

Fundamentalists and the “Incorruptible” Blood of Christ (1)

Martyn McGeown

Introduction

The Bible glories in the atoning work of the Lord Jesus Christ, in “the blood of his cross” (Col. 1:20). God “hath set forth [Christ] to be a propitiation through faith in his blood” (Rom. 3:25). Believers are “justified by his blood” (Rom. 5:9); we have “redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins” (Eph. 1:7; cf. Col 1:14; I Peter 1:17-18); Gentile believers “who sometimes were afar off are made nigh by the blood of Christ” (Eph. 2:13); the blood of Christ “purges the conscience” of the child of God (Heb. 9:14); we “have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus” (Heb. 10:19); we were “sanctified with the blood of the covenant” (Heb. 10:29); we are “sprinkled” (I Peter 1:2), “cleansed” (I John 1:7) and “washed” (Rev. 1:5) by that same blood. Clearly, the subject of the blood of Christ is important in divine revelation.

However, some, in a zeal which is not according to knowledge (Rom. 10:3), have gone on flights of fancy concerning the nature of the blood of Jesus Christ, adopting mystical theories about the blood, which, not only have no place in Scripture, soberly exegeted, but lead to heretical views about the Person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

The Doctrine

The doctrine we examine in this article is somewhat difficult to define, as there are different versions of it. In general, the teaching is that the blood of Christ was not truly and fully human, but divine or “supernatural.” Some concede that, although it was human blood, it could suffer no corruption; others say that since Christ is both human and divine, His blood must be both human and divine. Others say that it is divine blood. Being divine or supernatural blood, it is incorruptible and indestructible. Every drop of blood which Christ shed in His lifetime, and especially the blood shed on Calvary, was miraculously preserved, resurrected with Christ and is now with Christ in heaven. Some teach that the blood of Christ re-entered His body during His resurrection; others believe that the blood

exists as a separate entity in heaven in some kind of vial or bowl. In order to secure redemption, some say, it was necessary that Christ's blood be literally sprinkled on a divine mercy seat in heaven. Others maintain that Christ is the mercy seat, so a literal sprinkling of Christ's blood was unnecessary. All insist that believers must be washed in the literal blood of Christ to be saved, and they reject any attempt to explain the blood as a metaphor.¹ These men insist that Jesus' blood is now in heaven and will forever remain there as the object of adoration and wonder of the saints.

In their assemblies you will hear prayers in this vein: "Lord, cover this meeting in the Precious Blood." The idea is that the building in which the meeting is held is somehow painted over with the red blood of Christ, as a kind of protection, for, they say, the Scriptures teach that the saints overcome Satan "by the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. 12:11). This prayer to "cover the meeting in the Blood" is especially important because without it the devil may be able to enter and do much mischief.² Members of such churches are told to "exalt the Blood," "to make much of the Blood" and "to plead the Blood" (the capitalisation of the word "Blood" is deliberate, to emphasise its importance). They are warned that any denial of this doctrine is a "bloodless gospel" which leads to modernism and outright apostasy.

Its Advocates

In Northern Ireland, the staunchest advocates of this doctrine are Ian Paisley and the Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster. Martyrs' Memorial Free Presbyterian Church, of which Ian Paisley is the minister, regularly publicises its meetings in the press, announcing "We exalt the Blood."³ It is certainly biblical to proclaim, "We preach Christ crucified" (I Cor. 1:23) or to say, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord

¹For example, Alan Cairns writes, "*Washed in the blood* is certainly a figure of speech, but the figure is in the *washed* not in the *blood*" (*Dictionary of Theological Terms* [Belfast: Ambassador, rev. 1998], p. 66; italics Cairns').

²There is much anecdotal evidence that in such prayer meetings members offer such petitions as "cover my car in the Blood" (to prevent traffic accidents) or "cover the police in the Blood" (asking God to protect the police force in their duties). Examples could be multiplied.

³Paisley extols the blood, by praising the attributes of the liquid blood that flowed in Christ's veins. He exalts the blood, by teaching heresy about the blood. The doctrine of incorruptible, indestructible, divine blood is a form of Euthychianism, a heresy which was condemned in the early ecumenical creeds, most notably that of Chalcedon (451). This will be considered further in a later instalment in the *BRJ* under a section entitled "Its Historical Lineage."

Jesus Christ” (Gal. 6:14) or to declare justification in Christ’s blood (Rom. 5:9) but where in the Word of God are we enjoined to “Exalt the Blood”? In the Free Presbyterian seminary, the Whitefield College of the Bible, this view is promoted. This would appear to be the doctrinal distinctive of the Free Presbyterians in Ulster. No other denomination in Northern Ireland—except perhaps a few independent churches—believes this.

Outside of the Free Presbyterian denomination, this view is held by Fundamentalist preachers such as Jack Hyles, R. L. Hymers, the Bob Joneses, Rod Bell and others. One can examine Fundamentalist websites and repeatedly encounter this teaching on the blood. Indeed, in August 1986, the World Congress of Fundamentalists made an official declaration on this point. They passed a resolution that

... the precious Blood is incorruptible. It cannot be anything else because of its intrinsic purity ... the precious Blood is indestructible. It cannot be anything else because of its permanence. The Blood is eternally preserved in Heaven ... the precious Blood is invaluable. It cannot be anything else because of its parentage. It is the blood of God incarnate.

The Congress went on to declare that it

rejects every attempt either to deny the literalness of the Blood or to minimise its efficacy and the necessity of its shedding in Christ's death on the Cross. Such denial is a dangerous and devilish deception ... and [it] calls upon Fundamentalist preachers and God's saints everywhere to proclaim anew the saving efficacy of the shed Blood of Christ in His death on the Cross, and to alert the Church in regard to all heretical teaching on this vital truth.⁴

Rev. D. A. Waite, pastor of Bible For Today Baptist Church, Collingswood, New Jersey, has made this doctrine of the blood part of the Articles of Faith for his church, even updating them in November 1997 “to meet present-day threats to the Faith”:

⁴http://www.jackclassiter.com/underblood/quote_by_dr.htm

We believe that the doctrine of the Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ is of great importance in the Bible; that Christ's Blood has been under attack in centuries past as well as in recent decades by modernist apostates, Mary Baker Eddy, R. B. Thieme, Jr., John MacArthur, Jr., and others; that Christ's Blood is not a mere figure of speech or "metonym" to be equal to "death"; that Old Testament sacrifices had two distinct parts: (1) the death of the sacrifice; and (2) the application of the blood of the sacrifice; that death was not sufficient, but the blood had to be applied properly ... that some of Christ's Blood was taken by Him to heaven and placed on the heavenly mercy seat thus cleansing the heavenly tabernacle (Hebrews 9:12-14, 18-24; 10:19-22); that Christ's Blood is now in heaven as the "Blood of sprinkling" (Hebrews 12:22-24); that Christ's Blood gives us boldness and access to the holiest in heaven (Hebrews 10:19); that Christ's Blood makes us perfect in every good work to do His will (Hebrews 13:21); and that Christ's Blood overcomes Satan.⁵

Waite is a rank Arminian who is a premillennial dispensationalist in his eschatology.⁶ Interestingly, he defines justification as a declaration of God that the believer is righteous upon the basis of the imputed righteousness of Christ and this is bestowed "solely through faith in the Redeemer's incorruptible shed Blood."⁷ It would appear that to Waite, at least, this doctrine of the blood is vital. Notice too that John MacArthur, Jr. is classified with "Christian science" cultist Mary Baker Eddy as a "modernist apostate" because he disagrees with Waite on this point. We will have occasion to examine the Fundamentalists' controversy with MacArthur later.

Do Fundamentalists view Christ's blood as human or divine? Ian Paisley writes, "His Blood is divine Blood as opposed to human blood."⁸ This is an amazing statement. If the blood of Jesus is divine, it must have the

⁵http://www.biblefortoday.org/bft_articles_faith.htm#V.%20THE; italics mine.

⁶In his "Articles of Faith," Waite states that Christ died for all without exception (Article 7), that the new birth occurs after faith and repentance (Article 18), that national Israel will be singularly blessed during the millennium (Article 28) and that there will be a premillennial, pretribulational rapture of the church (Article 29).

⁷Article 19.

⁸*Christian Foundations* (Belfast: Ambassador, repr. 1996), p. 57; italics Paisley's.

attributes of divinity. It must, to quote the *Westminster Shorter Catechism*, be “infinite, eternal and unchangeable in [its] being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth” (Answer 4). Clearly, Christ’s blood does not possess these qualities.

Not all Fundamentalists agree with Paisley’s assertion that Christ’s blood is divine, not human. Dr. J. Hymers, Jr. of Baptist Tabernacle, Los Angeles, California, writes,

Everyone I know of teaches that Jesus is the God-man. Jesus was both human and divine. His Blood, therefore, was both human and divine Blood. That’s the position of every credible fundamentalist on earth today.⁹

Where does that leave Paisley’s credibility as a Fundamentalist with his view of Christ’s divine blood? Furthermore, if so-called “credible Fundamentalists” had been present at the Council of Chalcedon (451) and had expressed the opinion that Christ’s blood was divine and not human (Paisley) or both human and divine (Hymers), they would have been condemned as heretics, as we shall see.

Paisley,¹⁰ Hymers¹¹ and Waite¹² teach that Christ’s blood is in heaven as a distinct entity from His resurrected body, having been sprinkled on the heavenly mercy seat. Rev. John Greer of Ballymena Free Presbyterian Church and Dr. Alan Cairns of Faith Free Presbyterian Church, Greenville, South Carolina, both ministers of Ian Paisley’s Free Presbyterian Church,

⁹“Dr. MacArthur’s Logical Fallacies on the Blood—a prayer for the intervention of God’s Grace,” 27 June 2004, http://www.rlhymersjr.com/Online_Sermons/2004/062704PM_DrMacarthur.html

¹⁰Paisley writes, “If His blood was lost at the cross and not preserved and presented in the temple in heaven, of which the temple on earth is but a type, then redemption remains forever unaccomplished ... The blood is just as real in heaven as God, the Lord Jesus, the angels and the saints. That is what the Bible states, and I believe it” (“Ten Impossibilities if the Blood of Christ Perished” [United Kingdom: British Council of Protestant Christian Churches, date of publication not given], pp. 4, 10).

¹¹Hymers declares, “the Bible plainly tells us that ‘the blood of sprinkling’ is there (Hebrews 12:24). We are not told how it got there, in this verse. We are only told that it is there” (Sermon “Dr Bengel vs. Dr MacArthur on the Blood of Christ,” July 2005, http://www.rlhymersjr.com/Online_Sermons/2005/071605PM_BengelvsMacArthur.html).

¹²Article VI of the Waite’s Articles of Faith states, “Christ’s blood is now in heaven as the Blood of sprinkling” (http://www.biblefortoday.org/bft_articles_faith.htm#VI.%20THE).

hold a different view. Cairns writes,

The fact that Christ's blood may be spoken of metaphorically for His death has led some evangelicals to downplay or even deny the redemptive virtue of the actual blood of Christ. They do not scruple to say that Christ's blood perished in the dust of Palestine ... This is dangerous and without Biblical warrant ... The incorruptibility of Christ's body means that it was supernaturally raised from the dead (Acts 2:27, 31-32). There is no Biblical reason to deny that the incorruptibility of Christ's blood means that it was raised along with His body ... If the blood of Christ was preserved and raised incorruptible with His body we would expect it to be *in* His body.¹³

In a sermon entitled "The Blood of the Godman" (2002), Rev. Greer argues for this position:

... the blood of Christ is sinless.¹⁴ You see the whole humanity of the Lord Jesus Christ is a sinless humanity ... Since the blood belongs to His sinless humanity, that means that His blood is incorruptible and His blood is indestructible ... No part of the real humanity of Christ could ever see corruption;¹⁵ that includes the blood ... [in contrast to] the awful teaching of some that the Lord's precious blood perished in the dust of Palestine ... and I'm not talking about Liberals, I'm talking about men who say they're evangelical ... there are evangelical groups that teach that horrendous idea ... the Resurrection necessarily took place because the humanity of Christ could not see corruption ... the blood of the Lamb, being part of that humanity, neither saw corruption nor destruction but was actually resurrected along with the body. There's the simple answer as to what happened the blood. The blood was raised again ... Where is the blood now? Well, the answer's

¹³*Dictionary of Theological Terms*, pp. 66-67; italics Cairns'.

¹⁴Blood is not a moral or immoral substance; it is amoral.

¹⁵Does that mean that Christ's humanity was incorruptible? That would include Christ's skin cells, His hair, His toenails, etc? We speak reverently, but the points are serious ones, as we will demonstrate.

very simple. It's in heaven ... We often speak of the blood-stained mercy seat where Jesus answers prayer; have you never stopped to think (because, you know, all these hymns are not correct. I need to say that) ... there's no mercy seat in heaven, there's no altar in heaven. Christ has fulfilled all those things ... Christ is our mercy seat ... If we accept that doleful, morbid heresy that the blood perished, then my dear friend, lovely gospel verses lose their meaning ... Thank God that the blood lives on in the body of our glorified Christ.¹⁶

It ought to be pointed out at this juncture that when David writes of Christ in Psalm 16:10, "Neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption" (quoted by Peter in Acts 2:27), the Holy Ghost does not mean that the Messiah's body is indestructible. The fact that the text says "neither wilt thou suffer" implies that, left to itself, Christ's body would have decayed. Christ had a real human nature. Christ's real human nature would have gone the way of all human nature, if the Triune God had not ensured that Christ did not see corruption.

Its Implications

If Christ did not have human blood, His complete human nature is denied. Disagreeing with Paisley, who, we have seen teaches that Christ had divine, not human, blood,¹⁷ Greer and Cairns recognise the danger of denying Christ's humanity. Cairns warns of this:

On the other hand, it [i.e., Christ's blood] must not be deified. It belongs to Christ's humanity, not His deity ... we must never forget that in the incarnation there was no confusion of natures. Christ's deity was not humanized nor His humanity deified.¹⁸

Greer gives a similar warning to his congregation. In the aforementioned sermon he says,

¹⁶<http://www.sermonaudio.com/sermoninfo.asp?sid=10602123256>

¹⁷*Christian Foundations*, p. 57.

¹⁸*Dictionary of Theological Terms*, p. 67.

The humanity of the Lord Jesus Christ had a beginning. Now that may shock you, but it won't shock you when you think about it ... His humanity began in the Incarnation through the virgin birth ... The Holy Spirit took of the substance of Mary's womb and He created the sinless humanity of the Lord Jesus Christ ... There are evangelical preachers who will tell you that the Lord's humanity was brought down from heaven and planted in the womb of the Virgin Mary and that is absolutely wrong. That would mean that He would have what they call a heavenly humanity, but that wouldn't be our humanity.¹⁹

Such warnings are to be welcomed. However, can this view of the incorruptible, indestructible blood (even if it is not divine, or divine and human, blood) really fit with Christ's true and complete humanity? Consider the function of the blood in the human body. Blood is that fluid which carries oxygen (from the lungs to the tissues) and nutrients (from the digestive system to the tissues) and waste products (from the tissues to the liver, kidneys and lungs) around the body. Human blood is a complex substance consisting of plasma (a pale yellow mixture of water, proteins and salts), blood cells (red and white) and platelets. That is only a very simple explanation which barely scratches the surface of the composition and function of blood. Truly we are "fearfully and wonderfully made" (Ps. 139:14)! Blood cells die typically every few months and are regenerated by the liver and bone marrow. If Christ had incorruptible blood, did His blood corpuscles need to be regenerated regularly? Did His blood (being pure and untainted, as this teaching goes) need to be cleansed in His kidneys and liver? If not, He did not have a human liver, human kidneys, human bone marrow or even human lungs. Surely an indestructible humanity is not our humanity either. That would make Him a superman! In contrast, orthodox Christianity teaches that Christ had a *weakened* human nature. As the man of sorrows (Isa. 53:3), He experienced the infirmities of our flesh (Heb. 4:15). He knew what it was to be weary, hungry, thirsty and in pain. If it is denied that Christ's blood had the properties of normal

¹⁹This was the view of the Anabaptists, notably Menno Simons, which is specifically condemned in *Belgic Confession* 18. This will be considered further in a later instalment in the *BRJ* under a section entitled, "Its Historical Lineage."

human blood, it is impossible to confess His true and complete humanity.

How much of Christ's blood has been preserved? A pamphlet written by Alan Cairns leaves no doubt where he stands:

When I speak of the blood of Christ, I mean Christ's blood literally, not figuratively or mystically. When I speak of the blood of Christ, I mean all of His blood, including every drop He ever shed, from His circumcision at eight days old to His crucifixion. All the blood of Christ is precious blood. All the blood of Christ is atoning blood. But, pre-eminently, when I speak of the blood of Christ, I have in mind the "blood of His cross" (Colossians 1:20). The whole of Scripture is taken up with this theme.²⁰

The first recorded instance of Christ bleeding was as an eight-day-old at His circumcision (Luke 2:21). This blood too must be precious; this blood must also have been preserved according to Cairns, for he continues, "when the blood of Christ was shed, it did not congeal and disappear into the dust of the ground."²¹ As mentioned above, human blood is constantly being regenerated: the cells are regenerated in the bone-marrow and the liquid (plasma) is replaced when fluid is excreted by the kidneys and water and nutrients are taken in by the digestive system. In a life-time a human being goes through a staggering amount of blood. Was it all preserved? Are we to imagine a huge vat (containing hundreds of litres) of Christ's blood in heaven?²² If we accept the explanation of Cairns and Greer that Christ's blood was resurrected and returned to His body—and yet not one drop was lost—how can all the blood from Christ's infancy to His death, when aged approximately thirty-three, fit into His body again? If all was not resurrected with and in His body, are we to imagine the resurrected and glorified Christ with some of His blood in His body and the remaining blood in a vial?

²⁰"The Precious Blood of Christ," p. 2.

²¹*Ibid.*, p. 8.

²²An adult male has about 7 litres of blood, which is replaced through natural processes approximately every two months. That works out as $7 \times 6 = 42$ litres per year $\times 20$ years = 840 litres. If we halve the amount for a child (say about 420 litres), we have a total of approximately 1260 litres of blood in about 30 years (about 333 US gallons or 277 UK gallons). That is a very conservative estimate, but serves to make the point.

If all of Christ's sinless humanity has been preserved, what about Christ's skin cells, His hair and other bodily fluids (such as sweat)? Human beings shed billions of skin cells in a lifetime. This makes up the majority of the dust in our homes (cf. Gen. 3:19). If Christ had an incorruptible human nature, why have not all His skin cells and shed hair follicles, including those plucked when He was shamefully treated by the soldiers (Isa. 50:6), been preserved? All our sweat comes from our blood. Sweating, part of the human body's cooling system, is one of the functions of the skin. We secrete water and salts which come from the plasma in our bloodstream. Christ would certainly have perspired as He worked as a carpenter or after a day preaching in Israel (cf. Gen. 3:19). Are we to believe that all this sweat has been preserved? Of course not! There is no need. Why should Christ's literal blood be any different?

Hymers argues that there could be a bowl of Christ's blood in heaven, since Scripture teaches that there are "seven golden vials full of the wrath of God" (Rev. 15:7) there.²³ However, wrath is not a liquid which can be stored in a literal bowl. Wrath is the attitude of God in His holiness against sin; it is not a physical substance. God does not literally "pour" wrath! The things pictured in the book of Revelation are "signified" as signs (Rev. 1:1). How a supposedly educated man could utter such absurdities is beyond belief!

If Christ's blood is divine it must be worshipped. Indeed, Alan Cairns—who wants us to avoid deifying the Lord's humanity—is nevertheless bold to write,

Undoubtedly, the blood of Christ is the most precious thing in heaven, earth or hell. There are sound Biblical reasons for so esteeming the blood of Christ ... Nothing thrills the heart of a child of God more than to think upon the precious blood of Christ. Even eternity will not exhaust our praise for the shed blood of the Lamb.²⁴

Its Importance to Fundamentalists

To deny this cherished dogma makes one a heretic in Fundamentalist

²³"Answering a Preacher Who Doesn't Believe Christ's Blood Exists," <http://www.rlhymersjr.com/Articles/02-23-03AnsweringAPreacher.html>

²⁴"The Precious Blood of Christ," pp. 11, 14.

circles. John MacArthur, Jr., of “Grace to You” ministries, more than any other, has provoked the wrath of Fundamentalists because he allegedly “denies the Blood.” He first upset them in the 1970’s. Hymers has several sermons on his website, preached between 2002 and 2005, in which he attacks MacArthur’s “heresy.” In September 2002, Hymers preached a sermon in response to a letter which MacArthur had written to clarify his position. In that letter, MacArthur proves that he holds the historic orthodox Christian position on this subject:

The literal blood of Christ was violently shed at his crucifixion. Those who deny this truth or try to spiritualize the death of Christ are guilty of corrupting the gospel message. Jesus Christ bled and died in the fullest literal sense, and when He rose from the dead, he was literally resurrected. To deny the absolute reality of those truths is to nullify them ... Clearly the word blood is often used to mean more than the literal red fluid. Thus it is that when Scripture speaks of the blood of Christ, it usually means more than just the red and white corpuscles—it encompasses His death, the sacrifice for our sins, and all that is involved in the atonement ... We are not saved by some mystical heavenly application of Jesus’ literal blood. Nothing in Scripture indicates that the literal blood of Christ is preserved in heaven and applied to individual believers. When Scripture says we’re redeemed by the blood (I Peter 1:18-19), it is not speaking of a bowl of blood in heaven. It means we’re saved by Christ’s sacrificial death ... It is not the actual liquid that cleanses us from our sins, but the work of redemption Christ accomplished in pouring it out. That is not heresy; it’s basic biblical truth.²⁵

However, Hymers is not convinced by MacArthur’s explanation. He urges his congregation to join with him in earnest prayer for MacArthur, since “nothing short of divine intervention” can change MacArthur’s view on the Blood.²⁶ In another sermon, in September 2002, Hymers claims that

²⁵Philip R. Johnson, “What’s All the Controversy About John MacArthur and the Blood of Christ?” <http://www.spurgeon.org/~phil/articles/blood.htm>

²⁶http://www.rlhymersjr.com/Online_Sermons/09-0102PM_AnswerMcArthurLetter.html

MacArthur's heresy proves he has not even been truly converted:

What's the matter with MacArthur and his Geeks? The answer is simple: they have never been converted. Having never experienced either conversion or the new birth, these men simply cannot "see" what is in Heaven.²⁷

Almost two years later on 27 June 2004, in a sermon entitled, "Dr. MacArthur's Logical Fallacies on the Blood—a Prayer for the Intervention of God's grace," Hymers declared that at his midweek prayer meeting the members of his church still pray for John MacArthur by name. MacArthur's error still lies heavily upon Hymers' heart:

Untold millions will die the second death, in flames of torment for all eternity, because this error has been left unchecked. It is a key evangelical error today—not a side issue.²⁸

In a more recent sermon, entitled "Dr. MacArthur and the Blood of God" (July, 2005), Hymers warns his listeners that MacArthur is in danger of falling into the error of Nestorianism.²⁹ If MacArthur denies that Christ had the blood of God, then he is dividing the two natures of Christ, claims Hymers.³⁰ However, Hymers is oblivious to the fact that he is confounding or mixing the natures of Christ, the heresy of Eutychianism or Monophysitism.³¹ There is a world of difference between saying that Christ had the blood of God (that is, that the blood of Christ belonged to both His human and His divine natures [Hymers], or even only to His divine nature [Paisley]) and that the Person whose human blood was shed was also God.

²⁷"MacArthur, the Greek Geeks and the Blood," http://www.rlhymersjr.com/Online_Sermons/09-08-02AM_GeeksAgainstTheBlood.html

²⁸http://www.rlhymersjr.com/Online_Sermons/2004/062704PM_DrMacarthur.html

²⁹http://www.rlhymersjr.com/Online_Sermons/2005/072305PM_Dr.MacArthur.html

³⁰Nestorianism is the heresy that Christ existed as two persons. The Nestorians denied the unity of Christ's Person, the eternal Son of God. The *Athanasian Creed* expresses it thus, "Although He [i.e., Christ] is God and man, yet He is not two, but one Christ; one, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God, one altogether, not by confusion of essence, but by unity of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ."

³¹See the section entitled "The Historical Lineage," in a later instalment in the *BRJ*.

Belgic Confession 19 gives the orthodox position:

We believe that ... the person of the Son is inseparably united and connected with the human nature; so that there are not two Sons of God, nor two persons, but two natures united in one single person: yet, that each nature retains its own distinct properties. As then the divine nature hath always remained uncreated, without beginning of days or end of life, filling heaven and earth: so also hath the human nature not lost its properties, but remained a creature, having beginning of days, being a finite nature, and retaining all the properties of a real body. And though he hath by his resurrection given immortality to the same, nevertheless he hath not changed the reality of his human nature; forasmuch as our salvation and resurrection also depend on the reality of his body. But these two natures are so closely united in one person, that they were not separated even by his death.

Richard Alexander is another victim in the Fundamentalists' zeal for the literal, preserved blood. When he first encountered this theory, he was astonished. Now he faces ostracism because he dares to challenge the establishment and attacks a sacred cow of Fundamentalism. Unable to discuss it within his denomination, he was forced to go to print and has produced an on-line book on the subject. He tells of his experiences in the introduction:

The preachers will not permit him [i.e., Richard Alexander, the author] to speak of it to their members, formally or informally, nor will they answer his arguments themselves. The author does not expect them to read this book until they must, for they shun hard questions, calling them "vain babbling" and "division of the brethren." Perhaps if this book were made available to the general public, fundamentalism would realize that they must answer these questions when they make claims for the Blood Doctrine.³²

Rev. John Greer, in the sermon quoted earlier, calls a denial of this dogma that “awful teaching” and refers to it as “that doleful, morbid heresy that the blood perished.”

Rev. Thomas Martin, minister of Lisburn Free Presbyterian Church castigates the “blood deniers” in these words:

There are those who say that Christ’s blood perished ... that is heresy; that is bordering on blasphemy against the blood; they’re nearly guilty, only they’re saved ... they’re very nearly guilty of blaspheming the Holy Ghost who bears witness to the blood. If that ever happened to an unconverted man, they’d be sure of hell. Remember that: the unpardonable sin.³³

to be continued (DV)

³²Blood, the Bible and Fundamentalists, http://members.aol.com/pooua/Bloodbook.html#_1_3

³³“And the blood shall never lose its power” (February, 2006) on <http://www.sermonaudio.com/sermoninfo.asp?sid=21906152345>. In the same sermon, Martin also claims that all the blood of Christ was resurrected, “Where is the blood of Christ today, from His circumcision as a child of 8 days to His crucifixion whenever He was about 33 years of age, where is the precious blood of the Lord Jesus Christ ... Christ’s blood is in Heaven ... every drop of royal, crimson blood was resurrected ... I believe the blood of Christ is in His body.”