

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE CHURCHMAN."

DEAR SIR,—Surely the perception of the true meaning of John xix. 11, discussed in your last issue, is *not* so much a matter of scholarship, as of "common sense"?

Was not the "power" ("authority," *ἐξουσία*) possessed by Pilate, one that "was ordained of God," as in Romans xiii. 1, 2? ¹ In which case, he could *not* well *avoid* "trying" any one brought before him, as was Jesus Christ. Hence, he was not to blame (was *not* sinful) for so doing. And "For this reason" ² our Lord said, "He that delivered ("betrayed" ³) Me unto thee, hath the greater sin." ⁴ Where is there any difficulty, or anything lacking in such an explanation?

I have read with much interest the article on The doctrine of "The Presence," and the result agrees with the doctrine of our Prayer Book and Articles. But surely the *first* thing for a Protestant to inquire is *not*, What does the Church of England teach, or any of the old Protestants, but What is the teaching of the *New Testament*, *i.e.*, "What does the Holy Spirit say unto the Churches"? Now there are two or three points about the ordinance of the Lord's Supper which seem to me to have generally *escaped* the notice of Protestants.

(1) The *objects* respecting which our Lord spake at the Institution were NOT His *united* "Body-and-Blood," but "His Body *given-in-sacrifice-for-us*," and "His Blood-*shed-for-us*";—two *separate*, inanimate, material objects, resulting from His death and blood-shedding on the cross. In fact, when Christ died as "our Paschal Lamb," it *necessitated* the Institution by Him of a *new* "Paschal Supper,"—the *second* part of the complete ordinance of "Christ our Passover,"—at which the "sacrificed Body" of "the Lamb of God" *must*, in some way, be "eaten" by us. And, if the "Sacrifice" was a *literal* one, so must "the Supper" be,—"eaten with the *mouth*." And the fact that the bread and the wine ARE our Lord's "sacrificed Body" and "shed Blood," is *demonstrated* by the fact that they were *separately* "given," "taken," and "eaten" and "drunk," at an *interval* of time, thus "showing, declaring the *death* of the Lord" in the past,—"till He (the now-*living* Lord) come."

(2) The verbs "eat" and "drink" occur thirteen or fourteen times in connection with the accounts of the Institution, and an unbiased study is *bound* to admit that these two commands of our Lord refer *exclusively* to acts performed with the *mouth*, *i.e.*, the *only* method in which He bade us "eat" and "drink" *anything*

¹ Cp. Matt. xxi. 23.

² διὰ τοῦτο, cp. Jn. vii. 22.

³ For ὁ παραδιδούς,—"the traitor," cp. Matt. xxvi. 48; Jn. xviii. 2, 5; xxi. 20. And compare ὁ κλέπτης,—"the thief," in Eph. iv. 28.

⁴ Cp. Matt. xxvi. 25; xxvii. 2, 3, 4.

at the Supper, was with the *mouth*. Hence, if we are to "eat our Lord's Sacrificed Body," and "to drink His shed Blood" *at all* at the Supper, we must do so with the mouth.

(3) Our Lord did *not* bid us "eat" and "drink" "His Body" and "His Blood" *directly*, but *indirectly*,¹ *i.e.*, He did *not* say, "Take, eat My Body, etc.," and "Drink ye all My Blood, etc.,"; but He said, "Take, and eat *this* (object, bread), for *This* is My Body, etc.,"; and "Drink ye all of *this* (object, wine), for *This* is My Blood, etc." The *only* method in which He intended us to "eat His Body," was by "eating that which He said was His Body,—the *bread* ; and the *only* method in which He intended us to "drink His Blood," was by "drinking that which He said WAS His Blood,"—the *wine*. And if, as we have seen, the verbs "eat" and "drink" invariably mean "eat" and "drink" with the *mouth*, it is obvious that by "His Body" and "His Blood" He *could not* have meant any "inward and spiritual *grace*," or "spiritual food," which *cannot* possibly be "eaten" and "drunk" with the mouth.

The *only* method in which "the Body" and "the Blood" of Christ *can* be separately "eaten" and "drunk" with the *mouth*, at an interval of time,—*in* and *by* the "eating" and "drinking" of the separate, material, visible objects which our Lord said WERE that "Body" and "Blood," *is* upon the assumption that the bread and the wine ARE the *substitutes* of His "sacrificed Body" and "shed Blood." In this case *only* is "the eating of the *bread*" the "eating of the sacrificed *Body*," and "the drinking of the *wine*" is "the drinking of the shed *Blood*." Just as "the taking of *twelve pence*" is "the taking of *one shilling*,"; and "the taking of twenty shillings" is "the taking of one pound." And this is the *real* meaning of St. Paul's questions in 1 Corinthians x. 16 ;—"The cup of blessing, which we bless (and then drink), *Is it not* the partaking-in-common of the (shed) *Blood* of Christ? The loaf which we break (and then eat), *Is it not* the partaking-in-common of the (sacrificed) *Body* of Christ?" "For we, the many, are (form) one loaf,—one body ;—for we all *share* in the one loaf."

The interpretation of "the Body-and-Blood of Christ" to mean some "inward and spiritual *grace*" or "spiritual food," has arisen from *confusing* the *non-figurative* words of the Institution, with the *purely-figurative* language of the "parable" in John vi. 31-58, respecting "eating the true Bread-from-heaven,—*manna*,";—where the *food* to be "eaten" and "drunk" is *spiritual* throughout, and the *method* of "eating" and "drinking" that food is necessarily *spiritual also*. But the *type* of Christ referred to in that "parable," is that of "the *manna*,—bread-from-heaven,";—whereas, the *type* of Christ referred to in the ordinance of The Lord's Supper, is that of "the *Passover*,—or Paschal Supper,";—two different types, which had *no* connection whatever, and *no* allusion to one another. And, to confuse the *Antitypical* "Manna"

¹ In John vi. 53-56, our Lord spake of "eating His flesh, and of drinking His blood" *directly*.

with the Antitypical "Passover, or Paschal Supper," is to make *as great* a mistake as to confuse the *typical* "manna" with the typical "Passover, or Paschal Supper." This confusion between the words of the Institution and the language of John vi. 53-56, has been made by *both* Protestants and Sacerdotalists. Protestants *interpret* the words of the Institution BY what they *correctly* understand the language of John vi. 53-56 to mean,—"*spiritual* feeding" upon "*spiritual* food."¹ Whereas Sacerdotalists interpret the language of John vi. 53-56, BY what *they* understand the words of the Institution to mean,—"*physical* feeding" upon "*material* food."

Similarly, the fact that our Lord "suffered outside the gate" of Jerusalem, *constituted* Him "the altar or sacrifice" known as "the Sin-offering for the people of God,"—"of which (in the type) *no one* had any *right* to eat,"—or any *power* to do so, because "the body was wholly *burnt* outside the camp." Hence, no one has any *more* right, or *power*, to eat "of the *actual* sacrificed Body of Christ,"—because it is now *non-existent*. "Of the sacrificed Body" of the Paschal Lamb, the people were *commanded* to "eat the *whole*"²—whereas, "of the body of the sin-offering for the people of God," they were strictly *forbidden* to eat one morsel. How then, *could* there be *any* allusion in Hebrews xiii. 10 (written to *Hebrews*), to the ordinance of the New "Paschal Supper,"—the Lord's Supper? The fact that our Lord "suffered outside the gate of Jerusalem," as "the Sin-Offering for the people of God," as plainly *forbids* us to "eat His *actual* sacrificed Body,"—as the *other* fact, that "He was sacrificed-for-us as Christ our Passover," *commands* us to "eat" and to "drink" the bread and the wine, which He gave us as the *Substitutes* of His *actual* "sacrificed Body" and "shed Blood."

Is there, I would ask, a *single* point in the above-mentioned facts which can be *fairly* disputed, or even doubted?

Yours faithfully,

WERNER H. K. SOAMES.

6, ALBANY ROAD,
BEXHILL-ON-SEA.

¹ See the third rubric after the "Communion of the Sick."

² Cp. Exodus xii. 3, 4, 8, 46, 47.

[* * We regret to state that since this letter was written the Rev. Werner H. K. Soames has passed away. He died at Bexhill on March 2, aged 75 years.—ED.]

