

JESUS DID NOT START THE EUCHARIST

The Christian Churches are convinced that Jesus instituted the Eucharist at the last supper but it is easy to prove that this is untrue.

The resurrection was the superlative event in the early Church. It was more important than the crucifixion. If Jesus had instituted the Eucharist he would have said: "This is my body that has been raised from the dead for you." If the Catholic doctrine is true that it is the risen body of Jesus that is in the Eucharist not the crucified one then this wording would definitely have been used.

The apostles did not expect Jesus to die cruelly and bloodily so there was no Last Supper as described in the New Testament. Following supper, John 16:17 says that when Jesus told the apostles that he would soon be leaving them and that soon after that they would see him again they were puzzled. They wouldn't have been if they had just been told at the Last Supper that Jesus' hours were numbered.

The Gospel of John has ancient strands of tradition in it so its omitting the Eucharist account is telling. He wrote his gospel to make people believe in Jesus and would not have left out something so important and essential to a real understanding of the gospel.

John 6 is not about the Eucharist though it uses the same symbolical devices. John would not have put in material that gives the false impression of being about the Eucharist but isn't unless he wanted to attack the Eucharist.

The Eucharist would have been an excuse for the Jews to accuse the Christians of idolatry so Jesus would not have started it. But then they might not have used the words that Jesus used like, "This is my body/blood".

Assuming the narrative of the supper Jesus had with his disciples as reported by Paul is authentic and not the work of a forger, the first Christian writer, the apostle Paul declared that he received the story of the Last Supper from the Lord Jesus (1 Corinthians 11:23). He said from the Lord Jesus and not from the Lord Jesus through the apostles so he meant it was revealed to him in an experience that would be an "inspired" flash of intuition at the very least. Some Christians say that he had to be told about it in a vision because he had never heard of it. For a religious Pharisee who persecuted and condemned the Christian Church to be unconscious of his victim's main ritual would not merely be wrong but impossible. Paul does not say who was present at the supper so it was no problem to him if the twelve apostles had never heard of it for he was not saying they were there. Paul was writing against heretics who denied the resurrection for they hated the body in this letter so Paul needed to prove them wrong by proving that Jesus said that his body was good for us when he created the Eucharist. But he gives no verification at all. Paul invented the Eucharist.

In Mark 14, Jesus gives the bread and wine to "them" which can only be the Twelve as it reveals earlier on. Luke 22:21 also makes it clear that Judas was given it. Jesus knew that he was planning to betray him – a great sin – so he would not have let him take it but waited until he left to administer them to the others. Judas was there when the gospel says Jesus had the time to celebrate the Eucharist. This proves that Jesus did not institute the Eucharist at all or at least that it cannot be proved he did. A story with an error like that is unreliable.

The early Church was plagued by heretics who insisted that Jesus was only and ever an angel, and not a man at all. When these people, the Docetists, had such success it seems that the Christians had a hard time proving that the Eucharist came from Jesus.

The Eucharist was a man-made rite.

Even if the Bible commanded the acting out of the last supper the rite has been corrupted by Christian inventions.

There is no justification for calling the rite the Eucharist a word that means thanksgiving. It might have been meant as a mournful sad memorial not as a rite of thanksgiving. It is no reply to say that Jesus gave thanks before he took the bread and cup for that is a separate thing - a different action. He was only saying grace. The Christians might reply that Jesus would want us to be more focused on his resurrection so we would do communion in a state of joy. But that does not stop us having ceremonies on Good Friday to be sad about Jesus and neither should it. The very term Eucharist is heresy. The Lord's Supper cannot be a joyful rite when it pictures and remembers somebody's blood being violently separated from his body.

It is also heresy to call the partaking of the bread and wine communion. Communion means something that unites you with God and with other people. Anybody can take communion and be a secret enemy of the Church and most Christians are enemies though they won't admit it so the unity is artificial. It doesn't really do anything for unity. Paul knew human nature too well and would have understood the bread and wine to picture unity in Heaven. Paul wrote that the Church practiced Agape meals. That is they all brought food and drink to share with one another and the food and drink was a memorial not a symbol of the body and blood of Jesus and pictured union with Jesus. This was not communion but symbolism of the oneness that should exist between God and his people and with one another.

Jesus stressed in the Sermon on the Mount that true children of God hide their virtue and pray in secret and there was no way he would have wanted his followers to be taking bread and wine to state that they are trying to be virtuous and worthy enough to receive it. Paul saying that partaking in sin was a sin of sacrilege completely contradicts Jesus and shows that Paul was inventing.

Jesus regarded everybody as sinful and said that nobody was good but God alone and that nobody could be trusted (Luke 16:10) and so would not have instituted transubstantiation for you have to be pure to partake of the sacrament. It would be a sin to take the body of your Lord and Saviour into your own body if you are full of sin and rebellious towards God. If he did he was another deceitful religion-monger.

The Bible never says that Jesus meant for the apostles to authorise the Church to carry on the rite. The obvious sense of, "Do this in memory of me", is, "You who remember me may do this to carry on my memory." Only those who knew Jesus then would have been asked to do the rite. There is no hint that it would have been a sin if they hadn't. Matthias being picked to replace Judas does not refute any of this because there is no reason to hold that the substitute apostle could have the right to do the rite for that was given to those who were at the supper and who knew Jesus well and nobody else.

CONCLUSION

Holy Communion is one of Christendom's many religious hoaxes. And yet the faith corrupter the Catholic Church added to the faith. It has founded its doctrines about Jesus turning bread and wine into his body and blood on that invention not to mention the idea that the sacrifice of Jesus on Calvary is repeated at Mass!