

who cares for His children, and is well pleased when His children come to Him in every time of need. Dr. Cullis admits that with him faith does not always rise to a conviction that his petition is to be granted; it is a simple asking if it is His will, and such faith is honoured. At other times he owns that, when this conviction seemed to be present, he was disappointed. Does not all this indicate clearly enough that it is no new faith, nor a violation of any of the scriptural conditions of prayer, and that if the doctrine is to be intelligently rejected it must be on some other grounds?

But this view is not supported by negative arguments alone. There is a formidable array of positive evidence that seems exceedingly difficult to get over. James 5:14 seems inexplicable unless it means that the prayer of faith restores the sick. To say that the anointing of oil was medicinal will not satisfy, for if that were its significance, why ask the elders of the church to do it? Would it not be as well, and better, done by those in constant attendance? The natural interpretation is that the oil was symbolical of the Spirit's presence and the promise of physical benefit in answer to prayer, which is in accord with our Lord's final utterances before His ascension.

Then, has this power ever been withdrawn from the Church? To say it has, leaves many events in the history of the Church, all the way down through the centuries, unexplained and unexplainable. Many of the coolest heads and deepest thinkers, as for example, Theodore Christlieb, after careful investigation, admit the authenticity of modern miracles, and even contend that they ought to be expected in certain conditions. In this he is supported by many whose authority commands respect, and which, ordinary men at least, cannot

afford to despise or dismiss with a sneer.

And then, is there not strong *prima facie* evidence in the character of those persons who profess to receive those remarkable answers? Their other works of Christian philanthropy conducted entirely in dependence on faith as the only source of supply, entitles them at least to credit for veracity. If deceivers, the Lord would not honor them so exceptionally, by providing such enormous annual incomes for their benevolent enterprises, hospitals, homes, missions, tract societies, schools, etc., supported exclusively in answer to prayer. Are such men so dishonest as wilfully to deceive others, or so stupid and gullible as to be themselves easily deceived? We should rather say that the power to control such vast enterprises bespeaks unusual ability and shrewdness.

Then the burden of proof seems to be transferred from their shoulders to ours. They have given facts without number, and in good faith. They believe themselves what they ask us to believe. If we are going to reject them, it is our turn to show cause. And surely, with such large promises as "If ye abide in Me and My words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will and it shall be done unto you;" and many others as comprehensive, we should not be disposed to reject without just cause.

The antecedent probabilities are rather in favor of than against such cures, and instead of being unbelievers at first, we should be believers until convinced to the contrary, but unfortunately we try to shield our own unbelief by minimizing the power of prayer. Yet the writer must confess to hesitation in accepting this faith, and knows not why. It is so foreign to our former training and habits of thought, that it *seems* as if something yet remains to be said that would