39879

THE
PSYCHOLOGICAL REASONS
for the
APPEAL OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

by

Arthur T. Brown

LIBRARY
OF THE
MEADVILLE
THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

Thesis for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity,
Meadville Theological School, 1919

PREFACE

On Friday, September 20, 1918, I received a notice that a lecture would be given the following Monday on Christian Science in the local Christian Science Church. I arrived there just thirty seconds after the hour named, and was informed that there was standing room only. Now this local church (Evanston, Illinois) will hold at least fifteen hundred people. Evanston has somewhat less than forty thousand inhabitants. Speaking conservatively, then, and taking into account the probability that people came from other suburbs of Chicago north of Evanston, one person in every twenty-five in Evanston was sufficiently interested in Christian Science to wish to hear what the lecturer should say.

That this interest in Christian Science is by no means unusual is indicated by the opening paragraph of a newspaper report of a similar occasion which took place in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on Friday, September 15, 1917. The report is from the Cedar Rapids Republican for September 17, 1917. It says, "It was a large crowd, one filling the church to the doors, that listened to the lecture before the local congregation Friday evening by Wm. D. Kilpatrick on 'Christian Science, The Law of God'".

The extent of the interest in Christian Science, however, is best attested by the rapidity, the numerical extent, and the geographical range of the growth of the Christian Science Church. The first church was organized by twenty-six people (the total membership) in 1879. According to the list of

Christian Science churches and societies published in The Christian Science Journal for April, 1919, the short period of forty years has witnessed the growth of Christian Science from one, the "Mother" church, into 1766 churches and "societies", scattered on every continent, and on most of the more important of the world's islands. Nevertheless, though we find Christian Science churches or societies (churches in a state of "infancy") all over the world, by far the most of them are in the United States---1574 out of the total. England is next with 89, and Canada third with 46, leaving for all the rest of the earth only 57. Christian Science Reading Rooms, which constitute a distinct contribution by the denomination to missionary machinery, are found in about the same proportion as the churches in the several countries of the world. The number, however, is smaller, totalling 1252, of which 1084 are in the United States. It would be interesting to know just how many members these 1766 churches and societies have, but the Christian Science Board of Directors does not believe in "numbering the people"[1]. It would be, I think, a conservative estimate to say that the total membership is half a million. The number of people who are interested in "Science", as indicated by my observations of attendance at church services and lectures in Evanston, Minneapolis, and Milwaukee, would be at least four or five times larger. A further indicative of interest and of conviction that Christian Science is the truth the world seeks is the number of practitioners. For the whole world the total is (April, 1919) 6318, of which 5736 are in

1. Manual of the Mother Church, p. 48.

the United States. The average per church for the world is a trifle less than 3.6 practitioners, and for the United States a trifle more than that figure. In a word, forty years have made Christian Science a factor, particularly in the United States, which the student of religion cannot afford to neglect.

Especially should it be valuable to him to know why people become Christian Scientists. It is my opinion that valuable light on the religious needs of people to-day, in the United States, at least, would be furnished by the answer to that question. It is hardly likely that two people out of every hundred in this country would be interested in Christian Science did they not find therein some satisfaction for their needs. The answer to that question would also be worth knowing as a means of evaluating one's own religious faith. If students and workers in the religious field are to keep their faith and their efforts close to the needs of mankind, they must be forever sensitive to what other religionists are thinking and feeling and doing. In this study of Christian Science, then, I propose to answer as well as I may that vital question: Why do people become Christian Scientists. And my answer will be put in terms of psychology, which is the modern <u>aqua regia</u>. Every such study, however, requires a learned title, and this one, accordingly, I call THE PSYCHOLOGICAL REASONS FOR THE APPEAL OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

Although "the great task of the psychologist in the field of religious life is to return, through the distortions

and worthless accretions resulting from centuries of groping, to what is fundamental and essential in human nature"[1], one must often go far afield in order to obtain not only his data, but also the key to it. Accordingly I shall be obliged to consider not only the specifically religious aspects of Christian Science, but also its environment, and that of its adherents before and after they become Christian Scientists. Indeed, it is not too much to say that every element which affects human nature in any way is essential to a full understanding of the religious life and motives of man. It is impossible, of course, to make any such exhaustive study within the limits of this paper, but at least the general outlines of such a study, and its most important aspects must be included.

In any attempt to determine the motives of people, since we cannot go inside their minds and think and feel with them, we must first of all understand what it is that sets those motives in action. Accordingly, we must first of all get a clear idea of what, from the inside, Christian Science is--- not an easy or a short task. It will not suffice to gain a merely theoretical comprehension. We must know also what "Science" looks like to those who become interested. These two problems I will consider under the caption, "Media of the Appeal". Under the heading, "Who Respond to the Appeal", I will discuss the characteristics, personal and environmental, of those who become interested in Christian Science. Because

1. Leuba, Psychological Study of Religion, p. ix.

of the lack of statistical data, this problem is very difficult, and, indeed, cannot be solved with any high degree of accuracy. Nevertheless it is possible to bring out some valuable elements in it, and that I propose to do. After establishing, in this way, the objective factors of my subject, I will, under the title, "Why They Respond To The Appeal", discuss the motives themselves. It is only this third part of the study which is, in the narrower sense of the term, psychological. Finally, in my "Conclusions", I will give such generalizations as are suggested and supported by the data previously set forth.

ARTHUR T. BROWN

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

August, 1919

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	ii
MEDIA OF THE APPEAL:	1
THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PHILOSOPHY	2
The Christian Science Epistemology	3
The Absolute World	10
God	12
Universe	18
Christ	21
Man	23
Summary	28
The Relative World	29
Mortal Mind	29
Evil	34
The Function and Origin of the Relative World	41
The Philosophy Applied	47
Jesus	50
Christian Science	53
The Christian Science Purpose	55
Christian Science Practice	58
Conclusions on the Christian Science Philosophy	85
HEALING	92
PUBLICATIONS	94
SERVICES	99
CHURCH ORGANIZATION	101
MARRIAGE	103
WHO RESPOND TO THE APPEAL	105

WHY THEY RESPOND TO THE APPEAL 111

SATISFIERS 114

Elation 116

Submission 121

Tenderness 124

Acquisition 126

Anger 129

General Readiness 129

Gregariousness 133

Admiration 133

Awe 134

Reverence 134

Gratitude 135

Joy 136

Happiness 137

Familiarity 137

Idealism 148

ANNOYERS 150

Fear 151

Sorrow and Grief 155

Repulsion, Disgust, and the like 156

Sympathy and Pity 157

General Unreadiness 158

SUMMARY 164

CONCLUSIONS 171

BIBLIOGRAPHY 175.

MEDIA OF THE APPEAL

In this portion of my thesis I will attempt to set forth what Christian Science is. Like every religious system, Christian Science has a more or less coherent philosophy. But the intellectual side of the denomination is by no means the whole of it. In order to gain a clear comprehension of what the whole is we must consider the embodiment of that philosophy: its expression in books, in religious services, in healing, in publicity, teaching, church organization. Christian Science is not only a philosophy, not only an organization. It is a whole régime of life. We must, accordingly, attempt to set forth this whole. Like every other such distinctive reaction to experience, Christian Science is many-sided and by no means consistent. Nevertheless it has a decided flavor of its own, and it is that which is the central secret of its appeal. There is a distinctive Christian Science 'state of mind', an attitude of the whole mentality to experience, which keeps most Christian Scientists true to their religious allegiance, and which gives the movement its inner power. The healing activity of the Church is only one, though, numerically speaking, the most important, expression of this inner power. It is this aspect of the whole which we need most of all to discover.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PHILOSOPHY.

Most religions first believe and then reason about it. Christian Science starts with a full-grown philosophy, or, more exactly, perhaps, theology, and deduces its whole system of thought, practice, feelings, from that. Mrs. Eddy is entirely right in saying that "Without its theology there is no mental science [Christian Science]"[1]. But we must not expect too great consistency in this system of theology. One who reads Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, which is the principal exposition of the theology, for the first time, is prone to say that there is no consistency whatever about it. Such a reader is apt to alight with glee upon Mrs. Eddy's statement in the Preface, "Until June 10, 1907, she had never read this book throughout consecutively[2]", as her confession of incoherence. But such a judgment of the book and of its contents is superficial. A deeper study of it reveals a view of the whole of life as consistent, probably, as the views which the philosophers of the centuries have usually expressed in their weighty volumes. Nor is her system by any means sui generis. It has many likenesses to the Vedanta philosophy of India and to Neo-Platonism of the Graeco-Roman world. Those likenesses, however, are not essential to The Psychological Reasons for the Appeal of Christian Science!

1. Mary Baker Eddy, Miscellaneous Writings, p. 58
2. Mary Baker Eddy, Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, xii lines 20-21.

Note: Hereafter Mrs. Eddy's books will be referred to by title only, and Science and Health etc, will be abbreviated to S&H.

Turning, now, to the Christian Science philosophy, we are first concerned with what may, rather loosely, be called its epistemology. Mrs. Eddy does not, to be sure, manifest any clear consciousness that there is any such problem as the word 'epistemology' technically means. Nevertheless she does have a theory of knowledge---as applied to theology, and as applied to establishing the truth of theology.

The Christian Science Epistemology

As one aware of Mrs. Eddy's limited schooling and of her early religious training would expect, her theology is based upon revelation. But in turning to revelation she is not making a merely unthinking response to the religious 'folkways' of New England Congregationalism in the early nineteenth century. She has a profound distrust of the evidence furnished us by the physical senses. The evils of our earthly existence, she is convinced, are mainly due to our trust of those senses[1]. Nor is she thus distrustful by mere impulse, for she illustrates her argument against the evidence of the senses by citing the well-known facts of astronomy and of optics which contradict that evidence as it appears to the man unacquainted with those sciences[2]. Thus distrustful, however, she turns to the Bible as the source of religious truth. The Scriptures, she asserts, were her "only textbook"[3].

She does not by any means believe that every word in the Bible is the inspired word of God. Indeed, she recognizes

1. Unity of Good p. 8.
2. S&H, Pp. 119-123, passim.
3. S&H, 110:13ff.

the so-called 'higher criticism' as a valid addition to our knowledge of the Bible[1]. And it is, perhaps, significant in this connection that she, in her "Key to the Scriptures" deals only with a portion of Genesis (chapters 1-4) and with isolated passages from the Apocalypse[2]. That the Christian Science Church does not to-day accept the whole Bible, word for word, may be seen by examining the citations therefrom given in the lesson quarterlies. It is the usual thing to find those citations composed of a small number, or even of single verses from any given passage in the Bible. Those left out will be found inconsistent with the doctrines of Christian Science. Furthermore, she says specifically:

> "Spiritually followed the book of Genesis is the history of the untrue image of God, named a sinful mortal"[3].

Only the first account of creation does she consider a true account[4]; all the rest of the book tells the history of "mortal mind". But, despite all of these unsatisfactory passages in the Bible, it is, to Mrs. Eddy and to Christian Science, a revelation of the truth about God and man.

It must, however, be rightly understood if one is to discover there the truth. "The divine Science taught in the original language of the Bible came through inspiration, and needs inspiration to be understood"[5]. The method is "immortal Mind-reading", which means, being "sufficiently advanced in Science to be in harmony with the truth of being". When one is thus advanced, he becomes a seer or a prophet,

1. S&H 16:11-14; 523:14-21.
2. S&H 501-578.
3. S&H 502:9f.
4. S&H 502:1-8.
5. S&H 319:21ff; cf. 24:4ff.

"involuntarily, controlled not by demons, spirits, or demigods, but by the one Spirit"[1].

Now, according to Science and Health, Mrs. Eddy became such an adept in "immortal Mind-reading". She says that "God called the author to proclaim His Gospel to this age"[2]. Her book, Science and Health, she says, registers "the revealed Truth uncontaminated by human hypotheses"[3]. In other words, this Christian Science "textbook" is infallible[4]. We can, then, know reality, since it is infallibly set forth in this one book, Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures. But Mrs. Eddy warns us that this "book needs to be studied"[5], largely because of the vast difference between what is there taught and our ordinary ideas, but also because of the difficulty of expressing "metaphysical truth" in "material terms"[6].

Since this "textbook" is infallible, we find there what Christian Scientists are expected to believe concerning everything. One may not doubt any statement which comes to us "uncontaminated by human hypotheses". It is important, then, that we consider for a moment what Science and Health has to say about the Bible in addition to what I have already set forth. This book accepts without question the story of the flood and that of the Egyptian plagues[7]. It accepts every miracle recorded in the Bible, but maintains that they were not miracles, but

1. S&H 83:29-84:10.
2. S&H xi:32f.
3. S&H 457:1f.
4. S&H 99:15; 107:5; 108:1-18; 109:11-31; 110:11-24; 329:23; 460:24-32; and cf. 232:32; 233:25-28; 274:32f; 330:9; 410:1; 461:14; 547:3; Unity of Good p. 9; No and Yes, p. 11. These are only a few of many on this point.
5. S&H 147:17 (Italics Mrs. Eddy's).
6. No and Yes, p. 11; Miscellaneous Writings, p. 50.
7. S&H viii:21-23; 133:8ff.

simply the natural results of an understanding and use of "divine Science"[1]. Indeed, it is important to our subject to know that it maintains that Christian Science, though not physical, is natural[2]. Of the book of Genesis it insists that only the first chapter and the first five verses of the second give the true account of creation, while all the rest tells the story of human error, the story of "mortal mind". Without going into the details of its Biblical interpretation, it is important to note that, concerning Revelations x:9, Science and Health plainly says that in this verse we have a prophecy of the appearance of the Christian Science textbook. The "little book" is Science and Health[3]. Though Mrs. Eddy specifically claims the Sermon on the Mount as the Biblical epitome of Christian Science[4], she reinterprets the Biblical story in a considerable number of instances[5]. Throughout her reinterpretations of the Scriptures we find one method in use, the method hallowed by Origen:allegory, wherein we discern behind the literal meaning a 'spiritual' one. Mrs. Eddy, indeed, devotes a chapter of the textbook to the "spiritual meaning" of various terms used in the Bible[6].

With this brief consideration of the Christian Science view of the Bible, the importance of which to our subject will presently appear, we are ready to turn to the more philosophical aspects of Mrs. Eddy's epistemology. And our first query is,

1. S&H 83:12ff; Misc. Writings, p. 29.
2. S&H 111:6-18.
3. S&H 559:17-21.
4. S&H 271:22f.
5. E.g., S&H 131:26-134:3; 134:21ff; 135:26-142:24 (passim).
6. S&H, Chapter XVII.

What, to Christian Science, is reality? There is a sentence in Unity of Good which lets us into the center of the secret: "Everything is as real as you make it and no more so"[1]. But Mrs. Eddy chooses to "make" some things real, and others unreal. New Thought, so-called, insists that "thoughts are things", and Mrs. Eddy is not so far from this position as she thinks:

> "Christian Science classifies thought thus: Right thoughts are reality and power; wrong thoughts are unreality and powerless, possessing the nature of dreams. Good thoughts are potent; evil thoughts are impotent, and they should appear thus. Continuing this category, we learn that sick thoughts are unreality and weakness, while healthy thoughts are reality and strength"[2].

Again, she says:

> "Immortal Mind is God; and this Mind is made manifest in all thoughts and desires that draw mankind toward purity, health, holiness, and the spiritual facts of being"[3].

Reality, then, is wholly subjective (to speak psychologically). It is whatever makes for "health, holiness, immortality---infinite Life, Truth, and Love". And whatever thoughts and desires come under this classification are expressions of God, Mind, Spirit (synonymous terms). Reality, then, is to be tested by moral standards. Indeed, there is, implicit throughout Mrs. Eddy's writings, the conviction that there is a divine, an immutable standard of right and wrong. That which is right is of God. That which is wrong is an illusion, a "suppositional opposite" of Good, which is to say, God. We are here face to face with the fundamental philosophical

1. Unity of Good, p. 8.
2. Misc. Writings, p. 252.
3. Misc. Writings, p. 37; cf. S&H 518:21-23.

conviction (I avoid the word 'postulate' as emotionally inadequate) of Christian Science. That which is moral is an absolute real; that which is immoral or non-moral is an absolute unreal. And this ethical dichotomy of experience is, by an emotional habit of the human mind, bolstered up by elevating the half of experience which is considered valuable, worth striving for, into a super-sensible, a metaphysical, a real world. To describe this utterly worthful world Christian Science well-nigh exhausts the stock in the English language of expansive, colorful words, such as 'infinite', 'immortal', 'love', 'truth', 'spirit', 'God', and the like. Conversely, to describe the other half of experience, that which is not worth striving for, that which we, in our noblest moods, wish to obliterate, Christian Science similarly exhausts the resources of the language in repellent, odious terms, such as 'evil', 'nothing', 'lie', 'sin', 'sickness', 'matter', 'hate', and the like. Reality, then, in Christian Science, is what we want; unreality is what we do not want---with our best self.

Christian Science, fortunately, is not content with a merely speculative or subjective striving after reality. It is distinguished above---far above---other religions by its insistence on proof, or, to use the Christian Science term, "demonstration". This word, with its derivatives and variations, occur no less than 365 times in Science and Health. The word 'proof' and its plural occur 77 times. 'Prove', 'proved', 'proves', and 'proving' occur, together, 117 times. With this array of statistics we cannot fail to see how emphatically Mrs. Eddy wishes to convince the world of the truth of her

system, not only speculatively, but practically. Indeed, Christian Science constantly points, as everybody knows, to its cures as proof of its theology.

And the type of proof which Mrs. Eddy strives after is the mathematical[1]. Indeed, the word 'mathematics' and its derivatives occur in Science and Health an even dozen times. But, in this connection, mathematics must be understood only in the light of its more elementary forms: arithetic, geometry, and algebra, those forms which are strictly deductive in their logic. Mrs. Eddy starts with the proposition that God is All-in-all[2] and attempts to deduce therefrom the whole of her system, and, pari passu with her exposition, "demonstrates", as she believes, her thought by the empirical appeal to healing, whether from cancer or fornication or swearing[3].

The Christian Science epistemology, then, amounts to this, that we know truth by revelation; the Bible contains the truth about man, God, and the world, but must be spiritually interpreted; in Science and Health we find the correct interpretation, which is, that reality is ethical value, the truth of which is established by the practical appeal to the healing of sickness and sin.

1. See S&H 233:25; 298:21; 318:30f; and, especially, 113:9-27; 128:27-129:6; 546:31-547:6.
2. S&H 113:16-21.
3. For an excellent presentation of Christian Science thought in the characteristic Christian Science fashion, see the article, "Christian Science" by Charlotte Lilias Ramsay, CSB, in Hasting's Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.

The Absolute World

Christian Science is, as I have indicated, an ethical dualism[1]. The clearest expression of this fact is found, not in Science and Health, but in Mrs. Eddy's Unity of Good, where she says:

> "All that is beautiful and good in your individual consciousness is permanent. That which is not so, is illusive and fading. My insistence upon a proper understanding of the unreality of matter and evil arises from their deleterious effects upon the race[2]".

To say, however, that Christian Science is an ethical dualism, though it conveys to the psychologist the inner motive of the system, does not, in itself, indicate clearly the characteristics of each part of the dualism, nor the theoretical relationships of those parts. The separation of the desirable from the undesirable world is theoretically complete. Remembering that "Truth", "Love", and "Life" are synonyms of "God", the following illustrates this separation:

> "Truth has no consciousness of error. Love has no sense of hatred. Life has no partnership with death. Truth, Life, and Love are a law of annihilation to everything unlike themselves, because they declare nothing except God.
>
> "Sickness, sin, and death are not the fruits of Life. They are inharmonies which Truth destroys. God is good and the fount of all being, He does not produce moral or physical deformity; therefore such deformity is not real, but is illusinn, the mirage of error"[3].

The undesirable world, as we see, is an illusion, is "no thing". It is advantageous, therefore, to describe these worlds separately. I will do so under the titles, "The Absolute World", and "The Relative World". As we shall see, the world of sense, or of

1. Supra, pp. 7-8.
2. Unity of Good, p. 10.
3. S&H 243:25-244:3.

illusion, despite the assertion that it is nothing, has, nevertheless, a function to perform, though it is a function which results, according to the theory, in its own disappearance. Hence the word 'relative' is better than, for example, 'illusory'.

The Absolute World is utter reality. It consists of God, who is the uttermost reality of all, the real Man (I will use the capital for 'man' in the absolute sense), Christ (not Jesus, except as he is Man), and the real universe. Under these several headings, then, I will describe this Absolute World.

Before doing so, however, it is well to call attention to several peculiarities of Mrs. Eddy's thought which have a bearing on her conception of the cosmos in general, and therefore on that of the Absolute World.

In the first place, she rejects the theory of evolution: "Theorizing about man's development from mushrooms to monkeys and from monkeys into men amounts to nothing in the right direction and very much in the wrong"[1]. In discussing the 'real' universe, however, we shall see that she has a theory of evolution of her own[2].

In the second place, she seems to believe in various planes of consciousness[3]. This matter is important in connection with the relationship between the absolute and relative worlds, particularly in respect to the problem of life after death, which she seems to think of as neither entirely absolute nor entirely relative, though perhaps more

1. S&H 172:3-6; cf. 189:30; 551:12ff.
2. Vide sub. pp. 18-21.
3. S&H 82:9ff.

the latter than the former. She also believes in telepathy, though she does not call it by the name[1]. And she believes in what she calls "developed mental powers", a phrase which seems to mean that one with those powers can, at a distance and secretly, affect for good or ill other persons[2]. These flirtings with the occult will take on new meaning as we come to the consideration of the Relative World, and the Christian Science method of healing. They are a kind of connecting link between the real and the unreal worlds, and to that extent contradict the utter separation of those worlds upon which Mrs. Eddy insists most of the time. With these preliminaries out of the way we are ready to consider the Christian Science view of God.

God

Someone has said that Spinoza was a "God-intoxicated man". That being so, Science and Health reveals Mrs. Eddy as in the very last stages of such intoxication. The word 'God' occurs easily a thousand times in the textbook. But more than that, if one were to search out every reference to Deity he would have to look up in the book not only every reference given in the concordance to the word 'God', but to sixty-six other words as well! God is defined as "Divine Principle, Life, Truth, Love, Soul, Spirit, Mind"[3], as "The great I AM; the all-knowing, all-seeing, all-acting, all-wise, all-loving, and eternal; Principle; . . . . all substance; intelligence"[4].

1. S&H 81:31-82:1; 87:1-13.
2. S&H 105:22ff.
3. S&H 115:13ff.
4. S&H 587:5-8.

Indeed, practically every word used as a proper noun except names of persons is a synonym for God. The main exception is 'Christian Science', but even that is an aspect of Deity!

In order to get at Mrs. Eddy's thought concerning God, I will quote at some length from a chapter in Science and Health called "Science of Being". The paragraphs quoted give a fairly complete statement in short compass.

> "God is infinite, the only Life, substance, Spirit, or Soul, the only intelligence of the universe, including man. Eye hath neither seen God nor His image and likeness. Neither God nor the perfect man can be discerned by the material senses. The individuality of Spirit, or the infinite, is unknown, and thus a knowledge of it is left either to human conjecture or to the revelation of divine Science.
>
> "God is what the Scriptures declare Him to be,---Life Truth, Love. Spirit is divine Principle, and divine Principle is Love, and Love is Mind, and Mind is not both good and bad, for God is Mind; therefore there is in reality one Mind only, because there is one God"[1].
>
> "God is divine Life, and Life is no more confined to the forms which reflect it than substance is in its shadow. If Life were in mortal man or material things, it would be subject to their limitations and would end in death. Life is Mind, the creator reflected in His creations. If He dwelt within what He creates, God would not be reflected but absorbed, and the Science of being would be forever lost through a mortal sense, which falsely testifies to a beginning and an end.
>
> "The Scriptures imply that God is All-in-all. From this it follows that nothing possesses reality nor existence except the divine Mind and His ideas. The Scriptures also declare that God is Spirit. Therefore in Spirit all is harmony, and there can be no discord; all is Life, and there is no death. Everything in God's universe expresses Him.
>
> "God is individual, incorporeal. He is divine Principle, Love, the universal cause, the only creator, and there is no other self-existence. He is all-inclusive, and is reflected by all that is real and eternal and by nothing else. He fills all space, and it is impossible to conceive of such omnipresence and individuality except as infinite Spirit or Mind. Hence all is Spirit and spiritual.
>
> "Life, Truth, and Love constitute the triune Person called God,---that is, the triply divine Principle, Love.

1. S&H 330:11-24.

They represent a trinity in unity, three in one,---the same in essence, though multiform in office: God the Father-Mother; Christ the spiritual idea of sonship; divine Science or the Holy Comforter. These three express in divine Science the threefold, essential nature of the infinite. They also indicate the divine Principle of scientific being, the intelligent relation of God to man and the universe.

"Father-Mother is the name for Deity, which indicates His tender relationship to His spiritual creation"[1].

"Spirit being God, there is but one Spirit, for there can be but one infinite and therefore one God. There are neither spirits many nor gods many. There is no evil in Spirit, because God is Spirit. The theory, that Spirit is distinct from matter but must pass through it, or into it, to be individualized, would reduce God to dependency on matter, and establish a basis for pantheism.

"Spirit, God, has created all in and of Himself. Spirit never created matter. There is nothing in Spirit out of which matter could be made, for, as the Bible declares, without the Logos, the Aeon or Word of God, 'was not anything made that was made'. Spirit is the only substance, the invisible and indivisible infinite God. Things spiritual and eternal are substantial. Things material and temporal are insubstantial"[2].

One might go on through many pages quoting material such as this[3]. But we have enough of it before us to see what God is, according to Christian Science. Let us not be too critical of the phraseology or of the logic in the passages quoted! Mrs. Eddy has not attained her Euclidean standard of logic in her statements about Deity. But we can, nevertheless, get some order out of these multiform and confused assertiona about God.

God is reality---the only reality which is, except, indeed, that we, for the purposes of thought, divide God from

1. S&H 331:1-332:5.
2. S&H 334:31-335:15.
3. Cf. S&H 335:16-336:8; 336:19-24; 465:9-466:6; 467:29-468:7, 21f; 468:26-469:24.

His creation, which is also real[1]. In other words, God is substantiality, that which creates and sustains everything.

God is infinite, and so is all-powerful, omnipresent, all-knowing. He is both Justice and Mercy (capitalized). He is all-harmonious, therefore entirely beautiful, purely good. He is also love and tenderness. Indeed, Christian Science makes much use of the combined name, "Father-Mother" for God. Mrs. Eddy writes: "In divine Science, we have not as much authority for considering God masculine, as we have for considering Him feminine, for Love imparts the clearest idea of Deity"[2].

Nevertheless, God is impersonal:

> "As the words person and personal are commonly and ignorantly employed, they often lead, when applied to Deity, to confused and erroneous conceptions of divinity and its distinction from humanity. If the term personality, as applied to God, means infinite personality, then God is infinite Person,---in the sense of infinite personality, but not in the lower sense. An infinite Mind in a finite form is an absolute impossibility"[3].

In this passage Mrs. Eddy is trying to reconcile her constant emphasis on God as "Principle" with the demand of her followers for a God who is personal, a God to whom they can feel a warm, human, attachment. But her major insistence is on the thought conveyed in the term "Principle". "Principle is Mind, substance, Life, Truth, Love. When understood, Principle is found to be the only term that fully conveys the ideas of God,---one Mind, a perfect man, and divine Science"[4].

1. Cf., also, S&H 472:24-26.
2. S&H 517:10-14.
3. S&H 116:24-31; cf. Rudimental Divine Science, p. 2, No and Yes, p. 19, and Misc. Writings, p. 96.
4. No and Yes, p. 20. For S&H see the 118 references in the concordance under "Principle". Cf. Rudimental Divine Science, pp. 3-4.

It is, I must admit, difficult to know just what is in Mrs. Eddy's mind in this connection. Frequently "Principle" seems to mean "law", and so conveys the feeling of dependability, but there is, also, a suggestive resemblance between her thought here and the notion of primitive men subsumed under the word 'mana'. Both conceptions convey the idea of an impersonal, infinitely efficient force[1]. Perhaps we must sum up the meaning of "Principle" as 'mana' plus 'law' plus 'tenderness'. I suspect, though, that we can fully understand this concept, "Principle", only in the light of mystical experience, and this point I will take up later[2]. At any rate, it appears that this line of thinking led her to reject definitely the Christian dogma of the Trinity, which to her suggests polytheism[3]. But she has a trinity of her own: Life, Truth, and Love[4].

It is important to note that the Christian Science idea of God, in its insistence on His utter goodness, ascribes to Him ignorance of evil, and so, of matter, which is the embodiment of evil[5]. Accordingly, the Christian doctrine of a personal devil is definitely rejected[6].

In God, according to Christian Science, we have the beginning, middle and end of every 'never-too-much-to-be-desired' value. Christian Science elevates into God every ideal, every worth which men, in their most serious and moral moods, consider supreme. "God" consists of the apotheosis of all

1. Unity of Good, p. 20: "God..... the sole cause".
2. Vide, sub. pp. 77-81, 88-91.
3. S&H 256:9-13; cf. No and Yes, p. 15.
4. Vide supra pp. 13-14.
5. S&H 243:22f; 512:30-513:3; 279:6-10; 280:1; Unity of Good, pp. 1, 3.
6. S&H 351:16-26; No and Yes, p. 15.

abstract qualities after which we 'hunger and thirst'. And accordingly He is described by all of the words (capitalized), naming such qualities. The Christian Science God is the collective value-judgment of Mrs. Eddy. He is not the resultant of her value-judgments, however, for His qualities are in several ways conflicting. He is, for example, ignorant of evil. But He is also omniscient. The Christian Science God is, we must add, an emotional reaching out toward perfection, toward utter fulness of satisfaction. Psychologically, then, He is not different from your God, or mine. He is different, however, in that He is Mrs. Eddy's reaching out toward perfection[1].

God, then, to Christian Science, is all-in-all, the source and substance of all reality, of everything desirable. From this thought of God, Mrs. Eddy, with some success, tries to deduce every other element in her system of thought and practice.

> "The Christian Scientist accepts God as He manifests Himself in Christian revelation and then corrects his concept of the universe accordingly; afterwards verifying his conclusions in a richly modified experience with this human environment. In short the Christian Scientist affirms of God nearly if not all the attributes enumerated in the historic Christian creeds, and then, through thick and thin he sticks to his thesis"[2].

This statement by Mr. Moore is, in the main, correct. His chief mistake is in saying that the Christian Scientist affirms of God "nearly if not all the attributes enumerated in the historic Christian creeds". Calvin's 'inscrutable will of

1. In making this statement I am aware of the fact that James Henry Wiggin and others had a large share in the construction of Science and Health as it now is. But they did not affect materially the thought of the book, which is Mrs. Eddy's. They added ornaments of learning and burnished up the English of the book, but that is all. Cf. Milmine's Life of Mary Baker Eddy.
2. George H. Moore, Arena, vol. 39, pp. 299-300.

God' is but one instance of several ommisions by Christian Science of such attributes. The truth in Mr. Moore's statement which is important to our present topic is that the Christian Scientist corrects his conception of the universe according to his concept of God[1]. We turn, accordingly, to the Christian Science "universe".

Universe

> "God creates and governs the universe, including man. The universe is filled with spiritual ideas, which He evolves, and they are obedient to the Mind that makes them"[2].
>
> "The infinite has no beginning. This word beginning is employed to signify the only,---that is, the eternal verity and unity of God and man, including the universe. The creative Principle---Life, Truth, and Love---is God. The universe reflects God. There is but one creator and one creation. This creation consists of the unfolding of spiritual ideas and their identities, which are embraced in the infinite Mind and forever reflected. These ideas range from the infinitesimal to infinity, and the highest ideas are the sons and daughters of God"[3].
>
> "The divine Principle and idea constitute spiritual harmony,---heaven and eternity. In the universe of Truth, matter is unknown. No supposition of error enters there. Divine Science, the Word of God, saith to the darkness upon the face of error, 'God is All-in-all', and the light of ever-present Love illumines the universe. Hence the eternal wonder,---that infinite space is peopled with God's ideas, reflecting Him in countless spiritual forms"[4].
>
> "Immortal and divine Mind presents the idea of God: first, in light; second, in reflection; third, in spiritual and immortal forms of beauty and goodness. But this Mind creates no element nor symbol of discord and decay. God creates neither erring thought, mortal life, mutable truth, nor variable love"[5].

These several quotations from the textbook show us that the cosmos which you and I behold day by day, this nature "red in tooth and claw", is not real at all. But there is

1. S&H 124:14-19.
2. S&H 295:5-8.
3. S&H 502:24-503:5.
4. S&H 503:9-17.
5. S&H 503:20-25.

a real universe, a cosmos which is perfect[1], spiritual, not subject to growth and decay, eternal. It is God in expression. It is Mind (God) thinking, and so reflects God. But it is not the whole of God, for He transcends His universe[2].

Mrs. Eddy makes some startling applications of this conception of things, not only in respect to man(a subject which I will take up under that title), but also in respect to such things as rocks and plants and animals. For example, she says, "The divine Mind maintains all identities, from a blade of grass to a star, as distinct and eternal"[3]. The grass which Balaam's ass ate was not real grass, that is, but an illusion. The real blades of grass which formed, as it were, the suggestion for the illusion, still exist, and always will. And, of course, the ass still exists---or rather, the divine Idea of him, for "The only intelligence or substance of a thought, a seed, or a flower is God, the creator of it"[4]. So, of course, the only real substance of the ass is God. All this seems dangerously near absurdity. But there was a great philosopher who held rather similar notions: Plato. His archetypes, to be sure, were not of particular things. But he doubtless would have maintained that the 'assness' of Balaam's ass is eternal!

This Christian Science cosmos, real world, be it remembered, is not a mere attenuated replica of this dusty, sweaty world.

"All things beautiful and harmless are ideas of Mind"[5].

1. Cf. S&H 518:27-519:6; 530:3-15; 521:4-17.
2. S&H 331:1-3.
3. S&H 70:13f.
4. S&H 508:5-7.
5. S&H 280:6f; 281:14-17.

"The decaying flower, the blighted bud, the gnarled oak, the ferocious beast,---like the discords of disease, sin, and death,---are unnatural. They are the falsities of sense, the changing deflections of mortal mind; they are not the eternal realities of Mind"[1].

"All of God's creatures, moving in the harmony of Science, are harmless, useful, indestructible"[2].

"The individuality created by God is not carnivorous"[3]. (And here Mrs. Eddy quotes Isaiah xi 6 as a picture of the "real" world in which the "leopard shall lie down with the kid").

God's "beast is the lion that lieth down with the lamb"[4].

Of course these herb-eating lions are God's ideas, "but they manifest less of Mind"[5] than does man.

Not only does she remove the fangs from lions and the horns from bulls, but she also has equally revolutionary ideas about electricity, gas, earthquakes, and the rest of such things. For example:

"Electricity is not a vital fluid, but the least material form of illusive consciousness,---the material mindlessness, which forms no link between matter and Mind, and which destroys itself.....The material so-called gases and forces are counterfeits of the spiritual forces of Divine Mind, whose potency is Truth, whose attraction is Love, whose adhesion and cohesion[6] are Life, perpetuating the eternal facts of being. Electricity is the sharp surplus of materiality which counterfeits the true essence of spirituality or truth,---the great difference being that electricity is not intelligent, while spiritual truth is Mind.

"There is no vapid fury of mortal mind---expressed in earthquake, wind, wave, lightning, fire, bestial ferocity---and this so-called mind is self-destroyed"[7].

The temptation is too much! Mrs. Eddy's "real universe" is a 'perfect lady'! (Cf. Science and Health 516:9-23!) But, unlike the perfect lady, this universe does not grow old gracefully.

1. S&H 78:1-5.
2. S&H 514:28-30.
3. S&H 514:19-20.
4. Misc. Writings p. 36.
5. Misc. Writings p. 36
6. Cf. S&H 134:30-31.
7. S&H 293:3-23. See, also, S&H 93:17f.

Indeed, it remains forever young and beautiful. But it is a dream lady, for it is beyond our earthly ken. We must wait until we see with the eyes of the spirit before we may behold this beauty, gentleness, usefulness, harmlessness, which is the absolute universe of Christian Science.

But when we shall be able so to do, we shall behold not merely non-carnivorous tigers and oaks without a single gnarl, we shall also behold with the spiritual sense angels. But they "are not etherealized human beings, evolving animal qualities in their wings; but they are celestial visitants, flying on spiritual, not material, pinions. Angels are pure thoughts from God, winged with Truth and Love, no matter what their individualism may be"[1].

But we shall not, in that spiritual plane, behold only the set of divine ideas which first appears to our spiritual sense, because, though Mrs. Eddy rejects evolution as proposed by Darwin and other scientists, she believes in spiritual evolution, a process which forever brings forth new ideas in and of Mind, God. Such new ideas in the form of the spiritual realities back of trees and herbs are to be expected, as well as new Men and Women[2].

Christ

In the Absolute World we must place the Christian Science theories regarding Christ as <u>distinguished from</u> Jesus. Under

1. <u>S&H</u> 298:25-30.
2. Cf. <u>S&H</u> 507:15-29; 68:27-69:13.

the title "Jesus" I will discuss the relationship between Christ and Jesus, and, indeed, all that ordinarily goes under the term 'Christology'[1]. But Christ holds a peculiar place in the Christian Science system of belief, and so demands separate treatment. The "Christ or divinity of the man Jesus, was his divine nature, the godliness which animated him"[2].

> "Christ is the true idea voicing good, the divine message from God to men speaking to the human consciousness. The Christ is incorporeal, spiritual,---yea, the divine image and likeness[3], dispelling the illusions of the senses; the Way, the Truth, and the Life, healing the sick and casting out evils, destroying sin, disease, and death"[4].
>
> "Christ is the divine idea of God---the Holy Ghost, or Comforter, revealing the divine Principle, Love, and leading into all truth"[5].
>
> "The Christ is without beginning of years or end of days. Throughout all generations both before and after the Christian era, the Christ, as the spiritual idea,---the reflection of God,---has come with some measure of power and grace to all prepared to receive Christ, Truth. Abraham, Jacob, Moses, and the prophets caught glorious glimpses of the Messiah, or Christ, which baptized these seers in the divine nature, the essence of Love"[6].

From these quotations we see that Christian Science retains pretty fully the usual Christian ideas about Christ as distinguished from Jesus. But there are differences. One is, that God and Christ are not identical as Trinitarians commonly take them to be. Another is that Christ and the Holy Ghost are one and the same, whereas they have always been separated in Christian doctrine since the fourth century. To Christian Science Christ is, as it were, the pure reflection of God. But he is more. He is a kind of special function of God, His means of awakening mankind to spiritual sensitivity.

1. Below, pp. 50-53.
2. S&H 26:13-14.
3. S&H 54:9f.
4. S&H 332:9-15.
5. S&H 332:19-22.
6. S&H 333:17-26.

As we shall see, Christ is, so to say, the typical Man, who is, in the Absolute World, always a reflection of God.

Man

And with this observation we are ready to take up Man as distinguished from man. As we shall see, 'man', spelled with a lower case m, is a counterfeit of 'Man', spelled with a capital[1].

Man, the celestial, spiritual being, is a necessity to God. "God, without the image and likeness of Himself, would be a nonentity, or Mind unexpressed. He would be without a witness or proof of His own nature. Spiritual man is the image or idea of God, an idea which cannot be lost nor separated from its divine Principle"[2]. We have in this brief quotation the whole Christian Science theory as to the Absolute Man. Furthermore, after the conception of God, this conception of man is by far the most important in the whole system, not only as to its theory, but as to its practice.

"According to Christian Science", says Mrs. Eddy, "perfection is normal,---not miraculous. Clothed and in its right Mind, man's individuality is sinless, deathless, harmonious, eternal"[3]. I consider this statement, which is amply based on the textbook, as one of the most important in reaching an understanding not only of the philosophy of Christian Science, but of its appeal.

Turning, now, to the conception of Man as found in

1. This typographical distinction between the "real" and the relative or illusory man is not consistently made by Mrs. Eddy, though there is a tendency to make it.
2. S&H 303:25-30. Cf. 306:7ff.
3. Misc. Writings p. 104; cf. Rud. Div. Sci. p. 7.

Science and Health, I will first quote at some length the more important passages dealing with Man.

"Man is more than a material form with a mind inside, which must escape from its environments in order to be immortal. Man reflects infinity, and this reflection is the true idea of God.

"God expresses in man the infinite idea forever developing itself, broadening and rising higher and higher from a boundless basis. Mind manifests all that exists in the infinitude of Truth. We know no more of man as the true divine image and likeness, than we know of God.

.....

"Mortals have a very imperfect sense of the spiritual man and of the infinite range of his thought. To him belongs eternal Life. Never born and never dying, it were impossible for man, under the government of God in eternal Science, to fall from his high estate.

"Through spiritual sense you can discern the heart of divinity, and thus begin to comprehend in Science the generic term man. Man is not absorbed in Deity, and man cannot lose his individuality, for he reflects eternal Life; nor is he an isolated, solitary idea, for he represents infinite Mind, the sum of all substance"[1].

"Immortal man was and is God's image or idea, even the infinite expression of infinite Mind, and immortal man is coexistent and coeternal with that Mind. He has been forever in the eternal Mind, God; but infinite Mind can never be in man, but is reflected by man. The spiritual man's consciousness and individuality are reflections of God. They are the emanations of Him who is Life, Truth, and Love.....

"God, the divine Principle of man, and man in God's likeness are inseparable, harmonious, and eternal. .....God and man are not the same, but in the order of divine Science, God and man coexist and are eternal. God is the parent Mind, and man is God's spiritual offspring"[2].

"Man is idea, the image, of Love; he is not physique. He is the compound idea of God, including all right ideas; the generic term for all that reflects God's image and likeness; the conscious identity of being as found in Science, in which man is the reflection of God, or Mind, and therefore is eternal; that which has no separate mind from God; that which has not a single quality underived from Deity; that which possesses no life, intelligence, nor creative power of his own, but reflects

1. S&H 258:9-259:5.
2. S&H 336:9-31.

spiritually all that belongs to his Maker"[1].

We need not enlarge on these quotations, nor need we summarize them. They indicate, clearly enough, that Mrs. Eddy, and therefore Christian Science, takes literally the command of Jesus: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect"[2].

But there are some additional points which are worth bringing out. The real, or spiritual, or immortal man can do only good, never evil[3]. And, in this connection, it is worthy of note that Mrs. Eddy believes children are innately good[4]. The transmission of bad traits is an error of mortal mind. Indeed, birth itself is a "belief" of mortal mind. "Multiplication of God's children comes from no power of propagation in matter, it is the reflection of Spirit"[5]. Though this statement seems wholly absurd to non-Christian Scientists, as we shall see, I trust, in discussing mortal mind, it fits into the system without incongruity.

There is another aspect of this doctrine of immortal man which is important to this thesis. I will approach it gradually, through the lobby of "comeliness and grace". In the first place, Mrs. Eddy advises her followers never to record ages:

> "Chronological data are no part of the vast forever. Timetables of birth and death are so many conspiracies

1. S&H 475:13-22; cf, also, 76:15ff; 115:15f; 244:23ff; 336:25-337:13; 337:20-28; 300:28-301:29; 302:14-24; 265:10-15; 304:14f; 246:27-247:9; 516:19-517:24; 518:1-4. See, also, Misc. Writings pp. 79, 82, 97; No and Yes pp. 25-26.
2. Matthew v,48.
3. S&H 95:12f.
4. Misc. Writings p. 72
5. S&H 303:5-7.

against manhood and womanhood"[1].

"Comeliness and grace are independent of matter. Being possesses its qualities before they are perceived humanly. Beauty is a thing of life, which dwells forever in the eternal Mind and reflects the charms of His goodness in expression, form, outline, and color. It is Love which paints the petal with myriad hues, glances in the warm sunbeam, arches the cloud with the bow of beauty, blazons the night with starry gems, and covers earth with loveliness..... The recipe for beauty is to have less illusion and more Soul"[2].

Christian Science, then, has a recipe for beauty,---a suggestive fact when taken in connection with these two sentences: "The Mind or intelligence of production names the female gender last in the ascending order of creation. The intelligent individual idea, be it male or female, rising from the lesser to the greater, unfolds the infinitude of Love"[3]. Also, in interpreting the story of Eve and the serpent, Mrs. Eddy says that woman is the first to confess her fault: "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat'; as much as to say in meek penitence, 'Neither man nor God shall father my fault'"[4]. Then Mrs. Eddy goes on to say of Eve: "She is first to abandon the belief in the material origin of man and to discern spiritual creation. This hereafter enabled woman to be the mother of Jesus and to behold at the sepulchre the risen Saviour,.....This enabled woman to be first to interpret the Scriptures in their true sense"[5]. But the most unblushing elevation of woman into spiritual and moral primacy occurs in Unity of Good: "Man is the generic term for all humanity. Woman is the highest species of man"[6]. This championing of

1. S&H 246:17-20.
2. S&H 247:19-32.
3. S&H 508:21-25.
4. S&H 533:28-30.
5. S&H 534:1-7.
6. Unity of Good p. 51.

her sex by Mrs. Eddy appears also, in a less inelegant way, in her chapter on Marriage in Science and Health.

Before summing up this presentation of Mrs. Eddy's philosophy of immortal man, it is in order to speak of her conception of heaven, a subject which has played so important a part in Christian thinking throughout its history. We, more or less immersed in those traditional ideas, would naturally think that immortal man as Christian Science describes him, is man in heaven. And we are not far from right. Heaven is "the harmony of being"[1], "the reign of harmony in divine Science; the realm of unerring, eternal, and omnipotent Mind; the atmosphere of Spirit, where Soul is supreme"[2]. "Heaven is not a locality, but a divine state of Mind in which all the manifestations of Mind are harmonious and immortal, because sin is not there and man is found having no righteousness of his own, but in possession of 'the mind of the Lord'"[3]. But heaven is also a state of mind which can be attained in this erring world in a degree: "The sinner makes his own hell by doing evil, and the saint his own heaven by doing right"[4]. This all means, in brief, that the Christian Science state of mind, which I will describe later[5], is heaven, or harmony.

We are now able to summarize the Christian Science theory as to the "real" man. He is God's reflection, but he is not identical with God, for Deity transcends all of His ideas, of which man is the most complete and representative. Man,

1. S&H 6:15.
2. S&H 590:1-3.
3. S&H 291:13-18.
4. S&H 366:20f.
5. Vide sub. pp. 77-81.

however, is a generic term, of which the two complementary parts are the male reflection of God and the female reflection. "The ideal man corresponds to creation, to intelligence, and to Truth. The ideal woman corresponds to Life and to Love"[1]. Again we see that Christian Science expresses in its conception of Man its value-judgment as to human worth. We shall go astray if we try to fit this conception into a logical scheme.

Summary of the Absolute World

The Absolute World consists of God, who is All-in-all, of the universe which in "reality" consists not of rocks and stars and insects and disease and sunsets but of God's eternal and utterly good ideas, ranging from the infinitesimal to the infinite. But the universe consists not only of these ideas, but also of Man, who is, so to say, the summation of God's reaching out for expression. Christ, the type of the immortal Man, holds a peculiar place, since he is a function of God, namely, that of revealing to man his likeness to God, wherefore he is called the "Way-shower".

It is evident that in all of this ideal world, this absolute world, we have, as I have indicated in respect to God and Man, the value-judgment of Mrs. Eddy, and so, of Christian Science. The Absolute World is, primarily, the apotheosis of what Christian Scientists want most passionately, most supremely.

1. S&H 517:8-10.

The Relative World

No thoughtful person, probably, has failed to be puzzled by the problem of evil. This problem was given a radical solution in the days of polytheism by ascribing evil to demons. Christianity solved it by inventing Satan. But a pure monotheism cannot accept these explanations. And so monotheism has, for the most part, bungled the problem, or else ignored it. Even liberal Christianity has not made any successful solution. Christian Science, however, has made an attempt at solution which is the most radical within the ranks of Western monotheism. And it is that solution which we are to consider in this portion of this paper, under the title, The Relative World. I will consider this imperfect world under two main headings, Mortal Mind, and Evil. To be sure, mortal mind is itself an evil, and it is the cause of evil. But much that you and I do not consider evil is also included by Christian Science in mortal mind. Hence the division, which is for convenience's sake only. After presenting the material on mortal mind and its most aggravated form, evil, I will consider the relationship of the Absolute and Relative Worlds, including the origin of mortal mind.

Mortal Mind

In defining mortal mind, Mrs. Eddy says, "Usage classes both evil and good together as mind; therefore, to be understood, the author calls sick and sinful humanity mortal mind,---meaning by this term the flesh opposed to Spirit, the human

mind and evil in contradistinction to the divine Mind, or Truth and good"[1]. "The notion that both evil and good are real is a delusion of material sense, which Science annihilates. Evil is nothing, no thing, mind, nor power. As manifested by mankind it stands for a lie, nothing claiming to be something,---for lust, dishonesty, selfishness, envy, hypocrisy, slander, hate, theft, adultery, murder, dementia, insanity, inanity, devil, hell, with all the etceteras that word includes"[2]. Thus mortal mind is seen to be the ethical opposite of "immortal Mind", or God, the moral opposite of the "real" man, the opposite, indeed, of all the ideas considered under the title, The Absolute World[3].

But mortal mind is more than the blanket-term for the non-moral or immoral qualities of men and women:

> "The visible universe and material man are the poor counterfeits of the invisible universe and spiritual man. Eternal things (verities) are God's thoughts as they exist in the spiritual realm of the real. Temporal things are the thoughts of mortals and are the unreal, being the opposite of the real or the spiritual and eternal"[4].
>
> "The decaying flower, the blighted bud, the gnarled oak, the ferocious beast,---like the discords of disease, sin, and death,---are unnatural. They are the falsities of sense, the changing deflections of mortal mind; they are not the eternal realities of Mind"[5].
>
> "Mortal existence is a dream of pain and pleasure in matter, a dream of sin, sickness, and death; and it is like the dream we have in sleep, in which every one recognizes his condition to be wholly a state of mind. In both the waking and the sleeping dream, the dreamer thinks that his body is material and the suffering is in that body"[6].

Mortal mind, according to the textbook, makes certain erroneous postulates, as follows:

---

1. S&H 115:1-6.
2. S&H 330:25-32.
3. Cf. S&H 403:26f.
4. S&H 337:22-28.
5. S&H 78:1-5.
6. S&H 188:11-17.

1. "That substance, life, and intelligence are something apart from God".
2. "That man is both mental and material".
3. "That mind is both evil and good".
4. "That matter is intelligent, and that man has a material body which is part of himself".
5. "That matter holds in itself the issues of life and death,---that matter is not only capable of experiencing pleasure and pain, but also capable of imparting these sensations"[1].

"The foundation of evil", says Mrs. Eddy, " is laid on a belief in something besides God"[2]. This is the crux of her theory of mortal mind. Of course such a "mind" cannot know God, who is Truth, who is All-in-all[3]. It is always a "liar"[4].

In Christian Science mortal mind is often called the "Adam-dream", since the second account of creation in Genesis makes Adam the first man, made of the dust of the ground---therefore a material product. This whole second account is couched in material terms, and is filled with suggestions of pain, sin, and evil. So Mrs. Eddy, running true to form, says, "The parent of all human discord was the Adam-dream, the deep sleep, in which originated the delusion that life and intelligence proceeded from and passed into matter"[5].

Mortal man, then, the "material personality which suffers, sins, and dies", the creature commonly called a human being, "is not man, the image and likeness of God, but man's counterfeit, the inverted likeness, the <u>unlikeness</u> called sin, sickness, and death"[6].

Our whole usual interpretation of experience is called mortal mind by Mrs. Eddy. She is not as consistent here, as

1. <u>S&H</u> 91:25-92:6.
2. <u>S&H</u> 92:26f.
3. <u>S&H</u> 284:12ff.
4. <u>S&H</u> 554:20-22.
5. <u>S&H</u> 306:32-307:2; cf. 338:12-32, 282:28ff.
6. <u>S&H</u> 285:7-11; cf. 289:8ff, 14ff, 318:14ff.

the Hindus, however, who say the whole of it, both good and bad, is something to be gotten rid of, for she says, as we have seen in considering her epistemology, that all that is good, harmonious, beautiful, in this life, is divine, and so eternal and of God. But the whole of natural science is, of course, "mortal mind". Even our belief in gender is a belief of mortal mind[1]. Added to this is the assertion that human birth, too, is a "belief"[2]. Nor is this peculiarity confined to Mrs. Eddy. In a letter printed in Miscellaneous Writings, from Mrs. Dora Hossick, Carrolton, Mo., telling about the help received during her confinement, we find this: "If it had not been for the presence of my young hopeful, it would have been hard to believe that there had so recently been a belief of a birth in the house"[3]. Anything, in fact, which is undesirable, and therefore a manifestation of "mortal mind", is a "belief"[4], whether it be consumption, dyspepsia, tobacco, or "bad language".

Accordingly, we are prepared to expect that the human body itself is a "belief".

> "Mortal mind and body are one. Neither exists without the other, and both must be destroyed by immortal Mind. Matter, or body, is but a false concept of mortal mind. This so-called mind builds its own superstructure, of which the material body is the grosser portion; but from first to last, the body is a sensuous, human concept"[5].

Again, Mrs. Eddy says:

> "We call the body material; but it is as truly

1. S&H 305:12ff.
2. Misc. Writings p. 17.
3. Idem, p. 414.
4. Idem, p. 405.
5. S&H 177:8-14.

> mortal mind, according to its degree, as is the material brain which is supposed to furnish the evidence of all mortal thought or things"[1].

"The body is a lower stratum of the human mind"[2], says Stocking, who provides us with a mining engineer's interpretation of Christian Science in his novel, Carmen Ariza.

Matter, meaning by the term the stuff out of which the stars and the Rocky Mountains and the human brain and the violet and the White House are popularly supposed to be made, is, we readily see, only another form of mortal mind, according to Christian Science.

> "Matter and mortal mind are but different strata of human belief. The grosser substratum is named matter or body; the more ethereal is called mind. This so-called mind and body is the illusion called a mortal, a mind in matter. In reality and in Science, both strata, mortal mind and mortal body, are false representatives of man"[3].
>
> "What you call matter was originally error in solution, elementary mortal mind"[4].

Thus the White House is made of elementary mortal mind.

So, of course, the laws of health, as we customarily call them, are mere figments of mortal mind[5]. Heat, cold, fatigue, of course, are errors of mortal mind[6]. Furthermore, "A mill at work or the action of a water-wheel is but a derivative from, and continuation of, the primitive mortal mind"[7]. Thus the Erie Railroad, for example, is "primitive mortal mind".

1. S&H 189:15-18; cf. Misc. Writings p. 34: "The physique is simply thought made manifest".
2. Carmen Ariza Bk iv, p. 182.
3. S&H 393:6-12; cf. 158:26, 185:29, 198:1, 477:15.
4. S&H 372:3-5, Unity of Good pp. 50-51.
5. S&H 184:1-5.
6. S&H 184:18ff.
7. S&H 399:18-20.

Evil

It is plain from our consideration of mortal mind that evil is only an aspect of it. Evil is, so to speak, the essential characteristic or mortal mind.

> "Mortal mind, not matter, is the criminal in every case; and human law rightly estimates crime, and courts reasonably pass sentence, according to the motive"[1].
>
> "All sin is of the flesh. It cannot be spiritual. Sin exists here or hereafter only so long as the illusion of mind in matter remains. It is a sense of sin, and not a sinful soul, which is lost"[2].

Disease, of course, is a manifestation of mortal mind, a "belief"[3]. "All disease is the result of education, and disease can carry its ill-effects no farther than mortal mind maps out the way"[4]. Even the effects of poison are due to the beliefs of mortal mind.

And this point leads us to an important aspect of this Relative World which is "no thing". Let me quote the passage regarding poison:

> "If a dose of poison is swallowed through mistake, and the patient dies even though physician and patient are expecting favorable results, does human belief, you ask, cause this death? Even so, and as directly as if the poison had been intentionally taken.
>
> "In such cases a few persons believe the potion swallowed by the patient to be harmless, but the vast majority of mankind, though they know nothing of this particular case and this special person, believe the arsenic, the strychnine, or whatever the drug used, to be poisonous, for it is set down as a poison by mortal mind. Consequently, the result is controlled by the majority of opinions, not by the infinitesimal minority of opinions in the sick-chamber"[5].

A suggestive light is thrown on this deadly "government by majority" by Gerhardt C. Mars, graduate of the Garrett Biblical Institute, and sometime Methodist minister:

---

1. S&H 105:13-15.
2. S&H 311:9ff.
3. S&H 153:16-156:27.
5. S&H 177:25-178:7.
4. S&H 176:25-27; cf. 371:5-19, 373:14ff, 374:6-25, 375:26-376:5, 376:12-377:25, Misc. Writings p. 210.

"Misled by sense, mortal mind looks for the causes of its suffering, disease and death among outer phenomenal or material events, whereas they are always to be found in its own errors and sins. Thus from infancy to old age, all men, in their self-conscious state, grow up amid false conceptions of life and wrong motives for action. In childhood or in maturity, there is constantly streaming in upon their minds, from a thousand sources in the home, the school, the church, the state, erroneous---as well as true---ideas about all things, with their concomitant storms of contending sensations and emotions; innumerable forms of vice confront the mind, and a whole world of evil impulses, vanities, hatreds, chicaneries and lies invade consciousness, and produce inevitable results.

"In a word, the mistaken thoughts and perverted volitions, or the errors of sense and the sins of self, in both the individual and the entire community, come, in time, by a cumulative effect of infinitesimal causes, to be precipitated as fixed habits of thought and action, in the unconscious individual and communal mind"[1].

In other words, mortal mind has a social entity as well as an individual entity. And this "cumulative power of all the false thinking and wrong doing in the individual and the community, streaming out like a pernicious effluence to mislead and pervert"[2] is that much-maligned thing in Christian Science called "Animal Magnetism", and, when consciously used, as Christian Scientists believe it can be, to the hurt of people, "Malicious Animal Magnetism", or, as they like to abbreviate it, "M. A. M." Of course there is no real difference between animal magnetism and mortal mind[3]. Nevertheless in its "malicious" form it is the bête noir of Christian Scientists. Science and Health has many bits of advice to healers in respect to warding it off[4]. It is the duty of teachers to "thoroughly fit" their "students to defend themselves

1. The Interpretation of Life pp. 718-719.
2. Idem, p. 719.
3. S&H 103:18f.
4. Vide S&H 103:18-24, 447:2-5, 451:26-452:6, Misc. Writings pp. 40-41, 43, 114-115, 349, 384, 315f. For an antagonistic presentation of "M. A. M." see Frederick W. Peabody, The Religio-Medical Masquerade, pp. 168ff.

against sin, and to guard against the attacks of the would-be mental assassin, who attempts to kill morally and physically"[1]. Thus we see how the devil comes back in a new guise! If you can, "by holding the thought" of perfection, relieve a person of any disease, it is evident "by the law of opposites" that you can reverse the process, and by holding the thought of, for example, tuberculosis of the lungs, convert a well person into a consumptive. It is my opinion, based, however, on a numerically slender acquaintance with Christian Scientists who have told me about this matter, that it occupies a lesser place now than it did in Mrs. Eddy's lifetime.

There is another aspect, though, to the subject of animal magnetism which is illuminating. One adds to the power of animal magnetism, or mortal mind, whenever he "sympathizes", as we say, with one who is diseased or crippled, or otherwise subject to a "claim" of mortal mind[2]. This is perfectly logical, of course, for by so doing, by thinking, even, not to mention saying, "poor fellow" or the like to the unfortunate sufferer, one adds to the power of the "claim" over the person afflicted. By such a procedure, that is, one helps to build up the social entity of mortal mind, and hence is delaying the much-to-be-desired time when mankind shall be entirely free from mortal mind.

We are now ready to cut a little deeper into the subject of evil by considering what may be called the "pre-human" "beliefs" of mortal mind. Mrs. Eddy is not very clear on

1. S&H 445:2-5 (Ttalics Mrs. Eddy's).
2. Cf. No and Yes pp. 30-31.

this aspect of the subject, but her followers, with more or less warrant, have improved on her. Speaking of human reproduction she says,

> "From mortal mind comes the reproduction of the species,---first the belief of inanimate, and then of animate matter. According to mortal thought, the development of embryonic mortal mind commences in the lower, basal portion of the brain, and goes on in an ascending scale by evolution, keeping always in the direct line of matter, for matter is the subjective condition of mortal mind.
>
> "Next we have the formation of so-called embryonic mortal mind, afterwards mortal men or mortals,---all this while matter is a belief, ignorant of itself, ignorant of what it is supposed to produce. The mortal says that an inanimate unconscious seedling is producing mortals, both body and mind; and yet neither a mortal mind nor the immortal Mind is found in brain or elsewhere in matter or in mortals.
>
> "This embryonic and materialistic human belief called mortal man in turn fills itself with thoughts of pain and pleasure, of life and death, and arranges itself into five so-called senses, which presently measure mind by the size of a brain and the bulk of a body, called man"[1].

Apparently this passage in Science and Health is the basis[2] for Stocking's attempt to mediate the evolutionary theory to Christian Scientists in the following words:

> "It is the communal mortal mind that stands as the opposite and negative of the infinite mind that is God, and that.....is but a supposition, without basis of real principle or fact. It has its law of evolution, too, and evolves its types in human beings and animals, in mountain, tree, and stream. All material nature, in fact, is but the manifestation, or reflection, of this communal mortal mind.
>
> "But though God had no beginning, and will have no ending, this communal mortal mind, on the contrary, did have a seeming beginning, and will end its pseudo-existence. It seemingly began as a mental mist. It seemingly evolved form and became active. It seemingly evolved its universe, and its earth as its lower stratum. It made its firmament, and it gradually filled its seas with moving things that manifested its idea of life. Slowly, throughout inconceivable eons of time, it unrolled

1. S&H 189:25-190:13.
2. Cf. S&H 372:3-5, 399:18-20.

> and evolved, until at last, through untold generations of stupid, cluggish, often revolting animal forms, it began to evolve a type of mind, a crude representation of the mind that is God, and manifesting its own concept of intelligence. That type was primitive man"[1].

Stocking's novel, from which this quotation is taken, is not of the "authorized literature" put forth by the Christian Science Church. And so it is permissible, even for an outsider, to doubt its orthodoxy. Nevertheless it is important, for it represents the thinking of the better educated Christian Scientists of to-day. Mrs. Eddy leaves the matter of which Stocking treats sufficiently vague so that his interpretation is quite possible. And so I am inclined to adopt it as what Mrs. Eddy herself would have made, had she been forced to face this issue squarely. Certainly there is sufficient warrant for this decision in the total concept, mortal mind, as expounded in the textbook.

At any rate, this modern interpretation by a follower, coupled with what we have already taken from Science and Health, helps us to see that earthquakes, tornadoes, lightning, cobras, and tidal waves, are only manifestations of mortal mind[2].

And, since the essence of mortal mind is evil, it is logical that death, the "last enemy that shall be destroyed"[3], is also a part of the "Adam-dream". Mrs. Eddy explains the action of mortal mind in producing the "mortal dream", death, thus:

> "If you take away this erring mind, the mortal material body loses all appearance of life or action, and this so-called mind then calls itself dead; but the human mind still holds in belief a body, through which it acts and which appears to the human mind to live,---

1. Carmen Ariza, iv 99.
2. S&H 293:21-23.
3. I Corinthians xv 26.

> a body like the one it had before death. This body is put off only as the mortal, erring mind yields to God, immortal Mind, and man is found in His image"[1].

The second half of this quotation introduces a belief in Christian Science to which I shall return shortly: the belief in a second "mortal life", after death, and consequently, in a "second death".

And, of course, since mortal mind, of which death is a "belief", is nothing, death itself can be overcome[2]. To most people this idea seems nonsense, but it is interesting to note that even so keen a thinker as Henri Bergson says that "perhaps" we shall some time be able to overcome death[3]. But his thought is not, I think, the same as that of Christian Science. We get a carefully thought out version of the Christian Science idea about death in Mars' The Interpretation of Life, which is the most formidable and learned exposition and mediation to philosophy of Christian Science of which I know.

> "Death", he says, "must always be understood as a disaster, as the summation of all human ills, and the destruction of all human hopes. It is a defeat because it is the inevitable result and penalty of error and sin, and therefore a standing proof of man's failure, as yet, to have settled his specific problem of true thinking and right willing. In other words, it is a constant declaration that the spiritual man has as yet failed to win his divine right of dominion over all things, necessarily included in which is the subordination and control of the natural man.
>
> ".....the substantial and causal ground of death is error (false thought) and sin (wrong will), which in their nature are unrealities; while the substantial and causal ground of life is Truth and Goodness, the only real thought and real will for man, as a rational being. Hence the problem is solely one of a change of mind, a transformation of the entire consciousness, in virtue of which the unreality of error and sin is

1. S&H 187:27-188:2; cf. 42:6-8.
2. No and Yes p. 13; cf. S&H 325:2, 426:28-32, 573:27, 113:19, 429:11-18, 44:1-12, 347:7, 76:30, 289:15, etc.
3. Bergson, Creative Evolution p. 271.

denied and renounced, while the reality of Truth and Goodness is understood and willed.....

"By this victory over death.....Mrs. Eddy does not mean that man is to discover some fountain of youth in the material world by which he is to live on perpetually in the present, natural condition of things. Her meaning rather is that man is first to win that mastery over his material surroundings which Jesus won at his resurrection, and them to go on to the transformation of the natural world, by the transformation of his consciousness, into that spiritual world which Jesus entered, on his ascension"[1].

In the second half of the last preceding quotation from Science and Health we were introduced to the Christian Science doctrine of life after death, and of the "second death". Mrs. Eddy does not believe that we are automatically made perfect by death, as do most Protestants, particularly those who reject the doctrine of hell. Witness this:

"If the change called death destroyed the belief in sin, sickness, and death, happiness would be won at the moment of dissolution, and be forever permanent; but this is not so. Perfection is gained only by perfection. They who are unrighteous shall be unrighteous still, until, in divine Science Christ, Truth, removes all ignorance and sin.

"The sin and error which possess us at the instant of death do not cease at that moment, but endure until the death of these errors. To be wholly spiritual, man must be sinless, and be becomes thus only when he reaches perfection. The murderer, though slain in the act, does not thereby forsake sin. He is no more spiritual for believing that his body died and learning that his cruel mind died not. His thoughts are no purer until evil is disarmed by good. His body is as material as his mind, and vice versa.

"The suppositions that sin is pardoned while unforsaken, that happiness can be genuine in the midst of sin, that the so-called death of the body frees from sin, and that God's pardon is aught but the destruction of sin,---these are grave mistakes. We know that all will be changed 'in the twinkling of an eye,' when the last trump shall sound; but this last call of wisdom cannot come till mortals have already yielded to each lesser call in the growth of Christian character. Mortals need not fancy that belief in the experience of death will awaken them to glorified being"[2].

1. The Interpretation of Life pp. 693-695.
2. S&H 290:16-291:11.

This second life is material and involves suffering, though invisible to us, and hence will be subject to death as is this life. The only way out is the "spiritual understanding of Life"[1]. And this second life endures a greater or lesser time depending on the "tenacity of error"[2]. Its death, apparently, is the attainment of spiritual understanding, and not the mere passing to another plane of probation.

The basis of this theory, aside from its logical place in Mrs. Eddy's total system, is the record in the Bible of Jesus' resurrection and ascension. Mrs. Eddy firmly believed that Jesus was resurrected, and that his existence between that event and his ascension is the proof of the second mortal life. His ascension consisted in his winning of complete spirituality, whereby he disappeared to mortal sense[3].

The Function and Origin of The Relative World

Although Mrs. Eddy asserts times almost without number that mortal mind, and all of its manifestations, whether they be matter, lightning, sickness, sin, or death, are unreal, illusory, nothing, nevertheless mortal mind has a function to perform in the total system of things, and so, I must insist, it <u>has for Christian Science</u> a reality. It is that function, then, that reality, and the origin of the relative world, which I propose to discuss in the next few pages.

> "Divine Science", says Mrs. Eddy, "reveals the necessity of sufficient suffering, either before or after death, to quench the love of sin. To remit the penalty due for sin, would be for Truth to pardon error.

1. <u>S&H</u> 77:5-13; 36:21ff.
2. <u>S&H</u> 77:16-18; <u>Unity of Good</u> p. 3; <u>No and Yes</u> pp. 27-28; <u>Misc. Writings</u> pp. 3, 43.

Escape from punishment is not in accordance with God's government, since justice is the handmaid of mercy"[1].

"The sharp experiences of belief in the suppositious life of matter, as well as our disappointments and ceaseless woes, turn us like tired children to the arms of divine Love"[2].

"Progress is born of experience. It is the ripening of mortal man, through which the mortal is dropped for the immortal. Either here or hereafter, suffering or Science must destroy all illusions regarding life and mind, and regenerate material sense and self"[3].

"Disease in error, more than ease in it, tends to destroy error: the sick often are thereby led to Christ, Truth, and to learn their way out of both sickness and sin"[4].

"The knowledge of evil that brings on repentance is the most hopeful stage of mortal mentality"[5].

"The chaos of mortal mind is made the stepping-stone to the cosmos of immortal Mind"[6].

"Sorrow is the harbinger of joy. Mortal throes of anguish forward the birth of immortal being; but divine Science wipes away all tears"[7].

I have quoted enough to show that Mrs. Eddy believes that suffering has a function to perform, namely, to awaken mortal man to his predicament, and so spur him on to seek truth.

But mortal mind in general, and not merely its most painful aspects, has a function to perform. We find the clearest expression of it in connection with Mrs. Eddy's "Key" to the book of Genesis:

"Spiritually followed, the book of Genesis is the history of the untrue image of God, named a sinful mortal. This deflection of being, rightly viewed, serves to suggest the proper reflection of God and the spiritual actuality of man, as given in the first chapter of Genesis. Even thus the crude forms of human thought take on higher symbols and significations, when scientifically Christian views of the universe appear, illuminating time with the glory of eternity"[8].

This means that mortal mind, though it is "nothing", nevertheless, once the key to Truth has come by revelation, becomes symbolic of Truth. This is true by the law of opposites, of which

1. S&H 36:4-9; cf. No and Yes pp. 30-31, 42, S&H 332:14ff.
2. S&H 332:26-29.
3. S&H 296:4-9.
4. Misc. Writings p. 85.
5. Misc. Writings p. 109.
6. Unity of Good p. 56.
7. Unity of Good p. 57.
8. S&H 502:9-17 (Italics mine); cf. Unity of Good p. 61.

Mrs. Eddy makes much, and which will be discussed in this paper later[1]. According to this law, you can get truth from error by reversing the error---changing its 'sign', to speak mathematically[2].

But mortal mind is not unmixed error! Mrs. Eddy says so:

> "Mortal man is a kingdom divided against itself. with the same breath he articulates truth and error. We say that God is All, and there is none beside Him, and then talk of sin and sinners as real. We call God omnipotent and omnipresent, and then conjure up, from the dark abyss of nothingness, a powerful presence named evil. We say that harmony is real, and inharmony is its opposite, and therefore unreal; yet we descant upon sickness, sin, and death as realities"[3].

Furthermore, there are, according to Mrs. Eddy, three degrees of mortal mind. The first is depravity, or the physical degree, in which we find only evil, and no spirituality or morality whatsoever. The second degree finds "Evil beliefs disappearing". It is called "Moral", and is characterized by "Humanity, honesty, affection, compassion, hope, faith, meekness, temperance". The third degree, still called "mortal mind", is named "Understanding", or "Spiritual", and it is characterized by "Wisdom, purity, spiritual understanding, spiritual power, love, health, holiness"[4]. To be sure, in this third degree mortal mind disappears, and man as God's image appears! But we see from Mrs. Eddy's own words that mortal mind has a function, and a reality. If "nothing" can be mixed with "something", it surely is not pure nothing! In other words, mortal mind is one of those planes of consciousness in which Mrs. Eddy believes. There seem to be three

1. V. sub. pp. 45f.
2. S&H 282:31-283:1.
3. Unity of Good p. 60.
4. S&H 115:20-116:3.

principal planes: mortal mind as pure evil; mortal mind as mixed evil and good---a plane which is also found after death,---and immortal Mind, which is unmixed good[1].

We are now ready to consider the Christian Science teachings as to the origin of mortal mind, which is the most puzzling problem in the whole philosophy of Mrs. Eddy. The fact is, Mrs. Eddy nowhere ~~does~~ gives an answer consistent with her system. She thinks she does, to be sure, but her answer is merely a cloud of words. Nevertheless, without realizing it, she does give, psychologically speaking, the true answer to the puzzle.

The answer which she thinks she makes comes in connection with the second account of creation in Genesis. This account, she says, is that of the origin and history of mortal mind[2]. And she seizes upon Genesis ii, 6: "But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground", as the start of the whole process. This "mist" is a "mist of obscurity evolved by error", which "deepens the false claim, and finally declares that God knows error and that error can improve His creation. Although presenting the exact opposite of Truth, the lie claims to be truth. The creations of matter arise from a mist or false claim, or from mystification [sic], and not from the firmament, or understanding, which God erects between the true and false"[3]. In Miscellaneous Writings we find a clarification of this "solution".

1. Cf. supra pp. 11, 40-41.
2. S&H 502:9ff.
3. S&H 523:3-10; cf. above, p. 31, regarding the "Adam-dream".

"In the allegory of Genesis, third chapter and ninthe verse, two mortals, walking in the cool of the day midst the stately palms, may-hued blossoms, perfume-laden breezes, and crystal streams of the Orient, pondered the things of man and God.

"A sense of evil is supposed to have spoken, been listened to, and afterwards to have formed an evil sense that blinded the eyes of reason, masked with deformity the glories of revelation, and shamed the face of mortals.

"What was this sense? Error versus Truth: first a supposition; second, a false belief; third, suffering; fourth, death.

"Is man the supposer, false believer, sufferer?

"Not man, but a mortal---the antipode of immortal man. Supposing, false believing, suffering are not faculties of Mind, but are qualities of error.

"The supposition is, that God and His idea are not all-power; that there is something besides Him"[1].

This answer is, I take it, since Mrs. Eddy believes the whole of her system is based upon the Bible, the one which she would claim as hers[2].

But she has another answer which is the true one, though she does not realize, I think, that it is a second answer at all. And this answer revolved around the "law of opposites", which Christian Science constantly evokes both in its theory and in its practice. The fullest statement of this "law" is found in Unity of Good:

"Why are earth and mortals so elaborate in beauty, color, and form, if God has no part in them? By the law of opposites. The most beautiful blossom is often poisonous, and the most beautiful mansion is sometimes the home of vice. The senses, not God, Soul, form the condition of beautiful evil, and the supposed modes of self-conscious matter, which make a beautiful lie. Now a lie takes its pattern from Truth, by reversing Truth. So evil and all its forms are inverted good. God never made them; but the lie must say He made them, or it would not be evil. Being a lie, it would be

1. Misc. Writings p. 332.
2. Cf. S&H 544:17-19, 546:13-14, supra pp. 3-4.

> truthful to call itself a lie; and by calling the knowledge of evil good, and greatly to be desired, it constitutes the lie an evil"[1].

In Science and Health we have this law of opposites invoked a number of times, e.g.,

> "Because Truth is infinite, error should be known as nothing. Because Truth is omnipotent in goodness, error, Truth's opposite, has no might. Evil is but the counterpoise of nothingness. The greatest wrong is but a supposititious opposite of the highest right"[2].

Truth being infinite, error must be nothing. The brightest lights throw the blackest shadows: that is the "law of opposites"[3]. According to this law, then, the very fact that God is good inevitably produces the opposite, the supposition that evil is good. Because God is Life, death is produced, etc.

Adn in this "law of opposites" we discover the actual basis of the whole dichotomy of the Absolute and Relative Worlds. It is emotional. It is due to that habit of the human mind which, when we are looking for something, say a pencil, in a drawer filled with paper and pens, says, "there is nothing there". Unwittingly, Mrs. Eddy says the same: "I deny His coöperation with evil because I desire to have no faith in evil or in any power but God, good"[4]. Desire, then, is the secret of the whole antinomy of "all" and "nothing", of the Christian Science division of experience into Absolute and Relative, God and evil, Good and bad, Beauty and ugliness, etc. Whatever Christian Scientists desire is real, God, Good, Love, Truth, Life; and whatever they do not want is evil, matter, hate, falsity, death, and so forth[5].

1. Unity of Good pp. 53f (Ital. mine).
2. S&H 367:30-368:2 (Ital. mine).
3. Cf. S&H 215:15-18, 233:28ff, 282:31f, Unity of Good p. 10, Misc. Writings pp. 45, 57, 60.
4. S&H 348:16-18 (Ital. mine).
5. See, on psychological meaning of "nothing", Bergson, Creative Evolution, p. 273.

The Philosophy Applied

We have seen what the Christian Science philosophy of the infinitely desirable and the infinitely repugnant is, and I have indicated what I believe the psychological key to that philosophy is. But Christian Science, like every other religion, is forced to meet the facts of daily living. According to theory those facts are, at least most of them, illusion. But, as certain Christian Science healers put it, we are obliged "to live and act on the relative plane", though, as they also insist, we "think in the Absolute". So arises the problem of the relationship of the two. Even Mrs. Eddy admits that "From a human standpoint of good, mortals must first choose between evils, and of two evils choose the less; and at present the application of scientific [Christian Scientific] rules to human life seems to rest on this basis"[1]. And, as is usual in such 'comings to earth', the inconsistencies charged to Christian Science make themselves most evident in this connection. Some of those inconsistencies we saw in connection with the function and reality of the Relative World. Though pointing out inconsistencies is of little moment to this paper, some more of them must appear in presenting other features of the reconciliation of the actual problem of living and the philosophy of Christian Science. The first feature of that reconciliation is the relationship of God and man---mortal man, please note.

God does not know evil, as we have seen. Nevertheless in a sense He pities us:

---

1. Misc. Writings p. 289.

> "Truth is God, and in God's law. This law declares that Truth is All, and there is no error. This law of Truth destroys every phase of error. To gain a temporary consciousness of God's law is to feel, in a certain finite human sense, that God comes to us and pities us; but the attainment of the understanding of His presence, through the Science of God, destroys our sense of imperfection, or of His absence, through a diviner sense that God is all true consciousness; and this convinces us that, as we get still nearer Him, we must forever lose our own consciousness of error"[1].

Apparently it is when we mortals are in the second stage of mortal mind that we can thus apprehend God in a "certain finite human sense". This second stage is that in which evil beliefs are disappearing[3]. God's pity does not operate as mere sympathy with us, however, but as that "punishment" which destroys sin[3]. But this should not be considered hard, because there is no real pleasure in sin any way[4]. This does not mean, either, that we must appease God[5], for He simply does not know sin. Our suffering is a necessary consequence of our mortality, a necessity as immutable as the celebrated laws of the Medes and Persians. God knows us only as reflecting Him. Insofar as we do not so reflect him we incur suffering, for suffering means to be unlike God.

God demands of you that you "present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God"[6]. This task is not too difficult, however, for the body (which here means the whole fabric of mortal mind) "will reflect what governs it, whether it be Truth or error, understanding or belief, Spirit or matter"[7]. Thus mortal mind becomes a

1. Unity of Good p. 4; cf. p. 18.
2. Supra, p. 43.
3. S&H 405:9-21; 5:10.
4. S&H 404:3-25; cf. 405:29f.
5. S&H 23:27f.
6. S&H 325:21-23.
7. 324:9ff.

medium through which we can regain our rightful inheritance: conscious sonship to God.

This return to God, moreover, is a summum bonum which each and every one can accomplish for himself. Indeed, he alone can accomplish it. In this lone task we are emulating Jesus[1], and we shall have the strength to do it, for the divine Principle is with us[2]. And, most important of all, we can be saved, that is, become immortal Men and Women, now[3]. Indeed, as we have seen, death will not save us unless its coming coincides with our complete turning from sin to God, our complete rise to "spiritual understanding"[4].

Now there are, so to speak, two stages in this process of salvation. The first is to awaken to our perilous estate, and that, as we have seen, comes through suffering[5]. But, after all, that is only a beginning. Suffering is necessary to burn away every vestige of mortal mind. But suffering will not suffice to do that until we also understand Truth, God, Good, to be All-in-all. And that understanding can come only by revelation. Revelation has come to us through two channels, Christ Jesus and Christian Science[6]. We need, therefore, to consider at this point the Christian Science view of Jesus Christ as savior, and the meaning of Christian Science as an interpretation and clarification of this revelation through Jesus.

1. S&H 49:14ff.
2. Misc. Writings pp. 118, 127.
3. S&H 39:10-30.
4. Vide supra, pp. 40-41.
5. Supra, pp. 41-42.
6. S&H 84:28ff.

Jesus

The Christ is the divine element in Christ Jesus, as it were, the immortal Man which constitutes the reality, the substance, of which Jesus was the manifestation[1]. Christ is also the Holy Ghost, or Comforter, and this is none other than Christian Science[2]. Christ and God are not identical, however, except in quality[3]. Christ is "the true idea of God"[4] and so the type of Man as the reflection of God.

Jesus was "The human manifestation of the Son of God..... called the Son of man, or Mary's son"[5]. "The divinity of the Christ was made manifest in the humanity of Jesus"[6]. "Christ Jesus' sense of matter was the opposite of that which mortals entertain: his nativity was a spiritual and immortal sense of the ideal world. His earthly mission was to translate substance into its original meaning, Mind"[7]. This means that the virgin birth is accepted by Christian Science as true:

> "Jesus was the offspring of Mary's self-conscious communion with God. Hence he could give a more spiritual idea of life than other men, and could demonstrate the Science of Love---his Father or divine Principle"[8].

He was, therefore, "the most scientific man that ever trod the globe"[9]. "Wearing in part a human form (that is, as it seemed to mortal view), being conceived by a human mother, Jesus was the mediator between Spirit and the flesh, between Truth and error"[10]. Nevertheless, "the real Christ was

1. Vide supra p. 22.
2. S&H 46:30-47:3, 55:27ff, Unity of Good p. 52.
3. S&H 361:15f.
4. S&H 316:12; cf. 332:9,17f,23-32, 333:3f,13f.
5. Misc. Writings p. 84.
6. S&H 25:31f.
7. Misc. Writings p. 74.
8. S&H 29:32-30:4.
9. S&H 313:23f.
10. S&H 315:29-32.

unconscious of matter, of sin, disease, and death, and was conscious only of God, of good, of eternal Life, and harmony"[1]. Hence Jesus, the mortal aspect of Christ Jesus, when sore pressed, resorted to his diviner self for assurance, peace, and strength.

It was Jesus, not Christ, who was crucified, of course. "The efficacy of the crucifixion lay in the practical affection and goodness it demonstrated for mankind"[2], not in any magical propitiatory value for the sins of humanity. The night in the Garden of Gethsemane was the time in which "Jesus realized the utter error of a belief in any possible material intelligence.....[and] turned forever away from earth to heaven, from sense to Soul"[3].

> "The lonely precincts of the tomb gave Jesus a refuge from his foes, a place in which to solve the great problem of being. His three days' work in the sepulchre set the seal of eternity on time. He proved Life to be deathless and Love to be the master of hate. He met and mastered on the basis of Christian Science, the power of Mind over matter, all the claims of medicine, surgery, and hygiene"[4].

When he had completed this "demonstration" of the "nothingness of matter", he arose---indeed, his rising completed the demonstration. This rising from the tomb was, of course, entirely "natural"[5]. This return was not that of some "spirit", for Jesus had the same body he had before, a proof of the supremacy of Mind over matter"[6].

His ascension was his disappearance to mortal sense which interpreted the event as ascending into the heavens. It consisted in his complete and final assumption of immortal

1. No and Yes p. 36.
2. S&H 24:27f.
3. S&H 47:32-48:9.
4. S&H 44:5-12.
5. S&H 44:24.
6. S&H 45:28ff.

Manhood, and was accompanied, of course, by his utter relinquishment of all mortality[1].

From this sketch of the Christian Science Christology we readily see that the orthodox Christian dogmas regarding the eucharist and atonement are rejected by Christian Science. Vicarious atonement is rejected emphatically[2]. We must work out our own salvation, and we can do it if we follow the example of Jesus, the "Way-shower"[3]. Indeed, the only real atonement is the complete replacement of the mortal sense of life by the spiritual sense. Similarly, to Christian Science the rite of the last supper (eucharist) has a meaning very different from that which it has to orthodox Christianity. It is accounted the last concession made by Jesus to ritualism or to matter[4]. The Mother Church has no communion seasons, though the branch churches do. But the only communion observed at those services, which are held twice a year, is a silent one, a kind of silent prayer[5]. To Christian Science the only communion which is worth while is "demonstration"[6].

We can now proceed to a further consideration of the meaning of Jesus to Christian Science. Jesus, be it noted, was only gradually perfected[7]. Thus he is the more fully the divine example[8]. The Christian Science term "Way-shower", indeed, sums up the significance of Jesus to the faithful.

1. S&H 34:26ff; 46:15-24.
2. S&H 18:8f.
3. S&H 22:11ff; 19:6ff.
4. S&H 33:1f.
5. Manual p. 61.
6. S&H 33:27-34:17; cf sup. pp. 8f.
7. S&H 53:25-31.
8. S&H 41:1ff, 51:19-23, 317:6ff.

> The whole "drama of man's experience in the world is symbolized and exemplified in the life and death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus. Understanding the omnipresent and omnipotent Reality as the Absolute Beauty of Infinite Truth, manifesting Eternal Love, Jesus mastered the world of nature by healing all diseases, and lived in the kingdom of God on earth as the realization of history. His crucifixion, physical death, and entombment were the last mighty struggle; and the resurrection was the triumphant demonstration of power of Truth over all error, in which he brought the phenomenal world of sense into complete subordination to and harmony with the Real World of Spirit. He then finished his divine work of Atonement with God by entirely transforming the phenomenal order of sense into the real order of Spirit, through his ascension into the world of Spiritual Reality"[1].

Christian Science

But, unfortunately, the spiritual sense of reality which Jesus knew and taught the world was lost, and so it became necessary for God to make another revelation to mankind. This revelation was made through Mrs. Eddy, whom "God called....to proclaim His Gospel to this age"[2]. She has a high sense of her own importance in God's plan for the redemption of the world of mortal men, as is shown by the fact that in the Concordance to Science and Health there are two pages of references to her. The compiler has carefully collected in those pages every pronominal reference as well as others more explicit and unmistakable. Indeed, there is one reference, at least, in Science and Health which seems to indicate that she thinks of herself as the second coming of Christ[3]. But though she considers her version of "truth" to be "uncontaminated by human hypotheses"[4], she

1. Mars, The Interpretation of Life pp. 690-691.
2. S&H xi:32f.
3. S&H 118:6-9; cf. Misc. Writings p. 3.
4. Cf. Misc. Writings p. 365.

does not claim to be the savior of men[1]. I suspect we are to interpret her statements about herself as meaning that the divine idea which is Mary Baker Eddy in the sight of God---his reflection---is infallible, and therefore to be considered the source of revelation, but that her human personality, her mortal mind self, is to be looked upon only as a medium, never reverenced. It is, of course, her spiritual self which is the second revealer of truth. As a woman, and therefore belonging to the "higher species of man"[2], she is especially fit to be the bearer of truth "to this age", truth, moreover, which is utterly final.

Practically, then, we mortal men face this situation: We, partly sensible of our predicament as mortal mind, must somehow get out of it. We are, as mortal mind, the phenomenal manifestation of immortal Mind, which is our real self, just as matter, body, etc., are the phenomenal manifestation of mortal mind. Our problem, then, is that of awakening to this truth, and of realizing it, of trnaforming our mortal mind into immortal Mind. When we shall have done that, we shall have risen from the Relative World into the Absolute World, and so be free from all the ills to which flesh is heir[3]. And thus we see that Christian Science, denying theoretically the reality of evil, sin, death, matter, etc., admits its reality in practical living. History and nature are thus brought back into the Christian Science scheme of things[4].

1. Misc. Writings p. 308.
2. Supra p. 26.
3. Cf. Mars, The Interpretation of Life, pp. 717f.
4. Cf. idem, pp. 685f.

The Christian Science Purpose

In the light of what I have said about the relationship of the Absolute and Relative Worlds in a practical way, we can see readily what it is that Christian Science takes to be its purpose, its function in the scheme of God for the universe:

> "Man's one great problem....is to raise the phenomenal world of sense and transform it into its spiritual meaning.... Insofar as man is ruled by mortal mind, that is, thinks the phenomenal knowledge of sense to be the truth, and consequently wills to take the pleasures of sense as the motives of his will, he suffers the inevitable results in disease and death. Insofar, on the other hand, as he is ruled by Immortal Mind, that is, views the phenomenal world of sense in the light of Spiritual Reality, he escapes the errors of sense, rises above the sins of self, and in that proportion is freed from disease and death, and enters into the Real World of Life, Truth, and Love"[1].

This statement by Gerhardt C. Mars gives us the meat of Christian Science philosophy. It follows that the transformation mentioned is the Christian Science purpose. It is "the complete spiritualization and dematerializing of all human thought"[2]. Its purpose is to do away with the relative world altogether! Its purpose consists in making over man into the likeness of God, not in bringing God to man[3]. Furthermore, not man only, but the whole so-called material universe must be translated back into Spirit:

> "Material substances or mundane formations, astronomical calculations, and all the paraphernalia of speculative theories, based on the hypothesis of material law or life and intelligence resident in matter, will ultimately vanish, swallowed up in the infinite calculus of Spirit"[4].

The process will be accompanied, or, perhaps more accurately,

1. Mars, The Interpretation of Life, p. 691
2. Stocking, Carmen Ariza, iii, 63; cf. iv, 178.
3. No and Yes, pp. 10, 20; Misc. Writings pp. 15, 18.
4. S&H 209:25-30; cf. 209:16-20 and 396:4-18.

preceded by "interruptions of the general material routine.... Earth will become dreary and desolate, but summer and winter, seedtime and harvest (though in changed forms), will continue unto the end,---until the final spiritualization of all things"[1].

The universe thus made real, or spiritual, will not "remain the world of nature as presented to sense or to the abstract logic of natural science; nor the world of history as ruled by egotism, or by the abstract laws of a balanced justice; but it will become nature, reinterpreted in the light of Spiritual Truth, as the revelation of God; and history, transformed by the law of love, into the Kingdom of God"[2]. "The physical universe, the universe of matter, is the way the human mind sees its thought of the spiritual universe that was created by God"[3]. The process of spiritualization will consist, according to Christian Science, in replacing these human thoughts, human interpretations of the real universe, by the spiritual or actual thoughts of God which constitute that universe. It means seeing with God's eyes instead of with our own finite and purblind vision.

Christian Science is discreetly silent as to the character of this spiritualized universe, maintaining, sensibly enough, that we mortals cannot, however hard we try, imagine what it will be like in that day when all mortal mind shall have disappeared. But Christian Science does maintain that any student "who adheres to the divine rules of Christian Science and imbibes the spirit of Christ, can demonstrate Christian

1. S&H 96:4-97:4.
2. Mars, The Interpretation of Life, p. 687.
3. Stocking, Carmen Ariza, ii, 392; cf. ii, 214, 251, iv, 68.

Science, cast out error, heal the sick, and add continually to his store of spiritual understanding, potency, enlightenment, and success"[1]. Any person, then, can take his first infant steps toward

"...the great world's altar-stairs
That slope thro' darkness up to God"[2].

But Christian Science would insist that those altar-stairs, though beginning in darkness, become more and more brilliantly lighted as we go up them.

Christian Science, then, proposes to be a substitute for suffering as the way to God. Suffering at best can only awaken us. Revelation, which is complete and perfect in Christian Science, must teach us after the awakening[3]. Furthermore, Christian Science, if adopted, makes even the awakening via suffering unnecessary!

And, as everybody knows, the promise of Christian Science to suffering and weary humanity is not only to remove worry and heartache, replacing them with peace and joy, but to heal every physical ill[4]. Nevertheless, the mission of Christian Science is not primarily to heal physical ills. These "signs are only to demonstrate its divine origin"[5]. "The emphatic purpose of Christian Science is the healing of sin"[6].

Christian Science, indeed, aims to be not a religion for fair weather only, or for Sunday only, or even alone for times of suffering, but to be a working religion for every day. It is, then, an attempt to "wring a consciously adequate life out of

1. S&H 463:2-8.
2. Tennyson, In Memoriam lv, 4.
3. S&H 296:6f; Unity of Good p. 57.
4. S&H 145:31-146:12.
5. S&H 150:14f; Rud. Div. Sci. p. 2.
6. Rud. Div. Sci. p. 2.

the hard conditions of existence"[1], and it seeks to transform life into freedom and joy. Particularly are we impressed with this effort of Christian Science as we study its methods of regenerating the human body, and especially the human heart, for Christian Science makes a more thorough, and, on the whole, perhaps, a more successful attempt at thus fulfilling the essential function of religion than any other religious movement in America to-day. To that aspect of Christian Science, which, in many ways, is the most important for the purposes of this thesis, I now turn.

Christian Science Practice

Under the heading of Christian Science Practice I will include every usage of the denomination employed in furthering the purpose or aim indicated above, except details of organization, publicity, church services, and the like. Such details will be discussed under those headings, as separate "Media" through which the appeal of Christian Science is made. Of course Christian Science Practice is such a medium also, and might, no doubt, be profitably considered under that title. Nevertheless, it is so intimately related to the philosophy, so much an expression of it, that to me it seems more logically to come under that general caption. Those other media are less intimately connected with the philosophy, are, indeed, considered rather a necessary evil by Mrs. Eddy, than an essential part of the system. There is another reason why practice should be thus classified,

1. George A. Coe, Psychology of Religion, p. 10.

namely, that in discussing it we shall find additions made to our comprehension of Christian Sciencephilosophy. Furthermore, the whole division which I have called Philosophy, including its application, is intented to give us the mental furnishings of a 'finished' Christian Scientist. Every Christian Scientist is supposed to think in these terms, and the more truly he is a Christian Scientist, the more fully and exclusively he thinks in them. The philosophy and its applications, of course, appear to the person first interested in Christian Science as a vast fabric of mystery filled with colorful terms which strike his attention and secure his interest. It is, however, only as he gets beyond the "infant" stage that he learns this philosophy. But it is the philosophy which satisfies the intellectual hungerings of the initiate, and which, quite as much (at least in many cases) as the practical results, holds his allegiance. The other media, on the contrary, are, so to say, the surface appeals of Christian Science. Hence they belong outside of the philosophy, while that subject, including practice, constitutes a single medium, the parent, in a very real sense, of the others, and thus of primary importance.

Before taking up the practical details of Christian Science practice it will be necessary to consider the claims made for it. Those claims, of course, constitute a part of the technique used in producing the state of mind which is the innermost secret of Christian Science healing, whether it be of rose-fever, or business failure, or worry, or addiction to strong drink. And those claims are very inclusive.

Let me quote Mrs. Eddy on organic disease, the healing of which by Christian Science has been so much disputed.

> "Should all cases of organic disease be treated by a regular practitioner, and the Christian Scientist try truth only in cases of hysteria, hypochondria, and hallucination? One disease is no more real than another. All disease is the result of education, and disease can carry its ill-effects no farther than mortal mind maps out the way. The human mind, not matter, is supposed to feel, suffer, enjoy. Hence decided types of acute disease are quite as ready to yield to Truth as the less distinct type and chronic form of disease. Truth handles the most malignant contagion with perfect assurance"[1].

In spite of this large claim, however, Mrs. Eddy has some qualifications to make:

> "Until the advancing age admits the efficacy and supremacy of Mind, it is better for Christian Scientists to leave surgery and the adjustment of broken bones and dislocations to the fingers of a surgeon, while the mental healer confines himself chiefly to mental reconstruction and to the prevention of inflammation. Christian Science is always the most skilful surgeon, but surgery is the branch of its healing which will be last acknowledged. However, it is but just to say that the author has already in her possession well-authenticated records of the cure, by herself and her students through mental surgery alone, of broken bones, dislocated joints, and spinal vertebrae"[2].

Furthermore, she advises her students, in case of sudden pain so great as to make mental treatment unavailing to call a physician to give a hypodermic injection to lull the pain, for, when the pain has been thus decreased, the case can be handled, she says, mentally[3].

The word "healing" needs to be defined if we are to appreciate the scope of Christian Science claims. It includes any supposed subordination of "mortal mind" to "immortal Mind".

1. S&H 176:21-33; cf. Misc. Writings p. 41.
2. S&H 401:27-402:7.
3. S&H 464:13-20.

One testimonial which Mrs. Eddy publishes begins thus:

> "I am glad to tell how I was healed. Beliefs of consumption, dyspepsia, neuralgia, piles, tobacco, and bad language held me in bondage for many years"[1].

Another testimony speaks of a "belief of a birth" having been in the house[2]. She refers to her bearing of a baby boy. What this amounts to, of course, is that you can heal, that is, get rid of, anything whatsoever that you do not want. Among testimonials of the benefits of Christian Science which I heard in the Christian Science Church in Evanston, Illinois, were the curing of incipient colds, nervous prostration, the lack of a servant (she always had one, said the testator, if she had "love enough"), brain fever, pneumonia, business losses, stomach trouble, constipation, the use of glasses, Spanish influenza, dislocated hip, lack of "substance" (i.e., money). Published testimonies (in the Christian Science Journal and Sentinel) speak of the curing of about every trouble which anybody is ever apt to have. The word "belief" or "claim" (both have a technical significance in Christian Science) means any condition whatsoever that one wishes to be rid of. And Christian Science claims to be able to "cure" any of them.

Furthermore, "Science can heal the sick, who are absent from their healers, as well as those present, since space is no obstacle to Mind"[3]. There is a striking similarity between "absent treatment" in "Science" and the practice of the Buddhists recorded in the Tevigga Sutta and the Mâha-Sudassana Sutta. "And thus the whole wide world, above,

1. Misc. Writings p. 405.
2. Misc. Writings p. 414.
3. S&H 179:5-7; cf. Misc. Writings pp. 42f.

below, around, and everywhere, does he [the true disciple of Buddha] continue to pervade with heart of Love, far-reaching, grown great and beyond measure. Just, Vâsettha, as a mighty trumpeter makes himself heard---and that without difficulty---in all the four directions; even so of all things that have shape or life there is not one that he passes by or leaves aside, but regards them all with mind set free, and deep-felt love"[1]. The similarity will be more apparent when we come to the consideration of the state of mind which the healer endeavors to, nay, must enter in order to heal his patient.

Christian Science, as we should expect, claims that its method of healing is precisely that which Jesus used---and the most extravagant statements in the New Testament are accepted at their face value in making that claim[2]. But Mrs. Eddy recognizes the fact that neither she nor her students have done as wonderful things as did Jesus, and this she accounts for by saying that Christian Scientists have not yet reached his degree of possession of the divine Spirit, but that when they do they shall be able to do as much[3].

Indeed, Mrs. Eddy expects the passing of mortal mind to be gradual, not sudden. But she insists that some abatement of our subjection to it may be looked for even now[4].

The healing of physical ills, which is undoubtedly the most popular aspect of Christian Science, has, however, as I have indicated, a secondary place[5]. It is only the "proof" or "demonstration" of the divine origin of "Science".

1. Sacred Books of the East xi, 301; cf. xi 272f.
2. S&H 18-55, passim.
3. Misc. Writings p. 55.
4. S&H 319:29-32.
5. Supra p. 57

"The best sermon ever preached is Truth practised and demonstrated by the destruction of sin, sickness, and death"[1], a statement to which we can all say "Amen".

This "divine origin" makes it inevitable that these healings should be "supremely natural"[2], that the Christian Science practice should be "susceptible of no misuse"[3]. Indeed, it has the great advantage that it improves the patient morally as well as physically, that it leaves none of the after effects which the use of drugs so frequently does[4].

Christian Science practitioners are expected to heal only those cases in which the patient consents, unless there be an emergency. An emergency, however, is really not the only justification for healing a patient without his consent, for if the friends of the patient desire it, "it is sometimes wise to do so"[5].

This matter of consent introduces the whole question of "malpractice", a subject which is important to us since the fear of any danger of harm would tend to prevent people from turning to a "healer". Mrs. Eddy is very emphatic on this point:

> "Whoever practises the Science the author teaches, through which Mind pours light and healing upon this generation, can practise on no one from sinister or malicious motives without destroying his own power to heal and his own health"[6].

But, after reading that statement, we recall "malicious animal magnetism", and decide that here we have uncovered

1. S&H 301:1-3.
2. S&H xi, 15.
3. S&H 410:33f.
4. Misc. Writings pp. 33f.
5. Idem p. 382; cf. S&H 447:2ff.
6. S&H 446:11-15; cf. 365:25-366:2.

another inconsistency in Christian Science[1], for "malicious animal magnetism" is Christian Science healing reversed.

Because of the dangers of "M. A. M.", however, Mrs. Eddy cautions her students in their capacity as teachers of Christian Science to use care in selecting their students. The morals of the prospective student should be right[3]. Furthermore, teachers must thoroughly fit their students to defend themselves against mental malpractice[3]. Both teachers and practitioners should make love their first incentive in their work, love which extends both to God and to man. They should let the light of Truth shine through them, not attempt to be themselves the source of light[4].

The key-claim of Christian Science, however, aside from the claim of infallibility, is this, "It is Christian Science to do right, and nothing short of right-doing has any claim to the name"[5]. Only the pure in heart shall see God. "In proportion to his purity is man perfect; and perfection is the order of celestial being which demonstrates Life in Christ, Life's spiritual ideal"[6]. The perfect demonstration, of course, consists in attaining perfection: that is the ideal to be aimed at in all healing whether of sin, sickness, or death.

It is also an important part of the claims of Christian Science to paint a picture of what man will be like when he demonstrates Science perfectly. The description of Man in our consideration of the Absolute World[7] is the picture.

1. Supra, pp. 35f.
2. S&H 445:27ff.
3. S&H 445:3ff.
4. S&H 454:14-24; 455:3ff; Misc. Writings 92f.
5. S&H 448:28-30.
6. S&H 337:14-19.
7. Supra, pp. 23-28.

But Mrs. Eddy throws additional light on this picture thus:

> "When man demonstrates Christian Science absolutely, he will be perfect. He can neither sin, suffer, be subject to matter, nor disobey the law of God. Therefore he will be as the angels in heaven. Christian Science and Christianity are one"[1].
>
> "One infinite God, good, unifies men and nations; constitutes the brotherhood of man; ends wars; fulfils the Scripture, 'Love thy neighbor as thyself;' annihilates pagan and Christian idolatry,---whatever is wrong in social, civil, criminal, political, and religious codes; equalizes the sexes; annuls the curse on man, and leaves nothing that can sin, suffer, be punished or destroyed"[2].

Here we have the Christian Science conception of that long wish of the race: the kingdom of God on earth. The absolute demonstration of Christian Science---the philosophy, let us note---will, according to Mrs. Eddy, bring about that ideal estate of man.

There are certain particulars of the Christian Science claims which are important, first, that fear is always the primary basis of disease[3]. Therefore Science makes much of overcoming fear, whether of disease or of sin[4]. This emphasis on fear is very important to our quest for the motives which impel people to embrace Science. Worry, too, is combatted by Christian Science, which puts this old habit of mankind in a new light---as an evil to be overcome. And the modern hurry and rushing about which characterizes our time is removed by Christian Science and replaced by relaxation and peace[5]. Christian Science guarantees happiness---realize that God is All-in-all, that there can be no evil, and unhappiness passes. Christian Science, furthermore, claims to produce a

1. S&H 372:14-18.
2. S&H 340:23-29.
3. S&H 368:31f; 411:27ff; 377:26f.
4. S&H 405:18f.
5. Cf. Stocking, Carmen Ariza, iii, 136, 159, 166, 174, iv, 88.

lively religious life[1].

Aside from these claims to remove negative aspects of our life, Christian Science makes positive claims, e.g.,

> "Constant toil, deprivations, exposures, and all untoward conditions, if without sin, can be experienced without suffering. Whatever it is your duty to do, you can do without harm to yourself"[2].
>
> "Business men and cultured scholars have found that Christian Science enhances their endurance and mental powers, enlarges their perception of character, gives them acuteness and comprehensiveness and an ability to exceed their ordinary capacity. The human mind, imbued with this spiritual understanding, becomes more elastic, is capable of greater endurance, escapes somewhat from itself, and requires less repose. A knowledge of the Science of being develops the latent abilities and possibilities of man. It extends the atmosphere of thought, giving mortals access to broader and higher realms. It raises the thinker into his native air of insight and perspicacity"[3].

Such are the principal claims of Christian Science. We now turn to the methods used in substantiating these claims. And in depicting these methods we shall, I hope, get at the psychological basis of the healing power---which we cannot reasonably doubt to be real in many cases---of Christian Science.

Two complementary statements, not unlike thoughts with which we are familiar, may well form an introduction to the consideration of method, properly so named:

> "The destruction of sin is the divine method of pardon. Divine Life destroys death, Truth destroys error, and Love destroys hate. Being destroyed, sin needs no other form of forgiveness. Does not God's pardon, destroying any one sin, prophesy and involve the final destruction of all sin?"[4].
>
> "We cannot in reality suffer from breaking anything except a moral or spiritual law"[5].

These two statements indicate vaguely the dual method used in Christian Science: destruction of "error" and 'construction' within the mentality of "Truth".

But Christian Science does not insist that we leap to this

1. Cf. Carmen Ariza i, 46. 2. S&H 385:15-18.
3. S&H 128:7-19; cf. 85:7ff, 89:18-24.
4. S&H 339:1-6.
5. S&H 381:10-13.

state of perfect spiritual understanding, however. It recognizes that we must start wherever we happen to be in our mental and spiritual growth. Having made the start where we are, Christian Science aims to lead men gradually up to its 'heights'.

Its first step in this process is always to insist on the necessity of regulating our thinking:

> "Sin and disease must be thought before they can be manifested. You must control evil thoughts in the first instance, or they will control you in the second"[1].
>
> "Stand porter at the door of thought. Admitting only such conclusions as you wish realized in bodily results, you will control yourself harmoniously"[2].

In order, however, to do this regulating effectively, and in order, especially, for the practitioner to diagnose the trouble in his patient's mind, one must know mental "anatomy":

> "Anatomy, when conceived of spiritually, is mental self-knowledge, and consists in the dissection of thoughts to discover their quality, quantity, and origin. Are thoughts divine or human? That is the important question. This branch of study is indispensable to the excision of error. The anatomy of Christian Science teaches when and how to probe the self-inflicted wounds of selfishness, malice, envy, and hate. It teaches the control of mad ambition. It unfolds the hallowed influences of unselfishness, philanthropy, spiritual love. It urges the government of the body both in health and in sickness. The Christian Scientist, through understanding mental anatomy, discerns and deals with the real cause of disease"[3].

Practically, this paragraph from Science and Health means that we must learn to detect by introspection the real moral quality of our thinking. Unless we can tell whether or not our thoughts are "of God" or of "mortal mind" we cannot tell what to do with them. Moral thoughts and desires are

1. S&H 234:25-27.
2. S&H 392:24-27.
3. S&H 462:30-463:1.

of God, and should be encouraged. But thoughts which are non-moral or immoral, and fears of all sorts, are evil, hence not of God, and therefore should be gotten rid of. "Mental anatomy" reminds us of psychoanalysis. The only similarity, of course, is that both Freud and his school and Christian Science believe in the importance of knowing the basic quality of thoughts, of knowing what one "really" thinks and feels.

We can see from this consideration of mental anatomy that Christian Science sees no organic differences between physical and mental evil. "Healing the sick and reforming the sinner are one and the same thing in Christian Science"[1].

There is only one method used for "error" of all sorts[2]. That one method, to be sure, has more than one aspect, and so is divisible into parts for the purposes of analysis. But it is, nevertheless, a unity which is entirely summed up in the "scientific statement of being", viz.,

> "There is no life, truth, intelligence, nor substance in matter. All is infinite Mind and its infinite manifestation, for God is All-in-all. Spirit is immortal Truth; matter is mortal error. Spirit is the real and eternal; matter is the unreal and temporal. Spirit is God, and man is His image and likeness. Therefore man is not material; he is spiritual"[3].

This "scientific statement of being" is both a summary of the whole Christian Science philosophy and the key to Christian Science practice in the healing of every sort of ill. It is, indeed, itself commonly used in healing. Christian Scientists

1. S&H 404:26f; cf. 370:5ff.
2. S&H 242:9-14; Unity of Good p. 8.
3. S&H 468:9-15.

believe that whenever they completely understand (a term to be explained later[1]) this statement, healing is instantaneous. As we readily perceive, the statement involves a two-fold practice---denial of the ill, affirmation of the good[2]. There is an excellent summary of this process in Unity of Good:

> "We undo the statements of error by reversing them. "Through these three statements, or misstatements, evil comes into authority:---
> "First: The Lord created it.
> "Second: The Lord knows it.
> "Third: I am afraid of it.
>
> "By a reverse process of argument evil must be dethroned:---
> "First: God never made evil.
> "Second: He knows it not.
> "Third: We therefore need not fear it"[3].

This process, then, involves "a complete change of thought"[4], and such a change is, to Christian Science, salvation. It consists, according to the theory, in thinking God's thoughts instead of man's.

In order to get at the psychological significance of Christian Science practice in healing we shall have to analyze it further, and in so doing we shall see that it consists in a shrewd employment of the well-known agent, suggestion. First I will present the negative aspects of the method.

The first thing to do in case of illness or other "claim" is to "rise in rebellion" against it[5], "mentally [to] contradict" it. Every complaint from the body should be thus denied[6]. But, "the sick are not healed merely by declaring there is no sickness, but by knowing that there is none"[7].

1. Below, p.
2. Cf. Stocking, Carmen Ariza, iii, 62.
3. Unity of Good, p. 30; cf. p. 7.
4. Carmen Ariza, ii, 252.
5. S&H 391:8.
6. S&H 391:29-392:10.
7. S&H 447:27-29.

This means, of course, the repeated assertion of the "nothingness" of mortal mind in all of its manifestations until one "senses" that assertion as an immediate 'touching' of truth[1]. This process is, of course, always coupled with the positive assertion of "Truth". We shall see later what is asserted.

Besides this active denial, there is the passive form of it in which we "guard against false beliefs as watchfully as we bar our doors against the approach of thieves and murderers"[2]. Hence one must avoid worry in all of its forms, since worry means the entertaining of doubts as to the triumph of "Good" (that which one wishes). And we should avoid talking about disease: "Disquisitions on disease have a mental effect similar to that produced on children by telling ghost-stories in the dark"[3]. We must "suffer no claim of sin or of sickness to grow upon the thought"[4].

In short, the negative aspect of the healing method consists in convincing ourselves beyond a doubt of the truth of the first sentence in the Scientific Statement of Being: "There is no life, truth, intelligence, nor substance in matter", and of the other similar statements in it: "matter is mortal error", "Matter is the unreal and temporal", "man is not material".

The first thing which strikes our attention in taking up the positive aspects of the "healing" method is the thought contained in these sentences:

---

1. For arguments used, cf. S&H 270:24-30, 368:10-19, 409:9-26, 472:14-22, 478:16-482:12.
2. S&H 234:10-12; cf. 246:17ff.
3. S&H 371:5ff.
4. S&H 390:20f.

"Mortals must change their ideals in order to change their models"[1].

"The conceptions of mortal, erring thought must give way to the ideal of all that is perfect and eternal"[2].

The positive aspect of the method, then, is the deliberate setting up before the mind and heart of "models" of perfection to be made living realities in your experience. You must see yourself as already perfect, the actual likeness of God, who is infinite goodness, love, truth, life, plenty, health.

"Hold thought steadfastly to the enduring, the good, and the true, and you will bring these into your experience proportionably to their occupancy of your thoughts"[3].

Thus we see that the positive aspect of the method means the constant building up within one of the conviction, the "sensing of the truth" of the positive assertions in the Scientific Statement of Being: "All is infinite Mind and its infinite manifestations, for God is All-in-all. Spirit is immortal Truth;....Spirit is the real and eternal;....Spirit is God, and man is His image and likeness. Therefore man is....spiritual".

In the process of building up this powerful conviction of your present perfection and present likeness to God, several other factors are important, both as means and as ends. In the first place, a radical reliance on Christian Science is commanded:

It is not wise to take a halting and half-way position or to expect to work equally with Spirit and matter, Truth and error. There is but one way---namely, God and His idea---which leads to spiritual being. The

1. S&H 260:19f.
2. S&H 260:7f.
3. S&H 261:4-7; cf. 263:7-10, 264:10-12, 360:13ff, Misc. Writings p. 62. See, also, all of the references in the section on "immortal man" (supra pp. 23-28). For arguments, cf. S&H 208:25-209:4, 216:11-21, 302:19-30, 322:3-13, 469:13-24.

> scientific government of the body must be attained through the divine Mind. It is impossible to gain control over the body in any other way. On this fundamental point, timid conservatism is absolutely inadmissible. Only through radical reliance on Truth can scientific healing power be realized"[1].

If you wish to be healed through Christian Science you must burn every bridge behind you and trust utterly to this one guide.

The Christian Scientist is commanded, also, to <u>live</u> what he teaches and believes. "He must prove, through living as well as healing and teaching, that Christ's way is the only one by which mortals are radically saved from sin and sickness"[2]. This radical transfommation of one's life so that it shall be in accordance with one's belief is encouraged by Mrs. Eddy's dictum that Christian Scientists are to-day "the light of the world"[3]. Thus Christian Science deliberately <u>challenges</u> its followers to live up to its teachings, <u>dares</u> them to do it!

And the Christian Science helps them to meet this challenge by rigid requirements as to their reading and thinking. There is a gentle introduction to this subject in <u>Miscellaneous Writings</u>. Mrs. Eddy advises her students: "They should take our magazine, work for it, write for it, and read it. They should eschew all magazines and books which are less than the best"[4]. It does not require the acumen of a Sherlock Holmes to see that this means: "Read only the authorized literature". If one reads anything else, of course, he incurs the danger of getting errors into

1. <u>S&H</u> 167:22-33; cf. 183:22-26.
2. <u>S&H</u> 458:28-31.
3. <u>S&H</u> 367:19f.
4. <u>Misc. Writings</u> p. 271.

his mind, and so, sin, sickness, and death into his body and soul! But this gentle admonition is not the end of the matter. In the Manual of the Mother Church, which is the model for the by-laws of all branch churches, we find some very positive commands. These edicts are very far-reaching, since every practitioner is expected to be a member of the Mother Church, and every reader in any church must be a member of the Mother Church and hence amenable to its discipline.

These commands extend even to the regulating of the silent prayers which one may offer during the church services[1]. Furthermore, it is the duty of every member of the Mother Church to pray daily as follows: "Thy Kingdom come; let the reign of divine Truth, Life, and Love be established in me, and rule out of me all sin; and may Thy Word enrich the affections of all mankind, and govern them"[2]. One can have no objections to this prayer, of course. The important point is, that it is obligatory. Every member, also, is required to defend himself daily against "aggressive mental suggestion", and thereby "be made to forget [or] to neglect his duty to God, to his Leader [Mary Baker Eddy], and to mankind"[3]. Members are forbidden to "adulterate" Christian Science. Every member "shall neither buy, sell, nor circulate Christian Science literature which is not correct in its statement of the divine Principle and rules and the demonstration of Christian Science"[4]. Furthermore, members

1. Church Manual p. 42, section 5.
2. Idem, p. 41, sect. 4.
3. Idem, p. 42, sect. 6.
4. Idem, p. 43, sections 10, 11.

"shall not patronize a publishing house or bookstore that has for sale obnoxious books"[1]. This provision, however, is not enforced, for if it were, Christian Scientists would be able to buy Christian Science literature only, and that only in their own bookstores (reading rooms). Every member who can afford it, though, is expected to subscribe for the periodicals which are the organs of the church[2].

Although the matter is not mentioned in the Manual, it is expected of every Christian Scientist that he shall read and diligently study day by day the proper section of the "lesson", there being six such sections, one for each week-day. On Sunday he hears the whole six sections read as the "sermon". Thus, by the time he is through with the Sunday service he should be thoroughly permeated by the subject for the week![3]

There is another side to this control which is important.

> "Members of this Church shall not unite with organizations which impede their progress in Christian Science. God requires our whole heart, and He supplies within the wide channels of The Mother Church dutiful and sufficient occupation for all its members"[4].

Again:

> "It shall be the duty of the members of The Mother Church and of its branches to promote peace on earth and good will toward men; but members of The Mother Church shall not hereafter become members of other societies except those specified in the Mother Church Manual, and they shall strive to promote the welfare of all mankind by demonstrating the rules of divine Love"[5].

These two sections indicate a very definite attempt to confine the associations of Christian Scientists within the limits of their own denomination. The fruits of this attempt were

1. Manual, p. 44, sect. 13.
2. Manual, p. 44, sect. 14.
3. Vide, any "Quarterly"
4. Manual, p. 44, Sect. 15.
5. Manual, p. 45, sect. 16.

shown during the late war by the fact that the Christian Science churches did not affiliate with the Red Cross or other relief organizations, as did most Protestant churches, but organized one of their own: The Christian Science Comforts Forwarding Committee.

From these several provisions in the Manual we can see that there is a definite and extensive attempt to confine the mental activities of Christian Scientists to their own publications and forms of thought, and to their own societies, in every way. This effort, of course, operates powerfully in fostering faith in Christian Science teachings and in building up the state of mind which it is the aim of the practice to create.

Another factor in building up the Christian Scientist's dominant "sentiment" as A. F. Shand would call it, is the emphasis on "love". "Divine Love corrects and governs man. Men may pardon, but this divine Principle alone reforms the sinner"[1]. This "love" is not mere affection, or sentimentality, but an active kindliness, a taking literally of Jesus' demand that we love our enemies[2]. "We must love our enemies in all the manifestations wherein and whereby we love our friends; must even try not to expose their faults, but to do them good whenever opportunity occurs"[3]. Healers, of course, must not take up the work from mercenary motives[4]. This emphasis is expressed in another way, namely, that every Christian Scientist, as he goes about his daily affairs, is

1. S&H 6:3-5; cf. 365:15-24. 2. S&H 234:12.
3. Misc. Writings, p. 11; cf. pp. 9, 13, 32, and Stocking, Carmen Ariza, ii, 253.
4. No and Yes, p. 43.

expected to radiate kindliness, to "know" that everyone is a "reflection of God". For example, if he sees a cripple, he is supposed to try to see the unfortunate as really perfect in every way. If he comes in contact with people quarrelling he is supposed to affirm that all is love, that there is but one Mind, and so forth. Thus they are expected "to promote the welfare of all mankind by demonstrating the rules of divine Love". Thus we see that Christian Science in its practice makes a definite attempt to build into the fabric of daily living, and especially into the healing consciousness the profound conviction that God is Love, that man, His reflection, is also love, and therefore to be loved as a brother.

Naturally following from this effort to induce a permanent attitude of love toward God and man is the correlative discipline of surrender to God. "Obedience is the offspring of Love; and Love is the Principle of unity, the basis of all right thinking and acting"[1]. "Never absent from your post, never off guard, never ill-humored, never unready to work for God,---is obedience"[2]. This is "obedience" in the "absolute" sense. The Church Manual[3] inculcates a different and less admirable kind. But this conception of obedience as working with God is very important to our study of motives. In this discipline of surrender, of obedience to God, Jesus is made the example. But each one of us must work out God's commands for himself[4],---by complete surrender

1. Misc. Writings p. 117.
2. Idem, p. 116.
3. Manual, chapter entitled Discipline.
4. S&H 25:17-24.

to God:

> "Divine Mind rightly demands man's entire obedience, affection, and strength"[1].
>
> "Study thoroughly the letter and imbibe the spirit. Adhere to the divine Principle of Christian Science and follow the behests of God, abiding steadfastly in wisdom, Truth, and Love.....in Christian Science the first duty is to obey God, to have one Mind, and to love another as yourself"[2].

One can, moreover, surrender to God now and so advance in Truth now[3].

And this aspect of the Christian Science discipline, surrender to God, brings us to a very important question in connection with the practice: What is meant by "understanding"? Most of the references in the Concordance under the heading, "understanding", show that Mrs. Eddy commonly uses the term to mean 'power to comprehend', or even 'power to apprehend'. But the term is sometimes used in another sense, the sense in which practitioners and others deeply steeped with Christian Science use it. It is, in this second sense, the name for the condition of mind by which healing is said to be done. Mrs. Eddy says:

> "Understanding is not intellectual, is not the result of scholarly attainments; it is the reality of all things brought to light"[4].
>
> "Christian Science is not a remedy of faith alone, but combines faith with understanding, through which we may touch the hem of His garment"[5].

Mars interprets this use of the word "understanding" ("spiritual sense", "spiritualized thought" are synonyms) thus:

---

1. S&H 183:21f.
2. S&H 495:27-496:8.
3. S&H 326:16-22.
4. S&H 505: 26-28.
5. Misc. Writings, p. 97.

> "By understanding she [Mrs. Eddy] always means such a clear and efficient envisagement of objective Reality as to overpower feeling and result in action. That is, real thinking the Truth means in effect willing the Truth, or making it real to consciousness"[1].

Now, this "understanding" means the utter possession of the whole mind by the "model", "God is All-in-all", etc., the whole concept expressed in the "scientific statement of being". "For right reasoning there should be but one fact before the thought, namely, spiritual existence."[2]. "When the illusion of sickness or sin tempts you, cling steadfastly to God and His idea. Allow nothing but His likeness to abide in your thought"[3]. This is what Mars means by his "real thinking the Truth means in effect willing the Truth".

But there is another aspect to this matter of "understanding". It is the "feel" of it. We see that "understanding" amounts to the voluntary concentration of attention upon the "model" until that model fills the whole mind. But what does this state of things feel like? We must turn to the testimonies for that. I will quote a few extracts to give us our material:

> "Very soon I became so absorbed in the book [Science and Health] that I forgot all about my ankle; it went entirely out of my thought, for I had a glimpse of all God's creation as spiritual, and for the time being lost sight of my material selfhood.....It was healed while I was 'absent from the body' and 'present with the Lord'"[4].

> "I laid the book [Science and Health] down, involuntarily closed my eyes, and silently prayed to God.
> "I remained in that attitude a few moments, when I felt like the mariner who had been tossed for days upon a boisterous sea, the clouds bending low, the

1. Mars, The Interpretation of Life, p. 687.
2. S&H 492:3ff.
3. S&H 495:14ff.
4. S&H, Fruitage, p. 603.

billows rolling high, all nature wrapped in darkness; in his despair he kneels and commits his soul to God, when he suddenly beholds the North Star breaking through the clouds, enabling him to guide his ship to the shores of safety. Many things were made plain to me. I saw that there is one Fatherhood of God and one brotherhood of man; that though 'once I was blind, now I see'; that there was no more pain, nor aches, no fear, nor indigestion. I slept that night like a babe and awoke next morning refreshed. There are now no traces whatever of my former complaint and I feel like a new being"[1].

"I opened the book for the first time and found a paragraph near the middle which attracted my attention. I read the same paragraph over and over for nearly two hours. When the tea bell rang I closed the book [Science and Health] and I shall never forget my perception of the new heaven and the new earth,---everything in nature that I could see seemed to have been washed and made clean."[2].

"I opened Science and Health and these words were before me, 'If God were understood, instead of being merely believed, this understanding would establish health'[203:7f]. I saw that I must get the right understanding of God! I closed the book and with head bowed in prayer I waited with longing intensity for some answer. How long I waited I do not know, but suddenly, like a wonderful burst of sunlight after a storm, came clearly this thought, 'Be still, and know that I am God'. I held my breath---deep into my hungering thought sank the infinite meaning of that 'I'. All self-conceit, egotism, selfishness, everything that constitutes the mortal 'I', sank abashed out of sight. I trod, as it were, on holy ground. Words are inadequate to convey the fulness of that spiritual uplifting"[3].

"I read and prayed until about midnight, gradually reaching such a peace and spiritual vision as I had never found before. I finally retired, knowing there was nothing to fear, and happy in the knowledge of the one power, divine Love. The morning fulfilled the night's promise. The little hand and arm were entirely normal, except for a little scab"[4]. [This mother "worked" to relieve the poisoned arm of her little son].

"The 'scientific statement of being,' given us on

1. S&H, Fruitage, p. 622.
2. Idem, p. 652.
3. Idem, p. 669.
4. Christian Science Journal, April 1919, p. 48.

page 468 of Science and Health, was declared and the sense of God's presence was wonderfully felt"[1].

> "As the revelation [testator's first reading of the textbook] of the All-good appeared to me, all other books, all forms of religion, all methods of healing, to my sense became void. Chronic beliefs of disease of twenty years' standing, dimness of sight from the belief of age, all disappeared instantly; indeed, material life seemed a blank. The why? I could not explain, but this I did know, in this realm of the real I found joy, peace, rest, love to all, unbounded, unspeakable. Human language had lost its power of expression, for no words came to me; and in all this six years of bliss I still have found no words to tell my new-found life in God"[2].

"Joy, peace, rest, love to all, unbounded, unspeakable", such terms are used by practitioners to describe their experience when healing patients. Plainly the Christian Science "understanding", or "spiritual sense", is identical, psychologically, with that of the typical mystics[3]. There are, of course, differences in the quality of the experience. Many testimonies seem to indicate the absence of any such emotion as is described in the extracts given just above. Nevertheless, the experience tends to approach that indicated, which is the mystical type with its certainty, its sense of realities beyond the power of language to express, its joy and peace, and its love.

And this state of mind is the one which Christian Science considers normative. It is the condition which I have characterized as the central secret of Christian Science.

Furthermore, this state of mind is what Christian Science means by the word 'prayer'. Prayer is understanding in Science.

1. Christian Science Sentinel, June 7, 1919, p. 797.
2. Misc. Writings, pp. 427f.
3. For argument on this point, see below, pp. 88-91

It is identifying one's own will with God's, the sense of being at one with God.

> "To be 'present with the Lord' is to have, not mere emotional ecstasy or faith, but the actual demonstration and understanding of Life as revealed in Christian Science. To be 'with the Lord' is to be in obedience to the law of God, to be absolutely governed by divine Love,---by Spirit, not by matter"[1].

This emphasis on 'works' must, of course, be extended to "understanding" and to the Christian Science 'state of mind'. You prove your understanding of Science by "demonstrating" it[2]. Ecstasy is all right, but it is only the beginning: "healing" is the main thing. So is it, of course, with prayer: Desire is prayer. Prayer tends to bring us into harmony with God. "The habitual struggle to be always good is unceasing prayer"[3]. "Self-forgetfulness, purity, and affection are constant prayers"[4]. These statements about prayer point, of course, to the same psychological experience: the sense of communing with God, the conviction of thinking and of doing His will after him[5]. Such prayer is direct, without intermediary. It is not advising God, but surrendering to Him. Prayer, understanding, the Christian Science state of mind,---synonymous terms,---are summed up, then, psychologically, in saying that they consist in filling, to the point of saturation, the whole mentality with the thought, "God is All", with all of the valuational connotations of that statement. Then it is that, as Stocking says, "Life becomes what in reality it is, eternal ecstasy"[6].

With this discussion of the Christian Science state of mind during the healing process we finish the analysis of the methods used insofar as the healer, whether or himself or of

1. S&H 14:6-11; cf. Stocking, Carmen Arisa, i, 51, ii, 154.
2. S&H 345:17-20, 488:2-6. 3. S&H 4:12f.
4. S&H 15:26f. 5. Mars, op.cit., 721f.

another, is concerned. There are some additional points to be noted. Mrs. Eddy advises her students to see to it that, whenever possible, the mental atmosphere around the patient is favorable[1]. Adverse opinions, in other words, should not come to the patient's ears. Furthermore, she advises the healer to be alone with the patient when treating him.

The healer is advised to explain the "Truth" to the patient when the patient is "ready" for it. The healer must also bring moral relief to the patient if the healing is to be complete. This is, of course, the primary thing to do in healing sin.

The healer, furthermore, must pay special attention to his own mental condition. We have just seen what that condition must be: an utter filling of the whole mind and heart with the Scientific Statement of Being[2]. The healer must strive to make himself utterly transparent to Truth[3]. This is only another way of saying that he must be immediately aware of "Truth". But this does not mean that he must pay rigid attention to the letter, but rather, have the spirit of the doctrine[4].

Another practical point is that in treating young children the healer should work mainly through the minds of the parents, building up in them the conviction of the Truth[5].

1. S&H 424:12-27.
2. Cf. Rud. Div. Sci. pp. 9, 10, 11, 12.
3. Misc. Writings p. 40, and especially p. 59.
4. S&H 367:3-9.
5. S&H 412:29-414:3.

The process of healing, then, consists in this: that the healer must "understand" the Scientific Statement of Being and its implications (best found in the chapter, Recapitulation in Science and Health); that he must, in the midst, as it were, of this consciousness, deny the "belief" to be overcome; that he must affirm to the point of utter conviction the "reality" which the patient (whether himself or another) should be,---nay, is already. If this process be carried out so that the healer "knows" that the patient is well, healing results, and the more complete the certainty, the quicker the healing. As adjuncts to this process, the mental surroundings of the patient must be made favorable, and his mind must be brought into harmony with the process.

The whole Christian Science practice, as we readily see, consists in an unusually thorough employment of suggestion. The large claims made for the method, its essential harmlessness, its identity with that used by Jesus, its divine origin, the glorious and universally desirable results from its use---health, peace, joy, etc.---all aid in predisposing the subject (patient). The regulation of thought, its dissection to get at its emotional basis (usually fear), the steadfast denial of the "claim" coupled with the more steadfast holding of perfection before the mind, are all shrewd applications of suggestion. The challenge to desert all other means, the confining of the mental diet to the expressions of the convictions to be obtained, the predominant use of the most potent suggestion known, viz., that God does the work, all are calculated to unify the patient's whole mentality until he "knows" that he is healed. Thus every resource of his mind is brought to

bear upon the "claim". Inevitably, in a very large number of cases, it disappears. The limits, physically or mentally, within which Christian Science does cure, are outside the scope of this paper.

Note to Christian Science Practice(all citations are to page and line of Science and Health):
For an outline of the course of treatment used:pp. 410-430, especially, pp. 410-422.
For the explanation and practice in various diseases etc:
Fever: 375:1-7, 376:17ff; cf. 379:25ff.
Palsy: 375:21-25.
Consumption: 375:28-376:5, 376:10ff.
Colds: 377:1ff.
Loss of sleep and overeating: 385:22ff; cf. 388:22ff, 461:1-7.
Grief: 386:26-387:2.
Obstetrics: 463:5ff.
Brain diseases: 387:3ff, 407:21-408:27.
Sanitation: 383:3-11; cf. 383:12-20.

Conclusions on the Christian Science Philosophy

Mrs. Eddy defines and re-defines Christian Science, but she has one definition which suggests more of the philosophy and of its application than any other:

> "Having one God, one Mind, one consciousness,---which includes only His own nature,---and loving your neighbor as yourself, constitute Christian Science, which must demonstrate the nothingness of any other state or stage of being"[1].

This definition is less 'dehumanized' than are many by her. It represents, I think, more nearly than any other, the conception of Christian Science held by the better class of its adherents---better ethically and intellectually.

With this definition before us as a summary of the preceding exposition and discussion, I will attempt to classify Christian Science in several ways. As I have said[2], it is an ethical dualism in which the infinitely desirable is hypostasized and the infinitely undesirable is conversely 'debased' until it becomes "nothing". As I have shown, the psychological basis of this dualism is emotional[3]. In this connection, to bolster up my claim, I will quote an illuminating interpretation (by Prof. Irving King) of the meaning of 'finite' and 'infinite' as used in religion:

> "The separation between finite and infinite goodness or love is not primarily due to an attempt to describe two types of reality. It is merely an expedient by which we emphasize to ourselves the supreme significance of our actual efforts along the line of goodness, which, as far as realization

1. No and Yea, p. 38. Cf. No and Yea pp. 12, 17, Rud. Div. Sci., p. 1, S&H 109:1-3, 113:16-21.
2. Supra, pp. 8, 10.
3. Supra, p. 46.

> is concerned, generally seems to fall far short of intention. The very tendency to put off in a different sphere our highest valuations is merely an aspect of the valuating process itself, and is no indication of an ultimate difference in metaphysical reality. In the same way we seem best able to satisfy ourselves that this act or this person is of very great significance in our lives by saying that it, or he, is absolutely unique. Such assertions are not to be taken as descriptions of reality, but only as attempts to symbolise the worthfulness which we feel inheres in the object of consideration. The same may be said of the various attributes with which the deity is usually clothed"[1].

Christian Science, naturally, insists that its separation of infinite and finite does mean a metaphysical difference. But that means only that Christian Science is not governed by psychological fact, but by desire.

Another way of classifying Christian Science arises when we think of it theologically. It is not pantheism, for God is most emphatically <u>not</u> present in the phenomenal world (mortal mind). It is, rather, as Mars calls it[2], a theistic idealism. God is both immanent and transcendent, immanent in the Absolute World in the sense that He is its ground, but also transcendent in that He is more than it, and that it is His expression, not the whole of Him. Christian Science, then, is not a monism in any sense of the word, despite its basic proposition that God is All-in-all.

It is important to our purpose to consider whether or not, as some assert[3], Christian Science is a revival of magic. Dunlap asserts that it is, that it includes both 'white' and 'black' magic. And if we assume the point of view of naturalism it is, of course, a revival of magic. But

1. King, <u>Development of Religion</u>, pp. 279-280.
2. Mars, <u>The Interpretation of Life</u>, pp. 560f, 687ff.
3. Knight Dunlap: "Evil in Mrs. Eddy's Doctrines", <u>Journal of Abnormal Psychology</u>, ii, pp. 280ff.

to judge Christian Science from that point of view involves, I think, an injustice. Christian Science asserts that its practices are natural, and that the practices of naturalism are "unnatural". It does not believe that its healing power is some occult thing, but the very essence of reality. Judged from its own point of view, Christian Science is not magic. It does, however, aim to get certain "goods" for the individual. But so does naturalism. "Science", however, and this is the crux of the matter for this paper, maintains that one simple method works for the attainment of any worthy end. If the belief in a panacea be magic, then "Science" is magic. I suspect that natural science would, if it could, find such a simple, single way of solving all of man's problems. Its failure to do so ought not to be elevated into a virtue. Of course, as Dunlap points out, the belief in and practice of working against "malicious animal magnetism" closely resembles 'black' magic. But "M. A. M." is one of the most evident inconsistencies in "Science", one which is, I think, doomed to disappear, for Christian Science, even, is not a static thing. It changes with the years, and, in meeting the fire of criticism has already become more self-consistent, and concedes more to universally accepted ideas[1].

Psychologically, "Science" belongs to the class of religions called by James "healthy minded"[2]. A "conviction of sin" is no part of its technique or dogma. And Christian

1. Cf. Burrell, New Appraisal of Christian Science, p. 69.
2. James, Varieties of Religious Experience, pp. 94-107.

Science is also a part of that movement of revolt, which also produced Unitarianism, Universalism, Transcendentalism, and New Thought, against Calvinism and its degradation of human nature and its ascription to God of cruelty. It is, of course, most nearly allied to New Thought, having sprung (Mrs. Eddy and the Christian Science Board of Directors to the contrary notwithstanding) from the same personality, Phineas P. Quimby[1].

Both New Thought and Christian Science endeavor by similar "silent" methods to "realize truth", namely, that fear, disease, "lack", and the like, are unreal, and that confidence, health, plenty, goodness, etc., are real. Both, then, by the induction, through suggestion, of the mystical state in which the infinitely worthful is sensed as actual, attempt, with considerable success, to transform the self into the desired likeness.

Thus we come to the question of mysticism as a label for Christian Science. Coe thus classifies it[2]. Mrs. Eddy, however, strenuously objects to such a classification. But that is because to her mysticism means occultism, or "mystification"[3]. 'Mysticism' as here used includes only its religious forms, those classically called mysticism. It would be grossly unfair to include those forms to be found only in the textbooks on insanity, or even those produced by anaesthesia[4]. But, with this delimitation of

1. Horatio W. Dresser, Handbook of the New Thought, p. 37; Georgine Milmine, Life of Mary Baker G. Eddy; F. W. Peabody, Religio-Medical Masquerade, pp. 72ff.
2. Coe, Psychology of Religion, pp. 180, 267, 281.
3. S&H 80:14ff, 523:3-13, Misc. Writings p. 30.
4. James, Varieties of Religious Experience, 389, note 2, 426.

"mysticism" it is possible to show pretty conclusively that Christian Science is a form of mysticism, that the Christian Science "understanding" is essentially the mystic experience. In discussing this matter, I shall use material mainly from Underhill's Mysticism, though without committing myself to her enthusiastic conclusions.

"Le mystique", says Delacroix, "est celui qui croit appréhendre immédiatement le divin, éprouver intérieurement la présence divine"[1]. The "overcoming of all the usual barriers between the individual and the Absolute is the great mystic achievement. In mystic states we both become one with the Absolute and we become aware of our oneness"[2]. According to Evelyn Underhill, the object of mysticism is "conscious union with a living Absolute"[3]. This conscious union with God is both the substance of the philosophy and the object of the Christian Science practice in healing, whether of disease or of sin. I have tried to show[4] that the Christian Science "understanding" is psychologically the consciousness of being 'immersed' in "reality" (God), of "touching the hem of His garment", of being utterly governed by God. Over ten per cent. of the testimonials I have read or heard speak of "spiritual illumination", which is a typically mystic phrase. To have "an inrush of Divine Consciousness"[5] is also a distinctively mystical experience. Stocking, moreover, describes, as we have seen, the ideal state as one of perpetual ecstasy.

1. Études d'Histoire et de Psychologie du Mysticisme, p. vii.
2. James, Varieties of Religious Experience, p. 419.
3. Mysticism, p. 86.
4. Supra, pp. 78-81.
5. Used by testator heard in Wednesday night meeting in Evanston, Illinois.

The air of utter certitude which characterizes Mrs. Eddy and the Christian Science state of mind, a characteristic constantly mentioned in the testimonies, is typical of the mystic experience: mystics "know" that they are right!

Moreover, Mrs. Eddy's almost fruitless attempts to say what she wishes indicate the 'ineffability' which James[1] says is one of the marks of the mystic state. One who reads Science and Health with any sympathy whatever feels that the author is trying to describe an experience which is essentially indescribable. Mrs. Eddy says 'human' speech is inadequate.

Another likeness is this, that both Christian Science and mysticism make 'salvation' a personal matter. It is "the flight of the Alone to the Alone"[2].

The "Science" emphasis on God as essentially love is also characteristic of mysticism[3].

The practice of surrendering to God, and letting Him work in and through you characterizes both "Science" and mysticism[4].

Even the healing of physical ills, which is not, on the whole, characteristic of mysticism, is duplicated in St. Teresa's experience[5]. And it is the mystic state which did the healing.

An exhaustive comparison of typical mystic utterances, in short, would show that Coe is quite right in classifying Christian Science as a form of mysticism. But it must not be

1. Varieties of Religious Experience, p. 380.
2. Plotinus, quoted by Underhill, Mysticism, p. 98.
3. Cf. Underhill, op. cit., pp. 101-104.
4. Cf. quotations from Eckhart and Boehme, Underhill, p. 77.
5. Underhill, p. 73.

forgotten that Christian Science is much more. Not all "Scientists" are mystics, or have, even mildly, the mystical experience. But I think it is safe to say that the healer does her "work" in the midst of this experience. There is an important difference, however, between even this experience and that of the great mystics. It is this, that in "Science" the experience is induced by a definite discipline. Another even more important difference is this, that, whereas the mystics do not apply the experience to solving the problems of this world, Christian Science, having before it the determination to produce certain definite 'mundane' results, does use the mystic experience to reach those results.

Finally, we may say, in regard to the Christian Science philosophy and practice, that it places before the fearful, ill, unharmonious human mentality certain ideals (immortal Man) and endeavors to build them so deeply into the emotional structure of the mind that the whole personality is moulded to those ideals. Thus Christian Science, practically, succeeds in transforming human character into joy and peace, into confidence and love and health, into meekness and gratitude. This last characteristic is important. Every testimonial contains expressions of it, as felt both toward Mrs. Eddy and toward God. It is both a result and a cause of that peace of mind and that constant response to the ideal which characterises the more typical Christian Scientist.

HEALING

Turning, now, to the other "media" through which Christian Science makes its appeal, we must first consider "healings". Under the heading of Christian Science Practice I endeavored to show how the healing is done, and what it includes. Now I hope to show how this activity of Christian Science looks to the outsider, to the person who is attracted to Christian Science by the hope of health.

The proportion of converts to Christian Science through this motive is very large, three fourths of the total, indeed, as is estimated, according to J. R. Slater[1], by intelligent "Scientists". And that the Church itself considers this appeal very important is shown by the assiduity with which it publishes testimonials of healing, and by the authorized opportunity provided for giving them (Wednesday night meetings). Science and Health contains as its last chapter 84 testimonies of healing under the title Fruitage. Miscellaneous Writings contains 73 testimonials signed by initials as well as others in Mrs. Eddy's own words[2]. Out of six periodicals published by the Christian Science Church four, namely, Christian Science Sentinel, The Christian Science Journal, Le Héraut de Christian Science, and Der Herold der Christian Science, contain testimonies in every issue. Whether or not duplication occurs I do not know. There need be none, however, for the supply seems to be very great.

It is interesting and important to note that the proportion

1. Faunce et al., Searchlights on Christian Science, p. 20.
2. Misc. Writings, p. 401ff.

of females healed is considerably higher than that of males. In Miscellaneous Writings out of 48 testimonials in which the sex of the one healed is unmistakable, 28 were women and 20 men (boys are included under 'men', and girls under 'women'). In the Sentinel for June 7, 1919, the proportion of women is still higher: 11 females, 3 males. In the Journal for April, 1919, the difference is somewhat less: 10 females to 3 males. Out of fourteen testimonies which I heard in Evanston, Illinois, 8 were from women and 6 from men.

According to the testimonies, all sorts of 'trouble' have been healed by Christian Science. But Mrs. Eddy boasts that "These cases for the most part have been abandoned as hopeless by regular medical attendants"[1].

In this study we are not particularly concerned with the validity of these claims. It suffices that large numbers of people believe that those claims are valid. But there is no sufficient reason, nowadays, to doubt that many cures actually have occurred. There seems, indeed, to be some evidence that organic diseases have been cured[2]. Nor does this seem so impossible, if we admit, as I think we must, the converse result of similar mental activity (stigmatization)[3].

There is another aspect to "healing" which needs mention: the monetary profit in it. E. S. Plimpton gives an account of a merchant who gave up a paying business in order to become

1. S&H x:17f.
2. See, especially, B. O. Flower, Christian Science: As a Religious Belief and a Therapeutic Agent, pp. 73-150.
3. Cf. Cutten, Psychological Phenomena of Christianity, chapter on Stigmatization, and references there.

a healer[1]. Another aspect of this matter is the monetary profit in teaching. The Manual, to be sure, forbids teachers to have more than one class per year of not to exceed thirty pupils. But they may charge up to one hundred dollars per pupil, so that from teaching alone the income could be as high as three thousand dollars per year[2]. To that must be added the income from healing, at a dollar and up per treatment. An interesting fact in connection with this is this, that male healers are almost confined to the large cities. Very few indeed are to be found outside them[3].

The most important fact, however, to be considered in connection with healing as a medium of appeal is the fact that large numbers of people believe in it.

PUBLICATIONS

Many people come into contact with Christian Science through its publications. The most important is, of course, Science and Health, the textbook. I will devote most of my space to this one book. Our first impression on reading it is that of being baffled in trying to find out what Mrs. Eddy means. This is, as she insists, partly due to the difficulty of expressing "spiritual Truth" in human language. But there is another reason, namely, the method of presentation. Mrs. Eddy has only a very few ideas to present, and those all suffused with emotion. She proceeds, however, to present those ideas again and again, with endless repetition, in

1. Faunce et al., Searchlights on Christian Science p. 106.
2. Manual, p. 84.
3. Vide sub. p. 106.

slightly varying phraseology. Though Mrs. Eddy probably did not realize it, this is precisely the most clever thing about the book. The author aims at converting people to her doctrines. She uses very shrewdly the method of repeated, almost, of wearisome, suggestion. It one reads the book with any sympathy for the type of thought and of experience there set forth, he is likely soon to find himself believing what Mrs. Eddy says. I found myself, on a first reading, thus affected! If one even slightly sympathetic wishes to avoid being converted he needs to use his critical faculties, and his sense of humor, not, however, a very difficult task! This experience of mine is similar to that which Evelyn Underhill mentions as the effect made on her by reading the works of the mystics[1].

There is, I think, some psychological value to be attached to Mrs. Eddy's constant use of capitals, a use which occurs not alone in the textbook, but in all Christian Science publications. She capitalizes nearly every word which names a value, e.g., God, Spirit, Good, Truth, Reality, Mind, Love, etc. She does not capitalize those things which to her should be done away with, e.g., mortal mind, sickness, death, etc. The English-speaking mind naturally, I think, capitalizes whatever is regarded as important. The words Mrs. Eddy capitalizes, be it noted, are all colorful with the wonder of limitlessness.

Her vocabulary, too, is instructive. I have gone through the Concordance and picked out words other than connectives

1. Mysticism p. 95.

(with some exceptions) occupying more than one page. "Spirit" and its derivatives occupy the most space---ten pages plus. "God" and its derivatives occupy ten pages. Then comes "mortal" with 7; "man" with 7; and "truth" with a fraction less. "Mind" occupies 6 pages, with "science" taking a little more. "Life" and "belief" each take 5. "Error", "material" and "matter" require a little over five pages each. "Divine" takes four plus. The words (and derivatives) occupying about 3 pages each are: heal, all, body, Christ, disease, human, Jesus, real, sense, sick, sin, thought. Those taking about 2 pages are: evil, good, love, power, create, death, demonstrate, give, harmony, idea, immortal, law, soul, and understanding. Those taking about one page are: compounds with 'all' (grouped together), because, being (noun), destroy, eternal, ever, every, exist, fact, faith, fear, flesh, form, govern, great, heart, heaven, ignorance, image, infinite, intelligence, know, light(noun), mental, nature, need, never, nothing, perfect, physical, practice-practical, principle, reflect, reveal, right, Scriptures, so-called, suffer, suppose, system, teach, theory, therefore, time, true, way, woman, and work (verb and noun). "Finite" takes 1/3 page, "forever" 1/2, "glory" 1/2, "grace" 1/6, "happy" 1/2, "high" 2/3.

This rough analysis indicates several important things, the first being the large use of abstract terms. The words listed are nearly all of that kind. Indeed, it is most noteworthy that Mrs. Eddy never indulges in 'visions' and other similar paraphernalia of revelation. Another thing

shown (less clearly) by this list is this, that positive and negative terms in the "Science" sense of "real" versus "unreal" total nearly equal space, though the positives have somewhat the majority. The two-fold system of "desirable" and "undesirable" holds even in the Christian Science vocabulary.

Mrs. Eddy's statements are characteristically dogmatic. Dogmatism, indeed, despite the claims of democracy, toleration, and the like, made by the body, is fundamental in "Science". There is only one version of the truth, that copyrighted by Mary Baker Eddy.

Very shrewdly, Mrs. Eddy warns her disciples[1] that they must expect difficulty in learning "Science". But the reward, of course, is worth any difficulty.

There are certain obstacles that Mrs. Eddy had to meet in converting people which appear in Science and Health. Those obstacles indicate, I think, something of the mental furnishings of her converts, at least during the forty years in which the textbook was being written and constantly re-written. Her favorite enemy is pantheism. She also argues against phrenology[2], and devotes a chapter to spiritualism. (Theosophy is considered in No and Yes, p. 14). Astrology comes in for slight mention[3]. Animal magnetism gets extended attention in a chapter on it. What these 'enemies' signify will be discussed in my consideration of the Weltanschauung of those who embrace Christian Science[4].

1. E.g., S&H 147:14-23.
2. S&H 88:20ff.
3. S&H 103:12ff.
4. Below, pp. 108-109.

Mrs. Eddy tries hard to make the textbook seem "scientific". The large use of abstract terms helps her in this effort. So does the use of references to mathematics, logic, and the natural sciences. She argues for her healing theory by repeated references to homoeopathy, which seems, indeed, to have contributed much to the growth of her ideas. She quotes physicians to support her theory of the worthlessness of drugs[1]. She argues, also, from the well-known phenomena of visualization and dreams in support of her theories. And of course she tries to down the natural sciences in argument.

Her general method, then, is a compound one of assertion and argument. Her argument, however, is of the non-sequacious kind. It tends to amount to little beside the drawing of analogies. But it suffices to convince a vast number of persons who are predisposed by her sententiousness, and by the desire to glimpse wonders, to be convinced.

Mrs. Eddy's other books, comprising over a dozen volumes, do not give us any new light on Christian Science, except as to its history. Those books, however, put the system more simply and coherently than does Science and Health. They are especially valuable for clearing up questions of interpretation. Many Christian Scientists read certain of them nearly if not quite as much as they read the textbook. Unity of Good seems to be a general favorite.

Besides the books, there are numerous pamphlets, addresses and selections, and, of course, the periodicals. The pamphlets present Christian Science thought, while the

1. S&H 162:29-164:8.

notable things about the periodicals are the inclusion of testimonies of healing and the playing up of the news of the progress of the body. Especially important, in this last connection, is the publication, four times a year, of the list of all Christian Science Churches throughout the world, and of all "authorized" practitioners. In other words the definite effort is constantly made to bind the whole body into a close and unmistakably defined unity.

Besides these efforts, the publicity committee sees to it that the public is kept reminded of the presence of Christian Science in its midst. I know of no other religious body that has so able a publicity bureau, nor of one that gets so much space in the papers in proportion to its numbers.[1]

SERVICES

In this section of this paper I will not attempt to give any account of the Christian Science services in detail, but rather, some general observations which seem to me important. The service, in general, is like the simpler forms found in Congregational Churches: hymns, responsive readings, solo, prayer and sermon. But there are certain important differences. The most important is that everything is 'cut and dried'. The only originality allowed the readers (who take the place of a minister) is in selecting

1. Cf. Goodwin, Christian Science Church, pp. 13-15.

the hymns. (The Wednesday night service allows more freedom, extending even to the selection of Scripture passages). Even the sermon is made up of selections, chosen by a committee in Boston, from the Bible and from Science and Health. The prayer, aside from the use of the Lord's Prayer with Mrs. Eddy's "spiritual interpretation" of it, is silent. There is, in short, an air of finality, and of revealed truth about the whole service---to the Christian Scientist, who believes, of course, that the textbook as well as the Bible is from God.

The Wednesday evening meetings take the place of the prayer meetings of other churches. They are conducted by only one reader---the first. But even here he has no opportunity to express his individuality. He expresses no ideas of his own, though he has some leeway in selecting his readings. In place of the prayers of the brethren testimonials of healing and of other benefits are given. Those testifying, however, may not give details of symptoms or of suffering. These testimonials invariably contain expressions of gratitude to Mrs. Eddy, and usually, to God for blessings received. I have heard testimonies in which gratitude to God was omitted!

The services are always conducted in a dignified and efficient and authoritative manner.

Usually both sexes are represented in the leading of the services, one reader being a man, the other a woman.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

Under this heading I will discuss the organization side of Christian Science including the relationships of Christian Scientists with each other and with the rest of the world since those relationships are largely determined by the organization.

It is not necessary, however, to go into the details of the Church organization. Suffice it to say that it is absolutely centralized despite appearances to the contrary. The control of the Mother Church rests, finally, in the Christian Science Board of Directors. This board must be orthodox, a provision which is enforced through the stipulations of the trust deed given by Mrs. Eddy in conveying to them the title to the land on which the Mother Church is built. But the readers, be it noted, of all branch churches must be members of the Mother Church, and so amenable to the discipline imposed and administered by the Board of Directors. The first reader of branch churches is required to administer the discipline of those churches. He may not be a reader, of course, in a church which is not orthodox, and so the system of control is complete. A number of other provisions add to this control. Also, according to the Manual[1], the Board of Directors has final control of the Christian Science Publishing Society, of the Board of Education[2], and of the committees on "publication", which is to say, publicity, and the correction of "impositions on the public in regard to Christian Science"[3].

1. Manual p. 80.
2. Idem p. 88.
3. Idem p. 97f.

What the church organization amounts to, then, is this: The revelation contained in Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures is guarded and spread throughout the world under the final control of a self-perpetuating board of five men, the Christian Science Board of Directors, whose orthodoxy is enforced by the terms of the trust deed by which they hold title to the sits of the Mother Church. Everything is strictly regulated throughout the body to the end that the doctrine shall not be corrupted, and that the church shall spread as rapidly as possible. Christian Science is thus devoid of liberty either of action or of opinion within its ranks[1].

Persons becoming members of any Christian Science Church are required to sever allegiance with any other church[2]. The conditions of membership are strict in other respects[3]. Roman Catholics are debarred not only from membership, but from learning Christian Science from teachers or practitioners[4]. Members violating the by-laws are amenable to discipline, and to excommunication[5]. As we have seen[6], members are practically restricted to association with their own kind. To be sure, tolerance of others' opinions is inculcated[7] and Christian Scientists are expected to "love" their neighbors "as themselves"[8]. But they are taught, in addition to the by-law restrictions, that "sympathy with error should disappear"[9], and error includes

1. Cf. Goodwin, Christian Science Church, pp. 34-35
2. Manual p. 34.
3. Manual pp. 34f.
4. Manual p. 87.
5. Manual pp. 50-54.
6. Supra, pp. 74f.
7. S&H 444:13ff.
8. S&H 205:22ff, 206:15-18.
9. S&H 211:21.

grief over suffering or death. Furthermore, Christian Scientists must beware of the "baneful effect of evil associates"[1], which means practically all non-Christian Scientists, since all such believe in the reality of "evil" and of "matter". It is, indeed, common for Christian Scientists not only to 'flock by themselves', but to "demonstrate" after talking with non-Christian Scientists in order to remove the evil effects of such intercourse.

Mutual help is a concept little used in "Science". One should assist a fellow believer when that one, for any reason, is unable to overcome his error alone, but self-sufficiency is the rule[2].

We find, also, that "Scientists" have little sense of community responsibility. They do "mental work" only, I am told by a social worker who has been somewhat interested in Christian Science, for legislation designed to better social conditions, whereas they do lobbying of the usual type against legislation which would in anyway interfere with their churches or healing practice[3].

MARRIAGE

The "Science" view of marriage differs enough from that held by most of us to be worthy of consideration here. Mrs. Eddy had considerable experience in this matter of matrimony, having had three husbands. She seems to have serious doubts about the value of marriage as a source of happiness[4]. She

1. S&H 449:19f.
2. Misc. Writings p. 39.
3. Cf. Manual p. 45, section 16.
4. Misc. Writings p. 52.

quotes "It is not good to marry" from Matthew, and says these words have special reference to Christian Scientists[1]. There will be a time when marriage will no longer be necessary, since human kind will be propagated directly by God[2]. But, since marriage is at present necessary, it should be spiritualized as much as possible[3]. Mutual freedom of husband and wife (within the bonds of chastity) is best. Above all, once marriage is entered into, it should be made the best of[4].

There is only one provision in the Manual on marriage, viz., that "Scientists" must be married by legally authorized clergymen[5]. This rules out, apparently, justices of the peace and the like. It is in accord, however, with a general rule in Christian Science, namely, that the laws of the state, whatever they are, should be obeyed. This rule holds even to the extent of reporting contagious disease where the law requires it.

1. Misc. Writings, p. 398.
2. Misc. Writings 286; S&H 56:8-14, 64:17-25, 68:30-69:16.
3. S&H 57:15ff; 61:4ff; 61:30f.
4. S&H 56:15-57:3; 59:27-60:11.
5. Manual p. 49.

WHO RESPOND TO THE APPEAL

It would be most interesting and valuable for the subject of this paper to know the psychological characteristics of a large number of Christian Scientists. But it is not possible to get that information directly. A questionnaire would help, doubtless, but that method would be difficult of application, expensive (for the purpose of this paper) and unsatisfactory as a source of evidence. An extensive and intensive acquaintance with "Scientists" would be helpful, but I do not possess it. I have, therefore, been forced to be content with indirect methods of determining who respond to the appeal of Christian Science.

Since the primary division in the human race is sexual, it should be illuminating to find out which sex predominates in Christian Science churches, and by what percentage. Fortunately some data is available on this subject. McComas found on the basis of the Census for Religious Bodies of 1906 that the proportion of women members in "Science" churches in the United States was 72.4 per cent. By contrast, he found the percentage of women in Unitarian Churches to be 60.8. Women, he found, outnumber men in all churches[1]. An even larger disproportion of women is found in the ranks of the practitioners. The proportion (based on Goodwin's figures taken from the Christian Science Journal for June, 1916) is 88.7 per cent. But my own figure, based upon the list in the Journal for April, 1919, is even slightly larger:89 per cent. I have not been able to get a religious census since that used by McComas, sc I have not attempted to check up

1. McComas, Psychology of Religious Sects, p. 101.

his figures on total membership. It should be noted, however, that the proportion of women in the larger cities is somewhat smaller in the Christian Science churches. This statement is based in part on McComas' table of averages for six denominations in eleven cities, which, in the case of the Christian Science church, are all large (8 out of the 11), viz., Boston, New York, Cleveland, Chicago, Detroit, Denver, San Francisco, and St. Louis. The average for those cities, each being taken as a unit, is 70.75 per cent. The Unitarian average for those cities is 61.8. That the percentage of women is lower in large cities even in the case of practitioners is evident from my examination of the list for April, 1919. For the State of Wisconsin, for example, in which Milwaukee is the only large city, the proportion of men in Milwaukee is 20 per cent. For the rest of the state it is 5- per cent. For the City of New York (including Brooklyn) the proportion of women is slightly higher than normal: 90+ per cent. In Buffalo, on the contrary, it is much smaller, 80+. In Philadelphia the proportion of women is yet smaller, 70+. In Chicago it is only slightly lower than the average, viz., 87.8. In Los Angeles it is about the same: 87.6, while in San Francisco it is much lower: 81+ per cent. There is, in general, then, a tendency for a larger percentage of male practitioners in the larger centers of population. But, in any event, the preponderance of women is even larger than in the general membership.

On this whole question of sex we are bound to conclude that Christian Science appeals much more to women than to men.

Everyone familiar with the appearance of Christian Science assemblies has noted the sleek, prosperous appearance of the people composing them. Though figures are not accessible, it seems sure that the majority of "Scientists" are fairly prosperous in respect to this world's goods. Herbert W. Horwill, writing on Christian Science in England, says, "The converts made in the West End of London are already so numerous that one can scarcely say of the 'Church of Christ, Scientist', that 'not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called', while considerable progress has been made in several of those northern cities which are supposed to have little tolerance for creeds that cannot approve themselves to a robust intelligence. Newspaper editors, as a rule, are shrewd judges of the public mind, and the fact that a paper like the London Tribune should have thought it worth while to publish a verbatim report of a long lecture by Mr. Bicknell Young in the Albert Hall is a notable evidence of the success of the Christian Science propaganda in arresting general attention"[1]. Furthermore, Christian Science may be judged to appeal to the fairly prosperous middle class by the location of its very substantial, and, withal, beautiful churches. In Chicago, Evanston, Oak Park, (Illinois), Milwaukee (Wisconsin), and Minneapolis (Minnesota), all Christian Science churches are located in the 'better' residence sections. Another bit of evidence on this point of economic class is this, that Christian Science has no rural churches, and comparatively few in small towns.

1. London Quarterly Review, Oct. 1907 (vol. 108, p. 219).

In order to get at the psychological reasons for the appeal of Christian Science one should know the 'apperceptive mass' of those who join that religion before they join. That quest would involve the determination of the Weltanschauung of those people---a Herculean, if not a Sisyphean task. But it is possible to make a few 'guesses' at it by considering several historical facts, as well as by making some inferences from particular sections of the textbook.

To take the second class of evidence first, let us recall what I pointed out above[1], namely, that Mrs. Eddy in Science and Health has much to say against pantheism, spiritualism, and hypnotism (animal magnetism). I infer that she found a large number among those she wished to convert interested in those subjects. I do not think Mrs. Eddy was fighting imaginary enemies in her arguments against those subjects. That this 'guess' has a basis in fact appears when we consider certain historical facts.

"It is significant", says Cutten, "that the rise of this cult [Christian Science] was contemporaneous with the revival of and the scientific attention to hypnotism and mental therapeutics"[2]. Precise dates are nearly valueless for our present purpose, since the general spread of ideas is always some time behind their first publication. It is sufficient, then, to note that it was only about twenty years ago that the popular exhibitions of hypnosis ceased to be made. Mrs. Eddy's lifetime coincided, pretty well, with the revival of interest

1. Supra, p. 97.
2. Cutten, Psychological Phenomena of Christianity, p. 214f.

in hypnotism (after Mesmer's claims in the 18th century). Braid died in 1860, and thus the revival began about the time Mrs. Eddy began evolving her system and her book. Furthermore, spiritualism arose in New York state in 1848, hence was an actual opponent---and is to-day, for that matter. And, as I have noted, her own theories sprang from Quimby, who was the parent of several "mental healing" movements. It was in 1869 that Rev. Warren Felt Evans published his first book on the general subject of mental healing, and Evans was for years the great authority on the subject. Hence the various forms of mental and 'divine' healing became rivals to Christian Science. People who enter "Science" are very apt to have become predisposed to do so through prior interest in one or more of these rival cults. Christian Science is a part of the general revolt against Puritanism. Its strongest centers are in those states where that attitude was strongest: New England, Pacific Coast, the northern tier of states.

Another line of attack on this question of 'world view' is that of education in the natural sciences. Since the public school system became fairly general, which is since Mrs. Eddy began her work, though not long since, the natural sciences have become a part of the thinking of most people, particularly of the middle class. To be sure, the part occupied is very small, but at least the word 'science' has become a symbol of accuracy and of worth. Anything having the name 'science' or 'scientific' gets immediate attention. This interest must be considered a part of the world-view of the middle class now, and for a generation back. This conclusion is also verified by the

desperate efforts constantly being made to mediate science to Trinitarian Protestantism.

As a result of this infiltration of science and scientific concepts into the popular mind, a widespread and very deep questioning of orthodox views of the Bible, of Jesus, and especially of miracles, has become general. Doubt regarding the literal inspiration of the Bible, and especially regarding the actuality of the miracles is now well-nigh universal among people of any considerable amount of schooling. To be sure, we also find a reverse movement, though among a less educated class, toward a stricter insistence on the Bible. This class wants to know why the church is not closer than it is to the pictures of early Christianity found in the New Testament.

The Zeitgeist of our time should be considered. "After all", says McComas, "the world to-day is a young man's world; men of seventy who are still in the heyday of success are invariably young men at heart"[1].

Psychotherapy---aside from Christian Science---is in the air; spiritualism appeals to thousands; a questioning of orthodox dogmas and a tendency toward a liberal view of the Bible are prevalent. The gospel of success, of youth, of optimism, is universal. 'Science' is the Aladdin's lamp of to-day. With these observations on the Weltanschauung of people in general to-day (especially in the United States), we are ready to turn to the kernel of this thesis, the psychological analysis which shall, I hope, answer the question: Why do people become Christian Scientists?

1. Psychology of Religious Sects, p. 157.

WHY THEY RESPOND TO THE APPEAL

Most books on the psychology of religion have done little more than describe religious phenomena. They have made some progress toward defining religion, but thus far little has been done toward determining why religion has so powerful a grip on human minds and hearts. Researches during the past thirty years, however, in a different line, have, I think, given us the key to the problem---not, indeed, a key which fits every lock in the religious castle, but which does open at least the outermost door. I refer to the studies in the field of the instincts, or the "original nature of man", as Thorndike calls it.

Those studies indicate clearly one thing, namely, that in man exists a complex, more or less unified and coherent, of innate tendencies to act and to feel in rather specific ways in the presence of given situations. These innate tendencies appear to be nearly uniform throughout the human race, both historically and geographically speaking. They have their homologues in the higher animals, particularly the primates. They may be regarded as the basic characteristics of human nature. In an ultimate analysis they appear to be the springs of action and of feeling from which the whole of human conduct and thought and aspiration has arisen[1].

This whole has arisen from the primitive complex by reason of the fact that the complex itself is not consistent

1. McDougall, Introduction to Social Psychology, p. 20, Thorndike, Original Nature of Man, pp. 123, 310f.

either within the race or within the individual. It has within it conflicting elements, in the attempt to reconcile which, man has supplemented, redirected, and even reversed particular tendencies or instincts. Out of this conflict has come, among other things, religion. Accordingly we find within religion itself conflicting elements[1]. It is evident that that religion will most appeal which reconciles most effectively this conflict both within itself as a product, and in the original nature of man as a cause. Christian Science, as I hope to show, does make this reconciliation very effectively for certain types of people, and therein lies its power.

This conflict within original nature appears in the arousal of <u>any</u> tendency or instinct. Provided the neural basis of the tendency is ready to act, discharge is satisfying. If it be ready to act and is prevented from so doing, especially after discharge has started, annoyance results. If it be unready to act and is forced to do so, annoyance results[2].

But there are some tendencies or instincts which seem to be chronically ready to act, and some which are chronically unready. These Thorndike suggestively calls respectively, "original satisfiers" and "original annoyers". Any instinct may, under proper circumstances, either satisfy or annoy, but <u>on the whole</u> the instincts or tendencies which we need in this study of Christian Science can be classified as either satisfiers or annoyers. The division, of course, cannot be

1. Stratton, <u>Psychology of Religious Life</u>, pp. 3, 26-63.
2. Thorndike, op. cit. 128.

absolute, but it will be found both convenient and suggestive. Insofar as Christian Science succeeds in arousing and contenting the "original satisfiers" it appeals to human nature. Insofar as it brings to quietude the "original annoyers" it also satisfies and so appeals.

I will attempt, then, to classify the several tendencies which, in my opinion, Christian Science both as a philosophy and as a practice satisfies either positively or negatively, in the two broad ways indicated. Both in determining what instincts are pertinent to this subject, and in classifying them I am obliged to rely mainly on my own insight and 'common sense'. Thorndike lists some of the original satisfiers and annoyers, and to that extent my own judgment is reinforced. But, in deciding what instincts "Science" appeals to, I am obliged to rely altogether on my own judgment.

The testimonials would seem to be a proper source of information here, but as a matter of fact they are practically valueless. Most of them tell of events and of mental states which occurred some time, even as much as twenty years, before the relating. Furthermore, the testimonies are in the very nature of the case unreliable as an index of the real inner state. There is a propriety in testimonials as there is in polite conversation, which, in like manner, conceals the facts back of the words. Furthermore, the testifiers are suspiciously fluent of speech. Most of the testimonies which I heard were too coherent to inspire confidence, and I was unable, in hearing them, to avoid the feeling that they were the product of much rehearsing.

Another difficulty in judging what instincts are properly to be considered in this study arises from the fact that nearly if not every theory or practice in Christian Science may arouse or bring to rest different instincts in different individuals, and within the same person at different times. At most, then, this study can only indicate, as it were, sample ways in which Christian Science operates on the original nature of man. There is, however, a sufficient coherence in the results of the analysis to justify me in placing some reliance upon it. With these general observations I turn to the analysis proper.

SATISFIERS

"The states of affairs", says Thorndike, "which have the most reason to be regarded as original satisfiers per se, independently of any particular behavior-series, are sweet, meaty, fruity and nutty tastes, glitter, color and motion in objects seen, being rocked, swung and carried (in childhood), rhythm in percepts and movements, elation, the presence of other human beings, their manifestations of satisfaction and their instinctive approving behavior.....Other things being equal, to have sensations, to initiate movements and to make things happen are satisfying.....imaging or thinking may become as true a want as food when hungry, or capture after a chase"[1].

This quotation from Thorndike indicates the kind of instincts or tendencies which satisfy in and of themselves

1. Thorndike, Original Nature of Man, 130f.

almost always, and which therefore may be called original satisfiers. Not all of them are evoked by Christian Science, needless to say! Nor is the list in the quotation complete. Indeed, it is impossible to make a definite list, for any instinct may be an annoyer on occasion.

Moreover, we shall defeat our purpose to understand the psychological basis of the appeal of Christian Science if we confine ourselves strictly to instincts properly so named. We shall need to include in our classification those hierarchies of instincts and tendencies called "sentiments". Under the term 'Idealism' I will discuss certain very important appeals of "Science". Idealism is, of course, a sentiment. There is another way in which we must broaden our list. The presence of a state of 'readiness to discharge' of the whole system, a condition mainly physiological, must be considered under, for lack of a better term, 'General Readiness'. Similarly, among annoyers, we shall have to consider the opposite condition, that of lack of readiness to act along any line('General Unreadiness').

In discussing the various instinctive bases of the appeal of Christian Science I will use, mainly, McDougall's terminology and classification. Christian Science makes, for the most part, a subjective appeal. It does not, any more than most other religions, appeal by reason of setting in motion action-series. It does set in operation instinctive feeling-series. I will come to this matter again in my summary.

Elation

Under the heading of Elation I include all of the feelings and satisfactions connected with the self as distinguished from other people or the world. We like, instinctively, to feel that we are 'somewhat', or, as American slang has it, 'somebody'. And we like to have other people agree with us in so feeling, and to have them say so in words or in actions.

Christian Science makes a large variety of appeals both obvious and subtle to this instinct of elation. When, for example, the person interested in Christian Science wishes to become a member he finds a number of rigid requirements in his way[1]. Immediately, if he be normal, the instinct of self-assertion or elation is aroused. He will meet the requirements! Mrs. Eddy warns people, also, that Science and Health must be studied to be understood[2]--another appeal to this instinct.

A very clever side to Christian Science in this connection is its insistence that we give up all reliance on other kinds of healing[3]. Prophets have always won adherents by giving them hard things to do. Christian Science appeals for the same reason[4]. We refuse instinctively to be downed by the challenge, and so we exert the "will to believe" until we accomplish the task.

Yet another, and a more obvious appeal to elation is contained in the "Science" conviction that it is "the light

1. Supra, 102.
2. Supra 5, cf. 94f, 97.
3. Supra 71f.
4. Cf. Coe, Psychology of Religion, p. 224, note 2.

of the world"[1], that other Christians are, after all, Pharisees[2] and that therefore "Scientists" should "come out from among them"[3]. Furthermore, "Scientists" are counselled to beware of the "baneful effect of evil associates"[4] and they are expected to "demonstrate" after intercourse with such persons. It needs no argument to see that all of these demands appeal to the instinct of self-assertion or elation.

"Science" very distinctly makes salvation an individual matter[5]. Each one must find out perfection for himself. No one else, not even Christ, can do it for him[6]. Instinctively one accepts this challenge.

Another way in which "Science", in my opinion, appeals to this instinct is connected with the dictum that the Bible needs inspiration to be understood. In all times people have liked mystery, the occult, the secret. And most of us, I think, go through that stage. Certainly many people whom I know have, and I have. Judging from my feelings at that time, one of the elements in this love of the occult is elation. You feel that you have a secret, a deep truth which the rest of mankind does not have. Figuratively, you pat yourself on the back because of this possession. I take it, then, that Christian Science appeals to elation in this fashion. "Science" provides a more or less secret way of discovering the hidden truth in the great depository of truth, the Bible. The "Scientist" feels, being in possession of this secret, distinctly superior to the rest of the world which does not have it.

1. Supra, p. 72.
2. S&H 131:13-133:7.
3. S&H 238:6ff; 451:2-7.
4. Supra, p. 103.
5. Supra, 49, 103.
6. Cf. Mars, The Interpretation of Life, p. 690.

"Science" claims to arouse in men, whether business men or scholars, their latent possibilities[1], and so the instinct we are considering is aroused, since we all wish to be as great, as efficient, as powerful, as irresistible as we can. Christian Science makes an even more specific appeal to many, however, in this connection. We seek business success, seek to enter the 'leisure class' in order that we may indulge in the conspicuous leisure and waste which are the badges of that class[2]. Christian Science claims to be able to help us in business just as in disease and sin[3]. God is unlimited, and we, his reflection, need lack nothing. The desire for the approval, and the envy, of our fellows is satisfied, then, by this "law of unlimited supply"[4].

Elation in women is aroused by "Science" in quite special ways. As we have seen, it provides a recipe for beauty, it insists that calculating ages is foolish, that woman is "the highest species of man", that women are more spiritual than men[5]. A woman reader, equal to the man reader, is universal in the leadership of the church[6]. "Science" preaches the gospel of beauty as a natural expression of goodness[7]. To be well and beautifully dressed, to be always pleasant, always to look one's best in every way is good Christian Science doctrine. Equal rights for men and women, too, are insisted upon by Mrs. Eddy[8].

We naturally treasure those things in our inner life

1. Supra, 66.
2. Cf. Veblen, Theory of the Leisure Class.
3. Supra, 107.
4. Sub. pp. 128, 145f.
5. Supra, 25-27.
6. " , 100.
7. Cf. McCracken, North American Review, vol. 173, p. 535.
8. S&H 63ff.

which we consider beautiful and good. "Science" asserts[1] that those things are permanent, i.e., of God. Thus elation is aroused and satisfied.

Sin, moreover, is only an illusion. It is not a part of our real selves[2]. Now, we like to believe that the evil we do is not a part of ourselves, and this subtle way of keeping our self-respect is confirmed by "Science".

"The common opinion", says Leuba, "is that, in order to live with dignity and contentment, man must believe that his life possesses an absolute and eternal significance, and that devotion to an ideal must be more than a pedagogical device for the conduct of life"[3]. "Science" has a whole heavy battery of arguments enforcing this common opinion, which is, after all, only an expression of man's instinctive belief in himself. "Science" says that man is necessary to God, that God would be unexpressed did not man exist[4]. It gives, I submit, a most comfortable feeling to believe that God needs you!

And it is most comforting to believe that you are not only necessary to God, but also a reflection of Him[5]. You are therefore perfect as He is perfect, you are deathless, spiritual, good only, a child of God, finding your true being in God. Since God is the summation of all values, you are elated by this conviction. And you are further uplifted as you realize that perfection is normal, that, furthermore, you shall not cease ever to evolve and become more and more[6].

1. Supra, 10.
2. " , 34.
3. Leuba, Psychological Study of Religion, pp. 321f.
4. Supra, 33.
5. " , 33-35.
6. " , 31.

It is comforting to you if you are a man to believe that you, a child of God, His reflection, express "creation, intelligence, Truth", or, if you are a woman, to believe that you express "Life and Love"[1].

Christian Science proposes for itself no less grandiose task than to do away altogether with the Relative World[2]. It proposes to do away with all sickness, sin, error, even with death, and to replace all that we seek to rid ourselves of with perfection. It is evident that to ally oneself with such a purpose means to have one's self-assertiveness satisfied in rare measure. To be sure, elation is by no means the only instinct, nor, perhaps, the most important one satisfied by the Christian Science purpose. But that purpose does, I am sure, satisfy in that intimate way. To be convinced that you are doing God's work in His own chosen way, that you can, by right thinking, help to prevent earthquakes, tidal waves, and poverty, is to feel utterly content with yourself.

The various excitants of elation we have thus far considered are, on the whole, rather exterior to the mentality. But there is an important phase of Christian Science which touches the springs of self-assertion more directly. It consists in the mystic experience named, in "Science", "understanding"[3]. This experience touches the instincts and original tendencies of man all along the line(nearly), though in varying degree. Utter certainty that one is right is, as I

1. Supra, 38.
2. " , 55-58.
3. " , 78-82.

have said[1], characteristic of the mystic. And it is in this complete certitude that we find the awakening of elation. Your mystic has touched Reality with the heart of his heart: he cannot brook disagreement with his version of it. Usually he is dogmatic; always so, probably, when other instincts, e.g., submission, do not interfere. Furthermore, in the case of Christian Science, this mystic experience enforces all of these other appeals to elation. The mystic experience gives a happiness, an expansiveness, a sense of power, all of which enforce the instinct of self-assertion. It makes all the rest of the system with its multiform appeals, utterly real: therein is the special importance of "understanding".

Because of this result---expansiveness---Christian Science satisfies the instinct of rivalry, so-called, which is only a phase of elation.

In summary, then, we may say that Christian Science provides a considerable variety of means whereby the primary and very important instinct, elation, is awakened and satisfied.

Submission

Equally original and yet diametrically opposed to the instinct I have called elation is that which I shall call Submission. All normal people, and, probably, all women whether normal or not, take a positive pleasure at some time or other in surrendering to a master, to a force or a personality which seems to be greater than oneself. Submission is not, I think, so clearly an original satisfier as is elation. But,

1. Supra, p. 90.

on the whole, it should be so classified. Though we do not, commonly find satisfaction in surrendering to one of our own sex, we do take pleasure in surrendering to one of the opposite sex. This is less true of men, of course, than it is of women, who are, according to Thorndike, submissive (in general) to men (in general)[1]. But we all take pleasure in giving our wills and our lives to God or to some ideal which claims our uttermost allegiance. Patriotism is an expression, in large measure, of this instinct. So is religion. Christian Science, as we shall see, awakens this instinct with special potency.

Science and Health is a revelation of truth "uncontaminated by human hypotheses"[2]. "Science" sets up a final and absolute authority in its Board of Directors[3], and regulates even the silent prayers offered in church[4]. To be a good Christian Scientist you must submit to this authority both in the doctrine and in the institution[5]. You can, indeed you must, just surrender to the "Truth". "The satisfaction", says Lathan A. Crandall, "which multitudes seem to feel in submitting to the authority of Mrs. Eddy, makes it probable that the same cause which takes some people into the Roman Catholic Church accounts in a measure for the growth of Christian Science; viz., a desire to have troublesome questions settled for them"[6]. This "cause" is larger than Crandall makes it out to be. Not only do people want to have somebody else settle their problems,

1. Original Nature of Man, p. 93.
2. Supra, p. 5.
3. " , p. 101f.
4. " , p. 73.
5. " , pp. 72-75.
6. Faunce et al., Searchlights on Christian Science, p. 67.

but they derive satisfaction from giving up to an authority which they consider superior. Christian Science has the advantage of Catholicism in the United States and other predominantly Protestant countries in that it does not have attached to it the centuries-long fear and repugnance which is attached to Roman Catholicism.

Christian Science appeals to submission by means of its exaltation of God[1]. In our time no other religion lays such insistent emphasis on the infinite glory and goodness and love and truth and wisdom, and, in general, on the limitless worth of God. Other religions have turned away, largely, from God's infinitude to our present human duty and opportunity. Christian Science exalts God nearly as much as did Neo-Platonism and Judaism. But it also makes man and God very near to each other, for God needs man to reflect and express Him. The Christian Scientist cannot help feeling his utter dependence on so vastly superior a being as is God. Everything which to him is worth while is God. The instinct of submission is poignantly aroused by this conviction.

Furthermore, Christian Science plays most effectively upon this instinct by its practice of surrender to God, of "working things out God's way"[2]. This practice both suggests to the "Scientist", and furthers, the Christian Science purpose of abolishing mortal mind. Prayer consists in thinking God's thoughts after Him, a practice whereby we share His wisdom, His Love, Strength, and Truth. Prayer is surrender to God,

1. Supra, pp. 13-15, 16.
2. " , pp. 76-78, 90.

then, a means, too, of furthering His purpose. In the presence of God, and of this gigantic purpose in which we can share, we become conscious of our dependency on God, even while we are elated at our importance.

Surrender to God is essential to "understanding". And a characteristic of any mystic experience is submission to Reality, or God. Always in the records left by the mystics, great or small, we find expressions of humility, of lack of worth, of the submergence of the little human self in the vaster self of God. That is precisely the most potent way in which "Science" calls for the instinct of submission.

Tenderness

"Tenderness" is McDougall's name for the emotional aspect of the parental instinct[1], which he makes the root of most if not all of our altruism. Tenderness is found in both sexes, though it is far stronger in the female. Its great word is "love", by which, however, is meant something very different from the passion between the sexes. It is the love which makes other people, and even things worthful, so precious in many cases as to make us give up life itself for their sake. It is an emotion very important in religion.

Christian Science makes a strong appeal to this instinct both in its theories and in its practice. It appeals directly to mothers by its theory that children are innately good[2], by the assertion that children understand it[3], by the admonition

1. Introduction to Social Psychology, p. 71
2. Supra, p. 35.
3. Misc. Writings p. 53.

that children should be trained in love instead of by the use of force[1]. Mothers, especially those in whom the parental instinct is strong but the sexual instinct weak, are appealed to by the dictum that the propagation of the species is really spiritual, not physical, which means that their little ones are in reality utterly pure and holy. The instinct is also satisfied in mothers by the emphasis on love in developing the child's character. Three testimonials which I heard in Evanston, Illinois, bore upon this point directly.

But "Science" appeals to the instinct in its larger implications. It counsels us to love very literally our neighbors as ourselves, to do them every kindness, even to the extent of protecting them from themselves[2]. Further, "Science" maintains that "Man is idea, the image, of Love"[3]. The essence of the real man, then, is this tenderness which is love.

And thus we approach a very important way in which "Science" awakens this instinct: its emphasis, both in theory and in practice, upon love as the key to God's character. God is love[4]. He is also all good, without any evil or vengeance or other quality distasteful to the tender emotion[5]. And "Science" deliberately cultivates a passionate love for God[6]. "The West", says Stratton, "with its greater respect for woman and her love, has in general been less fearful than have the higher religions of the Orient, of admitting a passionate affection and not a mere <u>amor intellectualis</u> as a

1. <u>Misc. Writings</u> p. 51.
2. Supra, pp. 76, 103.
3. " , p. 34.
4. " , p. 15.
5. " , pp. 13f.
6. " , p. 76.

means of union with divinity"[1]. This Western type of love for God is that practiced by Christian Science despite its use of the word "Principle" as a name for Deity.

By exalting God to the uttermost possible extent, "Science" makes Him supremely worthy of devotion. And by making Man God's reflection, it makes this love seem not only possible but supremely right and natural. By putting before its adherents the task of spiritualizing not only mankind but the universe as well, a task which we can perform for and with God, "Science" excites the tender emotion to a very high degree: not only do we thus show our love for God, the Utterly Worthful, but we also express it for each and every human being, and for every creature.

The emotional essence, almost, of the mystic experience is tenderness. Every mystic speaks of love as the key-note in his harmony with reality. The deliberate discipline of Christian Science has as its aim the production of the mystic experience, "understanding"[2]. Thus Christian Science deliberately cultivates love as a vital reality, and so leavens the whole of life with the tender emotion.

Acquisition

Among the original constituents of human nature is the impulse to collect things, and to find satisfaction in possessing them, in contemplating them as one's own---as it were, a part of one's larger self. Ordinarily, I think, this instinct

1. Psychology of the Religious Life, p. 107.
2. Supra, pp. 78-80, 90.

is not called out by religion. But Christian Science does do so indirectly at least, and, I think, also directly in a 'rarified'form.

To take the direct incitement of this instinct first, let us recall that "Science" teaches us that we are God's reflection, that we live in and because of Him, as his children. Now children very commonly feel a sense of proprietorship in their parents, as is soon evidenced when another child claims them, or when a new baby takes their attention. I think that this instinctive impulse remains throughout life, that we adults express it sometimes in regard to the persons whom we love. In a sense this is jealousy, but it is not quite the same. When we contemplate one we love we are prone to feel a warm, cozy sense of possessing that person. Now "Science" cultivates such a passionate love of God that I suspect that, were we able to get into the minds of "Scientists", we should find the sense of proprietorship there. "I belong to God, and God belongs to me" would be the expression of it.

However this appeal be, whether real or fancied by me, the indirect appeal to acquisitiveness is real. The outward prosperity of Christian Science appeals to many who want to belong to the prosperous class, or who already are in it. But "Science" makes a more direct appeal than that. A business loss or a financial "lack" can be "healed" by "Science" just as a cold or the habit of smoking can. One testimonial I heard told of business losses having been "healed". And within the past fortnight, as I have been writing, a more striking case came to my attention. A certain patent medicine maker in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, found his income seriously

lessening owing to the decreasing demand for his product. A couple of years ago, when these losses had reduced his income to only a few thousands per year, he was "treated for prosperity" by a Christian Science practitioner. The very next morning, on entering the Plankinton Hotel in Milwaukee, he met a stranger who wanted capital to put an automobile accessory on the market. Convinced of the worth of the invention, the patent medicine maker advanced the money. To-day, after the accessory has been on the market but a short time, he is making, according to my informant, over six hundred dollars a week. The "treatment for prosperity" "worked", and the man is now a devout "Scientist".

This sort of thing, which reminds us of Aladdin's "wonderful lamp", is not at all an excrescence in "Science". God is able, and in fact does, according to Christian Science, provide an unlimited supply of whatever we, His reflection, really need, whether it be health, or love, or dollars[1]. Such is the "law of unlimited supply".

Another way, apparently, in which Christian Science appeals to the instinct of acquisition is through the profits in healing and in teaching[2]. It is a suggestive fact that men healers are hardly to be found outside of the large cities where, of course, the profits in the business would be very considerable.

1. Misc. Writings, p. 45.
2. Supra, pp. 93f.

Anger

"The state of affairs, angry and pugnacious behavior, is apparently satisfying. Of course, some of the situations that provoke it are far from satisfying intrinsically, but the responses made to them are, and often enough so to make one rather seek than avoid the situation itself"[1]. Such is anger as an original satisfier. Usually, of course, anger and pugnacity are not set in motion by religion. Nor are they by Christian Science in itself. But they are wherever "Science" is persecuted, and to-day even in the larger centers no other religion is so much maligned and ridiculed as is Christian Science. It is safe to say that some people find an outlet for their pugnacity in belonging to a religious body which is persecuted even in the mild way to which "Science" is subjected nowadays. Anger is not, however, of much importance as a motive in Christian Science. And, when "Science" shall have been entirely accepted as a part of our religious life this motive will be quite obliterated.

General Readiness

Under this highly unsatisfactory term, which, however, I have not been able to better, I include those general tendencies to mental and physical activity which result in curiosity, random movements, construction and destruction, and the like, all of which are eminently satisfactory unless obstructed. I include, that is to say, McDougall's

1. Thorndike, Original Nature of Man, p. 75.

"Curiosity-Wonder" classification[1], his "Construction"[2], both of which are included under the heading, "Tendencies to Minor Bodily Movements and Cerebral Connections" by Thorndike[3], and especially what the latter calls "The Instinct of Multiform Mental Activity"[4]. Physiologically speaking, all of these instincts require a general readiness of the neural complex to act.

The importance of this general classification is considerable in accounting for the appeal of Christian Science. "Not only making movements and thereby getting sensations, but also making an ideal plan and thereby getting a conclusion, making an imaginary person and thereby getting further imaginations of how he would act, and countless other 'gettings from doings', are satisfying. They are originally satisfying since, as soon as training gives the ability to make the plan or image and get the result, nature gives satisfyingness to the connection"[5]. In short, imaging or thinking becomes a true demand of human nature, and its satisfaction becomes a motive.

Christian Science in several ways appeals to people through this general readiness of the neural system. It claims, and for that matter fulfils its claims, to remove the vacuity of life which so many people feel after a long experience of social life, the pursuit of fame, money, and the like. "Science" introduces a sense of worthfulness into life; it

1. Introduction to Social Psychology, pp. 59ff.
2. Idem, p. 91
3. Original Nature of Man, pp. 135ff.
4. Idem, p. 141.
5. Idem, p. 142.

opens up a wholly new universe to such people through its theories of the reality of the good and true, the loving and the ideal, and its corresponding denial of the worth of that which those people had found ultimately unsatisfying(mortal mind[1]). Christian Science fosters a lively religious life by its regimen of daily reading, prayer, and "demonstrating".

Another way in which "Science" appeals to this hunger of people for activity of mind is through their curiosity to know what it is. The high prices charged for the books, the difficulty of becoming a member, the highly dogmatic claims of the body, all excite people to investigate. The testimonials also have this effect frequently. Often, too, people are inspired to investigate "Science" because they have seen how people have been cured, or sweetened and made well in mind and in body by it[2].

"Curiosity" is aroused also through the claim of "Science" that it has the true way to interpret the Bible. The many who are addicted to the occult are interested in it because "wonder" (McDougall's sense) is strong in them, and so they find Christian Science interesting to them.

One of the most common products of this general readiness to act or to think is asceticism. All through the centuries the desire to find satisfaction by sacrifice, by doing the hard thing, has existed in many people. That desire is, I think, mainly due to this surplus of energy. "Science" both appeals and repulses in this connection. Mrs. Eddy recommends

1. Cf. supra, pp. 23-28, 64-66, 78-80.
2. Cf. "How Clara Barton Became Interested in Christian Science", Arena, vol. 39, pp. 573f.

celibacy[1], and she demands obedience[2], but she also, or, perhaps more accurately, Christian Science also insists that poverty and other forms of material sacrifice are "error".

The surplus of energy is also called out by the challenge of Christian Science that we give up entirely our reliance on any other methods of relieving the ills of human life. And it is also called out by the dictum of "Science" that we must save ourselves. Again it is the hard thing which appeals, and it appeals because we fell full of energy and want something difficult to do.

A particular form of appeal made by "Science" in just this way arises by reason of the purpose which Christian Science sets before its members: to transform the mortal world into the immortal one.

General readiness manifests itself often in what is commonly called "constructiveness". "Science" satisfies this aspect of the general tendency by commanding us, and helping us to reconstruct our own personalities into ideal forms. And the way in which it helps us is through "understanding". When one succeeds in filling his whole mentality with the ideal concept he gets the conviction that he is actually, then and there, reconstructing himself,---or the person he is endeavoring to heal. After all, mysticism is trying to do the same thing that science is trying to do. The difference is that mysticism believes it has a short-cut method to attain the end: the spiritualization of life, the realization of the ideal[3].

1. Supra, p. 104.
2. " , pp. 101-103, 71-75.
3. Cf. E. S. Ames, "Mystic Knowledge", American Journal of Theology, vol. 19, pp. 250-267.

Gregariousness

Innate in humanity as in many of the higher animals is the desire to be with one's kind. The instinct of gregariousness, as this is called, has long been recognized as original.

Christian Science, as a system of thought and of discipline, makes only a feeble appeal to this instinct. God needs man to reflect and express Him. In a pale sort of way gregariousness, perhaps, is awakened by this doctrine, which means that God is a social being. It is also awakened by the doctrine that human kind is a unit, a family of which God is the head.

But "Science" makes no other appeal to gregariousness, at least in one who approaches it for the first time. After one has become a "Scientist", however, and has entered the Church, the instinct finds some satisfaction. Though the body has no social meetings as such, the members are very fond of chatting with one another after the services. They are also, by reason of the "baneful effect of evil associates" (the rest of the world), forced to 'flock together'. But this is rather the result of the unfulfilled demands of gregariousness rather than a stimulus to that instinct.

Admiration

According to McDougall admiration is a compound emotion consisting of "wonder" and "submission"[1]. It is, so far as I can see, little aroused by "Science". One on the outside feels, to be sure, admiration at the audacity of Mrs. Eddy in denying evil altogether, in saying that it is nothing. But

1. Introduction to Social Psychology, p. 132.

this is not, I am sure, the way a "Scientist" looks at the matter. Nor does he feel admiration, I think, toward God. Admiration is too slight a feeling for that connection.

Awe

McDougall says that awe is admiration plus a slight measure of fear[1]. It thus contains three elements, fear, submission, and wonder. Whatever the merit of this analysis, the emotion is well-known, and is satisfying.

It is aroused by "Science" in several ways, though it is not, I think, to be considered a strong source of the appeal made by Christian Science. Those who like the occult feel little thrills of awe in contemplating the secrets of the universe which are revealed to them. They find in "Science" some satisfaction, then.

More important is the arousal of awe by the exaltation of God in Christian Science. We instinctively feel awe in the presence of the vast and unknown whenever it does not evoke fear in a recognizable amount. The Christian Science God is certainly capable of arousing awe in this way.

Reverence

Reverence, according to McDougall, is awe plus tenderness. Whatever be the accuracy of this analysis, the emotion is a satisfier, and one which is awakened by Christian Science. Reverence is a gentler feeling than awe, and it therefore fits better the "Science" temper which attempts to resolve the

1. Introduction to Social Psychology, p. 135.

universe as well as man into love.

I take it from reading the testimonials, and from my attempts to put myself in the place of an "infant in Science", that this emotion is evoked mainly in the beginning of one's career in "Science". God is so infinite in every quality one admires that the thought of Him brings this gentle stirring of the heart and overwhelming of the mind which is reverence. But, I judge, the emotion does not persist in most "Scientists" for the reason that it is heightened into love. The same must be said of the feeling of reverence felt toward Jesus and Mrs. Eddy, though in both of these cases the tendency is, I think, for the emotion to remain longer at the stage of reverence, and sometimes it never ripens into love.

The process of ripening occurs, apparently, in the course of inducing the mystic experience ("understanding"). The sense of unity with God and with the whole ideal world becomes love as it does in the case of the religious mystics generally.

Gratitude

This emotion is, according to McDougall, a compound of tenderness and submission[1]. I am, in general, inclined to be rather skeptical of his analyses of emotions into elements, but this one seems to be accurate. Nevertheless, I seem to feel, in gratitude, an element which is sui generis. Be that as it may, the word gratitude names a feeling known to all normal people, particularly to women, a feeling which

1. Op. cit., p. 136.

is satisfying to most of us.

It is very prominent in Christian Science, though it is not, I think, so prominent as its universal expression in the testimonials makes it appear to be. Every one of them expresses gratitude toward Mrs. Eddy, and usually toward God, and sometimes also toward Jesus and the Board of Directors. The allocation of gratitude shown in the order given above makes me think that it is largely cultivated rather than spontaneous. It needs, of course, no profound acumen to see that people would feel gratitude toward one who had helped them to regain health or peace of mind. But Mrs. Eddy's constant insistence that we should give honor where honor is due seems to me to be a more potent cause of the expressions than the feeling itself.

At any rate, the exaltation of God, particularly as the infinitude of love, accounts for some of the gratitude, perhaps for most of the genuine feeling. And the mystic state which is induced by the discipline is certainly a strong agent in fixating the emotion. Mystic utterances in general express this combination of surrender to God and of love for Him.

Joy

Joy is a general state of emotional satisfaction with oneself and with one's world. It is a more permanent condition of mind than is pleasure, and may, indeed, be properly said to be the emotional aspect of a "sentiment", that aspect which exists when the sentiment is being normally expressed without obstruction. Any sentiment, e.g., the "self-regarding", will, I take it, be accompanied with joy under these circumstances. Joy is, it goes without saying, eminently satisfying.

Christian Science aims at developing a definite sentiment, which is to say, it attempts to unify the whole personality about certain interests or motives. I will attempt, in my summary of the psychological basis for the appeal of "Science", to give a sketch of this sentiment. It suffices here to say that your genuine "Scientist" is one who has succeeded in large measure in building up the sentiment, and that therefore he feels joy most of the time.

At the heart of the sentiment is "understanding" as the means, and a characteristic aspect of "understanding" is joy[1].

Happiness

There is much doubt in my mind as to the need of making any distinction between joy and happiness. The latter is, perhaps, only a farther-reaching kind of the former. "Science" guarantees happiness, which is both a claim and an attainment. "The real reason why at the present moment Christian Science is spreading by leaps and bounds is that, all theory aside, it does make men and women happy"[2].

Familiarity

Under this title I subsume the various expressions of that psychological fact which forms a part of habit, namely, that what we have already experienced is more easily experienced again, particularly in the near future. It is what McDougall means by the term "repetition"[3]. It is a source of general

1. Supra, pp. 78-80.
2. E. Brewster, in the Monist, vol. 17, p. 188.
3. Introduction to Social Psychology, pp. 119ff.

satisfaction, also, to meet with facts or persons that are familiar. As we shall see, this source of satisfaction is a very important means by which Christian Science appeals to people, since it includes the labyrinth of theories, of prejudices and preferences which go to make up one's world-view. Other things being equal, Christian Science will appeal in the proportion that it fits into the world-view one already has; furthermore it will appeal insofar as it settles conflicts among familiar ideas.

Nowadays in the United States most people are torn between the traditional tendency to judge religious claims by authority and the newer, scientific tendency to judge them by their results. Indeed, one may almost say that the great religious problem of to-day is that of reconciling the scientific attitude with the traditional one. Christian Science makes its appeal by reason of the fact that on the basis of much of the old it builds a structure which looks, in many ways, like the new. We shall need to go into this matter in some detail in order to appreciate how "Science" appeals to people thus.

Christian Science retains the belief in revelation as the basis of religious truth. The Bible is the primary revelation[1], and thus the childhood teachings of many people, particularly those of middle age, are reinforced by "Science". The disquiet aroused by modern teachings is allayed by the device of "inspired interpretation". However, "The fact should not be overlooked that few intelligent and careful students of the Bible have become Christian Scientists. The writer does not

1. Supra, 3-6.

personally know of one such instance, neither has he ever heard of one"[1].

The restoration in Christian Science of the connection between religion and physical healing which marked early Christianity argues, to many, its verity, both as a revelation and as a return to Christ. To thousands still attached to Christ in the traditional way this conviction appeals with tremendous power. Testimonials in which the Bible, as understood through "Science", is said to be the source of healing attest the living force of this appeal.

Another way in which "Science" appeals is through its revival of the doctrine of the "second death" mentioned in Revelations[2]. Indeed, the whole Christian Science doctrine regarding the life immediately after death[3] removes the perplexity in many minds over the instantaneous rise to perfection or sinking to perdition of souls which are mixed good and evil.

"Science" appeals, also, through its attempt to base its doctrine of mortal mind upon the Bible[4]. And the use of the phrase, "Adam-dream"[5], conciliates those who can no longer believe in original sin, but who still have lingering traces of that doctrine in their minds.

The Christian Science doctrines about Jesus and Christ appeal, too, because of their similarity to orthodox ideas. The virgin birth is made to seem reasonable to many, as are, also, the resurrection and the ascension[6]. "Science" retains,

1. Lathan A. Crandall in Searchlights on Christian Science, 68.
2. Rev. chapter 20, verse 6.
3. Supra, pp. 40f.
4. " , pp. 44f.
5. Supra, p. 31.
6. Supra, pp. 50-53.

too, the thought of Jesus as the mediator between God and man. Christ as the "Way-shower", or "Comforter", fits easily into the traditional Weltanschauung[1].

Many people are attracted by the Christian Science version of the second coming of Christ[2]. "Science" as the second coming seems more reasonable than the literalistic dogma of the Church.

The Christian Science reinterpretation of the belief in angels[3] doubtless appeals to some who have been taught to believe in those 'messengers' from God.

Persons with a pre-evolutionary world-view, and there are still thousands of them in the United States, are appealed to by Mrs. Eddy's rejection of Darwinism[4]. This doctrine, of course, interferes with the appeal of "Science" to younger and more modern people, but it appeals to them by its doctrine of a spiritual evolution[5].

These appeals by "Science" to the older point of view are counterbalanced by appeals to the newer. The problem of the miracles has bothered thousands. Christian Science solves this problem for many by its dictum that they were not exceptions to natural law, but, on the contrary, supremely natural[6]. Christian Science also admits the value of the so-called higher criticism[7] and so appeals to those who cannot help seeing the reasonableness of that way of examining the Bible.

The eighteenth century was marked, religiously, by the

1. Supra, 21-23.
2. Supra, 5f, 53f.
3. " , 21.
4. " , 11.
5. " , 21.
6. " , 5f.
6. " , 3f.

prevalence of 'deism', whereby God was removed far from the universe and man. Christian Science confirms the desire of people to have a vital, close relationship to God:

> "Christian Science affirms that God is as near his world to-day as in any age, and performing all the wonders now that he ever performed. In this it agrees with the Roman Catholic Church, and is a standing reproach to Protestant unbelief"[1].

Modern astronomy and the other sciences have made the belief in heaven as a place untenable. Christian Science solves this difficulty by saying that heaven is a state of the soul, a condition of harmony with God[2].

Not a few people are repulsed by the practice of many ministers, particularly Evangelical men, of advising God to do this, that, and the other, in their prayers. "Science" asserts that God needs no advice, that prayer is "understanding", which is to say, thinking God's thoughts after Him[3].

Further, many wish a direct contact with God in prayer. They do not wish to approach Deity even through Christ as intermediary. "Science" says we do pray directly to God.

Christian Science fits into the world-view of many because it retains, mutatis mutandis, many of the old terms, e.g., Trinity, Christ, etc. To be sure, "Science" rejects the traditional view of the Trinity[4], but it substitutes a trinity of its own, viz., Life, Truth, and Love, which are, however, not persons but functions of God, the One[5].

Satan, who has become an anomaly in modern thinking, even among orthodox Protestants, is rejected by "Science"[6].

1. W. H. P. Faunce, Searchlights on Christian Science, 46.
2. Supra, 27.
3. Supra, 81
4. " , 16.
5. " , 14, 16.
6. " , 16.

Due to the infiltration into religious thinking of the political doctrine of liberty for the individual, both in thought and in conduct, many rebel against the dogmas and creeds of the traditional churches. Though Christian Science is more completely centralized and dogmatized than Roman Catholicism itself, this fact is not apparent to the "infant in Science". He is expected to think his own way to perfection. He is expected to heal himself of all of his "claims". Thus the flavor of liberty is retained, though the substance is gone. But the flavor is sufficient for many.

In several important ways Christian Science appeals to what may be called the traditional ethical philosophy. Whether we act upon it or not, most of us accept as an ideal the saying of Jesus that we should love our neighbors as ourselves. "Science" not only holds this up as an ideal[1], but it shows us how we may make it a reality in our lives. "Science", in common with traditional thought, insists that the way to God is purity of heart[2], and it shows us how to attain it.

I am inclined to think that we must, in this connection, regard as important the naive division of acts into absolute categories of good and bad. Out of the static conception of the universe prevalent before Darwin, that conception which claimed that God created the universe once and for all, we retain the conviction that good and evil are utterly distinct. Christian Science appeals to this prejudice by elevating this ethical dogmatism into a dualistic metaphysics, and therefore appeals.

1. Supra, 76, 102.
2. Supra, 64.

And "Science", by this relegation of evil to the category, "nothing", helps many to solve the great problem of life: Why, if God is good, does evil exist? Another way in which "Science" attracts is by its acceptance, with differences, of the traditional view that the function of evil is, through the suffering involved in it, to lead us to seek out God[1].

Twice I have referred[2] to Mrs. Eddy's arguments and fulminations against certain enemies, pantheism, spiritualism, and the like. This battle is important psychologically. In their search after religious vitality and satisfaction, tens of thousands, if not millions of people, especially in the United States, have run after these strange gods. Spiritualism, especially, to-day, holds its multitudes. In Chicago there are more than a score of spiritualistic churches, more than there are of "Science" churches (16 only). So it is in much of the land. We have, also, a very widespread interest in New Thought and other psychotherapic cults. Not many years ago when I was selling books publishers sent me circulars advising me to "play up" books on New Thought and kindred subjects. Any any bookstore of reasonable size makes it a practice to keep a large stock of such books on hand. The demand, in short, is very large. So is the demand for books on astrology, palmistry, Oriental religions, Theosophy, Spiritualism, and hypnotism. In the United States, then, we must admit, exists a large number of people who are interested in these subjects. The hunger for the magical and the occult is as old as man, doubtless, and it is almost as strong now

1. Supra, 41f.
2. Supra, 97, 108.

as ever. Numerically, doubtless, it is stronger, for to-day not a Paracelsus here and there, but the mass of badly educated people is interested in the occult. What does Christian Science offer to these people? To answer that question is to tell why many people find "Science" satisfying.

I have indicated in some measure why Christian Science appeals to these people[1]. Now I hope to show how, through the satisfaction which the familiar brings, these people are further attracted to "Science". The fact that Mrs. Eddy felt it so necessary to distinguish clearly her system from these movements shows that many confused "Science" with them. Pantheism, particularly, was disliked by Mrs. Eddy, and yet her theory that the real universe, real rocks, plants, animals, men, are God's ideas approaches pantheism. People who have a leaning toward pantheism, then, may be expected to find this aspect of Christian Science congenial.

Mrs. Eddy asserts that various planes of consciousness exist[2]. Theosophists and Spiritualists also believe this, and so, to that extent, "Science" would appeal to them. In line with this mode of appeal is Mrs. Eddy's belief in "developed mental powers"[3], a notion which would appeal to the same people. Telepathy is accepted by Mrs. Eddy[4], and would form, therefore, a point of contact with the previous thinking of many.

Malicious animal magnetism[4] would certainly appeal to those people who like to dabble in the occult and in magic,

1. Supra, 117, 131.
2. " , 11.
3. " , 13.
4. " , 35f, 63f.

the people who devour the many books on the evil eye, the Rosicrucians, on magic in general.

After pantheism and spiritualism, perhaps the most bitter denunciations and arguments put forth by Mrs. Eddy are in regard to hypnotism, or animal magnetism[1]. We here approach the large field of mental therapeutics. As I have shown[2], the rise of "Science" was contemporaneous with the revival of interest in hypnotism, and with the rise of a number of healing cults, New Thought, Divine Science, Mental Healing, Divine Healing, etc., etc. All of them teach that thoughts are the source of actions, a distinctly Christian Science tenet[3]. Those, moreover, who have dabbled in psychology, especially the popularized brand which asserts that thoughts, if not inhibited, become actions (idec-motor theory), easily are convinced that Christian Science is true. "Science" classifies thoughts as powerful and impotent[4], a division common to New Thought as well. So, also, is the holding of "models" before the mind common to New Thought[5]. So is the theory that "God provides for every human need"[6]. Particularly suggestive here is the financial application of this doctrine of "unlimited supply". In discussing Acquisition[7] I showed how this "law" works. It is on all fours with a similar belief in New Thought---at least in some of its mulitudinous varieties. For example:

"Poverty does not exist"[8].
"Every man has within himself a magnet for drawing

1. Supra, 97.
2. Supra, 108f.
3. " , 67-71.
4. " , 7.
5. " , 67-71.
6. S&H 494:10f.
7. Supra, 126ff.
8. Ellsworth, Direct Healing, 23.

from the universal storehouse all that he desires"[1].

"This spiritual magnet will draw into your life what you desire, whether it be a brush and palette or a touring car"[2].

The book from which these statements are taken has two chapters on this "law": "How to Realize Abundance", and "Financial Healing". Anyone, then, who is familiar with these thoughts will find "Science" congenial.

The "mortal mind" theory of "Science" finds some justification even to the average person from the well-known fact that what we see, hear, smell, touch, etc., are not "things" but our concepts of the unknown outer reality.

Mental healing prepares the mind for "Science" also since both recommend that the "mental atmosphere" about the patient be favorable[3].

Thus far, under 'Familiarity', we have considered two general classes of appeals made by Christian Science due to its likeness to ideas and prejudices already in the minds of people. There is a third general class which is at least as important as either of the others. This class is indicated by the name "Science". As I have already said[4], a large proportion of people nowadays have come to regard the word 'science' as a symbol of worth. Christian Science appeals to some of these in the first instance by its name alone. But the appeal to them is larger. "Science" attempts to be scientific[5]. It asserts that perfection is normal---another magic word in our time[6]; that it, itself, is natural, though

1. Ellsworth, Direct Healing, p. 105.
2. Idem, p. 106.
3. Supra, 82.
4. Supra, 109f.
5. " , 96-98.
6. " , 23.

it is not physical[1]; the word 'natural' has become a word to conjure with. We insist to-day on 'natural' this and 'natural' that, and so Christian Science reaps the benefit of the 'natural' sciences, particularly by its insistence that its healing is 'natural'[2].

The many references in Science and Health (and in other literature) to mathematics, logic, law, principle, and the like, gain the attention of people through familiarity. Mrs. Eddy uses the natural sciences in her argument, e.g., that from the phenomena of visualization and of dreaming we must infer that all of our waking life is illusory, a product of our thought[3]. Mrs. Eddy's extensive use of the word 'Principle' as a name for God fits into the scientific world-view with its talk of forces and laws.

Another way in which Christian Science appeals to the popular mind thus soaked with the lees of science is by its constant appeal to "proof" or "demonstration". One of the things which distinguishes our time from all others is its firm belief in the pragmatic argument. If a thing works it is true. Christian Science puts forward its cures as proof of its theories. The average mind swallows the claim in toto.

The economic and political philosophy of the average man is also a point of contact. Most of us believe in abiding by the law, and we believe it because not only have

1. Supra, 6.
2. " , 63.
3. Cf. supra, 98, 3, 67-71.

we been so trained, but also because we believe that we have it within our power to change the law by orderly processes. Christian Science is highly to be commended because, though it rejects our medical theories, and opposes vaccination and the like, it always counsels its followers to abide by the law[1]. Another aspect of this appeal to our political and economic philosophy is this, that Christian Science advocates tolerance of others' opinions[2]. This position fits into our habitual ideas.

"Science" appeals to our unconscious politico-economic world-view by its adoption of laissez-faire in saving souls: each must save himself[3]. Christian Scientists oppose, judging from the attitude of the Monitor, socialism, bolshevism, and other symptoms of discontent with our economic system. In all of these ways, then, Christian Science sounds a familiar chord in our minds and so attracts us.

Idealism

Doubtless psychologists would be shocked to have the title I have just written coördinated with Elation and the like. It is convenient for my purposes, however, so I do it. Nor is this act entirely without reason, aside from its convenience. One of the persistent phenomena in the course of human thought has been the setting up of the desired as the real, and the degradation of the undesired by claiming that it is unreal. Never, probably, has this process been so naïvely done as in Christian Science. But from Vedantism to New Thought that process has been the inner fact in idealistic philosophy, and

1. Supra, 104.
2. " , 102.
3. " , 103.

in religion. Due to the conflicts inherent in his original endowment, man has been forced to bring peace out of war both within himself and within society. In the process he has learned to regard some things as much more valuable than others. He has produced within society, at least, a distinct tendency to regard ideas, love, faith, friendship, truth, and the like as especially worth while. The result of this long process is that by the time they reach adolescence many people, one may almost say most people of the more intelligent and sensitive sort, are more or less idealistic. They have chosen certain values as of more worth than others, values for which they will sacrifice other values. And that is idealism, a sentiment having those chosen values as its object. Its growth is very satisfying.

Now, Christian Science makes a strong appeal to this tendency which exists in the lives of many people, a tendency composed of 'divine discontent', of elation, submission, 'general readiness', and tenderness. It is hardly necessary to state the details of the ways in which "Science" satisfies this tendency or sentiment. The setting up of those qualities of life which are traditionally regarded as supremely worth while, health, love, truth, deathlessness, law, life, the soul, as reality, and the corresponding relegation to unreality of all the qualities of life commonly accounted evil, such as disease, hate, falsehood, death, anarchy, matter, preëminently satisfies the idealistic tendency in many who have it.

This static account of the appeal of "Science" to idealism, however, must be supplemented by the 'kinetic'. The purpose

of Christian Science, to remove utterly every unidealistic fact of life, and to replace each and every one with the highly worthful elements of life, appeals strongly to the idealist.

But more important than either of these sources of appeal to idealism is the reinforcement of them by the mystic experience which Christian Science sedulously works to induce. Your mystic is always an idealist. To him there is no other reality, for he experiences the ideal as the real. When, then, the idealist succeeds in touching the ideal in like manner, and so experiences it as real, his idealism is fixed in him beyond the power of argument or of fact to change it. Thus it is that Christian Science makes its strongest appeal to the person of idealistic tendencies.

ANNOYERS

Under proper circumstances any instinct or original tendency in human nature may be satisfying. Even a dash of fear is exhilerating, though in general fear is an experience which we do not like. Likewise any instinct may, under proper circumstances, be annoying. But a number of instincts and tendencies are, on the whole, annoying. Thorndike lists the chief "original annoyers" as follows: sensory pains, bitter tastes, the sight, touch and smell of entrails, excrement and putrid flesh, touching slimy things, depression as in fear, grief, the absense of human beings, their disapproving behavior, and very intense sensory stimuli of all sorts[1]. And any

1. Original Nature of Man, p. 130

instinct or tendency annoys when the neural basis is not ready to act, or, if ready, is prevented from acting.

Most of these "original annoyers" do not concern us in this study, but some of them do, notably fear, other depressants, and "general unreadiness".

Fear

One of the most deeply ingrained instincts in human nature is that of flight with its emotional accompaniment, fear. In the normal person a slight amount of fear usually adds tang to an experience, especially if it be some sort of an 'adventure'. But more than a slight amount means first annoyance, and then repulsion, and finally, when very intense, paralysis of the whole motor system. Fear easily becomes the emotional condition of dissociation and consequently a symptom in a great variety of disturbances[1]. Thus fear is one of the experiences most shunned in human life. Any theory or practice which will remove fear makes a most powerful appeal to people.

One, if not the most powerful appeal of Christian Science consists in just this, that it claims to be able to remove fear, and it backs up its claim with abundant facts. I wish to show, then, in some detail how "Science" allays fear.

Our civilization is based very largely upon the doctrine of laissez-faire, which means, "everybody for himself, let the devil take the hindmost". Now, in such a society, fear of poverty is bound to be very common, and so it is in ours[2].

1. Cf. Coriat, Abnormal Psychology, chap. on Psychasthenia.
2. Cf. Rev. Edward F. Hayward, "Poverty and the Modern Spirit", Unpopular Review, Jan.-March, 1919, pp. 91ff.

Christian Science appeals to those afraid of poverty by its doctrine that there is no such thing as poverty, and that anyway "Divine Love provides for every human need". Actually this "law" works, because, by removing anxiety and fear, by filling up the mind with confidence, one in fact uses his opportunities better. Business men, accordingly, find Christian Science a real help in their pursuits.

Turning to a very different matter, let us consider how "Science" helps prospective mothers. Many, perhaps most expectant mothers are more or less fearful of the event ahead of them. Christian Science asserts that a woman need have no fear of the event, because God is All-in-all, and He will preserve His perfect reflection (the woman) free from every ill. The testimonials, too, speak of positive help received during confinement[1]. The Christian Science methods, if faithfully followed, usually produce the utter peace of mind which both removes the fear and makes the physical condition the best that mental confidence can make it, often, a very great help through the relaxation of the system.

"Science" attracts parents, also, not only because it helps them to be free from fear in the crises of child rearing, but to see to it that their children shall be free from the fears which, in most cases, assailed them as children.

Though the fear of sin, and of hell no longer obsess people as they did a couple of generations ago, they still afflict many, and to such Christian Science comes as a great boon. You are the child of God, His perfect, deathless,

1. Supra, p. 32.

sinless reflection. It is impossible, then, for the real 'you' to commit sin, much less go to a hell of eternal torment after "passing on". Thus "Science" appeals, as do, indeed, all of the "healthy minded" religions.[1]

Not only does "Science" remove these more intense fears, but it also removes anxiety, and such phobias as the fear of becoming insane, of doing some improper thing, and the like, all, in fact, of the multiform and ubiquitous anticipations of disaster which afflict our city populations.

Mrs. Eddy boasts that most of the people healed in "Science" are those "abandoned as hopeless by regular medical attendants"[2]. What this means, of course, is that most of the cases Mrs. Eddy had in mind were neurasthenics, hysterics, or psychasthenics. Naturally these people had at last acquired a distrust of medicine and of physicians generally. Medicine had failed with them. The fear of never getting well takes hold of such people, and, indeed, the very fact of ill-health, whatever its seat, tends to make that which in health gives merely surprise produce in ill-health the grave shock of fear. Consequently we find such people filled with fears of this and of that. Hence when Christian Science comes to them saying that fear is the basis of disease[3], that when it is allayed the disease itself disappears, their minds are ready to receive the doctrine and to believe it. Of course, too, in many such cases the patient has previously dabbled in various "mental cures", and so are mentally ready for "Science".

1. Supra, 87f.
2. " , 93.
3. " , 65.

But these people, fearful as they are, want a system which is guaranteed to be harmless. "Science" provides just that, for malpractice destroys the power to heal[1].

The fear of thunderstorms, which is very common, especially among women, is a good starting point for the application of Christian Science to that and to cognate fears, such as fear of tornadoes ('cyclones'), of comets, earthquakes, etc. "Science" says, of course, that all of these things, from lightning to the tidal wave and the volcanic eruption, are products of the communal mortal mind[3]. They form no part of God, who is good and only good, nor of His universe which is also utterly and only good. When, says "Science", we "understand" this truth, fear disappears, and when all mankind shall "understand" it, the evil itself will disappear. Furthermore, insofar as each one understands this truth, he helps to cause the evil utterly to disappear. Thus "Science" tends to remove these fears of 'cosmic evils'.

After birth the next surest event in the life of each person is death. Fear of death seems to be original in human nature[3]. In the presence of death many people who before believed more or less firmly in the goodness of life and of God lose their faith. They feel helpless in the presence of death, not only for the deceased, but for themselves. And so it comes about that the wish to do away with death is found in human thought from the earliest known times. One of the

1. Supra, 63.
2. " , 20, 38.
3. Cf. James, Principles of Psychology, II, 420.

great appeals of early Christianity was just this, that Christ had done away with death for the Christian. And this appeal is made by Christian Science[1]. Death, says "Science", is no part of God, nor of God's plan; it is only a "belief". That this doctrine does remove the fear of death is abundantly shown in the cheerfulness of Christian Scientists after a member of their family has "passed on". They "know" that he is not dead, but has gone into larger possibilities, and so they rejoice, not infrequently to the scandal of their non-"Scientific" acquaintances.

The doctrine that God knows no evil[2] is the intellectual basis on which Christian Science removes fears of all sorts. And, although the intellectual basis alone may suffice in some cases, we shall never understand the appeal and the power of Christian Science unless we comprehend its practice and the result of it, "understanding", or the mystical experiencing of the doctrine. When you "know" that God is All-in-all, and that there is no evil whatsoever, your fears drop away.

Sorrow and Grief

These 'original annoyers', which burden the lives of so many, Christian Science removes by its doctrines of the nothingness of evil (the cause of sorrow and grief), and the allness of God, Good, and of the perfection of Man, His reflection. If a friend has proven untrue, the "Scientist" argues with himself that it is not the "real" friend who was false, but the mortal "belief" of him. The "real" friend is still true,

1. Supra, 39f.
2. " , 16.

and can never be otherwise. And so it becomes his duty to awaken the friend to immortal consciousness, for when that is done, the faithlessness will disappear, and the friend reappear more true than ever before.

I have just now shown how grief over the death of a loved one is met[1]. It requires no further explanation to make clear how "Science" meets all causes of sorrow and grief.

Repulsion, Disgust, and the like

Feelings of repulsion, disgust, loathing, hate, and the like are very common in the life of many. We feel them not only toward objects and acts in our daily life, but also toward people, both because of something they have done, and because of some physical or mental characteristic. These feelings are originally annoying, and we always try to get rid of them when we can, try to replace them by 'original satisfiers'. Of course we must admit that hate is under certain circumstances a satisfier, but I think close analysis would show that the satisfaction from hate results from its habitual association with elation, or perhaps with some other original satisfier. So with the rest of these annoyers.

Your thorough-going Christian Scientist conscientiously endeavors, and with considerable success, to eliminate these feelings entirely from his life. He does it, of course, by "knowing" that the cause, whether it be a disagreeable object or a 'hateful' quality in a person, is unreal, and that the

1. Supra, 155.

reality is only beautiful and lovable, and in every way perfect.

Sympathy and Pity

Sympathy is a bone of contention among psychologists. McDougall insists that there is an innate tendency to 'suffer with' others[1], while Thorndike calls this tendency a form of imitation, which, he says, is not an original tendency, and which amounts to this, that on seeing the same excitant to instinctive behavior we do what others do because the instinct in us is aroused, or, that, at most, we do what they do to gain their approval[2].

Pity is said by McDougall to be tender emotion tinged with sympathetically induced pain[3]. Pity is a form of 'kindliness' according to Thorndike[4].

Without going into this matter any further, it will suffice for the purposes of this analysis to say that whether original or a result of training, there is in man a tendency to suffer with others(sympathy), and to wish (silently or audibly) that the other should not suffer (pity). These tendencies, or aspects of one tendency, are not only not satisfying, but annoying. We do not like to feel pain with others, nor to be impelled to condole with them. People who seem to enjoy sympathizing with others' ills are not really doing so, but in fact getting satisfaction out of their elation at not suffering, or at being superior in that particular to

1. Introduction to Social Psychology, p. 95.
2. Original Nature of Man, pp. 108ff.
3. Op. cit., p. 157.
4. Op. cit., p. 103.

the one they 'sympathize' with.

Christian Science insists that not only is it undesirable to sympathize with others and to pity them, but that it is positively a bad thing to do so. By so doing we add to the power of the "claim" over the person suffering[1]. We should remember that the person subject to the "belief" of pain is really immortal and perfect, and therefore without any such thing as pain. By doing so we help to break the power of "animal magnetism" which holds him. Now, since many people of sensitive nerves really suffer very much from the pains and sufferings of others, Christian Science by this doctrine attracts them. They would rather <u>not</u> sympathize with and pity people. Christian Science says their desire is right, and helps them to make it fruitful. It is this attitude on the part of Christian Science which makes outsiders often call "Scientists" hard-hearted, even heartless. But the entire omission of the story of the Good Samaritan and its lesson from the Christian Science textbook and the teaching and practice of the denomination is entirely logical, and attracts some people.

<u>General Unreadiness</u>

Under this term I include mainly that condition of the mind which alienists and psychotherapists call neurasthenia, an ailment excessively common in cities (where Christian Science finds its greatest clientèle). Angell says,

> "The present-day American is notoriously predisposed to neurasthenic ailments of all kinds. He---and she---

1. Supra, 36.

> lives at a high tension, which readily permits the emergence of hyper-sensitivity of one kind and another, and readily gives an exaggerated neurotic turn to many ailments that normally are free from such complications. Here, then, is a very large contingent of persons suffering from impaired physical tone, with a morbid interest in their own hygienic welfare"[1].

The characteristic feature of these people is fatigue. They sleep much but they do not rest. They worry and ponder but they do not reach a conclusion. They are generally unready for the business of life. Over-fatigue seems to be the physical cause, but the feeling of fatigue remains long after the physical tone,in fact, is restored[2]. This situation is, of course, an 'annoyer'.

Christian Science makes a strong appeal to these people. In general it offers them health and spirituality, neither of which seems to be within their reach. Neither medicine nor the Church seems able to do them any good. They are apt to feel a strong sense of dependence which somehow is not satisfied. "Science" comes to them with authority and with long records of cures of cases as 'hopeless' as theirs. It therefore attracts them.

Let us see in some detail, however, how the appeal is made. Because of the failure of human remedies these people have in many cases lost all hope of help from that source. Conflicting schools of medicine have given different diagnoses, and have prescribed varying remedies to no avail. "Science" comes to them and boldly proclaims that all human science is foolishness, that medicine is vain. Being already of that opinion, "Science" fits right into their thinking. "It is

1. Cf. Coriat, Abnormal Psychology, Chap. vii, Neurasthenia.

true", they say, and forthwith hire a practitioner.

Or, perhaps, in their depressed state, these people have become discouraged in trying to understand the complex 'plan of salvation' of their church. The "Science" theology is simple, and so relieves the perplexity. They do not have to think very much to understand Christian Science[1]. They need only to believe and to do what is prescribed in the practice.

In another way Christian Science appeals to this desire for simplicity---in its services. Those who have been reared in the liturgical churches, and are worried by the complexity of their services turn to the simple form in "Science" churches with glad relief.

In the midst of our modern rushing after wealth and fame these people, generally unready for life, are worried and nerve-wracked. "Science" comes to them with its gospel of peace and relaxation, it teaches them precisely how to attain peace, and so attracts.

Furthermore, neurasthenics are apt to be tired of the world, of its strife and bickerings, to be afflicted with Weltschmerts. Christian Science affirms that the whole thing, world and strife alike, is unreal, that the real world is love and peace and perfect goodness and without evil or death.

Many people, even those who are not neurasthenics, have as their chief business in life the search after personal comfort. They will, if they can, flee their problems instead of solving them. Christian Science makes an especially strong

1. Cf. H. W. Horwill, "Christian Science as a Reaction", London Quarterly Review, vol. 108, p. 224.

appeal to these. It cultivates assiduously the consciousness of being at home in the world, of being sufficient for every occasion, of being calm and peaceful under all circumstances, of expressing one's life in terms of material comfort and beauty. It needs no abstruse or lengthy discussion to see how it reaches the hearts and minds of these comfort-seekers, for avoiding the unpleasant is a part of its practice and creed.

Turning, now, to the appeal of "Science" to these people, the generally unready, through its healing power, properly so-called, we need to recall that three fourths of all converts are to be attributed to this one appeal[1]. Christian Science seems to be especially valuable to those afflicted with "funk". Two testimonials out of fourteen which I heard in Evanston, Illinois, told of healings of this kind, one of nervous prostration, and the other of a person who "went to pieces" because she feared she had Spanish influenza. Christian Science claims that it heals every kind of ill[2]. Chronic invalids and those who have "gone to pieces" want something 'strong', and a panacea such as "Science" fulfils this demand. Furthermore, Christian Science, by its practice, removes the state of panic and gives 'nature' a chance, hence "Science" 'works'.

People of the type under consideration, chronic invalids and neurasthenics, long above all else for strength to meet the demands of life. Christian Science says "sinlessness" brings the power to endure all sorts of toil, deprivations, and the like without harm[3]. You can always do, says "Science", what it is your duty to do. The power of Christian Science

1. Supra, 92.
2. " , 60f.
3. " , 66.

to transform the hypochondriac and the neurasthenic into well persons lies in its dictum that we must live in God, know that He is all in all, never lacking, all good, and so on, and that we, His reflection, are therefore without lack, or evil, or illness. This doctrine is inculcated with all the power of suggestion---so well employed by "Science" as we have seen[1]. As a result of this process, the mentality is released from inner conflict; fears of all sorts are removed, and the person therefore is, as a matter of fact, renewed in strength and in hope, his mind is at peace, and so his power to meet life is increased.

There are several other interesting ways in which the doctrines of Christian Science attract those who are "generally unready" for life. The absolute standard of good and evil set up[2] is assuring to them. They do not have to calculate, that is, the niceties of conduct on the basis of greater or less good or ill. And the standard of reality set up (what we want is good, is real; what we do not want is evil, is unreal) makes the problem easy and therefore the standard attracts those chronically tired. The mutual exclusiveness of good and evil is, of course, another aspect of this same thing[3].

Most potent, though, in the system is the dogma that God is All-in-all, and that His best and truest name is Love[4]. A tremendous trust in life is born in one who actually believes this dogma. And this trust is increased by the corollary that the universe, the "real" universe, consists of God's eternal

1. Supra, 83f.
2. Supra, 7, 10.
3. " , 48, 29, 31, 30.
4. " , 13-15, 16, 17.

and perfect and utterly good ideas. Even the ferocity of animals is an illusion. To timid folk this thought appeals with considerable force. Added to this, and even more important, is the dogma that man is God's perfect reflection. Realize, even slightly, this doctrine, and all the kinks in you straighten out, as it were, of themselves.

These doctrines are enforced by the claim of revelation, as we have seen, and of final authority---a most potent suggestion to inspire confidence in those who cannot trust themselves.

Even the dictum of "Science" that we need not undertake the impossible task of becoming perfect all at once, but, instead, that we should start where we are and give up our "claims" only as they drop away of themselves, is a source of deep comfort to the "generally unready". Psychologically, of course, this means that the suggestion that the "claim" is unreal is planted deeply in the mind, and, in due time, flowers in the desire and the power to be rid of it. Take, for example, the thirst for alcohol. Christian Science does not say you must drop this habit all at once. It says that the habit is an evil, a "belief", which is to say, nothing. But you should wait until you no longer desire drink before giving it up. Through the practice of "realizing perfection", the suggestion that you do not want alcohol is sunk deep into the subconsciousness, and presently you lose the desire.

It is probably true that the "Science" practice of regulating ones thoughts appeals to neurasthenics and the like because it seems easy. They are already much concerned with themselves, they are already introspective, and this

business of regulating thought, of indulging in "mental anatomy", comes naturally to them.

The Christian Science doctrine that prayer is desire, that it is thinking God's thoughts after Him, that it is therefore direct, attracts those who need, above all, the conviction that they are linked up with a sufficient force, and that it is easy to be so connected with that force, to heal and to provide for them every needed good.

SUMMARY

In this analysis of the psychological basis of the appeal of Christian Science certain facts stand out. In general, the amount of space which I have given to the several "satisfiers" and "annoyers" indicates my estimate of their comparative importance as bases for the appeal of "Science". Elation, submission, tenderness, acquisition, the general tendencies to think and to imagine, and familiarity are the chief instincts appealed to by Christian Science in a positive way. Fear, sorrow and grief, repulsion and its similars, sympathy and pity, and 'general unreadiness' are the chief sources of the negative appeal of "Science". Fear and 'general unreadiness' are by far the most important of this second class. Elation, submission, tenderness, and familiarity are the most important of the first.

Purposely I have used the names of emotions rather than of behavior-series in analyzing the appeal of "Science". Christian Science asserts that activity is foolishness, that the sub-

jective aspect of life is the real causative factor, that therefore one's attention and effort should be devoted to making that factor ideally right. Christian Science does not say, 'Go out and feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and dress the wounds of the injured'. It says, rather, 'Think beauty and goodness and truth and love until your mind contains nothing else; when your mind is thus filled with these thoughts, you will be beautiful and good and true and loving, and by being thus perfect yourself, you will have done your part in bringing perfection into the world'. The Christian Science world and life are, then, predominantly subjective.

Accordingly, in common with Protestantism in general, "Science" fails to appeal to the action-series in original human nature. Roman Catholicism does much better by means of its pageants and ceremonials. But Christian Science fails worse in this matter even than Protestantism in general, for it neglects altogether the social side of human nature as well as the ritual-loving side. Other churches have fairs and suppers and clubs and bowling alleys, a hundred devices for satisfying the instincts of man toward activity. Christian Science has none of these things. It expects to reform the world, to transform it into the kingdom of God, not by doing, but by thinking, or, more accurately, by <u>feeling</u>. To be sure, "Science", through its discipline of "realizing Truth", affects the behavior of its adherents. But the effect on behavior is rather the result of the <u>spirit of our time</u> which insists on <u>acting out</u> one's convictions than of any distinct command by "Science" to go forth and reform the world.

In other words, the subjectivism of Christian Science tends, as it always has in human life, to quietism.

In discussing idealism[1] I spoke of it as a sentiment which is appealed to by Christian Science. And in discussing the stressing of love in Christian Science Practice[2] I spoke of "the Christian Scientist's dominant sentiment". A summary of the psychological reasons why Christian Science appeals would be incomplete without considering briefly what I mean by those two statements. It needs no lengthened train of reasoning to one familiar with Shand and McDougall to understand that idealism is a sentiment, or what, as such, it is. But it is necessary to outline and evaluate the dominant Christian Scientist's sentiment, and to show how idealism is related to it.

The result of any widely inclusive discipline is a definite type of mentality, a definite kind of reaction toward experience. Such a result is due to the fact that a discipline of that kind ordinates the whole of the personality into a hierarchy of values, and consequently, of thoughts and of behavior. Just as the Roman Catholic discipline produces the "Catholic mind", so the Christian Science discipline produces the "Christian Science mind", or, to speak in McDougall's language, the Christian Science sentiment.

"The typical sentiments are love and hate", says McDougall. "Love and hate are, not merely emotions, but enduring tendencies to experience certain emotions whenever the loved or hated object comes to mind"[3]. And these feelings arise because

1. Supra, 148ff. 2. Supra, 75.
3. Introduction to Social Psychology, p. 127.

the emotions of the person are organized into a system about the loved or hated object. Such a system is a sentiment. And it is such a system that constitutes the Christian Science sentiment.

This sentiment has as its nucleus the tender emotion, and is therefore a variety of the sentiment of love. But its object is not a specific person or thing, but the whole collection of values attributed to God[1]. Inasmuch as these values are thus hypostasized, it is, perhaps, right to say that God is the object of the Christian Science sentiment. But one must make an important qualification to that way of stating the matter. God is only one focus of the sentiment. Another is the "Scientist's" own self. Again, then, we have the primeval fact of self-consciousness, the subject-object relation. Even this statement of the situation is too simple. Just as, in the case of a mother's sentiment of love centered around her child the rest of the world must be taken into account, so here, in the love of the "Scientist" centered about God, the rest of the world must be considered.

But we must recall, before going on, what God, the self, and the world are according to "Science". God is the summation of all that is supremely desirable. The self is not the whole psycho-physical system ordinarily meant by that term, but only the ideal system of values desired, the finite "reflection" of the same values which are attributed to God. The rest of the self in the usual sense of that word is illusion, that which is to be gotten rid of. The world is

1. Supra, 13-17.

also thus two-fold. It is real insofar, and no farther, as it is desirable in the light of these values which are God. It is unreal, and to be obliterated, insofar as it falls short of these values. In a sense, all of the self and of the world which is desirable is of God, and thus a part of the object of the sentiment.

We can now see how the sentiment works. Its nucleus, the tender emotion, is called forth whenever the "Scientist" contemplates God, his ideal self, or the ideal world. With qualifications to be given below, the rest of the self and of the world (mortal mind), call forth repulsion, or even hate. The other emotions group themselves around tenderness (and its opposite) according to whether they satisfy or annoy. If they satisfy they are called forth by, and attributed to the object of love. If they annoy they are called forth by, and attributed to the object of repulsion. Thus, God, the "real" self, the "real" world, stimulate elation, submission (especially true of God), possession (including a sense of 'belonging to'), awe, reverence, and gratitude. The "mortal" self and "mortal" world, being by hypothesis and by training undesirable, are the stimuli of fear, repulsion, hate, and the like. The "Scientist", of course, would violently disclaim any feeling of fear or of hate toward the undesirable world, but the presence of the doctrine of malicious animal magnetism proves that he feels it. Of course, in respect to the "mortal" self and world the actual state of the "Scientist"s" emotions is not so simple as this outline makes it out to be. In fact he never succeeds in

wholly ordering his instincts about the infinitely desirable. He always retains remnants of his 'unregenerate' state in which he 'loved sin'. But the tendency is distinctly as I have outlined. The farther the "Scientist goes in Science", the nearer he approaches this ideal condition.

The flavor of the Christian Science sentiment is, then, distinctly feminine, in the sense that the emotions rather than the intellect determine the characteristics of the object of the sentiment, and also in the sense that tenderness, in a very literal and usual sense of that word, colors the whole.

The Christian Science sentiment differs from most sentiments of love in that its object is not a person or an objective thing but an emotional ideal. The question the "Scientist" must always ask herself is, Do I <u>feel</u> rightly toward God, toward myself, toward my neighbor? And, to feel rightly, she must feel lovingly, tenderly, protectingly, trustfully.

Though the Christian Science sentiment is a variety (an almost wholly subjective variety) of the sentiment of love, it is also allied to the sort of sentiment I called idealism. Indeed, we might well call it a sentiment of idealizing love. Its object is not a concrete fact but an ideal <u>worth</u>.

This sentiment is built up by means of the Christian Science discipline, and it derives its trmendous power from the induction, through that discipline, of the mystic experience by which the ideal is sensed as the present real. And the product of the sentiment thus dynamized is a nearly continuous state of peace and joy and love toward the object of the sentiment, viz., God, immortal men, and (though to

a much less degree) the ideal universe.

CONCLUSIONS

In these final pages I will try to show why the particular classes of people who enter "Science" do so, and I will also make some general observations suggested by this study.

Nearly three fourths of all Christian Scientists are women, and of the practitioners just less than nine tenths are women. Why is Christian Science so attractive to women? The answer is not hard to make. Under Elation I discussed certain special appeals which "Science" makes to women[1]. Its stimulation of submission and of tender emotion, both very prominent reasons why "Science" appeals, arouse dominant instincts in women. Its subjectiveness and its emotional epistemology are congenial to the feminine mind. The Christian Science sentiment is more congenial to women than to men, and is more easily developed in them: witness the striking paucity of men among the practitioners, in comparison with the average for the whole body of members.

These reasons become more cogent when we recall the fact that the women appealed to are not those who earn their living over the wash-tub or in factories, but those who belong to the leisure class, or at least who have some time in which to contract nervous troubles and in which to indulge in introspection.

The men who are attracted to Christian Science are also of the leisure class or of the sedentary class. In both

1. Supra, 118.

classes the mentality becomes sensitive to its own states, in other words, introspective. Your manual laborer never, so far as I have been able to learn, becomes a "Scientist", nor does the mechanic, or, in fact, any man whose mind is forced to be mainly objective. There are those, of course, who become "Scientists" for financial reasons, but I think they are few in number. There are more who become Christian Scientists because their wives are. But they are not fairly to be counted in estimating the class which is attracted to "Science". I think that it is fair to say that, on the whole, the person who enters Christian Science is he whose mind is "sickli'd o'er with the pale case of thought".

It would be very interesting to know what results Christian Science produces in character. Only the personal observations by a few individuals are available to me. My own observations indicate that the results are small, and indirect. Insofar as the Christian Science practice releases the "Scientist" from inner conflicts he or she becomes more kindly, less irritable, more pleasant in general. But the subjectivism of "Science" produces, as we should expect, no passion for justice, no public spirit, no active ethical interests. An interesting sidelight on the results of "Science" in the case of housewives employing domestic help comes to me from a woman whose business it is to place such help. She says that, judging from the reports brought in by the 'girls', Christian Science housewives are no kinder, nor in any way more considerate of their kitchen help than are

women of other or even of no religious connections. Goodwin, who may, however, be prejudiced, since, after fifteen years as a practitioner, he left the Christian Science Church, says, "As 'church members' individually, or in church business meetings assembled, you will find them ["Scientists"] very little different from the members of any other organization, be it ecclesiastical, social or political; and for this reason many refuse to attend the business meetings of the local organizations"[1]. The observations of a friend of mine who has rather extensive acquaintance with Christian Scientists, particularly among practitioners, and whose judgment I consider sound, bear out pretty well my own. She says that the practitioners are of a much better type mentally and ethically than the lay members known to her. But even they lack any social vision or interest. The net result, then, appears to be this, that Christian Science removes internal conflicts, and, largely because of that, though also because of the cult of 'pleasantness', improves the temper of "Scientists" in their intercourse with others. But Christian Science does not surpass other religions, or even, apparently, equal them in producing objective ethical results.

Turning from these considerations of the fruit of "Science", I will make some general comments which are suggested by this study. The first is, that McDougall's statement, viz., the emotions which play the chief part in religion are admiration, awe, and reverence[2], is quite inadequate in the case of Christian Science. Probably it is likewise inadequate for other religions.

1. Goodwin, The Christian Science Church, p. 102.
2. Introduction to Social Psychology, p. 309.

My opinion is that the emotions mentioned by McDougall do not, in "Science", play nearly so great a part as do elation, submission, tenderness, 'wonder', and fear. They do not play their parts, either, as constituents of admiration, awe, and reverence, but in their naked simplicity, or as they are ordinated in the Christian Science sentiment.

This study makes it clear that religion, to make its widest and strongest appeal, must, as does "Science", arouse the 'satisfiers' and quiet the 'annoyers' in human nature. Whether or not that result can be accomplished without a similar dogmatism and rigid discipline cannot be answered here. In order to make the widest possible appeal, too, religion must succeed in covering the whole gamut of original human nature in stimulating the satisfiers and quieting the annoyers. It must, then, transform the undesirable into supports for the desirable instincts and tendencies. Religion must realize that its function is no less than <u>to make life here and now worth living</u>. It cannot, then, confine itself to a "social gospel", or a "spiritual gospel", or any gospel except "the whole man, and him progressively better individually, socially, spiritually".

Religion, then, should produce not only the inner peace and joy and love which "Science" brings, but also a passion for justice, a <u>working love</u> for humanity collectively and individually.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(The more important publications consulted in preparing this study)

Ames, Edward Scribner, The Psychology of Religious Experience, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1910.

Angell, James Rowland, "Christian Science from a Psychologist's Point of View", World To-Day, vol. 8, pp. 403-406 (1905).

Bergson, Henri, Creative Evolution, Mitchell's translation, New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1911.

Brewster, E., "The Evolution of Christian Science", in Monist, vol. 17, pp. 186-199 (1907).

Burnham, Clara, Jewell (a "Science" novel).

Burrell, Joseph Dunn, A New Appraisal of Christian Science, New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1906.

Carrington, Hereward, Psychical Phenomena and the War, New York, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1918.

Carus, Paul, "Christian Science and the Reason for Its Strength", Monist, vol. 17, pp. 200-208 (1907).

Christian Science Publishing Society, The Christian Science Hymnal, Boston, 1909.

Coe, George Albert, The Psychology of Religion, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1916.

Conant, Albert F., (Compiler), Complete Concordance to Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures by Mary Baker Eddy, Boston, Christian Science Publishing Society, 1916. (Note: Mrs. Eddy is commonly given credit for this book).

Coriat, Isador H., Abnormal Psychology, New York, Moffat, Yard, & Co., 2nd edition, 1914.

Cutten, George Barton, The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.

Davenport, F. M., Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals, New York, Macmillan Co., 1905.

Delacroix, Henri, Etudes d'Histoire et de Psychologie du Mysticisme, Paris, 1908.

Dixon, F., "Growth of Christian Science in England", World To-Day, vol. 14, pp. 178-183 (1908).

Dixon, F., and Horwill, H. W., "Christian Science as a Reaction: A Criticism and A Reply", London Quarterly Review, vol. 109, pp. 130-135 (1908).

Dresser, Horatio W., The Spirit of the New Thought, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell, 1917.

Dresser, Horatio W., Handbook of the New Thought, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1917.

Dunlap, Knight, "Evil in Mrs. Eddy's Doctrine", Journal of Abnormal Psychology, vol. 2, pp. 280-282 (1908).

Eddy, Mary Baker, Manual of the Mother Church, 89th edition, Boston, Christian Science Publ. Soc., 1918.

---, Miscellaneous Writings 1883-1896, Boston, Christian Science Publ. Soc., 1896.

---, No and Yes, Boston, Christian Science Publ. Soc., 1908.

---, Retrospection and Introspection, Boston, Allison V. Stewart, 1917, copyrighted 1892.

---, Rudimental Divine Science, Boston, Allison V. Stewart, 1915 (copyrighted 1908).

---, Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, Boston, Christian Science Publishing Society, 1918.

Eddy, Mary Baker, Unity of Good, Boston, Christian Science Publ. Soc., 1918 (copyrighted 1908).

Ellsworth, Paul, Direct Healing, Holyoke, Mass., The Elizabeth Towne Co., 1918.

Elwell, F. E., "The Message of Christian Science", Arena, vol. 39, pp. 439-441 (1908).

Faunce, Pres. W. H. P; O. P. Gifford; Franklin Johnson; Benjamin A. Greene; J. W. Conley; H. H. Beach; Lathan A. Crandall; Cephas B. Crane; E. S. Plimpton; John Rothwell Slater: Searchlights on Christian Science: A Symposium, Chicago, Fleming H. Revell, 1899.

Flower, B. O., Christian Science As A Religious Belief and A Therapeutic Agent, Boston, Twentieth Century Co., 1909.

Geiger, M., "Christian Science in Amerika", Zeitschrift für Religionspsychologie, vol. 4, pp. 223-249 (1910).

Goodwin, William McAfee, The Christian Science Church, publ. by the author, 303-307 District National Bank Bldg, 1406 G Street, Washington, D. C., 1916.

Hanna, Septimus J., Christian Science History, Boston, Christian Science Publ. Soc., 1899.

Holt, Edwin B., The Freudian Wish and Its Place in Ethics, New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1915.

Horwill, Herbert W., "Christian Science As A Reaction", London Quarterly Review, vol. 108, pp. 218-228 (1907).

Hughes, P., "The Types of Religious Attitude", American Journal of Religious Psychology and Education, vol. 2, pp. 272-281 (1907).

James, William, The Principles of Psychology, 2 vols, New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1890.

James, William, The Varieties of Religious Experience, New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1902.

Jefferson, E. P., "How Clara Barton Became Interested in Christian Science", Arena, vol. 39, pp. 572-574 (1908)

King, Irving, The Development of Religion: A Study in Anthropology and Social Psychology, New York, Macmillan, 1910.

Kratzer, Rev. C. A., The Christian Science Church: A Friendly Review, Chicago, publ. by the author, 5531 Cornell Ave., 1914.

Lecky, W. E. H., History of European Morals, 2 vols, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1906.

Leuba, J. H., "Christian Science; Mind-cure; New Thought", Monist, vol. 22, pp. 348-360 (1913).

---, A Psychological Study of Religion, Its Origin, Function, and Future, New York, Macmillan, 1912.

McComas, Henry C., The Psychology of Religious Sects, Chicago, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1912.

McCracken, W. D., "The Strength of Christian Science", North American Review, vol. 173, pp. 533-539 (1901).

McDougall, William, An Introduction to Social Psychology, Boston, John W. Luce & Co., 1918 (13th edition).

Mars, Gerhardt C., The Interpretation of Life, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1908.

Milmine, Georgine, Life of Mary Baker G. Eddy and History of Christian Science, New York, Doubleday, 1909.

Moore, George H., "The Christian Science Concept of Deity", Arena, 39:299ff (1908).

Mosley, J. R., "Christian Science Idealism", Cosmopolitan, 43:330-334 (1907).

Müller, F. Max, Editor, The Sacred Books of the East, Oxford, Clarendon Press, vol. xi, Buddhist Suttas, 1881

Noble, J. H., "The Psychology of the 'New Thought' Movement", Monist, vol. 14, pp. 409-426 (1904).

Peabody, Frederick W., The Religio-Medical Masquerade, New York, Fleming H. Revell, 1915 (new edition).

Pratt, James Bissett, The Psychology of Religious Belief, New York, Macmillan Co., 1906.

Snell, L. W., "Method of Christian Science", Hibbert Journal, vol. 13, pp. 620-629 (1915).

Stocking, Charles Francis, Carmen Ariza (Christian Science novel), Chicago, The Maestro Co., 1918.

Stratton, George Malcolm, Psychology of the Religious Life, London, George Allen & Co., 1911.

Thomas, W. I., Sex and Society, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1907.

Thorndike, Edward L., The Original Nature of Man (vol. I of Educational Psychology), New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1913.

Titchener, Edward Bradford, A Textbook of Psychology, New York, Macmillan Co., 1911.

Underhill, Evelyn, Mysticism: A Study In the Nature and Development of Man's Spiritual Consciousness, New York, E. P. Dutton, 3rd ed., 1911.

Veblen, Thorstein, The Theory of the Leisure Class, New York, Macmillan Co., 1902.

Worcester, McComb, Coriat, Religion and Medicine, New York, 1908.

****

39879