

An Examination of A.J.G.'s "The Recovery and Maintenance (i. e. LOSS) of the Truth"

As is very plain, Mr A.J.Gardiner's "The Recovery and Maintenance of the Truth" is a cursory history of brethren that seeks to vindicate the teachings of James Taylor, and to suggest that the Taylor brethren are following in the path taken by the late Mr J.N.Darby and those who with him sought the path of the Lord's will amidst the ruin of the church. It was evident to many that from the earliest days of his published ministry the late James Taylor was utterly contrary to the ministry of J.N.D., although he, and his followers, have all along used that honoured name in an attempt to delude many into believing that Mr Darby would have supported the errors of Taylor.

From his early days as a minister of the Gospel, Mr Darby earnestly contended "for the faith which was once delivered to the saints" (Jude 3), and his "Collected Writings" and "Letters" show how great a debt the saints of today owe to him in meeting all kinds of evil and erroneous teachings. Some of these are brought to our notice in A.J.G.'s book, such as the Newtonian errors, and the errors of Mr Cluff, the teaching of the latter appearing in the periodical "A Voice to the Faithful", edited by Mr Stoney.

Mr Gardiner supports the judgment of Mr Darby, writing that Mr Cluff's "teaching, while having a superficial appearance of spirituality, was in fact destructive of it, and tended in its results either to unreality or to legality" (page 85). Quite unintentionally, Mr Gardiner has given us in this statement a very apt description of the school of teaching that he seeks to support in his book, a line of teaching that has been exposed by Mr Darby, as he tells us, and in a booklet written by Mr F.B.Hole entitled "Modern Mystical Teachings and the Word of God".

Shortly before the home-call of Mr Darby there was the sad division that separated Mr Wm.Kelly from Mr Darby, but this was over an ecclesiastical matter. It was indeed sad, and a great loss for brethren, that these two giants in the faith should be parted. Although the occasion of the division was ecclesiastical, Mr Darby viewed the division as allowed of the Lord on account of the lowering of the moral tone among the brethren generally.

After the home-call of Mr Darby some of the leading men among the brethren put out teachings that deviated from the truth taught by J.N.D., and unhappily these brought on divisions in America and Great Britain. Soon after the divisions brought on by the teachings of Mr C.E.Stuart and Mr F.W.Grant, brethren called in question the teachings of Mr F.E.Raven on the subject of eternal life.

Mr Raven sought to bring out more clearly the truth of eternal life, but in so doing made statements that many of his brethren

rejected. This is seen in a letter on page 136 by C.A.C., where he writes, "The subject of eternal life seems to be coming to the front again ... F.E.R.'s thoughts as to it were rejected at Gloucester, and I think he felt from that time that brethren in this country were not ready for the truth." F.E.R., on page 132, does say in regard to his thoughts, "I may be right or I may be wrong." On some points he was no doubt right, for his opponents said things that were not right, but other things he said will not bear the light of Scripture, and were contrary to what Mr Darby taught.

On page 133 Mr Raven writes, "The teaching of Scripture is not that a man gets it (eternal life) by faith, but that the believer is the person who has it." This is far too sweeping a statement, for although there are Scriptures that do show that the believer is the one who has eternal life, such as John v:24, there are others such as John xx:31 that clearly show that it is by "believing" we "have life through His name."

But I want to show that F.E.R. departed from the teaching of J.N.D. on eternal life. F.E.R. says we do not get eternal life by faith, but J.N.D. writes, "Life was through faith in Him, eternal life, that is, in the Son" (Notes and Comments, Vol.VII.552). In "Letters Vol.II.173" J.N.D. writes, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life," then adds, "And here it is by faith." Again, in this same volume, page 213, "We are 'all children (sons) of God by faith in Christ Jesus.' It is thus I do receive Christ who is eternal life, and having the Son I have the Father also."

On page 135 F.E.R. writes, "There is another point as to which objection has been raised, namely the application of the thought of eternal life to earth." Had he left the matter there we could not have but agreed with him, for it is undoubtedly applied to earth in Psalm cxxxiii:3 and in Daniel xii:2, and, of course we have it while still upon earth, but, unhappily he goes on to say, "I certainly am unable to find any Scripture that connects it with heaven." Surely the very word "eternal" shows that it belongs to heaven. Even Mr Gardiner, on page 124, quotes what Mr Darby said of eternal life, that it was "an out-of-the-world heavenly condition of relationship and being." Mr Stoney also partially quotes this on page 129.

Where did the eternal life come from? Was it not with the Father in heaven before it was manifested here? (1 John i:2). John's writings teach that we now possess eternal life in the Son, but Paul's that we shall fully possess it when we have bodies of glory like Christ's, and as such it is for us "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began" (Titus i:2). To have eternal life with Christ in heaven is the "blessed hope" for which we look, and it is connected too with the appearing of the Lord in Titus ii:13. J.N.D. also writes, "If heaven was in question, something more was needed than being born again. Sin existed. It must be put away for those who should have eternal life" (Syn. John p.404). Again, in

J.N.D.'s "Letter, Vol.III.60", we read, "Eternal life is full conformity to Christ in glory, according to the purpose of God." When the Lord spoke of "heavenly things" in John iii did He not connect eternal life with heaven?

THE PERSON OF THE CHRIST

Mr Raven, on page 145, is rightly "unwilling to enter on the field of controversy, especially on subjects touching the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ," but proceeds to do so, condemning those who hold that "the truth of His Person consists in the union in Him of God and man," condemning too those who say that Jesus is "God and man one Christ." In regard to this J.N.D. has written, "I am quite aware of and accept the ordinary orthodox statement of two natures in one Person ... for the simple faith that Jesus was God and man in one person can be easily accepted as plain and vital truth" (Coll. Writ. Vol. XXIX. footnote pp.321,322).

F.E.R. also refuses the expression "the unity of the Person of Christ," saying, on page 149, "There is no idea either of unity, or of change, in the Person." Now all would agree that there was no change in the Person of the Son in becoming Man, but J.N.D. and all with him accept that Godhead and Manhood were united in the Person of the Son. J.N.D. in "Letters Vol.III.128" writes of those who are in "danger of denying the unity of the Person," and in "Notes and Comments. Vol.VII.211", he again writes of "the Lord, and yet being Himself the Light ... and this in the unity of His Person." In a reading in which F.E.R. objected to the "Unity of the Person", it is plain that there were those present who showed that he was opposing the teaching of J.N.D. (Notes and Lectures of F.E.R. Vol.XIV.pp.126,140).

On page 146 F.E.R. says that "the two thoughts (of Christ being God and Man) ... cannot be grasped at the same time." He says the same thing on page 123 of Vol.XIV referred to above. This is not Scripture, or an explanation of Scripture; it is a human idea of what the human mind is capable of grasping. What we are seeking is not metaphysics, but to see how Scripture presents the Son of God to us. In the Scripture "The Word became flesh" are we not shown One who is God and Man at the same time? We can surely distinguish between His Godhead and His Manhood, and yet see how they are set forth unitedly in the incarnate Son of God.

"SALVATION IN THE ASSEMBLY"

We are told on page 226 that "In 1905 the importance of the assembly as a sphere of practical salvation from the world was emphasised in ministry by Mr James Taylor, and was, for a time, seriously opposed by certain well-known brethren in England." Indeed, it was opposed by "Sober men like T.H.R., J.A.T., and G.C. (who) were greatly distressed with these teachings, as also was J.B., who paid a visit to America, that he might see Mr J.Taylor of New York, who was very largely responsible for the utterances" ("Hear the Right" by Dr Wolston, p.28). Of the notes

of the meetings referred to, Dr Wolston wrote in 1905, "That such perversions of God's truth could have been issued by those who regarded themselves as the recipients of great favour from God in respect of His truth, and therefore responsible to be its promulgators and expositors, I could not have believed, had I not seen the Notes themselves" (page 29).

Mr James Boyd not only had a personal interview with Mr Taylor regarding his statements, but issued an "Examination of Readings and Addresses of Meetings held in Chicago, 1904-5." In this examination it is written, "I have gone through these readings and addresses, for which the brother who writes the preface makes himself responsible ... I find certain things in circulation, professing to be the gospel of God, and I find saints imbibing the deadly nectar. I know it will be their ruin; they will lose the Christ of God as their heart's object. The blight of death will wither up their souls if they receive this system of error" (pages 1,2).

On page 4 the writer says, "there is quite enough in this book to show that the minds of the speakers were under the influence of another gospel, which is not another," and on page 5 he remarks of the notes, "They are a complete perversion of the Gospel of God." On page 9 it is written, "The fact is this, according to these notes, the saints are everything, and Christ and His Gospel are of very little account." To show how the church displaces Christ in the mind of James Taylor and his associates, there is the quotation from the Notes, "Every thought of God for man must find its place in the Church now," so that it is no wonder Mr Boyd remarks, "But at all costs these notes must get rid of Christ" (page 10).

Having thoroughly examined the Notes, Mr Boyd writes, "I do not call to mind one truth that is touched in these notes that is not turned upside down... I have searched for one single subject of truth that is taken up in these notes, and which is not perverted, and I have not found one. What is said about heaven is on a par with everything else."

Towards the close Mr Boyd says, "When I undertook to read these notes I quite expected to find the same line of teaching as in the New York notes, for where a system of error has got hold of the mind it cannot be hidden, but will come out in everything; but I was not prepared for such a morass of error as I found I must cross in the perusal of this book. As I have already said, every single point of doctrine taken up is perverted; whether it be "The Preaching", "The Gospel", "Salvation", "The House", "The Ark", "Living Water", "Living Stones", "Unity", "The Witness", "Baptism", "Heaven". I never witnessed such a complete reversal of the whole truth of God."

The above examination was from the pen of an able servant of the Lord, who knew well the ministry of J.N.D., and who was in fellowship with J.T. when he wrote the examination.

Here is an extract from a letter by Mr T.H.Reynolds on the same matter, "Typed notes of a conference in Chicago on Dec.31.04, Jan.1 and 2.05 came unexpectedly into my hands (this copy came from Australia) in which I may briefly say, the distinctive features of the truth recovered to the Church through Mr Darby are subverted and falsified. I look on it, not as mistaken ideas, but as a perversion of the truth and dishonour to Christ."

Some time later James Taylor said, "To press the idea of Christ personally, that things are now vested in Him personally, to the exclusion of the church is ruinous," and to this Mr Boyd replied from Brighthouse, on March 20, 1906, "I charge the propagators of this doctrine with putting the church in the place of Christ."

"GLANTON AND ALNWICK, 1908"

No one who really knows the facts of the above issue will accept the account given by Mr Gardiner, nor does C.A.C., in the letter of pages 155-157, give any definite Scripture to condemn the action of the Glanton gathering. Indeed he writes, "Indeed Glanton was held to be quite in order in declining, for a time, to receive from either party in Alnwick." which clearly shows that Glanton did not act hastily, or without due consideration of the Lord's will in the matter. Then he adds, "It was when they absolved saints from their local responsibility in Alnwick by receiving them at Glanton that a serious issue was raised." This was certainly not the view of the meetings of Northumberland. If the London leaders were so anxious about "local responsibility," why did they not rely on the judgment of the local gatherings, those who knew intimately all the details of the case, instead of interfering with a matter 300 miles away?

Mr J.C.Trench quoted from Mr Darby's Collected Writings Vol.II,381-402, and showed that Glanton had acted exactly on the ground taken by Mr Darby, and wrote that "London and other places had utterly ignored the assembly at Glanton, and had done on a colossal scale what Glanton was wrongly accused of doing in a small way. They had indeed interfered with the Lord's rights, authority, and acts at Glanton, and thus brought in widespread confusion, sorrow and division."

In a letter to Mr George Cutting, dated 19.11.1908, Mr Hamilton Smith wrote, "In your reference to Laodicea... Is there not another terrible mark of Laodicea, viz: Self-complacency? And has not this solemn characteristic increasingly stamped us all of late years, and is it not painfully apparent in those who have raised this agitation against Glanton and Alnwick, and who in the time of our shame can be found boasting in 'new light,' and thanking God for the acquisition of 'new territory'?"

At the time of the 1908 division, one of Glanton's leading opponents wrote to Mr J.S.Oliphant, "None of us have any real difficulty as to Glanton knowing they acted in the fear of the Lord. What was desired, and what was accomplished by accusing Glanton of dishonouring Christ, by usurping his authority and

entrenching on His prerogative, was a re-adjustment of our fellowship... a select circle was to be formed after weeding out the undesirables."

Dr Wolston in "Hear the Right," pointed out that the real cause of the division was not to be found in Glanton's action in receiving saints from Alnwick, but rather the appearance "during the last four or five years, a system of doctrines, diverse and strange, as compared with that in which most of our souls had been reared and nurtured, "and that much of this teaching "WOULD DELIGHT THE HEART OF A ROMANIST."

Mr W.H.Westcott, in a letter to Mr G.W.Ware, wrote, "hearing the things which you had concealed or misstated emphasized the conviction forced upon me by the spirit of your letters, that your cause was not a just one, and that the division you advocated and pressed was not of God. It has been consummated all over the world, not by the insistence as you say of brethren in Glanton, but by the insistence of those who profess to have found 'new light,' and have demanded its acceptance by assemblies of saints, under alternative of expulsion from your fellowship."

Mr T.H.Reynolds and Mr George Cutting had stood in the support of the grace of the Glanton brethren at the beginning, but as division came in sight they changed their ground and turned against Glanton. Mr Arthur Cutting, in a letter to his brother George, remarked, "What a splendored sphere you thus throw open to the mystic, in which he can indulge his very wildest imagination, and where the bigoted zealot can find warrant and reason to 'put you out of their synagogues.'" and even slay you, and in so doing think 'he doeth God service' (John xvi:20). This feature has marked this movement from the start. D.L.H. admits 'We have no Scripture for this isolation of meetings, but it is the path of wisdom in a time of difficulty." Thus we get a man 'wise beyond what is written,' and thus a true example of what you describe as 'leaving the path of faith for the path of expediency'..."

In a letter on the subject of the 1908 division, written to a brother in Germany by Mr James Boyd, are the following words, "It is, I have no doubt, the inability to find in Scripture anything to support the contention that G. was infringing the rights of the Lord, that leads those, controlled by party spirit, to heap personal abuse upon the men whom they desire to condemn.

"And yet this division, however painful, has not been an unmixed evil. It has delivered us from a system of teaching which was sapping the foundations of Christianity, and threatening to leave us no personal Christ, as an object for our hearts."

Above it is stated that Mr T.H.Reynolds had supported the grace of the Glanton brethren. In a letter dated 30th April 1908 he supported also their actions where he writes, "In closing, I allow myself to quote a weighty word by J.N.D., not only in corroboration of what I have said, but with regard to the serious

matter of ignoring the action of Glanton. "Where two or three are gathered in His Name, there He is in the midst of them. Thus, while fully admitting that all the saints in the locality constitute properly the one assembly in a place; if they will not unite, the responsibility and the presence of the Lord are found with those who do, and their acts, if really done as met in His Name, have His authority; that is, another such assembly must own the assembly and their acts, or disown their connection with the Lord." (Coll. Writ. Vol. XX. 386, 387), (Discipline and Unity of the Assembly).

These letters claim that Glanton-Alnwick was a false issue, and that the true cause of the division was the forcing upon their brethren by certain London leaders of the "new light" in the doctrines of James Taylor, which were not according to Scripture. They also claim that the new system of teaching savoured strongly of Romanism and mysticism, and that doctrinally and ecclesiastically there was marked departure from the truth taught by J.N.D. The boasting in the "new light" manifested the spirit of Laodicea, and the forcing out of fellowship of those who did not agree with them showed the spirit of Diotrephes.

"FULFILLED RESPONSIBILITY"

The paragraph given to this subject shows very clearly (pages 228, 229) the high opinion that these brethren have of themselves, and of how they have claimed for themselves the perfection that was alone found in the Man Christ Jesus. Had brethren not the right to press James iii:2? Is it not true that "we all often offend"? It is blessedly true that when we walk "according to Spirit" that the righteous requirements of the law are fulfilled in us, but where is the man that will claim that he always walks according to Spirit? Surely only one who does not know himself, and who has little sense of what sin is in the sight of God. Even if there was not another Scripture to support James iii:2, it comes to us from God to tell us the truth about our failure to fulfil our responsibilities to God. Indeed it almost seems that Mr Gardiner quotes Romans viii:4 to minimise the force of James iii:2, as if both Scriptures were not God's word to us.

Scripture never supposes sin to be a necessity for the Christian, for the divine nature within us, given of God "cannot sin" (1 John iii:9), and we have Christ as our High Priest to keep us from failure, but how blessed is the knowledge that "if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous" (1 John iii:1). As long as we are in this world we shall need both the priestly ministry of Christ and His advocacy.

About 1920 Mr J.S. Giles left the Taylor fellowship, this doctrine of "Fulfilled Responsibility" being one of eight that he wrote of as "Errors of Doctrine." He quoted articles in "Mutual Comfort" of 1915, and said, "It was maintained by a prominent brother that: 1. The church had not broken down. 2. It was merely local failure at Ephesus. 3. Chapters ii and iii (of Revelation) were not an historical view of the assembly. 4. Revelation gave one

of the highest views of the Church, i.e. her place in intelligence in regard to all the interests of God. 5. Philadelphia was translated because it had fulfilled its responsibility. 6. The Book of Revelation was written to teach servants how to pull the responsible thing through. 7. Exception was taken to the church's translation being entirely through grace."

Mr Giles adds, "Some of these errors, if not all of them, have been taught in several places at different times, and practically no notice has been taken of them. The reason can be easily discerned - part of them are supported by James Taylor's teaching, as published in 'Mutual Comfort', and therefore to condemn them would be to condemn James Taylor."

2 TIMOTHY II:19-26

On pages 188-201 is a reading on the above subject, in which James Taylor stated that now that the church has broken down we cannot act on the divine principle given in 1 Corinthians vi:12, "put away from among yourselves that wicked person." Instead, each individual in a gathering is to withdraw from the evildoer. Mr Cluff and his followers averred that because of the ruin of the church we could no longer act on 1 Corinthians xi and remember the Lord, so they ceased to break bread. In 1918 James Taylor set aside another part of 1 Corinthians, and gave the same reason.

It must be clear to any intelligent Christian that there is a very great difference between a Christian withdrawing from a system of evil, as enjoined in 2 Timothy ii, and a company of Christians gathered to the Name of the Lord putting away from among themselves an evildoer, as commanded in 1 Corinthians v. When a Christian withdraws from iniquity what is he to do? The answer is given in 2 Timothy iii:22, he is to "follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart." Are those who go on thus together left to their own devices? Are they not to gather together according to the instructions of 1 Corinthians?

What else have Christians who have departed from iniquity to guide them in their gatherings but "all Scripture"? No Scripture is to be a dead letter to them. Even if they are only two or three gathered to the Name of the Lord, they will act, not as the assembly, but in the light of the truth given for the instruction and direction of the assembly. 2 Timothy ii was not given to set aside the truth of 1 Corinthians, but to supplement it, for guidance in a day of ruin. Those who justify James Taylor in saying we cannot act on 1 Corinthians v must all justify the Cluffites who set aside 1 Corinthians xi.

The subject of withdrawing is plainly stated in 2 Thessalonians iii, the brethren being commanded "in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ... (to) withdraw... from every brother that walketh disorderly" (verse 6). The disorderly brother was not to be put

away from fellowship, or counted "as an enemy," but to be admonished "as a brother" (verse 15), a very different thing from what is enjoined in 2 Timothy ii, or what is commanded in 1 Corinthians v.

T.H.R., who was in fellowship with J.T., was disturbed by this teaching of Taylor's, who had questioned "the competency... of any meeting of saints, now that the church, as set here on earth to be a testimony of Christ in glory, is in ruin, to carry out verse 13 of 1 Corinthians v: 'Put away from among yourselves that wicked person.' And instead of obedience to this plain command of Scripture, the principle of 'withdrawal' from such an one is advocated on the ground of 2 Timothy ii:9." In this letter, dated February 1920, T.H.R. goes on to show that Taylor's teaching was contrary to Scripture, as taught by J.N.Darby, and "A distinct giving up of church or assembly position."

THE MYSTICISM OF TAYLORISM

In 1922, Mr F.B.Hole wrote a criticism of the teachings of the Taylor system, entitled, "Modern Mystical Teachings and the Word of God," in which many of its errors were clearly exposed. Here are the headings of the booklet:

1. The features that characterize all Mystical Teachings
2. The Eclipse of the Objective Realities by the Subjective Impressions that correspond therewith.
3. The Belittling of Scripture in Favour of the Conceptions and Impressions of "Spiritual Men."
4. The Consequent Glorifying of a Priestly Caste who come between the ordinary saint and the Lord.
5. As a Further Consequence a Vein of Self-occupation runs through all their utterances.
6. Speaking According to the Light derived from the work within them, rather than from the Light of Scripture without, a Crop of Fanciful and Extravagant Ideas is produced.
7. A Brief Survey of the Teaching as a Whole, and of the Positive Testimony of the Word of God.

About 1924 Mr James Boyd was asked to comment on a paper entitled "Weight and Measure" by E.J.McBride, and he wrote, "Except 'Russellism' it is the greatest burlesque of the Gospel I have ever read. I am well aware that Mr McB. is in close contact with an order of teaching that is simply 'Cluffism' run riot, and in such associations it is difficult, if not impossible, to keep from being carried away with the current, nevertheless, there is no excuse for wandering into such a system of error, seeing that we all have an Open Bible in our hands... One can only cry to the Lord that their awful course may be arrested, lest in the end they come to utter ruin, and also become responsible for the ruin of others." (IS IT THE TRUTH?, pages 4,5).

NON-ETERNAL SONSHIP OF CHRIST DOCTRINE

Shortly after the home-call of T.H.R., at readings in Barnet in

June, 1929, J.T. called in question the truth of Christ's eternal Sonship, and soon it became an accepted doctrine in the Taylor system that Christ was not the eternal Son of God. This was hailed by the deluded followers of James Taylor as "new light" for the last days. It was really well-known heresy, and accepted by every Arian sect of Christendom, including Unitarians, Mormons, Russellists, Christadelphians and Christian Scientists, so that the Taylorites had got into bad company with their "new light."

The non-eternal Sonship doctrine, as expounded by J.T., had been introduced among the Methodists near the beginning of last century by Dr Adam Clarke, and was ably refuted by the Rev. Richard Treffry Jnr. in a book written in 1837. About the middle of last century the evil doctrine was introduced among the Baptists, but it was exposed as heresy, and the truth defended in a book entitled, "The Eternal Sonship of the Lord Jesus Christ," by J.C.Philpot, M.A. A new edition of Philpot's book was issued in 1926, just three years before J.T. fell into the snare of Satan.

Many able pens were used of the Lord in defence of the truth of His eternal Sonship. Among them were Mr. E. Middleton of Ayr, and Mr. V.W.J.H. Lawrence of Bath, who left the Taylor system over this matter. Writers from among almost every section of brethren wrote papers to show how J.T. had violated Scripture, and departed from the teachings of all the prominent servants of the Lord who had been used by Him in the recovery of the truth in the last century. C.H.M. had coupled together those who deny the deity of Christ with those who deny His eternal Sonship (Things New and Old, XVIII.59), and J.N.D. wrote that the non-eternal Sonship doctrine was "Destructive" and "Abhorrent" (Coll. Writ. III.135).

Just after the issue of the Revised Hymn Book, from which every mention of the eternal Sonship had been expunged, Mr. Lawrence of Bath wrote of the Taylor system, "The most amazing feature of this essentially Christless religious system which has been built up in recent years among these 'Brethren', is its power and its claims to persecute the children of God... A body of men has been at work on this system for years, and today it is well-nigh perfect. From its head downwards, through an intricate order of metropolitan, district and local leaders, all in touch with one another and the head, it is sought to maintain Mr. Taylor's position and doctrine at all costs... No one is free from its machinations, and no man's private life is safe. It is as cryptic in its workings as the Jesuit of old. Indeed, in the degree of its knowledge, and its dread secret power, it falls little short of the so-called 'Society of Jesus'. We have seen men fear and tremble at the idea of being found in opposition to the system that they well enough know holds them in its iron grip. It is a system of darkness, and its persecuting spirit is too-well known to need any comment here."

Mr. Lawrence quotes the case of Miss Stoney, daughter of J.B.S.,

who, on refusing the "new light" was excommunicated from the Taylor system. It was reported at that time that J.T. had said that Miss Stoney must be crushed. Mr. Page of Edinburgh was another victim of the cruelty of the Taylor system about this time. He had been a ministering brother for many years, but could not accept the "new light", so sent in a letter of withdrawal. The brethren in Edinburgh refused the letter, and "withdrew" from Mr. Page on account of his iniquity. The "iniquity" consisted of his holding fast the word of the Son of God, and refusing to deny His Name. The same cruel spirit that was spoken of in 1908 marks the persecuting system in 1932.

THE WORSHIP OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Every instructed Christian knows that the Holy Spirit, a divine Person, is the power for worship, and that all worship to the Father and the Son is "by the Spirit of God" (Phil. 3.3). The function of the Holy Spirit is to direct our attention to the glorified Christ, and not to Himself. As we worship God, the blessed Trinity, the Holy Spirit has His part, but does not present Himself personally, as a distinct Person of the Godhead, as an Object of our worship. We learn from the Scriptures very much concerning the Holy Spirit, of how He delights to glorify the Son, of His dwelling in the saints, and with them; of how He is the seal of God in the believer, the anointing and the earnest of every promise of God and of the inheritance, and that by Him God dwells in His house. Much more is taught us of the Spirit's presence and operations and manifestations of the Spirit of God (1 Cor. 12.14), but never once in the whole of Scripture does the Spirit present Himself Personally for our prayers and praises.

Ever in search of novelties, which can be presented as "new light", the Taylor company introduced singing to the Holy Spirit, and this was based on Numbers 21.17,18. God had said: "Assemble the people, and I will give them water." There is not a word of praise to the Lord in their song; they sang to the well, "which princes digged, which the nobles of the people hollowed out at (the word of) the lawgiver with their staves." There is not a mention of God in the song, nor of the Spirit of God, whatever the typical meaning of God giving His people the water from this well might typify. Yet this Scripture, and Psalm ???, in which there is no mention of the Holy Spirit made, are the only two Scriptures on which J.T., in his letter of July 31st 1942, founds this practice of singing to the Holy Spirit.

In a letter of September 2nd 1942 James Taylor quotes John 4 and 7 in addition to Numbers 21 to support his idea of singing to the Holy Spirit. We have often heard Numbers 21 connected with John 4, but the Lord in speaking of the well of water that He would give was a well "springing up to everlasting life". There is not the slightest indication of singing to the Holy Spirit. The Lord was speaking of the Holy Spirit in the character of life as the power for entering into the enjoyment of eternal life, even as He is the power for worship. As to John 7 the Lord Jesus plainly tells us of the Spirit as the power for testimony. Numbers 21 is a

faint shadow of God's provision in the Spirit for the blessing of His people, not an enlargement of John 4 as J.T. writes.

Typical language can be "intelligible and expressive, if we understand it by the Spirit", but it can also be misunderstood, and used by subtle minds, as in this case, to foist upon weak Christians the notions of the teacher who cares more for his own reputation as a teacher than for the honour of the Christ of God. Was not this a device of the enemy to take from the Son of God the worship due to Him in the assembly? In appearance to the simple it was a very pious endeavour to give honour to the Spirit of God, but in reality it was the work of the enemy to detract from the honour of Christ. J.T. had robbed Christ of His glory as the eternal Son, now He robs Christ of the praises due to Him in the gatherings of His saints.

If praying and praising the Spirit of God was a new thing among brethren, it was not a new thing in the religious systems of Christendom that brethren had left. One has only to look at the Hymn Books of these systems, and of other collections, to see how that in Christendom generally the Holy Spirit is addressed. When brethren withdrew from the human systems, and were guided in their worship by the light of Scripture under the help of the Holy Spirit, they no longer prayed and sang to the Holy Spirit, knowing that "It is not any question of Person or dignity as to the Holy Ghost that hinders His being the object addressed in prayer, but the place He holds in the divine economy" (J.N.D. Letters vol. 2.102). J.N.D. also writes, "You cannot properly address the Spirit, but this for another reason, the Holy Ghost being the one who is in me, and so He cannot address Himself" (Coll. Writ. 25.427).

Mr. J.A. Trench wrote of this "As to prayer to the Holy Ghost... Not a hint of it, as you say, in Scripture - surely a most powerful consideration when, too, the subject of prayer is so largely otherwise developed" (July 1892). To quote Genesis 24 and Ezekiel 37.9 in support of prayer to the Holy Spirit (pages 310, 311) only shows that J.T. has not one Scripture to support his notion. These passages have to be forced by the natural mind to support ideas that have originated in the natural mind.

THE SERVICE OF GOD IN THE ASSEMBLY

This chapter, in page 312, was on account of "Some controversy" in 1958 and 1959 on worship to the Spirit, its order in the assembly. A reading in Brooklyn N.Y. on October 2, 1956, published under "Notes of Readings...", Feb. 1957, vol. 26, no. 2, deals with this very subject, and J.T. the Second took second place to G.H.S. Price, for the papal seat had not yet been reached by the aspirant. After a good deal of discussion, the order of the liturgy given by Mr. Gardiner was arrived at (page 52 of the Notes). J.T. the Second had little to say in this discussion, so that Mr. Gardiner gives us a letter "of great value" by J.T. the Second to Mr. Percy Lyon. Mr. Gardiner may think it "of great value", but being written on March 9th 1959,

just as J.T. the Second had climbed on to the papal chair, one is left wondering if it was not to bring Mr. Percy Lyon to heel that this letter was written. No doubt those in fellowship in London could no doubt tell us the purpose of the letter to an old brother who, for long, had been a leading man in the Taylor system.

THOSE NAMING THE NAME OF THE LORD

It is well-nigh blasphemy for Mr. Gardiner to attach the Lord's holy Name, as he does, to the doctrine of J.T. the Second on "separation from evil" (page 316). He mentions a number of associations from which exercised Christians have always been free. He goes on to write of the "eating" doctrine, which forced husbands to leave wives and wives to leave husbands, which is the denial of God's word to us in 1 Corinthians 7.12,13: "Let her not leave her husband", and "let him not leave her". Yet this is studiously left out by Mr. Gardiner, though the practice was notorious. While eating and drinking together is an expression of Christian fellowship, to eat with one who is not a Christian is not viewed in Scripture, as Mr. G. writes as "really an affront to the Lord and the Spirit", it is the imagination of his own heart, and contrary to what Scripture says: "But if any one of the unbelievers invite you, and ye be minded to go, all that is set before you eat." (1 Cor. 10.27). The Lord in His word gives liberty to His saints, so that they can serve Him, and bring His word before others, but this system of bondage lays down rules that God's word does not sanction. Every exercised Christian will be careful with whom he eats and drinks, but God has given him liberty in this matter.

Under this heading a letter from J.T. the Second to Mr. G.R. Cowell is given. If there were any doubt as to the purpose of the letter to Mr. Percy Lyon, there can be none regarding that to Mr. Cowell. This letter was written on December 2, 1959, and on July 1960 Mr. Cowell had been cast out of the Taylor fellowship. Mr. Cowell was evidently a very able servant among the Taylor brethren, and this letter was evidently sent to raise "an issue" with Mr. Cowell, and the result of the issue shows clearly the purpose of the letter, and it is this that Mr. Gardiner justifies. Here is a man of outstanding ability, and highly valued in the Taylor fellowship, and must be got rid of that J.T. the Second might be the "universal leader", with no one to dispute his authority.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Gardiner tells us in his conclusion that "the maintenance of the truth requires, in those who desire to walk in it, practical subjection to the Lord, a practical walk in the Spirit..." (page 323). Has the leader of the Taylor brethren been walking in subjection to the Lord? If what the public press has been reporting of his evil ways is true, it is evident that he has not been, but on the contrary has been gravely dishonouring the Name of the Lord, so much so that, in shame, many of his followers

have turned from him. And this is the man, and the system of the man, that Mr. Gardiner has been supporting for many years. It is a very solemn matter to be supporting a Diotrophes in his casting out the saints of God, and then to find that this "diotrophes" was also charged by his own brethren with "corruption" in relation to grave moral sin.

All the cruelty, evil teachings, and dishonour to the Name of the Lord that have been exposed in Taylorism do not lie only at the door of the late J.T. the Second. He is a product of the system that was founded and developed by his father, James Taylor the First. Right from the beginning of his ministry he was charged with turning upside down every truth that he handled, and prominent in his system in those early days was his putting the church in the place of Christ.

Both James Taylors displaced the Son of God among their gatherings in His true place of Headship, arrogating to themselves the rights of the ascended Head of the church, and interfering with the assemblies of God's people in despotic fashion, and cruelly excommunicating the saints of God, imposing their own will on the brethren. James Taylor the First introduced the non-eternal Sonship doctrine, borrowed from the heretical sects of Christendom, which robbed the Son of God of His glory. He also, without the least Scriptural warrant, imposed on his brethren praying and singing to the Holy Spirit, a practice also borrowed from the systems of men.

In the "interregnum" between the reigns of the two Taylors, the cruelty of the system was much in evidence, for leading brothers were excluded from fellowship in the London area, and saints were excommunicated by London leaders, such as the saints at Zurich, Switzerland. This was around 1955, and could not be attributed to James Taylor the Second, for he was not yet in power as "universal leader", as his taking a second place at the meeting at New York when Mr. G.H.S. Price was present, in 1956, shows.

How very easy it is for saints of God, and even able men among them, to be led astray. In 1908 there were great pretensions of caring for the "rights of Christ", when the saints at Glanton, who had been seeking in meekness to act as for the Lord, were cast out by the London brethren, and now we see the end of it in the awful dishonour to the Lord's Name. Warnings as to the likely result of accepting the teachings of James Taylor were given as early as 1905, and now we see what was foretold taking place. God did not forget what Saul did to the Gibeonites, nor has He forgotten what London did to Glanton. May we all learn from the sad events considered how necessary it is for us to keep near to the Lord, abiding in Him, and counting on the grace, direction and supply from our blessed heavenly Head, the Lord Jesus Christ.

R. 17.11.70
Home 19.3.71