

## **Christianity and Modern Medicine Conflict or Prospects? A replication of Genesis 2:21-22**

**Matthew Vanen Chiangi PhD**

---

### **Abstract.**

Modern medicine is a replication of Genesis 2:21-22. The creation of Eve in Genesis 2 has become an issue of concern for both Christianity and modern medicine. God caused Adam to fall into a deep sleep, and he removed one of Adam's ribs and made a woman for him. This was first surgery ever performed by God the creator who is the author of modern medicine. Christianity evaluates the trend of events in medicine with skepticism as these could supposedly hamper on Christian faith. There are also some Christian practices that are sometimes undermined by modern medicine resulting to conflict between Christianity and modern medicine. This paper seeks to present God as the originator of modern medicine, as it is meant to be in the interest of man. When certain events take place man thinks he has to put things right with the divine, because man is vulnerable to pains and sufferings as a result of sin. This could be tempting to a Christian who seeks spiritual solution to some situations, thus, undermining the gift of medicine. As to methodology, the work adopted analytical method of research, using basically library as its main source and on-line resources. The finding is that God has given us modern medicine, so, even if there are prevailing happenings in modern medicine that are considered a threat to Christian thinking and faith, modern medicine is yet a great sector of benefit to Christianity and should not be undermined.

**Key words:** Christianity, Modern, Medicine, conflict, Prospects

## **Introduction**

The Bible gives a record of how God himself performed the first surgery and did what could be referred today in modern medicine as “organ transplantation.”<sup>154</sup> He removed one of Adam’s ribs and made a woman for him and thereafter closed back the place with flesh. How would the Christian faith consider issues in modern medicine that sometimes seem contradictory to the Christian faith when God himself has given us medicine as a special gift for our wellbeing? The health sector also sometimes undermines certain Christian practices and beliefs when man in his religious nature approves and apply spirituality in healing with the view that medical solution could be the best in dealing with such ailments. Medicine has so much advanced that today there are many medical issues that could be considered sinful, as they turn to undermine the creation of God. Christianity with no doubt in sincerity consider certain issues in modern medicine as undermining Christianity and vice versa. God never intended that modern medicine become a problem to the Christian faith, and at the same time did not intend that Christianity reproach medicine when man in his religious nature look for healing spiritually. This research work as a replication of Gen. 2: 21, 22 is bond to find out ways how Christianity could settle issues with modern medicine, so that Christians would not look at modern medicine as distorting the Christian faith and having a mischievous attitude towards Christianity. Therefore, this write-up, argues that Christianity could effectively dialogue with modern medicine and arrive at a conclusion which proves that modern medicine is not a threat to Christianity in any way; rather, that Christianity could utilize modern medicine as an effective tool for advancement of Christ’s kingdom.

---

<sup>154</sup> <https://my.clevelandclinic.org>

### Translation of Genesis 2: 21, 22 from Hebrew Language into English Language

<p><b>Gen. 2:21</b> וַיִּפֹּל יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים תְּרִדְמָה עַל-הָאָדָם וַיִּישָׁן וַיִּקַּח אֶמֶת מִצַּלְעָתָיו וַיִּסְגֶּר בָּשָׂר תַּחְתָּנָה:</p>	<p><b>Gen. 2:21</b> So the LORD God caused the man to fall into a deep sleep; and while he was sleeping, he took one of the man's ribs and closed up the place with flesh.</p>
<p><b>Gen. 2:22</b> וַיִּבֶן יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת- הַצֶּלַע אֲשֶׁר-לָקַח מִן-הָאָדָם לְאִשָּׁה וַיְבִיאָהּ אֶל-הָאָדָם:</p>	<p><b>Gen. 2:22</b> Then the LORD God made a woman from the rib he had taken out of the man, and he brought her to the man.</p>

### An exegetical consideration of Genesis 2: 21, 22

The book of Genesis presents an extraordinary account of the creation of the universe and in fact of man and his headship on all creatures. The first three chapters present the “eternal nature of God and his work of creation of the universe and the central place giving to human beings as capable of fellowship with God (Gen. 1:26; 2:7, 18)” (Hinson, 56). God in his infinite wisdom laid out the foundation of the whole of the universe and beautifully designed all that we see and that which we do not see with necked eyes. We are then called to “honor and glorify” him as the work of his creation. David VanDrunen in his *God’s Glory Alone: The Majestic Heart of Christian Faith and Life* refers to “*Soli Deo Gloria* (Glory of God) as the Reformation motto” (26), for Reformers maintain that man, created to the glory of God is to do all things for the glory of God. In Genesis 2: 21 and 22 we see a detail account of the creation of mankind, presenting a view that the creation of man and the woman was on the sixth day. This view is very vital because it has to do with our understanding of the God who made man and his purpose for the creation of man, that man should “honor and glorify” him. Ligon J. Duncan III and David W. Hall link this to our understanding of creation days as very essential to the Christian community, involving our “doctrine of knowledge (epistemology), doctrine of man (anthropology), defense of the faith (apologetics), and method of interpreting the scriptures

(hermeneutics)” (21). They insist that all of these “are intertwined with the account of creation” (21).

There are three evangelical schools of thought regards to the day issue. David G. Hagopian name these views as ‘the 24-hour view’ which suggest that God created the universe and all that is in it in six sequential natural days marked by evenings and mornings, and this view is sponsored by Duncan and Hall. The ‘day-age view’ sponsored by Ross and Archer holds that God created the universe in six sequential ages of unspecified, though finite, duration. Then the ‘framework view’ sponsored by Irons and Kline which holds, that God’s been pictured in the creation of the universe in six days and resting on the seventh does not indicate sequence or duration of creation, but it is to ‘proclaim an eschatological theology of creation’ (16). This work, however, does not seek to get so much involved with the debate on the day’s view of creation because it might take the whole time and space. It may only want to note that it is also aware of the views of creation, however, it does not matter the length of the day on which God created man, but the most important point is that God created man on the sixth day. He created them both male and female.

Genesis 2:21, 22 clearly tells us that God performed an act that was unique in the creation of the woman. After man was formed of the dust of the earth, God caused the man to fall into a deep sleep, and he took one of the man’s ribs and closed back the place. Then he formed the woman out of the rib and brought her to the man. Palmer Robertson notes here that “God formed Eve in a very specific way that she might be the perfect companion to Adam” (12). This account is a clear representation of an event that happened in time and space, but we can as well see how it exhibits really a portrait of the relationship between man and his creator. Bruce Waltke says, “The scenes of the action are painted as an artist might envision them: God, as a porter, forming the man, designing a garden of beauty and abundance; and as temple builder, raising the woman from rib of the man” (80). He adds that “the supra-

historical dimension is also essential for the theology of this account. On this register, Adam and Eve represent every man and woman (Gen. 3:16-19; cf. 2:24; Matt. 19:4-6; Rom. 5:12)” (80). Here, God designs the man and the woman and both are looking identical. Claus Westermann avers that God created the woman, and in her the creation of the man became complete (20). Adam had already been given the opportunity to search among the creatures that were made to see if he could find the one that matches him but he had none. At the creation of the woman “Adam explicitly recognizes this identity in his statement ‘this is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh’” (Richards 32). God in his infinite wisdom made a suitable partner for Adam that both may live together and bring to its full scene the glory of God. This was on the whole the beginning of human race. We are able to also see from this background how man, created in the image of God, can also use the knowledge given him by his creator to also imitate God in performing wonderful acts as was initiated by God the creator. Alluding to Hall, we may have a clear understanding of our ‘doctrine of knowledge (epistemology)’, when man is capable of causing someone to sleep before surgery is performed. We also have understanding of the ‘doctrine of man (anthropology)’, when we are able to know who we are and even the components of man and his existence. We are also able to ‘defend our faith (apologetics)’, coming up with sound and clear biblical elucidation that whatever is obtainable in human medicine is a gift from God for our well-being. Finally, we are able to hold onto a good and sound method of ‘interpreting the scriptures (hermeneutics)’, that we do all things to the glory of God (21).

### **God performs the first surgery**

The Hebrew phrase ( *Wayafel adonai Elohim taridamah al-haadam* ) וַיַּפֵּל יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מַרְדָּמָה עַל־הָאָדָם then the Lord God caused Adam to fall into a deep sleep gives a deeper explanation of this verse. The Hebrew וַיַּפֵּל (*wayafel*, Hiphal, waw consec, imperfect 3ms of נָפַל – to fall) indicates that God actually caused Adam to fall into a deep sleep. The use of hiphal is an indication that Adam

did not sleep on his on, but God was rather the cause of Adam's deep sleep. When Adam was in a deep sleep, God opened one of his sides removed one of his ribs and closed it back, then he formed a woman of the rib that he had removed from the man, and he brought the woman to Adam. In my understanding of this act one could liken it to how man in his performance of Human medicine appreciate what God himself did at the creation of humankind. In human medicine anesthesia is induced on patient causing them to sleep before a surgeon performs his duties. Andrew Bowdle maintains that "Induction of anesthesia refers to the transition from consciousness to the unconsciousness at the outset of the general anesthetic" (1). In human medicine men use anesthesia to induce a state of sedation or unconsciousness in the patient before they begin the surgical procedure. This act is a representation of God who right at creation caused Adam to sleep before he perform the surgery. Everything done in human medicine had its beginning with God. God is the author of human medicine and he wants medicine to be of help to us in dealing with illness and human predicaments that could be handled.

### **Health and Human Predicaments**

The Merriam Webster defines health as "the condition of being sound in body, mind."<sup>155</sup> This includes the work of providing medical services. Man needs to be healthy for him to function well. Genesis 1:26 says, God created man in his own image and he was created healthy in all aspects. Man was physically, emotionally, psychologically and spiritually healthy. It was as a result of sin which consequences distorted the well-being of man that man became unhealthy being. Christianity and in fact all world religions seek to interpret certain human predicaments and especially ill health conditions as divine punishment. A religionist begins to think of how he could get right with the divine so as to get out of such predicaments. Sin and its guilt make one to sometimes depreciate in his health

---

<sup>155</sup> <https://my.clevelandclinic.org>

condition; emotionally, psychologically and spiritually, he gets sick.

David G. Banner in an attempt to deal with Sin, Guilt and Forgiveness also sees a relation of failure or sin to emotional displacement, transfer identification and compensation, since people attempt to alter the body's physical and chemical processes in an effort to produce comfort, or to alter the sensitivity or reactivity of the individual with sedation, electrical manipulation or even surgery. He concludes that nothing should be done that will cause patients not to evaluate themselves and their creature-creator relationship. His words: "I believe nothing should be done that will permanently alter Patients' ability to evaluate themselves and their creature-creator relationship" (52). Banner's opinion strongly relates psychology to religion in respect to health. A critical analysis of his view shows that it is possible for one to get sick or have some health challenges when one examines ones creature – creator relationship and sees that there is a problem. Robert D. Orr also sees it in the same way when he says, "The Christian's worldview is theocentric. God has authority, is sovereign, is known by revelation, and operates according to biblical principles. Humans are created in the image of God and given free will but have fallen from grace by sinful choices. God has provided the means of redemption through his son Jesus Christ. The Christian's approach to ethical dilemma takes this into account" (145). The two opinions indicate that man would and is always viewing human predicaments in respect to his relationship with the creator.

### **Christianity and modern medicine: Conflict or prospect?**

This section deals with how Christianity could dialogue with modern medicine on issues that seem controversial, bearing in mind that health is a gift from God that man may seek to get proper medication for a healthy living. John Hargreaves notes, that "theologians and scientists need each other. Each group has its special task, its own way of learning about and

interpreting the universe” (20). This section looks at issues that could cause the Christian thinking to be in conflict with modern medicine, on the one hand, and how Christianity and modern medicine could work together without any hitches on the other hand.

### **Christianity and modern medicine: Conflict**

Anything done in the Modern medicine that does not respect scripture could be conflicting, based on the Christian thinking. Few issues are considered here, as conflicting to the Bible that Christianity must seriously involve modern medicine into dialogue.

### **Illegal Abortion**

This is a willful termination of pregnancy, thereby removing the human fetus from the uterus and terminating life. There have been several opinions on the legalistic aspect of this encroaching evil. Those who argue for, claim that it is the right of the mother to keep or to terminate any pregnancy. Some yet, say that the fetus is not yet human, so, no murder has taken place. To some, life begins at birth, so it is only when a child is born that one could consider him murdered if he was killed.

Ekwe Festus in *Abortion in Christian Perspective*, maintains that throughout the world abortion has highly increased. He briefly states the proportion thus: “It is reported that 50 percent of all pregnancies were terminated in one country, while in another country it is estimated that the number of abortions actually exceeds the number of registered births. Researches carried out have shown that in USA alone, illegal abortion exceeds at least two million annually” (1). In addition to Festus observation is Stephanie J. Smith who says that “In great Britain there are between 170,000 and 180,000 abortions a year – that is one in five pregnancies ending in abortion” (169). She adds that “Abortion is a serious moral issue primarily because it involves the taking of the innocent human life” (167).

People argue for this evil with different reasons. Norman L. Geisler's comment here explains clearly that the Bible is against this act. He argues that "both scripture and science support the view that an individual human life begins at conception, and both special and general revelations declare it is wrong to kill, even if it is a minute old life" (154). Christianity certainly argues against illegal abortion because it is murder. Human medicine could possibly have those who with the fear of God also condemn this act, but still, many do not consider it a sin. This calls for dialogue. For God told Jeremiah, "Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you as my prophet to the nations" (Jer. 1:4). This implies that one's life begins at conception and not at birth. Therefore, terminating life illegally is murder.

### **Assisted Reproduction**

This is another area of great concern for dialogue between Christianity and Human medicine. This section deals with what is today called assisted reproduction or artificial reproduction. The research is aware that this section addresses a matter that is in the area of bioethics. This area is particularly dealing with infertility, which afflicts pains on people both Christians and non-Christians alike. In a general note it involves suffering both physically and spiritually. VanDrunen in his *Bioethics and the Christian Life: A Guide to Making Difficult Decisions* observes, that "All difficult bioethical decisions involve suffering, whether matters of infertility or illness or the approach to death. A bioethical decision is not merely a response to health-care crisis, but at the same time it is a response to suffering and the temptations that suffering brings" (61-62).

The bioethical issue of assisted reproduction, therefore, entails that health is looking at ways by which infertility might be treated so as to alleviate both Christians and non-Christians from this kind of sufferings. Assisted reproduction itself is not a sin, but what form the major concern of Christianity are the moral issues that are raised in the process. There are basically

three techniques by which assisted reproduction is carried out as briefly discussed.

### **In vitro fertilization (IVF)**

This is a medical way of assisting couples to have a child. In this technique, egg and sperm (one of which comes from a third party- donor) are joined in the laboratory to form an embryo, which is later inserted into the wife's body with the hope of implantation in her womb" (VanDrunen 130). This is done to ensure infertility treatment, in a situation where the woman and the man cannot naturally bear a child. Sometimes "both sperm and ovum may come from the husband and the wife" (Mainlander 12). In the case of both sperm and ovum coming from the husband and the wife there is no technical reason why they must do it. This research observes that although technically, there is no physical adultery committed, it is morally wrong, and also against the original plan of God for reproduction. For God intended reproduction and not manufacturing of babies (Gen. 1:26).

### **Artificial Insemination**

Artificial insemination is a method of procreation whereby "a man other than the husband contributes semen, which is then inserted into the wife's body during a fertile period with hope of ordinary fertilization and successful pregnancy" (VanDrunen 130). This method is also applied to treat infertility in a situation where by the husband's sperm cannot fertilize the egg of the wife. This is possible because of modern medicine. As stated above technically, adultery is not committed but morally it is wrong.

### **Surrogate motherhood**

On this matter VanDrunen says, "A husband and a wife contribute their own sperm and egg to create an embryo through IVF and reach an agreement with a third-party woman,

the surrogate. She agrees to let the embryo be inserted into her, to carry it to term, and then to hand the baby over to the biological parents” (130). This type of assisted reproduction is applied when the wife’s womb is not able to carry an embryo to its full development until delivery. In this method no adultery is committed since both the sperm and the egg come from legitimate couples. However, this also poses a lot of moral issues. In the first place, what would be the relation of the surrogate mother to the child that she delivers? Meilaender’s observation clears the second issue of concern. He observes,

In short, it is technically possible for a child to have as many as five parents: two genetic parents from whom sperm and ova come; the surrogate who serves as gestational mother and two rearing parents (who need not be the same as the genetic parents). Such possibilities, in which human freedom intervenes to make choices possible, force us to reflect upon the meaning of the bond between parents and children (12).

Though, this research has not exhaustively discussed these issues due to time factor and space, they could still be evaluated in a Christian perspective.

- i. God intended that we should reproduce, naturally and not artificially. We are not called to create children.
- ii. When in vitro fertilization is done sometimes many embryos are created. We are increasingly able to screen those embryos before they are planted, to determine whether they are free of certain defects. We are able, that is to consider whether this particular product of conception is one we desire, one whose worthiness in life we wish to affirm (Meilaender 20-21). If some of the embryos are not implanted, what are we going to do with the remaining product? There are possible ways they would be used; they may be discarded, they may be kept

frozen for future use, or they may be used for research to improve our knowledge of this process. All of these are possible with modern medicine and are against the original plan of God for reproduction.

- iii. There is every possibility that a surrogate mother would claim the child she was contracted to deliver. Though it is defended on the ground that “it is analogous to sperm donation, which is accepted in some societies, sperm donation is wrong because it introduces the collaboration of a third party into reproduction (Meilaender 23).
- iv. Children are a gift from God, and in fact a heritage from God (Ps. 127:3). They are not our own project.
- v. The basic medical procedures that enable a couple to conceive a child naturally are generally not morally difficult, because they carry out ordinary purposes of medicine: restoring the body to normal healthy functioning (VanDrunen 129). These could be applied but, in a situation, where it does not work, couple should learn to live to bear with, as maybe it is the will of God for them.

### **Human Cloning**

This topic has in recent times generated a lot of arguments between Christianity (even non-Christians) and modern medicine. With Christian sight one would argue that medicine is going beyond its intended purpose as destined by God.

According to section 302.1 of the Human prohibition Act, human cloning is defined as asexual reproduction, accomplished by introducing the nuclear material of a human somatic cell into a fertilized or unfertilized acolyte whose nucleus has been removed or

inactivated to produce a living organism (at any stage of development) with a human or predominantly human genetic constitution (Morgan 1).

Human cloning involves the creation of a genetically identical copy of a human, human cell or human tissue. This is a highly controversial issue. The major issue of debate here is whether human cloning is morally right or wrong? Does human cloning tamper with human nature? Should it be legalized since it is beneficial in medicine and surgical treatments? In as much as scientists and fertility researchers claim its benefits such as “resolving heart problems, repairing damaged tissues and organs, decreasing infertility, correcting defective genes, and preserving animals” (Morgan 2), it is with no doubt morally and biblically wrong. The point here is that no matter what medicine and science do, death is inevitable. In as much as human cloning may be utilized, it will not stop death when it comes. Man is using the benefits of modern medicine which is a gift from God in a way that soon it will render God irrelevant in human endeavors. Already man is able to do and undo certain things. This is not the intended purpose of medicine as given by God.

Ontario Consultants on Religious Tolerance, maintain that human cloning is basically in three types:

**Embryo cloning-** This type is a medical technique which produces monozygotic identical twins or triplets. It duplicates the process that nature uses to produce twins or triplets. One or more cells are removed from a fertilized embryo and encouraged to develop into one or more duplicate embryos. Twins or triplets are thus formed with identical deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA).

**Adult DNA cloning-** This is also known as reproductive cloning. This technique is intended to

produce an exact duplicate of an existing animal. The DNA from an ovum is removed and replaced with the DNA from a cell removed from an adult animal. The fertilized ovum, now called a pre-embryo, is implanted in a womb and allowed to develop into a new animal.

**Therapeutic cloning-** This is also known as biomedical cloning. Here the stem cells are removed from the pre-embryo with the intent of producing tissue or a whole organ for transplant back into the person who supplied the DNA. The goal of this is to produce a healthy copy of a sick person's tissue or organ for transplant (1-2).

When applied to humans all of these three types attract major ethical issues. Cloning creates a new life without a father, thereby reducing the mother to a provider of an almost emptied egg. Scholars on the liberal position opt that, human cloning allows man to mode his own indispensable nature, turning chance into choice. It will also with time permit scientists to fashion organs that are a flawless match for patients who are in need of transplant. Upon all the benefits that one would expect from human cloning VanDrunen categorically states that;

“Despite the bible obvious silence on the cloning question, numerous considerations raise pressing ethical questions about cloning as a method of reproduction. Christians seem to have good reasons to resist the temptation to it as a promising method for the future, and they should certainly consider how they might contribute to present public policy discussions about it” (144).

God is able to cure all kind of sicknesses. No matter what we do as men in treatment of infertility and sickness God's will shall always prevail.

**Christianity and modern medicine: Prospects**

Christianity views modern medicine and in fact even traditional medicine as a gift from God. For this reason, it is absolute that Christians derive a lot of benefits from modern medicine. This section seeks to address areas in life whereby Christianity could make effective use of modern medicine for the benefit of its adherents. The new trend of events in the church, (and especially the wrong application of African Christian theology by some church leaders) has put the church in a dilemma of sometimes neglecting the use of medicine, holding strictly to prayer (which of course is good for a Christian).

We live in the charismatic age of extremism of charismatic movement, where people receive new revelations, that become the foundations for their churches. Peter Masters also sounds the same alarm. He says, “We have to face this today in the latest extremism of the charismatic movement, which now revels in direct revelations from God which destroy the time-honored biblical foundations of worship and practice. Now, is the time to sound the alarm and to save countless churches and believers from terrible disaster” (20).

In this section too, the work has discussed basic issues of concern whereby the church and modern medicine could dialogue and come up with the benefits of human medicine to the church.

**Treatment of sicknesses**

This section does not seek to trace the history of medicine, (both traditional and modern) but it seeks to unveil the fact that God had purposed the wellbeing of his people through the use of medicine. In Exodus 15 the people of Israel after crossing the Red Sea, journeyed from there and got at the wilderness of Shur. Then the whole nation had no water to drink because the water was bitter. Moses cried to the Lord, and the Lord commanded him to cut a leaf of a tree and cast into the waters

of Marah. The water was made sweet and the entire congregation drank (Exod. 15:23-25). In the New Testament Jesus healed a blind by applying saliva on his eyes as part of the healing process. When he touched his eyes again, he could see (Mark 8:24-25). James encouraged the elders to pray for the sick and anoint them with oil (James 5: 14). Anointing with oil was medicine since oil is medicinal. Christians are not only to pray for the sick; the use of medicine is possible.

Today churches sometimes reject medicine and ask their members to attend all night prayers in church for healing, neglecting the use of modern medicine. Sometimes women come to deliver in churches. The minister of the word becomes both the minister and a medical doctor. This research thinks those practices are wrong. In dialogue we seek to appreciate what the other party does. "Dialogue leads the partners to appreciate goodness of life, faith in God, religious experiences and thirst for love, peace and justice which the spirit has produced in the other" (Omeire,78). Christianity must also appreciate medicine. We can by faith pray for the sick, but at the same time ask them to visit a health institution for appropriate diagnosing and medication. Churches should not be turned into medical centers.

### **Exorcism: Its wrong application today**

This is the last of many issues this work seeks to address. Exorcism is an act of driving unwanted elements (e.g. demons) by prayer or magic. We live in a society where it becomes difficult to differentiate between sickness and demonic attack. Someone who is naturally crazy is sometimes said to be possessed by an evil spirit. People living with HIV/AIDS are sometimes said to have been inflicted by an enemy. A woman with the problem of infertility is said to have been placed under a curse that needs deliverance. A pastor prayed for a lady who had an abortion that resulted into total abdominal hysterectomy because of complications, and he promised her a baby boy in the next nine months. He said that he had cast

away the evil spirit that placed a curse on her. There are many more such issues that one could think of, however, for the sake of this work few that are mentioned could serve as an eye opener.

The church should also appreciate the gift of modern medicine in dealing with issues like this. This research entitled this section, “a wrong application of exorcism” because none of the cases above requires exorcism. Such patients could visit a medical center for appropriate treatment. The church must not profess to see demon possession everywhere and seek to cast out. Peter Masters’ comment here is very appealing when he says, “Charismatic, however, see demon possession everywhere, casting demons out of people who manifest none of the symptoms present in biblical descriptions of possession, apart from the programmed hysterical reaction which is sometimes seen in charismatic adherents who are being exorcised” (95). The sick that should visit hospitals must be advised to do so. In this the dialogue between Christianity and modern medicine would be more meaningful.

### **Evaluation**

Modern medicine is a special gift from God that all religions and especially Christianity should benefit from. This work has gone through a careful analysis of how Christianity is sometimes at conflict with modern medicine especially on issues like abortion, assisted reproduction and cloning. These are all morally and biblically wrong. Christians have every cause to reject these as is practiced in modern medicine.

Christianity too sometimes seems not to give proper appreciation to modern medicine by trying to do what medicine should normally take care of. This is discussed in areas like treatment of sickness, and wrong application of exorcism. The basic issues discussed if not properly handled, would leave Christianity and modern medicine at conflict. Christianity would look at modern medicine as going beyond its boundaries

and modern medicine would in likewise manner assess Christianity. There must be a balance. Christianity must appreciate what medicine does; medicine too should seek to avoid issues that would contradict the Christian faith.

### **Recommendations**

A challenging work like this one must leave its readers with constructive recommendations. Therefore, the following recommendations are considered.

- i. Christians should not take things for granted. These issues discussed above could affect the Christian thinking and belief. Therefore, there is every need that good Christian medical practitioners engage medicine in a constructive dialogue so as to get at how issues discussed above would be settled. This would avoid Christianity being at conflict with medicine.
- ii. Christianity must appreciate the benefits of medicine as a gift from God. We must turn to medicine where appropriate. Churches should no longer become health centers.
- iii. Modern medicine should also appreciate the knowledge God has given man. Yet, God still rules, and he is sovereign. Anything (e.g. human cloning) that makes people to doubt the sovereignty of God should be avoided.
- iv. Christians should remember also that modern medicine is a sector under “common grace” of God. By this the research mean, it is not only Christians that work in health sector. It might, therefore, be difficult to stop non-Christians from practicing what they do. However, Christians should not participate in whatever is done in modern medicine that is against their conscience.

- v. Christianity must learn to accommodate modern medicine. It is not everything practiced in modern medicine that is contradictory to the Bible. The benefits of modern medicine must also be enjoyed by Christians, despite some ill practices identified.
- vi. In difficult decision making, the Christian should turn to the word of God, and not the alternative offered by modern medicine. For example, VanDrunen gives a valuable comment here about infertility saying, “by facing infertility with courage, contentment, and self-sacrificial charity, Christians present a witness to the world that their hope lays far beyond the passing things of this age” (145).

### **Conclusion**

Christianity and Modern medicine ought not to be at conflict. God has given us medicine for the purpose of our wellbeing. There could be happenings in modern medicine that are considered a threat to Christian thinking and faith. In as much as these prevail, health is yet a great sector of benefit to Christianity and should not be undermined. Therefore, since God is the author of modern medicine there should be a proper dialogue between Christianity and modern medicine so that instead of conflicts, there would be prospects.

### **Sources**

- Banner, David G. *Counseling and Human Predicaments: A study of sin, Guilt and forgiveness*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986.
- Bowdle, Andrew T. “Induction of anesthesia”. *Clinical applications: evidence-based anesthetic practice*. Accessed from <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/abs/anesthetic-pharmacology/induction-of-anesthesia/13CC956BA569C4744FAE07FC8C91A26C>. January 27, 2025.
- Cleveland Clinic. “Organ Donation and Transplantation”. *Cleveland Clinic*. Accessed from <https://my.clevelandclinic.org>. February 07, 2025

- Duncan, Ligon J III and Hall, W. David. "The 2 Hour view". *Three Views on the days of creation: The Genesis Debate*. Foreword Norman L. Geisler. Edited, David G. Hagopian. Los Alisos: Crux Press, 2001.
- Ekwe, Festus. *Abortion in Christian Perspective*. Aba: Vincent, 2002.
- Geisler, Norman. *Christian Ethic: Options and Issues*. England: Inter-Varsity, 1990.
- Hargreaves, John. *A Guide to Genesis*. Cambridge: SPCK, 1998.
- Hinson, David. *The books of the Old Testament*. Cambridge: University Press, 1992.
- Masters, Peter & Whitecomb, John. *The Charismatic Phenomenon*. London: Wakeman, 1982.
- Masters, peter. *The Healing Epidemic*. London: Wakeman, 1992.
- Meilaender, Gilbert. *Bioethics: A Primer for Christians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Merriam-Webster. "Health: Definition". *Merriam-webster*. Accessed from [www.merriam-webster.com](http://www.merriam-webster.com). February 5, 2025.
- Morgan, Shana. "What is human cloning?" Accessed from, [https://www.ehow.com/facts\\_5155045\\_humancloning.html#ixzz102RmRT](https://www.ehow.com/facts_5155045_humancloning.html#ixzz102RmRT). January 30, 2025.
- Ontario Consultants on Religious Tolerance. "Quotations on Reproductive Cloning" in Religious Tolerance. Accessed from <https://www.religioustolerance.org/cloning.htm>. January 26, 2025.
- Orr, Robert D. "Christian and Secular Decision-making in Ethical Issues". *Bioethics and the Future of Medicine: A Christian Appraisal*. Ed. John F. Kilner et al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.
- Richards, Lawrence O. *Illustrated Bible Handbook*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1987.
- Robertson, Palmer O. *The Genesis of Sex: Sexual Relationships in the First Book of the Bible*. New Jersey: P&R Publishing, 2002.
- Smith, Stephanie J. "Post-Abortion Syndrome – Fact or Fiction?" *Bioethics and the Future of Medicine: A Christian Appraisal*. Ed. John F. Kilner et al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.
- VanDrunen, David. *Bioethics and the Christian Life: A Guide to Making Difficult Decisions*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2009.
- VanDrunen, David. *God's Glory Alone: The Majestic Heart of Christian Faith and Life*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015.
- Waltke, K. Bruce. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.
- Westermann, Claus. *Genesis: A practical Commentary*. Trans. David E. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987.