

# *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/robbadshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

THE  
CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

*CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN  
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*



VOL. XI.



LONDON  
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW  
1885

THE  
**CHURCHMAN**

---

OCTOBER, 1884.

---

ART. I.—CANON WESTCOTT ON 1 JOHN I. 7.

IN a Commentary on St. John's Epistles lately published, Canon Westcott has a note on chap. i, ver. 7, of the first Epistle, in which he has propounded a remarkable theory. That he attaches some importance to it appears from his having transferred this note to another still more recent work, "The Historic Faith." If we understand his view aright, it is as follows: It is a mistake to suppose that in Scripture the expression "blood of Christ" signifies merely expiation or atonement; on the contrary, the idea of life is to be connected with it. In the Jewish sacrifices the victim was first slain by the offerer, not necessarily a priest, and so far the transaction conveyed the notion of an expiatory death. But the blood which was abstracted from the victim, and borne by the High Priest into the Holy of holies, carried with it the life of the victim, and by the sprinkling of the blood on the mercy-seat this life (in what sense is not explained) was imparted to the Jewish worshippers. So as regards the antitype; the death of Christ on the Cross was expiatory, but in the expression "blood of Christ" the additional idea of life is involved, the life of Christ; and further, of this life as imparted to the Church for the purposes of quickening and sanctification.

If we have misrepresented the author's view we are open to correction; but we can attach no other meaning to such statements as the following: "It must be observed that by the outpouring of the blood [in the Jewish sacrifices] the life which was in it was not destroyed, though it was separated from the organism which it had before quickened." "The blood already shed is distinctly treated as living. When it is sprinkled on the altar, it makes atonement in virtue of the life which is in it." "In accordance with the typical teaching of the Levitical ordinances, the blood of Christ represents

Christ's life (1) as rendered in free self-sacrifice to God for man, and (2) as brought into perfect fellowship with God, having been set free by death. The blood of Christ is, as shed, the life of Christ given for men; as offered, the life of Christ now given to men; the life which is the spring of their life. In each case the efficacy of the life of Christ depends, from man's side, on the incorporation of the believer in Christ.' "The blood always includes the thought of the life preserved and active beyond death." "Participation in Christ's blood is participation in His life (John vi. 56)." "The blood is not simply the price by which the redeemed were purchased, but the power by which they were quickened so as to be capable of belonging to God." "By 'sprinkling' of Christ's blood, the believer is first brought into fellowship with God in Christ; and in the imperfect conduct of his personal life, the life of Christ is continually communicated to him for growth and cleansing. He himself enters into the divine presence 'in the blood of Jesus' (Heb. x. 19), surrounded, as it were, and supported by the life which flows from Him" (Note, pp. 34-37.)

It does not necessarily militate against this theory that it seems rather of a mystical and fanciful character, and certainly bears upon it the stamp of novelty. Scripture is an inexhaustible mine, and what appears to have escaped the notice of previous commentators, it may be reserved for others to discover. And the language of Scripture, we know, in dealing with the mysteries of redemption, often abounds in figure, which must not be taken literally; that is, it affords scope for the exercise of the imaginative faculties. In all ages, the figurative language of Scripture has furnished the material of mystical interpretation. It is not because the theory seems fanciful or novel that we propose to examine it, but because we believe it to be both exegetically incorrect, and dogmatically of very doubtful import.

The physiological conception on which it rests is that the blood, as separated from the "organism," *i.e.*, the body which it had before quickened, retains or suggests a principle of life, nay, that the life was actually liberated "in or with the blood." It must be left to physiologists to determine in what particular part of the living body the life resides; whether the blood, or the nerves, or the spinal cord, or the whole "organism" itself. We apprehend that the dispute has not yet exhausted itself, nor, indeed, is likely soon to do so. But of one thing we feel sure, that no physiologist would connect the idea of life with *shed* blood (*cruor*) as distinguished from blood circulating in the veins (*sanguis*). But we need not interrogate the votaries of science. What idea would the Jewish worshipper, what idea would any common man associate with a

vessel of shed blood (*cruor*, not *sanguis*), obtained by abstracting it from a victim the body of which lay on the ground before him? One only idea in our opinion; that of death, not of life. The moment the blood became *cruor*, it lost all its associations with life. It suggested, and could suggest, nothing but that a violent death had taken place. As long as it was in the veins, so essential is a healthy state of the blood to bodily health, it might be popularly said that the life was in the blood; drawn from the body, it would be as dead a thing as the body itself which it once animated.

But, of course, physiological objections must yield to the testimony of Scripture, if such can be produced. And the Canon does interpret Scripture in favour of his view. We cannot think, successfully. The capital passage is, of course, Leviticus xvii. 10, 11, "Whatsoever man of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood, I will even set My face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." There seems little difficulty in arriving at the sense of this passage. The Israelites needed an "atonement" (literally a *covering*) for their souls, *i.e.*, for the sins of which they had been guilty (every Hebraist knows that "souls" in Hebrew = persons); such a (typical) atonement Jehovah provided in the death of a morally innocent being, the animal being incapable of moral guilt; and as the symbol and sure sign of the victim's having suffered a violent death, its shed blood (*cruor*) was carried by the High Priest into the most holy place and sprinkled on the mercy-seat. It will be observed that there is not a word in this passage implying that "life," except so far as the covering of sin from the sight of God may be called life, was an element of the shed blood; one idea, and one alone, that of atonement (*Cipper, Capporeth*<sup>1</sup>), pervades it. "The life of the flesh is in the blood;"—certainly in this sense, that when the blood is drawn from the body, death, as a matter of course, ensues; but not in the sense that the life, passing out of the body, becomes incorporated in the *cruor*, or shed blood. The idea is not only without warrant from the passage, but repugnant to common sense. As an old and valuable commentator on the Pentateuch observes, "The blood is figuratively called the life, because the seat thereof is in the blood, as Moses here sheweth; so that if

<sup>1</sup> That is, the mercy-seat. The word is derived from the Hebrew *Caphar*, to cover; *Piel*, *Cipper*, to cover sin; *Capporeth*, the cover of the ark, on which the blood was sprinkled, lxx. *ιλατριπον*.

the blood be gone, the life is gone with it" [gone not into the shed blood, but gone altogether], "as daily experience confirmeth" (Ainsworth, on Leviticus xvii. 11). So that what the High Priest bore to the mercy-seat was not a life but a death—an atoning or covering death—the sure evidence of which having been suffered was the blood obtained, not merely by bleeding the animal, but by bleeding it to death. And the Jews were commanded not to eat the blood, but to cover it with dust; not, apparently, for the reason assigned by the learned author, "that a man might not use another's life for the support of his physical life" (if this means that he might not eat an animal alive, it may be true; but not if it means that he might not support himself by taking the life of an animal—see Gen. ix. 3), but to impress upon the Jew the sanctity of that which was appointed as the special symbol and type of Christ's atonement: "Let no man apply to the common use of nourishment that which I have given as a typical covering of your sin." Precisely in a similar manner, even "the bodies of those beasts whose blood was brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest for sin," since they were not, like other sacrifices, to be consumed by the priests, "were burned without the camp" (Heb. xiii. 11), and "in a clean place" (Levit. iv. 12), as being peculiarly holy from their direct reference to the Christian atonement, and therefore to be guarded from natural corruption. The blood was not to be eaten, but covered with dust, as being too sacred a symbol to be exposed to the same liability.

But we are told that "the slaughtering of the victim, which was properly the work of the offerer, was sharply separated from the sprinkling of the blood, which was the exclusive privilege of the priest" (Note, p. 35). No doubt it was: any offerer might slay the victim; only the priest sprinkle the blood upon the altar. And therefore in the Levitical ritual we cannot make the death of the victim strictly and formally equivalent to the sprinkling of the blood. Yet the two things were not distinct in nature, but parts of one great transaction, the covering of sin from the sight of God: and it was only the imperfection of the typical institute which rendered the separation necessary. The priest, the mediator between God and man, went into the most holy place "with blood of others" (Heb. ix. 25); he sprinkled the blood on the *Capporeth*, not because there was life in it, but as the evidence of an expiatory death, which (typically) silenced the accusations of the law within: the victim meanwhile lying dead outside the tabernacle. What was thus portioned out into several parts is united in the antitype Christ, Who is offerer, victim, and priest, all in one; and all connected, not

with the communication of spiritual life, but with propitiation for sin.

If the shed blood (*cruor*) had had the notion of life (in a sense different from that of covering sin) connected with it, it is not easy to understand why the Jew should have been forbidden to eat it. For such eating would have been a striking symbol of the appropriation of the life in the blood; in no other way could the worshipper have so intimately assimilated what is supposed to have been liberated with the blood. It would, in short, have been an eminent type of feeding on Christ by faith. That the Jew was forbidden, under the most stringent sanctions, to eat the blood; and thereby, if the Canon's theory is correct, to assimilate the life; is sufficient to throw doubts upon the correctness of that theory, and to confirm the conclusion that no life, except in the sense of remission of sin, was supposed to be in the blood.

Nor can we think that the passages which Canon Westcott adduces from the New Testament support his view; on the contrary, they seem in their obvious sense incompatible with it. We venture to say that in no instance is the expression "blood of Christ" directly used otherwise than with a reference to atonement—"We have redemption through His blood"—but it is that specific aspect of redemption which consists in "forgiveness of sins" (Eph. i. 7, comp. Col. i. 14); "the blood of Christ purges the *conscience* from dead works to serve God" (Heb. ix. 14); "by one offering He perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14), and His bearing His own blood with Him into the presence of God (whatever we are to understand by the transaction thus indicated) was but the completion of the expiatory work, the antitype of the completion of the Jewish atonement by the sprinkling of the blood on the mercy-seat. When St. Peter declares that Christians are "elect to the sprinkling of the blood of Christ," he directs our thoughts to the same topic. "We are saved," no doubt, "by His life," for if He had not risen from the dead we should have no living priest to offer the blood, no covenanted title to the gift of the Holy Spirit; but when "the blood" in the same passage is mentioned, it is in connection with justification, "much more being justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath by Him" (Rom. v. 9, 10). The substance of the song of the Church triumphant is, that the Lamb had "redeemed" them "by His blood" (Rev. v. 9).

But "the blood of Jesus Christ," we are told, "cleanseth us from all sin." No doubt this passage, on which the Canon's theory is suspended, bears, in its connection, on the doctrine of sanctification; but only as that doctrine always depends on the atonement as its foundation. For there can be no true

sanctification objectively except through the Holy Ghost, the fruit of Christ's atonement, nor subjectively, except the conscience is first cleansed from guilt. "If we walk in the light," the Apostle says, "as He is in the light," if we strive to be perfect "as our Father in heaven is perfect," we have indeed "fellowship one with another;" but another effect is also to be anticipated. Every step of advance in holiness will be accompanied with a corresponding increase of sensitiveness to the remaining defilement of a corrupt nature; so that the Christian, in proportion as he ascends the height, becomes conscious of the depth whence he has emerged. Yet, continues the Apostle, let him not be cast down by these discoveries. The atoning work of Christ, comprising both His death and the offering of His blood, though never to be repeated, is of continuous application, and "cleanseth us from all sin," actual and original; that is, it covers from the eye of God the imperfections which, in spite of his efforts after holiness, cleave to the believer. The reference is partly to that mysterious transaction in heaven of which we have but a limited knowledge, and chiefly, indeed, through the typical ordinance, but which is expressed in Scripture by "Christ ever living to make intercession for us" (Heb. vii. 25), Christ bearing "His own blood" into the holy place above, and applying it, as the High Priest did "the blood of bulls and goats," to the purposes of atonement or remission. We are aware that the word used in the passage for cleansing (*καθαρίζει*) sometimes denotes what we mean by sanctification; but we cannot think it does so in this instance.

We proceed to make some remarks on the dogmatical import of the theory. We are constrained to regard it as a symptom of the tendency, visible at present in many quarters, to substitute the *Redeemer* Christ for the third Person of the Holy Trinity, the Holy Ghost, in the economy of redemption. If Scripture is plain upon any point, it is upon this: that Christ, the incarnate Son, is no longer upon earth, but has passed into the heavens, to discharge peculiar and most important functions on behalf of His Church, but not offices connected with sanctification. The offices of King and Priest He discharges in His own Person, the office of Prophet He has delegated to the third Person, His Vicar, and only Vicar, upon earth. It was expedient for His Church that He should thus depart, no more to be present as the incarnate Son until He comes again; and that He should commit the active administration of this dispensation, calling, quickening, teaching, sanctifying, to the Holy Ghost, who by His interior and most efficacious operation more than compensates for the personal intercourse which the Apostles enjoyed with the Redeemer (see John xiv., xvi.). The Holy Ghost is now "Christ in us,

the hope of glory." Christ "dwelling in our hearts by faith;" the same Christ Who instructed and comforted the Apostles, for where the Holy Ghost is, there is in fact the Son; but Christ under the form, the *modus subsistendi*, of the Holy Ghost, not as the incarnate Redeemer. The essential deity of Christ, by virtue of which He is everywhere present as God, is not here the point in question, but His presence as the second Person of the œconomical Trinity, the Trinity of Redemption. And we repeat it: He is no doubt present on earth, but it is as the Holy Ghost, Whom He has formally appointed to take His place, Who proceeds from Him, and receives from Him what is to be, in the way of spiritual influence, imparted to the Church (John xvi. 14). When the Saviour promised "I will come to you," "I will manifest myself to him," "I will sup with him, and he with ME" (John xiv. 18, 21; Rev. iii. 20), "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst" (Matt. xviii. 20), it is to this indwelling of the Holy Ghost that He refers: the Holy Ghost, Who is in fact Christ, but Christ as the Holy Ghost, and not as the incarnate Son. Only they who reject the doctrine of the Trinity, or refine it away, can find a difficulty in this interchange of Christ and the Holy Ghost. Difficulties, perhaps to a finite understanding insuperable, do indeed attach to the doctrine itself, but not especially to this particular application of it. And it is one proof among others how vitally that doctrine is interwoven with the economy of redemption.

It is impossible, in our opinion, to over-estimate the importance of the great truth now under notice. No Christian, no Christian theologian, professes to ignore the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as set forth in Holy Scripture. Nevertheless, it is unquestionable that its full import and bearings are far from being realized as they ought to be. Hence the tendency alluded to, to bring down Christ the Redeemer from heaven to earth again, in His human nature, and to invest Him with functions which He has Himself expressly assigned to His Divine Vicar, the third Person; to the disparagement, or at least comparative forgetfulness, of the peculiar functions which "terminate in" (i.e., are specifically ascribed to) the third œconomical Person.

The danger will be best seen in the interpretations assigned to certain figurative expressions of Scripture, often used in this connection. We hear a good deal of "union with Christ," "the life of Christ imparted to us," "partaking of Christ's life," and the like; all good and Scriptural expressions, if properly understood, but liable to misapprehension. What do we mean by "union with Christ"? If we take it literally, we may lapse into those physical theories which find their ultimate result in

transubstantiation. The physical conception of the fact culminates in Leo's unhappy saying, "*Corpus regenerati fit caro Crucifixi*" (The body of the regenerate man is made the flesh of the crucified One), which has given rise to so many erroneous theories. But the Apostle, we are told, expressly declares that "we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones" (Ephes. v. 30). It is strange that they who insist on this strong figurative language should not perceive that the context is decisive against the physical view. The passage to which St. Paul alludes, and which he adapts to his purpose, describes, in its original application, the union of husband and wife—"Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be one flesh" (Gen. ii. 24)—language quite as strong as that of St. Paul. Was, then, the union of Adam and Eve a physical one, like that of the Siamese twins, and not rather a moral and spiritual union of the most intimate kind? The latter, no doubt. And such, and no other, is now the union of husband and wife, the figure which the Apostle employs to describe the union betwixt Christ and His Church. That is, the latter is a moral and spiritual union; not an immediate union of ourselves with Christ's glorified body, but a mediate union effected through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, Who (in this sense) does certainly unite us to Christ. "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit" (1 Cor. v. 17), not physically one flesh.

Again, it is said that "the life of Christ is communicated to His Church for its cleansing and growth" (Westcott, Note). The statement may, in a proper sense, appeal to Scripture for confirmation. "Christ is our life;" "Because I live, ye shall live also;" "I am the Life;" "He that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit." But the question is, what are we to understand, due regard being paid to the analogy of faith, by such language? If we suppose the present life of Christ in His glorified state to be literally communicated to us, it is not easy to form a clear conception of what is meant. The life of Christ while upon earth was not communicated literally to His disciples. What is there in the fact that He now lives in a glorified body to facilitate the conception? The saints, too, will exist in glorified bodies; but this will not, as far as we perceive, render them more capable of communicating "their life" to each other than when they had mortal bodies. It is obvious that, as in the former instance, the intervening link is wanting. Christ is our life, because from Him proceeds, as the purchased gift of His atonement, that Divine Agent Whose office it is *directly* to communicate spiritual life and growth. It may be that this, after all, is what is really meant by the language in question; but,

if so, why is it not expressly thus stated? Why is the office of the Holy Ghost in the work of redemption almost lost sight of? Why is mystical language employed about union with Christ, which, wrought out to its results, must land us in serious error? This practical eclipse of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost is, we may depend upon it, of serious moment; and not only so, but that all the theories which rest upon a supposed active administration of this dispensation by the incarnate Son lead, not remotely, to those physical views of the gift in the Eucharist of which the late Archdeacon Wilberforce's book on that subject is the fullest development. The "humanity," "the glorified humanity" of Christ has, of late years, played a conspicuous part in theological speculation; it seems time for us to dwell, in turn, upon "the Spirit of Christ," *i.e.* not "the life of Christ," but the third Person of the Holy Trinity—His gracious presence; His regenerating and sanctifying work; His assistance in prayer, interceding "in us with groanings which cannot be uttered" (Rom. viii.); His inward testimony assuring us that we are children of God (*ibid.*); His Divine teaching; His calling of ministers; His communication of spiritual gifts; in short, His discharge of the very offices, but in a more effectual manner, which Christ Himself would discharge if He, in His human nature, were present amongst us.

E. A. LITTON.



## ART. II.—PAU AS A WINTER RESIDENCE.

WHERE to spend the winter, is a question of yearly increasing importance to many whose health is too weak to stand an English climate without risk, and yet is susceptible of improvement under favourable circumstances. Each year more persons are sent abroad by our leading medical men, and each year more persons are enabled to resume their home duties and responsibilities, fortified by the effects of two or three winters' sojourn in a milder climate.

The south-west of France is less known to the general public than the Riviera and its neighbourhood, and yet its advantages are so great, and its points of interest so numerous, that it seems worth while to set them before the readers of THE CHURCHMAN as far as may be done within the limits of an article.

Pau is the centre of a district whose hallowed associations