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 Christ: not by water only   
 not in the water only, but in the but by water and blood.   
 pon xiv7- water and in the blood. k   
 xsi 13. And the| 4nd it is the Spirit that   
 Trim. ii.a6,   
 are used of our Lord in Heb. ix. 12, 25, It rests now then that we enquire into   
 which chapter is the best of all com- the meaning of each expression. On the   
 ments on this difficult first, there cannot surely be much   
 by water and blood has been very vari- uncertainty. ‘The blood of His Cross must,   
 onsly understood. Two canons of interpre- by all Scripture analogy, be that intended.   
 tation have becn laid down by Disterdieck, ‘The pouring out of this blood was the   
 and may safely be adopted: 1) “ Water” eompletion of the baptism which He had   
 and “blood” must point both to some to be baptized with, Mark x. 28, 29, Luke   
 purely historical facts in the life of our: xii. 50. And if this is so, what can the   
 Lord on earth, and to some still present term water be referred so simply, as to   
 witnesses for Christ : and 2) they must not that baptism with water, which inangu-   
 he interpreted symbolically, but understood rated the Lord’s ministry? It might in-   
 of something so real and powerful, as that deed be said, that the baptism which He   
 by them God’s testimony is given to bee instituted for His followers, better sa   
 lievers, and eternal life assured to them, fies the test of our 2nd canon, that vi   
 ‘These canons at once exclude all figurative being an abiding testimony in the Chris-   
 interpretations, such as that of Socinus tian Church. But to this there lies the   
 und his school, in which water stands for objection, that as blood signifies some-   
 the purity and innocence of the life and thing which happened to Christ Himself,   
 doctrine of Christ, Heb. x. 22, Eph. v. 26, so must water likewise, at least primarily,   
 —and blood for the death of Christ as His whatever permanent testim   
 testimony of Himself. may have left in the Chris   
 Diisterdieck observes that it is ‘And thus some modern Commentators   
 that the best Roman-Catholic expositor, have taken it; as uniting the historical   
 Estius [whose commentary is unfortunately fact of the Lord’s baptism with the ord   
 broken off at this verse], does not, as some nanee of baptism, grounded on it, and   
 have done, interpret blood of the Sacra- abiding in the Christian Church. Diister-   
 ment of the Lord’s Supper, but puts toge- dieck refuses to accept this view, denying   
 ther water and blood, as Calvin and Luther. that our Lord’s baptism was any proof or   
 So that, as Diisterdieck proceeds to say, testimony of His Messiahship, aud under-   
 the great leaders of the three schools of standing water of the ordinance of bap-   
 theology have had the tact to see that which tism only. But surely we are not right   
 their less skilled followers have missed in interpreting the words “ He that caine   
 secing,—that blood cannot by any means ly water,” He that ordained baptism:   
 be understood of the Lord’s Supper, as nor in giving the two, blood and water,   
 has been done by many. an entirely different reference. For his   
 ‘The next point which comes before us endeavour to escape from this by making   
 is to enquire whether at. all, or how far, the former represent not Christ’s death   
 our passage is connected with John xix.34? but His blood, applied to us, cannot be   
 It ocenrs here, beeanse many Commen- accepted, as giving a “non-natural”   
 tators have scen in the incident there re- sense to the words “he that came by   
 lated a miraculous symbolizing of the two Blood” likewise.   
 sacraments, and in this passage an allusion All this being considered, it seems im-   
 to that incident. To deny all such allu- possible to avoid giving both to Blood and   
 sion seems against probal The Apostle water the combined senses above indi-   
 could hardly both here and in that place cated, and believing that such were before   
 lay such evident stress on the water and the Apostle’s mind. They represent,—the   
 blood together, without having in his water, the baptism of water which the   
 mind some link connecting this place Lord Himself underwent and instituted   
 and that. The idea that we have here for His followers,—the blood, the baptism   
 nothing more than » reference to the fuct of blood which He Himself underwent,   
 of John six. 34, is against our 2nd canon and instituted for His followers. And it   
 above: but that John xix. 34 and this is equally impossible to sever from these   
 refer to the same fundamental truth, is I words the historical accompaniments and   
 conceive hardly to be doubted. associations which arise on their mention,