His knowledge of the Father is *complete*and immediate; ours, *partial*, and derived through Him only.

**47.]** Our  
Lord now recurs to the subject of their  
murmurs, and gives the answer for which  
He has been preparing the way, repeating  
nearly ver. 40 and adding,

**48.]** If  
*so*, (see ver. 47,) there is full reason for  
my naming Myself the Bread of Life.

**49.]** *That* bread from heaven had  
no power to keep off death, and that, *death  
owing to unbelief*:—our Lord by thus  
mentioning **your** *fathers* and their death,  
certainly hints at the *similar unbelief* of  
these Jews. And the same dubious sense  
of “*dying*” prevails in ver. 50. Death is  
regarded as being swallowed up in the  
glory of the resurrection, and the second  
death—which was hidden in the former  
term **died**—has over him who eats this  
Bread of Life, *no power*: nay, he is  
brought, even *here* into a resurrection  
state from sin and death; see Rom. vi. 1  
ff. and Col. iii. 1 ff.

**51.] the living** *bread*; ‘containing life in itself,’ not merely  
supplying the waste of life with lifeless  
matter: see on ch. iv. 13, 14.

**yea, and the bread that I will give]** From this  
time we hear no more of bread: this  
figure is dropped, and the reality takes  
its place.

Some difficult questions  
arise regarding the sense and reference of  
this saying of our Lord. (1) Does it refer  
to HIS DEATH? and, (2) is there any  
reference to the ORDINANCE OF THE  
LORD’S SUPPER?

(1) In treating  
this question I must at once reject all  
metaphorical and side-interpretations, as,  
that the *teaching* of Christ is the Bread,  
and to be *taught by Him* is feeding upon  
it (so Grotius, and the modern rationalists):  
that the *divine Nature of Christ*, or His  
*sending of the Holy Spirit*, or His *whole  
life of doing good on earth*, can be meant:  
all such have against them the plain sense  
of the words, which, as Stier observes, are  
*very simple ordinary words*; the only difficulty arising, when we come to enquire  
into their application to His own Person.  
The Bread of Life is *Himself*: and, strictly  
treated, when we come to enquire *what*, of  
that body, soul, and spirit, which constituted Himself, this Bread specifically is,  
we have His answer that it is *His Flesh*,  
which He will give (for this will be the  
meaning, whether the words “*which I will  
give*” are to be regarded as part of the text  
or not) on behalf of the life of the world.  
We are then specifically directed to *His  
Flesh* as the answer.

Then, *what does  
that Flesh import*? The flesh of animals  
is the ordinary food of men: but *not the  
blood*. The blood, which is the life, is  
spilt at death, and is not in the flesh  
when eaten by us. Now this distinction  
must be carefully borne in mind. The  
*flesh* here, (see ver. 53,) and the *eating of  
the flesh, are distinct from the blood*, and  
*the drinking of the blood*. We have no  
generalities merely, to interpret as we  
please: but the terms used are *precise and  
technical*. It is then *only through or after  
the Death of the Lord*, that by any propriety of language, His Flesh could be said  
to be eaten.

Then another distinction  
must be remembered: The flesh of animals  
which we eat is *dead* flesh. It is already  
the prey of corruption; we eat it, and die  
(ver. 49). But *this* Bread, is *living Bread*;  
not dead flesh, but living Flesh. And  
therefore *manducation by the teeth materially is not to be thought of* here; but  
some kind of eating by which the *living  
Flesh of the Son of God* is made the *living  
sustenance* of those who partake of it.  
Now His Flesh and Blood were *sundered*  
by Death. Death was the shedding of His  
precious Blood, which (most probably) *He  
did not afterwards resume* : see ch. xx. 27,  
and Luke xxiv. 39. His Flesh is the glorified substance of His Resurrection-Body,  
now at the right hand of God. It is then  
in His *Resurrection form only* that His  
Flesh ean be eaten, and be living food for