

Roman Catholicism: Sally Was Right, But....

Sally Quinn has set herself up as a sure target, a conscious challenge, and a possible model. For all three, I congratulate her. As all politics is local, all religion is most interesting when it gets personal. In telling us that she, a non-Catholic, took Communion at Tim Russert's funeral, she has asked us to *get personal about her* no matter how little or much we "On Faith" panelists may know about her. I know little, so feel free to assume much.

1.....I assume "On Faith" was her idea, and further assume that the strongest strand of her motivation in this project was and is the pursuit of personal interior business: she's deeply interested in something she has no specific commitment to, namely, *religion*. And she's sincere enough about it to be a good listener to those of various specific religious commitments....

2.....and an admirer of the Tim Russerts, those religious folk who daily drink from *the deep wells* of peace and joy, love and laughter, and pass out their refreshment to the thirsty. At Tim's funeral, Sal wanted to say yes to Tim, yes to authentic religion, yes to the church – the Roman Catholic Church, his spiritual mother. In that yes mood, she said yes to the Mass, to participation in Holy Communion, to which Tim had been life-long faithful. What a dissonance it would have been for her to say no!

3.....Doing the right thing for the right reason is best; doing the right thing for the wrong reason is better than not doing the right thing; doing the wrong thing for the right reason is the greatest danger; and society normally manages to constrain those who do the wrong thing for the wrong reason. As a fellow-Christian, I believe Tim did "best": he was a full participant in the Christian faith, Christian worship, and a Christian life of loving service to his "neighbor" (the word Jesus used for everybody). Sally didn't do "best" in this rich, comprehensive sense; but she did better than if she had refused Communion; and only God can be the real Judge of her motivation.

4....."God is Love," says the Bible – "the Love that moves the worlds," as Dante put it. Why do people take Communion (also called the Lord's Supper and the Eucharist) in Christian churches? Many mixed motives. Central should be love of God, who in the Lord Jesus Christ has come to us for a good we could not otherwise obtain, namely, salvation (in the ancient phrase, "from sin, death, and the devil"). At his Table, the Communion Table or Altar, Jesus offers us himself (however the theologians may conceive it) and commissions us to offer ourselves in service to the world. Christians are walkways to the Lord's Table; that's how Sally got there, she walked on Tim – on her affectionate admiration of him, what he did and what he stood for, and the honor he brought to journalism, their profession. How natural that, as she says, taking Communion "made me feel close to him."

Sally says her one experience of Communion in an evangelical church was negative. Perhaps she's more biased against evangelicalism than Roman Catholicism. But in my opinion, the experience would not have been negative had there been a Tim Russert to walk on to the Table. Few come to Christianity without known-admired-loved Christians as walkways into the Church.

5.....Before I get to defending "the fencing of the Table," "eucharistic discipline," the proper rule (among almost all churches) that *the Lord's Table is only for the Lord's people* (committed Christians), I'll get personal about *myself*, a Protestant clergyman who has often participated in the Roman Catholic Mass as a communicant. My most awesome experience of it was in the NYC church nearest the UN: in line, the person in front of me was a Catholic radical named Dan Berrigan (who knew I wasn't a Catholic), and the person behind me was the Catholic radical named Dorothy Day. I was standing between two very different but authentic Catholic saints.

Two experiences on Cape Cod:

(1) In a Kennedy church, at a wedding in which I was the co-celebrant, the Catholic pastor served Communion to me - a Protestant! - before to the bride and groom. In his homily, he honored me as a biblical scholar, and joked that he expected me to tell him, after the wedding, how he could have improved on his homily's use of the Bible. Humble, brotherly love, in Christ. (But all great priests are humble.)

(2) When I chaired the worship-and-education committee of Craigville, a Protestant community founded in 1872, I convinced the committee to invite the clergy of the nearest Roman Catholic church to celebrate Mass on certain Saturday evenings in our Craigville Tabernacle. I attended and took Communion at all the masses until a

new priest came, and before Communion announced that the invitation was for Roman Catholics only. That was my last Mass in Craigville.

6.....Was that Cape Cod priest wrong to exclude me from Communion? He was "regular," playing by the rules. Before the Mass, I asked his permission to commune, and (by the boundary, identification rules of his Church) he had to say no. I could have argued that it's the Lord's Table, not the Church's! But I respect rigorous priests, though I prefer the latitudinarians whose response to me has been, "What the bishop doesn't know won't hurt him." Jesus was both inclusive and exclusive, as his Church must be. (My practice in serving Communion has always been to invite all Christians to participate, not only those of my own particular church [denomination].)

7.....Sally points to the heart of Christian action in a quotation on a card passed out at Tim's funeral: "No exercise is better for the human heart than reaching down to lift up another person." Tim, she says, "was so comfortable talking about his faith." And he often used the quotation from Jesus, "To whom much is given much is expected."

BY WILLIS E. ELLIOTT | JULY 8, 2008; 8:15 PM ETSAVE & SHARE:        

PREVIOUS: [WHAT WOULD TIM RUSSERT DO?](#) | NEXT: [RITUALS AND THE MODERN SEARCH FOR MEANING](#)

Comments

Please report offensive comments below.

Get FDA approved prescription meds from a US licensed pharmacy. FedEx overnight shipping. No Prior RX needed. You will save time and money here.

POSTED BY: BUYZYRTEC | AUGUST 20, 2008 4:32 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Get FDA approved prescription meds from a US licensed pharmacy. FedEx overnight shipping. No Prior RX needed. You will save time and money here.

POSTED BY: BUYZYRTEC | AUGUST 20, 2008 1:20 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Hillel descended from the tribe of Benjamin on his father's side, and from the family of David on his mother's side. Nothing definite, however, is known concerning his origin, nor is he anywhere called by his father's name, which may perhaps have been Gamliel.

In mentioning these characteristics, which the Haggadah then already ascribed to Moses' brother, Hillel mentions his own most prominent virtues. Love of man was considered by Hillel as the kernel of the entire Jewish teaching. When a Gentile who wished to become a Jew asked him for a summary of the Jewish religion in the most concise terms ("while standing on one foot"), Hillel said: "What is hateful to you, do not do to your fellow: this is the whole Law; the rest is the explanation; go and learn" (Shab. 31a). With these words Hillel recognized as the fundamental principle of the Jewish moral law the Biblical precept of brotherly love (Lev. xix. 18).

In the Midrash compilation Sifre (Deut. 357) the periods of Hillel's life are made parallel to those in the life of Moses. Both lived 120 years; at the age of forty Hillel went to the Land of Israel; forty years he spent in study; and the last third of his life he was the spiritual head of the Jewish people. A biographical sketch can be constructed; that Hillel went to Jerusalem in the prime of his life and attained a great age. His activity of forty years likely covered the period of 30 BCE to 10 CE.

Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my defence which I make now unto you.

(And when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more silence: and he saith,) I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day.

Gamaliel the Elder (gēmā'lēəl), or Rabbi Gamaliel I, was the grandson of the great Jewish teacher Hillel the Elder. He was a leading authority in the Sanhedrin in the mid first century. He died nine years before the destruction of Jerusalem (63 AD).

Gamaliel is also thought to be the originator of many legal ordinances. He fathered a son, whom he called Simeon, after his father's name, and a daughter, who married the priest Simon ben Nathanael.

POSTED BY: ANONYMOUS | JULY 14, 2008 12:20 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Hebrew tablet suggests tradition of resurrected messiah predates Jesus

"In three days you will know that evil will be defeated by justice"
blood and slaughter as pathways to justice

In Knohl's interpretation, the specific messianic figure embodied on the stone could be a man named Simon who was slain by a commander in the Herodian army, according to the first-century historian Josephus. The writers of the stone's passages were probably Simon's followers, Knohl contends.

The slaying of Simon, or any case of the suffering messiah, is seen as a necessary step toward national salvation, he says, pointing to lines 19 through 21 of the tablet - "In three days you will know that evil will be defeated by justice" - and other lines that speak of blood and slaughter as pathways to justice.

And Leah conceived, and bare a son, and she called his name Reuben: for she said, Surely the Lord hath looked upon my affliction; now therefore my husband will love me.

And she conceived again, and bare a son; and said, Because the Lord hath heard that I was hated, he hath therefore given me this son also: and she called his name Simeon.

And Shechem said unto her father and unto her brethren, Let me find grace in your eyes, and what ye shall say unto me I will give.

Ask me never so much dowry and gift, and I will give according as ye shall say unto me: but give me the damsel to wife.

And the sons of Jacob answered Shechem and Hamor his father deceitfully, and said, because he had defiled Dinah their sister:

And they said unto them, We cannot do this thing, to give our sister to one that is uncircumcised; for that were a reproach unto us:

But in this will we consent unto you: If ye will be as we be, that every male of you be circumcised;

Then will we give our daughters unto you, and we will take your daughters to us, and we will dwell with you, and we will become one people.

But if ye will not hearken unto us, to be circumcised; then will we take our daughter, and we will be gone.

And their words pleased Hamor, and Shechem Hamor's son.

And unto Hamor and unto Shechem his son hearkened all that went out of the gate of his city; and every male was circumcised, all that went out of the gate of his city.

And it came to pass on the third day, when they were sore, that two of the sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brethren, took each man his sword, and came upon the city boldly, and slew all the males.

And they slew Hamor and Shechem his son with the edge of the sword, and took Dinah out of Shechem's house, and went out.

Simeon and Levi are brethren; instruments of cruelty are in their habitations.

O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united: for in their anger they slew a man, and in their selfwill they digged down a wall.

Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce; and their wrath, for it was cruel: I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel.

Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise: thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee.

They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God; they have provoked me to anger with their vanities: and I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation.

For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell, and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains.

I will heap mischiefs upon them; I will spend mine arrows upon them.

They shall be burnt with hunger, and devoured with burning heat, and with bitter destruction: I will also send the teeth of beasts upon them, with the poison of serpents of the dust.

The sword without, and terror within, shall destroy both the young man and the virgin, the suckling also with the man of gray hairs.

I said, I would scatter them into corners, I would make the remembrance of them to cease from among men: Were it not that I feared the wrath of the enemy, lest their adversaries should behave themselves strangely, and lest they should say, Our hand is high, and the Lord hath not done all this.

Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them.

For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:

Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,

And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things.

An instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law.

Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?

Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?

Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God?

For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written.

For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law: but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision.

Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?

And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?

For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh:

But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.

But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.

But I say, Did not Israel know? First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish nation I will anger you.

But Esaias is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me.

But to Israel he saith, All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.

For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.

That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.

But there was a certain man, called Simon, which beforetime in the same city used sorcery, and bewitched the people of Samaria, giving out that himself was some great one:

To whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, This man is the great power of God.

POSTED BY: ANONYMOUS | JULY 14, 2008 12:01 AM

[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Ryan Haber

I am merely suprised that you seem to think that Willis Elliot is such a wicked person, which he obviously is not, that the priest will be punished for admitting him to Catholic Communion.

When something is obvious, it just is.

Isn't it?

That is all.

POSTED BY: DANIEL IN THE LION'S DEN | JULY 11, 2008 11:35 AM

[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

E Favorite,

Priests have made promises to uphold and teach the teachings of the Catholic Church, and to obey her disciplines.

There is no sin where there is no intent; a priest is guilty of nothing who unknowingly gives the Holy Eucharist to persons undisposed to receive it. That is not the case with the priest mentioned by Rev. Elliott. The priest knowingly flouted his promises and flouted the bishop to whom he made them. That is not good.

Likewise, someone who receives Communion improperly but also without knowing his own indisposition, has intended nothing wrong. That is a different situation who knows that they are doing something their host would prefer they didn't do. At the very least, they are being discourteous and abusing hospitality.

"On the other hand, Walking up to the altar, breaking bread and partaking together is lovely. That's how I think of it now, on the rare occasions I'm in a Catholic church."

Good for you, E Favorite. You might make up your own religion, but we very sincerely believe that we have received ours from Jesus Christ, the Son of God. It therefore has a reality not subject to the subjective desires and preferences of its participants. We believe it is something like piloting an airplane: you can pretend or believe it is whatever you want, but unless you are correct, you are going to make very serious mistakes.

Your little rebellion against the Church - staying in Her periphery while doing what you please, even to Her - is adolescent. It's like a nineteen year old coming home from college for the first time, insisting that she's old enough to smoke, and refusing to come to the dinner table.

I pray and urge you to make a good confession and to return to the life of the Church, or to at least have the integrity to leave Her once and for all.

POSTED BY: RYAN HABER | JULY 10, 2008 5:28 PM

[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Daniel in the Lion's Den,

Thanks for the advice. If you'll forgive me, I'll keep my own counsel. If you would be so kind as to point out exactly what is foolishness, and what is wrong with it, logically speaking, provided my basic premises are true, I would be very grateful.

If we don't share basic premises, then we haven't anything in common upon which to reason.

I mean, come on, really. What do you expect me to say, "Oh, gee! DitLD doesn't agree with me. He thinks the Eucharist is just a glorified Nilla Wafer. What was I thinking all this time?!"

Do you have something specific to say, or are you just going to throw up your hands at my brainlessness? - which does neither of us much good.

POSTED BY: RYAN HABER | JULY 10, 2008 5:16 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Patrick Sarfield

The severesst critics of the Catholic Church are Catholic. I think you have a touch of paranoia.

POSTED BY: DANIEL IN THE LION'S DEN | JULY 10, 2008 2:40 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

" In that yes mood, she said yes to the Mass, to participation in Holy Communion, to which Tim had been life-long faithful. What a dissonance it would have been for her to say no!"

are there people who are actually watching what sally does, and caring about her reaction?

there were people at Mr Russert's funeral who were much more famous and important than sally-

no, it would have been a non-event if sally had said no-

POSTED BY: VICTORIA | JULY 10, 2008 12:04 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Elliott wrote: " I attended and took Communion at all the masses until a new priest came, and before Communion announced that the invitation was for Roman Catholics only. That was my last Mass in Craigville."

Ok, so you showed respect and stopped taking communion. Sally likely heard the same announcement but went ahead and took communion. That is the difference. She was no more right than her not taking her shoes off at the door of a Japanese friend's house because she liked to keep her shoes on. Its not what YOU think is right, its what the owner of the house thinks is right. Anything else is pure disrespect.

You respected the new priest's wishes. Sally ignored those wishes. That makes what she did wrong.

What you did however was on the edge. As long as the priest was not offended you assumed no one else would be ("what the bishop doesn't know won't hurt him"). I must say, coming from a man of the cloth I find that statement just a little wierd. Did you steal cookies from your neighbor's house assuming no one would be the wiser? Just where do your ethics come from anyway, or do you make them up as you go along in a "if it feels good do it" mentality?

POSTED BY: FATE | JULY 10, 2008 10:13 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Folks,

Another non-Catholic clergyperson is coming up with another long-winded put-down against the reaction of Catholics that what Ms. Quinn did was wrong and offensive. We Catholics understand that people like Minister Elliott disregard the religious requirements of Catholicism whenever they can. That comes with most of the more

vicious anti-Catholic Protestant sects. Rev. Elliott unusually for even a Protestant can claim two sources for his anti-Catholicism since he is both a United Church of Christ and an American Baptist minister. Both of those churches have long histories of anti-Catholicism.

For example, the UCC is the result of a merger of several protestant sects in the 1950s, including the Congregationalist Church. The Congregationalist Church, which was the de facto Established Church of Massachusetts from 1630 or so until 1832, had a law passed in 1647 making the mere presence of any Catholic priest in the Colony of Massachusetts punishable by death.

But let's focus on just how weird it must be to be an ordained minister in two different religions! Is it any wonder that Minister Elliott has no problem disregarding what another religion says when he has no problem being a minister for two different sects? How does he keep the different beliefs straight?

POSTED BY: PATRICKSARSFIELD | JULY 10, 2008 8:28 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Nothing fresh or interesting going on here then.

POSTED BY: FANNY | JULY 10, 2008 1:01 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

{{{Ryan Haber}}}

What happens to priests who unknowingly serve communion to Catholics-turned-atheist??

Is there a special punishment on Judgement day for them, for not being able to discern the innocent, beseeching Catholic-like supplicant at the altar with outstretched arms and cupped palms?

I can play the part of a Catholic very well. It comes from years of practice when I actually was a Catholic. Though I attend Mass very rarely now, it's usually at family funerals, where I make a point to participate in the ritual, even though I don't believe for a second that the host is the body and blood of Jesus.

Gag me, it makes me sick that I ever could have thought it was a good thing to eat someone's body and blood - even the son of god's. What a revolting custom.

On the other hand, Walking up to the altar, breaking bread and partaking together is lovely. That's how I think of it now, on the rare occasions I'm in a Catholic church.

POSTED BY: E FAVORITE | JULY 9, 2008 10:44 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

lets make it simple shall we?

Those who eat and drink unworthily eat and drink judgment on themselves. If you have the power to prevent that and do not warn them of this fact according to Ezekiel (either Ch.32 or 34 I don't remember which) there blood will be required at your hand.

POSTED BY: GARYD | JULY 9, 2008 9:58 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

The Catholic Church is by no means the church that Jesus founded. Period.

For the mere fact they call their priests 'Father'..that fact alone...they go against scripture.

Nicene council, 'changing' (who gave them the right to change?) doctrine to include the pagans...

Heresy. Nothing but.

POSTED BY: ANOTHERPOINTOFVIEW | JULY 9, 2008 4:45 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Ryan Haber

Many of the statements that you have made here are absurd, even ridiculous, for example, that Catholic Priests will be judged for allowing Willis Elliott to receive communion. Surely you can see how the logic of all that you believe leads you to utter and complete foolishness.

Don't you have a brain? Then use it, Man! Don't wait for the edict from above;; think your own thoughts!

I feel that your Christian beliefs are wrong on a fundamental level, and that you should seriously consider changing, to be a better person, and a better Christian.

POSTED BY: DANIEL IN THE LION'S DEN | JULY 9, 2008 4:15 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

I am very frustrated with wishy-washy thinking, and am not feeling charitable, but do believe that your post merits response.

Rev. Elliott, those priests who were complicit in giving you the Holy Eucharist, in giving you the sacrament of Communion while you are not yet in communion with the Church, they will have to answer for their consciences on Judgment Day.

Jesus Christ gave us a religion (faith, morals, worship, and community), the religion preserved and nurtured in the Catholic Church. If you accept that, then why not enter into the Catholic Church? Then there will be great rejoicing when you approach the altar.

As a Protestant, you presumably reject the above proposition, that the Catholic Church is the one Church founded by Jesus Christ to hand down the teachings of Jesus Christ. That being the case, why should you care so much about our sacraments? Why not just leave them - and us - alone?

Perhaps you believe that all Christians are fully incorporated in the Church, so you have no need for union with Rome or the Church of Rome before entering into communion with those of us in communion with her. Those of us in communion with her disagree with you, as does she. You will also see that it is impossible to be in communion with a those churches in communion with Rome, while yourself rejecting that communion.

It's like you want to have your cake and eat it, too.

I invite you to consider another possibility. Perhaps the Church is what she claims to be, and the Eucharist is Who we claim it to be. In which case, one would expect It to exert an almost gravitational pull on those who pass by It, just as He did. This possibility certainly would explain the attention any number of people give to the Eucharist in Catholic Churches - even Satanists will only conduct their rituals using hosts stolen from Catholic tabernacles. Doesn't it strike you as odd that people - Catholics and non-Catholics alike - aren't as remotely interested in the Methodist or UCC communion services, as they are in the Eucharist consecrated at the Catholic Mass?

Our Lord was, as you noted, both inclusive and exclusive. All were welcome to join Him (inclusivity), but because he is God and immovable, the union had to happen on His terms (exclusivity), and those who wouldn't accept His terms were free to leave. John 6 provides an excellent example of this dual dynamic, to which I humbly refer your attention.

POSTED BY: RYAN HABER | JULY 9, 2008 3:26 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Some comments about the Last Supper and its history:

"Luedemann [Jesus, 94-97] concludes that the asymmetrical forms cited in 1 Cor 11 are older than the parallel forms of the sayings over the bread and cup in Mark. He also suggests that the eschatological prospect entertained by Jesus is a later addition, and notes that it has nothing to do with the gift of bread and wine. On the other hand, Luedemann notes that the Pauline text reflects a later development than Mark with its twofold command for repetition of the supper ritual in memory of Jesus. In the end, Luedemann decides that the differences between Mark and Paul are small enough for him to use the two accounts in determining both the content of the final meal and the ways in which the supper was understood by early Christians.

At the same time, Luedemann concludes that the portrayal of Jesus celebrating such a ritual on the night before his death is not historical. He is clear that there is "no generic relationship" between any actual final meal and the Lord's Supper understood in cultic terms. He also denies the Passover character of the supper as a Markan creation. Like Meier (below), Luedemann does accept the saying (Mark 14:25) about drinking wine in the kingdom of God as authentic. He concludes: (this saying) "hardly came into being in the early community, for in it Jesus does not exercise any special function for believers at the festal meal in heaven which is imminent. Only Jesus' expectation of a the future kingdom of God stands at the centre, not Jesus as saviour, judge or intercessor."

"In Crossan's view, this is the third example of a plurally attested complex from the first stratum which, although summarizing "principles or practices, themes or emphases, of the historical Jesus, stem not from him but from the liturgical creativity of the early communities" [Historical Jesus, 360]. (The other examples were 013 Two As One and 120 The Lords Prayer.)" Professor Crossan is an On Faith Panelist.

Jesus Seminar - all the following passages were judged to be probably not or definitely not said by the historical Jesus.

Sayings of Jesus

1 Cor 11:23-25

Mark 14:25

Mark 14:22-25

Matt 26:29

Matt 26:26-29

Matt 26:28c

Luke 22:16,18

Luke 22:15-20

Did 9:4

Did 9:1-4

John 6:51-58

1 Cor 11:23-26

Mark 14:22-26

Matt 26:26-30

Luke 22:14-20

John 6:26-70

"Fredriksen [Jesus of Nazareth, 117-119] accepts the Passover character of the event and places the actions of Jesus in the context of messianic meals in his own ministry and at Qumran. When discussing the final days in Jerusalem (page 252), she assumes the basic historicity of the last supper narrative as a self-conscious final meal in which Jesus spoke of his impending death saying the words over the bread and cup." Professor Fredriksen is an On Faith panelist.

"When discussing the saying on Drinking Wine in the Kingdom of God (Mark 14:25, Professor John Meier [Marginal Jew II,302] notes that "the historicity of a final farewell meal held by Jesus with his disciples is generally accepted by scholars across the spectrum, since its existence is supported by both the criterion of multiple attestation and the criterion of coherence."

POSTED BY: CONCERNED THE CHRISTIAN NOW LIBERATED | JULY 9, 2008 2:20 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

The comments to this entry are closed.