

# FUNDAMENTALISTS AND THE “INCORRUPTIBLE” BLOOD OF CHRIST (3)

Martyn McGeown

## Some Fundamental Theological Errors Underlying this View

### I. A Mistaken View of Original Sin

Some Fundamentalists believe that original sin is propagated through blood. For example, Ian Paisley writes, “Through the veins of humanity flows a poisoned bloodstream. The life of the flesh is in the blood. The life of man is totally depraved, therefore his blood is but human depravity in solution.”<sup>1</sup> Likewise, Alan Cairns asserts, “Each of us is naturally corrupt. The poison of sin flows in the veins of every one of us, and the foul corrupt nature of sin is passed on from father to son.”<sup>2</sup> Scripture teaches that “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned” (Rom. 5:12) and “by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners” (Rom. 5:19). For this reason, the Psalmist teaches that he was “shapen in iniquity” and conceived in sin (Ps. 51:5) and so “the wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born” (Ps. 58:3). But we reject the idea that sin is passed on through the blood and that we all have polluted and sinful blood. Our blood is not the problem; blood is an amoral substance. Blood in itself, as a red liquid, which carries nutrients, gases and waste products through the body, is neither virtuous nor sinful, neither pleasing nor displeasing to God.

The Reformed creeds explain original sin thus:

Man after the fall begat children in his own likeness. A corrupt stock produced a corrupt offspring. Hence all the posterity of Adam, Christ only excepted, have derived corruption from their original parent, not by imitation, as the Pelagians of old asserted, but by the propagation of a vicious nature (*Canons of Dort* III/IV:2).

---

<sup>1</sup>*Christian Foundations*, p. 56.

<sup>2</sup>“The Precious Blood of Christ,” p. 6.

Ian Paisley writes of the blood of Christ, “His Blood is innocent Blood as opposed to guilty blood,” and quotes Matthew 27:4.<sup>3</sup> However, when Judas Iscariot speaks of betraying “innocent blood” (Matt. 27:4), he does not mean that the physical blood of Jesus—His haematology—was pure or without guilt (for it was amoral), but Judas means that Christ was innocent of crime. His regret at betraying “innocent” blood is recognition that Jesus was not guilty of the charges against Him and that He was being treated unjustly.<sup>4</sup> Nor, does a reference to Christ’s innocent blood in this text imply that others have guilty and sinful blood. The term “innocent blood” cannot mean pure and sinless blood, if we consider other passages. In Jonah 1:14, the sailors beseech God not to punish them for shedding Jonah’s “innocent blood,” but nobody maintains that Jonah was sinless. Indeed, by the reckoning of Paisley and Cairns, he must have inherited the same “poison of sin” in his veins. Deuteronomy gives directions to Israel on what to do if a dead body is found in the field “and it be not known who hath slain him” (Deut. 21:1). A sacrifice is to be offered and prayer made to God that “innocent blood” be not imputed to Israel (v. 8). Obviously, this victim is not sinless either. King Manasseh is said to have shed much “innocent blood” in Israel (II Kings 21:16), yet every victim of that murderous king was born with original sin. Jonathan refers to David’s “innocent blood” (I Sam. 19:5), yet remember David’s confession in Psalm 51:5. Examples could be multiplied. The term “innocent blood” simply refers to a person innocent of the crime of which he is accused. Original sin, then, is not passed on through blood, but is imputed to us as guilt by God, and passed on to us by human generation.

Therefore, it is not that man has polluted *blood*. He has a polluted or totally corrupt *nature*. The effects of sin are universal: his mind, his will and his soul are totally depraved and marred by sin. The *Canons of Dordt* express it thus:

... revolting from God by the instigation of the devil, and abusing the freedom of his own will, he [i.e., man] forfeited these excellent gifts; and on the contrary entailed on himself blindness of mind, horrible darkness, vanity and perverseness of judgment, became wicked, rebellious, and obdurate in heart and will, and impure in his affections (III/IV:1).

---

<sup>3</sup>*Christian Foundations*, p. 57; italics Paisley’s.

<sup>4</sup>Judas’ regret was remorse, not repentance. He was “the son of perdition” (John 17:12). “Perdition” is from “perish” and the perishing here is that of hell (cf. Acts 1:25).

## Fundamentalists and the “Incorruptible” Blood

Sin is no more carried in blood than in urine or in sweat.<sup>5</sup> Blood is simply a bodily fluid. Christ’s blood, since it was human blood (because Christ had a real human nature), had all the properties of human blood. It was not supernatural blood. The incarnation of Christ involved His taking a real, complete, sinless and weakened human nature, “with all the *essential properties* and common infirmities thereof” (*Westminster Confession* 8:2) or as the writer to the Hebrews put it,

Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh *and blood*, he also himself likewise took part of the same ... For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore *in all things* it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest (Heb. 2:14, 16-17).

### 2. A Misunderstanding Concerning the Virgin Birth

Following from a mistaken view of original sin, some Fundamentalists believe that the virgin birth was necessary in order to prevent Jesus inheriting sinful human blood from His parents. Paisley claims,

If [Christ] had been born by natural generation His blood would have been poisoned by the universal malady of sin and would have been absolutely valueless as an atonement for the sinful sons of men ... The Virgin Birth of Christ, which took place with no male contribution which would originate the infant’s blood in the usual way, but by a supernatural act of God thus originating *supernatural blood*, is absolutely essential to the work of redemption. By such a birth and by such a birth alone could blood be produced—*precious, incorruptible, supernatural and divine*, to redeem the fallen sons of Adam’s accursed race.<sup>6</sup>

The Bible teaches that the virgin birth was both a wonder and a sign (Isa. 7:14), a wonderful sign pointing to an infinitely greater wonder, the incarnation of the

---

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Louis Berkhof: “This pollution is not to be regarded as a substance infused into the human soul, nor as a change of substance in the metaphorical sense of the word. This was an error of the Manicheans and of Flacius Illyricus in the days of the Reformation” (*Systematic Theology* [Banner: Edinburgh, repr. 2003], p. 246).

<sup>6</sup>*Christian Foundations*, pp. 58-59; italics mine.

Son of God: “without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: *God* was manifest in the flesh” (I Tim. 3:16). The idea that Jesus would have been tainted by sin except He was virgin-born has no basis in Scripture. The reason why Jesus was born sinless is because He is the Son of God. It is impossible for Jesus to be tainted with sin! Jesus did not need a sinlessly perfect mother (as Rome teaches) to be the Lamb without blemish or spot, nor did He need supernaturally-created divine blood or divine and human blood (as some Fundamentalists teach). Who can even understand what supernatural, “divine” blood is? Remember God is spirit and has no blood (John 4:24). The Bible explains how Jesus was born without sin in the womb of a sinful woman:

And the angel answered and said unto her, The *Holy Ghost* shall come upon thee, and the *power of the Highest* shall overshadow thee: *therefore* that *holy thing* which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God (Luke 1:35).

The reason why the human nature of Christ was free from sin is because of the power of the Holy Ghost, not because of some quality in Christ’s blood.

The *Heidelberg Catechism* too teaches that the blood of Jesus’ human nature (obviously His divine nature had no blood) was from His mother:

God’s eternal Son, who is, and continueth true and eternal God, took upon him the very nature of man, of the flesh *and blood* of the Virgin Mary, by the operation of the Holy Ghost; that he might also be the true seed of David, like unto his brethren in all things, sin excepted (A. 35).

Rev. Ronald Hanko explains the virgin birth thus:

Christ was born of the flesh and blood of Mary ... he was a Jew of the line of David, of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh. So, too, he was a true son of Adam, our own flesh and blood. This seems self-evident, but it has been denied in church history. Some taught that Christ brought his human nature with him from heaven and that by his birth and conception he merely passed through Mary’s womb like water through a tap. Or they taught that his human nature was specially created in her womb, so that he was not genetically and physically her son. This was taught by some Anabaptists at the time of the

## *Fundamentalists and the “Incorruptible” Blood*

Reformation, and more recently by the neo-orthodox theologian Karl Barth. Both Barth and the Anabaptists held such views in the interest of preserving Christ’s sinlessness. If Jesus was not born of human ancestry, they claimed, then there was no possibility that he was tainted with human depravity. It is not necessary to hold these views, however, in order to believe that Christ was wholly without sin. His conception by the Holy Spirit guaranteed his sinlessness, as Luke 1:35 teaches. Indeed, to hold the view of the Anabaptists and of Barth is to deny that Christ was like us in all things except sin (Heb. 2:14; Heb. 4:15), even in his conception and birth.<sup>7</sup>

### 3. A Misguided Appeal to Science

One of the main proponents of this doctrine, who has influenced Ian Paisley in his views, was Dr. M. R. De Haan of Radio Bible Class, Grand Rapids, Michigan. De Haan in his 1943 book *The Chemistry of the Blood* asserted, “Not only is it a scientific fact, but it is plainly taught in Scripture that Jesus partook of human flesh without Adam’s blood.”<sup>8</sup> Let the import of those words sink in! Christ—according to Paisley and De Haan—did not have Adam’s blood. Obviously, nobody literally had Adam’s blood but Adam himself, but what is meant here by De Haan is that Christ was not in the “bloodline” of Adam. Therefore, He did not have the blood (was not in the “bloodline”) of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David or any of the others in the covenant line. How, then, could Christ be “of the seed of David according to the flesh” (Rom. 1:3)? How can He have taken “on him the seed of Abraham” (Heb. 2:16)? How can it be said that, of the Jews, “concerning the flesh, Christ came” (Rom. 9:5), if Christ was not in the “bloodline” of Adam and the covenant people of God?

De Haan (and Paisley) would grant that Christ was a true descendant of Adam, Abraham, and David but they insist that Christ had a *different sort* of blood. However, the Bible teaches that Christ had the same sort of blood we do: *human* blood! Hebrews 2:14 proves that Christ took part of the same “flesh *and* blood” of the children, so that He was “in all things [sin excepted] made like unto his brethren.” De Haan twists this text and Paisley quotes De Haan’s Scripture-twisting with approval

---

<sup>7</sup>*Doctrine According to Godliness*, p. 135.

<sup>8</sup>Quoted with approval in Paisley’s *Christian Foundations*, p. 59.

(cf. II Peter 3:16).<sup>9</sup> De Haan wants Hebrews 2:14 to say that “the children take both flesh and blood of Adam, but Christ took only part, that is, the flesh part, whereas the blood was the result of supernatural conception,” but Hebrews 2:14 does not say that.<sup>10</sup>

Furthermore, De Haan stated elsewhere, in *The Chemistry of the Blood*, that the blood of Adam was sinful, but not his flesh:

Christ could partake of Adam’s flesh, which is not inherently sinful, but He could not partake of Adam’s blood, which was completely sinful. God provided a way by which Jesus, *born of a woman* (not man), could be a perfect human being, but, because He had not a drop of Adam’s blood in His veins, He did not share in Adam’s sin.<sup>11</sup>

De Haan, who studied medicine nearly a century ago, is still hailed as an authority by some Fundamentalists who insist that the blood comes from the father, and never from the mother, and that the blood of the foetus and the mother never mix. Because of these medical “facts,” Ian Paisley and others believe that Christ’s blood came from a different source than His flesh. However, de Haan’s medical “facts” are at variance with recent medical discoveries. In his book *Blood, The Bible and Fundamentalism*, Richard Alexander explodes the treasured theories of De Haan and demonstrates that the “Blood Indoctrinators,” as he terms them, are building on an unsound foundation: “Doctor De Haan, in many of his writings, constantly displayed inaccurate ideas that were scientifically naive.”<sup>12</sup> Jesus got His flesh and blood from His mother (or, to speak more precisely, He inherited her chromosomes so that the foetus could produce the cells and tissues, including blood cells, from her) and He was born sinless, because He was conceived of the Holy Ghost. An appeal to science, outdated science at best, is not only unnecessary, but also foolish and brings reproach on the Christian gospel.

Another preacher who appeals to faulty medical science is Calvin Ray Evans, pastor of Rubyville Community Church, Rubyville, Ohio. In a sermon preached in 2003 entitled “The Incorruptible Blood,” he tells the anecdote of how he came across an amazing fact about our blood and by implication astounding facts about

---

<sup>9</sup>*Christian Foundations*, pp. 59-60.

<sup>10</sup>*Christian Foundations*, p. 60.

<sup>11</sup><http://www.knology.net/~byrdland/blood.html>; italics De Haan’s.

<sup>12</sup><http://members.aol.com/pooua/Bloodbook.html>

## *Fundamentalists and the “Incorruptible” Blood*

Christ’s blood. He starts by making scientifically-credible statements about human blood:

... you know, our blood, if we spill our blood on the sand, if you bleed and your blood pours out, immediately your blood has a clotting ability. Coagulates are in your blood. It’ll clot. If the blood falls on the sand, that same ability will cause that blood to dry, and as the blood dries, it starts a decaying process ...<sup>13</sup>

After explaining that to the congregation, he relates the story of a man he visited in the hospital who had almost died from internal bleeding. This man mentioned something very interesting to Evans which he claims revolutionised his thinking about Christ’s blood. Having heard this from the patient, he calls a doctor to confirm the accuracy of what he has just heard. The doctor confirms it.

He said, “Preacher, I didn’t realise ... when your blood comes out of your body quickly, that your organs shut down ... all of your organs immediately stop excreting any kind of fluid in your body, and the blood pulls the water out of your body” ... so I called a doctor and I said, “Let me ask you something, Doc” ... he said, “Yes,” he said, “that is exactly what happens” ... and I said, “Well, let me ask you this ... what would happen if your body lost, or it was absent in your body, the coagulates which cause your blood to clot” ... he said, “I’ll tell you what would happen ... immediately, your blood,” he said, “you wouldn’t lose blood with a trickle, he said your blood would pour out or flow out, and because the fluids is [sic] there, the fluids keep the consistency coming out with the blood that it keeps pouring out, and he said immediately your organs would shut down and it would pull all of the fluids out of your organs.” And he said, “Basically, what would happen, your organs would become petrified on the inside.”

Evans at this stage is overcome with emotion (he “laid the phone down and [he] wept for just a minute or two”) and presses the doctor for more information.

I said, “Doc, let me tell you what I’m thinking about, I’ve heard preacher after preacher after preacher preach about when Christ died on the cross and they plunged the spear into His side that it punc-

---

<sup>13</sup><http://www.sermonaudio.com/sermoninfo.asp?currSection=&sermonID=470385058>

tured the pericardial sack, the sack around your heart, and the fluids was [sic] there.” And I said, “Doc, do you believe that it was possible since Jesus’ blood was incorruptible, that meant His blood could not rot” [frenzied cheering from the congregation] and I said, “Since His blood could not rot, that means that you have to have clotting ability or coagulates to make it dry up to start the deterioration process. Would that mean that Jesus would have started bleeding?” And he said ... “That would have meant when they drove nails in His hands and His feet, it would have become like a fountain that was open” [more cheering from the audience] ... and he said, “Do you know what would happen if you did not have that clotting ability?” I said, “What?” He said, “If you would sweat intensely enough”—we preach that the capillaries broke down. He said that we’re wrong. That’s not what it was—He said, “It was the incorruptible blood of a perfect Saviour, that as He sweated, the blood began to flow, and His sweat became as though it were great drops of blood, because out of the blood He poured the fluids from His body” [enthusiastic, fanatical cheering from the audience]. And then it dawned on me: God said in Acts chapter 2 that He would not allow His Holy One to see corruption, and I said, “If that was the case, if the blood flowed out of Him in that manner, and the fountain was opened, and the blood was flowing like a mighty crimson river, what would that do to the body, would it die?” He said, “It wouldn’t rot, not in three days would it rot” [enthusiastic “Amen” from the audience] ... how do they keep you as a corpse from becoming an odour, take the blood out of you, O glory! and then I went to Zechariah chapter 13 verse 1 ... and that blood will never decay. This same doctor told me, he said, “You know if people would just understand; that would mean that the blood of Jesus was just as fresh today [audience screaming, “Amen!”] as the day He died on Calvary.”

We must interrupt this fanatical, frenzied cheering of hallelujahs, into which Evans has whipped his audience, and inject some sober thinking into this discussion (Acts 26:25; I Thess. 5:6; I Peter 4:7). If Christ’s blood had lacked the vital clotting ability, He would not—in a day of primitive medicine—have lived to thirty-three years. He would have died in childhood, probably shortly after being circumcised or whenever He suffered a cut or injury or serious bruise. Moreover, He would have

## *Fundamentalists and the “Incorruptible” Blood*

been a haemophiliac and therefore ceremonially unclean in Israel (cf. Lev. 15). How, then, could He have been a high priest unto the people of God?

Assuming that He had survived to adulthood, let us consider the example that Evans gives. If Christ had started bleeding from His pores in the Garden of Gethsemane, in the way described by Evans (though not in the way described in Luke 22:44), He would have been dead within a matter of hours, if He had had no coagulates in His blood. He would not have been able to walk the way to Calvary or even stand up at His trial. In the unlikely event that He had survived the arraignment before the Sanhedrin, the scourging by the Romans (John 19:1) would have brought a swift end to His life. It was not unknown for people to die from scourging, and certainly a haemophiliac would have stood no chance.

Laying aside all this nonsense, we ought to note that Scripture makes it clear why Christ died so quickly on the cross—a death which ordinarily could take days. It was because Christ was completely in control. He gave up His spirit to the Father at the appointed time (Luke 23:46; quoting Ps. 31:5) for no man took His life from Him (John 10:18). Pilate marvelled at the swiftness of Christ’s death (Mark 15:44) but God was in control of all events (Acts 4:27-28) making sure that Christ’s bones would not be broken (John 19:36), which would have happened if Christ had died as slowly as those who were crucified with Him. The reason why Christ’s body did not decay in the grave was not because His body was drained of His special non-coagulating blood, as Evans surmises, nor because He had an incorruptible humanity, as Greer and Cairns teach, but because God preserved Christ’s corpse in the grave miraculously. It was God’s purpose that Christ rise again for our justification (Rom. 4:25). Death could have no power over Christ (Rom. 6:9), because He has vanquished death by His own death on the cross.

### **4. A Bizarre Interpretation of Old Testament Typology**

Since Fundamentalist preachers like Ian Paisley believe that the blood of Jesus Christ is incorruptible and indestructible, they teach that it has been preserved in heaven. Every drop of Christ’s blood, they claim, has been resurrected, gathered and brought to heaven, where it pleads for blood-bought souls before the Father. Paisley excoriates those preachers who dare to oppose such a teaching:

Into the pulpit of the churches there has come a new breed of men who sail under the flag of Evangelicalism and some of whom even dare

to hoist the flag of Fundamentalism. Their message is void of the “blood evangel” and destructive of the Rock granite of accomplished redemption ... the bloodless track of these preachers is a road of impossibilities, the cul-de-sac of Bible rejection.<sup>14</sup>

Paisley teaches that Jesus fulfilled the Old Testament types and shadows (such as the sacrifices of Leviticus) when He made atonement on the cross. With this we agree. The book of Hebrews explains at length that Christ fulfilled the Old Testament sacrificial system, superseding it. However, some believe that in order properly to fulfil the types Jesus had to die *and then present His blood in heaven*, where the divine mercy seat is said to be situated.<sup>15</sup> This is unnecessary to fulfil the type because Jesus Christ Himself is the mercy seat; there is no separate ark of the covenant with a mercy seat in heaven.<sup>16</sup> Such Fundamentalist preachers confuse the types and believe that Jesus had to do more than die on the cross to secure our redemption. As A. M. Stibbs writes,

There is in heaven no blood ritual such as there was in the Levitical tabernacle. For, in the fulfilment of these divinely-ordained “figures of the true,” Christ Himself does not do things after His sacrifice with His blood, as something material and outside Himself, which He comes before God to minister. He entered in not with, but “through his own blood,” that is, by means of, or because of, His death as Man, when His human blood was shed. So, in the heavenly glory, He does not sprinkle, and never has actually sprinkled, blood upon some heavenly mercy-seat. Rather He is Himself, so to speak, the mercy-seat or propitiation, being Himself sufficiently “blood stained” by reason of His death on the Cross.<sup>17</sup>

Some “Blood Indoctrinators” (to use Richard Alexander’s term) see in the events after the resurrection proof for their theory. In the garden, Mary Magdalene was not permitted to touch Christ: “Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not ascended to my Father” (John 20:17). In chapter 14 of his book *The Church*, Dr. Jack

---

<sup>14</sup>“Ten Impossibilities if the Blood of Christ Perished,” pp. 3, 10.

<sup>15</sup>This is the view of Paisley and Waite, as we have seen.

<sup>16</sup>Paisley’s colleagues, Alan Cairns and John Greer rightly point this out.

<sup>17</sup>*The Meaning of the Word “Blood” in Scripture* (London: Tyndale, repr. 1958), p. 18.

## *Fundamentalists and the “Incorruptible” Blood*

Hyles, pastor of First Baptist Church, Hammond, Indiana, until his death in 2001, offers this highly speculative explanation:

When Jesus was resurrected, and Mary Magdalene saw him, Jesus said, “Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father.” He was the High Priest. He was taking the blood He had shed as the Lamb of God to the Mercy Seat in Heaven, to sprinkle it there. Between the time the High Priest took the blood in the basin and sprinkled it on the Mercy Seat, nobody could touch Him. That is why He told Mary Magdalene not to touch Him.

Later He told Thomas to put his hands into His side. Why could Thomas touch Him when Mary Magdalene could not? Because when Thomas saw Him, He had already been to Heaven, sprinkled the blood, and the blood was already talking to the Father.<sup>18</sup>

According to this view, Christ had *two* bodily ascensions. Christ ascended soon after His resurrection to sprinkle the blood on the heavenly mercy seat, came back down to earth, appeared several times to His disciples over the space of 40 days, and then made a second ascension from the Mount of Olives (Acts 1:9). However, there is no biblical evidence to support this idea of *two* bodily ascensions of Christ, and the church has never held such a view.

Moreover, this highly speculative interpretation does not accord with other material. For example, after Mary Magdalene finds the empty tomb (Matt. 28:1) and meets the Lord (John 20:16), Christ appears to His disciples (Matt. 28:9). This is after the women had fled (Matt. 28:8). Christ greets His disciples with “All hail.” The text goes on to say that the disciples “came and *held him by the feet* and worshipped him” (Matt. 28:9). However, Christ did not rebuke His disciples for holding him. About a week later, Christ appeared again and this time Thomas (who previously had been absent) was also permitted to touch Jesus. Hyles wants it to appear that about a week elapsed between Mary’s being forbidden to touch Jesus and Thomas being allowed to handle Him. He needs this time for his fanciful blood-sprinkled-in-heaven theory. However, the time between Mary being forbidden to touch Jesus and the disciples (excluding Thomas) touching Him was probably very short indeed, as indicated by Matthew 28:9.

---

<sup>18</sup>“The Price of the Church” (<http://jackhyles.net/thechurch.shtml>).

More serious than that objection is that Hyles contradicts the Saviour's words on the cross: "It is finished" (John 19:30). If Hyles is right, Jesus ought not to have uttered those famous words. He ought instead to have said, "It is *almost* finished. Once the blood has been gathered and sprinkled in heaven, then it will be finished." He did not say that. He did not even hint at such a thing. The very idea is foolish.

Rod Bell, pastor of Tabernacle Baptist Church, Virginia Beach, Virginia, and often a guest speaker in Paisley's Martyrs' Memorial Church, utters the same non-sense:

Atonement, my friends, cannot be completed at the cross, but at the altar and upon the mercy seat. Neither the Old Testament nor the New Testament leaves us in any doubt on this matter ... just as the High Priest in Old Testament times took with him into the holiest the blood of animal sacrifices. Christ our High Priest entered heaven with His own precious blood. He took His own precious blood into the holy place to obtain eternal redemption for us. Now, Christ our High Priest entered into heaven with His own precious blood. Where is the blood of Christ now, today? It is in heaven, because it is indestructible blood.<sup>19</sup>

Notice that Bell emphatically denies that atonement was completed on the cross. He appeals to Hebrews 9:12 which says that "by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place" and argues that "by" should be translated "with" so that Christ brought His own blood into the holy place. Notice too his misquoting of the text. Hebrews 9:12 does not say "*to obtain* eternal redemption for us," but "*having obtained* eternal redemption for us." Redemption was accomplished before Christ ascended to heaven. George Smeaton is just one of many Reformed writers who explode this theory:

To suppose, as we must do in that case, that Christ's priestly action began in heaven,—that is, that He sprinkled the mercy-seat, and completed the atonement only when He entered on the mediatorial exaltation or reward,—seems to confound everything ... A few words will suffice to prove that He entered within the veil and sprinkled the mercy-seat at the moment when He commended His spirit into His

---

<sup>19</sup>"The Precious Blood of Christ," *The Cutting Edge*, vol. 3 (1989) (<http://www.f-b-f.org/sermon.asp?id=27>).

## *Fundamentalists and the “Incorruptible” Blood*

Father’s hand ... When did the true High Priest sprinkle the mercy-seat?—which was a propitiatory act in the course of averting wrath—we must emphatically answer, At the moment of death ... it is incongruous and absurd to hold, then, that the sprinkling of the mercy-seat and the purifying of the heavenly things (Heb. 9:23) took place only after His ascension.<sup>20</sup>

A. W. Pink too disagrees with Bell and others. On Hebrews 9:12, he writes,

It was by virtue of the blood of these animals that Aaron entered so as to be accepted with God. The reference here is not directly to what the high priest brought with him into the holiest—or the “incense” too had been mentioned—but to the title [or right] which the sacrifices gave him to approach unto the Holy One of Israel.<sup>21</sup>

John Owen calls the idea that Christ brought His own “material blood” into Heaven “vain speculation.” Commenting on Hebrews 9:12, he declares,

It is a vain speculation, contrary to the analogy of faith, and destructive of the true nature of the oblation of Christ, and inconsistent with the dignity of his person, that he should carry with him into heaven a part of that material blood which was shed for us on the earth. This some have invented, to maintain a comparison in that wherein is none intended. The design of the apostle is only to declare by virtue of what he entered as a priest into the holy place. And this was by virtue of his own blood when it was shed, when he offered himself unto God.<sup>22</sup>

*to be continued (DV)*

---

<sup>20</sup>*The Apostles’ Doctrine of the Atonement* (Edinburgh: Banner, 1961), pp. 47-52, 341.

<sup>21</sup>*An Exposition of Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Baker, repr. 1989), p. 489.

<sup>22</sup>*An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Baker, repr. 1980), vol. 6, p. 280.