

## Strifes About Words — The Atonement

*Q.: In view of the allegations made in "The Believer" that "A.J." of England, whose articles have recently appeared in "Logos", is really a pseudonym for "J.P.A." and that he is teaching the doctrine of alienation, I would appreciate it if you would confirm or deny this claim. — G.G. (NSW).*

*Ans.* The article in *The Believer* is from the pen of Brother E. J. Russell, the Secretary of the Central Standing Committee of Sydney.

We regret the appearance of such articles, especially from one holding such a position as Secretary of an organisation designed to weld Ecclesias together. A simple enquiry to us would have put his mind right upon several matters upon which he presumes to unfairly and incorrectly dogmatise.

Actually, though we are referred to directly in that and other articles published in the same periodical, we had not intended to notice either it or them, for we felt that the Brotherhood is distracted enough without adding to the confusion. However, such requests as the above (twice made) plus many others that we have received, demand some answer.

### **Fact And Fiction Regarding The Atonement**

On re-reading the article, it appears to us that Brother Russell is at variance with the Unity Book issued by the Central Standing Committee.

Otherwise he would not write about Brother "A.J." as he does,

nor suggest that the signature is a pseudonym for "J.A.A."

Who is A.J.? The answer is Brother Arthur Jannaway, who vigorously co-operated with Brother Roberts in opposing the errors of Andrewism, and setting forth the truth concerning the Atonement. With his brother, F. G. Jannaway, he was a regular contributor to *The Christadelphian*.

As a matter of fact, some of the comments of Brother F. Jannaway are contained in the Unity Book (see p.76) to illustrate the truth in contrast to the errors of Andrewism. They are taken from *The Christadelphian* of 1894, which Brother Russell also quotes (*The Believer*, p.6). If he cares to examine that volume of *The Christadelphian*, he will find large sections of it taken up by the writings of Brother Jannaway.

It was a principle set forth by Brother Roberts, endorsed by Brother Jannaway, included in the Statement of Faith, and incorporated in the Unity Book, that the consequences of Adam's sin inherited by his posterity were physical and not moral or legal.

It was Brother Andrews who set forth the additional concept

that the posterity of Adam inherited the legal condemnation of his sin, and that because of legal condemnation all, including Jesus, are "children of wrath because of their nature." That doctrine is and ever has been opposed by *Logos*. We become children of wrath only when we obey our nature by giving way to its lusts. This Jesus never did, and thus was always at one with his Father.

These facts, and the intricacies of the present controversy, are obviously cloudy to the mind of Brother Russell, for he apparently endorses the very principle that Brother Carter refutes in the Unity Book, and, which in fact, was the foundation doctrine of the late Brother Andrews.

For the latter's doctrine of alienation was based upon the theory of legal condemnation inherited through the sin of Adam.

From this Brother Andrews taught that we are "by nature children of wrath," and unless we are justified therefrom by circumcision or baptism, we cannot be raised from the dead to judgment, no matter how knowledgeable we might be in the Truth.

Unconsciously (for we do not believe that Brother Russell understands the implications of his words), the author of the article in *The Believer*, seemingly condemns the teaching of the physical consequence of Adam's sin, and implies that it was legal. We say this because he condemns the claims of "A.J." that our nature is "evil and condemned," etc., and quotes apparently in deprecation (for his words are far from clear), the Editorial in *Logos* that oppos-

ed the teaching of "legal" defilement resting on Adam's posterity. He writes:

"Then in January, 1971, there appeared another unsigned article in "Logos" (p.135) which claimed that Bro. Roberts repudiated the concept of 'legal' defilement . . . and clearly showed that the nature of the defilement was physical."

But our words are in exact accord with what the Unity Book teaches, confirming our belief that some who quote it do not know or understand its contents.

On p.66 it repudiates "legal" defilement such as Bro. J. J. Andrews taught, and which Brother Russell seemingly supports.

Moreover, it fully supports that physical defilement came by sin as taught in *Logos*.

Consider these passages:

"Through Adam's sin the original very good state was lost, and his posterity inherit a nature with a tendency to sin to which all have succumbed. Because this inherited tendency is so evident a characteristic of human nature, and because it is the result and the cause of sin, Paul by the use of metonymy can describe it as sin: 'It is no more I but sin that dwelleth in me. He gives it other names as well, such as 'a law — evil present with me', the 'flesh', 'a law in my members, etc. (Rom. 7).' — Unity Book, p.20.

"We cannot help the possession of the natures with which we were born; our nature needs changing." — Unity Book, p.20.

"There are impulses that lead to sin . . . that are the result of sin at the beginning, which we have by inheritance" — Unity Book, p.32.

"Our relationship to Adam is physical; we share the evil and the mortality that belongs to him. But that physical inheritance is our misfortune; we cannot help it, and we are not to blame for it" — Unity Book, p.77.

"Was Jesus born under condemna-

<sup>ation</sup>  
sense of hereditary condemnation, the answer is, yes; but this requires to be fenced against the misunderstanding to the terms employed" — Unity Book p.78.

Christ "was a sufferer from the hereditary effects of sin; for these effects are physical effects. Death is a physical law in our members implanted there through sin ages ago, and handed down from generation to generation" — Unity Book, p.78.

"Now, what is this element called 'uncleanness', 'sin', 'iniquity', etc.? The difficulty experienced by some in the solution of this question, arises from a disregard of the secondary use of terms. Knowing that sin is the act of transgression, they read 'act of transgression' every time they see the term sin, ignoring the fact that there is a metonymy in the use of all words which apply even to sin" — Unity Book, p.80.

"A disregard for metonymy and ellipsis in such statements, has led to most of the errors of the apostacy; and is leading some back to them who had escaped" — Unity Book, p.81.

"There is a principle, element, or peculiarity in our constitution (it matters not how you word it) which leads to the decay of the strongest or the healthiest. Its implantation came by sin, for death came by sin; and the infliction of death and the implantation of this peculiarity are synonymous things" — Unity Book, p.81.

Paul "speaks of 'sin that dwelleth in me', and as he defines me to be 'my flesh', sin that dwelleth in me is 'sin in the flesh' — a metonym for those impulses which are native to the flesh, while knowledge of God and of duty is not native to the flesh" — Unity Book, p.81.

"As a sufferer from the effects of

sin, he (Jesus) had himself to be delivered from those effects; and as the mode of deliverance was by death on the cross, that death was for himself first, not for sins of his own committing, but for deliverance from the (effect of (the) sin of Adam from which he suffered in common with his brethren, and from the sins of his brethren which were laid upon him" — Unity Book, p.81.

These are expressions contained in the Unity Book, published by the Central Standing Committee, all of which show that "the nature of the defilement was physical." The terms "evil and condemned nature," "sinful flesh," "sin in the flesh," "sin-contaminated nature" are shown to be clearly related to this theme as outlined in the articles by "A.J."

#### Andrewism Taught

It is a fact that some occupying positions of authority in the Ecclesias, do not know Andrewism when they see it, though they wax eloquent about the "blasphemy" of certain statements that are in accordance with the Truth.

For example, for some years Logos has warned against permitting the book *The World Redemption* to replace *Elpis Israel*. Why? Because *The World's Redemption* is biased in favour of Andrewism. However, we have been opposed by brethren who have sponsored it as against *Elpis Israel*.

#### PAUL AND CHRIST

Paul had a risen Christ before his mind; he recognised Christ's present existence and controlling presence in heaven; he looked forward to the certainty of standing before his judgment seat at his coming, and of receiving at his hands the unspeakable gift of immortality, and a place in the endless kingdom of God, if his present ways were acceptable to Christ. He had constantly before his face the Eternal Creator of heaven and earth, who, in the unity of universal presence, is near to every one of us, from whom no creature is hid, to whose eyes all things are naked and open. With this mental picture of facts before his mind, it was impossible that he should be otherwise than earnest and enthusiastic,

Further: consider this statement:

"Sin having taken effect in the nature of our first parents, and that nature having been transmitted to us, we are dying creatures, and are therefore 'by nature children of wrath' (Eph. 2:3) . . . In the Bible we read of the first Adam and the second Adam. In the first there is death; in the second there is eternal life. Our birth of the flesh gives us relation to the first only; but God in His goodness has opened up a way by which we may change our relationship from Adam the first to Adam the second, and thereby become now heirs of eternal life, and in the future possessors of that boon with all its glorious consequences."

This statement alleges:

- a. We are dying creatures, and therefore "by nature children of wrath";
- b. We change our relationship from Adam by baptism.

Both statements are contrary to the truth as outlined in the Unity Book, and consistently maintained in *Logos*. They express the theory of the late Brother Andrews; whereas the truth is:

- a. We become "children of wrath" by our own misdeeds;
- b. We can only change our relationship to Adam by the change of nature at the judgment seat.

The statement above, however, is from *The Great Salvation* under Part Third, as issued by The Central Standing Committee!

\* We therefore have this anomalous situation: the Secretary of that Committee accusing us of Andrewism because we publish statements which are consistent with the Unity Book, and condemning us for stocking *The Real Christ* (written by Bro. Andrew before he embraced the error associated with his name — and which, incidentally, is also advertised on the back cover of *The*

*Shield*), whilst at the same time issuing a book, written by an associate of Brother Andrews, and clearly proclaiming the Andrew theory of alienation.

Brother Thomas Williams, the author of both *The Great Salvation* and *The World's Redemption* was also founder of *The Christadelphian Advocate*, a monthly magazine originally devoted to sponsoring the cause of what is called Andrewism.

#### Making A Man An Offender For A Word

In view of the fact that the book quoted above is issued by the Central Standing Committee we could legitimately, claim that those occupying positions of authority in that Committee are tainted with Andrewism.

We do not believe that that is the case.

But we do suggest that a little charity and understanding should be projected into the controversy which is today disturbing the minds of brethren, and we also maintain that the cause of truth is not advanced by such extreme, and untrue, statements as are contained in *The Believer*.

Such statements provide a clear case of trying "to make a man an offender for a word." In the case of the article before us, it lays hold of words and expressions that A.J. has used, and ignoring the similar use given to similar words in the Unity Book, apply to them a meaning that is wrong. Isaiah warns of the terrible punishment awaiting those at the Judgment Seat of Christ who:

"Make a man an offender for a word, and lay a snare for him that

reproveth in the gate, and turn aside the just for a thing of nought" (Isa. 29:21).

In view of that terrible warning, we appeal to the writers of the articles in *The Believer* to review

again their actions and words in relation to that publication, and desist from a form of agitation that can only result in condemnation at Christ's coming.

— THE EDITOR.

### The Truth's Vocabulary

## The Ecclesia of Chiefborns

*"Men are not ushered into being for the purpose of being saved or lost; God manifestation, not human salvation, is the doctrine of the Bible."*

—:—

#### Why Exclude The Use Of "Church"

In the rendering of the original I have not translated the word *ekklesiai*, but simply transferred it. It is generally rendered "churches"; but this word does not express the idea of *ecclesia*. Church is a corruption of *kuriake*, which signifies "pertaining to a lord." The Anglo-Saxons took the first and last syllables of the Greek word, as *kur-ke*, which they spelled "Circe"; but which is more obviously shown in the Scotch *kirke*; both of which are equivalent to the modern English "Church." "Something pertaining to a lord" is the etymological signification of the word; and although, in a certain sense, an *ecclesia* is something pertaining to a lord, and that lord the Lord of heaven and earth, yet the ideas of property and lordship are not contained in the word *ecclesia*. This is one reason why in this exposition of the Apocalypse we reject

the word "church" as the representative of *ecclesia*.

Another reason is, that ideas are conventionally associated with the word which are altogether unscriptural. *Ecclesia* never signifies in the Bible "the place which Christians consecrate to the worship of God"; nor does it signify such collective bodies of "professors of religion" as pass current for Christians in and with the world, under the various "names and denominations" of "Christendom." These, and many other ideas associated with the word "church," such as "churchman," "church-warden," "church-attire," "Churchyard," "churching of women", and all such papistical foolishness, are altogether foreign from the scriptural use of *ecclesia*. In order, therefore, to get quit of all the rubbish we exclude "church" from our apocalyptic vocabulary, and hold on to the word used by the apostles. We have therefore