

generically 'animal' and specifically 'man'; thus a list of slaves published by Dr. Scheil is dated in 'the year when Rim-Anum the king (conquered) the land of . . . bi and its inhabitants' (*a-dam-bi*).¹ In the table of the antediluvian kings of Babylon given by Berossus, 'Alorus of

¹ *Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*, xx. p. 65. Dr. Pinches notices that in the bilingual story of the Creation

Babylon' takes the place of Adamu of Eridu, but it is significant that the third and fourth kings are Amelon, *i.e.* Amelu, 'the man,' of Pantibibla or Sippara, and Ammenon, *i.e.* Ummanu, 'the craftsman,' of Chaldæa, who correspond with the Biblical Enos, 'man,' and Cainan, 'smith.'

we have in the Sumerian (line 9): *uru nu-dim a-dam nu-nun-ya*, 'a city was not built, a man was not made to stand upright.'

Gifts of Healing.

BY THE REV. PERCY DEARMER, M.A., LONDON.

II.

The Healing Works of the Apostles.

THE disciples, then, like their Master, did works of healing, and they did them in His name. One case of failure is mentioned; and Christ attributed the failure to their little faith. ('Why could not we cast it out? . . . Because of your little faith,' Mt 17^{19, 20}; cf. Mk 9²³, 'If thou canst! All things are possible to him that believeth.') The Twelve were expressly sent out with the double object of preaching the Kingdom and healing the sick (Lk 9²; cf. Mt 10⁸, and also 10¹ where the description of their powers is made as wide as possible, 'unclean spirits . . . all manner of disease, and all manner of sickness'). St. Mark alone tells us that unction was the method of healing employed (6¹³, 'and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them'). In the *Acts*, however, there is no mention of unction, though healing is described on twelve occasions (if we include the raising of Dorcas and of Eutychus), of which five refer to numbers of people (*viz.* the shadow of Peter, 5¹⁵; Philip in Samaria, 8⁷ and 8¹³; St. Paul's 'special miracles,' 19¹¹; and his works at Melita, 28⁹. In two cases the healing was by Word (if we include the raising of Dorcas, 9⁴⁰; the other is the cripple at Lystra, 14¹⁰); in two others the use of the name of Christ is mentioned (at the Gate Beautiful, 3⁶; the maid with the spirit of divination, 16¹⁸); in two others prayer and the laying on of hands (Ananias and Saul, 9¹⁰⁻¹⁹; the father of Publius, 28⁸); in the case of Eutychus we are told that St. Paul embraced him (20¹⁰). In 5¹⁵ the people believed

that the shadow of St. Peter healed the sick; in 19¹² healing powers is transmitted from St. Paul by what a later age would have called relics—'unto the sick were carried away from his body handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them.' The case of the lame man at the Gate Beautiful is remarkable, because (in contrast with the cripple in 14⁹, who 'had faith to be made whole') the patient had no expectation of recovery, and only looked to receive an alms (3^{3, 5}), and St. Peter attributes the cure to his own faith, or to a collective faith in Christ ('by faith in his name hath his name made this man strong,' 3¹⁶). With this may be compared the prayer that follows (4^{29, 30}): 'Grant unto thy servants to speak thy word with all boldness, while thou stretchest forth thy hand to heal; and that signs and wonders may be done through the name of thy holy Servant Jesus.' Such was the disciples' own description of their works of spiritual healing.

In the Epistles of St. Paul the power of healing is definitely attributed to the Holy Spirit, and it is taken for granted that the gift of healing was possessed by some only, and not by all. ('And to another gifts of healings, in the one Spirit,' 1 Co 12⁹; 'Have all gifts of healings?' 12³⁰; 'He therefore that supplieth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you,' Gal 3⁵.) It is especially remarkable that St. Paul recognizes a unity between spiritual, psychical, and physical things (*e.g.* 1 Th 5²³, 'May your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire'), and assumes the interaction of spiritual and physical power. He distinctly attributes bad physical effects to a faithless reception of the

Eucharist: 'For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body. For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep' (1 Co 11^{29, 30}). This belief that a Sacrament can affect the health of the body, which till lately was ignored or regarded as superstitious, is very simply explained by the two facts—(1) that the subliminal self controls the functions of the body, (2) that the subliminal self has remarkable powers of spiritual communication, and is readily influenced, by spiritual power from without. The fact has always been borne witness to by the Words of Administration in the English Communion Service—'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.'

Spiritual Healing in the Church.

The passage in *St. James* (5^{14, 15}) leads us on to the question of spiritual healing in subsequent ages of the Church. 'Is any among you sick? 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; and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him.' We need not dwell upon the able efforts that have been made to explain these words away, since such attempts were due to a disbelief in what we know now to be true. *St. James* could hardly have made his description of healing by unction more definite; and his inclusion of the forgiveness of sins is only one more instance of that interaction between the spiritual and the material plane which we have already noticed, and which the Church has never ceased to proclaim in the doctrine of the resurrection of the body and in the use of Sacraments.

This order of *St. James* and the example of the Twelve in *Mk* 6¹³ could not but lead to the use of unction in the Church. Of the second century we know but little. *Justin Martyr* mentions gifts of healing (*Dial.* § 39) and exorcism (*Apol.* ii. 6; *Dial.* 3c. 76), but only the use of word and prayer is implied.

The blessing of oil at the time of the Eucharist is first mentioned in the *Canons of Hippolytus* (ed. Achelis, p. 56), c. 200 A.D.; but the reference to health is very vague, and the oil seems to have been merely one of the first-fruits that were offered.

Tertullian in the year 211 gives an interesting case, the healing of the Emperor *Septimius Severus*: 'He sought out the Christian *Proculus*, surnamed *Torpacion*, the steward of *Euhodias*, and in gratitude for his having once cured him with oil (*per oleum*), he kept him in his palace till the day of his death' (*Ad Scapulam*, iv.). The earliest certain liturgical example occurs in the Sacramentary of *Serapion*, Bishop of *Thmuis* in *Egypt* in the middle of the fourth century, and a friend of *Athanasius*. In this we find that there was still (as there is in the N.T.) more than one method of healing, for *Serapion* mentions the drinking of water as well as unction; and the present ending to *St. Mark's Gospel* (all the more valuable for our purpose, because it represents the experience of the second and not the first century) refers to the laying hands on the sick (*Mk* 16¹⁸). *Serapion's* form of blessing, which occurs after the communion of the people and thanksgiving, is as follows:—

'We bless through the Name of thy Only-begotten, Jesus Christ, these creatures. We name the Name of him who suffered, who was crucified, and rose again, and who sitteth on the right hand of the Uncreated, upon this water and this oil. Grant healing power upon these creatures, that every fever and every demon and every sickness may depart through the drinking and the anointing, and that the partaking of these creatures may be a healing medicine and a medicine of complete soundness in the Name of thy Only-begotten, Jesus Christ, through whom to thee are the glory and the strength in the Holy Spirit to all the ages of the ages. Amen.' (*J.T.S.* i. 108.)

But another part of *Serapion's* Sacramentary (*J.T.S.* i. 267) adds yet another medium of healing, for it gives, 'A Prayer for Oil of the sick, or for Bread, or for Water,' besides mentioning in detail many forms of sickness to be healed thereby (*e.g.* 'all fever,' 'every plague, every scourge, every smart, every pain, or stroke'). This use of bread as well as oil and water was not a mere local custom; for *Bede*, in his *Life of St. Cuthbert*, devotes three chapters (cap. 29–31) to holy oil, holy bread, and holy water as means of spiritual healing. (A trace of this seems to be preserved in the Eastern offices. The Russian *Trebuik*, or *Book of Needs*, orders the cruet for the oil at the anointing of the sick to be placed on a dish of wheat (ed. G. V. Shann, p. 83), and mentions the pouring of water or wine 'into the cruet of prayer-

unction' (p. 94). To return to the fourth century, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, a Syriac document of the latter half of that century, mentions both oil and water, and requires them to be blest either by the bishop or the presbyter: 'But, concerning water and oil, I, Matthias, make a constitution. Let the bishop bless the water or the oil. But if he be not there, let the presbyter bless it, the deacon standing by . . . but let him say thus. . . . Do thou now sanctify this water, and this oil, through Christ, in the name of him that offered or of her that offered, and give to these things a power of producing health and of driving away diseases, of putting to flight demons, of dispersing every snare, through Christ our Hope' (cap. 29; *Pitra Jur. Eccl. Græc. Hist. et Mon.* i. 62). These examples, coupled with a reference to the statement of Irenæus (*adv. Hær.* ii. 32), that healing and exorcism were common among the orthodox, will suffice as illustrations of the practice of the Primitive Church: similar contemporary evidence will be found in the *Verona Fragments* in the *Testamentum Domini*, as well as in several fourth-century accounts of healing by unction which are given in Pullar's *Anointing of the Sick*.

The Sacrament of Unction.

As time went on, unction became the official use of the Church, till in the twelfth century Peter Lombard started the idea that there were seven sacraments, and included unction as a sacrament (*Sentent.* lib. iv. 2; *P.L.* cxcii. 841, 842). But, meanwhile, a great change had taken place. In the first seven centuries, unction was used for therapeutic purposes (for instances, see Pullar, as above). But in the ninth century we find it being used for what is really the exactly opposite purpose, namely, as a preparation for death (e.g. Theodolph of Orleans, †818, *Capitulare, P.L.* cv. 220-222, reprinted in Pullar, *op. cit.* 397-405). This was due to the idea which grew up that the purpose of unction was the remission of sins; and henceforth, both in the East and West, this idea prevailed (the East following the West after about a hundred years), though the mention of bodily healing did not altogether disappear from the office books of either the East or the West. It would seem that only the Nestorians have been conservative enough to retain, as they do to this day, the form of consecration of both oil and water for the definite object of healing the sick (Denzinger, *Ritus Orient.* ed. 1863,

i. 184, ii. 518), though even with them the custom of thus actually anointing the sick seems to have fallen into desuetude since the eighteenth century (Pullar, *op. cit.* 140-146).

Thus we see that in the Middle Ages the primitive method of spiritual healing was diverted from its original use: the healing unction of the first seven centuries became the sacramental prayer-oil for the absolution of the soul in preparation for death, and the spiritual was divorced from the physical plane—'thy sins be forgiven thee' took the place of 'rise and walk.' This was probably due to the rise of scholastic theology rather than to a loss of faith in spiritual healing; for the lives of the saints are full of miraculous cures, after as well as before the eighth century, and in popular practice the sick resorted to relics and holy places, where no doubt their faith often made them whole.

At the Reformation in England, an attempt was made in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. to restore unction to something like its primitive purpose, in the following beautiful and reasonable form, in which, however, the mediæval idea of forgiveness retains a prominent if secondary place:—

'If the sick person desires to be anointed, then shall the priest anoint him upon the forehead or breast only, making the sign of the cross, saying thus :

'As with this visible oil thy body outwardly is anointed: so our heavenly Father, almighty God, grant of his infinite goodness that thy soul inwardly may be anointed with the Holy Ghost, who is the Spirit of all strength, comfort, relief, and gladness. And vouchsafe for his great mercy (if it be his blessed will) to restore unto thee thy bodily health, and strength, to serve him, and send thee release of all thy pains, troubles, and diseases, both in body and mind. And howsoever his goodness (by his divine and unsearchable providence) shall dispose of thee: we his unworthy ministers and servants, humbly beseech the eternal majesty to do with thee according to the multitude of his innumerable mercies, and to pardon thee all thy sins, and offences, committed by all thy bodily senses, passions, and carnal affections: who also vouchsafe mercifully to grant unto thee ghostly strength by his Holy Spirit, to withstand and overcome all temptations and assaults of thine adversary, that in no wise he prevail against thee, but that thou mayest have perfect victory and triumph against the devil, sin, and death, through Christ our Lord: who by his death hath overcome

the Prince of death, and with the Father and the Holy Ghost evermore liveth and reigneth, God, world without end. Amen.'

But the swing of the pendulum was too violent, and the form disappeared in 1552, though prayers for recovery are of course still retained in the service for the Visitation of the Sick. Unction lingered here and there in the Anglican Communion in the seventeenth century, and a form of consecrating and administering oil was published in the Non-juring *Communion Office* of 1718, with the note: 'It is not here administered by way of *extreme unction*, but in order to recovery,' and was repeated in the Non-juring Bishop T. Deacon's *Compleat Collection* of 1743; unction was also used among the Scottish Episcopalians, and there is a M.S. form on the fly-leaf of a Prayer Book of Bishop Jolly of Moray, who died as late as 1832. In England the service for touching for the King's Evil was bound up with some editions of the Prayer Book from the reign of Charles I. till 1719: the king laid his hands on the patients, but oil was not used. The present 72nd Canon (Code of 1603) requires the minister to obtain Episcopal licence before exorcising 'by fasting and prayer.' Meanwhile the Roman and Eastern forms for unction retain prayers for the healing of the body, as well as for the remission of sins, though belief in the healing can hardly be said to have recovered from the modest position which it assumed under mediæval scholasticism. The following extracts from the present Eastern and Roman offices may be taken as fairly representative:—

The *Russian* service is very long and elaborate, and is conducted by seven priests: an English translation will be found in the *Book of Needs* (tr. G. V. Shann). At the consecration the priest says: 'O Lord, who through thy mercy and compassions healest the infirmities of our souls and bodies; do thou thyself, O Master, sanctify this oil, that it may be to them that are anointed therewith for healing, and for the removal of every passion, of defilement of flesh and spirit, and of every ill.' At the actual anointing he says: 'Do thou heal thy servant *N* from the bodily and spiritual weakness that presseth upon him, and quicken him by the grace of thy Christ.'

From the *Roman* service: '*Ad oculos.* Per istam sanctam unctionem, et suam piissimam misericordiam, indulgeat tibi Dominus quidquid per visum deliquisti. Amen. *Ad aures,*' etc. etc.

'Cura, quæsumus, Redemptor noster, gratia sancti Spiritus languores istius infirmi, ejusque sana vulnera, et dimitte peccata, atque dolores cunctos mentis et corporis ab eo expelle, plenamque interius et exterius sanitatem misericorditer redde, ut ope misericordiæ tuæ restitutus, ad pristina reparetur officia.' The form, in fact, represents the transitional view of the ninth century, when the idea of remission was combined with that of healing. The Tridentine decree (1551), on the other hand, shows how the mediæval view has almost ousted the belief in healing, e.g. cap. 2, 'Res etenim hæc gratia est Spiritus sancti; cujus unctio delicta, si qua sint adhuc expianda, ac peccati reliquias abstergit; et ægroti animam alleviat, et confirmat, magnam in eo divinæ misericordiæ fiduciam excitando; qua infirmus sublevatus et morbi incommoda, ac labores levius fert; et tentationibus dæmonis, calcaneo insidiantis, facilius resistit; et sanitatem corporis interdum, ubi salutis animæ expedierit, consequitur.' We are here a long way from St. James. But we are still further in a Danish form of 1513 (*Manuale Curatorum sec. usum eccl. Roskildensis*; ed. J. Freisen, Paderborn, 1898, p. 26): 'De sacra unctione est notandum quod infirmo amministrari non debet nisi de vita desperatur, quia cura maxima debetur sacro oleo.'

Little need be added, except the remark that the belief in spiritual healing has persisted, although unction came to be used in a way which is called in the Thirty-Nine Articles a 'corrupt following of the Apostles.' Among Roman Catholics Lourdes stands out as a salient instance; in Russia, Father John of Cronstadt is famous for his 'miracles.' In Protestant Christendom there have been considerable faith-healing movements during the last century, both in America and in England. Dr. Schofield (*Force of Mind*, 157-160) mentions, in addition to the 'Christian Science' movement with about a million adherents, one single faith-healer in New Jersey with 15,000 patients in one week, and a conference in London a few years ago of 2000 faith-healers, representing even then 150 different centres in England. The recent rapid growth of various forms of spiritual healing amongst educated persons is known to everybody. The practice is likely to continue growing, and to exercise great influence both upon doctors and upon the clergy, now that it is receiving support from psychological and physiological science; and

it certainly can find ample justification in the history of Christendom.¹

¹ For further study the following works may be recommended:—W. James, *Principles of Psychology*, and *Varieties of Religious Experience*; F. W. H. Myers' great work on *Human Personality*; F. W. Pullar, *Anointing of the Sick in Scripture and Tradition*. Liturgical books—*Canons of Hippolytus* (Achelis); *Testamentum Domini* (Cooper and Maclean); *Apostolic Constitutions* (Wordsworth); *Serapion* (Wordsworth); *Book of Needs* (Shann); *Rituale Romanum*; *Manuale eccl. Sarisburiensis*, etc. From the medical point of view—A. T. Schofield, *The Force of Mind, or the Mental Factor in Medicine*; many

articles by Bramwell and others in the *Proceedings, Society for Psychical Research* (also *Mind-Cure, Faith-Cure, and the Miracles of Lourdes*, by A. T. Myers in vol. ix.); Hack Tuke, *Influence of Mind upon the Body*; see also *Annales Médico-Psychologiques, Revue Philosophique, Revue de l'Hypnotisme, Bulletins de la Société de Psychologie Physiologique*, and other foreign reviews, etc. There is a vast amount of popular literature on the subject, mostly American, of very varying merit, among which Mrs. Eddy's curious book must be mentioned for its enormous circulation; the much-read works of Jay Hudson, Dresser, and Trine are good examples of this American literature. Dr. Schofield gives a list of over two hundred scientific books bearing on the subject of mental therapeutics in the *Force of Mind*.

At the Literary Table.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIOLOGY.

SOCIOLOGICAL PAPERS. Vol. ii. (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.)

WHAT is Sociology? In the second year's *Proceedings of the Sociological Society* are included papers on 'Eugenics,' 'Civics,' 'The School' (primary and secondary, provided and non-provided, English and German and American), 'The Influence of Magic,' 'Ethics,' 'The Philosophy of History,' and 'A Classification of Knowledges.' It is true that all these things are dealt with and discussed in their social aspect, but their social aspect seems to be all the aspect that most of them have. It does not seem, therefore, that we have yet discovered a definition of Sociology. We do not yet know what to take in and what to leave out. And one of the best of many services which the new Sociological Society will render is to make the discovery for us.

But this can be done only by actual experiment. Before any subject of study can be excluded from Sociology, it must be tried within it. As we say, there is a social aspect to everything. Even man's inhumanity to man, when discussed at an annual meeting, suggests its social opposite, and encourages it. It is therefore utterly unscientific to complain that the volume of *Proceedings* is too miscellaneous. This second volume is not so miscellaneous as the first was. In course of the years the Society will have made its selection of topics, and we shall know what Sociology is.

Meantime each topic will be taken by the average reader apart by itself. One will occupy his time

in the study of Mr. Francis Galton's 'Eugenics.' Eugenics is the science of being well born—not highly born, you observe, but healthily; and he will shake his head over Mr. Galton's drastic proposals in the way of restricting marriage to those whom he would count fit to be married. Another will spend his time upon Professor Patrick Geddes's 'Civics,' a topic which has been carried over from the last volume. For our part, we have found Dr. Westermarck's 'Influence of Magic on Social Relationships' of most interest. Its scientific value is probably not less than that of any of the other papers, and its literary grace is more.

THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION.

A HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION. By Thomas M. Lindsay, M.A., D.D., Principal of the United Free Church College, Glasgow. In two volumes. Vol. I. The Reformation in Germany. (T. & T. Clark, 12s.)

There are no books more difficult to review than histories. There are no histories more difficult to review than histories of the Reformation. There is no history of the Reformation that ever was written more difficult to review than Principal Lindsay's.

For reviewing is a very different thing from reading. The reading of a book and the reviewing of it may both be the occasion of enjoyment. But the enjoyment of the reading is most when the book is best, of the reviewing when the book is worst.