duty of reliance on faith and prayer; the indisputable results of the revival of trust in spiritual agency; the aberrations of "Christian Science"; the necessity of the testing by scientific experts of all evidence of spiritual healing; the duty of consecrating personal gifts to God; thankfulness for the triumphs of medical and surgical skill; improvements recommended in Pastoral Visitation, especially the addition of collects more hopeful of recovery; the permission that such prayers should be accompanied by the Laying-on of Hands; the difference between Psychic Forces and Spiritual; the need of prayer for guidance on the whole subject; the impossibility of giving official recognition at present to "Gifts of Healing"; caution to those who believe themselves to have such gifts, especially as to the need of medical study and the avoidance of Occultism and Spiritualism. With regard to the practice of anointing with oil, the Bishops pointed out the obscurity as to the primitive practice; the gradual attraction of the practice as an encouragement to faith into a sacramental preparation for death; and though refusing to prohibit it, declared that at present it could not be authorized by the Church, but that the bishop of each diocese should be consulted. The Archdeacon went on to show how large a part the healing of the sick occupied in the ministry of Christ and His Apostles, and of the Church at large. To the continuance of these gifts evidence was given by Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Origen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Augustine. To the practice of anointing the sick with oil with a view to recovery testimony was found in Tertullian, Serapion, Jerome, the Apostolical Constitutions, the Testamentum Domini, St. Martin of Tours, and others. From the great mass of works of healing in the Middle Ages down to the present time, Mr. Dearmer, who had written on the subject, had selected a list of forty-five, including in recent times George Fox, John Wesley, Prince Hohenlohe, Father Matthew, Dorothea Trüdel, Pastor Blumhardt, and Father John of Cronstadt. Hutton, the late editor of the *Spectator*, took a favourable view of these agencies. In England until the end of the reign of Queen Anne was retained the custom of touching by the king for scrofula, with indisputable results in certain cases. The part borne by faith in healing was fully recognized in the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL. From the JOURNAL accounts were quoted of three remarkable faith healers—Valentine Greatrakes, the Deacon de Paris, and Johann Joseph Gassner. The cures effected at Lourdes might be reckoned at about 5 per cent. In modern times an American movement for faith healing had begun in an episcopal church in Boston, which had not received much encouragement from the authorities on nervous diseases; its promoters had finally decided that nothing should be attempted without the sanction of a responsible physician. In this country, Dr. Alexander Robertson, Physician of Glasgow Royal Infirmary, had practised healing by mental suggestion as far back as 1871 and 1889. In London an association had been formed in 1908, called the Church and Medical Union for the promotion of the recognition of the power of faith in sickness in co-operation with medical skill. There was also the Society of Emmanuel, conducted by Mr. James Hickson, with a view to the employment of spiritual forces in healing. Articles were quoted from the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL which supported the cautious views of the Bishops at Lambeth, acknowledging the wonderful power of mind over matter, and pointing out the lessons to be drawn from the past history of faith healing. The Archdeacon referred to a remarkable discussion at the Harveian Society at a meeting held last autumn, when the powers of suggestion in mental and nervous diseases was fully acknowledged, while the final responsibility of the experienced practitioner was strongly maintained. The upshot seemed to Archdeacon Sinclair to be that there were no limits to the powers of faith and prayer; that many persons, like wise parents, had a gift of personal impressiveness; that the subconscious self was a fact in psychology; that the clergy might do more in their visitations of the sick by encouragements to faith; that the laying-on of hands and the anointing with oil might be tangible helps to faith; and that religion and medical science should always co-operate, while the ultimate responsibility must lie with the accredited physician.

HEALTH VALUES.

BY

GEOFFREY RHODES,

HONORARY SECRETARY OF THE CHURCH AND MEDICAL UNION.

PROFESSOR SIDGWICK once excused himself for devoting two lectures out of a course of three to a definition, and in the present instance I find myself in a very similar position. My friend, Sir Clifford Allbutt, in his *System of Medicine*, says health is an ideal conception, with which assertion I am in complete agreement, for layman, doctor, philosopher, and priest have an ideal before them when they discuss health. Unfortunately, however, not any two of these ideals are the same, and therein lies the main difficulty of coming to any general conclusions in connexion with the phenomenon known variously as spiritual, mental, or faith healing.

One does not by any means get over the difficulty by talking of spiritual health and physical health as two distinct states of being. The realms of consciousness cannot be divided in this way. A sense of wrong-doing can result in a physical breakdown just as surely as a toxic substance in the system may cause mental collapse. It comes, then, to a question of finding some definition of health that shall satisfy all ideals of life.

The great pitfall into which we all, to a certain extent, run the risk of tumbling when we consider the influence of mind over matter is the error of placing physical excellence first. Perhaps I may be allowed to explain what I mean. We no sooner, for instance, realize that thought can control the body than we rush off into the extreme of imagining that, if we only knew how, the mind could be so directed as to obliterate all physical abnormalities of the body. Whether such a process might be scientifically possible or not is quite foreign to my argument. I am merely here interested in the ethical point, namely, the danger of making the spiritual the servant instead of the master of the material. We may not all go to the extreme of trying to cure toothache by being so good that no ache would presume to attack our person, but there is certainly, I believe, a risk of our moving in this direction—it may be all unconsciously—if we do not specially guard against the temptation. Morally it can never be a question of developing the highest in us for the good of the lowest. We know that by cultivating our character we can rise superior to mere material conditions, but we cannot expect to still be counted sane if we pretend that we have completely changed the material. A man may learn to be happy in sordid surroundings. He may consider himself to have become rich in a philosophic sense, but woe betide him if he starts cashing cheques! In the same way, a man who loses a limb may lead a more useful life and be a more valuable citizen after the accident than he was before it, but that will not restore the missing leg or arm. It is irrevocably gone. On the other hand, there would appear to be within each of us a source of psychic energy of which we really know very little at present. That such a reserve fund exists is proved in many ways, as, for instance, when a naturally feeble woman performs some task for her child that entails a herculean effort on the part of mind or body or it may be both. I think it is a mistake to talk of this as being miraculous, for what is the miracle of to-day is often found to be the ordinary working of a scientific law, to-morrow.

The alleviation of sickness by means of the influence of mind over mind is a practice as old as the medical art itself. But it is with certain modern aspects that we are specially concerned. Among all primitive peoples religion and medicine are very closely allied. As civilization advances, the two practices—that of priesthood and that of surgery—become divided, probably because it is found that an aptitude for metaphysical speculation and for practical medicine does not usually occur in the same person. This division of labours has its drawbacks as well as its advantages. It tends in its first inception towards superstition on the one hand and butchery on the other. Witness the belief in sorcery and the burning and bleeding,¹ not only of the Middle Ages, but of a hundred years back! We have left all that behind, but

¹ Bleeding was of course, based on the pathology of the time.

undoubtedly are still to some extent suffering from the evils of the dual system, the foremost of which has been in recent years the tendency for a sick person to be treated as if composed of two not only distinct but independent parts, the mind, spirit or soul being considered on an entirely different plane from the physical organism. Modern psychological research has, however, tended to the diminution of this error, and has further stimulated a sympathetic regard on the part of the doctors and the clergy for each other's ministrations.

A few words in conclusion on the relationship between the two professions.

Every medical man endeavours to exert a beneficial psychic influence on his patients. All the modern school believe in Professor Osler's mixture of hope and punction. Naturally those endowed largely with what is called "personal magnetism" have a great advantage in the application of this kind of treatment.

But above and beyond this the physician is keenly concerned in all influences that are likely to make for recovery, and the "mental healer" has a definite place in the scheme of cure, just as the chemist, the masseur, or the nurse may have theirs. It is difficult for the doctor professionally to concern himself with dogmatic religion. He has to regard religion rather from a philosophical or ethical standpoint. It matters not whether he personally be a devout Churchman or what Bishop Welldon has called (I think) a believing Agnostic; in his professional eyes the minister of the Gospel is merely an expert in peace of mind and a messenger of hope.

Reviews.

MIND AND BODY.

A SMALL but highly-important essay, dealing with the psychic treatment of the sick,¹ by Professor KERN, is not one of the usual descriptions of psychotherapeutic practice and of clinical cases and categories, of which large numbers have been published recently. These, as a rule, accept the fact that so-called mental influences, such as persuasion, suggestion, hypnotism, etc., are capable of modifying for good or for ill the mental and bodily states of the subjects to whom they are applied, without attempting any searching examination of the fundamental question of how such action is at all possible. Professor Kern's essay, on the other hand, is a closely-reasoned discussion and attempt at explanation of the one question of how the mind can act on the body.

After a rapid historical survey of psychotherapy, in the course of which he traces it from its beginnings in the magic of the "culture-folk" or primitive peoples—from which medicine only became separated by Asclepiades and later grounded on an empiric basis by Hippocrates—through incubation or temple-sleep, exorcism, miraculous healings, animal magnetism, and mesmerism up to the hypnotism of to-day; and after referring to the work of Scheidemann (1787) on the emotions as healing agents, and of Johannes Müller (1842) on the interaction of soul and body, he describes how the doctrine of the conservation of energy, which dates from 1842, appeared to deal the death blow to mental action on bodily processes.

Concerning this, he says that an age of anatomical and physiological scientific medicine does not perceive its helplessness with regard to mental processes, nor see that its foundation, the law of a closed causality, is refuted by every instance of the working of the mind on the body. Man, he maintains, is a psycho-physical unity, and it cannot be denied that bodily conditions markedly affect mental states, and vice versa. Common opinion, he says, finds an easy way out of this difficulty by abandoning the question as insoluble, that is, by proclaiming the limita-

tions of human intellect and the unknowableness of the essence of all things. Before criticizing the various explanations which have been advanced with regard to the mutual relations of mind and body, and before exposing his own views, Professor Kern brushes aside this doctrine of the unknowable. Science, he maintains, cannot rest here. Natural science, he says, is in the right in ascribing to mental or spiritual and spaceless things an epiphenomenal value, but in the wrong when it begins to reckon with this epiphenomenon, and to assert its unknowable character, particularly as mental phenomena are the only processes of which we have immediate knowledge, being more truly knowable than spatial and material processes known only by the intermediation of the senses. Physiology, as a part of natural science, is concerned only with things with spatial content. To psychology, on the other hand, the objective facts are strange and foreign, and the chasm between them still unbridgeable, or only to be spanned by an investigation into the nature of knowledge. A great part of the difficulty, he considers, has been unnecessarily imported into the matter by way of framing the question, that is, by regarding mind and body as separate entities. Of mind, or soul, we know nothing; we know only mental processes, and mind is only a concept or *Denkbegriff* to which we fasten a chain of mental events. The body also is only a chain of organic processes for whose permanent and actual foundation we vainly seek, and whose constant connexion in time and space alone justifies us in regarding it as a separate entity. "Mind" and "body" are thus for us, whatever their actual essence, secondary concepts whose uniting point is to be sought, as already said, in the nature of knowledge.

Disregarding these abstractions of mind and body, and confining his attention to the twin series of bodily and mental events—or, as he would say, the same series differently regarded—Professor Kern passes under review and discards, first, materialism, according to which mental processes are the result of neuro-cerebral processes; or more cautiously, as "epiphenomena," bi-products whose appearance belongs, if materialism be accepted, to the realm of the marvellous: a position, he says, not recognized by science to-day. He then briefly discusses and dismisses neovitalism; then dualistic interaction theories, according to which a conversion of physical energy into "psychical energy" is assumed, such as is implied, for example, in the statement that external stimuli give rise to sensations, sensations to perceptions, perceptions to ideas, etc., or that mental processes influence cortical motor paths, and eventuate in action or muscular movement. Such statements, he contends, cannot be reconciled with natural laws.

Next, in very interesting fashion, he traces the development of the psycho-physical parallelism doctrine from its origin with Descartes and Leibnitz. This view, which is sometimes called a hypothesis and at others a theory, though it is neither, in order to furnish some sort of causal explanation of the invariable side-to-side relation of the bodily and mental series of events, had to assume the existence of a divinely pre-established harmony (Leibnitz and the Occasionalists), the necessity for which assumption is frequently overlooked by the modern exponents of this view. Although discarding this view, he gives it importance as marking a stage in the progress of our conception of world phenomena, of which the next stage was the positing of an "identical third" between the two series; then the view (Fichte and Fechner) that the mental and the bodily series were merely the two sides of one and the same process; and, finally, the hypothesis, which he himself adopts, that the apparent difference between the mental and bodily series lies entirely in the mode of regard—that is, whether apprehended objectively or subjectively by the apprehending subject.

¹ Die psychische Krankenbehandlung in ihren Wissenschaftlichen Grundlagen. By Berthold Kern. Berlin: August Hirschwald. 1910. (Pp. 58. M. 1.20.)