

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 17.—January, 1884.

I.

THE SACRAMENTS AND THE CHILDREN OF THE CHURCH.

ALL Protestant creeds, notably the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, insist upon the distinction between the invisible and the visible Church, the one consisting of all true believers in Christ, and the other of all professed believers; and while all these creeds embrace the glorious anticipation that this distinction will be utterly abolished when the divine ideal is realized and the Church is presented to Christ "without spot or wrinkle or any such thing," they also recognize the fact so clearly set forth in our Lord's parables and illustrated even in the calling of the twelve apostles, that, in the Kingdom of Heaven, under the present dispensation, the Gospel net gathers of every kind, both good and bad, and the tares and the wheat grow together until the harvest. But notwithstanding this theoretical agreement there is a wide practical difference even among Protestants as to how far and by what means the visible Church is authorized and required to conform herself to the invisible.

That only regenerate persons have any divine right to visible Church membership, and that the Church ought to preach this doctrine, we are all agreed. But the open question is, how far she may undertake to apply and enforce the doctrine in the exercise of discipline and the administration of the Sacraments. For the solution of the problem there are two theories which may be designated as the Puritan and the Reformed. We use the word Puritan, of course, not as the historic name of any sect or body of Christians, but simply as the abstract and upon the whole the most expressive term for certain views as to the province and functions of the visible Church. With the ultimate design of Puritanism, which is to rid the

III.

HEALING THROUGH FAITH.*

THE subject which Dr. Vincent discusses in the July Number of the PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, under the head of "Modern Miracles," attracts the attention of the Christian Church, in some degree, and is destined to attract it to a still greater extent. Sufficient evidence of this is seen in the articles named in the note below, to which many might be added, all these articles being in sympathy with the general drift of the views which Dr. Vincent advocates. No apology is needed, therefore, for a further discussion by one who differs materially from these and other recent writers.

It is well in the outset to have a definite conception of the topic to be handled. With the change of a single word, Dr. Vincent states it fairly in his opening paragraph, when he says of "the question": "The principal form in which it arises in our day is the claim to the power of healing the sick by the prayer of faith." The better term would be "*through* the prayer of faith," regarded simply as a means, the real "*power* of healing" which the claim involves being directly of God. Another change for the better, removing certain unnecessary elements from the discussion, would be to put the "*healing of the sick*" into the category of the supernatural instead of that of the miraculous. Dr. Vincent, however, is not responsible here; he merely

* "Modern Miracles," Rev. Marvin R. Vincent, D.D., New York, PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, July, 1883. "The Faith Cure," Rev. Samuel T. Spear, D.D., Brooklyn, Paper read at a "meeting of the resident and visiting clergymen," at Saratoga Springs, *The Independent*, September 14, 1882. "The Faith Cure," Rev. Robert W. Patterson, D.D., Professor of Apologetics, Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, *The Interior*, Chicago, December 14, 1882. "The Faith Cure," Rev. George H. Hepworth, D.D., New York, *The Independent*, Oct. 19, 1882. "Faith Cures," Rev. Theodore L. Cuyler, D.D., Brooklyn, *New York Evangelist*, May 3, 1883. "The Scientific Relations of Modern Miracles," William A. Hammond, M.D., late Surgeon-General U. S. Army, *International Review*, March, 1881. "Supposed Modern Miracles," Sermon, Rev. R. R. Meredith, D.D., Boston, *Daily Advertiser*. "Anointing the Sick for Healing," two editorials, Rev. Francis S. Hoyt, D.D., *Western Christian Advocate*, Cincinnati, October 25 and November 8, 1882. "Faith Convention at Old Orchard," and "Well-Meant Wrong," two editorials, *The Congregationalist*, Boston, August 9, 1882; "Miracles," editorial, *The Congregationalist*, August 16, 1882. "Faith Cures," Prof. B. N. Martin, D.D., New York University, *The Congregationalist*, August 30, 1882. "The Faith Cure—Opinions of Eminent Physicians—What Drs. Hammond, Hamilton, Spitzka, and Clymer think of Mr. Simpson's Work," *New York Tribune*, December 24, 1882. "Dr. Newton, the Healer; his Methods, Success, and Death," editorial, *Christian Advocate*, New York, September 20, 1883.

follows Dr. Gordon and some other writers in classing these alleged healings as miracles. But this unfortunate designation opens the door to the whole question of miracles ; whereas, the special topic in hand lies within a narrower compass. We prefer, therefore, the term supernatural, thus placing the healing of the body alongside of the cure of the soul, both being works of the Holy Spirit. True, indeed, some writers call regeneration a miracle ; Dr. Schaff calls it a "moral miracle." But this seems to be an unhappy terminology. In the spiritual and physical realm alike, in this special line, the Spirit's work is above nature, above man, above means, above diabolical agents, purely supernatural.*

Passing these incidental matters and coming to the *gravamen* of the question, we are at once confronted with that which excites a little surprise. It characterizes the article of Dr. Vincent not only, but the papers of Dr. Spear, Dr. Patterson, Prof. Martin, and others, and, in truth, is seen in nearly everything we have met with on that side of the question, whether in books, tracts, periodicals, or newspapers. All these writers (we discover no exception) employ the *a priori* style of reasoning. Beginning with a given premiss they easily reach a foregone conclusion. To take, for example, one of the more popular formulæ, "The age of miracles is past," and then putting the alleged "healing of the sick" into the category of miracles, the conclusion is inevitable that no such healing either does or can occur. This is "the short and easy method." Other writers define the term miracle, or attempt it, and then, under their definition—and rarely do any two define it alike—they rule out, and rule in, just what suits the case. Others, again, adopt a theory of nature, or a theory of the Church, its organization and functions ; others, still, adopt a particular theory of the plan of salvation, or a certain method of interpreting the Scriptures ; and so on, indefinitely, from premises thus taken, the logical result is what, at the outset, may be always foretold with certainty, namely, the impossibility of "healing the sick through the prayer of faith," is triumphantly established. Nothing is more easy, by such a course, than to prove or disprove almost any proposition ; and it is by these and similar processes that many of the rankest heresies in the history of the Church have had their life and growth.

* We speak, in the foregoing, merely of healing *the sick*, distinguishing this from other "mighty works." "Gifts of healing" are several times pointedly distinguished, in Scripture, from "miracles." For example : "To another, faith, by the same Spirit ; to another, the gifts of healing, by the same Spirit ; to another, the working of miracles ; to another, prophecy," etc. (1 Cor. xii. 9, 10). Again : "God hath set . . . after that, miracles ; then, gifts of healing," etc. (v. 28). "Are all workers of miracles ? Have all the gifts of healing ?" (v. 29 and 30).

THE QUESTION PRE-EMINENTLY ONE OF FACT.

It is by the opposite method to that employed by Dr. Vincent and others that we propose to test the present question. It is, indeed, the only way in which it can be fully and fairly tested. The process is that of rigid induction. It is eminently the scientific method. We propose to begin with facts, and trace them to their true cause; and facts are never heresies, either in science or religion. But it is just here that these writers are found wanting. They neither begin with facts nor end with them. They appear studiously to avoid them. Even Dr. Spear, in stating the "nature of the question," near his opening to his six columns in *The Independent*, says: "It is not a question whether such a method of curing disease is possible to God, but simply a question of fact." True enough; but it is curious to observe how often Dr. Spear substantially says, "Now, if there be any facts," leaving the impression that he has searched in vain for "facts." He does not condescend to cite for examination, or even allude to, a single case of alleged healing, although the very city in which he dwells, as we shall show, has furnished conclusive examples. It is, however, just possible, that he has rendered himself incapable of looking at any case of alleged healing with candor, for he has, in advance, pronounced every witness to "healing through faith," embracing the sick and those who have attended them, to be "impostors," or under "delusion" or "both combined," when he must himself admit that it is utterly out of the question that he should know one in a thousand of the witnesses to these alleged healings, found as they are by multitudes throughout Great Britain, Germany, Switzerland, the United States, and other Christian lands; to say nothing of many of them being his equal in every quality which enters into the constituents of Christian manhood.

Dr. Vincent does barely a trifle better. His article fills thirty pages. At the middle of the twentieth page he says: "But we must now pass to the consideration of the question of *fact*" (his italics). To this he devotes two and a half pages, closing with, "We cannot multiply illustrations." But what, upon "the question of *fact*," do these two and a half pages contain? After excusing himself from going "into a detailed examination of the mass of testimony adduced in favor of miraculous cures," he sees fit to "confine himself to the discussion of a few broader facts and principles which bear upon the whole body of evidence." All is then arrayed under three classes: "1. Results precisely identical with many of those ascribed to believing prayer, are of frequent occurrence in the annals of med-

ical practice, where no supernatural agency is sought or pretended." No illustrative case, however, is here given. But suppose we admit this, which we freely do, what then? It is merely concerning "many of those" that the assertion is made, and it matters not how "many"; but does that settle anything? What of all the rest? But let us pass on. "2. Similar results are wrought by faith exercised in the objects of Romish superstition." Under this head, Dr. Vincent refers to just two cases, and no more, with which the world is familiar; one of these occurring as long ago as A.D. 1656, the case of "the Holy Thorn in the monastery of Port Royal," where it was claimed that "a niece of Blaise Pascal" was cured of a "lachrymal fistula," by a touch of "a thorn from the Saviour's crown"; the other, the famous affair of "Our Lady of Lourdes," who still has her devotees in Europe. On the general question of the genuineness of these alleged cures, Dr. Vincent remarks: "So far as testimony goes, the curative miracles, so called, of the Romish Church, are, many of them, as fully and as respectably attested as those of Protestantism." Upon the alleged cures through "Our Lady of Lourdes," he says: "The testimony to the cures is as abundant and respectable as that which attests the work of Dorothea Trüdel or of Dr. Cullis." We cannot forbear merely to remark, in passing, that it is with a good degree of surprise that we observe how complacently Dr. Vincent can put Protestant testimony—especially of that quality which we shall show belongs to the witnesses to actual cases of "faith healing" yet to be cited, and which was within his reach, and even found in the very books he had in hand—on the same low plane with that of the devotees of Jesuitism, a system which dominates the Romish Church, and one of whose radical principles is that the end justifies the means, and whose practice sanctions the tenet that it is a saintly virtue to lie to advance the interests of the Church! We pass to the last point. "3. The operation of ordinary physical laws will explain and eliminate from the catalogue of modern miracles, both Protestant and Romish, a goodly number of cases; and subtler and less familiar interactions of body and spirit another considerable number." Well, suppose we admit it, what then? After eliminating "a goodly number" and "another considerable number," what shall be done with the remainder? Dr. Vincent's case is not made out until he has overthrown the whole; and this he admits he cannot do. Under this third head no actual cases are given. But he goes a little further. He gives an entire page of the two and a half to the "Perkins Tractors" of nearly a century ago, and to the "old, old story" of "Bishop Berkeley's craze over the virtues of tar water," with a foot-note upon

a case of "hysteria," in New York, and another note upon a case where the patient's "right side appeared to be paralyzed," but which also proved to be merely "an obstinate case of hysteria, resulting in abeyance of the will, and only to be overcome by the exertion of another and stronger will."

Such is the grand result of Dr. Vincent's "consideration of the question of *fact*," after sifting "the mass of testimony adduced in favor of miraculous cures," with the purpose of exhibiting "a few broader facts and principles which bear upon the whole body of evidence."

But, after all this, he is candid enough to say: "If it can be satisfactorily shown, in any instance, that a sick man has been healed by the prayer of faith, we will join in giving honor and thanks to God." In this state of mind, Dr. Vincent cannot well avoid the force of the testimony we shall produce for certain cases of "healing through the prayer of faith." Dr. Spear, also, speaking of "the fact of miracles," in the "healing of all manner of diseases by Christ and his apostles," says: "The believers in this cure (the faith cure) are entitled to the benefit of this fact; and *when they establish a similar fact* in the present age of the world, I pledge myself to become one of their disciples and recommend you to do likewise." From this frank declaration we might then reasonably expect, but for the force of invincible prejudice, a large accession from the "noble army" of unbelievers; for the facts we shall present, in the cases to be cited, are immovable.

Before, however, presenting these cases, it may be well to say a word about the character and standing of the witnesses. Almost every writer against "faith healing" attempts to disparage them in advance. But Dr. Spear goes beyond any one, in this line, we have met with. He says: "Taking into the account the character of the persons who, in these exceptional cases, have professed to have the power of such cure, the character and circumstances of those upon whom the cure is claimed to have been wrought, and the character and qualities of the evidence upon which the claim rests and is reported to the world, *the reasonable conclusion is* [our own italics] that these so-called exceptional cases *are the products of imposture, or the products of delusion, or of both combined*, and may be fully explained on natural grounds, without the presence or intervention of any miraculous power. *This is my conclusion*, and I think that *if the cases were taken up, one by one, and carefully examined* by a competent and impartial mind, such would be the conclusion with regard to all of them." Observe: "If the cases were carefully examined"; and yet, without examination, this sweeping judgment! Can prejudice go farther?

Among the witnesses to "healing through the prayer of faith"—including the cured and their attendants—are found ministers of the Gospel of the highest standing in their respective churches; eminent physicians and surgeons in regular practice; educated and cultured men and women in the most respectable positions in social life. They testify to what they know, even to what they have seen and felt; to physical transformations in their own persons, as to those cured; and these last can say, like the blind man cured by the Saviour, with vivid recollection of their sicknesses, and the equally vivid certainty of cure which he had, "One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see." These witnesses embrace a vast number, found in every Christian nation. They can be produced in court, and subjected to the most rigid examination.

But now we come to the crucial point. To what, definitely, do these witnesses testify? For illustration, take a case of *cancer*, such as will soon be given. (1) The most eminent physicians pronounce it cancer; also, that it is in its last stage, and absolutely incurable. (2) In answer to specific inquiry, whether cancer, at this stage, is ever cured "by nature," by any recuperative power or process within or known to the human organism, these medical gentlemen with one voice answer, "No! nothing of the kind; no such cure is within the knowledge of medical science."* (3) It is scarcely necessary to add what is notorious, that the testimony of physicians and surgeons, as experts, is taken to settle cases under judicial process, in every enlightened nation, where men are on trial for capital crimes, as well as to determine all other questions affecting life, liberty, character, property, whose settlement depends upon their professional judgment. (4) But now mark. This case of *cancer*, and others equally hopeless, have been cured, through no other means than "the prayer of faith"; and also, nearly every other sort of disease, perhaps literally every other, pronounced incurable by the best judgment of the medical profession, has been cured in like manner.

EXAMPLES OF CASES HEALED THROUGH THE PRAYER OF FAITH.

The first example of healing is taken from an article by the Rev. Asa Mahan, D.D., LL.D., now of London. Dr. Mahan, as an author and educator, is too well known in the United States and in England to need introduction to the public on either side of the Atlantic. It

* In addition to what may be found in books on medical science, we took especial pains to inquire of several eminent physicians and surgeons, here in Washington City, D. C., who were, at the time, attending a patient in, apparently, the last stage of cancer, whether "nature" was ever known to effect a cure in such a desperate case; and the answer was as quoted above.

may be well, however, to state how he comes to present this and several other cases, the manuscript record of which is now in our possession. Dr. Spear published his elaborate paper in *The Independent*, September 14, 1882. He has been for many years, and we think he still is, one of the editorial staff of that able journal. Dr. Mahan's article was written as a reply to Dr. Spear, and was sent to *The Independent* for publication. For some reason, however, this reply was not published. At length, finding it was not to appear, Dr. Mahan ordered his manuscript put into our hand, with the liberty to use it as might be judged proper. The following case of healing a "withered hand" is taken from Dr. Mahan's manuscript, and the circumstances under which the account was written will explain a portion of its phraseology. After having detailed other cases, Dr. Mahan says:

"Permit me now to state one or two cases which have, among very many others, come to my knowledge here in England. Dr. Spear does not question the miraculous character of the healing by our Saviour of the withered hand. How long the hand had been in that state, and of the attendant circumstances, we are left in total ignorance. I will now parallel this case by another, all the circumstances of which are well known. In the city of Hull lives a young lady, the daughter of highly respectable Christian parents, who was born and grew up to womanhood with a withered hand, which was bent in upon the wrist as no well hand, by any act of will, can be, and presented nothing but a mass of skin and bones, with not a vein visible upon it. She had never had the least control over a single muscle or joint of that hand, with the exception that she could barely move, a very little, her thumb and forefinger. Such was this case as originally presented. As advised by the colored evangelist, Mrs. Amanda Smith, through whom this young lady had been convinced that her hand might be healed through the prayer of faith, she came, for this purpose, to London, and spent one week at the residence of the Misses Green, five orphan sisters, daughters of a highly respected clergyman of the English Established Church. One of these sisters, Miss Emma M. Green, was, several years ago, instantly restored, in answer to her own prayer, to perfect health, after a prostration of more than a year's continuance, from spinal disease. Since then she has enjoyed a growing reputation as a faith healer, I, myself, being aware of about fifty cases of healing in answer to her prayers, some of which cases are as marked and wonderful as any cases of healing recorded in the New Testament, two recoveries being from utter derangement of mind having just occurred. To see this Miss Green the young woman came on from Hull. When the two kneeled together for the first time, and while Miss Green was praying, that withered hand instantly stretched out and was restored whole like the other, all its joints and muscles becoming perfectly flexible, and subject to the will. In this state, to the great joy of herself, parents, and friends, she returned to her home. Several months subsequent to this, she, in answer to a special request from me, wrote me, that, since the moment of healing, her hand had remained perfectly well, that the flesh was steadily coming upon it, and that she then wore a glove upon it several sizes larger than the one she had formerly worn. No case can be better authenticated than this. Now, will any candid mind tell us why the healing of the withered hand by our Saviour should be regarded as a veritable miracle, and this as no supernatural cure at all?"

We shall next give the account of the cure of Mrs. Mary E. Mahan, the wife of the Rev. Dr. Mahan, of both cancer and tumor. This is the case referred to on a foregoing page (as of "cancer"), which the doctors had pronounced incurable, and where the patient was appar-

ently *in articulo mortis*. Dr. Mahan does not mention this among those detailed in his article written for *The Independent*. But it is now given as we heard it from the lips of Mrs. Mahan, one evening in the summer of 1879, at her house in London, Dr. Mahan and others being present. At our request she afterward gave us the account in writing; and, within the year past, a statement of her cure, with her name attached, has appeared in book form, in London, with a detail of other cases, by our personal friend, Admiral Fishbourne, of the British Navy. This also is in our possession. The facts of her case are these in brief:

Mrs. Mahan had a cancer in the breast, which had eaten into her lungs, and was frequently discharging blood from her mouth. The best medical authorities deemed death inevitable, from this cancer, and near at hand. At the same time she had a tumor so located as to be inaccessible to surgical operation, which also gave her great pain. This, too, was declared incurable, and equally threatening as to fatal consequences. Mrs. Mahan's attention had not been called specially to the subject of faith healing much before this. One night, from the profuse hemorrhage through her lungs and mouth, she thought the fatal hour had come. Dr. Mahan was then out of London, holding a protracted religious meeting, and she declined to have him called home. Regarding death to be very near, she lifted up her soul to God in prayer, substantially to this effect: that if it were God's will to take her then to himself, she could say, "Thy will, O God, be done!" But she desired to live a few years longer, to assist her husband in certain literary work, and therefore she prayed for immediate healing, yet with entire submission. Upon the utterance of this prayer, yes, instantly, "wonder of wonders," as her written narrative says, the blood ceased to flow, all pain from both cancer and tumor at once ceased, and she fell into a quiet slumber and slept till morning. She then arose, felt entirely cured, dressed herself, went down-stairs—which she had not been able to do for some time—was able to attend to her household duties and her literary work, and has had no trouble, since, from either cancer or tumor, both having entirely disappeared. At the time this narrative was related (1879) Mrs. Mahan had been healed some two or three years. She is still living, and in good health, as her occasional letters to us bear witness.

Dr. Mahan details another case, in the article before referred to, which occurred in the Island of Jersey. We abridge his statement:

A lady, from a fall, had a "double curvature of the spine and a total paralysis of her lower limbs." She had, from this cause, lain in bed fourteen years. The most eminent physicians and surgeons, both residents and visitants of Jersey, "declared the case hopeless." On the facts, as carefully written out, "a college of physicians in London gave, as their unanimous judgment, that there was no hope of cure in the case." After this, Mrs. Douglas, a Quaker lady of Dublin, being on a visit to Jersey, convinced the lady that she might be healed, in answer to prayer. A meeting for prayer was held. Soon after the meeting was over, the lady said: "I am healed, and was consciously so during the meeting, and I now desire to rise and walk." She arose, was dressed, and "walked about the room, and kneeled down and gave thanks to God." Two days after, Mrs. Douglas made her final visit, and found the lady "walking about her house, affirming herself to be well, her spine having become perfectly cured." Dr. Mahan adds: "I can furnish any desired number of cases, equally specific and decisive in their bearing, in favor of the actual occurrence, in this our day, of faith cures, which have occurred among the most enlightened portions of the community."

But we need not go across the Atlantic for cases. They are found in every part of our own country and in nearly every city. Washington

City is not without them, several being of recent date, of some of which we are personally cognizant. We give one example, from Washington, where the healing was performed in June, 1882, upon a gentleman of the medical profession, with whom we have the honor to be personally acquainted. Dr. Clift tells his own story, in a monthly journal, the *Triumphs of Faith*, for July, 1883, published in Buffalo, N. Y. Dr. Clift completed his medical education at Harvard University, a short time before the outbreak of our civil war. In 1862 he entered the service of the United States Government, and for two years and a half was an acting assistant surgeon in the army of the Potomac, when, near the close of the war, he took charge of an army hospital at Savannah, Ga. He was active in the reconstruction movements in that State, and in 1868 was elected to the House of Representatives of the Fortieth Congress, from the Savannah district. We have heard from his own lips a much more full account of his illness and recovery than he has published; but we here give the published account in full in his own words:

"A Physician Healed.—Excessive mental labor, followed by sunstroke, caused me to suffer for nearly ten years from insomnia, or sleeplessness, with severe pains near the lower end of the spine, and in the back of the head at the base of the brain. This was accompanied by seasons of great irritability and excitability of the entire nervous system, with inability to control thought or sometimes even muscular action. There was great sensitiveness and intensity of thought and feeling, and a tendency of the mind to worry over trifles, and cling to and brood over painful subjects from which I was unable to divert it, till thought, rioting uncontrolled in the brain, became torture, sleep impossible for long periods, and life a burden. It seemed certain that the membranes of the brain and spinal cord were seriously affected, a future of softening of the brain was not improbable, while the functions of all the large internal organs of the body were more or less deranged. The principal trouble was diagnosed as neurasthenia, or deficient nerve-force, the nerve-power being expended more rapidly than the system could accumulate it. With the exception of two attempts to practice medicine, which failed, all business was abandoned for years, and I led a quiet country life, prescribed for by skilful physicians, and aided by a cheerful disposition and a will naturally strong, but grew no better, but rather worse. The outlook for health, or even relief from suffering, was gloomy. In this situation, at times enduring indescribably agonizing sensations in the head and spine, then better, but never free from pain or distress, a care and burden to my friends, my attention was drawn to the duty of Christians in sickness. Careful and prayerful reading of Scripture relating to the subject, together with 'The Ministry of Healing,' by Dr. Gordon, of Boston, Mass.; 'The Prayer of Faith,' by Miss Carrie F. Judd, of Buffalo, N. Y.; and a work of Carl Andreas, giving an account of one hundred and sixteen cases healed by prayer, convinced me that obedience to the command contained in James v. 14-16 was my duty. Earnestly asking God to strengthen my faith, and consecrating my future life anew to his service, on the evening of June 15, 1882, in the presence of my wife, a consecrated Christian lady touched my forehead with oil, laid a hand on my head and united with us in a short but earnest prayer for the restoration of my lost health. At the same hour, Miss Carrie F. Judd and her friends, in a meeting in Buffalo, N. Y., and friends elsewhere, offered prayer for the same object. *Three days afterward I felt and believed that I was perfectly well.* All the painful and unpleasant sensations in the head, spine, and elsewhere, which had not left me for years, were entirely gone and have not since returned. I felt like a new creature, physically, mentally, and spiritually, and gained strength several months, when friends

thought they detected slight symptoms of nervousness about me, but a resort to prayer caused them to disappear, and the old trouble seems gone. Language fails to express my feelings, or describe my sensations, during the three days immediately following the prayer. It will not, therefore, be attempted, save to say that the presence of a Divine Healing Power manifested itself by wonderfully strengthening my mind and body, and restoring them rapidly to a normal condition. The pulse which had been for years at sixty-four and weak, immediately rose to seventy-two and became strong and remained so. At the same time I felt a more intense love for God, and a greater sense of his power and presence, than ever before; in fact, my supreme desire then, and my greatest now, is to give him all the glory. *There is not a shadow of doubt on my mind that he, and he alone, healed me in direct answer to prayer.*

“JOSEPH W. CLIFT, M.D.,

“WASHINGTON, D. C., June 26, 1883.

1117 Massachusetts Avenue.”

We can find space but for two or three other cases. We select them from sources which were accessible to Dr. Vincent, Dr. Spear, and indeed to all the world. One example from Mr. Boardman's book, “The Great Physician,” which Dr. Vincent had in hand, will be given, where the names of all the parties are mentioned. The account is related by the father of the healed boy, who was Mr. Boardman's family physician. We condense it, retaining the principal facts:

A little son of Dr. Read, a physician of Philadelphia, fell and broke both the bones of the forearm. A brother of Dr. Read, Professor of Surgery in a Chicago Medical College, being then on a visit to Philadelphia, set the broken bones. The next morning the boy wished the bandages removed, insisting that his arm was well. The father questioned him, when the son said: “Last night, when I went to bed, it hurt me very bad, and I asked Jesus to make it well, and he did make it well.” The father, “not willing to chill the child's faith,” said: “Your uncle put the things on, and if they are taken off he must do it.” The uncle told the boy that “he would have to go as he was for six or seven weeks, and must be very patient.” On his saying that “Jesus had made him well,” the uncle sent him away with a “Pooh! pooh! nonsense!” The next morning, the boy again importuned his father “with so much sincerity and confidence that he more than half believed he was healed,” when he said to his brother, “Had you not better undo his arm, and let him see for himself? If you do not, I fear he will undo it himself.” Dr. Read, the father, then says: “My brother yielded, took off the bandage and the splints, and exclaimed, ‘It is well! absolutely well!’ and hastened to the door for air to keep from fainting. He had been a real, simple-hearted Christian, but in his student days wandered away; but this brought him back to the Lord!”

Must such a case as this be passed by, unnoticed, with the book in hand which records it, while special court is paid to “Our Lady of Lourdes,” along with superstitions of Romanism of an age long past? Two other cases are taken from a book which reports a large number, collected especially for his work, by the Rev. Wm. W. Patton, D.D., President of Howard University, Washington, D. C., the book being entitled “Prayer and its Remarkable Answers,” issued in 1877. Prior to knowledge of the fact, we should have been slow to believe that Dr. Spear could brand Dr. Patton as an “impostor,” or that he could

set down his well-known townsman, Mr. Platt, the restored man, as under "delusion." In the account given of the Rev. S. H. Platt, Dr. Patton says he "is at present stationed in the De Kalb Avenue Methodist Church, Brooklyn, N. Y." We abridge the story which Dr. Patton gives, as follows :

"He has been lame, and a great sufferer in one knee, for twenty-five years, and in both for three years, and has never been able to preach standing, until since his recent cure. In the summer of 1875, he went to Ocean Grove, for a vacation, and took with him a collection of narratives of faith-cures, which he carefully read, and by which he was much impressed. Sunday, July 25, two ladies called at his cottage, one of whom was a Miss Mossman, who claimed that the Lord had sent her to tell him that he might be cured of his lameness, if he would only believe; that she felt divinely impressed to go to him with the message mentioned, as she had successfully gone to several others." Mr. Platt then says: "Kneeling, she rested one hand upon each knee, just as she would upon a chair, with no pressure and no motion of any kind, and in a short prayer of not even two minutes, she asked for 'the healing of these knees.' I was conscious of no change whatever, either mental, spiritual, or physical, until about a minute after she had resumed her seat, when a sensation, unlike anything ever before or since experienced by me, began about four inches below each knee, and slowly swept upward with a sort of enveloping, condensing, and toning up feeling, seeming to permeate every fibre of tissue about the joints, and then faded out at about the same distance above the knees. I mentioned this sensation. 'Oh, yes, you are cured,' was her confident reply." Dr. Patton adds: "Since that time, Mr. Platt has walked without his canes, has preached standing, and has gradually been delivered from pain. Mr. Platt had previously tried medical and surgical remedies in vain; as also electricity and magnetism, without any permanent benefit. He has published the full particulars of his case in a pamphlet."

The last case is that of Miss Lucy R. Drake, related in Dr. Patton's book, also given by Mr. Boardman, Dr. Gordon, and others. Hers was the first case of cure at Dr. Cullis's "Home," in Boston, after he had embraced "faith healing" views. Dr. Cullis's account is this:

"At this time I had under my professional care a Christian lady, with a tumor which confined her almost continuously to her bed in severe suffering. All remedies were unavailing, and the only human hope was the knife; but feeling in my own heart the power of the promise, I one morning sat down by her bedside, and taking up the Bible, I read aloud God's promise to his believing children: 'And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.' I then asked her if she would trust the Lord to remove this tumor and restore her to health, and to her missionary work. She replied: 'I have no particular faith about it, but am willing to trust the Lord for it.' I then knelt and anointed her with oil in the name of the Lord, asking him to fulfil his own word. Soon after I left she got up and walked three miles. From that time the tumor rapidly lessened, until all trace of it at length disappeared." In Mr. Boardman's book is an account of Miss Drake's case, written by herself, at his request, dated "London, August 31, 1879." She adds some interesting facts not mentioned by Dr. Cullis. As the time for the surgical operation drew near he said to her: "You had better know how desperate your case is. You cannot live without three successive surgical operations, and the probability is you will die in the first one; but if you should live you must be a great invalid for years, enduring no common suffering, but agony." She finally decided to "let the doctor try faith. This was done, and the prayer offered was, that from that moment I might begin to amend, and the tumor to disappear. When he was praying I felt a change go all through me. As soon as he crossed the threshold and went out, I realized at once such a change and renovation that the thought came to me,

and I said, 'If I did not know I had lain here five months I should think I had been put into bed well. What God gives I'll take.' And because I had no more desire to lie in bed than if I had been perfectly well, I arose, went out to walk," etc. "And so the result can be summed up thus: Dr. Cullis prayed with me at 11 P.M. January 27, 1870, and that night found me feeling well, after a walk of three miles."

In the summer of 1879, we had the pleasure of meeting Miss Drake in London, and after a drawing-room religious service which we attended, we sought an introduction to her, and heard from her own lips an extended account of her illness in Boston, and of her recovery, as given above. Previous to this, her health having been completely restored, she had been a missionary in India for several years, had been home to the United States for a year, and was then on her way to India for the second time. She is now the wife of the Rev. Wm. B. Osborne, a missionary of the Methodist Episcopal Church in India.

We must here rest the detail of cases. Our selection has been confined to those previously published, in all instances, except those taken from Dr. Mahan's manuscript; and all of them are of recent date. The question now is, What shall be done with these cases? They cannot be puffed out by a breath, nor destroyed by a dash of the pen. If these witnesses are not competent and trustworthy, not a particle of confidence can be placed in human testimony on any subject whatever; nor is individual experience of the least possible value to determine when one is ill or when one is recovered from illness. But these narratives are true. To say that these patients and witnesses are "impostors," or are under "delusion," or "both combined," is as weak as it is wicked.

OTHER POINTS, PRECEDING THE SCRIPTURE ARGUMENT.

Before proceeding to show the foundation for "faith healing" in the Scriptures, a point or two may demand further consideration. Dr. Spear says: "These exceptional cases of faith cure are not and cannot be known to be cases of such cure at all. In not one of them can it be shown that the sick person would not have recovered if the faith cure had not been applied."

Here are two distinct propositions. Let us take the latter first. Dr. Spear seems to claim wisdom and knowledge, on this point, above all the men of medical science. They with one voice declare that medical knowledge does not compass a single case of recovery from certain diseases after they have reached a certain stage, "by nature," that is, by any recuperative power within the human organism, or any power which may be brought to bear upon it from without.

But Dr. Spear says, on the contrary, without any attempt at proof or illustration, that "these exceptional cases of faith cure may be fully explained on natural grounds." Let us take, then, as a test, a case of "cancer"—the very test which the doctors present—and let the test be represented by the case of Mrs. Mahan, which we have heretofore related. She was ill of cancer; it had reached the incurable stage; death was at the door; but she was immediately and completely cured; has been, ever since, well, during several years; is living still, in good health. Now, Dr. Spear is reduced to this alternative: (1) Either to deny the whole story concerning Mrs. Mahan—embracing alike her illness and her recovery—and to pronounce herself, Dr. Mahan, and numerous other trustworthy witnesses, "impostors," or under "delusion," or "both combined," including the ablest physicians; (2) Or he must lay claim to a knowledge superior to that of the whole medical world, and say that "nature" *did* cure Mrs. Mahan. This may do for theologians, but medical men have not been satisfied with such retreat. Some of the most noted of them have frankly said of such cases, "This must be a miracle."

The other proposition is the former of the two above-quoted sentences. Dr. Spear asserts that these alleged "cases of faith cure cannot be known to be cases of such cure at all." Let us see. That "every effect must have a cause," is an axiom in science. In some cases the cause may not be easily discovered; in others, perhaps not at all. An agnostic might say that the present issue falls into the latter category. But we are not driven to this. Here is a given effect occurring in *apparent* connection with a given instrumental cause. Multitudes of such effects, thus related to this cause, are occurring all over the most enlightened nations and among the most intelligent people. It is conceded that this instrumental cause uniformly points to an efficient cause which is capable of producing these effects; and it is also conceded that no other cause is known which satisfactorily accounts for them. In ordinary cases, if the subject were one of indifferent interest and the mind were free from prejudice, it would be readily admitted that this instrumental cause, thus related to these manifold effects, stands in *actual* connection with the efficient cause, uniformly relied on, which produces them. This would be deemed a satisfactory solution to thinking men generally, when looking at the matter upon its naked merits. But, unfortunately, the case in hand is obliged to encounter the prejudices of education, and to combat preconceived and indurated notions and religious animosities, as shown in several articles placed as references at the opening of this paper, the most remarkable culmination of

which is seen in that an able divine can deliberately pronounce multitudes of the most enlightened persons in every profession and position in life—equal, at least, to himself in every natural quality and in every Christian virtue—to be fit only for a penitentiary or a lunatic asylum, when in fact he cannot claim even the most casual acquaintance with one in a thousand of them.

Now, to apply the present issue practically, the immediate cure of the most extreme and hopeless cases of disease being affirmatively settled, the question is, What is the cause of the cure? The answer ought not to be difficult *to those who believe in prayer*. For example, prayer is offered for a sick man's recovery who is "at the point of death from an incurable disease," and, without any other means being used, he immediately recovers. The prayer invokes the immediate power of God. Thousands of such recoveries occur in all Christian lands, and, reasonably, they have a common cause; for prayer is the uniform instrumentality, the appeal is solely to the power of God, and the result is as indisputable as any well-established fact whatever. Is it not, then, scientifically rational, nay, scientifically compulsory—to those at least who believe in prayer—to admit that prayer, uniformly employed as an instrumentality, must stand connected with an efficient cause, the power of God, which produces these effects? Is there any more inherent difficulty in regarding this a rational solution than there is in accounting for innumerable answers to prayer, found in the Scriptures and out of them, relating to both secular and spiritual affairs, embracing small things and great, with which the Christian world is familiar? As a factor in the world's forces, prayer belongs to the realm of certainty. Nor is it confined to things spiritual. It reaches out and touches physical nature and works mighty changes. The Scriptures are full of this; the history of the Church, all down the ages, is full of it; the events of to-day abound with it, and this would be seen more plainly by the Church at large were it not so profoundly immersed in worldliness. The promises to prayer, with which the Scriptures abound, and whose tenor is perpetual, relate as fully to things secular and to matters in the natural world as they do to things which concern the higher interests of the soul; and their fulfilment is the same—reduced to certainty upon a basis of fact. It is just here that we place "faith healing." Through prayer it involves physical changes, and it rests upon immovable facts. Is not this solution, for the immediate cure of disease, a trifle more rational than seeking vain comfort in Christian agnosticism? Indeed, is there any other solution?

But the issue is pressed still further. It is often said that cures of

diseases of all kinds have been effected by the exertion of a superior will; by deception, such as Dr. Hammond says he practiced by giving "Croton water," which the patient supposed was "Lourdes water"; by bread pills; by a threat of horsewhipping, or a threat of murder; by spiritualism; by almost anything which powerfully excites the imagination, the hopes, or the fears, of the sick. We need only say, in reply, that nothing of all this has anything to do with the question. We fully concede all the curative virtue which may be justly claimed from these means. This entire list of remedies is, by medical writers themselves, confined to "hysteria" in its multi-form phases, along with the whole class of "nervous disorders" whose name is legion, with various other diseases of the mind, affections of the heart, hallucinations, imaginations, visions, and "what-nots." *But in no instance do medical writers pretend that cases parallel to the examples given in this paper have been cured by these agencies*—such cases as "broken bones," "withered hands," "cancers," and the like. To bring the matter to a point, we take the test which the physicians have often named—"organic diseases"—and for convenience we specify *cancer*, an "organic disease," such, for example, as the case of Mrs. Mahan. Does anybody say that such a case was ever cured by any of the above-mentioned means? Neither Dr. Hammond nor any other eminent physician or surgeon will affirm it. But the curing of "organic disease" is the challenge, in the name of medical science, to believers in "faith healing." We accept the challenge, and give the proof. The issue is then settled, and the case is closed. If any persons demur, we ask them to cure a case of "cancer" *in articulo mortis*, or mend "broken bones" immediately, by "bread pills," or by "Croton water," and give the proof to the world.*

In closing our remarks upon the branch of the theme involving the issue of fact, we are of course obliged to omit some things which may seem to demand notice. We have dwelt, however, upon what have appeared to be the more important points, while others, from the

* Dr. William A. Hammond, late Surgeon-General of the United States Army, now of New York, in his article on "The Scientific Relations of Modern Miracles," in the *International Review*, March, 1831, says: "All these cases belong to one class, the class which is peculiarly susceptible to the influence of time, of emotional disturbances, or of other strong mental impressions. *None have been of what are called organic diseases.*" Among other tests, he challenges the curing of a "broken arm in a day"—one of the very cases we have given. Of Mr. Simpson's work in New York (*Tribune*, Dec. 24, 1882), Dr. Spitzka says: "Faith cures are made in functional diseases, but there is no instance on record of *organic disease* being cured by faith. Organic troubles may perhaps be favorably influenced by it, so that the manifestations of the malady would be temporarily suspended, but this to a very slight extent." *These eminent doctors are mistaken.* We have detailed seven cases simply as examples, giving names, dates, and every essential particular—all recent cures—and six of these cases (and six hundred might be added) are classed, by medical science, as "organic diseases." We repeat, therefore, that the issue is met, the proof given, and the case closed, so far as the incontrovertible facts are concerned.

necessities of the case, must be passed over. Indeed, so much space has already been occupied with this first and essential branch of the subject, that we shall be compelled to abridge the Scripture argument much more than we could otherwise desire.

HEALING THROUGH THE PRAYER OF FAITH, SCRIPTURAL.

We come now to the question, What is the Scriptural basis for the facts of "faith healing"? It is sufficiently clear, from the facts themselves, that these healings are accomplished by the power of God in answer to prayer. It follows from this that they have their warrant in the atonement of Christ. On this point Dr. Gordon speaks with reserve, although his argument proceeds upon this basis. From this position Dr. Vincent dissents. He at least calls in question Dr. Gordon's statement, "In the atonement of Christ there seems to be a foundation laid for faith in bodily healing—seems, we say," etc., by pronouncing this "a piece of special pleading." Nothing, however, can be clearer, the facts of healing being proved, than that their warrant is in the atonement. All the evil mankind suffer results from sin. All the good they enjoy flows from the atonement. Bodily healing, then, through the prayer of faith, being a good, is among the provisions of the atonement.

It may be well to say, as there are several "theories" of the atonement, that we hold that Christ's sufferings and death for his people were strictly a vicarious offering. The truth lies here, as we understand it, rather than in what is called the "Moral Influence" theory.

All Christians admit that Christ's redemption embraces the whole man, body, soul, and spirit. But those who are ranged upon opposite sides of the present question may perhaps differ as to the time and circumstances, not only, but also as to the nature of the provision which the Gospel has made for the progress and completion of this work. Our own view is this: that the material and spiritual nature of man stands on a perfect equality before the atonement, so far as that the same provision is made for the body that is made for the soul, allowing for their natural and circumstantial differences; that in so far as the soul may be delivered from sin, during life, the body may be delivered from disease, the fruit of sin; that, as to progress in purification, and final conquest over sin and its fruits, there is no greater necessity that Christ's people should pine away during many years or through their whole earthly pilgrimage, in sickness, as many of them do, than there is that they should spend the greater part or their whole lives so largely under the power of sin; in short, if the full deliverance of the soul from sin may be at any time reached

on this side of death, so may the body be freed from disease; or if the soul must struggle with sin till death, the body may not be completely delivered till then. It is not essential to the present question, what theory of sanctification may be held, whether immediate or gradual; we merely say that the provision made for the body runs parallel to that made for the soul, so that the fruits of sin, along with sin itself, may be purged away together. If it be said that there is one noted exception to this, in that, while the souls of believers are fully released from the curse at death, the final deliverance of the body is not effected till the resurrection, we reply: We grant that the body's final triumph over "the last enemy" does not come till the resurrection, whenever that may occur. But who knows enough about the soul, or enough of death, to affirm what changes may or may not occur to the soul in the moment of dissolution, or even after death, before entrance on final glory?

That Dr. Vincent takes an opposite view, and perhaps the more popular view, is indicated by the dissent implied in the following sentence, the italics being his: "But, while the *final* redemption of the body is admitted, it is claimed that a vast *intermediate* work of cleansing takes place between conversion and final sanctification of the *soul*, and that *therefore* we are to infer a similar intermediate work for the *body*."

The truth here, however, is not suspended upon this "therefore"; nor is the doctrine concerning the provision which Christ has made for the body a mere inference from what he has done for the soul. But the whole man intact, his physical and spiritual nature alike, stands before the atonement, claiming its provisions equally for the renovation of every part of his being, in just so far as sin has made ravages, whether in the body or the soul. This parceling out of the benefits of the atonement, withholding here and granting there, is a refinement of theology, for which there is not the least authority in the word of God.

We regret that our space warrants little more than a bare statement of principles.

First. To show that the atonement furnishes the warrant for healing the body, we rely upon direct teaching of the word of God. While it might be shown, did space permit, that this provision stands forth, with most abundant illustration, in the types and shadows and rites and covenants and oaths and promises of the older economy, running back to the earliest proclamation of redemption immediately after the fall of man, it will be sufficient for our present purpose to note the specific announcement of the doctrine by the Prophet Isaiah,

more than seven hundred years before Messiah's advent as interpreted and applied to the subject in hand by the Evangelist Matthew. Isaiah has been called, emphatically, the "Evangelical Prophet." With a clearness surpassing, perhaps, that of any Old Testament writer, he sets forth the full design of the sacrifice of Christ. He declares, in terms, that it embraces the body and the soul alike, the sins and defilements of the latter no more than the diseases and corruptions of the former. His language is: "He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities." "*Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows*"; "and with his stripes we are healed" (Isaiah liii. 4, 5). How does the Evangelist apply these words of the Prophet? Christ had healed a leper; then, immediately after, he healed the centurion's servant; then he healed Peter's wife's mother; then, upon healing a great multitude, occurs this comment: "When the even was come they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils; and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the Prophet, saying, *Himself took our infirmities and bear our diseases.*"—*Rev. Ver.* (Matt. viii. 16, 17).*

* Archbishop Magee, in his work on "The Atonement," will be deemed a competent authority on the matters here noted. The Septuagint uses a word (*ἀμαρτία*) for "griefs" in this passage from Isaiah, which means *sins*. But this is evidently an error, as observed by Dr. Magee, who says: "I find that in ninety-three instances in which the word here translated *ἀμαρτία*, or its kindred verb, is found in the Old Testament in any sense that is not entirely foreign from the passage before us, there occurs but this one in which the word is so rendered; it being, in all other cases, expressed by *ἀσθενεία, παῖσκα, or some other word denoting bodily disease*. That the Jews themselves considered this passage of Isaiah [he hath borne our *griefs*] as referring to *bodily diseases*, appears from Whitby and Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. viii. 17, and also *Poole's Synopsis* on Isaiah liii. 4, *Pes.* and *Alsch.* And that the word is to be taken in this sense, appears not only from the authority of the Jews, but from that of most of the ancient translations." Then, after giving many names as authorities, Dr. Magee says: "All the lexicons explain it in the same sense,"—"so that the word *infirmities*, by which Lowth and Vitringa, in agreement with the old English versions, have rendered it in this place, cannot possibly be rejected. Mr. Dodson entirely concurs in this interpretation; and Kennicott asserts positively that the word always denotes *bodily diseases*." In full accord with Dr. Magee, says Lange: "Christ takes away disease, in token of removing its root, sin, by taking upon himself death as the full wages and the full burden of sin." "The Evangelist gives us here the key to the mystery of Christ's atoning death. By his fellow-suffering with our diseases, he gradually descended into the unfathomable depths of his full sympathy with our death. Hence his miracles of healing partook of the nature of atoning suffering, and prepared for it." Says Albert Barnes: "In the fifty-third chapter, Isaiah fully states the doctrine of the atonement, or that the Messiah was to suffer for sin. In the verse quoted, however (Matt. viii. 17; Isaiah liii. 4), he states the very truth which Matthew declares. The word translated '*griefs*,' in Isaiah, and '*infirmities*,' in Matthew, means, properly, in the Hebrew and Greek, *diseases of the body*. In neither does it refer to diseases of the mind, or to sin. To bear those '*griefs*' is clearly to bear them *away*, or to remove them" (*Notes on Isaiah*). Commenting further on Isaiah liii. 4, when speaking of the phrase, "He hath borne," Mr. Barnes says: "If applied to *sin*, it means that a man must bear the burden of the punishment of his own sin, or that the suffering that is due to sin is *taken up* and *borne* by another. If applied to *diseases*, as in Matt. viii. 17, it must mean that he, as it were, lifted them up and *bore them away*." Upon the words, "our griefs," Mr. Barnes says: "The word here used means, properly, *sickness, disease, anxiety, affliction*. It does not refer to *sins*, but to *sufferings*. It is translated *sickness*, Deut. xxviii. 61; vii. 15; 2 Chron. xxi. 15; 1 Kings xvii. 17—*disease*, Eccl. vi. 2; 2 Chron. xxi. 18; xvi. 12; Ex. xv. 26. It is never, in our version, rendered *sin*, and never used to denote sin." These authorities are sufficient for our purpose.

The doctrine taught by Isaiah and Matthew embraces these points: (1) That these passages speak of Christ's atonement. (2) That this atonement was not only made for sin, but also for disease, the fruit of sin. (3) That in atoning, for our diseases of body, just as for our sins of soul, Christ took them upon himself that he might *bear them away*, and thus relieve his people from the need of bearing them.

Dr. Vincent does not agree with the foregoing view. He dissents, in terms, from the doctrine, "that Christ vicariously endured our *diseases* as well as our *iniquities*" (his italics). Again: "Christ, it is said, is our *pain-bearer* as well as our *sin-bearer*. But this kind of reasoning appears to overlook the *disciplinary* office of affliction" (his italics). Dr. Vincent's "quarrel" (to use his own term) is with Isaiah and Matthew. But his doctrine is simply monstrous. (1) Christ bore our sins, that he might remove them; so that we, therefore, need not bear them. (2) *But Christ did not bear our pains, the fruits of sin, and accordingly they are not removed; therefore, we must bear them!* (3) The outcome is, that Christ's sufferings were a partial, but not a complete atonement; therefore, the sufferings of his people are necessary to complete it!

Against this teaching we present the whole body of Scripture. It is something, indeed, to have sin removed, yea "much every way"; but still, if its pains remain, Christ's atonement is but a *half* work. This doctrine involves some nice questions. If it applies here, why should it not apply hereafter? An atonement which merely cancels sin may lay the foundation for pardon; but if sin's pains are not borne away, how is the soul ever to get to heaven without carrying its pains with it? (As to the "*disciplinary* office of affliction," we shall notice that farther along.)

Second. The healing of the body having its warrant in the atonement, we should naturally expect to see it practically carried out in Gospel work. It was so in Christ's ministry. "He went about doing good" is a phrase which sums up his daily life. He gave quite as much attention to healing "all manner of sickness and all manner of disease," as he did to preaching salvation from sin through his name. Nor were these "multitudes" of healings, daily, designed, "primarily," to prove his authority. Although they did attest it, other "mighty works" were chiefly designed for this, while curing disease was but practically "fulfilling," as Matthew declares, what Christ's atonement directly provided for. With this design, it is worthy of note to observe how often it is said he was "moved with *compassion*"

to heal;* just as "God so loved the world," is the key to the entire work of redemption.

If, then, Christ's ministry was thus distinguished, and if bodily healing was intended to be incorporated as among the regular provisions of grace, we should expect to find Christ giving express authority to proclaim the healing of the body as well as the cure of the soul, when he should send out the preachers of his Gospel; and this is just what we do find announced in distinct terms. (1) When he sent forth the "twelve disciples" to preach, he "gave them power to cure diseases"; and he "sent them to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick." Acting on this commission, "they went through the towns, preaching the Gospel and healing everywhere." (2) When Christ sent out "the seventy," into certain cities, he said to them, "Heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." It is conceded that the commission to "the twelve" and that to "the seventy" were of a temporary nature. (3) But after his resurrection, Christ gave a permanent commission to his Church to "preach the Gospel to every creature." Here, also, we find "healing," and "preaching the kingdom," combined. Among the "signs" which, in the execution of this perpetual commission, should "follow them that believe," were, "they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."† (4) We find this power of healing, under this general and permanent commission, exercised throughout the primitive Church and wherever the Gospel was preached. The Acts of the Apostles is full of it. (5) It is spoken of as a power, in Paul's writings, among other powers which are conceded to belong to the Church to the end, or "till he come" (1 Cor. xii.).

Third. Was, then, this provision for the body designed to be temporary or permanent? "Our real quarrel," says Dr. Vincent, "arises on the claim" that these healings "must be a *standing feature* of the Church of the present day" (his italics). But why not? Notice the reasons for permanency. (1) Bodily healing springs from the atonement, just as soul-cure does. (2) As people are still everywhere diseased, *and sickness is the most wide-spread of all the fruits of sin*, the same necessity exists now, for bodily cure, that existed in Christ's

* Jesus "saw a great multitude, and was moved with *compassion* toward them, and he healed their sick" (Matt. xiv. 14). The same, also, in Matt. xx. 34; Mark i. 41; v. 15-19; Luke vii. 13.

† On a subsequent page, notice is taken of the other "signs" mentioned in Mark xvi. 17, 18. We are well aware that the authenticity of the last twelve verses of Mark's Gospel is questioned, but we are not disturbed at this. Able scholarship vindicates it. Among the latest presentations of the case we have seen, is that by Prof. B. B. Warfield, D.D., in *The Independent*, who disputes its authenticity. We counted, at the time, just three dozen names of scholars, whose opinions Prof. Warfield referred to, and, if our recollection serves, they were about equally divided upon the question. The Revised Version retains the passage, although stating that it is not found in certain ancient manuscripts. One of the ablest experts on such matters was the late Prof. J. Addison Alexander, D.D. His reasons for the full authority of this passage we deem highly satisfactory.

time, or that ever did exist; the same that exists for soul-cure, arising from the continuance of sin. (3) It was, in view of this, put by Christ into the Church's universal and perpetual commission. (4) It stands, also, side by side with other provisions which are conceded to be permanent. (5) Of course, then, it has never been revoked—Dr. Vincent admits this—or in any manner limited or restricted. (6) If this provision were designed to be temporary, is it not reasonable to suppose that we should have had some revocation of it? for it is, as a principle, or a doctrine, one of the most radical and far-reaching. (7) The most rational conclusion is that it remains in permanency; for this is the only satisfactory ground on which to account for the actual cases of healing which are still occurring all over the Christian world.

We wish distinctly to emphasize this last point. The phenomena of "faith healing" being established by unimpeachable testimony, it is impossible to explain them on any Scriptural basis other than that they have their warrant in the atonement as among the regular provisions of grace. The passages we have quoted distinctly show this basis and directly declare this warrant; the authority for the phenomena has never been revoked; the facts of healing continue. This is the whole case.

It is just here that our opponents make their most signal logical blunder. They assume that the primary purpose of primitive healings was the authentication of the preacher's commission, and now that the necessity for that is past, these healings must have ceased. It is fully conceded that such "mighty works" as "raising the dead," and some others, were for such authentication, and as this may be no longer needed, *they* have ceased. But "healing the sick," as before shown, flows from the divine "compassion," as the Gospel itself does; and, as sickness and disease, in their various ramifications—by far the most prevalent, oppressive, and unceasing of all the fruits of sin—still continue, the same necessity for healing exists that ever did exist. Hence, while "healing the sick" is expressly mentioned in the universal and perpetual commission given to the Church to "preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark xvi. 17, 18), the "raising of the dead" is excluded from it. Moreover, each of the other powers therein mentioned is directly concerned with the spread of the Gospel, and the work is benevolent in its character; and it can easily be shown, from the history of the Church, that all of them have been exercised whenever the exigencies of Gospel service, in extreme cases, have demanded it.*

* "The Scots Worthies" show this, in regard to nearly all the five "signs" which Mark mentions. Modern missions to the heathen show it. Professor Christlieb, of Bonn University, admits

But it is still claimed that cases of healing are only "exceptional," even though the provision be admitted to be permanent. "One reason," says Dr. Vincent, "why God *uses sparingly* the miracles of healing, is," etc. By "exceptional" is meant that they are not universally prevalent. This, however, does not prove that bodily healing is not a "standing feature" of the provisions of grace, any more than "non-user" in regard to any other provision would be proof against it. Observe how this would bear upon essential doctrines of the Gospel. It is clear, even admitted, that bodily healing prevailed in the primitive Church and continued down into the early centuries of the Christian era. But suppose, after a time, the truth on this point became obscured and the practice was held in abeyance, was it not so with nearly every vital Gospel truth? Soon after Cæsar and the Bride of Christ were joined in unholy wedlock in Rome, nearly the entire Gospel went into almost total eclipse and remained so for centuries. "Salvation through faith in Christ alone" was buried under a rubbish of works, idolatries, and diabolisms. The successive persecutions of Imperial Rome drove the true Church into the hills and valleys of Piedmont; and what do we find there? The Waldensian Church embody this doctrine of "healing through faith" in their creed, showing, as their judgment, that it is an essential element of the Gospel.*

Indeed, the proof is clear and abundant that the practice of "healing the body through the prayer of faith," never did wholly cease in the Church, even in its darkest and most corrupt periods, any more than that "justification by faith" ceased to be held by the Lord's true people. Nothing is better established than this in the facts of history.

Fourth. Dr. Vincent shrinks from admitting Christ to be our "pain-bearer," because this "appears to overlook the *disciplinary* office of affliction." But we beg to ask, For whom did he bear pain, if not for his people? Certainly not for himself. We demand, also, to have it

its necessity. In Christian lands, to-day, as complete a casting out of demons occurs, in certain cases of moral reform, as did in Christ's time, and the cure of total derangement of mind, in answer to prayer, is not uncommon. Dr. Mahan testifies to cases coming within his knowledge in England. Others, engaged in Gospel service, have been "miraculously" delivered when brought into peril; others still have been saved from the "deadly thing," so that it did not "hurt them," and from the serpent's bite. If it were asked why "healing the sick," with other promised blessings, is not more common, the true answer might be the same as to the question why conversions to Christ are not more numerous. The Church lacks the requisite faith; in some cases, lacks knowledge.

* "Therefore, concerning this anointing of the sick, we hold it *as an article of faith*, and profess that sick persons, when they ask it, . . . praying that it may be efficacious to the healing of the body, according to the design and end and effect mentioned by the apostles; and we profess that such anointing, performed according to the apostolic design and practice, will be healing and profitable. . . . We exhort all, that when they are really ill, they omit not to receive that ordinance at their hands, and in no way despise it" (Waldensis "Confessio," as cited by Gordon, p. 65).

shown, not by human reasoning, but by direct Scriptural authority, that Christ endured a single pang of suffering, from the manger to the cross, that was not endured as a work of atonement, embracing those actually rescued from sin and all others who are in any way benefited by it.

This problem of suffering requires a treatment by volume, rather than in a page at the close of a review article. The vital question is, If Christ has made a complete atonement, if he is our "pain-bearer" as well as our "sin-bearer"—if he has *borne away* both our sins and our pains—why do his people still so greatly suffer? The ordinary view is that affliction (and sickness in particular) is a blessing to be prized. It is exalted into a regularly-ordained means of grace, deemed to be essential to the perfecting of Christian character, regarded as on the same plane of gracious provisions as prayer, the sacraments, divine truth, and the influences of the Spirit of God.

Dr. Vincent, in seeming accord with this view of the case, thinks the salutary "office of affliction" will be seriously compromised if we grant Christ to be our "pain-bearer." He remarks, very truly: "No one needs to be told the salutary uses of affliction are emphasized in the Scriptures." He quotes, at considerable length, passages to show that affliction is sent directly by God: "Whom the Lord loveth *he* chasteneth." "Though *he* cause grief." "*He* doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." "I know that *thou* in faithfulness hast afflicted me." "Let us return unto the Lord, *for he hath torn*, and he will heal us. *He hath smitten*, and he will bind us up."

These italics are his, and they are introduced to emphasize the doctrine that as God directly sends affliction, it must be a part of the economy of grace in such a sense as that Christ cannot have borne our pains. Had he done this, "the *disciplinary* office of affliction" would have been destroyed. That God sends affliction no one questions. But he sends it for a purpose. The whole question, which Dr. Vincent scarcely touches, is, *Why* does he send it? Why is it at all a necessity of his administration? The whole turns upon this; and, indeed, God's purpose cannot be concealed, for it glimmers, even though faintly, from some of the texts which Dr. Vincent quotes.

The starting-point is this: that Christ has borne our "pains" as truly as our "sins." If this be not so, any attempt to explain the atonement, or to solve the problem of suffering, is hopeless. Then it inevitably follows, that what Christ has borne for us, we need not bear for ourselves. He took the whole load from our shoulders to his own, that he might *bear it away*, and forever relieve us of the burden. We are speaking, now, of the "pains" of the present life,

and not of natural death ; that, all are to endure, as before stated. Upon these postulates, the sufferings of the Lord's people may be reduced to the following three classes: (1) "Discipline" visited for sins and shortcomings. (2) Sickness, with other sufferings, endured because the sufferer has been taught to regard this as unavoidable, a direct and essential means of grace of divine appointment. (3) Sufferings from the world and from Satan, because of the Gospel, voluntarily endured for Christ's cause, for all which a higher reward is promised. We note these points separately, but can barely touch them.

1. A large part of the sufferings of the Lord's people belong to the first class. The term "discipline" implies that many will not be taught without it, although the direct provisions of grace are suited to all the exigencies of life. As distinguished representatives, we put into this class David, Peter, and Paul. David has written much in praise of affliction ; and yet, no writer's case has been so little understood, although it is a very plain case. David said : "It is good for me that I have been afflicted." How many plaintive and beautiful homilies on "the sweet lessons of affliction" have been fairly, rather unfairly, *wrenched* out of these words, though David is in no way responsible for the perversion ! What are the facts ? The great king had been guilty of lying, adultery, and murder ! When Nathan stripped off the royal purple and aroused him from his guilty trance, he could, of course, praise affliction. It was his only salvation. "Before I was afflicted I went astray." But if he had not gone astray, his affliction would not have been necessary. So, also, Peter could praise affliction after the second cock-crowing ; but had he not shamefully denied his Lord, that piercing look need never have been given. Even the idolized Paul frankly admits the necessity of his "thorn in the flesh" to prevent his undue elation. So it will be found, among multitudes of Christ's followers, that their afflictions have a "*disciplinary* office" to fill, just because their sins or shortcomings have made this necessary. The ordinary and regularly prescribed means of grace—such as the study of the Scriptures, prayer, the sacraments, Christian fellowship, earnest Christian work, and the like, blessed of the Holy Spirit—are all that are needed, in any case and for every case, for the perfecting of Christian character ; but if Christians fail to embrace their full privileges and to discharge their full duties, God must afflict them ; there is no other way.

2. But many others suffer affliction just because they have been educated to believe in it as a regular, essential, and "blessed means of grace." In a long sickness, they think they are fulfilling the entire will of God if they endure suffering meekly and show to others the

virtues of patience and submission. As examples of patient suffering—which they truly may be—they are held up to the world as its instructors; and thus, possibly, uniting their sufferings to those of Christ, they unconsciously eke out for mankind what is lacking in Christ's atoning work. But what, right here, do we see? Though bedridden for twenty years, under an impression that they have no duty or privilege but to "endure the will of God patiently," multitudes of these sick ones have been instantly healed. They eagerly seized the word which roused them from bondage and brought them deliverance, and, made "every whit whole," they started on their way rejoicing.

3. Another class become sufferers for the Gospel's sake, voluntarily enduring "the reproach of Christ"; and to all such, special reward is promised. (1) There are degrees in the heavenly reward. "According as his work shall be," not as of merit, but for service rendered, is a phrase which indicates this. Christ taught this doctrine in his parables (*vide*, also, Psalm lxii. 12; 2 Cor. v. 10). (2) All Christians will get into heaven, but some will get barely within the gates; others will be saved, but "so as by fire"; while those distinguished for faithful service, or who have laid down their lives for Christ, will be advanced to the higher glory. Paul will be of this latter class, and hence, representing many, could "glory in tribulations." His terrible "perils" were endured voluntarily; but they had the pledge of a glorious recompense. (3) Voluntary suffering and devotion always stand connected with the promise of the higher glory. "If so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." This phrase, "if so be," indicates a voluntary consecration. Then, for encouragement to such consecration, we are assured that our present "light affliction," arising therefrom, "worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." (4) All those Scriptures which speak of "tribulation," "persecution," bearing "reproach," and many more in the same line, presume a most hearty surrender of all to Christ in Gospel work for mankind, resulting in various "afflictions" endured from the world and from Satan, which supreme devotion to the Gospel is sure to bring, sometimes even unto a martyr's death; but, for such supreme devotion, a special and glorious reward is promised. (5) Nor is this reward wholly reserved for the future life. A goodly portion is often enjoyed here, even when in the midst of the furnace. The martyrs could sing praises to Christ, when in the flames. The presence of Christ, by his Spirit, filled them with a joy which quenched suffering. So, Paul declares: "I am exceeding joyful in all our tribulation"; "who now rejoice in my sufferings for you."

We think it will be found, as already stated, that all those texts of Scripture which bear upon the sufferings of Christ's people, may be classed under the foregoing heads. But we cannot pursue the point further.

Fifth. It is worthy of special notice, amidst all that is said in the Scriptures concerning affliction, chastisement, suffering, tribulation, persecution, sorrow, lamentation, mourning, etc., including Paul's terrible catalogue of "perils" and all other reproaches borne for Christ in advancing the Gospel, that *sickness* and *disease* (omitting that accompanying death) are not once mentioned as entering into the experience of the Lord's people, by his appointment, except under the following conditions: As rebukes for sin, or for delinquency in duty, express or implied; (1) often previously *threatened* as such, in case of disobedience; (2) afterward *sent* as such, when disobedience has occurred; (3) their *removal* promised, on return to obedience; (4) their *prevention* assured, in case of continued obedience.

As this is a negative proposition, proof by citation of texts would not be complete if a single text bearing on the case were omitted; therefore, to avoid encumbering the page, even by mere references to so many texts, each reader is left to search for himself. Enough passages directly sustain each of these specifications to establish the doctrine; in all other cases it is fairly implied.*

Moreover, sickness and disease, as fruits of sin, along with sin itself, are among the "works of the devil" which "the Son of God was manifested to destroy," although they are utilized by God in the manner stated; and while it is worthy of remark that the vast mass of disease under which the world groans—evincing the direst of sin's fruits—is the result of violating "nature's laws," the laws of health, which are but the laws of God, it is especially noteworthy that the extent of this violation, in the abuse of man's natural appetites and passions, shows Satan's most ingenious and successful device for

* The minds of some will immediately turn upon such cases as that of Trophimus, Paul's "thorn in the flesh," Epaphroditus, and possibly others. These are stock objections to the whole doctrine of "faith healing." But they are easily disposed of. Our total ignorance never furnishes a good premiss from which to reason in such grave matters. (1) Of Trophimus, the entire account is this, in Paul's words: "Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick." Scores of guesses why Paul did not heal him have been made. To say that he had not faith to be healed will do for another; and, if a true guess, his case would be similar to what Christ and the Apostles sometimes found. But, be that as it may, until we know what the matter was we cannot argue the case; much less have we a right to cite it against the doctrine in hand in the face of the overwhelming positive proof which sustains it. (2) As to Paul's case, our ignorance is equally profound. More solutions have been attempted, as to what his "thorn in the flesh" was, than there are letters in the alphabet. One thing, however, is reasonably clear: it was not sickness, in all probability, and that is what we are now chiefly concerned with. (3) But the case of Epaphroditus is decidedly in our favor. Paul says: "Ye had heard that he had been sick. For indeed he was sick nigh unto death; but God had mercy on him," etc.

attaining his end, the ruin of mankind, and brings out also, in the strongest light, the grandeur of that atonement which embraces the body and its diseases along with the soul and its sins.

Sixth. But, it may be said, if the atonement has this wide sweep, and Christ is really our "pain-bearer" as well as our "sin-bearer," why need the Lord's people suffer in *mind* any more than in *body*? Why has not Christ borne away, so that we need not bear them, our sorrows of *heart* of every kind, as well as our diseases of body and sins of soul? *This is precisely what he has done*; "hath borne our griefs," not only, but hath "carried our sorrows," and borne *them away*, also, so that we need no longer bear them. This exemption, to accept and enjoy, is the Gospel offer to all believers; and, to decline or neglect this, is as clearly a sin against God as to decline or neglect the offer of salvation. It is, in fact, so far forth, rejecting the "great salvation" which Christ has provided. Every sorrow, therefore, should be turned over to Christ; and, if this be done, he will take all and relieve us.*

This is the meaning of scores of texts in both the Old and New Testaments, of which the following are a sample: "Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and he shall sustain thee" (Psalm lv. 22). "Casting all your care upon him, for he careth for you" (1 Peter v. 7), (*vide*, also, Matt. vi. 25-34; Ps. xxxvii. 3, 4, 25; Rom. viii. 28; Phil. iv. 4; James i. 2-4). Doing this, in trusting confidence of faith, the bitterest sorrows may be turned into joy. This is not only Christian doctrine, but actual Christian experience, with many, and might and should be with all. Hence, Paul declares for himself and his fellow-disciples what might be true of every child of God, and is so for those who voluntarily and cheerfully bear reproach for Christ: "We glory in tribulations"; and, to fully devoted ones, these "tribulations" shall bring, as a reward, "a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

In a word, Christ having borne our *sins*, our *sicknesses*, our *sorrows*, in order that we *need not bear them*, his complete atonement provides for our being "complete in him"; and as all his blessings are now freely offered us, we may now take and enjoy them; or, if any deem it a

* Archbishop Magee, in his work on "The Atonement," commenting upon the words of Isaiah (liii. 4), "carried our sorrows," says: "This relates not to bodily pains and distempers, but to the diseases and torments of the *mind*." He then gives many passages where the Hebrew is so rendered. So, also, on this phrase of Isaiah, "our sorrows," Albert Barnes says: "The proper difference between this word (sorrows) and the word translated 'griefs,' is, that this refers to the pains of the *mind*, that to the *body*; this to anguish, to anxiety, and trouble of the soul; that to bodily infirmity and disease." "The phrase ('our sorrows'), therefore, properly seems to mean, that he took upon himself the *mental* sorrows of men. He not only took their diseases, and bore them away, but he also took or bore their *mental* griefs; that is, he subjected himself to the kind of mental sorrow which was needful, in order to remove them." (Notes on Isaiah, author's italics.)

better way, then let them drag their threefold burden of sin and sickness and sorrow till death shall release them, thus appearing more as Satan's deluded galley-slaves than as the Lord's enlightened freemen.*

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

The attentive reader will perceive that this subject touches the vitals of the Christian scheme. It is no more than just to say that some bearings of the truth still lie before our mind in a tentative state; nevertheless, what we have advanced, we deem abundantly sustained by Scripture. No theologian whose views are of real value will claim that he has exhausted all that God's revelation contains, any more than the true scientist will claim that he has exhausted nature. That student of the Bible is truly to be pitied upon whose mind and heart, under the light promised by the Holy Spirit, new aspects of truth are not frequently dawning; and the world will long realize the correctness of the remark of the old Puritan, John Robinson, who was "very confident that the Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word." God's word is "forever settled in heaven" (Psalm cxix. 89), but our complete knowledge of it is not yet attained; hence, in the proper sense of the phrase, theology is

* Dr. R. W. Patterson says: "It now only remains to speak very briefly of the facts alleged in the proof of the Faith Cure." Of course, "very briefly"; for "the facts" always get pushed into a corner. He then continues: "Dr. Cullis' many letters from persons supposed to have been healed, are given without a single full name of any one claiming to have been cured by the prayer of faith. Only the initials of the names are published. Thus we have the testimony of unknown persons respecting their own experience, without the means, in most cases, of investigating the facts" (*The Interior*, Dec. 14, 1882). Dr. Cullis is not the only one who publishes cases of cure. If Dr. Patterson intends "investigating the facts" in sober earnestness, he can be accommodated with multitudes of cases, with names and dates in full. We have given a few, barely as a sample. He makes a point that prayer is offered for some who are not healed. Be it so. But the real question for him is, Why are *any* healed, of "organic diseases"?—and not why there are some failures. He further says: "There is no case alluded to where the Saviour or the apostles attempted to heal the sick without entire success." Such a broad assertion is a little remarkable, in view of the following concerning Christ: "And he did not many mighty works there, because of their unbelief" (Matt. xiii. 58). Again: "And he could there do no mighty works, save that he laid his hand upon a few sick folk, and healed them. And he marveled because of their unbelief" (Mark vi. 5, 6). The following also occurs concerning the disciples, who asked Christ, "Why could not we cast him out?"—that is, a "devil" out of a child. Christ answered, "Because of your unbelief" (Matt. xvii. 19, 20). Upon these incidents we ask, Was it any more difficult for Christ to raise the dead than to heal the sick, or *vice versa*? Who can tell whether the "mighty works" which "unbelief" hindered Christ and the apostles from doing did not include "healing the sick"? Indeed, the above passage from Mark—"upon a few sick folk"—shows that "unbelief" *did* hinder his work of "healing," so that he could heal only "a few," instead of the "multitudes," as he had healed elsewhere. If, then, "unbelief" hindered both Christ and his disciples, why may it not account for failures now? Will Dr. Patterson tell us why *any*, in this day, should succeed in the same field where Christ so signally failed? And now comes good Dr. Cuyler with this, among other things which want of space compels us to omit: "Christ has never promised to restore any invalid *without* the use of human expedients" (*N. Y. Evangelist*, May 3, 1883). But will Dr. Cuyler please tell us of a single case where Christ has ever promised this *with* their use; or where he has, in any case, prescribed their use, except in such instances as those which "faith healers" recognize, namely, "laying on hands" (Mark xvi. 18), and "anointing with oil" (James v. 14)?

and must be a progressive science, although its elemental doctrines are well understood by the Church. As to the special subject treated in this article, we barely state, in conclusion, a few points.

1. We have met with those, interested in the subject, who desire many questions answered which could not be even touched within the limits of this article. Suffice it to say, that every difficulty, or supposed difficulty, concerning the healing of the body of disease, may be fully and sharply paralleled concerning the curing of the soul of sin. A parallelism runs through the Scriptures upon the provision which Christ has made for our physical and spiritual nature. This principle may serve as a key to answer many questions. Take, merely as an example, the following: Why are not all healed who are prayed for? Why are some healed immediately, and others gradually? Why do some, who have been partially or wholly cured, again relapse into sickness? If this doctrine is true, why do not all the sick embrace it? These and many other questions will apply just as well, and for precisely the same reasons, if asked concerning the curing of the soul of sin, and the general progress of the Gospel among men, both in relation to presenting the truth to the impenitent and to Christians. This parallelism stands forth in remarkable completeness.

2. One thing which stumbles certain inquirers, when they really do condescend to look at facts, visiting, for example, such a convocation as assembles at Old Orchard, Maine, under Dr. Cullis, every summer, is, that many of the diseases treated are comparatively slight, and possibly some of these persons would recover in any event. Dr. S. Irenæus Prime, of the New York *Observer*, on visiting Old Orchard, in 1882, admits that many were cured, but says "they were not miracles." Of course, if the doctrine of "healing through the prayer of faith" be Scriptural, its practical application will be mostly concerned with moderate ailments, for these are the more prevalent. Cancers are probably few compared to fevers and lighter disorders. It is only the graver cases—such as cancers, broken bones, withered limbs, etc.—which, to the sceptical, are the real tests of the doctrine; while it is true that all lighter ailments, even to a "sick headache," are equally provided for. It is just here that Dr. Vincent seems a little troubled. He says: "Dr. Boardman relates that, being at the house of a lady who was detained from her guests by sick headache, he sent up word to her that, if she would only accept *literally* the words of the one-hundred-and-third Psalm, 'who healeth all thy diseases,' she might be cured." Dr. Vincent thereupon asks: "Whether in the millennium of miracle which these writers are laboring to bring in, miracles . . .

are to be cheapened into ordinary remedies for sick headache or colic?" He thinks, apparently, that this is rather a small business for the Almighty to be concerned about. We ask, in return, if God's providence, which numbers the hairs of every head, is at all "cheapened" when concerned with the aching brain which those hairs cover? Or, if the fond mother's love for God is likely to be lessened, or his love for her "cheapened" in her esteem, when she is assured that he who directs the stars in their orbits, bends low his ear from the highest heavens to listen to every heart-throb of her sick babe?

3. The opponents of "faith healing" delight in exhibiting the vagaries of some who claim to exercise this power from God, and from certain evident freaks of fanaticism they immediately draw unfavorable conclusions and repudiate the whole subject. But where would Christianity have been, to-day, if, when treated in like manner, such evidence had guided the world's judgment? Fanatics will always seize upon every good thing under heaven. On the other hand, there is no good cause which fails to encounter ignorance and prejudice, and the world is familiar with illustrations which show that, full often, some of the Lord's people have been in this condemnation; and it will be so to the end.

4. Of the fifteen or more articles named in a foot-note at the beginning of this paper, to which many similar ones might be added, embracing long and labored essays in quarterlies, monthlies, pamphlets, newspapers, written by professors in theological seminaries, professors in universities, editors, pastors, physicians, surgeons, scientists, all of them being against "faith healing," there is scarcely one of these articles which goes to the core of the subject, while but a few of these writers make even a respectable approach to its confines. This could be easily shown, and the showing would be entertaining, had we space for a bill of particulars. The staple commodity of quite a number of these pieces, written by confessedly able men, is sneers and ridicule. The time for this method of attack, with sensible men, should be past. The theme demands a more serious handling. With some little acquaintance with theological discussion, we have rarely met with so much ineffective writing, covering so much space, by men of prominent standing, as is found in these articles. We suggest to them, with all due deference, if they again essay to take up the subject, to begin at the only place where a proper beginning can be made, and earnestly grapple with the facts. So far, they for the most part ignore them, while not a few entertain us with an able presentation of axiomatic generalities about miracles and cognate themes, which no one disputes, but which have little or nothing to

do with the real question at issue. Often it happens that one of the weakest weapons which a logician can use—and these writers, as a class, seem remarkably fond of it—is a proposition involving the universal negative. To make this effective, on any given subject, universal affirmative knowledge is required upon it; but this is rarely ever possessed, and frequently its attainment is impossible. Universal denials, therefore, of the facts presented in the annals of the “faith cure,” amount to nothing in the argument but to make manifest the folly of those who resort to them.

R. L. STANTON.