

AN EXAMINATION OF *THE CHEMISTRY OF THE BLOOD*

by

J. C. Settlemoir

A printed copy of this article is available for \$1.00 from

Bryan Station Baptist Church
3175 Briar Hill Road
Lexington, KY 40516

INTRODUCTION

In 1943 M. R. De Haan, M.D., a well-known radio preacher and the founder of the Radio Bible Class, published a book entitled *The Chemistry of the Blood*¹. In this book, De Haan takes the position that *sin is in the blood and is transmitted through the blood*. He goes on to argue that the father alone is the contributor of the blood of an embryo and the mother alone is the contributor of the body of an embryo. It is, he contends, the only way Christ could be born without sin, as he got his body from his mother, and his blood from God the Father. Otherwise, Christ would have had the blood of Adam, and thus would have been a sinner!

De Haan's position became a mark of orthodoxy among a considerable number of Baptists, even among sovereign grace landmark Baptists. There is a wide spectrum of Baptists today who hold to De Haan's theory. When a preacher makes the statement that the blood comes only from the father or that sin is in the blood, he will be sure to get many hearty "Amens." This theory was accepted without question among the Arminian Baptist churches (the American Baptist Association) with which my folks were associated when I was a child. No one in those churches, so far as I know, ever questioned the idea that sin was in the blood! I first heard this theory at the knees of my father, who listened to M.R. De Haan on the radio and who read his book on this subject. When I first read *The Chemistry of the Blood*, I knew nothing of biology and very little about the Scriptures. Of course, the book is very convincing when one considers the quotes De Haan makes from medical text books, and that he was himself a surgeon.

Let me emphasize at the outset that I have nothing against M. R. De Haan. His name was held quite high by my father and others with whom I was associated in my early years. I believe I learned from him as I listened to him on the radio and read several of his books. He held to the veracity of Scripture, the deity of Christ and other great fundamentals. I do not question him nor his motives. My only concern with his teaching in *The Chemistry of the Blood* is, *What saith the Scriptures?*

I thought it improper to write upon this subject without contacting Radio Bible Class Ministries² (RBCM) to ask them their present position on this subject. I received a nice letter from Kurt E. De Haan, the Managing Editor of RBCM and a grandson of M.R. De Haan. He informed me that RBCM would not now “give unqualified support to the book as originally published.” They have, in fact, revised the book as to this idea of sin being in the blood, and that blood comes only from the father.

IS SIN IN THE BLOOD

This is De Haan’s theory. Is it true? Do the Scriptures teach this doctrine? I believe it can be clearly demonstrated that no such doctrine is taught in the Bible. This is false doctrine pure and simple. If this theory is false, then the whole thing goes down.

My contention is that this theory, that sin is in the blood, is neither taught nor implied in the Scriptures. Because of this one error, many others are introduced and, consequently, this original error is compounded. Some of the more glaring mistakes De Haan made I will now list, with the pages where the reader may find the references. Only the quotes are actually De Haan’s words.

- 1] The blood of a child comes from his father alone, and “the male sperm is the source of the blood”; “...Every drop of blood in an infant’s body is the contribution of the male parent,” p. 32, 35,42.
- 2] The body of an embryo comes from his mother alone, p. 36. She contributes no blood at all to the embryo, p. 33, 42.
- 3] The blood of Adam came directly from God, p. 36; the blood was put into his body when God breathed into him the breath of life; De Haan calls it “a separate gift of God,” p. 14; p. 41.
- 4] The only cause of corruption [of a dead body] is sinful blood, p. 27.
- 5] The blood of Adam was changed in some way when he sinned and thus became sinful blood, p. 14. “Sin is a disease of the blood,” p. 25. “Sinful and polluted blood,” p. 14, “. . . Adam’s blood, which was completely impregnated with sin.”

- 6] Sin is transmitted only through the blood, p. 13, 24; sinful heredity is transmitted through the blood, p. 31; cf. p. 36.
- 7] Sin is in the blood and not in the flesh. Flesh can only be called sinful flesh because it is nourished and fed and sustained by sinful blood, p. 14, 24. On p. 15 the author says “He [Christ] had not a drop of Adam’s sin in His veins.”
- 8] Physical death is the result of death in the blood, p.13.
- 9] The Holy Spirit contributed the blood of Jesus, Mary, His body. This blood was divine blood, p. 36; on p. 42 he says “the virgin-born Son of God, with a human body, but sinless supernatural blood, inseminated by the Holy Ghost.” “His blood was of the Holy Ghost.”
- 10] Christ did not partake of the same flesh and blood as His people did. “ONLY Jesus is called the Seed of the woman, because He was born of a woman and was without one drop of human blood in His veins”; p. 25. On p. 36 the writer says: “The children [referring to Heb. 2] 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.” p. 42.

It is my position that every one of these ten propositions is false or contains false elements.

DE HAAN’S THEORY DISPROVED

If I did not know the first thing about biology, I would argue that De Haan’s theory of the father contributing the blood, and the mother the body of a child is flatly false. I have seen many children who are so much like their fathers they could pass for twins. I am one such child. I am the same size as my father was. I weigh about the same as he did. My left eye droops exactly as his did. The older I get the more I look like my dad. On the other hand, my mother was a very small woman and never weighed much more than a hundred pounds and there is very little resemblance between me and my mother as far as appearance is concerned. Every reader knows this is true in countless cases. These facts alone disprove De Haan’s position, if we had no other evidence than observation.

DE HAAN’S THEORY DISPROVED BY BIOLOGY

But, secondly, De Haan’s theory, that the blood of a child comes only from the father, and the body comes only from the mother, goes contrary to commonly known and easily ascertained facts of biology concerning the genetics of reproduction. I believe his idea is a scientific blunder

which exceeds anything I ever read which was written in modern times! De Haan's theory would require us to throw out the factual foundation laid by Mendel³ on the genetics of reproduction!

The idea that the father alone is the source of a child's blood is completely false. My wife has O+ blood and mine is A+. My son has O+ blood. This is genetically predictable when one considers the blood is derived from both parents but it is impossible with De Haan's theory.

It is a fact that is clearly and easily demonstrated that the things male and female children share, are contributed by both parents. The parents together contribute the blood, the mental capacity, the resistance or susceptibility to disease, the appearance, the color of hair, eyes, skin, and every other inheritable trait common to both male and female. The traits which are not common to both male and female are sexual. "The 46 chromosomes of human somatic cells actually consist of two 23-chromosome sets (22 autosomes and 1 sex chromosome per set), with one set derived from the individual's father and one from the individual's mother."⁴ The male chromosome (XY) does not contribute the blood to the child, for only male children receive this chromosome. Therefore every non-sexual organ, every muscle, every bone, every gland, every nerve, and all the other parts, and extracellular materials, including the blood, are derived from both parents.

If the blood comes only from the father, then where do female clones get their blood? "Cloning is the production of a group of genetically identical cells or organisms, but all descended from a single individual."⁵ The cloning of a viable human is not yet done to my knowledge, but they have just this past year (1997) cloned sheep in Scotland and if the Lord does not intervene, I believe they will clone humans. As these cloned sheep were yews, one can only wonder where their blood came from, according to De Haan's theory.

DE HAAN'S QUOTES ARE MISAPPLIED

But someone will object: "De Haan quotes medical textbooks to support his theory." And this puzzled me. While I knew there had been great strides in genetics in the last fifty years, (my copy of De Haan's book has the date of 1943, and it is the fifth edition) I was quite certain that the basics of genetics had not changed all that much. Therefore I tried to obtain each of the three medical text books from which De Haan quoted. Through the interlibrary loan I was able to obtain two of the books quoted, however I could not obtain the exact editions quoted. The two text books obtained contained no hint of De Haan's theory that the blood comes only from the father and the body only from the mother.

The quotes he gives in his book are irrelevant to the purpose for which he quotes them. He quotes from *William's Practice of Obstetrics*, third ed., p. 133, as follows:

“The foetal blood in the vessels of the chorionic villae AT NO TIME GAINS ACCESS TO THE MATERNAL BLOOD in the intervillous spaces, BEING SEPARATED FROM ONE ANOTHER by the double layer of chorionic epithelium.”⁶

And again he quotes from the *Nurse's Handbook of Obstetrics* by Zabriskie, R.N., fifth edition, p 75:

“When the circulation of the blood begins in the embryo, it remains separate and distinct from that of the mother. All food and waste material which are interchanged between the embryo and the mother must pass through the blood vessel walls from one circulation to the other.”

And from the same book he quotes p. 82:

The foetus receives its nourishment and oxygen from the mother's blood into its own through the medium of the placenta. The foetal heart pumps blood through the arteries of the umbilical cord into the placental vessels, which looping in and out of the uterine tissue and lying in close contact with the uterine vessels, permit a diffusion, through their walls, of waste products from child to mother and of nourishment and oxygen from mother to child. As has been said, this interchange is affected by the process of osmosis, and there is no direct mingling of the two blood currents. In other words, no maternal blood actually flows to the foetus, nor is there any direct foetal blood flow to the mother.” *Ibid.*, p. 34.

The problem with these quotes is that they say not one word about the point to be proved! The point he is attempting to prove is that the source of an embryo's blood is from its father alone. What he quotes only teaches what no one denies— that the blood of an embryo does not ordinarily mingle with that of its mother. In fact the blood of the mother and that of the embryo may be two entirely different and incompatible types. But this has not one thing to do with the *source* of that infant's blood.

De Haan does not produce a single quote, from either Scripture or Biology, which supports his proposition that the blood of a baby comes from the father alone and its body comes from its mother alone and if he knew of such authority surely he would have produced it.

De Haan would have us believe that sin was lurking in the blood of Mary, separated from Christ only by the villae of the placenta. And if one drop of her blood passed through the placenta into the body of the Lord Jesus He would have been a sinner!⁷ “Some venereal diseases can be transmitted to the fetus, particularly gonorrhoea, syphilis and ...AIDS.”⁸ “Jesus could have a human body, but one drop of Adam's blood would have made him a sinner like you and me.”⁹ While it is not normal for a mother to send her blood to her fetus, it does happen. Can anyone believe our Lord came so close to being a depraved sinner? This is a theory totally foreign to the teaching of Scripture. Similar faulty thinking developed the immaculate conception of Mary and a host of other fanciful, bazaar, and false teachings. We have higher ground for the foundation of Christ's impeccability.

DE HAAN CLAIMS THE BLOOD OF ADAM CAME DIRECTLY FROM GOD

As I reread this message in De Haan's book, I was surprised to see no appeal to Scripture to prove his propositions. Indeed he did allude to some passages, but not once does he say, "This is the text which proves my proposition." And you don't have to wonder about it, when a writer is seeking to prove a proposition scriptural without Scripture, you can be sure he has none!

De Haan writes "The breath of God put something in man that made him ALIVE. That something was blood. It must have been. It could be nothing else . . ." ¹⁰

Now this is how errors get started! It could have been a thousand other things, so far as we know, for with God all things are possible. But we are not left in doubt about this. The Scripture says: "And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Ge 2:7). Notice the text does not say that God put *something* into man, but God "*breathed* into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul!" Adam was perfectly created. He was all there. He had a brain, he had a heart, he had lungs and he had blood. He had every essential except life. And for De Haan to say Adam lacked blood is not exegesis but imagination! If there had been a Scripture which taught this doctrine, it would have been given instead of a mere assertion.

DE HAAN CLAIMS THE ONLY CAUSE OF CORRUPTION IS SINFUL BLOOD

This is stated on p. 27. Surely no one would make such a statement without some Bible evidence! Yet the reader will look in vain for any. Indeed the author does quote Ps 16:10: "[For] Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither with thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." But there is not a word in this text which states *the cause* of corruption. He goes on to say: "Lazarus being dead only one day more¹¹ was said by his sister to be STINKING with corruption, but this One saw no corruption because the only cause of corruption, SINFUL BLOOD, was absent from His flesh."

What is wrong with this position?

The first thing wrong with De Haan's statement is, he gives no Scripture for it. It is merely an assertion! If sinful blood is the only cause for a dead body's corruption, then one wonders why dead animals stink! Do they have sinful blood?

This reminds me that Augustine claimed that peacock meat would not rot! He said he tried it himself and found that it was indeed true.¹² And some people will believe such claims simply because they wish to believe them. It has nothing to do with evidence for there is none and I beg to be excused.

De Haan also claims that something happened to Adam's blood when he sinned. "Since life is in the blood, when man died [spiritually], something happened to the blood. Sin affected the blood of man, not his body, except indirectly, because it is supplied by the blood. For this very reason sin is not in the flesh but in the blood."¹³

Now where is this found in the Scripture? He gives no Scripture to prove it. He expects the reader to accept his word on this. I maintain that Adam's blood (and Eve's too) was exactly the same the day before they sinned as it was the day after, as far as sin is concerned. Whatever difference there may have been was the effect not the cause. Their blood was the same type, same color, the same as to sin and there was no corruption in the red fluid which did not result from the effects of their depraved hearts. Just as we say "He has wicked hands," "he has a vile mouth" or "his brains are perverted." Yet no one, I suppose, really believes that the hands, the tongues, or the brains of such individuals, are actually sinful. These are but the instruments of sin. And when someone receives a heart transplant from a wicked man, surely no one would think that the organ can impart character to the recipient. And neither will blood impart character to an individual, either good or evil.

SIN IS A MATTER OF THE HEART

Sin has ever been a matter of the heart: "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man."¹⁴ Notice our Lord does not look at the blood as the place where sin resides, but at the heart! The blood is no more corrupt than the body, but the heart—the spiritual part of man—is another matter. "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked: who can know it?"¹⁵ But where is the text that says the blood is desperately wicked? When God looked down on the antediluvians did He see that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that *his blood was completely evil*?¹⁶ Surely God knew the source of sin in man, surely God saw the real problem in man, and surely God did not think it in one part of man while it was really in another part! Therefore, if God said sin was in the heart, then it was not in the blood but in the spiritual nature of man.

There can be a moral and spiritual disorder in the soul without a perversion of the substance or essence of the soul or the body. This is the real nature of a depraved soul. It is a matter of the heart and it has nothing to do with the body and it has nothing to do with the blood. B. H. Carroll said: "The members of the body are merely instrumental, and Paul says that *all sin is apart from the body*. The body cannot sin. The body is used as an instrument of sin, but the sin comes from the inner man; it comes out of the heart of the man."¹⁷ Total depravity is a spiritual and moral defect, not a physical thing.

IF A MAN LOSES HIS BLOOD WOULD HE BECOME SINLESS

Does a man become less sinful as he bleeds? Maybe the old bloodletting had spiritual advantages which it lacked for medicinal purposes. If sin is in the blood as De Haan teaches, then the loss of blood would be a positive thing. And if man could substitute all his blood with something else the consequence would be a sinless man! Just such a substitute has been devised and used successfully. Fluosol, a fluorocarbon emulsion was developed by Dr. Leland C. Clark in 1966. "Finally, consider the case of a patient who had fallen into a deep coma caused by infectious hepatitis. The diseased liver poured toxins into the blood, and the toxins poisoned the liver cells, thus creating a vicious cycle of liver destruction. Dr. Gerald Klebanhoff of Lackland Air Force Base Medical Center used artificial blood to break this cycle. He drained the patient's blood entirely and replaced it with artificial blood. This removed the toxins and allowed the beleaguered liver to begin to recover, while life was sustained by the blood substitute. After a short time, the artificial blood was drained and replaced with whole blood. The comatose patient awoke in the recovery room a few hours after the procedure, attesting to the success of the total blood replacement."¹⁸ According to De Haan's theory this man would have been sinless during this procedure as he had no sinful blood in his body!

SCRIPTURE DOES NOT TEACH THAT SIN IS IN THE BLOOD

The one great objection to these ideas, that "sin is in the blood" or that "Adam's blood . . . was completely impregnated with sin," is, they cannot be found in the Bible! Look where you will. Read prophet, read apostle, read the inspired historian or listen to the words of the Lord Himself, but you cannot find these theories in the Bible!

Sin is a matter of the heart, and is found in the so-called psychological core of man. It is the inner personality of a human being that is corrupted with sin. Sin is in the spiritual recesses of man and not in his capillaries. There is no physical part of man which compels him to sin. Man sins because his nature is sinful. When man sins it is not because there is some poison in his blood, in his flesh, or in his brain. There is nothing in the substance of a man which makes him sinful. It is his spiritual nature which is corrupted. The Scripture calls this depraved nature by such terms as, an evil heart, a carnal mind, the law of sin, the old man, the flesh, and filthiness of flesh and spirit.¹⁹ This position is further supported by the terms which the Scriptures use to speak of the regenerate: They are said to have a spiritual mind, to be the new man, to be a new creature and to have a new heart. But where is the Scripture which speaks of bad blood, good blood or new blood? De Haan himself gives no Scripture to prove his proposition and I do not believe any can be given.

T.P. Simmons says: "The basis of depravity and spiritual inability lies in the heart. It is deceitful and incurably wicked (Jer. 17:9). Out of the heart are the issues of life (Prov. 4:23). No one can bring a clean thing out of an unclean one (Job 14:4). Hence neither holiness nor faith can proceed from the natural heart. Good things proceed from a good heart and evil things proceed from an evil heart (Mt 7: 17, 18; Lk 6:45)."²⁰ Notice here that Simmons does not teach that evil things proceed from bad blood.

SIN IS NOT TRANSMITTED BY THE BLOOD

De Haan says, “So potent was this poison [of the tree of knowledge of good and evil] that six thousand years after, all who are related to Adam by human birth still succumb to that poison of sin which is transmitted through the blood.”²¹ The author quotes Acts 17:26 which simply says all men have a common origin. We are all related. This text teaches that we all came from the same source. Whether we are Jews, Greeks, Scythians, barbarians, bond, free, or whatever we all have the same ancestry. “The main idea, beyond question, is that God had created the entire human race from a common stock . . .”²² There is not one word in this text about the transmission of sin by any means, much less by the medium of blood.

Nor, because the lineage of man, in Scripture, is traced through the male generally, are we to think this means sin is transmitted through the blood of the male. For as we have already seen the blood comes from both parents. It takes one illogical (not to mention unscriptural) leap after another for De Haan to come up with this fallacious position. The blood of the race came equally from Adam and Eve not from Adam alone. Eve is the mother of all living, (Gen.3:20). Both Adam and Eve have the common name of Adam, “Male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created,” (Ge 5:2). Where is the Scripture which teaches that sin is transmitted through the blood?

Now it is a secret which God has not seen fit to reveal how depravity is transmitted from the parents to the children. We do know that when a child is conceived in the normal way he is depraved. We know that Christ had the same flesh and blood which we have yet He was not depraved. This means that neither sin nor depravity are transmitted via blood.

CHRIST TOOK OUR NATURE

The Word of God says that as the children of promise took part of flesh and blood the Lord Jesus Christ took part of the same. “For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil”; (Heb. 2:14).

De Haan denies this. He says “. . . But Christ took only part, that is, the flesh part, whereas the blood was the result of supernatural conception.”²³ He tries to substantiate his position by referring to the margin of his Bible and from the Greek of Hebrews 2:14.

He quotes his Bible margin thusly: “In the margin of my Bible, I read that the word translated ‘took part’ implies ‘taking part in something outside one’s self.’”²⁴ I assume De Haan was using a

Scofield Bible which has this note on He. 2:14: “The word trans. *took part* is not the same as that trans. *partakers*, but implies taking part in something outside one’s self.”²⁵

De Haan then gives the meaning of *koinoneo* as “to share fully,” and for the meaning of *metecho* “to take part but not all. The children take both flesh and blood of Adam but Christ took only part . . .”²⁶ He tries to draw a distinction between *koinoneo* and *metecho* yet they are clearly synonyms as Spicq states: “The nuance of intimate sharing, of assimilation, already suggested by the use of the verb *metecho* for eating or instruction, is revealed by its interchangeability with *koinoneo*: ‘so, since children have flesh and blood in common (*kekoinoneken*), he also shares (*meteschen*) in these same things.’”²⁷

Let the reader mark well De Haan gives no source for this definition of *metecho*.

Why not?

This word means: “to be or become partaker; to partake . . .”; — Thayer’s. “Share, have a share, participate w. gen. of the thing in or of something . . .”: — *A& G*. “To partake of, enjoy a share of, share in, take part in . . .” — *Liddell & Scott’s*. “To be partaker of, to share in...” — *Berry’s Lexicon*. “...To share or participate . . .” — *DNTT*. “*Metechain* always means ‘to have a share in’”: — *TDNT*, Vol. II, p. 830.²⁸ I might give other references, but these will suffice to prove his definition is not supported by the lexicons.

In Heb. 2:14, De Haan meets a passage which flatly opposes his doctrine. This text teaches that Christ *likewise*²⁹ took part of the same flesh and blood as we did. T. P. Simmons, in reference to this passage, said: “Christ’s body and human nature were in all respects like our own, except that there was no taint of sin in Him. He was the flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood.”³⁰ Lev. 25:49. Which reads “nigh of kin” in the KJV, and Gill says the word “*goel* signifies both a redeemer and a near kinsmen,” Com. *loco*³¹ His participation in our flesh and blood was absolutely essential because only a near kinsman could redeem. Therefore, Christ was related to his people.³² “...They are of one man, Adam, Christ is a son of Adam, though not be ordinary generation, they descend from him in the common way; they are all of one nature, of one blood; Christ has taken part of the same flesh and blood with them...” Jn. Gill, Com. He. 2:11.³³ He became their Kinsman Redeemer. This Scripture declares this truth in express terms: Christ participated in, He shared in, He took part of, the same flesh and blood we did and there is no exegetical reason to exclude the blood any more than there is to exclude the flesh. If you exclude either flesh or blood, there can be no relationship and no Redeemer. De Haan’s theory says Christ did not take part of our blood! And while this is without doubt unintentional, it is yet an attack on the humanity of our Redeemer. The text says He took part of both our flesh and our blood.³⁴

THE BLOOD OF GOD

One of the texts which is often produced to prove that Christ received His blood not from Mary but directly from God³⁵ is Acts 20:28. “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.” Strangely, De Haan does not quote this verse which, on the surface, seems to teach his theory.

There is no question that this clause, *He hath purchased with His own blood* means the church was purchased with the blood of God. The antecedent of the pronoun is not *God the Father* in vs. 27 but *God* in the clause *church of God*. This text does not support the idea that the blood of Christ came directly from God the Father, but it teaches the deity of the person of Christ! It is Christ’s blood of which Paul here speaks because God the Father has no blood, no body parts and no similitude of any kind, being a pure Spirit. All the references to God having body parts are anthropomorphic.³⁶ God’s right hand is His mighty power. *His feet* is a term that signifies that He moves, and His eye that He sees. Yet there is no body, no bone, no blood in God. When the elders of Israel *saw God* they saw a Christophany for God is invisible. When Christ’s body was prepared, we are to understand that his body and all its organs, His physical appearance, His blood, and every other part of his physical nature came from His mother, but without sin. De Haan says: “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.”³⁷ But this is false!

He was the seed of the woman. His conception was supernatural for both his body and his blood! His divine nature came from Heaven. In great humility He disrobed himself of His Deity and was made in the womb of his mother and by this means the pre-existent One came into union with real human nature, both flesh and blood.³⁸ This union of the divine with sinless human nature is what gave His blood that powerful efficacy so that He could redeem us. It was not the other way around as De Haan and so many others believe. If both His body and blood were not human, then how could His sacrifice be effective to redeem fallen men who were human?

But why then does the text say “the blood of God”?

Because anything true of His Divine nature is true, and can be said, of the whole person. Just as we say of a man who is strong and healthy, but depressed in mind, John is very low. Now we speak of his mind only, but it is true of his person. On the other hand we say of one at the point of death, he is very well, because he is full of faith and anticipating glory, while his body is wasting away. Thus, we say of the person of Christ, that His blood, his head, his hands are Divine. Not because the organs of His body are Divine, but because He is a divine person. This is the way the Scripture speaks of the two natures, referring what is true only of the human or the Divine to His person.

Thus whatever is true of Christ as a man can be said of Christ as a person. We read of Him being weary. Was deity tired! We read of Him being hungry. Was deity hungry? We read of him being acquainted with grief, shedding tears, being angry, weary and being ignorant of certain things. Who would claim that these things pertain to God? But they were true of the person of Christ because they were true of His human nature. He said while on earth that He was in Heaven, that He was before Abraham, which things were not meant of His human nature which had its

beginning when He was conceived in the virgin Mary. But these things were true of His person. This is, I believe, the correct interpretation of Acts 20:28.

This is the teaching of Scripture in other passages pertaining to the Incarnation. “In Romans 1:2-5, the Apostle says that the gospel concerns the Son of God, who is our Lord Jesus Christ, who, as to his human nature, *kata sarka*, is the Son of David, but as to his divine nature, *kata pneuma*, is the Son of God. Here also the two natures and one person of the Redeemer are clearly asserted.”³⁹

The blood of Christ was divine in the same way his hands and feet were divine--because He was a divine person. His body and his blood came from the same source. He was as human as we are, on the one hand, and as much God as His Father was on the other. Yet these two natures were not mingled. His blood was the blood of God because His person was divine, not because His blood came from Heaven.

CONCLUSION

We have looked at *The Chemistry of the Blood* carefully. We have examined its claims and found them to be fallacious and absolutely opposed to the truth of God. We have presented good solid evidence, from many quarters, which conclusively proves these theories are unsubstantiated, unscientific and, most importantly, unscriptural.

Because there is no biblical support for the idea that sin is in the blood, nor for the errors that orbit around it, there should be a public rejection of all of these errors in the churches. It is not enough to merely stop teaching these doctrines, where they have been taught. We must not only proclaim the Word of God, but we must also disclaim these errors as we proclaim the truth. Where these thorns are embedded in the sheep, we must first extract them. Then, and only then, can the healing begin.

We must learn to reject such theories, as these put forth by De Haan, because they do not have a “Thus saith the Lord.” Those who espouse these ideas do give definitions of the words they use but they are not right definitions. They do quote authorities but they misapply the quotes. They do refer to doctrines but not those in accordance with the analogy of faith. They do quote Scripture but the Scriptures quoted do not support the propositions. Therefore such false teaching, even though it may have the hash marks of centuries on its sleeves, and on its shoulder the laureates of a thousand campaigns, and on its chest medals from many a battle, such teaching, I repeat, must be rejected for the error of it. We must prove all things by the Word of God. Cunningly devised fables may sound convincing, they may use scriptural terms, they may come in orthodox garb and they may be paraded as the truth of God, but they are false none-the-less because they are not founded upon the proper exegesis of Holy Scripture.

Remember, these kind of errors— and this one concerning the blood in particular— run in the minds of a thousand men who never read De Haan’s book, who never spent five minutes time to see if the Scripture does indeed teach his theories, who will never check out the novel meanings

assigned to words and without the support of authorities. They heard someone declare these theories and they took them on human faith. Investigation and research were excluded.

Once such an error is introduced into the minds of preachers and congregations, it is almost never totally eradicated. Thus, we must learn to challenge, at the very door, every doctrine that cannot give a “Thus saith the Lord.” Let the fight begin then and there. It is better to fight at the door than in the pulpit and in the pews!

1 *The Chemistry of the Blood*, M. R. De Haag; Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Fifth Edition; 1943. The book is a series of nine messages. It is the first message only which is discussed in this article.

2 RBC Ministries, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49555-0001

3 Gregor J. Mendel, was the first person to discover the basic laws of heredity and suggest the existence of genes. He was an Austrian monk. Mendel’s work was published in 1866 but was not recognized until 1900 when other scientists discovered the same laws independently. The laws Mendel discovered laid the foundation for the science of genetics.

4 “There are 46 chromosomes in each of the human somatic cells (all cells except the reproductive cells). Two of these are sex chromosomes (two X chromosomes in females; one X and one Y chromosome in males). The remaining 44 chromosomes are called autosomes. The 44 autosomes consist of 22 pairs of similar-appearing chromosomes. One member of each pair contains genetic information derived from the individual’s mother. The other member of each pair contains genetic information derived the individual’s father. Each pair comprises a set of homologous chromosomes. The two sex chromosomes (XX) of the female are also homologous, but the two sex chromosomes (X and Y) of the male are not homologous. Homologous chromosomes each possess genetic information that controls the same functions or characteristics. Often the genetic information on one chromosome of a homologous pair takes precedence over the corresponding genetic information on the other chromosome of the pair. If the genetic information derived from the individual’s father takes precedence over the genetic information derived from the individual’s mother, the paternal functions or characteristics will be dominant and the individual will display the paternal functions or characteristics. In such a case the maternal functions or characteristics are said to be recessive. If the maternal genetic information takes precedence over the corresponding paternal genetic information the individual will display the maternal functions or characteristics. If neither the paternal not the maternal genetic information for a particular function or characteristic is dominant, the individual may display some intermediate function or characteristic.”

“The 46 chromosomes of human somatic cells actually consist of two 23-chromosome sets (22 autosomes and 1 sex chromosome per set), with one set derived from the individual’s father and one from the individual’s mother. Thus the gametes (reproductive cells) of male (the sperm from the testes) and female (the ova from the ovaries) each contain only 23 chromosomes. When a sperm fertilizes an ovum, each gamete contributes 23 chromosomes, thereby establishing the full 46 chromosomes in the new individual.”
Basic Human Anatomy, A. P. Spence, p. 40.

5 Grolier Electronic Publishing, Inc.

[6](#) *Chemistry of the Blood*, p. 34. The capitalization is De Haan's.

[7](#) While the blood of an embryo does not ordinarily mingle with the blood of its mother, yet some things in the blood do pass through the placenta in one direction or the other. These include, oxygen, carbon dioxide, glucose, amino acids, fatty acids, various ions, antigens and other substances. This is how the RH positive fetus gives antigens to its mother. If another child is carried with the RH positive factor, the mother's plasma now possessing anti-RH antibodies may send these across the placenta and this may cause the baby to have a severe anemic condition. While modern physicians do not speak of these materials as blood, it is quite certain that no one before modern times could have appreciated this. If sin is in the blood, then if any thing from the mother's blood passes over to the embryo through the placenta (and this is the case), it is difficult to see why sin might not also pass through the placenta, if anyone can conceive of sin as being in blood as poison is in water! De Haan's theory requires the placenta to be impermeable to sin!

Let the reader consider carefully what we all know. Some venereal diseases can be passed from the mother to the fetus and where this risk is known to be present, routine tests are conducted before and during pregnancy to test for these infections and, if possible, treat them before harm is done to the fetus.

[8](#) Grolier Electronic Publishing, Inc. Cf. *Infectious Diseases*.

[9](#) *Chemistry of the Blood*, p. 25.

[10](#) *Chemistry of the Blood*, p. 14.

[11](#) De Haan here takes the position that Christ was in the grave seventy-two hours. Cf. Luke 24:31; Mk. 15:42, the word preparation always means Friday.

[12](#) Cf. *Miracles Yesterday and Today*, Benj. Warfield, Eerdmans, p. 77.

[13](#) *Ibid.*

[14](#) Mt. 15:19-20,

[15](#) Jer. 17:9;16:12.

[16](#) Gen. 6:5.

[17](#) *Interpretation of The English Bible*, Baker Ed., Ex.-Lev., p. 192.

[18](#) *Basic Human Anatomy*, Alexancer P. Spence, p. 268.

[19](#) II Co r. 7:1 "Where not only gross wickedness, such as procedeth from fleshly and brutish lusts is called filthiness, but such as is more spiritual, unbelief, heresy, or misbelief, & c., nay, original corruption is called so: Job 14:4, 'Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?' " — Thomas Manton, *Exp. of James*, p. 148.

[20](#) T.P. Simmons, *Systematic Study*, p. 168

[21](#) *Chemistry*, p. 13.

[22](#) *The American Commentary on the NT, Acts*, Hackett, p. 206.

[23](#) *Chemistry*, p. 36.

[24](#) *Chemistry*, p. 35.

[25](#) *Scofield Reference Bible*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1945, p. 1293. Whatever the Scofield editors may have meant by the phrase no reference which I have seen gives this meaning. It is interesting to compare this text in the new Scofield Bible. It does not have this note or any other on Heb. 2:14.

[26](#) *Chemistry*, p. 36.

[27](#) *Theological Lexicon of the NT* by Ceslas Spicq, Vol. 2, p. 481.

[28](#) This verb occurs in the NT eight times: I Cor. 9:10,12; 10:17, 21,30; He. 2:14; 5:13; 7:13.

[29](#) *Likewise* is the translation of a Greek word which occurs nowhere else in the NT. Yet the meaning is clear. "The word does not show clearly just how far the similarity goes. But it is used in situations where do differentiation is intended, in the sense *in just the same way...*" A& G. P. 621.

[30](#) *Systematic Theology*, p. 86. Chrysostom commented on this verse : ' It means not merely "in like manner," but "in absolutely the same manner." '

[31](#) *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. 4, Heb. P.267.

[32](#) The context carefully spells out just who it was that Christ was related to. In verse 10 they are called "sons," in 11 "Both he that sanctifies and they who are sanctified are all of one";

[33](#) in 12 and 17 they are called "brethren;" in 13 and 14 they are called "children" and in 16 they are called "the seed of Abraham." These are but other terms for the elect of God and Christ was related to us, and because we partook of flesh and blood, in time He also partook of the same flesh and blood as we did, but without sin. "Now rather than engaging in a debate between Newton and Einstein, it seems better to say that whatever body fundamentally is, Jesus had a body of the same composition as those of Mary and Peter." *The Atonement*, Gordon H. Clark, p. 43.

[34](#) Lest the reader think scholars and commentaries support De Haan's view, a few references are given: *Hebrews*, Pink, p. 122; Cf. *Hist. of the Christian Ch*, Schaff, vol. I, p. 563, #2; *NT Theology*, Guthrie, p. 363; *Interp. of Heb*, Lenski, p. 89; *Meyer's Com.* Heb., p. 441; *Gill's Com.*, Heb. 2:11; *Institutes*, Turretin, II, p. 307; *Systematic Theo.*, Berkof, p. 333, 1, a. A host of others could be given.

[35](#) Cf. *Chemistry*, p. 36, 36,41,42.

[36](#) Cf. Ex. 15:3; Num. 12:8; Ex. 24:10, 11; Gen. 2:2; 6:6; Hos. 11:8; Jn 4:24 with Ps. 50:21.

[37](#) *Chemistry*, p. 36.

[38](#) As it was a real man by which death came, so also must Christ be a man as real as Adam, I Cor. 15:21.

[39](#) *Systematic Theology*, Hodge, Vol. II, p. 385.