

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

ward as spiritually intelligent exegesis; and it appears to us that the man who says that Ps 130 is speculative would say anything.

One noteworthy point is that Staerk agrees with Duhm (his highest authority, obviously) in believing that the 'I' of the Psalms means the individual, not the community. He speaks with the greatest decision on this subject. It is surely cheering to the humble outsider thus to find the most advanced scholarship returning, with a

resolute step, to the intuitive convictions of the believing consciousness in every time.

Near the close there is an interesting and rewarding discussion of the view of sacrificial ritual to which various Psalmists give expression. Valuable appendices are added, containing a new translation of the Penitential Psalms, with full textual notes, and a history of their private and liturgical use in the Church.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

## Gifts of Healing.

BY THE REV. PERCY DEARMER, M.A., VICAR OF ST. MARY THE VIRGIN, PRIMROSE HILL, LONDON;  
AND SECRETARY OF THE LONDON BRANCH OF THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL UNION.

A GENERATION has hardly passed since Matthew Arnold remarked, with all the confidence of italics, that '*miracles do not happen.*' To him, and to most of his contemporaries, this was an axiom upon which it was not necessary to waste time in argument; it needed only to be stated in order that the Christian faith might be reconstructed on reasonable lines. But time is sometimes swift in its lessons. At the present day we have discovered that, whatever else may be true or false, this at least is certain—*miracles do happen*, and always have happened. We cannot yet, indeed, say this of all the miracles recorded in the N.T.; but we can say it of that class of miracles which far outnumber all the rest—the works of healing. The other miracles may bide their time; it is enough for one generation to have certified the majority—to have shown that so many N.T. incidents seemed incredible to the nineteenth century only because they were in advance of it.

We can now only say that miracles do not happen in the sense that we can say that treason does not prosper—because the name is changed. But even here the N.T. is in advance of us, for in it *τέρας* is as a matter of fact changed to *σημείον*; miracles are 'signs' and 'powers,' 'works' (in St. John) and 'mighty works' (see art. 'Miracle' in *D.B.* p. 384). Recent advances in psychology have given us a rough and sketchy but sufficiently valid explanation of these 'powers' of healing. Evidence of the fact, indeed, has always been plentiful; at the time when scientific men were most confidently denying such 'miracles,' they were occurring in great number; but the scientists were then convinced

that they could not happen, and were consequently blind to the fact that they did.

Those were the days of triumphant materialism, when the mind was regarded as the product of the cerebral tissues, because the mind ceased to act when the brain decayed—as we might consider the sailor to be the product of his ship, because if the ship is destroyed he cannot sail. Christendom for a moment bowed before this strange and narrow dogmatism. She forgot her own history, and accepted the charge of superstition—a word which since the Reformation has greatly terrified her, in spite of Bacon's warning. But the history of Christendom is thoroughly intermingled with spiritual healing, as will be mentioned later.

It is now no longer Spirit but Matter that is on its trial. The atom itself has crumbled away; matter has no fundamental existence; mass, formerly thought indestructible and invariable, depends solely on the velocity of negative electrons. We are near to proving the unity of Things—a trinity in which the three entities, matter, ether, energy, are but forms of a One persistent Power. Beyond and within this world of energy, or electricity, if it is to be so called, may be—nay, must be—a still profounder aspect of the Cosmos; but at least, even on the 'material' plane, a new world is opened to us in the knowledge that matter itself is the outward and visible sign of an intense and inconceivably potent Energy.

Before, however, natural science had reached these discoveries, it had become clear to the more

advanced men among the experimental psychologists that the materialistic conception of man would not do. To put the case in its simplest form, the growing mass of evidence showed that man is not a body possessing a spirit, but is a spirit possessing a body; and that so far from the body creating the spirit, it is the spirit which is every moment creating and re-creating the body. As this has always been the belief of Christendom, it seems strange that Christians should ever have boggled at the belief that remarkable changes in the body could be effected through spiritual means. Yet so it was. The average intelligent Christian, while he accepted the N.T. miracles because they were part of his dogmatic outfit (being in the Bible), came to regard all later miracles of healing as belonging to the realm of superstition. Nor was this the case with healing only. Other strange instances of the power of spirit over matter were equally attributed to the picturesque mendacity of the Middle Ages, e.g. the Stigmata of St. Francis. At the present time numerous other cases of stigmata have been recorded, and contemporary instances may be studied in the records of learned societies. (For more modern examples, see Myers, *Human Personality*, i. 491-499.) Now one scientifically observed case of stigmatization would be sufficient to illustrate the possibility of spiritual healing, even if we were not so beset with cases of remarkable cures that at the present day there are few who have not come into personal contact with some.

The psychologists have discovered, through the observation of abnormal cases, that not only is the spiritual personality master of the body, but that this personality is an exceedingly complex thing, so that two or more different personalities may at different times hold possession of the same body. Modern cases are now on record which are far more remarkable than any instances of demoniac possession recorded in the N.T.; and thus is justified that class of N.T. miracles of healing which even Romanes, after his acceptance of Christianity, regarded as incredible. Indeed, through the study of sleep, of hysteria, and of other phenomena, especially those classed as hypnotic, there has emerged a reasonable explanation of our complex being—an explanation that covers those strange phenomena which scientists were once content to ignore and to deny.

### The Psychology of Healing.

In his normal, balanced state, man's personality consists of two parts, that which is below and that which is above the line of consciousness. Personality may in fact be compared to an iceberg of which the greater part is submerged. This submerged, subconscious, or subliminal self is that which controls the functions of the body, without any conscious will or guidance on our part (on the part, that is, of the conscious or supraliminal self); it is responsible for our health, and its perversion or failure at any point is the cause of disease, while its recovery of control (which has always been recognized in medicine under the name of *vis medicatrix natura*) produces restoration to health. Medical treatment may assist it, but medical treatment does not itself effect the restoration; it merely removes obstruction, or assists and invigorates the subliminal self, which itself restores the affected part. Now medical treatment has been largely physical (in more senses than one), but by no means entirely so; good doctors know, and always have known, the value of confidence and hopefulness; that is to say, they have always recognized that there are spiritual factors in recovery, though 'mental therapeutics,' as Dr. Schofield points out (*Force of Mind*, 13), have been strangely ignored in the medical textbooks and classrooms.

This being so, it is the more strange that any Christian accepting hope as a factor in material change should have doubted the power of still higher factors—of prayer, for instance, and the sacraments, of religious faith, and of religious energy transmitted by word or touch,—one need not say 'of God,' because it is always the power of God that effects a cure, whether the means employed be medicine or miracle. The farmer does not create the corn, he merely assists the processes of nature; in the same way, the doctor, or miracle-working saint, or the ordinary faith-healer do not create healthy tissue,—they merely assist the spirit within which controls the bodily functions to make good use of the Life that is the Word of God, and thus to restore the body into closer conformity with God's laws. The doctor who calls this Life the *vis medicatrix natura* is falling back upon a theological mystery, just as much as St. John when he called it the Word, or St. Paul when he said, 'To another gifts of healing by the same Spirit' (1 Co 12<sup>10</sup>), or St. Peter when he said, 'In the

name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, walk' (Ac 3<sup>6</sup>). The difference is one of method: the spiritual healer makes a more direct and radical appeal to the subliminal self, and therefore often succeeds where the doctor fails, and often effects more astonishing cures—cures that are impossible to the normal material methods, and were therefore regarded by the religious world as miraculous, and by the agnostic world as incredible. But in practice the religious world had almost come round to the agnostic position: such things as unction for the sick or touching for the king's evil disappeared from our midst during the Hanoverian period; though—as is usual—many sects rose up to bear witness to the forgotten truth, and faith-healers appeared in many places, gradually gaining in numbers and in respectability till our own time. In the religious world at large, however, even prayer for the sick became a very faint-hearted thing; it was seldom the 'prayer of faith' that 'shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up' (Ja 5<sup>15</sup>). The popular view, for instance, of the clinical function of a minister of religion is that he comes to prepare the sick person for death, and not at all as a therapeutic agent; consequently, the doctors have become increasingly shy of his presence, and enjoin 'complete quiet' and no visitors. They are not to be blamed: if a minister brings a death 'suggestion,' the doctor shows his appreciation of the spiritual factor in healing by refusing him access to the patient. If the clergy regarded sickness as the N.T. writers regarded it, they would be called in by the patient and welcomed by the doctor as a valuable ally.

Healing by a direct appeal to the subliminal self is still relatively rare (although the cases become more and more numerous), because faith in the reality and prepotence of the spiritual or psychic factor is still relatively rare. The controlling power of the body, the subliminal self, with its extraordinary faculties, is readily amenable to control by suggestion; and in the hypnotic hospitals of France the most remarkable cures of both mental and physical diseases are daily effected as a matter of course. Whether 'suggestion' is to be referred to the psychic or spiritual realm, or both, we may leave undecided; but we may well believe that of all non-material agencies, those which we call spiritual are the most powerful—and none the less if it be proved that they operate through 'suggestion,' just as much as the will power of a

possibly agnostic doctor at the Salpêtrière. Only, in every case, a certain receptivity on the part of the patient (whether it be normal or induced by hypnotism), and a certain confidence on the part of the operator are needed—in other words, faith. Neither objective nor subjective faith, in this connexion, has been usually found in the modern religious world. God has done 'not many mighty works there because of their unbelief' (Mt 13<sup>58</sup>).

### The Healing Works of Christ.

We are now in a position to consider the works of healing as they are recounted in the N.T., beginning with those of our Lord. For convenience let us first take *St. Mark* as our basis, using square brackets for the other Evangelists. There we find works of healing (including exorcism) described twenty times; of these, eighteen occasions refer to Christ, one (including numerous cases, Mk 6<sup>12</sup>) to the Twelve, and one to a man who cast out devils in Christ's name (Mk 9<sup>38</sup>). Of the eighteen occasions referring to Christ, seven describe the healing of multitudes; and we thus have a vast number of cases before us. Now, in all these cases, it is remarkable how often stress is laid on the element of faith (*e.g.* 'thy faith hath made thee whole,' Mk 10<sup>52</sup>) [cf. Mt 9<sup>29</sup>, 'according to your faith be it done unto you']. It is also remarkable that these acts of healing were not done as a display of power: they were not primarily evidential, but were called forth by the compassion of the Master in response to the appeal of faith; and though many were necessarily public (and, in the case of the demoniac at Gadara, the man was told to tell his friends, 5<sup>19</sup>), our Lord sometimes took pains to enforce silence—it may be, in order to avoid the danger of counter-suggestion in certain cases (Mk 1<sup>44</sup>, 'See thou say nothing to any man'; 5<sup>43</sup>, 'He charged them much that no man should know this'; 7<sup>36</sup>, 'He charged them that they should tell no man'; 8<sup>26</sup>, 'Do not even enter into the village'). It is not less remarkable that, in the case of children, mention is made of the faith of a parent. In such cases the necessary receptivity on the part of the patient was unconscious, or, in other words, was a subliminal receptivity induced by the power of Christ, and apparently also by the telepathic influence of another's faith, unless we regard that faith as only of the nature of prayer moving Christ to use His powers. The three parents mentioned are—Jairus (Mk 5<sup>22</sup>), the Syro-

Phœnician woman (7<sup>24</sup>), and the man who had a son with a dumb spirit (9<sup>14</sup>) [cf. the centurion's servant (not a child in this case) in Mt 8<sup>5</sup>, Lk 7<sup>2</sup>, and the nobleman's son in Jn 4<sup>46</sup>]. In other cases a *collective* faith is mentioned, which was probably shared by the patient (e.g. 'Jesus, seeing *their* faith, saith to the sick of the palsy,' Mk 2<sup>5</sup>; cf. 6<sup>55</sup> 7<sup>32</sup> 8<sup>22</sup>). In other cases (e.g. 'The people . . . began to carry about on their beds those that were sick, where they heard he was,' 6<sup>54, 55</sup>) the collective faith is obvious. In the case of the leper (1<sup>40</sup>), of the woman with the issue (5<sup>25</sup>), and of Bartimæus (10<sup>46</sup>), the faith of the patient is mentioned. No mention is made of any petition or other expression of faith in the case of the man with the withered hand (3<sup>1</sup>), but it may well be taken for granted, and he had at least sufficient receptivity to obey the command to stand forth and stretch out his hand. [The case of Malchus in Lk 22<sup>51</sup> is the most difficult, but it is quite possible that this servant turned to Christ for succour in his pain.]

The evidence of the other Evangelists leads to the same conclusion. *St. Matthew* describes twenty-three occasions (as compared with *St. Mark's* twenty), of which seven again refer to multitudes, but adds little that is not in *St. Mark* or *St. Luke*. In *St. Luke* the number reaches twenty-four, of which four refer to multitudes: in one of the latter cases he notes that there were no refusals or failures—and them that had need of healing, he healed' (Lk 9<sup>11</sup>; cf. Mk 6<sup>56</sup>, 'as many as touched him were made whole'). *St. Luke* gives the additional cases of the woman with the infirmity (13<sup>11</sup>), the man with dropsy (14<sup>2</sup>), the ten lepers (17<sup>12</sup>), of Malchus' ear (22<sup>51</sup>), and in common with *St. Matthew* the healing of the centurion's servant (7<sup>2</sup>, and Mt 8<sup>5</sup>), and of the blind and dumb demoniac (11<sup>14</sup>, and Mt 12<sup>22</sup>). *St. John* refers to but four occasions of healing, but of these three seem to be new cases, while one is a passing allusion to 'the signs which he did on them that were sick'; the three special cases are the healing of the nobleman's son (4<sup>46</sup>), the impotent man at Bethesda (5<sup>2</sup>), and the man born blind (9<sup>1</sup>).

We find, then, that there was apparently always faith on the side of the recipient; and that our Lord sometimes attributed the cure to this faith—drawing attention away from Himself in order to strengthen the spiritual strength of the patient

by deepening his confidence. Our Lord, then, certainly attributed a recuperative force to the patient himself; though, at the same time, He clearly knew that healing was also caused by a power that went out from Him ('Jesus, perceiving in himself that the power proceeding from him had gone forth, turned him about in the crowd, and said, Who touched my garments?' Mk 5<sup>30</sup>) [Lk 8<sup>46</sup>; cf. Lk 6<sup>19</sup>, 'for power came forth from him, and healed them all']. All this is in complete accordance with the discoveries of modern science. So also is His refusal to confine Himself to one particular method of inducing this subliminal restoration.

The *methods* are indeed much varied. *St. Mark* mentions six cases of healing by *Word* ('Hold thy peace, and come out of him,' 1<sup>25</sup>; 'Arise, take up thy bed,' 2<sup>11</sup>; 'Stretch forth thy hand,' 3<sup>5</sup>; 'Come forth, thou unclean spirit, out of the man,' 5<sup>8</sup>; 'He rebuked the unclean spirit, saying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I command thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him,' 9<sup>25</sup>; 'Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole,' 10<sup>52</sup>); two cases of healing by *Touch* ('He came and took her by the hand, and raised her up,' 1<sup>31</sup>; 'He laid his hands upon a few sick folk,' 6<sup>5</sup>); four by *Word and Touch combined* ('He stretched forth his hand, and touched him, and saith unto him, I will; be thou made clean,' 1<sup>41</sup>; 'Taking the child by the hand, he saith unto her, Talitha cumi,' 5<sup>41</sup>); while in the two last of these instances the action is ceremonial and symbolic in character ('he . . . put his fingers into his ears, and he spat, and touched his tongue; and, looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him, Ephphatha,' 7<sup>33, 34</sup>; and also in the remarkable case of gradual recovery from blindness in 8<sup>22</sup>) [cf. Jn 9<sup>1</sup>: where, after the anointing with clay, the blind man is told to wash in Siloam]. In three more cases it is our Lord who is *Himself touched* by the sick persons ('that they might touch him,' 3<sup>10</sup>; the woman with the issue, 5<sup>27</sup>; 'as many as touched him were made whole,' 6<sup>56</sup>). In one case, that of the daughter of the Syro-Phœnician woman (7<sup>29</sup>), the healing is accomplished by *Telepathy* [cf. the centurion's servant, Lk 7<sup>10</sup>; and in Mt 8<sup>13</sup>, 'the servant was healed in that hour'; also in Jn 4<sup>52, 53</sup>, the nobleman's son, 'so he inquired of them the hour when he began to amend. . . . So the father knew that it was at that hour in which Jesus said unto him, Thy son liveth']. The method is *not*

mentioned in the two occasions that remain in the exorcisms (1<sup>32</sup> and 1<sup>39</sup>). To these eighteen occasions of healing by Christ, St. Mark adds the healing by the disciples through unction (6<sup>13</sup>), and the healing by one who was not a disciple, but cast out devils in Christ's name (9<sup>38</sup>).

St. Matthew and St. Luke mention our Lord's attributing His power of casting out devils to the 'Spirit of God' (Mt 12<sup>28</sup>), or the 'finger of God' (Lk 11<sup>20</sup>; cf. Lk 10<sup>18</sup>, 'I beheld Satan fallen as lightning'); and St. Mark (3<sup>11</sup>) describes the devils as recognizing Jesus as the Son of God, and dreading Him (cf. Mk 1<sup>24</sup> 5<sup>7</sup>). St. Luke also mentions one case of his directly attributing a physical ailment to the enemy ('this woman . . . whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years' (13<sup>16</sup>)). In Jn 9<sup>3</sup> our Lord describes the healing of the blind man as the manifestation of 'the works of God': here He distinctly says that neither personal nor parental sin had anything to do with the blindness; though He forgives sin, as well as heals sickness, in the case of the palsied man (Mk 2<sup>5</sup>); and in Jn 5<sup>14</sup> He warns the healed man to 'sin no more, lest a worse thing befall thee.' In Jn 5<sup>20, 21</sup> our Lord gives His opponents the following explanation of His miracles or 'works': 'For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that himself doeth; and greater works than

these will he show him, that ye may marvel. For as the Father raiseth the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son also quickeneth whom he will.'

Our Lord, then, effected His cures by His own power as the Son of God—as having the Divine power in Him—in co-operation with the faith on the side of the patient. But so far from claiming that this power was confined to the Divinity in His own Person, He gave the Twelve 'authority' to exercise it also (Mk 6<sup>7</sup>); He also recognized the power of one who was not a disciple, but who used His name (Mk 9<sup>38</sup>); and He insisted on the need of prayer at least in one special class of affliction ('This kind can come out by nothing, save by prayer,' Mk 9<sup>29</sup>). He predicted, indeed, greater powers for His followers than He had exercised Himself—'He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do. . . . And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do' (Jn 14<sup>12, 13</sup>). Indeed, He mentions even the wicked as casting out devils and doing 'mighty works,' because they used the power of His name (Mt 7<sup>22, 23</sup>)—a remark which throws a good deal of light on the undoubted successes of some unworthy healers of our own time.

(To be concluded.)

## A Lost Uncial Codex of the Psalms.

BY THE REV. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, B.D.

IN the early part of last year the writer had occasion to apply to the authorities of the Royal Library at Turin, asking for permission to have some photographs taken of a manuscript (LXX) of the *Minor Prophets*; permission was immediately granted. But by some oversight (a fortunate oversight, as it proved) the photographer made a mistake, and photographed three pages of another MS. Only a few weeks after a disastrous fire broke out in the Library, and among the many valuable MSS which were destroyed, the one under consideration was included; its destruction was almost complete, even the negatives of the three photographs (which, according to the law, have to be deposited in the Library) were wholly destroyed. Last autumn the writer was permitted to see the remnants of this MS.;

they consisted of a handful of ashes. It is true, in the centre of some of the leaves a few letters are still visible, showing a beautiful handwriting, with here and there an initial letter coloured vermilion or light blue; but for all practical purposes all that remains of what was once one of the choicest treasures in the Library are the three photographs referred to above.<sup>1</sup>

The MS. in question was a Greek uncial of the Psalms, belonging to the eighth or, at latest, ninth century. The accompanying plate gives approximately the size of the leaves. It has not,

<sup>1</sup> These photographs were sent in duplicate; one set belongs to Dr. Swete, who most kindly shared the expense involved in taking them; the other set is in the possession of the writer.