

**‘The Mass’ deceptions advocated by Peter Williams:
A review of his Revelation TV debate with Cecil.
(Part 1 – ‘The 4th cup’ and ‘it is finished’).**

On Tuesday evening 23 October 2012 I took part in a 1-hour long live TV debate with Peter D Williams of an organisation called ‘Catholic Voices’ – the subject for debate was ‘**The Mass and Transubstantiation**’. A video of the debate can be viewed on YouTube on this link <http://youtu.be/QPL1JKOdWvc>

For the purposes of these articles I shall be referring to my ‘opponent’ as ‘Mr Williams’ rather than ‘Peter’ so as to avoid any confusion with the Apostle Peter who I shall on occasions be referring to.

Obviously both Mr Williams and I had prepared opening statements setting out our positions and convictions on these issues and, as he had spoken first, my opening statement that followed was not a direct response to what he had just said. As he spoke he confidently made a number of assertions that just did not ‘ring true’ with my understanding of God’s only Word, the Bible. However, not wishing to be deflected from what I had prepared and also recognising a need to check into certain aspects before publicly refuting what he had stated, I refrained from doing so on the night.

In this series of articles I will now address those concerns that surfaced within me as Mr Williams made his opening statement; I will also address other issues of concern to me that were touched on albeit briefly during the debate and then I will include some relevant comments that I had prepared in advance but because of time limitations I was not able to present on the actual evening.

In relation to Mr Williams’ opening statement I contacted him by email to ‘run past him’ a brief summary (4 points) of what he had said on some issues and to ask him if my summary was indeed an accurate reflection of what he had said.

He was in agreement with my first 3 points but made a correction to point 4. The now agreed 4 points summarising what Mr Williams said in his opening presentation are as follows –

- (1) Mr Williams said the Lord and the disciples did not actually eat a Passover lamb at the Last Supper
- (2) Mr Williams said that to ensure that the law requiring observation of The Passover was fulfilled the Lord transubstantiated the bread into Himself (“our Passover” as Paul referred to Him in 1 Corinthians 5:7) and so this substitution of Himself for an actual lamb ensured that He/they fulfilled the law

(3) Mr Williams said that after the Lord drank what he believed was the 3rd cup of the Passover meal with His disciples that drinking the 4th cup would be fulfilled by Jesus on the cross when He partook of a sponge of vinegar.

(4) In relation to the 4th cup, Mr Williams claimed the Lord's words "**IT IS FINISHED**", uttered by Him just before His death, refer only to the satisfaction of the requirements of the Passover meal.

Let me first deal with point 3. **Quite simply, this claim made by Mr Williams that by drinking vinegar the 4th cup of Passover has been fulfilled does not find support in God's Word.** Mr Williams chose **Mark 14:25** to prove his position – "**Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God**". Mr Williams says that this promise was fulfilled **later the same day** when Christ accepted the vinegar offered to Him a second time (Matthew 27:48).

Mr Williams needs to compare scripture with scripture to get the full picture on this incident and when we read Matthew's account of what was recorded in **Mark 14:25** we find these words in **Matthew 26:29** "**But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom**". It is clear that Mr Williams' explanation is contrary to Scripture because **when Christ took the vinegar on the Cross He was certainly NOT drinking the "fruit of the vine" new with His disciples.** In addition, as I highlighted in the previous paragraph, are we really to believe that when Christ spoke of "**until that day**" He was actually meaning **later the same day**?

With reference to point 4, Mr Williams' claim, that (when the Lord accepted vinegar on the Cross) the Lord's words "**IT IS FINISHED**" refer to the ending of the Passover meal, is simply not true. **The action that was 'finished' on the Cross was not as Mr Williams claims the Lord's observance of The Passover ritual but rather the earthly aspect of His work of redemption.**

In **John 17**, the chapter that is known as Christ's great '**High Priestly**' prayer the Lord stated in verse 4 "**I have glorified thee on the earth; I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do**". What work was it that Christ had at this stage '**finished**'? It is certain that it was His work as God's "**prophet**" – the one promised in **Deuteronomy 18:15** and the one confirmed as being the fulfilment of that promise in **John 1:45**. Christ had '**finished**' His work as God's promised '**prophet**' of bringing God to the people and that included perfectly fulfilling all the requirements of God's law for holy and righteous living. Think of the Lord's words in **John 8:29** "**And he that sent me is with me. The Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him**". Not only had Christ '**finished**' that 'prophetic' work perfectly but in doing so He had "**glorified His Father on the earth**" as quoted earlier.

That work was now '**finished**' and so in this prayer Christ is moving/transitioning from His role as '**Prophet**' into His role as the '**Priest**' who by the sacrifice of Himself would bring His people to God. That 'priestly' earthly aspect of His redeeming, sacrificial work is the work that was '**finished**' on the Cross. In this new 'phase' as

'Priest' He desired both to be glorified and to glorify His Father as we read in verse 1 **"Father, the hour is come, glorify thy Son that thy Son also may glorify thee"**.

Redemption necessitated two vital 'ingredients' – **'propitiation'** (the turning away/appeasing of God's anger stirred up by man's sin) and **'expiation'** (the removal of man's guilt due to his sin). These 2 earthly aspects of redemption are pictured perfectly by the sacrificial goat (**'propitiation'**) and the scapegoat (**'expiation'**) that were central to the Old Testament **'Day of Atonement'** ritual outlined in **Leviticus 16** – a ritual that of course prophetically pictured the Atonement that Christ would make on the Cross of Calvary.

Clearly the Lord had **'finished'** these works (**'propitiation'** in the daylight hours on the Cross when His blood was shed **"God hath set forth a propitiation through faith in his blood" Romans 3:25** and **'expiation'** in the hours of darkness on the Cross when **"The Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all" Isaiah 53:6**) because only then did He accept the pain-numbing vinegar, and only then with His dying breaths did He cry out in triumph **"It is finished"** and **"Father into thy hands I commend my spirit"** (John 19:30 and Luke 23:46). Both John and Luke record that with these dying words He then **"gave up the spirit"**.

What was declared **'finished'** by the Lord on the Cross was not, as Mr Williams claimed, the Lord's observance of The Passover ritual but rather the earthly aspect of the Lord's work of redemption for His people on the Cross. As I stated in the debate, the immediate **'divine seal of approval'** upon this aspect of His redeeming work was the rending from the top to the bottom of the Veil of the Temple (**Matthew 27:51**).

Now I won't take issue with Mr. Williams' assertion that Christ's finished work (of redemption) on the Cross awaited a subsequent 'heavenly' completion through His personal High Priestly offering to His Father when He entered into the heavenly 'Holy of Holies'. One could in fact make the case that beginning with His supernatural birth and ending with His presentation in the 'Holy of Holies' in heaven and His resultant glorification we see the entire, fully completed work of Christ for the redemption of lost sinners. But we need to carefully note the following (1) the death of Jesus on the cross was specifically the moment for the satisfaction of God's wrath against sin and for the expiation of the guilt of sin for all those whom the Father would give to Christ and (2) the eternal benefits accruing from His death on the Cross would flow forth after His resurrection and His presentation to His Father in the heavenly 'Holy of Holies'.

Fully satisfied with Calvary's atonement the Holy Spirit was then sent forth as promised - this was the fulfilment of what we read in **John 7:37-39** **"In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried out, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that BELIEVETH on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, whom they that BELIEVE on him should receive, for the Holy Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified"**.

The Old Testament High Priests, after completing the work connected with sacrifice, then had to enter the Holy of Holies to 'present' if you like the evidence for the

sacrifice and that was 'the blood'. The Lord Jesus Christ, having completed the earthly aspect of His redeeming work likewise had to 'present' evidence of sacrifice.

Unlike the earthly Old Testament priests, who entered into the earthly 'Holy of Holies' by the merits of shed animal blood, the Lord entered into the heavenly 'Holy of Holies' by the merits of His own precious shed blood as we read in **Hebrews 9:12** **"By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place having obtained eternal redemption for us"**. He Himself was the evidence – no wonder we read in **Revelation 5:6 & 9** **"And I beheld and lo, in the midst of the throne... stood a lamb as *though* it had been slain... And they sang a new song saying Thou art worthy... for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood"**.

Rome and Mr Williams claim that this sacrifice and the evidence for it are offered and re-presented every time a Sacrifice of the Mass is celebrated. According to their Eucharistic Prayer, the sacrifices offered on their altars are carried up into heaven by angels for re-presentation to God. So in their view even though these aspects are **'finished' by Christ** they must be re-presented perpetually to be effective. On the night of the debate I twice repeated the words of **Hebrews 7:26-27** concerning Christ, our great High Priest **"For such a high priest became us (perfectly suited us) ... who needs not daily... to offer up sacrifice... for this he did once when he offered up himself"**.

Listen to the words of **Hebrews 9:24-26** **"For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: **Nor yet that he should offer himself often**, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: **but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself"**.**

Rome's position is that though the sacrifice of Christ is completed, and the presenting of His blood is completed once for all time, both of these aspects of redemption must be re-presented perpetually by Roman Catholic priests. Mr Williams was very clear that he believes that this is how the benefits of Christ's work are mediated to and appropriated by sinners seeking salvation.

Roman Catholics including Mr Williams, as he stated during the debate, argue that the re-presentation of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ via The Mass is the 'instrumental' way in which the finished work of the Cross is applied to sinners seeking salvation. Their claim is that the benefits of Christ's sacrifice at Calvary are applied sacramentally through the re-presentation of His sacrifice on an un-bloody altar.

Instead of viewing all the redemptive work that has been finished by Christ Himself as the sole basis of receiving the benefits of Christ BY FAITH ALONE, Rome sees His work as finished only in the sense of then using it as a base upon which to re-present it over and over again. **It is in the re-presentation of the blood of Calvary and the re-presentation of the blood offered by Jesus in the 'Holy of Holies' that Rome ironically destroys the very essence of His finished work.** Instead of receiving the finished work of Christ and the corresponding benefits of propitiation, reconciliation, redemption, justification and salvation BY FAITH ALONE Rome opts

to construct a system of re-presentation using an 'army' of priests, and reconstructing in many ways a new priesthood that stands between Christ and salvation BY FAITH ALONE.

The basis for this construction of a New Testament priesthood is Rome's insistence that Jesus told them to do so. Mr. Williams argues over and over again that Jesus Christ commanded His followers to re-present His finished work on an un-bloody altar in what Rome calls a memorial sacrifice. From this Rome naturally assumes that Jesus would want His blood re-presented in heaven in the 'Holy of Holies' as well. But is this the teaching of the Scriptures?"

Rome basically says, "The work of Christ is done once but only for the purpose of re-presenting it so that grace for forgiveness can be gained."

Christians say, "Christ's work was done once without any need for re-presentation as forgiveness is gained by grace alone through faith alone in the finished work."

Roman Catholics put a re-presentation, performed by Roman Catholic priests, between the gift of grace and the lost sinner. Christians know better. God's gift of Christ's righteousness is given directly through faith alone. Jesus lived an obedient, sinless life for His own chosen people – something they could not do for themselves. Rome's constant mantra amounts to "Now that all the work is finished let the work begin." In stark contrast Christians say, **"IT IS FINISHED"** in every way conceivable. Let us rejoice in the words of **Hebrews 10:11-18** as found in the NASB for I think their translation captures so well the hopelessness of Rome's ongoing supposed re-presentation of Christ's sacrifice at Calvary via The Mass –

"11 Every priest stands daily ministering and offering time after time the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; 12 but He, having offered one sacrifice for sins for all time, SAT DOWN AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD, 13 waiting from that time onward UNTIL HIS ENEMIES BE MADE A FOOTSTOOL FOR HIS FEET. 14 For by one offering He has perfected for all time those who are sanctified. 15 And the Holy Spirit also testifies to us; for after saying,

**16 "THIS IS THE COVENANT THAT I WILL MAKE WITH THEM
AFTER THOSE DAYS, SAYS THE LORD:
I WILL PUT MY LAWS UPON THEIR HEART,
AND ON THEIR MIND I WILL WRITE THEM,"**

He then says, **17 "AND THEIR SINS AND THEIR LAWLESS DEEDS I WILL REMEMBER NO MORE." 18 Now where there is forgiveness of these things, there is no longer any offering for sin".**

So, to summarise, Rome views the benefits of Christ's finished redemptive work as being gained in part through the Roman Catholic sacrament of the Mass conducted by their 'army' of priests. This is foreign to the Bible. The only way that Christ's benefits are gained is through faith alone in the finished work of Christ alone. Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word of God. God is pleased to use the **"foolishness of preaching"** His word to bring the message of the gospel to poor lost sinners. Paul makes this abundantly clear in **1 Corinthians 1:18 & 21 "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness;**

but unto us who are saved it is the power of God... For... it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe” and in 1 Corinthians 2:2 he sets forth the sole theme of his preaching in Corinth **“I determined not to know anything among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified”**.

The great apostle Paul was commissioned to preach the Word of the saving benefits of the cross of Christ. He gave the gospel message that through faith alone all the benefits of Christ’s work would come to lost mankind – He knew this was how God was pleased to draw sinners to Himself for salvation so no wonder he declared later in 1 Corinthians 9:16 **“For though I PREACH the gospel, I have nothing to glory of; for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me if I PREACH not the gospel”**.

The Apostle Peter likewise confirmed this truth. He writes the following with reference to Christians who have believed the Word of God: **“Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever” (1 Peter 1:23)**.

This ‘new birth’ comes from God Who in harmony with the Word preached, and the supernatural conviction of the Holy Spirit, creates new life in the soul of those dead in sin (**Ephesians 2:1**). We cannot help but notice that Christians are born again by the Word of God directly for it is **“living and powerful” (Hebrews 4:12)**. This incorruptible Word as it is preached, and not the sacramental industry as found in the Roman Catholic religion, is the means through which eternal life with God in Christ is gained.

In closing we are reminded that there is no scriptural ground for an ongoing perpetual re-presentation of the sacrifice of Christ, or a re-presentation of Christ’s blood in the Holy of Holies as alleged in the Roman Catholic Mass. Hence there is no need for the Roman Catholic priesthood.

Scripture is clear as to how the benefits of Christ’s saving work are applied to sinners seeking salvation. I’ll simply quote one of the clearest statements on this as found in **Ephesians 2:8-9 “For by grace are ye saved through FAITH; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; Not of works lest any man should boast”**.

In Part 2 of my review of this debate I will (DV) look at the points 1 & 2 mentioned earlier in this article.

Cecil Andrews – ‘Take Heed’ Ministries – 5 November 2012

Footnote

1. For those who may have a deeper interest in ‘the 4 cups’, on this web site http://www.hebrew4christians.com/Holidays/Spring_Holidays/Pesach/Seder/Kadesh/kadesh.html there are helpful comments in relation to ‘the 4 cups’ – let me quote this portion –

'The four cups of wine used in the Seder symbolize four distinct promises made by God as told in Exodus 6:6-7. These are traditionally referred to as follows –

- 1. Cup of Sanctification – “I will bring you out of Egypt”**
- 2. Cup of Deliverance – “I will deliver you from Egyptian slavery”**
- 3. Cup of Redemption – “I will redeem you with my power”**
- 4. Cup of Restoration – “I will take you as my people”**

Opinions vary as to when the words spoken by the Lord in Mark 14:25 were actually uttered. Some commentators believe it was after He drank the first cup whilst others favour the view that it was after the drinking of the 3rd cup. Here are examples of these 2 differing opinions -

Daniel Fuchs in his booklet **'Israel's Holy Days in Type and prophecy'** wrote (p 26) **'A cup of wine was poured for each one in the company. And then our Lord “gave thanks”... The first cup of wine was then drunk. It was at this first cup that our Lord said: “Take this and divide it among you. For I tell you I will not drink again of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God comes” (Luke 22:17-18).**

However in a little booklet issued by RBC Ministries entitled **'The Holidays of God: Spring Feasts'** we read the following **'During a typical Passover Seder four cups are shared each with its own significant picture in the ritual... Our attention here is on the third cup “the cup of redemption”... which in the modern Seder comes after the eating of the *afikomen*... some Christian theologians believe that this is the cup Jesus lifted and declared “Drink from it, all of you. For this is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins” ... Symbolically with the cup and literally through His blood shed at the crucifixion, the Messiah proclaimed the beginnings of a new covenant'.**

Personally I would tend to favour the '3rd cup' view – as we have read earlier it was traditionally known as **'The cup of redemption'** and Peter reminds us in **1 Peter 1:18-19** that Christians have been **“redeemed”** not **“with corruptible things... but with the precious blood of Christ”** so Christ's symbolic use of this 3rd cup (of redemption) to picture the redeeming blood that He would shed on the Cross seems to me to be the most likely understanding of what took place during the Last Supper.

However, whether it was the first or the third cup, that is really immaterial when it comes to Mr Williams' claim that Christ drank the 4th cup when He took vinegar on a sponge lifted up to Him on the Cross and so fulfilled, as he claimed, the words recorded in **Mark 14:25**.

Acknowledgment

I want to publicly put on record my deep gratitude for and appreciation of the help given in the writing of this article by my dear friend and brother in Christ, Rob Zins. His help and input has been invaluable and will I am certain continue to be so (DV)

as the other articles relating to this debate are written and published. Full details of Rob's own excellent ministry can be accessed on <http://www.cwrc-rz.org/>