

# THE TENTS OF ISSACHAR

## *THE FULFILLMENT OF PROPHESED ARRESTED PROGRESS*

MOSES IN his redemptive song of the tribes of Israel when conjoining Issachar and Zebulun at the point of their united activities (“They shall call the people unto the mountain [typing heavenly ascent together] . . . [and] they shall suck . . . of treasures hid in the sand [after their descent to earth]”) prefaced this prophetic assignment of their medial work together with a prophecy of their final temporarily divergent positions in the following words:

“Rejoice, Zebulun, in thy *going out*; and, Issachar, in thy *tents*,” Deut. 33:18.

And Jacob prophesied of Issachar:

“And he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and *bowed his shoulder to bear*, and became a *servant unto tribute*,” Gen. 49:15.

Moses’ prophecy of the “tents” of Issachar and Jacob’s prophecy of Issachar’s conception of a “land that . . . was pleasant” and a “rest [that] was good” have an identical trend, both “tents” and “rest” suggesting *arrested progress*.

The responsibility which was prophesied to rest upon the shoulders of the detached branches in line with Isaiah’s prophecy of the typical Branch as growing from the “roots” of Jesse (“self-existence”) with its self-government resting upon its own shoulder (Isa. 11:1; 9:6) had always been placed by Mrs. Eddy upon the shoulders of the branches as if to prepare them for the final prophesied “half a time”

of Motherhood, Rev. 12:14. (This responsibility placed upon the branches was, as before presented, pictorially typed in the outgoing vestibule window of The Mother Church by the sturdy "man child" with the detached grapevine branch over his shoulder and his arm placed around the neck of a lion, typing "moral courage . . . 'the lion of the tribe of Juda,'" S. & H. 514:10, which suggests the moral code of the *Manual*.) But prophecy was against the continuance of the branches' own self-government after the final "half a time," or passing, of Motherhood was fulfilled by the wilderness-woman—as the thirteenth to the nineteenth chapters of Revelation attest.

This prophecy of the unpreparedness of the branches to bear the government upon their own shoulders after the passing of Motherhood is particularly pointed in the first three verses of the thirteenth chapter of Revelation, which read, "And I . . . saw a beast rise up out of the *sea* [the turbulence of confusion after the passing of Motherhood], having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns [the symbols of victory] . . . and the dragon gave him his power, and his *seat*, and *great authority*. And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death [and what could wound the seat of great authority but the challenge of its authority as in the litigation subsequently presented?]; and his deadly wound was healed [the 'seat' of 'great authority' was *legally* justified]." This "beast" is undoubtedly the Uzzah-like would-be helpfulness\* demanded by the dragon of Old Theology, which "beast" arises from the troubled waters (Rev. 13:1) to steady the seemingly tottering Ark of the Covenant. Note that this "beast" as described in the thirteenth chapter of Revelation has ten crowned horns, typing the victory of aggressive "power," and seven uncrowned heads, typing lack of intelligence; whereas in the twelfth chapter of Revelation before the passing of Motherhood, when it resisted womanhood, the reverse is true.

Is not this changed symbolism (the crowning of the ten horns and the uncrowning of the seven heads) a prophecy of the changed purpose of the Church from that of Science back to Christianity as reflected in the present statement of the Church's mission which appeared for the first time years after Mrs. Eddy's passing and still continues to appear on the inside of the *Quarterly* cover, reading: "This denomination was founded by Mary Baker Eddy, at Boston, in

\* It will be remembered that Uzzah in his endeavor to steady the tottering Ark of God, which was sacrosanct against human touch, was struck dead for his deed despite his would-be-helpful intention.

1879, as 'a church designed to commemorate the word and works of our Master, which should *reinstate primitive Christianity* and its lost element of healing.' " This was the design of the First Organization, founded on Jesus, which Mrs. Eddy dissolved in 1889, as historically recorded in the *Manual*, p. 17; and after an interim of three years (when there was no organization of the Christian Science Church in Boston), the Church was reorganized upon the basis of an entirely changed mission which read, "The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Mass., is designed to be built on the *Rock, Christ*; . . . healing and saving the *world* [embracingly beyond individual healing] from sin and death," *Manual* p. 19.

Thus is not the present statement on the inside of the *Quarterly* cover, which claims for the Second Organization founded on "the Rock, Christ," as *Science* the mission of the First Organization founded on Jesus (that "should *reinstate primitive Christianity*"), the literal fulfillment of the changed symbolism from the crowned *heads* of the dragon (with which Woman warred and which she uncrowned as related in the twelfth chapter of Revelation) to the crowned *horns* of the triumph of "primitive *Christianity*" over Science?

Remembering that Mrs. Eddy defines the dragon as "the sum total of human [not mortal] error," S. & H. 563:10, and that she associates "humanity" with *Christian* ("Moral") virtues in the "Scientific Translation of Mortal Mind," and also that both the "dragon" and the "beast" as one of his angels were *heavenly* creatures until scientific Christianity (typed by Michael) cast them out of heaven unto the earth and sea (Rev. 12:7-9; S. & H. 567:26-28), does not this "beast" prophetically rising out of the troubled "sea" of confusion after the passing of the wilderness-woman typify emotional Christianity whose claim to power is its would-be helpfulness? And is not this dragon the same old drag-on which was defined by Mrs. Eddy in the following terms: "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 [not mortal or moral] wickedness in *high places*,'" S. & H. 563:27-30—"spiritual wickedness" being suggestive of failure to see the progressive spiritual idea of which Woman is the type (rather than moral delinquency), for Mrs. Eddy defines "ungodliness" in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* as, "Opposition to the divine Principle and its spiritual idea," S. & H. 595:25.

Justifying the division of the word "dragon" as "drag-on"—while

Mrs. Eddy, in dividing the word "Adam" into "a dam," admonishes her readers not to divide words except when metaphysically justified ("aside from their metaphysical derivation," S. & H. 338:26), the division of the word "dragon" comes within the category of "metaphysical derivation." "Metaphysical" is derived from the words "*meta* [between]" and "physical," and therefore the realm of metaphysics is the mental plane which lies between the physical and the spiritual. Mrs. Eddy defines the dragon as the "sum total of *human* [which also lies between the physical and spiritual] error."

Thus only during the *medial* footsteps of Christian Science, while it is reducing divine Science to *human* (Christian) apprehension, S. & H. 471:30, is the contemplation of the dragon possible, since Mrs. Eddy said only after the battle with the dragon had been fought and the victory won (in the Word of *Science and Health*), "Christian Science teaches only that which is *spiritual* and *divine*, and not human," S. & H. 99:14. Hence the contemplation of the dragon and its divisible derivation lies within the realm of metaphysics, below Mrs. Eddy's revelation of *divine* Science; and the dragon prophetically appeared in the "*divine* method of warfare in Science," S. & H. 568:6, only because the lives of Christian Scientists were not attuned to the *science* of Christianity, and therefore they *dragged on* their previous Christian limitations into their concept of Christian Science.

As touched upon in the comments on the first picture, one form of this *drag-on* of Christian limitation was the dragging into Science by Christian Scientists of the theological doctrines of Jesus' personal vicarious atonement which tended to make the impersonal Christ, Truth, a vicarious Saviour, instead of realizing that Truth's utilization in one's life gave it the only power it had to redeem "the objects of sense" to "the ideas of Soul," S. & H. 269:15. In other words, Is not the belief in the power of repeated words of Truth as sufficient to save on the same plane with Christian vicarious atonement which believes that to ask "in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth" is sufficient to save without the utilization of the "word and works" of Jesus in one's own life. Again, Was not the belief in the virtue of "sacrifice" in the lives of Christian Scientists the *drag-on* of the belief in the efficacy of "the blood of the Lamb [the supreme sacrifice of Jesus]" to save the world, when sacrifice denies the limitlessness of all good which precludes the possibility of one having to offer his good to or for another. Mrs. Eddy says, "The spiritual essence of blood is sacrifice," S. & H. 25:3; thus sacrifice always means "blood," even in the lives of Chris-

tian Scientists, and it denies the ever-presence of "right," for Mrs. Eddy says, "Right reigns, and blood was not its price," *Poems* p. 22.

Again, Was not the *drag-on* of the Christian "love one another" into Christian Science that which defeated the abiding consciousness of indivisible Love in Christian Science which does not know "another." And was not the Christian *drag-on* of self-denial into Christian Science that which would forever defeat the consciousness of true selfhood which must be the nucleus for loving one's neighbor *as* (not like) *oneself*, not as "another." Still again, Was not the Christian *drag-on* of "cross-bearing" into Christian Science that which said in the words of St. Paul, "For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him *crucified*"—when Christian Science says, "I am determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him *glorified*"? To know nothing but a crucified Saviour would forever keep a Christian Scientist under the claim of crucifixion; whereas to know only a glorified Jesus would hold such one forever above crucifixion or "cross-bearing."

To epitomize, Christian Science says, "Man is as perfect now, and henceforth, and forever, as when the stars first sang together," *Mis.* 188:3; while the *drag-on* of Christianity replies: "But Jesus said, '[Strive to] be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in *heaven* is perfect,' and dare Christian Scientists go beyond the injunction of Jesus?" The answer is Mrs. Eddy *did* when she removed the three injunctions of Jesus from the sixth Tenet in 1908 at the demand of the Christ.

However, since Mrs. Eddy says, "Christian Science may absorb the attention of sage and philosopher, but the Christian alone can fathom it," *S. & H.* 556:13, Mrs. Eddy, after first revealing Christian Science, was forced to *Christianize* the *followers* of Truth before they could accept her higher revelations. It was this necessity that proved to be the *drag-on* of Old Theology that resisted the higher consciousness of Womanhood as Science. This necessity, however, had been prophesied and thus could not have been escaped.

Returning to the subject matter of the thirteenth chapter of Revelation, in the eleventh verse a second "beast" is described. This "beast" with "two horns like a lamb" (when a lamb has none), which came "up out of the *earth*," typed the lamblike response and defense which Christianized earth always makes to and for would-be Christian helpfulness. The two "horns" of the "beast" which were described to be like those of a lamb (horns typing both aggressiveness and defense)

might be interpreted to mean emotional Christian loyalty and defense of Christian virtues, Mrs. Eddy's definition of "sheep" being, "Innocence; inoffensiveness; those who *follow* their *leader*," S. & H. 594:12,—thus sheep always *demand* a *leader*. This emotional loyalty is occasioned by the fact that Christianity is only the third side of the City foursquare which has not yet become conscious of the fourth side of the City as "Science [or demand of inflexible Principle, which] makes no concessions to persons or opinions," S. & H. 456:17,—and all sheep type Christianity only and require a "leader" to "follow," while Science is an inner Principle which precludes the possibility of a "leader."

As a protection to Christian Scientists against such Christian concessions, Mrs. Eddy, as before presented, removed from the sixth Tenet of Christian Science the three Christian expressions, "meek," "strive," and "love one another," substituting for "love one another" the square of Love, or the Golden Rule, at the same time separating the branches from associated activities with each other, and immediately thereafter adding to *Science and Health* her injunction to Christian Scientists which demanded, "Christian Scientists, be a law to yourselves," S. & H. 442:30, simultaneously separating the branches from communion with The Mother Church. Had the severance of family Christian ties been understood by the branches, what Mrs. Eddy says of the chapters subsequent to the twelfth chapter of Revelation—"The following chapters depict the fatal effects of trying to meet error with error," S. & H. 568:7,—would have been defeated, thereby avoiding the confusion of disobedience to the *Christian Science Manual*. But in view of the fact that Jesus said that "the scripture cannot be broken," John 10:35, neither could these intervening prophecies of Jesus from the thirteenth to the nineteenth chapter of Revelation be defeated; for in the words of Jesus in accepting the prophecies of his crucifixion, ". . . how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" Matt. 26:54.

This second "beast" with two horns like a lamb, which came "up out of the *earth*," also typed the prophesied lamblike submission of earth to the "great authority" of the first "beast." The lamblike beast caused "as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed" (perhaps by putting them out of the synagogue and, therefore, causing them to be "dead" to the churches' sense—"killed" by the church), Rev. 13:15, until, at the point where "there was no more sea" (Rev. 21:1) of turbulent confusion out of which the first "beast"

could arise with "great authority," the descent of the unified consciousness of the Bride and the Lamb (after their marriage in heaven) as the City foursquare, symbolized by the generic second Concord Branch with its inner coherence of Truth, is discerned as the pattern for each and every branch church.

As world conditions are but replicas of church conditions, and "judgment must begin at the house [church] of God" (I Pet. 4:17) in order to meet them, may not the "great authority" of dictatorships in the world to-day be the outcome of church conditions—there having been no "dictators" or "totalitarian states" until the fulfillment of the warning prophecies of the consequences of violating the divine plan for the relinquishment of Motherhood in church. Only when "seats" of "great authority" and lamblike submission thereto are met in church can these conditions be met in the world, since the world progresses no further than its highest *religious* light. In other words, the Church (symbolically expressed in the footsteps of organic church) originates and shapes conditions in the world. Therefore the entire book of Revelation is a continuous prophecy of the footsteps of Church as governing world conditions.

Thus until such overthrow of the beast's "seat, and great authority" in church, it would seem, in terms of the Bible's warning prophecy concerning Issachar (Gen. 49:15), that the "rest" where the government was laid upon others' shoulders "was good" and "the land . . . it was pleasant" because productive of church approval and incidental "pleasant" human associations; hence Issachar "bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute [surrendering his own self-government to a government outside of himself]," Gen. 49:15. Confusion always ensues when motherhood relinquishes her natural authority, which places upon the shoulder of the child his own self-government; for no matter how great the effort of the mother to prepare the child to meet such expectancy, the full weight of responsibility is never felt until the passing of motherhood. And this confusion after the passing of motherhood oftentimes occasions unwitting disobedience to principles that have been unthinkingly accepted under motherhood direction.

The joining of Moses in his prophecy (that Issachar would remain in his tents) with Jacob in his prophecy (that Issachar would claim a "rest" from responsibility and pay for his desire for ease by bowing "his shoulder to bear" and becoming "a servant unto tribute") doubly foretold that the Issachar branches (typed by the branches other than

the second Concord Branch) would not immediately take with Zebulun the last step in Church as the four-walled City foursquare. It is interesting to note that Moses in his final redemptive prophecy first announced the final divergent estates of Issachar and Zebulun when he said, "Rejoice, Zebulun, in thy going out; and, Issachar, in thy tents," before prophesying their medially conjoined missions, just as Mrs. Eddy first revealed the final spiritual estate of the followers of Truth before she perceived the collective work necessary to its attainment. The prophesied medially conjoined work of Issachar and Zebulun prototyped the conjunction of the Issachar branches with the Zebulun, or second Concord, Branch in the Extension, before they were separated by the temporarily divergent positions of the Issachar branches (other than the second Concord Branch) as remaining in their "tents" of Christian warfare while Zebulun (as the second Concord Branch) descended to earth as the City foursquare to "suck" of the "treasures hid in the sand" prior to Issachar's joining Zebulun in this privilege. For Zebulun and not Issachar spiritually discerned the joyous privilege of such leadership, Moses' prophetic exhortation being, "*Rejoice, Zebulun, in thy going out; and Issachar, in thy tents* [continuance of Christian warfare]," Deut. 33:18. Likewise Jesus in his prophecy from the thirteenth chapter to the nineteenth chapter of Revelation joined Moses and Jacob in prophesying the arrested progress of the Issachar branches.

### LEADERSHIP

Mrs. Eddy rhythmically sounded the height and depth of Woman's mission in her poem entitled "Woman's Rights," the last two steps of which are, " 'To point to heaven and *lead* the way,' " Mis. 388:13-4. It was the province of Motherhood " 'To *point* to heaven,' " for a mother never precedes her child in her heavenward course but lifts her child to the throne of God as in the prophesied course of the wilderness-woman's "man child," who was lifted up unto God, and to His throne (the God-crowned Woman's "man child" being "*caught* up unto God, and to His throne," Rev. 12:5) while she remained in the wilderness to await the termination of her "half a time," after fulfilling her "time [Fatherhood as Life] and times [Motherhood as Truth, bringing forth her 'man child' as Truth, which she lifted to his heavenly Bride as Love. As the fullness of Bride is a descending-to-earth idea, *heavenly* Bride as the highest potentiality of Mother as Love is but its initial 'half a time'; thus the Love-phase of Mother is



completed in the remaining 'half a time' of her Bride-consciousness].” An immature child can never intelligently follow leadership, having within himself no adequate capacity so to do, but must obey pointed, motherly direction. This was the position of Church up to the time of Mrs. Eddy's passing, inasmuch as the Church was always two steps behind Mrs. Eddy's revealed Word.

Thus when Mrs. Eddy permitted the building of the Extension (which started in the preparation of its ground in 1903) she forbade in the *Manual* the further use of the title of "Mother" as applied to herself (which her students had bestowed upon her, and which she had reluctantly temporarily accepted and defended to herself in her *Manual*, p. 64), substituting therefor the title of "Leader," the last step in Woman's mission being to "lead the way." However, although Mrs. Eddy had the word "Mother" effaced from the mosaic at the door of the previous "Mother's Room," at the same time substituting her own name as "*Leader*" thereupon, she reminded The Mother Church in her Message at the dedication of the Extension ("the crown") that the Room of its "Leader" still "remains in the beginning of this edifice" (The Mother Church as "the cross" distinguished from the Extension as its "crown"), My. 6:20. For her own students as the basic members of The Mother Church, who had founded it at her request and built it—pledged as they were to life \* membership in the "Assembly of Christians," or Christianity—needed her further leadership from Motherhood to Branch; whereas the collective branches which built the Extension had their leadership in the impersonal second Concord Branch.

Had Mrs. Eddy's students seen the step to Branch and ceased to call her "Mother" (as they continued to call her up to the time of her passing), it might have defeated the prophecy of the passing of Motherhood at the point of its unfinished "half a time," the remaining "half a time" being that of the consciousness of the Bride, typed by the Branch-idea. In other words, after objectively unfolding the Branch and subjectively revealing the consciousness of the "city of our God," Mrs. Eddy was forced to take her place as "Leader" of her Christian

\* As previously presented, Mrs. Eddy's own students in the Massachusetts Metaphysical College Association who founded and built The Mother Church and had never been members of a branch church were pledged to *life* membership in the "Assembly of Christians" into which the Massachusetts Metaphysical College Association resolved itself in 1890 after the dissolution of its first organization and that of the First Organization of the Christian Science Church.

students, whose Christian limitations she was unable to meet, thereby accepting the prophesied "half a time" of Motherhood.

Only one of the Israelites that left Egypt with Moses (of which there were over 600,000) ever reached the "Promised Land" after the forty years of struggle in the wilderness, and that was Joshua, the son of "Nun" (meaning the "eternal"), Moses' *minister*, Joshua 1:1. (Caleb, supposed to be an Egyptian, also reached the "Promised Land" with Joshua and was given an inheritance.) Thus Joshua typed the spiritual idea which led Moses and to which Moses surrendered his earth mission, as Mrs. Eddy did to the final "half a time" of Bride beyond the medial "half a time" of Motherhood. Mrs. Eddy says impersonally of all followers of Truth: "As the children of Israel were guided triumphantly through the Red Sea, the dark ebbing and flowing tides of human fear,—as they were led through the wilderness . . . so shall the spiritual idea guide all right desires in their passage from sense to Soul . . .," S. & H. 566:1, and she says of *her own* leadership: "I saw before me the awful conflict, the Red Sea and the wilderness; but I pressed on through faith in God, trusting Truth, the strong deliverer, to guide me into the land of Christian Science," S. & H. 226:29.

Thus in placing herself and her initial student followers in the identical positions of Moses and the children of Israel that left Egypt with him, did not Mrs. Eddy place herself and her own student followers who left Egypt with her under the same Scriptural prophecy of not reaching the "Promised Land" (to earth sense), as descended Bride, and Jesus said that "the scripture cannot be broken," John 10:35? Was it not with this foreshadowing knowledge that she pledged her followers to "life membership" in the "Assembly of Christians," which was below the full-orbed promises of Christian Science, standing with them there—since they *at her request* formed, built, and governed The Mother Church through her leadership—until she took the reins of government into her own hands in preparation for the final "half a time" of Motherhood. Thus as was concretely prophesied by the fact that only the *children* of those who left Egypt with Moses ever reached the "Promised Land" with Joshua, so only the *branches* or those who have seen their spiritual significance will ever on this plane reach the full measure of the "Promised Land" in church demonstration. This does not necessarily mean that one must be a member of a branch to do so, but that he must identify this last associated step in Christian Science understandingly in his own life.

In other words, the understanding of "New Jerusalem" as "the kingdom of heaven, or reign of harmony," *on earth*, likewise defined as "the spiritual facts and harmony of the *universe*" (S. & H. 592:18, which could be attained only "in *some degree*" by The Mother Church, *Manual* p. 19), must be reached by the branches; for the symbols of the Bible must be understood and spiritually incorporated into one's life in order to bring the full measure of freedom for which they were divinely revealed, and Mrs. Eddy has left a definite process by which this can be done in or out of church organization. This spiritual understanding, itself, is "The BRANCH," Zech. 6:12.

Inasmuch as each branch of The Mother Church was based in its motto on but one of the trinity of Life, Truth, and Love (other than the first and second Concord Branch), My. 213:28, each was forced to be one of a "family" idea rather than a generic idea, and its demonstration of the full idea could be none other than collective up to the point of the completion of the Word, at which time the branches were disassociated from each other and from communion with The Mother Church. And yet until the progressive unified consciousness of the branches as typed by the generic second Concord Branch is discerned and the detachment of the branches from the "family" communion of The Mother Church is realized, the branches are still left under the consciousness of man rather than of Woman, for "man [not Woman] is the family name for all ideas,—the sons and daughters of God," S. & H. 515:21. Man is divisible collectivity ("family" idea), while Woman is a unified whole. Thus earth had but one expression of Woman as composite Bride, and that was the pre-detached generic (second) Concord Branch.

It is important to note that after the dedication of the Extension in June 1906, Mrs. Eddy in the last *Manual* of the same year made her first provision for the Church in the event of the relinquishment of her leadership, and it pertained only to the branches. In Article XXIII, Section 6, page 72, lines 19-24, she enjoined "each branch church . . . [to] continue ['continue' does not mean to form other churches] its [then] present form of government in consonance ['in sound'] with The Mother Church Manual."

It is interesting to contemplate in connection with the *Manual* as a guide to the branches that not one word appears in the *Manual* limiting in number and character the mottoes of the branches. Is it not therefore possible that Mrs. Eddy's division of the branches into a "family" idea by reason of the division of Life, Truth, and Love

into three mottoes, making their intercommunion necessary for their "family" completeness, was confined only to the period of their inter-association with each other and their communion with The Mother Church? And is it not therefore possible that after the completion of each branch in its heavenly source and its figurative descent to earth, each as a full City unit of Life, Truth, and Love, it was free to characterize its completeness with such mottoes as might seem most fitting to it, so long as they embraced the foursquare elements of the full trinity of Life, Truth, and Love, plus "omni-action"?

In 1908, nearly three years before Mrs. Eddy left us in person at the last of 1910, she added Article XXIII, Section 7, to the *Manual* in regard to the creation, or the formation of, new branch churches, in which the requirement was made that the nucleus for each branch formation should consist of twelve prospective members, as well as one practitioner whose card was in the then *Christian Science Journal*. Also in addition to the basic twelve branch members as types of the twelve cohesive gates of the City foursquare, each branch church was then required to have four Mother Church members, typing the four *protective* walls of the City foursquare as symbols of *church* walls, inasmuch as the City foursquare with its four walls is the last step in Church, and Isaiah prophesied of the City foursquare, ". . . thou shalt call thy *walls* Salvation," Isa. 60:18, Mrs. Eddy having defined "salvation" as "Life, Truth, and Love understood and demonstrated . . .," S. & H. 593:20. Considering that this By-law in regard to the creation, or formation, of new branch churches was placed in the *Manual* three years before Mrs. Eddy's passing, is it not probable that Mrs. Eddy regarded this By-law as only applicable to the branches until her relinquishment of her leadership through her passing, inasmuch as she used the word "continue" (and not the word "multiply") in her only provision for the branches after her passing, *Manual* p. 72. It is most probable that Mrs. Eddy did not realize how long or short a time she would be personally with us when she made the By-law pertaining to the formation of new churches; thus she left the remaining "half a time" of Motherhood prophecy to the providence of God's plan.

Hence Mrs. Eddy in her final provision for the branches' continuance perpetuated the self-government which she had always permitted the branches under the *Manual* and in strict obedience to which (its progressive eliminations as well as its progressive perpetuities) lies the key to her declaration that "eternity awaits our Church

Manual," My. 230:2. But "time" as applicable to our Church *Manual* is ushered into "eternity" through the provisions of the *Manual* for the branches and not through the provisions for The Mother Church, since The Mother Church was formed for the purpose of completing the church history of the Boston Organization. In evidence of this, after expressing doubt as to whether the Boston church would ever be reformed (two years after its dissolution in its first Organization and about a year before its reformation), Mrs. Eddy said, ". . . this Church may find it wisdom to organize a second time for the *completion of its history*. This however is left to the providence of God," Ret. 58, 1st to 4th ed. inclusive, 1891. On the same page and at the same time Mrs. Eddy said, "Adding to its ranks and influence, this *spiritually* organized Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, still goes on," when *no church organization existed in Boston*—all that was "adding to its ranks and influence" in Boston was the progressive revisions of *Science and Health*, which were being published in Boston as the truly "spiritually organized" church of the Word (fulfilling the prophecies of Jesus concerning the "little book" and its progressive accomplishments), and outside of Boston "adding to its ranks and influence" was the responsive organization of the branches all over the Field. Thus by no manner of thought-process could the *second Boston Organization*, formed over a year after Mrs. Eddy expressed her doubt as to whether its organic reformation would ever be necessary, be associated with her statement made at the same time and on the same page that "this spiritually organized Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, still goes on." Even now this statement remains in *Retrospection and Introspection* (on page 44, beginning with line 29) in its proper setting between a statement of the dissolution of the First Organization and Mrs. Eddy's strong reason for the temporary nature of all church organization, saying that it is necessary only in the crudest periods of Christian history, her statement being, ". . . material organization has its value and peril, . . . organization is requisite only in the earliest periods in Christian history," Ret. 45:5.

If there were no other evidences that the Second Organization was not a "spiritually organized Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston," the fact of Mrs. Eddy's constantly *eliminative* organic changes \*

\* The most important early organic eliminations were: the elimination of personal preaching, which was authorized for three years after the Second Organization was formed; the elimination of the marriage ceremony in the church; the elimination of more than one communion service a year; the elimination of the governing and exclu-

therein would bear conclusive testimony thereto—for spiritual progress adds to, but never subtracts from, spiritual structure. Mrs. Eddy's last eliminations in organic church started two years after the dedication of the Extension in 1906, at which time she permitted the branches their annual communion with each other in the Extension, which Communion Season she had characterized in the *Manual* as the "conference of churches" (as branches, not as individuals), 49th *Manual*, p. 74. After this period of two years Mrs. Eddy in 1908, as previously presented, dissolved the associated activities between branches, which had been demanded by the By-law directing them "to help one another" (dropped in the 69th *Manual*, in 1908), and then immediately in 1908 dissolved the communion between The Mother Church and the branches. Mrs. Eddy immediately thereafter (in 1908) disbanded (dissolved) the "Executive Members" (formerly called "First Members"), who had formed the basic Mother Church and who had been the only voting body of the church. Mrs. Eddy also in 1908 dissolved the General Teachers' Association, which had been formed during the preparation for the building of the Extension and which had remained active after that time until dissolved.

Mrs. Eddy's leadership during the interval between the assumption of the title of "Leader" in 1903 and 1909 was largely, if not wholly, through her written Word in *Science and Health* and her *Manual*, but she never emphasized that this was her exclusive process until after the last textual change was added to *Science and Health* in 1909 in the statement now reading, "The truth of being is perennial, and the error is unreal and obsolete," S. & H. 265:20, at the same time adding, "Christian Science teaches only that which is spiritual and divine, and not human," S. & H. 99:14. This was the final Word-attestation that manhood, typing "Christian Science," and Womanhood, typing "divine Science," had become one. Mrs. Eddy's emphasis of the fact that the Word was the Leader came at the end of 1909 (a year after the dissolution of the associated activities between the branches and their communion with The Mother Church) when she *publicly* declared her relinquishment of her personal leadership to her written Word in the following statement, ". . . I hereby *publicly*

---

sive voting powers of the "First Members"; the elimination of the "Department of Obstetrics" in the Massachusetts Metaphysical College; the abolishment of communion between the branches and The Mother Church; and so on in the constant changes in the *Manual* form of government of The Mother Church up to and including the year of 1910, as the year of her passing.

declare that I am not personally involved in the affairs of the church in any other way than through my written and published rules," *Sentinel*, Oct. 16, 1909 (My. 359:8).

## THE POSITION OF THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE CHURCH AFTER THE "HALF A TIME" OF MOTHERHOOD

### TWO DETERMINATIVE STEPS OF MRS. EDDY'S IN 1901

At the dawn of the "God-crowned . . . [Twentieth] century" (*Poems* p. 22) in 1901, Mrs. Eddy took two simultaneous steps of the greatest moment to the Cause of Christian Science.

Mrs. Eddy's *first* step was to take to herself for the first time the responsibility for *each* and *all* of the vital functions of The Mother Church, in the sense that she required that the officers performing these functions be elected only after her "approval" \* or "consent . . . given in her own handwriting" had been obtained, thus restricting the Board of Directors to the position of a mere agent of her *Manual* purposes.

The basic church functions which *could not be performed by the Board of Directors without Mrs. Eddy's "approval" or "consent . . . given in her own handwriting"* were (and are): the election of the President, Clerk, Treasurer, and Librarian of The Mother Church, Art. I, Sect. 2, 3 (pp. 25, 26) † and Art. XXI, Sect. 2 (p. 63); the election of Lecturers, Art. XXXI, Sect. 1 (p. 93); the election of the manager of the general Publication Committee in Boston, Art. XXXIII, Sect. 1 (p. 97); and the appointment of an assistant manager if needed, Art. XXXIII, Sect. 6 (p. 100); the election of the manager and editors of The Christian Science Publishing Society, Art. XXV, Sect. 4 (p. 80). All of these official positions, which were of one year's duration, expired June 1911, about six months after Mrs. Eddy's passing on December 3rd, 1910; whereupon the election or re-election of any candidates for these offices became impossible under the *Manual* of The Mother Church in view of the fact that the *Manual* required that each and all of the candidates for these official positions have Mrs. Eddy's approval, which was no longer obtainable. Mrs. Eddy's approval was also required in order to enable the Board of Directors

\* Mrs. Eddy's approval had been previously required for the appointment of only the Directors, Readers, and President of The Mother Church.

† All of the *Manual* references are taken from our present *Manual* for the convenience of the reader in verifying.

to elect (or to remove) the Readers of The Mother Church, Art. I, Sect. 4 (p. 26), and Art. II, Sect. 3 (p. 30); in fact, the candidates for Readers of The Mother Church were always subject to the approval of Mrs. Eddy. (Although for a brief period the "First Members" *elected* the Readers as provided in the eighth and ninth *Manuals*, in 1898, the *nominees*, which were named by the Board of Directors, had to have Mrs. Eddy's approval.) Despite the fact that the term of the Readers was three years, by providential fulfillment of divine plan, their three years' term also expired in 1911, at the same time as that of all other officers; therefore the Readers could not be replaced according to the By-law in the *Manual* governing their election (any more than the other officers of The Mother Church could be) in view of the fact that Mrs. Eddy's approval of candidates was no longer obtainable.

Other basic functions of The Mother Church *which could not be performed by the Board of Directors under the Manual without Mrs. Eddy's "approval" or "consent . . . given in her own handwriting"* were (and are): the filling by the Directors of a vacancy on their own Board, Art. I, Sect. 5 (p. 26); the formation of syndicates or trusteeships, Art. I, Sect. 8 (p. 27); the election of the Committee on Business of The Mother Church, Art. XXIV, Sect. 9 (p. 79); the making of a donation by the church or the sanctioning of any important movement of the manager of the Committee on Publication, Art. XXIV, Sect. 7 (p. 78); the adoption of any new Tenet or By-law and the amendment or annulment of any Tenet or By-law in the *Manual* (a violation of this prohibition invalidating the "Deed Conveying Land for Church [the Extension] Purposes" to the Board of Directors, see Appendix to *Manual*, p. 137), Art. XXXV, Sect. 3 (p. 105). Mrs. Eddy's approval was likewise required for the triennial election (beginning 1907) of the teacher of the Board of Education of the Massachusetts Metaphysical College, Art. XXVIII, Sect. 2 (p. 88). However, due to the fact that certificates of the students of this College required the signature of the President of the College (Art. XXX, Sect. 3, p. 91), which position had always been filled by Mrs. Eddy from the beginning to the end of this institution (the end being when Mrs. Eddy passed on), Art. XXVIII, Sect. 1 (p. 88), there could be no students taught after Mrs. Eddy's passing, even though the last teacher's term did not expire until 1912. Although the Board of Directors could elect a vice-president of the Board of Education of this College annually without Mrs. Eddy's approval, Art. XXVIII, Sect. 2 (p. 88), the



vice-president could not succeed Mrs. Eddy as President of the College, even after the relinquishment of her Presidency, without her approval, Art. XXVIII, Sect. 4 (p. 89).

As a striking evidence of the limitation of the authority of the Board of Directors, the Finance Committee of The Mother Church, which was appointed with the "consent of the Pastor Emeritus [Mrs. Eddy]," could "in case of any possible future deviation from duty [on the part of the Board of Directors] . . . demand that each member thereof comply with the By-Laws of the Church. If any Director fails to heed this admonition, he may be dismissed from office and the vacancy supplied by the Board," Art. XXIV, Sect. 4, 6 (pp. 76-78). Thus the Board of Directors was subject to discipline not only by Mrs. Eddy but by other officers of the church.\*

The only church functions which could be performed by the Board of Directors *without* Mrs. Eddy's approval or written consent were: to provide a suitable building for the publication of the Christian Science literature and to provide suitable rooms therein for the publication of Mrs. Eddy's own writings, Art. I, Sect. 7 (p. 27); to demand that officers perform their duties, Art. I, Sect. 9 (p. 28); to receive or reject applicants for membership in The Mother Church and to discipline members thereof when needed, Art. VI, Sect. 3, p. 38, and Art. XI, Sect. 5, p. 51 (there are several sections pertaining to the subject of admitting, disciplining, and dismissing members under specific circumstances which would come under this general authority); to declare vacancies in Trusteeship of the Publishing Society but not to fill them,† Art. XXV, Sect. 3 (p. 80); to remove the card of a practitioner from *The Christian Science Journal*, Art. XXV, Sect. 9, (p. 82); to remove the general Committee on Publication should

\* Notwithstanding this as well as all of the before-mentioned prohibitory provisions of the *Manual*, the Board of Directors, four days after Mrs. Eddy's passing, issued a statement to the press, through the Publication Committee, to the effect that the result of Mrs. Eddy's passing was to "place the direction of the *spiritual* and business affairs of the Church *entirely* in the hands of The Christian Science Board of Directors." That the Board of Directors realized it had no *Manual* authority for such assumption will be seen by the pamphlet "Permanency of The Mother Church" wherein appears the letters of three different firms of lawyers which the Board of Directors had consulted as to whether it "may *legally* exercise the administrative powers which in terms are made subject to the consent or approval of the Pastor Emeritus by certain By-Laws in the Church Manual now that such consent or approval cannot be obtained," p. 23, "Permanency of The Mother Church."

† But one exception was made to this rule and that was in the case of insubordination of the Trustees to Mrs. Eddy herself; whereupon the Board of Directors was empowered to supply the vacancy subject to her approval, *Manual* p. 65.

he neglect to fulfill the obligations of his office, also to notify any branch to remove its Committee on Publication \* and if it (the Board of Directors) so desired to name a new Publication Committee, Art. XXXIII, Sect. 5 (p. 100); to annually elect the vice-president of the Board of Education of the Massachusetts Metaphysical College, Art. XXVIII, Sect. 2 (p. 88); to call on any member of the Board of Lectureship to lecture in any community and at any time when the need was apparent, Art. XXXII, Sect. 1 (p. 95); to appoint a Committee on Publication for Massachusetts and the counties in which London, England, is situated, the latter to act in addition as District Manager of the Committees on Publication of Great Britain and Ireland, Art. XXXIII, Sect. 3 (p. 99); transact the business of The Mother Church, pay taxes, insurance, and so forth, on "First Reader's Residence," Art. I, Sect. 6 (p. 27), Art. II, Sect. 4 (p. 30); see that the periodicals are ably edited and kept abreast of the times, Art. VIII, Sect. 14 (p. 44); order the disposition of the "net profits" of The Christian Science Publishing Society in accordance with the By-laws of the *Manual* only, Art. XXV, Sect. 2 (p. 80).

(The functions which the Board of Directors could and could not perform under the *Manual* without Mrs. Eddy's approval or written consent are all facts which are attested by our present *Manual* and thus can be easily verified.)

The new order established in 1901, which required Mrs. Eddy's approval for the performance of nearly all the functions of The Mother Church, was brought about by Mrs. Eddy's requiring the transference of the previous governing powers of the "First Members" of The Mother Church (most of whom were Mrs. Eddy's own students who had organized The Mother Church at her request) to the Board of Directors in the same year, see 20th *Manual*, p. 30. Unlike this new church dispensation requiring Mrs. Eddy's approval for the performance of all basic church functions, the governing powers of these "First Members" had up to this time been in a large measure resident within themselves without recourse to Mrs. Eddy—the Board of Directors performing comparatively minor functions outside of church under its financial Deed of Trust (printed in the Appendix to the *Manual*); in fact, its official specific functioning in church as a Board of Directors had never been mentioned in the main body of the *Manual* under

\* In this connection it must be remembered that this was not a local committee but served the whole State. Thus there was no interference with the local self-government of the branches.

the division entitled "Church Officers" until 1899, four years after the *Manual* was given to The Mother Church. (However, even before the Directors were specifically mentioned in the main body of the *Manual* in 1899, each and all of the then Board of Directors of the financial Deed of Trust were Mrs. Eddy's students and as "First Members" had shared equally in the responsibilities of the "First Members.")

Mrs. Eddy's *second* momentous step taken simultaneously with the requiring of her final approval of all basic functions of The Mother Church in 1901 was the making of her (first) *Last Will and Testament* (there being two subsequent codicils)—its greatest moment not consisting of the document itself but of the state of mind which actuated it as having a collateral bearing upon the *reason* (Mrs. Eddy's acceptance of her passing) for her drawing the reins of government into her own hands in such manner that The Mother Church would cease to function with her passing. However, neither the members of The Mother Church nor of the branch churches had any responsibility at any time to consider anything more than the *Manual* for the purpose of determining Mrs. Eddy's first and "Last Will and Testament" for her *church*.

#### FOUR LEGAL INSTRUMENTS OF TRUST

Despite the fact that Mrs. Eddy gave the church only the *Manual* for its guidance, certain legal Deeds of Trust (in addition to her Last Will and Testament) which Mrs. Eddy purposely formed entirely outside of church have been allowed to confuse the church thought in regard to her disposing intent for the church to the point of involving it in litigation over matters with which it had no concern—for legal instruments are subjects for Court adjudication in which church has no part.

The four entirely legal instruments which Mrs. Eddy prepared outside of the range of church consideration for the handling of the financial interests of the church (Trusts being concerned only with property interests) to the end of rendering "unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's" were, in the order of their subsequent presentation in this outline: *first*, the original financial Deed of Trust, given the Board of Directors before the formation of the Second Organization; *second*, the second financial Deed of Trust, conveying the land upon which the Extension was built; *third*, the Deed of Trust to the Publishing Society, and *fourth*,

Mrs. Eddy's personal Deed of Trust conveying her entire earthly fortune, including "interests in copyrights," to personally appointed trustees.

### THE ORIGINAL FINANCIAL DEED OF TRUST

The first deed of trust made by Mrs. Eddy was the financial Trust which she gave to the Board of Directors of The Mother Church on September 1st, 1892, three weeks before The Mother Church was formed on September 23rd, 1892. This financial Deed of Trust was explicitly, in terms of its own statements, executed for the purpose of keeping the financial affairs of the church outside of the domain of church, in order that the church might become an unchartered voluntary association and be free from the weight of lawful demands, inasmuch as the course of The Mother Church was that of heavenly ascent, it being founded on the basis of the twelve-star crown of the heavenly God-crowned Woman, which human law as an earth-weight would obstruct. Bearing on the point of human law as obstructing the ascending heavenly course of The Mother Church, Mrs. Eddy wrote in the October 1892 *Journal*: "About six weeks ago I called for legal counsel and engaged two able lawyers in my native state. Guided by the Divine Love they found in the laws of Massachusetts the statute referred to in the following deed (and which is herewith published) for incorporating a body of donees, without organizing a church. Truly, God's ways are not man's ways; and faith in the Divine methods are indeed the footsteps of the flock. . . . All loyal Christian Scientists will be pleased to know, that we can have and hold church property without going *back to outgrown forms of church organization* [under the *law*, for the First Organization was chartered under law],"—in this article was incorporated the financial Deed of Trust together with its footnote, both of which are printed in the Appendix to the *Manual*, pp. 128-134. (Thus the position of The Mother Church as typing the coincidence of the human with the divine at the point of its culmination in heaven was unlike that of the branches, which typed the coincidence of the divine with the human at the point of earthly descent where divine consciousness dwells with men in harmony with their laws. Inasmuch as the branches type the City foursquare, it is interesting to note, in connection with their identity with law, the following excerpt from Mrs. Eddy's description of the fourth side of the City foursquare: ". . . Science . . . is the fourth side of our Four-square City. . . . It is an era of Natural

Science, and our City must not lack this boundary. Nor is it found wanting. If Natural Science says one thing more clearly than another, it is this: that *law is everywhere*, and that there can be no exception to it," S. & H. 231, 232, Revised Edition of 1890, which Mrs. Eddy made a part of her present writings, as previously noted. Also as showing the wholly human domain of this fourth side of the City as typed by the branches, Mrs. Eddy speaks for the first time of the Christ in this connection as "Christ, or anointed imperial *humanity*," S. & H. 232, Revised Edition of 1890.)

This financial Deed of Trust accorded to the Board of Directors (and still does) absolute self-perpetuity; that is, it permitted the Board to replace a vacancy among its members without outside approval, even that of Mrs. Eddy. But when the office of the Board of Directors was for the first time included in a By-law in the main body of the *Manual* under the division entitled "Church Officers" in 1899, the By-law stipulated that (as a Board of Directors under the *Manual*, not as a Board of Directors under its self-perpetuating financial Deed of Trust, the former empowering its church functions and the latter its perpetual financial responsibility to "hold church property") it could only replace a member of its own Board with the approval of the candidate by Mrs. Eddy, the exact wording of this By-law (its provision being the same as in our present *Manual*) reading: "The Christian Science Board of Directors of this Church, shall not fill a vacancy occurring on that Board, except the candidate is *approved by the Pastor Emeritus* and the remaining members of the Board," 10th *Manual*, p. 22 (the same in substance in our present *Manual*, p. 26). Previously, up to this tenth *Manual*, in a subordinate position under the title of "First Members" the Board of Directors was forbidden to replace a member on its Board without the unanimous approval of the "First Members," the By-law then reading: "The Christian Science Board of Directors of this Church shall not fill a vacancy occurring on that Board except the candidate is approved by a unanimous vote of all the First Members of this Church," 9th *Manual*, p. 14. Thus the provisions in the main body of the *Manual* (from the first to the last) forbidding the self-perpetuity of the Board of Directors without approval of either the "First Members" or of Mrs. Eddy of a candidate to fill a vacancy on the Board were in direct conflict with the stipulation in the financial Deed of Trust in the then and present Appendix to the *Manual* which granted the Board of Directors the unqualified power of self-perpetuity without recourse to anyone.

The introduction of the By-law concerning the Board of Directors into the main body of the *Manual* in 1899 under the division entitled "Church Officers" (10th *Manual*, p. 22) making it necessary for the Board to have Mrs. Eddy's approval of a candidate to fill a vacancy on its own Board (contrary to its broader privilege under the financial Deed of Trust) was undoubtedly to the end of providing a means for the Board of Directors' *church functional capacities* to terminate after Mrs. Eddy's demise so soon thereafter as a vacancy should occur on its Board, necessitating the replacement of a Director, which could only be done with Mrs. Eddy's approval. Such a vacancy occurred when Stephen A. Chase passed on in June 1912, one year and a half after the passing of Mrs. Eddy in December 1910, thus automatically dissolving the Board of Directors *as a church body under the Manual*, allowing it only further self-perpetuity under its financial Deed of Trust (which, as already noted, was executed before The Mother Church was formed) to hold church real estate, property, and church funds.

The main body of the *Manual* was also at variance with the financial Deed of Trust in that while the financial Deed of Trust empowered the Board of Directors to maintain regular services in The (little) Mother Church by the election of "a pastor [pastors having presided over the church for three years after its second formation in 1892], reader or speaker to fill the pulpit" without the approval of either Mrs. Eddy or of the "First Members," Appendix to *Manual*, p. 131, the Board was never permitted to do so *under the Manual provisions*; for even from the first publication of the *Manual* in 1895 it was required that Readers be substituted for "a pastor, reader [note the singular form] or speaker," and at no time in the church's history did the *Manual* allow the Board of Directors to select the *Readers* of The Mother Church without the approval of their candidates by Mrs. Eddy: thus the *Manual* in *practice* took precedence over the financial Deed of Trust in all *church* matters.

The fact, therefore, that the Board of Directors was never permitted *under the Manual* to carry out the *church functions* granted it in its financial Deed of Trust (which church functions, as stated in the financial Deed of Trust, were to maintain "preaching, reading or speaking"—the *Manual* requiring the election of a Reader only after Mrs. Eddy's approval was obtained), and the further fact that its power to perpetuate itself "without hindrance or let" under the financial Deed of Trust was modified by the *Manual* as applicable to church,

first by a By-law in the *Manual* requiring the approval of the "First Members" before the *Board of Directors* could fill a vacancy on its Board, and more latterly by a By-law in the *Manual* requiring Mrs. Eddy's approval of a candidate to fill a vacancy on the *Board of Directors*, as before presented; both show beyond the shadow of a doubt that Mrs. Eddy expected the *church functions* named in the financial Deed of Trust to be subject to such modifications or eliminations as she saw fit from time to time to impose in the *Manual*—even to the point of the termination of *Manual* church functions with her passing, for, as already set forth, no candidate for church office could be elected under the *Manual* without her approval.

#### THE SECOND FINANCIAL DEED OF TRUST, CONVEYING LAND ON WHICH THE EXTENSION WAS TO BE BUILT

A second Deed of Trust, dated March 19th, 1903, conveying the land upon which the Extension was more latterly built, was added to the original financial Deed of Trust (that conveyed to the Board of Directors the land upon which The [original] Mother Church was built, as already presented). This second Deed of Trust contained the following stipulation: ". . . the land conveyed by said deed was conveyed to the grantees therein, as they are the Christian Science Board of Directors, upon the trusts, *but not subject to the conditions* mentioned in the deed creating said Board given by Mary Baker G. Eddy to Ira O. Knapp and others, dated September 1st, 1892," Appendix to *Manual*, p. 136.

It would seem from this stipulation that the intent of this conveyance to the Board of Directors was to add this property to the original financial Deed of Trust only in order that it might be legally owned by the Board of Directors although held for the benefit of the church as expressed in Article XXIV, Section 2, *Manual* p. 75, where it states that "the Christian Science Board of Directors owns the church edifices, with the land whereon they stand, legally; and the Church members own the aforesaid premises and buildings, beneficially."

Referring to Mrs. Eddy's distinction between "trusts" and "conditions" in the requirement that the Deed of Trust should be conveyed upon the "*trusts*" but "not subject to the *conditions*," a "trust" is always the expression of the deed's basic purpose, whereas the "conditions" are an extrinsic imposition upon the "trust." Thus the original purpose of the first Deed of Trust of September 1st, 1892, being to provide a repository for the property and funds of the church in con-

formity with statutory law permitting the formation of a church without a legal charter (in the words of Mrs. Eddy, “. . . without going back to *outgrown* forms of church organization,” which she said in the October 1892 *Journal* upon the occasion of the finding of the statute permitting the incorporation of “a body of [financial] donees, without organizing a church,” see also footnote, *Manual* p. 130), it was a basically *financial* Deed of Trust, its *church* “conditions” being conditions superimposed upon it. In other words, the financial and property elements were always the nature of its “trusts,” since they were the reason for its creation. The “conditions” of the original financial Deed of Trust which Mrs. Eddy specifically *excluded* from this second Deed of Trust, covering the Extension, pertained to the *church activities* which the Directors were required to maintain and supervise and for which they were empowered to make “all necessary rules and regulations,” par. 3, Deed of Trust to the Board of Directors,—after the *Manual* was given to the Field in 1895 (three years subsequently to the formation of The Mother Church in 1892), its provisions superseded this investiture of authority. (Thus Mrs. Eddy’s restriction of this second Deed to its “trusts,” or property rights, *only* is in line with the definition of “trust” in *Webster’s Dictionary* as “a *property* interest held for another’s benefit.”)

Hence when Mrs. Eddy makes the following *condition* in the second Deed of Trust: “. . . this property is conveyed on the further *trusts* that no new Tenet or By-Law shall be adopted, nor any Tenet or By-Law amended or annulled by the grantees unless the written consent of said Mary Baker G. Eddy, the author of the textbook ‘SCIENCE AND HEALTH WITH KEY TO THE SCRIPTURES,’ be given therefor . . .” (Appendix to *Manual*, p. 137), instead of calling her provision a “condition” she calls it “trusts” because she adds it to the previous “trusts” which she had made binding upon this second Deed of Trust—her expression being, “*In addition to the trusts* contained in said deed of September 1, 1892, . . . this property is conveyed on the further *trusts*”; she could not have said in the second Deed in addition to the “further *conditions*” of the first Deed, for the conditions of the first Deed had been *abrogated* with reference to the second Deed when she said, “. . . upon the trusts, but not subject to the conditions,” and had she introduced the word “conditions” in this connection it might have confused her previous distinction between “trusts” and “conditions” in the first Deed.



In connection with Mrs. Eddy's implication that the amendment or annulment of the By-laws without her consent would nullify this second Deed of Trust, while legally speaking no By-law in the *Manual* may have been "amended or annulled" by literal additions to, modifications of, or eliminations from the *Manual*, still the By-laws pertaining to church functions have almost in their entirety been violated or breached in *practice* to the effect of nullification ever since 1911, when the terms of all the officers of The Mother Church expired and their election and reëlection continued without Mrs. Eddy's approval of the candidates, contrary to her provisions in the *Manual*. Had the *Manual* By-laws been obeyed in regard to requiring Mrs. Eddy's approval, it would have necessitated the discontinuance of the Extension as a *Mother Church*, as subsequently presented.

The fact that Mrs. Eddy specifically abrogates the church functions of the Board of Directors in the first Deed of Trust as applicable to the second Deed of Trust, covering the Extension, further confirms the position that she intended that the church functions of the Board of Directors should terminate when the Board became inoperative under the *Manual*. Thus even her legal footsteps confirm her spiritual intent.

In view of Mrs. Eddy's abrogation of the "conditions" in the first Deed of Trust as applicable to the second, covering the Extension, it is evident that the church "conditions" of stipulations 9 and 10 in the first financial Deed of Trust, given to the Board of Directors on September 1st, 1892, applied only to The (original) Mother Church and not to the Extension—the "conditions" in stipulations 9 and 10 reading as follows: "9. Said Directors shall maintain regular preaching, reading or speaking in said church on each Sabbath, and an omission to have and maintain such preaching, reading or speaking for one year in succession shall be deemed a breach of this condition. 10. Whenever said Directors shall determine that it is inexpedient to maintain preaching, reading or speaking in said church in accordance with the terms of this deed, they are authorized and required to reconvey forthwith said lot of land with the building thereon to Mary Baker G. Eddy, her heirs and assigns forever by a proper deed of conveyance," Appendix to *Manual*, pp. 132, 133. Furthermore, in the light of Mrs. Eddy's emphatic statement that these "conditions" did not apply to the second Deed of Trust, covering the Extension, then, after the expiration of the terms of all of the officers of The Mother

Church as the Extension, or "crown" of Motherhood, in June 1911,\* the Extension as "The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Mass.," in its potential *branch* identity (remembering that what was known as The Mother Church was founded as "The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Mass.") would have continued on, its property held legally by the Board of Directors under its second financial Deed of Trust (executed in 1903) for the benefit of the members of "The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Mass." In other words, this plan for the dissolution of the Christian "crown," which the Extension up to this time had typed and which had superseded the Christian "cross," typed by The (original) Mother Church, would have permitted the Extension under the eliminative functions of the *Manual* to have become a branch church, in which each and every member would have had his part in forming By-laws, each member thus participating in the privilege of self-government, which privilege the members of The Mother Church (either as "cross" or "crown") had never had under the *Manual* government of The Mother Church—its members (other than the "First Members," who, according to the *Manual* By-laws, could never fall below forty or exceed one hundred in number) never having had even voting power at any time.

Inasmuch as The (original) Mother Church was not used for church services after the Extension was dedicated in 1906, four years before Mrs. Eddy's passing (three years in excess of the "one year in succession" for the discontinuance of church services named in the first financial Deed of Trust [stipulation 9] before the provision for its final disposition was binding upon the Board of Directors [stipulation 10]—and yet Mrs. Eddy did not require that the Board of Directors return it to her, "her heirs and assigns"), it is assumable that she intended it should share the final disposition of the Extension as an *embraced* Mother's Room, such as was in the first and second Concord Branch (which latter was the pattern for all the branches), continuing to be associated therewith as a treasure-house of the footsteps of the past for then present and future generations, its art windows presenting in pictorial succession the fulfilled prophecies of Church

\* The one exception was the Board of five Directors, which could continue only so long as it was not necessary to replace one of its members—this being impossible without Mrs. Eddy's approval under the provisions of the *Manual*, p. 26. Thus in June of 1912, upon the passing of one of the Board's members, the church functions of the Board of Directors, requiring five members, automatically ceased under the *Manual*, and the Board of Directors reverted to its original Deed of Trust, which was given to but four Directors and under which the Board was self-perpetuating without Mrs. Eddy's approval.

from "cross" to "crown"—Christianity to Science. Thus the Extension would have, for the first time, assumed its basic branch identity as "The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Mass.," embracing the medial Mother Church and its Mother's Room, just as the second Concord Branch as a spiritual pattern for all branches had embraced a Mother's Room, symbolizing the fact that a branch, typing the Bride, progressively embraces the full ends of Motherhood.

THE INTERLOCKING DEED OF TRUST  
OF THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PUBLISHING SOCIETY

The Deed of Trust given by Mrs. Eddy organizing The Christian Science Publishing Society on an unincorporated basis January 25th, 1898, was, in the words of the Deed, ". . . for the purpose of more effectually promoting and extending the religion of Christian Science." The Deed stated that the property conveyed by Mrs. Eddy to the Trustees had been transferred to her by the previous incorporated Publishing Society, this latter conveyance having been made four days previously, on January 21st, 1898. It provided for the publication of *The Christian Science Journal*, the hymnal, pamphlets, tracts, and all other literature, including the preparation and publication of the *Christian Science Quarterly*—Mrs. Eddy having added to this list of periodicals in September of the same year, the *Sentinel*, and later *Der Herold* in 1903 and *The Christian Science Monitor* in 1908, when they were first, respectively, created (*Le Héraut* not having been published during Mrs. Eddy's presence with us)—by *Manual* provision, Art. XXV, Sect. 6, p. 81. Also, this Deed of Trust provided that the Trustees were to manage the business of The Christian Science Publishing Society "upon their own responsibility," subject only to Mrs. Eddy's supervision, if at any time she should elect to advise or direct them.

In confirmation of these statements the following excerpts are quoted directly from this Deed of Trust (the full Deed being available to anyone who might apply to the Clerk of the Court in which it is filed, it is not fully quoted here for the sake of brevity):

"BE IT KNOWN That I, Mary Baker G. Eddy . . . do hereby sell and convey . . . all and singular the personal property, goods, and chattels which were sold and conveyed to me by the Christian Science Publishing Society by its bill of sale dated January 21, 1898, . . . including the publication called 'The Christian Science Journal' (not including the copyrights thereof), the linotype, all

pamphlets, tracts, and other literature conveyed to me by said sale, the hymnal, the subscription lists of 'The Christian Science Journal' and of 'The Christian Science Quarterly' . . . upon the following perpetual and irrevocable trust and confidence, namely: . . . 2. The business shall be done by said trustees under the unincorporated name of 'The Christian Science Publishing Society.' 3. Said trustees shall energetically and judiciously manage the business of the Publishing Society on a strictly Christian basis, and upon their own responsibility, and without consulting me about details, subject only to my supervision, if I shall at any time elect to advise or direct them. . . . 8. Said trustees shall have direction and supervision of the publication of said Quarterly, and also of all pamphlets, tracts, and other literature pertaining to said business, using their best judgment as to the means of preparing and issuing the same, so as to promote the best interests of the Cause, reserving the rights to make such changes as I may think important. . . . 10. Whenever a vacancy shall occur in said trusteeship for any cause, I reserve the right to fill the same by appointment, if I shall so desire so long as I may live; but if I do not elect to exercise this right, the remaining trustees shall fill said vacancy."

Although this Deed of Trust to The Christian Science Publishing Society was, according to its provisions, "perpetual and irrevocable," it had six limitations, two of an interlocking nature. These limitations are here numbered according to convenience, irrespective of their order in the Deed of Trust, with the interlocking limitations named last: First, Mrs. Eddy reserved the right to fill a vacancy in the Trusteeship during her presence with us—otherwise the Board of Trustees, according to the Deed's provisions, was self-perpetuating; second, Mrs. Eddy reserved the right to make such changes in the preparation and issuing of all Christian Science literature as she might deem important; third, Mrs. Eddy reserved the right to supervise the Publishing Society's business affairs (which the Trustees were otherwise to manage "upon their own responsibility"), should she at any time elect to advise or direct the Trustees with reference thereto; and fourth, Mrs. Eddy retained the copyright to *The Christian Science Journal*, which was to become the sole property of the Publishing Society only at her "demise," reserving the right to withdraw the *Journal* from the Trust at any time. In the words of the Deed: "11. I also reserve the right to withdraw from said trust, if I shall so desire, the publication of the Christian Science Journal, but if I do not exercise this reserved option, then said Journal shall remain a part of the

trust property forever. 12. Upon my decease, in consideration aforesaid, I sell and convey to said trustees my copyright of 'The Christian Science Journal' to be held by them as the other property of said trust." The same reservations were also made with reference to the other periodicals in the *Manual* (no periodicals other than the *Journal* and *Quarterly* being existent when the Deed of Trust was given) as pertaining to this Deed of Trust, Art. XXV, Sect. 6, p. 81.

The fifth limitation, and one of the interlocking features in this Deed of Trust of the Publishing Society, was as follows: "Once in every six months, the trustees shall account for and pay over to the treasurer of 'The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Mass.' [who was always a Director before Mrs. Eddy's passing \*], the entire net profits of said business. . . . Said treasurer shall hold the money so paid over to him subject to the order of 'The First Members' of said Church, who are authorized to order its disposition only in accordance with the rules and by-laws contained in the Manual of said Church." The fund's being placed in the hands of the Treasurer as a Director and subject to the First Members constituted the interlocking feature of this provision as between the Trustees and outside agencies.

The sixth limitation, and the second interlocking feature of this Deed of Trust to the Publishing Society, was the one that interlocked the Deed with the authority of the Board of Directors *and* the "First Members," in that it stated that the "First Members *together with* the directors of said Church" were empowered to exercise a disciplinary function—to remove any member of the Board of Trustees of the Publishing Society "for such reason as to them [the 'First Members' and Board of Directors] may seem expedient," the exact wording of this limitation being: "The First Members together with the directors of said Church shall have the power to declare vacancies in said trusteeship for such reason as to them may seem expedient." Contrary to this *joint* authority of the "First Members" and the Board of Directors of The Mother Church under this Deed of Trust to the Publishing Society to declare a vacancy in the trusteeship of the Publishing Society, as just presented, the Board of Directors *under the Manual*

\* Up to the time of Mrs. Eddy's passing, the Directors of The Mother Church functioned under a cabinet form of government in the following manner: one Director was Treasurer of The Mother Church; one was Editor-in-Chief of all the periodicals; another was Clerk; one was Publisher of Mrs. Eddy's writings; and another was in charge of Reading Rooms in Boston, as well as being individually responsible for other special duties connected with the church.

(from the twentieth, in 1901, after the "First Members" transferred their specific church functions to the Board of Directors, to the present *Manual*) had the "power [alone—without 'First Members'] to declare vacancies in said trusteeship, for such reasons as to the Board may seem expedient," *Manual* p. 80. (Thus the *Manual* was in conflict with another legal Deed of Trust in addition to the Directors financial Deed of Trust of 1892. However, from the eighth *Manual*, in 1898 [when the Deed of Trust was granted to the Publishing Society], to the twentieth, in 1901, the *Manual* and the Deed of Trust of the Publishing Society were in agreement in that both required the authority of the "First Members" *in conjunction with* that of the Board of Directors to declare a vacancy in the trusteeship of the Publishing Society.)

#### MRS. EDDY'S PERSONAL DEED OF TRUST

On March 6th, 1907, Mrs. Eddy made a personal Deed of Trust whereby she placed her entire earthly fortune in the hands of three Trustees: namely, Honorable Henry M. Baker, her cousin; Josiah E. Fernald, her banker; and Archibald McLellan, the Editor-in-Chief of the Christian Science periodicals and the only Director of The Mother Church who was not her own student. (Mr. McLellan previously has been named as the first fifth Director and the only one from the field of branches. Also he was the only Christian Scientist among the Trustees of this personal Deed of Trust.) These three Trustees had sole responsibility for the management of Mrs. Eddy's personal affairs up to the time of her passing.

Inasmuch as this Deed of Trust transferred and assigned to these Trustees ownership in Mrs. Eddy's copyrights to her writings, this Deed of Trust is here referred to in order that ownership of her copyrights might be traced from herself to her personal Trustees and from them to the Executor under her Last Will and Testament, Hon. Henry M. Baker, who was also, as before noted, one of her Trustees under her personal Deed of Trust. That this Deed of Trust transferred her copyrights from her own personal ownership to her Trustees is seen by the following quotation from this Deed of Trust which indicates the character of the property transferred as well as the full scope of the Trustees' responsibility and authority under this Deed of Trust:

"KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That I, Mary Baker G. Eddy . . . do hereby grant, convey, assign, and transfer

unto the said Henry M. Baker, Archibald McLellan, and Josiah E. Fernald, their heirs, successors, and assigns, all my interest of every kind and description in and to any real estate wherever situated; also all my interest of every kind and description in and to any estate, personal or mixed, which I now own or possess, including stocks, bonds, *interests in copyrights*, contracts, actions, and causes of action at law or in equity against any person . . . *First:* To manage, care for, and control all the above granted real estate and interest therein during my earthly life. . . . *Fourth:* At the termination of my earthly life, this trust shall terminate, and all the personal estate then held by my said trustees shall pass to the executor of my last will and the codicils thereto, to be disposed of in accordance with the provisions thereof."

Inasmuch as Mrs. Eddy willed the residue of her estate (after the disposition of her personal bequests) to The Mother Church and inasmuch as the Board of Directors was the financial repository of The Mother Church, the copyrights as a part of the residue of her estate (since not specifically bequeathed) came into the hands of the Board of Directors, which now utilizes her copyrights under the title of "Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker G. Eddy."

However, neither the Board of Directors nor anyone other than Mrs. Eddy's own son or adopted son ever had a right to renew her copyrights at the time of their expiration. That the Board of Directors understood this legal point is definitely attested by the fact that it used Dr. Ebenezer Johnson Foster-Eddy (her legally adopted son, who had the full rights of a lineal son) to renew all copyrights from the time of Mrs. Eddy's passing in 1910 until the time of the passing of Dr. Ebenezer J. Foster-Eddy.

The provision in the present copyright law regarding the renewal of copyrights definitely names those who may renew, and the Courts in construing this Act have strictly limited the right to those specifically named and in the order named:

1. At the expiration of the original copyright period (28 years) the author may renew.
2. If the author be dead, then the widow or widower may renew.
3. If there be no widow or widower, then the children may renew.
4. If there be no children, then the Executor named under the will may renew.

5. If there be no will, then the next of kin (such as brothers, sisters, nephews, nieces, etc.) may renew.

6. The courts have very definitely said that there is no provision for an Administrator to renew.

An investigation of the Court's construction of the right of an Administrator to renew copyrights when he has been appointed by the Court to take the place of an Executor who had passed on before his executorship in the disposition of the estate had been completed shows that it has never been definitely decided by a Court. However, it is a definite fact that neither an Executor nor an Administrator so appointed could renew copyrights after he had completed the administration of the estate. Josiah E. Fernald, who was appointed Administrator by the Court to succeed Henry M. Baker, Executor, after the latter's passing, ". . . closed his final account [as Administrator] March 26, 1914," according to the Register of the Court of Probate for the County of Merrimack in New Hampshire. (Despite this fact, past Administrator Josiah E. Fernald renewed the copyright on *Science and Health* in 1934.) In this connection, it might be added that the copyrights of 1890, 1894, and 1901 were properly renewed by Dr. Ebenezer J. Foster-Eddy, who, however, passed on shortly before the time to renew the 1906 copyrights, which expired in 1934.

Inasmuch as Mrs. Eddy previously had always copyrighted her editions at the time any extensive changes were made, irrespective of the date of her last copyright (as for instance her copyrights taken out on *Science and Health* in 1875, 1878, 1881, 1883, 1885, 1890, 1894, 1901, 1902, and 1906, despite the fact that copyrights run for 28 years), does not the fact that she did not copyright her *Science and Health* after 1906, although she subsequently (during a period of four years before her passing) made extensive additions thereto covering the whole range of *Science and Health*, show that her last great illuminations lifted *Science and Health* beyond the power of law or church to bind? In other words, did not her last illuminations in *Science and Health* beyond the limits of church universalize *Science and Health*? It is interesting to note in this connection that all of her last and highest statements (other than those in *Science and Health*) were directed to the world through its own channels and not to church, as evidenced by the headings of her articles in *Miscellany*, notably: "The Significance of Christmas," *New York World* (p. 259); "What Christmas Means to Me," *The Ladies' Home Journal* (p. 261); "A Word in Defence," *Boston Herald*, May 5, 1900 (p. 264); "Christian Science



Thanks," *Boston Globe*, November 29, 1900 (p. 264); "Insufficient Freedom," *New York World*, December 1900 (p. 266); "Christian Science and the Times," *Concord (N. H.) Monitor*, July 1902 (p. 266); "Heaven," *New York American*, February 1905 (p. 267); "Prevention and Cure of Divorce," *Boston Herald*, March 5, 1905 (p. 268); "Harvest," *The Independent*, November 1906 (p. 269); "Mrs. Eddy Describes her Human Ideal," *The Evening Press*, Grand Rapids, Mich., August 1907 (p. 271); "Youth and Young Manhood," *Cosmopolitan*, November 1907 (p. 272); "Mrs. Eddy Sends Thanks," *Boston Herald*, April 1908 (p. 274); "Universal Fellowship," *Minneapolis (Minn.) News* (p. 275); "Mrs. Eddy's Own Denial that She is Ill," *New York Herald* (p. 275); "Politics," *Boston Post*, November 1908 (p. 276); "Other Ways than by War," *Boston Herald*, March 1898 (p. 277); "How Strife may be Stilled," *Boston Globe*, December 1904 (p. 278); "Practise the Golden Rule," *Boston Globe*, August 1905 (p. 281). Also the following letters were addressed to the world through its own channels: "Christian Science and the Church," *New York Commercial Advertiser* (p. 299); "Faith in Metaphysics," *New York World* (p. 301); "Reply to Mark Twain," *New York Herald* (p. 302).

Returning to Mrs. Eddy's personal Deed of Trust, the subject of this subtitle, the Deed was the outgrowth of a suit filed by Mrs. Eddy's own son by her first marriage, George W. Glover, together with her nephew, George W. Baker, and her granddaughter, Mary B. Glover, and shortly thereafter concurred in by Mrs. Eddy's adopted son, Dr. Ebenezer Johnson Foster-Eddy, and Fred W. Baker, for the custody of Mrs. Eddy's person and fortune upon the alleged basis of her mental and physical irresponsibility therefor due to her alleged extreme age.\* Sibyl Wilbur in her *The Life of Mary Baker Eddy*, under the chapter title, "The Leader in Retirement," generalizes the particulars of the complaint as follows: ". . . it was set forth in the bill that Mrs. Eddy was forcibly detained and constrained to do the will of strangers, that her large estate was manipulated improperly by her secretaries, and that she was in a feeble mental state which prevented her comprehending what disposition was being made of her affairs. The plaintiffs prayed that the defendants be required to give account of all their

\* The style of this suit was: "The petition of Mary Baker Glover Eddy who sues by her next friends George W. Glover, Mary Baker Glover, and George W. Baker against Calvin A. Frye, Alfred Farlow, Irving C. Tomlinson, Ira O. Knapp, William B. Johnson, Stephen A. Chase, Joseph Armstrong, Edward A. Kimball, Hermann S. Hering, and Lewis C. Strang."

business transactions, and if they had wrongfully disposed of any property that they be made to restore it; that they be restrained from any further business dealings in Mrs. Eddy's name, pending the suit, and that a receiver be appointed to take possession of all Mrs. Eddy's property."

Upon the testimony of alienists appointed by the Court to examine into these matters, Mrs. Eddy won a great triumph—one of the alienists, said to be the most celebrated in the country at the time, who had declared himself to have been initially much prejudiced against her, having said: "The idea that this strong-minded woman is ever a victim of coercion is manifestly absurd. Her own daily life is run on a thoroughly systematized set of rules. At six o'clock she is up and attending to her household affairs, after which she dictates to her stenographer or writes with her own hand. Every day she takes a drive in a closed carriage, accompanied by one of her household who sits on the box with the driver. . . . For a woman of her age I do not hesitate to say that she is physically and mentally phenomenal. . . . I fancy that the belief among some of her followers involving the indefinite continuance of her earthly life arises purely from the visible evidence of Mrs. Eddy's great vitality and the absence of any of the usual tokens of mental breakdown natural to one of her great age," *Christian Science Sentinel*, September 7, 1907.

Shortly before the filing of the suit, Mrs. Eddy had made (on February 25th, 1907) a munificent Trust settlement of securities and other assets upon her son and his family; however, it bore the proviso "that the beneficiaries should not directly or indirectly contest her last will or other disposition of property," Sibyl Wilbur's *The Life of Mary Baker Eddy*, under the chapter entitled, "The Leader in Retirement." On March 11th, 1907, after the filing of the original suit on March 1st, Mrs. Eddy's adopted son, Dr. Ebenezer Johnson Foster-Eddy, and Fred W. Baker joined in the original bill of particulars and concurred in its complaints and petitions.

In addition to the settlements made to her lineal son, Mrs. Eddy bestowed upon him and his family the following amounts in her Will, saying: ". . . I give and bequeath to my said son, George W. Glover, the sum of ten thousand dollars . . . [and] to each of the five children of my son, George W. Glover, the sum of ten thousand dollars." In addition to a previous settlement in 1909 (Sibyl Wilbur's *The Life of Mary Baker Eddy*, under the chapter entitled, "Life at Chestnut Hill"), she also bequeathed the sum of five thousand dollars to her

adopted son, Dr. Ebenezer J. Foster-Eddy, her bequest being expressed in the following words, ". . . to my adopted son, Benjamin J. Foster, M. D., the sum of five thousand dollars."

In spite of her son's acceptance of the provision in her settlement upon him on February 25th, 1907, to the effect that he as beneficiary would not "directly or indirectly contest her last will or other disposition of property," after Mrs. Eddy's passing he did so contest her Will by filing a suit as intervener in a cause of action brought by the Attorney-General of Massachusetts upon the ground that the Massachusetts law forbids a church's receiving so large a bequest as the residue of her estate devised to The Mother Church; however, this suit was dismissed by reason of the fact that the Bill as drawn was legally deficient. The Board of Directors was afterwards empowered to receive Mrs. Eddy's bequests to The Mother Church by virtue of special enabling legislation passed by the State Legislature, the seeking of such legislation being made necessary by the fact that Chapter 37, Sect. 1, of the Revised Laws of Massachusetts then forbade a Massachusetts church's receiving a bequest in excess of \$2,000.00—this limit afterwards amended to \$10,000.00.

In this way the Board of Directors in its capacity as financial repository for the funds of The Mother Church was enabled to receive the residue of Mrs. Eddy's estate, which included the copyrights to *Science and Health* and her other writings. This was the final step in the liquidation of the provision in Mrs. Eddy's personal Deed of Trust conveying these copyrights to her personal Trustees, Hon. Henry M. Baker, Josiah E. Fernald, and Archibald McLellan, from whom they later passed to the Board of Directors, which now holds them under the title, "Trustees under the Will of Mary Baker G. Eddy."

This personal Deed of Trust completed the four legal instruments that, together with Mrs. Eddy's Last Will and Testament, later commented upon, were the means by which Mrs. Eddy made legal provisions absolutely outside of church for the disposition of all matters that had no bearing on her *Manual* provisions for the church—the *Manual* being her "Last Will and Testament" for her church's guidance. They are recorded here only for their historic value and for an authentic presentation of matters which, having erroneously been injected into church councils, have proved to be an insuperable obstruction to the church's perception of Mrs. Eddy's inspired foresight of God's plan.

## THE ONLY SURVIVING CHURCH FUNCTIONS AFTER FINISHED MOTHERHOOD IN 1910

Mrs. Eddy under the *Manual* left the organization of church at the time of her passing in 1910 in the exact position in which it was placed after she dissolved the First Boston Organization in 1889—that of the branches' going on under their own self-government (*Manual* p. 72, lines 19-24) with an outside Deed of Trust agency (The Christian Science Publishing Society) to publish the branches' *Quarterly* (this fact being subject to a later explanation) and an independent (of the Publishing Society) publisher of her own writings.

Recapitulating—in 1891, two years after the dissolution of the First Organization of the Boston Church Mrs. Eddy, as previously presented, expressed doubt as to whether any other church activities than the branches would ever be needed to complete Church, however at the same time adding that “this [Boston] Church may find it wisdom to organize a second time for the *completion of its history*,” concluding with, “This however is left to the providence of God,” Ret. 58, 1st to 4th ed. inclusive, 1891. To this end (“*the completion of its history*”) The Mother Church was formed in 1892. The completion of The Mother Church's history in 1906, after fourteen years of church activity, was attested by the fact that Mrs. Eddy at the dedication of the Extension designated The Mother Church as “the cross” and the Extension as “the crown,” calling the Extension The Mother Church's “crowning *ultimate*,” My. 6:22.

At Mrs. Eddy's passing, “the crown,” typed by the Extension, yielded to the *Manual* provisions which demanded her approval for the Extension's continuing functions as a Mother Church (even its “crown”), leaving the branches (including the Extension as “The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Mass.,” embracing its Mother's Room, as before noted) rooted in the Word of *Science and Health* to go on under their own government in “consonance with [*con-*, with, + *sonare*, to sound,—‘in sound with’] The Mother Church Manual,” *Manual* p. 72, Art. XXIII, Sect. 6, both “cross” and “crown” being symbols of Christianity only, the branches typing Christian Science. This provision for the branches was divine attestation of the fact that the branches had progressed to the point of inherent self-sufficiency which would enable them to dissipate the walls of limitation with which they had been medially surrounded and which had prevented them from realizing the import of Mrs. Eddy's trenchant

denunciations of organization expressed in the following quotations: ". . . material organization . . . wars with Love's spiritual compact . . .," Ret. 47:2; ". . . Christian Science shuns whatever involves material means for the promotion of spiritual ends," Ret. 47:10; ". . . the time cometh when the religious element, or Church of Christ, shall exist alone in the affections, and need no organization to express it," Mis. 145:3; ". . . material organization has its value and peril, and . . . organization is requisite only in the earliest periods in Christian history," Ret. 45:6.

All organization is material that governs from "without" one's own consciousness, not permitting such one a voice in his own government; hence the self-governing branches,\* in whose Constitution and By-laws each member had active participation, remained after The Mother Church passed (whose government was from without), following "the completion of its [church] history"—such "completion" being a medial necessity to the final goal of branch church sufficiency.

In connection with the position of the branches and the possible channel for the publication of their *Quarterly* after Mrs. Eddy's passing as being identical with the previous position of the branches and the provision for publishing their *Quarterly* after the dissolution of the First Organization of the Boston Church, there was a Publishing Society operative during the interim between 1889 and 1891 when there was no Boston church organization, the first *Quarterly* for the branches having been published in 1890. (Since Mrs. Eddy's plan for the Second Organization was that all agencies inside or outside of church should be unincorporated, Mrs. Eddy's reason for dissolving the first Publishing Society was doubtless because it was incorporated, one of the provisions in the Deed of Trust covering the reformation of the Publishing Society in 1898 reading, "The business shall be done by said trustees under the unincorporated name of 'The Christian Science Publishing Society.'")

As an explanation of why Mrs. Eddy made The Christian Science Publishing Society a legal trust outside of church, an incident might be cited, as recorded in the March and October 1892 *Journals* which shows Mrs. Eddy's conviction that church and a Publishing Society were incompatible in the sense that church is above the plane of com-

\* The branches were never required under the *Manual* to observe even the "Order of Services" of The Mother Church, *Manual* p. 120; the words "and Branch Churches" were added after Mrs. Eddy had passed on, as will be seen by reviewing the *Manuals* from the 1895 edition (the first) to the 1911 edition, published shortly after Mrs. Eddy's passing.

mercial life while a publishing society cannot escape the material phases of commercial demands: Certain Christian Scientists at that time sought to erect a Publishing Society building adjoining the prospective church structure, each being under its own separate roof and united to the other only by a common heating system. Mrs. Eddy's concern was so great in regard to the spiritual incongruity of this association that she demanded the return of all the donations which had been received from the Field for this purpose. Her very forcible denunciation of this association of church and Publishing Society on the same level of consciousness was expressed by her in the following statement: "I am confident that all loyal Christian Scientists will gladly consecrate our church to a more dignified end, than an exchange, or a place for business bickerings, bag and baggage!" Thus Mrs. Eddy always placed the Publishing Society outside the sacred thought-precincts of church, and it was in this form (as a legal instrument of trust) that it survived her passing.

While the Board of Directors held a financial Deed of Trust which temporarily \* survived Mrs. Eddy's passing (this Deed of Trust making it the repository outside of church for the real estate property and funds of The Mother Church), the Directors *never* had any general denominational agency powers, inasmuch as neither they nor The Mother Church had any control over the branches, the *Manual* from the first to the last edition forbidding official control (more latterly, in 1903, even "general" official control) by The Mother Church of the branches. Our present By-law on this subject (which, with the exception of the word "general" added in 1903, has remained exactly the same in its demands from the first *Manual* to the last), under the title "The Mother Church and Branch Churches," reads as follows: "Article XXIII. *Local Self-government*. Section 1. The Mother Church of Christ, Scientist, shall assume no [even] *general* † official control of other churches, and it shall be controlled by none other. Each Church of Christ, Scientist, shall have its own form of government." Also Section 10 bearing upon this subject reads: "*No Inter-*

\* The word "forever" which appears in the Deed of Trust (*Manual*, Appendix, bottom of p. 133) is the standard term used in all conveyances of property. It must be used to indicate a complete quitclaim to the property conveyed. That it does not mean "never ending" in its application to the Board of Directors is proved by the Deed itself, which, in its own terms, *requires* the *return* of the property to Mrs. Eddy, her "heirs and assigns," under certain specified conditions contained therein, see stipulations 10 and 11.

† This word "general" was added in 1903 to strengthen the previous statement so that the church could not exercise even general supervisory powers over the branches.

ference. . . . In Christian Science each branch church shall be distinctly democratic in its government, and no individual, and no other church shall interfere with its affairs"—and certainly the powers of the Board of Directors of The Mother Church could not exceed the power of The Mother Church itself in this connection any more than any other servant of purpose could exceed its master's prerogatives.

The Directors under their temporarily surviving Deed of Trust were self-perpetuating because no recourse to Mrs. Eddy's approval was required. On the contrary, the Board of Directors *under the Manual* ceased to exist as functionaries of The Mother Church one year after The Mother Church ceased to exist in June 1911, six months after Mrs. Eddy's passing (for one of the Directors passed on in June 1912 at which time the Board was unable to elect an officer to fill the vacancy because Mrs. Eddy's approval, required by the *Manual* By-law, was unobtainable),—this intervening year providentially allowing sufficient time to make suitable disposition of the affairs of The Mother Church.

In line with Mrs. Eddy's plan that all agencies both inside and outside the church in the Second Organization should be unincorporated, the Board of Directors, although formed ostensibly as a corporate body, or corporation, "under and in accordance with section one, Chapter 39 of the Public Statutes of Massachusetts," was never a corporate body, or corporation, according to the Supreme Court's statement in regard to the Master's finding on this point, which the Court accepted in the Litigation between the Trustees of the Publishing Society and the Board of Directors (comments on which immediately follow under the next subtitle), the Court's statement reading: "The deed declared that the grantees [the Board of Directors] should 'constitute a perpetual body or corporation under and in accordance with section one, Chapter 39 of the Public Statutes of Massachusetts.' The master has found that the grantees never organized themselves as a corporation and never became such by virtue of their duties of similarity to deacons and wardens. The mere declaration of the grantor, Mrs. Eddy, could not make them a corporation . . . [the Court adding] It is unnecessary to determine in this connection whether the Board of Directors constituted a corporation or not. For the purpose of this decision the finding of the master that they never became a corporation is accepted."

Thus Mrs. Eddy's divinely inspired plan that all agencies inside and outside of church should be unincorporated was unwittingly ful-

filled in the sense that the Board of Directors was never incorporated as the Statute under which it was operating seemed to demand. Thus again "the superiority of the claims of Spirit over matter or merely legal titles" was triumphant—in the words of Mrs. Eddy when she spoke of a transfer of this selfsame property previous to its being conveyed to the Board of Directors under its financial Deed of Trust, which first transfer she described as being in a "circuitous, novel way, at the wisdom whereof a few persons have since scrupled," adding, "The foundation on which our church was to be built had to be rescued from the grasp of legal power, and now it must be put back into the arms of Love, if we would not be found fighting against God," Mis. 139, 140. Thus this property (of the *ascending* church) which was once redeemed from legal power could not again be placed in its grasp, even though the law seemed to demand it and Mrs. Eddy to wittingly accept its necessity.

So long as Church was in the process of ascent with The Mother Church (Mrs. Eddy having said of The Mother Church in her Dedicatory Sermon: "May the kingdom of God within you,—with you always,—*reascending*, bear you outward, *upward*, *heavenward*. . . . May all whose means, energies, and prayers helped erect The Mother Church, find within it home, and *heaven* ['heaven' is italicized by Mrs. Eddy]," Pul. 10:30), for it to have been *under* earth law would have blocked its heavenward course, holding it earth-bound. The Mother Church as a medial necessity only could have no foothold on earth; thus its unincorporated character was also a type of its impermanency.

However, the branches as typed by the second Concord Branch, as the *descending* Church idea (which bears redemption for even Cæsar's image and the "laws of the land,") are forced to find within themselves on earth the true idea which our Nation vaguely glimpsed when it stamped on the face of its coin—or that which Jesus called the Cæsar-element—"In God We Trust"; thus our Nation sought to associate God with the medium for even its mundane needs, in the spirit of the Twentieth-Century message which it was the branches' sole privilege to understand—" 'Tis writ *on earth*, on leaf and flower: Love hath one race, one realm, one power," *Poems* p. 22, of which "power" the world regards money as the most realistic symbol. So Mrs. Eddy said of certain passages in the 37th Psalm which associate man's earthly needs with God's power to meet them, "It [this coincidence of the human and the divine] is His coin, His currency; it has His image and superscription," My. 170:16. Hence the branches have



always chartered their church as a type of the redemption of the "laws of the land [their City foursquare domain where God dwells among men]" and, therefore, have been able to keep their finances within the spiritual coffers of their earth-redemptive consciousness.

But referring again to the contrary position of The Mother Church (as an ascending idea whose goal was heaven) with reference to law, Mrs. Eddy's further trenchant statement in regard to the contention that arose over the legality of the title to the land on which The Mother Church now stands has been reserved for the last expression on this subject because of its bearing upon the next subtitle, "Litigation between Interlocking Boards," which pertains to a legal controversy involving The Mother Church and the relation of its *Manual* to legal instruments constituted outside of church—this statement reading: "The land, and the church standing on it, must be conveyed through a type representing the true nature of the gift; a type morally and spiritually inalienable, but *materially questionable*—even after the manner that all spiritual good comes to Christian Scientists, to the end of taxing their faith in God, and their adherence to the superiority of the claims of Spirit over matter or merely legal titles," Mis. 140:3-10.

In the following topic it will be seen how The Mother Church came to be justified by, and consequently to rest under, "merely legal titles."

### LITIGATION BETWEEN INTERLOCKING BOARDS

As previously mentioned, the authority of the Trustees of the Publishing Society under their Deed of Trust and the authority of the Board of Directors *under the Manual* were interlocking in that the Deed of Trust given by Mrs. Eddy to the Publishing Society permitted the Board of Directors *in conjunction with* "First Members" (who as "Executive Members" were "disbanded" in 1908) to remove a member of the self-perpetuating Board of Trustees of the Publishing Society for "such reason as to them may seem expedient"—a purely disciplinarian function; while in a By-law of the *Manual* beginning with the twentieth *Manual*, in 1901, Mrs. Eddy (having caused the "Trust Members" to transfer all of their active Mother Church functions under the *Manual* to the Board of Directors) delegated to the Board of Directors *alone* (without "First Members") the authority to remove a member of the self-perpetuating Board of Trustees of the Publishing Society. In other words, conflictingly, the Board of Direc-

tors was given a superseding authority in the *Manual* over the conjoined authority of the "First Members" and the Board of Directors in the "irrevocable" Deed of Trust of the Publishing Society to remove one of its Trustees for cause.

Mrs. Eddy also delegated to the Board of Directors as a function *under the Manual* (but not under the Deed of Trust of the Publishing Society) the authority to elect the editors of the Christian Science periodicals, with Mrs. Eddy's consent in her own handwriting, *Manual* p. 80, Sect. 4, and to see that these publications were "ably edited and kept abreast of the times," *Manual* p. 44:21; while under the Deed of Trust of the Publishing Society the Trustees were empowered to "manage the business of the Publishing Society . . . upon their own responsibility." Thus again Mrs. Eddy superimposed a conflicting *Manual* provision upon this "irrevocable" Deed of Trust.

Hence it was but inevitable that friction in regard to the performance of these functions should arise after Mrs. Eddy's passing—spiritually due to the fact that the *Manual* of The Mother Church, as previously presented, forbade (and still forbids) the continuance of all Christian Science periodicals, inasmuch as the *Manual* prohibitively required Mrs. Eddy's approval in her own handwriting of the candidates to be elected by the Board of Directors for the positions of editors thereof, remembering that the editors' terms of office expired in June 1911, six months after Mrs. Eddy's passing, and disobedience to this *Manual* provision could not have escaped the judgment of God, manifest in the struggle of men. (The periodicals, which were constantly under Mrs. Eddy's pre-scrutiny before their publication and which had made it possible for her to keep in touch with the progressive thought of the Field to the end of promoting the completion of the generic Word of *Science and Health*, had fulfilled their providential mission of time and purpose *under the provisions of the Manual*, and Mrs. Eddy did not leave them to adulterate the purity of the impersonal Word by allowing them to feed the Field with unsupervised opinions about Christian Science, she having said as the reason for her suspension of the meetings of the National Christian Scientist Association, ". . . I saw no advantage, but great disadvantage, in one student's opinions or *modus operandi* becoming the basis for others . . .," Mis. 156:14. Mrs. Eddy's statement forces the inescapable conclusion that she permitted the "opinions" of others to circulate in the Field through the medium of these periodicals, not for the edification of the Field, which had her Word, so superior

to any opinions about it, but rather for her own necessity to make the generic Word all-embracingly meet the needs of the Field as having in it the elements of the world—her pre-scrutiny of the periodicals protecting the Field from definitely erroneous opinions or opinions in advance of the church's demonstrated position.\*)

Thus friction between the Board of Directors and the Trustees of the Publishing Society arose in connection with their interlocking authority and eventuated in the Board of Directors' demanding that a certain pamphlet entitled "Purification" made up of reprints from the already published current literature should not go out to the Field. However, the Board of Trustees of the Publishing Society de-

\* An instance of this is seen in Mrs. Eddy's article, "Watching *versus* Watching Out," written in response to an article under this same title which appeared in the *Sentinel* of September 16th, 1905 (not "September 23, 1905," My. 232), wherein Mrs. Eddy denounced the "opinions" of even the editor of the *Sentinel* (of whose appointment she had approved); for this editor's article advocated a position which was beyond all need for church (the history of which had not yet been completed), inasmuch as it placed the "Watch" within oneself alone in disregard of any outer association, which is the province of church. Even *Science and Health* had not then (in 1905) been lifted to this position of completeness through Mrs. Eddy's final additions to *Science and Health* applicable to the last step in church, which she did not add to *Science and Health* until 1907, two years later. The editor's article presented such statements as, "Watchfulness means thoughtful forelooking from the citadel of *conscious adequacy* [self-completeness, which never could have been the consciousness of man until the Word was complete] . . . He who watches rightly . . . rests in Principle. . ." These statements compared with others in his article show that he presented only a theoretical position, which Mrs. Eddy sensed. Just two months previously Mrs. Eddy had addressed to the Field an explanation of why she had asked Christian Scientists to stop special prayer for the peace of nations (in the war between Japan and Russia) after having initially asked them to pray therefor, the explanation reading: ". . . a spiritual foresight of the nations' drama presented itself and awakened a *wiser want*, even to know how to pray *other than* the daily prayer of my church [the Lord's Prayer].—"Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven," My. 281:1. Thus Mrs. Eddy showed that it would take a higher prayer than the Lord's Prayer (which was given to consciousness in need of church, to meet Nation's need; and as church had not completed its history (as evidenced by its petition "[May] Thy kingdom come," rather than as now "Thy kingdom *is* come") as a precedent necessity to reaching Nation, Mrs. Eddy stopped their "special" prayers in response to her initial request. Evidently the editor's article "Watching *versus* Watching Out," which she denounced, had theoretically caught the tone of the unified consciousness which Mrs. Eddy had expressed when she sensed Nation's privilege beyond the need of church, which latter at its fullest point of expression is a symbol of twelve *individual* gates of consciousness each in outer association with the others as a necessary step before they become unified in one consciousness in the "tree of life," typing Nation. Thus Mrs. Eddy in her pre-scrutiny of this article must have permitted it to go into the *Sentinel* to the end of giving her the opportunity to turn church back to its need of the Lord's Prayer (after she had called attention to Nation's need beyond it), the demands of which church could never go beyond until it had completed its last step.

cided to send it out despite the demand of the Board of Directors. Whereupon the Board of Directors sent the Trustees notice of its dismissal of Mr. Lamont Rowlands, one of the Trustees, ostensibly under its *Manual* authority to act alone in this regard (without "First Members"), which *Manual* (but not Deed of Trust) authority was substituted for the previous *Manual* section requiring that the Board of Directors act only *in conjunction with* the "First Members" in performing this disciplinary function, this substitution having been made simultaneously with the transfer of the *church powers only* of the "First Members" of the Board of Directors in the following words, "*The business of the Mother Church* hitherto transacted by the First Members, shall be done by its Christian Science Board of Directors," 20th *Manual*, p. 30,—the Publishing Society, however, being legally constituted outside of church. Thus the Board of Directors' authority in the *Manual* conflictingly exceeded its authority under the "irrevocable" Deed of Trust of the Publishing Society, which declared that the Board of Directors could only perform the disciplinary function of removing a Trustee *in conjunction with* the "First Members" of The Mother Church, and it was upon the basis of this claimed *Manual* authority that the Board of Directors acted.

However, neither the Board of Trustees nor the Board of Directors in their struggle over conflicting authority took into consideration the fact that the Board of Directors' *Manual* authority became inoperative when the first vacancy on the Board occurred—the *Manual* prohibiting the filling of such vacancy without Mrs. Eddy's approval.

Upon receipt of the Board of Directors' notice of dismissal of Mr. Rowlands, the Trustees took the matter to Court on the basis that the disciplinary authority of the Board of Directors in the Deed of Trust to the Publishing Society under which the Trustees were functioning could be used only "together with" the "First Members," who were not available for action because of their then nonexistence, which deficiency the Trustees contended nullified the claimed authority of the Board of Directors to dismiss a Trustee.

Inasmuch as Mrs. Eddy had for nine years before her passing permitted to remain in the Deed of Trust of the Publishing Society the conflicting provision which required *the conjunction* of the "First Members" with the Board of Directors in order to remove a Trustee of the Publishing Society and also the conflicting provision that the disposition of the "net profits" from the Publishing Society should be ordered by the "First Members," after she had changed the By-law to per-

mit the Board of Directors *alone* to remove a Trustee and to order the disposition of these "net profits," it is reasonably assumable that Mrs. Eddy had fully realized that the seeds of conflict lay *at this very point* in this legal Deed of Trust of the Publishing Society. And might not these have been witting provisions of Mrs. Eddy for the failure of this Publishing Society Deed of Trust when neither the First Members nor the Board of Directors existed under the *Manual* as church functionaries empowered to perform these functions? In other words, might not this have been her second line of assurance that the Trust of the Publishing Society would be found wanting in its ability to continue (to repeat, after its disciplinary clause and clause pertaining to the disposition of the "net profits" had become inoperative)—this second line of assurance to operate in the event that the church did not obey her *Manual* provisions designed to terminate this Publishing Society Trust after her passing when there could be no editors to carry on the work of the periodicals by reason of there being no Board of Directors under the *Manual* to elect them and consequently no "net profits" to consider?

It will be readily granted that Mrs. Eddy could easily have changed the Deed of Trust with the consent of the Publishing Society to remove these points of conflict had she so desired, since such action is legally possible, as attested by the following finding of law by the Master in the Litigation between the Trustees and the Board of Directors (next presented): "The terms of a trust of the above character, thus established and declared irrevocable, cannot thereafter be varied *without the consent of every party interested, expressly manifested by an instrument sufficient for the purpose . . .*," which is a negative setting for the implication that it could have been done *with* the consent of all parties concerned.

That it is reasonable to deduce that Mrs. Eddy might have wittingly left the provisions in the Deed of Trust of the Publishing Society requiring the "First Members" to perform two vital functions after they no longer existed for the purpose of insuring the failure of the Deed of Trust when it was impossible to elect the editors under the provisions of the *Manual* is attested by a statement of the Supreme Judicial Court in its Decision in this Litigation, which is here prematurely quoted to sustain such assumption: "If the words 'First Members' in this connection in paragraph four are given a hard, fixed and unchangeable meaning, then the trust must come to an end when First Members are abolished as a part of the church. If 'First Members'

have been irrevocably established as an essential part of the machinery by which alone the trust can be carried out, and if for any reason that the machinery breaks down or becomes incapable of operation, then the trust itself would fall." The fact, therefore, that Mrs. Eddy allowed the provisions concerning the "First Members" to remain suggests a possible design on her part to the end of doubly assuring that her spiritual plan would be fulfilled. However, Mrs. Eddy could never have dreamed that the *Manual* of The Mother Church would be submitted by the church to a Court of Law for a legal interpretation of her spiritual intent. On the contrary, her natural assumption would have been that her legal instrument outside of church would fail when it was found to be in conflict with her *Manual's* literal declarations taken at their face value which showed her unmistakable intention of dissolving the functions of The Mother Church—one of which was the election of the editors by the Board of Directors—at her passing, when she could no longer give her approval to their continuance in accordance with the requirements of the *Manual*.

#### THE TRUSTEES' BILL IN EQUITY

The following is the general substance of the Trustees' averments in their Bill in Equity (of March 25th, 1919), which presents the bases of their suit against the Board of Directors:

" . . . The 'Christian Science Board of Directors,' hereinafter referred to as the directors, or directors of The Mother Church, are directors of only one of these Christian Science churches: to wit, The Mother Church situated in Boston.\* The Church By-laws created by Mrs. Eddy provide for local self-government of churches:

#### 'Article XXIII

'Local Self-government, Section 1. The Mother Church of Christ, Scientist, shall assume no general official control of other churches, and it shall be controlled by none other.

'Each Church of Christ, Scientist, shall have its own form of government. No conference of churches shall be held,

\* Amended Sept. 17th, 1919, to read: "The 'Christian Science Board of Directors' under Deed of Trust of September 1, 1892 and subsequent trust deeds hereinbefore referred to, are trustees of the property of only one of these Christian Science Churches; to wit, The Mother Church situated in Boston, and together with the defendant Merritt they have for the time being acted as directors of only one of these churches; to wit, The Mother Church."

unless it be when our churches, located in the same State, convene to confer on a statute of said State, or to confer harmoniously on individual unity and action of the churches in said State.

'Section 10. . . . In Christian Science each branch church shall be distinctly democratic in its government, and no individual, and no other church shall interfere with its affairs.

#### 'Article XI

'Section 13. . . . Each church shall separately and independently discipline its own members,—if this sad necessity occurs.'

"In recent years, since the passing on of Mrs. Eddy, the directors have been gradually endeavoring to assume and exercise powers with regard to the Publishing Society which the directors never assumed or attempted to exercise during the lifetime of Mrs. Eddy. . . .

"In addition to such specific requests within the months recently last past, the directors have repeatedly insisted that the Board of Trustees should make open, specific and public acknowledgment that the directors were the supreme and final authority with reference to all of the affairs of the Publishing Society and the management of the trust created by the trust deed of January 25, 1989 (Exhibit 'A'). . . .

"The directors have demanded of the trustees in substance and effect not that they should do or refrain from doing any particular thing but that the trustees should declare their general acceptance of and assent to the directors' claim of supreme authority and agree definitely and *in writing* that they would thereafter discharge their duties as trustees in accordance with the directors' interpretation of the By-laws of The Mother Church; and that upon occasions where the directors' interpretation of the provisions of the Church By-laws or Manual was inconsistent with and contrary to the provisions of the Deed of Trust the trustees should disregard the provisions of the Deed of Trust and exercise their powers, or refrain from exercising their powers, in accordance with the interpretation of the directors of such By-law,—denying to the trustees the right to act either upon their own interpretation of the provisions of the Manual or that of any person or persons other than the directors. . . .

"The trustees desiring information as to their powers and responsibilities in the premises, consulted counsel in order to secure

a competent opinion for their guidance. The trustees were advised, and accordingly communicated to the directors, that they were unable to conform to the request of the directors, because they believed that the demand which the directors had made was contrary to the purposes and intentions of the Founder of The Mother Church, the Donor of the powers declared in the Deed of Trust, and inconsistent with Mrs. Eddy's plans for the promotion and extension of Christian Science, especially in respect of maintaining the control of the Publishing Society apart and free from interference by the directors: that compliance with the demand of the directors would be in effect to defeat the purposes of the Donor as declared in the Deed of Trust; and that thus the trustees would become recreant to a sacred duty imposed upon them and them alone by the Founder and great Leader of the Christian Science Church.

"Thereafter there occurred an interchange of correspondence between the Board of Directors and the Board of Trustees. . . . On the third day of January last past, the Board of Directors sent to the Board of Trustees a communication in substance and effect demanding the resignation of the Board of Trustees, said demand being couched in the following terms:

'The Directors have one more proposal to make. It is that the present members of the Board of Trustees submit their resignations to The Christian Science Board of Directors to take effect when their resignations are accepted by the Board of Directors.' . . .

"Upon receipt of said demand by the Board of Directors for their resignation, the Board of Trustees again consulted counsel and . . . Counsel thus employed rendered an opinion in terms which appear in a communication addressed to counsel employed by the Board of Directors, as follows:

'Dear Sirs:

.....  
 After having carefully considered the deed, we have advised our clients that,

(1) The Deed created a valid, express trust. The activities, powers and duties of the Trustees are therein stated in clear and decisive terms;

(2) The Deed of Trust is complete in itself and irrevocable. By it the title to the property therein described was transferred and the relation of the Trustees and *cestuis que trustent* was definitely fixed. It was beyond the power of Mrs.



Eddy, the creator of the trust, thereafter to change, alter or modify the rights and interests established by the Deed [*Author's Note: See ruling of Master indicating that it could be done under certain conditions: ". . . the consent of every party interested expressly manifested by an instrument sufficient for the purpose . . ."*].

(3) The power under the Deed of Trust to declare vacancies having been vested jointly in the Board of Directors and the First Members, the Board of Directors alone cannot exercise the power.

(4) The source of the powers and duties of the Trustees is the Deed of Trust. To it they must look for the extent and limit of their authority. The language of the Deed of Trust being definite and controlling, neither subsequent provisions of the Church Manual nor, as heretofore stated, any subsequent declarations of Mrs. Eddy, can have the effect of modifying the Deed of Trust or the estates and equitable interests thereby created. Nor can such provisions or declarations add to, or detract from, the particular responsibilities, duties and functions imposed upon the Trustees by the Deed;

(5) If there be any conflict between the terms of the Deed and the language of the Church Manual, the legal and moral obligation of the Trustees compels them to respond to and obey the mandates of the Deed. Should they do otherwise, they would violate the compact which they made by their acceptance of the trust "to honestly and faithfully do and perform all things to be done and performed by them within the terms, objects and purposes of this instrument." . . .

We reiterate what was stated to you at the interview—our earnest wish to cooperate with you to the end that our respective clients may work harmoniously and effectively in the discharge of the duties which they have severally assumed, and we welcome your suggestions.

[Signed] CHARLES E. HUGHES,  
SILAS H. STRAWN,  
SHERMAN L. WHIPPLE'

". . . it was agreed that the respective boards would make a sincere attempt to harmonize their different views as to the authority of the Board of Trustees in respect to the manner in which the trustees should perform their duties as such. The plaintiffs endeavored in good faith to carry out such agreement, but the directors personally and through counsel, both in interviews and by correspondence, demanded of the trustees and insisted as a condition

of their continuing to hold their offices, that the plaintiffs should explicitly and in writing repudiate the advice and opinion of their counsel as hereinabove set forth, and agree that their actions should not be governed thereby. . . .

"Thereafter solely for the reasons above set forth the directors . . . on the 17th day of March current delivered to the plaintiff Rowlands a so-called 'Notice of Dismissal' of said plaintiff as a trustee of The Christian Science Publishing Society, said 'Notice of Dismissal' being as follows:

'The following resolution is offered for adoption by The Christian Science Board of Directors, the Board of Directors of The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, and *the governing board of the Christian Science denomination*. . . .

'Whereas it has become evident that Mr. Rowlands does not understand or recognize the importance and necessity of promoting the interests of Christian Science by following the directions given by Mrs. Eddy in our Church By-Laws; and . . .

'Now therefore it is resolved by The Christian Science Board of Directors, the Board of Directors of The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, and the governing board of the Christian Science denomination . . . that the trusteeship in connection with said Society heretofore held or claimed by him be and hereby is declared vacant.'

"On the following day the defendant directors caused to be delivered to the plaintiff Rowlands' associates on the Board of Trustees a communication reading [in part] as follows:

' . . . It is the Board's desire that you immediately appoint some one to fill the position made vacant by their action of yesterday, and in the appointment of Mr. Rowlands' successor they expressly request that you name a person who shall be suitable and satisfactory to the Board of Directors.' . . .

"The plaintiffs believe that no valid or sound reason exists why the plaintiff Rowlands should be removed . . . that said action is undertaken for the purpose of extending the power of the directors, individually or collectively, into a domain purposely excluded from their jurisdiction by the specific provisions which the Donor caused to be inserted in said trust instrument . . .

"The plaintiffs further aver upon information and belief, that

the defendants have stated to many Christian Scientists in substance that they plan to obtain control of the Publishing Society, or destroy it; that if the plaintiffs as trustees continue to resist the demands of the directors and refuse to conform to their will, the directors propose in the terms used by one of them, 'to make the Publishing Society an empty shell,' and to accomplish that result by using their great influence with Christian Science churches and throughout the field to induce Christian Scientists not to continue to subscribe for and support the publications published by the Society established and founded by Mrs. Eddy, but to subscribe for and support new publications which the directors have threatened, themselves, to publish and issue, to take the place of those which the plaintiffs as trustees are now publishing as the duly authorized and accredited works of the great Founder and Leader of the Christian Science movement.\*. . .

"WHEREFORE the plaintiffs pray:

"1. That the defendant directors be restrained and enjoined from taking any further action intended directly or indirectly to impede or interfere with the plaintiff Rowlands, or either of the other plaintiffs, in the discharge of his or their respective duties as trustees, under the trust instrument of January 25, 1898 (Exhibit 'A').

"2. That the resolution hereinbefore recited purporting to remove the plaintiff Rowlands as trustee of The Christian Science Publishing Society and declare said trusteeship vacant, be adjudged as nugatory and of no legal effect;

"3. That the defendants be restrained and enjoined from carrying out any purpose or plan by either direct or indirect means . . . to injure the business of said Publishing Society either by creating and maintaining a publishing society to conduct a business in competition therewith, or otherwise . . .

By their solicitors.

(Signed) WHIPPLE, SEARS & OGDEN.

(Signed) CHARLES E. HUGHES,

(Signed) SILAS H. STRAWN,

(Signed) SHERMAN L. WHIPPLE,

*of Counsel.*

\* This assumption would seem to be justified by an assertion made by the Board of Directors in a letter written to the Trustees February 24th, 1919 (to which the Directors referred in their Answer to this Bill in Equity in order to make use of other statements contained therein), which indicated that such outlook was within the range of its contemplation—the Board of Directors' assertion reading: "It is to be observed, also, that the Trustees' interpretation would take what Mrs. Eddy has described as 'the periodicals

## INJUNCTION ISSUED

“On this bill on March 25, 1919, an *ad interim* [until suit was tried] injunction by the Supreme Judicial Court was issued, restraining all the defendants, as follows:

‘Until said hearing you the said defendant directors, your agents, attorneys and counsellors, and each and every of them are commanded to desist and refrain from taking any further action intended directly or indirectly to impede or interfere with the plaintiff Rowlands, or either of the other plaintiffs, in the discharge of his or their respective duties as trustees, under the trust instrument of January 25, 1898; and from carrying out any purpose or plan by either direct or indirect means to compel the plaintiffs or any of them to resign their offices as trustees; to impair, destroy, or in any way injure the business of The Christian Science Publishing Society as conducted by the plaintiff trustees; or in any way to carry out any threat or purpose to injure the business of said Publishing Society either by creating and maintaining a publishing society to conduct a business in competition therewith, or otherwise; and from taking any action to defeat or tending to defeat the purposes of Mrs. Mary Baker G. Eddy, the Donor, as set forth and declared in the Trust Deed of January 25, 1898.’ ”

For the sake of brevity—inasmuch as it is largely a general denial of the plaintiffs’ allegations and a recitation of their authority under the *Manual* to dismiss a Trustee without the “First Members” contrary to the demands of the Publishing Society Deed of Trust, which conflict of provisions has already been presented and which can be verified by reference to the *Manual*,—the defendants’ Answer is not here presented. The sole object in quoting the Bill of Complaint in a general way is for the purpose of presenting the nature of the suit as only an original Bill of Complaint can do. The defendants’ full Answer to this plaintiffs’ Bill, as well as the full Bill of Complaint, and all other documents in this suit may be obtained from the Clerk of the Supreme Judicial Court, Boston, Mass.

---

which are the organs of this Church’ away from The Mother Church and make them only organs of The Christian Science Publishing Society. It would virtually compel The Mother Church to have no periodicals as its organs, or compel it to *start other periodicals for that purpose.*”

## THE MASTER'S REPORT

The Master appointed by the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts to find the facts and recommend the rulings of law sustaining such facts made his recommendations to the Supreme Court in favor of the Trustees of the Publishing Society.

As a matter of side-light interest, a few excerpts are quoted from his findings regarding the distinction between the original Board of four Directors under the financial Deed of Trust constituted before the church was formed and the Board of five Directors under the *Manual* as an ecclesiastical church body (which would cease when the first vacancy occurred after Mrs. Eddy's passing):

"The Board [of Directors] was originally constituted not by any vote or By-Law of the church, but by Mrs. Eddy herself in an earlier deed of trust dated Sept. 1, 1892, before the church was organized. . . . There has resulted an ambiguity in the use of the above name of the Board, important to be kept in mind. By that name was originally designated only the Board of four trustees constituted by the deed of 1892. As often afterward used in the church By-Laws or Manual, it designates a Board exercising also functions and powers not derived from the deed at all, but from church By-Laws purporting to confer them; and since Feb. 7, 1903, a Board containing one more member [Merritt, who succeeded Archibald McLellan, the first fifth Director, as previously noted] than the deed directs.

"On said March 17, 1919, at a meeting of said Board attended by the defendants Dickey, Merritt, Rathvon and Dittimore, the resolution set forth in the plaintiffs' Bill, purporting to remove the plaintiff Rowlands from his trusteeship under Mrs. Eddy's deed of Jan. 25, 1898, and to declare his said trusteeship vacant, was adopted by the unanimous votes of the defendants Dickey, Merritt and Rathvon. The defendant Neal was not present at the meeting, but signified his assent to the vote by telephone. The defendant Dittimore, though present, declined to vote either for or against the resolution . . . the plaintiffs do contend that the only Board having any power to act under par. 10 of Mrs. Eddy's deed of 1898, was a Board composed only of the four trustees named in her former deed of 1892, or their respective successors elected according to par. 1 thereof [inasmuch as the fifth Director was not appointed until five years after the 'irrevocable' Deed of Trust to the Publishing Society was executed in 1898]. Merritt's participation in the vote to remove Rowlands is claimed to have made that

vote ineffective, as action by the Board empowered by the deed of 1898 to act in such cases.

"Since Merritt . . . had not been elected in succession to any originally named Director, he was a Director within the meaning of par. 10 of Mrs. Eddy's deed of 1898, only in case it can be said that the change voted by the Directors Feb. 7, 1903 . . . [adding the fifth Director], long after both of Mrs. Eddy's above deeds had been executed, lawfully effected a substitution, for the purposes of both said deeds, of a Board of five in place of that Board of four trustees, which, established by the earlier deed in 1892, was acting thereunder at the date of the later deed in 1898 . . .

"I find . . . that on March 17, 1919 [when Mr. Rowlands was removed from the office of Trustee] no power was vested either in the then Board of five Directors or in those of their number then serving in succession to the original four trustee-directors under Mrs. Eddy's deed of 1892, to remove a trustee under her deed of 1898; and that the vote of March 17, 1919, purporting to remove the plaintiff Rowlands, was for that reason without effect. . . .

"That a Board of five trustees has taken the place of the originally constituted Board of four trustees, authorized as 'directors' by par. 10 of the deed of 1898, to act in removing a trustee thereunder, I am unable to find; in view of the other findings hereinbefore made regarding the By-Laws adopted on or after Jan. 10, 1901, and their effect. I find that no such result has been accomplished by the By-Law adopted Feb. 7, 1903 . . . The effect of that By-Law was, at most, to authorize the exercise of such functions as have been or might be assigned to the Board of Directors by By-Laws of the church only, by the Board of five members instead of the Board of four members. It did not authorize the Board of five members to act in the place of the Board of four trustee-directors under the deed of Sept. 1, 1892. . . ."

Thus it is seen that the Master wholly upheld the Deed of Trust to the Publishing Society as a legal instrument outside of church and as wholly unaffected by any *Manual* By-laws.

Inasmuch as the Master's decision was reversed by the Supreme Judicial Court (for the reasons later noted under the title "Decision of the Supreme Judicial Court") with reference to his findings of law,—although his findings of fact were sustained in their entirety by the Court,—it is not deemed necessary to quote his voluminous arguments. The excerpts from his report which have been presented are deemed sufficient to illustrate the previous position of this book, that it is feasible to assume that the church functions of the five Di-

rectors as an ecclesiastical church body could be discontinued without affecting the functions of the original four Directors (or their successors under their financial Deed of Trust of September 1st, 1892). The Master's discrimination between the Board of Directors of The Mother Church and the Board of Directors under the financial Deed of Trust before the church was formed was in line with Mrs. Eddy's *Manual* plan, as previously presented, which would permit the original Deed of Trust given to the four Directors only (before the church was formed) to operate after the church was self-dissolved (by reason of its inability to continue after it could no longer elect its officers), thus releasing the Directors from their superimposed church duties after their fulfillment and when they (the Directors) were unable to perpetuate themselves as five under the *Manual* without Mrs. Eddy's approval of the election of a Director to fill a vacancy, in this case due to the decease of a Director. To attest the feasibility of Mrs. Eddy's *Manual* plan in this regard is the sole purpose of the use of these excerpts from the Master's findings of fact and law.

#### "SEA OF CONFUSION"

After the contents of the Master's Report, which so completely sustained the Trustees in their position, became generally known throughout the Field, the Sea of Confusion—out of which the "beast" to whom the dragon gave his "seat, and great authority" was prophesied to arise, Rev. 13:1, 2,—began to stir violently and to send its waves of agitation over the "land that . . . was pleasant," disturbing the "rest [that] was good," Gen. 49:15, typed in Revelation by the lamb-like consciousness (Rev. 13:11), which demands a leader, Mrs. Eddy having defined "sheep" as "those who follow their leader," S. & H. 594:12. For great consternation and fear for the Cause of Christian Science swept over the Field at the realization of what this Master's Report augured, since in Supreme Court procedure great weight is always given by the Court to the Master's Report. In consequence, waves of emotional would-be helpfulness for the Directors (allegedly inspired by those close to the Directors and with their knowledge) successively spread over the Field from church to church, teacher to pupil, practitioner to patient, and Scientist to Scientist, each exhorting the other to join in a mass effort to sustain the Directors in their claim to denominational leadership and thus prevent what was thought to be an on-coming church cataclysm.

Meetings were called in various churches for the purpose of influencing members to discontinue the literature for the effect it might have upon the Court in its consideration of the Master's Report, and Resolutions were passed directing that notices of such meetings and the resultant actions be sent to all other Christian Science churches, teachers, practitioners, and nurses in the Field of Christian Science. Central committees were formed for the purpose of issuing periodic bulletins in which all information favorable to the Directors and unfavorable to the Trustees was transmitted to other churches—all of the foregoing activities took place in utter disregard of Mrs. Eddy's *Manual* prohibition that "no individual, and no other church shall interfere with . . . [a branch church's] affairs," *Manual* p. 74.

As a result, churches were divided and other churches formed in the name of loyalty—all churches, teachers, practitioners, and nurses who wished to maintain a neutral attitude and who continued to take the literature or allow their cards to remain in the *Journal* being regarded by those who emotionally favored the Directors as disloyal Christian Scientists, to the complete intimidation of those who wished to follow the dictates of their own spiritual light as guided by what they thought to be the provisions of the *Manual* directing those "who . . . [could] afford it" to take the periodicals, *Manual* p. 44.

From all the previous presentations in this book which showed that The Mother Church had completed its history, it will be seen that the violence of these waves from the Sea of Confusion that swept over the Field arose from the fact that neither the Board of Directors nor the Board of Trustees was right in its stand, which was that the literature should continue after it was impossible for the editors of the periodicals to obtain Mrs. Eddy's approval of their election; therefore there was no really right thought in the situation to mitigate the force of the confusion and the intensity of the waves of emotion that unthinking disobedience to Mrs. Eddy's definitely inspired plan had occasioned. However, as before noted, this turbulent, prophetic Sea of Confusion incident upon the passing of Motherhood as Leader (Revelation thirteenth chapter immediately following Revelation twelfth chapter) could not have been escaped by her prophetically unprepared offspring—no offspring ever being prepared for the passing of motherhood even in human experience.

During the height of the confusion, the Board of Directors changed its position from one of defense to that of active aggression by filing



a new Bill in Equity \* wherein it became the complainant against the Board of Trustees, instead of the Board of Trustees against the Board of Directors—the high light of its Complaint as susceptible of influencing the Court's decision being the Trustees' mismanagement of the Publishing Society, as evidenced by the alarming cancellations of subscriptions to the Christian Science periodicals and wholesale resignations of employees of the Publishing Society, as well as the resignations of the editors, whom the Directors elected. This feature of its Complaint is set forth as follows:

"Said defendants [the Trustees] . . . have antagonized Christian Scientists throughout the world upon whose support the success of said business is dependent, as a result of which many Christian Scientists and branch churches, acting under Article VIII, Sections 11 and 14, of the by-laws have cancelled subscriptions to the periodicals and withdrawn their paid advertisements from the Christian Science Journal, and withdrawn their financial and moral support from said Society as a protest against misconduct of the business by the defendants; and plaintiffs are informed and believe and so aver that such cancellations are rapidly increasing; and said defendants have also assumed the exclusive editorial control of the periodicals. Because of the above described attitude and conduct of the defendants, many faithful and efficient workers in The Christian Science Publishing Society have resigned their positions, many others have been unjustly and improperly discharged for the reason that they remained loyal to the Church by-laws and they refused to support the defendants in their refusal to be longer guided by said by-laws and because said workers insisted upon their own individual and conscientious convictions:—in all more than two hundred. Moreover for the same reasons the editors of The Christian Science Journal, Christian Science Sentinel, Der Herold der Christian Science, and Le Héraut de Christian Science, heretofore elected by the plaintiff Board of Directors in accordance with the directions of Mrs. Eddy contained in the Church Manual, have resigned their positions. And solely because of the above described attitude and conduct of said defendants the said periodicals for the time being have ceased to be the organs of said Church

\* The style of this case was—"The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts, Adam H. Dickey, James A. Neal, Edward A. Merritt, William R. Rathvon, Annie M. Knott, the Christian Science Board of Directors, and Edward L. Ripley, Treasurer, *versus* Herbert W. Eustace, David B. Ogden and Lamont Rowlands, Acting as Trustees of The Christian Science Publishing Society."

within the meaning of the Church Manual and have become the personal organs of said defendants.”

The reply of the Board of Trustees as defendants in this new Bill in Equity was, in brief excerpts, as follows:

“Most of the averments of this bill were set up by way of answer by the defendants in said suit of *Eustace v. Dickey* (No. 30,654), and the issues of fact thus made up were determined by the Master . . .

“These defendants are informed and advised that so far as issue between the plaintiffs and themselves in this suit are the same as those raised in the suit of *Eustace v. Dickey* . . . they are not called upon to make answer in this suit, and that the plaintiffs are not permitted, having once tried out the issues which they now seek to raise, again to raise and try the same in this Court as against these defendants, but are bound to await the final decision in *Eustace v. Dickey*, now pending in the Supreme Judicial Court for the Commonwealth . . .

“The defendants state the fact to be that the individual Directors . . . have done the things (more fully hereinafter set forth) which tend to impair, if not entirely destroy, the successful management of the Publishing Society’s affairs . . .

“Upon the filing of the bill in *Eustace v. Dickey* . . . an injunction was granted, a copy whereof is hereto annexed marked ‘Exhibit 3.’

“Shortly after the service of said injunction upon the defendants in that case and before the hearings were begun, the plaintiffs *Dickey, Neal, Rathvon and Knott*, together with their counsel, one *Clifford P. Smith*, who is also Publication Committee, so-called—an official subordinate to and under the direction of the plaintiffs—violated said injunction, and, upon complaint before this Court, were duly punished for such violation; the said plaintiffs *Dickey, Neal, Rathvon and Knott*, being subjected to a fine of \$50 each, and said *Smith* to a fine of \$100.00.

“But thereupon and thereafter, as the defendants aver upon information and belief, the Directors did not yield their purpose to accomplish what they had intended to accomplish but which they were forbidden by said injunction to do, but conceived a plan whereby, in case the result of the litigation should be adverse to their contentions, they might through others and by indirect means, do the things and accomplish the results that were forbidden by said injunction. . . .

“On December 20, 1919, counsel for the parties were furnished with a draft of the Master’s Report in form not different substan-

tially from the final report, of which 'Exhibit 2' is a copy. Immediately upon the findings in said report, which were sweepingly adverse to the Directors' contentions, being made known to the Directors, one Harney, who had been for some years private secretary to said Smith, counsel and Publication Committee, as aforesaid,—in accordance, as the defendants believe and accordingly aver, with a preconceived and prearranged plan so to do,—sent out generally to State Committees of Publication, subordinates of said Smith, and others, messages by wire in which the suggestion was urged that in view of the unfavorable nature of the Master's Report, Christian Scientists now might well begin cancelling the subscriptions to the periodicals published by the Publishing Society. . . .

"Immediately thereafter, persons appeared at meetings of Christian Science churches in different sections of the country, actively urging the members of the Churches to do those things which were forbidden to be done by the outstanding injunction, and especially urging the doing of those things which would injure the Publishing Society and diminish its business. Said persons urged and incited the Churches and members to cancel their subscriptions to the periodicals of the Publishing Society, to cancel their contracts with the Society for advertising in its periodicals, to pass resolves at Church meetings criticizing the Trustees, calling upon them to resign, and tending to insult and humiliate them in this and other similar ways.

"Said persons, or some of them, made statements with regard to the Trustees and their administration of their trust which were scandalously false and for which there was absolutely no foundation in fact. Said persons generally represented to the audiences which they addressed, and Christian Scientists with whom they talked, that they were acting in accordance with the wishes of the Directors of The Mother Church and with their approval; that they had come directly from the presence of these Directors, and knew that what they were doing and saying had the Directors' approval, but that by reason of the outstanding injunction, the Directors were not permitted and did not dare to publicly state their approval of what was being said and done.

"The similarity of the things that were said and done in different sections of the country and by different people, unmistakably indicated that what the respective persons were doing was being done in accordance with a preconceived and deliberate plan . . .

"Statements were repeatedly made through the public press that what these persons were doing and saying was done and said

with the approval and authority of the plaintiffs, and although these statements were specifically called to the attention of the plaintiffs, it was never denied by the plaintiffs, or any of them, that said statements were made and things were done with their approval and authority. . . .

“It is declared in the Church Manual (Article XXXIII, Section 2) to be the duty of the Committee on Publication to correct misstatements appearing in the public press or circulating literature of any sort with reference to matters affecting Christian Science or Christian Scientists. If the statements of the aforesaid persons, that they were speaking and acting under and by the authority of the Board of Directors and with their approval, were untrue or incorrect, it was the duty of said Smith, as Committee on Publication, as declared specifically by the Manual, to correct said misstatements either directly or through his subordinate committees on publication in the different states; and in case he failed so to do it was the duty of the Directors, whose appointee he was, to see that said Smith performed his duty; but neither said Smith nor any of the subordinates ever either directly or indirectly, as the defendants are informed and believe, undertook to contradict, modify or in any way correct said statements of said persons that they were acting under the authority of the Board of Directors and with their approval . . . in pursuance of the same scheme and plan on the part of the Directors to embarrass them in the administration of their trust, some two hundred of their employees suddenly and without notice left the employment of the Publishing Society in a manner calculated most seriously to embarrass the defendants in printing and publishing their periodicals. . . .

“Immediately following the concerted action of these employees in leaving the employ of the Publishing House, committees self constituted as such, opened headquarters in Boston and actively circularized Christian Science Churches and Christian Scientists throughout the United States, seeking contributions of funds for the support of the deserting employees, and for the payment of their expenses incurred in the execution of the conspiracy to do injury to the business of the Publishing Society in violation of the outstanding injunction.

“These requests were read in some of the Branch Churches and funds collected in connection with said services and in response to said requests. . . .

“Prior to these solicitations it had been the invariable custom of the Directors to discourage the solicitation of funds from Branch Churches except under their authority as officials of The Mother

Church, and it had been the habit of the Directors in case of solicitation of funds of which they did not approve, to publish in the *Christian Science Journal* or *Christian Science Sentinel* a statement to the effect that the solicitations for funds in question were not made by their direction,—thus implying their disapproval of the solicitations.

"Although the solicitations hereinabove described were made known to the Directors, and the fact that the solicitors intended to use the same in a manner injurious to the interests of the Trustees and the Publishing Society, yet the Directors have neither directly nor indirectly, either in writing or otherwise, discouraged the contribution of funds for the purposes aforesaid, and have never given notice that the solicitation was not by their authority; but, on the contrary, by their active conduct, as well as by their silence, have given approval to such solicitations and encouraged members of the Branch Churches to respond thereto.

"Being thus left as a result of the secret activities and instigation of the Directors and said Smith without editorial staff \* for the periodicals belonging to the Trust, these defendants temporarily employed editors in order to prevent the possibility of suspension of publication of periodicals founded by Mrs. Eddy . . .

"The Deed of Trust of January 25th, 1898 . . . provides in the words of Mrs. Eddy herself,—'Said Trustees shall employ all the help necessary to the proper conduct of said business . . . ' And said section further provides that,—'. . . the business manager may call in at times of necessity such temporary help as will facilitate the business.'

"Said Trust also provides . . .,—'Said Trustees shall energetically and judiciously manage the business of the Publishing Society on a strictly Christian basis, and upon their own responsibility . . . '

"It was therefore not merely the right, but the absolute duty of the Trustees in the emergency and crisis . . . to do the things which they did do in providing the help necessary for the proper conduct of the business which Mrs. Eddy had enjoined upon them, to 'energetically and judiciously manage . . . upon their own responsibility.'

"These defendants requested the Directors, as officials of The Mother Church, to approve the editors thus temporarily employed, which the Directors peremptorily refused to do.

"Thereupon, the defendants requested the Directors to name editors of whom the Directors would approve, and this they refused to do. . . .

\* The editors having resigned.

“The defendants aver upon information and belief . . . [that] those acting in the interests of the Directors and with their approval, have more actively and vigorously urged Christian Science Churches and Christian Scientists generally to cancel their subscriptions to the periodicals published by the defendants, on the ground that since said periodicals were no longer edited by persons who had the Directors’ approval as editors, said periodicals were no longer organs of The Mother Church, but on the contrary were spurious Christian Science literature. . . . The Directors and their associates have thereby sacrificed the interests of Christian Scientists, of The Mother Church, and of the Trust created and inspired by Mrs. Eddy, in order to achieve by indirection the things forbidden by the outstanding injunction of this Honorable Court, and thereby to render nugatory such decision as this Honorable Court may render on the Master’s Report which is now before it for consideration. . . .”

#### DECISION OF THE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT

The following are progressive quotations from the Supreme Court Decision which show the general trend of thought leading to the Court’s final decision, with the author’s bracketed italicized comments from time to time. Attention is particularly called to the fact that all trusts are subject to the jurisdiction of Courts of Equity rather than Courts of Law. Unlike Courts of Law, which are bound by fixed law and legal precedent, Equity allows the broadest discretion of the judges in their interpretation of the intent of the creator of a trust:

“Rugg, C. J. This is a suit in equity. The plaintiffs are three persons, who by succession are trustees under a deed of trust executed by Mary Baker G. Eddy, the founder of ‘Christian Science’ so called, as donor, on January 25, 1898, to three persons therein named as trustees. The defendants are four persons alleged to be *trustees* under another deed of trust executed by Mrs. Eddy dated September 1, 1892, and also to be *Directors* of The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts, and two other persons, each alleged to be claiming to be a trustee and director in association with the other four. [John V. Dittimore and Annie M. Knott, Mr. Dittimore having been dismissed before the suit was filed and Mrs. Knott elected to fill the vacancy. Inasmuch as Mr. Dittimore’s suit for reinstatement was still pending, both had to be introduced as defendants until decision in Mr. Dittimore’s case was rendered.] The basic question is whether the defendants have power to remove one of the plaintiffs from the position of trustee.

“The answer to that question depends upon the true interpreta-

tion of these deeds of trust executed by Mrs. Eddy and whatever other matters rightly may be considered in ascertaining their meaning. . . . In clause 10 of the trust deed, it is provided . . . that 'The First Members together with the directors of said Church shall have the power to declare vacancies in said trusteeship for such reasons as to them may seem expedient.' . . . In every edition [of the *Church Manual*] the names of the Christian Science Board of Directors have been printed under the caption 'Church Officers' together with the names of other officers of the church. This is true of those editions issued before January 25, 1898. At that time important functions of the church such as the election of all officers, the appointment of missionaries, the appointment and removal of readers of the church to conduct its services, amongst others, were vested in the board of directors by the *Church Manual*. Although it was not until 1908 \* that a by-law of the church expressly included a board of directors among the officers, it always has been provided by a by-law that all officers of the church should be elected by the board of directors [*It will be noted that the Court has seemed to take no cognizance of the fact that the election of the officers named required Mrs. Eddy's approval and that, therefore, the Board of Directors had in such matters no inherent powers within itself to act upon its own judgment but only agency powers to execute Mrs. Eddy's expressed will.*] . . . .

"Subsequent events have introduced new factors with reference to which the trust deed must now be applied. In . . . 1901 . . . a by-law, to the effect that vacancies among the trustees of The Christian Science Publishing Society (the trustees created by the trust deed of January 25, 1898) might be declared by the First Members and the directors, was changed so as to vest that power exclusively in the Christian Science Board of Directors. . . .

"So far as concerns the government of the church, treating it as an ecclesiastical organization, the First Members, who alone had voting power, have been abolished and have ceased to exist and the entire management has passed into the hands of the directors, a self-perpetuating body, all this at the suggestion and with the approval of Mrs. Eddy [*Here it will be noted that the Court made no distinction between the truly self-perpetuating power of the Board of four Directors (without the approval of Mrs. Eddy) under its financial Deed of Trust of September 1st, 1892, before the church was formed, and the Board of five Directors as an ecclesiastical church body which under the Manual was not self-perpetuating without Mrs. Eddy's approval. Surely Mrs. Eddy made*

\* This date is incorrect. It should be 1899 (tenth *Manual*).

*this distinction of self-perpetuation for a definite purpose—that of abolishing the Board of Directors as a church functionary with the the passing of The Mother Church (its ecclesiastical church functions never having extended beyond The Mother Church) while permitting its continuance under its financial Deed of Trust given September 1st, 1892 (before the church was formed), until the fulfillment of its trust as aforesaid.] . . . .*

“The last several editions [of the *Manual*] issued during the life of Mrs. Eddy contained provision that ‘This *Manual* shall not be revised without the written consent of its author.’ Since the Church *Manual* on its face purports to be the work of Mrs. Eddy as author and the master has found it to be proved that substantially all its provisions were suggested or proposed by her, it is apparent that there can now, since the decease of Mrs. Eddy, be no change in the provisions of the Church *Manual* in accordance with its terms [*Did not the Supreme Court amend the Manual when it revitalized the Board of five Directors as a church functionary after it had ceased to exist at the demise of the first Director subsequent to Mrs. Eddy’s passing under the provisions of the Manual which required Mrs. Eddy’s approval of the election of a Director to fill a vacancy on the Board? And has not the revitalization of the Board of Directors under the Manual to function without Mrs. Eddy’s approval legally revitalized all of the functions of The Mother Church contrary to the Manual’s provisions which had demanded that they cease when her approval was unobtainable after her passing? Thus in effect have not all the By-laws of The Mother Church been amended? And is it not astonishing that a Court which had access to the entire Manual as an exhibit filed for its information, as did this Court, should have used one portion of the Manual to determine this power of the Board of Directors to remove a trustee and yet not have taken the slightest cognizance of Mrs. Eddy’s fundamental demands throughout the entire range of the Manual that the Board of Directors could not perform any vital Church functions without her approval particularly as applicable to the election of Editors of the periodicals, Lecturers, General Publication Committee, Teachers, First and Second Readers, President, Clerk, and Treasurer of The Mother Church?*].

“The trust deed made provision for the removal of a trustee by the concurrent action of the First Members and the directors of the church. . . .

“The precise question to be decided is whether under these circumstances one of the trustees can be removed by the board of directors, since the First Members have been deprived of all



ecclesiastical power and have been disbanded in accordance with the polity of the church. . . . It is a cardinal rule in the interpretation of trust instruments that they are to be so construed as to give effect to the *intent* of the founder of the trust as manifested by the words used in the light of all the surrounding facts, unless inconsistent with some rule of law or repugnant to the terms of the instrument. . . . The decision of the question concerning any trust instrument depends upon the intention of the founder as manifested by the words used. An omission to express an intention cannot be supplied by conjecture. But if a reading of the whole trust instrument produces a conviction that a particular interest or power must have been *intended* to have been given not expressed by formal words, the court must supply the defect by implication, and so mould the language of the founder of the trust as to carry into effect the intention which it is of opinion has by the instrument as a whole been sufficiently declared. This principle has been chiefly invoked in the interpretation of wills but is equally applicable to a trust deed like that here involved [*From this it will be seen that the Supreme Court did not assume to decide this case upon the basis of law or even upon the actual letter wording of the trust but solely upon its own interpretation of Mrs. Eddy's intent in what it conceived to be the light of both intrinsic and extrinsic evidence—the intrinsic evidence being Mrs. Eddy's general statements of purpose in the Deed itself and the extrinsic evidence the Manual provisions interpreted as bearing upon the Deed of Trust—wholly disregarding Mrs. Eddy's prohibitory provisions which were intended to effectuate the discontinuance of the literature itself, as well as the church functional activities of the Board of Directors. In connection with the Court's broad discretionary powers in deciding this case, it is reasonable to assume that the Court was influenced by the general disruption of the Cause, evidenced by the 'alarming' number of cancellations of subscriptions to the periodicals so dramatically presented in the new Bill in Equity filed by the Board of Directors after the Master's Report.*] . . . .

"It is manifest from the structure of the trust deed as well as from its express words that the single and only design of the founder was to promote and extend the religion of Christian Science as taught by Mrs. Eddy. Every part of the trust deed reënforces and makes even more plain the avowed purpose of Mrs. Eddy that her sole and completely dominating aim in establishing the trust was to promote and extend the religion of Christian Science as taught by her. The administration of the trust must continue to be directed exclusively to the accomplishment of that object alone.

“A trust of that nature cannot be revoked or modified in the absence of reservation of an express power to that end by the donor. The deed in question created a trust *complete in itself*. By its own phrase it was declared to be upon the ‘perpetual and irrevocable trust and confidence’ therein set out. The delivery by the donor of the trust deed and of the property thereby transferred and the acceptance thereof by the grantees and the performance by them of the trust thereby established was an executed trust. It must be construed and applied *according to its terms*. . . .

“The clause at the end of paragraph eight which conferred upon the trustees direction and supervision of the publication of the Quarterly and all tracts and pamphlets, ‘reserving the right to make such changes as I may think important,’ is not a reservation of a general or special power of revocation of the trust itself or of any of its terms or provisions. The context shows that that clause refers only to the direction and supervision of the trustees over publications. Its scope and force are confined to the particular subject matter of that paragraph. It vested in the donor the right of modifying and altering the publications to be issued ‘to promote the best interests of the Cause.’ The power there retained concerned the publications and did not extend to the whole frame of the trust.

“[*The Court’s reference to Mrs. Eddy’s statement of purpose which it paraphrased as ‘to promote and extend the religion of Christian Science as taught by Mrs. Eddy’ seems to have been the springboard of its entire decision not only as regards the Deed of Trust but also as sustaining the status quo of The Mother Church, despite Mrs. Eddy’s meaningful provisions to the contrary. There could be no doubt but that the Court, if it silently took note at all of the fact that under the provisions of the Manual all functions of The Mother Church would cease when Mrs. Eddy’s approval could no longer be obtained for the election of its officers, regarded such restrictions as a colossal oversight on Mrs. Eddy’s part and thus felt called upon to correct by its decision the Manual’s own assumed ‘defects’—in the manner expressed in its own words in connection with the Trust Deed which was to ‘so mould the language of the founder of the trust as to carry into effect the intention which it is of opinion has by the instrument as a whole been sufficiently declared.’*]

“The words ‘First Members’ occur twice in the trust deed, in paragraph four and in paragraph ten. The context in paragraph four is that . . . The ‘First Members’ of that church . . . were constituted by the trust deed the sole body by which the net income of the publishing business as conducted by the trustees could be disbursed.

. . . It is manifest that the trust deed was intended to be made subject, so far as it concerned the officers of the church and their powers and duties touching the disbursement of the net income paid by the trustees to the treasurer of the church, to such changes as the occasion might require to be made in the manual. If the words 'First Members' in this connection in paragraph four are given a hard, fixed and unchangeable meaning, then the trust must come to an end when First Members are abolished as a part of the church. If 'First Members' have been irrevocably established as an essential part of the machinery by which alone the trust can be carried out, and if for any reason that the machinery breaks down or becomes incapable of operation, then the trust itself would fall. . . . Such a result ought not to be reached except for most compelling reasons, after the trust has been established and executed for so many years. No such compelling reasons are found in this record. The plain intent of the founder of the trust is that the net income must be used to promote the religion of Christian Science as taught by Mrs. Eddy even though First Members may pass out of existence. The conclusion is inescapable that in this connection the words 'First Members' had no hard and fast meaning, but were used in a broad sense to designate a body connected with and forming a part of that church, and to comprehend whatever body might from time to time exercise in accordance with the ecclesiastical laws of the Christian Science denomination the functions then exercised by First Members. Since the First Members have been abolished and all their powers transferred to the board of directors, it must follow that the directors are authorized to exercise the functions vested in First Members under paragraph four of the trust deed. . . .

"The second occurrence of the words 'First Members' in the trust deed is in paragraph ten. The sentence there is 'The First Members together with the directors of said Church shall have the power to declare vacancies in said trusteeship for such reasons as to them may seem expedient.' The precise point is whether the power of removal is gone if there are no longer any First Members. Although the trustees under the trust deed were given extensive powers concerning the publication of the so-called literature of the church, nevertheless they were not the final arbiters concerning these matters, because they might be removed from office by other church authorities 'for such reasons' as to such other church authorities 'may seem expedient.' The soundness of the reasons for such removal is not made subject to review or revision by any other church tribunal, body or officer [*While this is true with reference to the*

*Board of Directors in this particular instance, it does not follow that the Board is not subject to reproof or dismissal by a higher tribunal than itself, for the Finance Committee has the power under the Manual to admonish and dismiss members of the Board. This had been a By-law for eleven years before Mrs. Eddy left us, Manual p. 77. The fact that nothing but 'finance' is placed over the Board of Directors in its church functions shows that this is the true nature of its calling to which it is subject and to which it must do obeisance; in other words, this fact is the axiomatic reminder that nothing can rise higher than its source. This alone should defeat the claim that the Board of Directors is the ecclesiastical authority of the Church.] . . . It is a familiar principle of legislation, illustrated by numerous statutes, that one board, commission or other body may be abolished and its powers and duties transferred to other and succeeding officers. . . . The presumption is inevitable that all the parties to the trust deed of January 25, 1898, intended that the power of removal should be vested in the responsible representatives of The First Church of Christ, Scientist, however they might be described or denominated, provided they succeeded to the powers and exercised the functions of First Members and directors. . . . Interpreting the words of the trust deed according to their true meaning, we are of opinion that the power of removal thereby survived and became vested in the board of directors. . . .*

"The board of directors as those words are used in the trust deed of January 25, 1898, do not in our opinion refer to the board established by the deed of September 1, 1892, but to the officers constituting the ecclesiastical board of directors under the polity of the church. The reasons already stated respecting First Members lead to this conclusion. No reference to the deed of September 1, 1892, is found in the trust deed of January 25, 1898. The latter deed throughout relates to those connected with The First Church of Christ, Scientist, either as First Members or directors. These terms are ecclesiastical. When therefore the board of directors under the practice of the church was increased in membership, it became vested with powers formerly exercised by the four directors, so far as concerns the power of removal in the trust deed of January 25, 1898. . . .

"The result is that the board of five directors have the power, if they act in accordance with law and with the terms of the trust deed of January 25, 1898, to effect the removal of a trustee under that deed.

"The conclusion that the power of removal of a trustee is now

vested in the board of five directors is contrary to that of the master, but it is in substance and effect the application of different legal principles to the facts found by the master. The facts found by him are accepted in their entirety. The result which has been stated follows in law from those facts.

*"[Thus again attention is called to the fact that the Supreme Judicial Court took no cognizance of the fact that while the Board of Directors under the financial Deed of Trust could perpetuate itself without Mrs. Eddy's approval, the Board of five Directors under the Manual could not do so without such approval and thus had ceased to exist before the Bill in Equity was filed, which termination of its Directorate voided the Manual power of the five Directors as an ecclesiastical body to remove a Trustee of the Publishing Society.]*

"One being absent and one refusing to vote, the three remaining directors adopted a resolution removing the plaintiff Rowlands . . . This resolution is somewhat long and recites numerous reasons. One of these is that Rowlands 'evidently has other interests which prevent him from giving sufficient time and attention to the business of The Christian Science Publishing Society.' Respecting this the master was 'unable to regard the charge made as one actually believed to be true, by the directors who made it, after due inquiry into the facts, or as one which they would have considered sufficient for his removal if they had not desired to remove him for other reasons.' The other reasons assigned in the resolution of removal grew out of a controversy, arising some years after the death of Mrs. Eddy, between the trustees and directors regarding the extent to which the former were subject to the control and supervision of the latter. . . .

"The words of the trust deed are that vacancies in the trusteeship may be declared 'for such reasons as to them may seem expedient.' That is a broad phrase. Expediency is a word of large import. It comprehends whatever is suitable and appropriate in reason for the accomplishment of the specified object. . . . It hardly can be held to be a capricious or arbitrary exercise of power for the directors to determine that, because a radical difference of opinion as to the interpretation of the Church Manual existed between them and the trustees, the welfare of the trust required the removal of one of the trustees. . . . While ordinarily one, whose conduct is called in question, ought to be given an opportunity to be heard in his own defense, it is apparent that the long controversy between the trustees and the directors had brought out clearly the points of difference between them. . . .

“A majority of the directors were present at the meeting and voted for the removal. That was sufficient in form to effect a removal. A unanimous vote was not required. The result is that upon the application of the principles of the law to the facts found by the master the removal of Mr. Rowlands as one of the trustees was effected. . . .”

Thus ended the conflict which faithfulness to the precepts of the Word of *Science and Health* and the demands of the *Manual* would have revealed to be the inexorable fulfillment of the passing of Motherhood to the end that the “adorned” (*completed*) Word as Bride might hold sway, but which instead has been construed to establish the permanent authority of the Board of Directors as an *ecclesiastical governing body* of the Christian Science Movement.

Had the Court merely used the *Manual* to determine if the “First Members” legally transferred their powers to the Board of Directors in 1901, thereby ceasing as a body to be reckoned with, and whether then the Board of Directors still existed as a functionary of The Mother Church under the literal provisions of the *Manual*, that was as far as the Court’s determination of the matter on the basis of Mrs. Eddy’s intention in the *Manual* should have gone in justice to the spiritual nature and intent of the *Manual* provisions (which no Catholic, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, or any other denominational judge could possibly spiritually interpret). The *Manual* as the Ark of the Covenant containing only spiritual provisions should have been kept free from ever-so-well-meaning Uzzahs who attempted to steady it with human law when to their sense it seemed tottering—as if divine law could ever totter; for Mrs. Eddy says on the flyleaf of the *Manual* that the By-laws in the *Manual* were “impelled by a power not one’s own,” her statement in part reading: “The Rules and By-Laws in the Manual of The First Church of Christ, Scientist, Boston, originated not in solemn conclave as in ancient Sanhedrim. They were not arbitrary opinions nor dictatorial demands, such as one person might impose on another. They were *impelled* by a power not one’s own, were written at different dates, and as the occasion required.” In other words, had the Court seen fit to “render . . . unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s,” Matt. 22:21, it would have confined its decision to the legal instruments before it, using the *Manual* only to determine if the “First Members” had, under Mrs. Eddy’s direction in 1901, legally transferred their powers of government to the Board of Directors, as bearing on the

conjoined functions of the "First Members" and the Board of Directors under the legal Deed of Trust of the Publishing Society, and if the Board of Directors as a church functionary had ceased to function under the provisions of the *Manual* (as it did in 1912, the litigation not having started until 1919); then the Court would have realized that it had but one question before it—Could the Publishing Society's legal Trust still go on after (to use the Court's own terms) "the machinery [the conjoined authority of 'First Members' and Directors] by which alone the trust can be carried out . . . breaks down or becomes incapable of operation." This was the question within Cæsar's province, which would have left God and His divine plan a place for action within the church, thus rendering "unto God the things that are God's."

Confusion arose within the church by reason of its attempt to grapple with legal trusts which Mrs. Eddy had with much deliberation placed entirely outside the church's contemplation—which confusion yielded to palpable error when the church decided to appeal to law for a solution of such matters, when the church's only concern should have been obedience to the spiritual demands of the *Manual* which were as much without the Court's rightful jurisdiction as legal documents were without the church's domain. Had Christian Scientists been obedient to the letter and spirit of the *Manual* instead of going to the law for its legal interpretation, they would have placed themselves *in line* for their spiritual understanding of its meaning.

Of all situations that have arisen since St. Paul the Benjamite spoke so forcefully on this subject, this was one in which law, that was "weak through the flesh," could afford no aid in the rightful clarification of Mrs. Eddy's meaning. St. Paul's admonition was as follows: "Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall *judge angels*? . . . Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another," I Cor. 6:1-3, 7. The rebuke of the prophet Samuel to Saul the Benjamite, who disobeyed the divine commands under the assumption of the claim that sacrifice could atone for disobedience, was, "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams," I Sam. 15:22.

Thus in the church's acceptance of the Supreme Judicial Court's

Decision as sustaining the authority of the Board of Directors as an ecclesiastical board, the *Manual* might be said to have been yielded entirely to the law of the "unjust" (to use Paul's expression) and all functions of The Mother Church to be operating under the fiat of the laws of Massachusetts. How truly fitting then is Isaiah's prophecy to this lamentable travesty of Mrs. Eddy's spiritually inspired plan, which prophecy reads: "And judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off: for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter," Isaiah 59:14,—for when "truth is fallen in the street," anything done in the name of equity is a travesty!

#### "AND HIS DEADLY WOUND WAS HEALED"

In line with the foreshadowing inexorability of prophetic Scripture, what could have more strikingly fulfilled Jesus' warning prophecy of the healing of the "wound" of the "seat . . . [of] great authority" that the drag-on of Old Theology (outgrown medial methods) sought to establish than this apparent sustentation of the Board of Directors in its assumed ecclesiastical authority by the Supreme Judicial Court—Jesus' warning prophecy reading: "And I . . . saw a beast rise up out of the *sea* . . . and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death [and what could wound the 'head' of 'authority' but a challenge to its power!]; and his *deadly wound was healed*," Rev. 13:1-3.

Jesus' trenchant warning prophecy of this healing of the "wound" of the "seat . . . [of] great authority" was also accompanied by an equally trenchant prophecy of another element of support necessary to the effectuation of the first—earth's response to the would-be helpfulness of the first beast, the drag-on of Old Theology, which was fulfilled in a lamblike acceptance on the part of the Field of the import of the sustentation of the Board of Directors, even to the point of aggressive defense thereof and the giving of such power to this "seat . . . [of] great authority" as would enable it to kill (to church) those who did not "worship" its authority, this further warning prophecy of Jesus reading: "And I beheld another beast coming up out of the *earth*; and he had two horns [of defense] like a lamb [when a lamb has none], and he spake as a dragon. And he . . . causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed . . . saying to them that dwell on the earth, that



they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword,\* and did live. And he [the lamblike beast] had power to give life unto the image of the beast [whose wound was healed], that the image of the [latter] beast should both speak [through the mouth-piece of the literature which the Field had helped to divert to the control of the Board of Directors], and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed [to church]," Rev. 13:11, 12, 14, 15.

## THINKING OBEDIENCE *versus* UNTHINKING DISOBEDIENCE

That Mrs. Eddy knew the meaning of the intervening prophecies between the twelfth and the nineteenth chapter of Revelation is evidenced by the fact that she said they "depict the fatal [to her inspired *Manual* provisions] effects of trying to meet error [disobedience] with error [legal justification for the assumption that Mrs. Eddy had made a *fatal* mistake in failing to provide for the continuance of The Mother Church after her passing]," S. & H. 568:7.

Since Mrs. Eddy knew the meaning of these intervening prophecies, one may say, Why did she not make plain the spiritual import of her *Manual* provisions? Had she done so, obedience would have continued to be the unthinking obedience that a mother demands of her children, and which she had demanded under the *Manual*. Mrs. Eddy knew that only thinking obedience would encompass the prophecies of confusion and struggle that lay between the twelfth chapter of Revelation, with its final "half a time" of Motherhood (typed by The Mother Church), and the nineteenth and twenty-first chapters, depicting, respectively, the marriage of the Bride and the Lamb (typed by the Extension) and the descent of the City foursquare (typed by the branches). However, thinking obedience must be preceded by letter obedience, as typed by the fact that the *Ten Commandments* (demanding unthinking outward obedience) were given before the Beatitudes, which through their inner workings lifted consciousness to their higher meanings.

Inasmuch as Mrs. Eddy says, "Either . . . suffering or Science must . . . regenerate material sense and self," S. & H. 296:6-9, the

\* Mrs. Eddy's interpretation of "Sword" in the "Glossary" being "The Idea of Truth; justice. Revenge; anger."

angelic vials of wrath in the intervening chapters between the twelfth and nineteenth will be understood as the demands of the revealed Word upon the unthinking human consciousness, which thinking obedience to the demands of Truth as "Science" would obviate, as evidenced by the fact that only those "who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name" (Rev. 14:11) are subject to these vials of wrath, while those who stand on "mount Sion" with the "Father's name ['the one Mind' as exclusive to Fatherhood, S. & H. 586:9] written in their foreheads [typing intelligent obedience]," Rev. 14:1, are unscathed.

It has doubtless been seen from presentations in this book that Mrs. Eddy, after discovering in 1866 the "divine laws of Life, Truth, and Love" and naming her discovery "Christian Science" (S. & H. 107:1), was forced by the divine nature of these qualities to reveal them step by step to others to the end that her individually subjective consciousness might objectively be reached by all mankind. However, after struggling for many years to lift others to her vision abstractly through the practice, teaching, and writing of the Principle of her discovery, Mrs. Eddy made another discovery (in 1891, immediately before the formation of The Mother Church),—namely, that "spiritual teaching must *always* be by *symbols*," S. & H. 575:13. This latter discovery forced her to accept the necessity for the building of the three tabernacles which Peter demanded on the Mount of Jesus' Transfiguration after Jesus had given him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, declaring that he would found his Church on his (Peter's) spiritual perception of the Christ. These three tabernacles as expressed in Science were: The (wilderness) Mother Church, built by forty of Mrs. Eddy's chosen students; the heavenly Extension, built by the heavenly collective branches; and the earthly, composite, objective second Concord Branch (built upon the foundation of her subjective first Concord Branch), which was conjointly expressive of both her individually subjective consciousness and the collectively objective consciousnesses of her followers as the "offspring" of her own revelation and, therefore, equally her own consciousness. Mrs. Eddy's necessity for permitting the building of the three tabernacles was to the end of showing her followers *through* symbolic mediums the way *out* of the symbolic consciousness which she had been forced to express as Church—Church alone being able to symbolize collective consciousness.

Thus Mrs. Eddy permitted the building of The (wilderness \*) Mother Church as a type of the first phase of "Love" as "Life"—"Mother" being defined by Mrs. Eddy in the first phase of its trinitarian nature of "Life, Truth, and Love" as "Life," S. & H. 592:16. After her followers abode in this consciousness about twelve years, she permitted them to build the Extension (of Motherhood to *heavenly* Bride) as the symbol of "Love" in its second phase, "Truth." However, just as Mrs. Eddy had been forced to figuratively pull down the stones of Motherhood in the first tabernacle (The Mother Church, typing the "Life"-phase of "Mother") by rejecting it for further physical occupancy and thought-occupancy, as previously described, she was likewise forced to pull down the stones of the second tabernacle (the Extension, typing the "Truth"-phase of "Mother" as one with *heavenly* Bride, *heavenly* Bride being likewise a limited concept because it rejects earth) in order that its earthly tabernacle (the third and last tabernacle—the composite second Concord Branch, typing the third phase of "Mother" as "Love," Love being Mother's highest potentiality as Bride beyond Motherhood) might be discerned in the human consciousness as the full expression of "Love," or the descended Bride, the union of heaven and earth on earth; for no two tabernacles could stand at the same time without the absorption of the higher into the lower—which has been the case with the continuance of the Extension of The Mother Church in its relationship to the branches. This fact—that no two tabernacles could stand at the same time—is attested by St. Paul's discernment when he said that "the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing," Hebr. 9:8. Thus the reversal of Mrs. Eddy's plan to dissipate the "first tabernacle" (at this point, the Extension) has defeated the understanding of the second Concord Branch with its outflowing mottoes prophesying the ultimate necessity to dissipate church walls to the end of making possible the objective realization of Mrs. Eddy's subjective consciousness—divine Life, Truth, and Love in one consciousness, initially typed by her subjective revelation in 1866 which resisted church walls. This unified consciousness alone could identify the final phase of "Love" beyond even *heavenly* Bride (in which Mother had found "her home and heav'nly rest," *Poems* p. 5). Just as Life can only be individually lived and Truth only col-

\* It is interesting to remember that Mrs. Eddy associates both "Life" and "wilderness" with "spontaneity"—"Life is the spontaneity of Love," My. 185, and "wilderness" is defined in the "Glossary" of *Science and Health* as "spontaneity of thought and idea."

lectively demonstrated, so Love can only be generically felt by an individual consciousness after it as Life has risen to collective Truth in Church and finally dissipated Church's erstwhile protective walls.

This last state of individually generic consciousness was expressed by Mrs. Eddy in the first edition of *Science and Health* in the following words: "Man is not distorted into shocking dimensions, because he is *the infinite idea*, nor is he but a solitary thought, disembodied and alone. When realizing Life as it is, namely, Soul, not sense, or the personal man, we shall expand into Truth and self-completeness that embrace all things, and *need communion with nothing more than itself, to find them all,*" p. 223, S. & H., 1st ed.

Thus Mrs. Eddy's mission could not have been complete to the human consciousness until she had, so to speak, thrown down the stones of the Extension so that her followers could enter into the last "half a time" of Love—Bride as "adorned" (completed) Word, My. 125:26. And this Mrs. Eddy did in her *Manual*, which, as left by her, forbade the future thought-occupancy of the Extension as typing the second phase of Motherhood, "Truth," which is one with Love as *heavenly* Bride.

With the closing of the second phase of Motherhood as "Truth," as one with heavenly Bride, by the imperative demands of the *Manual*, Mrs. Eddy simultaneously disposed of all previous mediums through which she was able to build the Word in human consciousness to its final point of completion, such as the periodicals, the Board of Lectureship, the Massachusetts Metaphysical College,—particularly the Christian Science periodicals, by which she was constantly able to discern the minds of her collective Field through the expression of their own thought-placement as indicative of their further needs. However, after she had finally completed the Word of *Science and Health* in its inspired purity, she left no mediums by which her Word might become adulterated through faulty interpretation on the part of those who had never understood the fuller meaning of her life-work—every word of these periodicals having been previously subjected to her personal pre-scrutiny before being published. No more did she leave unsupervised-by-her lecturers to *discourse* on this Word, thus *spreading abroad* what might conceivably be their own adulterations of the Word. Also she did not permit the teaching of prospective teachers in the Normal Class of the Massachusetts Metaphysical College after she was no longer able to approve the teacher of such classes

(as the *Manual* requires) or his, or her, teachings extraneous to the definite assignments for such College teaching in her textbook, *Science and Health*,—these extraneous teachings being, for instance, the two lessons on "mental practice and *malpractice* [the italics are Mrs. Eddy's]," *Manual* p. 90. Such latitude, unless censored by her, would be liable to result in merely "one student's opinions or *modus operandi* becoming the basis for others," *Mis.* 156:15, and thus the Word would become adulterated by taking to it the misapprehension of others.

This danger did not attend the teaching of Primary Classes in the Field by previously authorized teachers because they were under strict *Manual* demand to merely ask questions and have them answered from "Recapitulation." Therefore Mrs. Eddy left them free to teach until there were no more qualified teachers, else until such teachers rose to a higher privilege than that of motherly ministry—or, best of all, until such time as the Field rose to its prophesied privilege of being "all taught of God" through the Word as Bride, which was "in the beginning . . . with God, and . . . was God"; for Mrs. Eddy says: "The student, who receives his knowledge of Christian Science, or metaphysical healing, from a human teacher, may be mistaken in judgment and demonstration, but God cannot mistake. . . . No person can misuse this mental power, if he is taught of God to discern it," *S. & H.* 455:17-27.

Thus Mrs. Eddy forbade the continuance of these agencies and left only the branches typing Love as embracing Truth to flow into the "tree of life" as the spontaneity of Love (*My.* 185:16) growing in the "city of our God" in one consciousness. This privilege could only be spiritually discerned outside the limiting walls of church, for church divides "Mind into minds . . . and Being into beings" (*Ret.* 56:6) even in its last step as the City foursquare with its twelve symbolic gates typing twelve varying approaches in as many consciousnesses to the oneness of Love.

Mrs. Eddy, like all loving and wise mothers, constantly prepared the branches as the children of her Word for the passing of Motherhood by demanding of them in advance absolute self-government, even to the disciplining of their own members. In contrast, the members of The Mother Church were constantly forced to pass under the rod of *Manual* provisions with no voice in The Mother Church's government, even the Directors being placed under the discipline of

the *Manual*, as previously noted. In this connection also, the Publishing Society Deed of Trust gave the Trustees power of self-perpetuation only in case Mrs. Eddy did not elect to fill the vacancy, and in each and every instance of their replacement (with one possible exception of which there is no record, as indicated by the Directors' Answer to the Bill of Complaint) Mrs. Eddy herself elected to fill the vacancies among the Trustees in line with her reserved option in the Publishing Society Deed of Trust.

Thus Mrs. Eddy held the reins of government in her own hands with reference to The Mother Church and its inside and outside activities until time for Motherhood's departure, sharing Motherhood as Leadership and its responsibilities with no one and leaving no one prepared therefor. Far be it from her to place a substitute "Mother" as "Leader" in her own place with a "seat . . . [of such] great authority" as only Mother-love could safely wield. In this connection, Mrs. Eddy speaks in her writings of trying to transfer such authority in her "lifetime" in order to watch its operation, but found a *father*-disciplinarian in her place—her reference to such result being: " 'A position of authority . . . became necessary. Rules were necessary, and I made a code of by-laws . . . Entrusting their enforcement to others, I found at one time that they had five churches under discipline. I intervened. . . . I wrote to each church in tenderness, in exhortation, and in rebuke, and so brought all back to union and love again,' " My. 343:22-30.

However, as no mother can expect a child to understand her until he has individually, in the sense of assuming his own self-government, stood in her place, which demands her precedent withdrawal, no one could have understood Mrs. Eddy's consciousness until she had by such withdrawal left him to complete the Word in his own consciousness by standing in his own self-government, which he must do before he could take her last step of Bride. That no one understood her last bridal step is evidenced by the fact, previously mentioned, that all of her students still called her "Mother" at the time of her passing, their inability to see her demonstration beyond Mother presaging their inability to do without her motherly ministrations when she passed on; for in order to do without them, they must of necessity have taken the step of self-motherhood before her passing. Mrs. Eddy, well knowing that her own students had not prepared themselves by self-motherhood for the cessation of outer motherly ministry, thus

could not desert her children of the Word, to all of whom she was responsible since they had left all for her own conception of Christ as discerned by their highest understanding; hence, in the spirit in which she had always sustained her followers in their medial necessities, she made temporary provision (as hereinafter presented) for their spiritual sustenance until they could gain an understanding of the spiritual import of the bridal demands of the Word, or until they should through suffering overcome the prophecy which inexorably foretold the dire "effects of trying to meet error [disobedience] with error [legal justification]."

One may say, Could she sustain her followers in their disobedience to her commands in the *Manual*? Until they could see the reason for her plan, she knew that they would choose what they deemed to be the lesser of two evils—either to disobey the *Manual*, thereby attempting to rectify what they deemed to be her own colossal mistake; else to obey it and seemingly (to their sense) risk the destruction of the Cause of Christian Science, which they felt was greater than any founder—not realizing that the demands of the *divinely inspired* By-laws of the *Manual* were inseparable from the Cause of Christian Science.

Jesus well knew this struggle would come, because his own disciples, after declaring their undying devotion to the Cause of being fishers of men for which Jesus demanded they leave their previous position of fishers of fish, returned to their old calling the third day after he was crucified. Thus in Revelation thirteenth to nineteenth chapter Jesus prophesied a repetition of this backward step for the followers of the consciousness of Mother and Leader and the terrific struggle through which the church would pass before it rose to the privilege of thinking obedience. But he also prophesied the church's final triumph in the twenty-first and twenty-second chapter of Revelation, which Mrs. Eddy foresaw—such foresight giving her the assurance that any provision she might have to make to sustain her church would be only temporary. It should be specially noted, however, that she made such temporary provisions for her followers in instruments *outside* of church, completely independent of the church's clear and unequivocal "Last Will and Testament" as contained in the *Manual* (which forbade the continuance of the activities of Mother), so that these temporary provisions should be no impedient to her *Manual* plan for her church when the church was able to understandingly rise to it.

TEMPORARY PROVISION  
FOR THE CAUSE OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE  
DURING ITS PROPHESED SELF-ARRESTMENT  
OF THE SPIRITUAL PROGRESS DEMANDED BY  
THE MANUAL

The most obvious of Mrs. Eddy's temporary provisions for the sustenance of her Cause during its prophesied arrested progress in the "tents of Issachar" due to unthinking disobedience to the spiritual demands of the *Manual* were contained in her personal *Last Will and Testament*.

THE LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT OF MARY BAKER EDDY

In September 1901, simultaneously with her taking the reins of government into her hands in the *Manual* and making the Board of Directors her mere agent to execute her own wishes, as previously presented, Mrs. Eddy made her *Last Will and Testament* disposing of her personal fortune after her prospective passing, appointing Hon. Henry M. Baker, her cousin, who resided in Concord, New Hampshire, her sole Executor without bond.

In this *Last Will and Testament*, after making personal bequests to some of her students and helpers, she bequeathed one hundred thousand dollars to the Directors to "hold, invest, and reinvest . . . [using] the income and such portion of the principal, from time to time, as they may deem best, for the purpose of providing free instruction for indigent, well-educated, worthy Christian Scientists at the Massachusetts Metaphysical College . . . [or] elsewhere, if, in the unanimous judgment of all said trustees for the time being, such course shall seem best." Further provision was also made for financial aid to be given these "indigent . . . Christian Scientists" thereafter, the provision reading, ". . . until they can maintain themselves in some department of Christian Science." In the light of Mrs. Eddy's statement: "In the early history of Christian Science, among my thousands of students few were wealthy. Now, Christian Scientists are *not indigent*; and their comfortable fortunes are acquired by healing mankind . . ." (Mis. ix:6), did not this provision in Mrs. Eddy's Will for "*indigent* . . . Christian Scientists" show that Mrs. Eddy realized that a backward step such as was prophesied in Revelation thirteenth chapter would bring great poverty among the members of the church, like that which was experienced in the "early history"



of Christian Science when she was forced to build a home for her indigent students because they were unable to sustain themselves?—for disobedience loses the light of spiritual leading and reduces its channel to poverty.

That the church literally took a backward step from the progressive privilege of the Second Organization, founded on "the Rock, Christ," to its previous position in the First Organization, "designed to commemorate the word and works of our Master, which should reinstate *primitive* Christianity and its lost element of *healing*," *Manual* pp. 17, 19, is attested by the fact that after Mrs. Eddy's passing, and even at the present time, a statement indicating this return to the mission of the First Organization appeared, and still remains, on the inside of the front cover of the *Christian Science Quarterly*, reading: "The Mother Church, The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts, and its branches in all countries constitute the Christian Science denomination or Church of Christ, Scientist. This denomination was founded by Mary Baker Eddy, at Boston, in 1879, as 'a church designed to commemorate the word and works of our Master, which should reinstate *primitive* Christianity and its lost element of *healing*' (Church Manual, p. 17)," *Christian Science Quarterly* of the year 1939. Thus the church has turned back from its foundation in its Second Organization, "designed to be built on the Rock, *Christ* [within, rather than Jesus as Master without]; . . . healing and saving the *world* [rather than individual persons, as was the case with primitive Christianity] . . .," *Manual* p. 19. So it was that Mrs. Eddy felt constrained to make provision in her Will for this prophesied "return to positions outgrown," S. & H. 74:30; in other words, the church prophetically turned back to its "early history" of "primitive Christianity," wherein Jesus "hath not where to lay his head," from the inherent wealth of its Christ-foundation in the Second Organization, wherein its world healing so broadened its concept as to bring its members, in the words of Mrs. Eddy, "comfortable fortunes" as expressions thereof.

Returning to the provision of Mrs. Eddy's Will under discussion, Mrs. Eddy's indicated preference for the Massachusetts Metaphysical College in which to teach these "indigent" students was undoubtedly to the end that they should have in this temporary period the most supervised instruction of the shortest duration, the College selecting its students from the highest and best in the Field in accordance with strict requirements for a term lasting but one week. Also, the College

was accessible to but few, due to the infrequency of its meetings and the smallness of the maximum number that could be chosen for the Normal course.

But whether it was to be "private" teaching or teaching in the Massachusetts Metaphysical College, Mrs. Eddy's provision for "indigent" students to be taught was only until the Field could rise to the "Love [that] . . . never loses a case" (My. 132:28) and heals "at one visit" (S. & H. 365:16); for Love that is felt will supersede metaphysics that is taught, and no more need will be found for a "Metaphysical College"—Mrs. Eddy having given proof of this from her own experience in her statement: "When I have . . . most sensibly *felt* that the infinite recognizes no disease, this has . . . [enabled] me *instantaneously* to heal a cancer which had eaten its way to the jugular vein," Un. 7:8-12.

In the same vein of temporary provision for the sustenance of the Cause in its continued need of outward motherly ministry during its prophesied period of arrested progress, Mrs. Eddy bequeathed fifty thousand dollars to The Mother Church (with no stipulation for its use), the bequest reading as follows: "I give and bequeath to The Mother Church—First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts, the sum of fifty thousand dollars." Mrs. Eddy's last bequest was also to The Mother Church, wherein she stipulated that it should receive the residue of her estate after the disposition of all of her other bequests.

In addition to the above, Mrs. Eddy bestowed upon Calvin A. Frye and Joseph G. Mann "the right, during the term of their respective natural lives, to occupy and use . . . [her] homestead and grounds called 'Pleasant View,'" which was also to be used for a residence for her grandchildren while attending school, and, after the termination of the foregoing rights, as "a place for the reception, entertainment, and care of Christian Science visitors and their friends, and to such other purposes looking to the general advancement of the Christian Science religion as may be deemed best by the residuary legatee."

In November 1903 Mrs. Eddy added her first codicil to her *Last Will and Testament*, making it ostensibly for the purpose of changing the tenantry of her "Pleasant View" home, but also making certain additional personal bequests, as well as a bequest to Second Church of Christ, Scientist, in New York City, of a "sum not exceeding One Hundred and Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$175,000.) sufficient to pay the indebtedness which may exist at the time of . . . [her] decease

upon the church edifice. . . ." (It is alleged that Mrs. Eddy bore a personal responsibility for the establishment of this church by one of her students.)

In May 1904 Mrs. Eddy made a second and last codicil to her main Will and first codicil, wherein she changed her previous provisions for her "Pleasant View" home—this time requiring its sale within three months after her "demise," and directing that the funds should go to the Board of Directors, as the repository of other church funds and properties, "to be used for such purposes in connection with said Church ['First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts'] as said Directors may determine." The provision further reading: "Nothing contained in my will or codicil thereto shall be considered inconsistent with said Church purchasing said real estate, if the Directors may consider it desirable so to do." The contents of "Pleasant View," with the exception of such keepsakes as Calvin Frye should desire, were bequeathed to "The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts." She also directed that Calvin Frye should be provided with suitable rooms in her home at 385 Commonwealth Avenue, if he so desired, during his natural life, the expense to be provided out of the income from the residue of her estate left to "said The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts."

Thus in the devotion of her own private fortune to the temporary needs of her Cause, Mrs. Eddy but sought to prevent its seeming destruction from her followers' lack of discernment and consequent disobedience to her spiritually discerned plan for its redemption to her subjective consciousness of Church as expressed in her initial repudiation of church in the first edition of *Science and Health* (and in the many statements in line with this position in her latest writings). Hence in this last concession to her followers' lack of vision, Mrs. Eddy but *continued* her own course of sustaining them in their disobedience to her revelation of the obstructive limitation of church organization, the formation of which she had permitted only for their own thought-necessity until they could rise to her initial vision.

#### UNAUTHORIZED PUBLICATION OF MRS. EDDY'S LETTERS

In 1927, several years after the Supreme Judicial Court had rendered its Decision (which had been widely distributed in the Field) and during the intense study of the *Manual* by dissatisfied Christian Scientists, the Board of Directors authorized the publication of a small pamphlet through Judge Clifford P. Smith, entitled "Permanency of

The Mother Church." This pamphlet contained a letter that Mrs. Eddy had written February 27th, 1903 (about eight years before her passing), and which she had asked to be put upon the records of *The Mother Church*. In this letter she said: ". . . Never abandon the by-laws nor the *denominational government* of The Mother Church. If I am not personally with you, the Word of God and my instructions in the *by-laws* have led you hitherto and will remain to guide you safely on, and the teachings of St. Paul are as useful to-day as when they were first written."

From this letter addressed to The Mother Church (through its Directors), or figuratively to the "remnant of her seed, which keep [only] the *commandments* of God, and have [but] the testimony of Jesus Christ [Christianity]"—with which "remnant of her seed" the dragon "went to make war" after the passing of Motherhood, Rev. 12:17, it would seem that Mrs. Eddy, foreseeing the temporary continuance of The Mother Church during the prophesied period of confusion because of its members' non-understanding of her higher *Manual* provisions, realized that the members' only protection from the depredations of the dragon, or the complete undoing of her Cause, lay in their preservation of the denominational form of government until such time as they should understandingly see the *Manual* plan; in other words, she realized that the denominational form of government was the only means by which the church could be held together and thought kept in line (through the *Manual* provisions) to intelligently see such purpose. The fact that Mrs. Eddy's letter was at her request put upon the records of *The Mother Church* rather than preserved in *her Word*—which latter would apply to the branches as well, rooted as they were in the Word and not in The Mother Church—shows that her injunction to preserve The Mother Church's denominational government was intended to stand only so long as The Mother Church stood.

Mrs. Eddy says that "eternity awaits our Church *Manual*" (My. 230:2)—not The Mother Church; for the Church *Manual* contains specific provisions for the continuance of the branches after Mrs. Eddy's passing (when she should "relinquish her place as the head or Leader of The Mother Church," *Manual* p. 72), beyond the "half a time" of The Mother Church. The "eternity" of the *Manual* lies in the fact that the branches symbolize the City foursquare (S. & H. 575), which, by reason of the indwelling nucleus of its characterizing idea, dissipates its own walls and, as generic idea alone, spreads itself to the

boundless "city of our God" (S. & H. 577) through the medial foot-step of "no temple ['material structure'] therein," S. & H. 576:10-12; for *idea alone is eternal*.

Thus to paraphrase St. Paul's statement, "I through the [fulfillment of the] law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God" (Gal. 2:19), "eternity" says, I through the (fulfillment of the) *Manual* am dead to church, that I might live unto the infinitude of Love,—which is the Word with no church necessities, this being Mrs. Eddy's initial revelation in the first edition of *Science and Health* wherein she says: "The mistake the disciples of Jesus made to found religious organizations and church rites, if indeed they did this, was one the Master did not make; . . . No time was lost by our Master in organizations, rites, and ceremonies, or in proselyting for certain forms of belief: members of his church must answer to themselves, in the secret sanctuary of Soul, questions of the most solemn import," pp. 166, 167.

Hence can be seen the marvelous significance of the coincidence of Mrs. Eddy's addition to *Science and Health* in 1909 of the statement that "error is unreal and *obsolete*" (ending "time" in the Word and taking the branches, rooted in the Word, beyond church necessity to "eternity") and her sealing of a packet containing a collection of articles which she had begun to gather after the publishing of *Miscellaneous Writings*,\* the articles in this packet (published in 1913, three years after Mrs. Eddy's passing, under the title of *The First Church of Christ, Scientist, and Miscellany* †) representing the *history* of the evolving Word as applied to the branches—*Miscellaneous Writings* having been the history of the Word in its application to The Mother Church, remembering that *Miscellaneous Writings* was published after the establishment of The Mother Church and simultaneously with the building of the first Concord Branch as symbolic of the time for *Branch* expression. Mrs. Eddy sealed this packet on August 21st, 1909, writing across its face, "Nobody shall open this or read its contents during my lifetime without my written consent." Thus Mrs. Eddy set the "seal of eternity on time" with reference to the branches and their history, and to all that she had intended to survive her passing. As this letter to The Mother Church enjoining it to preserve its "denominational government"—written six years before she sealed

\* Page 21, "Report of the Committee on General Welfare," authorized by the Board of Directors, March 1920.

† If Mrs. Eddy chose this title for what has since been called "Miscellany," attention is called to the fact that "The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Mass.," was the basic branch identity of that of which The Mother Church was but a medial necessity.

the packet—was not included, it had no right to be published as having any bearing on the branches or the completed Word as Idea.

In connection with Mrs. Eddy's reference in this letter to the teachings of St. Paul as associated with her passing, what other meaning could it suggest than that which warned against going to law for a solution to spiritual matters—"Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life? . . . But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers. Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another" (I Cor. 6: 1-3, 6, 7)—otherwise why did Mrs. Eddy call attention to St. Paul's teachings rather than to those of Jesus?

Mrs. Eddy's setting of the "seal of eternity on time" (which Jesus did individually and Mrs. Eddy collectively for church) proved that the *Manual* had reached the "eternity" which had *awaited* the fulfillment of the culminating footsteps of evolving church! The demands of "eternity" having been satisfied, "time" continues only in the consciousness of the follower of Truth who "awaits" merely his own discernment of its complete fulfillment.

Another instance of the unauthorized publication of a letter (in *Miscellany*), which has caused great confusion in the Field, was one addressed to "First Church of Christ, Scientist, New York City" under the great stress of circumstances previously noted, reading in part as follows: "My beloved brethren in First Church of Christ, Scientist, New York City, I advise you with all my soul to support the Directors of The Mother Church, and unite with those in your church who are supporting The Mother Church Directors. Abide in fellowship with and obedience to The Mother Church, and in this way God will bless and prosper you," My. 360. The confusion which has attended the unauthorized publication of this letter (which was not in the packet prepared by Mrs. Eddy and was, therefore, unauthorized for publication in *Miscellany*) was occasioned by the fact that it was written during Mrs. Eddy's presence with us, when The Mother Church was existent under the *Manual* and the Board of Directors was empowered by *Manual* provisions to discipline members—both of which conditions ceased to be after Mrs. Eddy's passing, whereupon this exhortative letter had no further relevancy.

Another unauthorized publication in *Miscellany* is a message headed "Take Notice," written October 12th, 1909, published in the *Sentinel* of October 16th, 1909, from which the following is an extract: "I approve the By-laws of The Mother Church, and require the Christian Science Board of Directors to maintain them and sustain them. [It will be noted that this message having been published over a year before Mrs. Eddy's passing was addressed to the Field when The Mother Church was existent under the *Manual* and the Board of Directors was acting under Mrs. Eddy's direction except in matters of Mother Church discipline, as before noted.] These Directors do not act contrary to the rules of the Church Manual [a thing impossible while Mrs. Eddy was with us], neither do they trouble me with their difficulties with individuals in their own church or with the members of branch churches [who were members of The Mother Church, for their disciplinary powers were limited to Mother Church members only]," My. 358:30-5.

Still another unauthorized publication in *Miscellany* was a notice addressed to the Christian Science Field, in which Mrs. Eddy requested that matters pertaining to the then duties of the Board of Directors be addressed to it and not to her, My. 242:15-26. This notice was added to *Miscellany* by vote of the Board of Directors on June 9th, 1915, two years after *Miscellany* had been published in 1913 (see "Report of the Committee on General Welfare," p. 21).

In addition to these unauthorized published letters and notices, Mrs. Eddy's private letters have been gathered by the Board of Directors from the Field and, according to its own words, ". . . bound and indexed, so that they may always be preserved and may be available for reference by the Directors and their successors in office, to enlighten and guide them in the innumerable problems confronting the Cause, and that they may be used in any other way which from time to time may be determined through prayerful consideration by the Board of Directors. The letters, notes, and memoranda relating to Christian Science, written by Mrs. Eddy at various times, which have come into the possession of the Directors, contain nothing in any degree different from what she has fully elucidated in her published works. Her books contain the whole of her teachings on Christian Science," *Sentinel*, Jan. 21, 1928, p. 412. Despite this latter clearly stated truth, excerpts from Mrs. Eddy's unpublished letters were later presented to the Field from time to time in the Christian Science periodicals. (For examples,

see the *Sentinels* of September 1936 and the issues of Oct. 3, Nov. 7, Dec. 5, 1936; Jan. 2, Feb. 6, Mar. 6, Apr. 3, 1937; also the *Journals* from May through December 1936.) Furthermore, in view of Mrs. Eddy's progressive unfoldments of Truth in her published writings, there is a decided hazard in using these seasonal letters, written under circumstances not apparent to the reader. In fact, in view of all that has been presented in this book as showing Mrs. Eddy's fulfillment of progressive prophecies involving the adaptation of her subjective revelation to the objective consciousness of her followers, whose collective needs were progressively changing, the use of private communications (as well as old *Journals* and *Sentinels*, and even the early editions of *Science and Health*) out of their seasonal setting is highly dangerous.

(While slightly afiel of the subject of Mrs. Eddy's private letters and yet in line with the nature of the previous comments thereupon, it might be well to call attention to the alarming multiplicity of biographical and historical books setting forth others' impressions of Mrs. Eddy's life and character which are now being "authorized" for publication by the Publishing Society [as advertised on the inside cover of the *Sentinel*], despite the warning of the Board of Directors in the *Sentinel* of Oct. 22nd, 1927, which reads as follows:

"The teachings of the textbook of Christian Science, 'Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures,' and the other writings by our Leader, Mary Baker Eddy, furnish more spiritual food than has been fully assimilated by any one in this age. Hence there is no good reason why a professed Christian Scientist should be eager to seize with avidity anything Mrs. Eddy is reputed to have said or done that she herself has not made public.

"Incidents and anecdotes in which she was the central figure, as related to-day by others than those who directly participated in them, are apt to be inexact, if not illusory or imaginative, and therefore should not be invested with undue importance as compared with the words of wisdom and spiritual enlightenment which have come to us direct from her pen, the full significance of which the world is just beginning to appreciate. Personal opinions and interpretations of those once close to Mrs. Eddy are often given more weight than they deserve. Merely because Mrs. Eddy has not specifically repudiated them is no evidence of their validity.

"Another form of recital in which Mrs. Eddy is made prominent is the record of impressions of persons who may have been in



occasional touch with her and who have written down what they have recalled of her words and actions. The personal characteristics of such a chronicler are commonly reflected in what he writes. If he is temperamentally erratic, what he may set down as having been said or done by our Leader is prone to be colored with his own proclivities and is not to be regarded as entirely trustworthy or informative. In form or substance it may be out of line with her purpose and intentions, and thereby prove mischievous and misleading. Wrong impressions are easily acquired, but are often hard to dislodge.

"It is a serious mistake to expect to learn more of what Mrs. Eddy wanted us to know by reading what others have written about her. Those who do so are losing her instead of finding her. She wanted us to know her only as she is revealed in her published writings. On this point nothing could be more definite and direct than what she has written in 'The First Church of Christ, Scientist, and Miscellany,' page 120, line 2, where these words appear: 'Those who look for me in person, or elsewhere than in my writings, lose me instead of find me.' "

Did not Mrs. Eddy sense a hazard in biographies when she hesitated so long after *The Life of Mary Baker Eddy* by Sibyl Wilbur had been published before she gave her consent to its being sold to Christian Scientists—and even then implying that she had never personally read it [as will be seen by her statement on the flyleaf thereof], thus in no sense sponsoring either its contents or the practice of writing such biographies?)

#### WITNESSES TO FINISHED PURPOSE

The seasonal adaptation of the periodicals to the progressive needs of the Field and the importance of holding them in their seasonal placement is given significance by Mrs. Eddy's provision in the Deed of Trust to the Publishing Society for the copyrights of the *Journal* to become the sole property of The Christian Science Publishing Society *after her demise*, as previously referred to (Art. XXV, Sect. 6, of the *Manual* making the other periodicals, which were published subsequently to the filing of the Deed of Trust, subject to this same provision), the provision in the Deed of Trust reading: "11. I also reserve the right to withdraw from said trust, if I shall so desire, the publication of the Christian Science Journal, but if I do not exercise this reserved option, then said Journal shall remain a part of the trust

property forever.\* 12. Upon my decease, in consideration aforesaid, I sell and convey to said trustees my copyright of "The Christian Science Journal" to be held by them as the other property of said trust."

The question arises, Why did Mrs. Eddy make provision in the Deed of Trust for the copyrights of the *Journal* (and, in the *Manual*, for the other periodicals) to become the property of the Trustees of the Publishing Society at her demise unless she had expected some use to have been made of them at her passing? And as the *Manual* prohibits the continuance of current literature after the editors are no longer subject to her approval, there is but one use to which the copyrights to all of her periodicals could have been put, and that is the rights that ownership of the copyrights would have given the Trustees, —namely, to republish the *old* volumes of the *Journals*, *Sentinels*, and so on (since copyrights which must be obtained from issue to issue cover only issues already published, and mere *titles* of periodicals cannot be *copyrighted*), for the Reading Rooms, as well as for individual Scientists who desired to trace "the divine Science of Truth" in the *Journals* and the fulfilled missions of the other periodicals to the end of completing church consciousness—remembering that when she contemplated the possibility of permitting the Boston Church to reorganize after its first dissolution, Mrs. Eddy said that it would be only "for the completion of its history," Ret. 58, 1st to 4th ed. inclusive, 1891. Thus Mrs. Eddy indicated the *impermanency* of The Mother Church except as completed *history*; and this is all the periodicals as "organs" thereof (*Manual* 44:18, 19) could ever be after Mrs. Eddy's passing—witnesses of completed mission.

It is interesting to remember that Mrs. Eddy never declared the missions of any of the periodicals until she sent forth *The Christian Science Monitor* at the Thanksgiving season in 1908 (the year Mother Church history was completed in the separation of the branches from The Mother Church), her interpretive characterizations of their missions reading: "I have given the name to all the Christian Science periodicals. The first was *The Christian Science Journal*, designed to put on record the divine Science of Truth; the second . . . [the] *Sentinel* . . . to hold guard over Truth, Life, and Love; the third, *Der Herold der Christian Science*,† to proclaim the *universal* activity

\* Note that the word "forever" used in this Deed of Trust is the same as that used in the financial Deed of Trust of the Directors, to which the same comments apply.

† Mrs. Eddy never authorized the publication of *Le Héraut*, which was established after her passing.

and availability of Truth; the next . . . [the] *Monitor*, to spread *undivided* the Science that operates *unspent*," My. 353. Thus even Mrs. Eddy could declare their missions only in perspective analysis; in other words, as messengers of divinity, their true nature was seen by her only as declared by their own self-completion.

The great blessing of individual self-completeness awaits Scientists only as they view these periodicals in the light of the completion of their missions—as typing the four rivers of God that went out of Eden (Gen. 2:10), which rivers are defined by Mrs. Eddy in her "Glossary": "Pison [typed by the *Journal*]," "Gihon [typed by the *Sentinel*]," "Hiddekel [typed by *Der Herold*]," and "Euphrates [typed by the *Monitor*]," this last-mentioned "encompassing the universe and man" in its mission of *spreading* (expanding) "*undivided* the Science that operates *unspent* [beyond any limiting walls to *spend* its power]." Thus the progressive missions of the four periodicals, in the order of these four-missioned rivers that went out of Eden, like Ezekiel's "waters [that] issued out from under the threshold of the house eastward," grew deeper and deeper (Ezek. 47:1, 3-8) until, culminating in the oceanic proportions of the fourth river, Euphrates, they encompassed "the universe and man" (S. & H. 585:17), as typed by the fourth periodical, the *Monitor*, which in its limitless mission was designed to "spread *undivided* the Science that operates *unspent*" and which, also like Euphrates, subjectively declares the "atmosphere of *human* belief before it accepts sin, sickness, or death," S. & H. 585:19,—such subjective atmosphere typing true humanhood, of which Mrs. Eddy says, "The more I understand true humanhood, the more I see it to be sinless,—as ignorant of sin as is the perfect Maker," Un. 49:8. This consciousness types the garden of Eden as embracing the *undivided* "tree of life" (Gen. 2:9) before the parting of the one river ("river of water of life . . . in the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life," Rev. 22:1, 2) into four heads (Gen. 2:10) which resulted in the Adamic division of the four kingdoms—mineral, vegetable, animal, and human—foreshadowing, in turn, the subsequent separation of the fourth kingdom into man and woman (Gen. 2:21, 22) as typing the separation of the moral and spiritual, which Mrs. Eddy says "*demoralizes* . . . man" (S. & H. 533:14). The proclamation of the *Monitor*, therefore, as spreading "*undivided* the Science that operates *unspent*" (thereby attesting the return to the primitive purity of the garden of Eden as the type of *undivided* Word) witnessed to the completed mission of the periodicals.

It must have been the natural expectancy of Mrs. Eddy that the completion of the periodicals' mission would have been seen when the development of events brought to Scientists' attention the incongruity of the Deed of Trust with the *Manual* (as pertaining to the literature). Had the significance of this incongruity been seen, it would have been realized that only the gems of thought in the past periodicals, which had had Mrs. Eddy's approval, rightfully remained to influence the consciousness of Christian Scientists (such influence being in a constantly progressive trend of thought tending to completeness), and thus her intention in her temporary provision for the copyright would have been rightly interpreted—temporary because all copyrights expire after a maximum of fifty-six years.

Also, the printing and binding together of entire volumes of the *Journals* and other periodicals would have prevented single copies from being detached from their consistent settings and used one against the other for current light, as is so much the practice now. In the light of the progressively changing statements of *Science and Health*, as touched upon in this book, could one picture the confusion that would result from chapters of early editions being compiled with chapters of more progressive editions to the point of a completed *Science and Health*? And yet this is the thought-compilation which now results from the promiscuous, unintelligent use of the old literature, which should be used rather, and only, for its comparative values as showing the progress of later editions, such comparative use being suggested by the *Journals* of March and April 1891, previously quoted.

It is certain that during Mrs. Eddy's presence with us she encouraged Christian Scientists to bind and keep the yearly volumes of these periodicals, and that the Publishing Society, when desired, bound them for those retaining them, affixing the Christian Science seal to the cover in attestation of Mrs. Eddy's approval thereof. Those who had disbursed all or any of their periodicals in their Field work could at that time purchase them from the Publishing Society in either bound volumes or single copies so long as they lasted.

With respect to the old copies of the *Quarterly*, these too could be republished for the Lesson-Sermons of the branches when the Deed of Trust failed by reason of the failure of its "machinery" clauses. However, should the churches desire to continue the current publication of the *Quarterly* by the Trustees (but outside the Trust), this is one branch of the activity of this previous Trust that entails no risk in its continuance, inasmuch as its subject matter must always be from

the Bible and *Science and Health*, precluding the possibility of the Word's being adulterated. The publication of the *Quarterlies* could even be upon the basis of a publishing society (independent of either the later Trustees or the Trust established in 1898) such as existed in the three years' interim between the dissolution of the First Organization of the Boston Church and the formation of The Mother Church \*—remembering that Mrs. Eddy had always placed the preparation and publishing of the *Quarterlies* exclusively within the province of a publishing society outside of church,† the responsibility for which function was never interlocked with the Board of Directors or any other agency.

Nevertheless, a great privilege remains in the use of the old issues of the *Quarterly* (to which certain branch churches reverted during the time of the Litigation), for they contain the complete footsteps out of church, as evidenced by the fact that Mrs. Eddy placed a pure white cross with illuminated stars in its encircling crown on the *Quarterly* cover just three months before her passing—exactly the length of time that elapsed between the passing of Moses and the succession of Joshua, Moses' minister, who led the Children of Israel across the River Jordan ("Jordan" meaning "river of judgment") into the "Promised Land." Joshua, being the son of "Nun," which means the "eternal," typed the "eternity [that] awaits our Church Manual." Thus the placing of this pure white cross with its encircling crown on the cover of the *Quarterly* surely typed a prophecy of the succession of "the spiritual idea," Mrs. Eddy's minister, to her leadership—in line with her statement that "the spiritual idea" (and not a denominational, ecclesiastical Board of Directors) would be her "successor," her statement reading: "What remains to lead on the centuries and reveal my successor, is man in the image and likeness of the Father-Mother God, man the generic term for mankind" (My. 347:2)—impersonal

\* The question might here arise as to the agency to which the "net profits" of the publication of the old periodicals and *Quarterlies* (either old or new) should be turned over. The reply is that due to the great diminution of the business after the discontinuance of the periodicals, there would probably be no "net profits" beyond the normal requirements of the business.

† As previously noted, Mrs. Eddy refused to permit the erection of a building for the first Publishing Society adjoining (though under a separate roof from) a prospective church building, upon the basis of the incongruity of the commercial functions of the one and the church functions of the other, she having said: "I am confident that all loyal Christian Scientists will gladly consecrate our church to a more dignified end, than an exchange, or a place for business bickerings, bag and baggage!" (See *Journals* of March and October 1892.)

Womanhood, Mrs. Eddy having said, "The *woman* in the Apocalypse symbolizes generic man ['the generic term for mankind'], *the spiritual idea* . . . ," S. & H. 561:22.

### "A LAMB STOOD ON THE MOUNT SION [ZION]"

While it must have been distressing to Mrs. Eddy to contemplate the prophecies that lie between the twelfth and nineteenth chapter of Revelation,—particularly the thirteenth chapter,—the prophecies of Jesus were not without hope that a line of spiritual thought would be preserved within the Field to reach the perfect understanding of impersonal Womanhood as the Bride. For in the fourteenth chapter of Revelation, immediately following the narration in the thirteenth chapter of the false healing of the wound of the self-assumed "seat . . . [of] great authority" (self-assumed, for the drag-on of Old Theology is in the one's own consciousness that accepts its claim of power), there was seen to stand on "mount Sion" ("Zion" meaning, "Spiritual foundation and superstructure," S. & H. 599) "a Lamb . . . and with him an hundred forty and four thousand . . . which . . . are virgins" (Rev. 14:1-4), typing, in the highest sense of collectivity, those who follow the virgin Word, and not personal or ecclesiastical leadership, —this virgin host being the true idea of what the lamblike Field-consciousness reversed. In other words, these are they who find in the Word the living leadership of Mrs. Eddy, needing none other, for Mrs. Eddy says, "Those who look for me in person, or elsewhere than in my writings,\* lose me instead of find me," My. 120:2. However, this consciousness was prophesied to arise in the Branch and not in The Mother Church, since in The Mother Church could not be found the full measure of the City foursquare (one hundred and forty and four thousand, Rev. 14:1-4; Rev. 21:17).

Both in revelation and founding, Mrs. Eddy had taken the church over the prophesied "highway . . . of holiness [the wholeness of the Word]," Isaiah 35:8, as a bridge from Revelation twelfth chapter to the nineteenth and twenty-first chapters, but without interpreting the intervening prophecies other than to generally say that they "depict the fatal effects of trying to meet error with error," S. & H. 568:8,—confusion with disobedience. To those who followed her Word and understandingly kept step with her founding church symbols, this "highway" was a sustaining bridge above the morass of calamitous

\* None can gainsay the fact that she referred to her current published writings, which were available to all.

experience resultant upon personal leadership beneath. Mrs. Eddy did not interpret these intervening prophecies, inasmuch as her mission was to reveal the Word of *Science and Health* as the Lamb wedded to its Apocalyptic Bride in the *Key to the Scriptures*, and to found the three tabernacles of the Word: The Mother Church (typing the wilderness-Mother), the Extension (typing the marriage of the Bride and the Lamb in heaven), and the second (composite) Concord Branch (typing the descent to earth of this Bride embracing the Lamb-consciousness). The intervening prophecies that she sealed up with a warning (but without interpretation) were, therefore, the self-assumed responsibility of her unheeding followers, which prophecies her heeding followers, typed by the Lamb and his virgin host, escaped.

It is the followers of the impersonal Word, and not of Mrs. Eddy's personal teachings, unchronicled sayings, letters, and so forth (written at various stages of her revelation), who stand on "mount Sion" with an inner consciousness of the Word, as symbolized by the "Father's [Principle's] name written in their foreheads." It is the Branch-consciousness only that will be self-taught to the point of the fullness of the Word of *Science and Health* and will thus expandingly be enabled to consciously reach the subjectivity of the one who discerned, through inner healing, the "divine laws of Life, Truth, and Love," which she, in 1866 (nine years before writing *Science and Health*), named "Christian Science" (S. & H. 107:1-3), and of which she said, "Christian Science [is] as old as God," S. & H. 146, marginal topic. This "virgin" consciousness pleads through the Word, "Just take Me in! No *mass* for Me!"

### NO REJOICING IN DISOBEDIENCE

Thus, as was seen from the foregoing presentations, Mrs. Eddy, who dropped the veil of "time" over her church when she accepted the rôle of "Mother" in the Word (thereby assuming responsibility for objectively placing the church within the limits of "time," contrary to her subjective revelation that declared "there should be time no longer," Rev. 10:6), also with loving human hand temporarily provided for the bivouacking of her church in "The tents of Issachar" until the laggard consciousness of her followers should realize the eternal ("eternity") values of her *Manual* provisions, which terminated Motherhood (to which "time" alone belongs) at her passing. However, Mrs. Eddy's motherly provisions for the sustenance of the church until it awoke to the privilege of understanding obedience in

no sense extended to it the possibility of rejoicing in disobedience as a perversion of Moses' injunction to "Rejoice, . . . Issachar, in thy tents," inasmuch as Moses' prophecy was for the concurrent rejoicing of Issachar and Zebulun—"Zebulun, in thy going out" and "Issachar, in thy tents," and inasmuch as Issachar's prophesied period of rejoicing was during the three years' interim between the "going out" of Zebulun in the 1907 illuminations of the Word and the passing of Mrs. Eddy in 1910, when the "Tents of Issachar" likewise passed under the provisions of the *Manual*.

Even so, Issachar's prophesied rejoicing in his tents was a period of ignorance at which "God winked"—the Bible saying, "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent"—obey! Acts 17:30. This command is the purpose of this book in its erstwhile phase. Its latter phase, which we shortly approach, is applicable to the consciousness which has intelligently obeyed the "eternity" demands of the *Manual* by lovingly accepting the higher-than-Motherhood privilege, to which all the Field branches symbolically pre-subscribed when they participated with Mrs. Eddy in building the second Concord Branch as an expression of their unity on earth with the Bride of Mrs. Eddy's consciousness beyond Motherhood.

The difference between ignorant and knowing disobedience is strikingly presented in the contrast which Mrs. Eddy draws in her writings between a *midnight day* (*Poems* p. 26), as embodying the elements of previous Christian light followed in obedience to Truth's then highest demands up to the bridegroom's "midnight . . . bridal hour" (Mis. 276:15), and *daylight night*, in the stanza pertaining to the tenth picture, wherein Mrs. Eddy says, in seeming paradox, "*Today*, as oft, away from sin . . . Truth pleads *to-night*,"—illustrated by the picture itself in the symbolic representation of the noonday glory of Woman's revelation without, as resisted by the midnight darkness of disobedience within, the semblance of light seen in the latter's being but the artificiality of illusion.

Apropos to Mrs. Eddy's reference to "midnight day" in the Poem indited to the year 1865, as previously cited in this book, wherein she said of the assassination of Lincoln, "Chill was thy *midnight day*, while Justice grasped the sword to hold her throne, and on her altar our loved Lincoln's own great willing heart did lay" (his willingness showing the midnight struggle of Christianity for higher light), *Poems* p. 26, she places the "midnight day" of Christianity, in its highest



point of possible attainment, at the threshold of the "midnight hour" of her own bridal discernment (Ret. 23:7-24) of "the Christ Science or divine laws of Life, Truth, and Love," which she discovered at the dawn of 1866 and named "Christian Science," S. & H. 107:1-3. Thus the *midnight day* of obedience to advancing light led to the full-orbed glory of Christian Science.

Contrarily, the *daylight night* of disobedience, lightened only by its own artificial (in this sense legal) expedients, obstructs the light of progressive revelation, which "shineth in darkness; and the darkness [of disobedience] comprehended it not" and, therefore, does not hear the knock of the Woman at the door in the tenth picture pleading, "Just take Me [the demands of the completed Word] in! No mass [either ceremonial or ecclesiastically governed] for Me! [for I am the ever-present generic Idea which no ceremony could 'commemorate' and no ecclesiasticism govern. My final message is the living injunction that gives Me freedom to 'Rejoice . . . in . . . going out'—'Christian Scientists, be a law to yourselves!']"

Have not the branches, after being separated by this very injunction from their "father's [in this sense 'mother's'] house" in Joseph, done exactly what Joseph did, which resulted in only his "dead body" (deadness of idea) being *buried* in the "Promised Land"—that is, have they not *remembered* instead of "forgotten" their "father's [mother's] house" and so renewed their "toil," even at times being forced to make "bricks without straw" in the land of their thought-captivity?—for thought is captive when held within its "father's [mother's] house," since man, according to the Scriptures and as correlated by *Christ and Christmas*, is "without father, [and] without mother"!

Thus Mrs. Eddy's *Manual* provisions were the call of divine Principle to "The tents of Issachar"—to the acceptance of the privilege beyond Motherhood, expressed by Mrs. Eddy in 1885 (seven years before she requested her students to form The Mother Church to meet their own medial necessities) in the following words: "I know not what the person of omnipotence and omnipresence is, or what the infinite includes; therefore, I worship that of which I can conceive, *first*, as a loving Father and Mother; *then*, as thought ascends the scale of being to *diviner* consciousness, God becomes to me, as to the apostle who declared it, 'God is Love,'—divine Principle" (Mis. 96:8-15)—the impersonal Bride (Word, My. 125:26), within one's own consciousness.

To epitomize "The Tents of Issachar" in result: Although Mrs.

Eddy changed the statement concerning the mission of The Mother Church in 1902 (in the 29th *Manual*) to "reflect [only] in some degree the Church *Universal* and Triumphant," *Manual* p. 19,—in 1908, after The Mother Church had reached its heavenly goal as a basic Branch-idea in the Extension in 1906, she declared that "The Mother Church" had "blossomed into spiritual beauty, communion *universal* and divine," My. 141:28. And inasmuch as Mrs. Eddy had declared that The Mother Church could not reach this point of *universal* expression as The Mother Church, her statement was tantamount to declaring that The Mother Church had reached in the Extension its own branch (bridal) expression as the highest potentiality of Motherhood as Love. Thus The Mother Church through its own self Branch-idea "blossomed" to the end of fulfilling branch fruitage, for a vine neither blossoms nor fruits except through its own branches, and the field branches were never branches of The Mother Church. It will be remembered that The Mother Church was built solely by the students of Mrs. Eddy, while the Extension was built by the field of branches as a heavenly "family" idea within themselves, after which this inter-association was completely dissevered by Article XXIII, Section 1, second paragraph, and Section 6 of the *Manual*, as before presented. Thus the only link between the branches and The Mother Church was a common communion service, which was abolished in 1908, immediately after the disseverance of the branches (that had built the Extension as a heavenly "family" idea) from each other.

Therefore, the branches have no detachment from The Mother Church to accomplish but merely have to recognize their forever detachment. This recognition, alone, will bring "the tents of Issachar" (typed by the Extension, built by the heavenly branches) down to earth to "suck" with Zebulun "of the abundance of the seas, and of treasures hid in the sand," Deut. 33: 19, in fulfillment of Jacob's prophecy concerning Issachar and Zebulun.