

THE FIRST PICTURE

“STAR OF BETHLEHEM”

THE SCRIPTURAL “basis” (Chr. p. 55) given by Mrs. Eddy in the “Glossary” of *Christ and Christmas* for the first stanza of the poem, “Christ and Christmas,” as well as for this first picture as illustrative thereof, shows that it encompasses not only this first picture but the full gamut of all the succeeding pictures, inasmuch as it is the last promise in the Bible and embraces both the genesis and the apocalypse of being as “root” and “offspring”—

“I am [both] the *root* and the *offspring* of David,
and the bright and morning star.—CHRIST JESUS.”

This all-embracing statement was made by Jesus in the last chapter of his great Revelation to St. John, Rev. 22:16, and since it is the very last statement of revelation in the Bible it calls for the highest correlations in *Science and Health*, which of necessity makes the subject matter of this first picture sound a depth that may take the unfolding of this entire book to fully fathom. The promise of this “*morning star*” (although in another Biblical setting, Rev. 2:28) is also the last Scriptural offering in *Christ and Christmas* (succeeding even the Poem, its pictures, and its “Glossary”), which promise Mrs. Eddy likewise attributes to Christ Jesus, as commented upon in the footnote at the bottom of the page.*

* In line with the introductory statement in the first verse of the first chapter of Revelation pertaining to the entire book of Revelation (which reads, “The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto His servants things which must shortly come to pass; and He sent and signified it by His angel unto His servant John”), Mrs. Eddy in the “Glossary” of *Christ and Christmas* places the name “Christ Jesus” after the Scriptural “basis” for this picture and after the Scriptural “basis” for the tenth

(Footnote cont. on next page)

In view of the all-embracing range of the Scriptural "basis" of this first picture, the full significance of the title of the book under comment, *Christ and Christmas*, should be readily seen in this first picture as the re-dedicating of "Christmas," typing Jesus' first appearing, to the "Christ" of Jesus' "second appearing." Thus the "Star of Bethlehem," the title of this first picture, as indicating the birthplace of the personal Jesus in his first appearing to the human consciousness must be re-dedicating to the "star of Boston" as indicating the birthplace of the impersonal Jesus in his "second appearing" as Truth. And inasmuch as the plan for the comments on *Christ and Christmas* in this book is to apply Mrs. Eddy's own statements found elsewhere in her writings on the same subjects as those presented in *Christ and Christmas* to the diversified phases of its Poem and its pictorial illustrations as the means to the end of their authoritative interpretation, attention is here called to the following excerpts from Mrs. Eddy's article in *Miscellaneous Writings* entitled "Christmas." In this article she dedicates "the star of Bethlehem" to "the star of Boston," thus giving to "the star of Bethlehem" the more progressive aspect which this first picture demands—her dedicatory statements reading:

"The star of Bethlehem is the star of Boston . . . that looketh down on the long night of human beliefs, to pierce the darkness and melt into dawn," p. 320:23-26.

"The star that looked lovingly down on the manger of our Lord, lends its resplendent light to *this* hour: the light of Truth, to cheer, guide, and bless man as he reaches forth for the *infant idea of divine perfection* dawning upon human imperfection. . . . The wise men follow this guiding star: the watchful shepherd chants his welcome over the *cradle* of a great truth, and saith, 'Unto us a child is born,' whose birth is less of a miracle than eighteen centuries ago . . . ," p. 320:9-13; 321:1-4.

"The star of Bethlehem is . . . to-day christening religion undefiled, *divine Science*; giving to it a *new name*, and the white stone in token of purity and permanence," p. 320:27-30.

It will be noted that three outstanding features of this first picture

picture, also after the last Scriptural verse succeeding the "Glossary" and the Poem. As all three of these Scriptural texts cover the book of Revelation from the second to the last chapter inclusive, Mrs. Eddy in the "Glossary" of *Christ and Christmas* now accredits to "Christ Jesus" the entire book of Revelation, and not to St. John as she had formerly done up to the last (ninth) edition of *Christ and Christmas*, in 1910, the year that she left us in person.

have been pointedly interpreted in the texts just quoted from the article entitled "Christmas" in *Miscellaneous Writings*:

First, that the re-naming of "the star of Bethlehem" as "the star of Boston" re-dedicating it to its more progressive purpose of announcing the reappearing of Jesus in his "second appearing," for Mrs. Eddy says that "the second appearing of *Jesus* is, unquestionably, the spiritual advent of the advancing idea of God, as in Christian Science [*divine Science . . . reduced to human apprehension*,' S. & H. 471:30]," Ret. 70:20.

Second, that Mrs. Eddy presents the babe of Jesus' first appearing under "the star of Bethlehem" as a symbol of "*the infant idea*" of his "second appearing," as typed in this first picture by a cloud-like form of "The Holy Family" of Joseph, Mary, and the babe Jesus (its outline suggesting a famous painting), which is directly under "the star of Bethlehem" as "the star of Boston."

Third, that Mrs. Eddy speaks of the "*new name*" with which "the star of Bethlehem" as "the star of Boston" christens undefiled religion (scientific Christianity) as "*divine Science*," using as a basis therefor Jesus' promise in Revelation to a more *matured* concept of his "second appearing" than an infantile consciousness could receive—his promise reading: "I . . . will give him a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no *man* knoweth saving *he* that receiveth it," Rev. 2:17.

In line with this more *mature* promise than an *infantile* thought of Science could receive, other and more advanced statements from Mrs. Eddy's own writings will be brought to bear upon the more progressive aspect of this first picture than those applicable to the *infantile* thought of Christian Science presented in the article "Christmas"; for this article appeared in the January *Journal* of 1885, one year before Mrs. Eddy added the chapter entitled "The Apocalypse" to *Science and Health* in 1886, which presented her interpretation of Jesus' prophecy of the Woman's "*man child*" ("*man child*" indicating a more matured concept of Christian Science than that symbolized by an infant babe), and eight years before *Christ and Christmas* was published in 1893. The more progressive aspect of this first picture to which reference has been made is the cloud-formed head of a *woman* (in the upper right-hand corner) typing the "*new name*"—which Jesus prophesied and Mrs. Eddy interprets as "*divine Science*." "*Divine Science*" as applicable to Jesus' "second appearing" is beyond the Christian manhood character of his first appearing; for the "*new*

name" of which Jesus spoke applied to the mission of Woman as revealed by him in the book of Revelation and interpreted by Mrs. Eddy in "The Apocalypse" (which chapter, as just noted, was not added by Mrs. Eddy to *Science and Health* as her more progressive concept of Science beyond its manhood phases [remembering that a man-angel was prophesied to initially bring the "little book"] until one year after she wrote the article entitled "Christmas"). It will be seen that the head of this woman in the upper right-hand corner of this first picture is prayerfully bowed over a dark mass that might be identified with "the long night of human beliefs" upon which Mrs. Eddy in her article "Christmas" represents "the star of Bethlehem" as "the star of Boston" to be shining. In reversal of the "new name" which he prophesied would be given to Woman's mission, Jesus in his prophecy concerning the mission of Woman, also in the book of Revelation, gives to this "night of human beliefs" as typing the resistance of error to Woman's mission the "new name" of dragon (or the attempted "*drag on*" * into Science of old beliefs), and Mrs. Eddy interprets this dragon ("*drag on*") as "the sum total of *human error*," S. & H. 563:10.

The triple demands of this first picture, as presented in Mrs. Eddy's article entitled "Christmas" (typed by "the star of Bethlehem," the babe as the "infantile" thought of Christian Science, and the woman's head bowed over the chaotic mass), present the two-phased aspect of its Scriptural text of both "*offspring*," typing "the infant idea" of the "second appearing" of Jesus, and "*root*," typing the full maturity of its self-existence as one with its divine source (as subsequently identified). Mrs. Eddy speaks of the first appearing of the Christ-idea on this wise: "No advancing modes of human *mind* made Jesus: rather was it their subjugation, and the pure *heart* that sees God," Mis. 360:32. So Jesus in his first coming was "the *offspring*" not of the human *mind* but of "the pure *heart* that sees God"—the "offspring" of Mary's spiritual "communion with God," S. & H. 29:31; and he was "the root" as well as "the offspring of David" only after having reached the fullness of completed being in his "second appearing," incident to the assumed fulfillment of the entire gamut of his Apocalyptic prophecies

* It is true that Mrs. Eddy in her division of the word "Adam" into "*a dam*" warns against the "dissection and definition of words, aside from their metaphysical derivation," S. & H. 338:25. However, the word "dragon" does not fall into this category, since its derivation indicates it is a "metaphysical derivation." Also in an old *Journal* (November 1887) published under Mrs. Eddy's supervision, authority is given for the division of the word "dragon" as "*drag on*."

to St. John, which *Christ and Christmas* illustrates, at which point of universal (generic) completeness he could say (as quoted for the Scriptural "basis" of this picture), "I am [both] the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star."

Of the process in the human consciousness needful to the perception of the "second appearing" of the Christ-idea, Mrs. Eddy says: "It is well that the upper portions of the brain [typing 'the human mind'] represent the higher moral sentiments, as if hope were ever prophesying thus: The human *mind* will sometime rise above all material and physical sense, . . . exchanging human concepts for the divine consciousness," S. & H. 531:8. This demand upon the human *mind* in Jesus' "second appearing" is indicated by Mrs. Eddy's placing "intelligence" as a quality of "the human *mind*" between "creation" and "Truth" (in her correlation of "the male idea" in the first chapter of Genesis as "the ideal man," S. & H. 517:9) to the end of lifting "the human mind" to coincidence with the divine, beyond "the pure heart that [only inspirationally] sees God"; therefore Jesus' "second appearing" makes a broader demand for the intelligent rooting of Jesus as Truth in "the human *mind*" than was required by Mary's spiritual discernment of Truth through the channel of "the pure *heart*" only, which brought forth the individual Jesus in his first appearing as "offspring": for until Truth is rooted in "the human *mind*" ("intelligence") it is but an outer consciousness to be worshiped by "the pure *heart*," which brings forth fruit as "offspring" outside of itself. Hence the prophecy that God's Laws first must be put into the *mind* and then written in the *heart*, Hebr. 8:10, before "root" and "offspring" can become one (as prophesied by Jesus). As illustrative of this broader demand upon "the human *mind*" to rise above even the "higher moral sentiments" in "the upper portions of the brain," it will be noted that in this first picture the ascending cloud-outline of "The Holy Family" * (of Joseph, Mary, and the babe Jesus) is placed directly under "the star of Bethlehem" and thus as typing Christianity in Jesus' first appearing is rising above a chaotic mass's head resembling (at the topmost portion) a *broken* human *skull* that permits "the human *mind*" to escape from the narrow confines of even its "higher moral sentiments" to a more advanced position under "the star of Bethlehem" as "the star of Boston."

* The outline of "The Holy Family" persisted in much clearness from the first to the last edition of *Christ and Christmas* and for some years after Mrs. Eddy left us in person but has since become almost obliterated by the renewal of the photographic plates.

This advanced position types Christianity's dedication to Science as the "second appearing" of the Christ-idea, for Mrs. Eddy's mission under the light of "the star of Boston" was her re-discernment of the same "infant idea" of the Christ which Mary brought forth through her "self-conscious communion with God," S. & H. 29:32. And Mrs. Eddy says of her own revelation, "No human pen [which wrote the entire Bible] nor tongue taught me the Science contained in this book, SCIENCE AND HEALTH . . . , S. & H. 110:17, which forces the inevitable conclusion that she brought forth her "infant idea of divine perfection" as well as her matured "man child" as Truth through her own "self-conscious communion with God," as Jesus prophesied that Woman, typed by Mrs. Eddy, would do, Rev. 12:5. Thus the "second appearing" of the Christ-idea was *generic Truth* including all mankind (the first appearing having been as Life, for Jesus said of his first appearing, "I am come that they might have life," John 10:10, and life is individual), which demands that mortals "peck open their shells [the claim of intelligence 'beneath a skull bone,' S. & H. 280:11] with Christian Science, and look outward and upward" (S. & H. 552:17) for their own spiritual identification with generic Truth rather than depend upon an individual, vicarious Saviour to do it for them.

The illustration of the Christ-idea as a babe in this first picture types the manner in which the Christ-idea first appeared to the human consciousness, both in its first appearing as Christianity and in its "second appearing" as Christian Science; for the Bible records Jesus' first appearing, typing Christianity, as a babe in a manger, and, in "A Christmas Sermon" in *Miscellaneous Writings*, Mrs. Eddy says of the appearing of "Christian Science" as "the *infantile* thought of God's man": "Is the babe a son, or daughter?" "Both son and daughter: even the compound *idea* of all that resembles God," Mis. 167:7-9. Thus when Jesus said, "I am the *root* . . . of David," it was at the point of the fullest development in the human consciousness of this babe in its "second appearing" as the *impersonal* Christ-idea, which had made its initial appearance as "offspring" in the human consciousness in the form of a personal babe. (It will be noted from the date above "A Christmas Sermon" in *Miscellaneous Writings*, that this sermon, which takes in the "compound" nature of the "babe" as "both son and daughter," was delivered in December 1888, nearly three years after Mrs. Eddy had written her article entitled "Christmas," and two years after she had added to *Science and Health*, in 1886, "The

Apocalypse," then exclusively presenting the compounded vision of Woman bringing forth her "man child" as Truth, Rev. 12:5.)

While "The Holy Family" has been pictured in *Christianity* as Joseph, Mary, and the babe Jesus (Joseph merely symbolizing by fatherly protection Jesus' divine Father, since Jesus had no human father), Mrs. Eddy in *Science* presents "The Holy Family" in quality "as Life, represented by the Father; as Truth, represented by the Son; as Love, represented by the Mother," S. & H. 569:1, thus enabling each individual to impersonally and progressively incorporate "The Holy Family" in quality as Life, Truth, and Love into his own consciousness; for Mrs. Eddy said in her early editions of *Science and Health*, "At present we know not what we are, but certainly we shall be Love, Life, and Truth, when we understand them," 2nd ed., S. & H. p. 19.* Hence the appropriateness of "The Holy Family" in this panoramic first picture as a preview of the "second appearing" of the Christ-idea's demand that the entire human consciousness progressively become "The Holy Family" of Life, Truth, and Love.

As previously noted, it will be seen that in the upper right-hand corner of this first picture a cloud forms the *crowned* head of a woman prayerfully bowed over a chaotic mass below. This woman suggests the Woman of the Apocalypse, who is presented in the twelfth chapter of Revelation in two phases—firstly, as the heavenly God-crowned Woman "clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars" (Rev. 12:1)—in the full resplendency of her generic completeness; and secondly, in the Mother-phase of divisional being wherein she brought forth her "man child" as Truth (which was immediately "caught up unto God, and to His throne," Rev. 12:5). Note that Mrs. Eddy makes this clear distinction between the two phases of this Woman when after presenting this Woman in her first phase, which, Mrs. Eddy says, symbolizes "generic man," S. & H. 561:22, she adds, "Also the spiritual idea is typified by a woman in travail," S. & H. 562:24,—her travail resulting from the resistance of the human consciousness to the revelation of Truth. Because of this resistance, Mrs. Eddy says of the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse, "The twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse typifies the divine method of warfare in *Science*, and the glorious results of this

* This quotation was worded slightly differently in the first edition of *Science and Health*; it read, "At present we know not what we are, but hereafter we shall be found Love, Life, and Truth, because we understand them," p. 77.

warfare," S. & H. 568:5. Inasmuch as Mrs. Eddy was the channel for both the revelation of the God-crowned Woman as typing generic being and the foundational Mother-phase of divisible being, she typed these two women in one consciousness.

The resistance of the unregenerate consciousness to the revelation of Truth as presented in the twelfth chapter of Revelation is typified by a *heavenly* dragon,* which stood before the heavenly Woman seeking to devour her "man child," Rev. 12:3, 4. The chaotic mass over which the woman's head is prayerfully bowed in this first picture suggests this heavenly dragon, which Mrs. Eddy defines as "the sum total of *human* error," † S. & H. 563:10. The fact that this dragon appeared in *heaven* unquestionably indicates that it typed the previous Christian conception of heaven as an outer consciousness, vicariously attained (the old heaven, which rejected earth), warring with the Science conception of heaven as an inner consciousness, attained by an inner process of the demonstrable redemption of man to his always-perfection, wherein heaven and earth became one on earth (the new heaven as one with a redeemed earth, Rev. 21:1), Rev. 21:3. Thus the power of the dragon in the lives of Christian Scientists was the temptation to merely use the letter of Truth as a vicarious ingress into heaven ("harmony," S. & H. 587:25) rather than to demonstrably utilize Truth in their inner lives as the only means to heaven ("harmony"). Therefore was not this dragon which appeared in heaven the drag-on of Old (Christian) Theology, which warred against Christianity's progressive Science? It is true that Mrs. Eddy says that "Christian Science may absorb the attention of sage and philosopher, but the Christian alone can fathom it," S. & H. 556:13, but she did not mean *formal* Christianity, whose spirit had been defeated by the dragon of Levitical ritualism, which dragged into Christianity formulated prayer, baptism, communion, and so on. Jesus formulated prayer only at the demand of his disciples (they being first disciples of John the Baptist, a Levite), one of whom said, "Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples," Luke 11:1; he was baptized only as a "Suffer

* The Bible recording, "And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon . . .," Rev. 12:3.

† Inasmuch as Mrs. Eddy says that the dragon types "human [not mortal] error," the consistency of calling the chaotic mass's head "the human mind" is justified—particularly as the dragon appeared in heaven, which characterized it as the resistance of the highest Christian theological beliefs to the revelation of scientific Truth as Woman's "man child," that it stood ready to devour, Rev. 12:4.

it to be so now," * and he immediately suffered by being driven of "the spirit" into the wilderness, Mark 1:12; and he instituted communion only because his ritualistic disciples could not commune with his true nature.

According to the Bible record the "tail [of the dragon that 'stood before the woman . . . to devour her child as soon as it was born'] drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth," Rev. 12:4, thus making the *tail* of the dragon its only power against the stars on Woman's crown. The power of this woman to resist the depredation of the dragon lay in the completeness of her revelation, typed by her crown of stars as angels, or progressive messages, of light, Jesus having said that the stars are "angels," Rev. 1:20, and Mrs. Eddy having defined "angels" as "messages," S. & H. 558:9; 566:29; 574:10. The dragon had his angels, or messages, which the woman's "man child" as Truth cast out of heaven, the Bible recording that "he [the dragon] was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him," Rev. 12:9. Mrs. Eddy interprets this dragon's angels by saying, "His [the dragon's] angels, or messages, are cast out with their author. The beast and the false prophets are *lust* and *hypocrisy*," S. & H. 567:26.

Inasmuch as the dragon's *tail* is the only activity against the woman, and his angels, or messages, are the channels for this activity, his tail must present the character of his angels, or messages of "lust and hypocrisy." In line with this fact, the tail of the chaotic mass, or dragon, over which the woman's head is prayerfully bowed in this first picture is presented in two divisions: the first division, which faces the star, has the appearance of the head of a bearded Pharisee, † typing the appearance of the "false prophets," and Mrs. Eddy defines "Pharisee" in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* as "*hypocrisy*"; while the second division, which is turned away from the star, has the appearance of the head of a snarling serpentine beast, † that Mrs. Eddy describes as "full of *lust* and hate, loathing the brightness of divine glory [typed by the star]," S. & H. 565:4. The division of the tail having the appearance of a Pharisaical head, typing "*hypocrisy*,"

* Saying, ". . . thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness," Matt. 3:15. Inasmuch as Jesus' disciples were all previously those of John the Baptist, he was forced to "fulfil all righteousness" at the point where John the Baptist left off. However, the Bible says, ". . . Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples [alone baptized]," John 4:2.

† Both the bearded Pharisaical head and the snarling beast have been almost obliterated by the renewing of the photographic plates since Mrs. Eddy's passing.

seems (with its hypocritical justification of present indulgence by the material perversion of Jesus' injunction, "Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness [Matt. 3:15]," or by the utilization of the "devil's" perverted corresponding exclamation, ". . . art thou come hither to torment us before the time" of our necessity to give up *unrighteousness*? Matt. 8:29) to protect from the light of the star the snarling head of lust, for lust being non-intelligent relies upon the seeming intelligence of Pharisaical reasoning for its license.

Thus Mrs. Eddy (in fulfillment of the prophesied two-phased woman persecuted by the serpent, or dragon, Rev. 12:4, the word "serpent" and the word "dragon" being used interchangeably in the Scriptures and in *Science and Health*), like Moses (who was told to "take it [the serpent] by the tail" in order to defeat its power to harm, Ex. 4:4), in handling the serpent by the tail, as typed by the head of the woman bowed over only the tail of the dragon, or serpent, in this first picture, destroyed the power of its head to harm; for according to the Scriptures (Rev. 12:4), in reversal of the physical fact that a serpent's venom is in its head, the tail (typing the "*drag on*" of Old Theology) alone manifested the power of the serpent to harm. In other words, Mrs. Eddy in handling the serpent, or dragon, of error by its tail of "lust and hypocrisy" completely rendered its venomous head powerless; for the understanding of the allness of divine Intelligence, which declares that "evil is destroyed by a sense of good" (S. & H. 311:13), alone could handle a serpent by the tail and not feel the power of the so-called intelligence of its head to harm. Hence the head of the woman in the upper right-hand corner of this picture is prayerfully bowed over the two divisions of the tail of the serpent, or dragon, as suggestive of the two-fold resistance of the human consciousness to the two-phased mission of the Woman of the Apocalypse, typing "Life," and "Love," S. & H. 517:10.

On the one hand, the two-fold resistance of the dragon took the form of persecution of the two-phased Woman in the sense that it taunted each phase with being inconsistent with the other, claiming that after the God-crowned Woman had revealed the allness of good and the perfection of man as its "man child" (Truth), the wilderness-woman attempted to lift the human consciousness thereto, thus denying her (as the God-crowned Woman's) initial revelation of the allness of good and the perfection of man—in other words, the dragon accused

the two-fold Woman of "*hypocrisy*," the first phase of its own nature, in line with Mrs. Eddy's interpretation of the dragon as, ". . . evil [which] still charges the spiritual idea with error's own nature and methods," S. & H. 564:3. On the other hand, the two-fold resistance of the dragon constantly stultified the effort of the wilderness-woman to lift the would-be followers of Truth to the initial revelation of the God-crowned Woman by tempting the Christian phase of the human consciousness to declare itself unworthy of claiming the fruition of its initial vision, thus permitting the drag-on of Christianity in its first coming to defeat the Science of its second coming; else the dragon tempted the unprepared thought of the would-be followers of Truth to metaphysically claim the *letter* of Truth, which is perfect, as the perfection of their own morally chaotic lives, thereby permitting license to lust by failing to challenge its depredations in the human consciousness, "*lust*" being the second phase of the dragon's own nature. And unchallenged lust for things and persons seems to open the door of consciousness to the fullness of the dragon's nature as defined by Mrs. Eddy in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health*,—namely, "Error; fear; inflammation; sensuality; subtlety; animal magnetism; envy; revenge," S. & H. 593:7. In short, the God-crowned Woman's revelation of Truth was a *subjective* consciousness which demanded the lifting of the followers of Truth *objectively* thereto; while the prophesied unpreparedness of the would-be followers of Truth made her revealing and founding consciousness seem inconsistent, which gave the drag-on of Old Theology its leeway.

In interpreting the tail of this heavenly dragon as having the power to draw the third part of the stars of heaven and cast them to earth, Mrs. Eddy says: "The serpentine form stands for subtlety, winding its way amidst all evil, but doing this in the name of good. Its sting is spoken of by Paul, when he refers to '*spiritual* wickedness in *high* places,'" S. & H. 563:27. The dragon had the power to cast but four of the twelve stars on Woman's crown to earth (Mrs. Eddy having stated that the twelve stars type the twelve tribes of Israel, which "show the workings of the spiritual idea," S. & H. 562:18), for the first four stars belong to *earth* demonstration inasmuch as Jesus of the fourth tribe of Israel, or Judah, ascended above earth in the morning light of Judah only after completing its evening phase—the tribes corresponding to the evenings and mornings in the first chapter of Genesis.

It will further be noted that the cloud-formed head of the woman in the upper right-hand corner of this picture now has a man's head as her crown. While this cloud-formed head of the woman had from the first edition of *Christ and Christmas* seemed to be crowned, not until the last revision of *Christ and Christmas* in 1910 did Mrs. Eddy remove this crown and replace it with a man's head as characterizing the nature of the crown of the heavenly Woman, who, Mrs. Eddy said at the point of the completion of her revelation, ". . . symbolizes generic [whole, complete] man," S. & H. 561:22. Thus this crowning of Woman's head showed that "the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse [which] typifies the divine method of warfare in Science" had reached "the glorious results of this warfare" in the sense that the wilderness-woman *had* lifted up the human consciousness as her "man child" to oneness with "Truth" (S. & H. 517:9) as the "man child" of the God-crowned Woman, for this latter "man child" was prophesied to be "caught up unto God, and to His throne," Rev. 12:5. When the head of manhood was placed as a crown upon the head of womanhood in this first picture in 1910, the mission of Womanhood was triumphant, for the God-crowned Woman, typed by the revealing (subjective) consciousness of Mrs. Eddy, and the wilderness-woman, typed by the founding (objective) consciousness of Mrs. Eddy, had become one.

The difference in the two processes as shown in this picture between "The Holy Family" as an ascending idea which turns its back on the human consciousness in line with Christianity's "Get thee behind me, Satan" and the cloud-formed head of the woman (in the upper right-hand corner of this picture), typifying Science, which prayerfully *faces* its problem in the more subtle forms of the human consciousness as "lust and hypocrisy" (typed by the two divisions of the dragon's tail) until it overcomes their resistance illustrates the difference between Christianity (which rose above error), typed by Jesus in his first coming, and Science (which demands the facing and scientific overcoming of error by each individual consciousness), typed by Jesus' second coming, under the light of "the star of Boston."

In the first and second editions of *Christ and Christmas*, the first two lines of the present stanza of the Poem corresponding to this first picture were then its third and fourth lines (or last two lines), and the first line of the present stanza, which begins with the words, "*Fast circling on,*" then read, "*Still circling on.*" The lines of this stanza were transposed to their present position, and the expression, "*Still circling*

on," was changed to, "Fast circling on," in the third edition. The word "still" suggests passive aimlessness, while the word "fast" suggests active objectivity. Also the first edition had "O'er the *dark* night" instead of "O'er the *grim* night" as in the second edition. *Webster's Dictionary* defines "dark" as "destitute of moral or spiritual light," and defines "grim" as "savage," "merciless," "fierce," and "relentless." Thus the definition of "dark" suggests the chaos and "darkness . . . upon the face of the deep" in the second verse of the first chapter of Genesis before "the Spirit of God moved upon" it; while "grim" describes the struggle of light with darkness in the human consciousness after God had said, "Let there be light," Gen. 1:3. This was the first divine command given to the human consciousness, and it started the grim struggle of manhood to *objectively* demonstrate the light of Womanhood, which existed *subjectively* before the command was necessary. Thus when Mrs. Eddy used "O'er the *dark* night" instead of "O'er the *grim* night" in the first stanza of the Poem, Woman did not give credit to the struggle of manhood, typing Christianity, that changed *darkness* into *grim* moral struggle. In confirmation of the significance of this change, Mrs. Eddy simultaneously added the "Glossary" of *Christ and Christmas* containing the Scriptural texts for the pictures—the Scriptures recording the struggle of manhood.

THE "FAST CIRCLING" STAR

Inasmuch as the star which characterizes this picture is (in the words of the first stanza of the Poem) "fast circling on, from *zone to zone*," a very pertinent question might be asked, What are the successive *zones* within its orbit? and again, From what "*zone*" does it start its progressive "circling"?

The *zones* are undoubtedly the twelve tribes of Israel as the human counterpart of the twelve stars on Woman's crown, S. & H. 562:11, or the twelve sons of Jacob ("Israel" being Jacob's spiritual name bestowed upon him by the last angel with which he wrestled, Gen. 32:24, as subsequently presented), for Mrs. Eddy calls Jacob "the revelation of Science" and says that the twelve tribes of Israel are "the lamps in the spiritual heavens of the age, which *show the workings of the spiritual idea*," S. & H. 562:16-18. Jacob had a pre-vision of his twelve sons in a dream wherein he beheld "a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it," Gen. 28:12. That this Ladder had seven

rungs * is evidenced by the fact that the first chapter of Genesis, which Mrs. Eddy calls "the Science of creation," S. & H. 537:23, unfolds seven days of ascending consciousness from earth to heaven. As the Bible records that the angels on Jacob's Ladder first ascended and then descended, they prototyped the processes by which the twelve sons of Jacob as the twelve tribes of Israel first ascended from earth to heaven (typing the angels of human purification with "fingers . . . [which] point upward to a new and glorified trust," S. & H. 299:9, or man's thoughts rising to God) and then descended to earth (typing "God's thoughts passing to man," Mrs. Eddy's definition of "angels" in the "Glossary"). Jesus, typing Christianity, or manhood, in his Revelation to St. John first appeared holding seven stars in his right hand, Rev. 1:16, which he called "angels," Rev. 1:20, and subsequently prophesied of twelve stars on Woman's crown (Rev. 12:1) as typing Science. Mrs. Eddy in her interpretation of Jesus' prophecy of the Woman crowned with twelve stars says that this Woman types "the spiritual idea" (S. & H. 561:23) and, as before noted, that the twelve stars on Woman's crown are *spiritual* identification of the twelve tribes of Israel to which the *human* symbols of the twelve tribes of Israel yield, and as such become "the lamps in the spiritual heavens of the age, which *show the workings of the spiritual idea*," S. & H. 562:17. Hence the orbit of the "fast circling" star presented in the first stanza of the poem "Christ and Christmas" (which stanza corresponds to this first picture) embraces the full twelve tribes of Israel, and the "zone to zone" progress of the "fast circling star is from star to star, or from tribe to tribe, starting with the first star on Woman's crown and finishing with the twelfth, or last, star. So the first star in the orbit of the "fast circling" star would type Reuben, the first tribe of Israel, and the last star would type Benjamin, the twelfth, or last, tribe of Israel.

As before noted, when Jesus appeared to St. John in his great Revelation he held but seven stars in his right hand, Rev. 1:16, more latterly prophesying of the twelve stars on Woman's crown, Rev. 12:1.

* In an old *Journal* (June 1886) published under the supervision of Mrs. Eddy in an article entitled "Jacob's Ladder," it was stated that Jacob's Ladder was typified by "the seven colors in the rainbow," thus confirming the thought that there are seven rungs on Jacob's Ladder. This article also stated that "the Tree of Life bore the leaves of Truth, and the fruits of Love, the latter . . . [being] subject to twelve statements, which are necessary to its understanding." The twelve "fruits of Love" symbolize the twelve tribes of Israel.

Thus the progressive *zones* which constitute the progressive course of this "fast circling" star must be the encompassment of the seven stars in Jesus' right hand, typing Christianity, by the twelve stars on Woman's crown, typing *Christian Science*. The seven stars in Jesus' right hand as related to the twelve on Woman's crown show the limitation of "the masculine representative of the spiritual idea," S. & H. 565:11, typed by Jesus' first appearing, when compared with the feminine representative of "the spiritual idea," typed by Jesus' "second appearing"; for Mrs. Eddy says, "The second appearing of Jesus is, unquestionably, the spiritual advent of the advancing idea of God, as in *Christian Science*," Ret. 70:20. The significance of the numerical disparity between the stars held by manhood and those on Woman's crown may be seen in the relative definitions of "the ideal man" and "the ideal woman," S. & H. 517:8-10, also by Mrs. Eddy's statements as showing the distinction between St. John's conception of Jesus as "the human and divine coincidence," or "divinity embracing *humanity*," and her interpretation of the Woman in "The Apocalypse" as symbolizing "generic man," or "the coincidence of God and man as the *divine* Principle and *divine* idea" with no humanity,—both statements being found in *Science and Health* on page 561.

Hence, as the advancing "*zone to zone*" of the "fast circling" star in *Christ and Christmas* (starting its orbit in this first picture) is the progressive course from star to star on Woman's crown, all the pictures in *Christ and Christmas* as presenting the progression of "the spiritual idea" must be the step-by-step illustration of these *zones*. Since the twelve tribes of Israel are the *human* symbols of the twelve stars on Woman's crown to which Mrs. Eddy says the tribes must yield, S. & H. 562:14, the pictures should also be regarded in their progressive aspects as illustrative of the twelve tribes of Israel yielding to the twelve stars on Woman's crown as their spiritual identity.

Inasmuch as "the twelve tribes of Israel [which must yield to the stars on Woman's crown] stand in type for the whole human race," * a comparison of the definition of "Children of Israel [tribes of Israel]" in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* as, ". . . the offspring of Spirit, who, having wrestled with error, sin, and sense, are governed by divine Science," with Mrs. Eddy's immediately preceding definition of "children" as, "The spiritual thoughts and repre-

* See authorized interpretation of the twelve tribes of Israel as typing "the whole human race," *April Journal*, 1895, p. 5.

sentatives of Life, Truth, and Love [God's children]" as well as "sensual and mortal beliefs; counterfeits of creation ['children of men'], whose better originals are God's thoughts, not in embryo, but in maturity . . .," show that the progressive consciousness of the twelve tribes of Israel perform the *working* office of lifting the widely divergent reversal of children as "sensual and mortal beliefs" to their "better originals . . . [as] God's thoughts." Thus Mrs. Eddy defines the twelve stars on the heavenly Woman's crown as "the twelve tribes of Israel *with all mortals*" after they have "through much tribulation yield[ed] to the activities of the divine Principle of man in the harmony of Science," adding, "These are the stars in the crown of rejoicing. They are the lamps in the spiritual heavens of the age, which show the *workings* of the spiritual idea," S. & H. 562:14. The words "*with all mortals*" show that the tribes' progressive work in the human consciousness is the manner in which "all mortals" yield "to the divine Principle of man in the harmony of Science," for each and every tribe in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* as defined by Mrs. Eddy starts its course heavenward as "a corporeal mortal," or its equivalent in mortal expression. In other words, the twelve tribes of Israel (Children of Israel) do the *work* in the mortal consciousness for "all mortals" in proportion to mortals' utilization in their own lives of the Principle behind the twelve tribes of Israel. Therefore the "Children of Israel" as "the offspring of Spirit" ("spiritual thoughts and representatives of Life, Truth, and Love," Mrs. Eddy's *spiritual* definition of "children") as specific tribes of Israel indicate the thought-steps of each human consciousness in bridging the seeming chasm between "sensual and mortal beliefs" and their "better originals" as "God's thoughts."

Since Jesus defined the seven stars which he held in his right hand (Rev. 1:16—before prophesying of the twelve on Woman's crown in Revelation 12:1) as "the angels [spiritual ideas] of the . . . churches,"* Rev. 1:20, and since Mrs. Eddy says that the twelve stars on Woman's crown (which embrace the seven stars in Jesus' right hand) are the twelve tribes of Israel, S. & H. 562:16, the angels of the churches are the angels (spiritual ideas) of the twelve tribes. This is symbolically attested by the fact that a tribal angel appeared at each gate of the

* Mrs. Eddy associates the seven churches which Jesus sent out (Rev. chaps. 2 and 3) on the basis of the seven stars with "the full number of [seven] days named in the creation," *Message '00*, p. 14, typed by the seven ascending angels on Jacob's Ladder of Life.

City foursquare, Rev. 21:12. Thus as the Poem and pictures in *Christ and Christmas* illustrate the progressive twelve tribes of Israel, they are the "glad echoes" of the "overtures" of the "angels of the . . . churches" into whose angelic charge Mrs. Eddy has placed *Christ and Christmas*, as previously noted in the Foreword,—each successive picture, together with its stanza or stanzas of the Poem applicable to it, echoing the progressively new overture of its specific tribal *angel*, or spiritual idea, which is its specific star-light. In this connection it will be remembered, as also presented in the Foreword, that Mrs. Eddy in her article in *Miscellaneous Writings* entitled "Christ and Christmas" says of "Christian Science and its art": "*Angels, with overtures, hold charge over both, and announce their Principle and idea*" (Mis. 374:14)—this is strikingly the function of the tribes as angels in this book.

(Bearing out this conception of *Christ and Christmas* as echoing angels' "overtures," Mrs. Eddy in her basic presentation of *Christ and Christmas* in 1893 and even after its restoration in 1897 pictured the descending light behind the Woman in the tenth picture as emanating from a gathering of stars, suggesting the song of the stars ["the stars sang together and all was primeval harmony," S. & H. 565:23] as "angels of the . . . churches." These stars in the tenth picture progressively changed their form in the eleventh picture [as presented in the early editions of *Christ and Christmas*] to a vast concourse of angels in heaven inspiring the song of the singing birds on the cross, of whose song Mrs. Eddy says in the corresponding stanza of the Poem, "Eternal swells Christ's music-tone, in heaven's hymn"—heaven being typed by the angels.)

Each of the twelve gates in the City foursquare (for the *heavenly stars* come down to earth as gates—of human opportunity) is symbolized in the twelfth verse of the twenty-first chapter of Revelation as having the name of one of the tribes on it (each gate typing a separate tribe), and at each gate, which was made of one solid pearl (typing its redemption to self-purity), was a corresponding tribal angel, typing its own angelic tribal "overture." Therefore, starting this first picture upon the basis of these premises, it and each of the following pictures will be characterized by the "zone" of a progressive tribe; all of the pictures, which "show the workings of the spiritual idea," collectively illustrating the complete orbit of the "fast circling" star, which culminates in the redemption of "all mortals," S. & H. 562:12.

SYMBOLIC SOURCES OF THE TWELVE TRIBES OF ISRAEL

St. Paul in his discourse on faith in Hebrews * wrote: "By faith Abraham [together with Sarah his wife], when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. . . . For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God," Hebr. 11:8, 10. Mrs. Eddy identifies St. Paul's description of this city for which Abraham looked as the City foursquare, S. & H. 575:7-13. Since this City foursquare, founded on the twelve apostles of the Lamb, with its twelve angelic tribal gates was symbolically built in the human consciousness by the twelve tribes of Israel (the lineal and spiritual descendants of Abraham and Sarah), Abraham and Sarah in looking for this City *subjectively* foresaw what proved to be the full *objective* demonstration of the twelve tribes of Israel.

St. Paul calls the literal history of the basic characters of the Bible—Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar (Sarah's handmaid)—"an allegory," Gal. 4:24, thus inferentially giving immortality to all Bible characters (beyond their literal history) by making each and all a phase of the allegory of each individual human life, in line with Mrs. Eddy's calling the entire Adam-dream of man and woman an "allegory," S. & H. 177:15. So each Bible character is a forever symbol of the divine as far as it is an expression of progressive Truth in the human consciousness; while each seeming successive "deflection of being" becomes a negation of the phase of Truth behind its positive symbol, for Mrs. Eddy says that a "deflection of being, rightly viewed, serves to suggest the proper reflection of God . . . ," S. & H. 502:11.

In line with the fact that Sarah and Hagar are basic characters in the allegory of everyone's life, St. Paul called them "the two covenants" (of Inspiration, or Spirit, and Law), Gal. 4:24. He characterized Sarah, the first covenant, as, "Jerusalem which is above [and that] is free, which is the mother of us all," Gal. 4:26,—thus negating the motherhood of "Eve," meaning "mother of all living" (Gen. 3:20), until true Motherhood was established, which redeemed all motherhood. He characterized Hagar, the second covenant, as "mount Sinai,

* Despite the fact that many Bible scholars contend that St. Paul did not write Hebrews, Mrs. Eddy accepts his authorship of this Epistle. See Scriptural "basis" for seventh picture in the "Glossary" of *Christ and Christmas* from Hebrews 7:3, which Mrs. Eddy attributes to St. Paul.

which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar [Hagar]. For this Agar [Hagar] is mount Sinai in Arabia," * Gal. 4:24, 25, despite the fact that Hagar lived four hundred and thirty years before the Law of Mount Sinai was revealed to Moses, indicating that Hagar's real identity came only when the Law for which she was a negative demand (by reason of her deflection therefrom, as subsequently presented) came to expression; for St. Paul said that the Law of Mount Sinai was "added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made," Gal. 3:19. Thus transgressions of the Law were charged to transgressors even before the Law came to expression, as in the case of Hagar.

Since Abraham and Sarah were brother and sister (they having had the same father, fatherhood typing Principle, S. & H. 586:9), Gen. 20:12, they *approached* in type the unified male and female elements as "man and woman unchanged forever in their individual characters . . . governed by one Principle," or "Mind" as Father (as expressed in the definition of "Us" in the definition of the "I, or Ego," S. & H. 586:12); however, Abraham and Sarah could not wholly type the unified male and female elements "governed by one Principle" because they had two mothers (Gen. 20:12), or different sources of conception, which divisible motherhood must be subsequently reckoned with in the unfolding Principle of the allegory of Life.

Sarah being barren and despairing of earthly fruit gave her handmaid, Hagar, to Abraham for the purpose of bearing her a child, Gen. 16:2, in accordance with the human law of her time, or "the laws of the land," that in this instance permitted the husband of a barren woman to use his wife's handmaid in order to bring forth a child to his wife. Inasmuch as true Womanhood, typed by Sarah, subjectively embraces true manhood as an exclusive reflection of "the one Mind," and inasmuch as true Womanhood is "a law unto" itself, seeing everyone else in the same position and, therefore, all men as equal,—the "saviour" of mortal consciousness (mortal consciousness being typed by Hagar as the servant-consciousness) must come through man (prototyped in this instance by Abraham) as the expression of Mind, for Mind as a Lawmaker for mortal consciousness is accorded exclusively to "Father" (S. & H. 586:9) and to "the male idea" as "intelligence" (S. & H. 517:9), Mind being the only quality that neither "Mother" as "divine and eternal Principle; Life, Truth, and Love" (S. & H.

* The *Twentieth Century Testament* translates this statement as "the word Hagar meaning in Arabia Mount Sinai."

592:16) nor "the [subjective] female idea" * as the full trinity of "Life, Truth, and Love" (before it was divided for objective demonstration as now, S. & H. 517:10) characterizingly embraces. Therefore "intelligence" as the medial footstep of manhood became the constructor of the medially progressive laws (beginning with "the laws of the land"), and Abraham in his willingness to accept a child through the process of man-perceived laws instead of awaiting the child of "promise" later borne by Sarah (who as typing true Womanhood was "a law unto" herself) accepted a divisible position from Sarah.

Thus the medial law of divisible (from woman) man that permitted Abraham a child by a servant when accepted and conformed to by Sarah brought her only the hatred of her handmaid as soon as her handmaid had conceived with Abraham, Gen. 16:4. Whereupon Sarah said unto Abraham, "My wrong be upon thee: . . . the Lord judge between me and thee" (thus showing the divisibility of their two positions, or the great distance between Love and Law at this point), Gen. 16:5. And Abraham said unto Sarah, "Behold, thy maid is in thine hand; do to her as it pleaseth thee," and the Biblical record continues, "And when Sarai [Sarah] dealt hardly with her, she fled from her face," Gen. 16:6. But Hagar was told by an angel (which is only a "mediator," in whose hands the Law is placed, between God and man, Gal. 3:19) to return to do Sarah's bidding in all things, because Law (of which Hagar was the prototype) is always subject to Inspiration (which Sarah typed) as its divine source.† In other words, the reason for the angel's telling Hagar to submit to Sarah's bidding was that Hagar as the then channel for the process of man-perceived law prototyped the fact that Law is always the servant of Inspiration (or Spirit), with no separate mind or identity therefrom.

However, since not even the Law of Mount Sinai (of which Hagar

* From the third edition of *Science and Health*, in 1881 (in which the male idea and female idea were distinguishingly interpreted for the first time in correlation of Genesis 1:27), to the sixteenth edition, in 1886, wherein Mrs. Eddy divided the male idea and female idea for demonstration as now, S. & H. 517:8-10, Mrs. Eddy said, "The male idea corresponds to creation, Life, and Truth; the female idea to Life, Truth, and Love," third ed., Vol. II, p. 118. In the sixth edition, in 1883, when Mrs. Eddy added the "Glossary" to *Science and Health*, she defined "Father" as, "The great forever, eternal Mind; divine Principle, named God," and "Mother" as, "Divine and eternal Principle,—Life, Truth, and Love."

† As an evidence that divine Law is the source of human law, or "the laws of the land," Mrs. Eddy says of even Christian Science, ". . . Christian Science cannot annul nor make void the laws of the land, since Christ, the great demonstrator of Christian Science, said, 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil,'" My. 219:21-25.

was the prototype) could exalt itself above Inspiration, or Spirit (typed by Sarah), as its source, when Sarah used Hagar as her lawfully mindless channel for a child, and Hagar (rebellious at the law that denied a bondswoman any identity as a mother) claimed this child—whom she had named Ishmael—for her own son, despising Sarah as the source of its conception, she (Hagar) transgressed a law more basic than the human law which permitted a mistress to use a bondswoman as a channel for her own child. As Hagar in her rebellion typed the mortal will to which the Law of Mt. Sinai with its “*Thou shalt[s]*” and “*Thou shalt not[s]*” was first directed over four hundred years thereafter, to the end of forcing the mortal will to wholly negate itself in abject obedience to the divine will, her enforced obedience to the higher will of Sarah (whose true Womanhood, corresponding to Love, prototyped the source of the Law of Mount Sinai, remembering that *God* himself “wrote them in two tables of stone,” Deut. 5:22), which negated her own mind and will, prefigured the fact that the mortal will must negate itself in “mindless” obedience to the divine will before it (the mortal will) can intelligently rise to an understanding of the Law of Mount Sinai’s inner justices. In other words, as Mrs. Eddy says in referring to mortal mind (mortal will), “We cannot fill vessels already full. They must first be emptied,” S. & H. 201:13; thus the process of the Law of Mount Sinai demands that mortal mind must by denials be emptied of mortal will in order to make room for the affirmations of the divine will, which latter lift it (mortal will) to the intelligence of the Law’s inner justices as its own will, that then says, “*I shall*” and “*I shall not*,” instead of being forced to obey, “*Thou shalt*” and “*Thou shalt not*.” Thus the very “law of the land” of Hagar’s time that robbed a servant of all mortal will and mental identity (as prototyping the negating necessities of the Law of Mount Sinai before its intelligent justices could be realized) *figuratively* drew its own life from the same source as the Law of Mount Sinai, which illustrates Mrs. Eddy’s exaltation of “the laws of the land” when she, as before noted, says of even Christian Science, “. . . Christian Science cannot annul nor make void the laws of the land,” My. 219:21.

Thus as Hagar prototyped the Law of Mount Sinai, in her rebellion to the will of Sarah she but reversed the process of the Law of Mount Sinai by claiming mortal will as her intelligence before obeying the higher will of her mistress, which demanded the denial of her (Hagar’s) own will. However, the affirmative justices of the Law of Mount Sinai were the true identity of Hagar, inasmuch as Mrs. Eddy interprets

"error as starting from an idea of good on a material basis," S. & H. 546:13, which "material basis" rebels against its true source as "an idea of good" until its "material basis" is negated, leaving the "idea of good" free to identify itself with its true source. Hence Hagar in her flight from the demands of her mistress' judgments "fled" the right to be even a servant of Law, which is the only channel through which mortal consciousness can reach the intelligence of its justices.

After Sarah bore Isaac as a child of "promise," Hagar's son, Ishmael, who was fourteen years older than Isaac (his mother having been taken back by Sarah into her home), "mocked" Isaac; whereupon Sarah demanded of Abraham that he cast out Hagar and Ishmael, saying, "[*You*] cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac," Gen. 21:10. It was but natural that Sarah as typing true Womanhood, that is "a law unto" itself and that sees God and man as needing no "mediator" (thus being above the mediatorial plane of law), should have demanded that Abraham as typing Fatherhood, or Mind (from which mediatorial law emanates), cast out her handmaid as a prototype of the mediatorial Law of Mount Sinai "which gendereth to bondage" (to the consciousness which needs no mediatorial proscriptions and prescriptions).

Mrs. Eddy says that "law is never material: it is always mental [wholly the expression of Mind]," Mis. 73:12, and since Mind is the only exclusive quality of the fatherhood of God (S. & H. 586:9), and "intelligence" as the emanation thereof is the only exclusive quality of man, S. & H. 517:9, all law lies within the province of manhood as divisibly distinguished from womanhood. Therefore when Sarah cast back Hagar (as a lawful process, prototyping the Law of Mount Sinai) to Abraham, saying, "[*You*] cast out this bondwoman and her son," Gen. 21:10, it was because Abraham as human father ("Abraham" meaning "father") was a symbol of the objective divisibility of the fatherhood of God as Mind—Mind being a mediatorial quality of God. The term "objective divisibility" as applied to the fatherhood of God is used because of the previously stated fact that "the one Mind" is the only exclusively characterizing quality of Father (as distinguished from Mother) as defined by Mrs. Eddy, which doubtless caused her to conclude her definition of "Father" with the words, "[only] *called* God," in contrast to her definition of "Mother" as "God," S. & H. 586, 592; and as "Mother" as "God" does not include

“the one Mind” it shows that Mind is objectively a mediatorial quality of God, that is divisible from Mother as God. Therefore Abraham as the reflection of the divisible fatherhood of God expressed a like objective divisibility from Sarah as typing the motherhood of God.* Thus Abraham (who had previously made a covenant with God for the preservation of Hagar’s son Ishmael), even while following Sarah’s direction to cast out Hagar and her son, aided in preserving their lives as channels for the ascending objectivity of law to Mind as its source in order that Mind might be demonstrably embraced in Motherhood. Never until the Law of Mount Sinai, which the transgression of Law demanded, was given Moses did Hagar again have the opportunity through her typical descendants to become an obedient servant of Law as a precedent necessity to lifting her son (who, like herself, was a rebellious “wild man” whose “hand . . . [was] against every man,” Gen. 16:12) through law to the house of “promise,” out of which she and her son had been cast by Sarah’s demand.

It should be borne in mind that as Sarah lived four hundred years before the Law of Mount Sinai was given Moses, she could inherently type only inspirational sense, or the first covenant; and that Hagar although living at the same time as Sarah could inherently type nothing (error being a negative sense, and a bondwoman a mental negation in relation to her mistress) until the Law of Mount Sinai, or the second covenant, which St. Paul said was “added because of transgressions,” provided a means of salvation for her and her son as transgressors (because Hagar, typing mortal consciousness, “despised” Sarah, and Ishmael “mocked” her son Isaac, the child of “promise”) of the first covenant of “promise,” for even a transgression of Law bespeaks the presence of that Law by reversal, Mrs. Eddy having said, “. . . a lie takes its pattern from Truth by reversing Truth. So evil and all its forms are inverted good,” Un. 53:1.

In the third edition of *Science and Health*, Mrs. Eddy, in inter-
 * The words “objective divisibility” as applied to Abraham as human father are used in the sense that Abraham when he preserved Ishmael, whom Sarah cast out, typed man in the position of being objectively divisible from woman, which eventuated, after Sarah’s passing, in Abraham’s objective marriage to Keturah, an *Egyptian* woman, who bore him six additional sons, Gen. 25:1, 2, thus opening up for him (as a type of all mankind) an objective ascending course leading to his former subjective position of oneness with Sarah when she bore their child of “promise.” So the first covenant of Inspiration, typed by Sarah, which Abraham accepted from God, was subjective; while the second covenant of Law, prototyped by Hagar, who bore Abraham’s lawful child, was objective.

preting earth and heaven, said that the male consciousness typed earth and the female consciousness typed heaven, her statement being, ". . . and this earth and heaven are now and forever the male and female of Spirit," Vol. II, p. 120. Thus in this allegory Sarah typed heaven, or "Jerusalem, which is from above" and knows nothing of the demands of earth; while Abraham typed the true sense of earth, which pleads for its preservation through the process of lawful ascension to the position of "promise." So, contrastingly with Sarah's ejection of Hagar and her son Ishmael, Abraham had prayed for the preservation of the life of Hagar's son Ishmael (typing unredeemed earth) after Hagar had "fled" from Sarah, Gen. 17:18, 20. And as a result of Abraham's prayer God later raised up twelve sons of Ishmael, prototyping the demand for the covenant of Law (Mount Sinai) as the only channel through which transgressors of Law could reach the position of Sonship, or the covenant of "promise."

Thus God made two covenants with Abraham, one (corresponding to Sarah) upon the basis of his son of "promise," which reads, "I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him," and the other (corresponding to Hagar) upon the basis of his son Ishmael by Sarah's handmaid, which reads, "Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation," Gen. 17:19, 20. St. Paul in his inspirational sense (in line with Sarah's inspirational sense when she cast out Hagar and her son) recognized God's covenant with Abraham concerning Isaac as the child of "promise" when he said: "For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died," Rom. 7:9, and again when he said: "And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise," Gal. 3:17, 18. However, St. Paul, as before noted, also recognized the necessity of the covenant of Law for transgressors as well as the covenant of "promise" for "the elect" when he said: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was *ordained by angels* in the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one," Gal. 3:19, 20. (These angels by which the Mosaic

Law * was "ordained" were symbolized by the ascending and descending angels on Jacob's Ladder of Life, typing the spiritual ideas of his twelve sons.)

Thus St. Paul saw "the two covenants" as those of the "chosen" and the "called." The "chosen" being those who, like Sarah, had never disobeyed the demands of the Law (for, in the words of St. Paul, she "having not the law" did "by nature the things contained in the law," thus becoming "a law unto" herself, Rom. 2:14), and the "called" being those who had transgressed the Law and must therefore have a "mediator" in the law, called by St. Paul, a "schoolmaster to bring us [the 'called'] unto Christ," Gal. 3:24, the original position of the "chosen." However, the "called" (and such was Hagar, "called" as she was by Sarah to perform a lawful mission) must be amenable to the will of the "chosen" rather than that the "called" should exalt itself above the "chosen," as did Hagar when she "fled" from her position as the lawfully "called" and tried to place herself in Sarah's position as the "chosen." Both God and Abraham upheld Sarah in her demands upon Hagar, as did the angel (remembering that the true sense of Law was "ordained by angels," Gal. 3:19), for the angel said unto Hagar, "Return to thy mistress, and submit thyself under her hands," Gen. 16:9, and God said unto even Abraham after Sarah had demanded the casting out of Hagar and her son, ". . . in all that Sarah hath said [concerning Hagar] . . . hearken unto her voice," Gen. 21:12. So the "called," typing Law, was forced to obey the "chosen," typing Inspiration, or Spirit.

Inasmuch as Abraham had made a covenant with God for the preservation of Isaac and a covenant with God for the preservation of Ishmael, and Sarah had accepted only the covenant concerning Isaac (rejecting the covenant concerning Ishmael, which was designed to

* When Moses gathered the twelve tribes of Israel together, the covenant of Mount Sinai with its Ten Commandments was forthcoming, the Ten Commandments corresponding to the first ten tribes of Israel. The two commandments referred to by Jesus (and upon which he said all the Law and the prophets hang because they embrace the two divisions, as written on two tables of stone, of the Ten Commandments—the first five pertaining to man's duty to God and the last five pertaining to man's duty to man), corresponding to the last two tribes of Israel, which type composite Love (above the Law of Mount Sinai), were: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength" (Deut. 6:5), and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Lev. 19:18), Mark 12:30, 31, these two commandments expressing the covenant of "promise." Hence the spiritual ideas of the twelve tribes of Israel as angels, or offspring of Sarah's vision, "ordained" the Law for the twelve tribes of "Ishmael," meaning "hearing," or obedience to Law,—the Ishmaelites being the offspring of Hagar's deflection from Law.

lift Hagar and her descendants through the footsteps of the Law of Life [progressive living] to the position of "promise"), the progressive Principle in the unfolding allegory of Life demanded that Isaac, the son of "promise," and his wife Rebekah (whose mother named her "Rebekah" in accordance with her destiny, "Rebekah" meaning "quarrel appeased" [but not dissipated] between Sarah [Inspiration, or Spirit] and Hagar [Law]) unite "the two covenants" of Inspiration (or Spirit) and Law in one consciousness in order to identify the "city" with its *lawful* foundations as well as *inspirational* superstructure for which Abraham and Sarah looked in vain. However, this demand failed of fulfillment through Isaac and Rebekah inasmuch as Rebekah again brought forth the same struggle between "the two covenants" in twin sons, who fought in her womb, even before birth.

It will be remembered that Rebekah was barren, and when Isaac (instead of Rebekah) prayed that Rebekah bear a child, Rebekah conceived the twins, Esau and Jacob as typing "the two covenants" of Law and Inspiration (thus perpetuating the struggle between Sarah's inspirational son, Isaac, and Abraham's "lawful" son by Hagar, Ishmael). And when they fought in her womb before birth, she (Rebekah, instead of Isaac) inquired of "the Lord" concerning its meaning. Upon being informed that it was a struggle between nations and that the "elder [which proved to be Esau in priority of his presentation] shall serve the younger [Jacob]," Gen. 25:22, 23, Rebekah, foreseeing the *end* from the beginning (as does the inspiration of true Womanhood always, hence its reluctance to recognize the lawful footsteps needful to its attainment), named the younger "Jacob," meaning "supplanter." Thus she naturally and justifiably favored Jacob (as the favored of the Lord), while Isaac favored Esau as his *lawful* first-born—the Bible saying, "And Isaac loved Esau . . . but Rebekah loved Jacob," Gen. 25:28. Thus unlike Sarah, who first fulfilled the demands of Law before she bore her child of "promise" (acting upon inspirational revelation, which sees only the end and eschews the lawful means), Rebekah planned for Jacob to deceive his father in order to unlawfully receive Isaac's final blessing (Jacob having previously, at the demand of inspiration for his spiritual preferment, bought his brother's birthright for a "mess of pottage"); and Jacob, yielding to his mother's plan, stole his brother's blessing and so fell under the curse of transgressed *Law*, which resulted in his being forced to flee for his life from Esau's wrath. Thus Jacob because of transgression violated his inspirational nature, or the first covenant,

and, like Hagar, was forced to flee from the wrath of violated Law. Hence he placed himself under the necessity of subsequently fulfilling the demands of Law, or the second covenant, below his inspirational nature until he, through lawful footsteps, could demonstrably rise to Truth, which is inseparable from Love, the covenant of "promise"; for one's own necessities identify one's needful progress to one's own true nature, since error starts "from an idea of good on a material basis," S. & H. 546:14.

Thus because Abraham had divided his consciousness between "the two covenants" when he pleaded for the life of Ishmael, prototyping the demand for Law, after a son was promised him by Sarah, typing Inspiration, Isaac and Rebekah renewedly brought forth "the two covenants" in the twin consciousnesses of Jacob and Esau—Jacob typing Inspiration, or Spirit, identifying the consciousness of Sarah, and Esau typing Law (he having had the lawful birthright), identifying the consciousness of Hagar. The difference in the position of Sarah and that of Jacob as types of Inspiration was that Sarah *first* recognized man-perceived Law (upon the basis that composite Womanhood in its embrace of manhood, embraces Law—the human law being but an echo of the divine) by bearing a lawful child (through Hagar, her handmaid) before she bore her child of "promise" typing her inspirational nature, which was "a law unto" itself—hence her privilege of demanding that Abraham cast out her handmaid; while Jacob, typing Inspiration (S. & H. 589:5), claimed the privilege of being "a law unto" himself *before* recognizing the lawful claims of his brother Esau to birthright and to his father's final blessing—hence Jacob's grievous necessities to the end of lawful reparation. Rebekah, typing Inspiration as the covenant of "promise," being told by God that the elder son Esau, typing the lawful covenant, should serve the younger son, and having, therefore, named her younger son "Jacob," meaning "supplanter," precipitatingly demanded a triumph in Jacob's consciousness over Law outside of himself. Nevertheless each covenant having received God's blessing, Jacob was forced in turn to find in his own consciousness the way by which "the two covenants" could be made one. But the outlook was unpropitious, because Rebekah loved Jacob and Isaac loved Esau, and, therefore, the two sons of these different concepts repeatedly renewed the antagonism between Inspiration (Spirit) and Law, as previously typed by Sarah and Hagar. It was only by a progressive revelation of the Science of Life that Jacob could

accomplish the assignment of objectively making "the two covenants" one, which God always demands of the "chosen" to save the "called."

Thus Mrs. Eddy in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* defines Jacob as "inspiration" as well as "the [progressive] revelation of Science, in which the so-called material senses yield to the spiritual sense of Life and Love," S. & H. 589:5. These two definitions indicate the union of both covenants of "inspiration" and Law in Jacob's consciousness; for the first identifies Jacob's inspirational nature (in line with Sarah's consciousness), while the second denotes his step-by-step wrestling with Law and yielding thereto, as the angels (or messages) of God, until he finally saw the face of his brother Esau (from whose wrath he had fled), typing the demand of Law for recognition, as the face of God (in line with Hagar's necessity in order to lift her child to the position of "promise," for in Jacob's violation of Law he fell to Hagar's necessity). It was only after the final triumph of Jacob's wrestling with the angel of Law (remembering that the Laws of Commandment were "ordained" by "angels," and not God, Gal. 3:19) that Jacob's name, meaning "supplanter," was changed to "Israel," Gen. 32:28, whose twelve sons were the medium for saving "all mortals"—"all mortals" typing the twelve sons of Ishmael, who needed the Law to "bring . . . [them] unto Christ," Truth, which is inseparable from Love. Thus "the two covenants" were prophetically seen by St. Paul as united only when God's laws were first put into the minds (typing lawful consciousness) and then written in the hearts (typing inspirational consciousness) of the "called"—in the words of St. Paul, "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts," Hebr. 8:10. When the spiritual Law is put into the minds and written in the hearts of the "called," then Law will not despise Inspiration, or Spirit, neither will Inspiration, or Spirit, cast out Law, for they will be one.

A demand for the progressive Science of Life to unite the two consciousnesses of Inspiration (or Spirit) and Law was put upon Jacob as the expression of his mother's consciousness (just as the same demand was put upon Isaac as the expression of his mother's consciousness); for mothers in the Bible always named their children according to their prophetic destinies, and "Mother" as defined in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* types the fullness of the Principle of "Life, Truth, and Love," while "Father" as defined in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* merely identifies Principle as "Life." Thus Mrs. Eddy calls "Mother" (of which the human mother is the type) "God," S. & H. 592:16; while she says that "Father" (of which the human

father is the type) is only "commonly called God," S. & H. 586:9. Inasmuch as Mrs. Eddy defines Jacob as "the revelation of Science," and a revelation must have a source, and inasmuch as "Mother" as "God" types the fullness of Principle as "Life, Truth, and Love," the source of Jacob's "revelation of Science" must be found in his wives as the mothers of the twelve tribes of Israel, which as footsteps of Truth progressively identified "the revelation of Science" in Jacob's own consciousness. Therefore, since Mrs. Eddy says that "spiritual teaching must *always* be by symbols," S. & H. 575:13, in order to objectively understand the "Science" which was revealed to Jacob's consciousness through the footsteps of Truth, typed by the true ideas of his twelve sons, it has been first necessary to consider the Biblical allegory of Jacob's human life * in association with his twin Esau, who had the lawful birthright and was entitled to his father's last blessing (both being unlawfully claimed by Jacob), in order to comprehend Jacob's necessity to lawfully ascend the Ladder of Life to the end of again reaching his inspirational nature (wherein he was "a law unto" himself) before considering his association with his two wives as the mothers, or sources, of his twelve sons, typing the ascending and descending rungs of the Ladder of Life by which "outer" Law became the "inner" Law of his own consciousness.

When Jacob (typing Inspiration) was fleeing from his brother Esau (typing the demand of Law for recognition), he, as previously presented, had a vision of a Ladder, which reached unto heaven, and upon which angels first ascended and then descended, Gen. 28:12. These angels, typing the Principle of being by which man's consciousness purifyingly ascends from earth to his heavenly Bride, which Bride embracingly (of man's consciousness) then comes down to earth to dwell with men, Rev. 21:3, were a preview of the progressive spiritual ideas of Jacob's twelve sons as the twelve tribes of Israel, which, Mrs. Eddy says, "show the workings of the spiritual idea" (S. & H. 562:19) in uniting Law and Love. After Jacob had his vision of the angels on the Ladder of Life in his flight from Esau into his mother's country to her brother Laban, at his mother's and father's request, he met his cousin Rachel, whom he loved, she being the younger sister of Leah, both being daughters of Laban. Rachel was promised to Jacob in marriage as his reward for seven years of service to her father; at the end of which time, Laban (the father of Leah and Rachel), typing retribu-

* The Biblical record of Jacob's footsteps applicable to these comments may be found in Genesis, chapters 27, 28; 29:1-28.

tory Principle, practiced a deception upon Jacob similar in kind to the deception Jacob had practiced upon Esau, for Leah was lawfully (in conformity with the human law that the older sister must be married before the younger, or that Law must be fulfilled before Love can be reached), but deceptively, forced upon Jacob with the disappointing demand that he work seven years more for Rachel and accept Leah to wife in the meantime.

The fact that in the allegory Jacob, typing Inspiration, first loved Rachel characterized her as his inspirational concept of Love, and the fact that he hated Leah characterized her as his own concept of Life, which was distorted because his own mortal life was out of harmony with Life's Laws. Thus this hatred became an obstruction to his objectively reaching Rachel as his own concept of Love until his own life was lawfully (as a reparatory necessity) lifted through "the [progressive] revelation of Science" to "Truth," which is inseparable from Love, St. Paul having said, "I *through the law* [only] am dead to the law, that I might *live* unto God," Gal. 2:19. However, Rachel was given to Jacob at the same time as Leah, typing the truth that one can never be deprived of one's own vision of Love. But as Jacob's vision of Love (typed by Rachel) was beyond the self-placement of his own human life (in view of the fact that he had stolen his brother's blessing), he was forced to accept the laborious, ascending conceptions of Leah (typing the lawful necessity for self-disciplining of his own life) before he could regain his initial inspiration of Love. In other words, Jacob was forced to reascendingly take with Leah the seven ascending steps (typed by the seven inspirational years he worked for Rachel and was given Leah) from earth, typing Life (for the Ladder of Life was set up on the earth), to heaven, typing Love (for the top of the Ladder of Life reached to heaven), before he could descendingly (as embraced in Love) retrace the seven ascending rungs of the Ladder of Life and bring his vision back to earth, the point of his initial deflection; for the seven additional years he worked in order to attain Rachel bore no fruit with Rachel until his transgression (stealing his brother's blessing) against the Law (Law being typed by Leah whom he hated, just as Hagar "despised" the true sense of Law which Sarah's inspirational nature embraced) had been descendingly redeemed.

Thus Jacob was compelled to accept for his first wife one who (inspired by her own subjective sense of Love) would lawfully lift the curse of violated Law from his consciousness by the step-by-step-with-

him bearing of its weight, since lawless inspiration through his mother's consciousness had placed its weight upon him. Although Leah typed Life, what greater love could any woman bear than to assume to lift man's consciousness step by step to his own goal of inspirational Love, in the meantime she being willing to bear his hatred of his lawful self (as the weak-eyed ["tender eyed," Gen. 29:17] "vision" of Law that never sees beyond its immediate step) with which he viewed her. Was it not fitting that Jesus, in the vicarious bearing of the sins of unlawful manhood, should be born of the consciousness which lineally descended from Leah?

That Mrs. Eddy's definition of "Jacob" in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* as "inspiration" and "the revelation of Science" is a progressive climax to his human footsteps leading thereto is shown by the preceding progressive phases of her definition of Jacob, which are: "A corporeal mortal embracing duplicity, repentance, sensualism." These progressive phases of Mrs. Eddy's definition might be correlated with her interpretation of "the male idea" in the twenty-seventh verse of the first chapter of Genesis as expressed in our present edition of *Science and Health*, "The ideal man corresponds to creation, to intelligence, and to Truth," S. & H. 517:8. To specifically illustrate, Jacob as "a corporeal mortal embracing duplicity" might be correlated with "creation," his claim to duplicity having been a perversion of his mother's *initial* consciousness when she named him "Jacob," meaning "supplanter." The placing of this name upon him demanded that he spiritually supplant his twin brother (whose nature typed Jacob's own corporeal consciousness), which he first did by "duplicity" rather than by awaiting his brother's moral ascension to his (Jacob's) own inspirational nature.

"Repentance" in Jacob's experience might be correlated with the second phase of Mrs. Eddy's definition of "the ideal man" as "intelligence"; for after taking advantage of his brother's physical hunger to buy his brother's birthright for "a mess of pottage" and after stealing his brother's blessing, he found himself in a stony place (expressed in a familiar hymn—"Out of my stony griefs [typing 'repentance'] Bethel I'll raise"). It was in this barren, stony place that Jacob gathered stones for a pillow and lay down to rest and had his dream of the Ladder of Life, which reached from earth to heaven, and upon which angels first ascended and then descended, the ascending footsteps illustrating the only way by which true "repentance" can be accomplished—through reformatory "intelligence," or metaphysics; in other words,

the ascension of the angels from earth to heaven prophesied a reformatory demand upon Jacob's life-process before his inspirational nature could be sustained. So unprepared was Jacob's consciousness for the demands of this vision of the Ladder of Life, which reached to heaven, typing Love, that the Bible records, "And he was afraid, and said, How *dreadful* is this place! [heavenly demands being always dreadful to the unprepared thought] this is none other but the house of God, and this [labored demand for ascension to reach it] is the gate of heaven," Gen. 28:17.

The next footstep in the definition of Jacob in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* is "sensualism," to overcome which requires an advance step beyond reformatory "intelligence" (or the exchanging of the *objects* of sense for the *ideas* of Soul)—the yielding of the mental senses to the spiritual. Therefore "sensualism" demanded the translation of the children of Jacob into spiritual (not mental) ideas before Jacob's inspirational nature could be attained, typed by Rachel; for after the yielding of the mental senses to the spiritual, "inspiration," the next footstep in the definition of Jacob, demonstrably reaches "Truth," the third and last phase of the definition of "the ideal man," that is inseparable from Love and to whose embrace it yields. The last of Mrs. Eddy's definitions of Jacob as "the revelation of Science," in which the "so-called material senses yield to the spiritual sense of Life [typed by Leah] and Love [typed by Rachel]," presents a recapitulation of his entire progress from "sense to Soul," Mrs. Eddy having said: "When the human mind is advancing above itself towards the Divine, it is . . . taking steps . . . upwards. This upward tendency of humanity will finally gain the scope of Jacob's vision, and rise from sense to Soul, from earth to heaven," *Message '02*, p. 10. In other words, in the entire allegory "corporeality" as "creation" was supplanted by "the revelation of Science" as "Truth" through the medial process of "intelligence," or "metaphysics . . . [which] exchanges the objects of sense [typed by Jacob's progressive children as 'sensual and mortal beliefs,' S. & H. 583:1] for the ideas of Soul," S. & H. 269:14.

To summarize, Jacob having wrongfully bought his brother's birthright and stolen his brother's blessing (thus robbing his brother of his lawful identity) through "duplicity" was forced to fulfill his brother's prophesied destiny of "finisher" (the meaning of "Esau") of the Law, typed by Leah whom Jacob hated because she (to his own consciousness), being weak-eyed ("tender eyed," Gen. 29:17) and (after undertaking to lift Jacob in his objective course) never able to see

beyond the Law's immediate footstep, was, therefore, ever weary and heavy-laden—her weariness not being occasioned by the necessity of her own consciousness but by her necessity to lift Jacob through lawful processes from Life to Truth, which is one with Love. It was not until Jacob had reached the "fruits of Love" with Rachel, expressed in the birth of their first son (after Jacob had finished his lawful work with Leah), and after he had later triumphantly wrestled with the angel "until the breaking of the day," Gen. 32:24 ("day" meaning "irradiance of Life . . . the spiritual idea of Truth and Love," S. & H. 584:1), that "the two covenants" of Inspiration and Law became one in his consciousness, whereupon he received his new name of "Israel"; for as a prince he had power with God and had prevailed, Gen. 32:28,—had supplanted the false concept of his brother Esau in his own consciousness to where he could say to his brother, "I have seen thy face, as though I had seen the face of God," Gen. 33:10. Thus Jacob reached the consciousness of Rachel ("Rachel" meaning "ewe"—a female sheep, or lamb), or purity, typing "the Lamb's wife," Rev. 19:7, which Mrs. Eddy interprets as, "The Lamb's wife presents the unity of male and female [typing 'the two covenants' of Law and Inspiration, or Spirit] as no longer two wedded individuals, but as two individual natures in one," S. & H. 577:4. Hence Jacob was forced to prove by "the irradiance of [his own] Life" (S. & H. 584:1) that Law lifts Life to "the spontaneity of Love," My. 185:16.

However, inasmuch as Jacob, prophetically prototyping "the revelation of Science," was forced to reach this indivisible unity objectively through the consciousness of seemingly divisible womanhood, prophetically prototyped by Leah and Rachel, Mrs. Eddy, in her correlation of the "female" idea in the twenty-seventh verse of the first chapter of Genesis, divides woman into the two phases, Life and Love, saying, "The ideal woman corresponds to Life and to Love," S. & H. 517:10, showing that Life and Love symbolize the two phases of the same woman in ultimate demonstration since both correlate the "female" idea. Also, in her correlation of the "male" idea as presented in the same twenty-seventh verse of the first chapter of Genesis, Mrs. Eddy, as before noted, states, "The ideal man corresponds to creation, to intelligence, and to Truth," S. & H. 517:8. This shows the three progressive stages of manhood through which the two phases of Woman as "Life" and "Love" lift Jacob to oneness with Love; for it will be remembered that Mrs. Eddy defines Jacob as "the revelation of Science, in which the so-called material senses yield to the spiritual sense

of Life and Love," S. & H. 589:5, prototyped respectively by Leah and Rachel. Thus as both women together represent composite Womanhood, with which Mrs. Eddy correlates the "female" idea, their progressive sons were the footsteps of "Truth" by which "Life" and "Love" became one in the consciousness of Jacob (as "the revelation of Science") through the processes of "creation" (progressive children) and "intelligence" (their exchange as "objects of sense for the *ideas* of Soul," S. & H. 269:15). If for no other reason than that Leah became the direct channel for progressive *human* conception of the earthly tribes of Israel, she should be designated as typing Life; and if for no other reason than that Rachel bore the composite "spiritual [heavenly] idea" after Leah had completed her mission (that of lifting Jacob's life from hate to Love), she should be designated as typing Love. Mrs. Eddy calls creative power "Life," saying, "The universe of Spirit reflects the *creative* power of the divine Principle, or Life," S. & H. 507:15; while Love's composite "spiritual idea" is the expression of *self-existent* reality, for Mrs. Eddy says that "Love is the generic term for God," My. 185:14, and characterizes the full trinity of Life, Truth, and Love, which Love embraces, as "self-existent," S. & H. 583:21.

Jacob, up to the point of Rachel's children, alternately blessed and cursed the twelve tribes of Israel in his last word of prophecy concerning them in Genesis forty-ninth chapter, which left Mrs. Eddy (consistently with her calling Jacob "the revelation of Science," S. & H. 589:5) no other course in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* than to accept his human prophecy of commending or condemning each tribe according to its human history, since Jesus said, ". . . the scripture cannot be broken [therefore they must be fulfilled]," John 10:35. However, in view of the fact that the twelve tribes of Israel must be redeemed in order to identify the twelve stars on Woman's crown to which they yield, the course of this book will be to present only their mothers' blessing of them as progressive spiritual ideas of Truth, which ultimated in their respective symbolization as whole pearly gates in the City foursquare.

That the true motherly conception of a child is always an idea of Truth, even though distantly discerned, is shown by Mrs. Eddy's statement: "Whatever seems to be a new creation [in the human consciousness], is but the discovery of some distant idea of Truth; else [materially speaking] it is . . . as when some finite sense peers from its cloister with amazement and attempts to *pattern* the infinite,"

S. & H. 263:21-26. Thus even the lowest conception of motherhood counterfeits the divine idea, which it must see to "pattern." Hence Mrs. Eddy says of even mortal conception: "Mortal sense inverts this appearing and calls ideas material. Thus misinterpreted, the divine idea [only] seems [to human conception] to fall to the level of a human or material belief, called mortal man," S. & H. 507:30-2. In line with the thought that every "new creation [in the highest sense] is but the discovery of some distant idea of Truth," Leah and Rachel in their conceptions of the twelve tribes of Israel as typing the progressive Principle, or source, of being named their children according to the progressive circumstances which shaped the need for each successive ascending or descending footstep of Truth on the Ladder of Life, always prophetically declaring the reason for such names at the time they were so bestowed. Thus the progressive names of their children as typing their true natures not only "show [to the human consciousness] the workings of the spiritual idea" but the progressive footsteps of Jacob as "the revelation of Science."

TRUE MOTHERHOOD AS THE MEDIAL FOOTSTEP TO INDIVISIBLE WOMANHOOD, OR BRIDE

Eve as prototyping Sarah cast out Cain when she claimed Seth for *her* seed after Cain slew Abel, saying, "For God . . . hath appointed *me* another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew," Gen. 4:25,—thus casting back upon Adam as the tiller of the ground the responsibility of Cain, who "brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord," Gen. 4:3. Therefore despite the meaning of Eve's name as "the mother of all living," Gen. 3:20, she was not that Mother, for true Motherhood redeems even its lowliest child and *never casts it out*. Sarah proved herself only to be, according to St. Paul, the "Jerusalem which is above [earth] . . . which is the [heavenly] mother of us all" (Gal. 4:26) and not "the mother of all living [earthly ideas]"; for she claimed Isaac, typing the progression of heavenly vision, or sight, but rejected Ishmael, meaning "hearing," which is an objective earthly sense. Rebekah did not represent true Motherhood, for while she brought forth twin sons, she claimed only Jacob, typing Inspiration, or heavenly vision, and *rejected* Esau, who had the lawful earthly birthright over Jacob. This *rejection* of Esau by Rebekah was evidenced when she helped Jacob in his "duplicity" to supplant his brother Esau (who, like Ishmael, was a "wild man," Gen. 16:12, and in his affinity for Ishmael married his daughter, Gen. 28:9). Leah and

Rachel, while typing the dual oneness of Esau and Jacob, were *two* mothers, culminating in Rachel as one Mother (which embraced the goal of Leah's motherhood). However, Rachel bore a two-in-one-consciousness son, in the sense that she bore two sons but named her first, or heavenly, son "Joseph," meaning "addition," or "increase," as evidencing expectancy of another son for the completion of this first son, and yet *rejected* her second, or earthly, son by naming him "Benoni," meaning "son of my sorrow, or pain"—Jacob afterwards naming him "Benjamin," as subsequently presented. (Even after the twelve tribes of Israel reached the "Promised Land," typing the "promised" son, they could not remain there because they *rejected* the whole of mankind other than themselves.)

Because Sarah *rejected* her lawful child Ishmael, she brought forth Isaac as a child of "promise" only and not as the "promised" child; for the latter must embrace the consciousness of both earth and heaven, typing Life and Love. Thus Sarah's son was forced to await the coming through the medium of lawful evolution in the human consciousness "the seed" to which the "promise" was made, before Sonship could come into its full heritage of "the only begotten" of heaven and earth. This "seed" did not come until the God-crowned heavenly Woman, as the inspirational revealing consciousness, subjectively brought forth the *one* "man child," absolute Truth, as *one* generic Son (true Motherhood bringing forth but one Son had no other son to *reject*), whereupon this "man child" as Truth "was caught up unto God, and to His throne" (Rev. 12:5), where he as Truth became embracedly one with Love, his heavenly Bride, for Mrs. Eddy says that "Love is the generic [whole, complete] term for God," My. 185:14; whereas the earthly wilderness-woman (as the human phase of the *selfsame* Woman as prophesied by Jesus in his great Revelation to St. John), as the lawfully founding consciousness, objectively lifted up the human consciousness to the God-crowned Woman's "man child" as Truth, where it demonstrably became one with its heavenly Bride as Love in the coincidence of the human with the divine, S. & H. 561:16. However, the composite Bride is *indivisible Womanhood*, or generic Love, before she, in her Mother-phase, divisibly brings forth her "man child" as Truth; therefore Love is the highest objective potentiality, or latent possibility, of true Motherhood, for "Mother" is defined in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* as the full trinity of "Life, Truth, and Love." Hence the heavenly sense of Mother as Love is the God-

crowned Woman as Bride, which subjectively embraced both the divine and human concepts of Motherhood.

In attestation of the *indivisibility of Woman*, in the present edition of *Science and Health* Mrs. Eddy says of the God-crowned Woman as resplendent in her self-completeness before she divisibly brings forth her "man child" as Truth, "The Woman in the Apocalypse symbolizes generic [whole, complete] man," S. & H. 561:22. Thus this Woman was not only the heavenly God-crowned Woman embracing the earthly wilderness-woman in one consciousness, but she was also in more progressive aspect the *descending* "adorned" Bride (or union of heaven and earth as "the two covenants" in one), which descended to earth to dwell with men, Rev. 21:3, after earth, typed by manhood, had completed its ascent to heaven (following the course of the "man child, who . . . was caught up unto God, and to His throne," Rev. 12:5); for Mrs. Eddy says that "the Revelator saw also the spiritual ideal as a woman [the heavenly God-crowned Woman] clothed in light, a bride coming down from heaven," S. & H. 561:10, and she further states that the descending heavenly Bride is the "adorned" (whole, complete) "Word," My. 125:26, containing the wedded elements of both manhood and womanhood, S. & H. 577:4-7.

That this *indivisibility of Woman* as the Bride, or Word, was also Mrs. Eddy's *initial* subjective conception is evidenced by the fact that she as early as 1881, in the third edition of *Science and Health* under the chapter entitled "Creation," presented her first distinguishing interpretation of the "male and female" ideas of the sixth day in the first chapter of Genesis as: "The male idea corresponds to creation, Life, and Truth; the female idea to Life, Truth, and Love" (typed by indivisible Woman, or Bride), Vol. II, p. 118. However, as this initial presentation of "the female idea," corresponding to the full trinity of "Life, Truth, and Love," embraced only two phases of "the male idea" as "Life" and "Truth" and did not embrace "the male idea's" first phase as "creation," Mrs. Eddy simultaneously in the same chapter of the third edition *objectively* presented the seven ascending days of "creation" as the expression of the motherhood of God by calling God "She" and "Her" (also God was called "the All Mother" in the same chapter, Vol. II, p. 130), thus placing Motherhood as creative Life (the first phase of "the female idea") supportingly under "creation," for "creation" could not produce itself. So in view of this *medial necessity for Motherhood* as "Life" ("Life" being the first phase of the definition of "Mother" as "Life, Truth, and Love," see present edition

of *Science and Health*, p. 592) to embrace the first chapter of Genesis as "the Science of creation" (S. & H. 537:23) and lift it to "Truth" ("Truth" being the second phase of "Mother" and the last phase of "the male idea") where it would become one with "Love" ("Love" being the last phase of "Mother" and the last phase of "the female idea"),—when Mrs. Eddy in 1883 first added the "Glossary" (as the then sole *Key to the Scriptures*) to *Science and Health* in the sixth edition, she gave to the *objective* definition of "Mother" the entire potentialities of "Life, Truth, and Love," despite the fact that she still (as in the third edition) presented her *subjective* conception of "the female idea" as having these same qualities of "Life, Truth, and Love."

Later, in 1886, in the sixteenth edition of *Science and Health* when "The Apocalypse" was added (to the *Key to the Scriptures*) presenting the God-crowned Woman bringing forth her "man child" as Truth and the wilderness-woman as lifting up the human consciousness thereto, thus seemingly dividing Woman, Mrs. Eddy, in correlation of this divided presentation of Woman in "The Apocalypse," separated her subjective discernment of "the female idea" as "Life, Truth, and Love" into two phases of womanhood and one of manhood, the sixteenth edition of *Science and Health* then reading: "The male idea corresponds to creation, to Intelligence and Truth [Woman's 'man child']. The female idea corresponds to Life [the wilderness-woman] and Love [the God-crowned Woman]," p. 444. Thus by comparing this interpretation of "the male idea" and "the female idea" with the interpretation of "the male idea" and "the female idea" in the third edition of *Science and Health* (as previously presented), it will be noted that Mrs. Eddy had removed "Truth" from "the female idea" and substituted "Intelligence"* for "Life" in "the male idea" in order that the necessary medial footstep might be provided by which Motherhood as "Life" could objectively lift "creation" to "Truth," which is one with Love as indivisible Womanhood.

Mrs. Eddy's division of woman into two phases, "Life" and "Love," and her separation of man as "Truth" from both of these phases in her interpretation of the "male and female" ideas (Gen. 1:27) in the sixteenth edition (and as they still remain in our present edition) were prototyped by the separation of Leah as Life and Rachel as Love from Jacob as potential Truth. This division necessitated *the medial process of Motherhood*, as they—Leah as Life, Jacob as Truth, and Rachel as Love—could only be united through the footsteps of children, typing

* The initial letter of "Intelligence" was not decapitalized until 1903.

the progressive "footsteps of Truth," * since Mrs. Eddy had characterized the first step towards this end as "creation." Each motherly conception of Leah, typing Life, was a higher "discovery" of Truth in Jacob's consciousness, which lifted him step by step from "creation" through the medium of "intelligence" to Truth as manhood (Motherhood simultaneously being progressively lifted from "Life," the first phase of Motherhood, to "Truth," the second phase of Motherhood), which is indissolubly one with "Love," typed by Rachel as Womanhood, or Bride (at which culminating point the two children of Rachel prophetically became one, for Mrs. Eddy defines the Bride as "conceiving [generic, whole] man in the idea of God," S. & H. 582:14). Since Truth and Love are inseparable, Jacob, typing Truth, when seemingly separated from Rachel, typing Love, ceased to be Truth and fell to the level of the "hate" of Life, Life being typed by Leah, and was therefore forced to be lifted by Life (identifying the progress of his own life) back to Truth.

After Mrs. Eddy, prototyped by Leah, had fulfilled in *Science and Health* the prophecy of the wilderness-woman by lifting "creation" to "intelligence" and "intelligence" to "Truth," she, by decapitalization of the initial letter of the word "Creator" throughout *Science and Health* in 1903, dropped "Creator" as divinity to humanity, or human conception, more latterly, in 1907, changing the statement, "The eternal Elohim has *created* the universe" (typed by Leah's creative process), to, "The eternal Elohim *includes* the forever universe" (typed by Rachel as both "root" and "offspring" in one consciousness), S. & H. 515:16, thereby eliminating the *medial necessity of Motherhood*; and yet Mrs. Eddy left the divided footsteps of her interpretation of "the male idea" and "the female idea" as correlating "the ideal man" and "the ideal woman" ("ideal" being the objective climax of the human consciousness) in the chapter entitled "Genesis" in *Science and Health* (S. & H. 517:8-10) in order that the divisional apportionments of the elements of indivisible Woman, or generic man as unified in the

* This phrase, "footsteps of Truth," has been quoted here and elsewhere in this book only as showing that Mrs. Eddy in her chapter under this title in *Science and Health* has accepted the fact that Truth, although absolute in its divine sense, is approached only by degrees by the human consciousness. However, this quoted phrase is not intended to indicate that the chapter in *Science and Health* entitled "Footsteps of Truth" contains *the* (orderly progressive) footsteps of Truth referred to in this book as corresponding to the progressive tribal footsteps in the human consciousness leading to absolute Truth, as richly fraught as the chapter "Footsteps of Truth" is with (tribally unordered) spiritual truths.

Bride ("adorned," completed "Word," My. 125:26) of "The Apocalypse," might forever show the *objective* demands of the Bride upon the human consciousness.

With these foregoing facts in mind we approach the presentation of the personal conceptions of Leah, typing Life, and Rachel, typing Love, in their medial motherhood processes as expressed in the Biblical record, which prototyped Mrs. Eddy's impersonal motherly processes in the Word of *Science and Health* by which she progressively lifted her "man child" from "creation" through the medium of "intelligence" to "Truth," which is one with "Love" as indivisible Womanhood, or Bride.

"ZONE TO ZONE"

The "zone" of the "fast circling" star in this first picture is "*Reuben*," meaning "VISION," the first son of Leah and Jacob (or the first tribe of Israel). The Bible says of the conception of this first son: "*And when the Lord saw that Leah was hated, He opened her womb: . . . And Leah conceived, and bare a son, and she called his name Reuben: for she said, Surely the Lord hath looked upon my affliction; now therefore my husband will love me,*" Gen. 29:31, 32.

In accordance with the present and future plan of this book each of the statements concerning the mothers' (Leah's and Rachel's) conceptions at the birth of their sons will be divided into component textual parts for more direct correlation, and thus we begin with:

"*And when the Lord saw that Leah was hated, He opened her womb*"—Because Jacob, as already noted, had a pre-vision of Love as typed by Rachel, he hated the lawful footsteps of Life leading thereto, as typed by Leah. Inasmuch as the lawfully ascending footsteps from Life to Love must be demonstrably attained, God opened the womb of Leah, typing Life, in order that Love, typed by Rachel, might be ascendingly reached by Jacob, typing the progressive footsteps of Truth. In Leah's case the progressive footsteps of "Life that is Truth" (S. & H. 97:29) leading to Love were expressed in *children* (corresponding to the first phase of "the ideal man" as "creation" in our present edition of *Science and Health*, p. 517), the *Church* footsteps from Life to Love being the mentalizing of these children as

the twelve tribes of Israel in *idea* (corresponding to the second phase of "the ideal man" as "intelligence," S. & H. 517:9), and the *spiritual* footsteps from Life to Love being "Truth" (corresponding to the third phase of "the ideal man," S. & H. 517:9), which is inseparable from Love, typed by Rachel.

When God opened Leah's womb he opened her consciousness to the vision of Love where all "offspring" is conceived "within" (not "without"), since Love is indivisible and "root" and "offspring" are therein inseparable. But Leah having an earthly objective, that of lifting the consciousness of man, typing humanity, to her initial vision of Love, she prophetically and objectively brought forth a symbol of her inner consciousness as a child; for "spiritual teaching must *always* be by symbols" (S. & H. 575:13) up to the goal of "root" and "offspring" in one consciousness as initially and subjectively discerned by Woman.

Thus, to the consciousness of Woman, to whom Life, Truth, and Love were inseparable from "the beginning" as "*the only*," the lawfully ascending footsteps on the Ladder of Life were unneeded, but Jacob by the violation of divine Law, when he bought his brother's lawful birthright and stole his brother's blessing, did need to take the ascending "footsteps" of Life leading to Truth; and only basic Life as inseparable from Truth and Love could animate these footsteps, for the processes of law must ascend by reason of subjective impulsion rather than objective demand. Thus Leah and not Rachel must lift the human consciousness from Life to Truth through progressively basic conception. Hence, the human law (which compelled Leah to wed Jacob) demanded that the "elder [Leah] shall serve the younger [Rachel]" (as God revealed to Rebekah in characterization of her two sons)—the subjective consciousness having existed before it was forced to an objective course.

"*And Leah conceived, and bare a son, and she called his name Reuben*"—According to Leah's conception "Reuben" means "vision"—"vision of *the* son," the article "*the*" making it generic, or "the only begotten Son" of Love. Hence Reuben as the *initial* "vision of the [only] son" of Love is in line with the correlation of the tribes of Israel with the days of "creation," the initial indivisible oneness of heaven and earth as presented in the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis, "In the beginning [which Mrs. Eddy identifies as '*the only*'*] God created [both] the heaven and the earth," heaven typed by "the

* The italics are Mrs. Eddy's, S. & H. 502:25.

female idea" and earth typed by "the male idea"; for Mrs. Eddy said in the second volume of the third edition of *Science and Health*, ". . . and this earth and heaven are now and forever the male and female of Spirit," or "root" and "offspring" in one consciousness.

However, the moment Leah's consciousness as initially typing Love as oneness of "root" and "offspring" in one consciousness, or the subjective consciousness typed by Leah before she brought forth her son for the definite purpose of healing her husband of hate, became divided into Mother ("root") and Son ("offspring") outside of her subjective consciousness, Leah became conscious of the formlessness and voidness of earth as expressed in the second verse of the first day of the first chapter of Genesis when "darkness was upon the face of the deep"—the "deep" demanding fathoming by *mental* processes because objective Love has no "vision," or "sight." In other words, when Leah conceived within her own consciousness her concept was subjective; but when she brought forth a son as separated from her consciousness, she divided "root" and "offspring," thereby dividing heaven and earth, "vision" ("sight") and "hearing."

In confirmation of the eternal fact that Sonship before it is objectified as "offspring" is wholly embraced in the female consciousness as Truth, when Mrs. Eddy subjectively presented "the female idea" as "Life, Truth, and Love" in *Science and Health* (from the third edition, inclusive, up to the sixteenth edition) she defined "the male idea" as possessing only such qualities as "the female idea" embraced. And it was only after she separated Sonship as "Truth" (Mrs. Eddy having said, "as Life, represented by the Father; as Truth, represented by the Son; as Love, represented by the Mother," S. & H. 569:1) from "Life" and "Love" as the fatherhood and motherhood consciousness of "the female idea" in the chapter entitled "Genesis" in *Science and Health* that she for the first time in the addition of "The Apocalypse" to *Science and Health* presented "the female idea" as objectively bringing forth its "man child" as Truth outside of its own consciousness as "offspring"—both of these changes having taken place simultaneously in the sixteenth edition of *Science and Health*.

"For she said, Surely the Lord hath looked upon my affliction; now therefore my husband will love me"—How little Leah dreamed of the vastness of Love's plan to which she was called—that of encompassing the footsteps (which covered the range of the seven days of "creation," typed by Jacob's Ladder which reached from earth to

heaven, Reuben typing the first day thereof) between herself as Life and Rachel as Love ("the ideal woman" corresponding to indivisible "Life" and "Love," S. & H. 517: 10) through the consciousness of Jacob as the progressive "revelation of Science" as Truth; for Leah in her first inner conception of Reuben before she brought him forth saw nothing but the undivided heaven and earth of the first day of consciousness as "*the only*,"* and so accepted her *dedication* to Love's plan.

But Leah did not see Jacob's necessity to objectively overcome the resistance of hate, which requires the full measure of the ascending footsteps demanded by the first chapter of Genesis in order to reach Love objectively when Love is not one's own subjective consciousness. In other words, Leah had hoped that her own inner conception of Reuben as Love's "only begotten Son" would lift Life into Love in Jacob's consciousness without the labored footsteps of "creation" and "intelligence" as the objective processes by which "Truth" is reached when not a subjective consciousness—Mrs. Eddy having said of the first day only, typed by Reuben, "Was not this a revelation instead of a creation?" S. & H. 504: 14. Subjective revelation precluding objective "creation," Leah had hoped to share her revelation of the beginning as "*the only*"* with Jacob—Mrs. Eddy having said that the "*beginning*"* signifies "*the only*,"* S. & H. 502: 24.

In line with the correspondence of the first seven tribes of Israel to the first seven days of consciousness, the cloud of "darkness . . . upon the face of the deep" in the second verse of the first chapter of Genesis (which forced a division of the light from the darkness of the first day) might be identified with Leah's disappointment after finding that her first son Reuben as her inner spiritual conception of "the only begotten Son" had failed to lift Jacob's consciousness to her own conception of the oneness of Life and Love. Thus Jacob's inability to accept the indivisibility of earth and heaven as Life and Love forced Leah to bring forth her first son as "offspring" outside of her own consciousness. Had she not brought forth this first son in the first day, thus dividing "root" and "offspring," she would not have had to analytically divide "the waters which were under the firmament" from "the waters which were above the firmament," the latter typing divine Mind in the second day (which is the only day in the first chapter of Genesis that does not receive God's blessing) and could have unfolded the

* The italics are Mrs. Eddy's.

vastness of Love without the "evenings" and "mornings" that divided day (S. & H. 584:1) into "days" in the first chapter of Genesis.*

Thus Reuben was Leah's unalloyed conception of Love's plan to which she *dedicated* herself by acceptance of the unknown vastness of its demands—Love's plan being that of reaching through demonstration a place in consciousness where she and her husband would become one in Love. "Dedication" means "*de*, down, + *dico*, declare," or a call from above to a mission, or purpose, larger than one's consciousness can then comprehend, but which one inspirationally accepts. So the first step in ascending Church is *dedication* to Love's plan, as Leah's first step prefigured, no two steps of which are demonstrably visible at the same time—the plan as a whole being visible only after its specific footsteps have been demonstrably taken.

(Identical Fulfillment)

The initial step of dedication could be generalized in this first picture as being the first illumination of the heavenly light of Christian Science to which one inspirationally *dedicates* himself; for this step types the first stage in Christian Science where the revelation of man's always-perfection is reached with the unalloyed joy incident upon a consciousness of nothing but good with no sense of the later painful necessity of dividing the light from the darkness. However, *Christ and Christmas* must first specifically identify this *dedicatory* call as the unfolding Word in Mrs. Eddy's consciousness; for the editor of the *Journal* said with Mrs. Eddy's unqualified approval, as previously presented: ". . . to the Christian Scientist whose eyes have been partly opened to Jesus' mission as it is being exemplified in Christian Science to-day, it [*Christ and Christmas*] must be a new revelation of the *God-anointed mission of our Leader*," *January Journal*, 1894, p. 467. Thus the following identifies the *dedicatory* call to the mission of the revelation of Womanhood through Mrs. Eddy's consciousness—the full demands of which were unknown to her just as they were unknown to Leah when she *dedicated* her consciousness to Love's plan.

In *Retrospection and Introspection*, on pages eight and nine, Mrs. Eddy records the divine call to *dedicate* herself to the fulfillment of

* The first chapter of Genesis had no relationship to time, as it was based upon the forever Principle of being, which Leah and Rachel inspirationally discerned approximately 250 years previously to the book of Genesis' being either written or compiled by Moses, it having been necessary for Woman, typing "sight," to discern this Principle before man, typing "hearing," could perceive it.

her great mission. In this connection she states that as a little child at the age of about eight* she heard repeatedly over a long period of time a voice calling three successive times, "Mary," "Mary," "Mary,"† and records the confusion and distress it brought into her life until her mother (after the call to her was heard by another little child—her cousin) interpreted it to her as a call similar to that which came to little Samuel (at about the same age) and suggested that she answer in the words of little Samuel, "Speak, Lord; for Thy servant heareth," I Sam. 3:9. The next time the call came she states that she was frightened and did not respond, but she repented this sorely and resolved to do so at the next divine call. This call came, and after replying in the words of little Samuel, "Speak, Lord; for Thy servant heareth," like Samuel, her child-consciousness never heard the call again; for she had accepted in her life the *dedication* it demanded of her, she (though of tender years) being at the highest point of Christian experience as the result of her natural heritage and environment.

Hence this first picture presents a panoramic preview of the fullness of the revelation and founding of Christian Science that Mrs. Eddy as a little child had inspirationally accepted, and which held her unsparingly to the fulfillment of each "jot" and "tittle" of the Law "till all . . . [was] fulfilled" (just as little Samuel was held to his youthful *dedication* to divine service), Matt. 5:18. The vast ultimate of Mrs. Eddy's *dedication* of herself in this picture is typed by the woman's bowed head crowned with the head of man, the latter symbolizing the ultimate lifting up of manhood by womanhood from Christianity to Science.

REUBEN'S SIN

While Leah as the mother of Reuben discovered (conceived) him in his true nature as a "distant idea of Truth," S. & H. 263:22, which she thought an *imminent* attainment (for she hoped that Jacob would immediately rise to her vision of Reuben as "the only begotten Son"

* The relative age of Leah and Mrs. Eddy as recipients of the dedicating call had no bearing upon the weight of the call, since they were not required to understand its ultimate message—*dedication* alone being its demand.

† Mrs. Eddy says of this call, "I thought this was my mother's voice [as did her cousin also], and sometimes went to her, beseeching her to tell me what she wanted." The fact that Mrs. Eddy thought it was her mother's voice indicates that it was a woman's voice that called her to her *womanhood* mission, in contrast with the fact that Mary (the mother of Jesus) received her call to a *manhood* mission from the angel Gabriel, who appeared to her as a man.

and thus spare her future conception), and while Jacob in his final prophecy for all the tribes both blessed and cursed him, and Mrs. Eddy in line with the tribes of Israel as typing the days of consciousness *subjectively* accepts his affirmative nature (by her interpretation of the revelation of earth and heaven in the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis as "*the only* [to which Reuben as the first tribe of Israel corresponds]," S. & H. 505:25, or the forever *oneness* of "the male and female of Spirit"), to her followers she *objectively* presents "Reuben" in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* without a ray of light as, "Corporeality; sensuality; delusion; mortality; error." This *negative* phase of Reuben corresponds to the chaos and darkness . . . upon the face of the deep," which is the second phase of his nature as revealed in the second verse of the first day of consciousness in the first chapter of Genesis before the darkness was divided from the light as the respective evening ("darkness") and morning of the first day.

This division of light and "darkness" was the only conception of Reuben vouchsafed to the objective followers of Truth whose lives were not sufficiently in tune with reality to receive the *affirmative* Reuben-consciousness as a direct revelation (as did Mrs. Eddy). None other than the revelator was in this affirmative position, else some other person would have received her revelation *subjectively* before she did, since God is no respecter of persons, and since He chooses as the channel for Truth's expression only that one (never two or more at the same time) whose life has risen to Truth's revelation.

Reuben's sin, for which he was so hopelessly condemned by his father Jacob, was that of materializing the truth, "Principle and its idea is [not are] one" (which statement Mrs. Eddy added to *Science and Health* in 1907 as an ultimate objective revelation), S. & H. 465:17; for Reuben claimed to be one in privilege with his father as typing Principle, and then materially defiled this spiritual truth, "Principle and its idea is one,"—in the words of Jacob condemning Reuben for his sin: "Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel; because thou wentest up to thy father's bed; then defiledst thou it: he went up to my couch," Gen. 49:4; 35:22.* Thus it must be recognized that the allness of good and the forever-perfection and unity of God and man (that Reuben

* Reuben's sin is recorded in the Bible, "And it came to pass . . . that Reuben went and lay with Bilhah his father's concubine . . .," Gen. 35:22,—Jacob's concubines being given a highly respectable place by Jacob and his wives as mothers (by his wives' own plan) of four of the tribes of Israel, as subsequently presented.

perverted, but which his true nature revealed and for which Jacob in his initial blessing highly commended him, Gen. 49:3), which subjectively levels all distinction between "Principle" as Fatherhood and its "idea" as Son, can be objectively attained by "offspring" only after the labor of the full six days of ascending consciousness in the first chapter of Genesis has been completed in the sixth day, which presents the "male and female" as the indissoluble spiritual qualities of Life, Truth, and Love ("Truth" to which "the ideal man corresponds," and "Life" and "Love" to which "the ideal woman corresponds," S. & H. 517:8-10),—rather than as persons, who are susceptible to defilement. However, this unity of the "male and female" ideas as *qualities* can never be objectively attained until "creation" is overcome, personalized "Fatherhood" yielding to "Principle," and personalized "Sonship" yielding to "idea," or generic man as Truth, which is one with Love, symbolically typed by the true idea of Reuben; for "creation" demands "offspring," and "offspring" being always a dual consciousness separated from its "root" can never claim the privilege of the consciousness that is both "the root and the offspring" of its own being (which is the Scriptural "basis" of this first picture) in line with the Scriptural "basis" of the seventh picture in *Christ and Christmas*, typing the seventh rung of the Ladder of Life, or the highest point of objective ascent.

No prophet, not even Jesus, had ever revealed, as does Mrs. Eddy, the oneness of God and man in *unified* perfection as expressed in the statement, "Principle and its idea *is* [not are] one," the true sense of Reuben, which Reuben defiled. While Jesus claimed to be one with God as Father and Son when he said, "I and my Father are one," John 10:30, it took Woman to change "are" to "is" in the statement, "Principle and its idea *is* one"; for no conception of either Father, Mother, or Son, wherein "root" and "offspring" are separated, could claim this indissoluble unity. However, Jesus did not go so far as to claim his own subjective unity with God for the objective followers of Truth, inasmuch as his highest injunction to them was, "*Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven [thus dividing God as in heaven and man as on earth] is perfect,*" Matt. 5:48, which placed upon man the ascending labor to attain this heavenly perfection. In this vein Jesus prayed that his disciples might be one as "Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us," John 17:21. Thus Jesus still divided Father and Son by de-

nominating them as "us." While Jesus said of himself, "Glorify Thou me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was," John 17:5, his prayer for the *return* to such glorified (heavenly) estate denied its presence in the relationship of Father and Son, just as it also is denied in the always divisible relationship of Mother and Son.

While God blessed the *light* of the first day, typing the affirmative nature of Reuben, He bestowed no blessing upon its darkness, typing Reuben's sin. (Likewise Jacob blessed the true idea, or "light," of Reuben and cursed his presumptive [dark] sin.) This division between light and its unblest darkness in the latter part of the first day was the basis of what subsequently became a demand for Church consciousness to heal the resultant divisions of heaven (typed by "the female idea") and earth (typed by "the male idea") that were identified in the waters above and below the firmament in the second day of consciousness in the first chapter of Genesis, which (second day, as before noted) was the only day that received no divine blessing. Each of the succeeding ascending five days of "creation" received its blessing as the activity of the earth-consciousness objectively tending to the demonstrable attainment of the subjective revelation of the unity of the "male and female" ideas in the affirmative statement of the first day—each objective day having its part in progressively re-collecting the elements of heaven and earth, which were divided in the second day.

Thus, after subjectively interpreting for the first time* in the third edition of *Science and Health*, in 1881, the first day of the first chapter of Genesis as a united heaven and earth (which is Reuben's consciousness as containing both "the root and the offspring [heaven and earth]" of being), Mrs. Eddy in the sixth edition, in 1883 (in the first "Glossary" added to *Science and Health*), by objectively characterizing "Reuben" as, "A personal belief; sensuality, delusion, mortality, error," warned her followers against the sin of Reuben, her characterization, as before noted, being in line with the "darkness . . . upon the face of the deep" in the second verse of the first chapter of Genesis. This same verse in initially stating that "the earth was *without form, and void*" (before adding the statement, ". . . and darkness was upon the face of the deep") presents the error, or the elements

* Mrs. Eddy did not interpret the affirmative phase of the first day of the first chapter of Genesis in the first two editions of *Science and Health*.

conductive to Reuben's sin, as the *formlessness* of earth as "compound idea" (S. & H. 585:8), which *voids* demonstration until overcome.* That the "darkness [that] was upon the face of the deep" as a consequence of this *formlessness* and *voiding* of earth materializes the entire first chapter of Genesis is seen in Mrs. Eddy's association of this second verse of the first chapter of Genesis with Adam in the second chapter of Genesis as being "*a dam*" to the fluidity of idea, as expressed by her in the following words: "Divide the name Adam into two syllables, and it reads, *a dam*, or obstruction. This suggests the thought of something fluid, of mortal mind in solution. It further suggests the thought of that 'darkness . . . upon the face of the deep [in the second verse of the first chapter of Genesis],' when matter or dust was deemed the agent of Deity in creating man,—when matter, as that which is accursed, stood opposed to Spirit," S. & H. 338:14. In confirmation of Adam's association with this second verse of the first day of consciousness in the first chapter of Genesis as "*a dam*," Mrs. Eddy directly states (as one of the last additions to *Science and Health* in 1907) that this same second verse (which refers to, ". . . and darkness was upon the face of the deep") indicates "a supposed formation of matter," saying: ". . . the allusion to fluids (Genesis i. 2) indicates a supposed formation of matter by the resolving of fluids into solids, analogous to the suppositional resolving of thoughts into material things," S. & H. 510:22.

The necessity for warning against the sin of Reuben lies in the *formlessness* ("the earth was without *form*, and void") of Science to a would-be follower of Truth at its first reception and, therefore, in the great susceptibility of Truth's materialization by its perversion to the gratification of material desires before "the Spirit of God . . . [moves] upon the face of the waters," expressed by Mrs. Eddy as "divine Love" which moves "upon the waters of mortal mind, and *form[s]* the perfect concept," S. & H. 454:22. In other words, in lieu of a spiritual *formation* of ideas, the tendency is to revert to the material *form* as a medium for new-found truths—which was Reuben's sin as "offspring," typing "idea" as separated from its "root," or Principle.

* "Without natures particularly defined, objects and subjects would be obscure, and creation would be full of nameless offspring,—wanderers from the parent Mind, strangers in a tangled wilderness," S. & H. 507:7.

The injunction, "Christian Scientists, be a law to yourselves"* (S. & H. 442:30, added in 1908), was placed in *Science and Health* subsequently, not antecedently, to "Principle and its idea is [not are] one" (S. & H. 465:17, added in 1907). This injunction was made possible of fulfillment only after thousands of years of thought-discipline since Adam accepted the "apple" of lawless pleasure from the hand of Eve and since Reuben defiled his father's couch upon the materialized basis of "Principle [typed by father] and its idea [typed by son] is one [in privilege]." Adam as typing mortal mind was forced to rise (through the "Scientific Translation of Mortal Mind," S. & H. 115:19) from the "Degree" of physical "Depravity," or "darkness," to the "Degree" of spiritual "Understanding," or "light," in order to attain this gift (of "Principle and its idea is [not are] one") upon the basis of Principle; while Reuben claimed to be "a law unto" himself antecedently, and not subsequently, to this ascending demonstration that culminated in "Principle and its idea is [not are] one." The female thought (Love) unsupported by the male (Law) is always *lawless love*, and *vice versa*—the male thought (Law) separated from Love is *loveless law*. These are the two thieves between which Jesus was crucified, as interpreted in the light of their conflicting statements. Loveless law railed at Jesus, saying, "If thou be Christ, save thyself and us," Luke 23:39; while lawless love said, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom" (Luke 23:42)—Reuben-like considering himself worthy of entering into even Jesus' heavenly reward. In other words, unredeemed Reuben claimed to be "a law unto" himself before Law has disciplined thought as presented in the succeeding tribes.

This first picture in *Christ and Christmas* is an illustration of both the affirmative and negative phases of the Reuben-consciousness, in the sense that good and evil are presented without distinguishable

* It is true that in the first *Manual* Mrs. Eddy admonished teachers to *teach* their students such moral (both prescriptive and proscriptive, or "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not") values as would enable them to "be a law . . . to themselves" as the only defense against mental malpractice, p. 160, present *Manual*, p. 84; for Mrs. Eddy says that "man is properly self-governed only when he is guided rightly and governed by his Maker, divine Truth and Love," S. & H. 106:9. This admonition in the first *Manual* has persisted in substance in all the *Manuals* including the present edition. However, Mrs. Eddy did not release the demands for outer moral proscriptions and prescriptions as a protection against animal magnetism until 1908, when she severed the communion between The Mother Church and the branches simultaneously with this direct injunction, "Christian Scientists, be a law to yourselves," S. & H. 442:30, laying upon Christian Scientists the responsibility, by virtue of their inner resource, to stand alone with no need of outer proscriptions and prescriptions.

values, neither of which (the good or evil) shows any manifest triumph over the other—the light of the star brilliantly shines, “The Holy Family” is presented in the light of the star, the woman’s head is bowed in prayer over a static chaotic mass, and yet the so-called law of mortal will and desire (typed by the Pharisaical head on the tail of the dragon, Rev. 12:4) protects lust (the snarly, serpentine head behind) from dissipation by the light of the star. Thus the mission of woman, as demanded in this first picture, was to unite “root” and “offspring” in the light of the generic morning star of being, expressed to the subjective consciousness of the revelator as one continuous day without the division into “evenings” and “mornings”—which “evenings” and “mornings” indicate footsteps to the sense of the followers of Truth. Hence to the negative phase of Reuben’s consciousness as typing “*a dam*,” or obstruction, the first day in its “resolving of fluids into solids” divided day (S. & H. 584:1) into “days,” each resisting the onward progress of the other until material things were again resolved into thoughts (“fluids”) by the revealing, interpreting, and founding consciousness of Woman. So when Reuben is redeemed to his original state of being as expressed in the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis, “In the beginning God created [both] the heaven and the earth [“root” and “offspring” in one consciousness],” which Mrs. Eddy interprets as, “This word *beginning* * is employed to signify *the only*,*—that is, the eternal verity and unity of God and man, including the universe,” S. & H. 502:24, the demands of Church (starting in the second day with the division of heaven and earth as Truth and error, which demands the salvation of earth) will have been fulfilled (as subsequently presented), and only then will the dark shadows in this first picture, typing the darkness in the first chapter of Genesis, be forever dissipated.

It was the separation of “offspring” from its “root” of self-existence (“the root . . . of David” is self-existence, for David was the son of “Jesse,” meaning “self-existence,” I Sam. 16:11-13) which divided being into Father, Mother, and Son,—Father and Mother always contradicting the Christ as being “without father, without mother, without descent [‘offspring’], having neither beginning of days, nor end of life,” Hebr. 7:3, which Scripture Mrs. Eddy has made the “basis” of the seventh picture. Thus “offspring” must demonstrably gather its “root” elements of Father and Mother into the oneness of its own being in order to reach unified selfhood; for Mrs. Eddy defines

* The italics are Mrs. Eddy’s.

"creator" in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* as "self-existent Life, Truth, and Love," and says of the Elohim: "The eternal Elohim includes the forever universe. The name Elohim is in the plural, but this plurality of Spirit does not imply more than one God, nor does it imply three persons in one. It relates to the oneness, the tri-unity of Life, Truth, and Love," S. & H. 515:16. Thus Father, Son, and Mother must yield to Life, Truth, and Love in one consciousness "as Life, represented by the Father; as Truth, represented by the Son; as Love, represented by the Mother," S. & H. 569:1.

That Father, Son, and Mother are but the medial footsteps in the process of lifting "Life" as "creation" to "Truth," which is one with "Love," is seen in the fact that Mrs. Eddy presents them as merely a rule of "self-abnegation," or self-renunciation, in Christian Science, S. & H. 568:30, which is the process of the objectively ascending sons (tribes) of Jacob; whereas Life, Truth, and Love as "self-existent" is subjectively both its own "root" and "offspring." Thus Motherhood (that objectifies its Son), although a medial necessity, contains an element of error as limitation in the sense that it is separated from its "offspring" and thus denies the indivisibility of being. It will be noted that while Mrs. Eddy retains all of the qualities of Life, Truth, and Love in her definition of "Mother" in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health*, she analytically divides these qualities in the chapter entitled "The Apocalypse" (page 569, lines 1-3) into "Father," "Son," and "Mother," as already noted, thus showing that Mother as potential Woman, or Bride, embraces "Father," "Son," and "Mother" in her potential quality of Love as Bride beyond Motherhood.

To epitomize: The true sense of Reuben types indivisible Love that is always subjective and thus can be interpreted neither to nor through "offspring." Hence Leah's consciousness of Reuben as her subjective conception of Love within her own consciousness (wherein Life, Truth, and Love were unified) was the true sense of Reuben. However, when Leah objectified Reuben as "offspring," he was forced to take all of the footsteps of being through the succeeding tribes of Leah's conception up to his mother's subjective consciousness as Rachel, Rachel as Love being Leah's compounded original selfhood. Thus Leah's portion was that of bringing forth both figuratively and literally the Children of Israel as types of the laboring ascent of the human consciousness.

Mrs. Eddy's consciousness of Reuben as her subjective conception of Love within her own consciousness (or her initial discovery of

Christian Science as unified Life, Truth, and Love), like Leah's, was the true sense of Reuben. However, when Mrs. Eddy objectified Reuben by revealing him to her followers as the perfection of heaven and earth, God and man, she placed Reuben outside of her own consciousness as "offspring" and, as prototyped by Leah, was forced to bring forth the successively progressive Children of Israel in the Word of *Science and Health* as idea to the point where her collective "man child" as *Science and Health* (exclusive of the *Key to the Scriptures*) reached her vision of Love, or Bride, in "The Apocalypse." So after Mrs. Eddy added the Bride as the City foursquare to "The Apocalypse" in the *Key to the Scriptures* in 1891, she in 1899 called the Bride the "Word," saying, ". . . the bride (Word) is adorned [adding with reference to the progressing changes and revisions of *Science and Health*, exclusive of the *Key to the Scriptures*], and lo, the bridegroom cometh!" My. 125:26. In other words, while Mrs. Eddy's subjective vision was the perfection of God and man, needing no medial Motherhood, she (as prototyped by Leah as Mother) was forced to objectively bring forth her vision as progressive, spiritual "offspring" in the Word of *Science and Health* (thus making her Mother in the Word) in order to objectively lift others to her subjective vision of Bride as original Word, which was "in the beginning . . . with God, and . . . was God," John 1:1,—thus "Christian Science," which Mrs. Eddy says is "as old as God" (marginal topic, S. & H. p. 146), is both "root" and "offspring."

Hence both Leah and Mrs. Eddy (one literally and the other in idea) finally objectively lifted collective consciousness to the Bride of their own subjective conception of Reuben as indivisible Love embracing Life and Truth, where consciousness could say with Jesus (after he had accepted his medial Sonship in his first appearing), "I am [both] the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star," Rev. 22:16. So the basis of Reuben's sin was the claim of "offspring" as separated from its "root," which as an untruth of being demanded progressive demonstration to reach the consciousness where "root" and "offspring" is one, expressed by Mrs. Eddy as, "Principle and its idea is one," S. & H. 465:17.

How little did Leah realize, when she subjectively conceived Reuben within her own consciousness and yet objectively brought him

forth as "offspring" to the end of healing the hate of her husband, the long and tiresome journey "'uphill all the way'" (S. & H. 574) which Motherhood requires to lift its "offspring" to her subjective vision of Love, each footstep of Truth, typed by ascending Sonship, lifting Fatherhood, typing Life, into oneness with Truth, where each and both become one with Love as Bride—the highest potentiality of Mother as Love. Likewise, how little did Mrs. Eddy at the age of eight—when she heard the voice of Truth calling her from the heart of Love to *dedicate* herself to the mission of lifting the lives of others to the same degree of purity that enabled her as a little child to hear the voice of Truth subjectively (in fulfillment of Jesus' admonition, "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein [the subjective consciousness of Love]," Mark 10:15)—realize how many footsteps she would be forced to take with the human consciousness before she had lifted it to her own initial vision.

How fitting that a little child should have been the first to have heard the call of Womanhood directly from the heart of divine Love where "root" and "offspring," typed by "vision" ("sight") and "hearing," are indissolubly one. Thus how different was the direct call of Love within the subjective consciousness of a little child as the "chosen" (which call only another child could hear—the call being inaudible to motherhood) as distinguished from the call of man to man, such as that with which Jesus called his disciples and Mrs. Eddy her followers, which demanded objective demonstration of those "called" by outer "hearing" to reach the subjective consciousness of the "chosen," where inner "hearing" is embraced in inner "vision" ("sight").

When Mary the mother of Jesus with added years of experience (beyond that of a little child), which impressed her with the reality of sin from "without," *heard* the call of Love through the angel Gabriel as a man-angel who appeared to her with a prophecy of her own conception of Jesus, Luke 1:31, she heard it as a call demanding of her own consciousness a Saviour of the people from their sins, Matt. 1:21. Thus Jesus was *prededicated* to the mission of Saviour before his birth in response to Mary's perception of the angel Gabriel's demand, "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS [meaning 'saviour']," Luke 1:31; whereas Isaiah had prophesied that a virgin would conceive the "Immanuel" as "God with us" (Isa. 7:14) rather than a

“Saviour” who would find men seemingly unworthy of God’s ever-presence on earth as dwelling with men.

But because Mary perceived the angel Gabriel as a man-angel and merely *heard* his prophecy of her own conception, she brought forth her child as an *outer* conception. Her child was so lifted beyond her own spiritual discernment that he was afterwards forced upon the occasion of her going to Capernaum with Jesus’ “brethren” to repudiate her as mother, or “root,” outside of his own consciousness; for on this occasion when he was told that his “mother” and “brethren” stood “without, desiring to speak with” him, he answered and said, “Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?” The Biblical record continues, “And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother,” Matt. 12:47-50. There is no record that he ever went out to see his mother or “brethren,” or that he ever saw his mother again until at the foot of his cross when he commended her to the protection of John as his (John’s) mother, although John had no lineal relationship to her, John 19:27.

Thus Mrs. Eddy says of Mary’s presentation of Jesus as the “offspring” of her “self-conscious communion with God” from “without” (rather than of her “self-conscious communion with God,” S. & H. 29:32, from “*within*”), “No advancing modes of human *mind* made Jesus; rather was it their subjugation, and the pure *heart* that sees God,” Mis. 360:32. But Mrs. Eddy, in contradistinction to Mary’s *outer* conception of Jesus as the basis of *Christianity*, discovered the “divine laws of Life, Truth, and Love” *within* her own consciousness and named her discovery “Christian Science,” S. & H. 107:1, which declares man’s oneness with God in such statements as, “Principle and its idea is [not are] one,” S. & H. 465:17. Hence Mary (as was said of her elsewhere in the Bible in connection with Jesus, Luke 2:19) merely “pondered . . . in her *heart*” (her inspirational nature) the things which she *heard* on the *outside* of her own consciousness before she conceived Jesus; while Mrs. Eddy “pondered” the *Science* of Christianity, which she had discovered not only within her heart but *within* the range of her own understanding (mind), thereby bringing forth Jesus in his “second appearing” as “the spiritual advent of the *advancing* idea of God, as in Christian Science” (Ret. 70:20) as both “root” and “offspring” in one consciousness, in fulfillment of his declaration, “I am [both] the root and the offspring of David [the son

of 'Jesse,' meaning 'self-existence']." Thus while Jesus felt the limitation of his outer *predestination* before his birth to be a Saviour,* Mrs. Eddy as a little child was *self-dedicated* to her redemptive mission and so bore no weight of others' limitations until she objectified her "offspring" (as Truth) to the consciousness of others.

So the second step of inherent Church in the life of Mary Baker Eddy and her mother's comprehension thereof, as presented in the comments on the second picture, which we now approach, is the natural consequence of her own *self-dedication* as well as her Christian mother's offering of her child to divine service, as previously presented. Little Samuel's mother had *dedicated* him to the symbolic temple; Mrs. Eddy's mother by her direction that her child should respond to the call of divine Love *dedicated* her to the spiritual temple of the living God.

* Although Jesus was called both "Saviour" and "Redeemer" in his first appearing as "the masculine representative of the spiritual idea," typing manhood, whose highest potentiality is Truth, "Redeemer" but prophesied his "second appearing"; for Mrs. Eddy says that "all are redeemed through divine Love," S. & H. 26:8, Love being the distinguishing quality of Womanhood.