

DIVINE HEALING

OR,

**The Claims and Cures of Faith Healers
Scripturally Examined**



BY

HAROLD P. BARKER

6 D. NET
Sevenpence
post free

“Divine Healing”

Scripturally Examined

DEALING WITH

Faith Healers—Their Claims and Cures
Favourite Texts of Faith Healers
Bible Cures and Modern Cures
Modern Faith Healing Campaigns

BY

HAROLD P. BARKER



PICKERING & INGLIS

14 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.4
229 BOTHWELL STREET, GLASGOW, C.1

Faith Healing.

	PAGE
I. The Standpoint of Examination, A Fancied Cure—A Real Cure—No Cures.	3
II. Faith Healers and Their Cures, No Organic Cures—Investigation Depre- cated—Subjective Results—Christ's Cures v. Modern Cures.	7
III. Favourite Texts of Faith Healers, Freedom from Sickness—Sickness Atoned For—Laying on of Hands—Sickness and Satan — Epaphroditus — Mortal Body Quickened.	12
IV. The Christian and Sickness, Timothy and his Stomach—James and the Prayer of Faith—Missionaries and Medicine —J. N. Darby and James V.	19
V. The Better Way—according to the Book, .. Healing Withheld—Healing of the Soul— As Christ Healed—Divine Healing and the Atonement—When Faith Healers Fail.	25
VI. The Bubble Bursting in America and Else- where, Campaigns for Healing—Marvellous Cures— Nearly Equal to Christ—Absence of Facts.	35
VII. Faith Healers' Questions Answered, .. Thirty-one Questions, propounded by F. F. BOSWORTH, answered from the Scriptures.	39

Reprinted from *The Witness*, a Monthly Journal of Biblical Literature to which Mr. Barker contributes.

“DIVINE HEALING”

Scripturally Examined.

The Standpoint of Examination

IN this booklet we write for those who recognise the Holy Scriptures as the final court of appeal, and who prefer to abide by their teaching rather than trust to “the evidence of their own senses.”

An appeal from the Scriptures to the evidence of our own eyes is ruled out by what would appear to be the true rendering of Colossians 2. 18. The Revisers, guided by the preponderance of authorities, omit the negative and translate “dwelling in the things which he hath seen,” giving as a marginal alternative, “*taking his stand upon* the things which he hath seen.”*

“Taking his stand upon the things which he hath seen” rather than upon the Word of God: this is the attitude that so many seem to adopt. If the Bible confirms them in their convictions, well and good. But if it contradicts that which they have seen with their eyes, so much the worse for the Bible! This booklet, however, is intended for those who gladly subscribe to the apostolic dictum, “Let God be true, but every man (even my own eyes and ears) a liar” (Rom. 3. 4).

* The marginal readings of the Revised Version are, by a general consensus of opinion among Bible students, often to be preferred to the text, and in Lloyd’s “Corrected English New Testament” the Revised Version marginal rendering is incorporated in the text.

Untrustworthy Evidence.

The evidence of one's own senses is notoriously untrustworthy. Who does not remember being informed in the early months of the Great War by persons of unquestioned integrity that they had actually seen trains filled with Russian troops journeying south from Wick and Aberdeen? The writer was told by a friend, who would die rather than knowingly utter a false word, that he had *seen* a train full of Russians pass through Oxford station. Others “spoke to them,” “heard their guttural voices,” “saw their bearded faces,” and regarded all incredulity on the subject as an insulting impeachment of their veracity. Yet there were no Russians. It was a delusion. Those who *took their stand upon the things that they had seen* were wrong.

This untrustworthiness of human testimony must be remembered in dealing with the subject that we have in hand. We should turn to the Word of God with increased thankfulness for its utter and absolute reliability and sufficiency.

Testimony as to Cures.

Now there exists, beyond all dispute, a most extensive array of testimony to the fact of cures being wrought by the agency of “faith,” or of some super-normal means. It has ever been so. But without digging into the records of the past, the testimony of hundreds of witnesses in our own day calls for serious and sympathetic examination.

The net result of such examination on the part of men well qualified both from a spiritual and from a medical standpoint is their conviction that a tremendous number of *real* cures have been effected at certain Roman Catholic “shrines” and

“holy places;” under “Christian Science” influences; at evangelical meetings where “faith healing” is practised; at certain Buddhist temples in eastern Asia, and under other circumstances.

In whichever of these directions we look we find plenty of (1) fancied cures, (2) real cures, (3) no cures. Let us take, as an example of what we mean, the happenings at the celebrated Romish pilgrim resort of Lourdes.

1. A Fancied Cure.

Miss Nellie Walker, of Anfield, Liverpool, on arriving home in June, 1922, gave an account of herself to a newspaper reporter. “I had been in bed for seven years,” she said, “and I was a very bad case. Now I am properly cured. I used to go off into sorts of trances, and the slightest noise would send me off. They never thought I should reach Lourdes, and they gave me up when we were nearing there. The least sound would cause me to become unconscious. It was on Whit Monday that the cure took place. We were watching the procession of the Blessed Sacrament. When two chairs had passed me I felt a funny sensation and all pain left me.”

Our unsophisticated readers may think this a marvellous case. The Roman Catholic authorities know better. Taught by experience, they regard it as of little importance. A Romish Archbishop said that Miss Walker’s was not regarded as an official case. Hers was only a nervous case, and the Lourdes authorities never recognise such. The girl had doubtless much to be thankful for, but no one would consider that she had been the subject of a miracle.

2. A Real Cure.

A young girl named Clementine Trouve suffered

from a disease of the legs. An operation could have been performed, but the doctors had given up the idea of a cure. The Viscountess de Roederer took her to the "holy pool" at Lourdes and began to bathe the invalid's legs. "I had not time to finish a prayer," says the Viscountess, "when the poor little invalid stood up, crying out, 'Let me alone; I am cured.'" *And she was.*

The office books at Lourdes chronicle thousands of similar cures. There are piles of crutches, walkingsticks, and various surgical appliances hung up in the grotto. These belonged to sufferers who came and were cured. Mere scepticism cannot disprove the facts. Real cures undoubtedly take place.

3. No Cures.

Persons who happened to be at Victoria Station, London, on the evening of 9th June, 1922, witnessed some distressing scenes. The Continental train came in, bringing a number of "pilgrims" who had been to Lourdes in quest of health. Some managed to walk painfully to the stand where taxis were waiting, but many were on stretcher-beds, and these were laid in rows along the arrival platform. They were those that had returned home uncured, and with a bitter disappointment in their hearts. The number of such cases is legion. For every one that is cured, hundreds make the journey in vain.

At Lourdes they claim to perpetuate the healing ministry of Christ. But did any ever come to Him in vain? Did He send any away unhealed? Nay, He "healed every sickness and every disease among the people" (Matt. 9. 35). None were too baffling for Him. "Great multitudes followed Him, and He healed them all" (Matt. 12. 15).

How different, both in manner and in degree, were the cures wrought by the Saviour, from anything that takes place to-day!

II.

Faith Healers and their Cures.

IN our first chapter we described what is taking place year by year at the Romish pilgrim centre of Lourdes, in France. But the problem of super-normal healing is brought nearer to our doors by the claim of some, who preach the Gospel with a large measure of clearness and fidelity, to be able to perform cures, and in doing so to perpetuate the healing ministry of the Lord Jesus.

But there are three great and vital differences between His deeds and theirs.

Hundreds Unhealed.

I.—There are multitudes of cases where the modern "faith healer" has failed to work a cure. For every one that testifies to having been healed there are hundreds that return home disappointed. Various excuses are made; it is alleged that they have not faith; that there is some unconfessed sin in their lives, etc. But the fact remains that the Lord Jesus healed *all* who came to Him for the purpose, and modern faith healers do not. Unbelief sometimes hindered a "mighty work" being wrought, but did not prevent the "few sick folk" on whom the Saviour laid His hands being healed (Mark 6. 5).

No Organic Cures.

II.—Modern faith-healers do not work *organic* cures, as the Lord Jesus did. Where is the equivalent nowadays, for instance, of the

“DIVINE HEALING.”

restoration of sight to the man born blind, or of the healing of the ear of Malchus, severed from his body by Peter's sword?

As to this perhaps I may be allowed to quote, at some length, from a very interesting article by Dr. A. T. SCHOFIELD, late of Harley Street, in *The Life of Faith* (Dec. 14th, 1921). He says:

“At Liverpool, on a Good Friday, a large number of people testified to having been healed of cancer, heart disease, blindness, etc. A doctor in Liverpool, doubting these cures, wrote to the *Liverpool Mercury* asking for a doctor's certificate of any one case, stating that the patient had been suffering from any disease at a certain date, and had been examined since the faith healing and found cured. This only brought a contemptuous reply, but the doctor persevered, and after a month four test cases of organic disease healed by faith were produced and were carefully examined by the doctor (an unbeliever) and three devout Christian medical men, all believers in faith cures, while a shorthand writer was present.

“After a full investigation for some weeks it was the unanimous opinion amongst the medical men that in not a single case of the four could there be *the slightest claim that they were cured by faith at all.*”

Wanted—A Genuine Case.

Pursuing the subject, Dr. SCHOFIELD says again:

“Knowing a Christian doctor, favourable to faith healing, I asked him for a genuine cure of organic disease. He only shook his head, but gave me interesting accounts of a great faith healer who had the promise of a new eye for eight years, but the eye had not come yet; also of another who had been waiting for some years

for a new arm and leg, but had now lost his faith. ...Disappointed with continual failure, I at last found a well-known Christian doctor presiding over a great conference, and asked him to give me some authentic cases. He wrote, 'I am afraid it is not in my power to gratify your request.' I could continue to give pages of most interesting unproved cases, but in England, at any rate, have found it impossible directly to verify a single organic case."

Investigation Depreciated.

We must content ourselves with one further extract from Dr. SCHOFIELD's interesting and instructive article. He remarks:

"With regard to an explanation of the extraordinary difficulty, not to say impossibility, of finding in England a single case of organic cure (I do not say there are none), I can only now give a *few* of the reasons which seem to me worth recording; for only then will it be possible fully to clear up the extraordinary fact of the comparative failure in physical cures of this nature. No one who believes God doubts either His infinite power or love; no one doubts the earnestness and reality of the prayers offered to Him, and yet it is clear that in England amongst earnest Christian faith healers independent investigation is deprecated; some going so far as to object to it, especially if made with care and in detail by a medical man. Now 'God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all,' and it is difficult to believe that it can be wrong to throw light, and thus truth, upon statements made in His Name, if done reverently and with a view to His glory. I have had no hesitation, therefore, in recording my actual experiences in this subject. I could

have multiplied them several times with similar evidence, but think I have given enough to show that organic cures, if they occur, are very rare."

Subjective Results.

III.—Modern faith healers demand, as absolutely essential, active faith on the part of those whom they seek to cure. It does not much matter what the object of their faith is. Christians are exhorted to trust in God; Roman Catholics encourage faith in Mary, or in the wonder-working power of some relic; Buddhist priests point those who apply to them in a different direction. And in a large number of cases, whatever be the object on which "faith" rests, *it works*, and cures are effected. In the case of the bones of some reputed "saints" to which great powers are ascribed by Romanists, it does not matter whether the bones are human or not. They may be the bones of a stag (as seems to be the case with a reputed arm of St. Anthony), but the cures are wrought all the same. Does this not conclusively prove that the result is one produced subjectively by the "faith" and not by the power of the object on which the faith rests? Here lies the real explanation of so many of the cures.

Christ's Cures v. Modern Claims.

But the Lord Jesus, while commanding and rewarding faith where it existed, made no such demand as a condition of healing. He healed "great multitudes" both in Galilee and "the coasts of Judea beyond Jordan" (Matt. 12. 15; 19. 2), and it is not to be supposed that each one in such multitudes had personal faith. Where could have been the faith of the demon-possessed man who was cured of his blindness and dumb-

ness? (Matt. 12. 22). Not faith, but *need*, was what drew forth the Saviour's healing power. He "healed *them that had need* of healing" (Luke 9. 11).

It would be well, therefore, if the claim to be perpetuating the healing ministry of Christ on earth were dropped. There is little resemblance between present-day doings and the gracious works that He wrought.

Only One Christian Cured.

Another thing is very worthy of notice, namely, that in Scripture we have no record of *a Christian* being healed in any super-normal way, save in one solitary instance. The exceptional case was that of Paul himself, just after his conversion. He narrates the occurrence very simply. "One Ananias...came unto me, and stood, and said unto me, Brother Saul, receive thy sight. And the same hour I looked up upon him" (Acts 22. 12, 13). Let it be remarked, however, that this was not an ordinary case of blindness. Of three days' standing only, it was the direct result of Saul's being smitten by "the glory of that light," "above the brightness of the sun." It was the consequence of a direct intervention of God, and three days after, the restoration of sight was accompanied by the falling from Saul's eyes "as it had been scales" (Acts 9. 18). It was, therefore, no ordinary case of healing. And apart from it, I repeat, there is no recorded case of the healing of *a Christian*. We read of Christians being sick: Paul, Timothy, Epaphroditus, Trophimus; but we read of none seeking "divine healing." Mercy was shown to Epaphroditus, and he was raised up, but there is nothing said that suggests that his recovery differed in any

way from an ordinary recovery from illness.

The More Excellent Way.

This being the case, is "divine healing" a thing that *Christians* should have their minds engaged with? Does it not tend to divert their attention from more weighty things, things of heavenly and eternal importance? Even when it is a question of healing others, "gifts of healing" were not numbered among "the best gifts" (1 Cor. 12. 30, 31), though they were made much of by the carnal-minded Corinthian Christians. May it be ours to learn the "more excellent way" of which the apostle speaks!

III.

Favourite Texts.

THOSE who claim to heal the sick to-day base their claim, not only on the large number of alleged cases of healing, but on the teaching of Scripture. We propose to deal with the question of how far the Word of God supports such claims. We shall consider four passages which seem to be brought forward by "faith healers" more than any others.

I.—Freedom from Sickness.

"IF THOU WILT DILIGENTLY HEARKEN TO THE VOICE OF THE LORD THY GOD, AND WILT DO THAT WHICH IS RIGHT IN HIS SIGHT, AND WILT GIVE EAR TO HIS COMMANDMENTS, AND KEEP ALL HIS STATUTES, I WILL PUT NONE OF THESE DISEASES UPON THEE, WHICH I HAVE BROUGHT UPON THE EGYPTIANS: FOR I AM THE LORD THAT HEALETH THEE" (Exod. 15. 26).

Here, it is said, is a definite promise that God will preserve His *obedient* children from illness, and, if

disobedient, will heal them (on their repentance).

But a noteworthy fact is that from apostolic days to ours it is often the choicest and most spiritually-minded amongst the people of God that are most afflicted with sickness. Paul had his infirmities (2 Cor. 12. 5; Gal. 4. 13); Timothy had his, and they were frequent (1 Tim. 5. 23); Trophimus was too ill to travel, and had to be left behind at Miletum (2 Tim. 4. 20); Epaphroditus, of whom the apostle speaks in such warm terms, was “sick nigh unto death.” Were all these, and hundreds of others that might be mentioned, to be numbered among the “disobedient”? If not, what becomes of the argument from Exodus 15. 26?

Earthly People—Earthly Blessings.

Mark the word “if” with which the promise starts. It was conditional, and this is the very essence of law. Freedom from the diseases so common in Egypt was one of the *earthly* blessings promised to an earthly people, conditional upon their obedience to the commandments and statutes soon to be proclaimed at Sinai. No doubt, in the Millennium, when the law will be written in the hearts of the men of Israel, and they will delight to do the will of God, the promise will be fulfilled as part of the new covenant. But to those who would claim immunity from sickness to-day on the ground of this promise, we would ask this: Do you mean that you have always done that which is right in the sight of God, and kept all His statutes? Do you claim immunity from disease on that ground? If so, we must beg leave to doubt whether you have really kept all God’s statutes. Remember that “whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all” (James

2. 10). The promise of Exodus 15. 26 is based on obedience to law. Do you honestly desire to be blessed according to your obedience? Think!

II.—Sickness Atoned For?

"HE CAST OUT THE SPIRITS WITH HIS WORD, AND HEALED ALL THAT WERE SICK, THAT IT MIGHT BE FULFILLED WHICH WAS SPOKEN BY ESAIAS THE PROPHET, SAYING, HIMSELF TOOK OUR INFIRMITIES, AND BARE OUR SICKNESSES" (Matt. 8. 16, 17).

This Scripture is the great bulwark of those who teach that sickness as well as sin was atoned for by Christ, and that therefore it is as wrong for the believer to be sick as it is for him to commit sin. But do the advocates of this theory really understand the meaning of the passage that they so constantly quote?

ARCHBISHOP TRENCH, commenting on the scene therein described, beautifully says:

"Not this day only, even had it been a day of special weariness, but every day of His earthly life was a coming under, upon His part, of those evils which He removed from others. For that which is the law of all true helping, namely, that the burden which you would lift, you must yourself stoop to and come under (Gal. 6. 2); the grief which you would console, you must yourself feel with—a law which we witness to as often as we use the words 'sympathy' and 'compassion'—was truest of all in Him upon whom the help of all was laid. Not in this single aspect of His life, namely, that He was

A Healer of Sicknesses

were these words of the prophet fulfilled, but rather in the life itself, which brought Him in contact with these sicknesses and these discords

of man's inner being. Every one of these, as a real consequence of sin, at every moment contemplated by Him as such, did press with a living pang into the holy soul of the Lord. Not so much the healing of these sicknesses was Christ's bearing of them, but His burden was that there were these sicknesses to heal."

But we shall return to this passage (see page 31) and consider more fully what is involved in the interpretation given to it by faith healers. To be logical, they must hold that the Lord Jesus was making atonement during His life as well as on the Cross. But this is entirely contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures. More of this, however, after we have examined other passages.

III.—Laying On of Hands.

"AND THESE SIGNS SHALL FOLLOW THEM THAT BELIEVE;...THEY SHALL LAY HANDS ON THE SICK, AND THEY SHALL RECOVER" (Mark 16. 17, 18).

Faith healers, in referring to this promise, loudly affirm that they believe that the Word of God means exactly what it says. We fully share this belief with them. We ought, therefore, to be very careful in observing just what it does say. Has the attention of faith healers been sufficiently directed to the two verses that follow? Verse 20 records the execution of the commission given in verse 15, with which the fivefold promise of verses 17 and 18 is connected. Those who were told to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature went forth, as they were bidden, and preached everywhere. The signs which the Lord said should follow those who believed their message did follow, as He had said, for He Himself wrought with His servants and confirmed their preaching with the promised signs.

Signs—An Initial Seal.

It was by means of these signs that the new and astonishing message, which the eleven apostles were commissioned to declare, was authenticated as of God, even as the mission of Christ Himself had been similarly accredited (Acts 2. 22). But a seal attached to a document to authenticate it does not need to be placed there again and again. It is attached once for all. So with Christianity. At its inauguration it was sealed as being of God by means of "signs and wonders." It remains in the world a thing that came in with these marks of divine authentication. Why should it be supposed that the initial authentication was to be perpetuated through the centuries?

And why should the last of the five signs be picked out, and undue emphasis placed on it? We heard the other day of a Christian drinking some oxalic acid solution in mistake for medicine. He did not die, but he suffered grievously for his error. How does this fact accord with the theory that the five signs are still following them that believe?

IV.—Sickness and Satan.

"AND, BEHOLD, THERE WAS A WOMAN WHICH HAD A SPIRIT OF INFIRMITY EIGHTEEN YEARS... AND OUGHT NOT THIS WOMAN, BEING A DAUGHTER OF ABRAHAM, WHOM SATAN HATH BOUND, LO, THESE EIGHTEEN YEARS, BE LOOSED FROM THIS BOND?" (Luke 13. 16).

This passage is continually quoted by faith healers with the object of proving that infirmity and disease are of Satanic origin, and that it is always the will of God that His children should be loosed from a cruel bond.

But it is a very slender foundation on which to build such a theory, or from which to conclude that every one who suffers from any disease has been "bound by Satan." The case of the woman referred to was not one of ordinary illness. She had *a spirit* of infirmity, or, as Moffatt translates it, "suffered weakness from an evil spirit." Her infirmity was the result of spirit-possession. This was the "bond" from which she needed to be "loosed."

The theory built upon what we are persuaded is a wrong interpretation of this passage will not bear examination in the light of Philippians 2. 25-30, where

The Case of Epaphroditus

is related. Observe three things:

1. It was a choice and devoted servant of Christ who was sick. Was he "bound by Satan"?
2. His sickness was a very serious one, and might easily have had a fatal ending. He was "sick nigh unto death."
3. The cause of this severe illness was *the work of Christ*. Epaphroditus had not considered his own health, nor regarded life itself, in his devoted service.

In view of these facts can it be seriously maintained that "all sickness is of the devil"? Is it not often a form of suffering for Christ's sake and the Gospel's, for which we may rejoice that we are counted worthy to endure it?

A young servant of Christ, knocked down by a Roman Catholic mob in South America and severely kicked and beaten, was carried home. For several days he lay in a high fever. Was not the fever and its resultant weakness part of his suffering for Christ's sake? It was of Satan in so far as he instigated the attack, but the same may

be said of the sufferings of Christ Himself. To suggest that one who is laid aside by illness is necessarily in the power of the devil, as "bound" by him, is a cruel slur upon thousands of God's dear children and faithful servants.

V.—The Mortal Body Quickened.

"BUT IF THE SPIRIT OF HIM THAT RAISED UP JESUS FROM THE DEAD DWELL IN YOU, HE THAT RAISED UP CHRIST FROM THE DEAD SHALL ALSO QUICKEN YOUR MORTAL BODIES BY HIS SPIRIT THAT DWELLETH IN YOU" (Rom. 8. 11).

This quickening of the believer's mortal body is said to be a present thing, the result of yielding the body to the control of the Holy Spirit, who thereupon "quickens" it in the sense of making it immune from disease. But surely this interpretation misses the whole force of the passage, which, on careful study, is seen to refer to the future resurrection. The argument is that what the Spirit is going to do for our mortal bodies by and by He can surely do for our souls now, and be in us "life, because of righteousness."

If our mortal bodies were quickened *now*, they would cease to be mortal, and we should be immune not only from sickness and decay, but from death. But for this quickening we have to wait. It is what is called, in verse 23, "the redemption of the body."

Note the perfection of the language of Scripture. It does not say that the Spirit will *raise* our mortal bodies, for that would imply previous death, and death for the Christian is by no means a certainty (1 Cor. 15. 51). Sleeping saints will be raised, and those whom the Coming of the Lord finds still alive will undergo an equivalent change; their mortal bodies will be quickened, and thus "this

mortal must put on immortality" (1 Cor. 15. 53). And it will be the work of Him who raised up Christ from the dead by His Spirit who already dwells in us as the power of the new life which we have received from God.

IV.

The Christian and Sickness.

IF the five Scriptures brought forward contain no instruction for the Christian bearing directly on the subject of sickness, where is he to seek guidance as to what he should do when ill? To this question we will now address ourselves.

Timothy and Wine.

There are two outstanding passages which we quote in order of their occurrence:

"DRINK NO LONGER WATER, BUT USE A LITTLE WINE FOR THY STOMACH'S SAKE AND THINE OFTEN INFIRMITIES" (1 Tim. 5. 23).

"IS ANY SICK AMONG YOU? LET HIM CALL FOR THE ELDERS OF THE CHURCH, AND LET THEM PRAY OVER HIM, ANOINTING HIM WITH OIL IN THE NAME OF THE LORD" (James 5. 14).

The first of these two passages speaks of wine as a well-known remedial agent of proved value, and may be taken as standing for simple medicinal remedies which Christians may take when sick, and upon the use of which they may seek God's blessing.

Yet Mr. PHILIP MAURO can say "We are, persuaded that those believers who resort to medicines for the purpose of combating sickness, and think they are trusting God while so doing, are deceiving themselves."

Would Timothy, then, be deceiving himself if he obeyed the apostolic injunction, and for his stomach's sake, and because of his frequent

infirmities, took a little wine? Could not he expect God's blessing thereon? Would his taking the prescribed remedy be inconsistent with real faith? To ask these questions is to answer them.

James and the Prayer of Faith.

In the passage in James "the prayer of faith" is the principal thing. But the anointing with oil has its place, and it is a mistake, we believe, to regard this anointing as purely ceremonial.

We are indebted to Mr. HAROLD ST. JOHN for the suggestion that the oil also may be intended, at all events in some cases, to have a remedial effect. The Greek word for anointing in James 5. 14 is that used not for ceremonial, but for *medicinal* anointing.

As a remedial agent anointing was in use among the Jews in pre-Christian times; it was practised by the apostles (Mark 6. 13), and mentioned in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10. 34). Its medicinal use made it a type of the grace that heals the sin-sick soul (Isa. 1. 6; Rev. 3. 18).

As to the use of oil as a common medicinal agent in ancient times, we read in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, under the heading "Oil":

"Oil is an ingredient in a very large number of the remedies prescribed in the Papyrus Ebers for the most diverse diseases. Pliny also speaks of its medicinal use. Dion Cassius relates that oil and wine were employed both externally and internally for the unknown disease which attacked the army of Aelius Gallus in Arabia, as we read of their being used in the parable of the Good Samaritan."

The Modern Application.

In the light of these facts we may perhaps

regard James 5. 14 and 1 Timothy 5. 23 as parallel passages with 1 Corinthians 6. 1-14. In this last Scripture Christians are exhorted not to have recourse to the heathen courts for the adjustment of their disputes, but to refer them for settlement to their fellow-believers. There was no need, however, to trouble the "elders" with these legal matters; any among the saints might be trusted to deal with such things, even those held in least esteem.

So, in case of sickness, Christians were not to have recourse to pagan physicians (who were often the priests of idol temples), with their degrading incantations, their cruel and crude surgery, and their futile empiric use of drugs. Nor were the Jewish physicians of much more use. Their treatment often caused suffering instead of relieving it, as we learn from Mark 5. 26. To turn to such men, instead of to the Lord, would be folly indeed. King Asa discovered this to his cost (2 Chron. 16. 12). True medical science was non-existent.

Instead of sending for heathen "medical men," or Hebrew physicians of no value, Christians were either to take some simple remedy, as in the case of Timothy, or to send for the "elders," who would use some medicinal agent of known efficacy, such as oil, and would accompany this with the effectual, fervent prayer that avails much.

Missionaries and Medicine.

The nearest approach to this in our day is, we believe, when a servant of the Lord keeps at hand a few simple remedies, and is sent for when a case of sickness occurs among the children of God, primarily to pray over the sick person, but also to administer the suitable remedy. It is wonderful how God has, in innumerable instances, been

pleased to bless such means. The medicine may possess its own therapeutic properties, but when given "in the Name of the Lord," and accompanied by "the prayer of faith," the blessing of God is vouchsafed and true efficacy imparted.

How much of this kind of thing is experienced in the foreign field among the native Christians! Take Central Africa for example. A believer falls sick. Instead of sending for the witch-doctor to come with his abominable heathen practices, he sends for one of the Lord's servants, who goes, prays with the sick person, and gives what he deems a suitable remedy. How often he has to rejoice that God has graciously heard his prayer and healed the sick!.

At the same time the services of a competent doctor, when available, are greatly to be valued. Nor does James 5. 14 prohibit our recourse to such. It seems specially to apply to a state of things where none are within reach, while leaving the door always open for faith to be in exercise.

Ceremonial Anointing.

One would not desire, however, to rule out altogether the anointing with oil in a ceremonial sense as an evidence of faith and obedience to the Word of God. It may interest our readers to know what the attitude and practice of the late J. N. DARBY was as to this. In a letter written in 1881 he said:

"No mistakes of men take away the plain force of God's Word, and that He does answer the prayer of faith. James 5 supposes the Church in order, and that those who in a certain sense represent it could be sent for; where God's order was going on, and His government regularly administered in the Church. That

is not the case now, but if those who are practically such, and have personally faith (that looks through the ruin to the source of good *according to the order*), and believe God will still hear the prayer of faith, I do not doubt it. In general it is only looking for so much physical relief, generally turning aside from what is heavenly. There may be faith in the person also; sending for the elders supposes something of this. But while I fully believe there may be such answers to prayer, the books about them seem to be full of errors, and (while there may be some faith, as to what is physical) not calculated to edify."

J. N. Darby and Practising James 5.

In another letter, written about same date, he says:

"I have no confidence in the movement for faith healing, save as it may rouse people to look more to God. I never saw it, save in individual instances, connected with real sound doctrine. . . . This does not hinder my believing that God does answer the prayer of faith. I have arranged that _____ and myself will be free at half-past four Monday next to look to Him for you."

In a third letter, bearing no date, Mr. DARBY says:

"I have known two cases of anointing by request, one at Plymouth, . . . the other in Switzerland, both these were blessed to the body. We owned we were not official, but cast ourselves on the Lord. I trust by giving it out you may not have a crowd of curious young brethren. Peter thrust them all out. It is 'the prayer of faith' which heals."

Doctors in Consternation.

The extracts given above are from the *Letters of*

J.N.D., vol. 3, pages 256, 257. From another source we gain further information. An aged servant of Christ, who knew Mr. Darby well, writes a letter which is given in an appendix to "By What Means?" by PHILIP MAURO. This letter, dated 10th August, 1910, is as follows:

"I have letters from Mr. Darby stating that prayers for the sick, and healing as the result of the prayer of faith, were common among brethren at the beginning. In the great cholera plague of 1832 this was so effective that the doctors were in consternation. But a physician, who was impressed with the results of the prayer of faith, asked for prayer for some of his patients; medicine was relinquished, and the patients recovered. When I was in Guernsey in 1866, Mr. Carey, who had been in the south of France with Mr. Darby, told me of the son of a Congregational minister who had been almost instantly healed through the prayer of faith of Mr. Darby."

A Personal Testimony.

Another personal acquaintance of J. N. Darby wrote a short biographical sketch of him in a periodical known as *The Passing Hour* for April, 1911. For the quotation we are again indebted to Mr. Mauro's book:

"Darby dressed poorly, was very charitable, and shared his income with his poorer brethren, and used it in the Gospel. He was a man of faith. When ill he simply rested in God, asking to be shown the spiritual cause of his illness, and just leaving himself in the hands of the Lord to heal him when he saw best. He assured me that he had not taken medicine* for

* He frequently consulted a doctor, however.

forty years (he was then about seventy-six, and still travelling around). And it was not that he had never been ill; but at such times he would simply fall back upon God."

In an article called "Cleansing by Water," written in 1875 in reply to R. PEARSALL SMITH, J. N. Darby says:

"That God often heals the sick in answer to prayer is clearly taught both in James and John: in the former according to ecclesiastical order, though by the prayer of faith; in the latter as an individual matter, and I have seen and assisted at the clearest examples of this both in England and on the Continent. In two cases, at the request of the parties, prayer was accompanied by anointing."

V.

The Better Way.

NO true Christian doubts for one moment that God answers the prayers of His children in connection with sickness as well as with regard to a hundred other things. Who among us cannot give instances of this from his own experience?

But sometimes it is far better that our prayers should go unanswered. It may be that when our requests are insistent and determined God will grant them, and as a result the soul may suffer impoverishment and loss. It is not for nothing that the words stand recorded in Scripture: "He gave them their request, but sent leanness into their souls" (Psa. 106. 15).

Healing Withheld.

Even for physical reasons God may see well to

withhold the healing that we desire. In a very sane and well-balanced letter to *The Christian* (31st August, 1922), Miss L. THOMAS says:

"A gentleman of European reputation went with some friends to a woman I knew who had sores that the doctors could not heal; she prayed very earnestly, and was persuaded to believe, till God really heard their prayers and the sores were healed. But she told me she wished they had never done it, for since then the poison which found vent through those sores spread in her body, and she was never well since!"

How much better it would have been for this good woman to have left herself in the wise and gracious hands of God for Him to have done what He saw to be best!

It is to be feared that undue attention is given to *the body* by many who seek healing. These should learn a lesson from Psalm 41, which gives us a lovely picture of the Lord with one of His sick saints. "The Lord will strengthen him upon the bed of languishing; Thou wilt make all his bed in his sickness" (v. 3). Note that even such an excellent and godly person as is described in the preceding verses was not immune from sickness.

The Healing of the Soul.

The gracious words of verse 3 evidently mean that the Lord will tenderly make His sick and suffering saint the object of His special care. Observe the effect of this upon David. "I said, Lord, be merciful unto me: HEAL MY SOUL" (v. 4). He was more anxious about the health of his soul than that of his body. It is good when we are the same!

There is a comforting thought for those whom

God has seen fit not to heal suggested in a letter to *The Life of Faith* (21st December, 1921) by one who signs himself "One of the Least of These." He says:

"In Matthew 25. 36, 40, how lovingly the Lord Jesus identifies Himself with His sick ones! There is no suggestion of censure for those who were sick any more than for those who were hungry and in prison. 'I was sick, and ye visited Me...Inasmuch as ye have done it unto...My brethren, ye have done it unto Me.' "

Could the Lord speak such words as these if sickness were a proof of the soul being in a bad state?

How many there are to whom sickness has brought a golden wealth of blessing, and who would have been tremendous losers if God had healed them. A case in point is that of a lady who received a copy of a little booklet entitled "Chastening," by J. H. M'CONKEY, and who wrote as follows:

"Please excuse my writing to you personally, but recently a dear friend and old class leader of mine wrote to me and enclosed a leaflet of yours called 'Chastening,' and somehow I feel that I cannot let it out of my sight. It has been, and is, such a source of help and comfort to me. It puts my own 'chastening' in quite a different light. I had no idea that the word had such a beautiful meaning—child-training. It makes me feel that however sore the chastening may be it is good to be a child.

Testimony of the Chastened One.

"For many years now I have been an invalid, suffering from tubercular disease of the bone,

for which I have had to lose my right leg, and which has now attacked my spine. I have not been able to sit up or move off my back for nearly two years...But in and through it all I can trace the Father's hand. I will not say that long continued pain, and hope deferred, have not at times made the heart sick, but always, however dark the clouds have been, their edges have been tinged with the golden glory of the sunshine of God's love, and when I could not see even *that*, I knew that behind the clouds the sun was still shining, and in His own good time the storm-clouds would break, and its brilliance shine forth to warm and lighten my pathway again...

Joy-Rides in Sickness.

"Then there are my 'joy-rides.' These are the outings in my spinal carriage,...and it is of these 'joy-rides' that I want to speak. When I first went out I noticed that many would stop and speak, and almost all would remark after a word or two: 'But how *can* you be so happy and cheerful, having to lie like that all the time?' Then I found that I could tell them of the many things I had to be glad about. I realised that often God sent special people to me. There was the blind man, who, in making for the seat near my chair, stumbled over me, and through that stumble I found an opportunity of speaking first a word of sympathy and then a word of help. He had 'lost his faith' through arguing with an unbeliever, and by God's grace I had the joy of helping to restore it to him.

"Oh! and how many others: sad ones, weary ones, foolish ones, on life's dusty highway, just

passing my chair, and I hand a leaflet or a card as I have the guidance. How stupid I was to think at first that now I could do very little for Him. Why! when I can do nothing else, I can smile; aye, and even ache to His glory. I own that once:

'I had high dreams, and visions fair and golden,
Of lofty service for my King divine
Not long ago. But now the days seem olden,
Wherein such visions and such dreams were mine.'

"Then after years of suffering, disappointment, and loss, wherein it seemed that He emptied my hands of all I held most dear, and I felt that I could only cry:

'Carry me out of the battle,
For I am wounded sore.'

He has put me back 'on active service,' and I can only say thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift."

How different is the whole tone and atmosphere of this beautiful letter from that of the elated, and often somewhat truculent, report given by one who claims to have been healed! In the case of the writer of the letter, her suffering has evidently brought her much into the company of her beloved Saviour. To judge by the words and bearing of *some* who have been "healed" one would almost imagine that now they can do without Him!

Healing "as Christ Healed."

But a faith healer asks, Why should I not continue to heal, as Christ and His apostles did, since I find myself possessed of the gift?

My brother, have you even begun to heal *as Christ did*, finding no condition necessary in those on whom you lay hands but their *need*? Do you, like the apostles, heal the unbeliever and

preach the Gospel to him? Or do you confine your healing ministrations to Christians, of whom the apostles, with all their gifts, never healed one as far as we know? It was because Philip wrought miracles of healing that the people gave heed to his preaching. It was not that they believed his message and then sought to be healed.

Can you show wherein your "cases of healing" differ from those that occur at Lourdes, or under Christian Science influences? You preach one thing, they preach another, and faith excited in a false object proves to be as efficacious in healing as faith in a right object! This is not *divine* healing; not a putting forth of the power of God. It is the reaction upon the body produced by the effect of new confidence (irrespective of the nature of its object) awakened in the subject.

In New Testament times, in some instances there was faith that ran in a right channel, and healing followed, as in Acts 14. 9, 10. But a precisely similar deed was wrought upon the cripple of Acts 3, whose "faith" expected nothing more than a gift of money. It was indeed "a notable miracle," and was quite independent of any faith on the part of the man on whom it was wrought.

To heal "as Christ and His apostles did" would be to go to the heathen or the Jews, cure their sicknesses with a word, or a touch, and then preach the Gospel to them. Till you do *this*, it would be more modest not to talk quite so loudly of continuing to heal as Christ did and His apostles in the early days of Christianity.

The Magna Charta of Faith Healers.

There remains for our consideration the text to which faith healers appeal more than to any other,

and which many of them regard as the Magna Charta of their doctrine. The text is: "He... healed all that were sick; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses" (Matt. 8. 16, 17). From this Scripture they draw the inference that "divine healing" is in the Atonement, and that consequently no one can "stand foursquare on atonement ground" without claiming complete deliverance from all sickness, and that "every obedient child of God has the right to claim exemption from all infirmity and disease."

The late Dr. A. B. SIMPSON, of New York, one of the most devout and reputable of this school, has laid down four postulates in his tract,

"Divine Healing in the Atonement,"

which we will quote, as it is well to have the theory before us in the words of one of its ablest advocates. Dr. Simpson says:

1. If our healing is provided for by Jesus Christ, then it is a redemption right which we may humbly and boldly claim by walking obediently with the Lord.
2. That it is a gift of grace, as all that Christ's blood has purchased will ever be, and therefore cannot be mixed up with our own works, or the use of human means.
3. That it must be by faith.
4. That it is not the exceptional privilege of a few favoured ones,...but that it is the heritage of all the children of faith and holy obedience.

Atonement in "Life" or "Death."

We have already (see page 14) given what we believe to be the true interpretation of Matthew

8. 16, 17, in the beautiful words of ARCHBISHOP TRENCH. In further consideration of the meaning of the passage let us point out that the use made of it by faith healers supposes that Christ was making atonement while going from place to place in Galilee. The great transaction of Calvary is thus transferred to an early stage of His ministry. But the whole doctrine of the atonement is vitiated by the teaching that Christ *lived an atoning life* instead of making it by the one great sacrifice of Himself for sin upon the Cross. It must, therefore, be some very different lesson than this that the Spirit of God would have us learn from Matthew's quotation of Isaiah 53. 4.

As a Canadian writer puts it:

"Sin is the only thing that demands expiation by blood. For if sickness needed atonement, then sickness implied a clouded conscience and broken fellowship with God. And such a cruel doctrine is denied by most saintly men, who in the direst sicknesses have had sweetest fellowship with God."

"Infirmities"—Why?

It is noticeable that *infirmities*, which, according to faith healers of Dr. Simpson's school, the Lord Jesus took upon Himself, and for which He made atonement, are things that the Apostle Paul *gloried in* (2 Cor. 12. 5, 9). Could he have done this if it betokened a bad state of soul for a Christian to be suffering such things? Instead of praying three times for his *infirmity* to be taken away, why did he not "claim his redemption right," as faith healers exhort their followers to do?

When Faith Healers Fail.

Observe the logical outcome of this teaching.

Faith healers pray again and again for the deliverance of some one from an infirmity, and, finding that their prayers remain unanswered, they excuse their failure by suggesting that the person for whom they have prayed in vain is allowing something wrong in heart and life. It is a cruel insinuation. It cannot very well be made in the case of Paul, however, for he had just had his experience in the third Heaven!

To quote the aforementioned writer once again:

“Paul was absolutely wrong (if he believed that divine healing was in the atonement, and that it was the privilege of every true believer to take deliverance from all infirmity and sickness by faith) when he enjoined Timothy to take a little wine for his often *infirmities* (1 Tim. 5. 23). These teachers could instruct Paul, doubtless, that he should have taught Timothy to take the Lord for his body, and not wine. They would possibly also call in question the Apostle’s own standard of walk when he wrote the Galatian Christians of having preached unto them in an *infirmity of the flesh* (Gal. 4. 13). When Paul prays for his fellow-workers that he has to leave behind sick, he does not suggest anything wrong in them, nor does he condemn himself when he fails to secure an answer to his prayers. If the blood-bought right of every Christian is such as these teachers assert, Paul surely did not need to leave Trophimus behind him sick.”

Outside the Book.

In what dilemma do we often land ourselves when, for what we deem a *good* purpose, we step outside the bounds of Scripture! We need to bear in mind an excellent word (though the man

who uttered it was far from being an excellent man): "I cannot go beyond (or outside of) the commandment of the Lord, to do either GOOD or bad of mine own mind" (Num. 24. 13).

Happy is he who, with unquestioning faith, takes as his guide the sure Word of the Lord!

VI.

The Bubble Bursting.

IN the United States and Canada "faith healing" has been developed to a much larger extent than in Britain, and has in many places become a veritable craze. From reports that reach us we find it difficult to view it, as practised on the other side of the Atlantic, as anything but a delusion and a swindle.

Campaigns for Healing

in many of the large cities are "boosted" with all the most up-to-date devices of the advertising agencies. If the reports of the faith-healing periodicals are to be relied on, over 500,000 persons must have been "treated" in these campaigns. Handkerchiefs for the sick that have been "blessed" have been distributed by thousands and sent by post far and wide.

But the real character of these huge campaigns is becoming manifest. The reports of marvellous miracles have been proved, in many cases, to be falsehoods. As the Editor of *Our Hope* tells us:

"Careful investigations in all these places have shown that the reported healings of blind men and women, of the deaf and dumb, the consumptives, crippled children and paralytics were fakes. We have investigated several cases of reported miracles and found them to be miserable lies."

One of the most notorious "faith healing and Pentecostal evangelists" in America is a woman named M'PHERSON. During her campaign at Rochester, N.Y.,

Marvellous Cures of Deafness

were reported. Now it happens that in this city there is an institution known as "The Rochester School for the Deaf." To this school a deaf woman in the West wrote as follows:

"Recently a certain evangelist, Mrs. M'Pherson, held meetings in the city of Rochester. Since then I have heard numerous stories of many cases of deafness cured. Little girls born deaf, youths deaf from infancy, some attending schools for the deaf—all cured instantly. I am interested to know the truth of these statements."

The School authorities made their investigations and published the result in their journal. This is what they say:

"After making careful inquiries, and after examination by the teachers of the children who were taken by parents or friends to Mrs. M'Pherson's meetings, we have to report that *we could not find that the hearing of any child had been benefitted in the slightest degree.*" (Italics throughout this chapter are ours.)

Other notorious "faith-healing boosters," as they are termed, are the brothers BOSWORTH. The *Toronto Star* says:

"In April, 1921, F. F. BOSWORTH and his brother, B. B. BOSWORTH, journeyed here from the States, and before they had been in the city a week had convinced hundreds of citizens that they were the prophets of a new age, in which physical disease was to be unknown. The

adjective 'incurable' was unknown to them and to their disciples. Their mission here lasted five weeks."

Commenting on this "mission," the editor of *Our Hope* remarks:

"After a great healing campaign...by the Bosworth brothers, preachers and others investigated the 'miracles' and alleged cures. *Not one of them could be confirmed.*"

The *Star Weekly* (May, 1921) published an article stating that although ten "cures" selected from a list of some scores by the Bosworths were investigated, *not one of them gave any evidence of being genuine.*

Nearly Equal to Christ.

To mention a third case, that of one JAMES MOORE HICKSON, we again quote from the *Toronto Star* (as given in *Our Hope*):

"In June, 1920, Toronto was electrified by the announcement that James Moore Hickson, an Anglican layman, who was credited with having performed in the United States a series of miracles such as had not been heard of since the time of Christ, would minister to the sick at St. James' Cathedral. He came and provoked scenes that caused many to believe that 'faith' could make whole all who suffered from any ailment whatever. The more hopeless a malady, in the light of medical science, the readier were victims of the malady brought to St. James' to have Mr. Hickson's hands laid on them. It was conservatively estimated that Mr. Hickson prayed over and anointed not less than 7000 persons during the few days he was here. Were Mr. Hickson's powers imaginary? Or did not one of these 7000 sufferers have sufficient

faith to be healed? The answer must be an affirmative to *one* of these questions, for *there is not, to the best of the knowledge of those responsible for bringing Mr. Hickson here, any authentic record of a single cure performed by Mr. Hickson.*"

Shall we tire our readers if we refer to yet one more of these notorious "faith healers," Mrs. CRAWFORD? Again we quote the *Toronto Star*:

"Mrs. Mattie Crawford, who closed her mission at Cecil Street Church of Christ on Monday night, was the third 'faith healer' to come to Toronto from the United States within less than two years...The *Star* made an investigation, in the course of which no record of a single *bona fide* cure...could be found...The two most sensational of all the alleged miraculous cures attributed to her ministrations have already been explained in the *Star* as *having positively no ground in fact.*"

It is often remarked that facts speak for themselves. Equally eloquent is

The Absence of Facts.

Yet in the matter of which we have been treating facts are not entirely absent. For, as *Our Hope* tells us, a number of persons landed in asylums for the insane, driven there by these lying "faith healers." We are not surprised at the additional remark: "*But the bubble seems about to burst.*"

"Divine healing," when sought in a submissive spirit at the hands of God, is frequently given. But the use of medicine, or recourse to a doctor, is not inconsistent with real faith, in spite of Philip Mauro's dictum (quoted on page 19) to the contrary.

As a testimony to the truth of this we cite a

letter written by "G." to *The Life of Faith* (December 14th, 1921):

"I should like to thank the correspondent who...sent an account of having in the end to consult a doctor, although he or she...had been trusting in God alone for healing. This testimony led me to consult a doctor. Although I had suffered for two or three weeks with a very painful back, being unable to stand upright, and having severe pain and high temperature, I had faith to believe that I should be healed in answer to prayer, as had happened before. But although my faith was strong my back got worse, and I went to God and asked why it was not done according to my faith.

"After reading this testimony I felt it right to consult the doctor, who said that I was close on an attack of rheumatic fever. His treatment gave me ease at once; after two days I was able to stand up straight, and now, in only a week, feel quite all right.

"This convinces me also that there are times when a doctor should be consulted, after first of all exercising prayer and faith in God, as this may be another way of God's healing, because unless He willed it the doctor would be powerless."

Why Limit the Holy One of Israel?

Why attempt to tie God down to one particular method? Why imagine that His power must always run in one channel? If it be replied that His directions are, in case of sickness, to send for the elders of the church that they may pray and anoint, one can only say that He has also given directions for one suffering from his stomach to use wine as a remedial agent (1 Tim. 5. 23).

VII.

Questions Answered.

SOMEBODY in Toronto sends us thirty-one questions propounded by the faith-healing preacher, F. F. BOSWORTH. Others also have sent us copies of these printed questions, one friend going so far as to pronounce them "unanswerable." But let us see if indeed they admit of no answer. With so many questions to answer the utmost brevity is, of course, necessary.

1. Since the seven compound names of Jehovah, one of which is Jehovah-Rapha (I am the Lord that healeth thee), reveal His REDEMPTIVE relationship toward each person, do they not point to Calvary?

If it be preferred to render the words in Exodus 15. 26 by "Jehovah-Rapha" (or "Jehovah-Ropheka") there can be no objection. I deny, however, that the title sets forth any relationship of Jehovah towards "each person." The relationship in view is that between Jehovah and *the nation of Israel*. They were already a redeemed people when the words were addressed to them, and the "healing" was no part of their redemption.

2. Since all the promises of God are yea and amen in Him, do not these seven names, including Jehovah-Rapha (the Lord our Healer), owe their existence and their power to the redeeming work of Christ on the Cross?

In a general way every promise that God has made, and every blessing that He has bestowed, are founded on the work of Christ on the Cross. His daily mercies are given on this ground. But this does not imply that such mercies are *invariably* bestowed. Thousands of God's choicest saints have had to do, not only without healing, but without bread, raiment, and lodging. See 1 Corinthians 4. 11; 2 Corinthians 11. 27. We cannot claim healing as our right, any more than we can *claim* bread, clothes, and shelter.

3. Has not every believer the same redemptive right to call upon Christ as Jehovah-Rapha (the Healer of his body) as he has to call upon Him as Jehovah-Tsidkenu (the Healer of his soul)? Is not His name given for healing as long as it is for salvation?

"Jehovah-tsidkenu" is a title that has nothing whatever to do with healing, whether of the soul or the body. It means, "the Lord our Righteousness," and has reference to the day of Israel's glorious restoration. See Jeremiah

23. 6; 33. 16. Even if an application of it be made to ourselves, it has nothing to do with healing. If a prisoner awaiting trial be sick, is the healing that he needs the same as his justification, or clearance of the charge against him? What a jumble this question makes of the doctrines of the Gospel!

4. If bodily healing is to be obtained independent of Calvary, as opposers teach, why was it that no blessing of the Year of Jubilee was to be announced by the sounding of the trumpet until the Day of Atonement?

This question is based, I suppose, on Leviticus 25. 9. But the sounding of the trumpet on the Day of Atonement was to announce *liberty*, not healing. If the liberty proclaimed in the jubilee year be taken as typical of the liberty wherewith Christ has set as free it is easy to understand why the trumpet that proclaimed it was to be sounded on the Day of Atonement. "The glorious liberty of the children of God" is indeed the fruit of the work of the Cross.

5. If healing for the body was not a part of Christ's redeeming work, why were types of the Atonement given in connection with healing throughout the Old Testament?

You cannot take part of a type as typical and the other part as literal. The healing referred to was also typical of the spiritual results of the Cross.

6. If healing was not in the Atonement, why were the dying Israelites required to look at the type of the Atonement for bodily healing? If both forgiveness and healing came by a look at the type, why not from the antitype?

This question is but an enlargement of the fifth. If the brazen serpent was a type of Christ uplifted on the Cross, the result of the "looking" was also typical of that which the sinner gains when he "looks" to the crucified Saviour. But where does it say that *forgiveness* came by a look at the type? It says, "any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, *he lived*" (Num. 21. 9). And this was a figure of the eternal life that we receive when we look to Christ. It was not a figure of bodily healing. See John 3. 14, 15.

7. Since their curse was removed by the lifting up of the type of Christ, was not our curse of disease also removed by the lifting up of Christ Himself?

Galatians 3. 13 speaks of the curse of *the law*, not of "the curse of disease." The tenth verse explains that

this is the righteous curse incurred by those under the law through their failure to keep it. *Disease* has certainly not been *removed* by the lifting up of Christ! But where does Scripture speak of "the curse of disease"?

8. In the passage, "Surely He hath borne our sicknesses and carried our pains" (Isa. 53. 4), why are the same Hebrew verbs for "borne" and "carried" employed as are used in verses 11 and 12 for the substitutionary bearing of sin unless they have the same substitutionary and expiatory character?

If I "bear" a basket and "bear" a punishment for some one (the same word), must the former act have an expiatory character because the latter has? Really a question like this supposes very little sane judgment on the part of those to whom it is put. Matthew 8. 17 shows that the words quoted from Isaiah 53. 4 have *not* a "substitutionary" character, for they describe what took place during the life and ministry of the Lord Jesus, and the work of substitution was performed only at the Cross.

9. If healing was not provided for all in redemption, how did the multitudes obtain from Christ what God did not provide?

How did the hungry multitudes obtain *food* from Christ? Was *that* "provided for all in redemption"? If so, why did not Paul, when he was hungry, claim food from God as a "redemption right"? The question is just as foolish as the one above. The healings performed by Christ were the exercise of the powers of the Kingdom, by the King who was there in person.

10. If the body was not included in redemption, how can there be a resurrection? or how can corruption put on incorruption or mortality put on immortality? Were not the physical as well as the spiritual earnests (foretastes) of our coming redemption enjoyed by God's people throughout history?

The Christian's body *was* "included in redemption," though for its actual redemption we have still to wait. See Romans 8. 23. The answer to the latter part of the question is in the negative if the questioner means, Did God's people throughout history enjoy physical mercies such as exemption from sickness? They did not.

11. Why should not the second Adam take away all that the first Adam brought upon us?

Why cannot professed Bible teachers quote their text-book correctly? We have read of the *last* Adam—for there can be no further Head of a race—but "the second

Adam''! Has the last Adam taken away all that the first brought upon us? Christ will eventually bring us to a place far better than that which Adam forfeited. But for this we wait. The days of our groaning are not yet past. See Rom. 8. 23.

12. Since the Church is the body of Christ, does God want the body of Christ sick? Is it not His will to heal any part of the body of Christ? If not, why does He command "any sick" in it to be anointed for healing?

Some members of the body of Christ are sick *by the act of God*. See 1 Corinthians 11. 30-32. He does not command "any sick" *in it* to be anointed for healing. His words are, "Is any sick *among you?*" *i.e.*, those to whom James's epistle is addressed. At Ephesus a member of the body of Christ was told, not to be anointed, but to take some wine as a remedy (1 Tim. 5. 23). And another was left at a near-by town sick (2 Tim. 4. 20). Why was this, if all that he had to do was to send for the elders to anoint him, with the assurance that he would thereby be healed?

13. Are human imperfections of any sort, be they physical or moral, God's will or are they man's mistakes?

They are the result of the state that men are in because of sin. The whole creation still groans, and we who have "the firstfruits of the Spirit" are not exempt from sharing the sad consequences of sin's entrance into the world.

14. Since "the body is for the Lord," a living sacrifice unto God, would He not rather have a well body than a wrecked one? If not, how can He make us "perfect in every good work to do His will," or have us "thoroughly furnished unto every good work"?

God has often got great glory to Himself from a saint whose body is hardly ever free from suffering. Some of His choicest saints have been the greatest sufferers. If *His will* for us is to testify to the grace that uplifts the soul to Heaven while the body throbs with pain, then He can perfect us by suffering to accomplish thus His will. The being "thoroughly furnished unto all good works" is by Scripture being given for the purpose (2 Tim. 3 16, 17). And this was so in the case of one beset with "often infirmities" of a kind that taking "a little wine" would relieve.

15. Since bodily healing in the New Testament was called a mercy, and it was mercy and compassion

that moved Jesus to heal all who came to Him, is not the promise of God still true, "He is plenteous in mercy unto all that call upon Him"?

Mr. Bosworth does not tell us *where* in the New Testament bodily healing was called a mercy. But suppose it is so, see where the argument lands one. When God, in answer to prayer, gave Elizabeth a son, it is said that the Lord showed great *mercy* upon her (Luke 1. 58). Then since God is plenteous in mercy, may not this same mercy, the gift of a son in old age, be claimed by all who "call upon Him"? Really some of the arguments we are asked to answer hardly lend themselves to serious treatment.

16. Does not the glorious Gospel dispensation offer as much mercy and compassion to its sufferers as did the darker dispensations? If not, why would God withdraw this mercy and this Old Testament privilege from a better dispensation with its "better covenant"?

Who says this is "a better dispensation"? Scripture calls it an *evil* age (Gal. 1. 4). It is true that it is the age when the glorious Gospel is proclaimed. But, unlike the previous age, and that which is to come, material, physical blessings form no part of that which is offered to the one who believes in Christ. He is saved *from* this age, to be no longer of it, but to have the actual possession of his inheritance by and by. The Spirit is given as the earnest of this, for the blessing itself is still future.

17. If, as some teach, God has another method for our healing to-day, why would God adopt a less successful method for our better dispensation?

We are not responsible for what "some teach," and as for the "better dispensation" see the answer to Question 16.

18. Since Christ came to do the Father's will, was not the universal healing of all the sick who come to Him a revelation of the will of God for our bodies?

The exercise of the powers of the Kingdom among the natural heirs of that Kingdom is no indication of the will of God for the bodies of Christians.

19. Did not Jesus emphatically say that He would continue His same works in answer to our prayers while He is with the Father (John 14. 12, 13), and is not this promise alone a complete answer to all opposers?

The Lord Jesus did not make the promise in quite the form suggested by this question. He was beseeching His eleven disciples to believe in Him, when invisible to them, and stated what would be possible to them if they did

thus believe. They should do His works, and even greater ones. *And so they did.* We have a brief record of their labours in Mark 16. 20, and in more detail in the Acts. The promise was amply fulfilled.

20. Why would the Holy Spirit, who healed all the sick before His dispensation began, do less after He entered into office on the day of Pentecost? Or did the Miracle-worker enter office to do away with miracles?

The healing of disease is really a *Kingdom* blessing, and is celebrated as such in the Old Testament. Psalm 103. 3, for instance, must not be torn from its setting. The previous Psalm gives us the Lord's appearing in glory. He will bring healing in His wings (Mal. 4. 2), and that, and the forgiveness of sins according to the terms of the new covenant, will then be universally enjoyed. Our Lord came, in the line of prophecy, with all the powers of the Kingdom. He healed all who came to Him. But, being rejected, the Kingdom is in abeyance, and its physical blessings suspended, though there was a transition time during which they continued. If, in answer to prayer, God graciously heals the body of any of His suffering ones to-day (and how many of us can bear testimony to the fact that He *does*!), it is on quite a different ground from the miracles wrought by the Lord and His apostles.

21. Is not the book of the Acts of the Holy Ghost a revelation of the way He wants to continue to act through the Church?

No; the Acts of the Apostles is the history of the formation and development of the Church, the spread of the Gospel, and the supersession of the expected Kingdom by a new hope altogether.

22. How can God justify us and at the same time require us to remain under the curse of the law which Jesus redeemed us from by bearing it for us on the Cross? (Gal. 3. 13).

Who imagines that God requires any such thing? Those that are redeemed by Christ are not under any curse whatever.

23. Since "the Son of God was manifested that He might destroy the works of the Devil," has He now relinquished this purpose which He retained even during the bloody sweat of Gethsemane and the tortures of Calvary? Or does He now want the works of the Devil in our bodies to continue that He formerly wanted to destroy? Does God want a

cancer—"a plague"—"a curse"—"the works of the Devil" in the members of Christ? "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?"

When will people learn to read Scripture in connection with its context? Read the passage about destroying the works of the Devil (1 John 3. 8) and you will at once see that "the works of the Devil" are not disease or sickness, but *sin*. To quote this passage in connection with disease is an unworthy device. The truth that our bodies are the members of Christ is brought forward as an incentive to holiness of life, and not as a reason for claiming exemptions from sickness. Read the whole passage, 1 Corinthians 6. 13-20, and not merely the 15th verse that Mr. Bosworth selects.

24. **Are the proofs of Divine Healing among the one hundred and eighty-four persons who testified in this Tabernacle the last two Friday nights less bright and convincing than the proofs of Spiritual Redemption among professed Christians to-day? Are not these 184 who have been healed in better health physically than the same number of professed Christians in Toronto are spiritually? Would not the physical health of these 184 compare favourably with the spiritual health of even the same number of ministers of our day?**

Mr. Bosworth says nothing of the numbers that had no healing of which to testify, but went away weeping with disappointment. There were no disappointments with the multitudes that came to the Lord for healing. He healed them *all* (Matt. 12. 15). Yet Question 19 leads us to suppose that Mr. Bosworth claims that in his campaigns there is a perpetuation of the healing ministry of Christ! But see page 36 as to the result of investigations conducted by those who were on the spot after the Bosworth "healing campaigns" in Toronto.

25. **Would not the argument commonly employed against Divine Healing, drawn from its failures, if employed against justification, regeneration, and all the rest be simply overwhelming?**

By no means. *No one* who puts his trust in the Saviour, as the Gospel bids him do, remains unjustified and unblessed. Whereas multitudes who act according to Mr. Bosworth's directions remain without the healing that they so earnestly seek.

26. **Does the fact that Christ could do no miracle at Nazareth prove anything except the unbelief of the people? or would it be right to conclude, because**

of the failure of Christ's disciples to cast out the epileptic spirit from the boy, that it was not God's will to deliver him? Christ proved by healing him that it is God's will to heal even those who fail to receive it.

Mr. Bosworth said Christ did *no* miracle at Nazareth, whereas Scripture says that, though He marvelled at their unbelief, He did lay His hands upon a few sick folk, even at Nazareth, and healed them (Mark 6. 5). The prevailing unbelief could not prevent that. Not faith, but *need*, was what drew forth the power to heal (Luke 9. 11). We shall be interested to hear when Mr. Bosworth begins to heal on this principle, not looking for faith, but having regard only to need. If Christ proved, by healing the epileptic boy, that it was God's will to heal all, we may with equal reason argue that since He left Trophimus unhealed, it was not God's will to heal any. See the folly of arguing from the individual to the universal in every case.

27. **Is not God as willing to show the mercy of healing to His worshippers as He is to show the mercy of forgiveness to His enemies?** (Rom. 8. 32).

It is not a question of God's willingness, but of His ways. There is no record in the Scriptures as far as we known of any *Christian* having "the mercy of healing" shown him, unless it be Saul, in Acts 9. 17, an exceptional case, on which no argument can be based.

28. **If Paul (as a New York minister says) "was the sickest of men, suffering from ophthalmia of the eyes," or if, as others teach, his "thorn in the flesh" was PHYSICAL weakness instead of what Paul himself says it was, "Satan's angel" inflicting the many buffetings which Paul enumerates, how could he labour more abundantly than all the other apostles? or since he had strength to do more work than all the others, how could his "weakness" be PHYSICAL? Since Paul's "thorn" did not hinder HIS faith for the universal healing of "all the rest of the sick folk on the island" of Melita (Moffatt's trans.), why should it hinder OURS? Would not PAUL'S failure to be healed, if he was sick, hinder the universal faith of these heathen for THEIR healing? Why do traditional teachers substitute "ophthalmia of the eyes," or sickness (neither of which Paul mentions) for the "reproaches," "necessities," "persecutions," "distresses," and all the other buffetings at the hands of "Satan's angels" which he DOES mention? If the**

former constitute his "thorn," why does he not say he takes pleasure in the former instead of the latter? How could Paul, sick in body, or with the unsightly disease of "ophthalmia of the eyes," and unable to be healed, "make the Gentiles obedient by word and deed **THROUGH MIGHTY SIGNS AND WONDERS**"? (Rom. 15. 18, 19).

We cannot undertake to defend the position taken by the New York minister. But we see nothing in the fact of Paul's infirmities being physical (if they were) to hinder him labouring more abundantly than the other apostles. *They* remained at Jerusalem; *he* travelled hundreds of weary miles and endured unheard of hardships in his service for Christ. To speak of "the universal *faith*" of the heathen that were healed is nonsense.

29. If sickness is the will of God, then would not every physician be a law-breaker, every trained nurse be defying the Almighty, every hospital a house of rebellion instead of a house of mercy, and instead of supporting hospitals should we not then do our utmost to close them?

It will be time to answer this question when it is proved that we have spoken of sickness as "the will of God." Certainly *suffering* is, in some cases, the will of God. See 1 Peter 4. 19. But Scripture does not speak of either sickness or health as being the will of God. God's will is generally spoken of as being concerned with things infinitely higher than any concerns of earth. There is "the good pleasure of His will" running on into eternity; "the mystery of His will," concerning "the dispensation of the fulness of times;" and "the counsel of His will," the working out of which is at the present time (Eph. 1. 5-11). And we have to pray for one another, that we "might be filled with the knowledge of His will," and "stand perfect and complete in all the will of God" (Col. 1. 9; 4. 12). These words carry our thoughts to a different plane altogether, and take us away from our own poor little interests and concerns to the great thoughts and designs of God, and to Christ who is the Sum of them all. Would that we more habitually lived *there*! But how little of these wonderful things we hear from "faith healers"!

30. Since Jesus in the Gospels never commissioned anybody to preach the Gospel without commanding them to heal the sick, how can we obey this command if there is no Gospel (good news) of healing to pro-

claim to the sick as a basis for their faith? Or, since faith is expecting God to keep His promise, how can there be faith for healing if God has not promised it? And since the Bible is full of promises of healing are they not all Gospel (good news) to the sick? Since "faith cometh by hearing . . . the Word," how can the sick have faith for healing if there is nothing for them to hear?

We open our eyes in astonishment at Mr. Bosworth's bold and untrue statements. Begin with Matthew's Gospel and read how Christ commissioned His apostles in chapter 28. He bade them teach and baptise, but nothing is said about healing the sick. The commission, as given in Luke, is one to preach repentance and remission of sins (chap. 24. 47). Again, nothing about healing the sick. In Mark the commission is to go and preach; no other command is given, but the Lord says that signs shall follow them that believe, including recovery of the sick by the laying on of their hands (chap. 16. 18). But this is not a *command*. The commission was duly fulfilled, as verse 20 informs us; the signs did follow, and the sick did recover through the laying on of hands. We do not accept Mr. Bosworth's definition of faith. If sick, I may pray to God with faith in Him, in His love, His wisdom, His power. This is a vastly different thing from a faith which is merely "expecting God to keep His promise," when no such promise is given. Christians are never promised immunity from sickness, nor bidden to have "faith for healing," though healing, like any other mercy, may rightly be sought by humble, submissive prayer.

31. Could the loving heart of the Son of God, who had compassion upon the sick, and healed all who had need of healing, cease to regard the sufferings of His own when He had become exalted at the right hand of the Father?

So far from ceasing to "regard the sufferings of His own," we read that "we have not a High Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities" (Heb. 4. 15). His tender heart feels profoundly all that His people groan under. But the exhortation based on this great truth is not "Boldly claim immunity from sickness as your redemption right," but "Come boldly unto the throne of grace," to obtain, not relief from the infirmities, but mercy and grace to help.

EVERY CHRISTIAN'S LIBRARY OF STANDARD BIBLICAL WORKS

Uniform Binding in Maroon Art Cloth, Gold Title.

THE PROGRESS OF DOCTRINE. Bampton Lectures delivered before University of Oxford. By T. D. BERNARD, M.A.

THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD: Its Meaning and its Power. By A. T. SCHOFIELD, M.D., M.R.C.S., London.

THE GOSPEL AND ITS MINISTRY. A Handbook of Evangelical Truth. By Sir R. ANDERSON, K.C.B., LL.D.

CHARACTERISTIC DIFFERENCES OF THE FOUR GOSPELS, THE. Considered as revealing various Relations of our Lord. By ANDREW JUKES.

DID JESUS RISE? A fearless facing of the Vital Fact of Christianity. By Dr. JAMES H. BROOKES.

HUMAN DESTINY. A Handbook of the Eschatological Controversy. By Sir ROBERT ANDERSON, K.C.B.

"I AM COMING": The Second Coming of Christ—Personal, Private, Pre-millennial. By Dr. J. H. BROOKES.

JESUS IS COMING. A Scriptural Survey of the arguments for the "Blessed Hope." By W. E. BLACKSTONE.

PROPHECY MADE PLAIN. A simple Bird's-eye View of Prophecy. By Dr. C. I. SCOFIELD, of the "Scofield Bible."

GOD'S LIVING ORACLES. The famous Exeter Hall Lectures on the Bible by Dr. A. T. PIERSON.

THE BIBLE AND MODERN CRITICISM. A Devout and Open-minded Study. By Sir ROBT. ANDERSON, K.C.B., LL.D.

TWELVE BASKETS FULL of Original Bible Outlines for Teachers, Preachers, and Workers. By H. PICKERING.

SAMUEL RUTHERFORD'S LETTERS. Revised for modern readers, rearranged in groups, and completed.

THE KINGDOM IN HISTORY AND PROPHECY. The Historic and Prophetic Aspects of the Kingdom in their relation to the present age. By L. S. CHAFER.

THE PROPHETIC HISTORY OF THE CHURCH. As seen in the Seven Churches of Asia. By F. W. GRANT.

THE HARMONY OF THE PROPHETIC WORD. The great subjects revealing the Future assembled and analysed. By ARNO. C. GABBELEIN, Editor of "Our Hope."

THE COMING PRINCE. The Standard Work on Daniel and the 70 Weeks. By Sir ROBT. ANDERSON, K.C.B., LL.D.

THE GREAT PROPHECIES OF DANIEL and the Principles therein revealed. By WILLIAM KELLY.

THE SILENCE OF GOD—The Greatest Mystery of our Existence. By Sir ROBERT ANDERSON, K.C.B., LL.D.

THE MAN OF SORROWS. A Simple and Soul-refreshing Exposition of the Gospel of Luke. By J. N. DARBY.

THE STORY OF OUR ENGLISH BIBLE: Its various Translations, Books, Writers, etc., etc. By WALTER SCOTT.

THE STUDY OF THE TYPES. A comparison of One with Another. By ADA R. HABERSHON.

Each 2/- net, 2/4 post free.

Complete List of over 100 Titles post free on application.

PICKERING & INGLIS, PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS
14 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4; 229 Bothwell St., Glasgow

A FEW IMPORTANT BOOKS ON
ESCHATOLOGY
OR, WHAT COMES AFTER DEATH?

FACTS AND THEORIES AS TO THE FUTURE STATE.
By F. W. GRANT, author of the Numerical Bible. The masterpiece on this momentous subject of the Destiny of the Souls of *all* men. 638 pages. 6/- net (6/- post free).

DID JESUS RISE? Will all men be raised? By Dr. JAS. H. BROOKES. Packed with information. 2/- net (2/- post free).

HUMAN DESTINY; or, AFTER DEATH—WHAT? By Sir ROBERT ANDERSON, K.C.B., LL.D. A handbook of Eschatological Truth for all readers. Revised up to date. 226 pages. 2/- net (2/- post free). Replies to Farrar's "Eternal Hope," "Salvator Mundi," "The Restitution of All Things," White's "Life in Christ," and other well-known volumes.

"The most valuable contribution on the subject I have ever seen."—C. H. Spurgeon.

"This masterly treatise ought to become a treasured handbook on the subject."—*Christian Leader*.

ENDLESS BEING; or, Man Made for Eternity. By J. H. BARLOW. Commended by J. R. Caldwell, F. C. Bland, etc. 2/- net (2/- post free).

OUR HAPPY DEAD—Where Are They? How do they Fare? What Saith the Scriptures? By H. D. BROWN. 1/- net (1/- post free).

AFTER DEATH, or, THE DESTINY OF THE SOUL. By D. ANDERSON-BERRY, M.D., F.R.S. (Edin.), etc. Deals with Man's Creation—Body, Soul, Spirit—Immortality—Sheol, Hades, Paradise—Christadelphians and Seventh-Day Adventists—Annihilation and Universalism, etc. 64 pages clear type. 6d. net (8d. post free).

WILL A GOD OF LOVE PUNISH ANY OF HIS CREATURES FOR EVER? By ALEX. MARSHALL. Scripture Statements. Forcible Facts. Popular Objections. Choice extracts and pithy points for all interested in life after death. 32 pages. 2d. net (2/- per dozen post free).

WHERE ARE THE DEAD? Can we be Certain? What saith the Scriptures? By F. E. MARSH. 2d. net (2/- per dozen post free).

SHALL WE KNOW ONE ANOTHER IN HEAVEN? A natural inquiry, a Scriptural reply. By WM. ROBERTSON. 2d. net (3d. each, or 2/- doz. post free).

DOES DEATH END ALL? A Vital Question answered by INTUITION, MORTALITY, SCRIPTURE. By F. E. MARSH. 32 pages. 2d. net (2/- per dozen post free).

PICKERING & INGLIS, Printers and Publishers,
14 Paternoster Row, London, E.C; 229 Bothwell St., Glasgow

These articles are reprinted from

THE WITNESS

THE STANDARD BIBLICAL MONTHLY.

An Unfettered Journal of Biblical Literature, Practical Papers, Expositions, Answers, Poetry, Reviews, Intelligence, etc. Issued regularly month by month since 1870 without a break, and read by over 23,000 Readers in all parts of the English-speaking world.

Editor: H. PICKERING.

Truth in Love; or, All the Word of God for all the People of God has been the motto of the paper since its commencement.

It Contains Edifying Expositions of various portions of the Word of God; Practical Papers on many phases of Christian Work; Devotional Thoughts from the writings of well-known men of God; Voices from the Vineyard—home and abroad; Suggestive Topics for Preachers and Teachers; Correspondence on themes of doctrinal and practical interest, and helpful all-round ministry.

Current Events dealing with some of the great problems facing the believer and the Church. Burning Questions for Students, and "Questions and answers" on subjects of general interest to all saints are dealt with in each issue.

Witnessing in many Lands; Stirring events in Heathen Lands; Records of Revival in English-speaking Lands; Notices of the Home-call of well-known Christians; Contributions to and Intelligence of work on Faith lines in many parts of the World; and a useful "Serve-One-Another" Column.

2d. Monthly: 2/6 (or 60 cts.) post free for one year

SPECIMEN COPY FREE ON APPLICATION.

PICKERING & INGLIS; Printers and Publishers
229 Bothwell St., Glasgow; 14 Paternoster Row, London