

Correspondence between A. Allfree and Russell Gregory on God Manifestation with further comment by Phil Parry

Letter from A.Allfree:

Dear Russell, I have received your copy of the Netherton Debate.

I am sorry to say that your speaker in the debate lacks a proper understanding of the Atonement, and about Adam and Eve he seems to jump from one idea to another and so reaches no proper conclusions, so please do not send me any more of your literature,

Please read Eureka by Bro. J.Thomas. Yours faithfully, A.Allfree.

* * *

In reply:

Dear A.Allfree, Thank you for your note in response to receiving a copy of the Netherton Debate.

It is sad you do not agree with Ernest Brady's understanding of The Atonement.

The Christadelphian view makes Jesus Christ to have a body full of sin, which could only have been made so by His Father, and was then told He had to suffer the crucifixion in order to demonstrate what such sinful flesh deserved; and if He refused to go to the Cross He would have been a sinner and would have perished as such. There would have been no Atonement for Him or for us.

But a body full of sin is not a fitting sacrifice. Even the types under the Law had to be without spot and blemish and Jesus Christ, the Great Antitype, must not be considered inferior to the sacrifices under the Law. Neither is it any use saying that Jesus Christ was acceptable because His character was perfect, because it was not His character which He sacrificed; it was His body of natural life.

There is no love in the Christadelphian view.

Please read The Scriptures by Almighty God.

Yours faithfully, Russell Gregory.

A.Allfree Replies:

Dear Mr Gregory, I gather you do not belong to the Christadelphian body otherwise you would not have written such nonsense about the atonement and the nature of Jesus Christ, and in future be very careful what you write about this subject. With your views you could not belong to the true ecclesias. We believe that Christ was more than man but He was a man who was the vehicle of a manifestation of God.

From His mother Mary He derived all the faculties, propensities and instincts which belong to the first Adam. He took upon Himself the nature of the seed of Abraham that sin might be condemned

in the nature which had sinned. His body was prepared for a habitation of the Spirit in all its fullness so He could say, 'Lo, I come to do Thy will O God.' So He was called Immanuel = God with us.

So we see for the first time God manifest in the flesh and this could not be affirmed of any other man. He was the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.

How was the Deity manifested? We answer, in the character of the Son and His mental attributes. So Jesus Christ was the wisdom of God embodied in the flesh. He was the express image of His person character because it was ordained of Jesus that in Him should dwell the fullness of the Godhead bodily so He received the Spirit from the Father at His baptism without measure for the purpose of preaching the gospel and working miracles and that also He should have power within Himself to become perfect in all virtue (Colossians 1:2)

In Him all fullness dwelt so from the Deity His Father He inherited wisdom, thought, intelligence, elevation and purity of character, but this in no way excludes the fact that the perfect man so made for us was of the same physical nature and put to the proof and was in all points tempted like we are, for without temptation the perfection of the result would not have been manifest and so the Son put to the proof was it was in itself the excellent thing God had made a pattern of His (God's) own character, the exhibition of His own excellence, the interposition of His own power and kindness for the salvation of His people from their sins as Paul says in Hebrews, Jesus learned obedience through suffering, this manifestation of the Father explains to us why in a man the deportment of God is visible, why in sinful flesh a similar character was involved, why in the impotent seed of Abraham the power of Abraham's God should be shewn, why a man born as a babe in Bethlehem should speak of having come down from heaven, why a man not 40 years old should speak as if He had been contemporary with Abraham, why a man should at once be David's Son and David's Lord, why a man of our own flesh and blood should assume the authority that belongs to God only saying ye call me Master, and Lord and ye say well for so I am. He, Jesus, is not only the first-born among many brethren, He is their Head.

Without sin in Himself we are washed in His blood though it was blood drawn from our poor sin cursed stock clothed with strength crowned with glory and honour He Jesus has known the weakness of human exhaustion and the bitterness of ridicule and insult anointed with joy and gladness, He has a history of sorrow and grief, so we see Jesus rooted in the Eternal Father, so He could be tempted in the wilderness.

I would recommend you read "Eureka," Vol.1, page 106 (New Edition) = Deity Manifested in Spirit.

I do not have any notion to which denomination you belong to, but please do read the Word of God and get rid of your false ideas.

A.Allfree.

Comment:

While Mr Allfree has asked me not to write back to him I shall take this opportunity of looking as some of the points of doctrine in his second letter. His first, very brief letter was blunt and without explanation. In response to this my letter to him was also blunt but put over very succinctly our view of one of the aspects to be found in the teaching within the Christadelphian Statement of Faith.

In reply to this Mr Allfree writes mainly of his views on God-manifestation which are similar to those expressed by both Dr.Thomas and Robert Roberts and this is what I want to look at first of all, for he writes, "We believe that Jesus was more than man..." This statement is extraordinary as nowhere in Scripture is such a view taught. Indeed, Jesus Christ was a remarkable man and we would not wish for a moment to detract from His achievements nor take away the honour and glory due to

Him, but was God really manifested in Jesus by making Him more than a man? Dr.Thomas thought so when he wrote; “Jesus had two sides, the one Deity, the other man.” And if you think this is a little too close to Trinitarianism for comfort, and seems somewhat mysterious, then it was good enough for Robert Roberts who went along with the idea and wrote; “It may be difficult for us, as mere flesh-borns, to realize this combination of the human and Divine in one person, but the fact of the combination is self-evident.”

So here we have it - the Christadelphian version of God-manifestation; Jesus was more than man, Christadelphians are, in fact, to comprehend a being part man and part God, a combination of human and Divine!

Before dealing with God-manifestation as taught in Scripture let's take a look at R.Roberts statement:

“It may be difficult for us, as mere flesh-borns, to realize this combination of the human and the Divine in one person, but the fact of the combination is self-evident.”

I have said before that R.Roberts was very clever in his use of words and here is an excellent example of his manipulation of his readers. Let's take a look at this example and see what he is doing to the reader. First of all he tells us something is difficult for us to understand; nevertheless he proposes to let us know what this difficult thing is - and in saying this he has made himself superior to his readers; after all, he knows something they are going to find hard. This strategy is necessary because he is about to tell us the bit of nonsense he wants us to believe, something which is “far-fetched” and he really doesn't know what he is talking about but in his position he feels he ought to know, so pretends he does and we can't until he tells us. So then he says what it is, and adds of course that it is self-evident, and by saying this he prevents being questioned, because the reader who has already been made to feel inferior, now feels intimidated and thinks it must be foolish of him to doubt the writer. The fact that it is supposedly self-evident, then the reader must be lacking in comprehension, but would not like to admit it. Of this statement of Robert Roberts, Ernest Brady wrote, “he should produce the evidence and meet the objections. But Robert Roberts did neither. He made the round assertion and blamed anyone who queried it with lacking in spiritual education.” When reading Robert Roberts works beware of these tactics; they are his “stock in trade,” and are not conducive to the study of the Scriptures, They are not enlightening to those who seek truth.

Coming back now to the subject in hand, it is our advice to leave any doctrine that has the any semblance of “mystery” to The Mother Church and her many harlot daughters and go to the Bible to see how Jesus Christ manifested His Father. He tells us, in John 5:19, “The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son. For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that he himself doeth.” How did Jesus manifest God? Why, of course, by doing His will, and in doing His Father's will He developed a character similar to His Father's. Straightforward, unambiguous and to the point.

It was prophesied in the Psalms 40:7,8, “Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart.” And when He came He said, “I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me. (John 5:30), By doing God's will perfectly (and so can we) He reflected His Father's character, so when Philip asked Him, “Lord, show us the Father,” Jesus was able to say, “Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works...”

With so much evidence of God-manifestation before us from the mouth of Jesus Christ Himself let us not make a mystery of it by adding to what is written. And let it be said that we can all be obedient; Jesus proved it can be done. “Be ye therefore perfect” is the command of the Lord Jesus to

each of us, and He meant what He said. Perfect obedience is attainable for each one of us and thus we can reflect His character as did Jesus Christ; we can and ought to manifest God in our lives. This does not make one a mysterious “combination of the human and the Divine in one person.”

The fact is simply that Jesus Christ derived His life direct from His Father as we do from ours and He was born of Mary, from whom He received the only kind of natural human body known to us; flesh and blood identical with all other people. I see no difference between Jesus and Adam; both Sons of God, both remarkable people, both with the same capabilities, attributes, faculties, and of equally intelligence. One failed to keep God’s law, the other did not. Jesus Christ was tempted in all points as we are, yet without sin and thereby He became our example and pattern, showing us that we too can be obedient. This is why Jesus Christ was justified in condemning sin, and this He did while He Himself was in flesh like ours. He was proving that we could and should be obedient and that there was nothing wrong with our flesh; we cannot blame our “sinful flesh” for our failures. He “condemned sin” while He was “in the flesh.” (Romans 8:3).

Jesus Christ is most certainly our Lord and Master and we do well to live by His commands, but He alone was in the position to give His life in place of ours. He bought us with His own precious blood and His life-blood was precious because it was not sold to Sin; whilst we are all born into the bondage of Sin as a result of Adam’s transgression. The one life given to Adam at creation has been passed down to us through generation after generation - a life which Adam by transgression, forfeited any right to; and but for the grace and mercy of God would not have continued. Jesus Christ was a new creation - He had another life from God, not life via Adam. Nowhere in Scripture are we told Jesus was a descendant or son of Adam. He was truly the Son of Man because He was related to the human race through Mary, His mother, but not through any male line traceable to Adam. He then gave His life in place of Adam’s life as the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world. Thereby redeeming Adam and all who share his forfeited life.

A few other points may be worth mentioning. Mr Allfree says that “Jesus inherited wisdom, thought, intelligence, elevation and purity of character.” None of this is true except perhaps the fact that intelligence can be inherited in some measure. Wisdom, thought, and character are not inherited in any sense whatever, while all can be developed with application.

Again, Mr Allfree contradicts himself where he writes; “He took to Himself the nature of the seed of Abraham that sin might be condemned in the nature which had sinned.” I see two misstatements here. Firstly Jesus did not take to Himself the nature He had unless of course He pre-existed. He had the nature His Father gave Him - the same nature as the rest of us. Secondly, the nature which sinned in Eden was very good nature, which, so they say, was changed afterwards to very bad nature; so, does Mr Allfree mean that Jesus Christ had the same nature in which Adam sinned? We would say, Yes, of course, but this would contradict Mr Allfree’s other claim that Jesus had sinful flesh which was not the nature before Adam sinned. There are other expressions and phrases in this letter which convey little or no meaning such as, “the perfect man” after being tempted became “perfection” and “This manifestation of the Father explains... why... the deportment of God is visible,” etc.

However, it is this idea of flesh being sinful that brings about all the trouble in Christadelphian thinking, and it has been Church doctrine for about 1400 years while before that it was pagan belief for several centuries.

With our last Circular Letter we sent out the booklet entitled “The Usage and Meaning of Muth Temuth and B’Yom” which gives positive proof that when God said to Adam that “In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die,” He meant what He said and Adam understood it. Adam and Eve hid in the Garden because they feared for their lives. There is no hint of any physical change to their flesh whatsoever.

Several times we have heard it said of the Nazarene Fellowship that in our understanding of Genesis 2:17 we start marching on the wrong foot, but this booklet shows we start on the right foot and are on the right pathway all the way through. We see Christadelphians as not starting on the wrong foot so much as launching themselves into flights of fancy on reading the early chapters of Genesis, then flying straight for Romans 8:3 which they briefly look at to confirm their hypothesis, without checking the grammar; a quick glimpse at Romans chapter 7 to convince themselves they are right in supposing they can't help themselves sinning from time to time; over to Hebrews where they pick out the most difficult passage they can find (13:20), and say their understanding of it is the only right one and make the assumption that Jesus Christ had to die for Himself; and then dare to say we are wrong! So please, stop and think and reason, before it's too late. We ask all who read this to prove whether Muth Temuth means natural death or inflicted death, and whether B'Yom means the very day of 24 hours or an age of a thousand years in Genesis 2:17; and to prove whether Romans 8:3 means flesh is full of sin or that it means flesh belonging to Sin as a 'Master'; whether Romans chapter 7 refers to Paul or others before or after conversion; and whether Hebrews 13:20 proves or does not prove Jesus had to die for Himself. Once these Scriptures have been proved, then is the time to re-think the Statement of Faith.

Russell Gregory.

Further Comment from Phil Parry

A Reply to Mr. A. Allfree and "Eureka", Volume 1,

"There is a generation that are pure in their own eyes, and yet is not washed from their own filthiness." Proverbs 30:11.

UNCLEAN, PHYSICALLY CONDEMNED FLESH?

See "Eureka," Volume 1, page 248.

"Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! ' To what end is it for you? The day of the Lord is darkness, and not light. As if a man did flee from a lion, and a bear met him; or went into a house, and leaned his hand on the wall, and a serpent bit him," Amos 5:18, 19.

FEAR OF THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST, YET PREACHING HIS COMING?

In accusing the late E.Brady of not understanding the true meaning of the Atonement and declining to give the meaning himself on the basis of Holy Scripture but directing us to the reading of "Eureka" by Dr.Thomas, and our knowledge after reading this and other matters on the same subject by his successors, Mr. Allfree's community in general would well fit the words above quoted from two sources of the Scripture and also his own adopted policy in making an accusation, i.e., fleeing to Dr.Thomas from the lion, and meeting a bear in the process. Indeed, in his exposition of the true meaning of the Atonement, Brother Brady was a lion compared to the weak case Dr.Thomas put up for the Lamb of God, for when he expressed the truth in one part of his writings he destroyed it in another part of the same book.

Take for example Mr. Allfree's statement about Jesus:-

"From his mother Mary he derived all the faculties, propensities and instincts which belong to the first Adam. He took upon Himself the nature of the seed of Abraham that sin might be condemned in the nature that had sinned."

We pause here to reflect on Mr. Allfree's mind and thinking. Why did he not say "Jesus took on him the nature of the first Adam that sin might be condemned in that "very good" nature in which sin was committed"? The latter is what Dr. Thomas stated, so why the interpolation in reference to the seed of Abraham unless Mr. Allfree found he had met with a bear?

That bear seems to be his belief in the false doctrine of "changed flesh" or "Original Sin" as defined in Clause V of the B.A.S.F., the mythical nature in which sin was never committed in the Garden of Eden, neither outside it. The Statement Dr. Thomas made was true but whether he realized the true meaning and import of it is not clear judged by other statements in connection with the same subject. For indeed he has stated in "Eureka" that not only was sin a physical element pervading the physical flesh, but that human nature is "Sin." The following is quotation from "Eureka," volume 1, page 248, (taking into account Dr. Thomas' admission that left to himself without modification to a higher nature of incorruptibility Adam would have perished eventually), he continues his theme: -

"Seeing that man had become a transgressor of the Divine law, there was no need of a miracles for the infliction of death (reader please note!). All that was necessary was to prevent him eating of the Tree of Lives, and to leave his flesh and blood nature to the operation of the laws peculiar to it. It was not a nature formed for interminable existence. It was "very good" so long as in healthy being, but immortality and incorruptibility were no part of its goodness. The animal or natural body may be transformed into a deathless and incorruptible body, but without that transformation, it must of necessity perish.

This perishing body is "Sin," and left to perish because of "sin." Sin, in its application to the body stands for ail its constituents and laws. The power of death is in its very constitution, so that the law of its nature is styled "the law of Sin and Death." In the combination of the elements of the law, the power of death resides, so that "to destroy that having the power of death," is to abolish this physical law of sin and death, and instead thereof, to substitute the physical "law of the spirit of life," by which the same body would be changed in its constitution, and live for ever."

I must say I am sad but nevertheless amused at the following words by Dr. Thomas and I quote part of them:-

"By this time, I apprehend the intelligent reader will be able to answer scripturally the question, "What is that which has the power of death?""

Any intelligent reader would accept the Dr's. statement that Immortality and incorruptibility were no part of Adam's created "very good" nature and it was therefore subject to a physical law of decay like all animal creation by Divine appointment of the species. But from this point on, he is in direct opposition to the teaching of the Apostle Paul who declares "The law of Sin and Death" to be a legal, not a physical constitution. A legal state of bondage to the Constitution of Sin into which he had been sold when in the loins of Adam, and from which he had been made free through the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus, without any necessity of a superior change of nature as stated a necessity by Dr. Thomas.

Dr. Thomas failed to understand that sin, being transgression of law was abstract, performed under law by a body of flesh and blood, but could not afterward change from abstract to a physical element and enter the physical flesh as a permanent resident.

One becomes a sinner by transgression of law, not by a change of flesh. Transgression of law is sin and applies to character not flesh; the flesh of a sinner is the same as the flesh of a righteous man.

Abel and Enoch were righteous men, but their flesh was the same quality as that of Adam before he sinned and after he sinned; so also was that of Cain who was a murderer by law.

With any applied intelligence in reading Genesis, Dr.Thomas should have come to this conclusion but instead he went completely off the track and ignoring what God had said would be the penalty, he turns this around by deciding what God needed only to do in order to inflict the death penalty. If then we leave it at that, all that awaited Adam and Eve was the prospect of final death resulting from their corruptible nature as created. There is no release - no coats of skins for sin-covering - the penalty stands and also passes upon all who sinned in Adam. What then of understanding the Atonement. Mr. Allfree, and your advice to our Brother Gregory to read "Eureka" by Dr. Thomas? What were the first words of the Creator to Adam for his continuance of natural life in the Garden? Did He say, "If you eat of the forbidden tree you will be prevented from eating of the Tree of Life by being turned out of the Garden, and you will be left to die in accordance with the operation of the laws peculiar to your flesh and blood nature"?

No! He did not. He said, "For in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. We agree, it needed no miracle for the infliction of death; all it required was an instrument for the taking away of the life in the blood, hence the origin of the shedding of blood and "Sacrifice." This is exactly what we are taught in Genesis and which points to the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world in the type, but slain by wicked hands on Calvary's Tree. in both cases it involved the shedding of blood, and in both cases life was given, that life might not be taken, firstly in Adam's case and secondly in our case when we become enlightened to the legal position. Dr.Thomas' theory of natural process of decay and ultimate death bears no resemblance to the meaning of the Atoning Work of God in Christ. His emphasis in "Eureka" of the blood of Christ being more precious than the blood of other men by reason that He had not been generated by the will of man but of God through the power of the Holy Spirit, becomes of no importance when he says, "Eureka" volume 1, page 247:-

""Sin" is a word in Paul's argument which stands for "human nature," with its affections and desires. Hence, to become sin, or for one to be "made sin" for others (2 Corinthians 5:21) is to become flesh and blood. This is called "sin," or "sin's flesh" because it is what it is in consequence of sin or transgression."

We are therefore to accept Dr.Thomas' version that Jesus was Sin's Flesh? GOD FORBID! Here again Paul's teaching is confounded and misrepresented for Paul does not teach that human nature stands for "sin" and he only teaches that unlawful desires and affections can lead to sin but as long as they are kept in check they cannot be styled sin. The Apostle James also confirms this. So here we have the Doctor stating that because Jesus was flesh and blood He became "sin," and that, while a babe. This is another misinterpretation of Paul's teaching based on the Edenic and Mosaic sacrifices which the Apostle understood perfectly after his conversion to Christ. We can therefore understand Jesus being made of a woman and flesh and blood for others, that He might be made sin as were the sacrificial animal types under the Law in having people's sins transferred to them and making them sin-offerings. Thus the animal was described as being "made sin" in the place of the one who had sinned. The same applied to Jesus who was perfect in every way a human being of flesh and blood was expected to be, and at the age of 33 approximately, He was made a "sin-offering" for us in the manner stated and as applicable to the Edenic transgression and the Mosaic, without the shedding of blood is no remission of sin. - a Life taken by this means, and not contrary to Divine Law - that which dieth of itself, natural death as taught by Dr.Thomas, Christadelphians, and most denominations as being the penalty.

God manifested His Power and attributes throughout history in many ways and especially His Holiness through Moses, for He said "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh unto me, and before all the people I will be glorified." He manifested Himself in the Angel which led Israel through the wilderness and warned, "My Name is in Him," also in the Cloud and Pillar of Fire, in Mt. Sinai, in the Tabernacle, the Ark of the Covenant, the medium of speaking indirectly His Holy Word. All a condition of approach; those approaching Him must be in the position of holiness required. Jesus was.

Mr.Allfree accuses our late Brother Brady of not understanding the Atonement and advises a reading of "Eureka" volume 1 under the heading of "Deity manifested in Spirit." Here Dr.Thomas makes a great display of rhetoric by teaching a dual Christ perfect in character but styled flesh of sin in which dwells no good thing and was like our flesh, in all points; weak, emotional, and unclean- He goes on to say "Sin had to be condemned in the nature which had transgressed in Eden," but he makes a complete hash of Scripture by stating that in the nature in which Adam sinned there dwelt no good thing and was therefore unclean, whereas God said it was "very good." Not only so, but Paul says; "God sent His Son in the likeness of this flesh which had become Sin's possession or sin's flesh, not by reason of being changed, but through Adam changing to another master and serving him whose wages is death (Romans 6:20-23). There was no difference in the quality of Adam's flesh after transgression and Dr.Thomas recognized this through lack of evidence to prove otherwise in Genesis; hence the use of the word "likeness" by Paul who could discern by the Spirit what Dr.Thomas could not, this being the importance of ownership and relationship. Jesus was God's Son by begetting through the Holy Spirit; a New Man sent with a mission from His Father which was necessitated by Adam's failure.

Nowhere in Scripture does it say of Adam that he bore God's Name, for Adam did not qualify to that exalted position unlike Jesus, who said to the Jews:-

"And the Father Himself which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen His shape. And ye have not His Word abiding in you: for whom He hath sent, Him ye believe not... And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life" (John 5:37-40).

The latter should appear rather a presumptuous statement to any who believed Jesus to be owned by "Sin" and styled "Sin's Flesh" needing to be released from this Lord and Bondmaster, to become God's Servant. Nevertheless this is the position in which an intelligent reader of "Eureka," volume 1, page 247, and of "Phanerosis," also by Dr.Thomas, would find he had placed Jesus.

How could any intelligent reader of the Holy Scriptures conceive the idea of Deity manifesting His Word and Name in one inhabited by the Diabolos (or Devil)? Where the need for God to prepare a body if it was not to be a body free of Adamic life under pledge through sin, so that Jesus could freely give such a life to pay the debt?

No preparation of a body was necessary according to Dr.Thomas if sin-in-the-flesh or the Devil was already in Adam's flesh and the flesh of all his posterity. Any descendant of Adam would meet the case if self-destruction or otherwise resulted in death, for Dr. Thomas maintains in "Eureka" this power of death is the process of decay and changed nature resulting from Adam's sin in Eden, and he describes it falsely as "the Law of Sin and Death" from which a person can only be made free by a change to incorruptible spirit nature. I say falsely because Paul, while in flesh and blood nature, informed the Roman believers he had been made free from the Law of Sin and Death through the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ, so that neither of these laws related to the workings of the physical body, but the legal and moral relationship through the effect of sin by Adam, or the imputed Righteousness of Jesus, the two Federal positions - Federal Sin and Federal Righteousness. We also have, like Paul to leave the former to be under the latter by the knowledge and belief in the Atonement correctly understood.

I know for certain and without boasting, that the Spirit of Truth working in me has scored points for the Word of God in contrast with the words of men. But the motive is not to boast or to score points but to show where the Truth is to be found and that Mr.Allfree will appreciate the exalted position pointed out by Dr. Thomas of Jesus manifesting Deity in the highest way possible but reject his final mistake of dumping Jesus into the dung-heap of condemned sinful flesh.

In "Eureka," volume 1, page 101, I quote Dr.Thomas and his "Dual Christ" error:-

“Did the union of Spirit with flesh annihilate that Spirit and leave only flesh? Was the holy thing born a mere son of Adam?, or “the fellow” and “equal” of the Deity? The latter unquestionably.”

If as Dr. Thomas argues, the product (flesh and blood) was Deity, why the mention even of Adam, let alone a mere son? Yet reading on from page 108 Jesus is brought down to the level lower than Adam in nature by His being clothed in the garments of filthy flesh, etc. etc., and I take it that Mr.Allfree refers this to be the body God prepared by which He could, in dying to condemn its “sin-content,” take away the Sin of the world, and also destroy him that had the power of death - which if it be the decay peculiar to our nature is still with us. I beg you, Mr.Allfree, read the Bible and compare its truth against the errors we were all taught by men.

Our late Brother Brady and the Nazarenes accept the meaning and teaching of The Atonement as stated by Dr.Thomas in “Eureka,” volume 1, pages 20 to 21, beginning at bottom paragraph and commencing with the subject of Redemption. His only mistake we find, is his belief that “The Law of Sin and Death,” is the corruptible and decaying nature resulting in natural death. As I have pointed out, Paul said he had been made free or released from this legal predicament yet was still alive as an active servant of God. Therefore, if our Brother Brady and his brethren and sisters in Christ believed and understood Dr. Thomas’ version here referred to on pages 20 and 21 as in harmony with Paul’s statement, what then is your understanding of the Atonement, Mr Allfree? Does Dr.Thomas teach two versions for our choice? The Scriptures only teach one and this is the one which Brother Brady understood and taught, and booklets are obtainable from Brother R.V.Gregory and myself.

Yours Sincerely in Jesus’ Name and defence of The Truth, P. Parry.