

APOLOGETICS 1

a·pol·o·get·ics
the branch of theology having to do with the defense and proofs of Christianity

For as often as YOU might be eating this bread, (matzos) and YOU might be drinking (this κ_1) cup, YOU are proclaiming the death of the Lord, until of which (season MR. 13:33) he might come.

I Cor. 11:26



The Passover Is The Lord's Supper



Mount Publications, Rt. 1, Box 298, Morrilton, Fla. 32668

Apologetics I

Why I believe the so-called Lord's Supper refers to the Passover. Jan 1984

I. First, note the fact, that the "church" through the centuries has been and still is in total chaos as to the meaning and the method of observing what is called the Lord's Supper, the Eucharist, or Holy Communion. The following Confessional Statements are from *Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. II, pp. 1348, 1349, by Philip Schaff, Funk + Wagnalls Company, New York, 1891.

IV. The Confessional Statements respecting the Lord's Supper.²

The ROMAN-CATHOLIC doctrine is officially given in the *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, Sess. XIII., Oct. 11, 1551. See *Creeeds*, ii. 126-139. The principal points are:—

"In the Eucharist are contained truly, really and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ."—*Can. 1.*

"The whole substance of the bread [is converted] into the body," and, "the whole substance of the wine into the blood."—*Can. 2.*

"The whole Christ is contained under each species, and under every part of each species, when separated."—*Can. 3.*

"The principal fruit of the most holy Eucharist is the remission of sins."—*Can. 5.*

"In the Eucharist, Christ is to be adored."—*Can. 6.*

"All and each of Christ's faithful are bound to communicate every year."—*Can. 9.*

"Sacramental confession is to be made beforehand, by those whose conscience is burdened with mortal sin."—*Can. 11.*

The same view is taught, though less distinctly, in the GREEK CHURCH in the *Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church*, *Ques. CVI., CVII.* (ii. 380-385); in the *Confession of Dositheus* (ii. 427-432); in the *Longer Catechism of the Eastern Church*, *qu. 315*:—

"What is the Communion? A sacrament, in which the believer, under the forms of bread and wine, partakes of the very Body and Blood of Christ, to everlasting life" (ii. 495).

The authoritative teaching of the LUTHERAN CHURCH is thus given, *Augsburg Confession* (A.D. 1530), *Art. X.*:—

"The true body and blood of Christ are truly present under the form of bread and wine, and are there communicated to and received by those that eat in the Lord's Supper" (iii. 13).

Afterwards Melancthon changed this article in the edition of 1540, substituting for *distribuantur* ("communicated") *exhibeantur* ("shown"). This departure occasioned much controversy.

The Lutheran doctrine is thus given in the *Formula of Concord* (A.D. 1576), *Art. VII., Affirmative*:—

"We believe, teach, and confess that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and that they are truly distributed and taken together with the bread and wine" (iii. 137).

The authoritative teaching of the REFORMED CHURCHES is thus given: *First Helvetic Confession* (A.D. 1536), *XXIII.*:—

"The bread and wine [of the Supper] are holy, true symbols, through which the Lord offers and presents the true communion of the body, and blood of Christ for the feeding and nourishing of the spiritual and eternal life" (iii. 225).

So also in the *Second Helvetic Confession*, *Cap. XXI.* (iii. 291-295).

The *French Confession of Faith* (A.D. 1559), *XXXVI., XXXVIII.*:—

"The Lord's Supper is a witness of the union which we have with Christ, inasmuch as he not only died and rose again for us once, but also feeds and nourishes us truly with his flesh and blood, so that we may be one in him, and that our life may be in common."

"The bread and wine in the sacrament serve to our spiritual nourishment, in as much as they show, as to our sight, that the body of Christ is our meat, and his blood our drink" (iii. 380, 381).

The *Scotch Confession of Faith* (A.D. 1560), *Art. XXI.*:—

"The faithful in the right use of the Lords Table do so eat the bodie and drinke the blude of the Lord Jesus that he remains in them and they in him" (iii. 467-474).

The *Belgic Confession* (A.D. 1561), *Art. XXXV.*:—

"Christ that he might represent unto us this spiritual and heavenly bread hath instituted an earthly and visible bread as a Sacrament of his body, and wine as a Sacrament of his blood, to testify by them unto us, that, as certainly as we receive and hold this Sacrament in our hands, and eat and drink the same with our mouths, by which our life is afterwards nourished; we also do as certainly receive by faith (which is the hand and mouth of our soul) the true body and blood of Christ our only Saviour in our souls, for the support of our spiritual life" (iii. 428-431).

2 The Heidelberg Catechism (A.D. 1563), qu. 76:—

“What is it to eat of the crucified body and drink the shed blood of Christ? It is not only to embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ, and thereby to obtain the forgiveness of sins and life eternal, but moreover, also, to be so united more and more to his sacred body by the Holy Ghost, who dwells both in Christ and in us, that although he is in heaven, and we are upon the earth, we are nevertheless flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, and live and are governed forever by one Spirit, as members of the same body are by the one soul” (iii. 332, 333).

The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England (A.D. 1562), Art. XXVIII. :—

“The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a [heavenly and spiritual] partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ” (iii. 505).

So the Irish Articles of Religion (A.D. 1615, iii. 542, 543).

The Westminster Confession of Faith (A.D. 1647), Chap. XXIX. :—

“The Lord's Supper [is] to be observed for the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of himself in his death, the sealing of all benefits thereof with true believers, their spiritual nourishment and growth in him, their further engagement in, and to all duties which they owe unto him; and to be a bond and pledge of their communion with him, and with each other, as members of his mystical body.”

“Worthy believers do inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all the benefits of his death” (iii. 663-667).

The Westminster Shorter Catechism (A.D. 1647), qu. 96:—

“What is the Lord's Supper? A sacrament wherein by the giving and receiving bread and wine, according to Christ's appointment, his death is showed forth, and the worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith, made partakers of his body and blood, with all its benefits, to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace” (iii. 697).

The Confession of the Society of Friends (A.D. 1675), Thirteenth Proposition:—

“The communion of the body and blood of Christ is inward and spiritual, which is the participation of his flesh and blood, by which the inward man is daily nourished in the hearts of those in whom Christ dwells; of which things the breaking of bread by Christ with his disciples was a figure, which they even used in the Church for a time, who had received the substance, for the cause of the weak; even as ‘abstaining from things strangled, and from blood;’ the washing one another's feet, and the anointing of the sick with oil; all which are commanded with no less authority and solemnity than the former; yet seeing they are but the shadow of better things, they cease in such as have obtained the substance” (iii. 797).

Reformed Episcopal Articles of Religion (A.D. 1875), Art. XXVII. :—

“The Supper of the Lord is a memorial of our Redemption by Christ's death, for thereby we do show forth the Lord's death till he come. It is also a symbol of the soul's feeding upon Christ. And it is a sign of the communion that we should have with one another” (iii. 823).]

An Introduction to the History of Western Europe by James Harvey Robinson Ginn and Company 1925

pp. 212 - 213

The priest not only forgave sin; he was also empowered to perform the stupendous miracle of the Mass. The early Christians had celebrated the Lord's Supper or Holy Eucharist in various ways and entertained various conceptions of its nature and significance. Gradually the idea came to be universally accepted that by the consecration of the bread and the wine the whole substance of the bread was converted into the substance of the body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine into his blood. This change was termed transubstantiation. The Church believed, further, that in this sacrament Christ was offered up anew, as he had been on the cross, as a sacrifice to God. This sacrifice might be performed for the sins of the absent as well as of the present, and for the dead as well as for the living. Moreover, Christ was to be worshiped under the form of the bread, or *host* (Latin, *hostia*, sacrifice), with the highest form of adoration. The host was to be borne about in solemn procession when God was to be especially propitiated, as in the case of a famine or plague.

pp. 308-309

Soon Wycliffe went further and boldly attacked the papacy itself, as well as indulgences, pilgrimages, and the worship of the saints; finally he even denied the truth of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

p. 425

The chief importance for the rest of Europe of Zwingli's revolt was the influence of his conception of the Lord's Supper. He not only denied transubstantiation,¹ but also the “real presence” of Christ in the elements (in which Luther believed), and conceived the bread and wine to be mere symbols. Those in Germany and England who accepted Zwingli's idea added one more to the Protestant parties, and consequently increased the difficulty of reaching a general agreement among those who had revolted from the Church.²

p. 431 Henry VIII

Henry was anxious to prove that he was orthodox, especially after he had seized the property of the monasteries and the gold and jewels which adorned the receptacles in which the relics of the saints were kept. He presided in person over the trial of one who accepted the opinion of Zwingli that the body and blood of Christ were not present in the sacrament. He quoted Scripture to prove the contrary, and the prisoner was condemned and burned as a heretic.

Thousands died because of the controversy over the Lord's Supper, a controversy which still exists today.

Note a little history from the same source concerning heresy. What is a heresy? "Heresy, (is) rejection of one or more truths of the Catholic faith," Baltimore Catechism, Index, p. 112, 1941. Probably the most controversial of the many heresies was the Lord's Supper.
p. 220

86. The evils which the churchmen themselves so frankly admitted could not escape the notice and comment of laymen. But while the better element among the clergy vigorously urged a reform of the existing abuses, no churchman dreamed of denying the truth of the Church's doctrines or the efficacy of its ceremonies. Among the laity, however, certain popular leaders arose who declared that the Church was the synagogue of Satan; that no one ought any longer to rely upon it for his salvation; that all its elaborate ceremonies were worse than useless; that its masses, holy water, and relics were mere money-getting devices of a depraved priesthood and helped no one to heaven. These bold rebels against the Church naturally found a hearing among those who felt that the ministrations of a wicked priest could not possibly help a sinner, as well as among those who were exasperated by the tithes and other ecclesiastical dues.

Those who questioned the teachings of the Church and proposed to cast off its authority were, according to the accepted view of the time, guilty of the supreme crime of heresy. To the orthodox believer nothing could exceed the guilt of one who committed treason against God by rejecting the religion which had been handed down in the Roman Church from the immediate followers of his Son. Moreover, doubt and unbelief were not merely sin, they were revolt against the most powerful social institution of the time, which, in spite of the depravity of some of its officials, continued to be venerated by people at large throughout western Europe. The extent and character of the heresies of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and the efforts of the Church to suppress them by persuasion, by fire and sword, and by the stern court of the Inquisition, form a strange and terrible chapter in mediæval history.

Even the materials used vary greatly. Some use wine, others grape juice. In some churches those receiving the bread do not receive the cup.

Some use leavened bread, that is, regular loaf bread baked with leaven (yeast), which Jesus most certainly did not use.

Some, or should I say, many use a round, unleavened wafer. The Roman Catholic Church displays such a wafer in an ostensorium. This wafer is called "the host" - (See Webster)



OSTENSORIUM

THE ROUND WAFER



Some, a very few, use an unleavened bread used by the Jews, called matzah; used by the Jews for Passover.

Some idea of the results of the disputes over the Lord's Supper may be learned from Fox's *Book of Martyrs*, a book which should be required reading for every believer. I have included two accounts here. (In my copy pp. 74 + 104)

The Life of William Gardiner

William Gardiner was born at Bristol, received a tolerable education, and was, at a proper age, placed under the care of a merchant, named Paget.

At the age of twenty-six years, he was, by his master, sent to Lisbon, to act as factor. Here he applied himself to the study of the Portuguese language, executed his business with assiduity and despatch, and behaved with the most engaging affability to all persons with whom he had the least concern. He conversed privately with a few, whom he knew to be zealous Protestants; and, at the same time cautiously avoided giving the least offence to any who were Roman Catholics; he had not, however, hitherto gone into any of the popish churches.

A marriage being concluded between the king of Portugal's son, and the Infanta of Spain, upon the wedding-day the bridegroom, bride, and the whole court went to the cathedral church, attended by multitudes of all ranks of people, and among the rest William Gardiner, who stayed during the whole ceremony, and was greatly shocked at the superstitions he saw.

The erroneous worship which he had seen ran strongly in his mind; he was miserable to see a whole country sunk into such idolatry, when the truth of the Gospel might be so easily obtained. He, therefore, took the inconsiderate, though laudable design, into his head, of making a reform in Portugal, or perishing in the attempt; and determined to sacrifice his prudence to his zeal, though he became a martyr upon the occasion.

To this end, he settled all his worldly affairs, paid his debts, closed his books, and consigned over his merchandise. On the ensuing Sunday he went again to the cathedral church, with a New Testament in his hand, and placed himself near the altar.

The king and the court soon appeared, and a cardinal began Mass, at that part of the ceremony in which the people adore the wafer. Gardiner could hold out no longer, but springing towards the cardinal, he snatched the host from him, and trampled it under his feet.

This action amazed the whole congregation, and one person, drawing a dagger, wounded Gardiner in the shoulder, and would, by repeating the blow, have finished him, had not the king called to him to desist.

Gardiner, being carried before the king, the monarch asked him what countryman he was: to which he replied, "I am an Englishman by birth, a Protestant by religion, and a merchant by occupation. What I have done is not out of contempt to your royal person, God forbid it should, but out of an honest indignation, to see the ridiculous superstitious and gross idolatries practiced here."

The king, thinking that he had been stimulated by some other person to act as he had done, demanded who was his abetter, to which he replied, "My own conscience alone. I would not hazard what I have done for any man living, but I owe that and all other services to God."

Gardiner was sent to prison, and a general order issued to apprehend all Englishmen in Lisbon. This order was in a great measure put into execution, (some few escaping) and many innocent persons were tortured to make them confess if they knew any thing of the matter; in particular, a person who resided in the same house with Gardiner was treated with unparalleled barbarity to make him confess something which might throw a light upon the affair.

Gardiner himself was then tormented in the most excruciating manner; but in the midst of all his torments he gloried in the deed. Being ordered for death, a large fire was kindled near a gibbet, Gardiner was drawn up to the gibbet by pulleys, and then let down near the fire, but not so close as to touch it; for they burnt or rather roasted him by slow degrees. Yet he bore his sufferings patiently and resigned his soul to the Lord cheerfully.

Granted, Gardiner should not have done what he did. But this torture by the Roman Catholics, as, almost always, carried out by civil authorities, gives you some idea of the paganism of the so-called "Holy Communion" or "Lord's Supper." The Roman Catholic Church has not changed in the least.

It is the same Catholic Church which recently tried to prevent the execution of a known murderer in the United States.

The facts of the millions of murders by the Roman Church are no longer generally taught in our public schools. The fact I present is that the Lord's Supper was a major point.

A young Englishman who happened to be at Rome, was one day passing by a church, when the procession of the host was just coming out. A bishop carried the host, which the young man perceiving, he snatched it from him, threw it upon the ground, and trampled it under his feet, crying out, "Ye wretched idolaters, who neglect the true God, to adore a morsel of bread." This action so provoked the people that they would have torn him to pieces on the spot; but the priests persuaded them to let him abide by the sentence of the pope.

When the affair was represented to the pope, he was so greatly exasperated that he ordered the prisoner to be burnt immediately; but a cardinal dissuaded him from this hasty sentence, saying that it was better to punish him by slow degrees, and to torture him, that they might find out if he had been instigated by any particular person to commit so atrocious an act.

This being approved, he was tortured with the most exemplary severity, notwithstanding which they could only get these words from him, "It was the will of God that I should do as I did."

- The pope then passed this sentence upon him.
1. That he should be led by the executioner, naked to the middle, through the streets of Rome.
 2. That he should wear the image of the devil upon his head.
 3. That his breeches should be painted with the representation of flames.
 4. That he should have his right hand cut off.
 5. That after having been carried about thus in procession, he should be burnt.

When he heard this sentence pronounced, he implored God to give him strength and fortitude to go through it. As he passed through the streets he was greatly derided by the people, to whom he said some severe things respecting the Romish superstition. But a cardinal, who attended the procession, overhearing him, ordered him to be gagged.

When he came to the church door, where he trampled on the host, the hangman cut off his right hand, and fixed it on a pole. Then two tormentors, with flaming torches, scorched and burnt his flesh all the rest of the way. At the place of execution he kissed the chains that were to bind him to the stake. A monk presenting the figure of a saint to him, he struck it aside, and then being chained to the stake, fire was put to the fagots, and he was soon burnt to ashes.

When protestants against the Roman Church began to separate from Rome they brought many of Rome's superstitions with them.

Let me give you some idea as to where the bread and cup of the modern Lord's Supper really came from and why there is total chaos as to how it should be observed; every week, once a month, or quarterly, there is no agreement.

II The next fact is that a very similar "supper" was observed by pagans. Let me give you some passages from Bible Myths and their Parallels in Other Religions, by Doane.

The Eucharist was instituted many hundreds of years before the time assigned for the birth of Christ Jesus. Cicero, the greatest orator of Rome, and one of the most illustrious of her statesmen, born in the year 106 B. C., mentions it in his works, and wonders at the strangeness of the rite. "How can a man be so stupid," says he, "as to imagine that which he eats to be a God?" There had been an esoteric meaning attached to it from the first establishment of the mysteries among the Pagans, and the Eucharistia is one of the oldest rites of antiquity.

The adherents of the Grand Lama in Thibet and Tartary offer to their god a sacrament of bread and wine.

The words of St. Justin, wherein he alludes to this ceremony, are as follows:

"The apostles, in the commentaries written by themselves, which we call Gospels, have delivered down to us how that Jesus thus commanded them: He having taken bread, after he had given thanks, said, Do this in commemoration of me; this is my body. And having taken a cup, and returned thanks, he said: This is my blood, and delivered it to them alone. Which thing indeed the evil spirits have taught to be done out of mimicry in the Mysteries and Initiatory rites of Mithra.

← p.305, 306

Justin Martyr noted a pagan connection. (110-165 A.D)

What then is the right explanation since these rites were before the time of Jesus?

(continued p.6)

For you either know, or can know, that bread and a cup of water (or wine) are given out, with certain incantations, in the consecration of the person who is being initiated in the Mysteries of Mithra."*

It is in the ancient religion of Persia—the religion of Mithra, the Mediator, the Redeemer and Saviour—that we find the nearest resemblance to the sacrament of the Christians, and from which it was evidently borrowed. Those who were initiated into the mysteries of Mithra, or became *members*, took the sacrament of bread and wine.*

M. Renan, speaking of *Mithraicism*, says:

"It had its mysterious meetings: its chapels, which bore a strong resemblance to little churches. It forged a very lasting bond of brotherhood between its initiates: it had a *Eucharist*, a Supper so like the Christian Mysteries, that good Justin Martyr, the Apologist, can find only one explanation of the apparent identity, namely, that Satan, in order to deceive the human race, determined to imitate the Christian ceremonies, and so stole them."*

P. Andrada La Crozius, a French missionary, and one of the first Christians who went to Nepal and Thibet, says in his "History of India:":

"Their Grand Lama celebrates a species of sacrifice with *bread and wine*, in which, after taking a small quantity himself, he distributes the rest among the Lamas present at this ceremony."*

In certain rites both in the *Indian* and the *Parsee* religions, the devotees drink the juice of the Soma, or *Haoma* plant. They consider it a *god* as well as a plant, just as the wine of the Christian sacrament is considered both the juice of the grape, and the blood of the Redeemer.* Says Mr. Baring-Gould:

"Among the ancient Hindoos, *Soma* was a chief deity; he is called 'the Giver of Life and of health,' the 'Protector,' he who is 'the Guide to Immortality.' He became incarnate among men, was taken by them and slain, and brayed in a mortar. But he rose in flame to heaven, to be the 'Benefactor of the World,' and the 'Mediator between God and Man.' Through communion with him in his sacrifice, man, (who partook of this god), has an assurance of immortality, for by that *sacrament* he obtains union with his divinity."*

The ancient *Egyptians*—as we have seen—annually celebrated the *Resurrection* of their God and Saviour *Osiris*, at which time they commemorated his death by the *Eucharist*, eating the sacred cake, or wafer, *after it had been consecrated by the priest, and become veritable flesh of his flesh.** The bread, after sacerdotal rites, became mystically the body of *Osiris*, and, in such a manner, *they ate their god.** Bread and wine were brought to the temples by the worshipers, as offerings.*

Note the early Christians observed the Lord's Supper only in connection with the "love-feasts"

Jude 12 KJ

12 These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear: clouds *they are* without water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots;

"These are the reefs in YOUR charity-(feasts?) banqueting-together fearlessly, shepherding themselves, waterless clouds being-brought-away by winds, etc." Cons. N.T.

Many more such examples could be given.

Hiding certain facts is not the way to a solution.

III The third fact is that the early Christians did not follow the present method of celebrating the Lord's Supper.

Note Alford's

Greek Testament,

Vol. I page 29.

Acts 2:42

The interpretation of ἡ κλ. τ. ἔστ. [here] as the celebration of the Lord's Supper has been, both in ancient and modern times, the prevalent one. Chrysostom himself, in his 27th Hom. on 1 Cor., p. 422, interprets it, or at all events τῆ κοινωβία and it together, of the Holy Communion. And the Romanist interpreters have gone so far as to ground an argument on the passage for the administration in one kind only. But,—referring for a fuller discussion of the whole matter to the notes on 1 Cor. x. xi.,—barely to render ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἔστου the breaking of bread in the Eucharist, as now understood, would be to violate historical truth. The Holy Communion was at first, and for some time, till abuses put an end to the practice, inseparably connected with the ἀγάται, or love-feasts, of the Christians, and unknown as a separate ordinance. To these ἀγάται, accompanied as they were at this time by the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the κλάσις τοῦ ἔστου refers,—from the custom of the master of the feast breaking bread in asking a blessing; see ch. xxvii. 35, where the Eucharist is out of the question.

Now the word "feast" does not occur in the Greek text.

I am giving here two records of the so-called "love-feasts" or Agapae (ἀγάπαι)

Mackey's Revised Encyclopedia of Freemasonry.

Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Schaff.

Vol. I p. 39

Vol. I p. 34

AGAPAE. The Agapae, or love feasts, were banquets held during the first three centuries in the Christian Church. They were called love feasts, because, including the partaking of the Sacrament, the Brethren met, both rich and poor, at a common feast—the former furnishing the provisions, and the latter, who had nothing, being relieved and refreshed by their more opulent Brethren. Tertullian (*Apologia*, chapter xxxix) thus describes these banquets:

"We do not sit down before we have first offered up prayers to God; we eat and drink only to satisfy hunger and thirst, remembering still that we are to worship God by night: we discourse as in the presence of God, knowing that He hears us: then, after water to wash our hands, and lights brought in, every one is moved to sing some hymn to God, either out of the Scripture, or, as he is able, of his own composing. Prayer again concludes our feast, and we depart, not to fight and quarrel, or to abuse those we meet, but to pursue the same care of modesty and chastity, as men that have fed at a supper of philosophy and discipline, rather than a corporeal feast."

The agapae united the group meal and the Lord's Supper because that Sacrament was first observed at a feast (see Matthew xxvi, 26-9). This custom was readily adopted among Gentile converts as such meals were usual practises by both the Greeks and Romans. Even in Bible times the observance was not always free of fault as is shown by Paul's rebuke at Corinth (see First Corinthians xi, 17-34; also in this connection note Second Peter ii, 13; and Jude 12). These disorders marred the religious value of the function and led to its suppression in churches. The merit of the purpose, when properly carried out gives substantial service to right living and has therefore much ceremonial and social importance.

Dr. August Kestner, Professor of Theology, published in Jena, in 1819, a work in which he maintains that the agapae, established at Rome by Clemens, in the reign of Domitian, were mysteries which partook of a Masonic, symbolic, and religious character.

In the Rosicrucian Degrees of Freemasonry we find an imitation of these love feasts of the primitive Christians; and the ceremonies of the banquet in the Degree of Rose Croix of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, especially as practised by French Chapters, are arranged with reference to the ancient agapae. Reghellini, indeed, finds an analogy between the Table Lodges of modern Freemasonry and these love feasts of the primitive Christians.

AGAPE, plur. AGAPAE, from the Greek ἀγάπη, "love," feast of love, a custom in the primitive Church according to which all the members of a congregation, even the master and his slaves, met together at a common meal, celebrating the Eucharist, as brethren among brethren. It would not be difficult to find striking precedents for such an institution, both among the Jews and the Greeks and the Romans. In his letter to Trajan, Pliny classes it among the meetings of secret societies, so well known to the Romans of the empire. It is more probable, however, that it grew up directly from the simple and natural commemoration of the events of "the night in which the Lord was betrayed" (1 Cor. xi. 23). It is mentioned for the first time in the Epistle of Jude (12); and during the next three or four centuries it is often spoken of by the Fathers: Tertullian gives a vivid and touching description of it in his *Apologeticus*, c. 39.

Originally the character of the agapae was strictly devotional: the feast culminated in the celebration of the Eucharist. At the same time, however, it was a social symbol of the equality and solidarity of the congregation. Here all gave and received the kiss of love; here communications from other congregations were read and answered, etc. As now the congregations grew larger, the social differences between the members began to make themselves felt, and the agapae changed character. They became entertainments of the rich. In Alexandria "the psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" of old (Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16) were supplanted by performances on the lyre, the harp, and the flute, in spite of Clement's protest (*Pædag.* II. 4). In other places the rich retired altogether from the meetings, and the agapae sank down into a kind of poorhouse institution (August. *Contra Faustum*, XX. 20). Again, in Northern Italy, Ambrose suppressed them altogether, because they gave rise to disorders, and propagated reminiscences from the Pagan *parentalia*.

Other circumstances contributed also to throw the agapae out of use. The Third Council of Carthage (391) decreed that the Eucharist should be taken fasting, and thereby separated the celebration of the Eucharist from the agapae. The synod of Laodiceæ, and again the Third Council of Carthage, and finally the Council in Trullo (692), forbade to hold the agapae in the church-buildings, and bereft them thereby altogether of their devotional character. After the close of the fourth century they began gradually to disappear; and an attempt made by the Council of Gaugra (about 380) to restore them to their old position by anathematizing all who despised them, and kept away from them, was in vain.

Note especially the underlined lines.

All of the confusion developed because the Gentiles coming into the church thought like the Pagans they had been. Further, very early in the church there developed an anti-Semitism. Let me give you some more information from the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Fourteenth Edition, Vol. 7, Easter, p. 858 etc.

EASTER, the annual festival observed throughout Christendom in commemoration of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. The name Easter, like the names of the days of the week, is a survival from the old Teutonic mythology. According to Bede (*De Temp. Rat. c. xv.*) it is derived from *Eostre*, or *Ostara*, the Anglo-Saxon goddess of spring, to whom the month answering to our April, and called *Eostur-monath*, was dedicated. This month, Bede says, was the same as the *mensis paschalis*, "when the old festival was observed with the gladness of a new solemnity."

The root *pasch*, from which so many other names for Easter are derived, is from the Hebrew *pisach* (Passover) from the verb form "he passed over."

There is no indication of the observance of the Easter festival in the New Testament, or in the writings of the apostolic Fathers. The sanctity of special times was an idea absent from the minds of the first Christians, who continued to observe the Jewish festivals, though in a new spirit, as commemorations of events which those festivals had foreshadowed. Thus the Passover, with a new conception added to it of Christ as the true Paschal Lamb and the first fruits from the dead, continued to be observed, and became the Christian Easter.

Although the observance of Easter was at a very early period the practice of the Christian church, a serious difference as to the day for its observance soon arose between the Christians of Jewish and those of Gentile descent, which led to a long and bitter controversy. The point at issue was when the Paschal fast was to be reckoned as ending. With the Jewish Christians, whose leading thought was the death of Christ as the Paschal Lamb, the fast ended at the same time as that of the Jews, on the fourteenth day of the moon at evening, and the Easter festival immediately followed, without regard to the day of the week. The Gentile Christians, on the other hand, unfettered by Jewish traditions, identified the first day of the week with the Resurrection, and kept the preceding Friday as the commemoration of the crucifixion, irrespective of the day of the month. With the one the observance of the day of the month, with the other the observance of the day of the week, was the guiding principle.

Generally speaking, the Western churches kept Easter on the first day of the week, while the Eastern churches followed the Jewish rule, and kept Easter on the fourteenth day.

A final settlement of the dispute was one among the other reasons which led Constantine to summon the Council of Nicaea in 325. At that time the Syrians and Antiochenes were the solitary champions of the observance of the fourteenth day. The decision of the council was unanimous that Easter was to be kept on Sunday, and on the same Sunday throughout the world, and "that none should hereafter follow the blindness of the Jews" (Socrates, *H.E. i. 9*).

Acts 12:4 KJ

4 And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quarters of soldiers to keep him; intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people.

The pagan Easter continued in the K.J. (Should be Passover)

* Tape 2

The modern Lord's Supper comes, not from the early Christians who kept the Passover, but from infiltrating pagans.

This same attitude toward the Jews still exists in the church today, even in evangelical groups.

IV. The next fact to consider is the word "feast" (ἑορτή - heortē), and the verb "to-keep-the-feast" (ἑορτάζω - heortadzō)

Now it is significant that the KJ translates the noun "feast" 26x, but once "holyday."

Matt. 26

AND it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these sayings, he said unto his disciples, 2 Ye know that after two days is the feast of the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified.

3 Then assembled together the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders of the people, unto the palace of the high priest, who was called Cai'-ā-phās,

4 And consulted that they might take Jesus by subtilty, and kill him.

5 But they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar among the people.

Matt. 27

15 Now at that feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would.

16 And they had then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas.

Mark 14

There is no question but that the uses in Matt. and Mark refer to the passover when Jesus was crucified.

2 But they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar of the people.

Mark 15

6 Now at that feast he released unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired.

6 Now at that feast he released unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired.

Luke 2

1

40 And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him.

2

5

41 Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the passover.

6

42 And when he was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem after the custom of the feast.

In Luke 2:41, 42 (#5#6) the feast is the passover when Jesus was twelve years old.

Luke 22

NOW the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the passover.

2 And the chief priests and scribes sought how they might kill him; for they feared the people.

Luke 23

7

8

17 (For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)

18 And they cried out all at once, saying, Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas:

Numbers 7 and 8 are also the passover when Jesus was crucified. Note the definition of passover in Luke 22:1. The term passover applies to the entire week.

John 2

23 ¶ Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast day, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did.

Numbers 9, 10, and 11 are all the feast of passover

Number 12

John 5:1

is probably the feast of Pentecost. The Jews had

AFTER this there was a feast of the Jews; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.

John 4

45 Then when he was come into Galilee, the Galilæans received him, having seen all the things that he did at Jerusalem at the feast: for they also went unto the feast.

10

11

3 set feasts, no more, Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles.

John 6

4 And the passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh.

← Clearly another passover.
13 "the passover the feast etc."

John 7

2 Now the Jews' feast of tabernacles was at hand.

← All 7 uses of "feast" in John 7 are references to the feast of tabernacles.

8 Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up yet unto this feast; for my time is not yet full come.

10 ¶ But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret.

11 Then the Jews sought him at the feast, and said, Where is he?

14 ¶ Now about the midst of the feast Jesus went up into the temple, and taught.

37 In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink.

John 11

55 ¶ And the Jews' passover was nigh at hand: and many went out of the country up to Jerusalem before the passover, to purify themselves.

56 Then sought they for Jesus, and spake among themselves, as they stood in the temple, What think ye, that he will not come to the feast?

John 12

12 ¶ On the next day much people that were come to the feast, when they heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem,

13 Took branches of palm trees, and went forth to meet him, and cried, Hosanna: Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord.

20 ¶ And there were certain Greeks among them that came up to worship at the feast:

John 13

24 **N**OW before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end.

28 Now no man at the table knew for what intent he spake this unto him.

29 For some of them thought, because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said unto him, Buy those things that we have need of against the feast; or, that he should give something to the poor.

Numbers 21-25 all refer to the passover when Jesus was crucified.

Acts 18

21 But bade them farewell, saying, I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem: but I will return again unto you, if God will. And he sailed from Ephesus.

23

The use of "feast" in Acts (26) is somewhat of a question. Alford says Pentecost; but many (ABX) good manuscripts do not have the word.

Col. 2

16 Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:

27

25

Is it not interesting #27 is "holyday" and the N.K.J is "festival." Note my Consistent N.T.

"Let not therefore anyone be-judging YOU in eating and in drinking or in part of-(a)-feast * or of-(a)-new-moon or of-sabbaths."

Strictly Jewish terminology, strictly (a) feast of Israel, one of the three.

We have here a statement to the church of the Colossians, Gentiles, uncircumcised in the flesh.

Col. 2

13 And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;

These Gentiles were not going up to the temple, which was still at Jerusalem but were keeping "part of (a)-feast", that is the passover even as we today.

(See page 8 from Encyclopaedia Britannia.)

Why were they observing part of the passover? First, they no longer needed to sacrifice a lamb. Secondly, connect what Jesus said with Col. 2:17.

"Which-things are (a) shadow of-the-things future, but the body (is) of-the Messiah."

Matt. 26

27 And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it;

28 For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

29 But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.

30 And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives.

← Jesus at the last passover. The passover will still be observed in the millennium.

Now consider the only use of the verb "to-keep-the-feast" (ἑορτάζω-heortadzō)

1 Cor. 5 A Consistent N.T.

vs. 7 YOU-purge-out the old leaven, in-order-that YOU-might-be (a) new lump, according-as YOU-are unleavened-breads. For even our passover was-sacrificed, Messiah.

vs. 8 So-that let-us-be-keeping-the-feast not with old leaven neither with leaven of-malice and of-evil, BUT with unleavened-breads of-sincerity and of-truth.

(ἑορτάζωμεν, 1 per. plu. pres. subj) "let-us-be-keeping-the-feast"

← continuously till Jesus comes.

The passover is the only feast with the very strict rules about leaven (always evil). It is amazing how Christians, who call themselves fundamentalists, can take "literally" what pleases them and "spiritualize" what they dislike.

Alford's Greek Testament

Bible Commentary

on 1 Cor. 5:8

8), seeing that our Passover was sacrificed (see reff.: and cf. Heb. ix. 26, 28), even Christ (the days of unleavened bread began with the Passover-sacrifice): therefore (reff.) let us keep the feast (not the actual Passover, but the continued Passover-feast of Christians on whose behalf Christ has died.

Why NOT the actual feast?

wherefore in the wake of this great fact let us keep festival accordingly: if the divine antitype of the legal lamb has been slain, let not the moral antitype of the legal leaven be readmitted into the House of God; but rather let us keep the feast, not indeed that material feast of seven days on cakes unleavened, but the spiritual feast perpetual of a good conscience unsullied of any vice and ever cheered by a lively hope of the coming Messianic joys that are "unseen, unheard, unimagined" (ch. ii. 9).

Remember the Gentiles coming into the body had a built-in hatred of the Jews. Why? The answer is simple. God created Israel when he changed Jacob's name to Israel; thus Jacob became the first Israelite. Abraham, their father, chosen by God, was given a specific promise in Gen. 12:3, Berry's Literal Translation. "And-I-will-bless-the-blessers-of-thee, and-the-despiser-of-thee I-will-curse."

Every word of Scripture has come to us at the hand of the Jews. (Rom. 3:1,2) God called them to be a separated people. The Gentiles, all pagans, hate God and hence God's choice of Israel. The early Gentile Christians soon unveiled their built-in hatred. Note a little more later history. Histories are filled with The Jews Under Rome, atrocities against the Jews. Morrison, 1899, p.360

A bitter feeling of resentment was aroused throughout the Roman Empire by the irreconcilable attitude of the Jews towards the rest of mankind. Cicero speaks of them as a nation born for servitude,³ and stigmatizes their religion as a barbarous superstition.⁴ Seneca despises them as a wretched and criminal people,⁵ and Tacitus says with some truth that the Jews had made themselves notorious by their hatred of the human race.⁶

An Introduction to the History of Western Europe

This ill-starred people played a most important part in the economic development of Europe, but they were terribly maltreated by the Christians, who held them guilty of the supreme crime of putting Christ to death. The active persecution of the Jews did not, however, become common before the thirteenth century, when they first began to be required to wear a peculiar cap, or badge, which made them easily recognized and exposed them to constant insult. Later they were sometimes shut up in a particular quarter of the city, called the Jewry.

^c p.246 & p.358

Unfortunately, the most industrious, skillful, and thrifty among the inhabitants of Spain, i.e., the Moors and the Jews, who well-nigh supported the whole kingdom with the products of their toil, were bitterly persecuted by the Christians. So anxious was Isabella to rid her kingdom of the infidels that she revived the court of the Inquisition.¹ For several decades its tribunals arrested and condemned innumerable persons who were suspected of heresy, and thousands were burned at the stake during this period. These wholesale executions have served to associate Spain especially with the horrors of the Inquisition.

← Pagan Romans.

This hatred of the Jew is existing today in the churches. Only very recently has there come a gradual change and then only very little.

Now it is easier to see why so many Scriptures are translated incorrectly, and why the so-called Christians separate themselves from the Jewish institutions. Churches today are almost totally ignorant of O.T. history as well as world history. Satan has done a good job.

V. The next fact to consider is the word "supper" (δειπνον - deipnon) and the verb "to-take-supper" (δειπνέω - deipneō).

Matt. 23

5 But all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments,

6 And love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues,

← "And-additionally they-are-loving the-first-reclining-group in the suppers"

Note "reclining" and the article "the" suppers, probably passovers. (Not "feasts.")

no article.

Mark 6

21 And when a convenient day was come, that Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords, high captains, and chief estates of Galilee;

2 "--- and first-reclining-groups in "the" suppers (As above - not feasts)

Mark 12

38 ¶ And he said unto them in his doctrine, Beware of the scribes, which love to go in long clothing, and love salutations in the marketplaces,

39 And the chief seats in the synagogues, and the uppermost rooms at feasts:

3

Luke 14

12 ¶ Then said he also to him that bade him, When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbours; lest they also bid thee again, and a recompence be made thee.

13 But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind:

14 And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.

15 ¶ And when one of them that sat at meat with him heard these things, he said unto him, Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God.

5 16 Then said he unto him, A certain man made a great supper, and bade many:

6 17 And sent his servant at supper time to say to them that were bidden, Come; for all things are now ready.

18 And they all with one consent began to make excuse. The first said unto him, I have bought a piece of ground, and I must needs go and see it: I pray thee have me excused.

7 24 For I say unto you, That none of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper.

Not "feast" but δεξιάν, dochēn, "reception."

#6 vs. 17, "on-the hour of-the supper"

The purpose here is to show all the uses of-the word "supper", not discuss theology.

Luke 20

46 Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and love greetings in the markets, and the highest seats in the synagogues, and the chief rooms at feasts:

8

"and first-reclining-groups in "the" suppers."

John 12

2 There they made him a supper; and Martha served: but Lazarus was one of them that sat at the table with him.

9

← "lying-back-together with-him"

No word "sat" and no word "table".

John 13

2 And supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him;

3 Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God;

4 He riseth from supper, and

10 ← "And (as) supper (was) having-come-to-pass" - not "ended" (see vs. 12, vs. 26)

11 ↙ "He-is-himself-rising-out-of-the-supper---"

John 21

20 Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following; which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee?

← "Who also fell-back on his chest in the supper ---"

12 / οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον
not it-is (a) lordly supper
φαγεῖν.

13 ↙ to-eat; * (A) LORDLY SUPPER

"the Lord's Supper" would

14 be - δεῖπνον τοῦ κυρίου
supper of-the Lord

1 Cor. 11

20 When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper.

21 For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken.

In 1 Cor. 11:20 we have an

adjective, (κυριακόν - kuriakon) not a noun.

The lexicons all admit this, but the pagan's lord's supper is so ingrained that various explanations are invented to translate "the Lord's Supper." First you will notice that the word supper always means a big meal. Do

you call the wafer and small glass of wine a supper?

The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament says, "In official terminology it is used especially as a technical term for 'imperial'"

p. 1096 Vol. III.

* IMPERIAL SUPPER

15 ← These last two uses of "supper" are no different in that they indicate a meal.



There are only 4 uses of the verb, to-take-supper, but we need to note these uses as well.

Rev. 19

9 And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb. And he saith unto me, These are the true sayings of God.

17 And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God;

16



Luke 17

8 And will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink?

← "What I-shall-take-(for)-supper."

Luke 22

20 Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.

← "the cup after the to-take-supper" This is the 3rd cup in the passover service. (See 1982, 83 Haqadah)

(ωσαύτως και τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνῆσαι)

1 Cor. 11

25 After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

← this Greek is exactly like that above Luke 22:20,

(ωσαύτως και τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνῆσαι)

Rev. 3

20 Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.

← "I-shall-take-supper with him and he with me."

The cup in 1 Cor. 11:25 is the 3rd cup of the passover exactly

as in Luke. To me, to try to make the "Lord's Supper" something special, totally isolated from the passover is foolishness. Jesus ate the regular passover meal on the 15th of Nisan, the lamb had been killed on the 14th.

(See the course, The Arrest and Trial of Jesus the Messiah 1978, The Day Christ Died etc. by R. H. Mount.)

A Consistent New Testament-1 Cor. 11

vs. 23 For I myself-took-along from the Lord, what also I-gave-over to-You, that the Lord Jesus in the night in-which he-was-being-given-over he-took bread

vs. 24 And having-given-thanks he-broke-(it)-in-pieces and said: *This is my body the (one) in-behalf-of YOU; this YOU-be-doing with-reference-to my remembrance.

vs. 25 In-the-same-way also the cup after tak(in)g-supper, saying; This cup is the new-quality covenant in my blood; this YOU-be-doing as-often-as YOU-might-be-drinking, with-reference-to my remembrance.

vs. 26 For as-often-as YOU-might-be-eating this bread and YOU-might-be-drinking this cup, YOU-are-proclaiming the death of-the Lord, until of-which he-might-come.

← "he-took-bread," "matzah" was the only bread he could use

during the feast of unleavened bread. Luke 22:1 p. 9

"he-broke-(it)-in-pieces". (See Apologetics * 7, Haggadah p.p. 10, 11)

* "This (matzah) is my body."

The matzah is unleavened, pierced with holes,

and browned from the furnace, a perfect picture of Jesus the Messiah.

vs. 24 "This (thing) YOU-be-doing with-reference-to my remembrance". That is, YOU, his disciples, Jews, annually keeping the passover; nothing else was at that time even thought of.

vs. 25 "The cup after tak(ing) supper", the 3rd cup. "This cup is the new-quality covenant in my blood." Again to his disciples, "YOU-be-doing this as-often-as YOU-might-be-drinking", that is every passover. (The bread was before the meal)

→ Now Paul addresses the Corinthians directly.

vs. 26 "As-often-as YOU-might-be-eating THIS BREAD (that is, the matzah of passover, once a year, the same bread Jesus used) and YOU-might-be-drinking THIS CUP (the 3rd cup of passover) YOU-are-proclaiming the death of-the Lord, until of-which he-might-come."

1. How would you be proclaiming the death of Jesus with a piece of leavened, regular loaf bread? Leaven is always sin in Scripture. Leavened bread for the "Lordly Supper" pictures Jesus as a sinner - an abomination-idolatry.

2. How would you proclaim the death of Jesus with a round wafer, the Egyptian sun god?

← See The Two Babylons, by Hislop.

Only unleavened (matzah) bread will do.

3. The cup was the cup of the passover - wine diluted with water, (see John 19:34,35) proclaims his death. (There is no way grapes could be picked in August - the juice pressed - and remain grape juice until the next April) (The third cup.)



All this nonsense comes about through pagan infiltration into the "church".

"Let-us-be-keeping-the-feast" (1 Cor. 5:8) even though we keep "part of-(a)-feast" (Col. 2:16) Our Lamb has been sacrificed once for all.

* Summary:

- ① There never has been nor is there now any agreement concerning the "Lord's Supper." pp. 1+2
- ② Thousands have died fighting one another as to how, when, and with what elements the "Lord's Supper" should be observed. pp. 3+4
- ③ The simple bread and cup was an ordinance among pagans before the time of Jesus. pp. 5+6
- ④ The first Christians never followed any of the present methods of observing the "Lord's Supper." Early, but not at first, the "church" celebrated the "Lord's Supper" in connection with a "love-feast." These "feasts" were soon corrupted and abandoned. (Jude 12, 1 Cor. 11:20-34) pp. 6+7.
- ⑤ Thousands of pagans brought into the "church," especially by Constantine, brought in their own idolatrous practises; the present systems. p. 8
- ⑥ The word "feast" (ἑορτή) in the N.T. always refers to one of the 3 feasts of the Jews. This word is translated "feast" 26x in the KJ, but 1x, "holyday." Why? It should read, "part of-(a)-feast." pp. 9, 10
- ⑦ The only use of the verb (ἑορτάζω), "let-us-be-keeping-the-feast" is explained away as not the "actual" feast, Thus paganism triumphs. p. 11
- ⑧ All of this corruption was made possible by a growing hatred of the Jews; which still exists. p. 12
- ⑨ The word "supper" (δειπνον) always denotes a big meal. (See all uses given, note the distorted translations.) A little "cup" of grape juice and a small piece of bread is hardly a supper. pp. 13+14
- ⑩ In 1 Cor. 11:20 Lord is an adjective, not a noun, hence a "Lordly Supper," "Imperial Supper." p. 14
- ⑪ Jesus instituted the "memorial?" after supper, with the 3rd cup of the passover and the broken matzah, the afikomen. (Kind of desert) p. 15
- ⑫ Jesus ate matzah, no other bread was permitted. Jesus refers to matzah when he said, "THIS bread." Paul addressing the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11:26) says, "THIS bread; THIS cup." p. 16 The first Christians observed the Jewish passover, Encyclopaedia, p. 8.