

the discoveries of one "medicine-man" would be told in confidence to his son, who again would keep the secret from all save his own flesh and blood. Thus the "medicine-man" eventually obtained a vast store of knowledge from which his fellow-countrymen were debarred. He would consequently be looked upon as something above the ordinary run of men, as a person with almost superhuman power, and would be trusted without reserve. But human nature is weak, and pride and ambition soon work havoc in a soil which is ripe for their mischief. The medicine-man, recognising the superstitious reverence with which he was invested, and knowing the shortcomings of his powers and the unreserved fidelity which the people had in him, turned away from the laborious and unprofitable accumulation of facts and began to practice by deceit what was so irksome by legitimate means. Gradually these early practitioners of medicine added sorcery and quasi-supernatural means to attempt to cure the sick. Thus it gradually came to be thought that the medicine-man was working in connection with evil spirits, and though he was made the chief and high priest of his tribe, it was through fear and not from gratitude that he achieved his position. It being no longer necessary for him to retain the true knowledge handed down through countless generations, that knowledge which had taken centuries of labour and observation to gather, was disregarded and so eventually lost.

In races that had advanced beyond the state of savagery, the practice of medicine was usually confined to the clergy, and so the intimacy between religion and medicine became very close. Down to comparatively recent times the knowledge of the healing art was almost confined to the religious; but I will refer to this later.

At the present day the practice of medicine is vested with the clergy in many parts of the world. The Dervishes of Arabia are both priests and physicians, and indeed, this is the rule in the East. Here, again, medicine is considered as a supernatural gift, but instead of being ascribed to the influence of devils, it is looked upon as a special gift from God. This, indeed, is a great advance.

The Greeks and Romans had physicians much as we have them now. For the first time in history, the records of their labours are written, so that at the present day we know the exact state of the medical sciences at that period. Had they handed down their knowledge by word of mouth, the fruits of their labours would almost for certain have perished, even as the races to which they belonged have died out. The antique physicians and surgeons advanced to a very high point of excellence; in fact, they knew more about the subject than has been known at any time except the latter half of the present century. The names of Hippocrates and Galen, and of many others, stand among the first of medical authors, and what they taught centuries ago, we practise to-day.

In the Middle Ages we meet with two sets of medical men. The first among the clergy, the second among the laity. Most of the knowledge of disease rested with certain orders of monks, and here we get the first examples of medical "specialists," for certain religious orders confined their attention to limited branches of practice. During this period medicine was in a flourishing condition, but as most of the books written at that time have been lost or destroyed, we cannot tell the exact state of the sciences at that period.

But besides the monks, there were members of the laity who carried on the practice of medicine in the same way as the "medicine men" already alluded to. These, at first few in number, gradually increased as the ages rolled on, and became divided into two distinct parties. One set ascribed their powers to magic, and were called "alchemists," and their science the "black arts." Though their knowledge was in most cases undoubtedly genuine, their methods of practising by secret means was justly punished by the severe treatment they often received from the clergy, who practised openly. This was the beginning of the feud between religion and science.

The second class to which I have alluded was, unfortunately, a very small minority, but many of the names of these medical men (who practised much the same as we do at the present day) will be remembered as long as our civilisation endures.

The period following the Renaissance is one of which those interested in the welfare of medicine would say but little. The science at this time had fallen into a state of degradation far more deplorable than it had ever done before in the whole course of its eventful history. Superstitions and hopeless ignorance had taken the place of true knowledge. Of the extraordinary superstitions of medicine at this date, I may tell you at another time, for they would be out of place here. Here is another cause of contention between religion and science.

Great as was the ignorance at these times, there was nevertheless an element of true learning, at first small, but steadily increasing till, at the beginning of this century, it had swept away the superstitions against which it had for so long contended. Many were the great surgeons and physicians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and their names will endure for ever, for from their teaching originated the science of modern medicine. May God prosper its course through the ages to come.

PART III.

CHRIST, THE PHYSICIAN OF THE SOUL AND BODY.

"Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses" (St. Matt. viii. 17).

THE duties of pastor and physician are combined in a most striking manner in the work of our Redeemer. A glance at the New Testament will show the very important part which the cure of the sick maintains during His mission upon earth. These accounts are of especial interest to the physician, and the better he understands them the more does he feel convinced that there exists a close intimacy between theology and medicine.

Most noticeable is the great frequency with which the miraculous cure of the sick is mentioned in the gospels. There are over thirty references to these miracles in the four gospels. Doubtless the immediate cure of a severe malady would make a deep impression on the minds of those who witnessed it, and this may have been one of the reasons why these miracles are so often mentioned. Christ came into the world to redeem us from the curse of the sin of Adam. Disease came into the world by the fall of man, and Christ, by curing disease, typified His complete victory over sin with His death upon the cross.

Before Jesus left the earth He gave His apostles power to continue the work of

healing that He had practised during His own lifetime.

"And when He had called unto Him His twelve disciples, He gave them power against unclean spirits to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease" (St. Matt. x. 1).

In the first ages of Christianity the care of the sick and of the sinner was carried on by the same persons, but in later times, as I have shown before, physicians became separated from the clergy. Yet still do they both carry on the duties entrusted to them by God.

I have heard it urged against my arguments that the apostles cured disease by miraculous intervention, and, therefore, are incomparable with the physicians of to-day, who heal by physical means. But did not the disciples convert sinners by supernatural means? If we look at the clergy of to-day as carrying on the spiritual work of the apostles, must we not also grant that physicians continue the lower, yet very important, mission of curing the sick?

It is held by many at the present day that man ought not attempt to cure disease by his interference, for if it has pleased God so to afflict him he has no right to rebel against the Divine decree. St. Luke was a physician, and yet he was chosen to describe the works of his Divine Master. If the practice of medicine were opposed to the will of God, surely He would not have appointed a physician to such a supreme calling.

I will conclude these remarks by referring to certain points which occur in connection with some of our Lord's miracles, but I will leave the interpretation of them to those who are more capable than myself to express an opinion in such matters.

The first point is the employment by our Divine Lord of physical means. Thus when He cured the blind man.

"And when He had spoken He spat on the ground and made clay of the spit, and He anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay."

"And said unto him, go wash in the pool of Siloam" (St. John ix. 6, 7).

The second point is that in some cases a condition was imposed upon those soliciting physical cure from Jesus before they were made whole. For instance, when Christ cured the lepers He commanded them, "Go, show yourselves to the High Priest" (St. Luke xvii. 14).

Christ is indeed the type of the true priest and physician, and surely, as He did not find that the duties of the one calling interfered with those of the other, we cannot say that the practice of medicine is contrary to the teaching of Christianity. Let us try to copy this Divine example.

"For I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you" (St. John xiii. 15).

Before I finish I wish to call your attention, to one other point. How often do we hear people say and really think that disease is a punishment for our sins or for those of our parents. Christ Himself, when curing the man who was born blind, refutes this untrue and uncharitable doctrine. Listen to what He tells us.

"And His disciples asked Him, saying, Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?"

"Jesus answered, neither hath this man sinned nor his parents: but that the wishes of God should be made manifest in him" (St. John ix. 2, 3).

