Eucharistic theology
Some untapped resources

Thomas Finger
Evanston, Illinois

Aeons ago, when I attended seminary in Massachusetts, Boston-area theological schools announced one of their first cooperative courses. How exciting, I thought, to study with Episcopalians, Catholics, Orthodox, and others! But then I learned that the subject was the Eucharist. How sad, I sighed, that they didn't select something important! I didn't take the course.

Though I was not Mennonite then, my attitude was like many Mennonites'. I simply couldn't imagine how important the Lord's Supper was in some traditions. Years later, when I first took Catholic eucharistic theology seriously, I was shocked. All that Catholics have written on the subject might fill a library. In contrast, only one scholarly book on the Lord's Supper in Anabaptism even exists.[1]

Mennonite attitudes

Why have Mennonites reflected so little on the supper's theology? Perhaps because, until recently, they paid little attention to the supper's practice. In a sense, this is fitting. Theology normally arises from a desire to articulate and examine what is already occurring in the church's life. But many Mennonite suppers offer little to examine. Many are still tacked on, at infrequent regular or irregular intervals, to services disconnected from them—and held at all because, well, Jesus commanded it.

What Catholics have written on eucharistic theology might fill a library. In contrast, only one scholarly book on the Lord's Supper in Anabaptism exists.

Mennonites may also have avoided eucharistic theology because it has engendered endless speculation and conflict. Its major question, at least in the West, has been: how is Christ present in the supper? Answers have been of three main types, or combinations thereof:

in the elements (bread and wine), in the verbal formulas of institution, in the recipient's faith. The first answer tends to construe this presence as a metaphysical substance. The second emphasizes correct ritual form. The third answer analyzes the relationship between the individual communicant's subjective faith and the ceremony's objective essence. For some theologies, this essence is not metaphysical but Jesus' historical crucifixion. It is often said that such a "memorial" view was the chief Anabaptist understanding. All three approaches profess that Christ's presence is dynamic and transforming. Yet each renders it fairly fixed and static, usually in abstruse language. It is hardly surprising that Mennonites, who emphasize the active life of concrete obedience, have shown little interest in eucharistic theology.

Ironically, however, Mennonite neglect of the supper's theology and practice has often rendered our own observances of it rather static. Many congregations "celebrate" it in routine, unthinking fashion, with no real rationale (other than "Jesus commanded it, so we've always done it"). Though Mennonites rightly stress the gospel's ethical dimensions, they sometimes minimize its other aspects and reduce their faith to little else.

Theology normally arises from a desire to articulate and examine what is already occurring in the church. But many Mennonite suppers offer little to examine. Many are tacked on to services, and held at all because, well, Jesus commanded it.

Recently, however, many Mennonites have been finding their worship life shallow. Their growing desire for richer celebration corresponds with greater emphasis on the aesthetic and emotional aspects of worship, and indeed of life in general. Moreover, concern for more meaningful experience of the supper is connected with the rising interest in spirituality. It is no accident that this second issue of *Vision* follows an inaugural issue on spirituality. I will propose that in the Lord's Supper a major, though largely untapped, source of spiritual nourishment already exists among us.

To elucidate this, I will first consider some insights from sixteenth-century Anabaptism. I will then show how similar notions have been given helpful contemporary expression—perhaps surprisingly—in Catholicism. I will close with suggestions for our communion practice.

Anabaptist memorialism?

It is often said or implied that sixteenth-century Anabaptists understood the Lord's Supper chiefly as a memorial of Jesus' crucifixion.[2] To be sure, they did regard this dimension as important. Further, they all rejected the Catholic notion of transubstantiation, the belief that the substances of the bread and wine actually change into the substances of Christ's body and blood. Anabaptists often insisted that the bread is simply bread, the wine simply wine, and reverence for the elements simply idolatry. Since Christ's presence had been conceived for centuries in terms of transubstantiation, it is often supposed that in rejecting this theory, Anabaptists rejected his presence in communion altogether, or greatly minimized it.

Anabaptists often insisted that the bread is simply bread, the wine simply wine, and reverence for the elements simply idolatry.

The memorial emphasis was indeed strong among Swiss Anabaptists, especially in the thought of Balthasar Hubmaier, who often insisted that because Jesus' risen body is in heaven, it could not possibly be in the supper.[3] Even here, though, I find the most pronounced and distinctly Anabaptist emphasis to be not memorial but communal. Hubmaier movingly portrayed how, when Christians remember together how Jesus gave his body and blood for them, they are also pledging to give themselves—body and blood, if need be—for each other.

Nonetheless, when we turn from Switzerland to Anabaptism's other main branches (South German/Austrian and Dutch), we find stress not only on the memorial and communal dimensions, but also on the living presence of the risen Jesus. Melchior Hoffman, for instance, affirmed that Christ

> *takes bread (just as a bridegroom takes a ring or a piece of gold) and gives himself to his bride with the bread (just as the bridegroom gives himself to his bride with the ring)…so that just as the bride eats a physical bread in her mouth and drinks the wine, so also through belief in the Lord Jesus Christ she has physically received and eaten the noble Bridegroom with his blood in such a way that the Bridegroom and the outpouring of his blood is [one]*

with hers…. She [is] in him and, again, he is in her, and they together are thus one body, one flesh, one spirit, and one passion.[4]

However one interprets this complex passage, the communicant clearly is not simply remembering Jesus' death, but is also experiencing intense personal union with him.

Yet while virtually all Anabaptists outside Switzerland affirmed Christ's presence in some way, in their reaction against the doctrine of transubstantiation they described this presence as spiritual. Even the Dutch (including Melchior Hoffman), who mentioned partaking Christ's body and blood, understood these as "heavenly flesh," so spiritualized that it rendered dubious any connection with physical reality.

John Rempel, in *The Lord's Supper in Anabaptism*, argues that nearly all Anabaptists assumed, on the conceptual level, that an "ontological barrier" separated spirit from matter. This made it virtually impossible to conceive, intellectually, how spiritual communion with Christ could have any close connection with the supper's physical actions and elements. I will ask later how true this conceptual separation was to actual Anabaptist experience of the supper, and indeed of Christian life as a whole.

In any case, over the next generations Anabaptism's heirs continued to stress the supper's communal dimension. Yet their awareness of God's Spirit, in the supper and elsewhere, faded. And since they generally continued to assume the spirit-matter disjunction, Jesus, whose body was in heaven, could vanish from the supper. It became increasingly possible to regard not Christ, but the church itself, through its active remembrance and its sharing, as the supper's main agent, and even its primary sacramental reality. Hubmaier, in fact, had already sketched such an understanding, affirming that the supper had to do "completely and exclusively with fraternal love."[5] North American Mennonites were most deeply influenced by the Swiss perspective, articulated by Hubmiaer.

Pilgram Marpeck

Assuming the spirit-matter tension, Hubmaier resolved it one-sidedly, by effectively reducing the Lord's Supper to a physical,

communal-ethical event. An opposite resolution was possible: if spiritual reality is far removed from matter, why bother with physical ceremonies at all? Yet Anabaptists rejected this. They insisted on water baptism at the risk of their lives. And they considered proper celebration of the supper essential to restoring a true church, however much their heirs minimized this. Nonetheless, when asked *why* these sacraments were so crucial, Anabaptists seldom said more than "because Jesus commanded them."

Pilgram Marpeck, however, probed for a deeper rationale. Unlike most theologians of his day, he emphasized that baptism and the supper are *activities*. He stressed "not the element…but the activity, …not water, bread, and wine…but baptism and the Supper."[6] Marpeck also insisted that God communicates the Spirit through matter, and wills that inner reality be expressed through outward actions. In other words, he rejected any ontological barrier, and elaborated this intertwining more comprehensively than any other Anabaptist.

In the Lord's Supper God draws a body of people into the continuing reality of Jesus' concrete suffering and humanity. Materiality is so basic to this reality that the physical actions and elements that draw us into it actually become part of it.

Marpeck not only affirmed, with all Anabaptists, that true faith expresses itself in concrete actions. He also pointed out that God's character and salvation were revealed only through Jesus' physical teachings and activities. Further, the church, for Marpeck, forms an extension of Jesus' physical humanity. This means that inner, spiritual reality continues to flow through its outward, material actions—including its sacraments.

Marpeck found other religious groups upholding one of these without the other. For him, Catholic and Protestant ceremonies—infant baptism, above all—were outer forms devoid of inner reality. Yet Spiritualists, who eliminated sacraments altogether, were seeking inner experience apart from outward expressions. Marpeck protested that authentic sacraments must include both physical activities and spiritual appropriation.

He did not simply mean, as some Protestant theologians stressed, that the individual communicant's subjectivity must be

connected with some ceremonial object. For this event involves not simply the response of individuals, but that of the whole congregation. Further, this response is not merely human. It is energized by God, working within the communicants as Holy Spirit. Moreover, since the ceremonial actions are expressions of Jesus' continuing humanity, God, who is working inwardly as Spirit, is simultaneously working outwardly as Son. In other words, the Lord's Supper (like baptism), for Marpeck, is basically a Trinitarian operation. Spiritual reality is channeled, as it had been in Jesus' history, through material actions and objects. It then draws participants into the transforming divine energy flowing among Father, Son, and Spirit.[7]

The Lord's Supper, for many Anabaptists, was not simply a communal experience or a memorial of Jesus' death—though it surely involved both. The risen Christ was experienced as actively present, not by bypassing material reality and community relationships but precisely through these.

Marpeck soared beyond static theologies of the supper, concerned with elements, formulas, and subjectivity, to portray it as dynamic *co-witness*.[8] God as Spirit co-witnesses with God as Son. The congregation's actions co-witness with these divine activities. The communicants' movements co-witness with their experiences, and each communicant's movements and experiences with the others'. Finally, the material elements themselves co-witness with the spiritual dynamism.

In fact, Marpeck asserted, when bread and wine function in this context, they are no longer simply signs, but "essence."[9] Such a statement went well beyond memorialism, and even beyond ordinary Anabaptist affirmations of Christ's spiritual presence. Yet Marpeck did insist that this presence is spiritual; the elements could not actually be Christ's body and blood. Marpeck, however, was trying to affirm that when Christ—indeed, the entire Trinity—acts in an authentic supper, its material components cannot be merely secondary or disposable. For the supper not only *symbolizes* but itself *is* an occasion when Spirit takes up matter as an indispensable means of conveying spiritual reality.

To be sure, God's Spirit is and can be present in many ways. Yet the Lord's Supper marks a special kind of presence. Here God

draws a body of people into the continuing reality of Jesus' concrete suffering and humanity. Materiality is so basic to this reality that the physical actions and elements that draw us into it actually become part of it. Though they are not transubstantiated into something else, they form aspects of the supper's "essence," without which it could not be what it truly is. Any ontological barrier between matter and spirit is bridged, as it was in Jesus' earthly life.

Contemporary Catholicism

I have maintained that the Lord's Supper, for many Anabaptists, was not simply a communal experience or a memorial of Jesus' death—though it surely involved both. In the supper the risen Christ was experienced as actively present, not by bypassing material reality and community relationships but precisely through these.

I believe that when it is properly practiced and understood, the supper can help satisfy the spiritual longings of many Mennonites today. Yet Mennonites seldom reflect on this. Is it possible, then, that another tradition might help? What about the one whose eucharistic reflection has been most extensive: Roman Catholicism? Are there resources for Mennonites in this tradition, even though Anabaptists criticized it sharply? Perhaps surprisingly, Mennonite World Conference is now engaged in official dialogue with the Vatican. So let us see.

Since Vatican II, Catholic theology has stressed that the congregation, not the priest, is the supper's primary celebrant.[10] Priests formerly officiated with their backs to communicants, but now they face the congregation. Priests usually presided at a raised altar, but now often at a table around which all can gather and share Christ's peace. Practices like these envision Christ more fully present amid the congregation.

Today's Catholic theology also affirms Jesus' presence throughout the service, not only at the table but also in the liturgy of the Word which precedes it.[11] And at the table, Jesus does not wait to emerge suddenly at the formula of consecration ("this is my body").

Current Catholic theologians also insist, sounding uncannily like Marpeck, that "*the sacraments are actions, not things*."[12] "The

original eucharistic symbols" are not bread and wine, but "*breaking the bread and sharing the cup*."[13] Consequently, many such theologians are critical of the doctrine of transubstantiation. They find it, at best, "a good answer to a bad question."[14] The broad question was, how is Christ present? But specifically, that meant, in what *things* (bread and wine) is Christ present, and through what changes in them?

Current Catholic theologians insist that "the sacraments are actions, not things." They find the doctrine of transubstantiation, at best, "a good answer to a bad question."

As mentioned above, Christ's presence has been the foremost topic in western eucharistic theology. Mennonites have shied away from this theology, at least in part because its theories seemed abstruse and irrelevant. But what if these theories arose largely from asking the wrong questions, from seeking Christ's presence in the elements or formulas or subjectivity? Might other ways of expressing this presence emerge if the supper is first understood as a *communal activity?* And might these aid those Mennonites who desire more profound experiences of the supper, and indeed of spiritual reality?

I think so, and here again I think Catholic reflection can help. The issue of Christ's presence perhaps arises most vividly when we consider the words that often accompany the elements: "This is the body of Christ." "This is the blood of Christ." If "is" resounds as bread and wine are presented, might it not seem possible that these things themselves are Christ? And if one wonders how this could be, might one not plausibly scrutinize these things, and search for some alteration in their substance? In contrast, if we focus on the overall eucharistic *actions*, we can think of objects changing in another way. They can be said to change when their *function* alters greatly—particularly when they begin to *signify* something quite different. That is, the change in the elements might be not trans-substantiation, but trans-signification.

To explain this, some Catholics draw on the illustration Melchior Hoffman used: a wedding ring. When a ring sits in a jeweler's shop, it is merely a circular object. But when it is offered in the context of engagement and marriage, it becomes a special token of a person's love and commitment, even of that entire person. As years pass, many additional events and commitments

become associated with the ring. Some people find that their wedding ring conjures up multiple impressions of their spouse, and can even make the spouse seem present.[15]

The same is true of other objects given to express special feelings or mark significant events. For many of us, a picture, a poem, a vase given by someone close calls that person to mind. Even years after we last saw them, even after they have died, such objects can bring back to us the whole relationship, and perhaps seem to bring that person back into our presence. In the physical sense, these objects do not really change. But after we have come to associate many profound experiences with them, can we really say that they have not changed in any way? Is a ring, at one's golden anniversary, the same in every respect as it was at the wedding? Has it not altered in the way it functions? In the meanings it conveys? In what it signifies?

Similarly, when bread and wine function to make Christ and his suffering present, and to draw whole communities into this presence, they are signifying something different from their usual signification. They change markedly, not in their substance but it what they do. They are taken up into a series of actions that connect them so intrinsically with this particular manner of Christ's presence that they help form, in Marpeck's words, the supper's "essence," without literally being Christ. Isn't this a change in what they, at the most important level, actually *are*?[16] As Jesus becomes present to his community, and the elements become so inseparably involved in this process, might we say that each one "is" him? Not because they change into him, but because they convey him? Because they are so directly connected with his coming that when they come, he comes?

In any case, while not all Catholics endorse the idea of transignification, it helps me understand how Jesus can be present in the supper, and so closely associated with its actions and elements that each element "is" him in some significant sense. This results, of course, not from any property of the elements, but because the risen Jesus is choosing to use them this way.

Worship implications

I am proposing, in short, that the Lord's Supper can provide profound occasions for encounter with and transformation by the

risen Christ. The supper need not be reduced to historical commemoration or communal solidarity, though it certainly includes these. I propose that theological reflection on Christ's presence in the supper, if it highlights activity and community, can enrich this encounter and transformation.

This implies, first, that Mennonites who search for a deeper spirituality already have one source of it close at hand. We should indeed explore the spiritual resources of other traditions. But we should not forget that the Lord's Supper is already ours. It has already been given to us (along with all Christians), as have rich Anabaptist insights, however little we remember them. Let us give much greater attention to what we—perhaps unthinkingly—already celebrate. Let us explore the many dimensions of this seemingly simple rite.

Mennonites who search for a deeper spirituality already have one source of it close at hand. We should indeed explore the spiritual resources of other traditions. But we should not forget that the Lord's Supper is already ours.

Second, since the risen Christ desires to be present among us throughout our worship, let us avoid tacking on the supper at the end. In all likelihood, the supper cannot become the focus of every service that includes it, especially if we begin observing it more often. But since the supper has many dimensions, we can briefly connect various features of any service with it. Even if a service's major theme lies elsewhere, we can design the whole to point in some way toward, and anticipate, this special kind of communion with our Lord and each other.

Third, in the theology I am sketching, Spirit is normally conveyed through matter and transforms it. This means that many more colors, shapes, sounds, movements, gestures, and objects than Mennonites have usually included can find a place in worship. While simplicity is a biblical value, plainness is not. (Mennonite worship in general stems chiefly from Swiss influence, which was quite plain.) Our world with all its beautiful, colorful variety was created to be the theater of God's glory. Though physical beauty can turn us from God, it was designed, and we can redesign it, to lead us back to God. The supper, as here sketched, promotes tasteful aesthetic worship.

This implies that the Anabaptists' conceptual barrier between spirit and matter conflicted with their experience and practice. Arnold Snyder argues that all Anabaptists insisted, in one way or another, that inner, spiritual reality must be expressed through outer, physical objects and actions—though they often elevated one over the other in theory and practice. I concur, and regard their intent to balance these as basic to Anabaptism, and to truly Anabaptist celebration of and reflection on the Lord's Supper.[17]

Fourth, Christ's communal presence suggests active congregational participation. In fact, since Christ is present in the way the elements *function*, "this" in "this is my body" probably indicates *sharing* the bread more than it indicates the bread itself.[18] Such active, corporate participation seems inconsistent with communicants simply receiving the elements from some presider(s). It seems more appropriate to pass and receive at least one element among themselves. "Laity" can, and perhaps should, participate in presiding functions, but only with careful preparation, consistent with the ceremony's dignity.

In the theology I am sketching, Spirit is normally conveyed through matter and transforms it. This means that many more colors, shapes, sounds, movements, gestures, and objects can find a place in worship.

Sharing the elements should be complemented by sharing mutual commitments, concerns, and Christ's peace. If some of these occur elsewhere in the service, they should be explicitly linked to the supper. However, despite this strong "horizontal" dimension, the supper's main agent is not the congregation (contra Hubmaier) but the risen Jesus. However meaningfully communicants interact with each other, the service should stress that all flows ultimately from him.

Fifth, though I am stressing Christ's presence, it should never be disconnected from remembering his cross. We do encounter the risen Jesus, but not as one distant from struggle and suffering, and we participate in the continuing reality of his crucifixion.

Further, as narrative theology shows, remembrance of a crucial event often brings the overarching story to mind. The cross, that is, can recall Jesus' life and teachings, and what brought about his death. We can visualize Jesus as a victim of the military government and religious establishment, as one who threatened

them by giving the downtrodden hope. Though such a remembrance resonates with Anabaptism, I have not found this articulated by Mennonites but by Catholics.[19]

While not all suppers will give priority to this concrete historical dimension, I advocate always repeating—not loosely paraphrasing—the words of institution, to establish significant connection with that history. And even if bread and wine have little significance in our culture, using them (and not, say, donuts and coffee) will remind us of the very different historical setting where our celebration originated.

Remembrance of a crucial event often brings the overarching story to mind. The cross can recall Jesus' life and teachings, and what brought about his death. We can visualize Jesus as a victim of a military government and religious establishment, as one who threatened them by giving the downtrodden hope.

Finally, should we announce: "This *is* Christ's body and blood"? If many communicants would understand this in a crude, literal, or quasi-magical sense, I would not. However, to say that the elements symbolize or remember Jesus or his cross often distances him from us. To be sure, Jesus was and is distinct from his community, both historically and at the Father's "right hand," as all Anabaptists affirmed. Even if the community is an extension of his humanity, he cannot simply be equated with it (nor did Marpeck do so).

Nonetheless, for those who often assume, even if subconsciously, that Jesus is distant, "This *is*" can be an invitation to expect him to be present, more fully, specifically, and joyously than they might begin to imagine. "This *is*" can invite people to open themselves fully to the Christ who wants to be more and more present in our lives, to transform us—individually and corporately—more and more. Yet "This is" should lead communicants simply to be open, not to expect some particular experience. For Christ comes in many ways. Yet we can be prepared to hope, to expect, to long to meet God in a ceremony that we already practice.

Notes

[1] John D. Rempel, *The Lord's Supper in Anabaptism: A Study in the Christology of Balthasar Hubmaier, Pilgram Marpeck, and Dirk Philips*, Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History, no. 33 (Waterloo and Scottdale: Herald Pr., 1993).

[2] See, for example, C. Arnold Snyder, *Anabaptist History and Theology* (Kitchener: Pandora Pr., 1995), 85–6; but note that Snyder does add the communal dimension (see p. 374). Despite my disagreement on this point, I largely concur with and greatly value Snyder's work.
[3] While virtually all Anabaptists agreed that Christ's body is in heaven, Hubmaier, following Zwingli, most sharply contrasted this with his being in the Eucharist. For many other Anabaptists, the two were not wholly opposed. For Hubmaier, God's Spirit could be in the supper, and since Christ's deity is omnipresent, it also could be in the supper, though Hubmaier scarcely mentioned this. While he found the risen Christ active in the preached Word, he otherwise stressed that Christ would remain in heaven until his Parousia.
[4] "The Ordinance of God," in *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers,* ed. George Hunston Williams and Angel M. Mergal (Philadelphia: Westminster Pr., 1957), 193–4. I cannot substantiate here the pervasiveness of the theme of Christ's presence in Dutch and South German/Austrian Anabaptism, but am doing so in my *A Contemporary Theology in Anabaptist Perspective* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Pr., forthcoming).
[5] "A Form for Christ's Supper" (1527) in *Balthasar Hubmaier, Theologian of Anabaptism*, Classics of the Radical Reformation, vol. 5, trans. and ed. H. Wayne Pipkin and John H. Yoder (Scottdale and Kitchener: Herald Pr., 1989). See Rempel, *The Lord's Supper in Anabaptism*, 48–9, 64–5.
[6] Johann Loserth, ed., *Pilgram Marbecks Antwort auf Kaspar Schwenckfelds Beurteilung des Buches der Bundesbezeugung von 1542* (Vienna: Carl Fromm, 1929), 137, cf. 453–6, 465. Cf. William Klassen and Walter Klaassen, trans. and ed., *The Writings of Pilgram Marpeck,* Classics of the Radical Reformation, no. 2 (Kitchener and Scottdale: Herald Pr., 1978), 170–1, 269, 277, 283.
[7] Klassen and Klaassen, *The Writings of Pilgram Marpeck,* 175–6, 184. Marpeck's Trinitarian expressions were not always consistent. For example, the Father working inwardly as Spirit and outwardly as Son (195–7) could be construed as modalism (cf. Rempel, *The Lord's Supper in Anabaptism,* 158–61). Yet Marpeck intended to express an orthodox view of the Trinity, despite his variations (cf. Finger, *A Contemporary Theology in Anabaptist Perspective*, chap. 7).
[8] Rempel, *The Lord's Supper in Anabaptism,* 120–8, 135–8, 150–2.
[9] Klassen and Klaassen, *The Writings of Pilgram Marpeck,* 195, cf. 196, 197; Loserth, *Pilgram Marbecks Antwort,* 114, 121, 124, 127, 456, 458.
[10] In liturgy, "full and active participation by all the people is the primary aim to be considered before all else" (Walter M. Abbott, ed., *The Documents of Vatican II* [New York: Guild Pr., 1966], 144). Some Catholic theologians, not unlike Hubmaier, take this to mean that "any liturgical celebration is in its total thrust horizontal" (Tad W. Guzie, *Jesus and the Eucharist* [New York: Paulist Pr., 1974], 155). "The church assembled to celebrate *is* Christ. The real mystery is that we ourselves are sacred" (Guzie, *The Book of Sacramental Basics* [New York: Paulist Pr., 1981], 62). Officially, however, the priesthoods of the laity and of the priests still "differ…in essence and not only in degree" (Abbott, *Documents of Vatican II,* 27).
[11] Joseph M. Powers, *Eucharistic Theology* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1967), 96–9.
[12] Guzie, *The Book of Sacramental Basics,* 31(Guzie's italics).
[13] Ibid., 34 (Guzie's italics).
[14] Ibid., 35.
[15] Powers, *Eucharistic Theology,* 166–7; cf. Hoffman: "a perky little bride, when she receives her engagement ring from her bridegroom, could speak to her childhood playmates and friends, showing it to them: Look here, I have my bridegroom Jack,

Nick, or Peter. Now those who hear such words and see the ring understand very well how the bride intends this kind of language, namely, that she does not mean that the ring is physically the bridegroom himself or that the bridegroom is physically contained in the ring but that she has with all her heart, spirit, and emotion received a bridegroom by virtue of his will, word, spirit, and intention" ("The Ordinance of God," in *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers*, ed. Williams and Mergal, 194–5).

[16] John Howard Yoder, who brilliantly discerned ethical implications almost everywhere, would apparently have disagreed. He claimed that Jesus, at the Last Supper, did not even introduce a ceremony, but simply made his followers' "*ordinary* partaking together of food" his memorial (*Body Politics: Five Practices of the Christian Community before the Watching World* [Nashville: Discipleship Resources, 1992], 16).

[17] Snyder, *Anabaptist History and Theology*, 134–8, 317–8, 346–7, 361–3, 372. Rempel, who stresses the "ontological barrier" in Anabaptist thinking, does not really disagree with Snyder, for Rempel often notes the inconsistency between this and more holistic Anabaptist intuitions.

[18] See Thomas N. Finger, *Christian Theology: An Eschatological Approach*, vol. 2 (Scottdale: Herald Pr., 1989), 339–42. Guzie concurs (*The Book of Sacramental Basics*, 34). See also Vernard Eller, *In Place of Sacraments: A Study of Baptism and the Lord's Supper* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 87–90, 106–9 (though I cannot concur with Eller's pejorative definition of sacraments).

[19] David Noel Power, *The Eucharistic Mystery: Revitalizing the Tradition* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1995), 304–16; Bernard J. Cooke, *Sacraments and Sacramentality* (Mystic, Conn: 23rd Pubns., 1983), 168–212; and Bernard J. Cooke, *The Future of the Eucharist: How a New Self-Awareness among Catholics Is Changing the Way They Believe and Worship* (New York: Paulist Pr., 1997), 26.