

THE TWELVE COURSES ON THE LAST SUPPER

THE TWELVE COURSES ON THE LAST SUPPER

By understanding the Jewish idioms of first-century Jerusalem and grasping the truth of what the Messiah *meant* at the Last Supper, many new truths that were previously obscured will become clear. When we consider the bread and wine (fruit of the vine) at this meal from *within* the first-century Jewish idiom, it becomes evident that Jesus was teaching in parables and not a ritual of Communion.

Instead, the Messiah was showing the true spiritual communion that God desires with, and among, His people. His words about the bread and fruit of the vine were parables to be understood within their Jewish idiom of the day.

I do not ask the reader if this is the interpretation you have previously heard, because it will most likely not be. I only ask if this is indeed what the Scriptures prove. The following conclusions are based on what proper logic and reason require when considered through the idioms of the first-century Messianic Jews. I only ask that you keep an open mind and an open heart as these points are proved using the first-century Jewish idioms and, most importantly, the word of God.

COURSE I

LAST SUPPER RITUAL OR PARABLE? THE MESSIAH HELD ONE *LEAVENED* BREAD

The Fourteenthers understood that the Last Supper was not the Passover, and this fits perfectly with the Jewish apostles and original disciples who all taught that Jesus gave them regular leavened bread at this meal. Had it actually been the Passover, serving such “bread” would have been illegal according to the law of Moses. These facts require believers to question the *unleavened* bread ritual that has been handed down from Rome and which the Protestants accidentally continued in a slightly altered form when they departed Catholicism.

For if Jesus shared regular bread at this supper (it not being the Passover), then the *unleavened* bread ritual did not come from his teachings. It was perfectly acceptable to eat regular, leavened bread (*lechem* in Hebrew, *arton* in Greek) instead of unleavened (*matzah* in Hebrew, *azumos* in Greek) only because the Last Supper took place the evening *before* the Passover sacrifice.

The original Jewish believers knew the Messiah was teaching spiritual truths, using figurative language (rather than the Roman ritual), for this is what Jesus explained to them right after supper:

^{NAS} John 16:25 “These things I have spoken to you in figurative language; an hour is coming when I will speak no more to you in figurative language, but will tell you plainly of the Father.

Uncontested Ritual

Jesus warned believers to beware of man’s traditions. Although scripture instructs us to “prove all things,” the Communion ritual is rarely questioned. However, it’s important to question it, for if this meal was indeed the Passover, then Jesus would have sinned by having regular bread with it. On the other hand, if Jesus used regular bread in a parable, why do most churches (both Catholic and Protestant) keep a ritual with unleavened bread?

According to God’s law, to eat leaven during the Passover *cut one off from Israel, and thus from God’s presence*:

^{NAS} Exodus 12:15 “Seven days you shall eat **unleavened bread**,⁵⁰ but on the first day you shall remove leaven from your houses; for **whoever eats anything leavened** from the first day until the seventh day, that person shall be **cut off from Israel**.”

^{NAS} Exodus 12:19 “Seven days there shall be no leaven found in your houses; for whoever eats what is leavened, that person shall be **cut off** from the congregation of Israel, whether *he is* an alien or a native of the land.”

Yet, all four Gospel writers—Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John—recorded that at the Last Supper, when Jesus said, “This is my body,” he held, broke, and then partook of regular *leavened* bread (*arton*).

^{KJV} Matthew 26:26 “And as they were eating, Jesus took **bread**, and blessed *it*, and brake *it*, and gave *it* to the disciples, and said, ‘Take, eat; this is my body.’”

^{KJV} Mark 14:22 “And as they did eat, Jesus took **bread**, and blessed, and brake *it*, and gave to them, and said, ‘Take, eat: this is my body.’”

^{KJV} Luke 22:19 “And he took **bread**, and gave thanks, and brake *it*, and gave unto them, saying, ‘This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.’”

^{KJV} John 13:18 “I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth **bread** with me hath lifted up his heel against me.”

Paul writes of *spiritually* fulfilling this Jewish feast of Passover with *azumos* (unleavened):

^{KJV} 1 Corinthians 5:8 “Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the **unleavened bread**⁵¹ of sincerity and truth.

50 The Hebrew word translated as “unleavened bread” does not contain the word “bread” at all; it is *matzah*.

51 The King James Version italicizes the word “bread” to indicate that it is not in the original Greek text; the Greek word used is *azumos* (unleavened).

^{GNT} 1 Corinthians 5:8 ὥστε ἑορτάζωμεν μὴ ἐν ζύμῃ παλαιᾷ μηδὲ ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας ἀλλ' ἐν **ἄζύμοις** εἰλικρινείας καὶ ἀληθείας.

Then in the same letter to the Corinthians, when Paul talks about what Jesus ate at the Last Supper, he uses *arton*, the Greek word for regular daily leavened bread, seven times. Not once does he say it was unleavened (*azumos*):

^{KJV} 1 Corinthians 11:23 “For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the *same* night in which he was betrayed took **bread**.”

^{KJV} 1 Corinthians 11:26 “For as often as ye eat this **bread**, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord’s death till he come.”

^{KJV} 1 Corinthians 11:27 “Wherefore whosoever shall eat this **bread**, and drink *this* cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.”

^{KJV} 1 Corinthians 11:28 “But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of *that* **bread**, and drink of *that* cup.”

^{KJV} 1 Corinthians 10:16b “The **bread** which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?”

^{KJV} 1 Corinthians 10:17 “For we *being* many are one **bread**, *and* one body: for we are all partakers of that one **bread**.”

As soon as Jesus spoke the following parable about *leaven*, the disciples failed to understand that he was actually speaking spiritual truth. Yet the first word that came to their minds when they thought of leaven was **bread**, for the two go hand in hand. So when Jesus mentioned *leaven*, they thought he was referring to the fact that the disciples had forgotten to bring the leftover *bread*:

^{NAS} Matthew 16:5 And the disciples came to the other side and had forgotten to take bread.

^{NAS} Matthew 16:6 And Jesus said to them, “Watch out and beware of the **leaven** of the Pharisees and Sadducees.”

^{NIV} Matthew 16:7 They discussed this among themselves and said, “It is because we didn’t bring any **bread.**”

These very same first-century Jews who equated leaven with bread would never declare to the whole world that the Messiah and his disciples broke God’s law by eating bread at Passover. Had this supper truly been the Passover, the apostles would have risked being cut off from Israel for making such a declaration.

In other words, if Jesus had actually eaten *matzah* (*azumos* in Greek), and if the Last Supper had indeed been the Passover, why would they discredit the Messiah by implying that he committed a grievous sin before the nation and before God by eating regular bread?

Additional Punishment for Leaven at Passover

Prior to the Resurrection, believers remained under Old Testament law. The Jewish writers of the Talmud describe the penalty of a high priest being whipped (referred to as “stripes”) for eating anything leavened at the Passover, just as if he had consumed blood or unclean meat. This is made clear in the following passage:

MISHNA *I*: To the following stripes⁵² apply:

... **A high-priest** who was unclean and partook of things belonging to the sanctuary or entered the sanctuary while unclean; and he who consumed illegal fat, blood, or meat left overnight from the sacrifice, or *piggul*, or unclean meat, and also of such which was slaughtered and brought outside of the Temple; **he who ate leaven on Passover**, ate or labored on the Day of Atonement; who compounded oil similar to that of the Temple, or compounded the frankincense of the Temple, or anointed himself with the oil used in the Temple; who ate carcasses or animals preyed by beasts, or reptiles—**to all of them stripes apply.** (*piggul*—*I. e.*, meat of a sacrifice illegally slaughtered.)⁵³

So if the Jewish authorities would whip even their own high priest for eating regular leavened bread at the Passover, certainly the disciples of Christ would also be soundly punished. Yet, when referring to what was eaten at the Last Supper, the scriptures all

52 This punishment comes from Deuteronomy 25:1–3.

53 Babylonian Talmud, Book 9, Tract Maccoth, ch. 3, p. 35, <http://sacred-texts.com/jud/t09/mac08.htm>.

use the Greek word *arton* for daily leavened bread, which once again proves that the Fourteenthers were correct and that this meal was not the Passover.

Some Find It “Dangerous” to Even Question the Ritual

Despite the presence of bread at the Last Supper, English translations of the Gospels *seem* to make it clear that this meal was indeed the Passover, and most churches and fellowships today adhere to this belief. Yet once I understood from the original Greek texts the proper way to translate those scriptures⁵⁴ such that all the Gospels harmonize, I became certain that the Last Supper was not the Passover.

Excited by discovering the answers to this longstanding controversy, I wrote to a few local church leaders concerning what Jesus meant when he broke the one *leavened* bread, and what this revealed about the Communion ritual with *unleavened* bread. I received the following response:

The implications of teaching that Jesus referred to leavened bread when he said, “This is my body,” are **dangerous**.

It’s not uncommon to see great religious fear and intimidation attached to the Communion ritual, and for some it can be “dangerous” to even question it. However, since the scripture warns us to “prove all things” (1 Thessalonians 5:21), we must see if this ritual and these doctrines hold up to the test of the scriptures. Jesus also cautions us to beware of man’s traditions that make the word of God of no effect (Mark 7:13, Matthew 15:6, Colossians 2:8). So at the very least, we should be willing to test this ritual to see if it falls into that category.

So I wrote that pastor back as follows:

Pastor, if that were true, then why did Jesus use the everyday word for **bread**, which was **leavened**, when he spoke of the bread at the Last Supper? Shouldn’t Jesus rather have said, “This holy and pure *azumos*, without leaven, is my body?”

Why would he use the Greek word for common daily leavened bread? Worse yet, why then would Paul, in every instance (seven in all), also use the Greek word for common daily leavened bread when he spoke of what they ate at the Last Supper? Was Paul dangerously sinning in referring to the Lord’s body, using the common Greek word for daily bread, rather than the Greek word for unleavened (*azumos*)?

54 The English translations that seem to so clearly have Jesus eating the Passover at the Last Supper will be explained correctly in “Three Keys That Unlock the Gospels.”

And I continued:

In my opinion, Jesus, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Paul were not tainting the Lord's body but they were stating a fact: that Jesus and the Apostles ate bread, and that this bread brings out the truth of what Jesus *meant* at the Last Supper.

Honest questioning as to whether the Messiah wanted an unleavened bread ritual is not dangerous before God. However, to declare you ate bread at Passover in first-century Jerusalem *would* have been dangerous.

I requested a meeting with that pastor and his research assistant to better explain these truths, but it was never granted. I was then invited to a private meeting with the next two men in line of authority under that pastor, and to their credit they saw the truth of this almost immediately. After I laid out these facts showing that the Last Supper was not the Passover, that Jesus did indeed eat bread, and that this ritual was not actually in the scriptures, one elder remarked about the ritual, saying "It's Catholic." Yet they were not about to approach their pastor with these truths, because they knew his reaction would not be good.

We often end up in churches where *man* is in control instead of allowing Christ to be the head of his Church. We need to conduct ourselves more like the Jews did in Acts 15, when reasonable men—various leaders and scholars—met and heard each other and then, led by God's spirit, decided on what the will of God was and whether or not a doctrine was from the Lord. Unfortunately, situations arise where one pastor rules as a sort of "Pope-lite," laying down the law and commanding all to believe, rather than allowing the Messiah to be the rightful head. Setting a leader with papal-style authority⁵⁵ over doctrine is not God's will for His assembly.

On a positive note, that pastor's research assistant has since started a new fellowship, and called me to say that he also is seeing some of these same truths and now agrees that the Last Supper was not the Passover.

Jesus Held One Bread, Not Multiple Breads

In every scriptural occurrence where Jesus holds bread at the Last Supper and then breaks it into pieces, the Greek word used for "bread" is always singular.

When Jesus broke the five breads and miraculously multiplied them to be distributed to the multitudes, the Greek plural word is used (Mark 6:41). When Jesus broke and multiplied the seven breads, again the plural word is used (Mark 8:6).

55 See "Appendix A: Proper Authority."

However, when the scriptures refer to the Last Supper bread that Jesus broke, in every single instance the Greek singular *arton* (“a bread”) is used.

^{KJV} Matthew 26:26 And as they were eating, Jesus took **bread**, and blessed *it*, and brake *it*, and gave *it* to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body.

^{GNT} Matthew 26:26 Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ δὸς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν, Λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.

Paul depicts this clearly when referring to what he understands from the Lord—that the one bread (singular) at the Last Supper and the pieces of it pointed ahead to spiritual truth in the New Covenant:

^{NAS} 1 Corinthians 10:17 **Since** there is one bread, **we** who are many are **one body**; for we all partake of the one bread.

Paul received special revelation from the Lord concerning the Last Supper (1 Corinthians 11:23). Paul himself was not present at the Last Supper, but he now understands that the Last Supper parables are spiritual instruction. Paul shows that at the Last Supper, when Jesus held one bread, broke it into pieces, and gave it to his disciples to partake, these individual pieces pointed to the various members that “are one body.” The Messiah’s breaking of the one bread into pieces was a parable to show that individual believers in the New Covenant would make up the one spiritual body of Christ and receive spiritual sustenance from one another, with God’s presence and the Messiah spiritually in their midst.

We can tell Paul understands this from what he teaches throughout Corinthians:

^{NIV} 1 Corinthians 12:27 Now **you** are the **body** of Christ, and each one of you is a part of it.

Since the parts of this one bread represent us—the members of the spiritual body of Christ—it makes sense that the bread was leavened because, spiritually speaking, we are not yet unleavened (i.e., experientially pure and having all truth).

As an aside, some may think it is strange that the pieces of the one bread would represent the believers, but God often used this kind of symbolic teaching through the prophets. God spoke a parable through the Jewish prophet Ezekiel to take two sticks—which he said were Judah and Joseph, representing the divided and scattered kingdom—and make them **one in a new covenant** (Ezekiel 37:16–26). In the same

way, God led the Messiah at his Last Supper to speak in parables using one bread, which he broke into pieces to show that those individual pieces represented parts/members of his spiritual body⁵⁶ and how they would function in the promised New Covenant. Paul shows that this parable meant we would all be *one* (1 Corinthians 10:17, 12:12, 13, 14, 18, 20, 25, etc.).

As with Ezekiel's parable, the parables taught by Jesus show forth aspects of this promised New Covenant and how God would unite all of his people as one.

The English Translations Can Cause Confusion

Original Hebrew and Greek scriptures never connect the word for regular leavened bread to the Feast of Unleavened, and the Jews deliberately kept this bread far away from it. Jewish writers of the Hebrew Old Testament used one word for unleavened: *matzah*. When Jewish scholars translated these Hebrew scriptures into Greek (called the Septuagint), they used the single Greek word for unleavened bread, *azumos*, which was also used by Jewish writers of the New Testament.

Literal words and typological understandings are essential to Last Supper scriptures. Yet, where the Greek and Hebrew simply read “unleavened” (*azumos* or *matzah*, respectively), English translations insert the word “bread,” thus rendering “unleavened” as two words: “unleavened *bread*.”

As a result, the Feast of Unleavened (*matzah*) was translated into English as the Feast of Unleavened **Bread**. However, this festival was never called the Feast of *Matzah Lechem* (“unleavened bread” in Hebrew), nor was it called the Feast of *Azumos Arton* (“unleavened bread” in Greek). It was not until 1,500 years or so later that the English translations joined “bread” to the name of this Jewish feast. This English idiom is now so common that it sounds strange in our vernacular to not add the word “bread” to the name of this feast, but this was not so in bible days.

Below we see the English translations join “bread” to the name of this festival by calling it the Feast of Unleavened **Bread**:

^{KJV} Exodus 12:17 And ye shall observe *the feast of* unleavened **bread**; for in this selfsame day have I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt: therefore shall ye observe this day in your generations by an ordinance for ever.

^{NIV} Exodus 12:17 “Celebrate the Feast of Unleavened **Bread**, because it was on this very day that I brought your divisions out of

56 Course 2 will delve deeper into the meaning of the pieces of bread pointing to the members of the spiritual body.

Egypt. Celebrate this day as a lasting ordinance for the generations to come.

Young's Literal Translation does a better job by not adding the word "bread":

^{YLT} Exodus 12:17 and ye have observed the **unleavened things**, for in this self-same day I have brought out your hosts from the land of Egypt, and ye have observed this day to your generations—a statute age-during.

Although it is not in the original text, most English translations add the word "bread" in referring to **what is eaten** with Passover:

^{KJV} Exodus 13:7 "Unleavened **bread** shall be eaten seven days; and there shall no leavened bread be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee in all thy quarters."

^{NAS} Exodus 13:7 "Unleavened **bread** shall be eaten throughout the seven days; and nothing leavened shall be seen among you, nor shall any leaven be seen among you in all your borders."

No fewer than 26 times do the Old Testament Hebrew scriptures mention the name of this festival, what God commanded the Jews to eat at it, or what they actually ate at it.⁵⁷ In all occurrences, the word *matzah* is used; not once does *lechem* appear, except in Deuteronomy 16:3 where *matzah* is referred to figuratively as "bread of affliction."

Why do the English translations insert the word "**bread**," when it is not present in either the Hebrew or Greek original scriptures? Is it because their translators see Jesus eating bread at what they *assume* was the Passover, and therefore try to explain it as "unleavened bread"?

Is that also why the King James translates the Greek word for Passover (πάσχα) as "Easter"—to imply that first-century Jews not only ate "bread" at Passover, but also celebrated Easter?⁵⁸

57 Exodus 12:8, 15, 17, 18, 20, 39; 13:6, 7; 23:15 (twice); 34:18 (twice); Leviticus 23:6 (twice); Numbers 9:11; 28:17; Deuteronomy 16:3, 8, 16; Joshua 5:11; 2 Chronicles 8:13; 30:13, 21; 35:17; Ezra 6:22; Ezekiel 45:21.

58 The word "Easter" comes from Astarte, the spring goddess of fertility. In Christ's day, bunnies and Astarte eggs had nothing to do with the Jewish Passover. For further reading concerning Astarte shifting to Easter, see Alexander Hyslop's *The Two Babylons*, p. 103.

^{KJV} Acts 12:4 And when he had apprehended him, he put *him* in prison, and delivered *him* to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after **Easter** to bring him forth to the people.

^{GNT} Acts 12:4 ὃν καὶ πιάσας ἔθετο εἰς φυλακὴν παραδοὺς τέσσαρσιν τετραδίοις στρατιωτῶν φυλάσσειν αὐτόν, βουλόμενος μετὰ τὸ **πάσχα** ἀναγαγεῖν αὐτὸν τῷ λαῷ.

The sad fact is that—whether by accident, idiom, or to bolster existing religious beliefs about Jesus eating bread at what was believed to be the Passover—the English translations can cloud the truth on this issue by adding “bread” to the Feast when it is not in the scripture.

Bread Is Bread?

Concerning the bread at the Last Supper, some wrongly suggest that “bread is bread” in the belief that “bread” and “unleavened bread” are essentially interchangeable. In doing so, they apparently think it would have been normal for Jews to go around Jerusalem declaring to the world that they ate bread at Passover, something that law-observant Jews would not do even in our day. They appeal to a few scriptures where bread is used figuratively for something unleavened, such as referring to *matzah* as “bread of affliction” (Deuteronomy 16:3).

Of the more than 300 times that the word “bread” is used in the scriptures for regular leavened bread, there indeed are a few rare occasions when it is used figuratively for something that was actually unleavened. However, in every single one of these cases, the scriptures fully qualify it, making it obvious that it is not meant literally (those rare occasions when something unleavened is figuratively called “bread” are covered in Course 7). The Jewish scribes never thought it was acceptable to eat bread at Passover because of its figurative uses in Deuteronomy and elsewhere.

Others point to the twelve temple breads (called “Showbread” in English), explaining that although they were always called regular “bread” in scripture, they were made unleavened in Jesus’s day. The reason that Moses called them “bread” is they *were* regular bread. And the reason God referred to them as “bread” in scripture and never once as *matzah* (unleavened) is that He never commanded for these “breads” to be made unleavened.

Jesus warned that some doctrines and traditions of the Pharisees made the word of God of none effect:

^{KJV} Mark 7:13 Making the word of God of none effect through your **tradition**, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.

It was only after the Pharisees gained control that these twelve breads were to be made unleavened, as this was not an original command from God. This Pharisaic change to unleavened therefore has no bearing on this argument.⁵⁹

New Ritual or Spiritual Truth in Parables?

It might be a surprise to some that until around the 9th to the 11th centuries, both Western and Eastern churches kept their Communion ritual with regular leavened bread. Those who imagine that the Last Supper was the Passover—at which *matzah* was eaten—must ask themselves, “How did all those early churches get it so wrong by eating regular leavened bread at their ritual?” and “Why did no historian ever record a single shred of the controversy this would have caused?”

If the Jewish apostles all taught the importance of keeping a ritual with unleavened bread, how could both Eastern and Western churches maintain their ritual with regular leavened bread for 900 years—without a single word of the controversy this shocking mistake would have caused? The reason is that the disciples never taught such a ritual, whether unleavened or leavened, for they understood it as spiritual truth in figurative language—something the Messiah was clearly known for.

Sometime after the ninth century, history shows that Rome established the doctrine of “transubstantiation.” This is probably why Rome made this late change, and insisted on using *unleavened* bread in their Communion ritual. In this Roman Catholic belief, the ritual bread actually turns into Christ’s sinless, human flesh—hence, the need for *unleavened*.

At that time, the Eastern churches derided those in the West for making this change in the ritual by calling them “Azymites” (Greek for “unleavened ones”). To this day, many Eastern churches still use regular *leavened* bread. When the Protestants left the Catholic Church, they accidentally took along the unleavened bread ritual in a slightly altered form, believing it was what the Lord wanted.⁶⁰

Last Supper Prophecy, Betrayed with Bread

In case anyone would like more proof that what Jesus shared at the Last Supper was regular leavened bread, consider the following: The betrayal of the Messiah was prophesied in the Hebrew scriptures to take place with **bread** (*lechem*), not *matzah*.

59 The history of the twelve breads being changed from leavened to unleavened will be covered in Course 7.

60 This history and the beginnings of the ritual are covered in more detail in the chapter “The Ritual—Why Didn’t the Jewish Disciples Teach It?”

It was prophesied in the Psalms that the one eating bread (*lechem*) with the Messiah would betray him. God, knowing that this betrayal would occur the evening before the Passover sacrifice, said it would be bread—regular leavened bread—that the betrayer would be eating. Otherwise, if God by His foreknowledge had known the betrayal would occur while eating the Passover, the scripture would say the “one eating my *matzah*,” not the “one eating my bread”:

^{YLT} Psalm 41:9 Even mine ally, in whom I trusted, One eating my **bread**, made great the heel against me

The present participle (“eating”) used in the Septuagint shows it is the one *presently eating* my **bread**, and at the Last Supper just before the betrayal, Jesus says that this scripture has been written of him:

^{NAS} John 13:18 “I do not speak of all of you. I know the ones I have chosen; but *it is that the Scripture may be fulfilled*, ‘He who eats My **bread** has lifted up his heel against Me.’”

Young’s Literal Translation brings out the present-tense aspect of the Messiah’s words in the Greek in this scripture:

^{YLT} John 13:18 not concerning you all do I speak; I have known whom I chose for myself; but that the Writing may be fulfilled: He who is **eating the bread** with me, did lift up against me his heel.

^{DBY} John 13:19 I tell you *it* now before it happens, that when it happens, ye may believe that I am *he*.

To paraphrase: “I tell you now, before it happens, so that you will know that this was written of me. I am he of whom this Psalm was written. I am he who will be betrayed by one ‘eating my bread,’ for just as soon as I give Judas this morsel/piece of my bread he will go out to betray me.”

^{NAS} John 13:21 When Jesus had said this, He became troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, “Truly, truly, I say to you, that one of you will betray Me.”

^{NAS} John 13:26 Jesus therefore answered, “That is the one for whom I shall dip the **morsel** and give it to him.” So when He had dipped the **morsel**, He took and gave it to Judas, *the son of Simon Iscariot*.

^{GNT} John 13:26 ἀποκρίνεται [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς, Ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ᾧ ἐγὼ βάρψω τὸ ψωμίον καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ. βάρψας οὖν τὸ ψωμίον [λαμβάνει καὶ] δίδωσιν Ἰούδα Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου.

Obviously Jesus is referring to a morsel of *bread*, as it was indeed a morsel (or “sop”) of the bread that he gave to Judas; remember the betrayal was prophesied to happen with bread (not *matzah*). This same Greek word for “morsel” (*psomion*) is used several times in the Septuagint, where it came from the Hebrew scriptures that always denoted a morsel of bread, and never a morsel of *matzah*.

In the following excerpts from the Greek lexicons, consensus exists that the Greek word *psomion* itself means a piece/morsel of bread:

UBS: ψωμίον, ου n: piece of bread⁶¹

BDAG: ψωμίον: (small) piece/bit of bread⁶²

Louw-Nida: ψωμίον, ου n: a small piece or bit of bread – ‘a piece of bread, a bit of bread.’⁶³

Here we see it used in the scripture:

^{NAS} John 13:27 And after the **morsel**, Satan then entered into him. Jesus therefore said to him, “What you do, do quickly.”

^{GNT} John 13:27 καὶ μετὰ τὸ ψωμίον τότε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὁ Σατανᾶς. λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὁ ποιεῖς ποίησον τάχιον.

When Hebrew scholars translated the following scriptures into the Greek Septuagint, they used the Greek word *arton* for regular leavened bread in every occurrence where this morsel is used:

^{LXE} Ruth 2:14 And Booz⁶⁴ said to her, Now *it is* time to eat; come hither, and thou shalt eat of **the bread**, and thou shalt **dip thy morsel** in the vinegar: and Ruth sat by the side of the reapers: and Booz handed her meal, and she ate, and was satisfied, and left.

61 *UBS Greek-English Dictionary*, p. 201.

62 Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (BDAG)*, 3rd ed., p. 1100.

63 Louw and Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, vol. 1, p. 49.

64 Most translations use the spelling “Boaz.”

^{LXT} Ruth 2:14 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Βοορ ἤδη ὥρα τοῦ φαγεῖν πρόσελθε ὠδε καὶ φάγεσαι τῶν ἄρτων καὶ βάψεις τὸν ψωμόν σου ἐν τῷ ὄξει καὶ ἐκάθισεν Ρουθ ἐκ πλαγίων τῶν θεριζόντων καὶ ἐβούνισεν αὐτῇ Βοορ ἄλφιτον καὶ ἔφαγεν καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη καὶ κατέλιπεν

^{LXE} 1 Samuel 28:22 And now hearken, I pray thee, to the voice of thine handmaid, and I will set before thee a **morsel of bread**, and eat, and thou shalt be strengthened, for thou wilt be going on thy way.

^{LXT} 1 Samuel 28:22 καὶ νῦν ἄκουσον δὴ φωνῆς τῆς δούλης σου καὶ παραθήσω ἐνώπιόν σου ψωμόν ἄρτου καὶ φάγε καὶ ἔσται ἐν σοὶ ἰσχὺς ὅτι πορεύση ἐν ὁδῷ

^{LXE} 1 Kings 17:11 And she went to fetch it; and Eliu cried after her, and said, Bring me, I pray thee, **a morsel of the bread** that is in thy hand.

^{LXT} 1 Kings 17:11 καὶ ἐπορεύθη λαβεῖν καὶ ἐβόησεν ὀπίσω αὐτῆς Ηλίου καὶ εἶπεν λήμψη δὴ μοι ψωμόν ἄρτου ἐν τῇ χειρὶ σου

^{LXE} Proverbs 28:21 He that reverences not the persons of the just is not good: such a one will sell a man for a **morsel of bread**.

^{LXT} Proverbs 28:21 ὃς οὐκ αἰσχύνεται πρόσωπα δικαίων οὐκ ἀγαθός ὁ τοιοῦτος ψωμοῦ ἄρτου ἀποδώσεται ἄνδρα

In the original Hebrew scriptures it's never called a "morsel of matzah." As we saw earlier in Psalm 41:9, it is clearly stated that Jesus would be betrayed by one eating his bread (*lechem*), and this is what happened:

^{YLT} John 13:18 not concerning you all do I speak; I have known whom I chose for myself; but **that the Writing may be fulfilled:** He who is **eating the bread** with me, did lift up against me his heel.

God knew that His Son would not be present to eat that Passover but would instead die at the legal time and day as the Passovers were to be sacrificed, soon after having been betrayed by one eating his *bread*. If Jesus had been about to eat the Passover, no bread would have been at that table.

The fact is that Jesus and the apostles did eat bread on this night of the Last Supper, just as the scriptures all say, but it was not a sin before God since this was not the night of eating the Passover. Instead, Jesus would die the following day, on which the Jews would always offer up their lambs, being the very time God's foreknowledge had ordained through Moses for them to sacrifice the Passover:

^{NAS} Acts 2:23 this *Man*, delivered up by the **predetermined plan** and **foreknowledge of God**, you nailed to a cross by the hands of godless men and put *Him* to death.

After all, how could Jesus have had a Passover lamb slain one day at the legal time, eat it that night with his disciples at the Last Supper, and then die—with he himself fulfilling the Passover sacrifice—the following day?

To summarize, the Fourteenthers witnessed the Roman Church joining the Passover with the Last Supper. However, the earliest historical evidence shows that the Last Supper was not a Passover, and the scriptures confirm this by stating that Jesus held and broke bread at this supper. So we see that something is not right in the theology that places Jesus eating the Passover with *matzah* at the Last Supper, or with his instituting a new ritual using unleavened bread.

Visit www.TheMessianicFeast.com