

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

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 παραδίδούς,—"*the traitor*," cp. Matt. xxvi. 48; Jn. xviii. 2, 5; xxi. 20. And compare ὁ κλέπτων,—"*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.]

