

**‘STATELY SCIENCE
PAUSES NOT...’**

(Mary Baker Eddy)

Max Kappeler

**‘STATELY SCIENCE PAUSES NOT...’
(Mary Baker Eddy)**

Max Kappeler



**Kappeler Institute Publishing
Wilmington, DE, U.S.A.**

This pamphlet contains the substance of two talks given in

Fort Lauderdale, Florida, January 6-7, 1979
Los Angeles, California, March 31-April 1, 1979

to students already familiar with Christian Science who
wanted to know more about its scientific aspect

© Copyright by Max Kappeler 1995
ISBN 0-942958-15-2

First published 1979
Reprinted 1985, 1995

KAPPELER INSTITUTE USA
P.O. Box 99735
Seattle, WA 98139-0735
Tel. (206) 286-1617
email: mail@kappelerinstitute.org
website: www.kappelerinstitute.org

KAPPELER INSTITUTE FOR THE SCIENCE OF BEING, INC. U.S.A.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. The development of the idea of the Science of Christian Science | 1 |
| I. The demand for a Science of Christian Science | 1 |
| - Christian Science must be understood as a Science | 2 |
| - Keynote of the textbook: Science and understanding | 5 |
| - Understanding and demonstration | 9 |
| - Christian Science is both intellectual and spiritual | 12 |
| II. The history of the development of the Science of Christian Science | 13 |
| - Christian Science must have a history | 13 |
| - The discovery of the orders of ideas | 14 |
| - The discovery of the system of Christian Science | 16 |
| - The immediate results | 24 |
| - Mary Baker Eddy: a Scientist of the first magnitude | 28 |
| 2. The structure of the Christian Science textbook | 31 |
| I. Is the textbook a scientific textbook? | 31 |
| II. The structure of the textbook | 39 |
| III. Christian Science today | 47 |

Abbreviations for the works of Mary Baker Eddy

| | |
|-----------|---|
| S. & H. | Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures |
| Mis. | Miscellaneous Writings |
| Ret. | Retrospection and Introspection |
| Un. | Unity of Good |
| Pul. | Pulpit and Press |
| Rud. | Rudimental Divine Science |
| No. | No and Yes |
| Mess. '00 | Message to The Mother Church, June 1900 |
| Peo. | The People's Idea of God |
| My. | The First Church of Christ, Scientist, and Miscellany |

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA OF THE SCIENCE OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

I. The demand for a Science of Christian Science

My platform. I would like to explain clearly right at the start the platform from which I work. I accept:

- that the Bible and the Christian Science textbook, 'Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures', by Mary Baker Eddy, are my only authority;
- that Christian Science is the Comforter for this age;
- that the textbook contains the complete revelation of the divine Principle of Christian Science;
- that the textbook contains the full statement of Christian Science (S. & H.456:28), so that no further revelation needs to be added, and no part of it can be taken away or neglected - which means that all the various aspects presented in the textbook must be considered equally in a balanced way;
- that there is no additional secret outside of its teachings (Mis.50:14);
- that Christian Science is not copyrighted (Ret.76:2);
- that the textbook is my only teacher and that consequently I owe no loyalty to any person, though I owe a great deal to John W. Dooley as a guide to the scientific aspect of Christian Science.

This impersonal, scientific platform is a healthy basis for the student's self-instruction. It finds confirmation in Mary Baker Eddy's statements: "You can well afford to give me up, since you have in my last revised edition of Science and Health your teacher and guide" (Mis.136:18), and: "Students who strictly adhere to the right, and make the Bible and Science and Health a study, are in no danger of mistaking their way." (Mis.284:10) Those who base themselves on the textbook in their research work cannot misinterpret Christian Science.

In talking to you today, I have no intention of giving you an inspirational talk on Christian Science. This would be very easy. Anyone who has a fair knowledge of the subject can do that and transport an audience up onto cloud nine. What I would like to do is

something much more fundamental, namely, to show you a *method* of approaching the statements in the textbook in such a way that each student can become his own teacher. Therefore, "come now, and let us reason together" (Isa 1:18).

Christian Science must be understood as a Science

Is it easy to understand Christian Science? Does reading and pondering the textbook make it easy to understand? Many have read, and re-read the textbook for ten, twenty, thirty years and more. They often know the text so well that when they begin to read a sentence they can finish it from memory. Has this really led to a deeper understanding of the textbook? Isn't it, rather, the case that we can only manage to grasp the meaning of each individual sentence? Must we not admit, deep down in our hearts, that we don't really understand the teaching of the textbook well enough to practise it with any measure of authority?

There can be no doubt that to understand the textbook in its real import is far from easy. Even its author states: "I have been learning the higher meaning of this book since writing it" (My 114:25), and only six months before she left us she told a student: "I feel that I am just really beginning to understand 'Science and Health'." (Miscellaneous Documents) If even Mary Baker Eddy needed a life-time's devotion to understand the higher and deeper meaning of her own textbook, how much more do the students need a similar devotion in order to fathom its depths! Hence her query (in 1887): "Who is it that understands, unmistakably, a fraction of the actual Science of Mind-healing?" (Mis.269:14) Then (in 1896) she made the further statement: "Scarcely a moiety, compared with the whole of the Scriptures and the Christian Science textbook, is yet assimilated spiritually by the most faithful seekers;...." (Mis.317:14).

These few references may suffice to make us aware that a proper understanding of the Christian Science textbook demands much more study than is needed to grasp the subject of any other textbook. They also make us aware that the author herself, having presented her revelation in a book, had afterwards to discover her own revelation. This fact - which must be rather incomprehensible to an outsider - shows that it is essential to be clear about the meaning of the two terms 'revelation' and 'discovery'.

Revelation and discovery. Mary Baker Eddy states in her textbook the complete revelation of the divine Principle of Christian Science. Our task is not to present a higher or further revelation of this Principle but to discover what this revelation is and what it implies. Thus we are engaged in the discovery of an ever higher insight into what the textbook already contains. We must therefore make a distinction between revelation and discovery.

Revelation means making known or manifest through divine inspiration; a vision, or the like. It is an impartation of insight into the whole of Truth that comes from a divine source directly to a transparent mentality. A *discovery* is different. It comes step by step and leads in an ordered process of understanding from one insight to the next. Through discovery one obtains gradually knowledge of the whole Truth, which one could not grasp as a whole before.

The textbook cannot be understood just by reading and re-reading it. The Science that is revealed in it must be discovered. "To one 'born of the flesh', however, divine Science must be a discovery." (Ret.26:22) Mary Baker Eddy knew "...that mortals must work for the discovery of even a portion of it" (Mis.22:9). It becomes evident that the student of Christian Science must have the mentality of a scientific discoverer. As the revelation cannot be fathomed just by reading the text, much more is required. It takes years and years of consecrated devotion, spiritual honesty and humility, coupled with a scientific, investigating mentality and willingness for untiring work. Let's not forget "the song of Christian Science", namely, "Work - work - work - watch and pray" (Mess.'00 2:7). Being engaged in the work of discovery we must muster our best moral, ethical, intellectual and spiritual abilities. We must be Scientists in the true sense of the word and fulfil Mary Baker Eddy's requirement: "Bear with me the burden of discovery ..." (My 120:9). We are only just beginning to sound the depths of the textbook and there is a vast undiscovered area still waiting to be explored.

Mary Baker Eddy foresaw an advancement in understanding. Mary Baker Eddy's final revelation of the divine Principle of Christian Science finds its complete statement in the textbook. It is written in plain language. One would think that the text only needed to be read

intelligently for the revelation to be understood. This is largely so with other textbooks, but not with a divinely inspired book like our textbook. Hence the warning we have in the well-known article 'Principle and Practice', which Mary Baker Eddy dictated to her secretary Adam Dickey only a few days before she left us (published in the 'Christian Science Sentinel', September 1st, 1917 and reprinted in my booklet 'Why Study Christian Science as a Science?'). There she says that "Christian Science requires understanding instead of belief", that instead of being a "faith-Scientist", a "faith-healer" performing "faith-cures", we must understand Christian Science, otherwise it will again be lost. Students of Christian Science are very quick to call themselves Christian Scientists, without first asking themselves if they really have a spiritually scientific approach to the subject. Can we honestly and truthfully call ourselves Scientists?

Why is it that we can learn any other science without much difficulty in five or ten years, but getting a workable understanding of Christian Science takes so much longer? Mary Baker Eddy's answer is: "It is true that it requires more study to understand and demonstrate what these works teach, than to learn theology, physiology, or physics; because they teach divine Science, with fixed Principle, given rule, and unmistakable proof" (No 11:18). Christian Science as the Science of all sciences covers the whole ground of our life-experience and therefore also demands a total life-commitment.

Another reason why Christian Science is not readily understood is that the teachings of Christian Science are "... in advance of the age ..." and therefore we should "... not deny our need of its spiritual unfoldment" (S. & H.371:24). Listen to this: "Centuries will intervene before the statement of the inexhaustible topics of Science and Health is sufficiently understood to be fully demonstrated" (Ret.84:1). This indicates that we cannot understand the textbook just by slowly, conscientiously and intelligently reading it through a few times. She says it takes centuries. Does she mean that the textbook should be read through for centuries? Not at all! As the textbook is in advance of the age, she foresees that as the age advances students will approach the textbook with a new and more

advanced model of thought, which is better adapted to unlock the spiritual secrets embedded in the text. Therefore, a better understanding is a matter, not of reading the same text over and over again, but rather of studying the text with the right model of consciousness. If our model of consciousness evolves, so does our understanding of the textbook. Let us remember, however, that “the great element of reform is not born of human wisdom; it draws not its life from human organizations ...” (Peo.1:1). This evolution is divinely individual.

In view of the prediction that it will take centuries for Science and Health to be fully understood it is interesting to ask if some important future changes can be foreseen. Mary Baker Eddy made several such prophecies. Writing in 1887 that the age was only prepared to accept “the Science of physical harmony”, she foresaw that “in less than another fifty years His name will be magnified in the apprehension of this new subject ...” (Un.6:10,28), namely the Science of spiritual harmony or divine Science. As we shall see later, the mid-1930’s brought this new subject to the forefront.

In a signed statement (according to an expert authority: summer 1909) she made another prophecy: “I calculate that about one half century more will bring to the front the man that God has equipped to lift aloft His standard of Christian Science.” (Divinity Course and General Collectanea, p.97) Here again we have an indication that Mary Baker Eddy expected new periods of progress, evolving the understanding of the idea of Science. As in other sciences, we should therefore culture the expectation of an influx of new ways of approaching our subject. Without such revolutions of consciousness any science will get into a rut and stagnate. Do we want this to happen to the most important of all sciences, Christian Science?

Keynote of the textbook: Science and understanding

In understanding Christian Science two main questions have to be investigated. The first question is: What is the subject that has to be understood? The subject of this investigation is the revelation of the divine Principle of Christian Science. This is stated in the textbook. It presents *what* must be understood. But this is not the theme of the present talk. The second great question, the one that concerns

us here, is: *How* can we understand the subject of our investigation - the textbook? The answer Mary Baker Eddy gives is: through Science and understanding - that is, through scientific understanding, not through belief and faith, not through religious emotions and sentiments, not through reading and re-reading. Therefore we have to know what is meant by the term 'science' and by the term 'understanding'.

Science defined. What Mary Baker Eddy presents in the textbook is Science, not religion. True, this Science has a religious aspect just as it has medical, metaphysical, sociological and many other aspects. In the textbook the term Science occurs more than a thousand times in order to indicate the nature of the discovery, whereas very little importance is given to religion. The term religion occurs only about forty times and in most cases in a negative sense. The textbook gives us fundamentally Science, and not a religion. As only like can understand like, the textbook can only yield its treasures if it is approached with a scientifically structured consciousness and not with a religious sense. A religious model of thought can grasp a religious subject but not a scientific subject. Only Science can understand Science.

What Mary Baker Eddy discovered was not just another science alongside all the other existing sciences. She discovered the proto-Science, or first-Science, namely the Science of Being, the Science of all sciences. This is naturally terrific. A century later, the thinkers of today are only now beginning to realize that there must be a science underlying all the sciences and this is also brought to the front by the philosophy of science. So we see that as a Scientist Mary Baker Eddy was far in advance of her age.

When we maintain that Christian Science is Science, do we really know what the term 'science' means and all that it implies? Or, are we just claiming to be Scientists and yet approaching the subject of Christian Science as religionists? We should be aware of what science is and what it is not. Funk & Wagnalls' Dictionary tells us what science is not: "*Knowledge* of a single fact, not known as related to any other, or of many facts not known as having any mutual relations, or as comprehended under any general law, does not reach the meaning of *science*." Therefore we must admit to ourselves that as long as we only know single facts, single statements, single truths

about Christian Science, such knowledge has no right to the name of scientific understanding. It is just knowing, but not Science.

What then is science? Funk & Wagnalls' definition continues: "*Science is knowledge reduced to law and embodied in system ...*". Only when facts or truths are seen in their system, seen in relation to the coherent whole, only then can they be understood in their science and become scientific facts or truths. The scientist Bronowski put it very clearly in the following words: "Science is not a fact-finding activity, but a fact-arranging activity." Fact-arranging implies that the facts are seen in their orders, laws and system. For facts to become scientific facts, they have to be understood in their relationship with all the other facts and as related to the whole. When single facts are stated and known merely as isolated units, we have only an *atomistic* sense of knowledge; but when we understand the facts as related to the whole, we have a *structural* sense of science, which alone comes up to the real standard of a science. Only by approaching the textbook with a structural sense of science will 'Science and Health' yield its fuller meaning. Bronowski further says: "We are no longer preoccupied with the mere facts, but with the relations which the facts have with one another - with the whole which they form and fill, not with the parts." So we can see that as long as we study the textbook in parts, in single statements, here a sentence and there a sentence, here a paragraph and there a paragraph, we have no chance of understanding it in its Science. By this method we shall never get a scientific understanding of Christian Science. It will remain an atomistic approach, which never leads very far, and is only too often misleading.

Understanding. So we see that knowing facts does not necessarily mean understanding these facts. There is a vast difference between a truth and a scientific truth. $2 \times 2 = 4$ is a truth. It is a truth, no matter if a parrot or a mathematician states it. It is a truth that cannot be denied, however it is stated, but not always the same kind of truth. Why? The parrot or a little child may just state it without knowing *why* it is true. The mathematician understands why it is so, because he understands it in relation to the whole system of arithmetic. Knowing and understanding are not synonymous. Understanding is more than knowing; it is the faculty of recognizing the

inner relationships of a system and of comprehending its meaning within the integral whole of the subject under consideration. Briefly, understanding involves the ability to comprehend structures. Structure means: "The interrelationships of parts as dominated by the general character of the whole." (Webster) Structure equals facts plus relationships.

This demands that we approach the textbook, not with an atomistic way of thinking, but with a model of consciousness which is structured according to "the categories of metaphysics" (S. & H. 269:13). Studying the textbook in this way, we are no longer mainly interested in single statements, terms and concepts, but we look out for relationships that exist between terms, sentences, paragraphs and chapters. But relationships are not spelt out in black and white, and they therefore demand a scientific sense of text-interpretation which has nothing to do with individually subjective text-interpretation. This raises a whole new subject which I do not want to expound just here, as it would take us on too far. The point to remember here is that terms per se have no exact scientific meaning. In structuralism meaning is relational. Therefore the textbook yields a higher insight only when it is no longer read as a collection of atomistic truths, but as laws, orders, systems, categories and structures - all of which define relationships.

Discovery. We have seen that the revelation of Christian Science demands discovery. But how can we become discoverers? Is the ability to discover, the gift of a few chosen ones? Or is it a scientific method? According to the definition of the term in the Oxford Dictionary, science "includes trustworthy methods for the discovery of new truth within its own domain." Science, understood as structural relationships, is the trustworthy method for discovery, because a discovery is the bringing to light of new relationships which have always existed but have not previously been perceived. Using a structured consciousness in the study of Christian Science, the student is able to make new discoveries "within its own domain" - within the total revelation of Christian Science. This method is supported by the textbook, which nowhere says that "*God* reveals", but states three dozen times that "*Science* reveals".

Understanding and demonstration

Understanding and demonstration are one. Why is understanding so important? Why are faith, religious belief and sentiment not enough? A fundamental point in Christian Science is that it is consciousness which determines our life-experience. The quality of consciousness we have determines the quality of life we have. Such as is our consciousness such is the demonstration we experience. Consciousness and demonstration are one.

Degrees of consciousness. But there are various degrees of quality of consciousness and consequently various degrees of demonstration. We naturally would like to experience the divine. This cannot be attained with a consciousness based on belief or faith; it requires spiritual understanding. "Until belief becomes faith, and faith becomes spiritual understanding, human thought has little relation to the actual or divine." (S. & H. 297:28) Thus we see that our whole attention should not be channelled in the first place into having better or higher demonstrations, but rather into getting a better or higher understanding.

We have already seen that consciousness includes various degrees, such as atomistic knowledge and structural understanding. If we have an atomistic model of consciousness we approach the textbook with the urge to know more and more facts or truths, thus piling up facts upon facts. Finally we may have acquired an enormous number of facts, truths, data on Christian Science and the history of Christian Science. After years and years of gathering and piling up knowledge students usually arrive at that very healthy state where they are feeling that they still don't yet quite know what Christian Science is really all about. Disillusionment sets in, bringing a sense that they have not really made any significant progress compared with all the time and energy they have put into the study. The reason for this is clear. An atomistic approach is unscientific and therefore does not lend itself to new discoveries or scientific inspiration.

Consciousness revolution. This inefficient fact-finding activity must give place to an efficient fact-arranging activity, to an approach with a structured understanding. This may be a very new concept to many students, even a revolutionary one. But we know that Science "is revolutionary in its very nature" (Mis.99:1). Also let

us remember that any science develops by revolution and not by the process of accumulating truths (see, for example, Thomas S. Kuhn, 'The Structure of Scientific Revolutions'). This naturally demands of the student a different model of consciousness, the willingness to let his way of thinking be restructured. As we saw before, a structured consciousness does not read words in a text; it reads relations - that is to say, laws, orders, categories, systems, structures, and so on.

Our model of understanding determines what we discover. A higher model of understanding, a structured consciousness, not only gives us a higher experience but also a higher concept of the textbook. The text of the textbook is fixed. It does not need to be changed. Yet this same text can yield different insights according to our method of approaching it; and changing our method of approach makes it seem as if we had a completely new textbook before us. We know that any object looks different according to the way we look at it. You may know that often quoted illustration which Lecomte du Noüy gives in 'Human Destiny': Take the edge of a razor blade. Looked at with the naked eye, it shows a continuous straight line. Through the microscope we see it as a broken but solid line. On the chemical scale we have neither a straight nor a zig-zag line, but atoms of iron and carbon. On the sub-atomic scale we have electrons in perpetual motion at terrific speed, looking much more like a swarm of gnats than a solid straight line. This illustrates the fact that the same object appears in very different form according to the model of observation; yet the identity of the object does not change.

So it is with the textbook. If we approach it with a religious sense we may find in it many marvellous religious truths and get all sorts of individually subjective inspiration from it, but we shall not be able to find its Science. Or again, if we read it with an atomistic consciousness we shall find many marvellous metaphysical facts which will help to solve many problems on a metaphysical basis and level. The textbook then appears as a most helpful collection of aphorisms, but not as a system of Science. But when we investigate it with a structured consciousness we find something infinitely greater, namely the structure of the one infinite Being, the Science of being.

A higher sense of demonstration. It is evident that a structural understanding, being a higher model of understanding than an

atomistic knowledge, also expresses itself in a higher *sense* of demonstration, a higher *sense* of healing and life-experience. We must be clear on this point. A structural understanding of Christian Science does not try to bring forth better demonstrations of what is expected with an atomistic consciousness, but something very different, namely a better sense of that which has to be demonstrated. The two cannot be compared, they are just different.

Demand for a structural understanding. If we ask what the general state of consciousness is among Christian Science students, then I think we have to admit that most of them work atomistically. They are engaged in reading passages out of context, studying single terms such as 'intelligence', 'substance' or 'supply' with the help of the Concordance. It is a fact-finding activity, piling up knowledge of data, facts, truths. This is all done with great devotion, sincerity and humility. Though this atomistic research is insufficient, it is just the same not superfluous. After all, we first have to get the facts before we can be engaged in a fact-arranging activity.

Though this fact-finding activity has its merits, we must become aware that we have to go further and see that by accretion alone, that is to say, by adding more and more, we do not make something more perfect, more complete. Most of us have been educated in the classical belief that the whole cannot be bigger than the sum of its parts. From this came the belief that in order to get the whole we must accumulate as many parts as possible. But the trans-classical concept (structuralism, gestalt-theory, synergy) no longer agrees with this belief, and rightly so. We now know that the whole is bigger, much bigger, than the sum of its parts. Mary Baker Eddy knew this, for she says: "the whole is greater than its parts" (Un.5:28). Today, structuralism teaches that the whole consists of its parts plus the relationships of its parts with the other parts and with the whole.

Take as an illustration the human body. If a surgeon dissected a human body and laid out all the parts separately on a table, we should have the sum of its parts, but not a body. The body would not live, breathe, move. What makes the body a body is not only that it has all its parts but that the parts also have their right relationships and interrelationships.

Thus it is with the textbook. We may read it over and over or even

learn it by heart and yet not understand it; nor will it live. The parts may be known, but that which makes it alive is the understanding of the relationships. Therefore we must get hold of it through understanding its structure. I will tell you more about the structure of the textbook later on in my talk.

Christian Science is both intellectual and spiritual

Whenever the human mind is confronted with new concepts it tends to resist them. Right from the beginning Christian Science was criticized as being intellectual, and the same thing has happened whenever a new aspect of Christian Science has been put forward. Unscientific thinkers like to attach the stigma of intellectualism to every progressive idea, as if 'intellectual' were a dirty word in a science. Let us see what Mary Baker Eddy's attitude is. As the study of Christian Science appeals to the highest intellectual faculties the textbook demands what she calls "academics of the right sort" (S. & H. 195:19). She also says that "spiritual rationality and free thought accompany approaching Science, and cannot be put down" (S. & H. 223:21). Without freedom of thought we should continue to think as former generations thought and there would be no progress. Man's birthright is to think freely and to be a revolutionary. Science is revolutionary, and we must have the courage to think along new lines and not in the same way as people were thinking a century ago. We must muster our best intellectual faculties and not be afraid of making mistakes.

Mary Baker Eddy uses the term 'intellectual' nearly always in a most positive way. She says that the medicine of Mind-healing is intellectual and spiritual (see S. & H. 460:9). It needs both, the intellectual and the spiritual. One without the other is incomplete. The intellectual without the spiritual becomes intellectualism; the spiritual without the intellectual becomes vague mysticism. She states further that the churches and the Christian Science periodicals have an intellectual, moral, and spiritual animus (see Mis.113:31) and that her students, with cultured intellects, give promise of grand careers (see Mis.356:10). She even indicates that we should not shun intellectual wrestlings, that "... as we drift into more spiritual latitudes ..." this will "impart grandeur to the intellectual wrestling and

collisions with old-time faiths” (Peo.1:12). Progress, a mutation of consciousness, does not just fall into our lap; it doesn’t come to the apathetic thinker. If it will take centuries for Christian Science to be fully understood, then it needs a succession of spiritual pioneers who can break through the “old-time faiths” and the same endlessly recurring statements, renderings, arguments. It should come about that, when an advanced age looks back on the preceding footsteps of Christian Science, it will see “the gain of intellectual momentum” (Pul.vii:13). We should be able to look back on a spiritual history of Christian Science, on the development of the spiritual idea. This is not primarily a question of how much the number of churches, practitioners or church members has increased or decreased, but rather of how much the understanding of the textbook has unfolded. All that matters is the spiritual idea, and “a small group of wise thinkers is better than a wilderness of dullards” (My 162:7). Let’s see that we keep the wise thinkers.

When the Science of Christian Science is attacked as being intellectual, it is good to remember that this is not an argument of spiritual thinkers but of animal magnetism, because it is “... mental haziness which admits of no intellectual culture or spiritual growth” (My 211:30). But let’s also be aware that intellectual culture is not synonymous with academic education. So-called ‘simple people’ can have intellectual culture, and quite often more than a Ph.D. It is the “poor in spirit” who are open enough to let go of preconceived conceptions and are receptive to the instruction of Mind-science and not what they are being told to believe.

II. The history of the development of the Science of Christian Science

Christian Science must have a history

Generic man leads on the centuries. Now I would like to show in a very concentrated survey how the new consciousness of a structural understanding came to light. It wasn’t the work of a moment nor did it come about in a premeditated way. Rather it was a step by step birth which had its initial conception some sixty years ago. When Mary Baker Eddy left us she had to leave the unfoldment of the idea of Christian Science in the hands of divine Providence; she did not

entrust it to a person or group of people. She considered generic man to reveal her successor and to lead on the centuries (see My 346:18-347:5). And indeed, the impulsion of the divine idea did unfold scientifically, so that now we can look back on its spiritual history. After all, "Christian Science and Christian Scientists will, *must*, have a history..." (Mis.106:3).

John W. Doorly. This brings me to the contribution of John W. Doorly, C.S.B., who was in his time an internationally well-known teacher, lecturer and practitioner and also, in 1919/20, President of The Mother Church. It was he who first brought to notice the scientific nature of Christian Science. A full statement of John Doorly's work can be found in Peggy Brook's book 'John W. Doorly and the Scientific Evolution of Christian Science'. Here, I will only pin-point some of the most important ideas.

In the pre-Kimball period (end of 19th century) the general attitude of Christian Scientists was that of right thinking, of having good thoughts; thinking good and right thoughts would heal. The healing was done through arguments of isolated truths. Unfortunately there are still today only too many students who believe that this attitude is Christian Science. With the turn of the century *Edward Kimball* stressed the fact that reality is of the nature of idea and that Principle has to be understood through the ideas which express it. So we had the shift from thought to idea. Yet, the movement at large could not grasp what he was teaching. From the mid 1910's onward *Bicknell Young* was stressing the fact that Being is one and that in Christian Science we have to set out from the infinite One and not from isolated ideas. His teaching rested on the oneness of Being, on the fact that there is only one Mind, one I, one Ego, one I AM, one Christ, one man, one universe.

The discovery of the orders of ideas

Order rests on differentiation. A great turning-point came with John Doorly. Though he could accept whole-heartedly Bicknell Young's teaching of the oneness of Being, he could all the same see a

great danger in it. The mystics have from earliest times accepted the statement that Being is one. Reading the great mystics one would not see any great difference. If one goes no further than this, then the oneness of Being is the oneness of an undifferentiated whole, whereas a science demands clearly differentiated, individualized identities, constituting the whole through ordered relationships. Doorly could see that unless we have clearly defined identities of being and unless we can see the ordered relationships of these identities, our concept of the oneness of Being is a mystical and not a scientific one. Identities that do not differ one from the other cannot be part of an order. Seven pearls that look exactly alike can be put in a row in any sequence without forming any definite order. But the moment they differ in any way, say in size, they can be arranged in definite orders. Through differentiation order becomes possible.

The order of the seven days of creation. As early as 1914 John Doorly began to see that the seven days of creation present an irresistible, definite, unchangeable order of ideas; it is the fundamental order of the law of creativity, the order of the Logos, or Word of God. Each day illustrates definite identities of ideas, and the sequence of these ideas determines the order of any creative process - the idea of the first day leading to the idea of the second day, the idea of the second day leading to the idea of the third day, and so on, up to the seventh day. In her chapter 'Genesis' Mary Baker Eddy depicts the third day of creation as "the third stage in the order of Christian Science" (S. & H. 508:28), indicating that the first day is the first stage, the second day the second stage, and so on, up to the seventh day as the seventh stage in the order of Christian Science. This corresponds with her further statement: "In its genesis, the Science of creation is stated in mathematical order, beginning with the lowest form and ascending the scale of being up to man" (Mis.57:27). We are here acquainted with the law of creativity, beginning with "light" or intelligence and unfolding in definite order up to the seventh day of rest, of perfection or fulfilment. The seven days of creation are therefore a guide to how, from the point of inception of an idea (first day), we can spiritually proceed up to the point of its perfect fulfilment (seventh day).

Further sevenfold orders. Some years later John Doorly saw that

the third degree in the “scientific translation of mortal mind”, entitled “understanding”, also gives a sevenfold sequence of ideas: “Wisdom, purity, spiritual understanding, spiritual power, love, health, holiness” (S. & H. 116:2). He could see that here again there was a definite, irresistible spiritual order leading any wise insight that breaks in on human thought up to its culmination at the point of holiness. Soon afterwards he could see that the Lord’s Prayer, the Commandments and the Beatitudes also followed a sevenfold order. Eventually he realized that all these orders were only individual illustrations of a fundamental order - the Word of God as defined through the seven synonymous terms for God: Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love (see S. & H. 465:10).

With these discoveries it began to be realized that the one Being is more than the sum total of atomistic or isolated ideas, that “Principle is not to be found in fragmentary ideas” (S. & H. 302:1) and that “Truth is not fragmentary, disconnected, unsystematic” (Ret.93:11), but that ideas have definite place values within the whole system of Christian Science. From this point onward thought was led into divine orders, just as Jesus was “always leading them into the divine order” (Ret.91:19).

John Doorly now began to teach these ideas in his classes, association-meetings and lectures all over the world. But at the same time he became aware that though the Christian Science movement was outwardly growing it was lacking in spiritual growth. He realized that Christian Scientists just had a belief in Christian Science, as if it were another religion, and were not even aware that it was not scientific understanding. He knew that if we did not find what constitutes the Science of Christian Science the movement had no chance of surviving and fulfilling its destiny. So he felt that he should do something about it. He decided that the best thing he could do was to retire from the lectureship (which he did in 1928) and devote his time to a consecrated study of the textbook and to the healing work, combined with a deep desire to investigate more profoundly the scientific nature of Christian Science.

The discovery of the system of Christian Science

“Divine metaphysics is now reduced to a system ...” Whereas up

to that point in Doorly's investigation the main accent had been on order, from the 1930's onward the accent shifted to system and science. He was very much struck by the statement: "Divine metaphysics is now reduced to a system, to a form comprehensible by and adapted to the thought of the age in which we live. This system enables the learner to demonstrate the divine Principle, upon which Jesus' healing was based, and the sacred rules for its present application to the cure of disease" (S. & H. 146:31). He now asked himself what this system was. System is based on categories and the laws interrelating these categories. Certainly, one was always saying that Christian Science is a system and that there are categories of metaphysics, because it is so stated in the textbook. But what is this system? What are the categories of divine metaphysics? What are the laws of God, the orders, the rules? Nobody could give a sensible, scientific answer. What would be thought of an arithmetician who stated that arithmetic has a system, that this system has laws, order, rules, but could not actually explain it in concrete terms?

Doorly became aware that the textbook is full of scientific terms that apply to any science, such as law, order, rule, system, method, form, plan which again form a sevenfold order. Christian Science, being the Science of all sciences, the proto-Science, would therefore furnish us with those scientific tools which are fundamental to any science. From this would follow the tremendous universal import and impact a scientific understanding of law, order, rule, system, method, form (gestalt) and plan would have for all the sciences.

Little by little during the years 1937 and 1938 the answers to all these questions were beginning to take shape in Doorly's thought, thus fulfilling the prophecies Mary Baker Eddy had made in 1887. The Science of spiritual harmony, defined through its constituents, began to take form. But the as yet faint outlines of the system of Christian Science needed still deeper investigation, to make its findings fool-proof and defensible against critics. In 1938/39, together with several other teachers and practitioners, John Doorly thoroughly investigated the seven synonymous terms for God and analysed them in depth.

The three categories of the divine system. In the course of many years of research three major categories of the divine system of

Christian Science crystallized in Doorly's thought:

1. *The nature of Being: the seven synonymous terms for God.* The divine system rests predominantly on the seven synonymous terms for God: Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love. We have already seen that without clearly differentiated identities, no order is possible. Now, order is God's first law. Being must be ordered, or it would be chaotic. If we want to understand God in order and harmony, we have to understand the order of the synonyms for God, and this is only possible if we can identify all the synonyms as being clearly differentiated from one another. This means that each one of the seven synonyms for God must be defined through its individual characteristic nature - through its characteristic ideas. So each synonym for God can be defined through the ideas that characterize it specifically and differentiate it from the other synonyms. Therefore the synonyms for God in a specific context are not freely interchangeable.

Unfortunately this is not seen by the student of Christian Science in general. The belief still persists that because each of the synonyms stands for God, they must be freely interchangeable. If this were so, we could ask: Why have seven terms, if one would do? Why complicate things, if it can all be so simple? The answer is that students are not familiar with the meaning of the term 'synonym' nor with the synonymy-principle which underlies the language of the textbook. And it was on this fundamental question of the meaning of the seven synonymous terms that John Doorly was finally excommunicated. (See "A Statement", by John W. Doorly)

What is meant by 'synonymous'? Funk & Wagnalls defines the term like this: "By *synonymous* words we usually understand words that coincide or nearly coincide in some part of their meaning and may hence within certain limits be used interchangeably; while outside of these limits they may differ very greatly in meaning and use", and adds: "To consider *synonymous* words *identical* is fatal to accuracy ...". Synonymous words have, so to speak, two different kinds of values, one kind which they share with each other and another kind which differentiates one from the others. A study of the seven synonymous terms for God would therefore have to investigate which values or ideas are shared among all of them and

which ideas are specifically characteristic of each individual synonym.

The subject of God is central to the teaching of Christian Science. Consequently any correct teaching must rest on a clear understanding of the differentiation of the seven synonyms for God. The question therefore arises how we can know the ideas characterizing each of the synonyms, thus differentiating them. Sadly enough the answer to this question was left either to individual inspiration or to an inadequate method of text analysis. It was left mostly to individual inspiration to determine what values or ideas were believed or felt to belong to each synonym, with the result that everyone arrived at a conclusion entirely different from everyone else's. This must honestly be regarded as an unscientific method which cannot be accepted if the teaching of Christian Science is Science. The more earnest student turns to the Concordance and tries to find his answer from the textbook references to the seven synonymous terms for God. He will study, for example, all the references to Mind and make a list of ideas which he finds associated with Mind in the text. At first sight this seems to be a reasonable method and an easy or obvious one. When he reads, for example, of "the power of Mind" he can easily conclude that power is a characteristic idea of Mind. But as he goes on to the other synonyms, he will soon be puzzled when he finds that the text also speaks of "the power of Spirit", and even more so when he goes on to the other synonyms because he will also find in the text "the power of Soul", "the power of the divine Principle", "the power of Life", "the power of Truth" and "the power of Love". It is not surprising if he comes to the conclusion that 'power' is an intrinsic characteristic idea of all the seven synonymous terms for God, and that consequently the seven synonyms have no differentiated characteristics and are therefore freely interchangeable. No wonder he feels that in any given context it is immaterial whether one speaks of the power of Mind or the power of Spirit. Actually, however, this is not so. Mary Baker Eddy's use of the synonyms for God is very exact. In no instance where she has 'power' in connection with a certain synonym could another synonym be put in its place. This is true not only for 'power' but for every other idea. Why?

One of the main contributions that John Doorly made to the scientific understanding of Christian Science was to explain the

synonymy-principle in Mary Baker Eddy's language. The method of text analysis just described is a much too simplistic one, which cannot produce conclusive results. Doorly found that there are scientific criteria for differentiating the synonymous terms and gave examples for the method of text-interpretation. It would get us on too far and take too much time to explain here the method of this text analysis. But this is a subject that is taught in our classes. Suffice it to say, for the moment, that through a scientific and therefore objective method of interpretation Doorly found a list of characteristic ideas for each of the seven synonyms for God, so that each synonym for God can be clearly defined in its identity and its differentiation from all the others. (These findings are also presented in seven booklets, Nos. 4-10 of 'Compendium for the Study of Christian Science', by Max Kappeler and co-authors).

In this way the fundamental elements of Being were found in their scientific meaning and thus became the basis on which Science could be built and understood. We saw that without differentiation there can be no order, without order there is no science.

Without a clear apprehension of the seven synonyms for God, students still build on belief, faith and mystical feelings or emotions. Martha H. Bogue reports from her class in 1888 that Mary Baker Eddy, referring to the synonymous terms for God, declared: "Upon the truth of these terms for God rests the basis of the Science; in fact they are the Science." (Miscellaneous Documents p.61) Another student reports: "Mrs. Eddy said if we were really conscious of the meaning of the synonyms of God, this would heal every case." (Divinity Course and General Collectanea p.212) A movement that claims to present to the world the Science of God has therefore no future unless it first begins to understand the correct meaning of the seven synonymous terms for God. This study is the most important thing in the whole universe, because there is nothing more important than God, divine Being, and today nobody can really afford not to be a conscious idea of the one Being.

2. *The operational sense of Being: Word - Christ - Christianity - Science.* When John Doorly undertook this meticulous research of the synonyms for God in 1938/39 he followed the sequence of Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love, as given on page 465 of the

textbook. These seven synonyms define the nature, essence and wholeness of God. In the course of further study it was seen that the order of the seven synonyms for God is not a casual one, that they are not arranged in an arbitrary way. Quite the reverse. It is the only order possible, if the *Word* of God or the Logos is to be defined. There are 5040 possibilities of arranging all the seven synonyms in sequence, but Mary Baker Eddy could put them in only *one* order when the purpose of the order is to bring out the aspect of the *creative Word* of God. This Word-order shows the spiritual flow from the creative Mind up to its fulfilment in Love. This links up with those many different examples of a sevenfold order that Doorly had seen long before as the creative flow and order: the sevenfold order of the days of creation, the Commandments, the Beatitudes, the Lord's Prayer, the third degree of the "scientific translation of mortal mind" and many others. They all follow the same order, the definition of God as Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love.

Though the discovery of the meaning of the Word-order and its far-reaching implications for any creative activity was overwhelming, an honest investigation of the synonyms for God could not overlook the fact that there are other orders of the seven synonyms in the textbook. For instance, in "the scientific translation of immortal Mind" on page 115 of 'Science and Health' we find the order of Principle, Life, Truth, Love, Soul, Spirit, Mind, defining the *Christ* in its office of *translating* God to the point of idea. As this order illustrates a different purpose from that of the Word, the synonyms for God are arranged in a different order. Again we become aware that in a structural concept it is not the facts (the synonyms per se) which are superimportant but rather the relationship, the order, which exists between the facts. The office of the Christ is to translate God, the divine Principle which is Life, Truth and Love, through Soul and Spirit to the point of manifesting God as perfect idea in Mind. Whenever the argument comes up in our consciousness that God does not come to a specific situation, we can counteract this argument of the anti-Christ by the understanding that the self-operative Principle which is the all-impelling Life, the ever-effective Truth and the ever-saving Love exchanges through Soul the false testimony of the material senses, thereby cleansing every situation through the

onliness and purity of Spirit, so that only that which is of the nature of idea is manifested as the presence of the All-Mind. You can just feel the terrific power of this translation-order, sweeping away all that would obstruct the divine manifestation.

Again, on page 587 of 'Science and Health' the term God is described in a different order, to bring out the *Christianity* sense. Here the order is Principle; Mind; Soul; Spirit; Life; Truth; Love, depicting God's *reflection* as His universe. The focus is on idea and this order answers the question: How big is a spiritual idea? It is always an idea of Principle in the universe of Mind, fully identified with this Principle through Soul-sense, thereby reflecting in Spirit all other ideas, thus being father (Life), son (Truth) and mother (Love) to the whole universe. Here the order serves to establish the full reflection of God's ideas.

These three orders are the only ones in which all the seven synonymous terms appear together in the textbook. John Doorly naturally felt that there should be a fourth, for *Science*, because the holy city has four sides, which Mary Baker Eddy interpreted as Word, Christ, Christianity and Science. Praying about it he was reminded of the symbol of the seven-branched candlestick. The seven lamps are not connected with one another in a linear sequential way but related through structure. This is very typical of Science: linear sequence, when understood in its isness becomes structural being. Therefore if one looks at the Word-order of Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love, not as linear arrangement but from the centre, the shaft (Principle), one gets a structural understanding of the synonyms for God. Next to Principle, are Soul and Life, then Spirit and Truth, and finally Mind and Love, connected in pairs, all resting on the central shaft of Principle. To explain fully what all this means, to show the beauty and power of all that it implies, can best be done in classes.

3. *The dimensional aspect of Being: the four levels of Science.* This development of defining the seven synonyms for God and the four sides of the holy city as Word, Christ, Christianity and Science has brought us up to the time of World War II. Though it seemed that much had been achieved, there was still something missing. Quite a few paradoxical questions remained unsolved, and a fundamental key was needed to solve them. They were the paradoxes that

every sincere thinker encounters when studying the textbook. To take two simple examples: Christian Science teaches on the one hand that God knows no sickness and on the other hand that God heals sickness; that there is no evil and yet that we have to overcome evil. For those thinking along the lines of classical logic, such seeming paradoxes or contradictions are encountered again and again in the textbook. But in fact Mary Baker Eddy does not contradict herself, if the textbook is read with the trans-classical logic which she was already using a century before the other sciences and the world awoke to it. As she wrote the textbook in a structural way and not according to one-dimensional linear reasoning, her teaching can only be understood through a multi-dimensional logic. What this really means I have not room to explain here. (There exists a five-hour set of tape recordings on the subject of 'the logic of Christian Science'.) The main point is that John Dooley realized that the subject of the textbook has various levels of spiritual altitudes and that this is brought out by the various levels of Science. He showed that any subject has a different aspect according to whether it is treated from the point of view of Science itself, from divine Science, from absolute Christian Science or from Christian Science. Therefore the student must approach the textbook with a consciousness that is cultured in thinking dimensionally with a dimensional logic, and then the seeming paradoxes can be solved even rationally.

When Mary Baker Eddy speaks about Science itself, then the infinite One as such is under consideration. Divine Science contemplates the infinite One in its expression as the oneness of being. Absolute Christian Science defines the relation of Principle to its specific ideas, while Christian Science explains the relationship between Truth and error, the impact of Science on humanity. Consequently each level deals with every question very differently, and so the method of healing, for example, is different according to, whether our practice sets out from the spiritual altitude of Science, or divine Science, absolute Christian Science or Christian Science. I have tried to show the main points of this subject in my book 'The Four Levels of Spiritual Consciousness'.

The divine system of capitalized terms. Surveying what had come to light, up to that point, reveals something else of great importance:

the whole investigation had to do with Mary Baker Eddy's new language - the language of capitalized terms. The seven synonyms for God are capitalized; the four sides of the holy city as Word, Christ, Christianity and Science are capitalized; and the four levels of Science relate to capitalized terms. In this way we have three categories of capitalized terms, showing 1) the seven synonyms for God defining the nature of Being, 2) the fourfold operation of Being as Word, Christ, Christianity and Science and 3) the four levels of Science, depicting the multi-dimensional sense of Being touching every level of experience. These three categories of Being, when interwoven, form the divine system of Christian Science - just as in arithmetic we have the 10 digits, then the four ways of calculating with them, and thirdly their use when integrated in the various fields of mathematics (algebra, trigonometry, calculus, etc.). No wonder that one of the first marginal headings in the textbook reads, "The spiritual mathematics" (p.3). In this way the system of Christian Science comes out of one root, God, and combines the capitalized terms for God into "one web of consistency without seam or rent" (S. & H.242:25).

We can now clearly see the task that lies before us. In the first place we have to study the spiritual meaning of the capitalized terms. This will gently culture our consciousness to think in terms of categories and relationships of categories - no longer in atomistic truths; consciousness then gets a multi-dimensional awareness, so that finally "thought accepts the divine infinite calculus" (S. & H.520:14). A whole new world opens up and its language is wholly spiritual.

The immediate results

What were the results, we may rightly ask, of understanding Christian Science as a system instead of atomistically? It brought forth an entirely new understanding of the Bible and of 'Science and Health' as a whole.

The Science of the Bible. Equipped with a scientific, spiritual understanding of the divine system, John Doorly was able with its help to decode the Science of the Bible. Ever since the Bible has been in existence, hundreds of thousands, even millions of attempts have been made to interpret it. The libraries are full of such books. The interpretation changes according to the individual's subjective

approach and inspiration. Is everyone free to interpret the Bible in any way he likes, or is there a fixed Principle behind the Bible? If there is, then this divine Principle interprets itself through and as the system of divine ideas which is inherent in the Principle itself. Knowing the system spiritually, John Doorly interpreted the Bible as a coherent exposition of the system of divine Principle.

We must therefore see the one superimportant point, namely, that Doorly did not give just one more new interpretation of the Bible alongside the already existing million ones, not a million-and-first interpretation; he did not give one more interpretation in the same category as all the others. Doorly's interpretation of the Bible is of an entirely new category - an interpretation from the standpoint of divine Principle interpreting itself through its own system. Mary Baker Eddy supplied the key in the chapters 'Genesis' (with its main accent on the seven days of creation) and 'The Apocalypse' (with its main accent on the four sides of the holy city) - the 'Key to the Scriptures'.

You can argue that the Bible has given you a lot of inspiration, that many biblical verses, stories, symbols have been a guide in your life or have helped to solve a problem, and that all this blessing came to you without knowing 'the system'. This is certainly so, but this argument is beside the point. Atomistic truths are still truths. But how much more we gain from a subject if we investigate it structurally instead of atomistically! How much more the Bible will teach us, and how much more richly it will bless us, when seen in its coherency as Science!

If a hundred people can get a hundred different interpretations out of the same text, does this mean that the Principle of that text changes a hundred times? Or does it not rather mean that the text is being interpreted in a humanly subjective way? The divine Principle does not change, and therefore the idea of the divine Principle has definite identity; the symbolism in human language can naturally vary, but never the basic structure.

So, Doorly did not just give us another individually inspirational interpretation of the Bible. He let the system of the divine Principle interpret itself and because his consciousness was cultured through the textbook in the divine system of ideas he was a transparency for

Principle's interpretation. Let's remember that only like can understand like. The result was the overwhelming discovery that the biblical writers or editors were already at that time presenting their themes according to the orders and system of Christian Science. The same Principle underlies both the Bible and 'Science and Health'. This reminds us of the statement: "To those natural Christian Scientists, the ancient worthies, and to Christ Jesus, God certainly revealed the spirit of Christian Science, if not the absolute letter." (S. & H. 483:19)

In investigating the Bible as a whole, Doorly first saw that the entire plan of the Bible unfolded in thousand-year periods correlative to the order of the synonyms in the Word-order: Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, leading in the sixth thousand-year period to Christian Science in Truth and to the coming millenium of Love. Also each book of the Bible shows a systematic lay-out. Some of the books unfold in the order of the seven synonyms as given in the Word-order, the Christ-order, the Christianity-order, or the Science-order; others may present their subject in the fourfold order of Word, Christ, Christianity and Science, and so on. All this therefore shows that what Principle means to interpret is in the first place its own categories, its own structure, and not single incidents or aphorisms, not atomistic truths. This also naturally demands a completely new attitude on the student's part. It is not the interpretation of the parts which is of foremost interest, but the structure of the whole. The Principle of Christian Science is fundamentally holistic; the parts serve through their interrelations to bring out the whole.

Understanding order creates deeper understanding. Let us take an analogy: The play 'Hamlet' contains some few thousand sentences. Each sentence is a statement that can be read as such. If from the whole text we cut out all the sentences and put them into a bag, mixed them up, took them out one by one, and then set them down in the random sequence in which they were drawn out, what would we have? The same number of sentences or statements, but not a story that makes sense, not 'Hamlet'. That which gives sense to a text is relationship, order. Meaning is relational. Only when the parts are in their right place, with regard to the other parts and to the whole, does the whole or any part of it make sense.

So it is with the textbook and the books of the Bible. If you take any one of the biblical books, say 'Samuel', you may love many of the little stories in it and they may teach you many good lessons. But the whole book is not meant to give us a collection of lovely stories; it seeks to illustrate the one overall idea of 'Samuel', how from the inception of a tender, unpretentious idea our lives can unfold to the consciousness of being king over the whole universe. Within this broad spiritual story each of the lesser stories has its definite place value, which can only be properly defined and understood if we take a general view of the whole.

When we put the symbolism of the Bible back into the language of Spirit, expressed in the language of the capitalized terms for God, it becomes clear that the Bible tells *our* spiritual story, the structure of our own being, of man as the infinite calculus of ideas. Take, for example, the four gospels - the story of Christ Jesus as the scientific man. What is this scientific man? The idea of the structure of the divine system, the idea of the structure of the seven synonymous terms for God in their fourfold operation constitutes scientific man. Therefore the Bible illustrates Christ Jesus first in Matthew in the Word-order of the seven synonyms for God, then in Mark through the Christ-order of the seven synonyms for God, then in Luke through the Christianity-order of the seven synonyms for God, and finally in John through the Science-order of the seven synonyms for God. Thus the Bible becomes a scientific textbook. This also shows how a synopsis which puts the four gospels into one chronological biography of Jesus would destroy the Science of Jesus' life.

In thirteen volumes John Doorly interpreted a great number of the books of the Old and New Testaments in this scientific way. He thereby fulfilled another of Mary Baker Eddy's prophecies: "I foresee and foresay that every advancing epoch of Truth will be characterized by a more spiritual apprehension of the Scriptures, that will show their marked consonance with the textbook ... Interpreting the Word in the 'new tongue', whereby the sick are healed, naturally evokes new paraphrase from the world of letters." (Mis. 363:30)

The structure of the Christian Science textbook. The second major result that followed from John Doorly's exposition of what

constitutes the divine system of Christian Science concerns 'Science and Health' as such. In the 1950's it was seen that the textbook has a very balanced coherent structure, so that it can be understood as a most remarkable exposition of the idea of Christian Science, in which from sentence to sentence, from paragraph to paragraph, from chapter to chapter, there flows a consistent unfoldment of the structure of Christian Science.

Reviewing the whole development since 1910 one can't help feeling that Mary Baker Eddy's prophecy of summer 1909 has found its fulfilment. Much research has been done to fathom Christian Science as a science in the proper meaning of the term. It has been lifted out of a religious connotation. Many fundamental aspects of what constitutes its Science have been brought to light. We see now that Christian Science has clearly defined elements, categories, orders, systems, laws, structures, and also "trustworthy methods for the discovery of new truth within its own domain" (ibid.). The moment Christian Science is seen in its Science, it lends itself to self-instruction and requires no loyalty to personal teachers. The only loyalty Mary Baker Eddy demands is "allegiance to God, subordination of the human to the divine, steadfast justice, and strict adherence to divine Truth and Love" (Ret.50:19). A science must be 'open'; all must be given access to it. It must be open for discussion and free from secrecy or any sense of 'hush-hush'. "Let the Word have free course and be glorified. The people clamour to leave cradle and swaddling-clothes." (No.45:24)

Mary Baker Eddy: a Scientist of the first magnitude

Without going into any elaboration, I would just like to stress the point that Mary Baker Eddy must be acknowledged as a Scientist who was far in advance of her age. Today the scientific thinkers of the world begin to reformulate the concept of 'science' and stress in their trans-classical concept many points that Mary Baker Eddy's concept of Science incorporated already a century ago (structure, dimensionalism, holism, new logic, gestalt-theory, general system theory, structural text-presentation, and so on). Writing mostly in the 19th century, she anticipated the late 20th century's concept of science, and who knows, the 21st century's concept too. How sad it

is, then, to see that officialdom constantly writes and speaks of 'the religion of Christian Science' and that the so-called 'authentic literature' broadcasts the opinion that "Mrs. Eddy's use of the term 'science' is clearly congruent with its general use in the late 19th century", that "her system is far from rigorously systematic in character", even that she "does not seek to resolve intellectually some of the paradoxes" and that consequently "a reduction ... to a closed system was impossible". This denies practically everything that Mary Baker Eddy stands for as a Scientist. It bluntly denies that she discovered a Science of the highest order, but graciously declares that this "unstructured quality of Science and Health made it workable as a religious book".

Mary Baker Eddy discovered Christian Science as a Science, Christ Science; she called her textbook "Science and Health". What future can a movement have if it bluntly denies its basis? None. No wonder then that the world at large classifies Christian Science as a religious cult. And as long as the scientific nature of Christian Science is not seen and understood, we cannot communicate with scientists in other fields of science, though they are deeply interested not only in consciousness expansion but also in a consciousness shift.

Everybody agrees today that the Christian Science movement is in a state of malaise. But it is weakness to blame Boston for it. Boston doesn't have an easy job and I very much wonder whether the critics could do any better themselves. There is something true about the saying that a nation gets the government it deserves; the members of the Christian Science Church also get the government they deserve. So, don't blame Boston, blame yourself. For what? For staying in the old rut; for not feeling responsible individually for the unfoldment of Mary Baker Eddy's discovery; for being unwilling to undertake scientific research for the purpose of progressing in scientific understanding; for being too apathetic to think individually; and, first and foremost, for letting yourself be robbed of man's right to free information.

Christian Science teaches man's rights, among which are his right to read, to write, to voice his opinion freely. The Western World stands up for man's rights in the whole world, for those who are imprisoned and tortured because they have claimed the right

to read, write and speak freely. Why then should we be willing to be deprived of these rights? Why should Christian Scientists turn back to the darkness of the Middle Ages and Rome's index of forbidden books? The Roman Catholic Church has overcome this unworthy tutelage. Mary Baker Eddy expected us to be always in advance of the age, and not behind. Where is the old pioneering spirit, the spirit of discovery in the realm of spiritual Science? Have we become so apathetic, so manipulated and indoctrinated, that we don't want to get out of the old rut? Have we forgotten that "Science ... is revolutionary in its very nature" (ibid.)? The responsibility of saving Mary Baker Eddy's discovery lies with each one of us. Each one has to act boldly and not count the cost humanly, otherwise he will lose his self-respect - for having betrayed the idea of Science and Mary Baker Eddy.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE TEXTBOOK

Structure. Now I want to talk to you about the structure of the Christian Science textbook and I want to make it clear right away that I am not going to speak about the content, or the inner teaching of the textbook, but only about its structure. Also it would be outside my present scope to try to show what such a structural sense of the textbook implies in our everyday life.

As far as its text is concerned the single statements of the textbook are available to all. But what has not been generally realized is that a very wonderful spiritual structure underlies its text. What does structure mean? Structure is defined as "the interrelationships of parts as dominated by the general character of the whole" (Webster). Therefore structure implies facts (parts) plus relationships. The facts are stated in terms of words in the textbook, whereas the meaning of the relationships cannot be spelled out in words and consequently asks for interpretation. Therefore the main object for the student is not so much to read the text but to discover in the text the underlying structure, which involves finding out how to classify divine ideas into categories of metaphysics and seeing the relationships of these categories. So, let us now consider this subject more fully.

I. Is the textbook a scientific textbook?

What can one expect from a textbook? We may first ask ourselves what a textbook is in the proper meaning of the term. As Mary Baker Eddy called 'Science and Health' a textbook, we should ask ourselves whether it comes up to the accepted meaning of a textbook. What are the criteria for calling a book a 'textbook'? Have we considered this question at all in our study?

If one wants to define something it is very often quite a help first to ask: What is it not? A textbook is not a reading book; it is not a book to be read and re-read continually. Nor is it a collection of isolated truths, unrelated facts or aphorisms; nor is it a reference book, though this may sometimes be a side use. A textbook must be a scientific book, otherwise it cannot be considered to be a textbook.

The question that we must honestly ask ourselves is therefore this: Have we studied the textbook as a textbook or merely as a reading and reference book - not knowing what a textbook implies?

What then can be expected of a textbook? A textbook must present the fundamentals of a science; it must define these fundamentals through the elements of the subject; it must show how the elements are categorized, and how these categories are united into a system through definite relationships. This presentation should be shown in an ordered sequence of reasoning, leading thought in logical order from beginning to end, so that the whole subject is presented in a coherent, systematic way, bringing out its structured wholeness.

As 'Science and Health' is a textbook, the whole body of the text should be like a seamless robe, "one web of consistency without seam or rent" (S. & H. 242:25), all growing out from one root, the divine Principle. "From the infinite One in Christian Science comes one Principle ...", and from this one comes what? "... its infinite idea ...", and as a further deduction comes what? "... and with this infinitude come spiritual rules, laws ...", and as a further effect from them come "... their demonstration ..." (S. & H. 112:16).

When we try to describe the meaning of a textbook in this way, we must admit to ourselves that if 'Science and Health' did not come up to the standard of a textbook, it could not be considered a scientific book at all. If, as students of Christian Science, we have never seen what constitutes the elements, the categories, the system and structure of the textbook, then we have not seen it as a scientific book and we are building on sand. Christian Science would lack a scientific foundation and would be bound to fail in its destiny; it would be doomed to disintegration. Hence the great importance of these questions and the urgent necessity to strive, in all humility and sincerity, to find an answer.

Criticism from outside. The message of the textbook is not easily understood by the reader. Therefore the teaching of Christian Science has always been criticized. But theologians, philosophers, logical thinkers in general have not only criticized the content of the textbook; they have also pointed out very emphatically that the textbook is not a textbook at all in the true sense of the word. They object to the use of the term 'textbook'. In their opinion 'Science

and Health' is nothing but "a collection of isolated statements", a collection of single truths, metaphysical aphorisms and fragmentary ideas. They claim that there is "a constant repetition of the same basic concepts" and that "there is no logical succession of thought from sentence to sentence, from paragraph to paragraph and from chapter to chapter" - in short, that "the text shows no systematized lay-out" and that it is paradoxical, contradictory, illogical, unsystematic, unscientific and unstructured.

What is our reaction to these critics? As we know how much time and effort it takes to understand the textbook we may feel some sympathy for their difficulties. On the other hand, as we have a great admiration for Mary Baker Eddy and her discovery of Science, we also feel hurt by such ignorance. But can we disprove their criticisms? Just to feel hurt is not enough; we need to know the answer. These questions are of the greatest importance; they concern the validity of the revelation of Christian Science itself and therefore of Mary Baker Eddy's contribution to the whole world. Are we honest enough to admit that we do not understand the textbook as a textbook, or are we just going on believing that it contains a science?

Can we answer the critics? It would be quite healthy to take stock of our knowledge of the textbook and ask ourselves whether we could answer these criticisms. Do we know what the fundamental elements of Being are? Do we know what "the categories of metaphysics" (S. & H. 269:13) are? When the textbook states: "Divine metaphysics is now reduced to a system ..." (S. & H. 146:31), do we know what this system is, especially when we consider that system rests on basic elements, classified in categories and inter-related through laws? Can we define the laws of being through their factors and functions? What are the orders of which the textbook speaks? What is meant by "the divine infinite calculus" (S. & H. 520:14)? Did Mary Baker Eddy use these terms loosely, as some believe, or did she know what she was stating? To me it is quite evident that she stated what she meant, and meant what she stated.

Some other questions. The critics say that there is "no logical succession of thought" in the text. If you read two or three pages consecutively, do you know what you have read? You may understand

a page sentence by sentence, but after a few pages could you repeat the flow of the subject? Reading a novel, you could; reading the textbook, you can't. This is an interesting phenomenon and it suggests either that it is very difficult to understand the flow of the subject or that we study the textbook with a wrong approach, with an unsuitable model of consciousness. Or, do we read it in English instead of with the language of Spirit?

Many of us have read the textbook for many decades. So one would suppose that one knew it very well. But if you read a chapter, slowly, intelligently, ponderingly, could you afterwards say what the spiritual line of reasoning is from the beginning of the chapter, in its successive stages of development, up to its conclusion at the end? Actually, after reading the textbook for so long, a student should know what the proposition at the beginning of the chapter is, how it unfolds in spiritual order through progressive steps, and how it reaches its climax at the end. But, do we? Can you tell me off-hand, for example, what the proposition is at the beginning of, say, the chapter 'Atonement and Eucharist', how it develops through definite steps and what the climax means at the end? I am not so sure that you can. No amount of reading has accomplished this. It needs something else.

Another question. Do you know the order of the chapters in the textbook? Do you know what the first chapter is, and the second, and the third, the fourth, etc.? Just stop for a moment and test yourself. This is not a question of memorizing, but of spiritual understanding. The order of the chapters cannot be changed, as it is a spiritual order, and without an understanding of this order the textbook as a whole doesn't make much sense. It is relationship that gives the meaning, as we saw when discussing structuralism. We may understand each sentence individually, but the sum total of all the sentences does not give us the understanding of the textbook as a whole. As we saw before, the whole is bigger than the sum of its parts. So the atomistic approach does not lead us very far; we need a structural approach. If we really feel that the chapters are not arranged in any particular order, then we must admit that there is no order in being, and that Mary Baker Eddy was just playing around with the chapters when she constantly re-arranged them until

they were in the order in which we have them now. But, if we believe that there is order in being, and that the textbook explains that order, then we have also to admit that we ought to understand why the chapters are in the order in which we have them today.

Criticism from within. We have seen, first, that outside critics question the textbook's claim to be a scientific book; secondly, that we are becoming aware that the student of Christian Science cannot answer the critics scientifically; and now, thirdly, I want to draw attention to the fact that authentic Christian Science literature is also beginning to share more and more the opinion of the external critics. It, too, now takes the view that the textbook is not a textbook in the strict sense of the term and that Christian Science is not a science in the strict sense of the term either. We read that Mary Baker Eddy "did not write in a linear-rational style with one idea succeeding another in orderly progression" - thus denying order -, that "the statements that make up the paragraphs ... do not necessarily have any logical sequence" - thus denying that Mary Baker Eddy wrote logically -, that the paragraphs are "most often not clearly related to each other", and that "the organization of the individual chapters in 'Science and Health' and of the book as a whole partake of a non-linear quality" - thus suggesting that the chapters could be put into any old order! We even encounter the view that "Mrs. Eddy ... never ordered [the chapters] in such a way as to provide the readers of her book with a systematic exposition of her thought". Though Mary Baker Eddy defines her discovery as a system, it is said that "her teaching is far from rigorously systematic in character"; they write of the "unstructured quality of 'Science and Health'" and declare that all this makes "a reduction of it to a closed metaphysical system impossible". Even her use of the term 'science' is questioned and relegated to a meaning "clearly congruent with its general use in the late nineteenth century thought". One wonders what there is left over as a textbook; and here comes the answer: "Yet this open, unstructured quality of 'Science and Health' made it workable as a religious textbook"! How sad to see the most scientific textbook thus devalued to the level of a "religious book"! It is symptomatic that there is today a marked tendency to designate Christian Science more and more as 'the religion of

Christian Science', a rendering which is used neither in 'Science and Health' nor in Prose Works.

All this denies Mary Baker Eddy her rightful place as a Scientist of the highest calibre. It makes her appear as an exponent of the outmoded 19th century concept of science, though she declared: "Centuries will intervene before the statement of the inexhaustible topics of Science and Health is sufficiently understood to be fully demonstrated" (Ret. 84:1). Naturally, if one has not become familiar with the trans-classical concept of science which belongs to the second half of our own century, one does not have the appropriate consciousness for recognizing the more advanced concept of science in the textbook. For the fact is that Mary Baker Eddy's concept of science is congruent with the most modern criteria of science and also, it may be supposed, with those of the 21st century. Certainly the movement which reached its peak after World War II cannot advance by hanging on to an outworn concept of science.

What are our findings? As we saw before, when I was presenting the development of the idea of the Science of Christian Science, John Doorly's research on the textbook brought to light the fundamental constituents of the Science of Christian Science: the elements of Being, the categories of divine metaphysics and the system of Christian Science. This proved very clearly that the textbook is a scientific and not a religious book. As a scientific book it shows a spiritually ordered way, leading the student's thought step by step from paragraph to paragraph, from chapter to chapter, unfolding as a beautifully balanced structure of divine ideas. It becomes clear that Mary Baker Eddy's sense of Science is far in advance of the 19th century concept of science and that it consequently needs a structural sense of science - that of the late 20th century - to understand the textbook.

How did we arrive at the new findings? Can the structural sense of the textbook actually be found in the text, or is it something that we have made up or forced upon it through our own preconception of what its interpretation should be? Actually it came to light in a completely unpremeditated way; nor was it the result of a moment. It was, rather, a spiritual birth, which had its inception way back in 1914 (when the idea of order dawned for the first time on Doorly's

thought) and subsequently unfolded step by step over the succeeding decades. Its beginning was meek and now it grows sturdily.

In order to understand the structure of the textbook, it is necessary for a student to exchange his atomistic concept of science for a structural concept of science. Most of us were educated at a time when it was customary to think atomistically - studying and analyzing parts, accumulating isolated truths, pondering single sentences in the textbook or isolated verses and stories in the Bible. We were contemplating isolated truths rather than relationships. The trans-classical concept of science demands a structural approach, the investigation of relationships which brings to light order, and order leads to structure. To understand the structure of Being we need a structured consciousness. As only like can understand like, we have no chance of understanding the structure of the textbook with an atomistic model of thinking - however diligently we may read it.

What do we gain by studying the textbook structurally instead of atomistically? A great deal, because in a structure the whole is bigger than the sum of its parts. Let me illustrate this. Take a melody. Is a melody just the sum of single tones? No. A melody, it is true, needs single tones, but just putting single tones in any arbitrary succession does not constitute a melody. It needs the right arrangement or order of the single tones to produce a melody. This arrangement is not a random one. In order to produce a melody one must know the laws and rules of arrangement and not just the single tones. Through the understanding of arrangements something is produced which is bigger than the sum of its tones, namely melody. So order is creative.

The same applies to the textbook. It contains the sum of its statements. Now, the question is, can we see the arrangement of these statements? If so, we get much more from them, namely the melody, as it were. At that moment it is as if we were no longer reading the text but hearing its melody, and beginning to understand its harmony, because we are aware of relationship, which cannot be as easily read as all the statements, which are written down clearly in black and white. Through this structural approach, which takes relationship into consideration, the textbook gathers a much higher meaning.

Or, as a further illustration, let us take a watch. It is made of many parts. If all the parts are neatly laid out on a table, do they then constitute a watch? No, - though all the parts are there; not one is missing. These disconnected parts don't make much sense. But the moment they are all put into their right relationships we get something more than the sum total of all these parts - we get a watch, and it begins to move, to tick, to show the time.

Knowing all the sentences of the textbook doesn't make it tick. What gives life to the textbook is to understand the relationship between the statements, the orders - to understand the structure. A structural understanding makes the textbook tick. By the grace of God, Being was revealed to Mary Baker Eddy in a structural way, and it is also through grace that our age can understand this textbook with a structured consciousness.

Necessity for a consciousness mutation. Just as in other sciences, so also in Christian Science, an atomistic approach to a subject is inadequate, outmoded, obsolete. An atomistic consciousness cannot take cognizance of a structured subject. What is therefore needed is not so much a consciousness expansion, obtained by adding more and more facts, but a consciousness mutation, the shift from an atomistic to a structured consciousness. This can be achieved by directing our study to the investigation of the divine system of Christian Science, which includes the seven synonymous terms for God, the four sides of the holy city (as Word, Christ, Christianity and Science), as well as the four levels of Science (Science itself, divine Science, absolute Christian Science and Christian Science). In this way our interest is primarily focused, not on isolated specific truths, but on the categories and system of divine metaphysics. Mary Baker Eddy expected that "the education of the future will be instruction, in spiritual Science, against the material symbolic counterfeit sciences" (Mis. 61:4). As long as Christian Science is regarded merely as a religion it cannot be taught in schools, where scientific subjects will not be accepted unless they are presented in a scientific way. Without re-educating ourselves out of a religious into a scientific sense we cannot offer schools instruction in spiritual Science. We would all love to see Christian Science taught in universities, colleges and schools, and we are disappointed that after

a century Christian Science is still not accepted and taught as a regular subject. Furthermore, we silently accuse these educational institutions of being unprogressive, narrow-minded and closed to new ideas. Instead of blaming them, however, we should rather blame ourselves for not having investigated Christian Science scientifically, and therefore for not being able to present the subject scientifically. It is first of all up to us to understand the divine Principle of being in its Science so that Principle can be taught in its system, learned as a system and applied as a system. In this way we should arrive at the point where we could see and feel that man, as the idea of Principle, is a divine infinite calculus of ideas - a structured idea of reality in multi-dimensional operation.

II. The structure of the textbook

What constitutes the structure of the textbook? The textbook has 18 chapters, but the 17th chapter, 'Glossary', is "added" (S. & H. 579:4) and, being an appendix, does not form part of its structure; and the same holds true for the 18th chapter, 'Fruitage'. The first 16 chapters therefore constitute the whole structure of the textbook.

How is the textbook built up? We have seen that the underlying system of Christian Science is based on three main categories: 1) The seven synonymous terms for God, 2) the fourfold operation as Word, Christ, Christianity and Science, 3) operating on the four levels of Science, divine Science, absolute Christian Science and Christian Science. The category that determines the overall structure of the 16 chapters is the fourfold operation of Being: the first four chapters have the overall aspect of the Word, the second four chapters that of the Christ, the third four chapters that of Christianity, and the fourth four chapters that of Science. In Spirit everything always reflects everything else. This is the reason that the textbook needs four chapters to explain each of the four sides of the holy city. We may remember that the 'Book of Revelation' states that each side of the city has three gates through which the three other sides can be seen. And so it is with the textbook. Of the first four chapters with the main accent on the Word, the first chapter explains the Word in its own aspect, the second chapter explains the

Word reflecting the Christ, the third chapter the Word reflecting Christianity, and the fourth chapter the Word reflecting Science. In the same way the second four chapters explain the Christ reflecting the Word, then the Christ in its own aspect, then the Christ reflecting Christianity, and lastly the Christ reflecting Science. Likewise there are four chapters explaining Christianity through Word, Christ, Christianity and Science and, finally, Science is presented in its four aspects as the Word, the Christ, Christianity and Science. This results in four by four, equalling 16, clearly differentiated aspects of Being. Therefore the textbook is not just composed of 16 metaphysical treatises or essays but of 16 aspects of the Science of Christian Science which are inherent in its system. This is quite a difference!

Once we have laid this four by four grid over the whole text, which at first appeared to be an undifferentiated whole, we begin to realize that each one of the 16 aspects - that is, each chapter - also has an ordered lay-out. In most chapters the subject is built up according to the order of the seven synonymous terms for God: Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love, as given on page 465 of 'Science and Health'. Therefore the moment our consciousness is moulded by the defined tones of these seven synonyms for God, we can also spiritually perceive their ordered flow through a chapter. For instance, when reading the chapter 'Prayer' we become aware that scientific prayer is first shown from the standpoint of Mind, then from the standpoint of Spirit, then of Soul, Principle, Life, Truth and Love. Very often this structure is even more refined. As the seven synonyms stand for the one God, each synonym reflects all the others, which gives seven by seven, or 49, reflections of prayer. Don't think this is complicated. Just as every child can easily grasp the numeration table in arithmetic, so the student of the divine system can easily grasp the "numeration-table of Christian Science" (S. & H. 326:18). The only condition is that he must first get a definite grasp of the seven synonyms for God. The lay-out of the chapters varies: It may be according to the seven or the seven by seven, or according to the four or the four by four (like the Platform), or according to the four levels of Science. The system, as in a kaleidoscope, lends itself to being structured in infinitely individualized forms.

What is the content of the structure of the textbook? As I said right at the beginning, in a short talk like this it is absolutely impossible to answer this question in any way satisfactorily. It is a subject of "Science vast ... the song of songs" (My 354:22). I must therefore refer to the existing expositions of this subject. The shortest presentation is in my book 'The Structure of the Christian Science Textbook - Our Way of Life'. It shows, in an overall way, how from beginning to end the subject flows in an order which is inherent in the system of Christian Science through each one of the chapters and also from chapter to chapter. In order to verify my findings more deeply I have given talks on the lay-out of each chapter. Beginning in 1956, these talks will have taken me up to the 12th chapter by summer 1979. They have been taped and already form a series of 220 cassettes which is of value only for an in-depth study.

Why was the structure not seen before? Since the time of Mary Baker Eddy millions of Christian Scientists have studied the textbook earnestly and devotedly. In view of this the question always arises why no one else has seen this new aspect. This is a question of personal sense. Principle does not know people and does not work through people - rather in spite of people. Behind such a question is really the argument: Who shall be greatest? Principle's interpretation shines through the mentality which is a transparency for a specific interpretation. Man does not think; he is being thought. Right from the beginning John Doorly was open and receptive to this question of the scientific nature of Christian Science and so the idea of Science used him.

Also, a right idea must find the right time. The forerunners of a new idea must always first go through a wilderness experience. They have first to take the babe down to Egypt, take it away from the hands of Herod, and nurture it in holy secrecy until it is strong enough to stand by itself.

There are also two other prerequisites for the understanding of the Science of Christian Science, namely the language of Spirit together with scientific text-interpretation.

The language of Spirit. If we read a novel, we can read it through rather quickly, some even diagonally or with speed reading, and still

get the gist of the whole book at one reading. Why? Because it is written in the human language with which we are so well acquainted and with which we have been brought up. Yet if we read the textbook in our ordinary language, we have the utmost difficulty in understanding what it means. And we can't understand anything in it at all if we read it diagonally or with speed reading! Why is this so, when both books use the same language? Because the textbook is not written just in English but in the language of Spirit. The English text is only its surface language, whereas the deep structure language is the language of Spirit. As long as we read the textbook just in English it seems actually to be true that we cannot recognize a "linear-rational style", or any "orderly progression" or "logical sequence". No human language can read the language of Spirit. English, as all other languages, "is inadequate to the expression of spiritual conceptions and propositions, because one is obliged to use material terms in dealing with spiritual ideas" (S. & H. 349:15). To Mary Baker Eddy syntax became "spiritual order and unity" (Ret. 10:16). Therefore we cannot reason according to English grammar. We have to reason in spiritual order, which requires that we should first know the spiritual values of the terms: Mind has nothing to do with mind, Spirit has nothing to do with spirit, or Soul with soul, etc. Nor do such terms as 'substance', 'intelligence', 'power', 'law', etc. mean the same thing in the language of Spirit as they do in common language. In Christian Science we have to re-define all terms spiritually. When we have done that we begin to read spiritual subjects and then we can also detect spiritually logical order. Thus we get the spirit of the letter, which is its true meaning.

Scientific text-interpretation. I have already pointed out the difference between individually subjective text-interpretation, which is not an appropriate method, and scientific interpretation, by which Principle interprets itself through and as the system of divine ideas which is inherent in Principle itself. I want to add one other point. It is not an easy one to explain, but I will try to do it as simply as possible.

We are used to reading a text from left to right, from the top line downward. We read horizontally, in a one-dimensional order, or linear flow. Our whole thinking is trained to reason in a linear way

from one concept to the next. It is like a melody sung by a single voice. If I sing, I can only sing one part. But I think we agree that this melody played by an orchestra of many instruments is something much bigger. All the instrumental parts are played together, but so coordinated that one definite melody can none the less be recognized. So the overall theme still runs linearly. But what does the score, the text of the notes, look like? The score which the conductor reads shows the linear or horizontal flow of the notes for all the parts. But, in addition to this, he has to read vertically at the same time. So a musical score has to be read at one and the same time, both horizontally and vertically - that is to say, symphonically.

The textbook is written more like a score than a book. Why? We have seen that we have various categories of metaphysics and, as they are spiritual, they all blend. These categories are not in watertight compartments but reflect one another infinitely, just as in music the category of tones blends with a second category, that of rhythm. However, they do not blend at random, but in a manner specifically adapted to the theme. If various categories blend at the same time, how can they be written, so that they can be read simultaneously? In music a score can do that. But a book? Theoretically one could write it like a score, but the reader would not understand it. So Mary Baker Eddy had to make a compromise between a score and the usual type of book by intertwining the categories into a consecutive text. Thus we have in the textbook a multi-dimensional theme written out in a one-dimensional, linear text, and it is then up to the student to filter out of a passage which part belongs to one category and which parts to other categories. So the textbook presents its subject as a multi-dimensional theme in a symphonically linear way. It is like one big symphony for many instruments, with one broad theme running through it as one big differentiated whole with an inner balanced consistency or harmony.

At first all this may seem to you very foreign or irritating. A new idea is always irritating if one wants to hang on to the old. Do we prefer to hear a melody in a one-voice tune or do we prefer to listen to it as a symphony? It is the same with metaphysics. Actually it is only a question of consciousness. If consciousness is cultured in the categories of divine metaphysics it becomes quite natural to read the

textbook structurally. It is only a matter of spiritual culture. Without this culture it is evident that the textbook seems to partake of a "non-linear quality", as the critics maintain. When an orchestra plays a theme, it is usually not one single instrument that plays the theme in an uninterrupted succession right through. So we cannot pick out the full theme from one instrument on its own, but from a combination of all instruments together. This also explains why a student reading several pages of the textbook finds it so difficult to hear the theme: he so often cannot hear it because of the blending of the many metaphysical categories. Taking again the analogy of music, if we jump about from one instrument to another, listening a few seconds to this one and then a few seconds to that one, we certainly don't get the theme. Similarly, with a consciousness which is educated in reasoning in a merely one-dimensional line we can never see the structure of the textbook.

The place value of healing in the textbook. Having seen that the textbook has a spiritually scientific structure, and that it can consequently only be better understood with a structured consciousness, it is very natural to bring up the question of practice. What bearing has this new insight on spiritual healing? Theory and practice are not two separate things; they are one. We should be making a great mistake if we considered them as two things instead of two aspects of the same thing - divine Principle. Already centuries ago Aristotle called theory the most humane practice. If a theory is not practical it is not a theory - it is just a hypothesis. In the theory of science we learn: "Nothing is more practical than a good theory, and nothing is more impractical than a practice without theory". It is not a scientific attitude to say: I don't care about theory, I am a practical person. What should we practise, if we had no theory? Just beliefs, I guess. In Christian Science Principle demonstrates itself. We don't have to apply Principle or Truth to a situation in order to heal it. Divine ideas demonstrate themselves. Remember the statement we had before: "From the infinite One in Christian Science comes one Principle and its infinite idea, and with this infinitude come spiritual rules, laws, and their demonstration ..." (ibid.). Naturally, as long as we don't see that Principle applies itself, that Principle practises, demonstrates and proves itself, and therefore believe that we have to

demonstrate Principle, we have not touched Science. We shall still be ordinary metaphysicians and not Scientists. What is it that distinguishes the metaphysician from the Scientist? The textbook answers: "Works on metaphysics leave the grand point untouched. They never crown the power of Mind as the Messiah ..." (S. & H. 116:13). The metaphysician's method of healing is through good and right thoughts; the patient asks to be sent good thoughts, and speaks of his practitioner as having a strong thought. The Scientist relies on the ever-operative Principle and its infinite ideas and their demonstration. His practice consists of adhering unwaveringly to Principle, through spiritual understanding; he does not try to plaster Principle upon various kinds of diseases. Practice is practising our oneness with the Principle of being.

Sometimes we are praised for our healing work and sometimes we are accused of de-emphasizing it. Both arguments are beside the point. Again it is the argument who is the greatest, the best. The fact is that John Doorly emphasized healing without over-emphasizing or de-emphasizing it. He was regarded as one of the best practitioners of his time. He also wrote a book of 327 pages solely on the chapter 'Christian Science Practice'. But he also emphasized that practice without theory is not scientific practice but, rather, benevolent or ignorant malpractice. He was deeply concerned that most Christian Scientists were not their own practitioners and had to rely constantly on practitioners. When he was President of The Mother Church (in 1919/1920) and had to go round the Branch Churches, one of his main points was that 95% of the members talked about who their practitioner was and only the remaining 5% were interested in how to understand Science better.

If one speaks about over-emphasizing or de-emphasizing healing, one should first state clearly what the right emphasis is. Everyone can have his own opinion about this, but we are not interested in a personal evaluation. Have we an objective criterion for finding an answer? I believe we have. One out of 16 chapters forming the structure of the textbook deals with Christian Science practice, that is to say, one sixteenth of the textbook - or page-wise only about one seventh of the whole. If our own emphasis on healing is no greater than this, we are keeping it in the right proportion, and we

shall have a normal, balanced sense of the part healing should play in our commitment to Christian Science. This would accord with the statement: "Healing physical sickness is the smallest part of Christian Science" (Rud. 2:23) and so we should give our greater attention to the greater part. But when students regard healing as super-important and adhere to Christian Science for the loaves and the fishes, then they are not ready for the Science of Christian Science and would do better to leave it alone. They are not looking for the real thing, for that which is presented in the other 15 chapters.

Students whose concern is focused mainly on the healing aspect of Christian Science actually malpractise themselves unconsciously. If they look upon Christian Science chiefly as a method of healing in case they fall sick, then they are really asking for sickness. Healing only has a purpose for sick people, and in order to get a healing you first have to get sick.

As for myself, I don't like getting sick. So I apply my mind to the Science of Christian Science, to the whole structure of the textbook, which is true health, my true being. In studying and becoming committed to Science, we are healthy and stay healthy. After all the textbook is called 'Science and Health' and not 'Science and Sickness'. To us health should be something most natural, and getting sick should be unnatural to us, even an impossibility. So we may justly be criticized for de-emphasizing healing, because we don't like getting sick in order to have an opportunity of proving Christian Science. We should actually regard the preventive art of Christian Science as being of greater importance and providing greater proof than the curative art. My observation over the last sixty and more years is that most Christian Scientists turn to their practitioners for help more often than ordinary people call in their doctors. Some just love to be treated by a practitioner. Is this the ideal which Mary Baker Eddy hoped we would attain?

The textbook as our way of Life. Still, Christian Science is more than a curative art and even more than a preventive art; it is really the art of being - it is a way of Life. Our aim is to be the idea of the one Being. Mary Baker Eddy established the movement through convincing healing. But she also saw that "healing physical sickness is the smallest part of Christian Science" (ibid.). It needs something

more; for, since her time, millions have been healed. Where are they now? Mostly fallen away. What we need is to understand that man is the idea of being; then we can no longer fall away, because being cannot turn into non-being. This is why I called my book on the structure of the Christian Science textbook 'Our Way of Life'. The structure of the textbook teaches us how to go along the way of Life, leading consciousness in an ordered way to the point where we embody the spiritual structure of the textbook, where we find man to be the structured idea of being, operating as a divine infinite calculus of ideas.

III. Christian Science Today

During World War II John Doorly showed what constitutes the Science of Christian Science. He never claimed to have a higher revelation than Mary Baker Eddy, but always pointed to the Science and its system contained in the textbook of Christian Science. The time was not ripe, however, for the general acceptance of it, and so the discovery of the Science of Christian Science was rejected by the Christian Science movement. John Doorly suffered the fate of every spiritual pioneer, namely excommunication (1946). This meant that the scientific nature of Christian Science was excluded from the movement.

At that time the movement was at its peak, but John Doorly left the warning "that in about 25 years ... the Christian Science church will be in danger of becoming another small religious denomination to which humanity will pay less attention than it is even now paying", and added: "I am in no way desirous or willing to take part in any campaign against the Christian Science Board of Directors" ('A Statement', 1945). It was evident to him that the Christian Science movement by rejecting the scientific nature of Christian Science would deprive itself of its basis and so destroy itself.

Today it is only too evident that this warning came true, for the movement is going through a serious crisis. This can be seen from the considerable reduction in numbers of people attending the lectures and services and also of Journal listed practitioners.

Naturally the importance of a spiritual idea cannot be measured in numbers, in quantities, but in qualities: "A small group of wise thinkers is better than a wilderness of dullards and stronger than the might of empires." (My 162:7). It is very gratifying to hear that the textbook is still selling well, which would indicate that there is a growing number of students who study Christian Science outside any religious framework. Also, one can see the tendency to disengage from organised religion; our time seems to have become ripe for Science.

We should not blame the Church for this situation. We should blame ourselves. Mary Baker Eddy gave the textbook to all students. We have to live according to it; the Church cannot live it for us. We are independent thinkers who have been given the right to investigate the textbook. The future of Christian Science is the responsibility of every student. We decide what happens to Mary Baker Eddy's spiritual legacy. Thinking Christian Scientists are beginning to understand that Christian Science is a Science, that is, more than a static set of religious dogmas.

Today the question is whether the movement will face these facts and if so whether it is strong and brave enough to set the ship on a scientific course? Since Doorly's time much has changed. The present Board of Directors is not responsible for what the Board did 30 years ago. I see no reason why the present or a future Board should not correct the situation without losing face. This would be no unusual move. Such things happen everywhere and all the time in all the fields of sciences. No body of people can be expected to be infallible, but anyone who corrects a mistake can only win respect. The movement badly needs the benevolence, the good will and the cooperation of each sincere student.

Instead of using up so much time and energy on church quarrels, the movement could only gain by channelling the best qualities of the members into the study of the Science of Christian Science. Instead of criticizing the organization and its administration, our love, energy and time should be devoted to the understanding of the system of Science; then the higher would govern the lower scientifically, bringing forth a spiritual solution which would determine the right

human solution. Then the prerequisite for church government would be fulfilled: "It will evolve scientifically" (My 342:27).

But such an investigation would demand that the religious sense of unity would have to be given up. Religionists have an urge for unity among people, and whoever does not conform is considered a heretic who must be excommunicated. Scientists seek unity with the principle of their subject and don't mind a collision of thought; rather they feel that such a catalyst is essential for progress. A university department usually comprises professors of very divergent views and considers this necessary for the intersemination of ideas. As Scientists we should have a similar attitude. Listen to what Mary Baker Eddy says: "Drifting into intellectual wrestlings, ..." (this is what will happen) "... we should agree to disagree; ..." (no fighting, no excommunication) "... and this harmony ..." (she calls this agreeing to disagree not disunion, but harmony!) "... would anchor the Church in more spiritual latitudes, and so fulfil her destiny." (No 45:21). With such an attitude, far from getting rid of the "few thinkers", one uses them in order to expand into "more spiritual latitudes". Jesus also taught that the tares and the wheat should grow side by side until the time of harvest, when it becomes clearly evident which is which. If one tries to pull out the tares too early one can make the mistake of pulling out the wheat.

Let me finish with two quotations which speak for themselves:

- "Spiritual rationality and free thought accompany approaching Science, and cannot be put down." (S. & H. 223:21)
- "Let the Word have free course and be glorified. The people clamour to leave cradle and swaddling-clothes ... Truth cannot be stereotyped; it unfoldeth forever." (No 45:24)