

CHAPTER III GENERAL REVIEW

Why Stress the Intellectual?

Before going on to study the synonyms and the terms listed under each, let's review what we have seen so far.

Why is it necessary to stress the intellectual side more than the inspirational side in this study of the seven synonymous terms for God?

Mrs. Eddy uses "intellectual" in a positive way both in *Science and Health* and in *Prose Works*. In *Pulpit and Press*, vii:13 she speaks of our present time as "that advanced age, with its lenses of more spiritual mentality, indicating the gain of intellectual momentum, on the early footsteps of Christian Science. . . ." Christian Science is both intellectual and spiritual. It must be explained in order to be understood. As mentioned before, Mrs. Eddy has more than one hundred and twenty references to learn, learned, learning, learns, learner and learners in *Science and Health*, indicating that Science is something that must be learned.

Why Study the Seven Synonyms?

Nothing is more important than this study of the seven synonymous terms for God, since only a consciousness that is prepared can ultimately grasp Being's own decla-

ration and explanation of itself. God, the one Being—*what you are*, having “the kingdom of God within you”—has declared its nature and essence to be Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love. The central theme of Christian Science is the investigation of the meaning of these seven synonymous terms for God. In no other way can mankind find reality and the divine system of reference than through learning and assimilating the meaning of the seven synonymous terms. How do they operate? What is their purpose? How can we catch the meaning and spirit of these seven terms?

Why Are the Seven Synonymous Terms So Important to Us?

The seven synonymous terms depict our Being; and the ideas of those synonymous terms reflect our Mind. These seven terms are the groundwork, the basis, the elements of our being. What could be more important than the study of Being *that is our being*? When we become aware of this, we realize it would not be an economical use of our time to pursue other lines of thought or try to get answers to anything other than the question of the one Being that in reality is our being. This must be established at the outset. When consciousness is engaged in the contemplation of the seven synonymous terms it is pursuing the only line that is beneficially productive. Nothing else really matters, as pioneers like Doorly, Kappeler and other earnest students saw.

Is the human mind or the brain a factor?

No. Mrs. Eddy took the giant step out of the mental into the one Mind. She introduced the great fact, the great proposition, *that Mind, your true Mind, is All*, and Mind reproduces all, meaning that all is Mind, God's own Mind which has nothing to do with the human brain, human thinking, and therefore nothing to do with thought concentration, with mortal thought activity, thought manipulation, etc.

The insightfulness that leads us to contemplate the seven synonymous terms—which constitute God, our Being—is a totally spiritual realm. Since the seven stand for the infinite One, contemplating them simultaneously detaches and turns our thought away from the limited realm of human thinking, material thinking.

There Are Not Two Planes

Are there two planes—the spiritual and the material?

No. A student might say, "But I am still living in this world; I have a family to support; I have responsibilities."

He feels it is all right to think about the spiritual, but doesn't see that the spiritual has a connection with his present situation on the human material plane. This kind of statement indicates the student thinks there are two great self-existent entities or realities in being—a spiritual reality on the one hand, and a material or human reality on the other, and that in some mysterious way these two must be connected. It reveals the student hasn't understood the *facts* concerning the human realm and the spiritual realm. Blessed is the per-

son who sees the need, recognizes his responsibilities and actively becomes the answer.

Christian Science teaches that if we stay with the spiritual and only with the spiritual—if we go out from God, from the one Being, the seven synonymous terms—we are going out from the fact that God, our true being, is the All and the Only. Because it is the All and the Only it will take care of everything that exists in that All and Only. It will by itself take care of what happens on any level of experience that is lower, spiritually, than the wholly spiritual level. “In divine Science,” Mrs. Eddy states, “God is One and All; and, governing Himself, He, (meaning our own Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth and Love) governs the universe” (*Mis.* 258:13). God, infinite good, Principle, by governing Himself, governs also man, the reflection, as a lower level of experience. The higher controls the lower, the lesser.

There Are Not Two Realms

If we see this, namely, that the spiritual is the higher in the hierarchy of these levels—where the lowest level of experience is the material, which is the unreal, hypnotic suggestion, illusion, while a little higher is the human level, the mental, the psychic level of experience, and on top is the spiritual level—then we see that the higher, the spiritual, controls the lesser. This answers the question, “How does the spiritual realm relate to the mental and physical realm? What connection does the spiritual have with my present situation on the human material plane?” We see now that there are not two realms. The spiritual

controls the human and material—*it sees the material doesn't exist*. This is the great teaching that is unique to Christian Science. *There is no matter, no material realm*, except in belief, in error, hypnotic suggestion. There is only one Being, and in that one Being, the only reality is the spiritual. This spiritual reality is controlling the lower levels of experience, and so we begin to see that the mental and the material, these lower levels, are just opaque states of the human mind that resist the spiritual, and hinder its shining through our true consciousness, which in reality is “the kingdom of God within [us].”

Where Are Our Priorities?

We have to give our whole attention to the real. Where are our priorities? Do we give precedence to the spiritual, the divine? Or does our consciousness concentrate on the human, the material? Are we willing to set our priorities right? Do we have the courage—and it takes courage—to become totally engaged with the one Being, the seven synonymous terms, and learn what they mean? Is this foremost in our consciousness, in our heart?

In all honesty each one must ask himself this question. Without this genuine and sincere commitment to the one Being, the seven synonymous terms for God, we will never reap the fruits of the spiritual. We cannot pursue other lines of thought and expect to gather a spiritual harvest. We must give the spiritual our all. *It is that little extra that makes the professional* and distinguishes him from the amateur. Do that little extra! Only then will you succeed.

That little extra means making sure we are honest and consistent in our attitude. *Do I really believe that being is only spiritual?* Or is this just a religious belief? This is a question each one must answer for himself.

If we see that only the spiritual is eternal, that Spirit alone is infinite, then we will ask, “Why should I devote myself to the human and material—to anything outside the spiritual? Why should I dedicate myself to that which is limited in time, limited in space, in capacity, in possibilities, in faculties? Why should I dedicate myself to that which is not leading me anywhere?” If we actually believe that being is eternal then we will channel our devotion, our time and energy toward an understanding of the one Being.

This takes courage. Looking at the big calibers in the spiritual realm, like Jesus, Mrs. Eddy, St. Paul, or Martin Luther, we marvel at their great courage. They had to have it to carry out their mission. So do we.

The Seven Synonyms Become Our Being

Devoting ourselves to the investigation of our true nature is an awesome, inspiring adventure, leading us to the understanding that our true nature is the nature of the seven synonymous terms—Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love. We soon find that it is the pearl without price, and we feel it is a great privilege to have the textbook that teaches us the nature of our true being through an understanding of the seven synonymous terms for God. These are the “few things” which if we are faithful over them, will make us ruler over many. Here

we have such a few things—only seven synonyms—but if we are faithful over those few things they will make us master over everything.

These “few things” may seem at the beginning to be just terms, but actually they are our being, our true being, our eternal being. Once we incorporate them into consciousness, they take over and become our being; they are no longer something objective, something “out there” that we study. *This is why Mrs. Eddy could say, “We will find ourself Life, Truth, Love when we understand them”* (S&H, first edition).

Mrs. Eddy indicated that these seven terms were the basis of her Science; and we can see it is only when we have a correct grasp of these seven synonymous terms that we can build a real Science on them. We can’t build a spiritual Science on anything other than the seven synonymous terms for God. In order to build a Science on them we must feel them *living* within us; they must become real identities of being within us; then they become a perpetual revelation. “The kingdom of God is within you.” Having submitted ourselves to the unremitting discipline that culturing the seven synonyms requires, our reward is unceasing revelation. These seven terms contain within themselves the power to reveal new insights, to reveal the Science of being.

“Science Reveals”

A further step in revelation is never something external or objective that we must grasp or get hold of. Revelation is something within one’s own consciousness.

“The kingdom of God is within you,” and it begins to grow out of itself. Therefore Mrs. Eddy says “*Science reveals*,” not “God reveals.” Once these seven synonymous terms consciously become our own being they build up within ourselves an ever-growing, ever-revealing Science. Being has no end, neither does revelation. This is the fruit and offspring that an intelligent culturing of the seven synonyms bears. “The kingdom of God is within you.”

Is there a shortcut? No, the meaning and substance of the seven synonymous terms must be mastered by each individual student. We can't circumvent or escape this task, this privilege. It would be a vain attempt, since in an understanding of the seven synonymous terms lies the key to the whole Science of being.

How We Become the Seven Synonymous Terms

This is not a merely academic study, but a study which concerns the core of our being. If one is interested in any other subject, say in trees, or in butterflies or beetles, he will always study that subject as an object, an object over there. If he is interested in trees, he studies trees, but he never becomes a tree. *But if one is interested in the very being of the seven synonymous terms he BECOMES the seven synonymous terms.* The energy we put into the study of the seven synonyms is not being put into an object outside of ourselves. The seven synonymous terms become our own state of being, as we enter into the consciousness of the one Being, since “the kingdom of God is within [us].” We *are* these seven synonymous terms and through our study *we become aware of what we are.*

Our study builds up a new consciousness. It is not only a new consciousness about something; it is the new consciousness of our being, of what we are. It is the consciousness of the “kingdom of God within,” which expresses the new man. It is a completely new concept of God—Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love—and of man—our full and final reflection.

Because consciousness determines our world experience, naturally an investigation into the subject of the one Being brings us a different world picture, a different world image, a different world experience. Thus we are considering here a subject of enormous and far-reaching consequences.

Do We Apply the Seven Synonyms?

We hear students say, “I study the seven synonymous terms but I don’t know how to apply them. How can I apply them? How can I make them practical?”

The question “How can I apply the seven synonymous terms?” is a wrong question. You can’t apply the seven synonyms like you apply a poultice, and watch what it does to the problem. The seven synonyms are just words, just concepts, until we begin to understand them, that is, until they become subjective within consciousness, become more and more our own consciousness, our whole attitude of life. Our consciousness determines our life experience; if the seven synonymous terms have become our consciousness they apply themselves. It is all a matter of culturing our consciousness in an *understanding* of

the seven synonyms; then they become our consciousness, *and they apply themselves.*

Contemplate the wonder that results from filling consciousness with an understanding of the seven synonymous terms. The impact of this understanding generates a capability that governs both man and the universe. We don't have to take our knowledge of the seven and plaster it on a situation. *We only experience what we have in our own consciousness.* If we build up in consciousness the true nature of being, and understand this nature of being, as "incorporeal, divine, supreme, infinite Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth and Love," we no longer ask, "How can I apply it?" It will apply itself.

You may not even like how your new consciousness applies itself. That wonderful, pure, spiritual state of consciousness will begin to remove and banish all those human characteristics that obstruct our attainment of true spirituality. It will do this even if we don't like it. The spiritual idea will countenance no error, no quality of error. It will remove all that is offensive to the spiritual idea.

We will see that the spiritual atmosphere we build up is the Christ to every situation. It is the savior, the solution, the resolving power to every situation. Know, then, that as the seven synonymous terms become your consciousness and expel all materiality, they become your Christ, your savior. They will take care of you, lead you, define your mission, open your vision to a whole new frame of reference. They will prepare the way so you can go forward unharmed.

This is the answer to, "How do I apply it?"

Mrs. Eddy's References to Application

Mrs. Eddy does speak of application, but in a very different way. The only application is to see that we are at one with the seven synonymous terms. It is not applying the seven synonymous terms to a problem. We must become synchronized with the whole tone of Truth. This is our application, and our practice. We must get into the tone and rhythm of it and let those seven synonymous terms work for us.

The Synonymity Principle

Our first tool in getting the tone and rhythm of the seven synonyms is the synonymity principle. The synonymity principle is a question of language. Nobody really knows how language came into existence. The first human being must have had a small vocabulary, but we do not know yet how language developed.

It is thought that the first word was "ma." This seems to be the first word a child can pronounce. All over the world we have "ma ma" for mother. Gradually that first sound was modified to take on new meanings. From there, other sounds were added and new meanings were attached to those sounds as the language developed further, but some of the most important words we have today still hark back to that root word "ma," like mater (mother) and matter. Through the synonymity of the word "ma" we had the development of the whole language.

Most linguists agree the synonymity principle ruled the development of the language. This means that from a

small vocabulary, or perhaps just one or two words, an expansion took place. Different shades of the meaning of “ma” developed, and with every new shade something new could be expressed. By the differentiation of those shades people could build up quite a large vocabulary, giving us the instruments for communication and for the identification of many different things.

For example, at the beginning, when language was concerned primarily with material objects, perhaps the symbol “tree” stood for all trees. Then from “tree” came the further shadings of various kinds of trees—oak, pine, fir, maple trees, etc. Maybe at first there was only a general symbol for animal, but that gradually expanded through new shadings into various kinds of animals.

Here we see that the principle of synonymity results in one word with a general meaning and many synonyms surrounding it, all referring to that one general term, but differentiating in some way from that general term.

This is the same principle Mrs. Eddy used. She had one term for the whole of Being, namely God, or Being. But she saw one can express that one Being in different ways; it can be seen from different angles, but always remaining the one Being, never changing into something else. The seven synonyms are just different accentuations of the one Being, according to the need or the requirements of the situation under consideration.

This shows us the synonymous terms are always overlapping with the general meaning. You have the term “tree.” Then you have “oak” or “pine,” but these terms still denote trees, so they overlap with the general term

“tree,” but showing an oak or pine as a special kind of tree. It is the same with Being or God; the seven synonymous terms are always overlapping with the general meaning of what you divinely are as Being or God. They never diverge or deviate from being aspects of the infinite One, of being all that the infinite One is.

Why We Need Aspects of the One

Why do we need different aspects of the One? Doesn't this make it more complicated? Why not just go back to the original, and only say Being, or God?

Without the seven aspects we would have no differentiation; and we could not communicate the exact meaning of that term, Being, and we could not build an exact Science on it. A Science demands differentiated and identified concepts to build on. These concepts must be so clearly differentiated from each other that they form identity units, units that are very exact, very defined, each with a clear-cut value. Only on such a basis or foundation can a *system* be built, can a *Science* be built.

A linguist in explaining the synonymy principle might take the term “to die” as an example that lends itself to an easy explanation of the synonymy of words.

To early man death must have been a mysterious and perplexing experience and they no doubt had a term that meant to die. Today we have a few dozen synonymous terms for it which we use in a discriminating or perhaps delicate way. A dictionary of synonyms will show the great variety of terms in use to express this concept of “to die.” These might include, for example: to breathe

one's last; cease to live; depart this life; to end one's days; to be no more; to go off; to drop off; to pop off; to peg out; to lose one's life; to drop dead; drop into the grave; close one's eyes; to give up the ghost; to make the great change; to take one's last sleep; to go the way of all flesh; to kick the bucket; to hop the twig; to turn up one's toes; to join the great majority; to go west; to have had it; to pass away; or to cross the Styx; to de cease; draw the last breath; to pay the debt of nature; go to the eternal rest; reach the Stygian shore; partake of the great adventure; to expire; to pass on; to hand in one's checks; to perish; to go to the happy hunting ground; shuffle off this mortal coil, etc.

Synonymous Terms Not Freely Interchangeable

These synonymous terms are not freely interchangeable. We can see these expressions all have one common denominator, namely, to die, and yet they give different shadings. If instead of saying "he died" we use one of these synonyms, a new meaning is brought in. We give to the sense of dying a specific meaning when we take a synonym for it.

Care must be exercised with regard to which synonym one takes. A pastor giving a burial ceremony must be careful which synonym he chooses out of the above list. He would hardly say, "Mr. A turned up his toes two days ago," or "he pegged out." The pastor must choose an expression that suits the occasion and is adapted to his point of view. He must choose those expressions that fit into the philosophy or religious concepts he holds.

Here we have a great field, the great array of terms, all meaning ‘to die,’ and according to the angle from which the subject is viewed there are overlapping synonymous terms referring to it.

You can see that you fill in this term, “to die,” according to what you bring in from the outside. If it is a gangland murder you might say “he perished like a dog.” If it’s a Baptist funeral the minister says “Brother Ben has gone to heaven.” The term changes according to the new field that is brought in. The more aspects we bring in, the greater will be the number of synonyms, but you can also see the terms are not freely interchangeable; the pastor must be careful which term he chooses for his burial ceremony so as not to alienate his flock.

We are dealing with a similar proposition in our work with the seven synonymous terms for God. Here, again, we have a common array surrounding a common term, God. According to the angle or view from which we are speaking we may say “Mind” or “Spirit” or “Soul” instead of “God,” focusing on different aspects, but always meaning the whole of God.

Defining the Terms of an Infinite Subject

Another unique approach Mrs. Eddy took to the Science of being was to choose a rare and exceptional way for defining a term. It is an unmatched, unparalleled approach.

In any other science, and in everyday language, when a term is defined, it is exclusive. When a dictionary defines “chair” the definition given is so specific it could

not be confounded with a table even though both have four legs. In ordinary language a definition always defines; it makes definite, but it also makes finite. The meaning is limited to that one thing, so there is no possibility of confusing it with something else, under that term.

Mrs. Eddy couldn't use this ordinary method of defining words because her subject was *infinite, the infinite One*. Her subject could not be finitized; it could not be defined or limited so that it is distinguishable from something else, because it is always, ultimately, everything. This forced Mary Baker Eddy to find a completely new way of defining terms like God, or the infinite One, through synonymous terms, a way not allowed in the ordinary way of giving definitions.

People who have been in Christian Science and who have slid more into the mystical line of Christian Science feel that a God who is infinite cannot be defined because it is not possible to give a definition of something that is infinite. They contend that every definition limits the infinite. They therefore eschew defining God, or Being, on the grounds that it is impossible to define the infinite with finite terms. This seems logical to them, because it is based on the way definitions are used in other fields of science.

Mrs. Eddy Found a Unique Way

Mrs. Eddy found a very unique way around this problem, by using the principle of synonymity with an array of defining terms that all mean the infinite. *Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love all mean the infinite*. They never mean less than the infinite, and yet they

show the possibility of differentiation—of differentiation according to the aspect or the approach that is used for defining or describing the infinite.

This is the principle of synonymy. We have God, our true being, as an infinite subject, but we can define this one God through seven synonymous terms which are not outside of that term “God.” The synonyms are inside the field of “God” and always mean the whole, even though from a differentiated standpoint.

If we define God through the seven synonymous terms, and each synonymous term means the infinite, then (*and this is the important point*) each synonymous term can only be defined rightly through the other synonymous terms. One synonymous term cannot stand by itself. By itself it is never a concept, defining God. Each synonymous term is only defined when it is defined through all the other synonymous terms, which are “the kingdom of God . . . within you.”

Take Life, for instance. When you say God is Life, or Life is God, then you must define Life through all the seven synonymous terms because only that is Life which is at the same time Mind, and at the same time Spirit, Soul, Principle, Truth, and Love. If it isn’t all seven of the synonymous terms it isn’t Life.

This is a completely new and unique way of defining terms. A house, table, or chair would never be defined through synonymous terms, but through its own characteristics. A house can be a house without having any relationship with a synonymous term for house. It is not so in the Science of being.

In the Science of being we have an infinite subject and then have the difficulty of defining that infinite subject without making it finite. If we define that infinite through the seven synonymous terms, that is still only one step, the primal step. Next we would have to ask, "What is Mind?"

The answer would be that Mind is Spirit, it is Soul, it is Principle, it is Life, it is Truth, and it is Love. That would have to be the first answer in defining Mind. The synonymy principle says, if you have a synonym for God, it is at once synonymous with all the other synonymous terms. There is no Mind without Spirit, without Soul, without Principle, without Life, without Truth, without Love. It is only when we define Mind through the seven synonyms that we have the infinite concept of Mind.

Differentiation

Throwing a stone into a pond makes a ripple leading to a second ripple, a third ripple, going out and out into more and more detail. If we have Mind, we can also ask, "What does the term Mind itself mean?" We are then asking, "What are the characteristics of Mind that differentiate Mind from Spirit?" Thus we come to differentiation.

We saw that in order to define a synonymous term for God we have to define it through all the other synonymous terms, but if we define Mind through Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love, the next question is, "How does Mind differentiate itself from Spirit and Soul, if we

have to define Mind through Spirit and through Soul?"

These questions bring us to a further ripple in our system, where we have to see how each synonymous term differentiates itself from every other synonymous term. Here we get *differentiation* within the oneness. This is not found in any other science. Mrs. Eddy had to find an original and totally new way to define Being because she was dealing with an infinite subject, a subject that couldn't be limited in any way.

The differentiation of the synonymous terms is brought out in the ideas that characterize them. Each synonymous term has its own characteristics, attributes, and qualities, and as we go on in this book we will explore these, for each of the seven synonymous terms.

A Great Step Forward

It was a great step forward when Doorly, in his investigation of the textbook, asked himself, "What differentiates Mind from Spirit, though they are related to the same thing, namely to God?" and he and his students began to study those ideas that differentiate each synonymous term from every other synonymous term.

The synonyms are all related to the infinite One, and yet they are differentiated. We first have God as a general term, then overlapping it are the seven synonymous terms, again all being God itself—for there is nothing outside of God, nothing in addition to God. These seven synonyms, or seven aspects, all bring out the nature of God.

Then we see how each synonymous term is differentiated by the ideas, qualities, attributes that characterize

it in a specific way. We can then see that every idea of each synonymous term is also synonymous with God. We never leave the field of the one Being. Even if we analyze the synonyms for God into their ideas, we find that each idea must be synonymous with every other idea of all the other synonymous terms. This is clear, because they never leave the infinite.

How Christian Science is a “New Tongue”

This is what distinguishes our Christian Science language from ordinary everyday language; and this gives rise to a difficulty—a great difficulty—because we live with our everyday language and use it constantly.

In everyday language the terms we use are not synonymous. In everyday language we have the term God, but everybody defines this term in his own way. There is no definitive definition of God, and each one means something different when he uses the term God. In everyday ordinary language our synonymous terms for God—Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love—are not capitalized, and what they stand for in ordinary language does not make them synonymous with God. Nor are mind, spirit, soul, principle, life, truth, and love synonymous with each other as they are used in everyday ordinary language. When a natural scientist speaks about his principle, that principle is not synonymous with soul, or with love. In everyday language these terms are not synonymous.

This distinction also applies to the ideas, qualities, and attributes characterizing the seven synonymous terms. In

the Science of being, these, too, are synonymous. If we take intelligence as an idea of Mind in Christian Science, and take joy as an idea of Soul, we find that intelligence and joy are synonymous because each refers to a synonymous term, and the synonymous terms refer to God. But this is not so in ordinary language.

This is a big hurdle for us. We must master a completely new language in Christian Science, a language that has a different meaning and content than ordinary language. Though we are using the same terms we must constantly shift to a different meaning when we are talking in Christian Science, in the new tongue, where every term, in the last analysis, is synonymous with God, since we know nothing exists apart from God, the infinite One.

Why Don't We Have a New Language?

Someone might ask, "Why don't we have a new language, a specific terminology such as any other science would use?" In biology or cybernetics, for instance, they use new terms to express the new ideas they bring out. They coin or form new words, often going back to the Greek or Latin to form new words, such as cybernetics (which meant steersman in the Greek). Then they give each word a definition which must be learned.

Why didn't Mrs. Eddy, or why don't we, invent a new language like natural scientists do—one that brings out the meaning that we want to bring out, which is so distinct from ordinary language that it can't be mistaken?

Naturally, Mrs. Eddy could have done that. She could have coined new words from the Greek and Latin that

would have been distinct and unmistakable in bringing out her meaning. But we are glad she didn't do it, because using the terminology she did, enabled her to build a bridge between everyday experience and the new teaching of Christian Science.

Capitalization

But Mary Baker Eddy had to do something about the new terminology to set it apart from the ordinary meaning the world gives to "mind," "spirit," "soul," "principle," "life," "truth" and "love." Capitalizing her synonyms for God was an easy way to introduce seven new meanings. This capitalization was only useful, of course, for the *written* word. This leaves the spoken word in Christian Science inadequate until such time as we have a common agreement that when we use certain terms we know at once whether they are capitalized or uncapitalized.

Mrs. Eddy created a new terminology, characterized by its use of capitalized terms in the written word, and in the spoken word by terms that sound familiar but have completely different meanings. In order to understand the textbook we must learn this new language.

We think human language developed—perhaps over a period of a million years—from maybe a single syllable into many variations, finally generating thousands of words. The language Mrs. Eddy introduced was built in the opposite way. Instead of going out from a single syllable, a single finite idea, and adding to it, she went out from the whole, namely, from the term God, from the most

comprehensive sense. She said, "There is one Being. I'll take in the one Being in one term, God. Then I will break down that one term, just like Moses broke down his vision on the Mount, and gave the Commandments." She broke down her vision of God, analyzing it through the seven synonyms. She then had seven aspects of the whole, identified by the use of capital letters, to mark them as distinct from the old usage.

Speaking In New Tongues

Mary Baker Eddy's new language, the language of Spirit, does not stop with the seven capitalized terms, of course. Mrs. Eddy again broke those seven down by characterizing each one through specific ideas. Therefore—*and this is an important point*—each one of those ideas, like intelligence, law, cause, guidance; ideas like unfoldment, order, fruit, etc., all the ideas that characterize the seven synonymous terms, mean something completely different from what they mean in ordinary language. Because this is the language that has been deduced from God through the principle of synonymy, each one of these ideas is synonymous with all seven of the synonymous terms and the seven are synonymous with God. Each of these ideas therefore gathers a totally different meaning than we have for that term in ordinary language.

We are now engaged in learning the *method* of culturing ourselves in a new language. It is a language that was not built up humanly. It is the divine language that was deduced from the one God. It is the language of Spirit. Even if we use, as symbols, such human language terms

as law, creator, cause, order, unfoldment, identity, etc., we are speaking the language of Spirit, because Mrs. Eddy has given these terms a new meaning, a divine meaning. We are “speaking in new tongues.”

If we would speak in new tongues, in the language of Spirit, we must be aware that it is the language of God, and is not the human language. It is the only language that Being understands, and that Being speaks. Training ourselves in this new language takes a lifetime, but it is necessary if we are to address the one and only question that is important, namely, our Being.

The One-Value Language

This language of Spirit has another quality; it is a one-value language. It is a language that has only one value. It is completely free from a dualistic sense, from the two-value logic. We will come back to this theme of the one-value logic as we go on, and we will explain the importance of it.

We can see that when we speak this new language of Spirit we always go out from God. We see that God is the only One, and is never dualistic. Therefore everything we say, with reference to being, has the same nature as God Itself. It never has an opposite nature. It is never dualistic. This is why it reasons only in the one-value logic. The human language always reasons in the two-value logic, giving reality to evil, to God’s counterfeits, as well as to God, good, but *the one-value logic gives value only to good.*

Human reasoning, up to very recently, has always been dualistic. The human mind can only reason in opposite values: something is either high or it is low; it is either great or it is small; it is either right or it is wrong; it is either dead or alive; it is either true or it is false. The human mind always considers both aspects of something. It is dualistic. It says something is right but everything else is wrong. It has two realms and classifies one realm against the other realm. It at all times has in view a dual realm, one realm opposed to the other realm. Out of that dualism we have reaped the characteristics of the human mind which is constantly at war with itself, constantly engaged in strife and struggle, with its counter views and counter powers. It is always a battle.

Training Ourselves in the Language of Spirit

Not so with the language of Spirit. If we train ourselves in the language of Spirit we think only in the one-value of Being. Spirit is the only. It has no dualism. It only speaks about the one and only Being. Training ourselves in the language of Spirit, we only think in terms of the one value of Being, and we use *the one-value logic that maintains good is real and evil is unreal; evil is not a value*. Nothing opposite to Spirit enters our calculation, our thinking. In the spiritual language we never run against something. There Life is the real, death is the unreal, the illusion; Love is the real, its opposite is unreal; order is real, disorder is unreal; intelligence is real, ignorance is unreal, illusion. Error of any kind is not a real value. Only that which comes from God, good, is a real value.

The study of the synonymous terms brings us an entirely different inner consciousness or attitude because we realize there is only one Being; “the kingdom of God is within you,” and everything has to be explained as within that one Being—from the standpoint of being within that one Being. Whatever the term is—even if it is a counterfeit, a nothingness, such as sickness, or the sum total of human misery, or sin, disease, death—whatever the term is—in the language of Spirit it must find its explanation in the one Being, or we have not found our answer in the synonymous terms.

Resolving the Dualistic Sense — Restructuring, Reculturing Our Consciousness

What we are trying to achieve in a practical way is something big, something unparalleled in human history. Through learning the synonymous terms and their ideas, and their further implications, *we will resolve the dualistic sense within ourselves*. As we will see, *Spirit means “the only;”* this is why this new language is called the language of Spirit. It is wholly good and has no dualistic sense within itself.

The practical use of studying the seven synonymous terms is now evident. It means that *we are beginning the reculturing of our consciousness, the restructuring of our consciousness*. The old human language with its dualistic values, where we thought, for instance, that good was real but evil was a reality also, is being replaced. We are now establishing consciously, through discipline and through exercise, a completely new consciousness. This

new consciousness always flows out from the one God, the one Being. The seven synonymous terms are still the one Being, because each synonymous term is one, and from there we still look out to the infinite ideas characterizing these seven synonymous terms, which are still one and are synonymous with God. *This new consciousness can only think in one-value logic where intelligence is a value, but ignorance is unreal and is no value; good is real and is a value, but evil is unreal and is not a value; life is real, and is a value, but death is unreal, illusory, and is not a value, etc.*

Reeducating Our Consciousness

We are going to reeducate ourselves in this new language. The implications of this reeducation are stupendous. *A billion-year tradition ingrained in our consciousness must be changed.* The mortal, human way of thinking must be supplanted and superseded with the divine way. To rid ourselves of dualistic thinking, our consciousness must be restructured, reeducated, and recultured consciously.

Reeducating our consciousness will be a step by step program. Step one, as we said, will be devoted to “concept building”—the building of new concepts.

If suddenly we are faced with Mind, capital “M,” instead of mind with a small “m;” Spirit, instead of spirit; Soul, instead of soul; Principle instead of principle, we must know what these capitalized terms mean. *We must get a clear “concept” of the terms Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love.*

Concept Building

We will start with Mind, which, before we build it up through our meticulous study of it in Science and Health, is just an empty shell. We are going to build it up with concepts that are adequate, and when the shell is full, when that concept is full, we will see that the concept has the nature of an idea; it is now clear, but it is still a concept. We will have clarified to the human mind a concept of one of the seven synonymous terms. This is called *concept* building. Thereafter when someone says Mind, we know whether the speaker means Mind with a capital "M," or is referring to mind with a small "m." When Mind is meant we now have a concept that is full. We know, too, that the speaker and the listener give the same meaning to Mind with a capital "M." They both speak the same language now, because of this concept building program that was undertaken.

Once we have this true concept we can go to the second stage: *tonality* building, or tonality culture, where we culture those concepts until they become a tone within us, a tone of consciousness that is independent of terms. Tonality building gets rid of the concepts by replacing the concepts with just hearing the tone of these synonymous terms. Then, when someone says Mind, and you know it is Mind with a capital M, you don't recount and enumerate all the qualities, attributes, and ideas that characterize Mind, but you just know the tone, Mind. It is now a tone that is independent of all the ideas characterizing that term. This means tone-building enables us

to drop that burdensome list of ideas we built up during concept building. We just have the tone.

Tonality Building

Once we have the tone, that tone is really much bigger than the list of ideas we had before in the concept-building activity, because when we have the tone we can hear and see Mind even where those specific terms that we learned characterized Mind do not appear. In the Bible, for instance, many of the words we found in Science and Health as characterizing the seven synonymous terms do not appear, yet the tone of them is there and is discernable to thought cultured in the tones. The terms Soul and Principle do not appear in the Bible, but the tone is there. If we have the tonality of the seven synonymous terms we free ourselves of the individual terms characterizing the concept of Mind and of Spirit, etc., and yet get a much bigger sense of what the seven synonymous terms mean.

This is tonality building. When we have mastered tonality building we can read the textbook quite differently. We will be able to read the Bible intelligently, and other books as well, and we will also see nature and happenings differently, because we have *a tonality-cultured consciousness*. We will have within ourselves what we might call a divine consciousness grid, with which we can scan practically everything within our life experience, and give those experiences proper interpretation. The Bible, the textbook, and our life experiences will all find new interpretation.

Consciousness-being Building

When we have mastered this tonality building we will go to a third stage, to a stage of *consciousness-being building*; that is, to being conscious of those seven synonymous terms as our own being. In this stage we are culturing ourselves into *being* those seven synonymous terms. This is not just having a knowledge of them as though they existed somewhere objectively, as something we can look at and think about. This means knowing them *as our own being*, and seeing there is no discrepancy between the one Being and our being. The one Being is actually our beingness.

This third step is again a stage we can culture with various methods until we feel *we are the very being of the synonymous terms*. This is the big picture of what we want to do, and it starts with concept building.

What Concept Building Involves

Thinking has to do with concepts. Concepts are experienced and symbolized through words—that is why we need language—in order to convey the message of concepts. At first mankind had concepts about objects, material objects. Only during the last twenty-five hundred years or so has mankind begun to think about spiritual concepts, or rather immaterial concepts.

We know from experience it is easier to teach children the meaning of words that define an object than to teach them the meaning of immaterial, unbodied words

such as honesty. Honesty is not an object a child can see and touch. You can't show him a picture in a book to explain it. You have to go through the procedure of telling the child a story which embodies the concept of honesty. Fairytales are used to transmit moral and ethical concepts. We have to build up such immaterial concepts as honesty, justice, mercy, generosity, kindness, etc. in a round-about way. We have to build up a whole situation which incorporates the non-material concept, and out of which that concept can be seen. From that point on the child knows what is meant by the term honesty.

We get the true concept of the seven synonymous terms in much the same way. We can't just say, "Well, here is Mind." Mind isn't something we can see. We must build up a whole story that brings out the tone of Mind. Words are used as symbols for concepts but a word is never the concept itself. To build up the real concept we need to use these terms to build a bridge between our understanding and the true idea—between the meaning and the term, the symbol. The term is never the thing itself. The seven synonymous terms are only symbols that stand for a whole concept. Terms that characterize ideas are only symbols. Only when we can fill that term with enough other terms to build up the concept, have we achieved something.

How Mrs. Eddy Uses the Term: Concept

It is interesting to see in the *Concordance* how Mary Baker Eddy uses the term "concept." We get the feeling that this term is a bridge Mrs. Eddy uses in order to bridge over from a material object to a spiritual concept. For in-

stance, we know the life story of Jesus, and in this regard, Mrs. Eddy says Jesus was the “highest human corporeal concept [note “corporeal concept;” corporeal concept of what?] of the divine idea.” Building up a true concept, a perfect concept, is the help that is necessary in order to understand ideas.

We need ideas to form a complete presentation of a concept. In another reference Mrs. Eddy says, “wait patiently for divine Love to move upon the waters of mortal mind, and form the perfect concept.” It is not just forming a concept that is important, apparently, but forming a perfect concept. And what is a perfect concept? A perfect concept would be to fill the empty shell of a term with all those terms necessary to make that initial term clear enough to form a complete perfect concept.

Just to anticipate what we are going to do, take the word intelligence. It is a term, a word. But what does it mean? In order to have “the perfect concept” of intelligence—what the word intelligence means—we have to fill the word intelligence with all those qualities which we attribute to intelligence, which are necessary in order to be the perfect concept of intelligence. This will necessitate the blending of ideas. For example, intelligence is only intelligence when its origin is in Mind and not in brain, it is only intelligence when it is spiritual and not material (and here we have given it a characteristic of Spirit), it is only intelligence when it reflects Soul, and we see that it is invariable and changeless, and doesn’t come and go. Thus we take in all that makes intelligence a perfect concept instead of an imperfect concept.

Human language says “intelligence” is a matter of using your brain, for instance, or intelligence is something we gain through academic study. For us, in Christian Science, that is an imperfect concept. We build the perfect concept of intelligence by blending intelligence with all the other ideas of the seven synonymous terms. Only when it is blended with all the other ideas can we say we have the true concept of intelligence, the perfect concept.

When Intelligence is An Idea of God

You can see what is necessary. Instead of just having a term individually defined, we must in our work gain the perfect concept, and it is only a perfect concept for us when it is synonymous with all other ideas. To have the perfect concept we must use the principle of synonymity, because intelligence is only intelligence when it reflects all other ideas of Mind, and also reflects all the ideas of Spirit, of Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love. Then intelligence is a perfect concept; and when we have the perfect concept we call it idea. Then we say intelligence is an idea of God.

Here again we can see the principle of synonymity. We say intelligence is an idea of God, and God is Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love, therefore intelligence must be an idea of Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love. Then, because these seven synonymous terms are each characterized by numerous ideas, intelligence must also reflect all the ideas representing Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love, otherwise it isn't an idea.

This is the great difference between our language and everyday language. This is why we must learn to blend the ideas, and this can only be done through exercises in blending the ideas. Gradually, through practice and drilling, we will be able to form the perfect concept.

How We Get “Idea”

When we have the perfect concept we have an idea; it is no longer a term, a word, or a symbol, but it attains the true meaning of idea.

The lists we make of the words characterizing the seven synonymous terms (as we go through Science and Health) are only concepts at first. For us they are not yet idea because we still have not filled them with the blendings, so they have not at this stage attained the status of the perfect concept. We start out with a list of terms and ideas but this is only the beginning of the synonym study. We first become aware of how to use this initial stage right, and second, how to build on it.

We first engage in filling a concept with its content so the word is not just an empty shell.

How Concept Building Evolved in Christian Science

If we go back to the Old Testament we won't find the seven synonymous terms. The Bible was speaking about the infinite One and was insisting there is only one God, but of course people used terms limited to their culture—the crude symbols of nature and of their environment. At that time the people in Israel didn't know much about

spiritual rationality. It wasn't possible for them to explain God with immaterial concepts, so they used words like the Lord, or Saboth, the Lord of Hosts (the general who leads the army). We feel in Saboth a sense of Principle—Saboth directs the whole army—but these people didn't know the term Principle or Mind, as a synonym for God, and the term Spirit only enters here and there as “the Spirit of God.”

Then we come to the New Testament, which had the impress of the Greek culture. Around 333 BC Alexander the Great brought Greek culture to Palestine where it began to mold the culture in that part of the world. A century before Jesus, the Romans came and added their culture.

With the impact of the Greek and Roman culture the writers of the New Testament began to use terms like Life, Truth, and even Love as terms for God. In some ways even their use of Spirit could be seen to refer to God, but these terms were never *used* the way Mrs. Eddy uses them, as big capitalized terms.

Mary Baker Eddy—the Most Scientific Being in History

For a long time Christianity got along with just the term God, without defining what God is. This of course resulted in the splitting up into many sects and denominations in our Christian history.

Then came Mrs. Eddy. She was the first one to ask: “Can't God be defined so there is one definition for God that is clear and so all-embracing that it would include

everything, and yet so precise and definite that a Science could be built on it?" She knew the answer was yes, and she set herself the superhuman task of finding this definition.

Many Christian Scientists regard Mrs. Eddy as only the discoverer of a new religion or as giving another interpretation of the Bible, or as giving just a more practical sense of God than other religions give. But her place is much more in the field of science than of religion. *Posterity will regard her as the most scientific being in human history.* Religion is only one aspect of her Science; it also includes medicine, psychology, philosophy, ethics, etc. Mary Baker Eddy was the founder of a new Science. What she discovered and founded was totally revolutionary. Jesus said, "Greater works than these shall you do." Mary Baker Eddy *did* those greater works.

Great Religions Did Not Ask Scientific Questions

None of the great religions of the world (mostly founded around 500 BC) ever asked scientific questions about God; they only asked religious questions. They never asked, "Is God a Principle? Can God be explained and interpreted? If God can be explained and interpreted, can the whole of Being be comprehended within the grasp of a Science?" These questions are foreign to all religions. To answer these questions requires a *scientific* mind, not a religious mind.

What Mrs. Eddy did was prodigious. She accomplished something unheard of in the fields of religion and science. All the great thinkers up to her time in all fields

were always building on the accepted human system of reference. They all accepted the human mind as the means of understanding being, of understanding nature, of understanding the logic of all that is going on. They all relied on the human mind, which we have seen is dualistic. They therefore had a sense that they must classify their field within the framework of human classifications. *Mrs. Eddy was the first one to see why this didn't work*, why it was inadequate, and she built a completely new divine system of reference, exchanging the human system of reference for an entirely divine frame of reference.

Mrs. Eddy Saw the Basis Was Wrong

Through ten thousand years of Western culture the great thinkers always tried to improve on the human system of reference. They came out from the magic stage to the stage of mysticism, to higher religions—always improve, improve, improve, but only on a human basis. Mrs. Eddy saw the basis was wrong, and what was needed was a new basis, a basis that was built on Being itself, on the one value of the one infinite One. *She saw she would have to reason from the one infinite One*. She needed a one-value logic *that reasons deductively* from the infinite One, not from human thinking and human experience.

Mrs. Eddy, like Jesus, was revolutionary. Her great insight was that God is Principle. This called for a radically new approach. She saw she had to build on a totally new and different basis. All ideas must come from the divine Principle, and their demonstration must come from the divine Principle. Her Science of Christianity reveals

the *incorporeal Christ*. As we grow in the understanding of this Christ Science it grows in favor with us, and by means of this lens of Science it will become so magnified to human sense that *it will reveal us, individually as well as collectively, to be the Principle*—to be the incorporeal, divine, supreme, infinite Principle. *We will see ourselves as wholly spiritual without the fetters of the flesh.*

The Bible had said God was Life, Truth, Love, and Spirit. Mrs. Eddy insisted that this must be a *divine Principle*, and introduced into her first exposition of Christian Science the term Principle as a synonym for God. She also introduced as a synonym for God the new term *Soul*.

Why Did Mrs. Eddy See That Soul is God?

Why did Mrs. Eddy see that *Soul is God*? Because her revelation made clear to her that there is only one Being; and because there is only one Being there must be complete identity between that one Being and its creation. She saw there wasn't somewhere a creator and somewhere else a creation, but creator and creation is identical, has identity of nature. Her name for this verity or reality was Soul. Soul is her term for identity; and identity means reality at its deepest level where subject and object is one.

She realized there is not a divine, thinking subject called God who has as his object man and the universe, but rather they are one and the same thing. Only in regard to cause and effect are they different, so she instituted the term Soul because Soul says there is only one Soul—not each one has his own soul—there is only one

Soul and therefore there is one great identity called God. There is not one central Principle and then split apart from it—not connected with it—everything that is experienced in the universe. This Principle, Mrs. Eddy saw, is the center and circumference of the whole. Therefore *everything within the whole is identical with its Principle*. To express this fact of everything being identified with the one Principle, God, she used the term Soul.

The first edition of Science and Health has many more references to Soul than later editions. Soul was the point of Mary Baker Eddy's stupendous revelation. She saw with startling clarity there isn't somewhere a God and somewhere else God's creation. *Where God is, His creation is*; where His creation is, there is God. There is absolute identity between them. They can't be split apart. *"Existence separate from divinity, Science explains as impossible."* Over and over Mrs. Eddy makes it clear that you are "incorporeal, divine, supreme, infinite Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love."

Not Capitalizing Mind Led to Trouble

Mind was not capitalized in the first and second editions. Instead various ideas of Mind, such as wisdom, intelligence, creator were capitalized. Because Mrs. Eddy didn't capitalize Mind she got into trouble. When she spoke of "mind," meaning the divine Mind and not the human mind, the reader generally took it as meaning the human mind instead of the divine Mind. *This led the reader into practicing mesmerism* instead of divine metaphysics.

So Mrs. Eddy had to investigate the subject of animal magnetism and malpractice. In the first edition she added a brief exposé of animal magnetism and malpractice. However in her chapter on animal magnetism in the second edition she still hadn't capitalized Mind, and this lack of capitalization got her into further trouble. In the third edition of Science and Health she did begin to capitalize Mind in the chapter on animal magnetism. That broke the mesmerism.

Synonyms Come One At a Time

The term we use most today, namely Mind, was the last of the seven synonyms to be capitalized. In her class of 1888 Mrs. Eddy told the students that at first she didn't know how to define God. Only when she began to see that God knows Himself were the synonyms revealed to her. And it was only when she took that extraordinary leap away from trying to define God from the human system of reference and instead adopted a wholly divine frame of reference that she realized God knows Himself, and because God knows Himself, she (Mary Baker Eddy) could know God. She saw God could reveal Himself to her. Then the synonymous terms began to reveal themselves to her step by step. They came one at a time. After receiving one term she had to patiently wait until the next synonymous term was revealed, until she had all seven. (See *Mis. Documents* pp. 61 & 62.) In this way she found the basis of her Science.

It was in the class of 1888 that Mrs. Eddy said, "Upon the truth of these terms for God rests the basis of this Sci-

ence; in fact they are the Science.” She built the whole Science on those seven synonymous terms, just as a science of music is built on the seven notes: do, re, mi, fa, sol, la, ti, and a science of arithmetic is built on the ten digits. On just a few fundamental elements we can build an infinite Science, if those few basic elements are clearly recognized, if their true place value is seen, and their order understood.

To master these primary essentials requires unremitting discipline, but once mastered *the reward is perpetual revelation*. In the late 1930s, as we have seen, Mr. Doorly made his students aware of the great importance of a *scientific* study of the seven synonymous terms, and they pursued it with single-minded determination. The development Doorly and his students went through is the development every student of Christian Science must go through, but fortunately it doesn't need to take twenty years. Once a pioneer has gone through the wilderness and mapped out the path, those who come after have a much easier time and can grasp very quickly what it may have cost the pioneer years of effort to perceive and understand.

Kuhn on Scientific Revolution

Kuhn, in his book on *Scientific Revolution*, presents the general structure of a scientific revolution. This is fundamental to every scientific revolution and it applies to us.

A paradigm, Kuhn tells us, is a set of rules, laws, and principles which are accepted within a science. Since the paradigm is the agreed-upon norm of a science, any sci-

ence that is established on an acknowledged paradigm, Kuhn calls normal science. Sometimes, as such a science is practiced over and over and over, suddenly a phenomenon appears which doesn't fit into that accepted paradigm and is not resolvable within normal science. Usually that new phenomenon, which Kuhn calls an anomaly, is swept under the carpet, disregarded. Normal science won't have anything to do with it because normal science is typically very traditional, orthodox, unable to think in new lines.

But anomalies pop up from time to time, and those who take notice and investigate the anomaly, those who try to find a solution for the anomaly, are ostracized. They cannot continue under the paradigm of normal science and consequently have to form a new paradigm. They must approach that whole question from a new angle, with a new frame of thought, and so establish a new paradigm. The science that results from this new paradigm, Kuhn calls extraordinary science.

When this extraordinary science becomes successful it slowly takes over and eventually it becomes normal science; it is accepted by everyone, after twenty, thirty, or a hundred years.

Kuhn goes a step further and describes what he calls a *mature scientist*. If a scientist is always willing to investigate an anomaly when it appears, and to work until he finds a solution for it, and continues to establish new paradigms which result in extraordinary science, then he is a *mature scientist*.

A mature scientist is one who is willing to question normal science and its paradigm continuously. He is the

thinker who is willing to investigate anomalies and new paradigms constantly. Therefore he is willing to change. He is working as a mature scientist.

Mrs. Eddy An Extraordinary Scientist

Mrs. Eddy was brought up in the old church, in the accepted paradigm of, let's say, the "normal science" of religion. After she had her revelation she began to bring out a new paradigm. She had been healed on a spiritual basis, not on a medical basis—an *anomaly* had occurred. Being first and foremost a Scientist (not a religious mystic) she pondered this spiritual healing. She was not satisfied with ordinary explanations. She said, in essence, "I must know the Science that lies behind this spiritual healing, this amazing experience. Here is an anomaly. I am not going to sweep it under the rug as just being something rare and abnormal that doesn't fit into the pattern of the old religion. I am going to investigate this occurrence, this instance of spiritual healing. I will find a new paradigm on which I can build a new Science, an extraordinary Science." This shows Mrs. Eddy not as a religionist but as a mature Scientist.

What happened to Mrs. Eddy in the way of a marvelous spiritual healing isn't so remarkable. There have been phenomenal spiritual healings all through the ages. Thousands of miraculous healings have been recorded during the past two thousand years. The mere phenomenon wasn't rare or singular. What was different in Mrs. Eddy's case was that she took the attitude "*This* should be normal!" This differentiated her from all the others who had

experienced miracles (anomalies) and had just swept them under the carpet; they remained “normal scientists” and went right back to the old way.

Mrs. Eddy Asked Heretical Questions

Mrs. Eddy was an *extraordinary Scientist* because she wanted to find the law behind this anomaly, this wonderful spiritual healing she had experienced. Mrs. Eddy asked heretical questions. She insisted there must be a Science to explain it. God, she declared, must lend Himself to explanation.

Mrs. Eddy found the new paradigm. She found the new definition of God. She presented extraordinary Science as Christian Science. She taught it, and attracted people who also were willing in a measure to get away from the ordinary church into the extraordinary church. The people who left the old church to join the new went through that revolution of going away from normal science, being attracted by the new paradigm, learning that new paradigm, and becoming Christian Scientists, adherents of extraordinary Science.

People who once were in another church and came to Christian Science seem to value Christian Science often times much more than those “born” in Christian Science. Why? Those who broke away from the old church had to make a move that entailed inward struggles and questionings. Frequently it meant estrangement from friends and relatives. They have taken the risk of moving from the normal to the extraordinary. Thus they often valued Christian Science much more.

We Too, Must Ask “Heretical Questions”

Unfortunately, over a period of fifty or sixty years, extraordinary Science became, for hundreds of thousands of Mrs. Eddy’s followers, normal Science; to be in the Christian Science church was normal Science. It was the accepted paradigm. You could write in the *Journal*, *Sentinel*, and *Monitor* about the paradigm; you could lecture about the paradigm, and teach about the paradigm, but *only* the paradigm that was accepted in normal Science. These Christian Scientists had once taken the step from normal science to extraordinary Science, and felt that one transition was enough; new anomalies must be swept under the rug.

These Scientists did not take the attitude of a mature Scientist, in Christian Science. A mature Scientist, in Christian Science, would be one who, when he has accepted a new paradigm and practiced that paradigm, does not disregard the appearance of an anomaly. He is watching for a new paradigm that will again give him extraordinary Science. The extraordinary Scientist is rare, indeed. “Many are called, but few are chosen.” Each one of us has the choice to make. Do we just want to be called? Do we just want to be normal Scientists? Or do we want to be “chosen”? That is, do we want to choose for ourselves? Do we want to be extraordinary Scientists, mature Scientists? Do we want to always have an inquiring mind that asks, “Is there something more I should know about that subject? Isn’t there another approach to it, an approach that might be much more direct?”

Doorly as a Mature Scientist And Pioneer

John Doorly had this questioning attitude. Early in his life he began to question the paradigm of the church. As early as 1916 he asked himself, "Can we call ourselves Scientists if we don't know the Science of it? If it is a Science, shouldn't we know the system of this Science? *If this is a Science with a system, then I must know the categories of this system.* In order to know the *categories* of this system I must know how to categorize the infinite phenomena. When I have the categories, I must know how categories (in order to be a system) blend with each other."

All these questions and reflections have to do with Science, and at Doorly's time thinking and questions like these were *heretical* in "normal" Christian Science. Church members were not allowed to ask these questions. At his time it was quite enough if you said that Being is one, and there is only one Being. But to ask, "What are the orders in that one Being? What are the laws ruling in that one Being?" was not allowed, and could not be answered at his time. Religiosity spurns such investigation into extraordinary Science.

But as we saw, a new thought goes through that revolution from an accepted paradigm in normal science, through the stage of anomaly; revolving and bringing up a new paradigm of extraordinary Science.

Are the Seven Synonyms Interchangeable?

What was the old paradigm and normal Science in Christian Science in the late 1930's?

It had been generally accepted in regard to the seven synonyms that they were freely interchangeable, and that they did not form a definite order, that we are free to put them into any order. These two great points were largely unquestioned at the time John Doorly began his reasoning with reference to the seven days of creation.

Through his intense study of Mrs. Eddy's chapter, Genesis, in Science and Health, Doorly began to feel that the seven days of creation were symbolizing the seven synonymous terms for God. He noticed that *each day was actually giving a very different concept of Being* and that these concepts, taken in sequence, linked uniquely and significantly with the synonymous terms—Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth and Love—in that order. Although, in the days of creation, it is always God that says, "Let there be"—and therefore each day is part of the God-genesis of infinite good's own nature—every day presents a completely different aspect of Being. Doorly could see that each day viewed Being from a different angle, and therefore each day, and by extension, each synonymous term, would have different characteristics and so would make a different contribution to the nature of Being.

Doorly Saw That the Seven Days Had a Definite Order

Secondly, Doorly began to see that these seven days have a definite order, an irrevocable order. Spiritually seen, it is impossible to place the symbolism for the third stage (or day) at the beginning, then put second what

we see now as the symbolism of the sixth day, then place third the symbolism of the first day. This would not give a story of creation, would it? First we would have, "Let the dry land appear;" secondly, "Let man appear, and let him have dominion;" thirdly, "Let there be light." This would not be an ordered, logical story. The days of creation, as they are given in the Bible, form an irrevocable, definite sequence of ideas. They are presented in a divinely logical order, starting out with the inception of a new idea, "Let there be light," and developing that new idea through further stages to the seventh day of fulfillment where God rested and saw that everything was good.

Thus it was that Doorly became convinced there was a sequence in the realm of spiritual ideas. This discernment was entirely new at that time. For a Christian Scientist to say, eighty years ago, that there are ideas forming a definite order that cannot be changed without changing the whole idea that lies behind that order, was heresy.

But Doorly saw that even the Bible gave a definite order and when he saw that the definition for God, which Mrs. Eddy gives on page 465 of *Science and Health*, follows the same order as the seven days of creation, his spiritual sense told him something big lay behind this fact. If the seven days of creation follow the same spiritual order as Mrs. Eddy's definition of God, which is also presenting the nature of God, and is presenting it in a definite order, then there must be something immeasurably deep indicated in this presentation.

What Is It Telling Us?

“What is it telling us?” was Doorly’s question. He had uncovered two anomalies, in regard to the general thought in Christian Science, anomalies too important to be swept under the rug. First was the realization that each synonymous term must have specific characteristics which distinguish it from the other synonymous terms. Second was the great point that the *way* one orders the seven synonymous terms must be something very definite, and must have a deep meaning, whatever that meaning was.

These were the subjects that occupied Doorly’s thought during the middle of the 1930’s. He didn’t know the answers, *but he was asking the right questions*—questions that were setting his thoughts to work in new channels. To ask the right questions is always the most important thing in solving any problem. Can we see the problem, the main problem? Usually the solution of the problem depends on asking the right questions, and pinpointing the problem.

Doorly arrived at the conviction that in order to find an answer to these questions he would have to investigate his hypothesis. Every theory starts with a hypothesis. Then that hypothesis is investigated to see if it is true or to what extent it is true. If it measures up and is found to be true, it can be stated as a new theorem.

Doorly’s first hypothesis was: Each synonymous term has unique and specific characteristics, which distinguish it from the other six synonyms.

His second hypothesis was: There must be a definite order ruling the definition Mrs. Eddy gives of God,

namely, Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love.

Doorly saw from the old editions of Science and Health that Mrs. Eddy had labored with that definition of God. Over the years she kept answering differently that question—What is God?—by changing the order of the synonymous terms. He saw she was endeavoring to state God not only in its nature, but also in an ordered way. The fact that she from time to time made changes in the order of the seven terms indicated to Doorly that she wasn't happy with the order up to that point. She was feeling out something. What was it?

The Word Order

Doorly came to the conclusion that Mrs. Eddy was feeling out what he called the Word order, as we have it today—the creative order of the seven days of creation. Only this order, which she arrived at in 1907, coincides with the tonality of the seven days of creation. Mrs. Eddy had labored and worked with the arrangement of the seven synonyms for God up until 1907; it was only in 1907 that she gave us the final order. At that point, Doorly realized, Mrs. Eddy saw the correlation of Bible teaching with Christian Science *in regard to* the creative aspect of Being. She saw that both the days of creation and the Logos (the Word of God) were given through the seven synonymous terms.

Doorly had heard a bugle-call that would never sound retreat. He had gotten the message, "Here is the key, the clue for a new Science, the *pure Science* of Christian Science."

Mrs. Eddy Rearranged the Entire Textbook to Reveal the Seven Synonyms

Today we can more fully appreciate how much time and attention Mary Baker Eddy devoted to this Word-order definition of God, because in the meantime we have discerned something else that is quite astounding, thanks to the work of Doorly and those that followed his lead.

Between 1888 and 1891, a very interesting period in Mrs. Eddy's life, she actually rearranged the entire textbook so that each chapter is written in order—*an order that conforms to the order of the seven synonymous terms*. In the 50th edition, which came out in 1891, the material included was practically the same as the material in the 48th edition (there was no 49th edition) but the order was different. Mrs. Eddy had done a scissors and paste job on the 50th edition, just as an editor would do in a newsroom. She had put sentences and paragraphs together in a new way.

The Wonder of "Prayer" in the 50th Edition

In the 50th edition she presented the material in each chapter in a distinct order which has not been changed since then. The careful student can see that the chapter "Prayer" first shows the prayer of Mind over a page and a half. The next two pages give the prayer of Spirit; then we have the prayer of Soul, then of Principle, Life, Truth, and Love. On closer examination we see that each of these

sections is itself divided into seven subtones reflecting the seven synonyms in the Word order. And that's the chapter. Suddenly, the subject, Prayer, is put into scientific order. Into what scientific order? Into the scientific order of the seven synonyms as given in the definition of God in our present edition.

Order and Structure Put Into Text

The forty-eighth edition did not conform to the definition of God, and that is why Mrs. Eddy had to change it. She did not change the data, the information. She only changed the order. Today we know the order is more important than the data. Order gives meaning to the data. We will come back to this point later on.

What we have just talked about partially answers the often asked question, "Why was Mrs. Eddy always revising Science and Health? What was she doing?" Along with making small corrections, *she was putting order and structure into her text.*

Proof That She Listened Only To God

The three years between 1888, when Mary Baker Eddy closed her College, and 1891 when she published the 50th edition, were years of great spiritual insight and depth. During this period she added the chapter Science, Theology, Medicine, one of the most fundamental chapters. Only listening alone to God could have enabled her to arrive at such profundity, because when the 50th edition came out (with these changes in it) her definition of God

still didn't coincide with the order she had established in the text, in the sixteen chapters. *This indicates that she allowed spiritual sense to guide her completely* in the arrangement of the material in her text. The following statement attributed to Mrs. Eddy bears this out, and reveals how revelation came to her:

Whatever I have discovered, understood, and taught of Truth I have never known beforehand its why or wherefore. It has always come into my thoughts and gone forth in words or deeds, before God's dear purpose in it, and the fruits it would bear were fully revealed to me. I have always been called in spiritual paths to walk by faith and not by sight, to abide in the senses of Soul and not body for insight and action (*Essays and Other Footprints* p. 61).

Mrs. Eddy continued to work on her definition of God until 1907, when she felt she had the ideal. She had the congruency. She had synchronized the order of the texts in each chapter with the definition of God. This is why in the Preface, she added, "Until June 10, 1907, she [Mary Baker Eddy] had never read this book throughout consecutively in order to elucidate her idealism."

"I Have Found It"

In June, 1907, this edition, which first presented the ideal order of the seven synonymous terms in her definition for God, went to press. With this book Mrs. Eddy is

saying, "I have found it! I have seen how God, the one God, the only subject that really matters, can be translated to any subject, to every chapter of the textbook. I can show every chapter of the textbook within the same line of reasoning of the ideal nature of God, and can present it always translated into every chapter of the textbook, adapted to the specific question. There is now an absolute congruency between the definition of God and the presentation of God in every situation."

The great marvel is, as we noted before, that she got the text in order before she attained the final order of Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love as her definition for God in 1907. This shows the intensity of her devotion to God and to listening only for the divine message. Truly she could insist, "God wrote the textbook. Study it; let God speak to you!" (*Collectanea* p. 197).

John Doorly Was First to See the System

John Doorly was the first to broach and tackle the textbook in a scientific way. Doorly didn't have an above-average education. He had the average education that a boy received in the last century, but he was phenomenal. He had a spiritual sense for scientific things, for scientific spiritual matters.

His spiritual sense always led him to the scientific approach. Everything drove him toward a scientific assessment of what he read in the textbook though he had never been scientifically trained.

This shows that a lack of academic education in the sciences doesn't prevent anyone from being scientifically

minded. The age is going forward. "The earth will help the woman" (generic man) because the idea of Principle is precipitating itself on the world and will find in the world transparent points (spiritually and scientifically-minded individuals) through whom it will shine. The world is changing rapidly; the idea wants to go forward, and it *is* going forward. We in Christian Science should be leading the world, and not following behind the physical scientists.

What Are Categories?

Doorly saw that the whole Christian Science movement was discussing Christian Science on the basis of isolated statements. He saw there must be *categories* since Mrs. Eddy writes, "The categories of metaphysics rest on one basis . . ." (S&H 269:13). What were these categories? Reading in the textbook, "Divine metaphysics is now reduced to a system," he asked, "What is a system?"

A system has categories. So again he asked, "What are categories?" At first he couldn't answer. It took him over twenty years to answer that question. It was around 1916 that he began asking, and it was only around 1937 that he began seeing what the categories are.

Doorly saw the first step must be to reduce a lot of ideas into a few categories. Finally, when he had the category of the seven synonyms, the category of the four sides of the city four square, and the category of the four levels, he could put the whole thing into one system through the relationship of the seven synonyms with the four—Word, Christ, Christianity, Science—as they oper-

ated on the four descending levels of Science itself, divine Science, absolute Christian Science, and Christian Science. Ultimately he would see that these three categories were interlocked, forming one system, and through the interlocking of these three categories the whole system became understandable.

Doorly Finds the Definite Order

In the mid 1930s Mr. Doorly was asking the question, "Doesn't Mrs. Eddy show a definite order in the synonyms?"

We can understand the significance of this question by asking another question, a question of great importance. If we have seven synonymous terms, and if, as the old paradigm stated, these synonyms can be put in any order—if, in other words, there is no definite order—then, mathematically stated, we could have 5,040 different arrangements of the seven before running out of possibilities. But Mrs. Eddy doesn't use 5,040 different orders in her textbook. She uses *four*.

Why?

Surely this is no accident.

Why can't these synonyms be put into just any order? Surely *something of vast consequence* is conveyed by the fact that Mrs. Eddy used only four orders.

The seven synonymous terms must be combined with regard to other categories. We have talked about the symbol of synonymity, using the example of "to die." The pastor delivering his funeral service for Mr. A is not allowed to take just any of those few dozen terms and used

them to symbolize dying. Why not? Because he has to bring in another category, another aspect of being, namely, his theology. This limits him to only three or four expressions of that entire list, because only those few fit into that category—in this case his theology. His choice has nothing to do with dying, but with his theology. The subject, theology, or whatever the subject is, will tell you, will determine, what can be used. In our case, it will determine what we are allowed to use as an “order.”

What Was the Other Category?

Those who criticized Doorly, insisted that any order can be used—any order! Their critiques were published in the *Sentinel* and *Journal* to make sure Doorly and his students got the message. This stimulated and impelled Doorly’s further research. He felt intuitively there must be something more than just putting those seven synonymous terms into a definite order; *there must be another category ruling*—but ruling how? How *can* you use those seven synonymous terms? In what order are you allowed to put them? And why?

Doorly began to see that what he was considering was not only the category of the seven synonymous terms, but a new category, the category of the Word—a category that has to do with the four sides of the holy city. He saw that the seven synonymous terms given in the definition of God are actually the Word of God.

When Doorly first had the feeling that order was significant and stated his hypothesis, namely, that each synonymous term is definitely characterized by ideas that dis-

tinguish it from the other six synonymous terms, and also that there must be a definite order of the seven synonymous terms, he was stating something big, but something that still had to be proved. In a science the genius is always the one who can ask the right questions. It is the province of a genius that he can somehow sense where the problem lies. He doesn't seek the answer in an unrelated field.

What Ideas Distinguish Each Synonymous Term?

Before he could map out the categories of the system of Science and Health, Doorly saw he must first find a method to prove his hypothesis that each synonymous term is definitely characterized by ideas that distinguish it from the other six synonymous terms. He must show that his hypothesis could stand and disprove the critics. Nobody knew how to prove it from the textbook. Perhaps a million readers of the textbook were under the impression that the seven synonymous terms were freely interchangeable, so they were in no condition to give a method of how to prove the very opposite of the delusion they were laboring under. We stress "*method*" because finding the method is one of the most important things, and the most difficult thing. To find the answer is easy once we have the right method.

It took many years to find the right method, but from the beginning the process Doorly used in seeking the right method was a very scientific approach. In any science you approach a subject by first stating your hypothesis. You feel this hypothesis may be true, but as long as it hasn't been proved it remains a hypothesis and not a new theory.

When you have stated your hypothesis you go to a second step, namely, you try to test your hypothesis wherever you can test it. Then, by testing it, you find out that this hypothesis might be wrong, or half wrong, or eighty percent wrong, etc. There are not many great discoveries made where the hypothesis could be proved a hundred percent immediately.

After a period of testing you come to a third stage where you begin to find out what was wrong about the hypothesis—what was wrong about the method. You find out the error—where the procedure was wrong.

So as a fourth step you modify or restate the hypothesis; you polish the hypothesis, you get a clearer hypothesis from which to work; and you again go through the whole process of testing the new hypothesis to see if it is valid this time.

You may find out that it is not yet conclusive, valid, or irrefutable; there is still something missing, so you take a fifth step and once again try to determine what was wrong. This brings you to your new third hypothesis which you again work out from. So in this step by step fashion you draw nearer to the final conclusion.

This is the method of a science; it is not the method of a religion. The religionist wants to go to the authority—the pastor, the bishop, the Pope, the Board of Directors. He says, “Here is a question. I want a blunt answer.” He expects a hundred percent answer, which he then considers the final authority. A scientist doesn’t operate that way. He tries to get nearer, nearer, nearer; but always feels he is never quite there. If he is completely there, well, then

we know he is wrong. Revelation is infinite; it goes on. We never arrive; we are always on the way. If we feel we have arrived we are not mature Scientists. We are just ordinary scientists—scientists of normal science.

The Mature Scientist

The mature Scientist is always willing to take into consideration that there is a higher view, a broader view—that there is something more to the subject than what he already knows.

The method of the mature Scientist is often the method of trial and error, of approaching the final results step by step, having to rectify again and again his findings, until he arrives at a solid basis to build on.

Only with the right method can the synonymous terms be taught.

Building the True Concept

After years of diligent study and hypothesis building, of repeatedly refining their method, John Doorly, Max Kappeler and their dedicated associates reached a level of understanding where they were able to compile a list of terms associated with each of the seven synonymous terms for God, as they occur in the Word order in the textbook, the order that coincides with the seven days of creation. We will present a short list at the beginning of each chapter as we consider the seven synonyms in turn.

These lists are only a starting point. These findings just tell us that a group of dedicated students have reached

the conclusion that Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth and Love are each characterized through a particular list of terms. By this we haven't gained very much, except a pure analysis. What does this pure analysis mean? What do these terms mean—these terms that have been taken out of the textbook?

Why Do the Terms Under Mind Link Together?

To build up the true concept we must now engage in concentrated and dedicated thinking. For instance, why do all the terms under Mind link together? What do they have in common? What does "creator" have to do with "producer" or with "maker"? In this way we are already beginning to build up a tone of Mind. As we build up the concept the tone slowly comes in. We begin to see that Mind has to do with creating something, producing something, making something, bringing forth something. We get the creative aspect of it.

Once we see this creative aspect, reason tells us that if something is creative, then it must have a causative aspect. So we see that Mind is not only the creator, Mind must also be the cause, since there is no creation going on without a cause. Cause is origin, and origin has to do with the source of all being, so we see the link between "creator," "cause," "origin" and "source." Source is always the beginning, so we get the sense of "first" coming in.

This is how we think about these ideas under Mind, and each of the other synonyms, and see how they all link together. They are not just terms that have no connection

with each other. As we think about them we gradually get the touch and the tone of each synonym.

It is necessary to see how and why such a term as “guiding” is linked with “cause.” Mind is both cause and guiding, but why do they form just one term, Mind? Once we cultivate our own understanding of how these results were arrived at, we can start right in, culturing the findings, culturing our spiritual sense through the exact letter, and so gaining the tonality of these terms. This pursuit, while requiring the most rigorous application of intellect, puts more stress on the spiritual aspect than on the letter aspect of the synonymous terms.

Why Doorly Was Excommunicated Seeing Order, Structure, in Science

It is interesting to note that Doorly was excommunicated on the grounds of his study of the seven synonymous terms. It was not a personal issue, it was a theological issue. Doorly held that every synonymous term had characteristics that distinguished it from the other six terms, and because of that difference, and only because of that difference, we can have order. If the seven synonymous terms were all the same and completely interchangeable we could not build meaningful orders. This was the first implication. Many other implications came afterwards.

If we have seven things that look exactly alike, can we put them into an order? Order is only possible when things are different. How could we have order in the seven

synonymous terms if they were the same? Or, to put it the other way around, if we find out that the synonymous terms are different, then they lend themselves for order; a completely new aspect enters in. At that very point we get away from the atomistic concept of the Science of being and begin to touch the structural aspect of it.

Why is this?

Because *structure is nothing other than to see all the interrelationships*, and all the orders that the whole consists of.

What Structure Is

If all the synonymous terms meant the same thing and were freely interchangeable there would be no possibility of building a Science on them, so we can see how fundamental this question was that was asked in 1938 by John Doorly. There is no possibility of a Science without having *differentiated* identities of being. We cannot build a science of music with just one tone, even if it has seven names, or build a science of arithmetic with just one number, even if ten symbols can be used to represent it. We have to have differentiated elements if we want to build order, because the moment elements are *differentiated* we can ask ourselves, "How are they interconnected? How do they link together?" Then we begin to see that not only the data are important, but also the relationships are important. Why does Spirit follow Mind? Why does Soul follow Spirit? Why does Life instead of Love come after Principle? These are questions of the greatest importance

because they lead us away from the atomistic concept of having only to do with data, and they bring us into relationship. The moment we have relationship we have the synergy principle.

The Whole Is Greater Than the Sum of Its Parts

The synergy principle—the understanding that the whole may be greater than the sum of its parts—has today broken down a false concept in our Western civilization. Until recently virtually no one challenged the old Greek concept that the whole is equal to the sum of its parts. In the 1930s this was a fundamental scientific theorem. Today science has seen that the whole is much, much, bigger than the sum total of its parts. Why is this? *It is because of the relationship that exists between the parts.* This relationship brings order, so that the whole as a whole is a whole structure within which all the parts are connected in an orderly way, in a systematic, orderly, lawful way. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts because the whole consists of the sum total of the parts *plus* the relationship that exists between the parts, plus the effects these interrelationships have on each of the parts and the system as a whole.

If we see this, we see that only on this basis can we analyze the textbook rightly. Before we see this we are always reading single sentences in the textbook and trying to understand the meaning of that sentence. Then we go on to the next sentence. We could jump from the first sentence in the textbook to the last sentence and some-

how “understand” it. Many of us, as we read the textbook in this way, felt that we understood every sentence, but after having read the whole textbook sentence by sentence, we wondered what it was all about. This is typical.

What Are We Learning?

Today, breaking in on this “normal” assumption of Christian Science, we have a completely new paradigm, which says that what we should understand is not any single sentence *but rather that which binds everything together in the textbook*. This is not something which is spelled out in black and white on the page. What we need to understand is relationship, and relationship cannot be written. We can read the data, the terms, the concepts, but we cannot read the relationships. These *relationships are what we are now attempting to learn*. Forty years of research by Doorly, Kappeller and the other deep researchers has finally given us a method of grasping this wholly immaterial principle of *relationship*, without a knowledge of which the textbook’s message remains more or less obscure.

Why does the textbook’s deepest message remain hidden—just beyond our grasp?

Because we have investigated the parts, the concepts, but not the relationships. It is *only as we see the relationships* from chapter to chapter, as well as from paragraph to paragraph, that the solution arrives. It is only when *we begin to see the structure* that is not spelled out in words, but which lies there as a spiritual structure, that we begin to understand the textbook. We understand it

from a higher point of view, and it then means a hundred times more than it did before.

Seeing the Relationships

So what is the issue? The issue is, yes, let's analyze the synonymous terms, but when we have analyzed them we must see the relationship between them. We must see the relationship of one synonymous term to the next synonymous term and to the other synonymous terms. Understanding the relationships is most important. Having our list is the beginning of our understanding, the very beginning, but not the end.

The "list" is just a tool with which we can begin to work. First comes *concept* building. Next comes *tonality* building. There the concept of relationship must be understood and mastered, and as the relationships that exist are brought to view we begin to sense the *structure* of being. Once we have found the fundamental structure of being we can restructure being infinitely. We just have to know a few rules. Suddenly we find we have an infinity of consciousness, a consciousness that never repeats itself, always new, always different, and yet always building on just a few fundamentals. That is Science. Science means to be able to reduce the infinite to simplicity, but to the *right* simplicity. And that is the main point.

After we compile our lists we embark on the tonality building adventure. If we have a hundred and fifty terms characterizing Mind and we take them all together as one big impression, one big concept, this is called *the*

tone of Mind. “Tone” is a word John Doorly used to symbolize those hundred or hundred and fifty terms, ideas, values, attributes, qualities, or concepts as one big impression, one tone. Once we have gotten the tone of Mind, Mind is no longer just a hundred and fifty or so terms. It is *MIND*. Then, when you read or hear Mind, you somehow have the whole tone, the spiritual tone, of all that this term implies, spiritually. This is called the tonality of Mind.

How Terms Become Our Consciousness

As Doorly showed in the verbatim reports of his Bible talks, Mind, as a tone, can be illustrated in many ways, in the Bible or in the textbook, but it always has the main category of Mind.

To build tonality, we first have our list of correct ideas, then we must have a method to make those concepts our spiritual sense, so that it becomes a spiritual tone independent of terms. Are there rules for accomplishing this? Yes. We can begin to ponder these terms, going over and over the list, asking ourselves, “*What do these concepts mean if they characterize the one Being?*” When we do this pondering—it is no longer studying—when we do this meditating, this contemplating, this reflecting on our study, this praying over it, we must *feel* this is the nature of the one God, or Being.

In this way we begin to take these terms into our consciousness. They *become* our consciousness. These terms, which were only concepts, begin to sink in, begin to become part of our very being; then they are no longer

concepts; they become our being, our nature; they become reality to us. In this way we make them subjective. Because we have taken them in, cherished, worshipped, adored them, we find they have become our being.

Realize You Are Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth and Love

Do this, and put yourself in the place of the synonymous term itself. Realize that you *are* Mind, you *are* Spirit, you *are* the synonymous term you are pondering. Say, "If I am Mind—if I am the very consciousness of Mind—what does Mind know about itself?" Then, to find out, go through the list, because *what is on your list is actually what the synonymous term, Mind, knows about itself*. Contemplate each quality, each value, each attribute, each idea of Mind.

We must do this over and over, asking ourselves, "What does it mean if Mind is this? or if Mind does that? or if Mind deals with this or that?" As we go through our list in this way we begin to feel the tone of that synonymous term welling up within our consciousness. At the beginning we need the list, but soon we feel we can do it without the list, and then we realize how much of the tonality we have already mastered and made our own.

Why We Must Acquaint Ourselves With the Synonymous Terms

There is nothing more important than to acquaint ourselves with the synonymous terms because that is the only

being there is, therefore the only *reality* there is. To concentrate on anything else is actually wasting our time, and for this reason it is a blessing to take every possible minute we can for the contemplation of the terms on our list.

No matter how busy we are, we all have a few minutes now and then when we can do this pondering to renew within our consciousness the tone of the seven synonyms. They may be only five-minute periods but we can use them for this holy work to turn our thought back to reality, to recall what Mind knows about itself, what Spirit knows about itself, etc. Actually a few minutes at various intervals during each day does the job better than whipping up a terrific study on a whole Saturday afternoon, because it gets us into the habit of renewing the tonality more and more until *finally we realize we don't fall out of the tonality any more*; we have become identified with it. Then, whether we are at the kitchen sink, waiting in line at the supermarket, or talking with people, we always *go out from* the tonality of the seven synonymous terms. It becomes our new system of reference, our new standpoint, our new attitude towards everything.

From Which Standpoint Do We Think?

We shouldn't forget that we are always thinking something from morning to night, as long as we are conscious. The question is, from which standpoint do we think? Are we continually conscious, at all times, from a human system of reference *or from a divine and spiritual system of reference*? One takes as much energy as the other, and just as much time. If we look out from the divine system

of reference we are looking out as Being would look at the situation, and that is the help we have, and it is reality. It is not true that we haven't time—time for Science—it is only that we must discipline ourselves to always go out from the seven synonymous terms no matter what we are engaged in. We are going to do what we do anyway, so why should we do it from a wrong standpoint when we could do it from the right standpoint?

All we need is that little time at first where we culture our tonality, where we are asking ourselves, “Do I actually know what Mind is? what Spirit is? what Soul is?” Here we need to continually go back to our list until it becomes our own natural being. After that we no longer need the list.

Much helpful material for culturing the seven synonymous terms can be found in Doorly's ninety-nine *Verbatim Reports* on the Science of the Bible, as well as in Max Kappeler's books, *The Minor Prophets in the Light of Christian Science* and *The Epistles in the light of Christian Science*.

Read Textbook Tone-wise

A good way to culture our synonymous terms, to get the tonality right, is to read the textbook tone-wise. When we read the textbook tone-wise we read a whole chapter, always *listening to the subject of that chapter*. We notice how, at the beginning, the proposition of the chapter is stated, how that proposition is evolved step by step, until it reaches its climax. Because it is a divine story—not a human story—Mrs. Eddy builds up that story in the order of the capitalized terms.

We no longer pay attention to where a synonymous term appears. *What is important is the subject matter itself.* The way Mrs. Eddy reasons out the proposition of the chapter, and shows how, step by step, we arrive at a final conclusion or climax, is all tonality. This cannot be seen through the printed word. *It is only what the printed word conveys as a subject that matters,* and if our consciousness is cultured tonality-wise we catch the message, the meaning.

This answers the great question why the millions—though they read the textbook faithfully everyday—were never able to see the structure of the textbook, never caught the inner coherent meaning of the story. They are still reading single sentences and understanding single sentences or perhaps the whole paragraph, but not the wonderful interrelationship that exists—the powerful divine logic that leads thought from page to page, from chapter to chapter. It is only when we have the tonality of the capitalized terms that we can read it that way. To read the textbook needs something very different from just a good academic education. *It needs a mastery of that language of Spirit*—a mastery of that language that has been coined by the seven synonymous terms. This language of Spirit, understood, alone can read the textbook rightly.

How the Textbook Yields Its Treasures

Read with an understanding of the language of Spirit, the textbook yields its treasures. Starting with a chapter, we see how Mind is expressed over perhaps ten pages—

always bringing up the tone of Mind and the various aspects of Mind. Then suddenly we feel the tone changes. From one paragraph to the next Mrs. Eddy changes the tonality. She then takes in the whole subject of Spirit, over, let's say, another ten pages. Then suddenly you come upon another break, and she begins the tone of Soul. If we read the textbook, always watching for the breaks, it cultures our sense of tonality until we become experts, because the language of the textbook is very precise and very scientific.

The Bible, with its picture language, also cultures our ability to read the tones through other words. This is a good culture. Reading the Bible will let us know if we have gotten the *tonality* (and not just the terms) because in the Bible we will only find tonality. The actual words on our list are often not present. Finding the tonality of the seven synonyms expressed in the Bible shows us that those seven synonymous terms can be expressed in many other words and symbols than in just the way we have them on our list. That is the big point. If we can hear the tones without the abstract symbols we have on our list it gives us a proof that we have touched the spiritual meaning and the spiritual sense of the seven synonymous terms.

When our sense of tonality gives us a glimpse of this spiritual meaning, we are able to listen to what is going on in the world with new understanding. For example, if we are reading books put out by the various sciences today we can begin to hear what they are talking about in terms of the seven synonyms for God. Nothing happens outside of God, outside of Being, therefore everything that

happens is within Being. Everything that happens can be reduced to the tonality of the capitalized terms.

The four sides of the holy city, represented by Word, Christ, Christianity, and Science, and expressed in the four orders of the seven synonyms, and the four levels of spiritual consciousness, expressed in the textbook, in descending order, also have their tonality. With that tonality also understood, we should be able to place everything that happens in the world in its right place value within the whole system of being.

Gravitating Godward

On p. 265:5 of *Science and Health*, Mary Baker Eddy states, "Mortals must gravitate Godward, their affections and aims grow spiritual...in order that sin and mortality may be put off." Isn't this what Jesus meant when he said, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me"?

If we uplift our consciousness—if we "gravitate Godward"—and become more loving, more helpful to others, won't it tend to "draw all men unto me," as Jesus said? Therefore, not only are you blessed by lifting up your consciousness, but the love you express inspires and blesses all who come unto your presence. So when Jesus said (or when you say), "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth,"—meaning "gravitate Godward"—you are blessing, healing, helping all you come in contact with.

Everyone must strive to lift up the Christ in human consciousness; we must all be in the business of "gravitating Godward."

In the mighty sweep of the 2000 years since Jesus spoke these words, Love has brought the second coming of the Christ, the “Comforter” that teaches us to gravitate Godward.

As we move to wrap up our work on the beginning of the Doorly saga, an example of how we gravitate Godward is shown in the following story.

About thirty years ago, a young and very successful executive named Josh was traveling down a Chicago neighborhood street. He was going a bit too fast in his sleek, black, 12 cylinder Jaguar XKE, which was only two months old. He was watching for kids darting out from between parked cars and slowed down when he thought he saw something. As his car passed, no child darted out, but a brick sailed out and — WHUMP! — it smashed into the Jag’s shiny black side door! SCREECH...!!!! Brakes slammed! Gears ground into reverse, and tires madly spun the Jaguar back to the spot from where the brick had been thrown.

Josh jumped out of the car, grabbed the kid and pushed him up against a parked car. He shouted at the kid, “What was that all about and who are you? Just what the heck are you doing?!” Building up a head of steam, he went on. “That’s my new Jag. That brick you threw is gonna cost you a lot of money. Why did you throw it?” “Please, mister, please...I’m sorry! I didn’t know what else to do!” pleaded the youngster. “I threw the brick because no one else would stop!” Tears

were dripping down the boy's chin as he pointed around the parked car. "It's my brother, mister," he said. "He rolled off the curb and fell out of his wheelchair and I can't lift him up." Sobbing, the boy asked the executive, "Would you please help me get him back into his wheelchair? He's hurt and he's too heavy for me." Moved beyond words, the young executive tried desperately to swallow the rapidly swelling lump in his throat. Straining, he lifted the young man back into the wheelchair and took out his handkerchief and wiped the scrapes and cuts on the young man, checking to see that everything was going to be OK. He then watched the younger brother push him down the sidewalk toward their home.

It was a long walk back to the sleek, black, shining, 12 cylinder Jaguar XKE—a long and slow walk. Josh never did fix the side door of his Jaguar. He kept the dent to remind him not to go through life so fast that someone has to throw a brick at him to get his attention.

Some bricks are softer than others. Feel for the bricks of life coming at you. For all the negative things, we have to say to ourselves, God has positive answers.

You say: "It's impossible."

God says: "All things are possible" (Luke 18:27).

You say: "I'm too tired."

God says: "I will give you rest" (Matthew

11:28-30).

You say: "Nobody really loves me."

God says: "I love you" (John 3:16 & John 13:34).

You say: "I can't go on."

God says: "My grace is sufficient" (II Corinthians 12:9 & Psalm 91:15).

You say: "I can't figure things out."

God says: "I will direct your steps" (Proverbs 3:5-6).

You say: "I can't do it."

God says: "You can do all things" (Philippians 4:13).

You say: "I'm not able."

God says: "I am able" (II Corinthians 9:8).

You say: "It's not worth it."

God says: "It will be worth it" (Roman 8:28).

You say: "I can't forgive myself."

God says: "I FORGIVE YOU" (I John 1:9 & Romans 8:1).

You say: "I can't manage."

God says: "I will supply all your needs" (Philippians 4:19).

You say: "I'm afraid."

God says: "I have not given you a spirit of fear" (II Timothy 1:7).

You say: "I'm always worried and frustrated."

God says: "Cast all your cares on ME" (I Peter 5:7).

You say: "I don't have enough faith."

God says: "I've given everyone a measure of faith" (Romans 12:3).

You say: "I'm not smart enough."

God says: "I give you wisdom" (I Corinthians 1:30).

You say: "I feel all alone."

God says: "I will never leave you or forsake you" (Hebrews 13:5).

Paradise Found

In Science and Health 285:3 Mrs. Eddy tells us, "This Science of being obtains not alone hereafter in what men call paradise, *but here and now*; it is the great fact of being for time and eternity." Right here, right now, we're in the paradise of infinite good (God). All good, here and now, is built into your being—"the kingdom of God is within you," Jesus said. The substance out of which we are all made is the living Truth which is eternal. So it is always the ageless living Truth announcing itself to us *as us*.

To believe that in reality evil has any power is hypnotic suggestion, as Mrs. Eddy tells us over and over. Evil is not real. In Science and Health she observes, "A blundering despatch mistakenly announcing the death of a friend occasions the same grief as the friend's real death would bring. You think that your anguish is occasioned by your loss. Another despatch, correcting the mistake, heals your grief and you learn that your suffering was merely a result of your belief."

Then Mrs. Eddy says, "Thus it is with all sorrow, sickness and death.... You will learn at length that there is no cause for

grief, and divine wisdom will then be understood. Error, not Truth, produces all the suffering on earth" (S&H 386:22).



A student in Mrs. Eddy's home told something of how Mrs. Eddy worked for the world. Every evening from 8 to 9, Mrs. Eddy withdrew to work for the world. This member of the household told that when the hour was up, and she rejoined the household,—she was so loving,—so tender,—so Christ-like,—that it almost made one's heart hurt. It touched the tenderest fibers of one's heart. — Clara M.S. Shannon, C.S.D., *Golden Memories*, p.3