

WHY THE VIRGIN MARY WOULD NOT BE A MASS GOER

The Catholic Mass has probably been the most successful public worship system ever. It claims that bread and wine are turned into Jesus and the people are fed with Jesus. Jesus' mother Mary is often honoured by the Mass for her feasts and she is named in every Mass. The real Mary would not want this and would not attend Mass.

The Mass is thought to be taught by Jesus in John 6. He is supposed to have said the first Mass at the last supper shortly before he died. There he said that bread was his body and the cup was his blood.

Scholars see a parallel between, "The bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world" in John 6 and "This is my body which is given for you" of the Last Supper. But this is a poetic parallel. Jesus giving his flesh does not mean the same thing as Jesus giving his body. His body would be his entire self. If the parallel is meant to shed light on the last supper then it contradicts the Catholic doctrine that Jesus gives us his whole self and not just his flesh in communion.

"Take this and eat it all of you for this is my body" implies that these words do not cause the change if the bread really changes. The words could be said if the change has already happened. The change has already been done. If the words had been meant literally, we would see a prayer by Jesus for the bread and wine to change before he said that it was to be taken for it was his body.

The Church says the bread and wine become one thing, the body and blood of Jesus. The problem is that both become the body and blood of Jesus. So why not call the wafer the blood of Jesus and the cup the body of Jesus? This problem shows that what Jesus did was symbolism.

Jesus said John the Baptist was Elijah and gave no hint that this was symbolism. He applied prophecies that spoke of Elijah's literal return to John. Yet the Church says its symbolism for John was not Elijah. If the Church is right, then Jesus may not have meant to say that the bread was literally his body.

There is no scriptural authority for the celebrating of communion for the request to use bread and a cup in memory of Jesus was made to the apostles. Paul in his letter tells the story as well. But nowhere is there a command to say the bread is the body and the wine is the blood. It seems to be just taking bread and wine and thinking of Jesus' body and blood. There is no mention of them even being symbols!

In John 6:53, Jesus asserts that unless his listeners eat his body and drink his blood they will not have life in them. He implied that none of his listeners were on the road to Heaven for life is the fulfilled life which is a life that is closed to God. Jesus said that those "who eat the bread that I shall give shall never die unlike the Israelites in the wilderness who ate the manna and died." If you have no life in you, you are not connected with God at all. The listeners were Jewish so Jesus is implying they must convert to Catholicism and if they ever go to Mass and decide not to bother with communion they will be damned. That is the interpretation a Catholic must take though they often try to avoid taking it. The Mass is vindictive and judgemental in principle. There is no evidence in the Bible that Jesus' mother was a disciple and approved of his ministry. In fact the earliest gospel says she came to take charge of him saying he was insane. The Mass attacks the real Mary.

John 6 allegedly has Jesus saying he will give his flesh and whoever eats it will have eternal life. The Church sees communion in all that. Jesus did not say whoever eats his flesh will have eternal life. He said that whoever gnaws his flesh like an animal and not like a human will have eternal life. This indicates a symbolic interpretation.

The Church argues however that the striking use of that word indicates that Jesus was emphasising that he was to be physically eaten in communion. But despite that, it still says the gnawing is symbolic. Why didn't Jesus simply say, "Bread will be changed into my flesh and to eat it is to eat me." Why risk confusing people? The reason is he didn't mean what the Church wants him to mean.

John 6:54 has Jesus saying that whoever eats him will live because of him in the same way as he lives because of the Father. Jesus does not eat the Father. The Father gives him love and supernatural help to overcome the crave to sin. That is how he eats the Father. Taking communion to become good is looking for a way out of having to make yourself good for it would be damn hard work.

Jesus said that he will give his flesh as food for the life of the world. The Jews ask how he can give his flesh to eat. The Catholic Church says that Jesus kept repeating that we must eat his flesh and drink his blood. So they say he meant it

literally for he did not correct the Jews. Jesus told them minutes before to stop their murmuring when they said he was only the son of Joseph and couldn't have come down from Heaven. Thus he had told them he was not going to respect their mutterings and so the Catholic argument is devoid of substance.

Jesus said we must gnaw his body and drink his blood to have eternal life in John 6. He said that if you do not eat the flesh and drink the blood you have no life in you - God does not live in you and does not have a relationship with you. Rome does not believe this for it says that you can go to Heaven for an eternal relationship with God without ever having taken communion. The Church even says that though Jesus commanded us to take and eat his body you don't have to (except once a year) for nobody is worthy to do so anyway. It is really annulling what it takes to be a commandment from God just like the Pharisees allegedly did. Jesus severely condemned the Pharisees for that. The permission to refuse to receive though you can contradicts the Church's doctrine that it is a hospital for sinners and not a haven for the righteous. Not partaking implies that you don't want to receive the graces given by communion in order to help you live more righteously. More importantly, if Jesus meant communion by eating flesh and drinking blood then it is a serious sin not to eat and drink. You cut yourself off from spiritual life by grave sin according to Catholic doctrine. So the Church should say that those who go to Mass and will not eat the body and drink the blood of Jesus are guilty of rejecting spiritual life and there is no life in them for Jesus said you must eat and drink his flesh and blood to have life. The Church won't take this interpretation which shows that it simply does not really believe John 6 proves the bread and wine becoming Jesus.

The first teachings thought to be about the Eucharist are laden with anti-semitism and threats against a good people who had enough bad things in their lives for the Romans were oppressing them. Even if John 6 is not about the Eucharist it can still be used as relevant. Texts are used to shine light on other subjects. The Mass insults Mary's religion and people and her and she would not be a massgoer.