

A close-up photograph of a person wearing a white robe, likely a priest or minister, breaking a piece of bread. The person's hands are the central focus, with one hand holding the bread and the other tearing it. Below the hands is a white plate filled with several pieces of golden-brown, oval-shaped bread. To the right of the plate is a golden chalice. The background is dark and out of focus.

# The Flesh of Christ and The Memorial Bread

Should We Remember the Death of Our Messiah with Leavened or Unleavened Bread?



# The Flesh of Christ & The Memorial Bread

## Should We Remember the Death of Our Messiah with Leavened or Unleavened Bread?

Jesus originally instituted the memorial service with unleavened bread, as it was his last Passover meal on a Wednesday at evening on the 14th day, beginning just after sunset in the first month. It would have been a sin for him to use anything but unleavened bread at a Passover meal. When Jesus observes his next Passover meal, in the restored Kingdom of God, he will again use unleavened bread. This is clear, based on Ezekiel's Millennial Kingdom prophecy in chapter 45:21 *In the first month, in the fourteenth day of the month, ye shall have the passover, a feast of seven days; unleavened bread shall be eaten.* Since Jesus instituted the Ecclesial Age memorial service with unleavened bread at Passover, and unleavened bread will be the required pattern in the subsequent Millennial Kingdom Age one has a legitimate platform to ask why our Christadelphian community has presumed it is appropriate to change the pattern of our Messiah by substituting leavened bread in remembering the death of our savior.

This consideration will review the original defensive reasoning suggesting that this divinely unspecified substitution of leavened instead of unleavened bread was considered to be insignificant. We will also review the mountain of evidence that has been historically ignored that validates not only the legitimacy but the great significance in maintaining the original pattern our Savior demonstrated by initiating the memorial service with unleavened bread. The scriptural and creational testimony is actually overwhelming in this conclusion.

### **The Command:**

**Matt. 26:26-28** *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. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.*

**Luke 22:19-20** *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. <sup>20</sup> Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.*

**1 Cor. 11:23-29** *the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. 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. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come. 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. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.*

**1 Cor. 5:6-8** *Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? <sup>7</sup> Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: <sup>8</sup> Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.*

**1 Cor 10: 16-18** *The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? <sup>17</sup> For we being many are*

*one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.* <sup>18</sup> *Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?*

It has been reasoned, by some of our community's most respected Bible students, that we have the right to change the initial unleavened bread application that our Messiah had to have used at the first memorial service. The basis for this shift from our savior's pattern is supposedly licensed by the mere absence of the particular Greek word defining unleavened bread that supposedly would have mandated the exclusive use of the unleavened bread our Messiah undoubtedly had to use, in order to avoid sinning against his Father.

One cannot easily dismiss the reasoning of Bible students like Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts. Their insight and wisdom has been foundational to the restored enlightened community in the last days of the Ecclesial Age. Yet they and others have defended an unlicensed modification in a highly significant ritual that projects the very basis for our potential salvation. It is never inappropriate to test that validity of any understanding concerning the righteousness of our Creator, meaning the features of His right-ness, that are demonstrated in all His testimony and through all of His educational nurturing of those into whom He has planted the seed of His image and likeness. They were always ready to promote and defend the truths about our Creator. On the basis of the example of these pioneer Brethren we can and should do the same. So let's consider the historical reasoning for this supposedly meaningless modification of our Messiah's original memorial service pattern.

We will be commenting on the phrases that are color highlighted.

#### **Christadelphian Magazine 1881 Vol 18 p245**

The Mosaic law was the *morphosis* or "*representation* of the knowledge and the truth" (Rom. 2:20) —the *skia*, or "*shadow* of the future good (or heavenly) things, not itself the image of the things," (Heb. 10:1; 8:5) — the *hupodeigmata*, or "*patterns* of the things in the heavens," not "the heavenly things themselves" (Heb. 9:23): for the *soma*, or "*corporeal substance* is of the Christ." Col. 2:17. That, namely, which is constituted of the good, the true, and the heavenly, pertaining to him in all his relations.

**Unleavened breads were representative, shadowy, or typical things.** They represented "purity and truth." This is apparent from the apostle's allusion to them in 1 Cor. 5:8. "Christ our Passover," says he, "is slain for us; therefore let us keep the feast, *not with old leaven*, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the *unleavened (cakes) of purity and truth.*" When therefore the law saith, "*Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven*" (Exod. 34:25), **we have a typical enactment before us, which was fulfilled in the letter by offering the blood with dough baked before it was leavened.** This observance was an element of the typical righteousness of the law, which was to be "*fulfilled*" by those "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." (Rom. 8:4.) If a Christian drink of the Lord's cup, not discerning the Lord's body, or with malice and wickedness he eats and drinks condemnation to himself; and does not "fulfill the righteousness of the law;" but on the contrary, "offers the blood of Jehovah's sacrifice with leaven," which is death. To eat bread and drink wine at the table of the Lord is to "offer up spiritual sacrifice." This offering is "acceptable to God through Jesus Christ," 1 Pet. 2:5, when offered, not in the letter, but *in the spirit* of the law. The letter of the law is, "Thou shalt not offer the blood of my bulls and goats, heifers and lambs, with fermented bread;" but the spirit of the law, "Thou shalt not eat my flesh and drink my blood with malice and wickedness; or thou shalt be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." John 6:53–58; 1 Cor. 11:27. **We conclude, therefore, that the quality of the bread matters not**, so that we eat it in purity and truth, discerning the Lord's body. **To strain at the quality of the bread and wine, is to Judaize; and to eat unleavened bread and drink unadulterated wine with the old leaven, or the leaven of malice and wickedness, is to swallow a camel.** We walk by faith, not by the five senses.

The quality of our meat or drink commendeth us not to God, 1 Cor. 8:8; but the fulfilling all righteousness witnessed by the law and the prophets. Matt. 3:15; Rom. 3:21. In doing thus, "we worship him in spirit and in truth." John 4:24.—*Dr. Thomas.*

### **Christadelphian Magazine 1890 vol 27 p 219**

F. G. H.—"Keeping the feast" of the memorial supper, "as the Lord Himself did," is not a question of the quality of the bread and wine we use: for on this we have no directions, and "where there is no law there is no transgression." It is our moral relation to the things signified that is everything. "Let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of Malice and Wickedness, but with *the unleavened bread of Sincerity and Truth*" (2 Cor. 5:8). No brother would object to literal unleavened bread being used, but no enlightened brother would insist on it essential. As for wine, you cannot have wine without fermentation. A rabid teetotalism is responsible for a good deal of fog on this question. Grape juice is one thing: wine is another. Men may agree to call the former wine, but it is not the thing that has for ages been known as wine. Bible wine is grape juice in the vinous stage, in which there has been that amount of fermentation of the saccharine matter that imparts to it the heart-gladdening power of which David speaks.

### **Christadelphian Magazine 1890 Intelligence Vol 27 p 434**

Following one of the lectures, I was introduced to a brother who was staying away from the table, because he had conscientious convictions against eating leavened bread at the Lord's table. I tried to show him that *unleavened bread was an institution of the now fulfilled and abolished law of Moses*; and that its typical intention was realized in our keeping the memorial feast, with the "unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." His chief feeling in the matter was that Christ must have used unleavened bread in the first institution of the supper. *It was admitted that this was probable, since the supper took place during the seven days feast of unleavened bread.* But the distinctions which the Mosaic law made between leavened and unleavened bread, and between clean and unclean animals are manifestly no longer binding institutions on those who believe the Gospel. There was an object in keeping up these distinctions until that to which they pointed was accomplished or took their place. *The all-important thing now is the "unleavened bread of sincerity and truth," that being present at the feast,* we have all the *conditions* that are essential to a right and acceptable keeping of the feast. The conditions have more to do with us (for "we being many are one bread") than with the condition of the literal loaf; the thing we need most to mind is, that we ourselves are not leavened with the "leaven of malice and wickedness."

### **Christadelphian Magazine 1892 Vol 29, p 484**

W. T. H.—The crotchet on this question is nothing new. It was buzzing about in the days of Dr. Thomas, who had no patience with it. The answer is this:—"Where there is no law, there is no transgression." Those who say we ought to have unleavened bread and unfermented wine, are "wise above that which is written." The Lord has left no directions, and therefore we are free.

The object of breaking the bread and drinking the cup, is to "bring to remembrance" the things symbolized, and this does not depend upon the quality of the articles partaken of, but on mental discernment in connection with the memorial act. *The Mother of Harlots has made everything depend on the articles eaten. Thus has she "changed the ordinance," like Israel of old.*

If much is made of the quality of the articles used, the object of using them is liable to be lost sight of. The finest bread and wine will fail to refresh the memory if the spiritual apprehensions are low; while, on the other hand, indifference of quality does not interfere with the spiritually quickened.

But it is contended we ought to get as near the original as possible. A good contention when not pushed too far. The "original" breaking of bread was partaken of at a triclinos, or three-sided table encircled with a lounge. Must we provide a similar piece of furniture, and recline like the Ori-

entals? The “original” was preceded by the Jewish passover, of which, indeed, the breaking of bread and drinking wine is itself a feature. Must we, in this, imitate the original? Must we eat roast lamb just before? The disciples were attired in flowing Eastern costume; must we be likewise? The bread and wine were served in vessels of Oriental construction. Must we refrain from bringing Christ to remembrance till we have found out the exact pattern and quality of these?

The answer is obvious. If Christ had commanded conformity in these particulars, we must needs have conformed, at however great inconvenience or contempt; but there is no such command. Neither is there any direction as to the quality of the bread to be eaten or the wine to be drunk. The command is limited to the act generally of eating bread and drinking wine in remembrance. We obey this command when we eat bread and drink wine, though the loaf we eat be differently shaped and compounded, and our wine differently tasted and made.

To contend otherwise is to make the observance of the Supper impossible; for if there is anything in the contention, the identity of the bread and wine must be exact and not approximate. We must have bread made exactly of the same quality of flour in the same way, and shaped in the same mould, and wine of identical color, taste, density, and flavor to the original used. And how are we to get at them in the absence of information of what these were? There were different kinds of wine then as now, and which was it? Who can tell? The disciples bought it in Jerusalem, and the quality of it depended upon the vendor, and how long he had had it in stock. How can we know what quality that was, and how old it was?

We are not told, simply because it was of no importance to know. It will not be contended that an essential piece of information was withheld. If so, there is no hope for us, and we cannot be saved. If not, then conformity to the original only requires us to use “wine,” without being particular as to the quality, the quality being of no particular moment, any more than the quality of the cloth out of which our garment is made. It is the spiritual and not the physical use of the wine that is to be considered, and therefore its physical constitution is altogether a secondary question, and not for a moment to be called “a question of much importance.”

We are not under the law which required a minute conformity in “meats and drinks.” The yoke is easy; the burden light. We bear that burden in this particular in breaking bread and drinking wine, without being contentious on a point that cannot be settled. If we knew exactly the sort the Lord used, our love for him would lead us to get the same; but we don’t know, and must conclude it is not important for us to know.

“It has been said that leaven is typical of sin. No greater mistake than this could possibly be made, for instead of being typical of sin it is typical of the most glorious thing under the sun, viz:—The gospel of the kingdom of god; in a word the truth. Proof of this is found in Leviticus, chap. 23. In verse 10 we find the priest has to wave a sheaf of the first ripe corn for an offering to be accepted for them (verse 11). “On the morrow after the Sabbath the priest shall wave it.” This would be the third day of the Passover, and was typical of the resurrection and acceptance of Jesus on that “morrow after the Sabbath,” when he rose from the dead.

“From the day when the ‘wave sheaf’ was offered they were to number fifty days, and then they were to offer a ‘new meat offering’ unto the Lord (verse 16). ‘Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves of two-tenth deals; they shall be baked with leaven; they are the first-fruits unto the Lord’ (verse 17). In these two wave loaves we have the 144,000 first-fruits of the Apocalypse typified; one loaf representing the obedient believers of Israelish descent; the other, that company taken out of ‘every kindred and tongue, and people, and nation;’ *two* loaves but only *one* bread, and thoroughly leavened by the truth. Indeed, I think that the word ‘leaven’ is more frequently used in connection with the things of the kingdom than in any other connection, and on the earliest opportunity I will ascertain what the fact is. There are one or two other testimonies that I would have noticed, but my letter is a long one already, so for the present I will leave them.

“And, in conclusion, I may say that so far ascertain my own inclinations go, if a brother or an ecclesia prefer to use ‘unleavened bread’ and ‘unfermented wine,’ they are at liberty to do so, but when they declare it to be essential to salvation, they go beyond what is written, and so make themselves transgressors, by passing judgment on their brethren in a matter concerning which there is no law.

‘The ‘one thing needful’ is an intelligent understanding of that which is signified coupled with that mental relation to God and man, which is free from the ‘leaven of malice of wickedness’ in every form.

### **Addressing the Reasoning**

So our initial question would be whether or not the reasoning of these highly respected Brethren is legitimate or not... for presuming it is acceptable to change the pattern practiced by our Messiah when he extended one portion of the Passover meal into one of the four Ecclesial Age divinely mandated rituals.

In order to understand the divinely intended significance of any divine ritual we should address our Creator’s educational pattern of communicating through the shadows of rituals. A shadow is created when light frames and outlines a corresponding substance being witnessed in the difference between light and darkness. Hebrews confirms that the divinely mandated laws and rituals of the First Kingdom of God were shadows of heavenly things.

**Hebrews 8:4-6** *For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: <sup>5</sup> Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.*

The significance of these shadows were divinely emphasized by the consequences for disrespecting those shadows of the true substance. If priests did not wash their hands and feet at the laver before approaching the altar, God would kill them (Ex. 30:19-20). If one refused to participate in the very inconvenient ritual of a 7 day expulsion from the wilderness camp to participate in two sin offerings then they were to be forever banished from the enlightened community (Num. 19:13,20). Anyone eating leavened bread during the Feast of Unleavened Bread was also to be forever banished from the enlightened community (Ex. 12:15).

### **Shadows And The Substance From Which They Extend**

These are shadows being cast directly from the substance of our Creator’s righteousness. If that divine substance casting these temporary ritual shadows was not significant, then there would be no death sentence for disrespecting these rituals. The purpose for the significant consequences for refusing to correctly perform the divinely mandated shadow rituals was to emphasize the significance of the heavenly substance casting these temporary rituals. If the enlightened community disrespected the temporary shadow then they disrespected the eternal substance from which the shadow extended.

Therefore, before we directly address the defensive reasoning historically offered for substituting leavened bread in the observance of the memorial service ritual let’s simply underline the significance of that substance casting the memorial bread shadow. On the basis of the divine pattern demonstrated in the previous dispensation we would have to understand the direct connection between shadow and substance in all divine testimony and educational patterns. So how truly significant is the substance casting that memorial bread shadow?

## The Signature Doctrine of the AntiChrist

Jesus personally and repeatedly defines the substance casting the memorial bread shadow to be his body. It is the challenge of the understanding of the nature of that 'body' projected by the memorial bread that John warns the Brotherhood would serve as the sign of the antichrist.

**1 John 4:1-4** *Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. <sup>2</sup> Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: <sup>3</sup> And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.*

**2 John vv 7-8** *For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. <sup>8</sup> Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought.*

The denial of the flesh (the body... therefore the memorial bread, as that is the divinely appointed representation) was prophesied to become the signature doctrine of the antichrist system. This has certainly proved true. While absolutely no religious organization has attempted to suggest that Jesus of Nazareth never existed, the harlot mother church has insisted Jesus was not mortal at all, but actually God who slipped into a mortal disguise and then lied about being a human being, lied about having the capacity to sin against himself, lied about dying (as it is impossible for an immortal to die) and lied about coming back from a fake death that any immortal could not possibly have truly experienced in the first place). This perversion of the flesh (the body) of Christ reverses the divine intention of creation for man to be in the image and likeness of the Creator. This God despising denial of the 'flesh' (mortality) of Christ demands that God recalibrated himself into the image and likeness of man, to supposedly save his wrecked creation project. This denial of the flesh of Christ blasphemously elevates man above God. It is a very serious mistake to misunderstand this feature of our Messiah's initial flesh nature. Therefore it seems very strange that the nature of that divinely appointed shadow (the memorial bread) of that body, the flesh, could be so disrespected by declaring it to be insignificant and meaningless. That memorial bread represents the very body (flesh) that we have been warned would become the signature doctrine of the antichrist system. So let's take this subject about what the bread represents (that substance casting the memorial bread shadow) very, very seriously,

## Creation's Validating Testimony

After all, do we actually see in the divine testimony of the terms of creation where a giraffe can cast the shadow of a hippopotamus? Do we see a lion casting the shadow of an ox? Why would we presume we are free to change a divinely appointed shadow without any consequence to mistaking the substance casting that shadow? Do we presume we can change the shadow of our Messiah's flesh without consequence? Our Creator is the author of both the Bible (His written word) and creation (His spoken word). The only component of creation that was not verbally ordered into existence was man and woman. Our original ancestors were crafted. This verbal summons for every other feature for the six day creative process is highlighted in Psalms:

**Psalm 33:6-9** *By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; And all the host of them by the breath of his mouth. He gathereth the waters of the sea together as an heap: He layeth up the depth in storehouses. Let all the earth fear the Lord: Let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him. For he spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast.*

In fact this creative order offers an avenue of validating testimony to the written words of our Creator.

**Pslam 19:1-4** *The heavens declare the glory of God; And the firmament sheweth his handywork. Day unto day uttereth speech, And night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, Where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, And their words to the end of the world.*

Creation speaks and testifies to anyone with ears to hear and demonstrates the truth of the terms of our Creator's righteousness (His eternal truths and principles) to anyone with seeing eyes. This is why Jesus quotes creation to declare our responsibility to love our enemies and bless those that curse us.

**Matthew 5:43-45** *Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.*

Jesus did not quote the Old Testament but weather patterns to prove the legitimacy of this greatly expanded understanding of his Father's righteousness. Rain and sunshine prove the truth of his teaching. So do shadows.

Paul quotes creation in his rebuke of the Corinthian Christadelphians for permitting the leavenous growth of a doctrinal contradiction to the promise of resurrection.

**1 Corinthians 15:35-38** *But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die: And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain: But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.*

The principle and promise of the resurrection is demonstrated all throughout the terms of creation. This creational testimony is why the previously "very good" creation model had to be dramatically downgraded when Adam & Eve's sin contagiously corrupted all of creation. Divine uncleanness is always contagious (Lev. 15:1-10). The earth itself was cursed due to the Edenic failure (Gen 3:17). Therefore everything is cursed, on the basis of the principle of the contagious nature of the divine principle of uncleanness. It should be noted that divine cleanness (physical holiness) was not contagious. The status of holiness could only be awarded by direct contact with an appointed holiness source, such as the Altar of Burnt Offering or the sin offering. God emphasizes this issue with the leaders of the enlightened community through the prophet Haggai.

**Haggai 2:11-14** *Thus saith the Lord of hosts; Ask now the priests concerning the law, saying, If one bear holy flesh in the skirt of his garment, and with his skirt do touch bread, or pottage, or wine, or oil, or any meat, shall it be holy? And the priests answered and said, No. Then said Haggai, If one that is unclean by a dead body touch any of these, shall it be unclean? And the priests answered and said, It shall be unclean. Then answered Haggai, and said, So is this people, and so is this nation before me, saith the Lord.*

Yahweh highlighted how the assignment of holiness by touch had to be direct and not indirect. This is exactly the opposite pattern for uncleanness (unholiness) where anything touching an uncleanness host automatically became a new uncleanness host.

### **The Creational Bond Between Physical and Spiritual**

This is also the principle by which the creational model will be dramatically modified when Christ returns and binds sin, the devil, the serpent and the dragon in the bottomless pit for 1,000 years. Since sin is restrained, the physical consequences of sin are automatically restrained, with venomous serpents becoming harmless, wars ending, carnivorous beasts being biologically changed to harmless herbivores and mortal human lives being extended to such a degree a man dying at 100 years old is mourned as if he died as a child (Is. 65:17-25).

The point in this scriptural exercise has been to validate the significance of divine shadow testimony. Shadows are a feature of the creational model. These divinely appointed shadows testify of the true



and eternal substance from which the divinely appointed shadows extend. Therefore, we do not have the freedom to disrespect divine shadows without encouraging divine displeasure. There is no freedom to modify divinely appointed shadows. While the education of the Ecclesial bride of the son of God certainly goes through transitions with changing priesthoods and changing rituals, we will find that the unleavened bread shadow has and will maintain its exclusive application through all four of the divinely appointed educational dispensations in the Creator's plan, without exception.

### **The Shadow of the Breaking of the Memorial Bread**

Let's consider one feature of this memorial bread shadow. Just like the unleavened nature of the memorial bread, there is no direct command to actually 'break' the memorial bread. This is something our Messiah simply performed, just like using unleavened bread demanded by His Father at every Passover. Therefore, employing the reasoning quoted at the beginning, suggesting the absence of a direct and childishly simple command frees us from any responsibility to maintain the original pattern, we should be free to conveniently serve unbroken memorial bread. Is that legitimate reasoning? Let's examine this 'breaking' aspect of the shadow testimony of the memorial bread that represents the flesh of our savior.

That 'breaking' of the memorial bread is powerfully emphasized by the recognition that Yahweh would not allow a single bone of His son's body to be broken. Yet the pattern is perfectly clear that Jesus broke the bread that he identifies as his body, before distributing that memorial bread to his disciples. Yet Jesus did not technically 'command' the bread to be broken. He simply established the pattern, just like with the unleavened bread. The significance of breaking the memorial bread (the Messiah's body) is a silent shout to the hearing ears within the enlightened community. Does it make a difference whether that bread being broken (the unbroken body of our Messiah) is leavened or unleavened? It certainly does. Shadows define substance. Admittedly it is defining the substance that is the real goal. But if we have the wrong shadow, our opportunity for defining the substance casting that shadow becomes exponentially more difficult.

### **Are We Free to Selectively Dismiss Divinely Appointed Shadows ?**

This mental exercise is certainly not fully developed, but the point should be accepted that the issue of the flesh of Christ, symbolized in the memorial bread, is of paramount importance to the community of the enlightened faithful. Therefore let's address the color highlighted sections of the reasoning of these respected pioneers.

- *Unleavened breads* were representative, shadowy, or typical things
- we have a typical enactment before us, which was fulfilled in the letter by offering the blood with dough baked before it was leavened.

The presumptive conclusion being promoted is that because unleavened bread is merely a shadow, a representation, that this makes its integrity inconsequential. It is presumed that only the substance casting the shadows has any significance. That presumption is very dangerous. If this were the case then we would be free to change any of the divinely appointed rituals of the Ecclesial Age. Why should we be fully immersed in water to be baptized, if shadows are completely meaningless and free to be disrespected? There is no direct command with a specific Greek word being used directing us to be 'fully' immersed. Therefore how is this issue different from using the 'unleavened' bread demanded by Yahweh at every Passover and offered by Christ at his last Passover as the precedent for understanding how the offering of his body was instrumental in our salvation? If we are free to change one ritual from the offered pattern then why are we not similarly licensed for all Ecclesial Age rituals? Why shouldn't Sisters be able to insult the righteousness of our Creator's hierarchy structure by praying with an uncovered head, radiating the glory of man in the face of God with an uncovered head

when directly addressing Him? Why shouldn't Brethren be free to insult the righteousness of our Creator's hierarchy of God being the head of Christ being the head of man being the head of woman by praying with a covered head? Why should we even bother with a memorial service... if shadows are so meaningless? The reasoning that simply because the memorial bread is a shadow, therefore that nature of that bread is inconsequential, is far more than illegitimate. That reasoning is actually dangerous.

The statement that "the enactment was fulfilled in the letter" is a suggestion that once it was initially fulfilled the shadow became inconsequential. While there is a sliver of truth in this, the application is groundless. Jesus is already dead so why do we have to remember that fulfillment in the letter with the memorial service? This is the same mistake many Christadelphians make in our generation when they assume the Kingdom of God will not be a restoration of the previous Kingdom of God... that there will be no temple, no bloody animal offerings, no circumcision, no Sabbath observance and no harvest feast week celebrations. The historically extensive spiritual blindness of the enlightened community is not limited to the preceding Patriarchal and First Kingdom Ages.

### **The Altar Offerings Were Fulfilled in the Letter But Will Be Restored**

Were not those sin and burnt and peace and trespass and bread and wine altar offerings fulfilled in our Messiah? Then why will Yahweh be demanding their observance again? We certainly do not have to observe these rituals during the Ecclesial Age, but this is just another temporary stage in the divine plan. We are not the last educational stage. We would have to ask **why** our Messiah is prophesied as actually having to offer a sin offering "for himself" during the Millennial Kingdom (Ezek 45:22). Wasn't that typical sin offering fulfilled in his death at his crucifixion? It would be impossible to presume that prophesied Prince is anyone other than Jesus Christ, as the Prince is the only one allowed to enter that 4th temple through the eastern gate. That 'Prince' is expressed as a prince for the same reason King David insisted to his wife Michal that he was only appointed as a Prince of Israel in the place of her father. David recognized that Yahweh was actually the true King and therefore he was truly only a prince. There is a wonderful and perfectly understandable answer as to why Jesus (the prince) will have to offer a sin offering for himself during the restored Kingdom. That is because he will still have the last two maturing stages of sin to defeat in both the saints and all of creation... not just himself. His defeat of sin in all its applications has not yet been achieved. Sin and death still exist. He only eliminated sin in himself so far. He has more to do and he is the only one capable of defeating sin in all 3 of its maturing stages throughout all of creation. Bro. Roberts suggests that sin offering for the Prince is a memorial for what is past but that would invalidate his own reasoning that once the letter of the law has been fulfilled that a ritual detail becomes inconsequential, as he suggested to license changing Christ's memorial bread pattern from unleavened to leavened. In fact both the memorial service and the sin offering by and for the Prince in the Millennial Kingdom are shadows of unfulfilled substance.

We have to understand that there are stages in the process of a divine "fulfillment". If the lesson of the unleavened bread representing the flesh of our Messiah was "fulfilled" and therefore inconsequential, then why will Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread be required to be observed again during the Millennial Kingdom (Ezek 45:21)? Obviously the use of the unleavened bread shadow has **not** been completely fulfilled and that highlighted claim is illegitimate. There is more yet to be fulfilled because that shadow of unleavened bread will still be defining the substance casting that exact same shadow in the Millennial Kingdom.

### **If The Memorial Bread Shadow "Matters Not" then the Substance of the Body/Flesh of Christ Casting That Shadow Must Also "Matter Not"**

- We conclude, therefore, that the quality of the bread matters not,
- To strain at the quality of the bread and wine, is to Judaize; and to eat unleavened bread and drink unadulterated wine with the old leaven, or the leaven of malice and wickedness, is to swallow a camel.
- The quality of our meat or drink commendeth us not to God
- It was admitted that this was probable, since the supper took place during the seven days feast of unleavened bread.

### Quality or Nature?

The use of the term “quality” in reference to the difference between unleavened bread and leavened bread is dramatically illegitimate. It is like a magician’s dependence on misdirection to perform his entertaining trick. The leavened or unleavened ‘nature’ of the memorial bread is not an issue of ‘quality’ but an issue of ‘nature’. Just because men and women are both human beings are we free to distinguish between the genders with a distinction of ‘quality’? That would certainly be not only insulting to women but highly illegitimate from a divine perspective. There is certainly a gender differential in relation to divine assignments and ritual observations but that too is not based on quality but the ‘nature’ of the gender. One might argue about the ‘quality’ of leavened bread to unleavened bread, perhaps on the basis of taste or texture. However it is certainly not a question of ‘quality’ between the dramatically different nature of unleavened bread and leavened bread. That “quality” distinction is simply an illegitimate term harnessed for the purpose of misdirection to defend one’s illegitimate understanding.

### The Unleavened Nature of the Memorial Bread Declares His Guilt-free and Unblemished Status as the Perfect Sacrifice

It is the ‘unleavened’ bread that declares the unpolluted nature of our Messiah’s sin cursed flesh, as can be endlessly demonstrated throughout scripture with an invariable pattern. Yes, his body was mortal (and therefore casting a ‘bread’ shadow through a variety of divine rituals) suffering under the divinely right ‘curse of death’ inherited from his mother. However, unlike everyone else our Messiah’s ‘flesh’ never allowed the temptations issuing from within and without to conceive into guilty sin (Js. 1:14-15). Jesus was unpolluted by guilty sin at his death, qualifying that voluntary death as a perfect declaration of his Father’s righteousness in originally and righteously demanding death for sin in Eden. If we change the shadow of the bread from unleavened to leavened, we automatically change the substance casting that shadow from an unpolluted body to a body polluted by guilty sin. It isn’t a question of the ‘quality’ of the bread. It is a question of the ‘nature’ of the bread. That ‘quality’ distinction is simply an illegitimate misdirection exercise excusing a convenience indulgence, just like the Jews with all their indulgent convenience variations degrading the intent of Sabbath law.

### Has God Truly Left Us Without Direction - Or Do We Just Have Unseeing Eyes

- “Keeping the feast” of the memorial supper, “as the Lord Himself did,” is not a question of the quality of the bread and wine we use: for on this we have no directions, and “where there is no law there is no transgression.”

We have already addressed the highly illegitimate use of the inappropriate term ‘quality’ in relation to the unleavened or leavened nature of the memorial bread. But, the statement that “we have no direction” is also completely illegitimate. This false conclusion is based on the inappropriate presumption that simply the absence of the Greek word for unleavened bread being used in the context of the first memorial service somehow offers an escape from the slight inconvenience of using unleavened bread to represent the unpolluted status of the body of our Messiah. There is actually a very **extreme** level of scriptural and creational “direction” for continuing the pattern that our Messiah employed in the first memorial service by using unleavened bread at his last Passover meal.

### **1st: The Illegitimacy of the Term “Probably”**

It is highly inappropriate to begrudgingly suggest that Jesus “probably” did use unleavened bread to institute the bread and wine memorial. Jesus was not a sinner. If he had eaten leavened bread with the Passover meal he would have broken God’s direct command, being guilty of a sin and therefore disqualified as the blemish free offering for sin that would save mankind. His Father absolutely forbid any leavened bread ever being used in the Passover meal and actually demanded that leaven not even be present in the homes of the enlightened community during the subsequent 7 days of the feast of unleavened bread (Ex. 12:8,15,17-20; 13:3,7). Again, Jesus was not a sinner and therefore would not have broken his Father’s direct command to exclusively eat unleavened bread with a Passover meal. It is not simply ‘probable’ Jesus used unleavened bread to initiate the bread and wine memorial. It is an absolute prerequisite for his own sacrificial effectiveness. He would never have been able to rise back to life from death if he had casually and disrespectfully substituted the absolutely forbidden leavened bread at that Passover institution of the bread and wine Ecclesial Age ritual, violating his Father’s highly emphasized command. The term “probably” in reference to our Messiah using unleavened bread at the first memorial meal is completely and disrespectfully illegitimate.

### **2nd: Redundancy**

Why would the particular word for unleavened bread even be expected in the bread and wine memorial precedent, as opposed to the generic term for bread? That would be unnecessarily redundant. Of course it had to be ‘unleavened’ bread! That was all Yahweh had ever allowed for a Passover meal, due to the divine substance casting that unleavened bread shadow. To say the Passover bread was unleavened bread would be like saying Jesus was killed dead. If one is killed then they are certainly dead without having to add that meaningless redundancy. Of course it was unleavened bread. It was a Passover meal. It could be nothing but unleavened bread, or it would have been highly insulting to Yahweh’s mandate and the substance of the Creator’s righteousness casting that unleavened shadow. The absence of that particular word for unleavened bread should be an expected form of expression due to the ‘presumption of familiarity’ that serves as a standard communication pattern throughout the New Testament.

Redundancy is certainly one of the divine communication tools. When employed, it is a spotlight that invariably invites considerable depth within that repeated expression. However it is not an indiscriminate communication tool in scripture. There is certainly a presumption of familiarity employed throughout the expressions of the New Testament. Using the generic term for bread in relation to the memorial service is an example of that presumed familiarity that is a common tripping point to the unenlightened Christian corrupters of Bible truths. The enlightened community should energetically avoid falling into that same trap of not expecting a presumption of familiarity. Of course the bread Jesus used in that first Memorial Service was unleavened, as exclusively demanded by his Father with extreme consequences for any substitution. This cannot be repeated often enough: Jesus was not a sinner. He would have been a sinner if he had substituted leavened bread to observe Passover. The very minimalizing and disrespectful suggestion that Jesus only “probably” used unleavened bread to institute the memorial service during Passover is extremely inappropriate and illegitimate.

### **3rd: The Divine Communication Pattern of Intentional Complexity and Its Purpose**

The presumption is made that if this were actually a ‘significant’ issue then the specific Greek word for unleavened bread would have been used in the gospels instead of the generic word for bread. That dependence on assured simplicity to insure any level of divine significance violently contradicts the entire communication policy of the Creator of heaven and earth. Not only is intentional complexity the obvious communication pattern of our God and His son, it is their very clearly stated policy. So on

what basis can anyone suggest that in this one single issue that invariable communication pattern of intentional complexity must be utterly abandoned by God and Christ?

### **The Intentional Complexity Policy in Divine Communication**

God demanded to know why Aaron and Miriam were not afraid to undermine the only man in the world to whom He could speak without that intentional complexity with which Yahweh exclusively communicated with every other prophet.

**Numbers 12:4-9** *And the Lord spake suddenly unto Moses, and unto Aaron, and unto Miriam, Come out ye three unto the tabernacle of the congregation. And they three came out. And the Lord came down in the pillar of the cloud, and stood in the door of the tabernacle, and called Aaron and Miriam: and they both came forth. And he said, Hear now my words: If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold: wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against my servant Moses? And the anger of the Lord was kindled against them; and he departed.*

Yahweh exclusively communicated with intentional complexity (dreams, visions, dark sayings, shadows) to every other person except Moses, the meekest man in the world (vs.3). Sadly Aaron and Miriam (two of the most influential and respected members of the enlightened community) were not smart enough to respect the consequences of that intentional complexity communication pattern. There was certainly a consequence for disrespecting the one exception for this invariable divine communication pattern. Miriam was inflicted with leprosy, which may have been permanent if not for Moses requesting mercy for his older sister. Perhaps we too should be careful about dismissing the invariable policy of intentional complexity by suggesting that if something isn't childishly simple, obvious and unmistakable... then it has to be meaningless.

### **Why Speakest Thou Unto Them in Parables?**

Jesus communicated to the enlightened community (the Ecclesia of his generation) to whom he was commissioned to preach with exactly the same intentionally complex teaching pattern of his Father. Jesus only spoke in parables to the general population of the enlightened community (the Ecclesia) to whom he was exclusively commissioned to preach. Jesus didn't explain those obviously confusing parables to anyone but his closest disciples privately (Matt. 13:34-35; Mark 4:33-34). It is obvious these parables were confusing because those closest disciples frequently needed explanations. Additionally they did not understand the necessity for the intentionally complex nature of the ministry of Jesus. They asked him why he taught in parables. His answer defines the entire purpose for the invariable divine policy of intentionally complex communication that is so disrespected when we presume that if the particular word for unleavened bread is not used then we are automatically free to abandon the pattern our Messiah demonstrated in that first memorial service.

**Matthew 13:10-15** *And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables? <sup>11</sup> He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. <sup>12</sup> For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath. <sup>13</sup> Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. <sup>14</sup> And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: <sup>15</sup> For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.*

The intentionally confusing parables of our Messiah were intended to cleave the enlightened community to whom he was exclusively commissioned to preach into the two groups of 'have' and 'have not'.

Those within the enlightened community who 'had' would get more. Those within the enlightened community who 'had not' would lose what little they had in the first place. Jesus defines the having or not having application to be hearing ears and seeing eyes. This is not a distinction between the enlightened community and the unenlightened, as is often illegitimately presumed. Jesus was only commissioned by his Father to preach to the enlightened community that were already in a covenant relationship... exactly like the Christadelphians. That intentional complexity communication pattern Yahweh exclusively employed with the enlightened community is the same pattern Jesus employed with the enlightened community during his ministry. It is not until Christ returns in power and glory that his personal ministry will extend to the unenlightened community. That is when enlightenment will no longer be optional on a global scale when the divine communication policy will be dramatically simplified. It will be the fear of God that will circumcise the hearts of those reluctant to voluntarily humble themselves through that personally degrading process of enlightenment.

### **The Disciples That Walked Away**

This separation within the enlightened community on the basis of intentional complexity was demonstrated powerfully when Jesus shocked his disciples by declaring they would have to eat his flesh and drink his blood if they ever wanted to inherit eternal life (John 6). He let disciples walk away forever rather than simply explain he was speaking representatively and not literally (Jn 6:60-66). They were supposed to understand the shadows. These disciples tripped over this communication policy of intentional complexity.

*Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard this, said, This is an hard saying; who can hear it? When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life. But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him. And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father. From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him.*

That resistance to embrace that intentional complexity in our Messiah's teaching is evident in the oddly convoluted and defensive explanations often being offered in our community to the supposedly challenging statement by Jesus: *Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?*

The immediate context was eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Jesus, referencing the memorials of his death and resurrection. Therefore exactly how difficult should it be to understand that Jesus is asking that if they have a difficult time understanding the symbolic (shadow) applications of his death and resurrection then how are they going to deal with the actual reality... when they see him alive again, ascended from the grave to where he was before? If we dismiss the intentional complexity key to our Messiah's question then yes... we are left with a clumsy attempt of defensively addressing some kind of return to heaven, which has absolutely nothing to do with the immediate context or the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood. That intentional complexity not only separated between the disciples who walked away disgusted and the disciples that stayed, but still separates the 'haves' from the 'have nots' among the Christadelphian disciples in the final generations of this Ecclesial Age.

### **The Two Blood Categories of Clean Animals Under Divine Law**

This separation distinction within the enlightened community is similar to the distinction of the blood (represented by the memorial wine) in the context of divinely clean animals. The blood of a 'sacrificial' and clean animal had to be offered at the Christ altar without exception.

**Lev. 17:8-9,11** *And thou shalt say unto them, Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers which sojourn among you, that offereth a burnt offering or sacrifice, <sup>9</sup> And bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer it unto the Lord; even that man shall be cut off from among his people.*

*For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.*

However the blood of a clean animal qualifying as an acceptable diet component, but not qualifying as being a sacrificial animal required at the altar was exclusively bound to the dust.

**Lev. 17:13-14** *And whatsoever man there be of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, which hunteth and catcheth any beast or fowl that may be eaten; he shall even pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with dust. For it is the life of all flesh; the blood of it is for the life thereof: therefore I said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh: for the life of all flesh is the blood thereof: whosoever eateth it shall be cut off.*

The blood represents mortal life, as repeatedly stated. Blood serves as a divinely appointed shadow of the substance of mortal life. The dust represents death, because that was how the curse was defined. *Dust thou art and to dust thou shalt return.* The distinction between the blood (life) of these two sub-categories of 'clean' animals was whether they were domesticated service animals or wild animals. The wild clean animal projects those within the enlightened community with ears that don't hear and eyes that don't see... just like the disciples that walked away from Jesus because they couldn't understand the intentional complexity of the Master's unexplained requirement for eating his flesh and drinking his blood. Therefore their 'life' is bound to the curse of death just as the clean wild beasts blood had to be poured into the dust.

This 3rd point is that we have no right to base our presumptions about significance on a simplicity requirement. The default expectation of simplicity to define divine significance completely contradicts God's invariable pattern of intentionally complex testimony. It is never wise to contradict the Creator of heaven and earth.

#### **4th: The Extreme Inappropriateness of Creatively Modifying Divine Rituals**

Changing or ignoring divinely appointed details in divine rituals has never been nor will it ever be inconsequential. This is because the shadows of divinely mandated rituals are projected by the substance of the terms of our Creator's righteousness. Subsequent commentary will conclusively prove that leaven represents a polluted state while the absence of leaven signifies an unpolluted state. These representations are 100% consistent throughout the Bible without a single exception... including the requirement for the limited use of leavened bread in certain divine rituals and a parable of the Kingdom. If we change the shadow of the memorial bread from unleavened to leavened bread, then we necessarily change the substance from which that shadow extends, suggesting our Messiah's flesh was polluted with transgressional sin when sacrificed in his crucifixion.

#### **The Red Heifer and How Death Defeats Death**

The red heifer ritual is a shadow projection of how our Messiah's death would have the capacity to cleanse the faithful from the defilement of death. Anyone touching a dead body had to exit the enlightened community's wilderness camp surrounding the sanctuary of God and participate in two sin offering rituals on the 3rd and 7th days in order to return to their family and the camp. The divine requirements for the physical features of that red heifer were very specific as they project the righteousness of our Creator in how and when His son would reconcile us to Him through His son's sacrificial death. Yahweh demanded a female bovine that had never given birth and never served under a

yoke, also having completely red skin but not a single blemish. Which shadow detail do you think the enlightened community was free to dismiss simply because it was a shadow?

### **An Albino Painted Red?**

If we were foolish enough to respect the Christian understanding that the flesh of Jesus was just a painted on disguise (as Trinitarians do in their denial of the flesh of Christ), then that red heifer should have been an albino required to be only painted red and not a red body by nature. That skin, that body of the heifer had to be physically red to project the spiritual truth that our Messiah's body suffered with the same sin cursed nature imposed on Adam and Eve in Eden for introducing that creation corrupting sin into a previously "very good" creative order. We have been warned that the denial of the 'flesh' of Christ would be the signature doctrine of the antichrist system, which would develop from within the enlightened community. However, despite the body of the Jesus/heifer being red it also could have no blemishes whatsoever. This projects the truth that in order for our Messiah's sacrifice to be effective for reconciling the defilement of death for the enlightened community he not only had to have a sin cursed nature (the red body of the heifer) in order to generate temptations, but that he also could not have generated any transgressional sins (completely without blemishes). These two red heifer issues are projected in the memorial bread in that we use bread (signifying the mortal flesh nature of the Messiah) but that this bread should be unleavened (signifying that this mortal flesh nature had not been polluted with personal and guilty transgressional sin).

### **Why Does God Require Rituals and Enforce Them with Death Sentences?**

We may be encouraged to ask 'why' our Creator uses physical rituals to such an extreme extent. Why did the enlightened community have to slaughter animals and burn them on a bronze fire pit? Why did priests have to dress a certain way? Why were divine sanctuaries architecturally designed so meticulously? Why were the priests threatened with death if they didn't wash their hands and feet at the laver before approaching the altar? Why were people threatened with death for merely gathering firewood on a Saturday morning? Why did the Levites have to personally carry that very heavy golden Ark of the Covenant rather than conveniently transporting it on an ox drawn cart? Why do Sisters have to cover their hair during any prayer to avoid offending the Creator of heaven and earth?

Certainly we have the educational application for the endless physical portrayals of divine truths and principals. However the ultimate and foundational application for these required physical projections of spiritual truths is the necessity for all that is physical to blend harmoniously with all that is spiritual in our Creator's ultimate plan. When God will "*be all in all*", after the last enemy (death) will have been eliminated then all of creation will have to be in perfect physical compliance with our Creator's eternal truths and principals. No contradictions to that eternal righteousness (right-ness) will be tolerated either physically or spiritually. Not only will there be no death (and therefore, necessarily, no sin) there will be no decay or rusting or rotting or any other effects of the sin curse. We are told there will be no darkness. There will be nothing 'unclean' that continues to exist when the Creator will "be all" as well as "in all" (1 Cor. 15:28). All that is physical will harmoniously blend with all that is spiritual, without a single contradiction at any level of examination. Therefore why should it be difficult to understand the significance of properly exercising the physical rituals that are intended to demonstrate the corresponding spiritual truths, when performed properly? Why should it be difficult to understand that divine shadow rituals define the eternal substance casting those shadows?

### **The Spiritual Restraining of Sin Demands A Corresponding Restraining of the Physical Effects of Sin**

A confirmation of this understanding or how the physical effects of sin are bound to the spiritual truth of sin is how the creational order changes in direct accordance to the chaining of sin during the Mil-



lennial Kingdom. Just as the four sin icons are chained in the bottomless pit for 1,000 years (Rev. 20:1-3) so there is a corresponding dramatic reduction in the intensity of the physical effects of sin. We can read many prophecies about how military weapons are reforged into agricultural tools. Military education centers will be shuttered (Is. 2:4; Micah 4:3). There is a rest from the curse on the ground during the Sabbath Kingdom so that desolate wilderness blossoms into verdant gardens (Is. 35). New agricultural species will reduce world hunger and provide medicine to alleviate disease (Ezek. 34:29; 47:12). Dangerous carnivorous beasts will be biologically transformed into herbivores and poisonous snakes will become naturally venomless (Is. 11:6-8; 65:25). Mortal life will be extended so significantly that a man dying at 100 years old will be mourned as if he died as a child, with most of his life before him (Is. 65:20).

### The Foolishness of Exact Retribution

There is a direct link between sin and the physical effects of sin. However this understanding is not a license for the foolishness of exact retribution, suggesting that any degree of suffering or misfortune would somehow highlight personal transgressions. That ungodly presumption would be based on the absurd presumption of limiting the definition of sin to nothing more than transgressions of the law. If the principle of sin exclusively applied to transgressional guilt and suffering somehow validated guilty sin then we would have to conclude Jesus of Nazareth was a sinner and his sacrificial death would have been ineffective.

The plan of God demands an eventual physical as well as spiritual harmony with the Creator's eternal right-ness. This is the precedent for why there are so many divinely mandated physical rituals being used to project divine truths and principles. Additionally this understanding explains why death sentences and permanent banishment underscored the significance of properly observing a number of these physical rituals.

- Ex 30:20-21 *When they go into the tabernacle of the congregation, they shall wash with water, that they die not; or when they come near to the altar to minister, to burn offering made by fire unto the Lord: So they shall wash their hands and their feet, **that they die not.***
- Lev 16:2 *Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the vail before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark; **that he die not.***
- Lev. 16:13 *And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that is upon the testimony, **that he die not.***
- Num. 19:20-21 *But the man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, **that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation,** because he hath defiled the sanctuary of the Lord: the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him; he is unclean.*

### The Two Aspects of Holiness

Both moral holiness and physical holiness had to be respected and observed under the laws of the Kingdom of God or the consequences were severe. This observation also blends perfectly with the ultimate physical and spiritual harmony in the Creator's plan that is demonstrated in why physical rituals project spiritual truths.

*Lev. 11:43-47 Ye shall not make yourselves abominable with any creeping thing that creepeth, neither shall ye make yourselves unclean with them, that ye should be defiled thereby. <sup>44</sup> For I am the Lord your God: ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy; for I am holy: neither shall ye defile yourselves with any manner of creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. <sup>45</sup> For I am the Lord that bringeth you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God: ye shall therefore be holy, for I am holy. <sup>46</sup> This is the law of the beasts, and of the fowl, and of every living creature that moveth in the waters, and of every creature that creepeth upon the earth: <sup>47</sup> To make a difference between the unclean and the clean, and between the beast that may be eaten and the beast that may not be eaten.*

Divinely mandated physical rituals should not be minimalized. We are not free to modify them according to our own preferences without consequence. Should Sisters be allowed to pray with an uncovered head or Brothers with a covered head, thereby contradicting the Creator's righteousness in the testimony of His hierarchy of being the head of Christ who is the head of man who is the head of woman? We should not indiscriminately substitute leavened bread for unleavened bread in our representation of our Messiah's sacrificial body, projecting the understanding that his body was polluted with guilty transgressional sin as well as guilt free sin nature at his death. Our Creator's plan mandates the harmonious blending of all that is physical with all that is spiritual. This policy is demonstrated in the many physical rituals projecting divine truths (divine right-ness). Dismissing this divinely intended physical/spiritual integration as being insignificant is a very unwise policy.

Let's examine one last correspondence published in the Christadelphian magazine of 1927: Intelligence vol 64 p 56

X. writes: I am not altogether satisfied with your reply to T.E.W. Is it not a fact that Jesus used unleavened bread in the Passover? And ought we not to follow his example?

Answer.—Read again what was advanced in our December issue, and surely you will not want to "Judaize." Why should we stop at unleavened bread? Why not "keep the feast" by having the literal lamb? Again, Jesus was circumcised in the flesh. Ought we not then to be circumcised in the flesh? This was the teaching of the Judaisers in the apostolic age.

### The 'Judaizing' Effect

This reasoning is just another misdirection. Jesus did not command the faithful of the Ecclesial Age to continue the entire Passover, just the bread and the wine of Passover. The weight of proof is assigned to those who wish to **change the pattern** our Messiah established, not those who wish to maintain the pattern he demonstrated. The name-calling is particularly interesting, as those who wish to change the unleavened bread pattern exclusively used throughout scripture to identify an unpolluted state are demonstrating the exact same manipulating thought process as the Jewish law scholars who twisted the requirements of the laws of God to accommodate their own conveniences and preferences, often similarly contradicting divine principles. Jesus highlighted their corruption of the 5th commandment with their law of Corban. This presumed that willing one's goods to the temple treasury excused children from expending their assets on caring for their aging parents. The Jewish enlightened community strained at gnats and swallowed camels with their law manipulations about what could and couldn't be done on a Sabbath day. Substituting the more convenient leavened bread for the pattern established by our Messiah with unleavened bread at the memorial at Passover is a perfect continuation of the same baby-step corrupting thought process of the Jewish pattern with the laws and rituals of God. The camel being swallowed by insisting leavened bread is actually more morally right changes the substance this memorial bread shadow that is being cast from ... to necessarily a polluted nature of the body of Christ. This suggests our Messiah was not transgression free at his death when the power of sin was broken in his sin cursed body. Leaven always, without exception anywhere in scripture, projects the principle of a polluted state.

The fact that Jesus was circumcised in the flesh does not demand that we be circumcised in the flesh, as this is not a command of the Ecclesial Age, unlike observing memorial service. It is a great blessing that we are not required to be exactly like our Messiah in every detail in order to be saved. We are incapable of living without transgressional sin. If we had to exactly match every feature of our Messiah's compliance to the laws of God delivered through His servant Moses, we would all be rejected. Therefore to suggest that our insisting on continuing the pattern Jesus established by using unleavened bread for the commanded memorial service would somehow require us to be circum-

cised, worship at a non-existent temple, perform miracles and be literally crucified in order to be consistent in our commitments... is more than being simply an illegitimate argument. It is another misdirection attempt intended to divert the weight of evidence being on those who wish to **change the pattern** initiated by our Messiah in the context of the command to partake of the memorial bread and wine... not those who wish to maintain his original pattern.

### **The Memorial Bread and The Death of Jesus**

Let's consider the foundational precedent for that first memorial service demonstrated by our Messiah. He and his disciples ate the Passover at the beginning of a Wednesday, which would be just after sunset (as the Jewish day began at sunset, due to the creational pattern in Genesis 1 of each day beginning at evening followed by a morning). We know Passover was a Wednesday in the year Jesus died because we know he was dead in the tomb for 3 days and 3 nights and that he was raised to life and left the tomb just before the end of the Saturday Sabbath following Passover (Matt. 28:1-6). We read that just at the end of the Sabbath day (which is late afternoon) and just as the next day was about to begin (as the sun was setting) the angel testified Jesus was already alive again... before the end of the Sabbath. Angels don't lie.

Jesus had to have died at the 9th hour on Passover, which had to be a Wednesday. The Sabbath that immediately followed the death of Jesus was not a Saturday Sabbath, it was the usual High Sabbath of the 1st day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread that always immediately followed Passover.

**John 19:31** *The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.*

The day after Passover (15th day of the first month) was always a High Sabbath.

**Lev. 23:5-7** *In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's passover. And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the Lord: seven days ye must eat unleavened bread. In the first day ye shall have an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein.*

### **The First and Last Days of Our Messiah's 3 Day Death Were Sabbaths**

In fact the first and last days of the first and last Feast Weeks (Feast of Unleavened Bread and Feast of Tabernacles) were always High Sabbaths. However only the first day of the Feast of Weeks was a High Sabbath, and not the last. This was exactly the pattern of the 3 days of our Messiah's death before he was the first to be divinely harvested from death. He was not the first to come back from the dead (as he was the 7th in scripture to be reclaimed from death back to mortal life) but he was the first to be immortalized (divinely harvested). The first and last of the 3 days of our Messiah's death were Sabbaths, just like the first and last days of the first and last divinely appointed harvest feast weeks. Those three harvest feast weeks project the three divine harvests (immortalizations) in the Creator's plan. All three are based on the victory of Christ.

### **Purchased Spices After Sabbath But Prepared Them Before Sabbath**

If fact this observation of the necessarily Wednesday death of our Messiah is definitively proven by comparing the time references assigned to the women buying and preparing the spices intended for the burial of Jesus. In Mark 16:1 we are told the women purchased the spices 'after' the Sabbath. However we are told in Luke 23:56 that the women prepared the spices 'before' the Sabbath. The only way they could prepare the spices before the Sabbath and yet not buy them until after the Sabbath is to realize the necessity for two separate Sabbaths within the three days of our Messiah's death. The women bought the spices on Friday morning, after the Thursday High Sabbath was over and the spice market was open for business. They went home and prepared those spices that Friday afternoon and then rested on the Sabbath that began at sunset. The two Sabbaths perfectly satisfy

the spice purchase and preparation time stamps of the women. This validates the integrity of our Messiah's testimony that he would be dead for 3 days and 3 nights (Matt. 12:40). Since Jesus left the tomb restored to mortality (but not yet immortal) before the end of the Sabbath he could not have died late on a Friday afternoon. That would make him either a liar or a fool, with his death only being one night and one day. It is always unwise to represent the Son of God as either foolish or deceitful.

## The Calendar of Christ's Death, Resurrection & the Beginning of the Ecclesial Age

1st Month						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
					1	2
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
			Passover Jesus Dies	1st Day of Feast High Sabbath 1st day & night of death	2nd day & night of Jesus' death Between 2 Sabbaths First Fruits Waving	3rd day & night of death 7th Day Sabbath Jesus Raised Before Sabbath End
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Jesus is immortalized & presented to Yahweh & to disciples; 1st day of 40 days for Inspection & Testimony						
25	26	27	28	29	30	
2nd Month						
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30				Jesus Ascends to Heaven on 40th day after resurrection		
3rd Month						
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	Pentacost-Holy Spirit Outpouring First Fruits Waving to Heaven High Sabbath & 7th Day Sabbath 66th day of Every Year 49 Days from Christ Resurrection 50 Days between First Fruit Wavings

1

### Jesus Is Alive Long Before Morning on the First Day of the Week

We can also confirm Jesus was alive (as well as immortalized) long before that Sunday sunrise that is usually and highly improperly assigned to his resurrection. This can be done on the basis of John's time-stamp for Christ's appearance to the disciples the night of the first day of the week.

**John 20:19- 20** *Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in*

*the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord.*

Each Jewish day began at sunset, based on the creational pattern described in Genesis 1. Sunday night, when we read that Jesus appeared to the disciples and showed them his crucified hands and feet, was long before daylight ever appeared on that first day of the week. If we inappropriately assume that the Sunday night Jesus appeared to the disciples was after the daylight on Sunday, then we are completely oblivious to the Jewish measurement of a single day. Our God-less society defines its day as beginning and ending in utter darkness, which is extremely appropriate. God defines a day as beginning in darkness and progressing into light until a new day begins again with darkness. This physical timing reality is a confirmation of the spiritual truth that natural has to precede spiritual (1 Cor. 15:46). Darkness must precede light.

### **Jesus and the Two Disciples on the Road to Emmaus**

In fact when we compare Luke's and Mark's accounts of a resurrected Christ's appearance to the eleven we find that this appearance at night in the first few hours of Sunday was after Jesus had already revealed himself to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13-43) as they were reporting their experience with a risen Jesus, he suddenly appeared in the room and offered his hands and feet as evidence of his identity. Additionally this was during their evening meal according to Mark's account. **Mark 16:12** *After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them. Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart.* Jesus appeared to them in that locked room while they "sat at meat". This was their evening meal, which is always the first meal of each Jewish day.

Many events had taken place with that risen Jesus long before morning on that first day of the week. It would have taken the two disciples about 1 hour to run or 2 hours at a fast walk to return to Jerusalem from Emmaus (being 60 furlongs or a little over 7 miles or about 12 kilometers). As the angel testifies in Matthew 28 Jesus was already alive when that first day of the week began at sunset. Therefore the day that the two disciples at Emmaus reported was "far spent" was the conclusion of the Sabbath day as Sunday (the first day of the week) began at sunset. They invited the unrecognized but 'risen Jesus' to join them for the night just as Sunday was about to begin at sunset. Their excited return back to Jerusalem found them interrupting the evening dinner of the eleven, which is why they had broiled fish and a honeycomb to feed an immortalized Christ when he upbraided them for their obstinate resistance to all the evidence of his resurrection.

### **The Prophetic Nature of the 3 Days of Our Messiah's Death**

There is significantly more evidence that Jesus died on a Wednesday afternoon at the end of Passover day and rose to mortality again late in the afternoon of the following Saturday Sabbath, 3 days and nights later. He was then immortalized, very appropriately, at the beginning of the first day of the week after sunset. This evidence is layered, offering that complete and unique validation to any correct understanding of Bible testimony. This is the principle of God manifestation, where everything blends together perfectly from every direction without a single contradiction or imperfection. This is the goal for all of creation when the Creator will be all in all (1 Cor. 15:28). An obvious example of this application would be the prophetic projection about how those 3 full days when our Messiah was under the power of death foretell how that will be the exact limit for all of creation, when death itself is eliminated after three full millenniums (3 divine days: Ps. 90:4; 2 Pet. 3:8). Our generation should be able to particularly appreciate this understanding as we are almost at the time when that 3rd and last day will begin. It has been almost 2,000 years (2 days) since our Messiah's death and resurrection. The Millennial Kingdom will be that 3rd day, that 3rd Millennium, after which death will be eliminated in all of creation (Rev. 20:7-15; 1 Cor. 15:25-28). This is exactly the same pattern of the necessarily 3

full days and 3 full nights our Messiah was under the power of death. If we try to desperately defend the foolishness of the harlot church's corruptions of Bible truths by insisting Jesus died on a Friday afternoon... all the beauty and glory of how all scripture testimony fits together perfectly at every level just fades to darkness, due to having eyes that can't see and ears that can't hear. The highly unscriptural suggestion that any part of a day is equivalent to a full day is shredded by the two edged sword of truth in how those 3 **full** days and nights of our Messiah's death project the 3 **full** divine days of 3,000 years during which all of creation would similarly continue under the power of death.

Jesus ate his last Passover meal at the same time as the rest of the nation, at the beginning of Wednesday in the early evening of the 14th day of the first month of that year (30CE). It was a real Passover, not a fake Passover as some Christadelphian writers have suggested within their attempts to prop up some sort of justification for changing the memorial service pattern Jesus initiated when he used unleavened bread at his last Passover. Therefore we should review the Passover requirements that our Messiah had to observe in order to live without sin to qualify as that perfect sacrifice to validate his Father's righteousness in demanding death for sin in Eden.

### **The Passover Precedent**

**Ex. 12: 8;17-20** *And they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and **unleavened** bread; and with bitter herbs they shall eat it.... 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. In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at even (Passover), **ye shall eat unleavened bread**, until the one and twentieth day of the month at even. Seven days shall there be **no leaven found in your houses**: for **whosoever eateth that which is leavened, even that soul shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel**, whether he be a stranger, or born in the land. Ye shall eat nothing leavened; in all your habitations **shall ye eat unleavened bread**.*

The divine emphasis is quite extreme. The judgment for disrespecting the exclusive unleavened bread nature (not "quality", as has been inappropriately suggested) of the Passover bread was being cut off from the enlightened community. Therefore there can be absolutely no question that Jesus initiated the memorial service with unleavened bread. Jesus could never have been so insultingly disrespectful of his Father's insistence for unleavened bread at Passover and still be so constantly approved by God. That would have been impossible if he only "probably" used unleavened bread when instituting the Ecclesial Age ritual of the broken bread and wine memorial. There is no "probable" possibility. The use of unleavened bread was absolutely required and Jesus was always obedient and never sinned even once.

### **The 3 Dimensional Structure of All Divine Communication**

We should always be asking 'why' questions as we consider the terms of our Creator's righteousness in the context of considering the two avenues of His testimony: scripture and creation. 'Why' questions are not operational questions. Why questions define motivation and not mechanical structure. Admittedly our primary question being addressed in this commentary is operational, whether we have the right to change the example our Messiah demonstrated in using unleavened bread to institute the memorial ritual... or not. However, the validation of any divine truth will always highlight motivation. Our God is not capricious or whimsical. His communications are 3 dimensional and perfectly harmonious at every point of connection. This is the nature of the 'glory' of the knowledge of the Creator of heaven and earth. The "why" answers will only become visible to any degree when we actually have a 'right' understanding. Then we will be enabled to witness the patterns of that right-ness (righteousness) across all of the divinely appointed educational stages (Ages) in the divine plan, maintain-

ing consistency across all rituals, laws, parables and miracles. The “why” answers are only for those within the enlightened community possessing those rare eyes that see and ears that hear that provide the “more” that our Messiah promises (Matt. 13:10-15).

### **Why Questions Address Motivation**

Therefore the question should be addressed: **Why** was it so incredibly important that no leaven be eaten for 8 straight days between Passover and the 7th day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, without leaven even being allowed to be present in the homes of the enlightened community? We will address this “why” question, but first we will underline the significance of this question by observing how God emphasizes that significance with an endless parade of subtle but interconnected patterns. Once we have emphasized the truly dramatic status being demonstrated by these patterns we will be compelled to address **why** God absolutely demanded unleavened bread to be exclusively used in the Passover meal, exclusively being offered on the Christ altar and why leaven was never, ever to be offered with the blood of any sacrifice.

Those 8 days of unleavened bread exclusivity extended from Passover (representing the sacrificial death of our Messiah for the passing over of death) and the full harvest Feast of Unleavened Bread (representing the first divine harvesting or immortalization of our Messiah). It is no secret that Jesus actually died on Passover day and rose from the dead and to immortality during the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Emphasizing that significance is how the harvest Feast of Weeks (the 2nd harvest feast each year) perfectly projects the 2nd divine harvesting of the first of the two sets of saints, at the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom. This can be proven conclusively in endless ways, including the timing of the feast which projects the 2,000 years between the first and second divine harvests from creation and how the delivery of the promise of the Holy Spirit power (the earnest of the promise of immortality) was delayed more than a week after the ascension of Christ so that it could be awarded on that first day of the Feast of Weeks: Pentecost.

### **The Unleavened Vs Leavened Identifications of the 1st Two Harvest Feasts**

Another absolute identification of the Feast of Weeks as being a projection of the first harvesting of the saints at the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom would be the dramatic difference between the first two harvest feast weeks. Although that 1st Feast of Unleavened Bread (projecting the harvesting of our Messiah) demanded absolutely no leaven whatsoever, that 2nd harvest Feast of Weeks was initiated by waving two “leavened” wheat loaves to heaven (Lev. 23:17). Although the reason Jesus could be divinely harvested (immortalized) was because he was unleavened (unpolluted by transgressional sin) that is absolutely not true of the divine harvesting qualification of the saints. Although Jesus was not dependent on grace for his precedent setting immortalization, we most definitely are dependent on grace for salvation. Despite our being leavened (polluted by transgressional sin) we can still possibly qualify for immortalization (divine harvesting) on the basis of grace. Therefore the two loaves waved to heaven to start that second feast had to be leavened.

### **The Wheat Harvest of The Feast of Weeks**

Another absolute identification of that leaven-stamped Feast of Weeks as being a projection of the first harvesting of the saints at the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom would be how Jesus defines the judgment and salvation process as the “wheat” harvest in the parable of the wheat and the tares (Matt. 13:24-30; 36-43). The Feast of Weeks was a celebration of the wheat harvest (Ex. 34:22), with the firstfruits of the wheat harvest being waved to heaven on the very first day (Pentecost) as two leavened loaves of wheat bread, projecting that 1st divine harvesting of the saints that are dependent on grace due to being polluted (leavened) by transgressional sin.

**3 Divinely Appointed Harvest Feast Weeks**  
**3 Divinely Appointed Divine Harvestings**  
**3 Immortalizations in the Divine plan**

**Feast of Unleavened Bread**

Immortalization of Jesus Christ 2000 Years Before the 2nd & 3,000 before the 3rd immortalization

15th-22nd of the first month, immediately following Passover

7 days

100% Unleavened bread; no exceptions. Jesus was unleavened (unpolluted by transgressional sin)

First and last days of the feast are High Sabbaths; therefore 3 Sabbaths during that 'alpha' feast week

First fruits identification  
Barley harvest

First fruits waved to heaven on the day after the High Sabbath, just as Jesus was immortalized immediately after the Sabbath during which he was raised to mortality

Jesus died on Passover day and was immortalized during the Feast of Unleavened Bread

**Feast of Weeks**

First immortalization of Saints at the Beginning of the Millennial Kingdom

50 days after the 2nd day of the previous feast which was the day after the High Sabbath and from the day of fruit waving to heaven... 66th day of every year, in the 3rd month

7 days

Must start with 2 leavened wheat leaves waved to heaven on High Sabbath. Despite being leavened (polluted by transgressional sin) we can still qualify for divine harvesting, by grace

Only 1 High Sabbath and therefore only 2 Sabbaths this week- no ending High Sabbath

First fruits identification  
Wheat harvest

First fruits of wheat harvest waved to heaven on the first day of the feast, on that High Sabbath (Pentecost), just as the saints will be immortalized at the beginning of the Sabbath Kingdom

The 120 Jewish disciples had the earnest of the promise of immortality poured on them at Pentecost, when the Babel 'confusion' was reversed

**Feast of Tabernacles**

2nd immortalization of Saints at the End of the Millennial Kingdom

15th-23rd of 7th month

8 days

There is no leavened or unleavened identification, Feast participants move from home to branch dwelling for 8 days

First and last days of the feast are High Sabbaths; therefore 3 Sabbaths during that 'omega' feast week

No first fruits identification, but identified as "final ingathering"; grapes-olives-figs

No first fruits identification, as the 2nd set of saints to be harvested could not possibly qualify as "1st"

The 'final ingathering' of the saints will be harvested by the Creator after the end of that 7th millennium, in the 8th day

The reason the first two harvest feasts are defined as a harvest of "first fruits" but the 3rd feast (Feast of Tabernacles) is not is because Jesus was the firstfruits to God alone (1 Cor 15:20,23) but the first group of immortalized saints constituted the firstfruits of **both** God and Christ (Rev. 14:4; Js. 1:18). However the Feast of Tabernacles does not reference any firstfruits but defines its bounty as the feast of ingathering at the year's end (Ex. 23:16; 34:22). This is because the Feast of Tabernacles exclusively represents the third and last immortalization event (divine harvesting) after the end of the Millennial Kingdom, that final ingathering of the Creators' fruits from His creation project. Those three divinely mandated harvest feast weeks during that first Kingdom of God projected the three divine harvests in the Creator's plan: 1) the immortalization/harvest of Jesus Christ (unleavened); 2) the immortalization/harvest of the 1st set of saints (leavened) and 3) the immortalization/harvest of the 2nd set of saints after the end of the Millennial Kingdom.

**Eight Days of Unleavened Bread**

These associations of the three feast weeks to the three immortalizations (divine harvestings of the Creator's image and likeness from creation) is highly significant in the context of our considerations of the exclusive appropriateness of using unleavened memorial bread to represent our Messiah's body where the power of sin was broken. The reason is that when we realize that the Feast of Unleavened Bread is a highly detailed projection of the exclusive divine harvesting of Jesus Christ, then the fact



that Yahweh absolutely demanded the exclusivity of unleavened bread consumption for those full 8 days running through Passover to the last day of the feast must be a significant shadow projection of a qualifying feature for our Messiah's divine acceptability. That eight day frame for that unleavened bread exclusivity is another unmistakable stamp of identification for our savior. The name of Jesus (meaning savior) as used through the New Testament has 6 alphanumeric Greek letters that add up to exactly three eights: (iota=10, eta=8, sigma=200, omicron=70, upsilon=400 and sigma=200...888). Just as the man of sin is defined by the number 666 (Rev. 13:18) so the man of righteousness is defined by the number 888. Scripture endlessly presents the number 6 as mathematically representing the divine curse of sin and death. Scripture endlessly presents the number 8 as representing that which is righteous and eternal. This name Jesus, meaning savior, is a prophetic shadow promise of the three immortalizations in the divine plan which are similarly projected in the three harvest feasts and the three rituals in the Most Holy Chamber on every Day of Atonement and the three Holy Spirit outpourings during the transition between the end of the First Kingdom Age and the Beginning of the Ecclesial Age. Each of these parallels share the same chronological representation of 1) the immortalization of Jesus Christ followed by 2) the immortalization of the saints at the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom and lastly 3) the immortalization of the 2nd set of saints just after the end of the Millennial Kingdom. Those three immortalizations will take place over three divine days (3 millenniums Ps. 90:4; 2 Pet. 3:8). Just as death was forever eliminated in Jesus after 3 full days in the tomb, so death will be forever eliminated in all of creation over a full three divine days of 1,000 years each. That is why unleavened bread had to be eaten for eight days encompassing Passover when Jesus died and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, when he rose to immortality.

These initial observations constitute just tiny finger scratchings compared to the volume of evidence to confirm that Feast of Unleavened Bread constituted a divinely orchestrated shadow projection of the qualifications, procedure and benefit of the immortalization of Jesus Christ. If you would like to see more of that validating evidence concerning how the 3 harvest feast weeks are exact projections of the 3 divine harvests in the Creator's plan you can research this at website: <http://www/spiritword.net> . Simply choose the Vocational Training for an Immortal Priesthood menu and then scroll down and click on Year 7. The commentaries addressing Secrets of the Feast Weeks begins on page 25 and continues through page 50. Another research reference would be <http://www.christadelphian-video.org> where you can search for the video series entitled: Visions of the Kingdom Age. Presentations numbered 5 through 8 all address this issue of how the 3 harvest feast weeks are detailed projections of the 3 divine harvests (immortalization events) in the Creator's plan.

The point of this recognition that 'the Feast of Unleavened Bread projects the immortalization of the Messiah in the context of the significance of using unleavened bread for the memorial bread with the wine' should be obvious. There is definitely evidence provided in scripture that completely contradicts the shallow claim that "The Lord has left no directions, and therefore we are free" (as expressed in the 1892 response in the Christadelphian magazine). A massive volume of "directions" have been provided to validate the significance for continuing our Messiah's pattern for using unleavened bread in the memorial of his death. Why would we want to use leavened bread to remember the God-reconciling death of our Messiah when God absolutely forbid such an association within the rituals projecting that death and subsequent resurrection of His son? Why would we want to contradict God? Why would we want to suggest His extreme emphasis is inconsequential? Are we not afraid of provoking the displeasure of the consuming fire we know to be God?

Hebrews 12:28-29 *Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence **and** godly fear: For our God is a consuming fire.*

## No Leaven Ever Accompanies Sacrificial Blood

The memorial bread represents the body, the flesh of our Messiah. The wine represents his blood. These are elemental understandings that are directly and repeatedly expressed. Yahweh absolutely forbid any leaven to ever accompany sacrificial blood on the Christ altar. Therefore, why do any Christadelphians think they have the right to do exactly the opposite of what God has mandated with in the laws of His Kingdom? Isn't it our goal to inherit that restored Kingdom?

**Ex. 23:18** *Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread; neither shall the fat of my sacrifice remain until the morning*

**Ex. 34:25** *Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven; neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of the passover be left unto the morning.*

In the complete absence of any direct command from our Creator to reverse that policy and actually substitute leavened bread to accompany the wine (representing the blood of Christ) in the memorial ritual it seems inappropriately presumptuous to indulge in such a convenience in the context of such an expressly forbidden association by the Creator of heaven and earth.

## The Exclusively Unleavened Grain Offering on the Christ Altar

We are told that the Ecclesial Age brotherhood eats from the Christ altar, particularly identifying a category of sin offering that was forbidden to the priests of the previous age.

Hebrews 13:10-11 *We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp.*

Our "altar" from which our Ecclesial Age Priesthood eats the sin offering is Christ. The priesthood of the previous 1st Kingdom Age, was forbidden to eat the flesh of the sin offering whose blood was taken into the Tabernacle.

Leviticus 6:30 *And no sin offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile withal in the holy place, shall be eaten: it shall be burnt in the fire.*

However, as we already read in Hebrews 13:10, we have an altar from which we certainly do eat that sin offering (our Messiah) whose sacrificial blood (life) was taken into the true sanctuary and not the shadow sanctuary of the Tabernacle.

Just as only the sons of the High Priest qualified as priests of the 1st Kingdom Age, so the children of the new and forever High Priest after the order of Melchizedek serve as the priests of the Ecclesial Age. This is why Peter defines the Ecclesial Age Brotherhood as a royal priesthood offering spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God (1 Pet. 2:5,9). This is why Paul parallels our Brotherhood partaking of the memorial meal to the priests of the previous age eating from the altar.

**1 Cor 10: 16-18** *The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread. Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?*

Since the Ecclesial Age enlightened community is identified as a continuation of the divinely appointed priesthood and our Messiah is identified with the altar where the priesthood served then should we not be taking careful consideration for the continuation of the principles being projected by these blended precedents? The shadow to substance relationship is consistent and demonstrates harmony, therefore why would we feel confident in dismissing this maturing shadow to substance relationship in the context of the original 'unleavened' bread demonstrated in the original memorial service?

## Without Exception

One of the absolute mandates concerning the bread identified with that Christ altar during the First Kingdom Age was that it always, without any exception, had to be unleavened.

**Lev. 2:3,10-11** *And the remnant of the meat offering shall be Aaron's and his sons': it is a thing most holy of the offerings of the LORD made by fire... And that which is left of the meat (grain/minchah) offering shall be Aaron's and his sons': it is a thing most holy of the offerings of the LORD made by fire. No meat (grain/minchah) offering, which ye shall bring unto the LORD, shall be made with leaven: for ye shall burn no leaven, nor any honey, in any offering of the LORD made by fire.*

The grain offering from the altar was the food of the priests, on the basis of being the sons of the High Priest. That grain offering had to be unleavened 100% of the time. As noted, under the terms of the new priesthood initiated at Jerusalem we also see the children of the High Priest (Jesus Christ) constituting the new priesthood.

Just as Israel 'after the flesh' partook of the altar, so Israel 'after the spirit' (our current enlightened community) partakes of our 'Christ' altar. Israel after the flesh was forbidden to eat leavened bread from their altar. Why is it we can heartily embrace the exalted priestly association with the last divine age but refuse to accommodate the accompanying slight inconvenience of continuing the divinely mandated pattern of limiting that Christ altar identification with unleavened bread? On what basis can we feel confident to dismiss the original pattern simply because there is no direct and very simplified command to continue that consistent unleavened pattern? The mental stumbling experienced in this expectation of simplicity is to assume the divine educational policy throughout history has only a 'quantity' goal and not quality... that if the divine communication isn't extremely simple and obvious then we are free to brush that divine communication aside as if insignificant. While our Creator certainly would like all men to be saved (1 Tim. 2:3-4) it is not quantity that serves as the primary control issue. Quality is far more significant than quantity in the divine plan. It is this primary 'quality' qualification that explains the frightening warning from Jesus at the conclusion of two separate judgment parables that many will be called (to judgment) but only a few will be chosen (Matt. 20:16; 22:14). Our Creator's intentional complexity communication pattern is a refining procedure that separates the chaff from the wheat and the gold from the dross within the enlightened community. It is not simple and easy answers we should be pursuing, but answers that are comprehensive, demonstrating that perfect harmony (peace) that is the defining feature of the principle of God manifestation.

## WHY?

**Why is leaven absolutely forbidden to be associated with the altar shadow of our Messiah?**

**Why is leaven absolutely forbidden to ever be identified with the blood shadow of our Messiah's sacrifice?**

Leaven is consistently presented throughout scripture as highly negative and a polluting influence, without a single exception. In fact, the infrequent association of leaven in a seemingly positive context will always demonstrate the exact same direct identification of a negative pollutant application (i.e. the two leavened wave loaves for the Feast of Weeks, the leavened bread in the peace offering and how a parable of the Kingdom is identified by the 3 measures of meal in which leaven is hidden by a woman).

### **Leaven is a Spiritual Pollutant**

Jesus identifies leaven with the polluting and negative interpretations of divine testimony presented by certain members from within the enlightened community that were already in a covenant relationship with Yahweh (therefore the 'Christadelphians' of their age).

**Matt 16:6;12** *Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.... Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.*

**Mk 8:15** *And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the leaven of Herod.*

**Lk 12:1** *...he began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.*

### **Rather Strange**

Shouldn't it seem strange that Jesus would consider the leaven that he identifies as a symbol of hypocrisy and doctrinal distortions to somehow be considered to be a perfectly acceptable component of the memorial bread representing his sacrificial body that had to be unpoluted by transgressional sin in order to be eternally effective? That contradiction is rather extreme.

### **The Ecclesia is Exhorted to Be Unleavened Just Like Their Memorial Bread**

Why is it the Ecclesia is expected to pursue an unleavened state but somehow presume it is inconsequential to keep our Passover feast with leavened bread that God never allowed to be identified with His son through every application of His shadow testimony at any time?

**1 Cor 5-8** *To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.*

Scripture identifies leaven with malice and wickedness, while unleavened bread is identified with sincerity and truth. Additionally we are told that we, as the body of believers, are supposed to be an 'unleavened' lump. How could we maintain our unleavened lump status (as is highly recommended in this context) if we partake of leavened bread in our "feast"? Why is it we are commanded to be unleavened but we think we are free to identify our Messiah as being leavened (as in the memorial bread representing his body)? The parallel is being made that just as we partake of the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth in our Passover memorial that we are supposed to extend that understanding to our brotherhood body in the sense of maintaining the absence of a polluting leaven, such as this unrepentant young brother living with his father's wife. It is presumed by the Apostle Paul that the Corinthian Ecclesia was actually using unleavened bread in their memorial service. He was simply extending the exhortation on that basis. Why would Jesus want to remember his sacrificial death with the leaven of malice and wickedness and not the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth? Doesn't that sound extremely disrespectful to our savior?!

### **A Little 'Leaven' Corrupts The Whole**

**Gal 5:7-10** *Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth? This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be.*

Again we see the same precedent that the Ecclesia should consider itself to be unleavened and should address the polluting, leavenous factors that develop within the Ecclesia. Why would we want to replace the unleavened bread our Messiah used to represent his unpoluted sacrificial body with leaven when we are constantly exhorted to remove a leavenous influence from the Ecclesia? That is a highly inconsistent thought pattern and disruptive to the intended harmonious blending of all divine truths and principles.

### **Creation's Validating Testimony**

There are two direct avenues of Divine Testimony to which we can refer to find, understand and prove the terms of our Creator's righteousness. The terms of God's right-ness is what the New Testament defines as "the truth". These two avenues of testimony (witnesses) are the written word of God (Bible) and the spoken word of God (creation). Our Creator demands a minimum of two separate witnesses for any life and death trial (Deut. 17:6; John 8:17-18). Therefore, by His own requirement He must offer another separate but corroborating avenue of testimony in addition to the Bible, which is His written testimony. Creation (His spoken testimony) exists on the basis of being verbally commanded into existence or into place (Gen. 1; Ps. 33:6,9). The single exception was the creation of mankind. Man and woman, where the image and likeness of the Creator is sought, were crafted and not verbally commanded into existence.

This second witness of our Creator (the terms of creation) is endlessly quoted throughout the Bible as a validation of that written testimony. Jesus preaches to the Christadelphians of his generation that they should be returning good for evil, on the basis of the testimony of the rain. *Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust* (Matt. 5:44-45). Jesus does not quote the scriptures for his authority in this dramatic change away from an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth policy. He quotes creation to prove one of the terms of his Father's righteousness.

### **Creation's Resurrection Testimony of the Seed**

The apostle Paul defends the doctrine of resurrection to a doctrinally 'leavened' Corinthian Ecclesia in the 15th chapter of his first letter. He even insults these Brethren, calling them fools, on the basis of their blindness to the divine evidence in the creational pattern of agricultural seeds.

**1 Cor. 15: 34-37** *But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die: <sup>37</sup> And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain.*

### **Creation's 25,000 Witnesses**

The terms of creation testify every single day to everyone about that very doctrine of resurrection when we sleep and awaken. Death is endlessly defined in scripture as sleep and the resurrection to mortality preceding judgment is very frequently defined as an awakening (Dan. 12:2; Mark 5:39-42; John 11:11-14). One wonders how this creational witness can be experienced more than 25,000 times during the life of the average person yet ignored so obliviously by apostate Christianity.

The truth of this matter (creation being the Bible's parallel validating testimony and the necessary second witness concerning the terms of our Creator's righteousness) is so extensive that this understanding can be demonstrated through scientific observations ranging from the vastness of the universe right down to molecular and atomic composition. However these volumes of evidence should not divert our attention from the issue under consideration. One would presume the evidence already presented and the wisdom offered should be sufficient to validate the integrity of this next confirmation for the understanding that leaven is a divinely appointed symbol for the pollution issuing from sin cursed flesh. If one needs more evidence for accepting this understanding of how the terms and features of creation testify to the same terms and features of our Creator's righteousness presented in the Bible that huge volume of evidence will be gladly provided.

## **Creational Features in Rituals Testify to Spiritual Truths**

Now this creational testimony distinction is significant. It is the bread that signifies merely the sin cursed mortal nature of mankind, similar to the red skin of the red heifer whose ashes cleansed from the defilement of death (Num. 19). The leaven that is used to make more palatable bread (soft and tender) represents the polluting transgressional sin that everyone generates, with the exclusive exception of Jesus Christ. This parallels the unblemished requirement of that red heifer whose ashes cleansed from the physical defilement of death. Although the heifer skin had to be red (projecting that necessary sin condemned mortal nature of our Messiah that is also projected in the 'bread' memorial) that animal also had to be unblemished. This unblemished requirement of the red heifer flesh projects the absence of any transgressional sin for which our Messiah would have suffered guilt, similarly being projected in the unleavened nature of the Ecclesial Age memorial bread.

### **The Parallel Testimony of Exhaling Our Cursed Mortal Body Waste and Leaven**

So we have the question before us as to 'how' the terms of creation testify to both the highly negative nature of leaven and how leaven can be directly associated as a pollutant. This is the testimony of carbon dioxide, which is both the unclean waste being expelled by our mortal lungs as well as the by-product of the bacteria that constitutes the leavening process in bread. The leavening process puffs up the bread through the creation of carbon dioxide when the living bacteria feeds on the nutrients in the finely crushed grain. The depth of this observation can be demonstrated by a considerable number of perfectly blending scriptural/creational parallels.

Our sin cursed mortal bodies need three categories of nutrients to live (gas, liquids, solid foods... air, water and bread). We breathe in and ingest those three categories of life sustaining nutrients in direct parallel to the positive patterns of 3 presented in the Bible. These include how Jesus defines himself as the truth, the life and the way and how Paul presents the 3 positive behavior patterns of faith, hope and love (1 Cor 13:13). Our bodies also have to expel the unclean waste our bodies have generated (carbon dioxide, liquid and solid waste), projecting not only the 3 categories of sin (1 Jn. 2:16) but in that pattern of the necessary two witnesses we also see the 3 stage maturing progression of sin (temptation, guilty sin & death; Js. 1:14-15). If we do not expel the body's unclean waste, we will die. In similar fashion we see the shadow testimony of the 3 progressive holiness entrances that similarly served as exits in the design of the tabernacle.

- 1) There was the doorway into the courtyard of the Tabernacle (with 3 curtains to the left and 3 to the right, just like the last temple with 3 chambers to the left of the gates and 3 chambers to the right (Ezek. 40:10,21), and also like the lampstand design with its 3 branches to the left and 3 to the right of that center shaft.
- 2) There was the second entryway into the Holy Chamber where only the priests were allowed and had to work daily.
- 3) There was a third entryway into the Most Holy Chamber where only the High Priest could enter and only once a year, but for 3 times for 3 rituals on that one day (1. incense burning to save his life, 2. east & west blood spattering of the bullock and 3. east & west blood spattering of the goat).

Since there were three entrance portals to approach the divine presence in an exclusively westward direction then these same portals also served as the exits to leave the divine presence, pursuing an exclusively eastern progression (matching the original eastern Edenic expulsion and the eastern national deportation to Babylon by the enlightened descendants of Adam and Eve). Paralleling these positive and negative patterns of three are the 3 positive life preserving components of air, water and bread that are naturally processed and dispensed from our bodies as 3 categories of negative waste.

Carbon dioxide, that same leavening component, is one of those three unclean creational witnesses. If we do not expel that carbon dioxide waste from our bodies, we will die.

Some of the depth demonstrated in this creational/scriptural parallel testimony is how it is the trees of life that naturally scrub our atmosphere by ingesting that unclean carbon dioxide (which creates that leavening effect in bread) from that “firmament” between heaven and earth (our atmosphere) and also generate oxygen through the photosynthesis process for all life to continue living. Just as it was a tree in the garden of Eden whose fruit promised eternal life before the curse of sin contagiously corrupted a previously very good creative order, it is now the trees in the terms of cursed creation that sustain mortal life by both eliminating the unclean carbon dioxide waste being generated from our sin cursed bodies and also replenishing our atmosphere with clean, life preserving oxygen. That negative association of leaven (on the basis of the creation of carbon dioxide in the leavening process) representing transgressional pollution all through scripture without a single exception fits perfectly into the second avenue of divine testimony, the features of creation. The only reason one might mistakenly suggest that “no direction” has been given concerning the continued use of unleavened bread in the memorial service is because they haven’t bothered to look at all for that extensive “direction” provided by our Creator throughout the Bible and creation.

Even the molecular structure of the waste gas being exhaled from our bodies exhibits this same divinely identified negative association. Carbon dioxide is CO<sub>2</sub>, meaning a molecular construction of two atoms of oxygen and one atom of carbon. These two elements numerically identify both the original curse of sin and death and the hopeful promise of immortality. Any 5th grade science class school book will tell us that carbon is number 6 on the element chart and that oxygen is number 8, due to the number of their protons and their atomic weight. These two numbers are endlessly identified throughout scripture with extreme precision to identify the curse of sin and death and its effects (number 6) and immortality and salvation (number 8). Emphasizing this understanding is how we have already noted that the man of sin is identified by triple sixes (Rev 13:18) and the man of righteousness is identified by triple eights. For six milleniums in the Creator’s plan voluntary enlightenment has been the divine policy. That will change dramatically in the 7th divine day of the Millennial Kingdom. However the divine plan is not completed until after that 7th millennium ends. It is the 8th day in the plan of Yahweh when the third and last immortalization is scheduled, as well as the complete elimination of death (1 Cor. 15: 26; Rev. 20:7-15). This is why the ritual of circumcision, the cutting away of the flesh, had to be performed on the 8th day of a boy’s life (Gen. 17:12). This is why a sacrificial animal was not eligible to be offered until the 8th day of its life (Ex. 22:30). This is why there were 8 people on the first salvation ark and Noah was defined by Peter as being the 8th person (2 Pet. 2:5). This is why David was the 8th son of Jesse, with the kingship of our Messiah defined through his identification of the son of David.

Carbon, with its sin and death identification to the number 6, defines mortal life from a scientific perspective. All forms of life that any scientist has ever observed is always described as “carbon based life forms”. The observation that carbon was created with 6 protons offers a seamless connection between shadow and substance from that second avenue of divine testimony, the spoken word of God witnessed in the things that have been made. Therefore, understanding how we breathe in O<sub>2</sub> (clean oxygen supplied by the trees of life) but exhale CO<sub>2</sub> from our sin cursed mortal bodies of flesh offers a flawless and seamless demonstration of the same divine testimony presented in scripture. That testimony offers substantial “direction” to those with eyes that see to understand the highly negative identification of the carbon dioxide that is generated in the leavening process that was never allowed by Yahweh to be identified with His son in any shadow ritual at all. So why do Christadelphians

choose to identify our Messiah with what God has always refused to be identified with His son 100% of the time?

### **The Positive Associations of Unleavened Bread In Scripture**

As opposed to the exclusively negative scriptural identification of leavened bread, we find that unleavened bread is exclusively presented throughout scripture as highly positive, divinely acceptable and repeatedly identified with our Messiah.

**Deut 16: 3** *Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it; seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith, even the bread of affliction; for thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt in haste: that thou mayest remember the day when thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt all the days of thy life.*

This restatement of the unleavened requirement for remembering the escape from Egypt identifies unleavened bread as the bread of affliction. However, this is not a negative association but highly positive, as the very inconvenient nature of a sacrificial life is demanded for divine acceptance, through trial after trial. In fact that first ritual on every Day of Atonement that saves the life of the High Priest demanded the conversion of that aromatic dust (incense) into the cloud embracing the divine glory between the cherubim through the medium of the fire (Lev. 16:12-13). The identification of unleavened bread as the bread of affliction is a highly positive association.

### **The Unleavened Manna**

**1 Cor. 10:1-4** *Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; And did all eat the same spiritual meat; And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ.*

The wilderness precedents for baptism and the memorial service are identified by Paul. The spiritual meat that Israel consumed was the manna in the wilderness. Manna was certainly not leavened in the form it was delivered by Yahweh each day. Leaven is an additive. We also see Jesus identifying himself with this unleavened manna to those in the enlightened community who baited him at Capernaum to repeat his food miracle of feeding the 5,000 from the day before.

**John 6:32-35** *Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.*

Jesus identifies himself as the antitypical (and absolutely unleavened) manna. He expands on this identification throughout this exchange.

**Vs.48-51** *I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.*

Jesus expands his direct identification with the wilderness manna to the memorial service bread and wine, representing his body and blood that must be eaten. That manna Jesus identifies with the memorial bread was not leavened. Therefore it seems rather illegitimate to suggest “the Lord left no directions and therefore we are free”. Our Lord seems to have left a rather considerable volume of direction concerning why we should remember our Messiah’s death with unleavened memorial bread... for anyone willing to look for that “direction”.



## **Illuminating Challenges**

Whenever we think we understand the divine mind on a matter, we should always look for exceptions. If we are correct then whatever suggested inconsistencies will only confirm and reveal an even greater and more glorious depth of understanding. If we are wrong then we must abandon our original premise, as being wrong about divine truths is not an inconsequential failure.

Therefore, It is interesting to note the divinely required inclusion of leaven in certain ritual applications and one of Christ's parables of the Kingdom. These are not reversals of divine policy, but further validations in the perfect consistency of our understanding.

### **Feast of Unleavened Bread Vs Leavened Feast of First Fruits**

The first of the three divinely imposed feast weeks each year was the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 23:14-17; 34:18-24; Lev. 23). As we have already noted, it was defined by the complete absence of leaven. However the second feast week began 50 days after the 2nd day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. It was known as the Feast of Weeks, as well as the Feast of First Fruits and also as Pentecost in Acts. The Feast of Weeks had to be initiated by waving two leavened loaves of wheat bread (Lev. 23:17; Ex. 34:22). This unleavened and then leavened requirement seems to be an extreme difference that certainly insists that we pay attention to the context of these considerations. The first feast demands an absolute and total absence of leaven but the second feast cannot start without the waving of two leavened loaves. We have to ask why our Creator would demand the faithful to observe these seemingly contradictory requirements.... and does this ritual reversal somehow license reversing the use of unleavened bread at Christ's last Passover to leavened bread at our memorial services?

First we have to understand the context of what these harvest feast weeks are intended to project. Our Creator communicates with an exclusive and intentionally complex pattern, as did His perfectly obedient son. God speaks through parables, visions, dark sayings, dreams and complex imagery. The purpose for this intentional complexity is two-fold. As Jesus answers his disciples, that intentional complexity is designed to give to those who 'have' while simultaneously taking away from those who 'have not' (Matt. 13:12). Complex images have to be interpreted. When the basis for our interpretation is our instincts and heart generated impressions or the popular impressions of those who make us feel good about ourselves.... what little insight we have into the mind of the Almighty will be taken away. When the basis for our interpretation is an intense, concentrated determination to find truth at any cost, with a willingness to accept personally diminishing understandings, then we will be given more (Matt. 13:10-15). The three harvest feast weeks (when God demanded the enlightened stand before Him) project the three great divine harvests in the divine plan. These are the three immortalization events in the Creator's plan. These include 1) Jesus Christ; 2) the family of Christ at the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom and 3) the rest of the world at the end of the Millennial Kingdom. Yahweh is the great Husbandman who has sown His image and likeness into the field of creation by sowing the seed of His word into the dust of the earth (from which we were created)... and He will certainly have His 3 harvests.

There was a specific agricultural harvest associated with each of the three feast weeks. The Feast of Unleavened Bread was identified with the first fruits of the barley harvest. The Feast of Weeks was defined by the wheat harvest. The Feast of Tabernacles, identified as the feast of ingathering, particularly included the vineyard and olive harvest. In perfect consistency the faithful are consistently paralleled to these categories of fruit bearing plant life. Appropriately contrasting this observation is that the unenlightened are repeatedly identified throughout scripture as non-fruitbearing plant life (briers,

thorns, grass, weeds). This demonstrates the three dimensional nature of all divine expressions throughout both avenues of divine testimony, the Bible and creation.

### **Divine Parallels Confirming the Three Harvests of the Creator**

The identification of these three harvest feast weeks with the progressive three immortalization events (harvests) in the divine plan is a common but rather subtly presented theme throughout divine communications. We see these three progressive immortalizations projected by the three outpourings of divine power on the faithful at the beginning of the Ecclesial Age.

1. The Holy Spirit is first poured out on Jesus at his baptism.
2. The second outpouring is on the 120 faithful Jews in Jerusalem, when they are “baptized with fire,” projecting the immortalization of the family of Jesus at the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom.
3. The third and last outpouring of Holy Spirit power was when the Gentiles were officially welcomed into the Ecclesia at the home of Cornelius, thereby projecting the immortalization of the rest of the world (conditioned by divine acceptability) at the end of the Millennial Kingdom. They too were baptized at that time.

The relationship between the three Holy Spirit outpourings and the three immortalization events is cemented by Paul who defines the miraculous Holy Spirit power as the “earnest” of the promise of immortalization (2 Cor. 5:1-5; Eph. 1:13-14).

We can further solidify this relationship between the 3 harvest feast weeks with the 3 immortalization harvesting events and the 3 Holy Spirit outpourings. The immortalization of Jesus Christ, the first divine harvest of creation, actually took place during the Feast of Unleavened Bread. The ‘earnest’ of the promise of immortality for the faithful at the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom was appropriately poured out on those 120 at Pentecost, which was the first day (the high Sabbath) of the Feast of Weeks. This is why Jesus told them they had to wait at Jerusalem after his ascension for the gift of the comforter. That comforter, the power of the Holy Spirit, could not be given to them until the Feast of Weeks (Pentecost)... that 2nd firstfruits feast, in order to maintain the divinely intended perfect symmetry of the three immortalization harvests in the Creator’s plan. Both the 1st and 2nd feast weeks were defined as “first fruits” but never the 3rd, also validating how these 3 harvest feast weeks project the 3 divine harvests (immortalization events) in the divine plan. As we have previously noted, Jesus served as the firstfruits to the Creator. However the saints immortalized at the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom serve as the firstfruits of **both** Christ and Yahweh (Rev 14:4). That is why the second set of saints harvested (immortalized) after the end of the Kingdom cannot possibly be paralleled to “first fruits” but can be defined perfectly as a ‘final ingathering’, identifying that third and last Feast of Tabernacles.

This is the basis for understanding why leaven is demanded to be associated with the 2nd divine harvesting but not the first. Although the salvation of our Messiah was entirely dependent on his capacity to live without generating any of that polluting transgressional sin (projected by leaven) that is thankfully not the case for the saints being clothed with immortality at the antitypical Feast of Weeks at the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom. We are saved on the basis of grace in addition to faithful works. Jesus was saved on the basis of works and was not dependent on grace to accommodate any leavenous pollution of transgressional sin. This understanding is validated powerfully in the context Jesus defines that first immortalization (divine harvesting) of the saints as the **wheat** harvest (Matt. 13:24-30; 36-43). The wheat harvest identified that 2nd harvest feast, projecting that 2nd immortalization in the divine plan... when salvation would be gracefully extended even to those who had been leavenously polluted with transgressional sin. The fact that two loaves were waved to heaven can indicate both the Jewish (natural seed of Abraham) and Gentile (spiritual seed of Abraham) will be har-

vested, or it may indicate both male and female genders or those two leavened loaves may embrace both applications. What those leavened bread loaves most definitely do not represent... is Jesus Christ.

Therefore the use of leaven in that Feast of Weeks is not an exception, but an extreme validation of the pattern being emphasized. We need grace and forgiveness. Jesus was not dependent upon grace, due to his perfect, leaven-free life. It is unleavened bread that defines the unpolluted, transgressional sin-free status of our Messiah's body (memorial bread) at his sacrificial death. It is leavened bread that defines the polluted, grace-dependent status of the faithful who hope to participate in the Creator's harvest.

### **But What About the Peace Offering Leaven?**

Leaven was required for the proper performance of the peace offering ritual, although certainly not on the Christ-Altar of Burnt Offering. Both leavened and unleavened bread were required for the Peace Offering.

**Lev. 7:11-14** *And this is the law of the sacrifice of peace offerings, which he shall offer unto the Lord. If he offer it for a thanksgiving, then he shall offer with the sacrifice of thanksgiving unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil, and cakes mingled with oil, of fine flour, fried. Besides the cakes, he shall offer for his offering **leavened bread** with the sacrifice of thanksgiving of his peace offerings. And of it he shall offer one out of the whole oblation for an heave offering unto the Lord, and it shall be the priest's that sprinkleth the blood of the peace offerings.*

A unique distinction of the Peace Offering was that it was the only offering category where all three participants shared in the same meal. Yahweh received his portion on the altar. The officiating priest received a portion of the offering and the offerer was invited to eat the flesh of his own Peace Offering. This was never allowed with the Burnt, Sin, Trespass, Meal or Drink Offerings. The 'divine' understanding of peace is the presence of harmony (not simply the absence of disturbance that facilitates only the contradictory principle of mere 'unity'). The sharing of this offering between Creator, priest and faithful is a projection of the divine plan when Yahweh, Christ and the faithful will exist in perfect harmony, in both image and likeness. Therefore it is highly appropriate that the offering demonstrating the principle of ultimate peace include both the unleavened bread (Christ's unpolluted basis of salvation) and the leavened bread (the faithful's necessary dependence on grace for salvation due to our polluted leavened state). The divine plan of perfect harmony (peace) when the Creator will "be all and in all" after that last enemy of death is destroyed demands the element of grace... or only Christ could be saved. This is why the leaven was required for the 2nd feast week and also for the peace offering. This application is yet another validation of the exclusive scriptural application of leaven representing a transgressionally polluted state.

### **The Kingdom of God is Like 3 Loaves of Leavened Meal**

If leaven is supposed to be representative of the polluting effect of transgressional sin then on what basis would our Savior identify leaven with our understanding of the coming Kingdom of God?

**Matt 13:33-34** *Another parable spake he unto them; The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened. All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them.*

There are a number of features in our Messiah's Kingdom parables that present negative issues. A parallel precedent is the presence of tares in the Ecclesial wheat field that is allowed to mature along with the wheat. It is at harvest time the angels (in Christ's parable explanation) separate the wheat

from the tares and then burn the tares. It is extremely obvious those tares do not represent the unenlightened among the nations Christ will rule, as those tares are burned completely before the wheat is stored in the barn. The nations will not be eliminated, but ruled by Christ. It is the rejected among the enlightened community (the tares) that will be eliminated at the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom Age.

### **The Leaven Represents the Ecclesial Apostasy**

Therefore it should not be surprising that the three ecclesial environments presented in this 3 measures of meal parable leading up to the introduction of the Kingdom can actually qualify as being leavened (polluted). Although Paul declares that he espoused a virgin Ecclesia to Christ we see the prophecy of the corruption of the enlightened community presented as a pregnant woman clothed with the sun (Rev. 12). The illegitimate child birthed by the unfaithful Ecclesial fiancé would be the Roman emperor Constantine, coming to power about 280 years (as 280 days constitute the gestation period from conception to birth for humans) from the establishment of the Ecclesia. Constantine became the exclusive Roman emperor in 312 CE. This demonstrates that the apostasy corrupting (leavening) of the enlightened community began almost immediately after the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ... to accommodate that 280 year conception to birth progression of the adulterous Ecclesia. It should not be surprising at all to see a parable depicting a polluted enlightened community.

### **But Why Are There ‘Three’ Measures of Meal in Christ’s Parable of the Kingdom?**

However this parable highlights exactly 3 measures of meal in which a woman hides leaven. The revealing of the leaven is identified with the full leavening process. This is a declaration of the leavening of the enlightened community through the 3 separate divinely appointed educational stages leading up to the introduction of the Millennial Kingdom when that continuous leavening process will be arrested. These 3 ages can be expressed as the Patriarchal Age, the 1st Kingdom Age and the Ecclesial Age. Each age is sharply defined by a change in divine law and a change in the divinely appointed priesthood as well as having those divine changes validated by powerful outpourings of miraculous divine power authorizing those changes. During each of these 3 ‘ages’ (3 measures of meal) there has been a leavening progression (a doctrinal polluting progression within the enlightened community). That pollution progression within the enlightened community will no longer be accommodated at the point of the introduction for the Millennial Kingdom, that fourth and final educational stage in the divine plan. The Kingdom is when truth is no longer optional or voluntary. The leaven in the Ecclesia will be revealed. The great divine educational tool of the fear of God will circumcise the hearts of the sons of men and they will declare: *Surely our fathers have inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein there is no profit. Shall a man make gods unto himself, and they are no gods (Jer. 16:19-20)?* That is why it is specifically 3 measures of meal where leaven is hidden before being revealed at the introduction of the Kingdom... in Christ’s parable.

There is not a single scriptural or creational contradictory application in our Creator’s use of leaven in its appointed representation of the polluting effect of transgressional sin. That polluting, transgressional sin identification is completely inappropriate in the context of how we remember the sacrificial death of our Savior. While he certainly suffered with the same sin condemned mortal nature as those he came to save (indicating the memorial ‘bread’ application and the red flesh of the red heifer), he exclusively never exercised that sin producing capacity (leaven). Shouldn’t that give us pause when we presume we are “free” to ignore our Messiah’s precedent in using unleavened bread for remembering how the power of sin was broken in his transgression-free body at his death? The fact that Jesus did not treat us like little children with the unnecessary redundancy of specifying the absolute necessity for the same unleavened bread he used is not some kind of license for personal accommodation.

## The Absence of the Command to Break the Memorial Bread

Despite the fact that most Christadelphians dismiss the obvious template of the unleavened nature of the memorial bread due to the excuse of the absence of a direct command to maintain the pattern employed by our Messiah, we see our community obediently following our Messiah's pattern of breaking the bread. However, Jesus did not directly 'command' the bread to be broken. He simply did it, just like the unleavened bread. Does that absence of a direct command 'free' us from the even slighter inconvenience of actually breaking the bread? Would we really want to distance ourselves from the breaking, cleaving salvation theme that is silently shouted all throughout scripture just because this feature of the memorial service template was not 'directly' commanded, but simply demonstrated?

### The Cleaving Salvation Theme

- The temple veil, just like the memorial bread, represents that same flesh of the Messiah Heb. 10:19-20 *Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh).* Both memorial components of blood and body are identified in this reference, That veil of our Messiah's flesh was ripped in two from heaven to earth immediately at this death (Matt. 27:51; Mk. 15:38; Lk. 23:45). That death of our savior is the primary memorial identification of the bread.... remembering the 'death' of our Messiah. Therefore the tearing of the veil (representing the flesh of Christ) immediately upon the death of Jesus perfectly parallels Christ's pattern of tearing the memorial bread (his flesh) in order to remember his death.
- That salvation through cleaving symbol, demonstrated in the breaking of the memorial bread is also demonstrated in the Rephidim fountain rock that Paul identifies as representing Christ.  
**1 Cor. 10:1-4** *Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; And did all eat the same spiritual meat; And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and **that Rock was Christ.***  
**Psalm 78:15-16** *He **clave the rocks** in the wilderness, And gave them drink as out of the great depths. He brought streams also out of the rock, And caused waters to run down like rivers.*  
**Isaiah 48:21** *And they thirsted not when he led them through the deserts: He caused the waters to flow out of the rock for them: He **clave the rock** also, and the waters gushed out.*  
That rock cleaved in two when struck by the serpent rod of the high Priest that was wielded by Moses in front of just a few of the elders of the people, thereby saving Israel from a waterless death. This is a perfect demonstration of how our Messiah suffered a sacrificial death under the authority of a few elders in Israel by the command of the Mosaic High Priest, but in the process serving as the avenue of the salvation for Israel. The breaking of the bread to remember the death of Jesus demonstrates that same salvation by 'cleaving' pattern that is demonstrated but not commanded at the last Passover meal of Christ.
- The cleaving of the Red Sea saved Israel from the murderous intentions of the Egyptian cavalry. The divine testimony records that Israel walked between two walls of water. The first water cleaving was under the direction of Moses to escape Egypt.
- The cleaving of the Jordan permitted the inheritance of the promised land at Passover, under the leadership of Joshua (that Hebrew name of Jesus). This is when the life to death water flow was reversed at the mouth of the Dead Sea and traveled all the way back to the city of Adam by Zaretan (meaning distress). That inheritance of the promised land under Joshua by crossing the cleaved Jordan will be offered to the faithful all the way back to the distress by Adam, meaning the judgment of death for sin in Eden.

Would we really want to ignore the precedent of our Messiah in breaking the bread of his body just because we don't have an actual, exceedingly simple, unmistakable direct command to break the

bread before partaking? 'Why' do we think this bread of his body was broken when God would not allow a single bone of His son's body to be broken.

**John 19:36** *For these things were done, that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken.*

**Psalm. 22:16-18** *They pierced my hands and my feet. I may tell all my bones: They look and stare upon me. They part my garments among them, And cast lots upon my vesture.*

**Psalm 34:20** *He keepeth all his bones: Not one of them is broken.*

Yahweh is emphasizing the spiritual lesson of the cleaving salvation theme by refusing to allow a single bone of His son's flesh to be broken. Yet that flesh is represented in the memorial bread that is broken. The Creator did not want the faithful to dismiss that flesh breaking ritual action as merely demonstrating a physical breaking of bones, instead of the spiritual lesson that declares features of our Creator's righteousness. In the exact same pattern it was commanded that not a single bone of the Passover lamb could be broken (Ex. 12:46).

The breaking of the memorial bread representing the body of our Savior where not a single bone was ever allowed to be broken is another one of those silent shouts from our Creator. That silent shout is directed exclusively to those within the enlightened community who possess hearing ears. The lesson our heavenly Father is emphasizing in the breaking (cleaving) of the bread is the breaking of the power of sin in the transgression free (unpolluted/unleavened) body of our Savior. This was accomplished on the basis of our Messiah experiencing the first and last sin maturing stages of temptation and death but not the second, which is guilty sin resulting from temptation progressing into a conception of sin.

**James 1:14-15** *But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.*

Those three maturing stages of sin are 1) temptation (no guilt is assigned); 2) sin conception (guilt is assigned) and 3) death (the divine answer for sin). Jesus suffered the first and third stages but never the second, as demonstrated in the unleavened nature of the memorial bread. That missing 2nd stage is how the power of sin was broken in the death of a transgression free Jesus when he voluntarily validated his Father's righteous judgment of death for sin in his crucifixion.

This breaking of the memorial bread is the demonstration of what Jesus declared after the voice from heaven testified to the glory of God in John 12.

**John 12:31-33** *Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. This he said, signifying what death he should die.*

It was the death of our Messiah that cast out the prince of the world, that serpent mentality that rules from uncircumcised hearts. We remember the breaking of the power of that 'prince of the world' in the breaking of the memorial bread.

Clearly the breaking of the memorial bread is the ritual crescendo in a symphony of harmonious divine testimony generated all through scripture and creation. Yet, just like the necessarily unleavened nature of the memorial bread that was broken by Jesus, that specific step of breaking the bread was not directly commanded but simply demonstrated.

### **The Four Divinely Appointed Ages of the Bread and Wine**

The significance of the bread and wine partnership within the framework of the rotating divinely appointed educational stages of the Creator's plan has been very consistent. The memorial bread and wine of the Ecclesial Age, that 3rd of the four of these clearly defined educational stages, is simply

the 3rd maturing stage in the progressive shadow lesson of the bread and wine (the body and the blood of the savior).

It is important to understand this four stage maturing process of the Creator's educational format, as it is a projection of the progression of the four letters of His memorial name. This same memorial name is expressed by Isaiah in these terms: *The desire of our soul is to thy name, and to the remembrance of thee* (Is. 26:8). That name (YHWH) has four consonants (no vowels). Four is the scripturally and creationally assigned number for the principal of God manifestation. This is validated by the endless sets of four, doubled fours, tripled fours and quadrupled threes presented all through the Bible projecting features of our Creator and His plan. The four progressive educational stages in the Creator's plan are sharply bordered by a change in divine law and a change in the priesthood that are always validated by an increasingly greater public outpouring of divine power at each transition into the next maturing stage.

### **The Rebellion Against A Priesthood Change**

The progression from the Patriarchal Priesthood Age into the 1st Kingdom Priesthood Age saw many new laws and rituals instituted under the operation of a dramatically reduced priesthood frame. This limitation of only Aaron and his sons qualifying as priests prompted that great rebellion of the enlightened community (the Christadelphians of that Age) under the direction of the highly respected Brethren in the truth named Korah, Dathan and Abiram. They refused to accept their degrading exclusion from the priesthood and the community supported them. Yahweh killed them... along with their wives and children, with the distinct exception of the sons of Korah who rejected their father's self-worshipping philosophy. The patriarchs had operated as the priests of the enlightened community for well over two millenniums, building altars and offering sacrifices and judging the enlightened community. Even after the miraculous execution of these 'Christadelphian' rebels, it took another 14,700 to die in the resulting plague the next day before their hearts were circumcised sufficiently to accept the wisdom of these divinely imposed changes.

The resistance of the enlightened community to progress into the subsequent educational stage in the divine plan resulted in the destruction of the nation and the dispersion of the Jewish people around the world. There was another change in divine laws and a change in the priesthood marking that progression into the Ecclesial Age with Jesus Christ as the immortal High Priest and his baptized children being the priests of this Age offering spiritual sacrifices and not animal sacrifices.

### **The Fourth Priesthood Age**

The fourth educational stage in the Creator's plan will be the transition into the Millennial Kingdom when there will be yet another change in the priesthood and dramatic changes in divine laws. The new priestly structure will include both immortal priests and mortal priests. The divine promise for making the genealogical descendants of Abraham into a nation of priests (Ex. 19:6) will finally be realized. Just as the 2nd transition into a new age was validated by a far greater public outpouring of divine power than the 1st transition, the 3rd transition into that 4th divinely appointed Age will be validated by an exponentially greater degree of publicly displayed miraculous power. This 4th Age will be when enlightenment will no longer be optional, on a creation-wide scale. Just as the 2nd and 4th letters in the memorial name of God are the same letter (YHWH) so those 2nd and 4th divine educational stages in the divine plan for God manifestation both qualify as the two stages of the Kingdom of God. The first is established at Sinai under a mortal Moses. The second is established at Jerusalem under an immortal Jesus Christ.

## The Bread and Wine Throughout the Four Educational Stages in the Divine Plan

Throughout these four maturing stages in the plan of the Creator we see shadow applications of the bread and wine, consistently projecting the body and blood of the savior that speak of the ultimate terms of divine righteousness necessary for that image and likeness that was intended with the original creation in Eden. These bread and wine shadows are always consistent. They never vary.

### The Patriarchal Age

1. In the Patriarchal Priesthood Age we see Abram and Melchizedek (presumably Shem the son of Noah, as he was contemporary with Abram) who was the King of Jerusalem and priest of the most high God sharing bread and wine. Abram pays Melchizedek tithes of everything, recognizing Melchizedek's exalted position (noted by Paul in Hebrews 7). That shared bread and wine between these two iconic men in that context establishes a foundational precedent that continues through all four of the divinely appointed educational ages.

Joseph interprets the bread and wine dreams of Pharaoh's baker of breads and wine steward (butler). This account perfectly shadows the eventual memorial bread and wine ritual of the Ecclesial Age in layered detail. It is the 3rd day after the interpretation of the two dreams that the baker of breads dies and the presenter of wine is raised to the right hand of the ruler of the people. This timestamp projects a powerful prophetic shadow. It will be on the third day when the faithful will rise to the right hand of power by the man represented in both the baker of bread and the wine presenter. This is why Hosea identifies the timing of the resurrection being "after two days", indicating being after two divine days totaling 2,000 years (Hos. 6:1-3).

It should be noted how it is the bread in this carefully recorded event that is identified with death and the wine that is associated with regained life and exaltation. This parallels the two progressive stages of our Messiah's saving process, being an achieved reconciliation to God on the basis of our Messiah's death and salvation in the future on the basis of his resurrection.

**Romans 5:10** *For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.*

Reconciliation is expressed in the past tense and is qualified by the death of Jesus (like the bread). However, salvation is expressed as being future and qualified by his life (indicating the Savior's resurrection to immortality) as seen in the wine. We are told the basis of the salvation of our Messiah was through the blood (demonstrated in the wine) of the everlasting covenant (Heb. 13:20). This two stage salvation understanding is perfectly demonstrated in the bread baker and wine steward account, as well as the two stages demonstrated in baptism being a burial in water and the rising again from that baptismal water grave.

### Bread and Wine In The First Kingdom Age

2. In fact this primary identification of the bread with the reconciling death of the Messiah and the identification of the wine with his saving life explains why the wine offering under the laws of the Kingdom of God was not even an independent offering, like the unleavened bread, burnt, peace, sin and trespass offerings. The wine offering simply accompanies the burnt and peace offerings, along with the unleavened bread. The wine was never offered independently on the Christ altar under the laws of that 1st Kingdom of God. The primary educational purpose of the Law was to condemn sin, just like the death of our Messiah demonstrated. This understanding is emphasized repeatedly by the Apostle Paul.

**Rom. 3:20** *...by the law is the knowledge of sin*

**Rom. 5:20** *Moreover the law entered, that the offense might abound*

**Rom. 7:7** *I had not known sin, but by the law*



**Rom. 7:10-13** *And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? By no means. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.*

The primary role of the 1st Kingdom Age laws was to validate our Creator's righteousness in demanding death for sin. This is how the law acted as a schoolmaster delivering us to Christ (Gal. 3:24). The Law condemned, but didn't save. This is the lesson in the memorial bread but balanced by the testimony of hope seen in the memorial wine. This is the lesson in our baptismal death but balanced in our baptismal resurrection demonstration through exiting that water grave. Therefore while the presence of the wine in the altar drink offering was necessary during that 1st Kingdom Age, it was diminished into a minor role on the Christ altar without an independent altar assignment. The drink offering (wine) merely accompanied the burnt offering. However in the Ecclesial Age where the educational themes are grace, imputed righteousness and forgiveness we see the wine being elevated to a highly significant role. The necessary condemnation of sin is still emphasized in the broken, unleavened memorial bread but in the new Ecclesial Age ritual of memorial service. That divinely right condemnation of sin (witnessed with seeing eyes in the broken unleavened bread) is balanced by the hope of life demonstrated in the wine, representing that blood of the covenant by which Jesus was raised to immortality.

There were six categories of bronze altar offerings mandated by the divine laws during that First Kingdom Age: burnt offering, peace offering, sin offering, trespass offering, the *minchah* (unleavened bread or unprocessed grain or flour) offering and the drink offering (wine). Of those six Christ altar offerings only the bread and wine progressed into the new Ecclesial Age laws and rituals. The four blood offering categories skip the Ecclesial Age, but will be required again in the Restored Kingdom Age of 1,000 years when the fourth temple is constructed under the direction of Jesus Christ. It should be clearly noted that not a single one of the 3 '*minchah*' (bread) altar offerings could ever be leavened.

**Ex. 23:18** *Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread; neither shall the fat of my sacrifice remain until the morning* (Ex. 23:18).

One wonders how we can be so unmindful of this divine requirement that no leaven ever accompany the sacrificial blood when we casually dismiss the perfectly consistent and extreme emphasis demonstrated throughout scripture by substituting leavened bread for the original unleavened bread with which our Messiah instituted memorial service.

### **Unleavened Manna**

Another application of unleavened bread during that 1st Kingdom Age was the manna divinely provided during 6 out of 7 days every week over the course of those 40 years in the wilderness. Since Jesus defines himself as the substance casting that manna shadow (John 6:31-35) this should draw our dedicated attention. That Christ manna was obviously unleavened in its heavenly delivered nature, before being prepared in the various ways the enlightened community chose to consume that manna. Jesus identifies himself with this 'unleavened' manna when declaring the enlightened community would have to eat his flesh and drink his blood in order to inherit eternal life. Once again we can see a direct connection between an unleavened nature to what the enlightened community is provided by the Creator to eat in a direct connection with our savior. The suggestion that there was no "**direction**" given as to the necessity for maintaining the unleavened nature of the bread used at the first memorial service is a highly inappropriate presumption.

Yahweh identifies that necessarily ‘unleavened’ manna directly with the word of God, just as Jesus is identified as the word of God made flesh (John 1:14).

**Deuteronomy 8:3** *And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the LORD doth man live.*

The divine substance casting the manna shadow is “every word that proceeds of the mouth of Yahweh”. Since Jesus defines himself as the “true bread from heaven” and is also defined as the word of the Creator made into flesh then why would we want to suggest that the word of God is polluted and identified with transgressional sin by using leavened bread to represent that word of God made flesh? Further confirming this exact understanding is how Jesus himself defines the corrupted understandings about the word of God within the enlightened community as leaven.

**Matt 16:6** *Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.*

Interestingly the disciples (just like many of us) didn’t understand the intended connection between leaven and the polluted word of God. We read in vs 7: *And they reasoned among themselves, saying, It is because we have taken no bread.*

Jesus doesn’t just respond to the confused disciples but to ‘everyone’ in the enlightened community since that doesn’t grasp this divine connection. Jesus says: *Do ye not yet understand?* Jesus is asking... What is so difficult to understand?

That word made flesh, that bread of God, that unleavened manna from heaven (our Messiah) went on to explain: *How is it that ye do not understand that I spake it not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.*

Why does our community identify with the confused disciples instead of our Messiah... in the presumption that the leaven or unleavened identification is meaningless from a divine communication platform? Do we not hear the rebuke of our Master?

### **The Golden Bowl of Uncorrupted and Unleavened Manna**

Additionally it was a still unleavened omer of manna (what Jesus calls the bread of heaven) that remained uncorrupted in that golden bowl that was placed inside the golden ark of the covenant, along with the incorruptible stones with the covenant written by the finger of God and the resurrection rod identifying the High Priest.

The only altar offerings that were ever miraculously accepted by fire from heaven were the burnt and peace offerings, which were always accompanied by the unleavened bread and wine offerings. This is true at the dedication of the Tabernacle and ordination of the Aaronic Priesthood (Lev. 9:24); David’s offerings on the threshing floor of Araunah (1 Chron. 21:26) and Elijah’s offering on Carmel (1 Kings 18:38). No heavenly fire is ever recorded as being used to accept any offering from an altar when unleavened bread was not demanded. Therefore shouldn’t it seem odd how our community reverses that pattern with leavened bread representing our Messiah’s body in the bread and wine memorial ritual of the Ecclesial Age.

### **The Bread and Wine In The Ecclesial Age**

3. The bread and wine continue their perfectly consistent 4,000 year divinely appointed shadow status as they are employed by our Messiah as the 2 components of the mandated Memorial Service

ritual. The bread is identified with the body of our savior, his flesh. The denial of the flesh of our Messiah was prophesied to be the absolute signature doctrine of the antichrist system, as noted earlier (1 John 4:1-3; 2 John vs 7). Apostate Christianity denies the flesh of Christ by insisting that sin-cursed mortal nature was only a temporary disguise. They insist that Jesus was actually the immortal God or a pre-existent angel disguising himself as a mortal and lying about his capacity to sin, his capacity to die and therefore also his capacity to rise again from that impossible death. Immortals cannot die. If they could die then they wouldn't be immortal.

The memorial bread symbolizes the inherent mortal nature of our savior, without which sin could never have been condemned in the crucifixion of our Messiah through a transgression free sacrificial body. Jesus declared in his violent, voluntary death that his Father was absolutely right to demand death for sin in Eden. This is exactly the testimony we offer when we descend into the baptismal water, declaring the righteousness of the Creator in His judgment of death for sin. This understanding is why Mary had to offer a sin offering for her own atonement simply because she gave birth to Jesus. Jesus "became sin" at his birth and not at his death, as apostate Christianity maintains in their denial of the flesh of Christ.

**Luke 2:22-24** *And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord; (As it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord;) And to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons.*

**Lev. 12: 6-8** *And when the days of her purifying are fulfilled, for a son, or for a daughter, she shall bring a lamb of the first year for a burnt offering, and a young pigeon, or a turtledove, for a sin offering, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest: <sup>7</sup> Who shall offer it before the Lord, and make an atonement for her; and she shall be cleansed from the issue of her blood. This is the law for her that hath born a male or a female. <sup>8</sup> And if she be not able to bring a lamb, then she shall bring two turtles, or two young pigeons; the one for the burnt offering, and the other for a sin offering: and the priest shall make an atonement for her, and she shall be clean.*

The fact that Mary had to offer Yahweh a sin offering for giving birth to Jesus for her own atonement, even after righteously performing exactly what God required, is a declaration that our savior 'became sin' at his birth. This is how it could be expressed that Jesus *put away sin by the sacrifice of himself* (Heb 9:26). This is how we can read Jesus offered himself *first for his own sin and then for the people's* (Heb. 7:27). This is why we read that *Jesus will appear the second time without sin unto salvation* (Heb. 9:28). The 'sin' that Jesus bore from birth was that mortal nature, that flesh nature denied by the antichrist religious system. There is no guilt assigned for this sin category, but a cleansing is absolutely required because holiness is both physical and behavioral.

This is why there were 6 guilt-free sin offerings required for physical conditions that were divinely unacceptable.

1. Giving birth (Lev. 12)
2. Touching the dead (Num. 19:9,17)
3. Leprosy recovery (Lev. 14:22)
4. Bodily issue recovery (Lev 15:15)
5. Bronze Christ altar dedication (Ex. 29:36-37)
6. Annual sin offering for the entire Tabernacle and contents (Lev. 16:27)

The fact that there were also six sin offerings for guilty transgressions is a very significant shadow lesson.

1. Bullock sin offering for the High Priest (Lev. 4:3-12)
7. Bullock sin offering for the nation (Lev. 4:13-21)
8. Male goat sin offering for a ruler Lev. 4:22-26)
9. Female goat sin offering for a commoner (Lev. 4:27-35)
10. Female lamb sin offering for an Israelite (Lev. 5:1-6)
11. Fine Flour sin offering for a financially destitute Israelite (Lev. 5:7-13)

The observation that there were two categories of sin offerings separated on the basis of forgiveness for behavioral transgressions and cleansing from an physically unclean condition is projected in how the gold was designed to cover the 6 exterior surfaces of the Christ-Ark of the Covenant as well as the 6 interior surfaces of the Christ ark. Those 6 surfaces were:

1. The left panel
12. The right panel
13. The front panel
14. The rear panel
15. The top panel (Mercy Seat cover)
16. The bottom panel

Emphasizing the legitimacy of this observation is how the name of our savior is a direct expression of the design of that golden Ark. That interior and exterior gold covered box was formed by 6 panels being joined together at 8 corners where 3 of those panels joined. The Greek name of Jesus is constructed of 6 alphanumeric letters adding up to 3 eights (as noted earlier in these observations). That 6-8-3 pattern in the golden Ark and our savior is also demonstrated in the 8 sacrificial components of the heaven and earth covenant God made with Abram (Gen. 15). Three earth-bound animals that were each 3 years old were cleaved into six components and added to the two whole 'fowl of heaven' to make those 8 components projecting how our Savior will not only be a product of both heaven and earth but serve as the binding agent to harmonize heaven and earth, spiritual and physical. The fact that the ark had 6 outside surfaces and six inside surfaces covered in gold is a shadow projection from the substance of how the righteousness of our Messiah will act as a covering for the two aspects of sin (guilty transgressional sin needing forgiveness and guilt-free sin nature only needing cleansing).

This layered testimony is offered simply to validate the original understanding of that substance of the flesh nature of our Messiah that is being shadow projected in the memorial bread. When we have the understandings correct, the validation of that correct understanding will be demonstrated perfectly in the endless layers and seamless connections radiating out from our Creator's perfectly harmonious expressions throughout His two avenues of testimony (Bible and creation). When we have it wrong our reasoning will be limited to the unscriptural foolishness of mere Lexicon manipulations and scripturally groundless presumptions.

### **The Millennial Kingdom Age**

4. It should be understood that not only was the Passover institution of the memorial service instituted with unleavened bread, but also the Passover in the Millennial Kingdom will be observed with unleavened bread. In the context of the prophecies of the Millennial Kingdom and particularly that fourth temple running from Ezekiel chapter 40 through 48 we read:

**Ezek. 45:21** *In the first month, in the fourteenth day of the month, ye shall have the passover, a feast of seven days; unleavened bread shall be eaten.*

Since the Passover procedure was initiated with unleavened bread in Egypt ... and the next divine worship model was necessarily initiated with unleavened bread at the last supper (so that Jesus

would not be a sinner)... and the next phase in the Millennial Kingdom will require unleavened bread... we should ask on what basis our community should have been so presumptuous as to change this pattern as if it were inconsequential and on what basis it could be presumed that no direction has been supplied in this unleavened nature of the memorial bread?

### **The Last Two Questions**

Two questions remain.

1. Once we understand the significance of using unleavened bread for memorial service, then what do we do when offered leavened bread at a Bible School or Fraternal Gathering or an Ecclesia we may be visiting? Do we refuse the bread? If so we must refuse the wine as that would demonstrate a contradiction to the truths projected in the progression and comprehensiveness in the two memorial components. Would the answer be to separate ourselves from all members of the enlightened community that do not respect an exclusive use of unleavened bread in the memorial service?
2. The next question would be that if we do not consider the prospect of occasionally partaking of leavened bread in the memorial service to be personally defiling while in the company of the enlightened who are either unfamiliar or ambivalent concerning the divine policy on the issue of unleavened bread, then why would we make any distinction in the first place?

These are appropriate questions and deserve not only attention but serious consideration. The eternal nature of our Creator's right-ness demands there can be no contradictions between features of that eternal righteousness. However there is a requirement to balance these truths, as there is definitely a hierarchy of significance in the features of our Creator's eternal truths (meaning His right-ness... His righteousness). This hierarchy of significance is demonstrated quite a number of ways throughout scripture.

### **The Progressive Nature of Mankind's Divine Education**

The foundational truth is that the terms of our Creator's righteousness are eternal. Yahweh is not looking for a better plan or ever needing to rethink anything. He was not caught by surprise by Adam & Eve's failure. The changes in the four priesthood ages in the Creator's plan do not reflect a replacement strategy that is so inappropriately presumed both outside and sadly even inside the enlightened community. Yahweh does not change. Malachi 3:6 *For I am the Yahweh, I change not.* Since our Creator does not change, then the judgement and personal righteousness principles being projected in the shadows of the divine laws of the 1st Kingdom of God are just as eternally right as the principles of grace, forgiveness and imputed righteousness being projected through the laws and rituals of the Ecclesial Age. It is simply an issue of temporary significance that is a component of a partial stage in the divine education plan and the maturing development of the bride of the son of God.

If this comprehensive as opposed to replacement perspective were not true then those laws and rituals of the 1st Kingdom Age would not be required yet again during the Restored Kingdom Age that will last 1,000 years. I have witnessed some in our enlightened community foolishly contradicting and even insulting our Creator by suggesting there will be no 4th temple with bloody animal sacrifices, that the prophecies declaring circumcision to be again required during the Millennial Kingdom would have to qualify as lies in the Bible. This is an extremely dangerous frame of reference.

### **The Degrees of Significance**

The testimony of our Creator is comprehensive and not like the stages in a rocket launch where sections of the rocket disengage and are disposed of when their fuel has been fully converted into thrust.

Our heavenly Father's testimony is more like how we train our children differently at different stages in their maturing development. The truths and principles we teach our children are the same no matter whether they are 3 or 15, but we certainly teach them differently at different stages in their development. What this means in the context of scripture considerations is that the primary educational focus of each separate and divinely appointed age is just as necessary as all the others. The focus on sin condemnation and judgment and personal demonstrations of God's righteousness that is so emphasized during the First Kingdom Age were not eliminated by the Ecclesial Age educational focus on forgiveness, grace and imputed righteousness. These are all additions without subtractions. However there are degrees of significance. The challenging issue comes when we realize those degrees of significance can change with changing circumstances.

This variation in the dominant divine principle can be witnessed in a number of divine judgments. While Nadab and Abihu were incinerated with fire from heaven for disrespecting the priesthood ordination their father was not only forgiven for producing the golden calf he was awarded the office of High Priest. Perhaps we should not be so quick to disrespect the ritual pattern of using unleavened bread for the memorial service demonstrated by our Messiah? That appointment of the idolater Aaron as High Priest was so misunderstood by the enlightened community of that generation there was a rebellion resulting in almost 15,000 divine executions through earthquake, heavenly fire and plague. We can see the principle of judgment and sin condemnation demonstrated in the execution of Achan for theft yet King David is forgiven for adultery and contract murder. Yahweh's applications (judgments) of His truths and principles are not simple and easy or the same in all cases. There are extenuating circumstances that emphasize specific principles above or below others, depending on the principles involved and the context of their application. We simply have to foundationally recognize that Yahweh is always right, without exception. If that is not our foundational understanding, we are already lost.

### **The Motivation Variable In Divine Judgments**

An example of this is the different judgment that is imposed on the basis of motivation in the context of the same failure. If one man kills another under the laws of the Kingdom of God the judgment can be dramatically different on the basis of motivation. If that death was intentional then the killer must be executed. If the death was an accident, without harmful intent, then the "manslayer" could live and was given the choice of six cities of refuge for asylum from those who wished to do him harm for causing the death of their loved one. The judgment for causing the death of another is very different on the basis of motivation.

This distinction highlights one of the two unforgivable sins. Jesus defines one unforgivable sin as being the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit. During the ministry of Jesus, some in the enlightened community had witnessed the unveiled power of God being demonstrated before them and called it evil, foul and the power of the pagan god Beelzebub. Jesus then warned them about the unforgivable sin of blaspheming the Holy Spirit (Matt. 12:22-32). Paul points out that those who possessed a Holy Spirit gift (tasted the powers of the age to come) and used that miraculous power to promote apostasy could not be forgiven (Heb. 6:4-6). The other unforgivable sin is also highlighted in Hebrews in chapter 10:26-27 *For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.*

If one presumes contradictions to our Creator's righteousness (sin) are inconsequential or perhaps that forgiveness is assured without condition, the resulting sin is unforgivable. This understanding is confirmed in the previous First Kingdom Age.

**Deut. 17:12-13** *And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die: and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel. And all the people shall hear, and fear, and do no more presumptuously.*

The 'motivation' factor in a failure exaggerates or diminishes the divine judgment significantly.

It is on the basis of these two issues (and a third to be explained) that affords our participation in a memorial service where leavened bread is used to represent the unleavened body of our savior.

- 1) There is a varying significance in divine judgments for the application of divine truths that depends on context and the other divine truths in consideration within that context. An example of this would be the Sabbath healing miracles of our Messiah as well as how the priests profaned the Sabbath but were guiltless (Matt. 12:5). The leaders of the enlightened community were wrong to desire the execution of Jesus for his Sabbath healings. They did not understand how those Sabbath healings were perfect demonstrations of the divine principles being testified in Sabbath law.
- 2) The 'motivation' catalyst in divine judgements is the second qualifier in our defense for sometimes being willing to accept broken 'leavened' bread to remember the reconciling death of our unleavened Messiah.

### **Our Messiah's Pattern**

Jesus knew the enlightened community of his generation did not sufficiently understand the eternal truths and principles of his Father. Yet he did not abandon them or refuse to enter the temple courtyard with them or refuse to teach in their synagogues. He certainly openly corrected the leaders. He twice violently disrupted their commercial corruption of the Temple with their merchandise peddling at Passover. He publicly insulted leading Brethren in the enlightened community, calling them liars, hypocrites, sons of the devil, blind guides, whited sepulchres and a generation of vipers. They will certainly face his judgment. Yet he would not separate himself from them.

### **Temporary and Permanent Separation Applications**

There is a legitimacy in separation, but it has to be applied correctly. Under the Kingdom laws there was a separation component that was sometimes temporary and sometimes permanent (i.e. Numbers 19 for both). There is also a legitimacy to the principle of separation in the Ecclesial Age, but that is primarily focused on encouraging an educational spiritual recalibration and not a permanent separation, unless there is no repentance whatsoever. That temporary and educational value expected from separation was certainly the case with the Corinthian Brother living with his father's wife (1 Cor. 5 and 2 Cor. 2) as well as Hymenaeus and Alexander (1Tim. 1:19-20). While there is a legitimacy to the principle of separation we must be properly assigning the appropriate value to each divine principle in the context of our considerations... or we risk contradicting our Creator's righteousness.

### **The Apostle Paul's Pattern**

The issue of motivation is a licensing feature in this consideration of being willing to partake of the divinely inappropriate leavened memorial bread. This is why Paul was not a hypocrite when he declares:

**1 Cor. 9:19- 23** *For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. And this I do for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with you.*

### **Naaman's Accommodated Request**

Paul's motivation for his inconsistency that adjusted according to environment was that he might be a "partaker" with those he fellowshiped with. This issue of 'motivation' can certainly minimize as well as exaggerate divine disfavor. I find the petition of Naaman valuable to consider in this context. The former pagan divinely cleansed of his leprosy, humbly asked the prophet of God:

**2 Kings 5:18** *In this thing the Lord pardon thy servant, that when my master goeth into the house of Rimmon to worship there, and he leaneth on my hand, and I bow myself in the house of Rimmon: when I bow down myself in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing.*

It is very comforting, in the context of this particular consideration, to hear the answer of the prophet Elisha to Naaman's request. vs. 19 *And he said unto him, Go in peace.* It is this same sense, expressed through Paul and Naaman and Elisha, by which we can be confident that we will not aggravate our God or our savior by willingly accepting leavened memorial bread in some situations to remember the death of our unleavened savior.

### **The Assignment of Guilt According to Perceived Guilt**

However there is yet another caveat. This is the issue of participating in an activity imposing a perceived guilt. Paul addresses this issue in 1 Corinthians 8 and Romans 14 in relation to eating meat that had been dedicated to pagan idols. It is the individual perception of guilt or innocence that imposes or dismisses true guilt in that application. Within that frame we also have to place the constraint of not being an inspiration of failure for another, by arrogantly eating that pagan dedicated food in front of those whose conscience and level of knowledge in divine principles lacks the proper definition and confidence. It is not supposed to be 'easy' to properly apply the principles of divine righteousness throughout varying situations and environments. This is why 'motivation' can have such an effect on guilt or innocence and the degree of offense imposed on our Creator's eternal rightness.

If those who understand the reasons why an unleavened condition is exclusively appropriate for the nature of the bread memorial do sometimes partake of leavened memorial bread then this issue of motivation will be extremely important.

### **Our Messiah's Pattern**

The third defensive issue to address is that we will not be personally defiled by sharing leavened bread and wine with Brothers and Sisters that are either unaware of the divine intention and lessons involved in using unleavened memorial bread or highly resistant to admitting historical error in the observance of this ritual. Jesus was not defiled or in any way divinely unacceptable for instituting the memorial service with 12 men that would certainly not have qualified to participate in memorial service during our generation of the enlightened community. Not a single disciple believed in the necessary death and resurrection of the Messiah at that point. None of them understand the basis of atonement. One of them with whom Jesus shared that first memorial meal had been told it would have been better for him to have never been born, due to the betrayal he would perpetrate that night. Jesus was not personally defiled in that memorial service, therefore sharing leavened memorial bread with other members of the enlightened community that are unfamiliar or resistant with the truths and principles being testified or through the unleavened nature of that broken bread is not going to personally defile us before our immortal judge.

### **Why Should We Even Care?**

The last balancing issue to consider is if we do not consider partaking of leavened memorial bread to be necessarily divinely objectionable in certain situations then why should we care at all about this matter.



## **The Motivation Trap**

The possibility of having to even address an instinctive response such as this is highly distasteful, but regrettably necessary. Once again the defining issue is motivation. If we are just looking to do the least possible to technically qualify for salvation then we shouldn't even bother participating and proceed with eating and drinking and being merry for we will certainly die... forever. Our divine rejection will be assured. Our attitude should parallel Saul of Tarsus, who effected a 180° personal reversal when the truth of the matter was presented to him in such a powerful way on the road to Damascus. Saul recognized he had been wrong all along and chose to humbly and energetically respond to the truths he could no longer ignore. He had to admit to himself that his mentors had been wrong and that the entire nation had been wrong. No matter what the personal cost he determined that he would not continue down that same false path he had pursued before his dramatic rebuke from the son of God.

## **Enlightenment Ends the Excuse of Innocence**

The motivation determination in a matter can greatly exaggerate the degree of the divine offense. The reason the King of Gerar was not executed by God for taking Sarah from Abraham was that he acted in the integrity of his heart in believing she was only the sister of God's prophet. God took that innocence of understanding into account and would not kill him as long as he returned Abraham's wife to him. Sins performed in weakness and ignorance have the capacity to be forgiven but if we sin presumptuously (defining motivation) then there is no possibility for forgiveness (Deut. 17:12-13; Heb. 10:26).

We should never look for precedents denying divine principles simply to accommodate our own convenience or validate relaxing community standards. The motivations for our actions will be highly significant when we individually face our judge who will decide whether we will live forever or die forever. He has already warned us that there are many to be called to judgment but only a few of those called to judgment will be chosen (Matt. 20:16; 22:14). Searching for conscience deadening exceptions to projecting divine principles is quite unwise.

Jesus put up with an awful lot of errors within the enlightened community during his ministry. He only cleansed the temple at the beginning and the end of his ministry. He didn't leave the community because they understood so many things incorrectly. He will be judging us, so if we follow his pattern then we will not be offending his Father's righteousness in this matter.

Brother Jim Dillingham  
Dunbarton New Hampshire  
[bible888@aol.com](mailto:bible888@aol.com)  
Cranston Rhode Island Christadelphian Ecclesia  
USA