



PUBLISHED BY THOMAS SCOTT,
11 THE TERRACE, FARQUHAR ROAD, UPPER NORWOOD,
LONDON, S.E.

1876.

Price Threepence.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

APRIL, 1876.

LAST month we left the Devil *in extremis*; this month we announce his decease, but a decease of an uncomfortable and dubious description, in no way satisfactory to the survivors. Mr. Jenkins has come out a victor:—a man who disbelieves in the devil is not henceforth necessarily an open and notorious evil liver—and without a clear and definite belief in the personality of Satan a man may henceforth eat and drink the body and blood of Christ. So far everything is clear and comfortable, but the devil, thus roughly pushed out of sight, does not appear to be finally disposed of, since there are already rumours in the air ecclesiastical of an intention to prosecute Mr. Haweis, the well-known Broad Church clergyman,

because he stated in a sermon that the existence of an arch-devil was not susceptible of proof. This suit would be of a more crucial character, and might enable our Courts to decide on the reality or unreality of Satan, whether he be shadow or substance, ideal or fact. As regards the late trial, as shown last month, the judgment would have been necessarily equally favourable to Rationalists whether it supported Mr. Jenkins or the Rev. Flavel Cook; for if Mr. Cook's action were endorsed the orthodox would triumph and the liberal party be enraged, while if Mr. Jenkins were vindicated the orthodox would rebel. The judgment has been given, and already the storm-clouds begin to gather; the Brighton branch of the English Church Union has passed a resolution unanimously "expressing indignation and alarm at the decision given by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the case of *Jenkins v. Cook*, and respectfully asking the Lord Bishop of the diocese to take any steps he may think desirable against such a wrenching of the custody of the sacrament from the hands of the Church, by which the communion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ has been grossly slighted." Here are the elements of "a very pretty quarrel:" no dogma has been more fruitful in divisions than that of the "Sacrament of the Lord's Supper;" the seamless robe has been rent over and over again about the fashion of the remembrance and the character of the rite; the giving of the cup to the laity, the true substance taken by the faithful, the sacrificiatory nature of the service, the effect of consecration, the necessity of an episcopally-ordained minister to officiate in it, all these points recall the memory of bitter words and cruel deeds, and remind the rationalist that the feast of communion has ever been transformed into the source of excommunication. And now has arisen a new dilemma: all good ortho-

dox people believe in the good orthodox devil : it is one of the cardinal points of the faith once delivered to the saints ; without belief in the devil—and the devils—belief in the inspiration of the Bible is impossible ; without belief in the fall brought about by “that old serpent” no belief in the redemption is likely ; without belief in an evil spirit to account for the sin and misery in the world, how can belief in a good spirit be defended ? From what do we need to be delivered by the blood of Christ and the guiding of the Holy Ghost, if there be no devil to lead us astray ? And if no devil, surely no hell, and if no hell no need for a dying Saviour, and if no dying Saviour then no Christianity. Thus wide reaching, thus fatal, are the issues dependent upon belief or non-belief in the devil. “And can it be,” the orthodox may fairly argue, “that a man who denies the devil, and thus implicitly denies hell, the redemption, and Christianity itself, shall be accounted as a worthy recipient of the symbol of the Christianity he is destroying ? If the non-believer in the devil may thus be welcomed, why not also the non-believer in Jesus ? The most sacred recesses of the Church are thus thrown open to the infidel and perhaps to the atheist.” The Low Church party, who joyfully welcomed the State as its ally against the hated Ritualist, and were unhurt by the handling of the sacred things of their adversaries by a secular Court, now find out, to their horror, that their own sacred things are subjected to the same treatment, and that the State lays sacrilegious hands upon the very devil himself. One wail arises from either side : if one cries that the sacrament is wrenched from the hands of the Church, the other moans over the cardinal truths of Christianity, and bewails the laxity of professors and the growing power of a false philosophy ; Pilate and Herod make friends to-day, to slay, if possible, the liberty which might otherwise escape. The *Rock*, strangely, favours

the judgment, although reprobating Mr. Jenkins, thus standing at variance with its party; in a letter to it we read that it is only the duty of a clergyman to warn, not to repel, and that if any insist on coming after being told that "The receiving of the Holy Communion doth nothing else but increase your damnation. Therefore, if any of you be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer and slanderer of His word come not to that Holy Table, lest after the taking of that Holy Sacrament the devil enter into you, as he entered into Judas;" if, after this, any insist, then it is their fault and not the clergyman's, and apparently they should charitably be left free to "increase their damnation," though this being already endless it is not easy to understand how it is to be increased.

At Clifton itself the commotion is great. Mr. Cook having stated that the appearance of Mr. Jenkins at the Communion Table would be the signal for his resignation, a requisition was signed by some 600 Cliftonians, asking Mr. Jenkins not to press his victory, but to take the Communion at one of the many other churches of Clifton, so as to save Mr. Cook from the necessity of giving up his charge, a necessity imposed upon him by his conscience. Mr. Jenkins dryly replied, through his solicitor, that he should go to his parish church to take the Communion when it suited him so to do; he added that he regretted that Mr. Cook could not obey the law of the land and of the Church. Hereupon Mr. Cook announces that he resigns his living, and says, "he bows to the law of the land by resigning the living he has held; and in reference to the allusion to the law of the Church he remarks that there is a law of much higher authority." It is rumoured that the admirers of Mr. Cook intend to build him a church in Clifton, where he can obey the law of higher authority, and be free from the interference of Privy Councils. An address has been forwarded to

Mr. Cook by Canon Conway from Convocation, a "memorial of sympathy." Mr. Cook, in acknowledging it and thanking them for "their kindness and moral support," says that the writers have "manifested their goodwill towards me in this my time of suffering for the truth:" the "truth" in question is the devil; would it then be fair to say that Mr. Cook is suffering for the sake of the devil? and if so, is it true to say that he is suffering for the sake of God? and if so, are "God" and "devil" interchangeable terms, as some have been led to infer from the fact that in 2 Sam. xxiv. 1, Jehovah, and in 1 Chron. xxi., Satan is represented as having incited David to commit the sin of numbering Israel, and was punished for his compliance by the inciter, whichever it might have been?

Mr. Ridsdale is another martyr, the Privy Council which disestablished the devil being rivalled in its cruelty by the new Court under Lord Penzance. His vestments are forbidden, his candles blown out, his crucifix iconoclasted, his raised pictures smoothed away, his bowings straightened. Poor Mr. Ridsdale! and when he meekly asked that he might go on as usual until the appeal was finally decided, Lord Penzance sharply refused to accede to the application, and ordered that the monition should be complied with. How terrible a sentence this is, and how fearful this deprivation of the coats of many colours, may be judged by the following extract from the *Church Times*:—"Timid Catholics feel now exactly as Christians felt when the outbreak of the Tenth Persecution showed that three hundred years of blameless conduct had done nothing to conciliate Pagans, but that the same lies were circulated, and the same cruelties inflicted as had marked the first onslaught under Nero." It must want a good deal of imagination—or of faith—to see much likeness between being forbidden to wear many-coloured raiment and being torn to pieces by wild beasts.

For the "blameless conduct" it would perhaps be too cruel to quote as witness the Apostle Paul, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians. Degraded impurity, licence, drunkenness and fierce quarrelling are all apparently consistent with "blameless conduct."

Some little excitement is going on in the town of Newton Abbot, in Devon, in connection with the following circumstances :—A woman, named Burnett, lay sick in one of the wards of the Newton Abbot Union, and the chaplain, the Rev. William Langley Pope, D.D., was reading for her the "Service for the Visitation of the Sick." What followed shall be told in his own words :—"I asked, in the course of the 'Service for the Visitation of the Sick' appointed by the Church, 'Dost thou believe?' repeating the Creed, in the form of a question, and perfectly unaware and uninformed by the woman Prowse, or any person, of the person questioned being a disbeliever of the Creed. The woman Burnett then commenced an answer to my question, stating, in a voice perfectly audible, and intended to be heard by the ward, that she disbelieved 'the end of the world,' the existence of 'hell' in any other sense than the 'grave,' 'the Resurrection of the body,' and 'the coming of Christ to judgment.' She also said, before making these most infidel statements, that she believed that her 'sins were cancelled!!!' On hearing these most dreadful blasphemies I felt perfectly horrified; and, raising my hands to heaven, I exclaimed, in utter horror of soul, and yet with the desire to set the poor wretched woman right if possible, 'Oh! what horrible blasphemy! Oh! what dreadful lies! yes, damnable lies!' These were my exact words, and I do not see what else I could have said, for she uttered her disbelief in a very sustained tone and most assured manner. The very essentials of Christianity are surely not to be allowed to be ruthlessly and ignorantly assailed and denied without indignant reprobation on the

part of any honest and true Christian. I also spoke from the strongest sense of duty to do what good, by God's blessing, I might be permitted to accomplish." Is this kind of language supposed to be beneficial to the sick? It certainly does not lack vigour, but can scarcely be regarded as exemplifying the "meekness and gentleness of Christ," nor can it be thought to obey the command: "The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, *in meekness instructing those who oppose themselves.*" The woman appears simply to have honestly answered the questions put to her, and must have been somewhat startled at the torrent of abuse poured out upon her. How could the remarks of this reverend gentleman "set the poor wretched woman right?" There is no instruction conveyed in shouting out: "Oh! what dreadful lies! yes, damnable lies!" and, one would fancy, "God's blessing" would scarcely be appropriate on such expressions. Dr. Pope says: "I can say most sincerely, before Almighty God, that I have most fully performed my duties under very painful circumstances, thrust upon me, when at my right post." Dr. Pope may, of course, be sincere, but so excitable a person is not the one best suited to the delicate duties which fall to the share of a workhouse chaplain; he resembles his namesake—the Pope—too much in the freedom with which "profane cursing and swearing" flow from his lips. Is it just to pay such a man as this from the taxes contributed by people of all creeds? Few liberal-minded Christians would think their faith best recommended by a clergyman of this sort, Doctor of Divinity though he be; if the horror he expressed were genuine, and not affected, it shows a marvellous ignorance of the movements going on in the world around him, of the questionings on every side, of the rapid and steady spread of "infidelity" in every rank of life. Doubtless, poor women lying sick in Union

wards ought not to venture thus to answer the chaplain's questions, but should show to the "good kind gentleman" the proper pauper acceptance of whatever he may please to say; but still, even in dealing with unbelieving paupers, one cannot but feel that the language of this "honest and true Christian" over a sick bed, is deserving of the strongest and most "indignant reprobation." So near Ash Wednesday, one cannot deny that clergymen have a vested right to curse their neighbours, but then it must only be done formally in church, and while cursing the man who removes his neighbour's landmark may be justifiable, there is no provision made by the Church for cursing the pauper who denies the resurrection of the body.

The *Jewish World* really deserves the support of Rationalists for the able articles against popular and traditional Christianity which it frequently inserts. In its issue of March 3, dealing with "The Christian Logos," it traces very clearly the gradual growth of the idea embodied in Christ. It says:—"The personification of the word of God as a vehicle of power and means of communication between God and man, was a very early conception, and is first traceable to those masters in all religious idealities, the Hindus. In pre-historic Vedic times they had such an image in the goddess Vach (*voc*), who is called in the Rig-veda, the earliest extant scripture existing in any language, 'the speech of the primeval spirit.' At a later time the Hindus had a male form of the like import, whom they styled Menu (*Mens*), or the embodiment of the mind or wisdom of the Deity. The Pythagoreans and Platonists, who derived their culture from the East, adopted the like mythical representation of the Divine action, terming it the Logos, or Word of God. In the Hebrew Scriptures a similar figure occurs." Then "at length there is the fancy of a Divine Sonship attached to this image," and we

see this divine personage in the fiery furnace, guarding Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego. The book of Enoch still further develops the idea. "The Son of God, the Elected One, the Prince of Righteousness." Then Philo-Judæus takes up the notion and formulates it yet more precisely: "He makes his imaginary idol to be the Son of God, a second Divinity, the first begotten of God, superior to all beings in heaven or earth, the instrument by whom the world was made, the substitute for God, through whom all operations are conducted, the light of the world, the only one cognisant of God, the most ancient of all His works, equal with God, a messenger from God to man, the mediator, the advocate and intercessor for mortal man, the true High Priest, the giver to man of everlasting life, the shepherd of God's flock, the physician who heals all evil, the seal of God, the universal refuge, the heavenly nutriment of the soul." This notion is the exact counterpart of the Christian Logos, the Word of the Father. "Philo's time covers that alleged to have been occupied by the life of Christ. . . . And he is seen to have provided, out of the workings of his imagination, all that the writer of the fourth gospel puts together and makes use of in exhibition of the Christ depicted by him. Philo has given the framework and the drapery, which the other has adjusted to his alleged living subject. He has described the powers and the attributes which the evangelist has adopted as carried out in the person of Jesus." Thus do allies, from a different standing-point, attack the crumbling traditional creed, exposing the rottenness of its foundations by the breaches made therein by the cannon-balls of history and of thought.

Why cannot the hysterical of the churches leave the little children alone, to grow up bright and fearless in healthy naturalness? In the *Christian* is a sermon for the young, in which we read "So with

you, dear little ones, if there is one sin against you written down in God's presence, you cannot see the beautiful place and the lovely flowers in the heavenly country. If the sin is not rubbed out you can never enter that beautiful place." And then we read of "sinful hearts" and "naughty hearts," and "wash you in His precious blood," and so on. Imagine the dread and the anxiety inflicted on a sensitive child by this notion of every wrong thought and word being "written down in God's presence" against it. It is bad enough to drive men and women into the madhouses with these miserable revivals; the children at least might be left alone until the brain and heart have somewhat hardened, and the pulses thrill less keenly in fear of the unknown.

We append an anonymous letter, bearing the Liverpool post-mark, recently sent to us; it is another specimen of the hysterical style of the Moody and Sankey school of preachers:—"I beseech you, cease from the awful blasphemies you are uttering by your pen—you are but trying to spread darkness and despair, and leaguering yourself with him who has been 'a murderer and a liar from the beginning.' Speaking as you do against the Most High God. Shall the *thing* formed say to Him that formed it, 'Why hast thou made me thus?' Poor miserable worm of the dust, how dare you! If you do not know the JOY of having made your peace with God through the one Name under Heaven through which we may be saved, seek it at once through your Crucified Saviour and repent of your blasphemies. Do not go on and 'darken counsel with words *without knowledge.*' 'Turn ye, turn ye, why *will ye die.*' 'Look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth, for I am God, and there is none else.'" The zeal of these anonymous letter-writers is always far more conspicuous than their courage.