

at Corinth, but Trophimus have I left at Miletum, sick." (II Tim., iv, 20.) Sick? Why did not the great Apostle cure him instead of leaving him sick? If the Apostles had been such miracle-makers as modern fancy has represented them to be, an occurrence of this nature would have been impossible. But this is not the only one recorded. Timothy, one of Paul's own converts and fellow laborers, is always spoken of in terms of high praise, and he is a noble instance of eminent gifts and grace in one young in years. This favorite of the Apostle was sick, however, and in his letter Paul therefore exhorts him to be careful about his health: "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities." (I Tim., v, 23.) Let those who have over-estimated the frequency of miracles at the time of the first Christian churches consider this passage well, and they will be likely to see their mistake. Here was a prominent man of the Church, himself possessing great spiritual gifts, constantly suffering from "infirmities." Here is the great "Apostle of the Gentiles", whose power always was great, advising that prominent man to use a little medicine. Why did he not promise him a miracle? Why? That we do not know, but this we do know, that miracles were never by God strewn round, "plenty as blackberries."

Anyone who will study the miracles of our Lord and His Apostles will find that they were always performed for the glory of God and conveyed a lesson necessary and appropriate. Although individuals were thereby benefited, yet this was never the only ultimate aim. Christ, for instance, heals with a touch a man whom the law had pronounced unclean, and whom no Jew would touch. He shows by His miracles that He is the Lord over disease, over demons, over physical nature, over brute creatures, in order that we may have confidence in Him in all things. We see Him forgiving sins, answering prayers, direct (Matt. 9: 20-22), intercessory (23-26), united (27-31), and even unuttered (32, 33). The same characteristics may be observed in the miracles of the Apostles. They were never performed for selfish purposes, nor for the gratification of curiosity, never for the sake of show. The epistles explain that miraculous gifts, including prophecy, were given to confirm the truth of the Gospel, promote its rapid dissemination, and edify the churches.

Such miracles, then, are from God, and may be relied upon as evidence of the truth of those revelations which they are intended to prove.

Two questions now become appropriate in our investigation: Did miraculous manifestations follow the message of Joseph the Prophet, and, if so, were these miraculous manifestations of such a nature as to warrant the conclusion that he had his power from God? Let us see.

In the year 1830 the Lord declared through His prophet: "And it shall come to pass that there shall

be a great work in the land, even among the Gentiles. . . . for I am God and mine arm is not shortened; and I will show miracles, signs and wonders, unto all those who believe on my name; and whoso shall ask it in my name in faith they shall cast out devils (demons); they shall heal the sick; they shall cause the blind to receive their sight, the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak, and the lame to walk. The time speedily cometh when great things are to be shown forth unto the children of men." (Doc. and Cov., sec. 35: 7-10.) Here we have an unmistakably clear promise that miracles should attend the message of our Prophet; and this promise is repeated at other times. But was this promise also kept? Were those "great things" shown unto the children of men? Or was the promise a false one?

How could it be false? This was one of the very first promises given. When we remember how rapidly the Church spread in those early days, no other conclusion is possible than this: that the promise given was also kept to the very letter. Men are not so foolish as to follow a man who promises "great things" and never keeps his promises. This the ministers of the world have learnt, wherefore they wisely abstain from promising any "great things" before the millennium, possibly. It is always convenient to have a future to draw on during present poverty. But here is a man who, contrary to most ministers of the world, declares in the name of the Lord that the time had now come for the manifestations of "great things." Thousands heard this and believed, in itself a sure proof that "great things" really were shown. The sick were healed, the blind received their sight, the deaf heard, the dumb spake and the lame walked.

At the time of Joseph it was generally accepted, even among the enemies, as a fact that the Prophet performed many great miracles. We remember a romance from that time wherein Joseph is represented as raising a dead lady. Of course, the author of this romance explains it as humbug, the apparent death being caused by a dose of morphine or something else. Other authors ascribe the works of the Prophet to magnetism. Joseph Smith, they say, knew the mysteries of magnetism and understood how to turn them to good account. These efforts on the part of the enemies to explain or account for the miracles of the prophet are a proof as sure as any one can desire that he showed those "great things" which he promised to show in the name of the Lord. Had there been nothing, the enemies would have nothing to account for. "He did it through magnetism," the modern expression for: "He did it through Beelzebub." Had Joseph been an impostor, how easily that could have been exposed. Here he promises that the sick should be healed by faith. Yet no attempt has been made to prove that the promise was never kept, only that he kept it through magnetism! The enemies well knew that such

work followed the testimony of Joseph the Prophet, work for which they could not account in the usual way.

As an instance of how commonly the enemies believed in Joseph's power, the following well-known incident may be referred to. A man once came to the Prophet and asked him to show a miracle. It was not the prophet's way to make "show" of such works; wherefore he positively refused. But the man grew impertinent and abusive, and talked lightly of the work of God. Finally the prophet said in a voice which penetrated the soul of the miracle-seeking visitor: "You want a miracle. Tell me what you want. Do you want to be struck blind, or deaf or dumb. In the name of the Lord God, I tell you, you shall have it." Upon this the man left the presence of the Prophet in a hurry. Now, why did not this man stay and have a fair trial? Joseph promised him a miracle. Why did he not wait and get it? Simply for the reason that he dared not. In common with all who knew Joseph, he was too well aware of the power of God through the Prophet. The enemies themselves are thus testifying to the fact that miracles attended this Prophet.

Orson Pratt in his work has recorded a number of cases of wonderful healing.

Nor are we referred exclusively to dead witnesses. There are still living men and women in Utah and elsewhere who were personally acquainted with the Prophet, and they are willing to testify to the last of the great works they have seen with their eyes and heard with their ears, performed by the Prophet. Moreover, great works still continue. To deny, therefore, that miraculous manifestations followed the message of Joseph the Prophet is to deny facts.

These miracles, on the closest investigation, will all be found to partake of the nature of genuine Scriptural miracles. Their aim is the glory of God, as they are always ascribed to Him alone, not to the power of man. Nor are they performed in order to glorify any one man, or set of men. They are performed as a confirmation of faith, not to produce faith.

These points are important and instructive. While the miracles of the Catholic Church are either silly nonsense or worked in support of some notoriously false doctrine, in order to gain proselytes, or otherwise exhibit their spurious origin, the miraculous manifestations following the Church of Christ exhibit no such marks. Their origin is divine, and they bear the divine marks in themselves. Like God's works in nature, these miracles must be closely studied in order to be known in all their beauty. The indifferent pass them by without notice. There is nothing of "show" in them. But this is one proof of their divine origin. Man always works in a "showy" way when left to himself; God's ways are "in the deep."

I have pointed out that true miracles are referred to as evidence of a