

Ernest Brady to Viner Hall

Dear Brother Viner Hall,

I was much interested to read the copies of your letters to John Carter and A.D.Norris and I return them herewith as requested. Thank you for sending them. As there was no covering note I assume that you still feel you cannot address me, so be it.

I am deeply sorry that our respective convictions should have this result and although I believe you to be grievously in error in regard to the nature of Christ and His death, I have great respect for you and admiration of your work and walk, and it is my hope and prayer that neither of us will be ultimately rejected, but find however humble a place in the Kingdom.

I have much sympathy with your complaint against Christadelphians in regard to their di-theistic tendency of late, but as I have shown in "What God Hath Cleansed," both R.Roberts and Dr.Thomas were confused on the question, though I do not suppose you will agree.

Even yourself however, in attributing Christ's success in overwhelming temptation, to His Divine begettal, are making Him different in nature from us, and although you strenuously insist on The Word as the source of His knowledge and strength, and that it was by His character, words, and works that men saw in Him the Father, yet if, as you say, "all these excellences were latent in Him" in a sense in which they are not latent in us (because of His birth), surely you too are making a metaphysical difference between Him and us.

If you claim that "the Holy Spirit gave Him a higher type than His brethren of purely Adamic stock," are you not also falling into the same error as S.T.Coleridge, and the Methodist minister you reprove? So far as A.D.Norris is concerned, I am bound to agree with the gentleman you quote - he certainly multiplies words and befogs everybody - probably himself included. I fear he has got above himself.

I must say however, that in one point on which you criticize him, I think he is correct. The blood of Christ was indeed God's own blood, in the sense of course, that it was His Property; just as Christ Himself was God's own Son. I think you are mistaken on your assertion that the blood of Christ was the blood of sin's flesh which Christ inherited from His mother. I understood it to be a biological fact that there is no connection between the blood circulatory systems of mother and child, but that when a new life commences, its blood is newly created in the embryo, from the nourishment of the parent. Thus, Jesus being begotten by a miracle, neither His blood nor His life which it sustained, can be the life of Adam.

This does not mean that either Jesus flesh or His blood, or the nature and quality of His life were different from Adam's or any other man's, but that He was a man newly created, from the Source. I believe that, as much of this as A.D.Norris accepts, he has learned from correspondence with me. I suppose you would say, so much the worse for him; but we shall see.

I agree with you in condemning his foolish talk about "the race of woman." The woman was Adam, as God says in Genesis 5:1-2, "In the day that God created man, in the

likeness of God made He him, male and female created He them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam.”

It is not surprising that A.D.Norris ignored your question, as to what he implies by saying that Adam was condemned both to a physical death, and death in the sight of God. Here again I think he has learned something from us, but dare not face up to it, and is seeking to combine what he realizes is true with the Christadelphian principle of physical condemnation. In truth, as I believe, the only death Adam incurred by sin, was death in the sight of God, and this death will be literally inflicted upon un-repentant sinners in the Day of Judgment. As I have shown in “What God Hath Cleansed,” pages 76 to 78.

Both Dr.Thomas and R.Roberts admit that Adam was corruptible and capable of death at his creation. Do you regard these as legitimate quotations, and do they fairly represent their views? If so, they contradict the teaching that the imposition of physical death was the penalty of sin, do they not?

You speak of Christ as having sin-impregnated-flesh, but I do not know of any Scripture which justifies you in speaking of sin-impregnated-flesh in either Christ or any man. If you have read any of our booklets you must know that we at least do not believe that Christ was incapable of sinning. Anyone who was so foolish would be making Him no more than a puppet. But if Adam was capable of sinning before he had the supposed sin-impregnated-flesh, and we know he was, because he did, why should not Jesus have been capable of sinning without having sin-impregnated-flesh?

You say truly that the glory of Christ consisted in His victory as a man and that those who hold Him not subject to the same innate susceptibility to temptation as every other son of man, would rob Christ of His glory. But do not you do this very thing when you say, “His begetting by the Spirit conferred upon Him a more susceptible organization – made Him of a quicker understanding - of a keener perception; by reason of His special mental-endowment - (Christ) was advantaged above all other men for the work of subdual of sin.”

You apply “Made strong for Himself,” as proving this superior mental endowment by reason of His birth, but if so you nullify the reality of His suffering under temptation. What is your reasoned objection to our contention that His strength lay in the fact that as Son of God, and free from Sin, His life was His own to give for our Redemption?

I cannot understand your assertion that “Our Lord Jesus Christ was what He was by the grace of God - for He could not save Himself, as witness Hebrews 5:7.” This says that in the days of His flesh He offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears, unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared. This does not indicate or prove that He could not save Himself, or that He Himself needed salvation.

It proves that He feared and dreaded the awful suffering and death, which He knew was necessary for our salvation.

I feel sure you must agree that this is a reference to His agony in Gethsemane and that Luke 22:43 gives us the explanation of how He was heard in that He feared; we are told “There appeared an angel unto Him from heaven, strengthening Him.” Knowing the terrible things through which He was shortly to pass, it is no wonder that sometimes His courage failed and His resolution wavered. “Though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the

things which He suffered.” You say that the fact that God “made Him strong for Himself precluded boasting even in the Lord’s case.” I would certainly not suggest that Jesus ever boasted, but I feel sure you are wrong in arguing that He had nothing of which He could not justifiably have boasted; indeed, in denying His right, you are minimizing His Sacrifice and giving Him too little honour. Myself I feel it would be impossible to give Him too much.

“I have trodden the winepress alone” “Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world” “Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down His life for His friends.” There are many other such passages, which while I think it would give a false impression, to say were boastings, nevertheless, suggest Jesus’ just claim to a recognition of His personal Greatness and the glory of His accomplishment, which your reasoning denies Him.

With very sincere regards,

Ernest Brady.
March 1959