

## THE PASSOVER

---

(Inaudible) . . . and frequently going to perform by your command. And you want these things to be ordained in such a way that everything about you will center the minds of people in the Atonement, above all other things. Now how could you do better than those two things? It is possible to deny that the ordinance that is in the gospel that would be the equal of either sacrifice or sacrament to these people everlastingly paying attention to the fact that Jesus was crucified. Can you think of anything better than that? Now this does not answer all of our questions, but we could tell you the references. Why is it that we have sacrifice from Adam to Christ, and why is it that we have sacrament from Christ to now? Why is it that one of them goes before and one of them comes after? What is the difference? It would be a lot easier to have sacrament all along, wouldn't it? Quite a little bit of trouble involved in getting an animal and building an altar and building a fire and killing the animal and losing that much by way of temporal necessity and burning it on the altar. Why didn't we have sacrament all along? Why did we have two different ordinances?

Comment: Sacrifice, for one thing, would have been much more dramatic.

**BRM:** Sacrifice maybe would have been a lot more dramatic than eating a piece of bread and drinking a cup of water.

Comment: Well, sacrifice was meant to bring to mind that which was to take place, and sacrament is to bring to mind that which did take place.

**BRM:** Well, that is true. That is absolutely right. But suppose he had said to Adam, "I am going to atone for the sins of the world and let us have the sacrament to remind you of my spilt blood and my broken flesh." He could have done that. What you said is right.

Comment: Well, sacrifice teaches the concept about the Father's blessings which would cover your needs, shed his blood.

**BRM:** Right. And the sacrament says, I will drink of this wine to remind me that he shed his blood. Then what is the broken bread because the flesh was his.

Comment: It appears that before the sacrament really becomes a principle in our lives, we must make a sacrifice ourselves, the before and after concept.

**BRM:** I think you have got something there.

Comment: I am thinking that they were not quite as clear in the mind as what he would want, and thus the sacrifice would make things more clear in their minds that the Firstborn of the Father, and so forth, what he was.

**BRM:** There might be an element of that in that it more clearly dramatizes it to a mind who has not seen what did, in fact, transpire. If you had your choice, which one would you say? Which one of these is the best ordinance? Sacrifice or sacrament?

Comment: Both.

**BRM:** Well, sure, they are both, so they are both because the Lord did it that way.

Comment: The Lord probably wanted one ordinance to point forward and one to point back so that they both centered on it. Historically, it took place at a certain time.

Comment: Yes, and the fact of the matter is that we, knowing both ordinances, get some amplified understanding of what is involved even though we only practice one of them. We can at least read about and visualize what was involved in the previous type.

Comment: Now there is the physical and there is the spiritual. Sacrifice brings out the physical factor of the Atonement and the sacrament, that demonstrates the spiritual implications of it.

**BRM:** Well now, maybe you might say that, but really what I would like to do is enlarge the concept of sacrifice to show that it also was bringing out those spiritual things. Now I do not know which one of these is the best ordinance. They are the best for before and after the Fall. But there is some element of sacrifice, in a sense, being superior, in that it more wholly and wholly demonstrates and symbolizes what it is going to be that the sacrament does. Maybe that is not that correct. But in any event, there is an element in sacrifice that is not present in sacrament. What is it?

Comment: The shedding of blood. There could be no forgiveness of sins without the shedding of blood.

**BRM:** Well, no, there is the element of shedding of blood here—the spilt blood. You drink the wine.

Comment: See, that is the life in this one.

**BRM:** Yes, if that is the life . . . (inaudible).

Comment: Well, in Third Nephi, he talked about the sacrifice of burnt offerings and he went on to say that ye shall offer for your sacrifice unto me a humble heart and a contrite spirit.

**BRM:** You are changing the type of sacrifice. From now on, the sacrifice is a broken heart and a contrite spirit, right. But what is the element that is present in our offering sacrifice that is not present in our offering sacrament?

Comment: It hits the pocketbook.

**BRM:** It hurts the pocketbook. There are two usages of this word sacrifice. You actually gave me a sacrifice, didn't you?

Comment: Yes, but nowadays you pay tithing.

**BRM:** No. We are talking about two ordinances here now, one is sacrament and one is sacrifice. And you paid tithing in the days of sacrifices in the same way. Now between these two ordinances, between these two ordinances, you actually did make a sacrifice. How much is a fine bullock worth on the present market?

Comment: Hundreds of dollars.

**BRM:** Hundreds of dollars. Comparably, it was so anciently. Every time they sacrificed something they would signify by the fact that they were willing to give up the animal that they put first in their lives the things of God's kingdom, and they were willing to, for all practical purposes, throw away the thousand dollars the several hundred dollars that might be involved in the value of the animal. So there is something added here, in that sense, that is not always added here, it is not added here, and I guess this means we have to make it up over here by contributing to the building fund. The purse foots the bill.

Well, all right, let us look at this just a little now. Without reading it, be reminded of the episode in Adam's life. "Why doest thou offer sacrifice?" the angel said. "I know not save that God has commanded me." Then the angel says that this thing is a "similitude" of the sacrifice of the Only Begotten. Now in a sense, you call upon God and do all things in the name of the Son. Most of these things are in similitude. But open to the 34<sup>th</sup> chapter of Alma, and let us read this much about sacrifice. Alma, the 34<sup>th</sup> chapter, the eighth verse. Alma is strong on this testifying business. Time and again he tells what the prophets say and then he says, now I have told you what the prophets say, let me tell you, I know of myself. And so he now says, "I will testify unto you of myself that these things are true. Behold, I say unto you, that I do know that Christ shall come among the children of men, to take upon him the transgressions of his people, and that he shall atone for the sins of the world; for the Lord God hath spoken it." So this is the setting. The Atonement with the ancient prayer, what Alma knows by revelation. And what is foremost now is testimony, that his testimony is born. "For it is expedient that an Atonement should be made; for according to the great plan of the Eternal God there must be an Atonement made, or else all mankind must unavoidably perish; yea, all are hardened; yea, all are fallen," and so on. There would be no resurrection, no spiritual life, everything would vanish away if there were no Atonement. "It is expedient that there should be a great and last sacrifice." So when we talk about Atonement from the ancient standpoint, we are concerned specifically with the matter of sacrifice, and we still are, but this was the point in their minds: "A great and last sacrifice; yea, not a sacrifice of man (Christ was not a man in the sense here involved, he was a God), neither of beast, neither of any manner of fowl; for it shall not be a human sacrifice (Christ was not human, the part of him that is

involved that enabled him to make out the sacrifice); but it must be an infinite and eternal sacrifice.” That is, the sacrifices of God. Well, he has drawn the analogy here. Every time they sacrifice a fowl or an animal, they have symbolized the infinite and eternal sacrifice. “Now there is not any man that can sacrifice his own blood which will atone for the sins of another,” and so on down to verse thirteen.

It is expedient that there should be a great and last sacrifice, and then shall there be, or it is expedient there should be, a stop to the shedding of blood; then shall the Law of Moses be fulfilled; yea it shall be all fulfilled, every jot and tittle, and none shall have passed away. And behold, this is the whole meaning of the law.

Now we read this, sort of, didn’t we, in Mosiah yesterday? And everything pointed to Christ: “This is the whole meaning of the law, every whir pointing to that great and last sacrifice; and that great and last sacrifice will be the Son of God, yea, infinite and eternal.” Well now, if we could analyze the Law of Moses, there would not be a single thing that they ever did in all that law and in all the rituals and in all the performances, which once operated on this principle, dramatizing and centering their minds in the atoning sacrifice of Christ.

Well, I do not know how you can compare these, but here are same things that seem just a little bit obvious. You could operate the law of sacrifice if the Church consisted of family units, just groups of related people; Abraham and his children, and so on. Well, it is different today. The Church does not operate in family units, but we have great congregations of unrelated people, in a sense. We are not living in the system that they lived in anciently. They lived in the pastoral circumstances where they had their flocks and their herds and the family was together and the family operated as a unit; and Lehi and his family sacrificed as a family. They are partaking of the portion of it that concerns them. We today have great urban populations where this sacrificial system is not available. This thing is pointing forward. It is all centered in a coming, infinite sacrifice. They want to think of a canting sacrifice. Well, this other business is commemorating what has been. It is reminding us of the sacrifice of Christ, since the sacrifice is past. I guess we do not need the same kind of literal, dramatic presentation of what is to be involved in it. We are aware that it took place and we can get our minds centered in it by what maybe people will think a more refined, a more delicate ordinance, a more sensitive ordinance. I think there is a little . . . (inaudible) . . . here in the eyes of some people, but not really in the eternal perspective of things.

Well, I do not know. Now maybe you can figure out some other comparisons. This is very excellent, this place here, that should be noted in Third Nephi—is it the eighth or ninth verse?

Comment: The ninth.

**BRM:** The ninth chapter of Third Nephi, where the principle of sacrifice, which always existed, is carried forward and refined and improved a little in the sense that now you give the sacrifice with a broken heart and a contrite spirit. Well, yes?

Comment: I am just wondering if there is not something else too, that goes along with what that chapter 34 says, the fact that it is to be the great and last sacrifice? In a sense, the people were required to offer sacrifices before, and the fact that the Atonement then rejected that requirement might dramatize this central position.

**BRM:** I think that is logical. It is the great and last sacrifice, it is the crowning thing, it is the crowning thing. On my more standard outline here in my hand, I have written the word, "crowning." It is what you are looking forward to. Its achievement is supreme, just what you say, the great, the last, and they have achieved it now. They have built up. It is the great crescendo building up to the finites of all eternity. And we look back on it now.

Well, the sacrament and the Bread of Life. You do not understand the sacrament unless you understand the ordinance of sacrifice.

Comment: Brother McConkie?

**BRM:** Yes?

Comment: Before you leave this, is there any possibility that in the Old Testament times they did commemorate the sacrament? I am referring to, I think it is chapter 14, where Abraham and Melchizedek break bread and drink wine.

**BRM:** I do not know if there is any way we can prove this and be sure, but in my judgment, there was an isolated instance at least in which they had the sacrament, for some special occasion and really, maybe to prefigure the fact that sacrament was going to be the ordinance. And there may have been some other instances. Maybe they did this in the city of Enoch or somewhere. I would not know. And on that same basis, we are going to have a sacrifice sometime to remind us and complete the restitution of all things that this was part of, not of the Mosaic Law, but of the gospel. I think probably there was apparently one isolated instance, there may have been others, but it was not the universal ordinance, universally spread among the people.

Now when we get talking, we have talked enough about the ordinance of sacrifice here. Our next heading would be the theme of the Passover and, oh, we do not have time to read this in the Old Testament, but Exodus 12 is the main account of the original Passover and supper. Yes?

Comment: I would like to ask at least one last quick question on sacrifice. This point that you made about sacrifice being different from sacrament in the sense that it hurts the pocketbook, were you just commenting in passing, or did I miss a significant point?

**BRM:** No, I was just saying that sacrifice has everything that sacrament does and sacrament has everything that sacrifice does, except that when you offer a sacrifice in addition to all that is here involved, you do make a real sacrifice in the sense that you have contributed your means. It is more of a test to offer a sacrifice than to partake of the

sacrament. It costs you something. That is the only point. I was not getting anything significant out of it except that. It was more of a test to a man to take the very finest thing he had in his whole herd and go offer it as a sacrifice when he loved animals, and all the rest. It is no test for us to take the bread and the water financially, so there is just that added element is all I am saying here.

Comment: Were you using that as a part answer to your question about which is the better ordinance?

**BRM:** I withdraw that question on which was the better ordinance. I was just presenting that to get you thinking on what is involved. Now obviously, this is the better ordinance here and this is the better ordinance here because the Lord did it. And what we are trying to do is figure out reasons why he would use one at one time and one at another.

Comment: You have suggested something when you spoke of sacrifice with the operation of a family. Now if you think of Israel beginning with Adam, in the sense that he was an Israelite in a spiritual sense, sacrifice is related to Israel. The sacrament begins at the coming of the times of the Gentiles again. In a sense, this can become a kind of Gentile, burgeoning sacrifice, or something which the Gentiles can participate in.

**BRM:** Well, I think that is pretty good. That is saying a little differently the concept that I had in mind here. You can run the short distances when it is a family organization, then you run it when the Gentiles and everybody brought in—that is sensible and right.

Well, we are not through exactly with that, but let us be reminded here: the Feast of the Passover. Now what concerns us particularly about the Feast of the Passover is it had become, at the time of Jesus' ministry, one of the key dramatic occasions on which the nation as a whole offered sacrifice and kept this thing so that they were, on the occasion of the Feast of the Passover, fulfilling the law of sacrifice that God had given them. Now it is a little different here. The Feast of the Passover pertains to the Mosaic law and not to the gospel of sacrifice in its larger sense; and yet, that is what is involved. This Law of Sacrifice is what is involved. So we come to the occasion in the life of Jesus, which is right here in this center. And on this occasion, he is going to keep the Feast of the Passover. So he is going to comply with the law of ancient ordinances that God has given. And in this account, in Exodus 12, you read such things as that they sacrificed and shed the blood and that they took the firstlings of their flocks. And you read that this feast lasted for a week and that they had a holy convocation on the first day and a holy convocation on the last day, and you get a picture of what they did and how they ate at supper. And the eating of this supper, or this meal, they ate all the lamb that was killed. And if they did not—every family by itself apart—and if there was some of it left, they had to burn it in the fire. Well, this thing, the Passover now, is what they were doing on this occasion.

And we want to talk now about what they were doing on that occasion when the sacrament was introduced. Our next heading, however, would be that the disciples arranged for the Passover meal. They are actually going to eat a supper—the Passover

meal. Now this is page 703 in our text and we are not taking the time now just to go in and analyze this, but this is the occasion where Jesus exercised seeric vision and told them to go to such and such a place and someone would meet them and take them to the upper roan and say the master has meat and prepare the supper and make all things ready, which they did. Well, so now let us come down to this matter of Jesus introducing the ordinance of sacrament. This is page 716. Now here is something that is extremely interesting to me. I did not know this (whether it is true or false), until I was doing research to write this commentary and then when it did get through I thought, this is quite a glorious illustration of how the Lord operates in the affairs of men and in religious affairs. He just does it automatically and easily without some great event transpiring that sets it out, apart from everything else. It just seems like what he is doing is normal, and natural and it just flows along. Now this, as a matter of fact, is how he will be doing a lot of things, and how he is. We read the isolated statements about the Second Coming, and we think a dramatic event here and a dramatic event there, when in fact these things are just flowing naturally along in our historical sequence of events. And it seems to us as though it is a normal thing. Well now, that is how this sacrament got started, and we will take a look at this. But before I relate this, this circle in the center is really the center of religion since. This is the occasion when there is a whole law of the ancients, symbolically—a symbolical occasion, when the whole law of the ancient people and when the whole law for the future commence. But this is the one occasion, the one place, that upper room, where two things transpired at once. Everybody who went before had sacrifice, everybody who comes after has sacrament. But in this one instance, they had both sacrifice and sacrament. And so we have Jesus on that occasion fulfilling what went before, doing the symbolical act that fulfills all of the law of old; he is going to do the actual act in the Garden after his arrest and on the cross. And as he did the thing that fulfilled all that went before, he also did the thing that introduced the new law for all of the future.

Comment: Brother McConkie?

**BRM:** Yes?

Comment: The Jews had animal sacrifices? Is that . . . (inaudible)?

**BRM:** No, the way they were doing it in Jesus' day, they were performing the animal sacrifice outside. The legal, authorized administrators who were empowered to do it were doing it for the family of Israel at the appointed time, slaying the paschal lamb. And then they were going, I guess, maybe, it would not be unfair to say that they had, by this time, twisted and perverted the mechanics of the ordinance a little and because they were somewhat in the apostate condition, they were not following the same procedures as they are. They have had a week of this celebration; they have been offering these sacrifices and there is a little time element difference if they were offering the sacrifices with the lamb and they are continuing the eating of it in their ritual and the unleavened bread and so on in that separate family unit. So the sacrifices were being offered and they were being offered by legal administrators who held the Priesthood in direct descension from Aaron.

Now let us make ourselves a little comparison between the Passover and the sacrament. And see if the point that I was hoping to make of how things just easily and naturally flow from one dispensation to the next. On page 716, you will look at this and you will have it before you as I put something on the board. 716 begins the article on Jesus introducing the sacrament. Now what will dramatize this is over on page 720. And this is quotations from Dummelow. He is a pretty good commentator, as sectarian commentators go. Now, there is about a page of quotes here, but we will see how it goes. The rituals and performances followed in celebrating the Passover were a perfect setting for the introduction of the new gospel ordinance of the sacrament. The Passover formalities, emitting a few details, are summarized by Dummelow as follows. And then there is a list of 11 successive things that the Jews did when they got together to eat the Feast of the Passover. And there the first thing that they did (certain of them we will single out), they took a cup of wine and they blessed it and they drank it. It was blessed and it was drunk. Now this is quite an interesting thing. Their ritual, they followed it carefully and exactly. Then there were some other things that they did. The next four steps that are listed here are then their hands were washed, they took bitter herbs, emblematic of the sojourn in Egypt and so on, the son of the house at the origin of the observance poles. The lamb and the burnt offering were placed on the table and they sang the quotations from the Psalms, and then the sixth successive thing that they did was this: they took a cup of wine and they blessed it and it was drunk. That is the second time that they do that. Then the next thing that they did, they took unleavened bread and they—and this is even more interesting than blessing of an ancient cup—they broke the bread, they blessed the bread, they ate the bread, part of the Passover ceremony. Then number eight, preliminaries being thus ended, the feast proceeded at leisure until all was consumed. Now here is an actual supper. They actually eat; this is symbolical of eating all of the lamb in the days of Moses. And so it is about . . . (inaudible) . . . into the fire, they ate everything, so there is an actual meal involved. And then at the end of the meal, number nine, they have this same thing over. They took the cup, they blessed it, that is the wine, and the contents were drunk following the blessing. And then, number ten, wait a minute, no, this is nine; they had this supper and drank of this cup, then number nine; and number ten, they took another cup and they blessed it and they drank it. Now in this Passover service then, there are four formal ritualistic ordinance occasions when they took a cup of wine and they blessed it and they drank it. And here is one occasion in the ceremony where they took bread and they broke it and they blessed it and they ate the bread.

All right, Jesus is going through this in an upper room and he is doing it officially to fulfill the law because he complied with the law. In his whole life in everything that he did he complied with the law. So if these commentators have analyzed this correctly, and I suppose they have, Jesus went through each one of those steps in order to fulfill the law, and as he did it, he modified some things. He made some changes. Now I do not know. Maybe I am overstating it when I say he made some changes. Maybe what he did is make some clarifying in purpose and comment that showed them really what they were doing, in that they had lost the complete knowledge of what they were doing. And when he got down here to number seven—and this is seemingly pretty clear what happened. You can note from these quotations from Dummelow when he got down here at number seven, he broke bread, he blessed it, and they ate the bread. But the new thing that he does, which is

either wholly new or else explanatory of what they had been doing symbolically without fully comprehending it, he says, “Take, eat. This do in remembrance of my body.” This do in remembrance of me, I am going to be sacrificed now like the Pascal lambs were being sacrificed, and you will do this in remembrance of me. Well, this is pretty good, isn’t it? They were doing it, weren’t they, for all practical purposes over here in anticipation of the sacrifice that was to be. This is in anticipation of the great and last sacrifice. And so he just simply takes this ordinance that they had in full operation and twists and changes it a little and simplifies it and modifies it and makes it an ordinance that looks back—it is very realistically . . . (inaudible) . . . He just modified Passover and made it into sacrament. And they got down here to number nine on this list and when he got to number nine, what he did was take the cup and he blessed the cup and they drank the wine and he says, “This do in remembrance of me and my shed blood.” Well, that is not bad, is it, do you think, what he introduced? Everybody thinks he went up into that—I suppose they think, at least I thought this, until I got into this particular research here and introduced the sacrament in the upper room. Well, put yourself in the position of these twelve now. What were they doing? They were celebrating the Feast of the Passover. They had done it over and over before. They knew that they were going to have four occasions where they blessed the cup of wine and drank it and one occasion where they broke the unleavened bread and they blessed it. And so it would seem like if they had been spiritually . . . it would seem like to them that he was just paraphrasing a little and changing a little the ordinance that they had all along, which he was. But on the other hand, they being spiritually enlightened, would discover that now the ordinance was new and was changed and was to be everlastingly the sacrament. Well, yes?

Comment: Well, in the 12<sup>th</sup> chapter of Exodus, it says that the Passover is supposed to be eternal and is supposed to be forever. Can we then assume that the sacrament is a continuation of the Passover?

**BRM:** I guess you can if you want, but this is one of the very interesting things about the usage of the word eternal. It does not mean forever, it just really does not. Now a better illustration of that than Passover is circumcision. Just out and out categorically and positively the ancient revelations say circumcision is to be an eternal ordinance. Well, if you take that to mean that it is going to last forever, you do and you do not get the right concept. Now I think what that means is—it just has to mean this—when it says circumcision is an eternal ordinance, it means it is God’s ordinance. It is like He does with eternal life. Eternal life is God’s life. Well, this Passover is an eternal ordinance in the sense that it is God’s ordinance. And like circumcision, it is going to pass away, even though it is an eternal ordinance, with that particular meaning of eternal, not the meaning of things going on forever. And yet there is an element of what you say. It did continue on in a sense and in a manner of speaking, in its essential part.

Now our time is gone. Let us see. There is one other major thing that we wanted to talk about, which we will not have time to do and I will just tell you what it was. The other major thing that is of real importance and concern to us in the consideration of this subject, is to take baptism and put it in one column, and the sacrament and put it in the other column, and having in mind that original diagram where the death, burial and

resurrection were tied in to the symbolism of the Atonement. Then, to consider the covenant that is involved in each of these ordinances. And for instance, if you look in the 18<sup>th</sup> chapter of Mosiah, and divide up those statements any way you want, you can divide into four, five, six, or seven. I divided into seven, but it does not make any difference. You can combine some of them and for all practical purposes, it says, "I covenant to do this, this, this, this, this and this." And in return, the Lord says, "And I promise to give this and this." Well, if you really want to get the concept in mind, then you turn to the sacramental prayer. And in those sacramental prayers, you covenant to do one, two, three, which in essence (and you can follow it out pretty closely) are the same things that you agreed to do over here. And in return, the Lord says, "And I will give you precisely the same thing." So what you do in the sacrament ordinance is renew the covenants made in the waters of baptism. You take upon yourself the name of Christ by baptism, you renew that covenant when you partake of the sacrament, you promise to keep the commandments in baptism, you covenant to keep the commandments in the sacrament. In baptism, the Lord says, "Ye shall have eternal life. I will pour out my spirit more abundantly upon you." In the sacrament, you get the promise that you will always have his spirit to be with you and you get the promise again of eternal life. "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life and I will raise him up at the last day," and we are back again to the Bread of Life concept, which is one of conformity and obedience. Now that is an analysis that we are not making, but in future may.

And then one concluding thing which is not as understood as it ought to be understood; and that is that forgiveness of sins comes through baptism. And on that same basis, forgiveness of sins comes through partaking worthily of the sacrament. And the way you reason that out and know that that is the case is this: there is no forgiveness of sins in baptism except you get the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost washes sin away, the baptism of fire. The way your sins are remitted in baptism is to get the baptism of fire, meaning the Holy Spirit comes into your life and washes sin out. All right, if the Holy Ghost comes into your life on a renewed occasion when you partake of the sacrament, that being the promise, to have his spirit, then you have again placed yourself in tune with the Lord because the Spirit will not dwell in an unclean tabernacle. And so you have done a renewed thing, that got the Spirit into your life, and therefore, you are in tune and in harmony; you are in "at-one-ment," as the expression is, with God again. And as a consequence, forgiveness of sins has came into your life again. Now, this is the same principle that is involved, where it says you get forgiveness of sins when the elders administer to you, in the book of James. If you have committed any sin, they are remitted in connection with administering to the Saints. And it is on this same principle of getting in tune with the Spirit.

Well, we are a minute over, we will have to stop.