

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights and duplication or sale of all or part is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for research, private study, criticism/review or educational purposes. Electronic or print copies are for your own personal, non-commercial use and shall not be passed to any other individual. No quotation may be published without proper acknowledgement. For any other use, or to quote extensively from the work, permission must be obtained from the copyright holder/s.



Radical idealism and empirical metaphysics in the work of Mary Baker Eddy

Nicholas David Sheldon

Ph.D. in Philosophy

June 2022

University of Keele

Abstract

The nineteenth-century American, Mary Baker Eddy, is well known in the United States for having founded the religion Christian Science, but she is not generally regarded as philosopher, let alone an original one. This dissertation argues that she is a philosopher, and an original one. Her Christian Science develops an empirical metaphysics which marries a radical form of idealism and scientific method by putting a priori metaphysical axioms to the test of experience. Christian Science's denial of the existence of illness, for which she is mostly known, is merely a fragment of a daringly ambitious, radical idealism denying the existence of matter and much more besides. Many factors may have contributed to history's mis-framing of Eddy. Her gender, the period in which she lived, and her notoriety in connection with the creation of a new religion made her appear non-conformal with the image of a philosopher. In the twenty-first century, interest has grown in the 'lost' female philosophers of history, although these figures have typically been overlooked due to their lack of visibility, rather than their prominence in another role. This thesis forms a part of the rediscovery of the contributions of female philosophers. Eddy wrote in a non-linear style, incorporating existing terms whose meaning she had redefined, making a careful restructuring and rephrasing of her work a necessary first step. Subsequent analysis of her system's internal consistency and its coherency reveals three potentially fatal flaws in her system of thought; a considerable part of the thesis therefore addresses these problems and offers possible solutions to them. A final chapter summarises key aspects of Eddy's thought together with its potential flaws, and offers suggestions for further research arising from this thesis.

Contents

Acknowledgements viii

Chapter 1 Introduction and overview 1

- 1.1 Overview 1
- 1.2 *Science and Health* 3
- 1.3 The content and structure of the thesis 6
- 1.4 Moving on 9

Chapter 2 Mary Baker Eddy 10

- 2.1 The promulgation of the work of Mary Baker Eddy 10
 - 2.1.1 Methodology 10
 - 2.1.2 Background to the author's involvement 10
 - 2.1.3 Setting the 'gold' in context 11
 - 2.1.4 Importance and relevance of the goal 12
 - 2.1.5 Re-expressing the core concepts 13
 - 2.1.6 Helpful comparisons 13
 - 2.1.7 Helpful contrasts 13
 - 2.1.8 Summary 14
- 2.2 Synopsis of Christian Science and Mary Baker Eddy's Idealism 15
 - 2.2.1 Christian Science 15
 - 2.2.2 Mary Baker Eddy as an idealist philosopher 16
 - 2.2.3 Synopsis of her ideas and evidence of their extreme nature 16
 - 2.2.4 Eddy's historic misrepresentation 21
 - 2.2.5 Eddy's main argument 22
 - 2.2.6 The consequences of Eddy's main argument 23
 - 2.2.7 Criticisms of Eddy's ideas and her own responses to them 26
 - 2.2.8 Eddy and the problem of 1943 34
 - 2.2.9 The initial popularity of Christian Science 35
- 2.3 Literature review: works specific to Christian Science and Mary Baker Eddy 37
 - 2.3.1 Introduction to the literature review 37
 - 2.3.2 Henry Steiger 39
 - 2.3.3 Stephen Gottschalk 40
 - 2.3.4 Beryl Satter 41
 - 2.3.5 Amy Voorhees 42
 - 2.3.6 Braude 43
 - 2.3.7 Twain 43
 - 2.3.8 Representative critical literature and difficulties inherent in the analysis of Eddy's work 44

2.3.9 Summary	45
2.4 Literature review: texts on idealism applicable to the philosophical analysis of Eddy's work	46
2.4.1 Introduction	46
2.4.2 Berkeley	46
2.4.3 Kant	46
2.4.4 Fichte	47
2.4.5 Novalis	48
2.4.6 Hegel	49
2.4.7 The American Transcendentalists	49
2.4.8 British Idealists: Green, Bradley and McTaggart	50
2.4.9 Summary	50
2.5 Literature review: other useful works	51
2.5.1 Introduction	51
2.5.2 Parker	51
2.5.3 Twain again	52
2.5.4 Edwin Franklin Dakin	52
2.5.5 Albert Einstein	53
2.5.6 Emma Curtiss Hopkins	53
2.5.7 Karl Barth	54
2.5.8 Georgie Sheldon	55
2.5.9 Summary	55
2.6 Literature review: biographical material with philosophical content	56
2.6.1 Introduction	56
2.6.2 Sibyl Wilbur	57
2.6.3 Lyman P. Powell	57
2.6.4 Georgine Milmine	57
2.6.5 Gillian Gill	58
2.6.6 Robert Peel	59
2.6.7 Summary and conclusions	59
2.7 Summary and conclusion	59
2.7.1 Works on the philosophy of Christian Science	59
2.7.2 General works on idealism	60
2.7.3 Other useful works	60
2.7.4 Biographical works	60
2.7.5 Rationale for the choice of literature	61
2.7.6 Conclusions and summary	61

Chapter 3 Mary Baker Eddy's philosophical system 63

3.1 Introduction 63

3.1.1 Beginning the re-presentation 63

3.1.2 The approach to the analysis 66

3.1.3 The presentation 67

3.1.4 The core argument 71

3.1.5 The main argument 71

3.1.6 The philosophical system 71

3.1.7 Inherent difficulties 72

3.2 Eddy's descriptions of Christian Science 78

3.2.1 Relevant works by Eddy other than *Science and Health* 78

3.2.2 Choice of sources 79

3.2.3 Summary 79

3.3 Core argument 80

3.3.1 The core argument 80

3.3.2 Limitations 80

3.3.3 Summary 81

3.4 The main argument 81

3.4.1 The nature of the main argument 81

3.4.2 Development from the core 82

3.4.3 The main argument expressed as questions and answers 82

3.4.4 Limitations 90

3.4.5 Summary of the development of the main argument 91

3.5 Eddy's philosophical system 92

3.5.1 Introduction 92

3.5.2 Augmentations to the main argument 94

3.6 The philosophical system itself 98

3.6.1 The philosophical system summarised 98

3.6.2 The next step 98

Chapter 4 The presentation of Mary Baker Eddy's system & an investigation of its consistency 99

4.1 Introduction 99

4.2 Testing Eddy's ideas for internal consistency 101

4.2.1 Comparisons involving Proposition I

God is infinite and unknowable, except by Divine revelation and human conjecture. 101

4.2.2 Comparisons involving Proposition II

God is Life, Truth, Love, Spirit, Principle, Mind and Good. 103

4.2.3 Comparisons involving Proposition III

The hypothetical construct, 'evil', is a "delusion of material sense." 105

4.2.4 Comparisons involving Proposition V

Nothing possesses reality or existence except Divine mind and His ideas. 106

4.2.5 Comparisons involving Proposition VI God fills all space, therefore all is Spirit. 108

4.2.6 Comparisons with Proposition VII The triune nature of God consists of Life, Truth & Love. 110

4.2.7 Comparisons involving Proposition VIII God is Father-Mother. 111

4.2.8 Comparison with Proposition XIV The idea of Christ (not the human form) is eternal. 112

4.2.9 Comparisons involving Proposition XV The invisible Christ appears to the Spiritual sense. 112

4.3 Moving on 112

Chapter 5 The analysis of Mary Baker Eddy's system 113

5.1 Initial observations 113

5.2 Potential problems 114

5.3 Potential strengths 116

5.4 To infinity and beyond 118

5.4.1 J. M. E. McTaggart 126

5.4.2 Baruch Spinoza 134

5.4.3 Nicolas Malebranche 142

5.5 A new summary 144

5.6 Julian of Norwich 152

5.7 Extreme criticism in the 21st Century 154

5.8 Conclusion 156

Chapter 6 Christian Science during the 1918-1919 'Spanish' Influenza 157

6.1 Background to the events 157

6.2 The Goat Island experiment 161

6.3 Debates at the time of the Spanish Influenza 164

6.4 Eddy's own experiments 167

6.5 Observations and conclusions 170

Chapter 7 Conclusions and suggestions for further research 171

- 7.1 Penultimate thoughts 171
- 7.2 A final description of Eddy's philosophical system 172
- 7.3 Remaining problems 174
- 7.4 An alternative interpretation 175
- 7.5 Still greater radicalism? 176
- 7.6 Suggestions for further research 176
- 7.7 Finally 177

Bibliography 178

Appendix 1 Glossary of terms in Christian Science 186

Appendix 2 More patient outcomes: subjective and objective medical evidence 208

Appendix 3: The Axioms and Propositions of Christian Science 251

Acknowledgements

This research has only been possible due to the great generosity and expertise of many people. Sadly, space does not permit thanking them all by name, so I would like to begin by firstly expressing my gratitude to all those who contributed but are not mentioned here. My supervisor, Dr. Giuseppina D'Oro has expertly guided this four-year, full-time research throughout a period during which the focus underwent two great changes, coped admirably with my boundless capacity to digress and also accommodated with grace the inevitable yet unforeseen obstacles faced by a fifty-something husband and father living over 200 miles from Keele. The unexpected cataclysm of Covid-19 over the last year has also not broken her stride.

Without the financial generosity and kindness of both my late father, Tom Sheldon, and my late uncle, David Wedmore, I would never have had the financial independence needed to embark on either this Ph.D. or the part-time Open University M.A. in Philosophy which permitted me to register for it; I wish they could see what they have made possible. My wife, Kay Sheldon OBE, and my children Daisy and Jem, have been unfailingly encouraging throughout, and fortnightly coffee and conversation with my cousin, the Rev. Kate Belcher, has been invaluable, and in one case crucial to the completion of the research. If I may finish on what may be seen as a frivolous note – although I do not believe it to be so – I would finally like to thank my emotional support cat, Violet, who has over the last four years expressed her great love for attempting to share the warmth of a modern laptop!

Chapter 1 Introduction and overview

1.1 Overview

This thesis sets out to discover whether, and to what degree, metaphysical idealism is present within the works of an extraordinary nineteenth-century woman, the American, Mary Baker Eddy. Eddy attained worldwide fame and notoriety in her lifetime, and created in the Christian Science Church an international institution which still exists today. It is also true that her work, and that of people following in her footsteps, was and continues to be of great cultural significance, but despite the system which she created being underpinned by ideas very similar to the metaphysical idealism of certain German and British idealists, Eddy is not regarded as a philosopher in the same sense as the famous men of the 18th and 19th Centuries; it is this injustice I hope to both demonstrate and rectify.

Mary Baker Eddy created the religion known as Christian Science, which although only publicly associated with healing, asserts something quite remarkable considering its distance from academic philosophy: illness, suffering and the entire physical universe are not real, the only true reality being spiritual.

The beginnings of a philosophical system

On February 1st 1866 a period in Eddy's life began in which she developed her own system of healing, initially with similarities to Phineas Quimby's - a clockmaker turned hypnotist who developed a form of mental healing and who had briefly been her teacher (Gottschalk 1973, p.106) - but with a radical philosophical underpinning which went far beyond anything her mentor had considered. The date is that of a fall during very icy weather at Lynn, Massachusetts in which Eddy suffered a spinal injury, serious enough to have been reported in the local paper two days later (Voorhees, p.57). Three days later, she wrote afterwards, she had "the healing Truth" dawn upon her; Christian Scientists refer to the date of her fall as the date of the birth of their religion (Eddy 1891, p.24).

In the years following the fall Eddy began to charge students very considerable fees to learn her own healing technique (and additionally committing them to pay 10% of any income resulting from their knowledge), and by 1872 had written the first 60 pages of a description of both her method and its philosophical foundations, which in 1875 was published as the first edition of her first book, entitled *Science and Health* (Eddy 1875). This self-published edition was 456 pages in length, and in its final form in 1910, after an astonishing 400-plus editions, attained 700 pages (Eddy 1910). It is in this form that the book has been published ever since that date.

Perhaps one of the reasons that there has been so little serious philosophical work on Eddy until very recently is that she was publicly hostile to the subject of philosophy as a whole, having declared it “ninety-nine parts of error to the one-hundreth [sic] Truth” (Eddy 1910, p.21-22). On the subdiscipline of metaphysics she wrote that “Such miscalled metaphysical systems are reeds shaken by the wind. Compared with the inspired wisdom and infinite meaning of the Word of Truth, they are as moonbeams to the sun, or as the Stygian night is to the kindling dawn.” (Eddy 1910, p.21-22)

Gottschalk (1973, p.33) seems to have concluded on this basis that “inconsistencies within her writing make a reduction of it to closed metaphysical system impossible.” However, Steiger, in his 1946 Ph.D. thesis, *A Philosophical Investigation of the Doctrine of Christian Science* (Steiger 1946), found much of interest. Since the later work of many eminent nineteenth century German Idealists was so at odds with that of their earlier publications, while not diminishing from their reputations as philosophers, Gottschalk does seem overly harsh in this respect.

Eddy herself referred to Christian Science as a ‘system’, and despite her idiosyncratic use of the word ‘metaphysical’ (which for the purposes of Christian Science understandably has more prominent theological overtones than is normally the case), did not misrepresent her work by describing it in this way. Christian Science is a religious metaphysical system, but it

is nevertheless underpinned by a thoroughgoing idealism which goes much further even than Fichte. It is Eddy's metaphysical daring in linking idealism with scientific method, and the consequences which logically follow from it, which I believe offer the opportunity for further research in this mistakenly neglected area of study.

1.2 *Science and Health*

Science and Health was largely written between 1872 and 1874, towards the end of a nine-year period from 1866 when Eddy had been almost entirely occupied by metaphysical matters and their relation to Christian Science. The book, from Eddy's viewpoint, was at one and the same time a textbook of Christian Science and its 'evangel' (Eddy 1910, p.113). Eddy's second longest work, *Miscellaneous Writings*, 1883-1896 (Eddy 1897), she later referred to as good preparatory reading for students of Christian Science before undertaking the task of reading and understanding *Science and Health*.

Although Eddy regarded the ideas expressed within *Science and Health* as revealed Truth, she nevertheless had to establish a quasi-technical vocabulary for communicating these ideas. Hand in hand with the development of this technical language, which gave new and precise meanings to terms borrowed from a variety of physical sciences, medicine, theology and philosophy, came the opportunity to develop these new ideas, as the terminology permitted both a more exact expression of her existing ideas and the possibility of setting forth entirely new concepts, which would have proved difficult in the immediately preceding years owing to their sheer novelty. As Eddy explained in *Science and Health* itself (Eddy 1910, p.115): "The inadequacy of material terms for metaphysical statements" was the cause of the principal impediment in communicating the ideas of Christian Science. "[E]xpressing metaphysical ideas as to make them comprehensible to any

reader” (Eddy 1910, p.115) would sometimes require hours of deliberation over a single word.

As Gottschalk (1973, p.43) untactfully explained in almost clinical detail, “*Science and Health* is not written in a linear-rational style, with one idea succeeding the other in orderly progression. The statements [...] do not necessarily have any logical sequence, and in many cases there is no particular reason why one sentence should be placed just where it is.” Nevertheless, no less an authority than Mark Twain described Eddy, with whose work he was very familiar, as:

“In several ways the most interesting woman who ever lived, and the most extraordinary [...] She has launched a world religion which now has 663 churches, and she charts a new one every four days. When we do not know a person – and when we do – we have to judge his [sic] size by the size of his [sic] achievements, as compared with the achievements of others in his [sic] special line of business – there is no other way.

Measured by this standard, it is 1300 years since the world has produced anyone who could reach up to Mrs. Eddy’s waistbelt.”

(Twain, 1907, p.102-103)

Notwithstanding, he considered *Science and Health* “Strange and frantic and incomprehensible and uninterpretable”, descriptions which may have been influenced by tensions within his own family: his own daughter Clara Clemens not only joined the Christian Scientist Church, but ultimately wrote a book on the subject (Clemens 1956).

Thomas (1930) suggested that Eddy’s ideas could have, at the very least, been influenced by the American Transcendentalists, who had amongst their numbers many respected authors, such as Emerson and Thoreau, and in Eddy’s case, of particular importance was

Bronson Alcott, the father of Louisa May Alcott (author of *Little Women*, and as a result the funder of her father's work). A further source for some of her central ideas both quoted and acknowledged in *Science and Health* from the 24th to the 33rd editions, is Vedanta philosophy. Passages from the *Bhagavad Gita* indirectly asserting the unreality of both suffering and the material universe were quoted (Farnsworth 1909, p.42), though from approximately 1885 Eddy sought to emphasise the differences between Hinduism (and other Eastern religions) and Christian Science; *Science and Health* from the 34th edition onwards no longer contained either the quotes or any references to Eastern religions.

W.F. Evans (a Swedenborgian minister and healer who along with Eddy studied under Quimby), an already well-established nineteenth-century author when Eddy launched her Christian Science, had written extensively on the action of the mind in relation to illness, and was well versed in both theology and metaphysical philosophy, making him aware of the potential links between 'mind-cures' and Hegelian and Fichtean idealism, as well as the philosophy within Hinduism and Buddhism. To what extent, if any, Evans' work influenced Eddy is hard to assess with any accuracy, but whatever the truth, Eddy was far more radical and her system of thought in many ways the opposite of Evans': he believed matter to be perfect, whereas Eddy denied its existence; Evans held desire to be the key to self-realisation, but Eddy considered the eradication of desire to be essential (Gill 1998, p.313).

There are clearly areas of commonality between the American Transcendentalists of mid-nineteenth century New England and the ideas foundational to Eddy's Christian Science, developed a few decades later. American Transcendentalism evolved from a merging of concepts from German Romanticism and Idealism of the years either side of 1800, albeit as interpreted by British authors. Alcott was initially very impressed with the first edition of *Science and Health* in 1875, seeing it as an important new development in the resistance against philosophical materialism. However, in 1878, after what would be his last meeting with Eddy, it was her sheer radicalism which

unsettled him, later writing that there “is perhaps a touch of fanaticism, though of genial quality, interposed into her faith.” (Shepherd 1938, p.489); given Eddy’s extraordinary degree of financial success and considerable oeuvre of published work, he may well have been correct.

Emerson, originally perhaps the most radically idealist of the transcendentalists, had by the 1870s backtracked on the position he had previously expressed in *Nature* (Emerson 1836, p.1-4). Eddy, therefore, was not only more extreme in her idealism, but also moving in the opposite direction to the by then aging transcendentalists. It can be argued that she was more consistent than they had been, in that she accepted the logical consequences of idealism, rather than balking at the counterintuitive implications.

1.3 The content and structure of the thesis

The thesis sets out to demonstrate the following aspects of Eddy’s thought:

- (i) There are two components to Eddy's metaphysics: the aprioristic and the empirical. Her application of what is arguably scientific method (although one may dispute the choice of her experimental data, which ignores cases in which ‘healings’ have not occurred) creates what might be termed ‘applied metaphysics’.
- (ii) There is coherence in her thinking and a commitment to accept some highly counterintuitive consequences arising from it; this is particularly the hallmark of a philosopher.
- (iii) Her claims and her method of arriving at them correspond to those of earlier and later academic philosophers.
- (iv) Although her system of thought leads to objections that she may not be able to counter, this does not imply that no coherent philosophical argument is present. Many Idealist philosophers can be refuted, and within general philosophy virtually all of the conclusions of the still-studied, highly respected Presocratic philosophers are no longer accepted without this affecting their

status as philosophers.

The structure of the thesis is as follows. After this brief introduction, I will outline the life and work of Mary Baker Eddy, and will then present her system of thought in summary before elaborating it in detail. This will necessarily require two chapters – Chapters 2 and 3 - as it will provide the formal, theoretical underpinning for the subsequent analysis of Eddy's work in Chapters 4 and 5. Chapter 6 explores the potential new injustice were Eddy thought of as a 'Covid denier'. Christian Science's response to the Spanish Influenza pandemic of 1918-19, offers intriguing parallels with the current Covid-19 pandemic, and the once-in-a-century rarity of a global event of this level of consequence strongly suggests that it would be a missed opportunity not to consider it. Lastly, in Chapter 7, I will summarise my results and conclusions, and offer suggestions for how the thesis could lead on to further research.

Here is the structure of subsequent chapters of the thesis in slightly more detail.

Chapter 2 The work of Mary Baker Eddy

Chapter 2 presents of an outline of Eddy's work, providing sufficient depth and breadth to indicate the possibility of re-framing the conceptual core of her magnum opus, *Science and Health*, as idealist philosophy. I also briefly discuss the only two PhDs which appear ever to have been written regarding the philosophical basis of her work.

Chapter 3 Analysing, restructuring and rephrasing Eddy's work

This chapter is an exploration of the 700-page, definitive statement of Eddy's beliefs, *Science and Health*. After a detailed synopsis of its contents, I will establish a minimal subset representative of the 1274 sections of which it consists, and then restructure and rephrase the text so as to reduce the redundancy (due to considerable repetition) and ambiguity (due to imprecise language) present in the original.

Chapter 4 A structured re-presentation of the work of Mary Baker Eddy

In order to represent it clearly, this chapter contains a minimal subset of the 'propositions' at the heart of Eddy's system, and corollaries which follow from them followed by an

exhaustive comparison of each of the possible pairings of the elements from this subset, testing every possible pairing of propositions for consistency.

Chapter 5 A philosophical analysis and an investigation of the coherency of Eddy's system

This chapter is a philosophical exploration of the restructured and rephrased expression of the ideas present in *Science and Health*. I will attempt to demonstrate the radical idealism upon which I believe it to be based, and identify and make explicit the subtly different forms of idealism which are present.

Following on from the presentation of Eddy's system in a concise form, this chapter contains a higher-level analysis of her work, identifying and then focusing particularly on a number of possible problems which, if unresolved, could entirely demolish her intellectual edifice. In brief, these are 1. Her use and understanding of the word 'everything'; 2. Her occasional use of seemingly antithetical physicalist/materialist language; and 3. The limitations of what she termed 'spiritual sense' when applied to aspects of the apparently existent external universe absolutely essential to her system. I offer potential solutions to these difficulties, which in at least one case may be entirely new.

Chapter 6 The Christian Science during the Spanish Influenza pandemic of 1918-19: its relation to the current Covid-19 pandemic of 2020 and 'Covid denial'

Given the Christian Science position regarding the nonexistence of illness, this will contain understandably polemic material diametrically at odds with established science and medicine, but stresses the many reasons why conflating Eddy's position regarding illness and that of 'covid deniers' would represent a new injustice.

Chapter 7 Conclusions and suggestions for further research

This chapter will re-present the results of the research in a summarised form and make a number of suggestions for further research. A recapitulation of particular similarities

between Eddy's conclusions and those later published by the British Idealist philosopher John McTaggart forms part of the chapter, demonstrating that, despite following completely different lines of argument, both Eddy and McTaggart agree that the ultimate, 'highest' form of entity within the radically idealist universe they both asserted, subsuming all others, is Love.

Bibliography

The detailed bibliography contains references from a great variety of useful sources, despite the historic lack of research in the philosophy of this subject.

Appendix 1: Glossary of terms

Eddy's work introduces a large number of specialist terms, and redefined existing terms from theology and other disciplines with sometimes entirely different meanings to the original. Although this will be explained where necessary throughout the thesis, for clarity a thorough glossary will also be provided.

Appendix 2: Empirical evidence in the form of patient outcomes

A minute but representative fraction of the vast body of evidence which Eddy and her very many followers regarded, and still regard, as confirming the axioms and propositions of Christian Science.

Appendix 3: Axioms and propositions of Christian Science

The axioms forming the core set, the propositions from the main argument and example empirical evidence forming Eddy's complete system are given in one separate section for the convenience of the reader.

1.4 Moving on

Having set forth the structure of the thesis, it is now time to begin the endeavour and privilege of presenting and analysing Eddy's system of thought.

Chapter 2 Mary Baker Eddy

2.1 The promulgation of the work of Mary Baker Eddy

This chapter attempts to present the system of thought known as Christian Science in a clear and logically sequenced form. It does not perform analysis, however, as this takes place in later chapters following the re-expression of Eddy's ideas.

2.1.1 Methodology

The overall approach of this thesis is the extraction and re-expression of Mary Baker Eddy's key ideas and core concepts from her published works, which I refer to as the 'gold'.

As with actual gold mining, there is a very great deal of material surrounding the gold which has to be removed; in the case of Mary Baker Eddy it is the ornamentation, ambiguity and repetitiveness of her prose which surrounds the gold of her ideas.

One aspect of Mary Baker Eddy's work which I believe has led to its misidentification as fringe theology, rather than core philosophy, is that her use of language, even when stripped of the above-mentioned redundancy, is that of a layperson untutored in academic philosophy. This, combined with her idiosyncratic redefinitions of existing technical terms from theology (and also regarding demotic language) creates a further barrier preventing her recognition as a highly original and thoroughgoing idealist philosopher.

2.1.2 Background to the author's involvement

My first contact with the work of Mary Baker Eddy was while carrying out background reading for the dissertation component of an MA in Philosophy with the Open University. I had become very interested in pacifism in general (and absolute pacifism in particular)

and, while investigating the different reasons which religious groups offered as justification for the most extreme form of pacifism, I was astounded to discover that, during the World War 2, at least some Christian Scientists, when asked how and why God could permit such slaughter, replied that it was obvious that it couldn't be happening, and must therefore be an illusion (Wilcox 1941, p.2). Fascinated, I started to explore the defining texts of Christian Science, and discovered that its founder, Mary Baker Eddy had created a theology underpinned by the most thoroughgoing form of idealism which I had met. Partially obscured by her occasionally nebulous style, I felt, was evidence of an idealist philosopher of great depth, breadth and originality, yet on searching for academic analyses of her work, only two names appeared with any frequency.

Why had her work been so neglected by academia? The charge of nebulosity, and, at times, a certain lack of logical progression in her arguments could be brought against many well-known idealist philosophers of the 19th Century. My hypothesis is that the reason is at least in part due to her gender; it is time for a reassessment of her work.

2.1.3 Setting the 'gold' in context

Before exploring Mary Baker Eddy's idealism in detail, it is useful to establish where her ideas place her in the spectrum of different forms of idealism, and in what ways her concepts are similar to, or different from, the thought of well-known idealist philosophers. Placing her ideas in context, of course, requires a summary of her work sufficiently detailed for this purpose yet concise enough not to be unwieldy. Luckily, Mary Baker Eddy herself provided a precis which can form the basis of this summary in Chapter 14 of her work, *Science and Health* (Eddy 1910, 465ff), and Steiger concludes with a similar conspectus in the last chapter of his 1946 Ph.D. thesis (Steiger 1946, pp.272-285).

At their centre, Mary Baker Eddy's ideas are breathtakingly radical: like Fichte she rejects the existence of the thing-in-itself (Fichte [1797] 1994, p.12-16), but beyond this, counters the Cartesian view that sensory experience, even with regard to pain and emotional states, is not a separate category to cognition. It is important to stress at the outset that this goes beyond Berkeleyan Idealism; what Eddy is asserting is, for example, that an individual can be mistaken about believing themselves to be in pain. This claim is only coherent if one accepts (for the purpose of argument) the concept that the experience of pain is actually a belief, that beliefs are the result of cognition, and that cognition can lead to error. From Eddy's standpoint, an individual who expresses the belief that they are in pain is simply wrong, and by correcting this false belief, the imagined, unreal pain will cease. In this particular case Eddy would be entirely certain, even without examining the supposed cause, as her theology (which is the result of deductive argument rather than mere conjecture or an assertion of faith), denies the existence of pain.

2.1.4 Importance and relevance of the goal

In recent years there has been an upsurge of interest in previously overlooked female philosophers from throughout history (Thomas 2018, p.1). I believe that Mary Baker Eddy's work fits into this category, with the injustice in her case being twofold, in that her work has not merely been largely ignored by the academic community, but is also not recognised even as coherent philosophy, let alone highly original coherent philosophy.

2.1.5 Re-expressing the core concepts

Once the overly ornamental and repetitive language has been removed, the next task is to re-express Eddy's core ideas in the language of academic philosophy. This will make the concepts involved clearer and permit the demonstration of the coherency of the arguments she put forward for her beliefs.

2.1.6 Helpful comparisons

There are many components to Eddy's idealism, some being recognisable as similar to the concepts of Fichte and Von Hardenberg (who wrote under the pseudonym 'Novalis'), others to those of Hegel and Schopenhauer, but, most importantly, a further group to those of the later British Idealists, and particularly to McTaggart. In some cases, Eddy's work predated the publication of these ideas in academic literature by as much as 50 years, as is true with the second volume of McTaggart's *The Nature of Existence* (McTaggart 1927).

2.1.7 Helpful contrasts

It is also important to point out certain contrasts between Eddy's system of thought and those of well-known idealists, and even more importantly, between Eddy's metaphysical system and how it can be easily misinterpreted.

The most commonly held misunderstanding regarding Christian Science is that it is either 'faith healing' or a 'mind cure'. Although I have touched upon this issue in Chapter 1, it so crucial to what follows that I will make mention of it throughout this thesis as it becomes

relevant at each point. Fundamental to Christian Science theology is that illness does not exist; what happens (adherents claim) when an individual's symptoms disappear as a result of the process undertaken by Christian Science Practitioners is that the patient realises the truth of this fact.

2.1.8 Summary

Although this research relates solely to the philosophy underlying Christian Science, the fact that this has hitherto been little researched necessitates trawling for relevant philosophical content in a variety of atypical sources, some of which are quite counterintuitive. Apart from a very few texts specifically on the idealism in Eddy's work, these other sources fall into five principal categories: (i) Biographies of Eddy with philosophical content; (ii) Theological texts on Christian Science, but explaining at least some of the idealism upon which it is founded; (iii) Works highly critical of Christian Science (and some of Eddy personally), which in seeking to argue against her system of thought, provide a useful exposition of the philosophy in question; (iv) Works of fiction which are in reality simply vehicles for the author to express their enthusiasm for Christian Science, and in seeking to justify it against its critics, offer detailed philosophical arguments for its validity; (v) Works making specific though false accusations regarding Eddy or Christian Science, but which apart from obvious falsehoods nevertheless address "Eddy's challenge to materialism" (Gottschalk 2006, v).

The last three categories, and especially the last of all, are perhaps surprising at first sight, but taking the fifth category as an example, there are excellent historical precedents for this eclectic approach. Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* is an exemplar (Tocqueville 1835, 1840): written following his extended investigative voyage around America, it notoriously contained many serious errors and misunderstandings, yet was critically acclaimed as being the best book on democracy in the USA up until that date, because the

errors lay outside its purpose and focus. Assessed as an analysis of America's implementation of democracy, it was unrivaled, despite the erroneous content.

2.2 Synopsis of Christian Science and Mary Baker Eddy's Idealism

Distilled from the million-or-so words Eddy used to describe her system of thought, this section seeks to summarise Eddy's philosophical ideas and their interconnections.

2.2.1 Christian Science

As with all religions, Christian Science is defined by its particular set of beliefs and practices, which in this case are part of the metaphysical family of religious movements. In addition to the Bible, it has another book which is considered an inspired text: *Science and Health*, (Eddy 1910) the main work of its founder and in which the main tenets are explained.

Eddy wrote 15 other books addressing specific issues: *Manual of the Mother Church* (Eddy 1895); *Miscellaneous Writings* (Eddy 1897); *Retrospection and Introspection* (Eddy 1891); *Unity of Good* (Eddy 1888); *Pulpit and Press* (Eddy 1895); *Rudimental Divine Science* (Eddy 1887); *No and Yes* (Eddy 1887); *Christian Science versus Pantheism* (Eddy 1898); *Message to the Mother Church, 1900* (Eddy 1900); *Message to the Mother Church 1901* (Eddy 1901); *Message to the Mother Church, 1902* (Eddy 1902); *Christian Healing* (Eddy 1886); *The People's Idea of God* (Eddy 1883); *Poems; Christ and Christmas* (Eddy and Gilman 1894); and *The First Church of Christ, Scientist and Miscellany* (Eddy 1908). I list these here to illustrate the breadth and depth of Eddy's work (approaching a million words), and, so as to further emphasise this point, it may be necessary for readers outside the USA to learn that in a poll of the most influential Americans of all time, she was included in the top-100 (The

Atlantic Monthly, 2006). Her degree of importance is not in doubt; it is the nature of that importance I seek to address.

As mentioned earlier, amongst the most important of Christian Science beliefs is the idea that illness is an illusion (which can be corrected, not cured, as it does not exist) only by prayer, but even more critical to the later analysis is the Christian Science assertion that this fact is simply a consequence of the entirety of material reality being illusory.

2.2.2 Mary Baker Eddy as an idealist philosopher

Idealism in all of its various forms - subjective, objective, absolute, magical, personal and many less well-known others - rejects the physicalist (materialist) notion that ultimate reality consists of the entities familiar to 'common sense', naive models of the universe, i.e. that we have a direct awareness of objects as they actually are, and that they are composed of matter, occupy space and obey the laws of physics, including those which relate to the categories of energy, space and time (Putnam 2012, p.252). Instead, it regards its ultimate constituents as non-material entities; for example, love and souls (McTaggart 1927, p.156). Eddy's world view thus fits precisely within this paradigm, in that she too rejected the physicalist concepts in favour of these idealist forms.

2.2.3 Synopsis of her ideas and evidence of their extreme nature

Fundamentally, by denying the supposed evidence of our senses, and recasting them as false cognitions, Eddy was able to redefine the common sense understanding of reality described earlier as 'error' (Eddy 1910, p.13). Idealists fall into one or other of two categories, either being descriptive or revisionist metaphysicians, with the former group rejecting the materialist epistemological understanding of the nature of reality (e.g. Berkeley 1710, p.42) and the latter group denying the materialist ontological model of

reality (e.g. Fichte 1800 in Preuss 1987, p.104). This categorisation is sufficient for the purposes of this chapter, but is deliberately simplistic and incomplete at this point, as I will expand upon the various descriptions used for the individual concepts of idealism and their groupings into recognised forms (such as those listed above) in Chapter 3.

Eddy, although superficially a Fichtean, went much further, rejecting the existence of things-in-themselves and all the apparent evidence of our senses, replacing them with an alternative set which she believed to be grasped by an innate, spiritual sense and which she was convinced that individuals could be awakened to by the methods of her Church, officially referred to as The First Church of Christ, Scientist. (Stark 1998, p.193)

Many of the early critics of Christian Science appreciated that the conceptual framework at the centre of Eddy's work was a very much more radical form of idealism. For example, Wolcott pointed out that Berkeley "never reduces idealism to absurdity attempting to apply it to the affairs of everyday life, and the conclusions of universal experience." (Wolcott 1896, p.15). Berkeley, of course, in explaining his own form of idealism had stated that "I do not argue against the existence of any one thing that we can comprehend either of sensation or reflection; that the things I see with my eyes and touch with my hands do exist, I make not the slightest question. The only thing whose existence I do deny is that which philosophers call matter or corporeal substance." (Berkeley quoted in Buckley 1901, p.23).

Eddy, however, denied exactly the component of reality which Berkeley so explicitly left untouched, and equally explicitly made this distinction between herself and Berkeley entirely clear (Eddy 1901, pp.23-24). Also, she states: " ... that by knowing the unreality of disease, sin and death, you demonstrate the allness of God." (Eddy 1887, p.9). This assertion was made on the basis that "As human thought changes from one stage to another, of conscious pain to painlessness, sorrow and joy, - from fear to hope and from

faith to understanding, - the visible manifestation will at last be manoeuvred by soul, not by material sense. (Eddy 1910, p.125).

While still searching for a treatment for various health difficulties, in 1861 Eddy discovered the method created by Phineas Quimby, who had developed his techniques for healing after abruptly recovering from what had been diagnosed as tuberculosis (Dresser 1921, p.168). Quimby's approach was initially based on mesmerism, the Nineteenth Century term for a form of hypnosis due to Franz Mesmer (Mesmer 1779, p.210). Mesmer had been working at a time when magnetic and electrical phenomena were being scientifically investigated for the first time and were a fashionable interest for many leading figures in European and American society. Influenced by the zeitgeist, Mesmer had interpreted his genuinely impressive results as being due to a hypothesized magnetic fluid permitting living things to affect one another by a process which Mesmer termed 'animal magnetism'. Quimby, however, working several decades later in 1847, when electrical phenomena were becoming better understood, considered that suggestion, rather than any magnetic or electrical effect, was responsible for the cures he was achieving.

Having determined that neither a hypothetical 'fluid' nor 'animal magnetism' was involved in the process, he instead considered that illness was in reality a state of mind; perfectly reasonable given that the 'cures' appeared to be resulting from suggestion. Quimby also found theological justification: the well-known Biblical account in which Christ heals a paralysed man, was, Quimby claimed, an example of something similar. He explained it (Quimby quoted in Dresser 1921, pp.319-320) as follows: "There is no intelligence, no power or action in matter of itself ... the spiritual world to which our eyes are closed by ignorance or unbelief is the real world ... in it all lie all the causes for every visible effect in the natural world." Quimby's method, therefore, was to explain to the patient that their own mind could control their symptoms.

The influence which Quimby had on Eddy's direction of thought was considerable, but despite his genuine success with his own professional activities as a healer, he was a largely uneducated man who knew nothing of the idealists. Eddy's subsequent contact with the Methodist minister Warren Felt Evans was very different in nature, however. Evans had read widely on metaphysical philosophy and theology, and was well aware of the connection between his ideas regarding the effect of the mind and the work of Fichte, Hegel, Edwards and the various philosophies underpinning Eastern religions such as Hinduism and Buddhism, eventually arriving at Swedenborgianism (Evans 1869, p.252). Of the German Idealists, Fichte comes closest to providing a formal framework for much of Eddy's ideas, notably In *The Vocation of Man* (Fichte 1799), but Swedenborg's theology is also of use to this analysis (Swedenborg 1749,1756).

The use of the word 'science'

In the 1870s, at the time Eddy wrote *Science and Health*, the physical sciences were already seen as the reference standard for claims regarding knowledge. A critic of Christian Science, therefore, might reasonably suppose that Eddy chose to use the word 'science' in the name for her new discipline simply to gain it extra authority and increase its standing among the general public, but this would be to do Eddy a great disservice. From her point of view, Christian Science was exactly what she claimed of it – a science – not just in the Aristotelian sense of knowledge in general, and certainly not in the pseudoscientific sense in which the word is sometimes now misappropriated, but in precisely the way that the word had become used by the rapidly advancing sciences of physics and chemistry, yet applied to a different 'data set': it offered claims which were testable, yet related to a metaphysical rather than mechanistic reality.

This genuine commitment to the true principle of science explains the very considerable

antipathy which Eddy felt for mysticism and mind cures, with which she was sometime wrongly conflated, and from which she believed her philosophy to be wholly separate. Prayer, for Eddy, was “an act” (Gottschalk 1973, p.281) within a spiritual universe, and the change in experience thus resulting was evidence – scientific evidence – for its effectiveness.

Christian Science metaphysics and the mechanistic universe

Although the mechanistic understanding of our experiences of the hypothetical ‘physical reality’ is now almost universal, it is nevertheless a theoretical construct. Assembling a set of sense perceptions into a unified whole is a purely mental abstraction, in which we assume the existence of solid objects in an objective, external universe with causality as its foundational principle. Developments in the 1920s in the field of quantum physics have provided extra evidence (extra to that of Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism and Sikhism) that a naïve realism is far from an accurate representation of reality. Einstein showed that physical measurements such as velocity and distance are subjective, depending on the frame of reference of the observer (Einstein 1905), and even causality is an illusion created by the statistics central to the uncertainty principle (Heisenberg 1932) As Bradley put it:

“To speak generally, the mechanical view [i.e. mechanistic] is non-sense [sic], because the position of the laws is quite inconsistent and unintelligible. This is a defect which belongs to every special science ... but in the sphere of Nature reaches its lowest extreme ... since these laws are not physical, and since on the other hand they seem essential to Nature, the essence of Nature seems, therefore, to be made alien to itself.”

(Bradley 1893, p.354)

The point which Bradley is making here is that a nineteenth century physicist would assert that only matter and energy exist, yet the laws of physics are neither, thus immediately demonstrating that something non-physical has to exist even in a pre-Einsteinian, naively mechanistic universe model. In the literal definition of 'metaphysics' - from the Greek μετά- meta-, meaning "after" or "beyond" – the laws of physics would appear to fit rather well, and could be seen as creating a segue into a greater reality.

2.2.4 Eddy's historic misrepresentation

Another facet in the complex set of reasons which I believe have prevented Eddy from being recognised as an idealist philosopher so far, is her claim, variously and repeatedly expressed, that her principal work, *Science and Health* (Eddy 1910) was an 'inspired book' (Gottschalk 1973, p.xxi). Having previously disparaged 99% of the academic philosophy that might have been thought to underpin her magnum opus, now she appeared to be additionally removing herself from its authorship. This is just one of the many reasons why her work has not been perceived as philosophy, others being documented later in this thesis.

The complexity of Eddy's historic misrepresentation is sufficient to warrant a small taxonomy in its own right. The main reasons for this century-long injustice appear to fall into the following broad categories: (i) Sexist prejudice: self-evidently still present in the 21st Century, but far worse in the 19th and 20th Centuries; (ii) The theological prominence of Christian Science outshining the philosophical content upon which it is based; (iii) The politics of envy: Eddy's great financial success; (iv) Inappropriateness of status: Eddy held no degrees or appointments outside of the institution which she had created; (v) Linguistic inexpertise: Eddy's ideas ran beyond her ability to express them; (vi) Outlandishness: the

sheer originality and extreme nature of the philosophy underpinning Christian Science creates a barrier between critics and a genuine attempt to engage with its ideas;

(vii) Offensiveness: conservatively-minded clerics were genuinely offended by some of Eddy's redefinitions and reinterpretations, e.g. regarding the nature of the Trinity and Christ's purpose on earth. (viii) Eddy's notoriety as a public figure, caused by (but independent of) the fame engendered by her role as the 'discoverer' of Christian Science (her preferred phrase (Eddy 1908, p.103)), creating an identity far from that stereotypically expected of a philosopher.

Some of these reasons are evident from the contemporary and extensive published criticism of Eddy and Christian Science, some are inferences from Eddy's own writing, and the remainder are *prima facie* conjectures.

2.2.5 Eddy's main argument

Mary Baker Eddy's argument in a paraphrased form, is roughly as follows. In this promulgation I will initially treat Eddy's assumption that God exists as axiomatic of her metaphysical system, but this is temporary, and only for the purpose of launching her argument; it will be replaced later with what she regarded as experimental proof for God's existence.

Beginning with an observation initially not unlike that of Berkeley, she notes that only minds can have ideas, and concurs that physical matter cannot be responsible for mental function, on the basis that mere matter cannot possess the ideas processed by cognition; for cognition to be able to access these ideas, it must be composed of the same immaterial substance that Eddy considered must be responsible for these ideas; both aspects of mental function must therefore be incorporeal (Eddy 1910, p.335). Although Eddy arrived at this independently, it is essentially a Fichtean position, and not original in itself,

but she immediately goes further with her argument in a way which I believe is original. By reassessing what we refer to as our senses as instead creating not sensation but false beliefs, she is able to create the possibility that all 'sensory' experience can be subject to error, ending what was then two centuries of acceptance of the Cartesian idea that sensory experiences are incorrigible (Raf 1966, p.42).

2.2.6 The consequences of Eddy's main argument

Eddy's main argument permits a complete reassessment of what we believe ourselves to be and what we imagine ourselves to exist within. Without hyperbole, it is hard to conceive of any element of what one might have assumed to be the case about our universe, life and God that is not, in principle at least, modified by her argument.

It is worthwhile re-capping at this point exactly what Eddy was claiming, and also taking the opportunity to add a little more detail. Of great importance in the terminology specific to Christian Science is the word 'error'. In Christian Science, it has an ontological aspect which can be negated by divine Truth; error, therefore, ceases to exist once this Truth has been realised. Eddy held that any belief system which posited the reality or power of anything other than God is in error; one of the consequences of this idea is that the concept of evil is itself an example of human-generated error. The classical explanation of evil offered by conventional Christian theology is that freedom of will created the freedom to sin, with evil being the result. Eddy's solution to the age-old 'Problem of Evil' was as breathtakingly simple as it was astoundingly radical: evil does not exist.

Unusually for a religion, both then and now, Christian Science strongly rejects any form of mysticism, with instead a declared preference for science and scientific method. Despite its profoundly metaphysical basis, Eddy saw her creation as part of empirical science; 'empirical metaphysics' might summarise her conception. This is a very substantive claim, and therefore requires a careful and thorough justification. How are the methods of

science to be reconciled with Eddy's claim? Does this mean that she thinks that the ontology of natural science (i.e. matter) can be separated from its methodology (i.e. the empirical method)?

Perhaps surprisingly, the answer is a resounding 'yes'. Eddy believed that the healings she and her disciples achieved (whatever we may believe to be the actual reason for them) was empirical confirmation for her foundational belief, namely that illness is an illusion. The observable, repeatable fact of the cures served exactly the function of an experiment in any of the physical sciences, not proving a hypothesis but providing evidence that it may be true. If Eddy had never achieved any healings, then her hypothesis would have been contradicted, as it fulfills the criteria for a scientific hypothesis: it can be falsified.

Although Christian Science is best known for its controversial claims regarding illness, this aspect is both greatly misunderstood by the general public, and a corollary of a belief system, rather than a core belief itself; it can be thought of as 'applied' idealism, very much in line with the suggestion made by von Hardenberg (who wrote under the pseudonym 'Novalis') in the 1790s within what he termed 'Magical Idealism' (explained later in this chapter). The healing performed by Christian Science practitioners involves helping the patient to deny the existence of their illness, wholly unlike faith-based healing claimed by evangelical churches on the right wing of mainstream Christianity.

The profoundly radical idealism of Christian Science is, of course, not confined to abstract, philosophical analysis and discussion, fascinating though this naturally is; Eddy, like the British Idealist McTaggart a few decades later, asserted that the "Love that is God" (Gottschalk 2006, p.83) is the one, true reality, and that "frighteningly real" (Ibid) suffering and illness are in truth "waking-dream shadows" (Eddy 1910, p.418). By ceasing to make the error of mistaking the false evidence of our senses for reality, "we draw closer to God" (Gottschalk 2006, p.83) and suffering is reduced or eliminated according to the degree of a particular individual's realisation of this unreality.

On the basis that illness and death are consequences of the false belief in the existence of evil, the corollary is therefore that these are also unreal: "We bow down to matter and entertain finite thoughts of God like the pagan idolater. Mortals are inclined to fear and obey what they consider a material body more than they do a spiritual God." (Eddy 1910, p.214). Eddy's position could therefore be seen as being more consistent than Berkeley, in that she accepts the logical implication of her commitment to the belief in God as an immaterial being, whereas Berkeley can be seen as backing away from what should be his conclusions.

Berkeley's 'immaterialism', now referred to as subjective idealism, is predicated upon the idea that we can only perceive sensations, as opposed to externalities, which have to be perceived in order to exist. What Berkeley backed away from is the logical consequence of this understanding of reality, which somewhat ironically was pointed out by G.E.Moore in his 1903 paper, *The Refutation of Idealism* (Moore 1903). He argued that for Berkeley to be correct, object and subject would have to be necessarily connected such that *there cannot be any distinction* between an object and its perception. Berkeley, however, although asserting that we cannot directly know external objects (with only sense perceptions being available to us), did not advance the model of reality in which these sense perceptions *are* the reality in question. Crucial to Eddy's extension of this idea is her replacement of 'material senses', which she argued were simply false beliefs, with 'spiritual sense', which, as part of Divine thought, is both the direct perception of reality and reality itself.

Eddy's thoroughgoing idealism also had consequences for the nature of the human body, in that she denied the existence of a material body, instead asserting the sole existence of Spirit. It might be thought - wrongly, in my view - that these ultimately amount to the same thing. Although Berkeley asserted that what exists is Ideal, which entails a denial of the existence of matter on the ground that ideas of mind-independent material things could not even be conceived, Berkeley was only denying the nature of what appear to be material objects, never the fact of their existence; he would not, for example, deny

the reality of illness.

It is also worth emphasising the extreme nature of the claim of Christian Science: as God is the Principle (to use Eddy's preferred term) of all reality, the real nature of the universe and of man is Divine perfection; the universe and man are spiritual, eternal, and - crucially – perfect. "All is Mind and its manifestation" Eddy wrote (Eddy, 1910, p.26), referring to the nature of existence as 'ideas'. "Metaphysics resolves things into thoughts, and exchanges the objects of sense for the ideas of the Soul." (Eddy, 1910, p.269).

Another fascinating example of Eddy's ingenuity regarding the manipulation of ideas follows from this observation. Having determined that, as part of the Divine, man is perfect, Eddy deduces that nearly two millennia of theological exegesis had entirely failed to understand Scripture at Matt. v. 48: "Thou must be perfect, as thy father in Heaven is perfect." (KJV). Far from being an entreatment to attempt to gain, perfection, Jesus was explaining to his audience that mankind is already perfect.

Christian Science, as the limiting case of radical idealism, denies the existence not only of matter, but also sickness and death. As God is infinitely good and God is everything, man is in reality part of the Divine consciousness and therefore perfect. Man, therefore, cannot sin; sin and evil are the consequence of an error of belief, as they are unreal. Christ, it follows, did not come to save mankind from sin, but to save us from the belief in sin (Eddy 1910, pp.38, 289, 430 and 497). The nonexistence of sin necessarily changes the meaning of hell, which becomes the suffering resulting from errors such as the belief in sin and death.

2.2.7 Criticisms of Eddy's ideas and her own responses to them

Eddy's fame, both for her controversial ideas and her considerable financial acumen, encouraged a range of critics, including theologians, clergymen, physicians and other people as prominent as Eddy in public life. It is the subject of some of these criticisms which I will now move on to, as it provides another opportunity to distinguish her subtle ideas

from the crude misrepresentations of her critics. At this stage I will present an outline, with greater detail following in Chapters 3 and 4.

Christian Science was vigorously attacked in the late Nineteenth Century by both the Roman Catholic church and the Protestant churches which were so prominent a part of life in the New England of Eddy's era. Having previously had to deal with Berkeleyan idealism a century-and-a-half before, and the American Transcendentalists fifty years in the past, now the established churches faced a very much more extreme form of idealism. Whereas neither Berkeley nor Emerson had denied the existence of common sense ontology, simply seeking to reinterpret its nature, Eddy denied corporeal existence entirely, going beyond the 'mere' assertion of the nonexistence of pain, illness and death. This they found extremely threatening, as absolutely central to their concept of Christ was his dual nature of being at one and the same time fully human and fully God; fully human in conventional theological terms required the possession of a corporeal body. Evangelical churches also have Christ's corporeal resurrection as a central tenet, and some also have the belief that His Second Coming will be in corporeal form. Thus, many usually rather separate branches of Christianity found themselves united against Christian Science.

The clergy of the 1880s and 1890s were extremely critical of Christian Science, often making the accusation that, having borrowed its foundational principles from Hinduism, it was therefore pantheistic (e.g. McCorkle 1899, p.84). This mistaken assumption became so widespread that eventually, in 1898, Eddy wrote and published *Christian Science versus Pantheism* (Eddy 1898), in which she emphasised the unity and infinity of God, but absolutely refuted the idea that He 'dwells' within material objects.

In the late nineteenth century, the growing popular interest in Eastern religions, such as Hinduism and Buddhism, meant that Eddy found it necessary to make a clear distinction between Christian Science and the popular understanding of Eastern philosophies. One example she used was that within Christian Science individual identity is both preserved

and eternal, and thus “absolutely refutes amalgamation, transmigration, absorption or annihilation of individuality”, as is understood in Hinduism.

Christian Science, despite the accusations of Eddy’s critics over the last 145 years, is not pantheistic. In contrast, even the Trinity doctrine as understood by mainstream churches concerned Eddy as being polytheistic; Christian Scientists regard God as the ‘Divine Principle’ and “incorporeal, divine, principle, supreme, life, truth, love.” Regarding Jesus, Christian Science considers the Divine conception as being of a spiritual being, and that ‘Jesus’ and ‘Christ’ are not precisely synonymous. Instead, Jesus is taken to refer to the man, and Christ to the “Divine idea”, owing to the logical consequence of the belief that good cannot dwell within an (illusory) physical body. As Eddy explains “The Christ is incorporeal, spiritual...” (Eddy, 1910, p.332) and additionally “matter is mortal error ... matter is unreal and temporal” (Eddy, 1896, p.21). Combining these concepts leads to the corollary that the apparent humanity of Jesus was illusory, “as it seemed to mortal view (Eddy, 1910, p.315). Eddy’s conception of the Holy Spirit is particularly original, and breathtakingly presumptuous: Christian Science is the Holy Spirit. Explaining this profoundly counterintuitive viewpoint, and using her preferred term Holy Ghost, she stated that:

“The advent of understanding is what is meant by the descent of the Holy Ghost, that influx of Divine Science which so illuminated the Pentecost Day and is now repeating its ancient history.”
(Eddy 1910, p.43)

Eddy saw Christian Science as a process as well as a body of knowledge, defining her Divine Science as the development of Life, Truth and Love (Eddy 1910, p.43), and also referred to scripture as further evidence in support of the exegesis above:

“[Jesus’s] students then received the Holy Ghost. By this is meant that by all they had witnessed and suffered, they were roused to an enlarged understanding of Divine Science.”
(Eddy 1910, p.46)

The most explicit example of her belief is from the chapter of *Science and Health* entitled 'Apocalypse':

"John saw in those days the spiritual idea as the Messiah, who would baptise with the Holy Ghost – divine Science."

(Eddy 1910, p.562)

Given that mainstream Christianity adheres to the Scriptural principle that there can be no forgiveness for blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, this particular claim of Christian Science created a permanent rift between it and other Christian denominations. Many Christian denominations share this belief, which is due to a number of explicit statements on the issue throughout the New Testament and their subsequent exegesis. For example:

³¹ Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men.

³² And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.

(Matt. xii. 31,32)

In *Henry's Commentary* (Henry [1708] 1960, p.64), Henry explains that

"... blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is the only unpardonable sin. What is sin? It is speaking against the Holy Spirit. See what malignity there is in tongue sins, when the only art of the sin is so. But Jesus knew their thoughts."

(Henry [1708] 1960, vol. I p.64)

What Henry is highlighting here is that it was not the thinking ill of the Holy Spirit that is blasphemous, but the speaking of it, as otherwise very few people would be free of this guilt. Henry then states that:

“This blasphemy is excepted, not for any defect in the mercy of God or the merit in Christ, but because it inevitably leads the sinner in infidelity and inpenitency”

(Ibid p.64)

What Henry means is that, as the Holy Spirit is the ‘active force’ with the potential to provide salvation, “There is no cure for a sin so directly against the remedy.” (Ibid p.64).

The quotes below indicate that it would appear to exist in perpetuity:

“Verily I say unto you, All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation.”

(Mark 3:28-30)

“Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: ⁹ But he that denieth me before men shall be denied before the angels of God. ¹⁰ And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven.”

(KJV: Luke 12:8-10)

The relevance of this point is that it provides another of the many reasons that mainstream Christianity has been so hostile to Christian Science ever since it first appeared. Even within the academic discipline of Religious Studies, normally distinguished from theology by its neutral stance towards the truth claims made by a particular religion, does not always achieve this neutrality when Christian Science is under consideration. This has compounded the historical injustice previously described, adding what might be termed academic religious prejudice to the philosophical dismissal of Eddy’s ideas.

The similarities between Christian Science and some Eastern religions echoed a growing interest in these previously poorly studied areas in the west, and particularly in Great

Britain and the USA. This was exemplified by the World Parliament of Religions in Chicago in 1893, at which there were presentations on Vedanta philosophy and Theosophy. Christian Science, Vedanta philosophy and Theosophy all attracted strong followings amongst the intellectuals of the late nineteenth century, but Christian Scientists themselves, however, sought to differentiate between the philosophy of Eastern religions and that of their own, which they held to be fundamentally different, though this was only really true from roughly the mid-1880s onwards.

The many vocal critics of Christian Science during Eddy's lifetime caused the publication of numerous defences of her position, including several by Eddy herself. As a consequence, in this subsection I will offer a selection of quotes from three works in which she sought to justify her counterintuitive system of thought: *No and Yes* (Eddy 1891a); *Rudimental Divine Science* (Eddy 1891b); and *The Unity of Good* (Eddy 1887).

Regarding the nonexistence of matter:

"There is no [...] material intelligence. God is infinite Mind, hence there is no other mind. [...] Spirit is not in matter, but in Spirit only. Law is not in matter, but in Mind only. (Eddy 1891b, p.7)

Also:

"The five material senses testify to the existence of matter. The spiritual senses afford us no such evidence, but deny the testimony of the material senses. Which testimony is correct? [...] If, as the Scriptures imply. God is All-in-All, then all must be Mind, since God is Mind. Therefore in divine Science [i.e. in Christian Science] there is no material mortal man, for man is spiritual and eternal, he being made in the image of Spirit, or God."

(Ibid, p.8)

"God is All-in-all. Hence He is in Himself only, in His own nature and character, and is perfect being, or consciousness. He is all the Life and

Mind there is or can be. Within Himself is every embodiment of Life and Mind."

(Eddy 1887, p.3)

Note the very important distinction: Eddy is claiming that within God is every embodiment, not God within other things. This vital difference is between pantheism, which Eddy's critics accused her of committing, and panentheism, which was her actual position. Panentheism, as well as asserting that the world is within God (as opposed to God being present in all worldly objects), crucially maintains the separate identity of the non-Divine. (Hartshorne and Reese 1953, p.378)

On the question of the nonexistence of illness (a good example of Eddy's denial of a common-sense view of reality):

"Disease is more than imagination; it is human error, a constituent part of what comprise the whole of mortal existence, namely, material sensation and mental and mental delusion [... T]he error of belief, named disease, never made sickness a stubborn reality ... { ... } the Science of Mind-healing destroys the feasibility of disease; hence error of thought becomes fable of fact. [...] Sin and disease are not scientific, because they embody not the idea of divine Principle, and are not phenomena of the immutable laws of God; and they do not arise from the divine consciousness and true constituency of being. The unreality of sin, disease, and death, rests on the exclusive truth that being, to be eternal, must be harmonious."

(Eddy 1891a, p.6)

Additionally:

"Christian Science refutes the validity of the testimony of the senses,

which take cognizance of their own phenomena, sickness, disease, and death. [...] The evidence that the earth is motionless and the sun revolves around our planet, is as sensible and real as the evidence for disease; but Science determines the evidence in both cases to be unreal. [...] Astronomy, optics, acoustics, and hydraulics are all at war with the testimony of the physical senses. This fact intimates that the laws of Science are mental, not material; and Christian Science demonstrates this."

(Ibid p.8)

So the key point is that the evidence of spiritual sense is without error, but is drowned out in ordinary life by the conventional senses, i.e. in people unschooled in Christian Science.

On the topic of the nonexistence of evil:

"Christian Science [...] gives the lie to sin, in the spirit of Truth; but other theories make sin true. [...] A lie is negation, alias nothing, or the opposite of something, named evil, must be [...] unreal."

(Ibid p.27)

Further:

"As God is Mind, if this Mind is familiar with evil, all cannot be good therein. Our infinite model would be taken away. What is in eternal Mind must be reflected in man, Mind's image. How then could man escape, or hope to escape, from a knowledge which is as everlasting as his creator?"

(Eddy 1887, p.19)

So evil is illusory - an error of belief – but more than this, note Eddy's analysis of a lie as the opposite of something and therefore nothing. It is this argument which she applies to many human constructs, such as pain, illness and death, but beyond even these radical claims, to the entire physical universe and all its assumed characteristics.

2.2.8 Eddy and the problem of 1943

Just as it is possible to damn an individual with faint praise, it is equally feasible for it to occur in the presence of an excess of praise. Few philosophers in the 2600-year history of the subject have had to deal with being equated with deity, but this is precisely what happened to Eddy's reputation in 1943.

In 1943 the Board of Directors of the Church of Christ, Scientist, concluded that Mary Baker Eddy was the woman prophesied in the twelfth chapter of the *Book of Revelation* within the Christian Bible. This was revealed to the public in the June 5th 1943 edition of the *Christian Science Sentinel*, and was a source of heated controversy amongst Christian, let alone the wider public. Mainstream Christians in particular felt that this was tantamount to blasphemy, and more conservative elements within the Christian Science church worried that it would bring their movement into disrepute and even ridicule.

The following text on an even more extreme version of Eddy's true identity is taken from an editorial by the Christian Science teacher, Judge Septimus J. Hanna, CSD:

"A second coming is as clearly prophesied as was the first coming. The Old Testament writers foretold it, Jesus plainly prophesied it, and the apostles reiterated these prophecies. The only question among believers in the personality of Jesus as he appeared nineteen hundred years ago. [...]

Only, as yet, a comparatively small part of mankind are ready to accept the larger coming comprehended in a re-establishment of the religious regime which Jesus inaugurated. This small part of mankind are satisfied that the second coming has commenced and is now manifesting itself in the works which Jesus taught should be evidence of the fact that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand Christian Scientists believe in a personal second coming Christian Scientists see in the non-acceptance

of [Mary Baker Eddy and Christian Science] an almost literal repetition of early history. They see a blindness to the signs of the times which compares well with the ancient blindness.”

[...]

"By common belief of all Christians, Christ Jesus represented the spiritual type or malehood of God. Is it not reasonable to assume that a full or completed revelation includes God's spiritual type of female-hood? If God is male only, it seems that he would embrace within himself but a half of Being or Individuality; and it would be impossible to reconcile such a conception with his own declaration in Genesis that out of his self-hood he created 'male and female.' Christian Scientists believe in a full Godhead; and thus believing they believe also in a full manifestation of that Godhead to humanity. Therefore they see in Genesis a prophecy of the second coming in female form. In Revelation they see the finality of prophecy. To their understanding the Woman of the Apocalypse stands in type for the female of God's creation spoken of in Genesis. [...]

We believe Mary Baker Eddy represents the Second Coming of Christ.”

(Hanna, S. quoted in *The Destiny of The Mother Church* by Bliss Knapp, pp. 271-297)

It is difficult to imagine that this decision encouraged the academic study of Eddy’s work as philosophy.

2.2.9 The initial popularity of Christian Science

One reason which has been suggested for Christian Science’s initial popularity and success in acquiring new members was that, until the discovery and introduction of antibiotics, conventional medicine achieved very poor outcomes with regard to infectious illness, and what treatments which were available were either unpleasant, harmful or both (Gill 1998, p.172). The occasional genuine cure (from a conventional medical standpoint) achieved by

Christian Science practitioners, whatever its actual cause, was greatly welcomed by the patient and their family and friends, whereas those who were treated, but unfortunately did not benefit were not harmed by the 'treatment', which consisted solely of an explanation regarding the nonexistence of illness, followed by prayer. The magnitude of potential harm which they were avoiding by not seeking contemporary medical attention can be judged by the fact that some medicines of the nineteenth century were based on arsenic, mercury and even strychnine, in the last case one of the most unpleasantly toxic alkaloids known either then or now, as overdoses, a frequent and facile unintentional outcome in Victorian times, kill by inducing cramp-level contractures of the entire body, including the muscles required for respiration, thus asphyxiating the patient.

Advances in medicine since the 1940s have presumably had a negative effect upon how Christian Science is generally perceived, and some extremely high profile, tragic cases in the late Twentieth Century, involving what was seen as a failure to obtain lifesaving medical interventions for children, have also had an impact. The underlying philosophy, however, is unchanged.

Christian Science, from its very beginnings, attracted an intellectual following, perhaps, at least in part, as a result of the highly counterintuitive philosophy upon which it is based; only those comfortable with pure abstraction and the rejection of the 'evidence' of the physical senses tended to join as members. Many of its followers in the first century of its existence were prominent members of British, Russian and American society, such as Nancy Astor, Sergei Prokofiev and Mary Pickford (Siewers 2019, p.3), although this is somewhat less true today than it once was.

A highly unusual but absolute rule affecting members of the Christian Science church is that they must not publish or reveal in any other form the level of membership; it is therefore hard to assess the current level in 2020, but approximately 20 years ago it was believed to be below 100,000 (Stark 1998, p.191). Although representing a large percentage fall

relative to the peak membership of 268,915 in 1936, it corresponds to the surprisingly small annual figure of roughly just over one percent per year (assuming a current membership of 100,000), which is broadly commensurate with the fall in attendance at established Christian churches.

What had led Eddy to these highly unusual views? How had her life experiences influenced a woman with no higher education to a wholehearted commitment to such an extreme abstraction? In the next section I will demonstrate how a consistent application of a very 'pure' idealism was absolutely central to the development of her ideas, and ultimately her entire system. Every aspect of Christian Science is in some way influenced by this idealism, and so this forms a natural framework for the exploration of her work.

2.3 Literature review: works specific to Christian Science

In this section a wide variety of sources will be referenced and the reasoning behind their choice for inclusion explained in detail.

2.3.1 Introduction to the literature review

Although much has been written about Christian Science over the last 150 years, very little pertains to its underlying philosophy. Instead, histories of the church and biographies of Mary Baker Eddy predominate, which although of interest are somewhat tangential to the precise topic of this thesis.

Eddy herself referred to as Christian Science as a 'system', and despite her idiosyncratic use of the word 'metaphysical' (which for the purposes of Christian Science understandably has more prominent theological overtones than is normally the case), did not misrepresent her work by describing it in this way. Christian Science is a religious metaphysical system, but although it is nevertheless underpinned by a thoroughgoing idealism which soars much higher even than Fichte, it is Eddy's metaphysical daring, and the consequences which logically follow from it, which I believe offer the opportunity for further research in this

mistakenly neglected area of study.

Eddy's ideas were set forth in her main work, *Science and Health*, which was largely written between 1872 and 1874, towards the end of a nine-year period from 1866 when Eddy had been almost entirely occupied by metaphysical matters and their relation to Christian Science. The book, from Eddy's viewpoint, was at one and the same time a textbook of Christian Science and its 'evangel' (Eddy 1913, p.113). Eddy's second longest work, *Miscellaneous Writings*, 1883-1896 (Eddy 1897), she later referred to as good preparatory reading for students of Christian Science before undertaking the task of reading and understanding *Science and Health*.

Although Christian Scientists value the Bible and *Science and Health* equally, the theological terminology Eddy used in *Science and Health* is not the same as in mainstream, academic theology. It is vital, therefore, to understand precisely what is meant by apparently familiar terms when used in this technical manner, specific only to Christian Science. Failing to do so can lead theologians and other academics into publicly disagreeing, sometimes very forcefully and in print, with assertions which were not actually being made. An excellent example of Eddy's curious choice of terms is her use of the word "chemicalization", which she used to mean the process of realisation that what we believe to be matter is in actuality spirit. The word "chemicalization" is therefore used to mean the opposite of what one might assume in three different ways simultaneously: 1. The word gives the impression that a process is taking place which will result in chemicals of some sort; 2. The word gives the impression of the existence of an objective, physical process; whereas Eddy's is referring to a subjective, mental one; and 3. In combination with the second word from the phrase 'Christian Science', the word "chemicalization" immediately suggests that whatever it is that is being referred to is within the bounds of the academic discipline of chemistry

2.3.2 Henry Steiger

Henry Steiger is one of the very few people who have addressed the philosophy of Christian Science. His 1946 Boston University Ph.D. thesis, *A Philosophical Investigation of Christian Science*, subsequently reworked as his 1948 book on the same subject (Steiger 1948), is a useful starting point, but is a little idiosyncratic in its coverage, perhaps as a result of Steiger's closeness to the Church of Christ, Scientist, of which he was a member.

2.3.3 Stephen Gottschalk

Stephen Gottschalk's two principal works, *The History of the Christian Science Church in North America*, and more particularly *Rolling away the Stone: Mary Baker Eddy's Challenge to Materialism*, provide thorough analyses of the philosophy underpinning Christian Science. Broader and more detailed than Steiger's, they offer a less optimistic assessment; as mentioned earlier, Gottschalk (1973, p.33) concluded on that a "closed metaphysical system" was "impossible" to obtain from Eddy's writing.

Although Eddy regarded the ideas expressed within *Science and Health* as revealed Truth, she nevertheless had to establish a quasi-technical vocabulary for communicating these ideas. Hand in hand with the development of this technical language, which gave new and precise meanings to terms borrowed from a variety of physical sciences, medicine, theology and philosophy, came the opportunity to develop the new ideas, as the terminology permitted both a more exact expression of her existing ideas and the possibility of setting forth entirely new concepts, which would have proved difficult in the immediately preceding years owing to their sheer novelty. As Eddy explained in the final edition of *Science and Health* itself (Eddy, 1910, p.115): "The inadequacy of material terms for metaphysical statements" was the cause of the principal impediment in communicating the ideas of Christian Science. "[E]xpressing metaphysical ideas as to make them comprehensible to any reader" would sometimes require hours of deliberation over a single word.

A further barrier to the academic analysis of Christian Science, as Gottschalk (1973, p.43) untactfully explained in almost clinical detail, "*Science and Health* is not written in a linear-rational style, with one idea succeeding the other in orderly progression. The statements [...] do not necessarily have any logical sequence, and in many cases there is no particular reason why one sentence should be placed just where it is." This facet of Eddy's work,

present to varying degrees throughout her 14 books, does not diminish the originality and ingenuity of the concepts she describes. What it does require of the reader, however, is the careful, piece-by-piece assembly of a coherent, macro-level expression of her system from the micro-level arguments which are present

2.3.4 Satter

Beryl Satter and Amy Voorhees have recently contributed highly significant additions to the body of literature on Eddy's work. Satter's recent work, *Each Mind a Kingdom* (Satter 1999) provides a wealth of detailed information specific to Evans and Quimby and their ideas. Both Evans and Quimby had provided elements of the foundational concepts upon which Eddy went on to build her system of thought, and Evans and Eddy initially shared a set of questions, such as what is the relationship between God and mind? Is mind in matter or separate from it? Should mind be thought of as masculine or feminine? Should matter be thought of as masculine or feminine? Evans concluded that man is equivalent to spirit and woman to matter, and beyond this that the 'mental' is scientific and desire the 'divine spark'. Eddy, of course, denied the existence of matter entirely (Satter 1999, p.70). Quimby, with whom both Eddy and Evans had studied, believed that the 'false opinions' of priests implanted fears, and that this continual 'background' worry led to illness. For example, the Calvinist concept that some people are predestined to go to hell at the end of their earthly existence, irrespectively of their conduct on earth and utterly beyond their control, would understandably be of very great concern to those with an absolute belief in its complete truth; it must be remembered that hell in this case is understood to involve *infinite agony for all eternity*.

During the 1850s and 1860s Evans offered new interpretations of familiar Bible stories, demonstrably improving the lives of those who heard them. He gave public demonstrations that, at least in some cases, the experience of illness could be eliminated by "reasoning them away from such false beliefs" (Satter 1999, p.60)

Unlike Eddy, Evans did not deny the existence of matter, instead considering as an emanation from God and existing in a set of hierarchical states - mineral, vegetable and animal – with developmental progress being governed by spiritual force', which he equated with revelation from God. He believed that humanity must seek to escape matter and become "transparent to spirit" (Satter 1999, p.61), with 'science' meaning 'spiritual knowledge' and therefore God as the 'master scientist'. Matter, for Evans, was affected by emotion, and the emotions, he claimed, could be shaped by thought, although in a puzzlingly contradictory analysis, claimed that as an emanation of God must already be Perfect. Humanity's task, he claimed, is to acquire Divine powers, with this being the true meaning of Salvation. This was where Eddy most vehemently disagreed with Evans, as his suggestion that mankind might develop Godlike power was for her the worst heresy, even blasphemy, instead envisaging a world in which no one would be "subject to birth, growth, maturity and decay", but instead reside within "painless and permanent" sphere (Satter 1999, p.77).

2.3.5 Voorhees

Amy Voorhees is an independent scholar who in both her PhD thesis and her subsequent book based upon it traces the development of Christian Science, contextualising it within the theological movements of the late nineteenth century and detailing the evolution of Eddy's unique understanding of Christianity.

Voorhees, in her book *A New Christian Identity* (Voorhees 2021), has in addition to superbly augmenting the scholarship regarding Eddy's history, her ideas and the context within which she developed them, has drawn attention to the great contemporary interest in the two varieties of the theological concept of Millennialism in the New England of Eddy's time. Pre-Millennialism refers to the idea of Christ returning before the Kingdom of God appears on earth, whereas post-Millennialism describes the situation where Christ returns once the Kingdom of God has arrived. Crucially, in both cases, these were thought of as future events, but as Voorhees points out, Eddy does not "fit neatly" into either "dichotomous option" (Voorhees 2021, p.100) of Millennialism then offered as

explanatory frameworks regarding Christ's return. Instead, Eddy thought of the Kingdom of God "appearing in human consciousness to transform earthly experience *now*" (Voorhees 2021, p.100, my italics), perfection already being present, but the human realisation of it only gradual. This is a further demonstration of Eddy's originality and prescience; it is only very recently that modern scholarship has considered the theological position known as preterism, which is the closest that mainstream theology comes to coinciding with this element of Eddy's thought.

Voorhees is also very helpful in summarising Jonathan Edwards's role in shaping Eddy's ideas. Edwards' *A History of the Work of Redemption* (Edwards 1739) presents arguments based on texts from the books of Daniel and Revelation to establish the beginning of the millennium (the 1000-year period involved in all Christian eschatology) as beginning in either the mid-nineteenth century or very early in the twenty-first, with 1866 being specifically mentioned. Bearing in mind the year of Eddy's fall on ice was 1866, it is unsurprising that she was influenced by this and the calculation of other dates, such as those shown diagrammatically by Frank Messenger in *Time of the End* (Messenger 1856) and referred to by Voorhees (Voorhees 2021, p.102).

2.3.6 Braude

Ann Braude has also contributed to the recently renewed interest in scholarship concerning Eddy, which has particularly accelerated in the first two decades of the 21st century (Braude 2007). However, her work is less relevant to this thesis than that of Satter and Voorhees, and so will not be considered here beyond acknowledging its existence and the contextualisation it provides for Eddy's oeuvre.

2.3.7 Twain

Mark Twain, like Eddy, had deduced to his own satisfaction that an omnipotent and omniscient God of love could not coexist with human pain and suffering. Analogously with C.S. Lewis's argument for the divinity of Christ (known as the Lewis Trilemma, in which we are forced to

accept either his divinity or dismiss him as either insane or satanic; there is no middle ground remaining (Lewis 1952, pp.54-56)). For Lewis, in the case of Christ, the option of regarding him as merely a great moral teacher “is not left open to us” (Lewis 1952, p.56), with Eddy’s system and the idea of pain, one either chooses God and the unreality of pain, or suffering and the absence of God. For Eddy, of course, it was the former, but for Twain, who had in 1909 recently lost both his wife and daughter, the overwhelming reality of grief was evidence of God’s nonexistence. Intriguingly, Twain’s bitterness towards these events in his life ultimately led him to a far more extreme denial of physicalist ontology than his initial metaphysics-denying response of atheism, albeit in a work of fiction. In his last novel, *No.44, The Mysterious Stranger*, the last chapter reveals an extraordinary truth, almost fully in keeping with that of Gorgias the Nihilist: “Life itself is only a vision, a dream ... Nothing exists save empty space – and you!” (Twain 1916, p.65).

2.3.8 Representative critical literature and difficulties inherent in the analysis of Eddy's work

One form of literature regarding Christian Science of which there is absolutely no shortage is that which is critical of Mary Baker Eddy either personally or regarding the system of belief constituted by Christian Science. Much of it was written in the late nineteenth century or the first decade of the twentieth century when Mary Baker Eddy was still alive. Incredulous and sometimes even hysterical in tone, these works gave Eddy herself the opportunity to tackle individual areas of misunderstanding by writing a series of monographs on specific topics. These, and others by a range of authors, were made available by the Christian Science Church's own publishing company and continued to be produced on single subjects in the years following Eddy's death.

As well as introducing original ideas of her own, Eddy’s works utilise forms of idealism which were already well known at the time she was writing. Although initially acknowledging the similarities between her principal work, *Science and Health*, and the

Hindu philosophy expressed in the *Upanishads* (and other Hindu and Buddhist works), she removed this acknowledgement from later editions of the same text. There is also some similarity between *Science and Health* and the work of the American Transcendentalists, such as Emerson, Thoreau and Alcott (Grodzins 2002, p.64), though it is clear that only the books of the last of these was known to Eddy, and even in this case only to the very slightest degree.

Other forms of idealism, however, are also present within her various works, with concepts from the absolute idealism of Hegel, the subjective idealism of Fichte and the idiosyncratic idealisms of the later Von Hardenberg and Schleiermacher, amongst several others. This is an important aspect with regard to elevating Eddy's standing as a philosopher, so although these other forms of idealism will not be described here, it is the fact of their existence which needs to be acknowledged at this early stage in the thesis. The problem in identifying these and other forms of idealism in Eddy's writing is that, in addition to the previously mentioned nebulousness and variable logical structure, she defined a lexicon specific to Christian Science in which many familiar words from theology, philosophy and psychology are used to convey sometimes very different meanings to those which are conventionally the case. A considerable familiarity with Christian Science is therefore a pre-requisite to any further philosophical analysis and may further explain the dearth of academic works on this sadly neglected subject, due to the completely understandable misinterpretation by highly skilled, academic philosophers regarding its true originality and subtlety.

2.3.9 Summary

In this overview of the relevant literature specific to Christian Science, I have begun to demonstrate that although there is a wealth of material regarding Mary Baker Eddy's life and work, there is an extraordinary lack of serious philosophical analysis. As a consequence, I will of necessity include a considerable quantity of non-specific texts on idealism which will assist in the analysis of Eddy's work.

2.4 Literature review: texts on idealism applicable to the philosophical analysis of Eddy's work

In this section an exploration and analysis will be made of the great variety of texts which may be helpful in achieving the goals of this research.

2.4.1 Introduction

A multiplicity of relevant general texts exist concerning idealism which are of obvious use in assisting with the identification of idealism in Mary Baker Eddy's writing. Narrowing the remit concerning these general texts on idealism is essential, as the field is far too large to conveniently survey and only certain types of idealism are helpful regarding this analysis. For this reason I will focus on similarities between Eddy's work and a carefully selected, small set of mostly German and British idealist philosophers.

2.4.2 Berkeley

Berkeley is the obvious starting point for a source of theoretical material regarding idealism (Berkeley 1710), but it is the differences between Eddy and Berkeley which are of issue. These will be elaborated greater detail in subsequent chapters.

2.4.3 Kant

Curiously, Kant can be a source of misunderstanding with reference to Eddy's idealism, as throughout her work, Eddy uses the word 'transcendental' in the manner adopted by the American Transcendentalists, rather than in the more familiar Kantian meaning. Kant's use of the word 'transcendental' in 'transcendental idealism' refers to the distinction between the experienced world and the world beyond. Kant did not deny the reality of our experience, whereas Eddy's system does, and claimed that we cannot have definite knowledge of the supersensible world, whereas Eddy's 'spiritual sense', within her system, provides this directly (Martin 1955, p.41).

American Transcendentalism was a mid-nineteenth century (c. 1830 to c. 1860) philosophical, literary and political movement strongly influenced by the German Idealism of a generation before (c. 1790 to c. 1830), but with many original features (Grodzins 2002, p.64). This topic and its relation to Christian Science will be discussed in more detail in section 2.4.7.

The potential confusion here is a good example of the kind of trap waiting for unwary academics, and also a further possible example of why the philosophy underlying her work has had so little serious study.

2.4.4 Fichte

Gottlieb Fichte, beginning as a talented follower of Kant, soon developed his own original system, the *Wissenschaftslehre* (Fichte 1797), which adapted the precise meaning of the word 'transcendental'. Fichte argued that there are only two possible starting points for a system of philosophy, which he described as pure 'selfhood' and pure 'thinghood'. By this he meant idealism, in the former case, and what he termed 'dogmatism', in the latter, dogmatism being his negative epithet for any philosophical system involving the-thing-in-itself. In *Wissenschaftslehre* (Fichte 1797) he explained that no 'mixed' system is possible, and that as no 'dogmatic' system can account for consciousness and all its corollaries, idealism is the only coherent solution. Very unusually, however, he conceived any constructed system as having the status of a hypothesis which must face subsequent testing; an intriguing parallel with Eddy clearly exists here regarding her understanding of 'healings' as providing evidence supporting her initial hypotheses.

Fichte conceived the 'I' as following from the act of its own positing (though actually simultaneously), with the *Anstoß* (the 'not-I') not external to the 'I' but created by it. He concluded that although philosophy could deduce the fact of spatial extension, the existence of time and the principle of causality, it had in certain areas very clearly defined limits; the properties of individual objects, for example, are outside its remit.

Schopenhauer was deeply critical of Fichte's approach, stating that:

"He declared everything *a priori*, naturally without any evidence for such a monstrous assertion ...
[and] he appealed openly and boldly to intellectual intuition, that is, really to inspiration."

(Schopenhauer 1851 *Parerga and Paralipomena* Vol.1 section 13)

Again, this is highly reminiscent of Eddy's understanding of Christian Science as revealed truth which she was inspired to write for the benefit of others.

2.4.5 Novalis

The early German Idealists, Fichte and Von Hardenberg (who wrote under the pseudonym Novalis) provide a useful conceptual framework for the analysis of Eddy's idealism. Very surprisingly, Novalis's *Notes for a Romantic Encyclopaedia* only appeared in an English translation in 2007 (Novalis [1798, 1799] trans. Wood 2007) two centuries after his death, so non-German-speaking academics until recently have not had access to his 'Magical Idealism', a form with certain parallels to that of Eddy's idealism.

Magical Idealism as a form is entirely due to Von Hardenberg, but sadly, owing to his premature death in 1801, a fully detailed working of this concept was never completed. However, in *Notes for a Romantic Encyclopaedia* (Novalis 1798, 1799) we are provided with at least an impressionist picture of his ideas. The fact of its incompleteness, and the fragmentary character of the notes Novalis bequeathed, gives the opportunity for many interpretations regarding true intentions for his project, but some important aspects are not in doubt. Novalis's use of the word 'magical', although potentially a source of misunderstanding for 21st Century readers, had a very specific quasi-technical meaning at the time of Novalis's writing. He used the term to mean the capacity to cause change in an apparently external reality by the action of will, an idea relating to Novalis's equating of will and thought. However, Novalis, like Eddy 80 years later, was adamant that he did not reject rationalism, but instead sought to incorporate aesthetics into his idealism, with love being

at its centre, just as McTaggart argued 120 years after Novalis's death.

2.4.6 Hegel

Hegel's absolute idealism denies the distinction between subject and object, positing this fact as a potential realisation of mind. Self-realisation advances spirit, Hegel claimed, to that of absolute spirit, this being prompted by the understanding that all apparently 'separate' objects are in fact 'self'. Hegel further argued that the finite man, in some ways not yet fully real, becomes infinite, attaining Divine status; Hegel considered that this occurred when he first had this realisation, making him the culmination of all history. Although Hegel is not now believed to have quite achieved this, he is nevertheless perhaps the holder of the record for self-aggrandisement. As Farnsworth put it in his 1909 work, *The Sophistries of Christian Science*:

“Christ was to Hegel’s conception what Speculative Philosophy had realized was possible of every free ego, to wit, attained self-conscious union with God, for which the idea, even the Absolute Spirit, externalized itself as pure but characterless shadow.”

(Farnsworth 1909, p.108-109)

It is important to note that while Eddy asserted that we are all Spirit and within God, we nevertheless maintain separate identities.

2.4.7 The American Transcendentalists

The American Transcendentalists were a loose grouping of writers, clergymen and theologians who were influenced by German Idealism through the interpretive texts of English and French authors, such as Taylor Coleridge, Thomas Carlyle and Victor Cousin (Grodzins 2002, p.64). Most had studied at either Harvard or Yale Divinity School, which in the 1820s and 1830s was surprisingly avant-garde theologically; the veracity of the Gospel accounts was a popular topic of discussion, and the historicity of all the miracles in scripture was similarly a matter of debate.

Many American Transcendentalists were initially Unitarian clergymen, but as they became more strongly influenced by metaphysical idealism, a change of career beckoned; writers, educationalists and social reformers therefore ultimately dominated the movement; Ralph Waldo Emerson is the most well-known of the group, and *Nature* his best-known work. This was described by Francis Bowen as “philosophy in its poetical aspect” (Bowen 1836, quoted in Gura 2007, p.50ff) and as having:

“occasional vagueness of expression, and ... a vein of mysticism that pervades the writer’s whole course of thought. ... To peruse this book is often painful, the thoughts excited are frequently bewildering and the results to which they lead us, uncertain and obscure.”

(Bowen 1836 in Gura 2007, p.50ff)

2.4.8 Green, Bradley and McTaggart

Thomas Hill Green was a central member of the British Idealists, whose objective idealism held that reality is monistic, but in which reality transcends experience. F.H. Bradley's proposed understanding of reality was similarly monistic, but in which perception and the perceived are undifferentiated.

J.M.E McTaggart's idealism held minds and love to be the only fundamental entities, arguing impressively in *The Unreality of Existence* (McTaggart 1922,1927) that matter, space and time are logically flawed concepts, and therefore cannot exist. McTaggart's form of idealism is particularly helpful in analysing Eddy's work, as although he published his ideas 40 to 50 years after Eddy, his detailed and carefully argued justification for his conceptual model of existence demonstrates a use of language and grasp of the rules of valid inference far beyond that of Eddy.

2.4.9 Summary

With regard to general works on idealism which are relevant to the analysis of Mary Baker Eddy's work, the exact opposite exists to that previously encountered concerning the

paucity of specific works on her underlying philosophy, in that there are so many titles of books and papers on idealism that a conscious narrowing of the remit becomes essential. The subset is essentially composed of early German Idealists and (with some exceptions) the later British Idealists and should permit a detailed and thorough analysis.

2.5 Literature review: other useful works

In this section the complexities involved in locating and responding to appropriate critiques of Christian Science are explored in detail.

2.5.1 Introduction

Many texts concerning Eddy's life and work can be of value, including some whose true value is quite counterintuitive. This section demonstrates the sheer variety and novelty of sources which may assist this research.

2.5.2 Parker

Theodore Parker was a highly influential ordained scholar who campaigned for women's rights and the abolition of slavery, and also gave sermons in which he expressed doubts regarding Biblical authority and the historicity of scriptural miracles. He is often quoted today without the realisation of his authorship, e.g. regarding his definition of democracy as "government of all the people, by all the people, for all the people." His ideas provide a useful context within which to frame Eddy's concepts and beyond which to note their originality.

Parker, in common with other Unitarians, believed that 'supernatural rationalism' was needed in order to determine religious truths, meaning that the 'natural religion' of reason is incomplete without the 'revealed religion' of the Bible, for example regarding Christ's role and his miracles.

Parker held that an analogy could be drawn between the laws of matter and the 'laws of spirit' on the basis that both were created by God, both are changeless and both are eternal. He believed that the greater the closeness with which one adheres to these spiritual laws, the greater the level of potential inspiration, offering the possibility that contemporary or future writers might demonstrate

equal or even greater inspiration than was evidenced by the historic writers of Scripture.

In the latter half of the 1830s, Parker's ideas began to coincide with the American Transcendentalists, resulting in him attending meetings of the Transcendentalist Club and, by the 1840s, publishing many articles in *The Dial*, the principal journal of American Transcendentalist thought (Grodzins 2002, p.110ff)

2.5.3 Twain again

Twain harboured an extraordinary level of cognitive dissonance regarding Eddy, the following two quotes illustrating the extreme dichotomy of what he appeared to believe concurrently. Regarding Christian Science, ".. it has the same value now as when Mrs. Eddy stole it from Quimby ... Mrs. Eddy the fraud, the humbug ..." (quoted in Bigelow 1912 vol.2, p.247) and:

"Christian Science is humanity's boon. Mother Eddy deserves a place in the Trinity as much as any of any member of it. She has organized and made available a healing principle that for two thousand years has never been employed, except as the merest kind of guesswork. She is the benefactor of our age.

(quoted in Bigelow 1912 vol.3 p.1271)

This sort of polarisation of two opposed opinions is commonplace within a population, but rare within a single individual.

2.5.4 Edwin Franklin Dakin

The title of Dakin's biography of Eddy, *Eddy: The Biography of a Virginal Mind* (Dakin 1929, 1930) provides potential readers with a prior warning as to its sensationalist tone and debunking nature, largely the same in character, although not with regard to either level of detail or overall length, as Milmine's biography. Dakin generously praises Milmine's work as being "so detailed and annotated that it is nothing short of a monumental piece of work" (Dakin 1930, p.418) and, regarding Milmine herself, " ... an intrepid, path-breaking

researcher." (Dakin 1930, p.418).

2.5.5 Albert Einstein

In as much as Einstein ever discussed theological and philosophical matters, his outlook was broadly Quakerly with regard to theology and Spinozian regarding philosophy (Isaacson 2008 pp.388-389). However, an until recently little-researched area of his interests late in life was Christian Science, or, more accurately, the philosophy underlying its relation to Einstein's physics. Parallels with the illusory nature of matter and the absence of an observer-independent frame of reference led him to remark in 1952, " ... to think a woman knew this 80 years ago." (Keyston 1996, p.189). Einstein visited his local Christian Science Reading Room a number of times and stated that "If I were not a Jew I would be a Christian Scientist." (Clark 2007 p.622).

2.5.6 Emma Curtiss Hopkins

Emma Curtiss Hopkins met Eddy in 1883, taking a class at her suggestion between December 1883 and January 1884, at which time she wrote that "I lay my life all talents, little or great, to this work." Appointed by Eddy in September 1884 as the editor of the *Journal of Christian Science* (later renamed the *Christian Science Journal*), she remained in post between 1884 and 1885, and was therefore well-placed to comment on both Christian Science and Mary Baker Eddy more personally. Hopkins commented that Eddy:

" ... clearly considered herself to be a revelatory prophet on a divine mission, functioning on a path parallel to the prevailing patriarchal system."

(Hopkins 1885, p.177)

It is this critical and analytical closeness which enabled Hopkins to make useful observations on the philosophy of Christian Science, particularly given the fact of her later firing by Eddy from her position

as editor following Hopkins claiming that she was in direct communion with God regarding the new metaphysics.

Following her dismissal by Eddy, Hopkins moved to Chicago (unusually for the era, without her husband and son) and began teaching her own version of a metaphysical healing system, forming the *Hopkins Metaphysical Association* for this purpose. This endeavour initially expanded faster than Eddy's Christian Science Church, in that within three years Hopkins had at least 17 branches of her association operating throughout the USA and had personally taught over 600 students (Satter 1999, p.81).

Given the nature of her separation from Christian Science, it is unsurprising that Hopkins' metaphysics differed markedly from Eddy's. Profound examples include the fact that Hopkins viewed Divine mind as masculine, with what she termed "carnal mind" as feminine and "akin to a window or a mirror" (Satter 1999, p.87), and her understanding of the belief in evil being "part of God's plan" and a "mentally created evil" (Satter 1999, p.86) implanted by mainstream Christianity. A further departure from Eddy was on a social issue. Hopkins's feminism concerned equality, and she was "... energetically devoted to feminism among other social reforms." (Gottschalk 2006, p.181), whereas Eddy's interest was in what women were (and would) achieve alone.

2.5.7 Karl Barth

Although the theologian Karl Barth considered that Christian Science theology has certain features in common with the New Testament, he also held that there was an important point of absolute difference:

"God is indeed the basis of all reality ... but He is not the only reality. As a Creator and Redeemer He loves a reality which is different from himself, which depends upon him, but which is not merely a reflection nor the sum of his powers and thoughts."

(Barth 1936, I, p.159)

It is by detailing these differences that Barth is so helpful, the above quote being just an example.

2.5.8 Georgie Sheldon

Georgie Sheldon (no known relation of the author of this thesis) had worked as a novelist for some decades when she embarked on writing *Katherine's Sheaves*, (Sheldon 1907) which although a work of fiction is nevertheless of both relevance to and use by this thesis because of the subject matter and its precise handling. The novel centres on a new student at an all-female college, who, owing to the combination of her adoption of Christian Science and the religiously conservative ethos of the college, encounters frequent resistance to her academic progress. The setting of the novel affords Sheldon the opportunity to involve the central character in lengthy, highly thoughtful and well-argued discussions with other students and, particularly, other staff; the novel can be seen as simply being a vehicle for these expositions of Christian Science beliefs and practices.

2.5.9 Summary

Atypical sources of information on a subject are not necessarily of less value than those which come from more commonly expected sources. In some cases the material provided by these sometimes surprising texts can be of greater value than conventional ones, being better expressed, more informed, and in rare cases, both. In the case of Mary Baker Eddy this is particularly true, as biographical texts have a hagiographic tendency, and standard works on the beliefs and history of the Christian Science church have broadly the same structure and content as each other and lack much detail regarding the underlying philosophy.

The best example of the usefulness of atypical sources is Sheldon 1907, which is almost the opposite case to that of standard works: expositions of the justifications for Christian

Science beliefs are present in quantity and quality.

2.6 Literature review: biographical material with philosophical content

The zealousness of Eddy's followers, coupled with their high level of education and intellect and combined with the free time available to the upper-middle class of the period, led to the publication of long and detailed biographies by some of the early Christian Science Church, and of course also by non-members. It is to these which the focus now moves.

2.6.1 Introduction

Mary Baker Eddy's fame and financial success, coupled with the early adoption of Christian Science by many notable public figures, created a demand for biographies of its founder. Another important driving factor for the early biographies is that they provided an opportunity to counter some of the negative publicity which Eddy's success and the controversial nature of her beliefs tended to attract. In some cases (e.g. Wilbur 1907) , lengthy and seemingly overdetailed 'arguments for the defence' concerning apparently trivial issues are present only to emphasise the author's perception of Eddy's honesty and integrity; the issue is not the content of the discussion, but the maintenance of Eddy's reputation. However, in amongst these overlong defences of Eddy's version of various minor events one can stumble upon well-argued explanations of the most abstract aspects of Christian Science theology and its philosophical basis; careful reading is therefore essential.

2.6.2 Sibyl Wilbur

Wilbur's main work on Christian Science (Wilbur 1907) is representative of the hagiographic school of biography, in which the subject is described as being almost saint-like, or, in the case of individuals who were ultimately beatified, actually so. The 'official' status of the

work (endorsed by Mary Baker Eddy herself) is both positive and negative: positive in that the work presumably lacks inadvertent errors, but negative in that it may contain deliberate ones intended to represent Eddy in a uniformly positive light. Criticism of either her or her ideas appears to be completely missing, whereas criticism of her detractors takes up large sections of the book.

2.6.3 Lyman P. Powell

Powell writes from a different perspective, as although a Christian he was not a Christian Scientist (Powell 1930). His biography of Mary Baker Eddy was, however, nevertheless approved by the Christian Science Board of Directors, for sale or for use in Christian Science Reading Rooms (the equivalent of a church building in Christian Science, and so can be presumed not to be critical of either Christian Science or Mary Baker Eddy personally).

Powell provides considerable detail regarding the period between 1866 and 1875, when Mary Baker Eddy was formulating and writing the first edition of *Science and Health*. Indicative of the level of this detail is the inclusion of a seating plan for the 14 named members of the team overseeing its publication, and his extensive analysis of the source of the title '*Science and Health*' (Powell 1930, p.95). The most interesting of these suggested sources is its appearance in Wycliffe's version of the New Testament (Luke i. 77), although this appears to have been unknown to Eddy at the time of its adoption. In Wycliffe's text, the Scripture is as follows:

“To yyue scyence of helthe to his puple , In to remyssioun her her synnes”

[In Modern English: “To give science of health to His people, into remission of their sins”]

(Wycliffe 1395, Luke i. 77)

2.6.4 Georgine Milmine

Milmine's work (Milmine 1909) is helpful in that it focusses on the differences between Mary Baker Eddy's understanding of Christian Science and that of some of her dissenting or defecting former students. One example is that of Josephine Woodbury, who was a Christian Science student of Eddy between 1884 and 1885, but in 1886 opened her own 'Massachusetts Academy of Christian Science'. Woodbury's intention, unlike many other defectors, was not to create a rival organisation but to promote Christian Science. It is the detail which Milmine covers so well, although it is worth noting that Gottschalk states that their work is " ... copiously documented, but heavily biased against its subject." (Gottschalk 1973, p.160)

2.6.5 Gillian Gill

Gill's biography (Gill 1998) is written from a late-twentieth century perspective, and therefore provides a useful counterbalance to the many historic and inaccurate criticisms of Eddy as being, in the words of the literary critic Harold Bloom, "a monumental hysteric of classical dimensions" (Bloom 1992, p.133). The combination of Gill's work (and other feminist analyses) in conjunction with the genuinely hysterical tone of some of Eddy's critics also illustrates the previously mentioned polarising nature of Eddy personally, engendering either intense admiration or profound contempt.

2.6.6 Robert Peel

Robert Peel wrote perhaps the best known and most detailed biography of Mary Baker Eddy (Peel 1966, 1972, 1982), extending to three volumes and, in so doing, delineating three distinct phases in her life: the years of trial; the years of discovery; and the years of authority. Although the combined length is an impressive 1289 pages, the work suffers from the same flaws afflicting many far less extensive accounts, in that it is a highly uncritical text by an individual who had been a Christian Scientist since the age of 10, and who was seemingly uninterested in resolving discrepancies between different sources, or

including and material critical of Eddy or of Christian Science. The resultant work, despite its length, is therefore incomplete in its coverage, and perhaps for this reason was approved by the Christian Science Church.

Despite the above comments, for the purpose of philosophical analysis Peel's work is actually very good indeed, as it provides a great deal of both Christian Science theology and its theoretical underpinning.

2.6.7 Summary and conclusions

Biographical works, despite necessarily focusing on Mary Baker Eddy's life and work rather than the justification of her theology, nevertheless can include useful material concerning the abstract philosophical basis for Christian Science. A thorough survey of this literature is therefore essential for the thesis.

Steiger throughout his thesis makes reference to the importance of Christian Science in relation to illness (Steiger 1946), but I believe this to be unnecessary. The popular understanding of Christian Science is of course a facet of it, but only a facet, and the underlying metaphysical idealism is its heart. To fail to realise this is to miss its real significance.

2.7 Summary and conclusion

The literature review has demonstrated the variety of material specific to Christian Science and to Mary Baker Eddy an individual, but additionally the great choice of works available to assist with the analysis of the idealism at the heart of Christian Science.

2.7.1 Works on the philosophy of Christian Science

Although some serious works on the philosophy of Christian Science do exist, and have done so since at least as early as 1946, the field is still remarkably sparse. Despite the clear difficulty which this presents to any researcher attempting the analysis of the philosophical

underpinning of Christian Science, there is nevertheless a wealth of material of use to this purpose.

2.7.2 General works on idealism

Idealism as an academic subdiscipline of philosophy has generated an enormous literature over the last 300 years, and even this excludes works from the classical and pre-modern eras. A carefully chosen subset of this body of work is of inestimable value in the analysis of Mary Baker Eddy's Christian Science.

2.7.3 Other useful works

Attractively counterbalancing the necessarily heavy editing of the general literature on idealism is the eclectic inclusivity which may be applied to the literature pertaining to apparently non-philosophical aspects of Christian Science, and to Mary Baker Eddy's works in general.

It would be a forgivable mistake to assume that works making false statements concerning either Mary Baker Eddy or Christian Science would be of no value to this thesis.

Nevertheless, it would be a mistake, as surrounding the false allegations are often interesting and well-expressed points of genuine philosophical interest. What sometimes happens is that, in their enthusiasm for making critical comments, a writer may go beyond their data. While this casts doubt on the overall reliability of a given work, it does not detract from other factually-evidenced criticisms which they may have made.

2.7.4 Biographical works

Driven by its commercial expedient is the vast quantity of literature concerning Mary Baker Eddy's life, some of which also details Christian Science, and a further subset of these works also meaningfully analyse the philosophy of her creation. Although this subset is very small in relation to the totality of works in this genre, the vast number of titles in the literature as

a whole means that even a minute proportion still represents a fairly large absolute number, and many of these works are of great use.

2.7.5 Rationale for the choice of literature

My approach regarding the choice of material to be considered as being of use to this thesis is a curious mixture of the eclectic and the highly focused. The wide range of material concerning Mary Baker Eddy and Christian Science, and the relatively small body of work on the philosophy of Christian Science means that a catholic approach is forced upon the researcher once this subset has been defined. However, regarding idealism, an extremely sharp focus is essential due to the sheer quantity of works available.

2.7.6 Conclusions and summary

The considerable notoriety which Mary Baker Eddy and Christian Science generated led to the publication of the great body of literature which is of use to this research. Although much of it is of little relevance, some is of the greatest value in assisting with the philosophical analysis of Christian Science, and so titles which at first sight may appear unhelpful nevertheless require careful and thorough reading if potentially highly valuable material is not to be missed.

This nicely segues into the next chapter, in which I will explore the idealism needed in order to analyse Christian Science's foundations. Note that a much fuller exploration of Eddy's work is provided in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5, after the theoretical concepts needed for this analysis have been discussed in Chapter 3.

As Eddy wrote in a letter to her editor, Rev. H.J. Wiggin in 1886, "Never change my meaning, only bring it out." This is a perfect summarisation of what I see as the two core purposes of this thesis: firstly, to evince the astonishingly radical philosophical ideas which Eddy's work contains; and secondly, to demonstrate their originality. Just as many of the

German Idealists, Hegel in particular, wrote in a style which even other academics found impenetrably obscure, Eddy's work can be difficult for non-specialists to follow. This, in addition to the understandably negative publicity previously mentioned, has, I believe, resulted in an unjustified neglect of Eddy's work. Her profound and ingenious philosophy demands greater attention. This thesis, I hope, is one small step in ending that injustice.

Chapter 3 Mary Baker Eddy's philosophical system

3.1 Introduction

Up to this point I have outlined Eddy's theology and its underlying philosophy, but without considering either the detailed structure of her definitive work or the text in its entirety.

The focus of this chapter will be the last two of these tasks, considering the outer and inner structure *Science and Health* and other works, and carefully editing, rephrasing or omitting Eddy's descriptions of her system of thought, thus creating a very much more concise and coherent text. This will form the source material for the philosophical analysis to come in Chapter 4.

3.1.1 Beginning the re-presentation

The last edition of *Science and Health* (Eddy 1910) – the 432nd – published in 1910 is considered as the definition of Christian Science by its adherents. It has the following high-level structure:

- Preface
- Chapter 1 Prayer
- Chapter 2 Atonement and Eucharist
- Chapter 3 Marriage
- Chapter 4 Christian Science versus Spiritualism
- Chapter 5 Animal Magnetism Unmasked
- Chapter 6 Science, Theology, Medicine
- Chapter 7 Physiology
- Chapter 8 Footsteps of Truth
- Chapter 9 Creation
- Chapter 10 Science of Being
- Chapter 11 Some Objections Answered
- Chapter 12 Christian Science Practice
- Chapter 13 Teaching Christian Science
- Chapter 14 Recapitulation
- Chapter 15 Genesis
- Chapter 16 The apocalypse
- Chapter 17 Glossary
- Chapter 18 Fruitage (testimonials from patients etc.)

Each of these chapters have what are effectively section titles, even though they are printed as marginalia. These provide names for the fragments of text which will either form part of the re-expressed description of Eddy's system of belief, or be excluded on various grounds. Some fragments will fall outside her argument, being extraneous to its logical progression, but the modal reason for exclusion is simply the repetition of a pre-existing stage of her deductive process.

A re-capping of the first two chapters of this thesis may be helpful in understanding the nature of the analysis which this chapter will present. Eddy begins with three statements which are at this stage effectively axioms of her system:

1. "God is All-in all."
2. "God is good."
3. "God is Mind"

Following which she immediately deduces that everything, without exception, must be good. Eddy then goes on to conclude that humans are the perfect spiritual ideas of a single, divine Mind, and are composed of Spirit, not material substance. What are conventionally thought of as the five physical senses, on the basis that they do not provide information concerning Spirit, are therefore in reality misleading, and are responsible for the almost universally held 'false beliefs' regarding the existence of pain, illness, disability, death etc.. Eddy, having concluded that all sickness is simply an error of belief, reasoned that praying in the company of the patient on this issue could dispel the belief and result in the disappearance of the supposed illness. This is expressed in *Science and Health* as follows:

The scientific statement of being

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.

(Eddy 1910, p.468)

For Eddy, the disappearance of the previous symptoms provided the third element in the sequence of hypothesis, experiment, results and conclusion, wherein the hypothesis is the set of three axioms, and the experiment is the attempt at 'healing' the patient by prayer. Eddy considered that any improvement in the patient's apparent condition confirmed the hypotheses; this approach to metaphysics she therefore claimed to be scientific, as it was, from her point of view, following scientific method. Each incidence of a 'cure' thus added weight to the veracity of her initial assumptions, ultimately to the point where Eddy could revise the three initial statements not as axioms, but, in her view, as hypotheses which she had experimentally proved.

An extremely important and fundamental difference between what Eddy suggested and Berkeley's form of Idealism rests upon Eddy's understanding of what is normally considered as being our physical senses. All the way through her many prose works are references to, and explanations of, these so-called senses being in reality generators of error - of false beliefs. For Eddy, only what she termed our 'spiritual sense' is capable of providing meaningful information. The consequence of this reframing of the 'five senses' is that, whereas Berkeley was subtly redefining the nature of reality, not its existence, Eddy on the other hand denied both its existence and even its possibility of existence. Although a

radical step, it neatly circumvents many of the difficulties which Berkeley's approach creates, including some of those of which Berkeley was himself aware and mentioned in his works.

Berkeley's suggestion that the continued existence of his claimed version of reality is maintained by God's awareness of it - something which if adopted creates a multitude of problems itself - was not needed by Eddy, for whom everything which exists is within God, due to the elegantly simple reason that God is everything. It is worth re-emphasising a very important aspect relating to this idea, as it has been the subject of a persistent misunderstanding regarding Christian Science and pantheism; Christian Science is emphatically not pantheistic, despite the statement above. This is because a vital distinction exists between pantheism and panentheism; the former can be summarised as "God is within everything", whereas the latter implies that "everything is within God". These two statements, which can sound very similar to some readers, are in reality conveying completely different concepts.

3.1.2 The approach to the analysis

One approach to forming a clear promulgation of Eddy's ideas would be to take each of the Expository chapters of *Science and Health* from 1 to 14, and systematically designate the named sections as being one of the following types:

1. A new stage in Eddy's argument;
2. A restatement of an existing stage in Eddy's argument;
3. A point of interest, but falling outside the logical progression of her argument;
4. Irrelevant to the topic of discussion.

The sections themselves

Paraphrasing Gottschalk, it has been stated (Gottschalk 2006, p.43) that Eddy's approach to *Science and Health* created the situation in which the sentences making up its content had no particular reason for being in the position or order in which they were published. Given that Eddy considered her work as 'revealed truth', this is unsurprising; she believed God to be the authority for her beliefs, so a coherent argument consisting of a logical sequence of deductions following from her initial premises was not her highest priority, especially as she considered the occasional genuine 'cures' of her patients as empirical proof of her beliefs. It does, however, greatly add to the effort involved in this analysis of her work.

A possible methodology

The process of rephrasing and editing Eddy's original prose could be a complex one, involving several stages: Classifying the content of each of the 1274 named sections in *Science and Health*; Producing a minimal subset of those sections sufficient to fully describe Eddy's philosophical system, but minimising redundancy; Rephrasing the content of sections in the chosen subset. The original text consists of 1274 section with an average of about 160 words each. Even if it were re-expressed as a subset of just 100, it would still represent a total wordcount of 16,000 or so, which is unwieldy given that the whole point of providing a shorter expression of Eddy's text is to facilitate the discovery and analysis of idealism within her work. Consequently, rephrasing the text in some other manner is a vital process, not simply clarifying Eddy's sometimes obscure expression, but distilling it to point of 'conceptual purity', where only the ideas remain.

3.1.3 The presentation

Although the approach described above would be achievable in principle, due to the nature of Eddy's writing it would be an impractically slow and cumbersome procedure, and despite *Science and Health* being what she saw as a complete statement of Christian Science, it would miss out some aspects which are important to the analysis of her work interpreted

as idealist philosophy, which forms Chapter 5 of this thesis. Thankfully, there is a very much better way, using a subset from *Science and Health* augmented by material from Eddy's shorter works, and it is this alternative methodology which will be adopted throughout the current chapter.

Two observations which are almost unavoidable from the process of editing and rephrasing Eddy's work are that, firstly, it develops over time with regard to its complexity and coherency, and, secondly, there is no reduction in redundancy – if anything, it increases. Both these points are of importance: an increase in coherency over time suggests, very strongly, that what Eddy was creating was her own work, as opposed to revealed truth; and secondly, the unreduced redundancy in her writing, with many conceptual aspects being repeated very many times, appears to imply the same aspect.

Unfortunately, the Christian Science church have not yet digitised all the editions of *Science and Health*, but certain key editions, where changes of significance have occurred, are available. The editions are the first, the last and a steadily increasing number of others. In each case, changes or additions have qualitatively altered the conceptual content of the work. The chosen subset of sections from *Science and Health*, which I believe represents a first step in the succinct expression of Eddy's system of thought, reveals the unexpected finding that many are composed of a combination of separate themes or elements within her philosophical system.

There are a number of terms needing definitions before embarking upon the process of choosing a subset of Eddy's sections, restructuring them and rephrasing their content. Firstly, I will distinguish between Eddy's core argument, a more elaborated version which I will term Eddy's main argument, and finally the longer description of the philosophy underpinning Christian Science's theology, which I will call Eddy's philosophical system. As I have previously stated, it has been observed that individual sentences in *Science and Health* do not have "a particular reason for being where they are" (Gottschalk 1973, p.43);

perhaps surprisingly, this affords the researcher a curious and unexpected advantage: the 'decomposition' of her work can extend below the level of the sections to that of the individual sentences within them, permitting a much greater degree of restructuring of Eddy's original text, as sentences expressing the same idea can be re-grouped as newly formed sections where this helps bring out her meaning. This will assist in the levels of restructuring, as each section of the new text will be more sharply focused on a specific concept or concepts, rather than being diluted by extraneous material.

The problem regarding Eddy's original source material

How, then, are we to reconcile the idea that the physical universe simply doesn't exist with the reliance on the Bible – presumably a physically existent one – as an essential part of Eddy's argument against the existence of physical universe? This is the first of three major problems with Eddy's system which require solutions for it to stand.

The answer, which is so important in establishing the coherency of Christian Science, depends entirely on Eddy's understanding of the so-called physical senses as generators not of information about an hypothetical external physical reality, but as creators of illusory ideas, i.e. of falsehoods. All throughout her many works, Eddy clearly emphasises not merely the pre-eminence of spiritual sense, but that it is the only true sense, i.e. providing information about reality – spiritual reality.

For the Bible to be: 1. existent; 2. true; and 3. interrogatable by spiritual sense in Eddy's meaning of the phrase, it must therefore be a spiritual entity and present to the spiritual sense. Given that Eddy considered it as an absolutely error-free source of information about the nature and attributes of God and of his creation, and that God is purely spirit, it is not unreasonable for the form in which this uniquely important information is presented to also be entirely spiritual.

As the entire focus of this thesis is upon Eddy's thought, it follows that giving her the benefit of the doubt on matters relating to apparent contradictions is a reasonable initial position to take, for if I did not believe her thoughts to be worthy of serious analysis they

would not form the basis for this research. What follows, therefore, will be an analysis predicated upon the general principle that Eddy is aware of the logical consequences of her sometimes highly polemic assertions, whether taken individually, as a subset or in their entirety. If this ultimately reveals unavoidable inconsistency in either her philosophical arguments or conclusions resulting from them, then I will treat these observations as the answer to the question with which this thesis begins.

Eddy's many critics, often highly vocal, widely published and even at times litigious, raised many questions about her system of thought, pointing out what they believed to be self-evident inconsistencies. Eddy was at least equally keen to publish replies to what she saw as false criticisms; having a publishing company at her disposal facilitated her in this regard. Many of Eddy's shorter works address these issues explicitly, consisting of a series of questions focused upon centrally important assertions and especially those which appear to be either self-contradictory or contradict other aspects of Christian Science.

A problem facing any scholar seeking to establish a consistent understanding of the philosophy underlying Eddy's system of thought is her apparently highly variable approach to the veracity (or otherwise) of what is conventionally thought of as physical reality. Although her theoretical approach eschews it completely, certain aspects of her writing appear to reference its existence. I believe that a consistent pattern exists to this vitally important component of her thought and it is Gottschalk's failure to discern it, as opposed to Steiger's perception of it (albeit only partially), which accounts for the difference in their conclusions regarding this aspect. Although Eddy occasionally uses the language of physical reality, it is purely a metaphor for the spiritual truth of the concept under consideration. She herself effectively makes this point in a published answer to a question from a member of her church, and this will be explored in detail in the next chapter.

3.1.4 The core argument

Four of Eddy's shortest works – *Unity of Good*, *Rudimental Divine Science*, *Christian Science Versus Pantheism* and *The People's Idea of God* - provide a small set of axioms which form the core of her ideas. These are largely expressed using a printed version of dialogue-based Socratic method, with both the questions and the answers on a small number of central topics. These can be rephrased so as to avoid the question and answer format, thereby forming the kernel of her system, and creating the foundation upon which the main argument, and ultimately the complete philosophical system, can be constructed. At this stage, the core axioms are precisely that - axiomatic - but later in this thesis will have been demonstrated empirically in the manner which Eddy considered sufficiently robust for her to assume that their validity to have been proved.

3.1.5 The main argument

The main argument consists of a much larger set of corollaries and a handful of lesser, extra principles taken from Eddy's second-most important work, *Miscellaneous Writings* (Eddy 1897), where they are again expressed using a form of the Socratic method. For the purposes of this chapter, however, they can be re-expressed largely as statements of assertion accompanied by their derivation from earlier principles, where appropriate. Although completing the formal component of Eddy's system, the main argument does not complete the system as a whole. Completion requires 'closing the loop' with empirical evidence in support of her claims, and a very detailed discussion regarding the concept known as 'science'.

3.1.6 The philosophical system

Eddy's philosophical system as re-expressed therefore consists of the set of principles formed by the core and main arguments, an examination of what constitutes 'science' and

what is needed in order to permit a 'theological science' to be constructed, and a vast (and continually growing) body of empirical evidence consisting of the testimonies of patients and their attending physicians. Thankfully, although this catalogue of evidence had already grown to two million examples by the 1890s, only a minimal, necessary subset of those testimonies is needed in order to corroborate the main argument. Instead, it is the discussion of the concept of 'science' and the efforts of MacIntosh (MacIntosh 1919), Torrance (Torrance 1969) and Polkinghorne (Polkinghorne 1988) and which will become a large and important component of the section completing Eddy's system.

3.1.7 Inherent difficulties

There is a very important difficulty regarding Eddy's work for which it is absolutely essential to find a method of resolution if her system is to be coherent. Eddy's understanding of the word 'infinite' echoes that of Spinoza two centuries before her, in that she interprets as meaning 'everything', as opposed 'going on for ever'. I believe that an argument composed of ideas from the branch of mathematics which relates to transfinite numbers, in combination with an intriguing and possibly novel application of apophatic theology, addresses this difficulty.

Specific terms in the Christian Science lexicon

In order to understand Eddy's work it is first necessary to define a number of crucially important key terms either specific to Christian Science, or which are used in an unfamiliar way which is similarly specific. This is additionally necessary as a prerequisite to presenting Eddy's metaphysics as a coherent system and demonstrating her incorporation of quite sophisticated idealist concepts, many of which she arrived at independently.

In *Science and Health* Eddy provides three main definitions of the Christian Science understanding of God, presented in a question and answer format and which I quote in full below. At this point it may be important to remind the reader that the nebulousness and

incoherency which they are about to meet in Eddy's original text is precisely what I am hoping to remove, substituting a new presentation of her system in a hopefully clearer and more appropriate form:

Definition 1

"Q. What is God?

A. God is incorporeal, divine, supreme, infinite Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love.

Q Are these terms synonymous?

A. They are. They refer to one absolute God. They are also intended to express the nature, essence and wholeness of Deity. The attributes of God are justice, mercy, wisdom, goodness and so on.

Q. Is there more than one God or Principle?

A . There is not. Principle and its idea is one, and this one is God, Omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent Being, and His reflection is man and the universe. 'Omni' is adapted from the Latin adjective meaning 'all'. Hence God combines all power or potency, all science or true knowledge all presence. The varied manifestations of Christian Science indicate Mind, never mind matter, and have one principle."

(Eddy 1910, pp.465-466)

Definition 2:

"GOD: The great I AM; the all-knowing, all-seeing, all-acting, all wise, all-loving, and eternal; Principle; Mind; Soul; Spirit; Life; Truth; Love all substance; intelligence."

(Eddy 1910, p.587)

The third definition occurs in Chapter 10 of *Science and Health*:

Definition 3 The Deific Supremacy

“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 to human conjecture or revelation of divine Science.”

(Eddy 1910, p.330)

The definition of man

In Christian Science the word ‘man’ does not refer to the (apparently) physical form of a human being, which Eddy describes as the empirical concept. Again, this can be extremely misleading, as far from an objectively real presence, she is distinguishing between this unreal, purely conjectural, erroneous concept, and the true, spiritual reality, for which she offers the following definition:

“Man is not matter, he is not made up of brain, blood, bones and other material elements. The Scriptures inform us that man is made in the image and likeness of God. Matter is not that likeness. The likeness of Spirit cannot be so unlike Spirit.”

(Eddy 1910, 475)

Eddy then goes on to distinguish ‘metaphysical man’ from ‘empirical man’:

“Man is spiritual and perfect; and because he is spiritual and perfect, he must be so understood in Christian Science. Man is idea, the image, of Love; he is not physique [sic]. 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.”

(Eddy 1910, p.475)

As Steiger put it (Steiger 1946, p.68) “Man lives as God’s image and likeness. God is the Mind, man the effect of Mind. As quoted in the definition of man, God is principle, and man the idea.”

The Concept of Mortal Mind

Eddy (1910, p.103) gives the following definition of the concept of Mortal Mind and is careful to distinguish it from the idea of immortal Mind: “It is the false belief that mind is in matter, and is both evil and good; that evil is as real as good and more powerful. It is either ignorant or malicious ... The truths of immortal mind sustain man, and they annihilate the fables of mortal mind, whose flimsy and gaudy pretensions, lie silly moths, singe their own wings and fall into dust.”

Earlier in the same work Eddy describes God as ‘immortal mind’ and “that which [imagines that it] sins, suffers and dies” as mortal mind (Eddy 1910, p.25). Interestingly, F.H. Bradley arrived at something broadly similar, although with a different terminology. He conceived reality in terms of a monistic whole in which there is no difference between perception and that which is perceived; he held that nothing can exist unless it is known by a mind:

“[T]his is the point on which I insist [...] I mean that to be real is to be indissolubly one thing with sentence. [...] [W]hat I repudiate is the separation of feeling from the felt, or of the desired from the desire, or what is thought from thinking, or [...] of anything from anything from anything else.”

(Bradley 1892, p.146)

He explains this further with a rather curious choice of language:

“For if, seeking for reality we go to experience, what we certainly do *not* find [italics in the original] is a subject, or an object, or indeed any other thing, standing separate and on its own bottom.”

(Ibid p.146)

So Eddy’s assertion is “that mind is a quality of God” (Steiger 1946, p.90). She acknowledges that the term ‘mortal mind’ is self-contradictory, but suggests that it is

nevertheless necessary as an intermediate step in the process of correcting the errors of naïve realism. Basing one's own model of reality on the idea of an external world and one's physical existence in that world allows contrary explanations to be dismissed as inconsistent, but once one's real-world model has become metaphysical, then the coherency of an external spiritual existence (remembering that in Eddy's world view, Spirit occupies space) and the unreality of the 'physical world' becomes apparent; "The dream and the dreamer are one." (Eddy 1910, p.530)

Mortal Mind, the Ptolemaic model and phlogiston

The concept of mortal mind is also analogous with the Ptolemaic model of the solar system (Steiger 1946, p.95), which wrongly placed the earth at its centre, and required a multiplicity of increasingly complex (wholly fictitious) artificial epicycles in order to achieve a reasonable degree of computational accuracy. Similarly, the idea of mortal mind wrongly places this construct as subject at the conceptual centre of the universe, all of which is then regarded as object. Regarding mortal mind as merely a hypothesis, however, allows the possibility of an alternative model, in which human existence is metaphysical and a reflection of the universe; an object, as opposed to a subject.

A similar and perhaps better analogy can be drawn between the hypothetical substance 'phlogiston' and the concept of 'mortal mind'. Phlogiston was suggested by 18th-Century chemists as a flammable 'essence' which all combustible substances must contain, and which was used up in the process of combustion. A better understanding of the process, however, demonstrated that combustion was a process of combining substances – the flammable material and the oxygen in air – rather than one of elimination. Similarly, 'mortal mind' is merely a hypothetical construct created to explain the apparent existence of human intelligence. Once seen as a consequence of the Divine Mind, the idea of 'mortal mind' is no longer needed.

The Christian Science concept of 'Divine Mind' is analogous to both the Greek idea of nous and the Hegelian concept of Absolute Mind. In answer to the question "who or what is it that believes?" Eddy explained that:

"Spirit is all-knowing; this precludes the need for believing. Matter cannot believe, and Mind understands ... Christian evidence is founded on Science or demonstrable truth, flowing from immortal mind, and there is no such thing in reality as mortal mind."

(Eddy 1910, p.487)

Here Eddy is implying that mortal mind does not refer to an existing entity, and is simply part of an erroneous model of reality. Based on the concept that the true essence or existence of man "is not mortal or limited" (Gottschalk 1973, p.67), mortal mind vanishes, along with the similarly erroneous belief in the reality of evil; both this belief and any question as to the origin of evil also vanish.

As Gottschalk explains, " ... the unreality of evil can be known to us only as we put on the Mind of Christ. As one follows in Jesus' way actually dissolving all forms of evil in his experience, he knows and understands the unreality of evil ... The understanding ... therefore, is inseparable from its demonstration." (Gottschalk 1973, p.67).

For Eddy, Salvation was not quite as mainstream theology imagined it. Instead of it being centred on Christ as mediator between God and mankind, with salvation being due to the grace of God, Eddy defined it as the realisation that the 'complete elimination of mortal mind' is required in order to yield a coherent metaphysical system (Steiger 1946, p.97). However, as virtually the entirety of those new to Christian Science will, as foundation rely on 'commonsense naïve realism' the self-contradictory term 'Mortal Mind' is needed as an artifice to help with the transition to a metaphysical understanding of the nature of Mind.

3.2 Eddy's descriptions of Christian Science

Although *Science and Health* (Eddy 1910) is definitive with regard to Christian Science, Eddy wrote many other works which serve as an introduction or clarification of her 700-page 'textbook'. It is these shorter books which will now be considered.

3.2.1 Relevant works by Eddy other than *Science and Health*

In addition to her primary work, *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, and some autobiographical reflections, Mary Baker Eddy wrote and published many other works during her lifetime, including the following texts: *Rudimental Divine Science* (Eddy 1891; 17pp) answers some of the most commonly asked questions about Christian Science and how it heals. *Unity of Good* (Eddy 1891; 64pp) provides a better understanding of God as completely good can bring healing to one's life. Fifteen short, individual chapters address subjects such as "The Ego," "Soul," and "The Deep Things of God". *Christian Science versus Pantheism* (Eddy 1898; 15pp) Defends (with an unusual degree of logic) Eddy's system of thought from accusations of pantheism and discusses how pantheistic beliefs have no relation to the concept of one universal God caring for man. *No and Yes* (Eddy 1891; 46pp) is a thought-provoking look at Christian Science in relation to other Christian faith traditions. In *Miscellaneous Writings 1883-1896* (Eddy 1897; 471pp) Eddy produced a collection of writings which she believed so important that in 1897 she requested that students of her ideas spend the next year thoroughly reading it. The diverse articles, addresses, letters, and poems—on topics such as mental healing, forgiveness, angels, and marriage—are based on the author's own experiences in putting her system of healing into practice. Considered by Eddy to be a book that would help readers better understand *Science and Health*, it contains dozens of letters from people healed just by reading that work. *Retrospection and Introspection* (Eddy 1891, 1892; 95 pp) is a short, reflective work on Eddy's life and work up to the point of publication. Some more of Eddy's individually published texts are also very short: *Christian Healing* (Eddy 1883; 20pp) Mary Baker Eddy

explains how the healings performed by Jesus and his early followers are possible today. *The People's Idea of God—Its Effect on Health and Christianity* (Eddy 1883; 14pp) looks at how individuals' lives are influenced by their views of God, and the life-transforming effect of spiritual ideas. *Message to The Mother Church for 1900* (Eddy 1900; 15pp) Includes a discussion of the "right thinker and worker," obedience to God and love for mankind. In *Message to The Mother Church for 1901* (Eddy 1901; 35pp) Eddy addresses the Church on the topics "Christ is One and Divine," "My Childhood's Church Home," and "Medicine" and *Message to The Mother Church for 1902* (Eddy 1902; 20pp) focuses on the First Commandment and Jesus' commandment to "love one another."

3.2.2 Choice of sources

Eddy's clarity of expression and logical progression of argument appears to be in inverse proportion to the length of her writing. As a consequence, in addition to Chapter 14 of *Science and Health*, I will use four of her very short works and a single chapter from her two longest ones; the complete set of source documents is therefore as follows: Chapter 14 of *Science and Health* (Eddy 1910); *Rudimental Divine Science* (Eddy 1891), *No and Yes* (Eddy 1891), *The Unity of Good* (Eddy 1891), *Christian Science Versus Pantheism* (Eddy 1898), and Chapter 3 of *Miscellaneous Writings 1883-1896* (Eddy 1897).

3.2.3 Summary

Due to the careful selection of a representative subset of Eddy's writing, and the brevity of Eddy's core argument, her curious disdain for logical progression in communicating the concepts within Christian Science is less apparent within the chosen sections of her works. Comparatively little re-ordering or re-expression of the fundamental axioms of the core argument is therefore necessary. Although Eddy considered Christian Science as revealed truth, potentially justifying the manner in which she herself understood its ideas, it does not explain why she had a clear tendency to retain this un-sequenced approach when

attempting to communicate the ideas to others, and especially so in the case of her paying students. Viewed *en masse*, her approach can be thought of as 'endlessly' repeating a relatively small set of principles, using differently worded statements to express them in an almost entirely random sequence; the phrase *reductio ad nauseam* comes to mind.

3.3 Core argument

The focus now moves to setting forth the foundational principles of Christian Science.

3.3.1 The core argument

Eddy's Christian Science begins with five initially axiomatic principles:

Core Axiom 1. God is omniscient

Core Axiom 2. God is omnipotent

Core Axiom 3. God is omnipresent

Core Axiom 4. God is infinite

Core Axiom 5. God is (completely/infinately) Good

From these Eddy makes a number of deductions, most of which form the augmentation to the core argument, but some are within what I define as the core. First and foremost is her deduction that, as God is infinite (which she interprets as meaning 'without limit', which she further interprets as implying 'is everything') , and God is Good, then it follows that everything - absolutely everything - must be Good [Main Argument 1]. This is how she determines at the outset of her system that pain, illness and death cannot possibly be real [Main Argument 2], from which it follows that our 'physical senses' must be nothing of the sort [Main Argument 3], and that we must therefore rely entirely on our spiritual sense [Main Argument 4] coupled with logical deduction.

3.3.2 Limitations

The core argument and the first four deductions arising from it, despite their fundamental importance, is only the very first step in setting forth the nuanced, highly complex and

original system which Christian Science represents. By far the greatest part of the threefold presentation adopted by this thesis will appear as the development of the main argument, with the empirical 'proof' second in length. Consequently, if Eddy's argument appears simplistic or contradictory at this stage, it is not the fault of Eddy; concerns such as these will be addressed later in this chapter.

3.3.3 Summary

As is very often the case when reading Eddy's many works, and particularly when attempting to analyse them, one is faced with the twin difficulties of her sometimes counterintuitive use of language and her seemingly random ordering of the concepts being expressed. Whereas the latter can merely lead to a lack of comprehension, the former can create serious misunderstandings, even to the point of the reader assuming the diametrical opposite to the meaning Eddy intended to convey.

3.4 The main argument

To recap, the main argument consists of the five core axioms and the deductions Eddy made from them. In her original text, these are not always made explicitly, instead sometimes being the implications of answers to questions she received from her many readers and published as part of one of her shorter works. Even during her lifetime, sales of her books were in the region of one million copies, and because of their content and style, naturally encouraged curious readers to write to her for clarifications, either due to the highly counterintuitive conceptual material, or as a result of the variable clarity of its presentation.

3.4.1 The nature of the main argument

As stated earlier in this chapter, apparent inconsistencies in Eddy's work will be treated as precisely that - apparent rather than real. Given her near half-century of thought devoted to Christian Science, and the extraordinary 432 editions of *Science and Health*, quite apart

from her multitude of other works, it would be reasonable to make the assumption of consistency on this basis alone. However, for the purpose of this thesis, the 'meta-axiom' initially adopted is that Eddy's axioms, corollaries and other statements do not contradict one another. In the same manner that Eddy's own axioms are ultimately demonstrated empirically (or, at least, deductions following from empirical results do so to Eddy's satisfaction), I hope to demonstrate that apparently contradictory aspects to Christian Science can be resolved at a later stage.

3.4.2 Development from the core

Even at this early stage, Eddy's idiosyncratic use both of words in everyday usage and of terms from conventional theology could lead to a degree of misapprehension completely undermining the intelligibility of her main argument, and by extension, her philosophical system. Consequently, although a full glossary is included as an appendix after the main body of this thesis, a discussion of a brief but targeted lexicon is necessary before progressing.

3.4.3 The main argument expressed as questions and answers

Having expressed the core of Eddy's Christian Science as a small set of (temporarily) axiomatic principles, the presentation of her argument moves on to a far more elaborate structure. Although built upon the foundation already provided, the first part of this new stage relies on a qualitatively different mode of presentation consisting of an edited, but nevertheless, quite substantial set of questions and answers regarding Christian Science drawn from Eddy's own work. I have used the very short texts *Rudimental Divine Science*, *No and Yes*, *Christian Science Versus Pantheism* and *The Unity of Good*, in combination with passages from Chapter 3 of *Miscellaneous Writings 1883-1896*. Although Chapters 10 and 14 of Eddy's longest work, *Science and Health*, is of relevance, they will, however, be more helpful in the later, analytical chapters of the thesis. The second part of expressing the

main argument involves rewording the questions and answers as an exposition of the principles of Christian Science.

3.4.3.1 Part 1: edited text taken from Rudimental Divine Science (Eddy 1891)

The next quote is exceptionally important:

“According to Christian Science, the first idolatrous claim of sin is, that matter exists; the second, that matter is substance; the third, that matter has intelligence; and the fourth, that matter, being so endowed, produces life and death. Hence my conscientious position, in the denial of matter. Spirit is the only creator, and man, including the universe, is His spiritual concept. By matter is commonly meant mind, --not the highest Mind, but a false form of mind. This so-called mind and matter cannot be separated in origin and action. What is this mind? [...]

Sight: Mortal mind declares that matter sees through the organizations of matter, or that mind sees by means of matter. [...] Here comes in the summary of [...] wherewith we started: that God is All, and God is Spirit; therefore there is nothing but Spirit; and consequently there is no matter.

Touch. [...] What evidence does mortal mind afford that matter is substantial, is hot or cold? Take away mortal mind, and matter could not feel what it calls ‘substance’. Take away matter, and mortal mind could not cognize its own so-called substance. [...] What is substance? [...]

Immortal Mind is the real substance, --Spirit, Life, Truth, and Love. Taste: Mortal mind says, "I taste; and this is sweet, this is sour." Let mortal mind change, and say that sour is sweet, and so it would be. If every mortal mind believed sweet to be sour, it would be so; for the qualities of matter are but qualities of mortal mind. Change the mind, and the quality changes. Destroy the belief, and the quality disappears. Is There no Death? God is Life; and as there is but one God, there can be but one Life. [...] Our Master said, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Then God and

heaven, or Life, are present, and death is not the real stepping-stone to Life and happiness. They are now and here; and a change in human consciousness, from sin to holiness, would reveal this wonder of being. Because God is ever present, no boundary of time can separate us from Him and the heaven of His presence; and because God is Life, all Life is eternal.”

(Eddy 1891, p.39-46)

Here, Eddy is providing her argument for the radically idealist world model which underpins Christian Science. She is seeking to demonstrate that every aspect of what is considered by others to be caused by interactions with an external world is merely a belief, and that in many cases – perhaps even most of them – it is simply wrong; a false belief. For Eddy, the only reality is God.

Eddy then addresses some highly important specific questions in the next section.

3.4.3.2 Selected passages from *No and Yes* (Eddy 1897)

Eddy addressed further questions in her very short yet helpful work *No and Yes* (Eddy 1897):

“Is Christian Science blasphemous? Blasphemy rebukes not the godless lie that denies Him as All-in-all, nor does it ascribe to Him all presence, power, and glory. Christian Science does this. Is there a personal devil? No man hath seen the person of good or of evil. Each is greater than the corporeality we behold. "He cast out devils." [...] That Jesus cast several persons out of another person, is not stated, and is impossible. Hence the passage must refer to the 'evils' [by which Eddy means 'errors' or 'lies'] which were cast out.”

(Eddy 1897, p. 22)

At this point Eddy first mentions Spinoza, which is important to the analysis later in this thesis.

“According to Spinoza's philosophy God is amplification. He is in all things, and therefore He is in evil in human thought. He is extension, of whatever character. Also, according to Spinoza, man is an animal vegetable, developed through the lower orders of matter and mortal mind. All these vagaries are at variance with my system of metaphysics, which rests on God as One and All, and denies the actual existence of both matter and evil. [...] Mortal man has but a false sense of Soul and body. He believes that Spirit, or Soul, exists in matter. This is pantheism, and is not the Science of Soul. [...] All power belongs to God.”

(Eddy 1897, p.24)

3.4.3.3 Selected text from Miscellaneous Writing 1883-1896 (Eddy 1897)

Amongst much else in this longer text, Eddy focuses on a commonly asked question, especially so in the nineteenth century:

“If I have the toothache, and nothing stops it until I have the tooth extracted, and then the pain ceases, has the mind, or extracting, or both, caused the pain to cease? [...] You call this body matter, when awake, or when asleep in a dream. That matter can report pain, or that mind is in matter, reporting sensations, is but a dream at all times. You believed that if the tooth were extracted, the pain would cease: this demand of mortal thought once met, your belief assumed a new form, and said, There is no more pain. When your belief in pain ceases, the pain stops; you scientifically prove the fact that Mind is supreme.”

(Eddy 1897, p.44)

This analysis was particularly in evidence during the 1918-1919 Spanish Influenza pandemic, when it was central to the Christian Science Church's understanding of what was taking place. Self-evidently, this is of great relevance to the current Covid-19 pandemic. The next question answered below is a surprising but nevertheless genuine reader's enquiry:

“Was ever a person made insane by studying metaphysics? Such an occurrence would be impossible, for the proper study of Mind-healing would cure the insane.”

(Eddy 1897, p.48)

So even if one was apparently driven insane by such radical idealism – ‘apparently’, because as all illness does not exist, psychiatric illness, as a subset, also cannot exist – it would also provide the healing, as the insanity would be a delusion: a delusion that one was insane. But the presence of a delusion is one of a range of possible symptoms of a psychotic illness, so this appears to create a paradox; it is analogous to a hypochondriac worrying that they have hypochondria.

The following question concerns one of the potentially serious flaws in Eddy’s system. This will be considered in great detail in Chapter 5.

“How does Mrs. Eddy know that she has read and studied correctly, if one must deny the evidences of the senses? She had to use her eyes to read.”

(Eddy 1897, p.58)

Eddy provided this answer:

“Jesus said, “Having eyes, see ye not?” I read the inspired page through a higher than mortal sense. As matter, the eye cannot see; and as mortal mind, it is a belief that sees. I may read the Scriptures through a belief of eyesight; but I must spiritually understand them to interpret their Science.”

(Eddy 1897, p.58)

In Christian Science, the partial isomorphism between illusory physical reality and true Spiritual reality is a highly variable one, but could be explained, within Eddy's system, as being due to a limitation of our very early stage in developing Spiritual sense.

The next question posits an interesting concept: if we cannot believe the evidence of our eyes, would it not permit the possibility of their being far more (or far fewer) real minds than there are false bodies?

"If mortal mind and body are myths, what is the connection between them and real identity, and why are there as many identities as mortal bodies? Every material belief hints the existence of spiritual reality. [...] The education of the future will be instruction, in spiritual Science, against the material [...] counterfeit sciences. All [...] will be swallowed up by the reality and omnipotence of Truth over error, and of Life over death."

(Eddy 1897, p.60-61)

Eddy also considers the 'nature versus nurture' debate:

"Does Christian Science set aside the law of transmission, prenatal desires, and good or bad influences on the unborn child?"

(Eddy 1897, p.71)

Here, Eddy is being asked about heritability, which at the time of her writing was almost universally believed to be not merely important, but, by many academics in biology and psychology, of sole importance. Her answer is that it does not occur at all:

“Whatever is humanly conceived is a departure from divine law; hence its mythical origin and certain end. According to the Scriptures,—St. Paul declares astutely, ‘For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things,’—man is incapable of originating; nothing can be formed apart from God, good, the all-knowing Mind. What seems to be of human origin is the counterfeit of the divine.”

(Eddy 1897, p.71)

This (the denial of inherited characteristics) is something claimed decades later in 1913 by John Broadus Watson in his so-called ‘Behaviorist Manifesto’. Watson’s paper, *Psychology as the Behaviorist Sees It* (Watson 1913), triggered a revolution in psychology, eschewing introspection, mental states and the inheritance of characteristics, while promoting the influence of environment and the necessity of quantifiable, objective data. This last point is another curious point of similarity between Watson and Eddy, despite Watson’s rigorous materialism and Eddy’s radical idealism, in that it was the objective, measurable recovery of her patients that Eddy cited as both evidence for the truth of her ideas and, crucially, the validity of her methodology.

3.4.3.4 Selected text Christian Science versus Pantheism (Eddy 1898)

Eddy regarded mainstream Christianity as having pantheistic tendencies, which she vehemently abjured, and was consequently angered by what she saw as the wholly unjust criticism that Christian Science was pantheistic. Her published response on this topic formed her short book *Christian Science and Pantheism* (Eddy 1898), in which she explained her position in some detail. As this is such an important aspect of her system, a fairly lengthy quote is needed in order to do Eddy justice:

“The Standard Dictionary has it that pantheism is the doctrine of the deification of natural causes, conceived as one personified nature, to which the religious sentiment is directed. [...] Theism is the belief in the personality and infinite mind of one supreme, holy, self-existent God, who reveals Himself supernaturally to His creation. [... It is the doctrine that the universe owes its origin and continuity to the reason, intellect, and will of a self-existent divine Being, who possesses all wisdom, goodness, and power, and is the creator and preserver of man. [...] Christianity, as taught and demonstrated in the first century by our great Master, virtually annulled the so-called laws of matter, idolatry, pantheism, and polytheism. The doctrines that embrace pantheism, polytheism, and paganism are admixtures of matter and Spirit, truth and error, sickness and sin, life and death. [...] They constantly reiterate the belief of pantheism, that mind “sleeps in the mineral, dreams in the animal, and wakes in man.” From a material standpoint, the best of people sometimes object to the philosophy of Christian Science, on the ground that it takes away man's personality and makes man less than man. But what saith the apostle? — even this: “If a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself.” The great Nazarene Prophet said, “By their fruits ye shall know them:” then, if the effects of Christian Science on the lives of men be thus judged, we are sure the honest verdict of humanity will attest its uplifting power, and prevail over the opposite notion that Christian Science lessens man's individuality.”

(Eddy 1898, p.2-10)

Again, it is Eddy's empiricism which is such an original aspect of her ideas.

3.4.4 Limitations

As stated earlier in this chapter, two essential aspects of Christian Science are highly problematic; this is now the point at which a resolution of these difficulties must be found if a coherent philosophical system is to be achievable. To restate the problem, Eddy uses the word 'infinite' to mean 'everything', as opposed to 'going on for ever'. Spinoza made the same interpretation, to which the classical rejoinder is to offer, for consideration, the set of all even numbers; it is clearly infinite, as it goes on for ever, but it is equally self-evidently not everything, as it by definition does not contain any odd numbers. A distinction would therefore appear to exist between the meaning of 'infinite' and that of 'everything'. Eddy, however, relies upon its interpretation as 'everything' in her argument that there is no 'room' for evil; if God could be infinite but without necessarily being everything, then her argument would break down.

The second problem to be resolved is the issue of what might be termed the 'nature' of the Bible. Eddy relied on her extensive reading of - and genuinely highly considerable knowledge of - Scripture in arriving at her core principles, yet, as part of her core argument denies the reality of the physical universe (a far more radical position than that of Berkeley), what, exactly, she had read - and how she had read it - is a puzzle, given that her main argument would appear to deny the physical reality of printed copies of the Bible, and defines the physical visual sense with which Eddy might be assumed to have read her Bible as simply a generator of error, and not a 'sense' at all.

3.4.5 Summary of the development of the main argument

One solution to the problem that 'infinite' does not necessarily mean 'everything' might be to separate immaterial 'substance' from God's omnipotence, leaving God as infinitely powerful and infinitely Good, but not definitionally 'everything'. Assuming that everything which occurs in the (apparent) universe is the result of the Holy Spirit - God's 'active force' - then, as God is infinitely Good, all events must be part of that Good, eliminating the possibility of illness and death.

There is, nevertheless, still a problem here, albeit a less serious one, despite being logically quite similar to the problem of infinite sets. If God is truly omnipotent, i.e. has power without limits, then God can create 'anything', but for 'anything' to be truly any thing, it must include 'that which is impossible for God to create', or this category would be absent from the supposedly limitless set. This implies that either 1. God cannot create a problem beyond her power to solve, or 2. God can create such a conundrum; in either case God's powers are not unlimited, which appears to deny the possibility of true omnipotence. This is, of course, the 'Paradox of the Stone': can God create a stone which is too heavy for her/him to move? Whether the answer is yes or no, a limitation is placed upon God's power.

Despite seemingly not being able to possess 'strong omnipotence' as an attribute (though a small minority of scholars dispute this), as God has complete freedom of action within that which is possible, it does not necessarily preclude God from creating only good events. Eddy's fundamental principles can therefore be justified, and the vast philosophical edifice she created can retain its foundations.

3.5 Eddy's philosophical system

In this thesis, I use the term 'Eddy's philosophical system' to stand for her main argument coupled with the 'healings' which she and her many followers regarded as empirical evidence.

3.5.1 Introduction

In this section, Eddy's philosophical system will be completed, although not yet in full detail. In Chapter 5, however, in sequence with analysis forming the bulk of that chapter, the complete system will be promulgated.

3.5.1.1 Introduction to the philosophical system

From within the vast body of testimonies given by patients who had experienced relief from their symptoms, a subset are accompanied by corroborating medical opinions, and a further subset of these formed the evidence which Eddy interpreted as demonstrating the truth of her original axioms at the beginning of the argument, transforming them into confirmed hypotheses. Since Eddy's death, this body of evidence has of course greatly increased in size.

3.5.1.2 The difference between the system and the previous arguments

Previously, when setting forth Eddy's ideas, either axioms have been stated or deductions drawn from them. In this section, however, rather than advancing the argument with

further stages of deduction or more axiomatic statements, the existing main argument will be bolstered by confirmatory evidence.

3.5.1.3 A different approach: completing the loop

In the physical sciences it is standard practice to form a hypothesis and then design an experiment in an attempt to either falsify or confirm the hypothesis. The results of the experiment therefore permit conclusions to be drawn about the original hypothesis, which 'completes the loop' of hypothesis, experiment, results, conclusions regarding the hypothesis. In metaphysics, however, it is highly unusual to follow this approach, but Eddy nevertheless does so precisely.

If one considers her initial axioms and their immediate consequences as her hypothesis, then every attempt by a Christian Science practitioner at a 'healing' for a patient is an experiment, with the results if successful confirming, but not proving, the likelihood of Eddy's hypothesis as being correct.

3.5.1.4 Theological Science

Great complexity surrounds the concept of theological science and Eddy's empirical metaphysics. Despite the fact that it is little known outside theological academia, theological science has been the subject of highly respected and very detailed texts, such as MacIntosh (1919), Torrance (1969) and Polkinghorne (1988). As a consequence, a detailed discussion of this aspect of 'closing the loop' is best left until later in this section, after the empirical evidence and some of the counterintuitive (and even bizarre) implications have been presented.

3.5.2 Augmentations to the main argument

The next stage in presenting Eddy's system of thought relies on what she saw as empirical confirmation of her metaphysical principles, i.e. the disappearance of the apparent symptoms of illness upon convincing the individual in question that they are not ill or in pain. Before looking at the specific case of Christian Science, it is first necessary to explore previous published work regarding the possibility of the existence of 'theological science'. Perhaps surprisingly, given its lack of visibility outside a very narrowly defined subdiscipline within theology and religious studies, there are a number of highly detailed and respected books covering what would constitute this hypothetical area of investigation, and it is to these I will now briefly turn.

3.5.2.1 Introduction to theological science

As previously mentioned, one of the original features of Eddy's work is embodied in the one-word abbreviation by which she often referred to it: 'science'. To reiterate, she was not using this word to the Aristotelian sense of 'knowledge'; instead, she was echoing its use in the physical sciences, as she (and her more than 100,000 followers) interpreted the many 'cures' achieved by Christian Science practitioners as empirical proof (or, at least, probabilistic confirmation) of the validity of her initial assumptions and the corollaries resulting from them.

The consequence of the above is that the next stage of the process of setting forth Eddy's work, and the philosophical system upon which it rests, requires the presentation of summaries of a selected subset of the many medically attested, apparently miraculous cures, the details of which being helpfully included in Chapter 18 of *Science and Health*,

entitled 'Fruitage'. This will complete the promulgation of her philosophy in a form convenient for the subsequent analysis of its precise idealist nature and level, or otherwise, of originality; this analysis takes place in the next chapter.

Had it not been for the selection of patient testimonies Eddy provided in *Science and Health*, any researcher interested in patient outcomes would have to find a method of approaching the truly vast body of literature this now represents. A systematic approach, preferably with a logical rationale, would be a giant undertaking in and of itself.

It might be assumed that a good basis for regarding the choice of empirical data would be to use only those outcomes which, in addition to the testimonies of the patients, are also documented by the attending medical professionals. However, a highly counterintuitive problem exists relating to what would conventionally be regarded as 'objective evidence', but before describing it, a helpful analogous problem from the realm of homoeopathic medicine will be presented first. When a conventional medicine is tested for efficacy, the gold standard is a double-blind, randomised trial, in which the medicine would be tested against a placebo, with neither the patient nor the experimenter knowing whether what is being administered is medicine or placebo. In the case of homoeopathy, however, no molecules of the active ingredient are present in the medicine, as the dilution achieved during its preparation can be more than 10 to the power 30 times beyond that which would reduce the initial presence of the active ingredient to a single molecule. As the placebo by definition also has none of the active compound, any possible conventional trial will result in comparing either the placebo with something chemically indistinguishable from the placebo (i.e. no active molecules with no active molecules), or the homoeopathic medicine with something chemically indistinguishable from the medicine (again, no active molecules with no active molecules).

Returning to the topic of objective evidence regarding patients helped by Christian Science, a similarly peculiar situation to that described above exists in relation to what would normally be considered 'objective evidence'. Accompanying some patients' testimonies are X-ray pictures of the condition of the patient before and after treatment. If Christian Science is correct in its fundamental assumptions, then the condition for which the patient sought treatment did not exist. If an X-ray film shows evidence of the assumed illness, it must presumably be part of the grand illusion leading us into believing in the reality of illness. If this is the case, only two possibilities seem to be available: firstly, anyone looking at the X-ray film is mistaken regarding what they believe that they are seeing; and secondly, the X-ray equipment and/or film has been misled in the same manner as a sentient, human observer could be. That a supposedly non-sentient medical device could have a false belief would appear not to be a coherent claim, thus leaving the human belief regarding the X-ray picture as the source of error. The 'objective evidence', or, rather, the human beliefs regarding the 'objective evidence', therefore cannot be regarded in this manner.

3.5.2.2 Theology as an Empirical Science (MacIntosh 1919)

MacIntosh published an exceptionally detailed suggestion for what could form a future empirically scientific theology, but despite the thought and erudition which is evident throughout, its focus on the physical world makes it of less application to Eddy's work than the next two authors.

3.5.2.3 Science and Creation (Polkinghorne 1988)

John Polkinghorne FRS, a professor of mathematical physics and additionally an ordained minister in the Church of England addressed this subject in his 1988 book, *Science and*

Creation (A potentially misleading choice of title, as the book has no connection with the fundamentalist doctrine expressed in the discipline known as 'Creation Science' within which the universe is sometimes asserted to be approximately 6000 years old). Given his dual qualifications to write this work, it is unsurprisingly excellent, and ideal with regard to this research.

3.5.2.4 Theological Science (Torrance 1969)

Theological science, insofar as it exists at all, "entails an epistemological inversion" (Torrance 1969, p.131), by which is meant that it is normally the case in science that it is "we who know, we observe, we examine, we inquire" (Torrance 1969, p.131), but in theological science it is the subject of our science, i.e. God, who knows, who observes and who examines. Eddy, however, reframes theological science as empirical metaphysics, bringing it within the methodology of the physical sciences while still denying the existence of physical reality. This is consistent with Torrance's view that:

"A primary requirement is that scientific questions must be genuine questions aimed at reality. Questions are not genuine if we already know the answer; they are only poses that do not get us anywhere but rather hold us back."

(Torrance 1969, p.123)

and, further, that:

"We have to dispose our questions into such an order that they form a 'series of thoughts in which thinking the thoughts is at the same time thinking the connections between them'."

(Collingwood, *Metaphysics*, p.63, quoted in Torrance 1969 p.126)

3.5.2.5 Eddy's work as empirical theological science

Christian Science thus clearly sits within the frameworks outlined by MacIntosh, Polkinghorne and Torrance, and it is notable that all three of these conceptual meta-systems appeared after Eddy's death. Her work cannot therefore be criticised as having been artificially forced into these schema, but instead, due to its coherence, consistency and methodology, does so naturally.

3.6 The philosophical system itself

It is now possible to move on to the re-expression of Eddy's system of thought.

3.6.1 The philosophical system summarised

The promulgation of a restructured and partially rephrased expression of Eddy's system of thought has now been completed. This has involved the identification of a core set of principles, initially treated as axiomatic, upon which the complex structure of her main argument could be constructed. Most importantly, from Eddy's point of view, the complete system of her Science succeeds or fails on the basis of its results; this consequently necessitated an analysis of the nature of science and what would constitute a theological science.

3.6.2 The next step

Setting forth Eddy's system of thought in this manner, although interesting in its own right, has been done for the purpose of analysing it with regard to the idealist philosophy, or more accurately, idealist philosophies, it embodies. Some of Eddy's concepts appeared in the published academic philosophy of the German Idealists long before the 1875 publication of *Science and Health*, and others in the writing of various British Idealists who were approximately contemporaneous with her, but a small yet highly significant set of components of her idealist thought appears to be both original and still unique to Eddy, even over a century after her death. It is this analysis to which I will now turn.

Chapter 4 The presentation of Mary Baker Eddy's system and an investigation of its internal consistency

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter I will consider the internal consistency of Eddy's system of thought, expressed in the form of 10 propositions chosen from Chapter 14 of *Science and Health* (Eddy 1910, pp. 465-497). Consistency has to be distinguished from coherency, however, and even if these 10 propositions are consistent with respect to each other, this does not necessarily imply that they are coherent individually; for example, it is entirely possible for two incoherent ideas to be mutually consistent. The vital and complex investigation into the coherency of Eddy's concepts therefore has a lengthy chapter of its own immediately following Chapter 4.

Although Eddy offers a core a set of 32 formal propositions in this Chapter, it is too large a number to permit an exhaustive test of consistency for pairs of propositions. The number of possible pairs from n items, not taking order into account, is $n(n-1)/2$, so for 32 propositions this would be $32 \times 31 / 2 = 496$. Writing even four sentences on each combination would yield around 50,000 words, a figure which is clearly not helpful in this context. However, the 10 selected propositions encompass the concepts elucidated in Chapter 3, but in a form small enough to permit every possible pair of comparisons to be made; for 10 propositions, this figure is $10 \times 9 / 2 = 45$ comparisons. The results of the analysis follows in the next section.

Emerging from this large amount of analysis are a much smaller number of repeated themes. Some of these introduce what appear to be completely novel concepts at the time of their publication. Other concepts arising from the analysis occasionally coincide with

ideas expressed by the British Idealists, either contemporaneously with, or, in a small number of cases, prior to, their academic publication.

The propositions selected for the purpose of this chapter are as follows:

- I God is infinite and unknowable, except by Divine revelation and human conjecture.
- II God is Life, Truth, Love, Spirit, Principle, Mind and Good.
- III The hypothetical construct, 'evil', is a "delusion of material sense".
- V Nothing possesses reality or existence except Divine mind and His ideas.
- VI God fills all space, therefore all is Spirit.
- VII The triune nature of God consists of Life, Truth and Love.
- VIII God is Father-Mother.
- XIV The idea of Christ (not the human form) is eternal.
- XV The invisible Christ appears to the Spiritual sense.
- XX Reality is spiritual, harmonious, immutable, immortal, divine, [and] eternal.

The figure of 45 comparisons arises from the fact that the first proposition can be compared with the remaining nine, the second with the remaining eight, and so forth until the penultimate proposition, which can only be compared with the last one in the sequence.

The total is therefore the sum of the integers from nine descending to one, so the complete sum is simply $9 + 8 + 7 + 6 + 5 + 4 + 3 + 2 + 1 = 45$.

4.2 Testing Eddy's ideas for internal consistency

4.2.1 Comparisons involving Proposition I

God is infinite and unknowable, except by Divine revelation and human conjecture

I & II God is Life, Truth, Love, Spirit, Principle, Mind and Good

God as unknowable except by these modes is unaffected by Eddy's 'scientific definition of God' using what she termed the 'Seven Synonyms'). For these terms to be applicable they must have been revealed by God or be Eddy's conjecture.

I & III The hypothetical construct, 'evil', is a "delusion of material sense"

The nonexistence of evil requires both Divine revelation, as a starting point, and human reasoning from there onwards. That God is Good is either Divine revelation or part of God (or both), that therefore evil cannot exist is a human deduction.

I & V Nothing possesses reality or existence except Divine mind and His ideas

The specified modes of acquiring knowledge of God may not be the only approach with regard to (at least) some ideas of the Divine mind. I assume that these can be perceived by the Spiritual sense, as only God and his/her Divine ideas are truly real.

I & VI God fills all space, therefore all is Spirit

Eddy's understanding of the word 'infinite is that it is synonymous with the word 'unlimited'. Consequently, given that this is a known truth regarding God's attributes, it must be either Divine revelation, or human conjecture, or both. An intermediate possibility is that it could be the result of Divinely guided human conjecture.

I & VII The triune nature of God consists of Life, Truth and Love

Eddy's understanding of the Trinity must have been acquired by either Divine revelation or human conjecture. As Eddy has stated throughout her many works, Christian Science is a form of revealed truth (although the exact wording changed at times during the 432 editions of *Science and Health*); it would be instructive to map the extent of this aspect in Eddy's work as opposed to subsequent deductions made from this revealed truth.

I & VIII God is Father-Mother

This could be seen as a novel consequence of God's infinite nature. If 'infinite' is interpreted as 'unlimited', then it cannot be the case that God is limited to only one gender, or, indeed, only two; God as having an infinite number of genders would appear to be the only possible conclusion.

I & XIV The idea of Christ (not the human form) is eternal

Although God is only knowable by Divine revelation or (valid) human conjecture, Christ's attributes are more readily apparent, as his literal 'appearance' in human form is in part due to his role as the only mediator between God and mankind.

I & XV The invisible Christ appears to the Spiritual sense

Although the invisible Christ appears only to the Spiritual sense, the conditions regarding gaining knowledge of God do not include the application of this sensory mode, adding to the distinction between God and Christ.

I & XX Reality is spiritual, harmonious, immutable, immortal, divine, [and] eternal

Although what we know of God is by revelation and conjecture, 'definitional' properties are also relevant, and all of the above are consistent with attributes of God.

4.2.2 Comparisons involving Proposition II

God is Life, Truth, Love, Spirit, Principle, Mind and Good

II & III The hypothetical construct, 'evil', is a "delusion of material sense"

Although not a complete description of God (as none ever can be), the seven so-called 'synonyms' of Eddy's 'scientific' definition of God do serve to highlight the idea that evil, and all that is associated with it, is the error of man's imagination, and no part of either God or of God's works.

II & V Nothing possesses reality or existence except Divine mind and His ideas

Combining Eddy's so-called scientific definition of God with the concept that nothing is real except God and his/her Divine ideas leads to the corollary that only Life, Truth, Love, Spirit, Principle, Mind and Good can exist, along with God's ideas.

II & VI God fills all space, therefore all is Spirit

The combination of Propositions II and VI imply that all space is completely filled with all that exists, namely, that which is described by the seven synonyms Eddy used to characterise God: Life, Love, Truth, Spirit, Principle, Mind and Good. Each of these terms, despite Eddy's claim of 'synonymity', deserves separate analysis.

II & VII The triune nature of God consists of Life, Truth and Love

Curiously, Eddy uses three of the seven synonyms of the 'Scientific definition of God' to represent the three elements (normally referred to as 'persons' in conventional theology) of the Trinity. In Christian Science, however, the word 'Trinity' is used differently, describing differing characteristics of a non-triune God (at least in the conventional sense of the word).

II & VIII God is Father-Mother

It follows from these two premises that God as Father-Mother must be representable by the 'scientific definition of God', implying that the Mother aspect of God's characteristics shares these descriptions

A non-physical reality potentially leaves the stereotypical roles associated with gender untouched, while conceivably eliminating sexual differences, assuming that they are purely physical and have an analogue in Eddy's spiritual reality. This could result in the gender roles being societal constructs and the assumed sexual dimorphism being neither a societal construction nor a biological one, but merely an error in keeping with error of belief in pain, illness and death.

II & XIV The idea of Christ (not the human form) is eternal

This a particularly weak point in Christian Science. Is Eddy really intending to imply that the human form of Christ, as opposed to the 'invisible', eternal one (actually visible to the spiritual sense), is not truly real, due to not being eternal? One presumes not.

II & XV The invisible Christ appears to the Spiritual sense

Whereas proposition II is a definition, Proposition XV is an assertion following from a definition. The invisible Christ perceived through spiritual sense is one example of this (only true) mode of perception.

II & XX Reality is spiritual, harmonious, immutable, immortal, divine, [and] eternal

This comparison can be thought of as simply an exposition of the attributes of God, who by any definition will be harmonious to herself/himself.

4.2.3 Comparisons involving Proposition III

The hypothetical construct, 'evil', is a "delusion of material sense"

III & V Nothing possesses reality or existence except Divine mind and His ideas

A further argument Eddy uses to deduce the non-existence of evil relies on her assertion that God occupies space - namely, all space. If, as Eddy does within Christian Science, evil is analogously defined as also needing to occupy space, then clearly the only possible conclusion is that evil cannot exist. Both of these spatial concepts are consistent with Eddy's statements on this issue throughout her many other works besides *Science and Health*.

III & VI God fills all space, therefore all is Spirit

Proposition III taken in conjunction with Proposition V fits into the pattern of Eddy's repeated assertion (albeit in different forms) that as God is Good and God, by virtue of being unlimited, is everything, then everything must be good. Evil, sickness and death, within the system of thought represented by Christian Science, therefore cannot exist, and are the result of erroneous human conjecture.

III & VII The triune nature of God consists of Life, Truth and Love

The triune nature of God, reflecting the attributes of God, clearly cannot and do not reflect the nonexistent construct, 'evil'.

III & VIII God is Father-Mother

These two statements, Proposition III and Proposition VIII, although they do not support each other, neither do they contradict each other's assertions. They are therefore in that very limited sense supportive.

III & XIV The idea of Christ (not the human form) is eternal

Proposition III and Proposition XIV, while not addressing non-overlapping magisteria, nevertheless appear to have no overlap of meaning. Therefore, although they are clearly not inconsistent as a result, neither are they literally supportive of each other.

III & XV The invisible Christ appears to the Spiritual sense

Proposition III and Proposition XV make a very interesting pair, as they raise different sides of one specific issue. Central to Christian Science is the concept of spiritual sense; what we normally think of as the physical senses are, in Christian Science, merely creators of error. The invisible Christ appears solely to the spiritual sense, whereas the delusion of evil appears only to the physical (non-) senses.

III & XX Reality is spiritual, harmonious, immutable, immortal, divine, [and] eternal

This is consistent with evil, pain, illness and death not being part of reality.

4.2.4 Comparisons involving Proposition V

Nothing possesses reality or existence except Divine mind and His ideas

V & VI God fills all space, therefore all is Spirit

Proposition V very clearly follows from Proposition VI, which uses the word 'all' twice in its assertion that all is God, and as God is Spirit, all is Spirit. Having made this statement, the Divine mind is consequently part of the 'all', as are ideas generated by the Divine mind.

Despite Eddy's assertion of a spiritual reality, Christian Science makes the highly unusual claim that spiritual entities, including God, occupy space. This assertion is unique within the metaphysical family of religions, and also within the variety of forms loosely grouped together under the generic term 'American Transcendentalism'.

V & VII The triune nature of God consists of Life, Truth and Love

Nothing possesses reality except the Divine mind and his/her ideas. Therefore, as Proposition VII relates to the 'inner' God, it is consistent.

V & VIII God is Father-Mother

In conventional Trinitarian Christian theology, God is Father, Son and Holy Ghost. In Christian Science, however, Eddy redefines God as Father/Mother. Christ within Christian Science must be a Divine idea of God, but nevertheless appears to exist within a hierarchy of concepts.

V & XIV The idea of Christ (not the human form) is eternal

In Eddy's system, Christ is subordinate to God, being a Divine idea of God, rather than a 'person' of the triune God himself. Additionally, Christ is the unique role of being the mediator between God and mankind, further emphasising the separation between God and mankind within Christian Science; this is just one example of the many tenets which were viewed as blasphemous by contemporary theologians (as some twenty-first century theologians still do). As the Divine idea of god, Christ must be subordinate to God, yet eternal and changeless, as if Divine thoughts changed with time, this would presumably imply some change in God, which is excluded within the definition.

Oddly, this concept seems immediately capable of generalisation. If all that exists is God and his/her Divine ideas, and if Divine ideas are changeless in the above manner, then

(spiritual) reality should be changeless, intriguingly echoing the conclusion of Parmenides (discussed later in Section 5.4), despite being the conclusion of a completely different style of argument.

V & XV The invisible Christ appears to the Spiritual sense

This is consistent with all true reality being Spirit. Soul must therefore also be Spirit and eternal. Christ can therefore in turn be seen as an eternal soul with the unique additional property of being the sole mediator between God and mankind.

V & XX Reality is spiritual, harmonious, immutable, immortal, divine, [and] eternal

Proposition V addresses what might be termed the 'structure' of Spiritual reality, whereas Proposition XX is concerned with its content; they are therefore harmonious.

4.2.5 Comparisons involving Proposition VI: God fills all space, therefore all is Spirit.

VI & VII The triune nature of God consists of Life, Truth and Love

God is defined as filling "all space" in Christian Science is an interesting variation on the concept of 'infinitely large', analogous to a more conventional definition of infinity as strong omnipotence is in relation to its more typical interpretation. It is possible for something to be infinitely large without it filling 'all space'.

VI & VIII God is Father-Mother

This is a particularly interesting combination. Proposition VI, taken in conjunction with Proposition VIII presumably mean that all space, and therefore the entire universe and everything within it, is ungendered., and beyond this, sexually non-dimorphic. It is difficult to image a more prescient statement.

The issue of gender identity is widely discussed on at present, but the denial of sexual difference is largely unknown outside academia, and even here it is a minority view. Butler's work (Butler 1990, xxviii-xxix) is an example of this minority strand of thought. In *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* Butler considers the works of Sigmund Freud, Simone de Beauvoir, Julia Kristeva, Jacques Lacan, Luce Irigaray, Monique Wittig, Jacques Derrida, and Michel Foucault, Butler's argument being that the categories of sex, gender and sexuality are cultural constructs resulting from repeated stylized actions. Although these acts create the appearance of an ontological gender, Butler asserts that gender, sex and sexuality are performative, explicitly challenging biological accounts of binary sexual categories. Instead, Butler argues that "disciplinary regimes," predetermine the set of possibilities of gender, sexuality and crucially, of sex, which are given permission to appear as "natural". The supposedly intrinsic nature of sex as a natural category demonstrates to how deeply its production in discourse is concealed. 'Sexes', once imposed as a physical 'fact', is the framework for constructions of gender and sexuality. Butler believes that one should not seek to define "women", arguing instead for the idea of identity as free. Although a daring intellectual position, it is arguably less so than Eddy's denial of the entirety of physical reality.

VI & XIV The idea of Christ (not the human form) is eternal

This pair of concepts create the possibility of speculation, rather than analysis, as they are not obviously linked. As all is Spirit, and the Spiritual Christ is eternal, the former statement refers to space, whereas the latter does with regard to time.

VI & XV The invisible Christ appears to the Spiritual sense

Christ's status as a spirit is consistent with all real existence being Spiritual, but Christ as the only mediator between God and mankind is by definition a unique status, and as such needs further analysis.

VI & XX Reality is spiritual, harmonious, immutable, immortal, divine, [and] eternal

As in an earlier comparison, this refers to 'structure' and 'content', and is harmonious, as before.

4.2.6 Comparisons involving Proposition VII The triune nature of God consists of Life, Truth and Love

VII & VIII God is Father-Mother

Eddy completely redefines the term 'Trinity', used in conventional, mainstream Christianity to stand for 'The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit', in terms used elsewhere in Christian Science. Although Proposition VII is not inconsistent with Proposition VIII, this is because the two propositions address very different aspects of the underlying philosophy.

VII & XIV The idea of Christ (not the human form) is eternal

These two propositions, Proposition VII and Proposition XIV, although both from within the same academic subject, nevertheless address non-overlapping magisteria. Eddy's highly controversial definition of God as Father/Mother (still controversial now, in the twenty-first century, let alone in the nineteenth) can deflect serious analysis from the issue actually under discussion.

VII & XV The invisible Christ appears to the Spiritual sense

Expanding on Eddy's assertion that all is spirit, that Spirit occupies space, and that God, as unlimited (but composed of Spirit) must occupy all space, the Divine ideas,

presumably cannot occupy space, as Eddy is quite explicit that there is none left! This creates the apparent contradiction that 1. Divine ideas exist; 2. All that exists is Spirit; 3. God's Spirit occupies all space. Either Divine ideas are part of the spirit forming all reality, or they do not appear to be able to exist.

VII & XX Reality is spiritual, harmonious, immutable, immortal, divine, [and] eternal

Eddy's redefinition of the Trinity is entirely consistent with Proposition XX.

4.2.7 Comparisons involving Proposition VIII

VIII & XIV The idea of Christ (not the human form) is eternal

God as Father-Mother is eternal is entirely consistent with the eternality of the Spiritual Christ. In the case of the Trinity as conventionally defined, all three 'Persons' clearly must be co-eternal.

VIII & XV The invisible Christ appears to the Spiritual sense

Eddy's radical statement that God is Father-Mother has the corollary that, if (unlike is the case in earlier Proposition combinations in this sequence) one assumes that Christ is not similarly bigendered, then this adds an extra layer of reasoning behind Eddy's exclusion of Christ from her definition of the Trinity.

VIII & XX Reality is spiritual, harmonious, immutable, immortal, divine, [and] eternal

Eddy's concept of God as Father-Mother has a symmetry to it which is arguably more harmonious than mainstream versions, and is therefore consistent.

4.2.8 Comparison involving Proposition XIV

The idea of Christ (not the human form) is eternal

XIV & XV The invisible Christ appears to the Spiritual sense

The idea of Christ is spiritual and therefore real. The 'image', i.e. the 'physical form' cannot be real; non-spirit is unreal and the non-eternal also lacks reality. The physical 'senses', even if they were as such, cannot perceive spiritual reality, and are therefore merely sources of error.

XIV & XX Reality is spiritual, harmonious, immutable, immortal, divine, [and] eternal

Christ, in eternal form, is clearly harmonious, and thus the comparison is consistent.

4.2.9 Comparisons involving Proposition XV

The invisible Christ appears to the Spiritual sense

XV & XX Reality is spiritual, harmonious, immutable, immortal, divine, [and] eternal

As all reality is spiritual, this is self-evidently consistent.

4.3 Moving on

Having considered the internal consistency of Eddy's system, it is now necessary to examine her ideas in full philosophical depth, analysing them to see if the concepts they express are coherent in themselves.

Chapter 5 The analysis of Mary Baker Eddy's system

5.1 Initial observations

Several themes have resulted from the analysis in the previous chapters. They include strikingly original contributions made by Eddy to the philosophy of religion, facets of her belief system characterisable as the limiting case of idealism, and the entire methodology of 'empirical metaphysics', but also a number of ambiguities and potentially paradoxical statements. I suspect it is at least partly the nebulosity of Eddy's prose style, coupled with occasional near (but never actual) incoherency, are largely responsible for the curious dearth of academic analyses of her work since her death in 1910., at least until very recently.

Foremost amongst the original aspects of Eddy's philosophical system is the concept of 'empirical metaphysics', in which she copies the sequence 'hypothesis, experiment, results, conclusion' from the physical sciences. This relies on her idea that, although matter does not exist, space does, and in her system of thought, spirit, although a non-physical substance, nevertheless requires space in which to exist. It is this latter concept which permits the major deductions Eddy makes from her initial axioms, such as the nonexistence of evil and illness, for example.

A major source of ambiguity is the somewhat variable degree to which Eddy considered that spiritual sense differs from what we (wrongly, according to Eddy) imagine to be our physical sense. For example, in the case of the Bible, for this to serve as Eddy's 'initial data' then the spiritual sense by which she claims that it is perceived must have a perfect correlation with our original conception. With a (supposedly) ill patient, however, the 'physical sense' and spiritual sense differ with regard to the existence of the patient's illness. Any situation in which the physical 'senses' suggest that only evil is present must

imply that the correct, spiritual-sense perception of the same situation is completely different.

Possibly the most curious aspects of Christian Science are where Mary Baker Eddy seems almost overly specific. Whereas her arguments about the nature of existence begin with simply stated premises, some of her definitions are, to say the least, puzzling. A good example of this tendency is her 'scientific' definition of God, in which she uses the seven 'synonyms'. This is odd in at least three different ways: firstly, unlike her arguably correct use of the word 'science' (in the modern sense) when applied to Christian Science as a whole, the definition she offers for God does not appear to be scientific at all; secondly, the seven terms used are not synonyms; and thirdly, how was this set determined? If it was Divine revelation then my criticisms are of course wrong, but if it is human conjecture (though some claimed, and others still claim, that Mary Baker Eddy was, and even still is, very much more than human, as previously described) the possibility of error remains.

5.2 Potential problems

One of the problematic areas of Mary Baker Eddy's system, as was briefly alluded to earlier, is her use of the word 'infinite' to mean 'unlimited', and thereby 'everything'. The logical difficulty which this presents may not be obvious if the reader is unfamiliar with either higher mathematics or symbolic logic, but is extremely well known within these fields.

Russell's Paradox (Russell 1903, p.101), as it is often known, is as follows: consider the set of all sets which are not members of themselves - is it a member of itself? If one answers 'yes', then the fact of its inclusion means that, by the definition above it must be removed from the 'superset', but having done so, now that it is no longer a member of itself, it should be reincluded, recreating the earlier situation which caused its removal. The question therefore cannot be answered either 'yes' or 'no'.

The point of this paradox is to highlight the curious problems which surround the concept of 'everything'. If we create a set which we believe to include 'everything', then if it does not include itself, it cannot logically be everything. If we then add the set itself as a member of itself, we have changed the contents of the original set (i.e. it now contains itself as an element, and is therefore no longer the original set in question), and so this new set must be included as an element. This clearly leads to an infinite series of extra inclusions, with a set that really is 'everything' always out of reach.

Another argument which leads to the same conclusion is as follows: any set, whether finite or infinite, has a series of subsets which can be formed from it. For example, the set {a,b,c} generates the subsets {a}, {b}, {c}, {a, b}, {a, c} and {b, c}. In pure mathematics, the empty set {} and the complete set {a, b, c} are also considered as being subsets, making eight in all. This figure is 2 to the power of the number of elements, so it increases rapidly with the size of the set; a set with just 20 elements has 1,048,576 subsets. Returning to the case of an infinite set, it has 2 to the power infinity subsets, which, if the original set is to be genuinely everything, must be included, as the subsets are of course 'things'. With the new set, with vastly more elements, we now face the same problem, i.e. that we need to include all of its subsets, which naturally creates a third set, with again very many more elements. Every time we include the subsets, we create a new, larger set, which then has to have its subsets included, and so in an infinite series of extra inclusions, never attaining 'everything' within a set.

Applying the above to Mary Baker Eddy's concept of God as 'everything' could be considered as demonstrating an element of incoherency of this definition. Alternatively, however, it can be viewed as a window through which we see both a new field of mathematics, its surprising importance to mainstream theology and its particular centrality to Christian Science. The mathematics in question is that discovered by Georg Cantor at the

end of the nineteenth century. Cantor set forth the theory of transfinite numbers, all of which are infinite, but all are also in fixed positions in a hierarchy of infinities (Cantor 1897). The lowest transfinite number, termed Aleph null or Aleph zero, describes the total number of integers. Aleph 1, in turn, denotes the total number of 'real' numbers, i.e. those involving recurring or non-recurring decimals. An elegant proof due to Cantor, known as the Diagonal Argument (Cantor 1897), demonstrates the fact that this number is greater than the number of integers.

Beyond these, an infinity of transfinite numbers extends upwards, but there is a set-theoretical concept, Absolute Infinity, denoted using the Greek capital letter Omega, which is beyond all of them. Fascinatingly, it has so far defied mathematician's attempts to precisely define it (Polkinghorne 1988, p.81). Polkinghorne has suggested that this may form what could be termed apophatic mathematics (Polkinghorne 1988, p.81), but Rucker (the great-great-great grandson of G.W.F. Hegel) reverses the analogy, suggesting instead that "set theory could form a precise theology" (Rucker 1982, p.81). It is the existence of Omega is a rigorous yet undefined mathematical concept which gives a possible solution to Eddy's otherwise problematic use of the word 'infinite'.

5.3 Potential strengths

One of the very strong themes which emerge from the 45 analytical comparisons are issues relating to the conception of Christ and God within Christian Science. Beginning with her strikingly courageous assertion that God is Father-Mother, we find her complete redefinition of the Trinity. Here she chooses not to include Christ in either form (visible or invisible) or in any way. This in turn redefines Christ. No longer part of the triune Deity, Christ now has precisely two roles in Eddy's system: communicating to mankind a set of vital truths (literally) and acting as the sole mediator between God and mankind.

The aforementioned truths are also radical. Firstly, Christ sought to explain that the Kingdom of God is already here (explained to earlier on p.52, rather than to appear during the 'end times' of future history. Secondly, and perhaps even more surprisingly, the 'correct' interpretation of Matt. v. 48 ("You must be perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect") is that a God, as a perfect being, would not create an imperfect being; mankind is therefore already perfect; it is not a command to seek to attain perfection, but the pronouncement of the truth that mankind is already perfect. Thirdly, and most originally of all, is the mechanism by which Christ 'healed' the sick: he succeeds in explaining to them that sickness is unreal.

Next in importance are pairings involving Eddy's concept that "only that which is eternal is real". Assuming mankind to be real, mankind must be eternal; this is consistent with man being the Divine idea of God, and the concept of God being changeless; if God's Divine ideas are changeless, and if mankind is one of these ideas, mankind must be changeless and therefore eternal.

As discussed in Chapter 3, Mary Baker Eddy's reliance on Scripture is only coherent if the Bible can be perceived through spiritual sense, as that which are normally thought of as the physical senses is in reality simply a source of erroneous thoughts, not sense impressions. As we have just seen, for something to be truly real, it must be eternal, and assuming that Eddy considered the Bible to be real (a fair bet) then the Bible must be eternal. This is strongly suggestive of the Christ-Jesus duality, in that as an invisible form, Christ has existed eternally, but as a visible form (Jesus) only for a finite time. This idea can be applied to Scripture, i.e. that Scripture has always existed invisibly as the word of God, but the visible form only began to be written around 3500 years ago.

The Bible considered as the revealed Truth of God is, in its written form the result of having been - to an extent at least - 'dictated' to the writer of each Book. This is of course also how Eddy viewed her main work, *Science and Health* (Eddy 1910), and the above

visible/invisible duality may be applied in this case. As the revealed ideas of God, the ideas themselves must have existed eternally, whereas the written, visible form only since the date of publication. However, assuming this to be the case, perhaps Eddy was plagiarising God, and therefore should not have sought to own the copyright.

The duality concept can be extended much further, having an intriguing similarity with Plato. If everything is either God or the Divine Ideas of God, then as a changeless, eternal being, these Ideas must have existed eternally. All possible entities must already be in the Mind of God, representing the invisible forms, and in a subset of cases ultimately become visible forms, but as the visible forms are only transitory, they are not fully real; only the invisible, eternal forms are truly real. It is these which I equate with Plato's ideal forms.

5.4 To infinity and beyond

Eddy's argument that God is infinite and therefore everything, hides another of her remarkably original concepts. The precise form of the argument she uses proves that as God occupies all space, all must be God; this implies that metaphysical, spiritual entities require space in which to exist. At first sight this may appear to be simply an unwise attempt to straddle the physical and the metaphysical, but in reality it is entirely consistent with her use of the word 'science' with regard to Christian Science, i.e. to close the loop of hypothesis (her axioms), experiment (attempting healings), result (the effect, or lack thereof, on the patient) and conclusion (if the patient 'recovers' then it supports the original hypothesis). It is this 'empirical metaphysics' or 'theological science' which is consistent with metaphysical entities occupying space.

If sin, sickness and death are unreal, and if we assume that this unreality consists of the erroneous thoughts of mankind, then belief in these concepts must have begun at some finite time ago for them to be non-eternal. However, if the visible/invisible duality applies

here, does this mean that as part of the infinite array of possible thoughts which God has already had, these ideas had already been present invisibly throughout eternity? This relates to the concept of strong omnipotence: can God have wrong ideas? If not, then surely this is a limitation, which is not congruent with Eddy's understanding of a unlimited God. Furthermore, if all that exists is God, or the Divine ideas of God, how does mankind firstly make any errors at all, and secondly, upon realising their nature as error, experience a change of mind? Surely, as either a consciousness within God, or a facet of Divine Ideas, the possession of an erroneous idea would be impossible; furthermore, any change would imply a change in a supposedly changeless God. Luckily, Mary Baker Eddy herself addressed this question in response to a reader's enquiry.

That God is Truth, the Scriptures aver; that Truth never created error, or *such a capacity* [my italics], is self-evident [...] therefore your answer is that error is an illusion of mortals; that God is not its author, and it cannot be real.

(Eddy 1897, pp.49-50)

At first it may appear that Eddy has failed to address the question, which relates not to the initial error of a person believing themselves to be ill, but to the capacity to make an error of this nature, and as a consequence, has also not answered the question. However, despite the partial truth of this accusation, my reading of the above is that Eddy has hit upon something quite subtle. Before explaining why this is the case, three things are needed: a digression into firstly, Presocratic philosophy, and secondly, symbolic logic.

Parmenides attained genuine sophistication in the arguments he put forward for his highly counterintuitive conclusions. Unlike the slightly earlier Milesian philosophers Thales, Anaximander and Anaximenes, Parmenides was less concerned with the natural philosophy which these earlier figures had largely been focused; for example “the exiguous surviving evidence of Parmenides’ astronomical system is so brief and so obscure that it is impossible with any confidence to reconstruct a coherent account of his extraordinary theory of “garlands’...” (Kirk, Raven and Schofield 1983, p. 259) Instead, his interests were often epistemological and ontological, with his conclusions resulting from following the path in which he was propelled by pure logic, as his “metaphysics and epistemology leave no room for cosmologies such as his Ionian predecessors had constructed nor indeed for any belief at all in the world our senses disclose to us.” (Kirk, Raven and Schofield 1983, p.241)

Beginning with the premise that a vacuum cannot "be a thing" on the basis that “what makes something real is ... that it has some predicate true of it (e.g. occupies space)” (Kirk, Raven and Schofield 1983, p.246), space itself, in the sense of a vacuum, therefore, fails this test, as it cannot have attributes, being nothing (i.e. no thing); it therefore follows that for Parmenides there are no gaps in the physical universe. The importance of this seemingly prosaic fact is very great indeed, as if an object – any object – is to move, the physical location of the place into which it is to move must first be vacated of the object currently present. This, in turn, necessitates the next space must be emptied for this new object to move. This process therefore occurs as an infinite sequence, which must be completed in order for the first object to move. As the ‘last’ object in any sequence has nowhere into which it can move, it follows that the entire sequence of movements cannot take place, and therefore the first object cannot move.

Parmenides used this argument not merely as entertainment or as simply interesting in and of itself (which it is), but as proof that our 'senses' mislead us; movement appears to take place, yet it cannot.

Although arguing from entirely different first principles, Eddy can be seen as having come to the same conclusions regarding the true nature of our physical senses, which, in her words, are merely “generators of error” and of “false beliefs.”

Other Presocratic philosophers also offered arguments supporting the idea that our senses are misleading. Zeno was the originator of a number of famous paradoxes, which although interesting in and of themselves, are designed for a very specific purpose, namely, that at the very least we should treat our sense-data with caution. For the purpose of this thesis, however, one of his paradoxes is presented as an example of the curious properties of an infinite series; this forms another element in the necessary digression (Boyer 1959, p.295). *The History of the Calculus and Its Conceptual Development*. Dover Publications. .

One of Zeno’s paradoxes concerns Achilles and a tortoise. Achilles was famed for his running speed, and so in the story of a race with a tortoise he gave the animal a generous head start. One might assume that despite this, Achilles would swiftly overtake the creature, but Zeno presented an ingenious argument that this could not actually take place. He explained that when Achilles caught up with the starting position of the tortoise, it will have moved forward. No matter how little the amount, the point is that the tortoise would still be ahead in what we will call Position 2. The paradox becomes apparent when, a little later, Achilles reaches Position 2; the tortoise, of course, has moved a little further still, in other words, to Position 3. It is now possible to see the problem Achilles faces in Zeno’s paradox: every time he catches up with the tortoise at a given position, it has advanced a little further; it appears from the argument that he can never catch up with the tortoise, let alone overtake it. This is completely at odds with our senses, which seem to communicate the visual impression of Achilles rapidly overtaking his competitor and winning the race. Zeno therefore argued that our senses must be in some way mistaken.

In the case of Zeno’s paradox of Achilles and the Tortoise, the concept at its centre which is responsible for the highly surprising apparent consequence is one from modern (Newton

onwards, so approximately the period since the 1660s) pure mathematics, known as the 'limit of a series as the number of elements tends to infinity'. As an example of the idea, consider the sequence 1, 0.5, 0.25, 0.125, 0.0625 ... onwards, without end. The terms halve each time, ever-nearing, but never actually reaching, zero, as half of any non-zero number cannot ever be zero. What Zeno didn't appreciate, however, (and in fairness to him, neither did anyone else for about 2000 years after his creation of the paradox) is that even though all of the terms of the sequence are non-zero, and despite the series infinite number of terms, its sum – that is its sum to infinity, adding together an infinite number of terms - is both finite and calculable.

In the case of this abstract example, one can determine the total using the following formula:

$$\text{Sum to infinity} = a / (1 - r)$$

This surprisingly simple formula – surprising in relation to the complexity of an infinite number of additions – can be proved using Newton's discovery of integral calculus, but even without this modest level of sophistication, there is still a very elegant proof available:

$$\text{starting with: } \text{sum to infinity} = a + ar + ar^2 + ar^3 + \dots$$

$$\text{therefore: } r \times \text{sum to infinity} = ar + ar^2 + ar^3 + \dots$$

$$\text{therefore: } r \times \text{sum to infinity} = \text{sum to infinity} - a$$

$$\text{therefore: } r \times \text{sum to infinity} - \text{sum to infinity} = -a$$

$$\text{therefore: } \text{sum to infinity} \times (r-1) = -a$$

$$\text{therefore: } \text{sum to infinity} = -a/(r-1) = a/(1-r)$$

In the case of this abstract example, one can therefore determine the total by putting in the values $a=1$ and $r=0.5$:

$$\text{Sum to infinity} = (1) / [1 - (0.5)] = 1 / 0.5 = 2$$

In the above, 'a' is the first term (in this case 1) and 'r' is the common ratio between each successive pair of terms (in this case 0.5).

The connection with Zeno's paradox is that, in each analysis of the tortoise's successive new positions, it has moved forwards by an ever-smaller amount corresponding to the common ratio 'r' in the formula, with the first term, 'a', being the first amount that the tortoise moves before Achilles catches up with the tortoise's first position. The formula then provides the position at which Achilles does overtake the tortoise and explains why the paradox appears to imply that Achilles never does so. The reason is that ever-smaller 'chunks' of time are being considered, with each one being related to the immediately previous one by the ratio 'r'. In the paradox, 'r' is the tortoise's speed divided by that of Achilles; if, for example, it is 100 times slower, then $r=0.01$. As the distance travelled during each chunk of time is directly proportional to the duration, each successive distance is also smaller. The distances therefore form a geometric series, with the sum to infinity being both finite and calculable. Zeno – and everyone else for two millennia – naturally, but wrongly, assumed that that an infinite sum of finite amounts (albeit increasingly small, finite amounts) must total infinity, meaning Achilles never overtakes the tortoise. Returning to the earlier assertion that there is a link here with Eddy's answer to the question regarding how a person, as the perfect creation of God, can be sufficiently imperfect to make the 'errors' of belief in pain, sickness and death. Before explaining the solution, another concept from pure mathematics is needed first. As before, it involves an infinitely long sequence, but in this case the even stranger concept of a series not having a finite limit, or an infinite one – the series has no limit in the completely different sense that it doesn't exist.

An abstract example may help illustrate the concept. Imagine a sequence as below:

1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1 ...

What is the 'last' term of the series if continued to infinity: one or minus one? This may seem a very long way from the original question, but we are nearly there. If there are an even

number of terms, then the last term is '-1', but if there are an odd number, then the last term is '1'. What, then, is the infinite sum of this series? This explains the purpose of the previous question. If it is 1, then the series adds to one, but if it is -1, then the series adds to zero instead. The infinite sum, therefore, relies as before on whether the number of terms in an infinite series is odd or even. Again, as before, this question does not have an answer, and therefore the sum of the infinite series also lacks an answer.

Finally, returning to the original question, the situation can be represented as below:

'first term': making the error of belief re illness etc.

'second term': making the error that it is possible to make the error inherent in the first term

'third term': making the error involved in making the error in the second term

And so forth. This is analogous to a sequence of Boolean 'NOT' functions from elementary symbolic logic:

NOT(NOT(NOT(A)))

If this sequence is continued to infinity, with an infinite incidence of 'NOT' functions, does it evaluate as A or NOT(A)? If it is an even number of NOTs, they cancel out, but if there are an odd number, they do not. Just as before, the answer does not exist. The original question therefore generates what in logic is known as a 'formally undecidable proposition'.

Although this argument, if valid, denies the possibility that Eddy is correct, it also implies that *she is definitely not wrong*. Many far better-known historical examples of individuals known as philosophers have left major works which although greatly respected in their time are now viewed as arguing for conclusions which are simply wrong. Eddy therefore exceeds this benchmark with her system of thought.

Melissus' ideas

The similarities between Melissus' philosophy and Mary Baker Eddy's Christian Science are

made strikingly apparent by the text below, taken from Burnet (Burnet 1920, pp.321 ff.)

“1. If nothing is, what can be said of it as something real?

1a. What was ever, ever shall be. For if it had come into being it must have been nothing before it came into being. Now, if it were nothing, in no [way] could anything have arisen out of nothing.

2. Since, then, it has not come into being, and since it is, was ever, and ever shall be, it has no beginning or end, but is without limit. [i.e. if it ended it would be nothing, which is impossible]

[...]

5. If it were not one, it would be bounded by something else.

6. For if it is [infinite] , it must be one; for if it were two, it could not be infinite; for then they would be bounded [limited] by one another.

7. So then it is eternal and infinite and one and all alike. And it cannot perish or become greater, nor does it suffer pain or grief...”

(Burnet 1920, p.321)

Melissus arrives at this astonishing idea by the same concept of changelessness which was seemingly a problem for Eddy's system earlier in this chapter; if any of these things happened to it, it would no longer be one.

“For if it is altered, then the real must needs (sic) not be all alike, but what was before must pass away, and what was not must come into being. [...] Nor does it suffer pain; for a thing in pain could not all be. For a thing in pain could not be ever (sic), nor has it the same power as what is whole. Nor would it be alike, if it were in pain: for it is only from the addition or subtraction of something that it could feel pain, and then it would no longer be alike [i.e. no longer be the same, implying change, which is not possible, since an infinite entity could only change by becoming greater – which is impossible by definition – or by becoming nothing, which is also impossible].”

(Burnet 1920, pp.321-322)

The same argument applies to grief as well as to pain. Consider the next part with reference to Eddy's concepts of spiritual sense versus the physical 'senses':

"[T]hings ... cannot be changed or altered, but each must be just as it is.

[...] [Y]et we fancy that they all suffer alteration, and they change from what we see each time. It is clear, then, that we do not see aright [sic] after all ... They would not change if they were real, but each thing would be as we believed it to be."

(Burnet 1920, p.322)

The first extraordinary facet of Melissus' conclusion is not just its similarity with Eddy's but that he arrives at it without claiming the existence of God or gods. Eddy, on the other hand, requires God to exist for her entire argument to work, so we end up at the same point either way. Secondly, although a healing in Christian Science appears to cause a change in an individual, it is really only revealing the underlying truth that the patient was not ill in the first place. This is therefore another point of agreement between Melissus and Eddy.

5.4.1 J. M. E. McTaggart

The next comparison to make between the work of a respected philosopher and that of Eddy's is that concerning John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart (1866–1925). McTaggart was a Cambridge idealist metaphysician, and amongst the most notable of the British Idealists. Best known for *The Unreality of Time* (1908), in which, unsurprisingly, he argues that time is unreal, his work has been extensively discussed throughout the 20th Century and into the 21st.

The unreality of time

McTaggart inherited from his predecessors an absolute commitment to the idea that a priori thought can pursue the nature of the ultimate reality, and beyond this, is the only way. For him, as with other Hegelians, this was the 'absolute idea'. His later work and mature system is mostly an attempt to give greater depth to this new conception of the absolute.

The reason for the focus on McTaggart at this point in the thesis is because he ultimately (after a meticulously detailed argument expressed with superlative clarity) arrived at some of the same conclusions as Eddy. There is a very intriguing difference, however, in the sequence of his argument. Eddy quickly arrives at the idea that the material universe is unreal, whereas McTaggart, after a lengthy proof that time is unreal, argues from this point that space is unreal, and as this eliminates the possibility of extension, matter must be unreal too. This process took McTaggart several tens of thousands of words, whereas Eddy arrived at the same result after just a single chapter of *Science and Health*.

McTaggart's paradox

McTaggart's proof that the concept of time is self-contradictory implies that reality cannot therefore be temporal, with the consequence that the perception of time is therefore an illusion. His argument, known as McTaggart's paradox, first appeared as a journal article entitled *The Unreality of Time* (McTaggart 1908), and was later republished as Chapter 33, 'Time', in McTaggart's posthumous Second Volume of *The Nature of Existence* in 1927 (McTaggart 1927). In it, he introduced the notions of the "A series" and "B series", representing two approaches to defining how events appear to have a position in time. The A series refers to the ideas of past, present, and future, and is "the series of positions running from the far past through the near past to the present, and then from the present to the near future and the far future" (ibid. p. 458). The B series, however, consists of positions ordered in a fixed

manner, with inter-relationships based on 'earlier-than' and 'later-than' descriptions. The A series, therefore, represents the events in 'time' to a temporally moving observer, whereas the B series is invariant. McTaggart argued that the A series was a necessary component of all possible theories in which the existence of time is asserted, since change only occurs in the A series, but claimed that as this is self-contradictory, the perception of time must be illusory, as it is an incoherent concept.

The necessity of the A series

The first part of McTaggart's argument is his answer to the question "whether it is essential to the reality of time that its events should form an A series as well as a B series" (p. 458). Essentially, McTaggart argues that events must be ordered by an A series as well as a B series as without this, change cannot exist, and so time becomes meaningless.

Paraphrasing his argument, an example of involving the birth of Queen Victoria (b. 1818) and Queen Matilda (wife of Henry I, b. 1080) is instructive. The event of Queen Victoria's birth is a later event than the birth of Queen Matilda, and this property is invariant with 'time'; the events themselves also do not change. There is only one respect in which the events ever change:

"It began by being a future event. It became every moment an event in the nearer future. At last it was a present event. Then it became past, and will always remain so, though every moment it becomes further and further past. Thus we seem forced to the conclusion that all change is only a change in the characteristics imparted to events by their presence in the A series."

(McTaggart 1927, p. 460)

The incoherence of the A series

McTaggart's proof of the incoherence of the A series (ibid. p. 468–9) appears in the original paper as a single part of a very much more sophisticated argument for this conclusion.

McTaggart argues that the human perception of time is contradictory, as all events appear to exemplify all three of the properties of the A-series, i.e. past, present and future. The self-evident response is that no event exemplifies all three at once, i.e. that no event is past, present, and future 'simultaneously'. A single event is present, will have been future, will be past; here there seems, equally self-evidently, no contradiction. However, McTaggart argues that this gives rise to infinite regress. because this approach requires the invoking of a second A-series of future, present, and past in order to explain how the events of the first series are not simultaneous, creating the necessity for a third series, and so on ad infinitum.

In McTaggart's own words, it is necessary to construct "a second A series, within which the first falls, in the same way in which events fall within the first" (p. 469), but the idea of a second A series within it will face the same contradiction, requiring the creation of a third A series within which the second series exists. This, of course, requires a fourth A series, and so on, ad infinitum. At every stage the contradiction will reappear; each A series will be, without reference to a further A series containing it, contradictory. McTaggart therefore concluded that the A series is contradictory and, therefore cannot exist.

The Nature of Existence

In his later work, particularly his two-volume *The Nature of Existence* (McTaggart 1921, 1927), McTaggart developed his own, highly original, metaphysical system, offering an Hegelian view of the universe consistent with his earlier work yet profoundly metaphysical throughout. McTaggart asserted that the world is composed of nothing of

souls, with each soul coupled to a number of the others by love. McTaggart claimed that souls (which are synonymous with human beings) are immortal, and, partly on this basis, defended the concept of reincarnation, maintaining the view that all selves are eternal and indestructible. *The Nature of Existence* also seeks to justify McTaggart's denial of the existence of time, space and matter despite their apparent existence.

Conceptually linking with this work with Eddy is the combination of apparently mystical conclusions denying the reality of a conventionally unquestioned facet of existence, yet resulting from deductive logic. For example, although mystical in style when assessed by its conclusions, the philosophical methodology of *The Nature of Existence* curiously unmystical. McTaggart arrives at his conclusions by a meticulous analysis of the fundamental requirements of all metaphysical systems (Volume I), followed by a proof that his system uniquely satisfies these conditions (Volume II). Logical rigour is central to his approach; the *Nature of Existence*, in conjunction with Bradley's *Appearance and Reality*, can be considered as the zenith of British idealism, with McTaggart being the last major British Idealist of the period before the rise of logical positivism. McTaggart points out that *The Unreality of Time* is an inquiry into whether reality can have the characteristics which it appears to have, principally whether it is temporal and physically material. In the introduction to the 2nd Volume of *The Nature of Existence*, he says:

“Starting from our conclusions as to the general nature of the existent, as reached in the earlier Books, we shall have to ask, firstly which of these characteristics can really be possessed by what is existent, and which of them, despite the prima facie appearance to the contrary, cannot be possessed by anything existent”

(McTaggart 1927, sect. 295)

A little later, he states that:

“It will be possible to show that, having regard to the general nature of the existent as previously determined, certain characteristics, that we consider here for the first time, cannot be true of the existent.”

(McTaggart 1927, sect. 298)

The most important result of McTaggart's inquiry into Absolute Reality, an inquiry using solely a priori arguments, is that existence and reality are equivalent and have no degrees of distinction: either something exists and therefore is fully real, or it does not, implying that for the future and past to be real, they must exist. Consequently, any future event or past event, even if they are the same event, must both exist if they are real, which is self-contradictory.

The C-series

Having come to the conclusion that reality can neither form an A- nor a B-series, despite appearances to the contrary, then McTaggart offered a picture of what the world is really like, called the C-series, describing it in great detail in *The Nature of Existence*, (McTaggart 1927: Chapters 44–49).

Fundamentally, the C-series consists of mental states (as McTaggart's argument in Ch. 34 of *The Nature of Existence* demonstrates that reality cannot be material), which are interrelated to each other on the basis of their conceptual content being either 'included-in' and 'inclusive-of' (McTaggart 1927: section 566 & Chapter 60). These atemporal relations replace the earlier-than/later-than relation and explain why the illusion of change and temporal sequences can appear to be present in an atemporal reality. Here we see two

very important isomorphisms with Eddy's earlier work: firstly, the recognition of the part played by illusion; and secondly, the demonstration of the non-material nature of reality. What follows is a heavily-edited subset of McTaggart's arguments for the above concepts in note form, but nevertheless largely in his own words where possible:

"Do events have to form an A-series as well as a B series? Events as observed by us appear to form an A series. This observation may be an illusion created by our minds; it is an assumption that we perceive time as it really is. Could it be that only the B series is needed? McTaggart rejects this idea on the basis that the A series is essential to the nature of time, and asserts that regarding the A series as unreal is equal to treating time as unreal. McTaggart states that: it is universally understood that time involves change, and that there could be no time if nothing changed. If event N is earlier than event O and later than event M, then this set of interrelations is invariant; event N must always be an element of the B series. However, this absence of change is precisely what is needed as one step in the argument proving the unreality of time. Events in the A-series are fixed within that series. Change does not take place to an object, but to its characteristics, which although they may be different, are attributable to each occurrence of that object in the A-series; change does not occur to the object itself. In one respect only, it does change, in that it was once an event in the future, then at every moment an event in an ever-nearing future before, for an infinitesimal instant, becoming present, and then continuously receding into an ever more distant."

(McTaggart 1927 pp.420-462)

McTaggart also explains that:

“This description of time is believed by most people, yet it clearly implies that the past is constantly changing, rather than fixed, as the same people believe; a combination which is inconsistent. The B-series cannot exist except as temporal, since all its elements are interrelated by the terms 'earlier' and 'later', which are clearly time relations. It therefore follows that there can be no B-series without an A-series, as without an A-series there is no such thing as time, and as there cannot be an A-series either, as demonstrated earlier, time is therefore ‘unreal’.”

(McTaggart 1927 p.13)

And regarding matter:

“The belief in matter could only be justified by inference from what we think of as the perceived senses. There is no need for detailed resemblance between sensa and their causes, so arguments based on the principle of resemblance lead to unreliable conclusions. Sensa are *prima facie* neither spiritual nor material. *We shall conclude that sensa do not exist, though other percepta are misperceived as sensa.* [my italics]

(McTaggart 1927 p.126)

Extraordinary! Eddy herself could have written this last line, as it is one of the principles at the heart of Christian Science. In her case, publication occurred in 1875, four-and-a-half decades before McTaggart’s date of publication. McTaggart concludes that we are certainly timeless, and therefore immortal, in the sense that there is no moment at which we shall cease to exist. Spinoza reached also reached this conclusion, and it is his work on this idea that I now wish to consider in relation to Eddy’s.

5.4.2 Baruch Spinoza

Spinoza is one of the most important and most radical philosophers of the early modern period. His thought combines Cartesian metaphysical and epistemological principles with elements from Stoicism, Hobbes and his own ideas in an original system.

God or Nature

On God begins with Spinoza's definition of terms:

- “1. By substance I understand what is in itself and is conceived through itself;
2. By attribute I understand what the intellect perceives of a substance, as constituting its essence;
3. By God I understand a being absolutely infinite, i.e., a substance consisting of an infinity of attributes, of which each one expresses an eternal and infinite essence.”

(Spinoza [1677] 1887, I: i-xxxvi)

The definitions of Part One are the concepts that are foundational to the rest of his system. They are followed by a number of axioms that, he assumes, will be regarded as obvious and unproblematic by the philosophically informed (“Whatever is, is either in itself or in another”;

“From a given determinate cause the effect follows necessarily”). From these, the first proposition necessarily follows, and every subsequent proposition can be demonstrated using only what precedes it. In propositions one through fifteen of Part One, Spinoza presents the basic elements of his picture of God. God is the infinite, necessarily existing (that is, uncaused), unique substance of the universe. There is only one substance in the universe; it is God; and everything else that is, is in God.

PROPOSITION 1: A substance is prior in nature to its affections.

PROPOSITION 2: Two substances having different attributes have nothing in common with one another. (In other words, if two substances differ in nature, then they have nothing in common).

PROPOSITION 3: If things have nothing in common with one another, one of them cannot be the cause of the other.

PROPOSITION 4: Two or more distinct things are distinguished from one another, either by a difference in the attributes [i.e., the natures or essences] of the substances or by a difference in their affections [i.e., their accidental properties].

PROPOSITION 5: In nature, there cannot be two or more substances of the same nature or attribute.

PROPOSITION 6: One substance cannot be produced by another substance.

PROPOSITION 7: It pertains to the nature of a substance to exist.

PROPOSITION 8: Every substance is necessarily infinite.

PROPOSITION 9: The more reality or being each thing has, the more attributes belong to it.

PROPOSITION 10: Each attribute of a substance must be conceived through itself.

PROPOSITION 11: God, or a substance consisting of infinite attributes, each of which expresses eternal and infinite essence, necessarily exists.

[The proof of this proposition is effectively that of the classic “ontological proof for God’s existence”. Spinoza writes that “if you deny this, conceive, if you can, that God does not exist. Therefore, by Axiom 7, his essence does not involve existence. But this, by Proposition 7, is absurd. Therefore, God necessarily exists, QED.]

PROPOSITION 12: No attribute of a substance can be truly conceived from which it follows that the substance can be divided.

PROPOSITION 13: A substance which is absolutely infinite is indivisible.

PROPOSITION 14: Except God, no substance can be or be conceived.”

(Spinoza [1677] 1887, I: i-xxxvi)

Although this approach to beginning the promulgation of a system of thought dates back at least as far as Euclid (and possibly very much earlier), there is much more of interest here

than a merely surface similarity of method. Both Spinoza and Eddy are working towards the ultimate presentation of profoundly counterintuitive concepts, and so both begin by establishing an exceptionally detailed foundation for what comes later. As with Eddy, this work follows the structure of a presentation of a small number of fundamental propositions, followed by the deduction of a further principles, before investigating some of their real-world consequences.

Some annotation of Spinoza's list of propositions is needed here. Proposition 6, "One substance cannot be produced by another substance" is clearly not the position of either chemistry or nuclear physics, but was an accepted principle at the time Spinoza was writing. Proposition 9 is wholly unlike McTaggart's assertion that a thing either exists, or it does not, with no 'levels' of reality, Proposition 10 makes the distinction between properties of an object requiring a subject, such as (for example) its odour requiring the presence of a subject experiencing that odour, and (again, for example) the number of legs possessed by a given animal, which is an independently true fact.

This proof that God—an infinite, necessary and uncaused, indivisible being—is the only substance of the universe involves three stages. Firstly, establish that no two substances can share an attribute or essence. Secondly, prove that there is a substance with infinite attributes (i.e., God). Thirdly, demonstrate that the existence of that infinite substance precludes the existence of any other substance. If there were to be a second substance, it would have to have some attribute or essence, but since God has all possible attributes, then the attribute to be possessed by this second substance would be one of the attributes already possessed by God, and as it has already been proved that no two substances can have the same attribute, it therefore follows, that there can be, besides God, no such second substance. If God is the only substance, and (by axiom 1) whatever is, is either a substance or in a substance, then everything else must be in God. "Whatever is, is in God, and nothing can be or be conceived without God". Those things that are "in" God (or, more

precisely, in God's attributes) are what Spinoza calls modes.

Here we see complete agreement between Spinoza and Eddy; more than this, the conclusion results from very similar arguments in each case. By illuminating where there are similarities between Spinoza and Eddy's arguments and conclusions, I seek to demonstrate Eddy's true status as a philosopher, and by showing the sometimes profound differences in Eddy's conclusions with respect to Spinoza's, I aim to present the case for Eddy to be seen additionally as a highly original philosopher.

Spinoza, like Eddy, asserts that God is substance and that everything is "in" God. Spinoza claims that stones, furniture, animals, geomorphology and human beings are all "properties" of God. It may appear counterintuitive to think that objects and individuals, i.e. independent "things", are really merely properties of a thing. Spinoza was aware of the alien nature of this idea, and of the philosophical problems which it creates; for Spinoza, pain and sickness are real. When a person feels pain, does it follow that the pain is ultimately just a property of God, and thus that God feels pain? Spinoza dealt with many issues raised by asserting that God is described not so much as the underlying substance of all things, but as the universal, immanent and sustaining cause of all that exists: "From the necessity of the divine nature there must follow infinitely many things in infinitely many modes, (i.e., everything that can fall under an infinite intellect)". The infinite and finite modes are not just effects of God or Nature's power but actually inhere in that infinite substance. Nature is an indivisible, uncaused, substantial whole—in fact, it is the only substantial whole. Outside of Nature, there is nothing, and everything that exists is a part of Nature and is brought into being by Nature with a deterministic necessity. This unified, unique, productive, necessary being just is what is meant by 'God'.

Although the majority of this is extremely similar to Eddy's system of thought, one aspect is diametrically opposite. Where Spinoza refers to Nature (which he capitalises) he is signifying a physically extant reality, similar to, but not exactly, as our sensory perception

suggests it to be. Eddy, however, denies its existence entirely, substituting a spiritual reality which is sometimes in close correspondence with the beliefs created by what we misidentify as our physical 'senses', but at other times wholly different to them.

Spinoza has been regarded as a pantheist. However, in general, pantheism is the view that rejects the transcendence of God. According to pantheism, God is, in some way, identical with the world, although there may be aspects of God that are ontologically or epistemologically distinct from the world, but for pantheism this must not imply that God is essentially separate from the world. Within this generic definition, it is possible to delineate two types of pantheism. Firstly, pantheism can be understood as the denial of any distinction whatsoever between God and the natural world and the assertion that God is in fact identical with everything that exists: "God is everything and everything is God" (Fox 1996, p.84). In this view, God is the world and all its natural contents, and nothing distinct from them; this has been termed 'reductive' pantheism. Secondly, pantheism can be defined as the position asserting that God is distinct from the world and its natural contents but nonetheless contained or immanent within them. God is therefore still everything and everywhere in this form of pantheism, on this version, by virtue of being within everything. This is known as 'immanentist' pantheism and involves the claim that nature contains within itself, in addition to its natural elements, an immanent, supernatural and Divine element.

Eddy faced repeated accusations from a variety of critics that Christian Science is pantheistic, something which she both rejected and found bitterly unjust, as, from her viewpoint, the established churches were occasionally guilty of an element of pantheism, whereas she maintained that Christian Science was absolutely its opposite. In 1898 she published *Christian Science Versus Pantheism* (Eddy 1898), which expresses the difference so clearly and completely that, in order to do both it and Christian Science justice, I would like to present a lengthy quote from it:

"The Standard Dictionary has it that pantheism is the doctrine of the deification of natural causes, conceived as one personified nature, to

which the religious sentiment is directed.

Theism is the belief in the personality and infinite mind of one supreme, holy, self-existent God, who reveals Himself supernaturally to His creation, and whose laws are not reckoned as science. In religion, it is a belief in one God, or in many gods. It is opposed to atheism and monotheism, but agrees with certain forms of pantheism and polytheism. It is the doctrine that the universe owes its origin and continuity to the reason, intellect, and will of a self-existent divine Being, who possesses all wisdom, goodness, and power, and is the creator and preserver of man.

God, Spirit, is indeed the preserver of man. [...] This being the case, what need have we of drugs, hygiene, and medical therapeutics, if these are not man's preservers? By admitting self-evident affirmations and then contradicting them, monotheism is lost and pantheism is found in scholastic theology. Can a single quality of God, Spirit, be discovered in matter? The Scriptures plainly declare, 'The Word was God;' and 'all things were made by Him,' — the Word. What, then, can matter create, or how can it exist? It is plain that elevating evil to the altitude of mind gives it power, and that the belief in more than one spirit, if Spirit, God, is infinite, breaketh the First Commandment in the Decalogue. Again: The hypothesis of mind in matter, or more than one Mind, lapses into evil dominating good, matter governing Mind, and makes sin, disease, and death inevitable, despite of Mind, or by the consent of Mind! [...] They constantly reiterate the belief of pantheism, that mind 'sleeps in the mineral, dreams in the animal, and wakes in man.'

Is there a religion under the sun that hath demonstrated one God and the four first rules pertaining thereto, namely, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" "Love thy neighbor as thyself;" 'Be ye therefore

perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect;' 'Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.' (John xi. 26.)"

(Eddy 1898, p.42-43)

Eddy is suggesting here that conventional Christianity is arguably quasi-paganistic due to the idea that creation is separate to God, though God-made. As pagan religions are sometimes explicitly pantheistic, she is effectively pointing out that conventional Christianity risks the charge of pantheism, not based on a false understanding (as with those who accuse Christian Science of pantheism), but on one which may well be true!

An analysis of Spinoza's identification of God and Nature will clearly show that Spinoza cannot be considered to be a pantheist in the second, immanentist sense, since for Spinoza, there is nothing but Nature and its attributes and 'modes'. And within Nature there can certainly be nothing that is supernatural; If Spinoza is attempting to eliminate anything, it is that which is above or beyond nature (i.e. which unencumbered by the laws and processes of nature). However, the question remains as to whether he is a pantheist in the first, reductive sense.

It has been argued that Spinoza is not a pantheist, because God is to be identified only with substance and its attributes, the most universal, active causal principles of Nature, and not with any modes of substance. Alternatively, others have argued that Spinoza is a pantheist because he does identify God with the whole of nature. However, if 'pantheism' is meant to represent the idea that God is everything, and if one reads Spinoza as saying that God is only *Natura naturans*, then Spinoza's God is not everything and consequently he is not a pantheist. Finite things, on this reading, while caused by the eternal, necessary and active aspects of Nature, are not identical with God or substance, but rather are its effects. However the relationship between God and Nature in Spinoza is interpreted, it is a mistake to call him a pantheist in so far as pantheism is a type of religious theism. The pantheist asserts that God — conceived as a being before which one is to adopt an attitude of worshipful awe — is or is in Nature; Spinoza does not believe that worship, awe or

reverence is appropriate in considering either God or Nature. There is nothing holy or sacred about Nature, and it is certainly not the object of a religious experience. Instead, one should seek to understand God or Nature with the intellectual knowledge that reveals Nature's most important truths and which demonstrates how everything depends essentially and existentially on higher natural causes. The key to discovering and experiencing God, for Spinoza, is philosophy and science. Superstitious behavior and subservience to ecclesiastic authorities is, for Spinoza, the exact opposite.

Apart from the use of the word 'science', which both Spinoza and Eddy use in its modern sense, this is at absolutely at odds with Eddy's conception of existence, as if all that exists is Spirit, and Spirit is quite literally synonymous with God (as it is within her 'Scientific Definition'), then awe and worship are exactly what is appropriate and required of mankind.

There is, for Spinoza, no causal interaction between bodies and ideas, between the physical and the mental. There is, however, a strong correlation and isomorphism between the two series. As Spinoza states, there is "a mode of extension and the idea of that mode are one and the same thing, but expressed in two ways".

One of the major questions in seventeenth century philosophy was the problem of how two radically different substances such as mind and body enter into a union in a human being and cause effects in each other. How can the extended body causally interact with the unextended mind, which is incapable of contact or motion, and "move" it, that is, cause generic mental consequences, such as pains, sensations and perceptions. Spinoza, however, denies that human beings are the union of two substances. The human mind and the human body are two different expressions—under Thought and under Extension—of one and the same thing: the person; since there is no causal interaction between the mind and the body, the so-called mind-body problem does not arise.

Eddy, of course, eliminates the mind-body problem by denying the physical existence of the

body. In as much as we have bodies, for Eddy they are formed from the same 'spirit' as is mind, so no such problem can exist. As everything is in a sense within God, God - Spirit – is for Eddy the ultimate source of all action, which is a similar approach regarding causality to that of Malebranche, and it is this facet of his philosophy I now wish to explore.

5.4.3 Nicolas Malebranche

The French Cartesian Nicolas Malebranche published major works on metaphysics, theology, and ethics (as well as studies within 'natural philosophy', such as on optics, the laws of motion and the nature of colour), but is known for his original synthesis of the ideas of St. Augustine and Descartes. Two profoundly distinctive results of this synthesis are Malebranche's doctrine that we see bodies as seen through ideas in God and his occasionalist conclusion that God is the only real cause (Malebranche *Œuvres complètes*, 2:316 in Robinet 1958). Despite the neglect of him in the Anglophone literature during the majority of the twentieth century, Malebranche has become increasingly popular as an area of research among English-language academics more recently. This change is visible in the number of English translations of his writings since the 1970s, and particularly since the 1990s. Fairly recent studies of Malebranche in English include Walton (1972), Radner (1978), McCracken (1983), Jolley (1990), Nadler (1992), Schmaltz (1996), Nadler (2000), Pyle (2003), and Peppers-Bates (2009).

In a section of the third book of the *Recherche* devoted to "the nature of ideas," Malebranche argued for his distinctive doctrine of the vision in God. The concept in this section is that external objects are seen by means of ideas in God, the argument for which is as follows. It begins with the assertion that "everyone agrees that we do not perceive objects external to us by themselves" since it cannot be true that "the soul should leave the body to stroll about the heavens to see the objects present there" (Enfield 1791, p.619). Malebranche claimed that there that only four other possibilities if the concept that bodies are perceived through ideas in God is rejected, three of which are immediately contradictory, leaving the hypothesis that "Our soul perceives the essence and the existence of bodies by the

consideration its own set of perfections.” (Ibid. p.619) Malebranche's argument against the fourth hypothesis begins with the observation that since a finite being can see in itself neither the infinite nor an infinite number of beings, and since we in fact perceive both the infinite and infinity in external objects, it must be that we see these objects by means of perfections contained in the only being that can possess an infinity of ideas, which in turn must, of course, be God.

Malebranche is best known for the concept of occasionalism, i.e. that God is the only causal agent, and beings simply strive to provide the “occasion” for Divine action (Malebranche *CŒuvres complètes*, 2:316 in Robinet 1958). Malebranche used this approach in order to resolve the problem with Cartesian dualism. Previously, occasionalists had conceded that God must “concur” with creatures in producing effects, but claimed that there is reason to conclude that creatures are true secondary causes of effects; if not, there could be no true scientific explanation of effects through their natural causes, the desire to retain this approach to explanation presumably outweighing the self-evident logic.

Malebranche responded to arguments against 'pure' occasionalism by asserting that it is in reality idolatrous to attribute divine power to creatures, rather as Eddy explicitly stated with attributing any power to matter. Malebranche's argument that only God can produce effects is predicated upon the concept that “a true cause ... is one such that the mind perceives a necessary connection between it and its effects” (Enfield 1791, p.618ff). As no such connection exists within bodily states, between bodily and mental states, or even within purely mental states, the only causal connection must be between an omnipotent Deity's volitions and the Divine will.

Theodicy

The existence of evil is problematic for any system of thought which claims that the world was created by a God who has infinite power, knowledge and goodness. However, the

problem is a profoundly difficult one for occasionalism, as here only God is the cause of all effects in nature. Malebranche's theodicy addresses the problem of evil by admitting that God could have acted to prevent natural evils such as illness, and thus could have produced a more perfect world. Malebranche asserted that God could have created a more perfect world only by sacrificing the simplicity and uniformity of action that is a supreme mark of His wisdom. God therefore does not will those specific evils, but because He wills a world governed by the fewest laws. Although an ingenious argument, it does not serve to explain why God does not will a universe with the fewest laws which would still completely eliminate the existence of evil. Evil therefore remains a severe difficulty for Malebranche, whereas for Eddy it is quite literally no problem at all, as within her system, evil doesn't exist. Consequently, despite the radically counterintuitive nature of Christian Science, it is less problematic, and therefore easier to accept as a system

5.5 A new summary

The thorough analysis of Eddy's work provided by the previous chapters facilitates and guides a new summary of the key aspects of her philosophical system. Although solely relying on Chapter 3 of Miscellaneous Writings (Eddy 1893, pp.31-94), the precis below nevertheless represents almost the entirety of the important concepts, and by virtue of having been taken from just one chapter of only one work, it offers a greater degree of self-consistency and coherency, albeit a very slightly artificial one. It is important to restate that consistency across the lifetime oeuvre of even first-rank, academic philosophers is rarely present, if ever, and so judging Eddy's full set of texts on this basis would not constitute a fair approach unless it was also applied to other philosophers.

On the perceived advantages of Christian Science as a method of 'healing' disease:
It is more effectual than drugs, curing where these fail, and leaving none of the harmful "after effects" of these in the system; thus proving that

metaphysics is above physics. (Eddy 1893, p.33-34)

On mortal mind:

“Mortal mind is an illusion; as much in our waking moments as in the dreams of sleep. The belief that intelligence, Truth and Love, are in matter and separate from God, is an error; for there is no intelligent evil, and no power besides God, good. God would not be omnipotent if there were in reality another mind creating or governing man or the universe.”

(Ibid. p.36-37)

On immortal mind:

“Immortal Mind is God. [...] Jesus recognized this when he said "I and my Father are one".

(Ibid. p.37)

On the aspect of spatial distance with respect to the treatment of patients:

“Mind is not confined to limits; and nothing but our own false admissions prevent us from demonstrating this great fact. Christian Science, recognizing the capabilities of Mind to act of itself, and independent of matter, enables one to heal cases without even having seen the individual, - or simply after having been made acquainted with the mental condition of the patient.”

(Ibid. p.42-43)

On the apparent effectiveness of some conventional medical treatments, such as dental extraction:

“What you thought was pain in the bone or nerve, could only have been a

belief in matter. That matter can report pain, or that mind is *in* matter [italics in the original], reporting sensations, is but a dream at all times. [...] When your belief in pain ceases, the pain stops. [...] Mind is supreme. [...] The full understanding that God is Mind, and that matter is but a belief, enables you to control pain.”
(Ibid. p.44-45)

On the concept of evil, Eddy demonstrates her remarkable creativity, reinterpreting a very well-known passage from the Bible in an entirely new way. Here, she quotes Exodus xx. 3, inferring that it refers to the 'imagined' concept of evil:

“It never originated or existed as an entity. It is but a false belief. This error of belief is idolatry, having "other gods before me".
(Ibid. p.45)

On the perceived experience of weight due to the gravitational attraction between the earth and the mass of individual human beings:

“By learning that matter is but manifest mortal mind [... and that] your night-dreams [...] elucidate [...] the mythical nature of matter, and the possibilities of mind when let loose from its own beliefs.”
(Ibid. p.47)

On the criticism that Christian Science is too conceptually complex:

“The teachings of Jesus were simple, yet he found it difficult to make the rulers understand. [...] Its seeming abstraction is the mystery of godliness.”
[Ibid. p.53]

On the apparent contradiction involved in the idea that man is coexistent with God, yet is stated in Scripture (Gen . i . 36 .) to have been created on the sixth and last day of the description of creation given in Genesis:

“In its genesis, the Science of creation is stated in mathematical order, beginning with the lowest form and ascending the scale of being up to man. But all that really is, always was and forever is; for it existed in and of the Mind that is God, wherein man is foremost.”

(Ibid. p.57)

The above is highly suggestive of McTaggart's C-series concept of time, involving a hierarchy of nested 'events' existing not simultaneously, as this would require the existence of time, but simply existing; Eddy, of course, was writing several decades before him. On the systemic problem at the core of Christian Science, i.e. its reliance upon the Bible while denying the existence of the physical universe, the ever-creative Eddy has what seems like a 'universal' get-out clause in her system of thought:

“I read the inspired page through a higher than mortal sense [...] it is a belief of eyesight [...] but I must spiritually understand them to interpret their Science.”

(Ibid. p.58)

This, however, much more subtle than it may at first appear. Here I believe Eddy's ability to formulate extremely sophisticated abstract concepts is running somewhat ahead of her ability to express them with full clarity, rather like a musician who can 'hear' their own compositions mentally, but who lacks sufficient technical skill on their instrument in order to play them. The distinction Eddy is attempting to describe as follows: given that what we call 'eyesight' is, in Christian Science, not a sensory system perceiving an external physical universe, but a generator of beliefs, these beliefs will range from the sometimes

wholly false to the occasionally sublimely true; only spiritual sense can make the determination as to which is which.

On the issue of prayer, Eddy addresses the puzzle of why an omniscient God would need requests from human beings, as, firstly, God would already be aware of the request, and secondly, if God had decided a course of action, it would be the best one; requests otherwise are therefore for sub-optimal alternatives. Her answer is that prayer should be solely for the realisation that the above is actually the case, and that any other form represents a lack of understanding or faith:

“[...] if we pray Scripturally, with the understanding that God has given all things to those who love Him; but pleading with infinite Love [...] is the prayer of doubt and mortal belief that is unavailing in divine Science.”

(Ibid. p.59)

A fascinating point raised by one of Eddy's many correspondents concerns the assumed one-to-one relationship between apparent, but illusory, mortal bodies and the real, spiritual identity of the individual - why should the illusion be representative of just one person? Alternatively, could the illusion be unconnected with a real, spiritual individual at all? Eddy's response is:

“Every material belief hints at the existence of a spiritual reality; and if mortals are instructed in spiritual things, it will be seen that material belief, in all its manifestations, reversed.”

(Ibid. p.60)

In response to a published criticism from an ordained minister, in which the claim was made that it is un-Christian to believe that pain and disease are illusions, Eddy adopted a counterattacking approach:

“It is un-Christian to believe that pain and sickness are [...] anything but illusions. My proof of this is, [comma in the original] that the penalty for believing in their reality is the very pain and disease. Jesus cast out a devil, and the dumb spake; [...] hence it is right to know that the works of Satan [see below for what Eddy means by the word 'Satan'] are the illusion and error which Truth casts out.”

(Ibid. p.68)

The key phrase here is "my proof of this is". Eddy is applying her scientific method of hypothesis, experiment, results, conclusion, with the hypothesis being the illusory nature of pain and sickness, and the results being that all those who believe in their existence suffer from their effects, whereas some who do not accept their reality no longer suffer. One aspect she does not address is what proportion of 'successes' would constitute sufficient reason for accepting her hypothesis. In the social sciences, the accepted standard for believing a hypothesis to have been 'proved' is that there must be less than a 5% chance of the result occurring by random chance. Unfortunately, quantitative data on this issue as it relates to Christian Science is very difficult to obtain.

Regarding Eddy's use of the term 'Satan', the glossary forming Chapter 17 of *Science and Health* explains it as follows:

“Evil; a lie; error; neither corporeality nor mind; the opposite of Truth; a belief in sin, sickness and death; animal magnetism or hypnotism; the lust of the flesh, which saith: "I am life and intelligence in matter. There is more than one mind, for I am mind, - a wicked mind, self-made or created by a tribal god and put into the opposite of mind, termed

matter, thence to reproduce a mortal universe, including man, not after the image and likeness of Spirit, but after its own image."

(Eddy 1910, p.584)

On the contentious topic of nature versus nurture, more properly known as heritability versus environment, Eddy states that:

"Whatever is humanly conceived is a departure from divine law; hence its mythical origin and certain end. [...] According to the beliefs of the flesh, both good and bad traits of the parents are transmitted to their helpless offspring, and God is supposed to impart to man this fatal power."

(Eddy 1893, p.71-72)

Another of Eddy's correspondents was concerned that Scripture appears to acknowledge the existence of matter in the following passage: "Your heavenly Father knows [...] that ye have need of these things" [KJV: Matthew vi. 32.]. Her reply is:

"Real sensation is not material; it is, and must be, [...] mental: and Mind is not Mortal, it is immortal. Being is God, infinite Spirit, therefore it cannot cognize aught material, or outside infinity. The Scriptural passage quoted affords no evidence of the reality of matter, or that God is conscious of it. The so-called material body is said to suffer, but this supposition is proven erroneous when Mind casts out the suffering. [...] Law is never material: it is always mental."

(Ibid. p. 73-74)

On the combined topic of there being only one soul, and that soul not being within the body:

“First: I urge this fundamental fact and grand verity of Christian Science, because it includes a rule that must be understood, or it is impossible to demonstrate the Science. Soul is a synonym of Spirit, and God is Spirit. There is but one God, and the infinite is not within the finite; hence Soul is one, and is God; and God is not in matter or in the [illusory] mortal body. Second: Because Soul is a term for Deity, and this term should seldom be employed except where the word God can be used and make complete sense. Third: Jesus said, ‘If a man keep [sic] my saying, he shall never see death.’ [...] The Science of Soul, Spirit, involves this appearing, and is essential to the fulfilment of this glorious prophecy of the master Metaphysician, who overcame the last enemy, death.”

(Ibid. p.75-76)

It might be imagined that if man is subject to illness and death, then he must have fallen from a state of perfection, but Eddy states that:

“If God is the Principle of man (and He is), man is the idea of God, and this idea cannot fail to express the exact nature of its Principle.”

(Ibid. p.78)

On the interesting point that is mortal man is unreal, how can he be saved?

“Man is immortal. Mortal man is a false concept that is not spared or prolonged by being saved from itself, from whatever is false. This salvation means; [semicolon in the original] saved from error.”

(Ibid. p.89)

The person leading Christian Science services is not ordained, so should the pastor of the administer communion? Furthermore, should members of a Christian Science church receive communion from someone who is not ordained, or is this blasphemous? Eddy responds to this concern as follows:

“Our great Master administered to his disciples the Passover, or last supper, without this prerogative being ordered by a visible organisation and ordained priesthood. [... This] is the spiritual communion which Christian Scientists celebrate in commemoration of the Christ. This ordinance is significant as a type of the true worship and it should be observed at present in our churches.”

(Ibid. p.90-91)

5.6 Julian of Norwich

Another writer whose conclusions concur with those of Eddy and McTaggart, yet who offers a third methodology in so doing, is the first woman ever to publish a book written in English, the anchorite Julian of Norwich. In a series of 16 visions, which she termed as ‘showings’, Julian believed that the essential character of God had been revealed to her, and after considerable reflective analysis of these showings, she concluded that the ultimate reality consists of solely of God’s love. Philip Sheldrake conducted a detailed analysis of the work of Julian of Norwich (Sheldrake 2019), in which he explained that “The visions are simply starting points for her teaching about God’s love for humanity.” (Sheldrake 2019, p.85) and, furthermore, that:

“Our ignorance of God’s love keeps us in sin and despair. In the end, therefore, there is only one ‘showing’ or ‘revelation’, and that is God’s love as the meaning of everything.”

(Ibid.. p.84)

This serves as an introduction to the explanation of the use of the word ‘love’ in this

context:

“God’s love is not an emotion. Nor is it one characteristic of God or simply related to God’s external action. For Julian, love is God’s very being or reality.”

(id., p.86)

Julian herself expands upon this idea, providing the following detail:

“Know it well, love was his meaning. Who reveals it to you? Love. Why does he reveal it to you? For love. Remain in this and you will know more of the same. But you will never know different, without end. So I was taught that love is our Lord’s meaning.”

(quoted in Ibid., p.91)

Sheldrake then explains that:

“Love is [...] the whole teaching of Julian’s book. Everything else (including, for example, God’s Lordship) is to be interpreted in the light of love. God may be thought of as all-powerful and all-knowing, but the deepest truth about God is love.”

(Ibid., p.92)

For Julian, God is not just all of creation, but also all of action:

“See, I am God. See, I do all things. See, I never remove my hands from my works, nor ever shall, without end.”

(quoted in Ibid., p.104)

Love, however, she considered as something quite different:

“Love is not something God ‘does’ or ‘has’. Rather, love is God’s very

nature and this love is directed outwards towards [...] humanity in particular.

(quoted in Ibid., p.110)

This she made clear in her 'showing':

"And I saw no difference between God and our substance, but, as it were, all God; and still my understanding accepted that our substance is in God, that is to say that God is God, and our substance is a creature of God. For the almighty truth of the Trinity is our Father, for he made us and keeps us in him. And the deep wisdom of the Trinity is our Mother, in whom we are enclosed. And the goodness of the Trinity is our Lord, and in him we are enclosed and he is in us. We are enclosed in the Father, and we are enclosed in the Son, and we are enclosed in the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit is enclosed in us, almighty, all wisdom and all goodness, one God, one Lord."

(quoted in Ibid. p.112)

Thus we have the same conclusion by whether deduction from initially a priori axioms which are subsequently justified empirically, in Eddy's case, deduction from a priori principles which remain a priori, in McTaggart's case, and reflection upon revelation, in the case of Julian of Norwich.

5.7 Extreme criticism in the 21st Century

Gerald Bergmann, writing in 2001, described Eddy's system of thought as itself "delusional". In an essay with the intensely provocative title *The Christian Science Holocaust* (Bergmann 2001) he sought to dismantle Christian Science, starting with its initial axioms, and progressing to the ideas arriving from them. Perhaps Bergmann was unaware that these criticisms of Eddy are not original, having

been made by Farnsworth (and many others) roughly a century before (Farnsworth 1909). Given Eddy's zealousness in defending what she referred to as her 'discovery', it is unsurprising that she published responses to these and other more sophisticated criticisms (Eddy 1898, p.45). For example, as quoted earlier in Chapter 3:

"If I have the toothache, and nothing stops it until I have the tooth extracted, and then the pain ceases, has the mind, or extracting, or both, caused the pain to cease?_

What you thought was pain in the bone or nerve, could only have been a belief of pain in matter; for matter has no sensation. It was a state of mortal thought made manifest in the flesh. You call this body matter, when awake, or when asleep in a dream. That matter can re-report pain, or that mind is in matter, reporting sensations, is but a dream at all times. You believed that if the tooth were extracted, the pain would cease: this demand of mortal thought once met, your belief assumed a new form, and said, There is no more pain. When your belief in pain ceases, the pain stops; for matter has no intelligence of its own. By applying this mental remedy or antidote directly to your belief, you scientifically prove the fact that Mind is supreme."

(Eddy 1898, p.45)

Criticisms of Bergmann's form (i.e. that Eddy was delusional) are from the point of view of a materialist interpreting 'sensory data' regarding a physical world as providing the basis for its existence. Having 'proved' this hypothesis, any idealist alternative – any whatsoever, whether Eddy's

or not -is, therefore, from this standpoint delusional, but this is really simply a restatement of the initial physicalist premise. Exactly the same structure of argument could be used with idealism as its premise, with the conclusion being – again, in the absence of evidence – that belief in the physicalist world is delusional.

It is said that 'familiarity breeds contempt'; perhaps, in the case of Christian Science, it is the lack of familiarity which publishes contempt.

5.8 Conclusion

Although there are clearly some problematic aspects to Mary Baker Eddy's system of thought, it is nevertheless a tour de force worthy of much greater analytical interest than was the case during the twentieth century. In echoing the ideas of earlier thinkers such as Spinoza and Malebranche, who are undoubtedly regarded as being philosophers, Eddy must be redefined as a philosopher, despite her protestations regarding "99% of philosophy". Furthermore, her sometimes profound yet evidenced disagreements with the ideas of these thinkers, coupled with publishing ideas isomorphic to McTaggart's, but 52 years before him, means that she must additionally be regarded as a genuinely original philosopher. In fact, her originality abounds: methodological contributions, her concept of God as Father-Mother, her thoroughgoing idealism, her concept of spiritual sense, her redefinitions of many existing terms in theology and philosophy and her dazzling denials of so much that is 'common sense' - all this points to a creative and daring intellect.

Chapter 6 Christian Science during the 1918-1919 'Spanish' Influenza

6.1 Background to the events

This chapter explores the important dichotomy between what would be Eddy's denial of the existence of Sars-CoV 2 as a specific pathogen within her denial of the existence of all illnesses, and the unitary denial of Covid-19 by various subgroups in 21st-century society whose world model is diametrically opposed to that of Christian Science. The previous chapters have described Eddy's philosophical system in detail, so there is no need to repeat that level of analysis here, other than to restate a brief summary for the purpose of demonstrating the profound differences which exist between Eddy's philosophy and the assumptions and assertions of those who would describe themselves as Covid deniers. The parallels between the Christian Science understanding of Spanish Influenza and that of Covid-19 are particularly instructive in this regard.

The 378-page book published in 1922 by the Christian Science Church on their response to the circumstances created by the Great War includes a substantial section on Spanish Influenza, and offers a very different viewpoint to that of the conventionally accepted one of *materia medica*. Given the once-in-a-century nature of the current Covid-19 pandemic, I felt it important to consider this aspect, and especially so given Eddy's central claims. This chapter will therefore use the historic Christian Science philosophical response to Spanish Influenza as a source of information for the analysis of the present pandemic, and specifically how it might be misunderstood in relation to the current situation.

Given the overwhelming numbers of casualties due to the 1918-1919 Influenza (estimated as being 50 million to 100 million worldwide), and the consequent fact that virtually every extended family would have lost someone to the virus, it might quite reasonably be thought that the Christian Science assertion regarding the nonexistence of illness could have proved hard to maintain during this historical period. The truth, however, is that if anything, far from diluting or side-stepping this central claim, Christian Scientists were even

more vociferous than usual. The *Christian Science Response in Wartime* (Brock et al 1922) devotes much of its text to how Christian Scientists responded to 'Spanish' influenza. This is not surprising: far more people died of the 'flu pandemic than were killed in the Great War. Christian Scientists were not untouched themselves. How did they respond to a complex situation, the cause and extent of which were reported and debated in the press? How did their practice of spiritual healing contribute to alleviating the crisis? Several aspects of their response stand out.

The Christian Science Monitor covered the pandemic closely and editorialized on it. In 1919 the newspaper made this observation:

If...the press could be induced to advertise courage instead of circulating fear, an enormous improvement would be rapidly manifested. The effect of the mere corralling of fear would be inestimable. The greatest service any paper, any doctor, any human being can perform for the human race is to teach it to think aright.

("Architects of Disease," The Christian Science Monitor, 13 August 1919)

The world model resented by Christian Science goes far beyond the denial of either influenza viruses or the existence of Sars-CoV 2, the virus which scientists believe causes Covid-19. Eddy would of course deny the existence of Covid-19, but only on the basis that it is an example of the erroneously-asserted entity known as 'illness'. It would therefore be an injustice to characterize Eddy as a 'Covid denier', despite the literal truth of the description, due to at least nine different reasons. These will now be explored.

Firstly and most fundamentally, completely different reasoning underpins her assertion. There is no reason to believe that Covid deniers are philosophical idealists. Their statements and behaviour strongly suggest complete commitment to a belief in physical existence, apart from that of Covid-19, of course. This is wholly antithetical to Eddy's position that entire physical world simply does not exist.

Secondly, there is no reason to believe that Covid-19 deniers disbelieve in the existence of other illnesses; their assertions regarding Sars-CoV 2 and Covid-19 are specific to these and only these constructs. Again, this is very different to the position of Christian Science, which is that (i) no physically existent, pathogenic organisms exist, and (ii) no illnesses exist.

Thirdly, Covid deniers assert that a variety of governments, national institutions and multinational companies are involved in a global conspiracy which (i) fictitiously asserts the existence of Covid-19, (ii) compels populations to accept what although termed vaccines are 'in reality' some unspecified form of control, often involving 'microchips'. Both of these core aspects - global conspiracy and maliciously injecting billions of citizens under false pretences – if true, would be undeniably examples of evil. Eddy, though, as an extremely early stage of her argument, concluded that 'evil' in any form whatsoever cannot possibly exist, and is merely the false belief in an erroneous human construct; a campaign involving harmful injections is therefore not possible within her world view.

Fourthly, the behaviour of some Covid deniers is aggressive, involving threats of physical violence, rape and death being made against medical and nursing professionals, and even their children, all on the basis of seeking to force the individuals concerned to 'admit' their part in the assumed conspiracy and desist from their alleged activities within it. As the term 'Covid denier' is inextricably associated with these behaviours and the many other views regarding the supposed 'true' purpose of vaccines, none of which would have been shared by Eddy, the potential injustice begins to appear. Intriguingly, this particular aspect, being a form of 'evil' if – from Eddy's standpoint - it *were* to exist, clearly *cannot do so*; the apparent behaviour being illusory implies that, in the absence of this behaviour, the individuals concerned cease to be covid deniers, and may of course be illusory themselves. Either way, Eddy would seem to be forced to deny the existence of Covid deniers!

The fifth difference between the beliefs of Covid deniers and Eddy's world model, following from the difference above, is that it is a reasonable assumption that Covid deniers do not deny their own existence!

Sixthly, resulting from her denial of the existence of physical reality, Eddy could not have concurred with the assertion that vaccines exist, irrespectively of their 'true' purpose; this is entirely separate from the assumed conspiracy held to exist by Covid deniers.

Seventhly, a very different further source of disparity between 'modern' Covid denial and the position arising from Christian Science relates to the published statistics regarding cases, hospitalisations and deaths from the disease. In this case, at first sight both sides appear to be in perfect agreement: they would both allege that no cases or deaths are occurring and the published figures are untrue. Again, however, the underlying reasons for these shared beliefs could hardly be more different; Covid deniers believe the statistics to be a malicious and intentional fiction, whereas from Eddy's point of view the figures are incorrect because death is an illusion.

Eighthly, the type of mathematical function which describes the published statistics regarding both Spanish Influenza and Covid-19 is known as an exponential function. As a consequence of the 2020 pandemic, this word is now often misused: it does not apply to an quantity and has no implication regarding size; instead, it refers to the shape of the curve describing 'geometric' growth. An example of this form is one with a constant ratio, such as the series 1, 2, 4, 8, 16 ... , in which each term is twice the previous one. This is called natural growth, as biological systems, such as the spread of infections, display it due to the fact that each infected person goes on to infect number of other people; if, for example, this number is two, then the series above is recreated. In the absence of a self-replicating organism or system, this pattern is unlikely to occur.

Returning to the issue of Covid-19, the only way that the published figures for cases could follow geometric growth is if each case creates more than one new case, i.e. in the presence of a contagious infection. Both modern Covid-19 deniers and Eddy would agree that geometric growth could not be taking place, and both would point to the lack of an infective, contagious organism, but, aside from this context, Eddy's position would appear to rule out this form of growth under any circumstances. This is not simply because of her disbelief in either illness or the organisms associated with it, but

because an exponential function is caused by the rate of growth of a system being dependent upon its absolute level, and it is difficult to envisage how this could be true within the profoundly idealist world view of Christian Science.

Ninthly, and finally, the conspiracy which Covid-19 deniers allege is held by some of their number to be a component part of an older a far greater global conspiracy, sometimes known as the New World Order. This fundamentally atheistic, geopolitical project, were it to exist, would be diametrically opposed to Christian Science in seemingly every aspect, given that it would be non-idealist in conception, assert the nonexistence of God and be of malicious intent.

6.2 The Goat Island experiment

Despite its radical nature, Christian Science does not include any element of paranoia or conspiracy theorisation in its argument for the nonexistence of Covid-19. With regard to Spanish Influenza, the Christian Science religious periodicals also shared reports pointing to the deleterious effects of collective fear, to medical tests that called into question popular assumptions, and to acts of unselfishness and courage. For example, the April 12, 1919, Christian Science Sentinel reprinted this from California's Oakland Enquirer:

"The experiments made at Goat Island [California] by Navy doctors in an effort to learn something about the influenza germ, carry a lesson that every person should study and understand. Fifty young sailors volunteered to become influenza victims, that the doctors might study the disease more carefully. These young men had no fear of the disease; they willingly offered themselves. They were placed with flu patients; they were given jars of flu germs, which they breathed into their lungs; they had flu germs injected into their bodies....

But no cases developed among these fifty sailors! These men had been inoculated; they had been exposed to the disease in every manner; they had breathed in the germs and eaten and slept with flu victims, and not one of them became infected! The medical men confessed themselves baffled. All their ideas of the disease were turned topsy-turvy.... The doctors are still wondering. The explanation, however, is simplicity itself, for it was proved by each one of these fifty young men.

These fifty young men volunteered to act as subjects upon which to be experimented. This showed clearly that they did not fear the disease."

(Christian Science Sentinel, April 12, 1919)

Referencing the Goat Island experiment, the Journal of the American Medical Association offered a frank observation:

"Dr. McCoy, who with Dr. Richey, did a similar series of experiments on Goat Island, San Francisco, used volunteers, who, so far as known, had not been exposed to the outbreak at all, also had negative results, that is, they were unable to reproduce the disease. Perhaps there are factors, or a factor, in the transmission of influenza that we do not know."

(Rosenau 1919, p. 313)

If false, this is clearly an extremely dangerous idea. That having been acknowledged, however, it is nevertheless a concept with some contemporary traction, with the work of Bruce Lipton (Lipton, 2005) being of particular importance. Despite having a Ph.D. in biology, Lipton has made the case for a reconsideration of the germ theory of disease,

noting the similarity between Eddy's claims and those reported by medical professionals long after her original publication. For example:

"When the mind, through positive suggestion improves health, it is referred to as the placebo effect. Conversely, when the same mind is engaged in negative suggestions that can damage health, the negative effects are referred to as the nocebo effect. [... A]

Nashville physician, Clifton Meador, [...] had a patient, Sam Londe, a retired shoe salesman suffering from cancer of the [o]esophagus, a condition that was at the time considered 100 per cent fatal. Londe was treated for that cancer but everyone in the medical community "knew" that his [o]esophageal cancer would recur. So it was no surprise when Londe died a few weeks after his diagnosis. The surprise came after Londe's death when an autopsy found very little cancer in his body, certainly not enough to kill him. There were a couple of spots in the liver and one in the lung, but there was no trace of the [o]esophageal cancer that everyone thought had killed him. [...]

What did Londe die of if not [o]esophageal cancer? Had he died because he believed he was going to die? The case still haunts Meador three decades after Londe's death."

(Lipton 2005, p.136-137)

Another quote is even more explicit:

"[The] nineteenth century German physician Robert Koch, who along with Pasteur founded the Germ Theory, [which] holds that bacteria and viruses are the primary cause of disease. [...] One of Koch's critics was so convinced that the germ theory was wrong that he brazenly wolfed down a glass of water laced with vibrio cholerae, the bacterium

Koch believed caused cholera. To everyone's astonishment, the man was completely unaffected by the [supposedly] virulent pathogen."

(DiRita 2000, pp.1488-1489)

The patient survived and Science, yet the "unanimity of opinion on the Germ Theory" (Ibid. p.119) was unchanged. Furthermore, physicians and biologists disregard this and other "embarrassing 'messy' exceptions that spoil their theories." [...] The problem is that there cannot be exceptions to a theory; exceptions simply mean that a theory is not fully correct." (Ibid. p.119-120)

But what of Christian Science treatments which do not result in the disappearance of symptoms? Isn't this an example of an exception meaning that Eddy's theory is not fully correct? This would be consistent with Lipton's argument, and presumably the opinion of the majority of the population who are not Christian Scientists (i.e. approximately 99.9987% of the world population, assuming it to be around 7.7 billion and the number of Christian Scientists as roughly 100,000), but it neglects the involvement of the patient in exactly the way in which Lipton is arguing. In both cases, it is the patient's belief which is crucial to the presence or absence of 'illness'.

6.3 Debates at the time of the Spanish Influenza

During the pandemic, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders debated government orders to close places of worship. Some believed that their ministry was needed more than ever, and that their doors should remain open. Christian Scientists participated in this debate; at least one branch church tried to challenge a closure order, but its suit was refused.

Christian Scientist volunteer workers regularly reported on their activities during this period, providing many accounts.

"There were also reports from enlisted men who were Christian Scientists:

One of the things for which we are most grateful is the fact that our

boys were able to help the others during the recent epidemic. One of them had charge of thirty-six others. The first night he went to each patient and tried to allay his fear and to reassure him. The doctors soon began to turn to him and he was put into a position of considerable responsibility and usefulness. Another boy read the 91st Psalm to his patients, and although only a beginner in Science, through using what he knew of the truth, was able to overcome a very high fever for one of the boys.”

(Brock et al 1922, p.342)

Similarly, a soldier writing from England said:

“I was placed in a hospital unit and sent overseas. This took place while the fear of the... influenza was on.... If you will remember I am just a beginner in Science, and so I held to the truth as best I could during that season. I did not use any preventives or medicine as did my associates. I had no fear and felt it my duty to serve instead of being served.”

(Brock et al 1922, p.343)

Individual Christian Scientists all over the world faced their own challenges during the epidemic. Many testimonies published after 1919 in the Sentinel and The Christian Science Journal, and in the French and German editions of The Herald of Christian Science, mentioned healings of Spanish flu. As far as Christian Scientists were concerned, during the Spanish Influenza epidemic a great mass of evidence was accumulated showing the physical healings resulting from the application of Christian Science to the treatment of disease. Some of these healings were brought about by the ministrations of War Relief Workers, some by the efforts of soldier Scientists in their own behalf or in behalf of comrades. [...] The group of testimonials which follow are expressions from Christian Scientists are of this nature.

“As testimonial to the exceedingly good work a Christian Science Welfare Worker did for me I wish to relate my experience at Kelly Field, San Antonio, Texas. [...]

“Last fall, during the ‘flu’ epidemic, I became suddenly ill. The day before I became unconscious, some Science literature was handed me, with the Welfare Worker’s name enclosed. I refused medicine of any kind, and called on the Welfare Worker for help. The next day I was forcibly taken to the hospital and passed almost immediately into unconsciousness. The Welfare Worker was with me every day and several nights practically all night.

“It was at a critical stage, when the army surgeon at the hospital said I could not live until a certain hour. They had done absolutely all they could, and told my parents that I would probably be dead within a few hours. This condition lasted for over a day. The Worker brought me back into sunshine and life again, staying constantly with me.

“The case was considered a very peculiar one in the hospital, and the surgeon predicted all kinds of after effects, none of which developed, nor ever will, for this experience has shown me thoroughly what Science is and what it will do for one. [...]

“William Huttig, Jr., “Kansas City, Mo.”

(Brock et al 1922, p.334)

This echoed Eddy’s own prior practical experience, which is the reason for their inclusion at this point.

Eddy’s experiments and the results from specific ‘healings’ are considered next.

6.4 Eddy's own experiments

On the issue of contagious illness being caused by a virus, Eddy's assertion that matter does not exist of course implies that as well as the illness being an error of belief, so is the belief in the existence of the virus, the only 'contagion' being that of being exposed to the false beliefs. In *Science and Health* (Eddy 1910, pp.153-157) Eddy describes her own experiences, using the term 'experiments', and, as before, implicitly using the sequence 'hypothesis, experiment, results, conclusion':

“The author's medical researches [sic] and experiments had prepared her thought for the metaphysics of Christian Science. Every material dependence had failed her in her search for truth; and she can now understand why, and can see the means by which mortals are divinely driven to a spiritual source for health and happiness.

You say a boil is painful; but that is impossible, for matter without mind is not painful. The boil simply manifests, through inflammation and swelling, a belief in pain, and this belief is called a boil. Now administer mentally to your patient a high attenuation of truth, and it will soon cure the boil. The fact that pain cannot exist where there is no mortal mind to feel it is a proof that this so-called mind makes its own pain - that is, its own belief in pain.

We weep because others weep, we yawn because they yawn, and we have smallpox because others have it; but mortal mind, not matter, contains and carries the infection. When this mental contagion is understood, we shall be more careful of our mental conditions and we shall avoid loquacious tattling about disease, as we would avoid advocating crime. Neither sympathy nor society should ever tempt us to cherish error in any form, and certainly we should not be error's advocate. Disease arises, like other mental conditions, from association. Since it is a law of mortal mind that certain diseases should be regarded as contagious, this law obtains credit through association, - calling up the fear that creates the image of disease and its consequent manifestation in the body.”

(Eddy 1910, p.153-154)

Eddy then describes an extraordinarily unethical experiment. This is an interesting albeit shocking account:

“This fact in metaphysics is illustrated by the following incident: A man was made to believe that he occupied a bed where a cholera patient had died. Immediately the symptoms of this disease appeared, and the man died. The fact was, that he had not caught the cholera by material contact, because no cholera patient had been in that bed.”

(Eddy 1910, p.154-157)

Here, Eddy is discussing the placebo effect, but then looks at the effect of belief more generally, considering that of the patient and the physician:

“When the sick recover by the use of drugs, it is the law of a general belief, culminating in individual faith, which heals; and according to this faith will the effect be. Even when you take away the individual confidence in the drug, you have not yet divorced the drug from the general faith. [...] When the general belief endorses the inanimate drug as doing this or that, individual dissent or faith, unless it rests on Science, is but a belief held by a minority, and such a belief [...] weighs against the high and mighty truths of Christian metaphysics.

[T]he percentage of power on the side of this Science must mightily outweigh the power of popular belief in order to heal a single case of disease. [...]

Homoeopathy diminishes the drug, but the potency of the medicine increases as the drug disappears. Metaphysics, as taught in Christian Science, is the next stately step beyond homoeopathy. In metaphysics, matter disappears from the remedy entirely, and Mind takes its rightful and supreme place. Homoeopathy takes mental symptoms largely into consideration in its diagnosis of disease. Christian Science deals wholly with the mental cause in judging and destroying disease. It succeeds where homoeopathy fails, solely because its one recognized Principle of healing is Mind, and the whole force of the mental element is employed through the Science of Mind [...] Christian Science exterminates the drug, and rests on Mind alone as the curative Principle, acknowledging that the divine Mind has all power.”

(Eddy 1910, p.154-157)

So Eddy considered a quasi-continuum of progress existing, with conventional medicine at one pole, homoeopathic medicine at some unspecified mid-point, and Christian Science at the opposite pole, representing the culmination of this development of understanding.

6.5 Observations and conclusions

Although twenty-first century science and technology can sequence both the Spanish Influenza virus (and the virus causing Covid-19) and the scanning electron microscope can even image individual virus particles, in Eddy's defence one has to consider the technological context in 1918/1919. As a virus cannot replicate without the live cells of a host organism, attempting to culture and incubate one in a petri dish will not prove effective. Furthermore, as virtually all viruses are far smaller than the wavelength of light, they cannot be seen under any optical microscope – then or now – which were the only microscopes available at that time. From the contemporary perspective of academic biology, therefore, one would have to postulate the existence of an invisible, seemingly nonreplicating organism as the hypothetical agent of contagion. Clearly, this does not conform to the standards of objective science, and so Christian Science's objection to the medical consensus regarding Spanish Influenza is far more reasonable than it may first appear.

Regarding Covid-19, although Eddy would have been seen as a 'Covid denier', this would do her a disservice, despite being literally true. This is because her reasoning would not be based on paranoia, such as the belief that Covid-19 is a hoax designed to malignly manipulate the public, and would not be limited to just Covid-19, which is the case regarding 'true' Covid-19 deniers. Although her position would be a far more extreme one, it is arguably more rational.

Regarding Eddy's view of homoeopathy as an intermediate step on the route to understanding the complete elimination of the role of matter, there is an analogy to be drawn with the present understanding of matter offered by nuclear physics, in which the structure of the atom is considered to be approximately one part per trillion matter by volume. Eddy's world model simply eliminates that last one-trillionth part.

Chapter 7 Conclusions and suggestions for further research

7.1 Penultimate thoughts

The philosophical idealism underlying Mary Baker Eddy's system of thought has emerged in this thesis as a curious mixture of dazzling intellectual daring and, being very charitable, apparent occasional incoherency. Eddy comes across the 110 years since her death as a more wholehearted, more committed idealist thinker than many - perhaps all - famous philosophers in the field, and, somewhat counterintuitively, it is this unwavering approach which led to the possible problems regarding incoherency. In this final chapter I will summarise what I believe to be her original contributions to the field, and also the ideas which she published before the academics who are known for them. For balance, I will also highlight the areas of her writing which remain problematic with regard to either their inconsistency within the system as a whole, or incoherency as it pertains to individual concepts.

The first original feature is that there are two components to Eddy's metaphysics: the aprioristic and the empirical. Her application of what is arguably scientific method (although one may dispute the choice of her experimental data, which ignores cases in which 'healings' have not occurred) creates what might be termed 'applied metaphysics'.

The second observation is that there is considerable coherence in her thinking and a commitment to accept some highly counterintuitive consequences arising from it. This, I think, is particularly the hallmark of a philosopher.

Thirdly, her claims and her method of arriving at them correspond to those of earlier and later academic philosophers.

Fourthly, although her system of thought leads to objections that she may not be able to counter, this does not imply that no coherent philosophical argument is present. Many Idealist philosophers can be refuted, and within general philosophy virtually all of the conclusions of the still-studied, highly respected Presocratic philosophers are no longer accepted without this affecting their status as philosophers.

The whole edifice of her thought (pun intended) relies on the nonexistence of matter, or, at the very least, our complete misunderstanding of its true nature. This is something that the British idealist John McTaggart concluded some decades later, with his most detailed argument for this position appearing in the second volume of *The Nature of Existence* (McTaggart 1927, sections 353 - 372).

The thorough analysis of Eddy's work provided by the previous chapters facilitates a parsimonious, final description of her philosophical system. Although it offers a greater degree of self-consistency and coherency, albeit a very slightly artificial one, it is important to restate that consistency across the lifetime oeuvre of even first-rank academic philosophers is rarely present, if ever, and so judging Eddy's full set of texts on this basis would not constitute a fair approach unless it was also applied to other philosophers.

7.2 A final description of Eddy's philosophical system

The initial axioms are:

- Axiom 1. God is omniscient
- Axiom 2. God is omnipotent
- Axiom 3. God is omnipresent
- Axiom 4. God is infinite
- Axiom 5. God is (completely/infinately) Good

Following from which Eddy constructs a system consisting of the following propositions:

Prop. 1. God is infinite and unknowable, except by Divine revelation and human conjecture.

Prop. 2. God is Life, Truth, Love, Spirit, Principle, Mind and Good.

Prop. 3. The hypothetical construct, 'evil', is a "delusion of material sense".

Prop. 4. Nothing possesses reality or existence except Divine mind and His ideas.

Prop. 5. God fills all space, therefore all is Spirit.

Prop. 6. The triune nature of God consists of Life, Truth and Love.

Prop. 7. God is Father-Mother.

Prop. 8. The idea of Christ (not the human form) is eternal.

Prop. 9. The invisible Christ appears to the Spiritual sense.

Prop. 10. Reality is spiritual, harmonious, immutable, immortal, divine, [and] eternal

This then leads immediately to the following corollaries:

Corollary 1:

Illness, pain and death, as examples of the non-existent human construct, 'evil', do not exist.

Corollary 2:

As 'all is spirit', and 'nothing possesses reality or existence except Divine mind and His ideas', as part of this reality we are therefore already perfect. Consequently, once a patient has been convinced of this their imaginary illness will disappear.

Corollary 3:

If a patient experiences the disappearance of the signs and symptoms that resulted in them contacting a Christian Science Practitioner, then this adds to the existing body of evidence of this type and increases the probability that the initial axioms and propositions are correct.

7.3 Remaining problems

At least three potentially serious problems have emerged from this analysis of Eddy's system of thought. Firstly, the variable degree of the isomorphism between 'spiritual reality' and its supposedly illusory physical counterpart (which gives rise to the specific problem regarding the accuracy of Eddy's perception of the Bible, upon which she placed considerable reliance); secondly the interpretation of infinity as 'everything', upon which Eddy's entire system relies; and thirdly, the paradox regarding the apparent error of being able to make errors, such as the error, as Eddy would see it, of believing in illness. The first problem could be considered as simply part of a human failing to understand 'Divine Science' at this early stage, and the second problem has at least an avenue to a solution in the realm of transfinite numbers, but the third is more serious. If the determined attempt at a solution given in Chapter 5 is not accepted, then an alternative would be a necessary prerequisite before accepting Eddy's philosophical system.

Notwithstanding the above, whether this solution or another is accepted or not, Eddy's work is nevertheless highly original, radically idealist philosophy. The case is proven for Eddy being a philosopher, but the jury still is out regarding whether or not she was right.

7.4 An alternative interpretation

Using the same approach as Eddy, but interpreting the evidence of our senses at face value, could one conclude the exact opposite to her? It would be as follows:

- only pain, illness and death exist;
- the perception of freedom from pain is an illusion;
- the perception of freedom from illness is an illusion;
- only the devil exists, who is entirely evil and, being unlimited, occupies all space; everything is therefore evil, necessarily including humans. There is therefore no 'good', and only evil exists.

- only the physical universe exists; metaphysical and spiritual entities are fictional.
- the devil, given the point immediately above, physically exists.

What evidence would support this set of concepts? It could be as follows:

- prayer does not work on the majority of occasions, and even when it appears to, this could be illusory;
- dreadful suffering is sometimes experienced by the completely innocent, such as very young children;
- the majority of deaths in wartime are civilians;
- for much of the world's population, war is the modal state, even to the point that many young people, both children and young adults, have never experienced peace time.
- In many developing countries, illnesses which would be easily treatable in richer nations can prove fatal due to either the lack of the necessary drugs or the unavailability of medical equipment. Even in wealthier jurisdictions, if healthcare is not funded by the state, the above situation can also be the everyday experience of the poor.

Curiously, this seemingly self-consistent alternative immediately faces a fundamental difficulty. If only physical entities – matter and energy – exist, what is consciousness, or the experience of pain? They appear to be neither matter nor energy in themselves, despite being caused by and modifiable by matter and energy. ‘Evil’, too, seems similarly problematic.

7.5 Still greater radicalism?

Although Eddy's philosophy appears to be an example of the limiting case of radical idealism, this could of course be a mistake. It would be interesting intellectual puzzle to attempt to construct a still more extreme system, and although the fact that her system is based on the zealous rejection of all things material might seem to imply that this would be an impossible task, there is a precedent offered in the work of the previously mentioned Christian Scientist, Emma Curtiss Hopkins, who developed her own form of metaphysical healing following her dismissal by Eddy. She stated that:

“There are other things besides sickness and sin which can be denied out of existence by our word. If we are in poverty, trouble, anxiety, *name the state or condition* and deny it. [my italics]

(Hopkins 1926, p.168)

Hopkins agreed with Eddy regarding the universe being Spirit, so if the above applies to all abstract concepts and propositions, then nothing would appear to be safe from denial, even including the concept of denial itself!

7.6 Suggestions for further research

Epistemologically, Christian Science is a curious combination of both fideism and correspondent truth. Fideism in that Eddy asserts the existence of spiritual sense, along with her acceptance of the complete accuracy of the Bible, seemingly on the basis of faith; correspondent truth, however, Eddy relies upon with regard to her healings as ‘proof’ of the correctness of her system of thought.

Although this could be characterised as an inconsistency of her approach, another reading could be that each form of truth is appropriate within the two magisteria straddled by Christian Science – the empirical and the metaphysical. Exploring what might be termed ‘fideist correspondence’, or ‘correspondent fideism’, would be interesting in itself, as would seeking other examples (if they exist) of its occurrence in existing work.

7.7 Finally

I would like to end this thesis by giving Eddy the last word. As an example of her sheer daring, the interpretation she provides for the Lord's Prayer seems unequalled. Given the limitations imposed by the necessity to communicate ideas in 'natural' language, it is Eddy at her very best; truly "The dream and the dreamer are one" (Eddy 1910, p.530).

"Our Father, which art in heaven,

Our Father-Mother God, all-harmonious,

Hallowed be thy name,

Adorable One,

Thy kingdom come,

Thy kingdom is come; Thou art ever-present,

Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven.

Enable us to know, - as in heaven, so on earth, - God is omnipotent, supreme.

Give us this day our daily bread;

Give us grace for to-day; feed the famished affections;

And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.

And Love is reflected in love;

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil;

And God leadeth us not into temptation, but deliver us from sin, disease, and death.

For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever

For God is infinite, all-power, all Life, Truth, Love, over all, and All."

(Eddy 1910, p.16-17)

And that is precisely what Christian Science is about. If we accept Eddy's system, then the naïve, physicalist world view is a great myth. Love stories are real, and we are in one, but the true surprise is that everything which exists is just one thing, and that, in the Christian Science sense, is Love.

Bibliography

- Bates, E.S. and Dittmore, J.V. (1932) *Mary Baker Eddy: The Truth and the Tradition*, A.A.Knopf.
- Blavatsky, H. (1907) *Some of the Errors of Christian Science*, Point Loma, California, USA: Aryan Theosophical Press.
- Boyer, Carl (1959) *The History of the Calculus and Its Conceptual Development*, New York: Dover Publications.
- Bowen, Francis, (1837) "Locke and the Transcendentalists", *Christian Examiner* 23 (November 1837),
- Bradley, F.H. ([1876] 1988) *Ethical Studies*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bradley, F.H. ([1893] 1916) *Appearance and Reality*, London: S.Sonnenschein; New York: Macmillan.
- Braude, Ann (2007) *Sisters and Saints: Women and American Religion*, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Brock, R. Lillian; Chalmers, Agnes F.; Dickey, Edward W. (1922) *Christian Science War Time Activities*, Boston, USA: Christian Science Publishing Society.
- Buckley, 'The Absurd Paradox of Christian Science' (1901) *The North American Review*, Vol. 173, pp.22-34.
- Butler, Judith ([1990] 1999) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, New York: Routledge.
- Clemens, C. (1956) *Awake to a Perfect Day: My Experiences with Christian Science*, New York: The Citadel Press.
- DiRita, V.J. (2000) *Genomics Happens*, Science: 289.
- Dresser, H.W. (1921) *The Quimby Manuscript, Showing the Discovery of Spiritual Healing and the Origin of Christian Science*, New York: Thomas Y. Cromwell Co.
- Eddy, Mary Baker ([1875] 1910) *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

Eddy, Mary Baker (1887) *The Unity of Good*, Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company, 1887.

Eddy, Mary Baker (1898) *Christian Science versus Pantheism*, Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

Eddy, Mary Baker (1891a) *No and Yes*, Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

Eddy, Mary Baker (1891b) *Rudimental Divine Science*, Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

Eddy ([1895] 1908) *Christian Science*, Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company

Eddy, Mary Baker (1896) *Manual of the Mother Church*, Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

Eddy, Mary Baker (1897) *Miscellaneous Writings 1883-1896*, Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

Eddy, Mary Baker (1901) *Retrospection and Introspection*, Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

Eddy, Mary Baker (1908) *The First Church of Christ, Scientist, and Miscellany*, Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

Eddy, Mary Baker (1895) *Pulpit and Press* Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

Eddy, Mary Baker (1898) *Christian Science versus Pantheism* Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

Eddy, Mary Baker (1900) *Message to the Mother Church, 1900* Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

Eddy, Mary Baker (1901) *Message to the Mother Church, 1901* Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

Eddy, Mary Baker (1902) *Message to the Mother Church, 1902* Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

- Eddy, Mary Baker (1886) *Christian Healing* Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.
- Eddy, Mary Baker (1883) *The People's Idea of God* Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.
- Eddy, Mary Baker (1894) *Poems; Christ and Christmas* Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.
- Einstein, Albert (1905) 'Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper', in *Annalen der Physik*. 17:891, 1905)
- Enfield, William (1791) *The History of Philosophy*, London: J. Johnson
- Evans, W.F. (1869) *The Mental-Cure, Illustrating the Influence of the Mind on the Body, Both in Health and Disease, and the Psychological Method of Treatment*, Boston: Carter, 1869.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, (1836) *Nature*, Boston: James Munroe and Co.
- Fichte, J.G. ([1799] 1987) *The Vocation of Man*, trans. P.Preuss, Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Fox, Matthew (1996) *Confessions: The Making of a Post-Denominational Priest*, North Atlantic Books.
- Gill, G. (1998) *Mary Baker Eddy*, Da Capo Press, 1998.
- Gotshalk, D. W. (1930) "McTaggart on Time", *Mind* 39(153): 26–42.
- Gottschalk, S. (1973) *The Emergence of Christian Science in American Religious Life*, Berkeley: Univ. Of California Press.
- Gottschalk, S. (2006) *Rolling Away the Stone*, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Grodzins, Dean (2002) *American Heretic: Theodore Parker and Transcendentalism*, Chapel Hill and London: Univ of North Carolina Press
- Gura, Philip (2007) 'The Transcendentalist Commotion', *New England Review* 2007, Vol. 28, No.3, 50-78
- Hammond, E.H. (1899) 'Christian Science: What it is and What it Does', *The Christian*

- Science Journal* 17 (7) 464, Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company, 1899.
- Hegel, G.W.F. ([1807] 1977) *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. Arnold V. Miller Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hopkins, E. Curtiss (1888) *First Lessons in Christian Science*, Chicago: Purdy, 1888.
- Ingthorsson, R. D. (2016) *McTaggart's Paradox*, New York: Routledge.
- Ingthorsson, R. D. (1998) "McTaggart and the Unreality of Time", *Axiomathes* 9(3): 287–306.
- Ingthorsson, R. D. (2001) "Temporal Parity and the Problem of Change", *SATS–Nordic Journal of Philosophy* 2(2): 60–79.
- Lewis, C.S. (1952) *Mere Christianity*, London: Collins.
- Lipton, Bruce H. (2005) *The Biology of Belief*, Carlsbad, California: Hay House.
- MacIntosh, Douglas Clyde (1919) *Theology as an Empirical Science*, Milton Keynes: Bibliolife.
- Malebranche, N., *Œuvres complètes de Malebranche* (20 volumes), A. Robinet (ed.) (1958-1984) Paris: J. Vrin.
- Malebranche [OC], 2:316
- Malebranche, N., *Dialogues on Metaphysics*, W. Doney (trans.) (1980) New York: Abaris Books.

- Malebranche, N., *Nature of God*, D. A. Iorio (trans.) (1980) Washington, DC: Catholic University Press.
- Malebranche, N. (1993) *Treatise on Ethics*, C. Walton (trans.) Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Malebranche, N. (1997) *Dialogues on Metaphysics and on Religion*, N. Jolley and D. Scott (trans.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malebranche, N. (1980) *The Search after Truth*, T. M. Lennon and P. J. Olscamp (trans.) Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Martin, G. (1955) *Kant's Metaphysics and Theory of Science*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- McCorkle, Rev. W.P. (1899) *Christian Science, or the False Christ of 1866*, Richmond, Virginia: Whittet and Shepperson.
- McTaggart, J.M.E (1927) *The Nature of Existence Vol.2*, London: Cambridge University Press.
- McTaggart, J. M. E. (1908) "The Unreality of Time", *Mind* 17: 457–73, 1908.
- Mesmer, F. (1779) *Memoire sur la decouverte du magnetisme animal*, Dido: Genf and Paris.
- Nenneman, R.A. (1997) *Persistent Pilgrim: The Life of Mary Baker Eddy*, Nebbadoon Press.
- Orcutt, W.D. (1950) *Mary Baker Eddy and Her Books*, Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.
- Patterson, Charles Brook (1905) *What the New Thought Stands For*, New York: Oscawana on Hudson.
- Polkinghorne, (1988) *Science and Creation*, London: SPCK
- Powell, Lyman, P. (1930)
- Putnam, H. (2012) 'How to be a Sophisticated Naive Realist' in *Philosophy in an Age of Science*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012.

- Raff, C. (1966) 'Introspection and Incorrability', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* Vol 27, No.1, 1966.
- Rosenau, Milton J. (1919) "Experiments to Determine Mode of Spread of Influenza," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 73, no. 5, 313.
- Rucker, Rudy (1982) *Infinity and the Mind: The Science and Philosophy of the Infinite*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Russell, Bertrand ([1903] 1996) *The Principles of Mathematics* 2nd. ed. Reprint, New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Satter, Beryl (1999) *Each Mind a Kingdom*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press
- Schelling, F.W.J. ([1800] 1978) *System of Transcendental Idealism*, translated by P. Heath, introduction M. Vater, Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Sheldon, Georgina (1904) *Katherine's Sheaves*, New York: The Federal Book Club.
- Shepherd, Odell ed. (1938) *The Journals of Bronson Alcott*, Boston: Little, Brown.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1851) *Parega and Paralipomena Vol.1*, Reprint: (Oxford: Clarendon Press) (2 vols., 1974) (English translation by E. F. J. Payne)
- Siewers, Paul (2019) 'How Christian Science Became A Dying Religion', *The Federalist* April 11, 2019
- Smith, Nicholas J. J. (2011) "Inconsistency in the A-Theory", *Philosophical Studies* 156: 231–47.
- Stark, R. (1998) 'The Rise and Fall of Christian Science', *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, Vol.13 1998 Issue 2 pp. 189-214
- Steiger, H.W. (1946) *A philosophical investigation of the doctrine of Christian Science*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston University.
- Steiger, H.W. (1948) *Christian Science and Philosophy*, New York: Philosophical Library.
- Thomas, Emily (2018) *Early Modern Women on Metaphysics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Torrance, Thomas F. (1969) *Theological Science*, London: Oxford University Press.

Twain, M. (1907) *Christian Science*, New York and London: Harper Brothers.

Twain, M. (1916) No. 44, *The Mysterious Stranger*, New York: Harper Brothers.

Voorhees, Amy (2021) *A New Christian Identity*, Chapel Hill and London: Univ. of North Carolina Press.

Watson, J. B. (1913) 'Psychology as the Behaviorist views it', *Psychological Review*, 20(2), 158–177.

Wilbur, Sibyl (1913) *The Life of Mary Baker Eddy* (4th edition), Boston: Christian Science Publishing Company.

Wilcox, M. (1941) *Association Address*, Healing Unlimited Association.

Wolcott, P.C. (1896) *What is Christian Science?* New York: Revell

Appendix 1 Glossary of terms in Christian Science

It is very important to fully appreciate the sometimes radical differences between the conventional meaning of many theological terms and Eddy's usage of them. Perhaps even more importantly, this difference also extends to words borrowed from natural language, but repurposed by her to an equal or even greater extent.

Where this tendency would lead to possible misunderstandings, in the main text of this thesis the novel usage is flagged up, and a brief explanation of Eddy's meaning in each case. The following is taken from Chapter 17 of *Science and Health* (Eddy 1910, pp.579-599), and provides many excellent examples of Eddy's inventiveness and courageousness.

ABEL. Watchfulness; self-offering; surrendering to the creator the early fruits of experience.

ABRAHAM. Fidelity; faith in the divine Life and in the eternal Principle of being.

This patriarch illustrated the purpose of Love to create trust in good, and showed the life-preserving power of spiritual understanding.

ADAM. Error; a falsity; the belief in "original sin," sickness, and death; evil; the opposite of good, - of God and His creation; a curse; a belief in intelligent matter, finiteness, and mortality; "dust to dust;" red sandstone; nothingness; the first god of mythology; not God's man, who represents the one God and is His own image and likeness; the opposite of Spirit and His creations; that which is not the image and likeness of good,

but a material belief, opposed to the one Mind, or Spirit;
a so-called finite mind, producing other minds, thus making
"gods many and lords many" (I Corinthians viii. 5);
a product of nothing as the mimicry of something; an
unreality as opposed to the great reality of spiritual existence
and creation; a so-called man, whose origin,
substance, and mind are found to be the antipode of
God, or Spirit; an inverted image of Spirit; the image
and likeness of what God has not created, namely, mat-
ter, sin, sickness, and death; the opposer of Truth,
termed error; Life's counterfeit, which ultimates in
death; the opposite of Love, called hate; the usurper
of Spirit's creation, called self-creative matter; immortality's
opposite, mortality; that of which wisdom saith,
"Thou shalt surely die."

The name Adam represents the false supposition that
Life is not eternal, but has beginning and end; that the
infinite enters the finite, that intelligence passes into non-
intelligence, and that Soul dwells in material sense; that
immortal Mind results in matter, and matter in mortal
mind; that the one God and creator entered what He created,
and then disappeared in the atheism of matter.

ADVERSARY. An adversary is one who opposes, denies,
disputes, not one who constructs and sustains reality and

Truth. Jesus said of the devil, "He was a murderer from the beginning, . . . he is a liar and the father of it."

This view of Satan is confirmed by the name often conferred upon him in Scripture, the "adversary."

ALMIGHTY. All-power; infinity; omnipotence.

ANGELS. God's thoughts passing to man; spiritual intuitions, pure and perfect; the inspiration of goodness, purity, and immortality, counteracting all evil, sensuality, and mortality.

ARK. Safety; the idea, or reflection, of Truth, proved to be as immortal as its Principle; the understanding of Spirit, destroying belief in matter.

God and man coexistent and eternal; Science showing that the spiritual realities of all things are created by Him and exist forever. The ark indicates temptation overcome and followed by exaltation.

ASHER (Jacob's son). Hope and faith; spiritual compensation; the ills of the flesh rebuked.

BABEL. Self-destroying error; a kingdom divided against itself, which cannot stand; material knowledge.

The higher false knowledge builds on the basis of evidence obtained from the five corporeal senses, the more confusion ensues, and the more certain is the downfall of its structure.

BAPTISM. Purification by Spirit; submergence in

Spirit.

We are "willing rather to be absent from the body,
and to be present with the Lord." (II Corinthians v. 8.)

BELIEVING. Firmness and constancy; not a faltering
nor a blind faith, but the perception of spiritual Truth.

Mortal thoughts, illusion.

BENJAMIN (Jacob's son). A physical belief as to life,
substance, and mind; human knowledge, or so-called
mortal mind, devoted to matter; pride; envy; fame;
illusion; a false belief; error masquerading as the possessor
of life, strength, animation, and power to act.

Renewal of affections; self-offering; an improved
state of mortal mind; the introduction of a more spiritual
origin; a gleam of the infinite idea of the infinite Prin-
ciple; a spiritual type; that which comforts, consoles,
and supports.

BRIDE. Purity and innocence, conceiving man in the
idea of God; a sense of Soul, which has spiritual bliss
and enjoys but cannot suffer.

BRIDEGROOM. Spiritual understanding; the pure con-
sciousness that God, the divine Principle, creates man
as His own spiritual idea, and that God is the only creative
power.

BURIAL. Corporeality and physical sense put out of
sight and hearing; annihilation. Submergence in Spirit;

immortality brought to light.

CANAAN (the son of Ham). A sensuous belief; the testimony of what is termed material sense; the error which would make man mortal and would make mortal mind a slave to the body.

CHILDREN. The spiritual thoughts and representatives of Life, Truth, and Love.

Sensual and mortal beliefs; counterfeits of creation, whose better originals are God's thoughts, not in embryo, but in maturity; material suppositions of life, substance, and intelligence, opposed to the Science of being.

CHILDREN OF ISRAEL. The representatives of Soul, not corporeal sense; the offspring of Spirit, who, having wrestled with error, sin, and sense, are governed by divine Science; some of the ideas of God beheld as men, casting out error and healing the sick; Christ's offspring.

CHRIST. The divine manifestation of God, which comes to the flesh to destroy incarnate error.

CHURCH. The structure of Truth and Love; whatever rests upon and proceeds from divine Principle.

The Church is that institution, which affords proof of its utility and is found elevating the race, rousing the dormant understanding from material beliefs to the apprehension of spiritual ideas and the demonstration of divine Science, thereby casting out devils, or error, and

healing the sick.

CREATOR. Spirit; Mind; intelligence; the animating divine Principle of all that is real and good; self-existent Life, Truth, and Love; that which is perfect and eternal; the opposite of matter and evil, which have no Principle; God, who made all that was made and could not create an atom or an element the opposite of Himself.

DAN (Jacob's son). Animal magnetism; so-called mortal mind controlling mortal mind; error, working out the designs of error; one belief preying upon another.

DAY. The irradiance of Life; light, the spiritual idea of Truth and Love.

"And the evening and the morning were the first day."

(Genesis i. 5.) The objects of time and sense disappear in the illumination of spiritual understanding, and Mind measures time according to the good that is unfolded.

This unfolding is God's day, and "there shall be no night there."

DEATH. An illusion, the lie of life in matter; the unreal and untrue; the opposite of Life.

Matter has no life, hence it has no real existence. Mind is immortal. The flesh, warring against Spirit; that which frets itself free from one belief only to be fettered by another, until every belief of life where Life is not yields to eternal Life. Any material evidence of death is

false, for it contradicts the spiritual facts of being.

DEVIL. Evil; a lie; error; neither corporeality nor mind; the opposite of Truth; a belief in sin, sickness, and death; animal magnetism or hypnotism; the lust of the flesh, which saith: "I am life and intelligence in matter. There is more than one mind, for I am mind, - a wicked mind, self-made or created by a tribal god and put into the opposite of mind, termed matter, thence to reproduce a mortal universe, including man, not after the image and likeness of Spirit, but after its own image."

DOVE. A symbol of divine Science; purity and peace; hope and faith.

DUST. Nothingness; the absence of substance, life, or intelligence.

EARS. Not organs of the so-called corporeal senses, but spiritual understanding.

Jesus said, referring to spiritual perception, "Having ears, hear ye not?" (Mark viii. 18.)

EARTH. A sphere; a type of eternity and immortality, which are likewise without beginning or end.

To material sense, earth is matter; to spiritual sense, it is a compound idea.

ELIAS. Prophecy; spiritual evidence opposed to material sense; Christian Science, with which can be discerned the spiritual fact of whatever the material senses behold;

the basis of immortality.

"Elias truly shall first come and restore all things."

(Matthew xvii. 11.)

EUPHRATES (river). Divine Science encompassing the universe and man; the true idea of God; a type of the glory which is to come; metaphysics taking the place of physics; the reign of righteousness. The atmosphere of human belief before it accepts sin, sickness, or death; a state of mortal thought, the only error of which is limitation; finity; the opposite of infinity.

EVE. A beginning; mortality; that which does not last forever; a finite belief concerning life, substance, and intelligence in matter; error; the belief that the human race originated materially instead of spiritually, - that man started first from dust, second from a rib, and third from an egg.

EVENING. Mistiness of mortal thought; weariness of mortal mind; obscured views; peace and rest.

EYES. Spiritual discernment, - not material but mental. Jesus said, thinking of the outward vision, "Having eyes, see ye not?" (Mark viii. 18.)

FAN. Separator of fable from fact; that which gives action to thought.

FATHER. Eternal Life; the one Mind; the divine Principle, commonly called God.

FEAR. Heat; inflammation; anxiety; ignorance; error; desire; caution.

FIRE. Fear; remorse; lust; hatred; destruction; affliction purifying and elevating man.

FIRMAMENT. Spiritual understanding; the scientific line of demarcation between Truth and error, between Spirit and so-called matter.

FLESH. An error of physical belief; a supposition that life, substance, and intelligence are in matter; an illusion; a belief that matter has sensation.

GAD (Jacob's son). Science; spiritual being understood; haste towards harmony.

GETHSEMANE. Patient woe; the human yielding to the divine; love meeting no response, but still remaining love.

GHOST. An illusion; a belief that mind is outlined and limited; a supposition that spirit is finite.

GIHON (river). The rights of woman acknowledged morally, civilly, and socially.

GOD. The great I AM; the all-knowing, all-seeing, all-acting, all-wise, all-loving, and eternal; Principle; Mind; Soul; Spirit; Life; Truth; Love; all substance; intelligence.

GODS. Mythology; a belief that life, substance, and intelligence are both mental and material; a supposition

of sentient physicality; the belief that infinite Mind is in finite forms; the various theories that hold mind to be a material sense, existing in brain, nerve, matter; supposititious minds, or souls, going in and out of matter, erring and mortal; the serpents of error, which say, "Ye shall be as gods."

God is one God, infinite and perfect, and cannot become finite and imperfect.

GOOD. God; Spirit; omnipotence; omniscience; omnipresence; omni-action.

HAM (Noah's son). Corporeal belief; sensuality; slavery; tyranny.

HEART. Mortal feelings, motives, affections, joys, and sorrows.

HEAVEN. Harmony; the reign of Spirit; government by divine Principle; spirituality; bliss; the atmosphere of Soul.

HELL. Mortal belief; error; lust; remorse; hatred; revenge; sin; sickness; death; suffering and self-destruction, self-imposed agony; effects of sin; that which "worketh abomination or maketh a lie."

HIDDEKEL (river). Divine Science understood and acknowledged.

HOLY GHOST. Divine Science; the development of eternal Life, Truth, and Love.

I, or EGO. Divine Principle; Spirit; Soul; incorporeal, unerring, immortal, and eternal Mind.

There is but one I, or Us, but one divine Principle, or Mind, governing all existence; man and woman unchanged forever in their individual characters, even as numbers which never blend with each other, though they are governed by one Principle. All the objects of God's creation reflect one Mind, and whatever reflects not this one Mind, is false and erroneous, even the belief that life, substance, and intelligence are both mental and material.

I AM. God; incorporeal and eternal Mind; divine Principle; the only Ego.

IN. A term obsolete in Science if used with reference to Spirit, or Deity.

INTELLIGENCE. Substance; self-existent and eternal Mind; that which is never unconscious nor limited.

ISSACHAR (Jacob's son). A corporeal belief; the offspring of error; envy; hatred; selfishness; self-will; lust.

JACOB. A corporeal mortal embracing duplicity, repentance, sensualism. Inspiration; the revelation of Science, in which the so-called material senses yield to the spiritual sense of Life and Love.

JAPHET (Noah's son). A type of spiritual peace, flowing from the understanding that God is the divine Principle of all existence, and that man is His idea, the child of His care.

JERUSALEM. Mortal belief and knowledge obtained from the five corporeal senses; the pride of power and the power of pride; sensuality; envy; oppression; tyranny. Home, heaven.

JESUS. The highest human corporeal concept of the divine idea, rebuking and destroying error and bringing to light man's immortality.

JOSEPH. A corporeal mortal; a higher sense of Truth rebuking mortal belief, or error, and showing the immortality and supremacy of Truth; pure affection blessing its enemies.

JUDAH. A corporeal material belief progressing and disappearing; the spiritual understanding of God and man appearing.

KINGDOM OF HEAVEN. The reign of harmony in divine Science; the realm of unerring, eternal, and omnipotent Mind; the atmosphere of Spirit, where Soul is supreme.

KNOWLEDGE. Evidence obtained from the five corporeal senses; mortality; beliefs and opinions; human theories, doctrines, hypotheses; that which is not divine and is the origin of sin, sickness, and death; the opposite

of spiritual Truth and understanding.

LAMB OF GOD. The spiritual idea of Love; self-immolation; innocence and purity; sacrifice.

LEVI (Jacob's son). A corporeal and sensual belief; mortal man; denial of the fulness of God's creation; ecclesiastical despotism.

LORD. In the Hebrew, this term is sometimes employed as a title, which has the inferior sense of master, or ruler. In the Greek, the word *kurios* almost always has this lower sense, unless specially coupled with the name God. Its higher signification is Supreme Ruler.

LORD GOD. Jehovah.

This double term is not used in the first chapter of Genesis, the record of spiritual creation. It is introduced in the second and following chapters, when the spiritual sense of God and of infinity is disappearing from the recorder's thought, - when the true scientific statements of the Scriptures become clouded through a physical sense of God as finite and corporeal. From this follow idolatry and mythology, - belief in many gods, or material intelligences, as the opposite of the one Spirit, or intelligence, named Elohim, or God.

MAN. The compound idea of infinite Spirit; the spiritual image and likeness of God; the full representation of Mind.

MATTER. Mythology; mortality; another name for mortal mind; illusion; intelligence, substance, and life in non-intelligence and mortality; life resulting in death, and death in life; sensation in the sensationless; mind originating in matter; the opposite of Truth; the opposite of Spirit; the opposite of God; that of which immortal Mind takes no cognizance; that which mortal mind sees, feels, hears, tastes, and smells only in belief.

MIND. The only I, or Us; the only Spirit, Soul, divine Principle, substance, Life, Truth, Love; the one God; not that which is/ in/ man, but the divine Principle, or God, of whom man is the full and perfect expression; Deity, which outlines but is not outlined.

MIRACLE. That which is divinely natural, but must be learned humanly; a phenomenon of Science.

MORNING. Light; symbol of Truth; revelation and progress.

MORTAL MIND. Nothing claiming to be something, for Mind is immortal; mythology; error creating other errors; a suppositional material sense, alias the belief that sensation is in matter, which is sensationless; a belief that life, substance, and intelligence are in and of matter; the opposite of Spirit, and therefore the opposite of God, or good; the belief that life has a beginning and therefore an end; the belief that man is the off-

spring of mortals; the belief that there can be more than one creator; idolatry; the subjective states of error; material senses; that which neither exists in Science nor can be recognized by the spiritual sense; sin; sickness; death.

MOSES. A corporeal mortal; moral courage; a type of moral law and the demonstration thereof; the proof that, without the gospel, - the union of justice and affection, - there is something spiritually lacking, since justice demands penalties under the law.

MOTHER. God; divine and eternal Principle; Life, Truth, and Love.

NEW JERUSALEM. Divine Science; the spiritual facts and harmony of the universe; the kingdom of heaven, or reign of harmony.

NIGHT. Darkness; doubt; fear.

NOAH. A corporeal mortal; knowledge of the nothingness of material things and of the immortality of all that is spiritual.

OIL. Consecration; charity; gentleness; prayer; heavenly inspiration.

PHARISEE. Corporeal and sensuous belief; self-righteousness; vanity; hypocrisy.

PISON (river). The love of the good and beautiful, and their immortality.

PROPHET. A spiritual seer; disappearance of material sense before the conscious facts of spiritual Truth.

PURSE. Laying up treasures in matter; error.

RED DRAGON. Error; fear; inflammation; sensuality; subtlety; animal magnetism; envy; revenge.

RESURRECTION. Spiritualization of thought; a new and higher idea of immortality, or spiritual existence; material belief yielding to spiritual understanding.

REUBEN (Jacob's son). Corporeality; sensuality; delusion; mortality; error.

RIVER. Channel of thought.

When smooth and unobstructed, it typifies the course of Truth; but muddy, foaming, and dashing, it is a type of error.

ROCK. Spiritual foundation; Truth. Coldness and stubbornness.

SALVATION. Life, Truth, and Love understood and demonstrated as supreme over all; sin, sickness, and death destroyed.

SEAL. The signet of error revealed by Truth

SERPENT (*ophis*, in Greek; *nacash*, in Hebrew).

Subtlety; a lie; the opposite of Truth, named error; the first statement of mythology and idolatry; the belief

in more than one God; animal magnetism; the first lie of limitation; finity; the first claim that there is an opposite of Spirit, or good, termed matter, or evil; the first delusion that error exists as fact; the first claim that sin, sickness, and death are the realities of life. The first audible claim that God was not omnipotent and that there was another power, named evil, which was as real and eternal as God, good.

SHEEP. Innocence; inoffensiveness; those who follow their leader.

SHEM (Noah's son). A corporeal mortal; kindly affection; love rebuking error; reproof of sensualism.

SON. The Son of God, the Messiah or Christ. The son of man, the offspring of the flesh. " Son of a year."

SPIRIT. Divine substance; Mind; divine Principle; all that is good; God; that only which is perfect, everlasting, omnipresent, omnipotent, infinite.

SPIRITS. Mortal beliefs; corporeality; evil minds; supposed intelligences, or gods; the opposites of God; errors; hallucinations.

SUN. The symbol of Soul governing man, - of Truth, Life, and Love.

SWORD. The idea of Truth; justice. Revenge; anger.

TARES. Mortality; error; sin; sickness; disease;

death.

TEMPLE. Body; the idea of Life, substance, and intelligence; the superstructure of Truth; the shrine of Love; a material superstructure, where mortals congregate for worship.

THUMMIM. Perfection; the eternal demand of divine Science.

The Urim and Thummim, which were to be on Aaron's breast when he went before Jehovah, were holiness and purification of thought and deed, which alone can fit us for the office of spiritual teaching.

TIME. Mortal measurements; limits, in which are summed tip all human acts, thoughts, beliefs, opinions, knowledge; matter; error; that which begins before, and continues after, what is termed death, until the mortal disappears and spiritual perfection appears.

TITHE. Contribution; tenth part; homage; gratitude. A sacrifice to the gods.

UNCLEANLINESS. Impure thoughts; error; sin; dirt.

UNGODLINESS. Opposition to the divine Principle and its spiritual idea.

UNKNOWN. That which spiritual sense alone comprehends, and which is unknown to the material senses.

Paganism and agnosticism may define Deity as "the great unknowable;" but Christian Science brings God

much nearer to man, and makes Him better known as the All-in-all, forever near.

Paul saw in Athens an altar dedicated "to the unknown God." Referring to it, he said to the Athenians: "Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you."
(Acts xvii. 23.)

URIM. Light.

The rabbins believed that the stones in the breastplate of the high-priest had supernatural illumination, but Christian Science reveals Spirit, not matter, as the illuminator of all. The illuminations of Science give us a sense of the nothingness of error, and they show the spiritual inspiration of Love and Truth to be the only fit preparation for admission to the presence and power of the Most High.

VALLEY. Depression; meekness; darkness.

"Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil." (Psalm xxiii.4.)

Though the way is dark in mortal sense, divine Life and Love illumine it, destroy the unrest of mortal thought, the fear of death, and the supposed reality of error. Christian Science, contradicting sense, maketh the valley to bud and blossom as the rose.

VEIL. A cover; concealment; hiding; hypocrisy.

The Jewish women wore veils over their faces in token

of reverence and submission and in accordance with
Pharisaical notions.

The Judaic religion consisted mostly of rites and ceremonies.

The motives and affections of a man were of
little value, if only he appeared unto men to fast. The
great Nazarene, as meek as he was mighty, rebuked the
hypocrisy, which offered long petitions for blessings upon
material methods, but cloaked the crime, latent in thought,
which was ready to spring into action and crucify God's
anointed. The martyrdom of Jesus was the culminating
sin of Pharisaism. It rent the veil of the temple. It re-
vealed the false foundations and superstructures of superficial
religion, tore from bigotry and superstition their
coverings, and opened the sepulchre with divine Science,
- immortality and Love.

WILDERNESS. Loneliness; doubt; darkness. Spontaneity
of thought and idea; the vestibule in which a
material sense of things disappears, and spiritual sense
unfolds the great facts of existence.

WILL. The motive-power of error; mortal belief; ani-
mal power. The might and wisdom of God.

"For this is the will of God." (I Thessalonians
iv. 3.) Will, as a quality of so-called mortal mind, is a wrongdoer;
hence it should not be confounded with the term
as applied to Mind or to one of God's qualities.

WIND. That which indicates the might of omnipotence and the movements of God's spiritual government, encompassing all things. Destruction; anger; mortal passions.

The Greek word for 'wind' (*pneuma*) is used also for 'spirit', as in the passage in John's Gospel, the third chapter, where we read: "The wind [*pneuma*] bloweth where it listeth So is every one that is born of the Spirit [*pneuma*]." Here the original word is the same in both cases, yet it has received different translations, as in other passages in this same chapter and elsewhere in the New Testament. This shows how our Master had constantly to employ words of material significance in order to unfold spiritual thoughts. In the record of Jesus' supposed death, we read: "He bowed his head, and gave up the ghost;" but this word 'ghost' is *pneuma*. It might be translated 'wind' or 'air', and the phrase is equivalent to our common statement, "He breathed his last." What Jesus gave up was indeed air, an etherealized form of matter, for never did he give up Spirit, or Soul.

WINE. Inspiration; understanding. Error; fornication; temptation; passion.

YEAR. A solar measurement of time; mortality; space for repentance.

"One day is with the Lord as a thousand years."

(II Peter iii. 8.)

One moment of divine consciousness, or the spiritual understanding of Life and Love, is a foretaste of eternity.

This exalted view, obtained and retained when the Science of being is understood, would bridge over with life discerned spiritually the interval of death, and man would be in the full consciousness of his immortality and eternal harmony, where sin, sickness, and death are unknown. Time is a mortal thought, the divisor of which is the solar year. Eternity is God's measurement of Soulfilled years.

YOU. As applied to corporeality, a mortal; finity.

ZEAL. The reflected animation of Life, Truth, and

Love. Blind enthusiasm; mortal will.

ZION. Spiritual foundation and superstructure; inspiration; spiritual strength. Emptiness; unfaithfulness; desolation.

Appendix 2 More patient outcomes: subjective and objective medical evidence

This section provides a subset of the patient outcomes described in Chapter 18 of *Science and Health* (Eddy 1910, pp.600-700), which is of course itself a subset. The testimonies below constitute less than 0.0001% of those which have been meticulously collected and archived by the Christian Science church over what is now a 150-year period.

RHEUMATISM HEALED

I was a great sufferer from a serious form of rheumatic trouble, my hands being affected to such an extent that it was impossible for me even to dress without assistance. The trouble finally reached the knees, and I became very lame and had to be assisted in and out of bed. I went to the different health resorts for the benefit I hoped to derive from the baths and waters that were prescribed by physicians, but found no permanent relief. I was placed under an X-ray examination, and was told that the joints were becoming ossified. I then consulted a celebrated specialist, who after a thorough examination said my condition would continue to grow worse and that I would become completely helpless.

At that time a copy of *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures* by Mrs. Eddy was loaned me. I read it more from curiosity than with the thought of any physical benefit. As the truth was unfolded to me, I realized that the mental condition was what needed correcting, and that the Spirit of truth which inspired this book was my physician. My healing is complete, and the liberation in thought is manifest in a life

of active usefulness rather than the bondage of helpless invalidism and suffering. I owe to our beloved Leader, Mrs. Eddy, gratitude which words cannot express. Her revelation of the practical rather than the merely theoretical application of Jesus' words, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," proved to be my redeemer. I did not even have to apply to a practitioner, but am most grateful for the helpful words of loving friends. - E. B. B., Pasadena, Cal.

ASTIGMATISM AND HERNIA HEALED

It is nearly five years since I bought my first copy of Science and Health, the reading of which cured me of chronic constipation, nervous headache, astigmatism, and hernia, in less than four months.

Where would I be now, had not this blessed truth been brought to me by much persuasion of a very dear friend?

I certainly should have been deep in the slough of despond, if not in the grave. Am I truly thankful for all the good that has come to me and mine? I try to let my works testify of that; but to those whom I do not meet in person, I can truly say, Yes; I am indeed more thankful than words can express for the glorious healing that has come to me, both physical, mental, and moral, and I also convey herein, my song of gratitude to the dear Leader who has through her fidelity to Truth enabled me to touch at least the hem of Christ's garment. - B. S. J., Sioux City, Iowa.

SUBSTANCE OF LUNGS RESTORED

It was about fifteen years ago that Christian Science first came to my notice. At that time I had been a chronic invalid for a good

many years. I had acute bowel trouble, bronchitis, and a number of other troubles. One physician had told me that my lungs were like wet paper, ready to tear at any time, and I was filled with fear, as my mother, two brothers, and a sister had been victims of consumption. I tried many physicians and every material remedy that promised help, but no help came until I found a copy of Mrs. Eddy's book, *Science and Health*. The book was placed in my hands by one who did not then appreciate it, and I was told that it would be hard for me to understand it. I commenced reading it with this thought, but I caught beautiful glimpses of Truth, which took away my fear and healed me of all those diseases, and they have never returned.

I would also like to tell how I was healed of a sprained ankle. The accident occurred in the morning, and all that day and during the night I gave myself Christian Science treatment, as best I could. The next morning it seemed to be no better, being very sore, badly swollen, and much discolored. Feeling that I had done all I could, I decided to stop thinking about it. I took my copy of *Science and Health* and began reading. Very soon I became so absorbed in the book 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. After two hours I laid the book down and walked into another room. When next I thought of my ankle, I found it was not hurting me. The swelling had gone down, the black and blue appearance had nearly vanished, and it was perfectly well. It was healed while I was "absent from the body" and "present with the Lord." This experience was worth a great deal to me, for it showed me how the healing is done.

- C. H., Portland, Ore.

FIBROID TUMOR HEALED IN A FEW DAYS

My gratitude for Christian Science is boundless. I was afflicted with a fibroid tumor which weighed not less than fifty pounds, attended by a continuous hemorrhage for eleven years. The tumor was a growth of eighteen years.

I lived in Fort Worth, Tex., and I had never heard of Christian Science before leaving there for Chicago in the year 1887. I had tried to live near to God, and I feel sure He guided me in all my steps to this healing and saving truth. After being there several weeks I received letters from a Texas lady who had herself been healed, and who wrote urging me to try Christian Science.

Changing my boarding-place, I met a lady who owned a copy of Science and Health, and in speaking to her of having seen the book, she informed me she had one, and she got it and told me I could read it. The revelation was marvelous and brought a great spiritual awakening. This awakened sense never left me, and one day when walking alone it came to me very suddenly that I was healed, and I walked the faster declaring every step that I was healed. When I reached my boarding-place, I found my hostess and told her I was healed. She looked the picture of amazement. The tumor began to disappear at once, the hemorrhage ceased, and perfect strength was manifest.

There was no joy ever greater than mine for this Christ-cure, for I was very weary and heavy laden. I thought very little of either sleeping or eating, and my heart was filled with gratitude, since I knew I had

touched the hem of his garment.

I must add that the reading of Science and Health, and that alone, healed me, and it was the second copy I ever saw. - S. L., Fort Worth, Tex.

INSANITY AND EPILEPSY HEALED

While an inmate of the State asylum for the insane at Middletown, Conn., an epileptic, and at times confined to my bed with bilious attacks, pronounced incurable by the doctors (at least six in number), the book, Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, by Mrs. Eddy was placed in my hands. After reading a few pages, I became very much impressed with the truth therein stated, and although I was surrounded with opposition, I knew that "underneath are the everlasting arms."

Since that time - past the middle of the year 1899 - I have kept pressing on, until I have been healed by reading Science and Health. At times I was beset by what seemed unconquerable opposition, until the first week in October, 1904, when, upon going to my home in Darien for a visit, I was given my liberty, and I am now earning my living in this city. After having been subject to epileptic attacks since 1892, and at one time pronounced dying by the doctor in charge, I am now well. I have had no fit, or symptoms of any, since the first week in May, 1904.

I trust that this testimony to the healing power of Truth, realized by reading Science and Health (for I had no treatment), may reach the eye of some to whom the battle seems long, and inspire them with fresh courage and a realization of the worth of the victory. I am filled with inexpressible gratitude and love to God, and to Mrs. Eddy. - Mrs. B. B.

C., Stamford, Conn.

A CASE OF MENTAL SURGERY

I have felt for some time I should give my experience in mental surgery.

In May, 1902, going home for lunch, on a bicycle, and while riding down a hill at a rapid gait, I was thrown from the wheel, and falling on my left side with my arm under my head, the bone was broken about half-way between the shoulder and elbow. While the pain was intense, I lay still in the dust, declaring the truth and denying that there could be a break or accident in the realm of divine Love, until a gentleman came to assist me, saying, he thought I had been stunned. I was only two and a half blocks from home, so I mounted my wheel again and managed to reach it. On arriving there I lay down and asked my little boy to bring me our textbook. He immediately brought Science and Health, which I read for about ten minutes, when all pain left.

I said nothing to my family of the accident, but attended to some duties and was about half an hour late in returning to the office, this being my only loss of time from work. My friends claimed that the arm had not been broken, as it would have been impossible for me to continue my work without having it set, and carrying it in a sling until the bone knit together. Their insistence almost persuaded me that I might have been mistaken, until one of my friends invited me to visit a physician's office where they were experimenting with an X-ray machine. The physician was asked to examine my left arm to see if it differed from the ordinary. On looking through it, he said, "Yes, it has been broken, but whoever set it made a perfect job of it, and you will never have any

further trouble from that break." My friend then asked the doctor to show how he could tell where the break had been. The doctor pointed out the place as being slightly thicker at that part, like a piece of steel that had been welded. This was the first of several cases of mental surgery that have come under my notice, and it made a deep impression on me.

For the benefit of others who may have something similar to meet, I will say that I have overcome almost constant attacks of sick headaches, extending back to my earliest recollection. - L. C. S., Salt Lake City, Utah.

CATARACT QUICKLY CURED

I wish to add my testimony to those of others, and hope that it may be the means of bringing some poor sufferer to health, to happiness, and to God. I was healed through simply reading this wonderful book, Science and Health. I had been troubled periodically for many years with sore eyes, and had been to many doctors, who called the disease iritis and cataract. They told me that my eyes would always give me trouble, and that I would eventually lose my sight if I remained in an office, and advised me to go under an operation. Later on I had to wear glasses at my work, also out of doors as I could not bear the winds, and my eyes were gradually becoming worse. I could not read for longer than a few minutes at a time, otherwise they would smart severely. I had to rest my eyes each evening to enable me to use them the next day; in fact gas-light was getting unbearable because of the pain, and I made home miserable. A dear brother told me about Christian Science, and said that

if I would read Science and Health it would help me. He procured for me the loan of the book. The first night I read it, it so interested me I quite forgot all about my eyes until my wife remarked that it was eleven o'clock. I found that I had been reading this book for nearly four hours, and I remarked immediately after, "I believe my eyes are cured," which was really the case. The next day, on looking at my eyes, my wife noticed that the cataract had disappeared. I put away my outdoor glasses, which I have not required since, and through the understanding gained by studying Christian Science I have been able to do away with my indoor glasses also, and have had no return of pain in my eyes since. This is now a year and a half ago. - G. F. S., Liverpool, England.

VALVULAR HEART DISEASE HEALED

Fourteen years ago my heart awoke to gratitude to God and the dear Leader at the same time. After a patient and persistent effort of three months' duration, to procure a copy of Science and Health (during which time I had visited every bookstore, and many of the second-hand bookstores in the city of St. Paul), and had failed to find it, I at last remembered that the stranger who told me I might be healed, had mentioned a name, and McVicker's Theatre Building in Chicago as being in some way connected with the work. I sent there for information regarding a book called Health and Science, and the return mail brought me the book, Science and Health, and in it I at once found sure promise of deliverance from valvular heart disease, with all the accompaniments, such as extreme nervousness, weakness, dyspepsia, and insomnia. I had suffered from these all my life, finding no permanent relief, even, in

material remedies, and no hope of cure at any time. Only those who have been healed in such bondage and have been liberated by the same means, can know the eager joy of the first perusal of that wonderful book.

Half a day's reading convinced me that I had found the way to holiness and health. I read on, thinking only of the spiritual enlightenment, content to wait until I should be led to some person who would heal me; but old things had passed away, and all things had become new. I was completely healed before I had met a Scientist, or one who knew anything about Christian Science, and before I had read a line of any other Christian Science literature except one leaf of a tract; so it is absolutely certain that the healing was entirely impersonal, as was also the teaching, which enabled me to begin at once demonstrating the power of Truth to destroy all forms of error. - E. J. W., North Yakima, Wash.

DEAF EARS UNSTOPPED

As a mother of a family my heart goes out in love and gratitude to that good woman we are privileged to call our Leader, for all she has done through her book for me and mine.

Ten years ago I was healed of hereditary deafness and catarrh of the head, simply through reading the book, Science and Health. For years previous I had consulted and taken treatment from some of the best specialists for the ear and throat, both in England and America, but grew worse all the time. I was then urged by a lady who had been healed through Christian Science to buy this book and study it. I did so very reluctantly, but had not read fifty pages before I felt I had indeed found the truth which makes free, and can truly say, from that time I

have never had a return of the ailment.

That for which I am, however, most grateful, is the daily help it is to me in my household of young children. I am sure if mothers only knew what Christian Science truly means they would give all they possess to know it. We have seen croup, measles, fever, and various other children's complaints, so-called, disappear like dew before the morning sun, through the application of Christian Science, - the understanding of God as ever-present and omnipotent. It has been proven to me without a doubt that God is a very present help in trouble, and what a blessed help this wonderful truth is in the training of our children, and how quickly the child grasps it.

Some time ago my little girl, then three years old, dislocated her shoulder. I was alone in the house at the time. The pain was so intense that she became faint. I treated her the best I knew how, but kept holding the thought that just as soon as some one came I would run for help. She seemed to grow worse and cried very much. I undressed her and tried to twist the arm into place, but it caused such suffering that I began to get afraid. Then like a flash came the thought, What would you do if you were out of the reach of a practitioner? Now is your time to prove God's power and presence. With these thoughts came such a sense of calm and trustfulness that I lost all fear. I then asked the child if I should read to her; she said "Yes, mamma, read the truth-book." I began reading aloud to her from Science and Health. In about half an hour I noticed she tried to lift the arm but screamed and became very pale. I continued to read aloud and again she made an effort to put some candy

into her mouth. This time I noticed with joy that she almost reached her mouth before she felt the pain. I kept reading aloud to her until my sister and two boys came in, when she jumped off her bed, so delighted to see her brothers that she forgot her arm. She then began to tell her aunt that she had broken her arm and mamma treated it with the truth-book. When this happened, it was about 10.30 A. M. and by 3 P. M. she was playing out doors as though nothing had ever happened. - Mrs. M. G., Winnipeg, Man.

SAVED FROM INSANITY AND SUICIDE

A few years ago, while under a sense of darkness and despair caused by ill health and an unhappy home, Science and Health was loaned me with a request that I should read it.

At that time my daughter was given up by /materia medica/ to die of lingering consumption, supposed to have been inherited. My own condition seemed even more alarming, as insanity was being manifested, and rather than go to an insane asylum, it seemed to me the only thing to do was to commit suicide. Heart trouble, kidney complaint, and continual headaches caused from female trouble were some of the many ailments I had to contend with. My doctor tried to persuade me to undergo an operation as a means of relief, but I had submitted to a severe operation ten years previous, and found only additional suffering as a result, so I would not consent.

When I began with Science and Health, I read the chapter on "Prayer" first, and at that time did not suppose it possible for me to remember anything I read, but felt a sweet sense of God's protection and power,

and a hope that I should at last find Him to be what I so much needed, - a present help in time of trouble. Before that chapter on "Prayer" was finished, my daughter was downstairs eating three meals a day, and daily growing stronger. Before I had finished reading the textbook she was well, but never having heard that the reading of Science and Health healed any one, it was several months before I gave God the glory.

One by one my many ailments left me, all but the headaches; they were less frequent, until at the end of three years the fear of them was entirely overcome.

Neither myself nor my daughter have ever received treatments, but the study of the Bible and Science and Health, the Christian Science textbook by Mrs. Eddy, has healed us and keeps us well.

While Christian Science was very new to me, I attended an experience meeting in First Church of Christ, Scientist, Chicago. A gentleman told of an unhappy woman who was about to separate from her husband. This gentleman had asked her if she did not love her husband. She replied, "No; when I married him I did, but not now." He told her God made man in His image and likeness, and that He is perfect. He said to her, "Go home and see only God's perfect man; you don't need to love a sinful mortal such as you have been looking upon." The lady followed his advice, as he told her there is no separation in divine Mind. In a short time peace and harmony were in her home, and both husband and wife became members of a Christian Science church.

This testimony was like a message from heaven to me. I had received many benefits from the study of Science and Health, but it had never dawned

upon my darkened consciousness till then how wonderful our God is. I knew what had taken place in that home could take place in my unhappy home where there was neither rest nor peace.

I hopefully took up my cross, and step by step my burden grew lighter, as I journeyed along, realizing the presence of the Christ, Truth, that indeed makes us free. Not all at once did any outward change appear, but at the end of three years all was peace, all the members of the family attending church together and realizing that there is but one Mind. - E. J. B., Superior, Wis.

STOMACH TROUBLE HEALED

I was healed of stomach trouble of many years' standing by reading Science and Health. My condition had reached the stage in which I had periodical attacks, that came on with greater frequency. I was a travelling salesman, and it was a common occurrence for me to have to call a physician to my hotel to administer morphine for an acute form of this disease. This became a regular thing at certain places, and these attacks always left me worse than before. As a result of the last one I lost a great deal in weight. I had tried many physicians and most of the usual remedies during these years of suffering, without any good result. Finally, as a last resort, I decided to try Christian Science, and I was healed by reading "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures" by Mrs. Eddy.

My health has been of the best since I was healed, now six years ago. In the family we have depended entirely on Christian Science for our healing, and have ever found it efficacious. We consider the physical

healing, however, only incidental to the understanding of God and His goodness. This, together with our increased love for the Bible, is proving most valuable to us. We are humbly trying to live the lives that will prove our gratitude to God, and to our beloved Leader, Mrs. Eddy. - Charles E. Peck, St. Johnsbury, Vt.

FREED FROM MANY YEARS OF SUFFERING

In the spring of 1880 I was taken down with a severe attack of stomach trouble, was bedfast for three months, and not able to drive out for nearly six months. During this time I had three good doctors treating me. I gained a little in strength, but had very little relief from the stomach trouble. I was recommended to try mineral springs and did so, but with the same disappointment. I went to a sanitarium, but yet the stomach trouble prevailed. I had some friends who recommended patent medicines, but no healing came.

I worried along in this way for several years. Finally I read medicine nearly two years with a good doctor friend, especially for my own benefit, and during this time I had a severe attack of bladder trouble, and for fifteen years I suffered so severely at times that I thought life was not really worth living. In connection with these troubles I suffered every winter with rheumatism and the grip. I also had a growth coming on both eyes called cataract, which caused my eyes to be inflamed nearly all the time, and this growth had made such progress that it was causing my vision to be very dim when reading. Corns were not forgotten, as I was reminded of them very frequently, and for all these troubles I had tried every remedy I heard of that I was

able to get, specialists included, without relief.

Thanks to a friend who took me in this hopeless, discouraged condition and led me to the light that never knows darkness, I got a copy of Science and Health by Mrs. Eddy and was healed in a short time by reading this work. - D. W. L., Anderson, Ind.

RELIEF FROM INTENSE SUFFERING

I became interested in Christian Science in 1901. For four or five years I had suffered with severe attacks which nothing but an opiate seemed to relieve. After one which I think was the worst I ever had, I consulted our family physician, who diagnosed my case as a dangerous kidney disease and said that no medicine could help me but that I must undergo a surgical operation. I continued to grow worse and went to see the physician again, and he advised me to consult a doctor who was connected with the city hospital of Augusta. This doctor made an examination and diagnosed the difficulty as something different but quite as serious. Meanwhile a friend offered me a copy of Science and Health. I said I did not care to read the book, but she was so urgent that I finally promised to do so. I received the book on Saturday, and on Sunday morning I sat down to read it. When I reached the place where Mrs. Eddy says she found this truth in the Bible, I began comparing the two books. I read passages which looked very reasonable to me, and said to myself, This is nearer to the truth than anything I have ever seen. I continued to read all day, stopping only long enough to eat my dinner. As I read on, everything became clearer to me, and I felt that I was healed. During the evening a neighbor came in, and I said, "I am healed, and that book

has healed me." I read on and was certainly healed. Eight days after my healing I did my own washing. This occurred in February, 1901. About six weeks after, I was called to care for my mother, who was under the care of my former physician. I again let him examine my side, as he wished to see if the trouble was still there. He said, "It is certainly gone." I said to him, "Doctor, you told me I would never be a well woman unless I was operated upon; what has healed me?" He replied, "God has healed you." - S. H. L., North Pittston, Me.

HEREDITARY DISEASE OF THE LUNGS CURED

For a long time I have been impelled to contribute a testimony of the healing power of Truth. As I read other testimonies and rejoice in them, some one may rejoice in mine. I was healed by reading Science and Health. By applying it, I found it to be the truth that Jesus taught, - the truth that sets free.

From childhood I had never known a well day. I was healed of lung trouble of long standing. Consumption was hereditary in our family, my mother and three brothers having passed on with it. The law of/ materia medica /said that in a short time I must follow them. I also had severe stomach trouble of over eight years' standing, during which time I always retired without supper, as the fear of suffering from my food was so great that I denied myself food when hungry. For over twenty years I had ovarian trouble, which was almost unbearable at times. It dated from the birth of my first child, and at one time necessitated an operation. I suffered with about all the ills that flesh is heir to: I had trouble with my eyes from a child; wore glasses for fourteen years, several

oculists saying I would go blind, one declaring I would be blind in less than a year if I did not submit to an operation, which I refused to do. But thanks be to God whose Truth reached me through the study of our textbook. Words fail to express what Christian Science has done for me in various ways, for my children, my home, my all. The physical healing is but a small part; the spiritual unfolding and uplifting is the "pearl of great price," the half that has never been told. - Mrs. J. P. M., Kansas City, Mo.

RUPTURE AND OTHER SERIOUS ILLS HEALED

When I took up the study of Christian Science nearly three years ago, I was suffering from a very bad rupture of thirty-two years' standing. Sometimes the pain was so severe that it seemed as if I could not endure it. These spells would last four or five hours, and while everything was done for me that could be done, no permanent relief came to me until I commenced reading Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures. After I had once looked into it I wanted to read all the time. I was so absorbed in the study of the "little book" that I hardly realized when the healing came, but I was healed, not only of the rupture, but also of other troubles, - inflammatory rheumatism, catarrh, corns, and bunions. I would never part with the book if I could not get another. I am seventy-seven years old, and am enjoying very good health. - Mrs. M. E. P., St. Johnsbury, Vt.

MOTHER AND DAUGHTER HEALED

When Christian Science came to me, I had been taking medicine every day for twenty years, on account of constipation. I had been treated by

doctors and specialists; had taken magnetic treatments and osteopathy; had tried change of climate; had an operation in a hospital, and when I came out was worse than before. I was so discouraged, after I had tried everything I ever heard of, and was no better but rather grew worse, that it seemed as though I must give up trying to get well, when a friend suggested that I try Christian Science. I had heard that Christian Scientists healed by prayer, and I thought this must be the way Jesus had healed. I felt that this was all there was left for me to try. I sent for the book, Science and Health, and commenced to read it out of curiosity, not thinking or knowing that I could be helped by the reading, but thinking I must still take medicine and that I must also have treatment by a Scientist. I, however, dropped my medicine and read for three days; then a light began to shine in the darkness. I was healed of the trouble and have never had to take medicine since. I have studied Science and Health faithfully ever since, and other ailments have disappeared. My little daughter has also been healed and has learned to use this knowledge in her school work. - Mrs. O. R., Leadville, Col.

A JOYFUL EXPERIENCE

In love and gratitude to God, and to Mrs. Eddy, the interpreter of Jesus' beautiful teachings, I wish to tell of some of the benefits which I have received from Christian Science. It is a little over a year since Science found me in a deplorable condition, physically as well as mentally. I had ailments of many years' standing, - chronic stomach trouble, severe eye trouble, made almost unbearable from the constant

fear of losing any sight (a fate which had befallen my mother), also a painful rupture of twenty-five years' standing. These ailments, combined with unhappy conditions in my home, made me very despondent. I had entirely lost my belief in an all-merciful God, and I did not know where to turn for help. At that time Christian Science was brought to my notice, and I shall never forget the sublime moment when I perceived that an all-loving Father is always with me. Forgotten was all sorrow and worry, and after four weeks' reading in Science and Health all my ailments had disappeared. I am today a healthy, contented woman. All this has come to pass in one short year, and my earnest desire is to be more and more worthy to be called a child of God. This is in loving gratitude for an understanding of this glorious truth. - Mrs. R. J., Chicago, Ill.

AN EVER-PRESENT HELP

It is a year since I began to read Science and Health, and I will now try to outline what a knowledge of its teachings has done for me. My condition was then very trying; my eyes, which had caused me much trouble since childhood, were very painful. For these I had been treated by some of the best specialists in my native land, and after coming to the United States I had been doctored much and had worn glasses for four years. I also had catarrh, for which I had taken much medicine without being relieved. In addition to this I was an excessive smoker, using tobacco in some form almost constantly. I had contracted a smoker's heart, and used liquors freely.

The one who brought to me that which I now prize so highly, was a book

agent. I told him that I should be forced to leave my trade on account of my eyes. He then told me of having been healed of a cancer, through Christian Science treatment. He showed me a copy of Science and Health, which had the signs of much use, and after being assured that if I did my part I would be healed of all my diseases, I sent for a copy of the book.

My recovery was very rapid, for after reading the book only three weeks I was completely healed of the tobacco habit. I will say, in regard to this healing, that it did not require even as much as a resolution on my part. I was smoking a cigar, while reading Science and Health, when all the desire to continue smoking left me, and I have never had a desire to use tobacco in any form since then. My eyes were the next to manifest the influence of the new knowledge gained, and had soon so far recovered that I could go about my work with ease, and I have had no more use for glasses. To-day my heart is normal, the catarrh has totally disappeared, and I am not addicted to the use of liquor.

Christian Science has proved to be an ever-present help, not only in overcoming physical ailments, but in business and daily life. It has also overcome a great sense of fear. The Bible, which I regarded with suspicion, has become my guide, and Christianity has become a sweet reality, because the Christian Science textbook has indeed been a "Key to the Scriptures" and has breathed through the Gospel pages a sweet sense of harmony. - A. F., Sioux City, Iowa.

SEVERE EYE TROUBLE OVERCOME

After hearing Christian Science lightly spoken of, from a Christian

pulpit, I decided to go to one of the services and hear for myself. From infancy I had been devoted to my church, and as soon as I was old enough I was ever active in the work. Feeling it to be my duty to attend every service held in my own church, I took advantage of the Wednesday evening meetings. My first visit was not my last, I am thankful to say, for I saw immediately that these people not only preached Christianity, but practised and lived it. At that time I was wearing glasses and had worn them for sixteen years. At times I suffered the most intense pain, and for this phase of the trouble, one specialist after another had been consulted. All gave me very much the same advice; each one urged extreme carefulness and gave me glasses that seemed to relieve for a time. None of them held out any hope that my sight would ever be restored, saying that the defect had existed since infancy, and that in time I should be blind.

The thought of blindness was very distressing to me, but I tried to bear it with Christian resignation, since I thought that God had seen fit to afflict me; but since I have learned that He is a loving Father, who gives only good, I regret that I ever charged Him with my affliction. I had no treatment, but I read Science and Health, and my eyes were healed and glasses laid aside. I can never find words to express my thanks to our dear Leader, through whose teachings my sight has been regained. I can truthfully say that "whereas I was blind, now I see" - through an understanding of Truth I have found my sight perfect as God gave it. -

Miss B. S., Wilmington, N. C.

A TESTIMONY FROM IRELAND

It is with a heart full of love and gratitude to God, and to our dear Leader, that I send this testimony to the Field. I had never been a strong girl; had always been subject to colds and chills, and suffered all my life from a delicate throat. Seven years ago I had a very severe attack of rheumatic fever and subsequently two less severe ones. These left all sorts of evils behind them, - debility, chronic constipation, and several others, so that with these ills my life was often a burden to me and I used to think I never should receive relief or health. I had also lost all love for God and faith in Him. I could not accept a God who, as I then believed, visited sickness and sorrow upon His children as a means for drawing them to Him.

I was in this state of mind and body when Christian Science found me. A dear friend, seeing my suffering, presented the truth to me, and though at first I did not believe that there could be healing for me, the Christian Scientists' God seemed to be the one I had been looking for all my life. I began to read Science and Health, and shall never forget my joy at finding that I could love and trust God. I took to studying the Bible, and read nothing but Science and Health and other Christian Science literature for a year. After studying the "little book" for about six weeks, I one day realized that I was a well woman, that I had taken no medicine for three weeks, and that my body was perfectly harmonious. The reading of Science and Health had healed me. The wonderful joy and spiritual uplifting which came to me then no words of mine can describe. I had also suffered from astigmatism and had for several years been obliged to use special glasses when reading or

working, and could never use my eyes for more than half an hour; but from the first reading of Science and Health I found that I could read in any light and for any length of time without the slightest discomfort. I am not only grateful for the physical healing but for the mental regeneration. I rejoice that I am now able to help others who are sick and sorrowing. - E. E. L., Curragh Camp, County Kildare, Ireland.

THE TEXTBOOK MAKES OPERATION UNNECESSARY

In the early part of the year 1895 my physician said I must undergo a surgical operation in order ever to be well.

While in great fear, and dreading the operation, a kind neighbor called, and after telling me of Christian Science gave me a copy of Science and Health. She said I must put aside all medicine, and by reading faithfully she knew I could be healed. The book became my constant companion, and in a short time I was healed. Besides the relief from an operation, I was completely healed of severe headaches and stomach trouble. Physicians could give me no help for either of these ailments. For ten years I have not used medicine of any kind, and have not missed a Christian Science service on account of sickness during this period. I am perfectly well. To say that I am grateful to God for all this does not express my feelings. The physical healing was wonderful, but the understanding given me of God, and the ability to help others outweigh all else. I also love our dear Leader. - Mrs. V. I. B., Concord, N. H.

KIDNEY DISEASE AND EYE TROUBLE HEALED

Early in 1904 I was teaching in a private boarding-school. I was a very unhappy, discontented woman; I had kidney disease, besides sore eyes,

and my general health was very bad. The doctor said that the climate did not suit me, and that I certainly should have a change. The best thing, he said, was to go back to France (my own country); but I did not like to leave the school, so I struggled on until July, when we went travelling for a month, but I came home worse than ever. I had a lot of worry, one disappointment after another, and I often thought that life was not worth living. In September, 1904, we heard for the first time of Christian Science through a girl who was attending our boarding-school, and who was healed through Christian Science treatment. We bought the textbook, "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures" by Mrs. Eddy, and what a revelation it was and is to us; it is indeed the fountain of Truth. I had read Science and Health but a very short time when I took off my glasses, began to sleep well, and soon found myself well in mind and body. Besides this, it has brought harmony into our school, where there had been discord, and everything is changed for the better. I cannot describe the happiness that has come to me through Christian Science; I can only exclaim with the psalmist: "Bless the Lord, O my soul;" and may God bless Mrs. Eddy.

My one aim now is to live Christian Science, not in words only, but in deeds; loving God more and my neighbor as myself, and following meekly and obediently all our Leader's teachings. Words cannot express my gratitude to Mrs. Eddy for Christian Science. - S. A. K., Vancouver, B.C.

DISEASE OF BOWELS HEALED

When I first heard of Christian Science I had been afflicted for nine years with a very painful disease of the bowels, which four physicians

failed even to diagnose, all giving different causes for the dreadful sufferings I endured. The last physician advised me to take no more medicine for these attacks, as drugs would not reach the cause, or do any good. About this time I heard of Christian Science, and had the opportunity of reading "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures" by Mrs. Eddy, a few minutes every day for about a week, and I was thereby healed. In looking back I found I had not suffered in the least from the time I began reading this book. It has been nearly seventeen years since this wonderful healing, and I have had no return of the disease. My gratitude is endless and can be best expressed by striving mightily to walk in the path our Leader has so lovingly shown us in Science and Health. - Mrs. J. W. C., Scranton, Pa.

HEALED BY READING THE TEXTBOOK

After doctoring about a year, I was obliged to give up school and was under medical care for two years; but grew worse instead of better. I was then taken to specialists, who pronounced my case incurable, saying I was in the last stages of kidney disease and could live only a short time. Shortly afterward my uncle gave me a copy of "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures," and asked me to study it. After studying a short time I was able to walk a distance of several miles, which I had not been able to do for three years. I also laid aside glasses which I had worn seven years, having been told I would become blind if my eyes did not receive proper care. It is over a year since I received God's blessing, and I am now enjoying perfect health and happiness. I have never had my glasses on since I first began reading Science and Health,

and I have not used any medicine. - L. R., Spring Valley, Minn.

A TESTIMONY FROM SCOTLAND

I came to Christian Science purely for physical healing. I was very ill and unhappy; very cynical and disbelieving in regard to what I heard of God and religion.

I tried to live my life in my own way and put religion aside. I was a great believer in fate and in will-power, and thought to put them in the place of God, with the consequence that I was led to do many rash and foolish things. I am now thankful to say that my outlook on life is entirely changed; I have proved God's wisdom and goodness so often that I am willing and thankful to know my future is in His hands and that all things must work out for the best. I have found a God whom I can love and worship with my whole heart, and I now read my Bible with interest and understanding.

I was healed of very bad rheumatism simply by reading Science and Health. I had tried many medicines, also massage, with no result, and the doctors told me that I would always suffer from this disease, as it was inherited, and also because I had rheumatic fever when a child. I suffered day and night, and nothing relieved me until Science proved to me the falseness of this belief by removing it. I gave up all the medicines I was taking and have never touched any since, and that is more than two years ago. Before this I had often tried to do without a medicine that I had taken every day for ten years, but was always ill and had to return to it, until I found out that one Mind is the only medicine, and then I was freed from the suffering.

I had also suffered constantly from bilious attacks, colds, and a weak chest, and had been warned not to be out in wet weather, etc., but now, I am glad to say, I am quite free from all those material laws and go out in all sorts of weather. - R. D. F., Edinburgh, Scotland.

CURING BETTER THAN ENDURING

For eight years I was a great sufferer from weak lungs and after being treated by ten different physicians, in the States of Illinois, Missouri, and Colorado, I was told there was no hope of my recovery from what they pronounced tuberculosis, which was hereditary, my father having been afflicted with it. I was greatly emaciated and hardly able to be about. My general condition was aggravated by what the doctors said was paralysis of the bowels. Three physicians so diagnosed it at different times, and assured my husband that I could never get more than temporary relief. This indeed I found difficult to obtain, in spite of my almost frantic efforts. At times I was nearly insane from suffering, and after eight years of doctoring I found myself steadily growing worse. For four years I did not have a normal action of the bowels, and it was only by extreme effort and by resort to powerful drugs or mechanical means, with resultant suffering, that any action whatever could be brought about.

I had heard nothing of the curative power of Christian Science, and only to oblige a friend I went one night, about three years ago, to one of their mid-week testimonial meetings, in Boulder, Colorado. I was much impressed by what I heard there, and determined at once to investigate

this strange religion, in the hope that it might have something good for me. I bought the textbook, Science and Health, and from the first I found myself growing stronger and better, both physically and mentally, as I acquired a better understanding and endeavored to put into practice what I learned. In one week I was able to get along better without drugs than I had for years with them, and before three months had passed I was better than I had been any time in my life, for I had always suffered more or less from bowel trouble. Since that time I have taken no medicine whatever, and rely wholly upon Christian Science. My lungs are now sound, my bowels normally active, my general health excellent, and I am able to endure without fatigue tasks that before would have prostrated me. The study of our textbook was the sole means of my healing. - L. M. St. C., Matachin, Canal Zone, Panama.

SEVERE ECZEMA DESTROYED

It is only two years since I came from darkness into the light of Christian Science, and to me the spiritual uplifting has been wonderful, to say nothing of the physical healing. Words cannot express my gratitude for benefits I have received in that time. For five years I suffered with that dreaded disease, eczema, all over my body. Five doctors said there was no help for me. The suffering seemed as terrible as the hell fire that I had been taught to believe in. When Christian Science came to me two years ago through a dear friend, she gave me a copy of Science and Health and asked me to read it. I told her that I would, for I was like a drowning man grasping at a straw. I had been a Bible student for twenty-eight years, but when I commenced reading

Science and Health with the Bible I was healed in less than a week. I never had a treatment. A case of measles was also destroyed in twenty-four hours after it appeared. - Mrs. M. B. G., Vermilion, Ohio.

SCIENCE AND HEALTH A PRICELESS BOON

I am a willing witness to the healing power of Christian Science, having had a lifetime's battle with disease and medical experiments. Various doctors finally admitted that they had exhausted their resources, and could only offer me palliatives, saying that a cure was impossible. I had paralysis of the bowels, frequent sick headaches with unutterable agony, and my mortal career was nearly brought to an end by a malignant type of yellow fever. Many were the attending evils of this physical inharmony, but God confounds the wisdom of men, for while studying Science and Health two years ago, the veil of ignorance was lifted and perfect health was shown to me to be my real condition, and to such there is no relapse. The constant use of glasses, which were apparently a necessity to me for years, was proven needless, and they were laid aside. Mrs. Eddy has made Scripture reading a never-failing well of comfort to me. By her interpretation "the way of the Lord" is made straight to me and mine. It aids us in our daily overcoming of the tyranny of the flesh and its rebellion against the blessed leading of Christ, Truth. The daily study of the Bible and our textbook is bringing more and more into our consciousness the power of God unto salvation. - J. C., Manatee, Fla.

A CRITIC CONVINCED

With gratitude to God I acknowledge my lifelong debt to Christian

Science. In 1895 I attended my first Christian Science meeting, and was deeply impressed with the earnestness of the people and the love reflected, but as for the spiritual healing of the physical body, I did not believe such a thing to be possible. I bought Science and Health and studied it to be able to dispute intelligently with the supposedly deluded followers of Christian Science. I pursued the study carefully and thoroughly, and I have had abundant reason since to be glad that I did, for through this study, and the resultant understanding of my relation to God, I was healed of a disease with which I had been afflicted since childhood and for which there was no known remedy. Surely my experience has been the fulfilling in part of the Scripture: "He sent His Word and healed them, and delivered them from their destructions." I believe that Science and Health reveals the Word referred to by David. - C. A. B. B., Kansas City, Mo.

MORALLY AND PHYSICALLY HEALED

I did not accept Christian Science on account of any healing of my own, but after seeing my mother, who was fast drifting toward helplessness with rheumatism, restored to perfect health with only a few treatments in Christian Science, I thought surely this must be the truth as Jesus taught and practised it, and if so it was what I had been longing for. This was about ten years ago and was the first I had ever heard of Christian Science. We soon got a copy of Science and Health and I began in the right way to see if Christian Science were the truth. I had no thought of studying it for bodily healing; in fact, I did not think I needed it for that, but my soul cried out for something I had not yet

found. This book was indeed a key to the Scriptures.

It was not long after I began reading before I discovered that my eyes were good and strong, I could read as much as I wished, and at any time, which was something I could not do before, as my eyes had always been weak. The doctors said they never would be very strong, and that if I did not wear glasses, I might lose my sight altogether. I never gave up to wearing glasses, and now, thanks to Christian Science, I do not need them, my work for the past two years as a railway mail clerk being a good test. At the same time my eyes were healed, I also noticed that I was entirely healed of another ailment which had been with me all my life, and which was believed to be inherited. Since that time my growth has seemed to me slow, yet when I look back and view myself as I was before Christian Science found me, and compare it with my life as it now is, I can only close my eyes to the picture and rejoice that I have been "born again" and that I have daily been putting off "the old man with his deeds," and putting on "the new man."

Some of the many things that have been overcome through the study of Science and Health, and through realizing and practising the truth it teaches, are profanity, the use of tobacco, a very quick temper, which made both myself and those around me at times very miserable, and such thoughts as malice, revenge, etc. - O. L. R., Fort Worth, Tex.

AN EVER-PRESENT HELP FOUND

On the 23rd of March, 1900, I received from one of my daughters a copy of Science and Health on my seventy-first birthday. Although a constant reader of all kinds of papers and books, I had never heard anything of

Christian Science, except a short notice that spring in a San Francisco newspaper, from an orthodox clergyman, referring to the Christian Science people in not very complimentary style.

In Mrs. Eddy's book I came across a great deal of thought that was not readily understood at the first reading, but by continued and careful study, and a good deal of help from my knowledge of chemistry and natural philosophy, I soon shook off the belief of sensation in matter, - the so-called elementary substance. One afternoon I put the belt on my circular saw to cut blocks of firewood and also to split a small stick of frame timber. In doing this the stick closed and pinched the saw. I picked up a small wooden wedge and tried to drive it into the saw kerf, but a bit of ice let the stick on to the back of the saw and instantly it flew, with heavy force, into my face, and bouncing off my left cheek fell about twenty feet off on the snow. The blood spattered on the snow next the saw table, and on feeling with my hand there were two wounds, one on the lock of the jaw and another forward, as big as a dollar, on the cheek bone. "Now," I thought to myself, "there is a case of surgery for you," and without further ceremony, I began to treat the case to the best of my knowledge, with the result that the bleeding stopped almost instantly, and so did a thumping pain, which had commenced. I paid no more attention to the matter, but finished my work, and then went to supper. When I washed my face, I felt a big lump on the jawbone where the block of wood struck, but after my usual reading I went to bed and slept all night until near daylight, when a pain on the right side awoke me. On feeling with my hand there was another big lump on the right

side, but I treated it and went to sleep again. I never lost an hour from the hurt, although I found out that my jaw was broken. There is no scar, only a little red spot on the cheek, and the lumps on the bone have long since disappeared.

In summing up the benefits I have received from the reading of Science and Health, I can but refer to a condition of sickness dating back to the war (1862), when chronic and malignant diarrhea came near making an end of my material existence. My hearing, also, was seriously impaired from the effect of cannon firing at Shiloh, but it has come back to me, and where I formerly dared not eat an orange, or grapes, I can now eat anything without being hurt. My peace of mind is giving me a rest which I never experienced before during my life, and I have ceased to look away off for the divine presence that was always near, though I did not know it. - L. B., Baldy, N. M.

MANY PHYSICAL AND MENTAL TROUBLES OVERCOME

Less than a year ago, when nothing but trouble seemed to encompass me, I was led to Christian Science. My mother's copy of Science and Health was always lying on the table, but I scarcely ever read it. One day, however, the mental conflict was so great I commenced reading in the hope of obtaining peace. Every day since then my companions have been the Bible and Science and Health. At that time I had a very serious eruption on my face, which had been there two years. We had consulted several physicians, and used every remedy suggested to eradicate it, but they proved useless. I had given up all hopes of its ever being healed,

as the physician we last consulted pronounced it tuberculosis of the skin and incurable. A few weeks after I commenced reading, I was amazed to see it almost healed over, and to-day my cheek is perfectly smooth, while the scar is disappearing.

In April my baby was born with only the practitioner and a woman friend present. I suffered little pain, and the third day I went down-stairs. I am able to nurse him, - a privilege of which I was deprived with my first child. He is a picture of health, having never been sick a day since he was born. - K. E. W. L., Mt. Dora, Fla.

A VOICE FROM ENGLAND

For a number of years I was a weary woman, not ill enough in health to, be called an invalid, but suffering more than could be told with fatigue and weakness. Feeling that this was God's will, I did not ask to be healed, although I was constantly doctoring. I suffered with dyspepsia, congestion of the liver, and many other things, including weak eyesight. With all the medicine, and with different changes for rest, I never regained health, and thought I never should, so I prayed for grace to bear my cross patiently for others' sake. One day, while lying on my couch exhausted, which had become a frequent experience, the words came to me, "Whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive." I rose, knelt down and said, O God, make me well. I was telling a friend this and she kindly gave me a /Sentinel. /Imagine my joy when I saw the testimonies of healing! I believed them, remembering our Lord's words, "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." I obtained a copy of Science and Health and before a week had passed I realized

that if God was my all I needed no glasses. My eyes were healed in a few days, and since then I have never thought of glasses. I was also cured of dyspepsia, and nothing that I have eaten has hurt me since then. The belief in health laws was next destroyed, by knowing that our heavenly Father did not make them, and from this has come the beautiful experience of the overcoming of fatigue.

For this alone I can never be thankful enough. True indeed are the words, "They shall run, and not be weary." This was more than a year ago, and I can say that not once have I felt inclined to lie on the couch, nor have I had a headache, although I am doing more work than ever before. Fear has also been overcome in many ways. - A. L., Chelmsford, England.

DEPRAVED APPETITES OVERCOME

When Christian Science first came to me, or rather, when I first came to Christian Science, I did not have a very bad opinion of myself. I thought I was a pretty good fellow. I had no religious views. I seemed to be getting along as well as, if not better than, some who professed Christianity. So I drifted along until I was led to investigate Christian Science.

As I progressed in the understanding as gained from the study of both Science and Health and the Bible, and commenced to know myself, I found that a great change had been wrought in me. For fifteen years I had used tobacco, both chewing and smoking; for ten years I had been a victim of the drink habit, sometimes to excess; I was also addicted to profanity. Christian Science removed these appetites. A stomach trouble and other

lesser ills, such as headache, a bad temper, an inordinate love of money, etc., disappeared under the same benign influence. Those things that seemed to be pleasure do not give me pleasure now. They were not real pleasure. I have lost nothing, I have sacrificed nothing; but I have gained everything, and not yet the whole, for I can see plenty yet to be done.

The condition of mind before investigating and after is as different as black and white. As Mrs. Eddy says, "Not matter, but Mind, satisfieth." - G. B. P., Henry, S. D.

SPINAL DISEASE HEALED

When I first heard of Christian Science, seven years ago, I supposed that it was some old fad under a new name. In the little Texas town where we then lived there were two or three Christian Scientists who met at the home of one of their number to read the Lesson-Sermon. Meeting one of them one day, I asked if unbelievers could come to their meetings. She said that they could if they wanted to. I went, expecting them to do something that I could laugh at when telling my friends about it. How surprised I was to find out that they didn't do anything but read the Bible and another book which they called Science and Health. I still thought it all foolishness, but resolved to go to their meetings until I found out all they believed. I continued to go until I began to understand a little of what they knew, not what they believed; and instead of spending my time telling others what a silly thing Christian Science is, I am now trying to find words to tell what a great and wonderful thing it is. I have been healed of so-called incurable spinal

disease of ten years' standing by studying the Bible and Science and Health. Science and Health has been my only teacher, and I wish to send my thanks to our dear Leader.

There are no other Scientists near where we now live, but I have the 'Quarterly' and study the lessons by myself. I have five small children, and Christian Science is invaluable to me in controlling them, and in overcoming their common ills. They often help themselves and each other to destroy their little hurts and fears. - Mrs. M. H., Oleta, Okla.

A CONVINCING TESTIMONY

I became interested in Christian Science some five years ago, the practical nature of its statements appealing to me, and I must say, at the outset, that with my little experience I have found it all and more than I ever dreamt of realizing on this plane of existence. I am satisfied that I have found Truth. God is indeed to me an ever-present help.

My little girl, some ten months old, was afflicted with constipation. It was so severe I dreaded to go out anywhere with her, as I knew not when she would be taken with a convulsion. I had tried all the usual remedies in such cases, but it seemed to grow more obstinate. There was a Christian Scientist living in the same house with us, a Scientist who let her light shine, and while she said little, I felt the reflection of Love. I had no knowledge of the teachings of Christian Science, save that God was the physician at all times. In my own way I believed He was all-powerful, and I said to my husband one day, "I am through with medicine for baby. I am just going to leave her in God's care and see

what He will do. I have done all I can." I did as I said, laid my burden at God's feet, and did not pick it up again. In two days the child was perfectly natural, and has since been free from the trouble. She is now six years of age. Some months later a second test came. She woke up at nine o'clock at night crying and holding her ear. There was to sense a gathering. I was alone. I took up my Science and Health and Bible, but the more I worked the louder she screamed. Error kept suggesting material remedies, but I said firmly: "No; I shall not go back to error. God will help me." Just then I thought of my own fear, how excessive it was, and a conversation I had with the Scientist who first voiced the truth to me, came to mind. She said she always found it helpful to treat herself and cast out her own fear before treating a patient. I put baby down and again took up my Science and Health, and these were the words I read: -

"Every trial of our faith in God makes us stronger. The more difficult seems the material condition to be overcome by Spirit, the stronger should be our faith and the purer our love. The Apostle John says: 'There is no fear in Love, but perfect Love casteth out fear' " (Science and Health, p. 410). I looked up, the crying had ceased, the child was smiling, and in a few minutes asked to be put to bed. There has been no further trouble of that kind.

I have since seen the power of Truth overcome error of many forms, including croup, whooping-cough, tonsilitis, etc. I am thankful for all these proofs, but far more grateful am I for the spiritual teaching to love, to forgive, to curb my tongue, and cease my criticism. - M. A. H.,

Brockton, Mass.

THROUGH GREAT TRIBULATIONS

When I attempt to make plain what Christian Science has done for me, words fail me. For twenty years I was a constant sufferer, my spine having been injured when I was very young. As a little child I suffered so much that I would look up to the stars and beg God, who I thought might be up there somewhere, to take me away from the earth, - I was so tired. A great wall of pain seemed to separate me from the pleasures enjoyed by others, and I could not explain how I felt, because no one could understand. Years passed, and I saw my earthly happiness swept away; my heart was broken and I did not know what to do. I cried for help, day after day and night after night, although I was not sure what God was, nor where He was. I only knew that I suffered, and was in need of help, and that there was no earthly help for either mind or body. I loved purity, truth, and right always, and this made evil seem a most terrible reality. I was unable to cope with it, and so found myself in despair. This was my condition when I commenced reading Science and Health. I was ready for its message, and in about ten days there came a wonderful insight into the truth which heals the sick and binds up the broken-hearted. All pain left me, I had a glimpse of the new heavens and the new earth, and was beginning to be fed by Love divine.

I had suffered for years with insomnia. That night I rested like a child, and awoke the next morning well and happy. A flood of light daily illumined the pages of the "little book," and the revelation it holds

for all came to my waiting heart. "The peace which passeth all understanding" rested upon me, and joy too deep for words transformed my life. My prayers were answered, for I had found God in Christian Science.

The Bible, which I knew very little about, became my constant study, my joy, and my guide. The copy which I bought at the time of my healing is marked from Genesis to Revelation. It was so constantly in my hands for three years that the cover became worn and the leaves loose, so it has been laid away for a new one. Two and three o'clock in the morning often found me poring over its pages, which grew more and more sacred to me every day, and the help I received therefrom was wonderful, for which I can find no words to express my gratitude. - I. L., Los Angeles, Cal.

HEALED OF BRIGHT'S DISEASE

August 18, 1902, I was taken down with what three doctors pronounced Bright's disease, and they stated that I would not live a year, or if I did succeed in living longer, I would be mentally unbalanced. On December 6, 1902, my wife presented me with Science and Health as a birthday gift, and it was indeed the best present I ever received. Since that time I have been reading it and attending the Second Church here. I have not used any medicine since, nor has any one in our home. I am in the finest of health and have lost all my bad habits. This truth has brought a great spiritual uplifting to all of us, and words cannot express my gratitude to Mrs. Eddy and to all who have helped me to the same. - T. V., Chicago, Ill.

FIBROID TUMOR DESTROYED

When quite young I was impressed that the Bible was not properly interpreted by the preachers, for I could not conceive of a God of wrath who was unjust enough to allow His little ones to suffer pain, misery, and death. I had hope, however, that some day the truth would be revealed to an awakening world, but little did I dream that even then there was one of God's noble women who reflected sufficient purity and holiness to entertain the "angel of his presence," and commune with the true God.

I was believed to be predisposed to scrofula, so that I was not a strong or attractive child, and my girlhood and womanhood were scarcely ever free from dread of the laws of matter and lack of strength. The climax was reached when a physician informed me, after weeks of treatment, that I had a fibroid tumor, which required an operation. The conditions were most trying and I was heartsick and discouraged when, in January, 1893, I heard of Christian Science through a letter from a dear sister who had been greatly benefited thereby, and I resolved to go at once to a practitioner, for I believed it to be the long-lost truth that would make me free. It meant a great effort and sacrifice for me to go to Chicago at that time, but divine Love opened the way and I reached there in March. I had been in my sister's home but a few days, reading Science and Health almost constantly, when I asked her if I had not better have treatment for the tumor, which had given me so much trouble. She said to me, "You feel well, do you not?" I assured her that I never had felt so well as I had since reaching there. "Well," she said with decision, "your tumor is gone, for God never made it," and her statements were

true, for it has never been heard of from that day. Since then I have been healed of chronic sore throat, hay fever, and other troubles, and I know that Christian Science is the truth. - B. W. S., Coldwater, Mich.

HEALED OF CONSUMPTION AND ASTHMA

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the great benefits which have come to me through Christian Science. It is nearly ten years since I began the investigation of the subject by borrowing a copy of Science and Health.

I had become a hopeless sufferer from asthma, - the disease being so aggravated at times as to make breathing almost impossible. I was also a victim of that dread disease, consumption. It was hereditary, nearly all my family on both sides having passed away with it. I took up Christian Science very much as a drowning man catches at a straw. However, I was much interested as soon as I began to understand it, and having read the book nearly all my waking hours for a few weeks, I became so much better and so convinced of its truth, that myself and wife destroyed all the medicines in the home, and have never since used any remedy except Christian Science. I continued to study and to put into practice the teaching as best I knew, and was restored to health in a few months.

Prior to my investigation of Christian Science I had been from boyhood an outspoken infidel, had read that class of literature extensively, and had no desire for anything of a religious nature, - the orthodox teaching never having appealed to me as a rational exposition of an all-wise God. I now have no more doubt of the truth of the teaching of the great Way-shower, Jesus of Nazareth, than I doubt the correctness of the basic law of mathematics or music. I have no doubt whatever that

Christian Science saved me from the grave, and thus proved a most practicable and efficient help in time of greatest need. However great my physical suffering has been, I can but feel glad that through it the door of consciousness was opened to let in the light of Truth. Thus I have progressed a little way in the knowledge of God, good, as revealed in Christian Science. - C. B., Webb City, Mo.

Appendix 3: The Axioms and Propositions of Christian Science

The initial axioms are:

Axiom 1. God is omniscient

Axiom 2. God is omnipotent

Axiom 3. God is omnipresent

Axiom 4. God is infinite

Axiom 5. God is (completely/infinately) Good

Following from which Eddy constructs a system consisting of the following propositions:

Prop. 1. God is infinite and unknowable, except by Divine revelation and human conjecture.

Prop. 2. God is Life, Truth, Love, Spirit, Principle, Mind and Good.

Prop. 3. The hypothetical construct, 'evil', is a "delusion of material sense".

Prop. 4. Nothing possesses reality or existence except Divine mind and His ideas.

Prop. 5. God fills all space, therefore all is Spirit.

Prop. 6. The triune nature of God consists of Life, Truth and Love.

Prop. 7. God is Father-Mother.

Prop. 8. The idea of Christ (not the human form) is eternal.

Prop. 9. The invisible Christ appears to the Spiritual sense.

Prop. 10. Reality is spiritual, harmonious, immutable, immortal, divine, [and] eternal.

This then leads immediately to the following corollaries:

Corollary 1:

Illness, pain and death, as examples of the non-existent human construct, 'evil', do not exist.

Corollary 2:

As 'all is spirit', and 'nothing possesses reality or existence except Divine mind and His ideas', as part of this reality we are therefore already perfect. Consequently, once a patient has been convinced of this their imaginary illness will disappear.

Corollary 3:

If a patient experiences the disappearance of the signs and symptoms that resulted in them contacting a Christian Science Practitioner, then this adds to the existing body of evidence of this type and increases the probability that the initial axioms and propositions are correct.