be the text of repentance where an example of remembrance of sins is shown by the perpetrator. The last text we will look at is the text where God promises forgiveness for those who are truly repents. The text of Jeremiah 31:34 is the notorious text on the topic of forgiveness of sins, where forgiveness is connected with remembrance. As mentioned earlier, these texts were selected because they have their own uniqueness, however it is not intended to exclude other texts.

2.4.1 Hosea: God Remembers Sins

Hosea was active in the third quarter of the 8th century B.C. His prophecy began when King Jeroboam II (786-746) was still in charge. His time was stretched from times of prosperity and comparative stability through to the instability of toppling dynasties, social unrest, warfare, vacillating leadership, and partial subjugation to humiliation and the shadow of final disaster. Hosea makes a major contribution to the message of hope and comfort. It functions as an entrance into the Book of the Twelve, telling the unforgettable imagery of God’s love which will not let God’s people go.

Because of God’s command, Hosea marries a prostitute. This symbolizes God who chooses Israel, a rebellious and unfaithful wife, and God’s love towards Israel.

142 See von Rad, Old Testament Theology II, 140.
145 For modern readers, these explanations could become an interpretative problem. In the first place the story tells us about the divine and human husband. God is considered as an all-forgiving male, and sometimes some thinks that inevitably the male becomes divine. Second, the sinful is embodied in the image of an unfaithful wife. As it was typical in Israel culture, woman becomes the primary offender in adulterous affairs. Third, the metaphor comes close to sanctioning a husband’s domestic violence against his wife. For further discussion on this read Yee, “The Book of Hosea”, 210 ff.
even though “they turn to other Gods and love the sacred raisin cakes (3:1).” The theme in Hosea is that God chose Israel and gives her grace and love. Yet, her response was rebellion and more sin. This unfaithful act of Israel made God punish her. However, Israel was unable to learn from her history and repeat the same cycle and again deserve the punishment. God is God who is gracious and full of love, who remembers the covenant and faithful to his promise. Hosea’s message was pointed to the falling Israel to remember her sins and God’s love.

There are at least four passages that we can see in Hosea where God remembered the evil deeds of Israel. Hosea 7:2 says, “But they do not realize that I remember all their evil deeds. Their sins engulf them; they are always before me.”

What does it mean that God remembered the evil deeds that Israel has done? This could mean that Ephraim’s guilt is not hidden; God watched it all. When Israel did not remember the covenant, God remembered their sin. Beeby puts his comments, “God remembers all their evil words in the past and their present villainy is even now before his face...as for Israel they do not realize even though their sins engulf them. They do not remember, and they cannot see...yet it is God who remembers not them.”

This means that God sets eyes on all our sins and misdeeds and remembers it. Israel was still does not aware of her sins, totally content with what they are doing then.

Further, God is not only remembered the sins of Israel, but God will also punish them. “They offer sacrifices to me and they eat the meat, but the LORD is not pleased with them. Now he will remember their wickedness and punish their sins (8:13).” It is not only remembered events, it is even noted down in a record. This act of remembrance can soon be connected with punishment. The sacrifices offered were done in a wrong motivation. The worshippers could eat the meat for the glory of the Lord or their own satisfaction. The people love the flesh because they assume by eating the meat they will be forgiven of all their sins and restored to the full fellowship. The sacrificial system does not serve its purpose; rather it becomes a barbeque party while allowing themselves continue sinning. The verdict is obvious. God remembers their iniquities and will punish their sins. The act of remembering here is again affects both present and future. God’s act of remembering Israel’s iniquity includes the inevitability of future punishment.

Verse 9:9 notes that “They have sunk into deep corruption, as in the days of Gibeah. God will remember their wickedness and punish them for their sins.” There are two possible answers about which event is ‘the days of Gibeah’. The first one is it symbolize the starting of the monarchy which produced so much corruption. The second and more possible answer is the expression recalls the horrifyingly shameless episode narrated in Judges 19-21. God remembers the days when Israel sins, as it is the past. God remembered and punish Israel. There is even a stronger emphasis on this remembrance of sins, which “their sins are kept in a record” (13:12). The evidence of Israel’s sins are collected and kept safe.

This part of the Old Testament is indeed has interesting passages about how God remember Israel’s sin. Hosea reminds Israel that they have been unfaithful to the covenant and not remember that they have sinned. God remember all the wrong deeds of Israel and punish them for it. Because of their sins, Israel will go back to Egypt. However, God is a gracious and compassionate God. God did not let Israel fall
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forever. He asks for forgiveness and repentance (Hosea 14). When Israel repents, they will receive God’s blessing.

2. 4. 2 Malachi 3:16 The Book Of Remembrance

The book of Malachi is written anonymously which use the name Malachi. It is difficult to set up a specific time line of the writing, however the common time of writing was made after the religious revival under Haggai and Zechariah and the completion of the rebuilding of the temple, and before the final breakdown of Persian rule in Palestine. The portion of Malachi is similar in some places with Ezra, Haggai, Obadiah, and the late material in Isaiah. The problem within Malachi’s community is about having Israel return to their homeland.

The fundamental in Malachi’s teaching is the concept of the covenant. It can be seen through his opening theme, the Lord’s love for Israel (1:2-5). The book also ends with a call to fulfill the obligations of the covenant as expressed in the law (4:4). The covenant is being threatened by Israel’s sin: the corrupted the covenant of Levi (2:8) and the people as a whole profaned the covenant of their fathers (2:10). Israel has despised their Lord (1:6). Their failure to protect the covenant also occurs in their broken relationship in the society, intermarriages and divorce are the examples. The family relationship illustrates love and loyalty towards the covenant, while divorce typifies broken faith and severe relationship. One of the problems in Malachi’s days was also the blurring of moral and theological values. No one seemed to be able to distinguish right from wrong, or the righteous from the wicked.

Malachi mentions God’s eschatological action in two of his six oracles (Mal. 2:17-3:5; 3:13-24 [3:13-4:3]). Malachi 3:16 generally included into the part of 3:13-4:3 in the heading of God’s judgment will be final. The message was that God is to come unexpectedly, and he will bring judgment to those who do not fear the Lord. The ‘scroll of remembrance’ will be read upon his presence concerning those who feared the Lord and feared his name. In this part, the prophet returns to the subject of judgment. He shows that there is a fundamental difference between the people who
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remember God and the covenant and those who are not. Innocence and guilt will be exposed in the day of the final judgment.

Malachi begins with God’s accusation in verse 13 by saying that Israel has spoken harsh words against God. This accusation was answered by what seems to be an ignorant answer, “what have we said against you?” Israel’s answer has shown their lack of understanding of their own mistakes. The question posed by Israel was how could God’s people suffer while the evildoers prosper. However, this is not a reason to be ignorant to the covenant. Justice will occur in the future, on the day when God will act. There is no promise of a sudden transformation, the ultimate judgment will eventually happen sometime in the future.

In verse 16, the divine reward of one’s faithfulness toward God is mentioned. “Then those who feared the LORD talked with each other, and the LORD listened and heard. A scroll of remembrance was written in his presence concerning those who feared the LORD and honoured his name”152

The International Theological Commentary on Joel & Malachi says that this verse has two scenes, one in the community and one outside the human sphere. The reward was their names, those who had been faithful to the Lord, shall be written in the book of remembrance. It says, “Book of remembrance means: God will not fail to remember those who are faithful to him (Exod. 32:32-33; Ps. 69:28; Isa. 4:3; Dan. 12:1; Rev. 20:12). They are witnesses to his love and care as they put their fate into his hands and remained determined to do his will...this verse, however, suggests that the fulfillment of this hope may now have been thought it have been deferred to another time, or even to the world to come.”153

This has been an apocalyptic message of the prophet that God will remember those who have been faithful to the Lord. The righteous and the wicked shall be separated in the face of the Lord. It is the people’s assurance of God’s act towards those who is in favor of him. God will forget not one of the believers.

Interestingly, some comments note that “those who feared the Lord are not necessarily a different group of those who had been complaining, but they are those who have taken the rebuke and they begin to encourage each other to renewed faith.”154 Smith suggests that it is better to take both groups separately because it is not possible to identify the God-fearing persons of verse 16 with the persons who gave expression to their doubt in the language of verses 14 and 15; two distinct classes are meant. Supposing the people who complained and feared the Lord are both the same, it must presuppose repentance. In other words, to be written in the book of remembrance means that to remember their guilt and repent. To be written in the book of remembrance is the consequence of repentance.

To conclude, Malachi 3:16 is about an apocalyptic message about God who will not leave those who have been faithful and remember the covenant. A book of remembrance means that those who have not feel justice will receive it in front of God. To put it in other words, God will also remember those who have sinned against the Holy One. Righteous and wicked deeds are indeed in God’s memory. God’s

---

152 Malachi 3:16, NIV. Notice the difference translation between the NIV that uses ‘a scroll of remembrance’ and the NRSV who uses ‘a book of remembrance’.

153 Ogden, International Theological, 109. Further, they say that the idea of a ‘book of remembrance’, a record of the faithful, appears to have been an important topic in so-called apocalyptic writings (beside Dan. 12:1 see 7:10; 10:21; Rev. 3:5; 17:8; 20:12). Perhaps the ‘tablet of fate’ (ANET, 541), or the ‘book of memorable deeds’ (Est. 6:1) gave rise to the idea of a ‘book of life’ (cf. also Ps. 139:16).

154 Smith, World Biblical Commentary, 338.
remembrance, as mentioned earlier, is not a merely psychological act. It is already a reward to those who was written in the book of remembrance and punishment towards those who have done him wrong.

2. 4. 3 Nehemiah 9:1-37 The Great Confession of Sins

Nehemiah is written in the post-exilic period. The nation must find their own identity after being exiled in Babylon. During this period, the sacred tradition of their forefathers must be re-adapted and re-actualized. In other words, they must remember what their forefathers have done in order to be able to grasp on their new identity. They must be able to do this without the city, the temple, and the Davidic leader. This is the setting that Nehemiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and Ezra must face.

There is a strong emphasis in the book of Nehemiah on the covenant by which God has bound himself to Israel in this way. God’s choice of Abraham, God’s rescue of Israel from Egypt and God’s patience under their provocations dominate the great confession of Nehemiah 9 and, less broadly, of Ezra 9; and the same faithful love had sent God’s Spirit among them, however little heeded, in the wilderness and in the preaching of the prophets (Neh. 9:20,30).

Nehemiah 9 tells the story of the time when Israelites confess their sins. It is a chapter where Israel celebrates a remembrance of her sins. On the twenty-fourth day of the month they gathered together, fasting, wearing sackcloth and having dust on their heads. This is a symbol of mourning, nakedness and death. Israel felt that her sins have made them mourned. They separated themselves from all foreigners. This is a very interesting fact because Israel did not put their sins on someone else’s behalf. They confess that they have sinned. For the next six hours, the Torah was read and Israel confessed their sins. The reading of Torah was to remind Israel what they had done against it.

Like some of the Psalm (see Ps. 78; 105: 106), the prayer is an example of confession in both senses of the word: a confessing of God’s glory and grace as well as man’s ingratitude. Indeed, it is worship, not merely wallowing in self-reproach. The theme is promise and fulfillment and the subject is God (vv. 6-15). From Abraham to the conquest the goal is the fulfillment of the promise of the land. In these events, God is remembered with praise, even in times of bondage in Egypt, desert journey, and Israel’s survival. Here, the law is viewed not as some obligation, but as a gift for Israel.

The later part of the confession consists the part of how generous and patient God is towards the ungrateful Israel (vv 16-25). In spite of the rebellious act of Israel, God continues to bless Israel. Israel confessed their times in the Judges period where the cycle of sin, decline, appeal, and rescue continues to happen with neither preaching nor experience could hold back Israel living the same pattern repeatedly.

---

155 See Fredrick Carlson Holmgren, International Theological Commentary: Ezra and Nehemiah, Israel Alive Again (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987), 130. Holmgren suggests that this separation did not mean that Israel wants to protect themselves from the other, it means that Israel felt responsible for their sins. Only those who were in the covenant with Yahweh were responsible when this covenant was broken. Foreigners (which could have been the people that were married to Israelites or their servants) could hardly expect to confess their sins before God for breaking the covenant because foreigners did not receive the covenant.


(vv. 36-31). Although Israel persistently broke the covenant, God considered himself to be bound to it. Israel confessed their rebelliousness “in your great mercy you did not put an end to them or abandon them, for you are gracious and merciful God (v. 31).” This is the covenant that God and Israel have to remember.

There is a difference between self-pity and self-knowledge. Israel recognizes herself in her sins. The painful admission, “you have acted faithfully (v. 33)”, would open the door to God’s mercy. Israel puts her hopes on God who continue to keep the covenant faithfully. The prayer calls this gracious God to look on the suffering that Israel has experienced during the exile.

Israel soon takes the experience of their forefathers as their own experience. Their encounter with God has been renewed through the remembrance of their sins. The new generation took over the sins because they experienced it as their own. The great distress, which ends the prayer, is a sign of life and of a vision that has not been tamely given up.\(^{158}\)

What is the point of this confession and prayer from Israel? Clines ends his commentary in this chapter by saying that the meaning is,

“That there is more than one way of telling the history of Israel. It can be recited as a story of salvation or of apostasy; it can be recounted with praise or with penitence. God needs no reminder of the tragic history; but the congregation in praying thus is confessing how it understands itself. Prayer is here shown to be not simply a matter of speaking to God, but also of critical self-reflection in the lights of God’s demands and his grace. Hence, this prayer cannot conclude with a superficial appeal for deliverance from misery, but must end simply on a note of confession (vv. 33ff) and distress (vv. 36f).”\(^{159}\)In other words, a self-knowledge is needed to be able to confess sins before God. A true confession demands an act of remembrance from the confessor, of how one betray the covenant with God. Israel, in this part of the prayer, was able to show their self-knowledge and repent. A note of confession and distress closes the prayer.

To conclude, Nehemiah 9 is an important part for Israel in confessing her sins. Israel’s plea for forgiveness was put forward after they put their cards on the table. They remember their sins. They remember their forefathers’ sins. They remember that God has been a gracious God who keeps the covenant faithfully, and it is Israel who keeps breaking it. God does not need any reminder of our history; rather, he would like to hear how we understand ourselves. Israel needed forgiveness from God. To be forgiven means to repent the sins Israel has done. A critical self-reflection is needed towards a true repentance. Therefore, a remembrance of sins and guilt of the past is needed to be able to step forward towards the future, which is God’s forgiveness. Israel lived through her history and learns their remembrance as encounter with God. Israel took over their past and experienced it as a new story with the grace of a God who is able to forgive their sins and being faithful to the covenant. A good story of remembrance of sin in connection with forgiveness is shown in this passage. To remember sin is important as recognition of one self to be able to ask for forgiveness from the victim – as in Israel story is God.

---


\(^{159}\) Clines, *The New Century Bible Commentary*, 199.
2. 4. 4 Jeremiah 31:34 God Remembers Sins No More

Jeremiah was not a systematic writer; rather he was a preacher whose preaching came from life and what he had learned from Israel’s tradition. His message was rather come from a truly human character. His writing was reflective and responsive to the historical crisis of the last days of Judah, culminating the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in 587 B.C. His writing engages in poetic reflection and didactic prose explanation about the cause of Israel’s end and the destiny of those departed to Babylon. The governing paradigm for the tradition of Jeremiah is Israel’s covenant with Yahweh, rooted in the memories and mandates of the Sinai tradition. Disobedience to the covenant will bring a heavy sanction that would be experienced as death or displacement. The destruction of Jerusalem is caused by Judah’s refusal to adhere covenantal requirements.

In the famous passage in 31:31-34 describing the New Covenant, Jeremiah reached the apex of his thinking on the new hope. One day God’s law will be written on people’s heart and give his people a new covenant, not like the one they had broken during the centuries, but it is when Israel remembers the covenant. For Jeremiah, restoration would take place in the land under wise and good government, with king and people renewed in heart so that all man would avow Yahweh and obey him by nature. Verse 31:34 is one of the passages most churches uses as their part of the reading in liturgy of forgiveness of sins. This is the promise when God will not remember our sins.

What does it mean that God remembers sins no more? Actually, to be forgiven means to know (yada’) Yahweh. The verb know here probably carries its most profound connotation, the intimate personal knowledge which arises between two persons who are committed wholly to one another in a relationship that touches mind, emotion, and will. In such relation the past is forgiven and forgotten. According to Hosea 8:1-2, the opposite of knowing the Lord is breaking the covenant and transgressing the law. “No longer will a man teach his neighbor, or a man his brother saying, ‘Know the Lord,’ because they will all know me, from the least of them to the greatest,” declares the Lord, “For I will forgive their wickedness and will remember their sins no more.”

Israel has survived because God has pardoned their sins. Through Jeremiah’s ministry, the Lord had invited Israel to repent and be forgiven (5:1; 36:3), but his contemporaries had refused the pardon. The final promise in this verse will put an end to the threat in Jeremiah 14:10: when the Lord remembers sin, punishment follows (see 44:21). The Lord’s promise not to remember their sins anymore means an end to divine wrath. The people of the new covenant will not bear the guilt of their ancestor’s sin or their own. They will be free to make a fresh start, under no lingering threats, because God gracious gift and pardon. The Lord will write the Torah on a heart polished smooth by forgiveness (50:22). The heart and mind inscribed with the revelation of God cannot turn sin again. Therefore, faithfulness to the new covenant will be a gift of divine mercy and not human achievement. The new covenant will be successful because God will put his love upon his people’s hearts. This new

---


161 See Keown, World Biblical Commentary, 135.
covenant will be recalled as grace, and the power will come along with forgiveness of sins because God remembers sins no more.

2.5 Conclusion

Childs gives what is perhaps the most detailed study in the word of zkr. He claims that Pedersen has imposed his own preconceived ideas on the material he has examined. He concludes that remembering in the Old Testament is more than a mental and psychological event. The author agrees with Childs in this point that remembrance in the Old Testament is not just an action of the mind recalling something from the past. Israel keeps the past by re-experiencing it again in a new way. There was actualization of the past, which is “the process by which a past event is contemporized for a generation removed in time and space from the original event. When later Israel responded to the continuing imperative of her tradition through her memory, that moment in historical time likewise became and Exodus experience. Not in the sense that later Israel again crossed the Red Sea. This was an irreversible, once-for-all event. Rather, Israel entered the same redemptive reality of the Exodus generation.”

The exploration on the biblical idea of remembrance has shown us that the Old Testament has a strong idea on the theology of remembrance, whereas it is not just a mere psychological act of the mind to recall something back in the mind, in fact it is sometimes already an action.

Childs’ research has been a major work on the Old Testament exploration on the theme of remembrance. However, it may be questioned that whether the concept of actualization really makes the past event becomes present. The critique against Childs is that he does not give enough data that shows that warrant the past is somehow made present. Past history serves to gives shape for the present. This connection between the past and present is important for the future of one’s story and history. This is what happened for Israel. Israel reflects her past and believed that their story and history is the God’s saving act towards them.

From the Old Testament we may draw a theology of remembrance as a memorial which not only serves to remind men of the past mercies of God as a ground for their presence obedience but also enables man to recall God’s past promises and deeds in thanksgiving and prayer for new blessings. The remembrance in the Old Testament is also connected with sins and forgiveness. The Old Testament is actually a book of remembrance of Israel sins and God’s grace, which keeps the record of Israel sins, how they remember their sins and ask for God’s forgiveness.

In the Old Testament, the theme of remembrance in accordance with God who remember Israel’s sins and Israel who remember their own sins are quite significant. When God remembers Israel’s sins, it usually will be followed by punishment. After the severe punishment, Israel will plea guilty before God and confess their sins, which remarkably extraordinary, because they actually know that they have sinned against God although they keep on doing it repeatedly. Because of God’s grace alone, he forgives Israel and remembers sins no more. Therefore, the idea of remembrance has a very strong root in the Old Testament, and it is also a way towards forgiveness of sins, where God remembers sins, Israel confesses and remembers her sins, and God

\[\text{Childs, Memory, 84 f.}\]

forgives them. The theme of remembrance in relationship with forgiveness of sins is prominent in the texts of the Old Testament.

The question that we need to explore next is what is the idea of remembrance in the New Testament that in connection with the forgiveness of sins, and what is the real action that can be taken by the victim and the perpetrator to celebrate the remembrance before God? We shall continue to the next chapter in the light of these questions.
Chapter 3
Remembrance In The New Testament

3. 1 Introduction

Now, as we move forward, we have seen that the idea of remembrance indeed has a biblical foundation. The previous chapter has shown us the aspects of remembrance in Old Testament theology as a memorial which not only serves to remind men of the past mercies of God as a ground for their presence obedience but also enables man to recall God’s past promises and deeds in thanksgiving and prayer for new blessings. We have seen the connection between remembrance with sins and forgiveness. The theme of remembrance in the Old Testament is in line with God who remembers Israel’s sins and Israel who remember their own sins. The idea of remembrance has a very strong root in the Old Testament, and it is also a way towards forgiveness of sins. The theology of remembrance for the forgiveness of sins has shown a very strong biblical root in the Old Testament. The remembrance of the covenant they have with God is the basis of all their remembrances.

We will move further by exploring the idea of remembrance in the New Testament. What is the foundation of theology of remembrance in the New Testament? Is the verb יָדכז has the same meaning with , which is the notion of remembrance in the New Testament? How could the idea of remembrance in the New Testament be connected with the theme of forgiveness and reconciliation?

The questions about the order to remember will soon lead us to the Lord’s Supper where Jesus instituted the event as a remembrance of him. Is the Lord’s Supper a meal of recollection and memorial of Christ, or does it embrace something more that we can use for the idea of remembrance for forgiveness and reconciliation? The author assumes that there is something in the celebration of the Eucharist that serves as a remembrance, not only to remember Christ, but also an active remembrance to celebrate and share the event for forgiveness and reconciliation. The Lord’s Table is the table of reconciliation and the sharing of memory, where victim and perpetrator celebrate the communion together. How can this be done, and what shall be remembered in the Lord’s Supper?

We will start this chapter with the analysis of remembrance as it is represented by the word anamnesis, and the meaning derived from the word. Afterwards, we shall explore the meaning of remembrance in the Lord’s Supper, as it will shown us a strong aspect of remembrance in it, and see how it could function as a table remembrance for forgiveness and reconciliation.

3. 2 Anamnesis as The Central Expression of Remembrance in the New Testament

3. 2. 1 Etymology, Occurrences, Context, and Usages

In the New Testament, the main word that is used for remembrance is αναμνησις (anamnesis), which means “remembrance” or “recolletion”; the synonym of the word is ὕ ὁ Anamnesis is distinguished from μνήμη (memory) as the “reliving of vanished impressions by a definite act or will”.

50
There is an active element within the word, it can leads on the signification of: a. “recollection in the consciousness” to that of b. “recollection by word” or commemoration” and c. “recollection by act,” i.e. “an action whereby the object is represented in memory.”

In the observation of the word, The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology says that 72% of all the passages in New Testament reflect the normal Greek usage. They bear the following meanings: (a) To remember, call to mind (i.e. Matt. 26:75, Mark 14:72; Luke 22:61); (b) To consider (i.e. Luke 17:32, 2 Pet. 2:7, Heb. 10:31); (c) To remember for good, to remember in a way which will benefit the person concerned in some way or other (i.e. Luke 1:54; Heb. 8:12), (d) To be mindful of, to affect one’s behavior (i.e. Heb. 11:15; 2 Pet. 3:2; Jude 5, 17; Acts 11:16); (e) To mention (i.e. 2 Cor. 7:15; Rev. 16:19; 18:5). In these instances, the use of ‘remember’ is within the normal Greek usage that is to remember, to call to mind. Looking at the percentage of the use, it seems that Greek understood ‘remember’ in a more direct way of the real meaning which is an action taken by the mind.

The specifically biblical use of the word occurs only 28% in the New Testament. They bear the following meanings:

(a) To mention in prayer, to remember in prayer. The two phrases mneiaν poiumenoi “mentioning” and mnēmoneuontes “remembering” in 1 Thess. 1:2 f. both mean to intercede. In Acts 10:4, Cornelius the centurion is told by an angel of God, “Your prayers and gifts to the poor have come up as a memorial offering before God.” The meaning here is simply that the prayers and gifts are remembered before God, this means that the prayer is simply to have been heard.

(b) To proclaim. The reminding in 2 Pet. 1:12 f. says, “So I will always remind (hypominnēsekein) you of these things, even though you know them and are firmly established in the truth you now have. I think it is right to refresh your memory (Bartels use the translation as by way of reminder, hypomnēsei) as long as I live in the tent of this body.” Here, it is understood in terms of presenting again the known truth of the Gospel.

(c) To believe. In 2 Tim. 2:8 Paul wrote, “Remember Jesus Christ (mnēmoneue Iēsoun Christon), raised from the dead, descended from David, this is my Gospel.” What to remember here is a short creedal statement, to confess the proclamation. It may be compared with the longer form in Rom. 1:3 f., where the order is chronological. Stress is laid on the fact that these truths are integral to the apostolic gospel.

(d) To confess, referring to the sacrifices under the old covenant (i.e. Heb 10:3). In the context the remembrance of sins, Behm puts Hebrew 10:3 as an example, where “those sacrifices are an annual reminder of sins (anamnēsis hamartiōn).” The annual sin offerings made on the day of the atonement are inadequate to remove sins, but serve rather to remind of them by the very fact that they are offered. To the members of the community they make sins

---


present *in actu* as a hindrance to fellowship with God. This assessment of the sacrifice day of atonement is wholly opposed to the Jewish view in spite of Numbers 5:15 that speak about the ordeal of jealousy involves a grain offering to as a reminder offering to draw attention to guilt. This means, there is a contradiction between the meanings of the offering in Hebrew 10:3 which tend as a memorial rather than an atonement of sins.

The other instance of the use of the verb in New Testament occurs in the Pauline and Lucan accounts of the Lord’s Supper. In 1 Corinthians 11:24 when Jesus broke the bread, he says “…do this in remembrance of me” and in the same way also the cup, after supper, verse 25 saying, “…whenever you drink it, in remembrance of me”, Christians are to enact the whole action of The Lord’s Supper. This is done in the recollection of Jesus, and this is not merely in such sort that they simply remember, but rather, in accordance with the active sense of anamnesis and the explanation in verse 26, in such a way that they actively fulfill the anamnesis. It is worth to note here what anamnesis means in the liturgy, since anamnesis is being variedly used in worship. In the Dictionary of Worship, anamnesis is considered untranslatable. Words such as memorial, commemoration, and remembrance suggest that the person or deed commemorated is past and absent, whereas anamnesis means exactly the opposite: “it is an objective act, in and by which the person or event commemorated is actually made present, is brought into the realm of the here and now.” In connection with it, “the Eucharist is the re-calling before God of the one sacrifice of Christ in all its accomplished fullness so that it is here and now operative by its effects in the souls of the redeemed.” Anamnesis means that the event of the past celebrated is actually re-lived and re-experienced in a new realm. Just like most of the use of *zkr* in the Old Testament, the meaning of anamnesis contains an active action of remembrance. It is not merely a recall of something back into mind, rather it feel the past event in a present reality.

As a liturgical term, the anamnesis signifies the part of the anaphora in which it is explicitly stated that the church is offering the bread and the cup with this meaning and for this purpose, in obedience to Christ’s commandment to do so. A statement of the memorial and a statement of the offering are comprised in the normal form of the anamnesis.

The use of *anamnesis* in the New Testament has a different employment from that in the Old Testament. If The Old Testament rarely translate *zkr* as a mere remembering as psychological act of recalling something from the mind, the New Testament uses *anamnesis* more in its normal Greek use.  

### 3.2.2 Anamnesis in Hebrew 10:3; The Memorial of Sins

The first parts of Hebrews 10 points that there is a theme of memorial of sins in connection with God’s forgiveness. The memorial of sins used here comes from the term anamnesis and the synonym of the word. In the letter of Hebrew, it is told that

---

167 See Behm, “ανάμνησις”, 348-349.  
168 See Behm, “ανάμνησις”, 349.  
172 In my opinion, this could be connected with the psychological and the development of the language itself, and also the environment where the language is used. However, this would need a further exploration.
the sacrifices are not effective anymore for the worshippers to ask for God’s forgiveness. Nevertheless, the sacrifices are used as a reminder of sins. The sacrifices and offerings for sins mean that the people are being reminded to confess before God and repent. God shall consider this act of repentance.

There is a kind of similarity between this letter and Numbers 5:15 where a reminder must be made to draw attention of guilt. Fred B. Craddock notes that a key term in the discussions of the subjective side of Christ sacrifice for sin is conscience. At Hebrews 9:14 it is clear that the benefit of Christ’s self-sacrifice is the purifying of the conscience from the dead works in order that worship of God may follow. Further, he explains, “the major inadequacy of the system of animal offerings was not only the inability to remove the ‘conscious of sins’ (NIV: felt guilty of their sins), but also a reminder, by the fact of constant repetition, of the very sin that could not be erased by the process (vv 2-3).”

Thurian understands these verses as a calling upon God on the guilt and sins of the people so God would not punish the people for it. The word anamnesis in Hebrews 10: 3 mean that there is an element of the memorial of sins before God to receive God’s forgiveness. There is a difference between the memorial action of sins through sacrifices and offerings in the Old Testament and the New Testament. In the Old Testament, sacrifices are for reminding Israel of their sins before God, while in the letter of Hebrews offerings are made to remember God’s compassion through Christ. The saying of Jeremiah was quoted in Hebrews, “This is the covenant I will make with them after that time, says the Lord. I will put my laws in their hearts, and I will write them on their minds…. Their sins and lawless acts I will remember no more.” The remembrance of God’s compassion can also be seen in the Song of Mary and the benedicts of Zechariah (Luke 1:54, 72).

There is a unique character of Jesus’ act of sacrifice on the cross. Thurian considers that Jesus is “a priest forever, in the order of Melchizedek (7:17, 21).” The status of Jesus as the priest once and for all is absolute. Jesus’ act of sacrifice as a priest has replaced the animal’s offerings (see 10:12). Other priests cannot replace Jesus’ status as the sacrifice on the cross. The sacrifice of the cross is above all sacrifices, the time is once and for all, and it carries the whole human’s offerings, prayers and actions. This means that Christ fulfillment in the letter of Hebrews is done within the consecration of faith.

The offerings and sacrifices have been completed by the sacrificial act of Jesus. There will be no more offerings because the perfect offering has completed it all (Heb. 10:8). Nevertheless, the offerings made by Israel are considered as a memorial of sins to receive God’s forgiveness. The repeated offerings are an objective memorial of the proclamation of sin.

---

174 Max Thurian, The Eucharistic Memorial II (London: Lutterworth Press, 1963), 5-14. See also Jusen Boangmanalu, Anamnesis: Study on the Anamnetic Meaning of the Communion Compared with The Ancestors Memorial Activities in the Batak Traditional Religion (Jakarta: Thesis presented to the Faculty of the South East Asia Graduate School of Theology, 1992), 49-55.
175 Heb. 10:16-17; see Jeremiah 31:33-34. Jeremiah 31:34 was quoted two times in the letter of Hebrews, see Heb 8:12. Compare with Revelation 18:5, “for her sins are piled up to heaven, and God has remembered her crimes.”
177 See Thurian, The Eucharistic Memorial II, 10-11.
3. 3 Anamnesis in the Lord’s Supper

The only other New Testament instances of anamnesis occur in Pauline and Lucan accounts of the Lord’s Supper. The Lord’s Supper is the account that Jesus institutes himself in order of a remembrance of him. From the early church, the Eucharist has been widely developed in the way of the sacrament and the theology of the Lord’s Supper. The Real Presence of Christ that has been firmly believed by the early church has developed variously in Eastern Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant theologies. Nevertheless, the author would not discuss about the discussion on the real presence of Christ in the Holy Communion, the sacrifice nature of the Eucharist, or how it is celebrated in different churches, rather we will start from the agreement that Christ gave his life as a sacrifice and that we will do the communion as a remembrance of him. We shall see and explore the meaning of remembrance in the Lord’s Supper and the connection of it with the forgiveness of sins and reconciliation.178

3. 3. 1 The Four Text

Anamnesis is the heart of the Lord’s Supper. The act of remembrance is being told in it and repeatedly celebrated by the church. However, the account of the Lord’s Supper is written in four parts in the New Testament. There is no exact match between the stories. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul are telling about the same story with different emphasis on what they consider important to tell to their readers. According to the time of writing, we should first go look the account of the Lord’s Supper in Paul’s letter to the Corinthians. Paul wrote,

“And when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, “This is my body, which is for you; do this in remembrance of me.” (touto poieite eis tēn emēn anamnēsin)

In the same way, after supper he took the cup, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood; do this, whenever you drink it, in remembrance of me (touto poieite, hosakis ean pinete, eis tēn emēn anamnēsin) (1 Cor. 11:23-25).”

In the account of Mark, which is the oldest of the synoptic gospels, the chapter on the Lord’s Supper is very essential in the whole teaching of Jesus’ suffering. It is

178 We will not go into the discussion of the presence of the Lord in the Eucharist because of the ongoing discussion in this matter alone. However, it is worth to note down little about the ongoing discussions on the Real Presence of Christ in the Lord’s Supper. The author suggests a small but valuable explanation on the theologies of the Lord’s Supper in Robert E. Webber (ed.), The Sacred Actions of Christian Worship Volume 6: The Sacred Actions of Christian Worship (Nashville: Star Song Publishing Group, 1994), 208-249 (specially in page 229). The Eastern Orthodox Churches generally avoid complex theological and philosophical explanations. In the West, modern Roman Catholic theologians have searched for biblical language to explain this mystery, notably, the Pauline language about being inserted into Christ. They continue to uphold the doctrine of transubstantiation, which teaches the sacramental and substantial (real) – but not carnal or physical – presence of Christ. Reformed (Calvinist) theology recognizes Christ’s real and spiritual presence, but resists the idea that the sacrament is efficacious in and of itself. Anglicans asserts Real Presence in a variety of ways, ranging from a position very close to the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation to an explanation that emphasizes the occasion when the believer receives the bread and wine. With his roots in the Anglican tradition, John Wesley considered the Lord’s Supper a powerful sacrament even while emphasizing inner renewal and sanctification. The radical Protestant memorialist viewpoint of the Anabaptists and Ulrich Zwingli continues to be held by the groups descended from the Anabaptists (Mennonites and others), as well as by some mainline Protestants, many evangelicals, and all Pentecostal churches. Each church contributes something worthy in the Communion service.
important to note that the last supper Jesus had with his disciple is similar with the Passover meal (Mark 14:12).  

“While they were eating, Jesus took bread, gave thanks and broke it, and gave it to his disciples saying, “Take it; this is my body.” Then he took the cup and gave thanks and offered it to them, and they all drank from it. “This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many, “ he said to them. “I tell you the truth, I will not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it anew in the kingdom of God (Mark 14:22-25).”

The Gospel of Matthew is fully connected with the Gospel of Mark and places the order in the same context.

“While they were eating, Jesus took bread, gave thanks and broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, “Take and eat; this is my body.” Then he took the cup, gave thanks and offered it to them, saying, “Drink from it, all of you. This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins. I tell you, I will not drink of this fruit of the vine from now on until that day when I drink it anew with you in my Father’s Kingdom (Matt. 26:26-29).”

Luke, the third writer in the Synoptic Gospels, is not fully different from the other gospels, but has a noticeably long entrance before the order of the supper.

“When the hour came, Jesus and his apostles reclined at the table. And he said to them, “I have eagerly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer. For I tell you, I will not eat it again until it finds fulfillment in the kingdom of God. After taking the cup, he gave thanks and said, “Take this and divide it among you. For I tell you I will not drink again of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God comes.” He took the bread, broke it, and gave it to them, saying, “This is my body given for you; do this in remembrance of me.” In the same way after the supper he took the cup saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is poured out for you (Luke 22:14-20).”

There are similarities between Mark and Matthew account, in fact it seems that Matthew is in line with Mark, while Luke seems to follow the Pauline tradition of the institution. It is notable that the account where Jesus instructed his disciple to do the same communion as a remembrance of him is only stated in Luke and the letter to the Corinthians. Mark, without doubt is the oldest tradition and Matthew is using it as his source. Having both accounts at his disposal, which are Mark and Pauline tradition, Luke chooses to use Paul that noted the instruction to do the same rite again as a remembrance of Jesus. Luke realizes that there are two times when Paul urged the people of Corinth to do the communion. Luke took the tradition and the instruction, used it only once, and put an eschatological stress instead of the second instruction.

Another thing that is important to note down here is the aspect of the communion, in the literal meaning of the word. Luke put a stress on the importance of the talk after dinner. He noted that Jesus and his disciples did not go right after the meal. They had a conversation. The table is not only a place for eating and drinking, it is a place where people meet and tell stories (see Luke 7:36-50; 10:38-42; 11:37-54; 14:1-24). Luke sees the connection between the institution of the communion and the talks after the meal which centered in Jesus as the servant.

The Lord’s Supper is considered as an event that establishes and confirms the remembrance of Jesus. Anamnesis here means not only the subjective representation
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179 See C. J. Den Heyer translated by Ny. S.L. Tobing-Kartohadiprojo, *Perjamuan Tuhan: Studi Mengenai Paskah dan Perjamuan Kudurs Bertolak dari Penafsiran dan Teologi Alkitabiah* (Jakarta: BPK-GM, 1997), 2. There are still discussions whether the Last Supper Jesus had with his disciples is the same with the Passover meal in Jewish tradition. We will discuss further about the connection of the Lord Supper and the Passover meal in the later part of this chapter.

of something in the consciousness and as an act of the remembering mind, it is also the objective effectiveness and presence of the salvific actions of God. The words Jesus said means a declaration that the bread and wine was Jesus’ body and blood, and a command to do the same celebration as the memorial of Jesus.

3. 3. 2 The Lord’s Supper and God Who Remember

Over the year, the meaning of Jesus’ words, “Do this in remembrance of me” has been fought for and vastly examined. Some modern scholars has suggested instead of interpreting that this was an Israelites memorial of what God has done for them, it is actually to enable Israelites to remind God of what he had done for them in the past with a plea that he will act for them again. We will see what exactly this interpretation means, since it is not the same with the general opinion of the meaning of the institution.

Jeremias claims that in passages such Mark 14:9 (par. Matt. 26:13); Acts 10:4; and in the Palestinian and Old Testament memorial formulae, it is almost always God who remembers. In the feast of the Passover, God is spoken as the one who has given to his people festal seasons and lezzikārōn – as the whole festal of the Passover and is a festal of remembrance, and the Passover meal is a meal of remembrance. He says,

“This zikhrötnōth are prayers which enclose Bible passages entreating of “remembrance”, exclusively God’s remembrance of His covenant promises both in the past and in the future. The closing prayer of the zikhrötnōth ends with a doxology: “Praised be thou, O Lord, that rememberest the covenant. Of the special importance is the old Passover prayer which beseeches God for “the remembrance of the Messiah”.

The same process could be happening in the Lord’s Supper. Jesus broke the bread and said that God may remember me. Paul’s explanation of the verse 1 Cor. 11:26 (For whenever you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes) is translated by Jeremias by “As often as the death of the Lord is proclaimed at the Lord’s Supper, and the maranatha rises upward, God is reminded of the unfulfilled climax of the work of salvation until (the goal is reached, that) he comes.” Briefly, his thesis is that Jesus instituted the celebration of the eucharist is to remind God; God is therefore is being asked to remember the messiah by bringing the kingdom through parousia (because when God remembers, He acts).

Jeremias is making a different point where there is nothing in his argument which suggests a doctrine of a real presence of Christ or a eucharistic sacrifice which either repeats or extends that of Christ on the cross. His emphasis is eschatological.

---


183 Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words, 162-163.


185 Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words, 164, see Bartels’ comments, “Remember”, 244-245.

God’s remembrance would be back on the Messiah: Christ himself. This is because “God’s remembrance … never means a mere recollection on the part of God; but when God remembers somebody, he acts, he does something, he sits in judgment and grants his grace, he fulfils his promise.” The eschatological message in Jeremias’ understanding is quite definite in his idea of the way God is expected to remember when the Messianic community meets and pray to him, that is “God remembers the Messiah by bringing his kingdom in the parousia.”

However, this idea of God’s remembrance and to the Old Testament for the idea of God remembering does not rule out other interpretations. Bartels suggests that *touto poieite* (this do) may be regarded as a summary of the procedure to be followed by participants in the Lord’s Supper. The participant act as Jesus did just like what Jesus had done in the institution of the Lord’s Supper, as being told in the Synoptic Gospels. The comparison made between the Old Testament and Heb. 10:3 can be paraphrased as follows, “Do this, by eating the bread and drinking the cup (i.e. by participating in my life and death), by the preaching of the word (1 Cor. 11:26) and the singing of praise.” The words “until he comes” denote a far more than waiting for the end of the day until the second coming of Christ, it is an active reaching out towards it, a prayer, *maranatha*. Bartels concludes that the word anamnesis covers all these ideas.

### 3. 3. 3 The Lord’s Supper and The Passover

The eucharist can only be understood in its most profound sense against the liturgical tradition of the Old Testament. The eucharist is not a new and independent act of Jesus. It is actually very important to interpret the eucharist in the light of Jewish liturgy and in particular in the paschal liturgy and to see the importance of the link between the Passover and the Lord’s Supper. The eucharist is an important event which becomes a central act of worship in early church, and still is perceived as such today. This event indicates aspects of remembrance which not only relates to our past events but also to the future events. What Jesus did was actually a celebration of the Passover which was also a celebration of remembering the exodus. The Passover is actually an act of remembering God’s salvific action, and Jesus used this tradition as a remembrance of him. Therefore we should see the link between those two events; what it actually means for God’s people at that time, and how Jesus used the tradition and even add a new meaning to it. However there is a problem in interpreting the Last Supper within the framework of the paschal celebration. Not all the facts in the Passover can be entirely reconciled with the Lord’s Supper. We shall take a look whether the Lord’s Supper is actually a celebration of Passover or it is a continuation of the Passover festival.

There are several indications that the Lord’s Supper was indeed a Passover. First, the Lord’s Supper took place in the evening and extended into the night, which is similar to the obligation that the Passover meal should be eaten at night. Second, Jesus and his disciples reclined at their last meal together (Mark 14:18; Matt. 26:20; Luke 22:14), where it was a Passover ordinance that Israel should recline as a
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187 Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words*, 163, see Bartels’ comments, “Remember”, 245.
188 Bartels, “Remember”, 245.
190 See Mark 14:7,30; Matt. 26:20; 1 Cor. 11:23. It seems that the synoptic gospels and Paul agree on this point. Luke’s explicitly draws the description that the meal is a Passover meal.
symbol of their liberty. Third, a dish precedes the breaking of bread only happens at the Passover. This is shown when the meal is already in progress when Jesus takes the bread and offers a blessing and breaks the bread (Mark. 14:18; Matt. 26:21). Fourth, wine as an obligatory drink at the Passover was drunk at the Lord’s Supper. The specific wine in the Passover was red wine, and it is proved by the comparison of it with the blood of Jesus. Fifth, the supper ended with the singing of a hymn (Mark 14:26; Matt. 26:30), which will have been the second part of the Hallel that closes the Passover meal (Ps. 114, 115, 118). Sixth, Jesus did not return to Bethany after the meal because according to the Passover regulation one should spent the night in a larger area after the Passover had been eaten. Seventh, Higgins argued that the very fact that Jesus spoke of his body and blood in connection with the bread and wine is an indication of the Passover character of the Lord’s Supper, because in the Passover Haggadah the person presiding explained the various elements in the meal, which what exactly Jesus has done. Based on the words of Jesus during the last supper, Jeremias has no more doubt that the Last Supper was indeed a Passover. The word of institution over the bread, which was commonly done before the Passover meal, was spoken by Jesus in connection with the grace at the beginning of the main meal.

However, there are also different note taken by the Gospel of John by not placing the Passover in relation with the last supper. Jesus has the evening meal with his disciples, afterwards he is arrested ad brought before Annas and Caiaphas and the following morning before Pilate. Here, John 18:28 note that, “Then the Jews led Jesus from Caiaphas to the palace of the Roman governor. By now, it was early morning, and to avoid ceremonial uncleanness the Jews did not enter the palace; they wanted to be able to eat the Passover.” Kilpatrick, a scholar in Bible Exegesis, argues that the time of the last supper John puts is the most probable that the last supper was not done in a Passover meal, otherwise it would have been possible for conservative Sadducee and Pharisee alike to take part in the arrest, trial, and crucifixion of Jesus during the Passover. Therefore he concludes that John has the most possible account of the time of the last supper, it happened before the Passover.

Den Heyer admits that the problem of interpretation between the Synoptic Gospel and the fourth Gospel on the exact date of the Last Supper has been debated for centuries. He suggests that the Fourth Gospel is not defining the exact date of the Last Supper, instead, the writer wants to stress his theological point of view by showing the real Paschal lamb died outside of Jerusalem when thousands of other lambs are ready to be sacrificed (see John 19:36, compare with Ex. 12:46). In other words, den Heyer wants to state his position on trying to reconcile the two conflicting exact date of the Lord’s Supper by saying that he is with the date given by the Synoptic Gospels and at the same time not underestimating the theological value of John’s chronology.
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194 See the note of G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 43-58. Notice that John 19:14 says that it was the day of the preparation of the Passover Week, about the sixth hour. In John 19:31 it was noted that the Sabbath and the Passover fell together on the following day after Jesus was put on the cross.
195 See Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist*, 58. He also suggests that Jesus did not plan to hold the Passover. He says that family plays an important role in the Passover meal, and it cannot be substituted with disciples.
Given the fact that the connection between the Lord’s Supper and the Passover has been widely debated, we should take a brief look at the meaning of the Passover itself. The Passover is the most widely celebrated of all the Jewish festivals. It celebrates a turning point in the history of the Jews, the time when they emerged as a free people after years of slavery in Egypt. It is a stirring festival of freedom, commemorating the birth of a community. 

The day of the Passover was to be celebrated from generation to generation as a memorial. Exodus 12:14 told Israel to “commemorate; for the generations to come you shall celebrate it as a festival to the Lord.” This feast is a recalling of the Lord’s act of deliverance that can be relived in liturgy, and also as a thanksgiving to God. Jeremias thinks that Jesus already referred himself as the paschal lamb that has to be sacrificed. This is shown by the fact that the words of interpretation refer the bread and wine to Jesus himself. Jesus’ parable only announces that no matter how, his vicarious death will happen, and that he foresaw a violent death.

This could strengthen the thesis that Jesus and his disciples are celebrating the paschal meal during in the last supper.

Thurian says, “The Passover is not just a didactic recalling to or edification of the people, it is a praising of God; the third cup of the paschal meal, in particular, emphasizes this thanksgiving.”

There is a triple memorial, or a triple anamnesis within the paschal meal: of a past deliverance regarded as typical, of a present deliverance through the sacramental action of the paschal meal and of a coming salvation in the day of the Messiah. This is an interesting sequence of time in celebrating one event. The past deliverance was celebrated which was taken as in the present time by the ‘sacrament’, and God was asked to fulfill it by sending the Messiah. The night of the Passover becomes the night when Messiah is awaited – a way to celebrate the past event to live for the future. Thurian says,

“The paschal meal is the memorial (zikkaron) par excellence in which the people of God actualize the historical deliverance, in a liturgy, and recalls to God what he once did, so that he may continue it today: “Our God, and God of our fathers!” says the Jewish paschal prayer, “May our remembrance (zikkaron, memorial) of our fathers…of Messiah … Remember us …” How many liturgical acts of the Old Testament are called in this way because they are a symbolic way of saying to God: “Remember us because of thy fidelity shown in former times by deliverance from slavery and by covenant with thy people.”

---

197 See Howard Greenfeld, *Passover* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978), James C. Vanderkam, *An Introduction to Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2001), 204-205. Much of the biblical legislation of the celebration can be found in Exodus 12: a one-year old lamb or goat without blemish was to be selected for each household on the tenth day of the month; it was to be kept until the fourteenth, when it was to be slaughtered and its blood sprinkled on the doorpost of a dwelling so that the Lord would see it and pass over that house when he came through Egypt at night. This event is celebrated every year on the fourteenth day of the first month.

198 Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words*, 144-146. For a comparison, see Léon-Dufour’s comments of the theses of Jeremias of the connection between the Lord’s Supper and the Passover. Léon-Dufour concludes that the only datum that tips the balance in favour of a Passover meal is the fact that the synoptics seem to say that the Supper was in fact a Passover meal, but the question is do they not tell how Jesus sent disciples to “prepare the Passover” which he is to celebrate? Therefore, he proposes that the way the Supper is presented is not in the Passover of the Jews but in fact the Passover of Jesus, *Sharing The Eucharistic Bread*, 306-308.


Thurian thinks that the liturgical celebration of the Passover makes concrete the mutual covenant of God and man; it recalls to God his promise of salvation and to the faithful the protection of his God; it is an act of witness to the faithfulness of God before the world. There are four aspects of the paschal meal that to be found in the Eucharistic liturgy: the affirmation of the presence of God in the covenant; the communication of salvation; the effective intercession by means of the memorial, and finally the proclamation of the word of God.

Therefore, Thurian concludes that in the way of Jesus celebrated the Holy Supper within the Jewish liturgy of the Passover makes us understand the Eucharist is a blessing for the wonderful deeds of God, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, a memorial; it is an actualization of the passion, resurrection and intercession of Christ, a memorial which rises before the Father as the Church’s offering of prayer, recalling to God’s remembrance all the needs of the people: Remember, Lord, thy Church and all those for whom we present to thee the sacrifice.

Whether or not that last supper was actually a Passover meal, its proximity both to the Jewish feast and to Jesus crucifixion gave it both paschal and sacrificial connotations which Christians utilized to interpret the meaning of the event. Jesus has used the tradition and gives it a new meaning. This is the connection between the Lord’s Supper and the Old Testament tradition, that it is actually rooted in the Jewish tradition of the Passover. Jesus remembers this tradition as a celebration of memory and uses this as a remembrance of him.

3. 3. 4 The Lord’s Supper and Sacrificial Act

We have seen that Jesus understood himself as the sacrifice paschal lamb in the last supper. However, it is important to note that what they understood as sacrifice is not the same as what modern think about sacrifice. Scholars have been speculated about the meaning of sacrifice. The key verse is held to be Leviticus 17:11, “For the life of a creature is in the blood, and I have given it to you to make the atonement for yourselves on the altar; it is the blood that makes the atonement for one’s life.” Bridge notes that there are two main opposing understanding of sacrifice resulting from this passage. Some scholars think that the worshipper is releasing the life of the sacrificed animal and offering it to God. While some other scholars think that in sacrifice, the animal is a replacement of the worshipper and the violent offering of life is important rather than the continued presence of life for some new purpose.

Kilpatrick suggested that the meaning of sacrifice has been developed from what the ancient world understanding of the word. There are three types of sacrifice: communion sacrifice, gift sacrifice, and atonement sacrifice; they mean as releasing and conferring life and power (2 Kings 3); to strengthen a material object (Exodus 12); reinforcing action (Numbers 22-24). In the story of Balaam, sacrifice can also reinforce a curse as well as a blessing.

Paul understood the Eucharist as sacrifice, and understood that it could bring a blessing or curse. That is why he wrote,
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203 See Max Thurian, “The Eucharistic Memorial, Sacrifice of Praise and Supplication”, 95
“Therefore, whoever eats the bread of drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of sinning against the body and the blood of the Lord. A man ought to examine himself before he eats of the bread and drinks of the cup. For anyone who eats and drinks without recognizing the body of the Lord eats and drinks judgment on himself. That is why many among you are weak and sick, and a number of you have fallen asleep (1 Cor. 11:27-30).”

F.F. Bruce explain the context of this examination of oneself as a self-examination to ascertaining whether or not one is living and acting ‘in the love and charity’ with his/her neighbor. Certain members of the church who do not think about their poorer-fellow Christians, was considered guilty and should incur divine judgment. This account of Paul must have the stories of Korah and his company and King Uzziah, where the virtue of a sacrifice which should have been for the sake of them turns back against them because they are unworthy to it.

Therefore, the meaning of sacrifice is basically the meeting or exchange between God and men, where it is arise out of God’s initiative. Kilpatrick says, “Sacrifice like them [all kind of sacrifices from the basic ideas to the more developed forms of it] assumes the primacy of God, and obviously they arise out of God’s initiative. Thus God forms the divine society and calls man into it, he inspires the prophets and speaks through the Scripture. Man is involved in these institutions, but while he co-operates with God, he does so in response to the divine initiative sacrifice on the other hand does involve both God and man, but at first sight, at any rate, the initiative seems to rest with man; he offers to God, who receives and gives again.”

Sacrifice is an exchange between human and God, where God took the initiative and inspires the people to response in an initiative of offering. Kilpatrick suggests that the Eucharist must also be seen through this way. This is a reaction not only to the presence of God but to God’s manifestation of himself in the saving act of the Lord. This manifestation calls response, which has been determined by what Jesus did. Jesus is the pioneer of the eucharist where he first offers himself in love and worship to the Father, and in him and through him we continue this offering.

The tradition of offering in the Old Testament is fulfilled by Jesus’ unique act of sacrifice, the once-for-all offering. To understand what Jesus did on the cross means to understand the tradition of offering and sacrifices in the Old Testament. The blood of the paschal lamb that was shed on the cross is perfecting the animal offering.

3.4 Churches’ View of Remembrance in the Lord’s Supper

The institution of these words by Jesus has long designated for the sacramental meal by the Church according to the example and instruction of Jesus himself. This celebration of the last meal Jesus had with his disciples has got various names: the Eucharist, the Lord’s Supper, the Lord’s Table, the Holy Communion, etc. however, they all points at the same direction, the remembrance of Jesus in the holy meal taken by the member of the Church. The command τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν εἰμὴν αἰνομένην has gave the church the power to do what Jesus did.

---
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As the words of institution that was instituted by Jesus himself, what do \textit{eis tēn emēn anamnēsin} mean and what does it mean for the church? Max Thurian takes the word \textit{eis tēn emēn anamnēsin} with the meaning “with a view to my memorial, in memorial of me, as the memorial of me.” Further he says that this memorial is not a simple subjective act of recollection; it is actually a liturgical action. Nevertheless, it is not just a mere liturgical action which makes the Lord present, it is a liturgical action which recalls the memorial before the Father the unique sacrifice of the Son, and this makes Him present in His memorial, in his presentation of his sacrifice before the Father and in His intercession as heavenly High Priest. Thurian says, “the eucharistic memorial is a recalling to us, a recalling by us to the Father and a proclamation by the Church; it is a thanksgiving and intercession of Christ for the Church.”\textsuperscript{211} Thurian continues by concluding what the Bible means by memorial: “to recall before God what he has already done for his people so that he may grant us today all the benefits thereof. Memorial is the actualization of the work of God and at the same time the recalling in prayer to the Father of what he has done, in order that he may continue his work today.”\textsuperscript{212}

David Power says, "The sacramental action of Christian liturgy is the recovery, the creative perception of the human within the memory of Christ and of Christ within the human." He states that, "such memorial needs to affirm, enlarge, and fill, what is lost. With the advent of a new millennium, a new evangelization, a new resurgence of hope, histories cannot be remembered, Christ is not embodied in a people, without remembrance of suffering, of time lost. Between time lost and time regained, there lies the art of sacramental remembrance."\textsuperscript{213}

The Lord Supper is the event where Christ's death is remembered, where in his self-emptying action, God takes form in a people who have suffered.\textsuperscript{214} Jesus said, "Do this in remembrance of me!"\textsuperscript{215} What does it mean, remembering Christ's death? The Lord Supper is an act of active remembrance in liturgy, for Jesus has given his very being for human. This act of remembrance is "guided by the power of the Spirit and focuses on the location of the memory of Christ within the memory of a people, and the memory of the people within the memory of Christ's \textit{kenosis}."\textsuperscript{216} The past has become the present for the future through the Lord’s Supper. Therefore, the

\textsuperscript{211} Thurian, \textit{The Eucharistic Memorial II}, 35 f.

\textsuperscript{212} Max Thurian, “The Eucharistic Memorial, Sacrifice of Praise and Supplication” in Max Thurian (ed.), \textit{Ecumenical Perspectives on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry} (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1983), 94. In connection with the remembrance in prayer, Blair, “An Appeal”, 46-47 says that praying in the name of Jesus, repeatedly enjoined in the New Testament, is a form of remembering Jesus. According to the Hebrew thought, by making mention of the name, one keeps the soul of another alive and active in the present. The person ceases to exist when the name is forgotten. Thus to pray in the name of Jesus is to make him present in living power. And to remember him when one eats the bread and drinks the cup is to know him as living presence and to look forward to his coming triumph. To remember him is to surrender to him, to obey him, to live in harmony with his gracious redemptive purpose, and to share in his destiny.

\textsuperscript{213} David N. Power, "Foundation for Pluralism in Sacramental Expression: Keeping Memory" in \textit{Journal of Worship} 75 no 3 May 2001, 198. David Power wrote his paper in connection with Church’s action in the past which has been guilty in keeping the people away from their traditional roots. As a result, he says that the Lord’s Supper is the place of ritual and narrative of sacramental memorial is faced with the memory of suffering and the call to confession and apology for past actions of the church.
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remembrance in the Lord’s Supper does not mean a passive remembrance of the past, but it is also a recalling of the present for the future through the memorial of Christ.

We shall see in the next part of the chapter, how tradition and churches sees the aspect of remembrance in their documents and confession. We will look through the Sacrosanct Concilium document and the Lima report on the part of the eucharist and the remembrance of the Lord.

3.4.1 Catholic View on the Remembrance in the Lord’s Supper

The Catholic Church, through The Second Vatican Counsel stated its teaching about the Eucharist in Sacrosanct Concilium (SC) 47 as follows,

“At the Last Supper, on the night when he was betrayed, our Savior instituted the eucharistic sacrifice of his body and blood. He did this in order to perpetuate the sacrifice of the Cross throughout the centuries until he should come again, and so to entrust his beloved spouse, the Church, a memorial of his death and resurrection: a sacrament of love, a sign of unity, a bond of charity, a paschal banquet in which Christ is eaten, the mind is filled with grace, and a pledge of future glory is given to us.”

What does this mean in connection with the remembrance in the Lord’s Supper? In the Roman Catholic teaching on the eucharist, it is celebrated as a memorial of Christ’s act of sacrifice on the cross, sacramental as in the Church’s liturgy. Eucharist is taken from the Greek Eucharistic, meaning thanksgiving. The eucharist is the memorial that Christ has instituted himself. Roman Catholic teaching believes that the eucharist offering is at the same time is Christ’s sacrifice on the cross. SC 47 gives an answer by the words perpetuate and memorial. The eternal Christ’s sacrifice on the cross is happening in the celebration of the eucharist through the celebration of memory. The anamnesis points at the past salvation work of God, brings back the memory of the past into present time in such a way, so that God’s redemptive action is still remembered as a present event. Martasudjita thinks that the memorial, or anamnesis, is not just a mind’s action of recalling the past, it is remembered and brought back within the Church. The one time event has become present through times and re-experienced in symbols, bread and wine.

Xavier Léon-Dufour says, “The command to remember Christ is an exhortation of the Church to renew its contact with its source: that is the purpose of memory, although this case is special since in Jesus the Church comes in contact with God at work.” The purpose of memory is to renew the contact of the Church with Christ, the source of the Church. This can only be done in the grace of the Father, and the Spirit will remind us of the action of the Christ (John 14:26). This is the place of the Holy Spirit; it is the living memory of the Church. He thinks that it is not a human action that makes believers present to Jesus during the eucharistic liturgy, but rather God himself acting through his Spirit. The remembrance of Jesus is actually God’s

---
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action through the Spirit that makes believers remember. Léon-Dufour concludes that this remembrance is dynamic, “it gives a forward thrust to the Church that has in this way renewed its contact with its Lord and that must express in its everyday life what Jesus himself experienced and lived on earth: the love of God that grounds love among human beings.”

3.4.2 Ecumenical View on the Remembrance in The Lord’s Supper

Here, we shall take a look at what the Document on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry has to say about the anamnesis in their part on Eucharist. For the purpose of this writing, we will only limit ourselves to a brief exploration on the part of the eucharist as anamnesis or memorial of Christ and the eucharist as communion of the faithful. This observation is not thorough; nevertheless this should make us see what the BEM report understanding of the eucharist, in connection with anamnesis (remembrance) and the forgiveness of sins.

The Faith and Order document starts its emphasis that the Eucharist is a gift of God (II, 1). This gift is given through the fundamental work of God, which is through Jesus Christ. It is “a sacramental meal which by visible signs communicates to us in God’s love by which Jesus loved his own ‘to the end’ (John 13:1) (II, 1).” The document stated the meaning of the Eucharist as follows:

“The Eucharist is essentially the sacrament of the gift which God makes to us in Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit. Every Christian receives this gift of salvation through communion in the body and blood of Christ. In the eucharistic meal, in the eating and drinking of the bread and wine, Christ grants communion with himself. God himself acts, giving life to the body of Christ and renewing each member. In accordance with Christ’s promise, each baptized member of the body of Christ receives the eucharist the assurance of the forgiveness of sins (Matt. 26:28) and the pledge of eternal life (John 6:51-58). Although the eucharist is essentially one complete act, it will be considered here under the following aspects: thanksgiving to the Father, memorial of Christ, invocation of the Spirit, communion of the faithful, meal of the Kingdom (II, 2).”

The Lima document understands the gift of Eucharist in a Trinitarian way; it is a gift of God, in Christ, and through the Holy Spirit. It is an event where Christian receives the gift of salvation through the communion in the body and blood of Jesus. The emphasis is stressed where Christ grants the communion with himself. The Faith and Order document stated that through the eucharist, each baptized member would receive the assurance of forgiveness and the pledge of eternal life. Because it is a gift of God through Christ, this event is the event where the assurance of forgiveness of sins is received. This would also stress that the forgiveness of sins is God’s grace; the assurance is given through the eating and drinking the eucharistic meal, and the promise of Christ.

Nevertheless, the eucharistic meal is not only based on the symbolism of the meals of the eucharist, it is also reminds us of the prophetic image of the
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eschatological banquet. This is not simply the announcement of that banquet, but the mysterious “anticipation of the Supper of the lamb” (I, 1). Every time it is celebrated, the people, the baptized member of the body of Christ are nourished with hope, the forgiveness of sins and eternal life. Tillard thinks that if the Lord’s Supper is not a sacrament of pardon, the eucharist will not be a sacrament of hope. This is where Tillard suggest – as the author would have too – that the Lima document should deal on the theme more intense, recalling more the way in which the evangelists link Jesus’ meals with sinners with the assurance of God’s pardoning presence in the mysterious guest who eats and drinks with them. Tillard question is, “If the eucharist is indeed the memorial of the sacrifice “accomplished once and for all on the cross and still operative on behalf of humankind” (II, 5), how could it be possibly otherwise?”

This is why the idea of pardon is not easy to neglect. The forgiveness of sins is an issue of reconciliation where it has two dimensions, the communion with God the Father and communion with fellow neighbors, and through Christ and his spirit. This is very important because through the eucharist, coming from the memorial of the sacrificed Christ, the one time event has offer and guarantee the pardoning of sin for the whole world, they who were baptized as the body of Christ.

Therefore, the memorial of Christ is one of the aspects which have an important place in the celebration of the eucharist. The Lima report puts the stress on the eucharist as anamnesis or memorial of Christ more than the other part on the II part of the Eucharist. The heart of the eucharist is the anamnesis, the memorial. It is the memorial of the “crucified and the risen Christ…accomplished once and for all on the cross and still operative on behalf all humankind” (II, 5). This memorial is not an empty memorial, a mere recalling of the past, in fact “Christ himself with all that he has accomplished for us and for all creation (in his incarnation, servanthood, ministry, teaching, suffering, sacrifice, resurrection, ascension, and sending of the Spirit) is present in this anamnesis, granting us communion with himself. The eucharist is also the foretaste of his parousia and of the final kingdom” (II, 6). This means that the remembrance of Christ is done in the wholeness of the memorial of him, his life, works, death, and resurrection until his ascension, and the sending of the Spirit. This is the memorial which is “the Church’s effective proclamation of God’s mighty acts and promises” (II, 7).

Because the eucharist is a unique gift, and it offers the entrance to the gift of which also invokes a presence, the church’s response to this gift is in thanksgiving and intercession through Christ the High Priest. “In thanksgiving, the Church is united with the Son, its great High Priest and Intercessor (Rom. 8:34; Heb 7:25)...It is the memorial of all that God has done for the salvation of the world...in the memorial of the eucharist, however, the Church offers its intercession in communion with Christ, our great High Priest” (II, 8).

The anamnesis is also believed as the basis and source of all Christian prayer, it relies on the risen Lord, and “In the eucharist, Christ empowers us to live with him, to suffer with him and to pray through him as justified sinners, joyfully and freely..."
fulfilling his will” (II, 9). This means, Christ empower us to live and suffer with him even though we are still sinners, because we are now justified sinners. As justified sinners, we have to offer ourselves for as our living sacrifice. “In Christ, we offer ourselves as a living and holy sacrifice in our daily lives (Rom. 12:1; 1 Pet. 2:5); this spiritual worship, acceptable to God, is nourished in the eucharist, in which we are sanctified and reconciled in love, in order to be the servants of reconciliation in the world” (II, 10). This is an important point in the terms of forgiveness and reconciliation. We must offer ourselves, the justified sinners, in our daily love. This means we must not differentiate the day of the celebration of the eucharist and any other days, instead, we must keep ourselves as a living and holy sacrifice in our daily activities. By living our live as an offering, then through the eucharist we are sanctified and reconciled in love, to be the agent of reconciliation of the world. In other words, without having offered ourselves, in our daily activities, our remembrance will not be acceptable and we will not be sanctified through the eucharist.

The communion is based on God’s love and reconciliation. The offering of life will not become acceptable when there is reconciliation among fellow human. The Lima Report stated, “The eucharistic celebration demands reconciliation and sharing among all those regarded as brothers and sisters in the one family of God and is a constant challenge in the search for appropriate relationships in social, economy, and political life” (II, 20). Further it says, “All kind of injustice, racism, separation, and lack of freedom are radically challenged when we share in the body and blood of Christ” (II, 20). In the eucharist, there should be a commemoration of injustices, racism, separation, and lack of freedom, because leaving it behind would mean “inconsistent if we are not actively participating in this ongoing restoration of the world’s situation and the human condition” (II, 20). This would also mean that the participants of the Lord’s Supper should and must against anything that challenge God’s reconciliation and love to the whole world, and also among brothers and sisters. Reconciliation among brothers and sisters must be made first before coming to the Lord’s Table. Through the memorial in eucharist, the active communion feels the unique but real presence of Christ, “Jesus said over the bread and wine of the eucharist: “This is my body….this is my blood…” what Christ declares is true, and this truth is fulfilled every time the eucharist is celebrated. The Church confesses Christ’s real, living, and active presence in the eucharist” (II, 13).

The document notes that in this memorial of the real presence of Christ in the communion recognizes that the liturgical rites embrace the “solidarity in the eucharistic communion of the body of Christ, and responsible for one another and the world (in the mutual forgiveness of sins; the sign of peace; intercession for all; the eating and drinking together; the taking of the elements to the sick and those in prison or the celebration of the eucharist with them” (II, 21). The celebration of the eucharist is meant to transform the community into a servant community, just as Christ the servant. There is a direct connection between the eucharistic communion of the body of Christ and being responsible for one another. One of the means of responsibility noted down here is the mutual forgiveness of sins. The solidarity of the eucharist demands a mutual forgiveness. A mutual forgiveness presupposes that there is the people who are being forgiven and the forgiver. The document does not explore much on this, however, the restoration of the world demands forgiveness. This can be experienced in the sharing of the Lord’s Table, the remembrance of Christ, and through it, the forgiveness of sins for those who had confess being in the same body of Christ.
The eucharist offered God’s grace, coming as a memorial of the Sacrifice offered once and for all for the salvation of the whole world, and being given in the power of the Spirit of the new times inaugurated by the resurrection of Christ, overflows the celebrating community and even of the church. Based on this statement, Tillard says, “Implicit in this grace is care for the world, the commitment of the will to the transformation of this world into the world which God wills, and therefore the disappearance of injustice, war, hatred, exploitation and the sources of these evils.”

In other words, through the remembrance of Christ in the eucharist, we should become a community of transformation of the world into God’s will.

3. 5 The Lord’s Supper as a Remembrance of Sins
3. 5. 1 The Lord’s Supper as Act of Confession

We have seen that the idea of remembrance in the Lord’s Supper is not a passive memorial. One of the functions of the eucharist is a foundation for pluralism in keeping memory of the people. This memorial for the people means that the people should know and recognize themselves before coming to the table of the Lord. This is where the act of confession comes. Gustaf Allen thinks that the Lord’s Supper also contains the idea of a confession of what has been happening to one’s life. The Lord’s Supper has the character of a confession. In the connection of the memorial in Sacrament and God’s victorious love, he says, “The Lord’s Supper as an in memoriam celebration brings the faithful back to “that night in which he was betrayed.” Participation in this memorial feast has therefore, a character of confession.”

This command of remembering in the end of the feast at the Lord’s Supper contains the aspect of memorial. The memorial in the Lord’s Supper makes one thinks and reflects of the past, and it was brought back in the Lord’s Supper. What happened will be brought again to mind in remembrance. The memorial that takes place must be celebrated in the means of God’s grace, by bringing forward and experiencing again God’s love. This means, the remembrance that happens in the Lord’s Supper is not a passive remembering, it is an active memorial of God’s redemption.

Allen explains further what he means by the character of confession. He says that the Lord’s Supper is actually an act of confession. It is not only an oral confession; there are also confessional acts such as that of the Lord’s Supper. He says, “This act is a confession which is concerned with the inner personal life and declares the confessor desires to belong to the Lord’s Supper.….if in this connection we speak of being “worthy and well prepared,” this “worthiness” and “preparation” consist only in this: that we are willing to have God judge our unworthiness.”

This will be connected with the self-examination process in the presence of God.

Mary Anne Coate seems to agree with the idea of confession within the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. She says, “The Eucharist or great thanksgiving stands as a remembrance and re-enactment of the redemptive work of Christ ‘through whom we are freed from the slavery of sin’. As such it includes – as do all public services – prayers of penitence and confession and the proclamation of absolution…the service reiterates the truth of our human condition that we cannot live up to the ideal of living without sin.
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Confession and forgiveness are, as it were, routine parts of our relationship with God.

Confession and forgiveness form a process that requires the taking of personal responsibility in the knowledge – as far as possible – of what has gone wrong and what has gone into the situation. The service of the eucharist demands confession as part of our relationship with God.

From the meal that is present, the presence of Jesus is not merely remembered, but it becomes a real presence through the remembrance. The remembrances are thus the medium for the holy reality of Jesus Christ, and in this reality the life of the spirit is quickened and revived. What does it mean for the memorial of the eucharist? Wainwright suggests that the forgiveness of sins means that the eucharist is approached with repentance. He says,

“The condemnation of sin which the divine justice demands have been carried out in the death of Jesus, in which Father and Son cooperated for the sake of man’s salvation. It is therefore clearly the will of the Father, and of Jesus the savior that men should be acquitted. The only condition is (in Johannine terminology) to believe in the Son and in the One who sent Him (John 3:18; 5:24) – which includes recognition that the death of Jesus was the divine condemnation of all sin, a recognition manifested in repentance for one’s own sin. The penitent believer is justified, acquitted; and at every eucharist the divine acquittal is pronounced that will be heard at the last assize.”

Remembering Christ and entering the table of the new covenant means a self-identification and the confession of sins. The call of confession is made clear when Paul warns the people who come to the table in an “unworthy” manner (1 Cor. 11:27 f.). People should check whether she/he is worthy to come to the table of the Lord. This means one must reconcile first with her/himself, their neighbor, and with God before coming to the table. To be able to reconcile means to remember and to confess sins and guilt.

3. 5. 2 The Lord’s Supper as a Reconciliation Table

When brothers and sisters are in dispute, how can the eucharist become the table of reconciliation? In the past, there are many stories of disputation in church that has made each group believed that the eucharist should be celebrated only by those in harmony with one another, and therefore excluding those who against them, or worse, both groups will have a separate eucharist. The reason used is that only they who are already at peace with their brothers and sisters may celebrate the eucharist together before God, “Therefore, if you are offering your gift at the altar and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before
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the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother, then come and offer your gift (Matt. 5:23 f.).”

When brothers and sisters continued celebrating the communion separately, because of their dispute, they actually mark the disunity of God’s people. This is because the eucharist too expresses the unity of the people. Reconciliation must be made between the conflicting sides before they come before the Lord. Wainwright says,

“Common participation in the one eucharist must be allowed to promote reconciliation among the opposing groups. The Eucharist’s value as expression will not be entirely lost, for it will express both the measure of unity that still holds the two parties together and also the will to reconciliation that already exists in those who seek fellowship at the Lord’s table even with their contemporary adversaries. But more important will be the fact that common participation in the one eucharist will allow the Lord creatively to bring us closer to the perfect peace and unity that will mark the final kingdom.”

In the light of eschatological purpose, Wainwright sees that the Lord’s invitation is to all penitents among his sinning people to gather up in the eucharist and receive his forgiveness for sins that have led to disunity filled them through his transforming presence with a uniting love. Further, he says, “Those who then, like the reneges in the parable of the Great Supper, refuse his invitation are excluding themselves, and may be pre-enacting their own final judgment at the hands of a Lord whose offer of salvation they spurned.” Reconciliation must be made in order to celebrate the eucharist.

However, how could the victim and the perpetrator come together to the table of the Lord? What if the perpetrator would not admit her/his guilt against the victim? What if the victim already reconcile with her/himself and not being able to reconcile with the perpetrator because they would not admit their guilt? What kind of forgiveness will be made if there is only one side that offers it? How much is the eucharist helps the victim? Looking from the perspective of the oppressed, Tissa Balasuriya says,

“We have to reflect from the position of the oppressed. We have to ask ourselves how much the Eucharist helps in our liberation. The Eucharist was meant to be a symbol, a commemoration and a participation in Jesus’ liberative action. But today, when it is allied to domination, its impact is toward preserving the status quo. Those who are oppressed as workers and marginalized groups in our own countries feel this even more; or at least suffer from it…. Our concern is with a total reorientation of Christianity to become a liberating power and not an ally of oppression. We have to ask these questions precisely because the Eucharist is central to the Christian community.”

This argumentation of Balasuriya obviously comes from her woman, Roman Catholic background. However, it is true that the Lord’s Supper should be a memorial of Jesus’ liberative action, which takes sides on the victim. The active participation of the people in Lord’s Table and the act of confession should take place before anyone enters the Lord’s Supper. This is the place where the Lord’s Supper will take side on
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the victim and becomes a liberating power, because it demands confession and repentance from the perpetrator to be able to enter the communion and receives the guarantee for forgiveness of sins.

3.5.3 The Lord’s Supper and Forgiveness of Sins

What does the connection between the Lord’s Supper and the forgiveness of sins? Between the four stories available on the Lord’s Supper (in the account of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul), only Matthew puts the saying that “the blood of the covenant, is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins.” This is a strong emphasis that is not available in the other accounts.

In Matthew 26:28, the blood of the covenant was told to be poured for the forgiveness of sins. There seems to be a parallel between the memorial and forgiveness of sins in the Lord’s Supper. This could mean that the Lord’s Supper can be seen as a memorial of Christ who died and gave the atonement of sins. The atonement of sins in this context is the result of Jesus’ unique act of sacrifice on the cross, and this could also mean that the Lord’s Supper has a memorial aspect of that sacrificial act on the cross.

M. Eugene Boring noted that the forgiveness of sins was one of the six main distinctive changes to the Markan meaning. The whole action by Jesus was related to “the forgiveness of sins”, the identical words dropped from Mark’s description of John’s baptism (Mark 1:4). Forgiveness is related to Jesus’ covenant-renewing death. Boring says that Jesus’ primary mission is the forgiveness of sins (1:21; 9:1-7). Forgiveness is accomplished by Jesus’ death, in terms of the sacrifice that seals the bond between God and the covenant people (cf. Exod. 24:8; Isa 53:12; but see Matt. 9:2). Matthew described Jesus’ death as replacing the sacrificial blood of the old covenant law. The death of Jesus was linked with the suffering of the servant Isaiah (cf. Isa. 53:12) and with the new covenant prophecy of Jeremiah (31:34). That is why Jesus’ words were connected with Isaiah 53, because without them the Eucharistic words of Jesus would remain incomprehensible.

Jesus saying on the Lord’s Supper can be interpreted that Jesus understood his position as the Passover lamb that has to be sacrificed. Jeremias argued that Jesus must have thought about the atoning effect of his death. He says that every death has an atoning power, even animals and criminals who repent at the end of his/her life. An innocent death has an atoning power for other. Jeremias says that this is what Jesus has in mind when he explains the meaning of his death, “His death is the vicarious death of the suffering servant, which atones for the sins of the many, the peoples of the world, which ushers in the beginning of the final salvation and which effects the new covenant with God.” This means that Jesus death has the atoning power for the sins of others.
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Further, Thurian thinks that the writer of the letter of Hebrews has considered the offerings in the Old Testament as a memorial of sin without the possibility that there is an aspect of the atonement. It is purely a memorial of sins; because the one time offering made by Jesus’ sacrificial act has atone the sins once and forever for God’s people. As the offerings of animals in the Old Testament reminded the people of their sins before God, the Lord’s Supper is also a unique memorial and sacrament of the sacrificed Jesus, which reminds the people who believe the forgiveness of sins through the blood of Christ.

The saying that Matthew’s include is not surprising since he has stress much on the fulfillment and new hope for present time and the future in the action and saying of Jesus (Matt. 1:23; 2:6, 15, 17, 23; 4:14, etc.). It is possible that Matthew add the stress on the forgiveness of sins in the saying of Jesus, nevertheless den Heyer suggests that Matthew must have really felt the action of Jesus in the adding of the Jesus’ words in the Lord’s Supper. This is probably because writer has seen the connection between the suffering servant and Israel sin’s which has already proclaimed by the prophet: “But he was pierced for our transgressions, he was crushed for our iniquities; the punishment that brought us peace was upon him, and by his wounds we are healed (Isaiah 53:5)…. Therefore I will give him a portion among the great, and he will divide the spoils with the strong, because he poured out his life unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors. For he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors (Isaiah 53:12).”

Matthew was fully aware of his writing by adding the saying “for forgiveness of sins” in the proclamation of the Lord’s Supper. He has a different opinion with the other Synoptic Gospels’ writers by not stating John the Baptist’ baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins (see Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3). Matthew seems to think that the forgiveness of sins can only be connected with Jesus Christ. In the beginning of his gospel, he speaks about how the angel came to Joseph and speaks, “She (read: Mary) will give a birth to a son and you are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins (Matt. 1:21).” Matthew has already stressed that Jesus come for the forgiveness of sins and it is not surprising when he stress the same theme again in the institution of the Lord’s Supper.

As noted in the BEM report, the eucharist nourished the hope of the forgiveness of sins for the baptized member of the body of Christ. The eucharist is a sacrament of hope, where the forgiveness of sins achieved through the sacrificial act of Christ, which has happened once and for all, through the reconciliation of people with their neighbor and God the Father. We are justified sinners who receive the gift of forgiveness in the memorial of Jesus. Therefore, it is essential for the people to be reconciled before coming to the table of remembrance. The account noted by Matthew is very important in the connection with the idea of forgiveness of sins in the Lord’s Supper. The eucharist is the offering of God which comes as a memorial and being given in the power of the Spirit, which guarantee the hope for the forgiveness of sins.
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3.6 Conclusion

There are differences in the use of the verb ‘remember’ as zkr in the Old Testament and anamnesis in the New Testament. In the New Testament the use of ‘remember’ are mostly in the normal meaning of the word, which are to recall in mind, to consider, to remember for good, to remember in a way which will benefit the person concerned in some way or other, to be mindful of, to affect one’s behavior, to mention. However, there are also other meanings derived from the word such as to mention in prayer, to proclaim, to believe, and to confess.

The idea of remembrance in the New Testament will soon lead us to the institution of the Lord’s Supper which was celebrated to remember Jesus. The order to remember in the Lord’s Supper is the account that Jesus instituted himself. Anamnesis is the heart of the eucharist where Jesus is being present through the Lord’s Supper in the hearts and minds of the church. It is the source of renewal between the Church and God. This single past event has been remembered and brought back to the present as an identity of baptized member of the church to the future. It is a gift of God, in Christ, and through the Holy Spirit where Christians receives the gift of salvation through the communion that Christ institutes himself.

The eucharist is not a whole new tradition that Jesus creates; it is indeed a continuation of the remembrance done in the Passover meal. The past deliverance of Israel is brought back to the present by the present redemption act by Christ and they are to be remembered for the future. Jesus is the paschal lamb that is to be sacrificed on the cross, and his sacrifice is a unique one-time event that works forever.

The remembrance in the Lord’s Supper is not merely a passive remembrance; it has the character of confession and reconciliation. It demands confession as a self-examination whether one is worthy to come to the table and be reconciled with God and her/his neighbor. Confession presupposes remembrance of one-self and to keep in mind that only through reconciliation with the other, one can come the table and receive the communion with the Lord. Forgiveness will be achieved through the sacrificial act of Christ, which has happened once and for all, through the reconciliation of people with their neighbor and God the Father. The eucharist is a memorial of Christ given in the power of the Spirit, which guarantees God’s forgiveness.
Chapter 4
Conclusion

As we have seen from the previous chapters, the topic of theology of remembrance is an important subject to deal seriously within the theme of forgiveness and reconciliation. Remembering does not merely mean to recall something in the past to one’s mind, it is actually to have a hold on your identity and your future as well. In the situation where trauma has hurt the people, individually and collectively, forgiveness is an important step to take to be able to achieve a real reconciliation. This is where remembrance takes its part in forgiveness and reconciliation: one must remember to be able to forgive. To forgive means to be able to remember what needs to be forgiven. Therefore, to remember is an essential factor in forgiveness and reconciliation.

Conflicts do happen in churches too. Because conflicts that produced trauma were also happened in the church, the main question of this research becomes important, what are the biblical and theological aspects of remembrance in the context of forgiveness and reconciliation as a way of healing trauma? Does remembering really have a theological aspect in it? How can the church deal with the issue theologically?

We have seen that there are indeed theological aspects of remembering. In the Old Testament, to remember means to remind men of God’s saving action towards them and to stay faithful to the covenant. The theme of remembrance in the theology of the Old Testament enables Israel to have a hold on their identity as God’s chosen people. In addition, especially within the theme of remembrance and forgiveness, the Old Testament is actually a book of remembrance of Israel sins and God’s grace, which keeps the record of Israel sins, how they remember their sins and ask for God’s forgiveness.

There is a repeated pattern of how remembrance is used in the relation of God and Israel. Israel forgetfulness is connected with their disobedience towards the covenant. When God remembers Israel’s sin, it is usually followed by punishment. After facing God’s punishment, Israel will admit their iniquities and confess their sins. Their confessions will consist a good remembrance of what they have actually done in the past, not merely their wrong actions in their generations, but also from the generations before them. When God forgives them, God remembers their sins no more. Despite the repeated pattern, one thing is important to note, Israel remembers what they have done in the past. The idea of remembrance in relationship with forgiveness of sins is clearly important in the theology of the Old Testament.

There is a continuation of the idea of remembrance that is in the Old Testament with the New Testament, especially in the institution of the Lord’s Supper. The Lord’s Supper is a unique event, which was instituted by Jesus himself to remember him. Remembrance is the heart of the eucharist where Jesus is being present and remembered. However, the eucharist is not a whole new tradition that Jesus creates; it is actually a continuation of the remembrance done in the Passover meal. The past deliverance of Israel is brought back to the present by the present redemption act by Christ and they are to be remembered for the future. Jesus is the paschal lamb that is to be sacrificed on the cross, and his sacrifice is a unique one-time event that works forever.
As we have seen in the previous chapter, the remembrance in the Lord’s Supper is not merely a passive remembrance; it has the character of confession and reconciliation. Just like when Israel confessed their sins, the Lord’s Supper demands a confession as a self-examination whether one is worthy to come to the table and be reconciled with God and her/his neighbor. Confession presupposes remembrance of one-self and to keep in mind that only through reconciliation with the other, one can come the table and receive the communion with the Lord. Forgiveness will be achieved through the sacrificial act of Christ, which has happened once and for all, through the reconciliation of people with their neighbor and God the Father. This is where the aspects of theology of remembrance as a way towards forgiveness of sins and true reconciliation play an important role within the Lord’s Supper.

In sum, the idea of remembrance has a very strong theological root in the bible. It is in fact a way towards a real forgiveness and reconciliation, to God or to fellow human. Forgiveness demands a self-knowledge of one’s own guilt, so that she/he would be able to recall her/his past iniquities and remorse from it. Confession of sins has an important role in the remembrance of one’s sin to be able to ask for real forgiveness.

We shall now come back to the idea that raises this issue. The author’s motivation to write this topic was the conflict that was happened in HKBP in 1992-1998. The churches decision to left the problem behind as if it was really solved was now questionable. Is it really better for the church to forget the past trauma rather than remembering it and to talk about it? What should the church do in dealing with the trauma of the past conflict? What should this research suggest?

The author would say that remembrance could be a better way than silence. It is indeed difficult to say who is right and wrong when the role of the perpetrator and the victim is somehow less clear-cut as it is in the case of the Apartheid with the black people; and the Nazi with the Jews. However, the story-telling community would be able to make both conflicting sides hear what the other want to say about themselves. The act of remembering by the two conflicting sides would make both sides aware of the other side’s story. That is why the church should not kept silence about it and start talking about it in the spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation.

This act of remembrance towards forgiveness and reconciliation has a strong biblical foundation. To be forgiven means to confess one’s past iniquities and to remember what is need to be forgiven. The church should not be afraid to remember her past guilt that has resulted deep trauma within the congregation. Rather, because of the strong biblical foundation of the theology of remembrance towards forgiveness and reconciliation, the church should be able to talk about it.

However, there are much more to be done before we can draw up the conclusion on how the church should deal with their remembrance towards their traumatic past conflict. This research is actually a starting point of a bigger research that follows next. How can a theology of remembrance apply to the forgiveness and reconciliation in the case of HKBP? What are the aspects that involved in the remembrance of the past? How are the congregations actually remembering their trauma? How can we approach this matter if it was to be applied in the HKBP case? A string of questions rises, in need to be answered.

As a reflection, the author felt that there are a lot more to be done. What the author has done is only a small contribution towards an ongoing discussion on this topic. This is the motivation that kept the author well spirited to go for the next research. Forgiveness and reconciliation are essentially important, especially within the body of Christ. Remembrance is a way towards real forgiveness and reconciliation.
even though it is not as easy as it seems. Yes, it is difficult to remember our past, either as victims or perpetrators. We don’t like to talk about the hurt in the past because it is too painful for us to bear. However, we should keep one thing in our mind that it is human who forget, but God will not forget. God remembers.
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