

Do This in Memory of Me

The Lord's Evening Meal, the Watchtower's Annual Memorial, and What Christ Actually Commanded

by Richard Whiting

© 2026 Richard Whiting. All rights reserved. May be reproduced in whole, with attribution. See full notice at the end of this document.

Contents

- I. Three Questions at One Table
- II. What the Watchtower Teaches
- III. A Memorial in the Hebrew Sense
- IV. The Mass Does Not Repeat Calvary
- V. John 6: Where Jesus Refused to Explain It Away
- VI. Paul Treats the Elements as More Than Symbols
- VII. The Last Supper Was Offered as a Sacrifice
- VIII. How Often: The Practice of the Apostles
- IX. Nisan 14 and the Calendar the Argument Forgets
- X. Who May Partake
- XI. The First Christians Left a Record
- XII. Two Remaining Objections
- XIII. The Reply in Brief
- Endnotes

I. Three Questions at One Table

On the night before He died, Jesus took bread, called it His body, and told the apostles to do what He had just done. Every Christian communion has obeyed that command in some form ever since. But obedience to it divides sharply on three questions: *what* the bread and wine are, *how often* the command should be kept, and *who* may keep it.

Jehovah's Witnesses answer all three in a way that sets them apart even from most of Protestantism. They observe the Lord's Evening Meal once a year, after sundown on Nisan 14. They hold that the bread and wine remain ordinary bread and wine, representing Christ's body and blood but in no sense becoming them. And they teach that only the 144,000 may eat and drink—so that at a typical Kingdom Hall the emblems are passed along the rows and returned untouched. Worldwide, those who partake number in the tens of thousands against an attendance of some twenty million—on the order of one person in a thousand.

The Catholic case does not rest on a single proof text. It rests on the convergence of what Christ said, what Paul assumed his converts already knew, what the first Christians did every week, and what they said they were doing while the apostles were still within living memory. This essay sets out the Watchtower's teaching first, at its strongest, and then follows that convergence where it leads.

II. What the Watchtower Teaches

The Society's teaching on the Memorial is set out in *Insight on the Scriptures* under the entry "Lord's Evening Meal," in *Reasoning From the Scriptures*, and in the *Watchtower* study articles published each spring before the observance. Its claims, fairly stated, are these. First, the rite is annual: because Jesus instituted the meal on the night of the Jewish Passover, and because the Passover was annual, the Memorial is to be kept once a year on Nisan 14, and the more frequent observance of the churches is without warrant. Second, the emblems are symbols and remain so: Jesus was standing bodily before the apostles as He spoke, so the bread in His hands could not have been His literal flesh, and He elsewhere used plainly figurative language—"I am the door," "I am the vine." The *New World Translation* renders His words accordingly: "Take, eat. This means my body" (Matt. 26:26, NWT). Third, only the anointed may partake: the new covenant was made with the little flock of 144,000 destined to rule with Christ in heaven, and the great crowd of other sheep, who hope to live forever on a restored earth, attend as respectful observers. Fourth, against the Mass specifically: Christ died "once for all" (Heb. 9:25–28; 10:10–14), so a rite claiming to be a sacrifice insults the sufficiency of Calvary; and the consuming of blood is forbidden by commands given to Noah, repeated in the Law, and reaffirmed by the apostles (Gen. 9:4; Lev. 17:10; Acts 15:28–29). Behind all of this stands the larger Watchtower narrative: that a literal presence in the bread and wine is a post-apostolic corruption, shaped by pagan sacrificial religion.

Elsewhere on this site I have compared Jehovah's Witnesses to your local postal carrier. A carrier knows every address on the route and the name that goes with it, but almost nothing about the people behind those doors; in a similar way, Witnesses know every proof text that can be 'cherry-picked' in support of their beliefs, while remaining strangers

to the historical, literary, and Scriptural context those verses came from. The objections above are a study in that pattern. Every address in the list is real: Hebrews does say “once for all”; the Passover was annual; the apostles did write “abstain from blood.” Each verse is the name on the envelope, read off correctly. What follows is a visit to the households behind those addresses, and in every case the household tells a different story from the envelope.

III. A Memorial in the Hebrew Sense

Begin with the word “remembrance,” because the whole Watchtower position rests on reading it in the weak modern sense—calling an absent friend to mind on an anniversary. The Bible’s own usage will not allow that reading. When God instituted the Passover, He called it a memorial:

This day shall be for you a memorial day, and you shall keep it as a feast to the Lord; throughout your generations you shall observe it as an ordinance for ever.

Exodus 12:14, RSV

The Israelite of a later century did not keep the Passover as the anniversary of something done to his ancestors. He was told to keep it as done for *him*: “It is because of what the Lord did for me when I came out of Egypt” (Ex. 13:8). The Hebrew memorial makes the saving act present to those who keep it. The principle survives in the Passover Haggadah to this day: in every generation a man is bound to regard himself as though he personally had come out of Egypt. Christ’s command to do this “in remembrance of me” uses that same category, not the weaker English sense of recollecting an absent friend.

The Greek confirms it. The word Luke and Paul use for “remembrance” is *anamnesis*, and in the Greek Bible it is liturgical vocabulary, not psychological vocabulary. The sacrifices of the Law were offered as a “remembrance” before God (Num. 10:10), and the letter to the Hebrews uses the same word of them: “But in these sacrifices there is a reminder of sin year after year” (Heb. 10:3). An *anamnesis* is a thing done before God, not a thought entertained about the past.

This is exactly the sense in which the Catholic Church understands the rite. The Catechism defines the Eucharist as “the memorial of Christ’s Passover, the making present and the sacramental offering of his unique sacrifice” (CCC 1362), and explains the term: “In the sense of Sacred Scripture the memorial is not merely the recollection of past events but the proclamation of the mighty works wrought by God for men” (CCC 1363). “When the Church celebrates the Eucharist, she commemorates Christ’s Passover, and it is made present: the sacrifice Christ offered once for all on the cross remains ever present” (CCC 1364). The Watchtower calls its observance “the Memorial” while emptying the word of

the very meaning it carries in the Scriptures the Society appeals to. The Church keeps the word's biblical weight.

IV. The Mass Does Not Repeat Calvary

The objection from Hebrews mistakes what the Church claims. She does not teach that Christ dies again, or that a new sacrifice is added to His. She teaches that the one sacrifice offered once on Calvary is made *present*. The Catechism is explicit: the sacrifice of Christ and the sacrifice of the Eucharist are one single sacrifice; “the victim is one and the same: the same now offers through the ministry of priests, who then offered himself on the cross; only the manner of offering is different” (CCC 1367, quoting the Council of Trent).

So the Watchtower and the Church agree that Christ died once for all. That is not the point in dispute; it is the Catholic premise. What is disputed is whether an event can be represented without being repeated, and Scripture already answers that, because the Passover the Memorial imitates worked in exactly this way. The Exodus happened once in history, yet God commanded it kept as a feast “throughout your generations”—and no Israelite ever supposed the seder repeated the Exodus, or that keeping it insulted the sufficiency of the first deliverance.

But the deeper answer sits in Hebrews itself, in the very letter the objection quotes—the address read off correctly, the household unvisited. The letter's picture of Christ is not of a priest whose work ended at the cross. He “holds his priesthood permanently, because he continues for ever,” and “he always lives to make intercession” for those who draw near to God through Him (Heb. 7:24–25). He has “entered, not into a sanctuary made with hands, a copy of the true one, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf” (Heb. 9:24). This is the fulfillment of the Day of Atonement: as the high priest carried the blood of the yearly sacrifice into the Holy of Holies, Christ has carried His one sacrifice into the true sanctuary, where He presents it eternally. The one offering of Calvary is not locked in the past; it stands forever before the Father. The Mass does not add a second sacrifice to that one; it is where the one eternal offering touches an altar on earth.

The Catechism states the principle: “The Paschal mystery of Christ, by contrast, cannot remain only in the past, because by his death he destroyed death, and all that Christ is—all that he did and suffered for all men—participates in the divine eternity, and so transcends all times while being made present in them all” (CCC 1085). None of this is a medieval invention. Augustine, writing in A.D. 408, could ask as though the answer were obvious: “Was not Christ once for all offered up in His own person as a sacrifice? And yet, is He not likewise offered up in the sacrament as a sacrifice, not only in the special

solemnities of Easter, but also daily among our congregations...?” Both halves of that sentence were already old when he wrote it.

V. John 6: Where Jesus Refused to Explain It Away

If “this is my body” stood alone, the figurative reading would be at least arguable. It does not stand alone. In the sixth chapter of John, Jesus tells the crowd that the bread He will give is His flesh, and the response is revulsion: “How can this man give us his flesh to eat?” This is the moment for a teacher who meant a symbol to say so.

Truly, truly, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in you.

John 6:53, RSV

He does not soften the saying. He sharpens it, and the Greek sharpens with Him: the ordinary verb for eating gives way to *trōgein*, a blunt word for gnawing or chewing. Many of His disciples then draw the obvious conclusion, “This is a hard saying; who can listen to it?” and they leave. Jesus lets them go, and turns to the Twelve to ask whether they will leave too. Nowhere else in the Gospels does He allow disciples to abandon Him over a misunderstanding He could have corrected with a sentence. When His hearers took “destroy this temple” literally, John tells us plainly they were mistaken (John 2:21). Here John offers no such note, because there was no misunderstanding to correct.

VI. Paul Treats the Elements as More Than Symbols

Writing to Corinth around A.D. 55, within about twenty-five years of the crucifixion, Paul passes on what he “received from the Lord.” His warning is the difficulty for any purely symbolic reading:

Whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord.
... For any one who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment upon himself.

1 Corinthians 11:27, 29, RSV

One cannot be guilty of profaning a person’s body and blood by mishandling a symbol of them. Paul adds that this is why some of the Corinthians are ill and some have died, a physical consequence he draws from failing to discern what is present. He asks earlier, “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ?” (1 Cor. 10:16). His answer assumes a reality, not a picture.

VII. The Last Supper Was Offered as a Sacrifice

There is a further feature of the institution accounts that the Watchtower's treatment never confronts: their vocabulary is sacrificial from end to end. Jesus speaks of His blood "poured out," the standard language of the altar, where the priest poured the victim's blood at its base (Lev. 4:7). He calls the cup "the blood of the covenant," the exact phrase Moses used at Sinai while ratifying the covenant with the blood of sacrifice: "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord has made with you" (Ex. 24:8). And He speaks in the present tense—"This is my body which *is given* for you... This cup which *is poured out* for you" (Luke 22:19–20)—not of a body that will be given the next afternoon, but of an offering under way at that table.

Even the command "do this" carries the freight. The Greek verb *poiein*, in the Old Testament Greek the apostles knew, is repeatedly the verb of sacrificial offering: "Now this is what you shall *offer* upon the altar: two lambs a year old day by day continually" (Ex. 29:38); "Draw near to the altar, and *offer* your sin offering and your burnt offering" (Lev. 9:7). Joined to *anamnesis*, the sacrificial "remembrance" we have already met, the command reads as the institution of an offering: do this as my memorial sacrifice. That is why the earliest Christians—as Section XI will show—were calling the rite a sacrifice within living memory of the apostles, and applying to it Malachi's prophecy of a pure offering made in every place among the nations (Mal. 1:11).

This is the sense in which the Church calls the Mass a sacrifice, and the only sense: "The Eucharist is thus a sacrifice because it re-presents (makes present) the sacrifice of the cross, because it is its memorial and because it applies its fruit" (CCC 1366). Not a new sacrifice; the same one, doing in every generation what the Passover did for Israel.

VIII. How Often: The Practice of the Apostles

The same letter settles frequency. Paul writes "as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup" (1 Cor. 11:26), language no one would use of a once-yearly observance. Luke reports that the first believers devoted themselves to "the breaking of bread" along with the apostles' teaching and the prayers, and that they did so day by day (Acts 2:42, 46), and that the disciples at Troas gathered to break bread "on the first day of the week" (Acts 20:7). The apostolic practice was continual, and it had already moved from the Jewish calendar to the Lord's day.

Read the whole Corinthian passage and the annual theory becomes impossible. Paul's complaint is about what happens "when you assemble as a church": "When you meet together, it is not the Lord's supper that you eat. For in eating, each one goes ahead with his own meal, and one is hungry and another is drunk" (1 Cor. 11:18, 20–21). These are habits—abuses that had settled into a pattern serious enough to reach Paul's ears and

require a ruling. Habits do not form around one night a year. And his remedy is a standing rule for a recurring assembly: “So then, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another” (1 Cor. 11:33). Nothing in the chapter reads like instructions for an anniversary; all of it reads like the regulation of the congregation’s ordinary worship.

The detail in Acts 20:7 points the same way. Luke troubles to name the day—“on the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread”—and the detail has no point unless that was the day such gatherings were held. “The breaking of bread” was already the rite’s technical name, and within two generations the *Didache* is giving the same instruction as a standing ordinance: “every Lord’s day gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanksgiving.”

There is even a Scriptural difficulty with the spirit of the annual argument itself. The apostle who said “as often as” also warned his converts against anxious calendar-keeping as a return to the shadows: “You observe days, and months, and seasons, and years! I am afraid I have labored over you in vain” (Gal. 4:10–11); “let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink or with regard to a festival or a new moon or a sabbath. These are only a shadow of what is to come; but the substance belongs to Christ” (Col. 2:16–17). A rite whose validity is made to hang on hitting one lunar date each spring has re-entered exactly the shadow-keeping Paul feared—and has done so in the name of the man who wrote those sentences.

IX. Nisan 14 and the Calendar the Argument Forgets

The annual argument depends on its date, so the date deserves a closer look than the Society’s literature gives it—the address again read correctly, the calendar behind it unvisited. In first-century Judaism the Passover lambs were slaughtered in the temple on the afternoon of Nisan 14, and the meal was eaten after sundown—which, by the Jewish reckoning in which each day begins at sunset, was no longer Nisan 14 but Nisan 15. The Gospels reflect that sequence: “And on the first day of Unleavened Bread, when they sacrificed the passover lamb,” the disciples asked where to prepare (Mark 14:12); “Then came the day of Unleavened Bread, on which the passover lamb had to be sacrificed” (Luke 22:7). The preparation belonged to the day of sacrifice; the supper that evening fell on the next Jewish date. The Society’s own study edition feels the pressure: its note on Matthew 26:17 allows that “on the first day of” could be rendered “on the day before.” But Luke’s wording forecloses the escape—the day of sacrifice had *come*, not merely drawn near. If the Lord’s command really bound His followers to a calendar date, the Watchtower has arguably chosen the wrong one.

The deeper problem is that no one today can reconstruct the first-century date at all. Nisan was fixed by observation—witnesses sighting the new moon, the authorities in

Jerusalem intercalating the year as needed—and the calculated calendar the Jewish community now uses was adopted centuries later. A modern observance pinned to “Nisan 14” is pinned to a reconstruction, computed by methods no first-century Jew used. And when the early Church did argue about the Pasch—the Quartodeciman controversy of the second century—the dispute was over which day the annual *feast of Easter* should be kept, the fourteenth or the following Sunday. It was not a dispute about how often to break bread. The weekly Eucharist stood on both sides of that quarrel; Justin’s description of the Sunday assembly, written in the middle of it, is quoted in Section XI. Had anyone in the second century believed the Lord’s Supper was an annual observance, that controversy is where the belief would have surfaced. It surfaces nowhere.

X. Who May Partake

The question of who may partake is graver still. Christ’s words are not an invitation extended to a class but a condition laid on everyone: *unless* you eat and drink, you have no life in you. A system in which the great majority of members deliberately decline what Christ commanded (passing the bread and the cup along untouched year after year) must hold that His condition does not apply to them. Scripture offers no such exemption. Indeed the commission runs the other way: disciples as such were to be taught “to observe all that I have commanded you” (Matt. 28:19–20), and the Supper is one of the things He commanded. Paul, writing to congregations of ordinary believers, assumes without argument that all of them eat and drink: “as often as *you* eat this bread”—the whole church at Corinth, not a class within it.

The exemption rests entirely on the Watchtower’s two-class reading of Revelation’s 144,000, and that reading fails on the book’s own terms. The number is drawn from a chapter of deliberate symbols—twelve tribes squared, multiplied by a thousand—and in the same vision the “great multitude which no man could number” stands in the same place as the sealed: “before the throne and before the Lamb” (Rev. 7:9), which is where the Watchtower says the great crowd can never go. The companion pages *Who are Jesus’ Other Sheep?* and *Heavens Above!* examine that system in full. Here it is enough to notice what it costs: it requires roughly nine hundred ninety-nine of every thousand Witnesses to sit before the emblems Christ said give life, and decline them.

XI. The First Christians Left a Record

If a literal presence were a later corruption, there should be an earlier and plainer stratum without it. There is not. Ignatius of Antioch, writing about A.D. 107 on his way to martyrdom, complains that certain heretics “abstain from the Eucharist ... because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Savior Jesus Christ.” That is not a man

defending a novelty; he is treating the doctrine as the settled test of orthodoxy, and using it against those who deny it.

Justin Martyr, describing Christian worship to a pagan emperor about A.D. 155, says the food is “not as common bread and common drink” but the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus. He also tells the emperor when the Christians meet: “And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place,” where the memoirs of the apostles are read, bread and wine are brought, the president offers prayers and thanksgivings, and there is a distribution to each—with a portion sent by the deacons to those absent. Weekly, not annually; and the description is offered casually, as common knowledge about what Christians everywhere do. Irenaeus, who had known Polycarp, himself a disciple of the apostle John, argues against the Gnostics precisely from the reality of the Eucharist. The *Didache*, perhaps the oldest Christian document outside the New Testament, already calls the rite a *sacrifice*: “every Lord’s day gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanksgiving after having confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure”—and it applies to that sacrifice Malachi’s prophecy of the pure offering made among the nations.

Notice what this record contains: the reality of the body and blood, the weekly Lord’s-day observance, and the name *sacrifice*—every element the Watchtower calls a corruption—present in documents written while men who had heard the apostles still lived, asserted without argument, as things already settled. A corruption needs time, and it leaves a quarrel behind it. Here there is no time for it to have happened in, and no trace of the quarrel.

XII. Two Remaining Objections

“This means my body.” The Greek *estin* is the ordinary verb “is.” The translators of the *New World Translation* render it “is” throughout the New Testament; the departure to “means” occurs where the doctrine requires it. That is not translating a text but adjusting it. In the NWT’s rendering of the institution itself, the adjustment must be made twice in one sentence: “This means my body, which is to be given in your behalf. Keep doing this in remembrance of me” (Luke 22:19, NWT)—where the future “is to be given” must also replace the present tense Luke wrote, because a body being given *at that table* is precisely what the symbolic reading cannot allow. The appeal to “I am the door” does not help either: no one hearing it thought Jesus was made of wood, and no one left Him over it. Here they did.

The prohibition on blood. The command given to Noah and repeated in the Law forbids consuming the blood of slaughtered animals, whose life belongs to God. The Eucharist is not that. It is not the natural manner of eating flesh and drinking blood

(which is why the Church has always rejected the charge of cannibalism) but a sacramental manner, the risen and glorified Christ giving Himself under the appearances of bread and wine. Above all, the objection proves too much: it would convict Christ of commanding what God forbade, in John 6 and at the Last Supper alike. Faced with that, the reasonable conclusion is not that He cannot have meant it, but that the prohibition was never about Him.

XIII. The Reply in Brief

Every objection above turns on reading a plain word as a figure of speech, and the difficulty is that the New Testament will not cooperate. When the crowd at Capernaum took Jesus literally and left over it, He let them go and asked the Twelve whether they would go too, which is not how a man behaves when He has merely been misunderstood. When Paul warns that eating unworthily makes a person guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, the guilt has to attach to something more than a wafer standing for an absent thing.

And the reading is not one the Church arrived at late. The men close enough to the apostles to have known them (Ignatius by about 107, Justin by 155, Irenaeus by 180) describe the Eucharist in terms no symbolic account can absorb, and describe it without argument, as something already settled. If the literal understanding were a later corruption, there ought to be a record of the earlier one it replaced, and of the quarrel when it was introduced. There is no such record. What the record shows is a Church that believed this from the beginning.

The verdict this site has reached about other Watchtower teachings holds here as well: what is true in it is not unique, and what is unique in it is not true. That Christ died once for all, that He commanded a memorial—this is common Christian ground, held by the Church more firmly than by her critics. What is unique to the Watchtower—the once-a-year observance resting on a miscounted calendar, the “means” written into the text, the table barred to all but one in a thousand—survives contact with neither Scripture nor history.

If the Church is right about this, the Mass is not a ceremony recalling something distant but the closest a human being comes to Calvary this side of heaven, offered daily, and open to anyone who will receive it. That is worth examining carefully before it is dismissed. The pages of this site on the New World Translation, the Great Apostasy, the other sheep, and the Watchtower’s blood doctrine carry the companion arguments; the references at the end of the Memorial page are a good place to go deeper.

Endnotes

1. The Watchtower's teaching is set out in *Insight on the Scriptures* (Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania, 1988), Vol. 2, entry "Lord's Evening Meal"; *Reasoning From the Scriptures* (1985; rev. 1989), entries "Lord's Evening Meal" and "Mass"; and *What Does the Bible Really Teach?* (2005). The Society publishes fresh study articles, with worldwide attendance and partaker figures, each year before Nisan 14.
2. New World Translation quotations—"Take, eat. This means my body" (Matthew 26:26) and "This means my body, which is to be given in your behalf. Keep doing this in remembrance of me" (Luke 22:19)—are taken from the Study Edition at jw.org, as is the study note on Matthew 26:17 allowing "on the day before" as an alternative rendering.
3. Unless otherwise noted, Scripture quotations are from the Revised Standard Version, Catholic Edition.
4. On the Passover kept as present participation: Exodus 12:14; 13:8. The Haggadah's principle that in every generation one must regard oneself as having personally come out of Egypt descends from the Mishnah (Pesachim 10) and remains in the seder liturgy; it is summarized here rather than quoted.
5. *Catechism of the Catholic Church* 1362–1367 on the Eucharist as memorial and sacrifice; CCC 1085 on the Paschal mystery transcending time; CCC 1367 quotes the Council of Trent (DS 1743).
6. Augustine, Letter 98 (to Boniface), 9, written A.D. 408; translation from the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers series, text at newadvent.org.
7. On the sacrificial vocabulary of the institution narratives: blood poured out at the altar's base, Leviticus 4:7; "the blood of the covenant," Exodus 24:8; *poiein* as the verb of offering in the Septuagint, Exodus 29:38 and Leviticus 9:7; *anamnesis* as sacrificial remembrance, Numbers 10:10 and Hebrews 10:3; the pure offering among the nations, Malachi 1:11.
8. Ignatius of Antioch, *Letter to the Smyrnaeans* 6–7 (c. A.D. 107); see also *Letter to the Romans* 7 and *Letter to the Philadelphians* 4. Texts in William A. Jurgens, *The Faith of the Early Fathers*, Vol. 1.
9. Justin Martyr, *First Apology* 65–67 (c. A.D. 155): the elements "not as common bread and common drink" (ch. 66); "And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place..." with the reading, the eucharistic prayer, the distribution, and the deacons' portion for the absent (ch. 67); translation from the Ante-Nicene Fathers series.

10. *Didache* 14, Ante-Nicene Fathers translation: “But every Lord’s day gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanksgiving after having confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure,” with Malachi 1:11 applied to the rite. On “breaking bread” as the rite’s name, compare Acts 2:42, 46 and 20:7, and Ignatius, *Letter to the Ephesians* 20.

11. On the Passover chronology: the slaughter of the lambs on the afternoon of Nisan 14 and the eating of the meal after sundown (hence on Nisan 15 by Jewish reckoning) was the practice of mainline first-century Judaism and remains the Jewish reckoning today; compare Mark 14:12 and Luke 22:7. The observational fixing of Nisan in the Second Temple period, and the later adoption of the calculated calendar, are common historical ground. On the Quartodeciman controversy as a dispute over the day of the annual Pascha rather than the frequency of the Eucharist, see Eusebius, *Church History* 5.23–25.

12. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 4.18.4–5 and 5.2.2–3, arguing from the Eucharist against the Gnostics; on his link to the apostle John through Polycarp, *Against Heresies* 3.3.4.

13. The Watchtower’s two-class system, and the readings of Revelation 7 and 14 on which it rests, are examined on this site’s pages *Who are Jesus’ Other Sheep?* and *Heavens Above!*; the blood doctrine on *Blood: A Question of Life*; the apostasy narrative on *Was There a Great Apostasy?*; the translation on *The New World Translation: A Version to Fit a Doctrine*.

For Further Reading

Jesus and the Jewish Roots of the Eucharist—Unlocking the Secrets of the Last Supper, by Brant Pitre.

The Lamb’s Supper—The Mass as Heaven on Earth, by Scott Hahn.

The Fourth Cup—Unveiling the Mystery of the Last Supper and the Cross, by Scott Hahn.

The Hidden Manna—A Theology of the Eucharist, by James T. O’Connor.

The Mass of the Early Christians, by Mike Aquilina.

This Is My Body—An Evangelical Discovers the Real Presence, by Mark P. Shea.

Eucharist, by Robert Barron.

The Faith of the Early Fathers—Volumes 1, 2, and 3, by William A. Jurgens.

And he took bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it and gave it to them, saying, “This is my body which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me.”

Luke 22:19

* * *

*Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit,
as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be,
world without end. Amen.*

Copyright and Distribution

© 2026 Richard Whiting. All rights reserved.

This essay may be reproduced and distributed freely, in printed or electronic form, provided that it is reproduced in whole and without alteration, and that the author’s name is retained. Excerpts may be quoted in reviews, scholarly works, or other writings consistent with fair use, with attribution.

A Note on Authority

This essay represents the author’s articulation of *the Catholic understanding of the Lord’s Supper as the memorial of Christ’s one sacrifice, in answer to the Watchtower’s annual Memorial*, drawing on Scripture, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, the Church Fathers, and the major theological tradition. It is offered as a personal defense, not as an official statement of the Church’s teaching. Where this defense is fortunate enough to align with the magisterial teaching of the Church, the credit belongs to the tradition that formed it. Where it falls short, the responsibility is the author’s alone.