

NO CHANGE AT THE LAST SUPPER

Catholics say that the first time bread and wine became Jesus was at the last supper before his crucifixion. He turned the bread into his glorious risen body though it was not risen yet! And where did the blood come from for symbolically the cup shows it was all spilled for sinners? The risen Jesus had no blood as a magical being would not have needed blood!

If Jesus was going to something that the Church considers to be its core sacrament then why didn't he do it after his resurrection? Why do we not have, "Take this for this is my body which was crucified for you and is now risen." That matches the core Christian doctrine that Christian spiritual life and ethos is about the death and resurrection of Jesus above all things. Paul said they are the centre.

According to Matthew 26:26-29 at the last supper, Jesus took bread and said, "Take, eat; this is My body". He said over the cup, "This is My blood of the new covenant which is being poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins". The Bible translations differ about whether Jesus said his body/blood is being or will be given up. Whatever it is, and if he meant it literally then he turned the bread and wine into his pre-resurrection body which contradicts the Catholic doctrine that it is the glorious and semi-spiritual resurrected body of Christ that is really present in the Eucharist (page 22, *Is Jesus Really Present in the Eucharist?*). A dead Christ would be no longer Christ but would be his remains while the Church holds that Jesus promised his Church would "eat me" (John 6:57). Dead flesh and dead blood will not be used to feed us spiritually so they are not present in the Eucharist. Jesus would be more likely to give us his glorious and risen and living flesh and blood. If Rome is infallible when she proclaims the living Jesus to be our food, then the Eucharistic words of Jesus are heretical and she ought to consider excommunicating Christ.

Hans Kung wrote in *On being a Christian* that when Jesus used the words flesh and body to describe communion he would have meant it in the Hebrew understanding that flesh and body meant the entire person. So this is my body means this is me (page 234). But nobody ever used blood as an expression to represent their entire being! Today we use flesh and blood to mean entire people. We use the word flesh. But we do not use the word blood. Kung is wrong. Even if flesh or blood meant entire person, Jesus might still have used the expressions symbolically. Any words or expression can be given a symbolic sense.

The Catholic Church's best theological encyclopedia tells us that when Jesus said the bread was his body and the wine his blood the Semitic expression behind his reference to the blood indicated blood especially that resulted from a violent death so it is the pre-resurrection body of Jesus that is made present if anything is (page 451, *Encyclopedia of Theology*, Edited by Karl Rahner, Burns and Oates, London, 1977).

The Catholic Church is taking the words about it being the body or blood literally and ignoring the rest of the words which say it was the pre-resurrection body and blood. When the Church's own interpretation cannot work, the Mass must be contrary to the Bible.

The Church of Rome has a nerve to say that the words Jesus said over the bread and wine were meant literally when she only takes bits of them that way. We wonder if there is honesty in a person who takes, "This is My body", literally and the rest of the sentence non-literally. Jesus was talking figuratively when he said his piece over the wafer and cup. That the Church recites the entire words that Jesus used and can still fool the public is a warning about how dangerous and cultic religious faith is. It pollutes the reason. It warps it.

Roman apologists inform us that when Jesus stated, "This is My body", instead of, "This is symbolically my body", when there were about forty ways of saying this in the Greek language in which the gospels were written that this backs their doctrine that Jesus said that the bread was literally his body (*Radio Replies*, Vol 2, Question 768). Really? When I say of a drawing, "That is me", instead of saying that it is an image of me do I mean it literally?

The ex-priest Bart Brewer, argued that when Jesus said this is my body/blood he was speaking figuratively for he did not say *touto gignetai*, this has become, but *touto esti*, which means this symbolises. *Touto esti* simply means is. Despite this, Catholics argue that if Jesus meant the bread stands for his body this would have been made clear in the Greek. Not necessarily even if this could be right.

The Gospel of Matthew (and in Mark) Jesus says that the cup is the fruit of the vine after Roman Catholics say he said it became his blood. He says he will not drink it from now until the day he drinks new wine in the kingdom of the Father. There is nothing in Matthew that hints that the bread and wine literally become the body and blood of Jesus so that means that we ought to take Jesus literally when he calls the wine wine. This was in a gospel for Heaven's sake and nobody would

leave out such an important doctrine. There is no evidence that the gospels had the one author, God, or that they are to be read as one account so we should take it that Matthew denies transubstantiation even if another gospel affirms it. Remember, the fewer miracles you believe in the better so if the Bible has disagreements over transubstantiation the denial of it should be accepted as the correct position.

When Jesus says he will drink the new wine in the kingdom it is clear that he means wine for entertainment. So the wine in front of him is “old” wine or its shabby wine. It is not his sacred blood. This emphasises for us that it is real wine and not blood under the appearance of wine. Would Jesus look forward to drinking his own blood in the kingdom? No. Mark says that Jesus said this is my blood first and then said he wouldn’t drink it again until the kingdom. So did Jesus drink his own blood? If Mark believed what Catholics believe he wouldn’t have put that in his gospel for it would only encourage those who held that the bread and wine didn’t become Jesus. If he was that keen on putting it in he might have tried to explain it.

In Luke, Jesus at the start of supper gives a cup to his disciples. He tells them to share it and swears that he will not drink wine again until the kingdom of God comes. Then later he gives the bread and then he gives them a cup as before but this time he says it is the new covenant in his blood. It would make more sense if they all drank the transmuted wine which was really his blood in the kingdom and not real wine. Jesus makes it clear that it is wine in every sense of the word that will be drunk when the kingdom comes. This is a hint that Heaven is not a eucharistic banquet though Catholic theologians say it is.

Jesus said that the bread was his body and the wine was his blood. The separation of the body and blood signifies death and so does the separate bread and wine. Would Jesus really turn food and drink into dead meat and dead blood? In the allegedly Eucharistic John 6 we read that he promised to give his living self as spiritual food. John 6 makes it unlikely that the other gospels and Paul posited a transformation of the bread and wine.

If Jesus meant transubstantiation by the words he used at the last supper then he would not have spoken the way he did. He would have made a better and more suitable choice of words. He would have said of the bread for example, “Take, eat, God, turn this bread into my body by your power. When you do this say, ‘God, turn the bread into the body of Jesus by your power as we do this in memory of him who gave his body on the cross for us for the forgiveness of sins’”. It is a mistake to have a priest saying, “This is my body.”

At what moment does the change occur? The Church says it happens during the words of consecration. But at what point?

If it happens at the word this then we have the bread becoming Jesus before it is said to be his body upon pronunciation of the word this. At the word this the rest of the wording is implied because the intention is activated then. But then the bread would have to be the body of Christ before the bread is said to be the body. If the word this is enough then why bother with the word at all? Why not just say it is the intention of the priest even without the words that effects the change. But you will notice that the words, “This is my body”, refer to the change taking place at This which makes no sense. The this describes what is there now and it is the body.

If it happens at the word body then we have the problem then that the change should happen at this. “Change into his body”, makes the change happen at the letter “y”. The Church claims that, “This is my body,” and, “Change into his body”, mean the same thing though only the first words are allowed. Yet there are problems with, “This is my body”, not, “Change into his body”. The Church says the two statements mean the same thing but how can they when they transform at different points? “This is my body”, does not mean to transform so the Eucharist is symbolical.

Catholics start adoring the bread when the priest is in the middle of saying the words. When Church liturgy has never specified any point as to when the worship should start it warns us that the Eucharist is an invention of the Church. It leaves the people adoring what they have no reason to think has become Jesus yet.

At the last supper Jesus broke the bread FIRST. He stated that the rite represented his violent death by which the bread and wine were separate as his body and blood would be on the cross. If he had been celebrating the Catholic Mass he would have said the bread was his body and then broken it up to facilitate his disciples for eating it. Why? Because as God asked that only perfect animals with no broken bones could be sacrificed so Jesus avoided having his bones broken on the cross so that he could be sacrificed to God. The John gospel tells us that Jesus died before the soldiers could break his legs to fulfil the prophecy that the body wouldn’t be broken. However Jesus breaking the bread before he said it was his body indicates that Jesus expected to be broken up. He could have waited till after he said it was his body so the timing is very significant and he did state that his little rite had hidden meanings. The Catholic Church says that because the communion wafers are the one body of Christ that dividing them does not break Jesus up. Yet many Churches and ancient Bibles had the following Eucharistic formula, “This is my body which is broken for you.” The Revised Standard Version says this reading comes from many ancient authorities whose works were looked at to get at the original text of the New Testament. Jesus would not say his body was broken for he would want the focus to be on his body that was present and couldn’t be broken. Why would he want to symbolise and refer to the breaking? It wasn’t important. But he would say it if the

communion was simply a commemoration and didn't have the magical powers that the Catholic Church ascribes to it.

When the oldest account of the supper in Paul refutes transubstantiation how can we expect the Gospels to prove it? He did not say directly they were the body and blood but uses language that suggests they were reminders. Why would he beat around the bush? He said that Jesus said the cup was the new covenant in the blood. He didn't say the blood.

Cannibalism whether real or symbolic is still evil. Child abuse of a doll is still showing what darkness you have inside. Jesus' rite was a disgrace. The Church links it and his death for sins with the animal sacrifices that God commanded. They have the same meaning - life belongs to God and atones for sin. All these things are evils. The Mass is declared to be the New Sacrifice which was prepared for by God with the killing of animals at the altar. Thus the Mass is an insult to animal rights.

The last supper was not the first Mass. The Mass is an invention of the Catholic Church.