

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1949

The Concept of God in Christian Science

George R. Kraus

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_krausg@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kraus, George R., "The Concept of God in Christian Science" (1949). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 308.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/308>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

INTRODUCTION

Mary Baker Eddy and the Church of Christ Scientist identify the concept of God in Christian Science with that of Biblical Christianity. This claim implies that the tenet of God in Mrs. Eddy's religious system is exactly identical with that of the Bible.¹ Furthermore, Divine Science claims that its concept of the Deity is unique, without counterpart in any other religious or philosophic system, either historic Christianity² or paganism.³

The purpose of this paper is, first, to examine Mrs. Eddy's concept in the light of Scripture and to prove that her concept of God is not Scriptural. In this connection it will be necessary to show how Mrs. Eddy uses Scripture passages in a metaphysical and even perverted manner to substantiate her claims. Secondly, we shall compare her concept of God with those of other religious and philosophic systems and demonstrate the falsity of her claim that her concept of God is unique.

Two more notes of explanation are necessary. First, since the concept of God in Divine Science is basically pantheistic, its concept will be presented in relation to the universe and man. Secondly, there are contradictions in Mrs. Eddy's writings; therefore those teachings presented as the beliefs of Christian Science are those

1. "Christianity and Christian Science are one...", Mary Baker Eddy, Science and Health with the Key to the Scriptures, p. 372.

2. "Christianity will never be...found to be unerring, until its absolute Science is reached.", Ibid., p. 483.

3. "No analogy exists between...agnosticism, pantheism, theosophy, spiritualism, or millenarianism and the truths of Christian Science.", Ibid., p. 110. See also pp. vii, xi, and 107.

most frequently found in her writings and which, consequently, are used as a basis for her sequence of religious tenets.

THE CONCEPT OF GOD IN CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

(Outline)

Controlling Purpose: This paper is to show that the concept of God in Christian Science is neither Scriptural nor unique.

I. The Person of God

- A. The God of the Bible
- B. The Christian Science use of Scripture
- C. The Christian Science concept of God
- D. Three major parallel concepts of God found in other religions evident in Christian Science
 1. Acosmistic Pantheism
 2. Hegelian Idealism
 3. Upanishad Hinduism
- E. The five minor parallel concepts of God in other religions evident in Christian Science
 1. Dualism
 2. Shakerism
 3. Emerson
 4. Gnosticism
 5. The Quimby manuscripts

II. The Trinity

- A. The Biblical doctrine of the Trinity
- B. The Christian Science Concept of the Trinity

III. An examination of the Persons of the Christian Trinity in relation to the works generally ascribed to the individual Persons by the Scriptures

- A. The Person of God the Father as the Creator of an objective universe and man
 1. The Biblical doctrine
 2. The Christian Science concept
 3. Acosmistic pantheism
 4. Hegelian Idealism
 5. Upanishad Hinduism
 6. Gnosticism
- B. The Person of Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Trinity, as the Savior of the world from sin
 1. The origin of sin and evil
 - a. The Biblical doctrine
 - b. The Christian Science concept
 - c. The Hegelian concept
 2. The problem of death and eternal punishment as the result of sin
 - a. The Biblical doctrine
 - b. The Christian Science concept
 - c. Hegelian Idealism
 3. The Person of Christ and His work of Redemption
 - a. The Biblical doctrine
 - b. The Christian Science concept

Outline (cont'd)

- c. Hegelianism
- d. Gnosticism
- e. Manichaeism
- f. Docetism
- 4. The doctrine of salvation and eternal life as the result of Christ's work
 - a. The Biblical doctrine
 - b. The Christian Science concept
 - c. Bhuddism
 - d. Upanishad Hinduism
 - e. Hegelianism
- C. The Person of the Holy Ghost, the Third Person of the Trinity, the sole cause for man's acceptance of the Redemption
 - 1. The Biblical doctrine
 - 2. The Christian Science concept
 - 3. The Hegelian Idealistic concept
 - 4. The concept in Mysticism
 - 5. The Gnostic concept

THE CONCEPT OF GOD IN CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

I. The Person of God

In order to examine the Christian Science concept of God fairly and according to the only standard which is final, it is necessary to examine the Scriptural doctrine of God. The God of the Christian religion as revealed in the Holy Scriptures is a personal Being, a complete entity in Himself, distinctly apart from His entire creation, neither limited by space nor time, entirely absolute. The Scriptural doctrine of God will be considered briefly under two aspects: the personality of God and the negative and positive attributes of God.

In Genesis I certain characteristics of God are recorded. These activities ascribe the powers to will, act, consider to God; they describe a personal, conscious Supreme Being. Thus, for example, the account of creation in the first chapter of Genesis ascribes to God the following acts: creating, moving, saying, seeing, calling, making. It is impossible for a neuter Principle to exercise these functions; they are possible only by a personal, individual Being. The God of the Bible is an active Agent towards objects outside Himself.

The Scriptures also ascribe to God the ability to express feeling or emotion toward His created objects. He is described as a God that hates, becomes angry, loves, pities, becomes jealous, etc.¹ Only personality can feel emotion and express that towards an object. There is no doubt that the God of the Bible reacts to the actions, thinking, and will of mankind, and that God loves, becomes angry, shows mercy, exercises justice, and so on because of men's attitudes and lives. An impersonal, impassive, immovable Principle can express none of these feelings or emotions.

The God of the Bible also appears in a definite local place in time and space. In such an instance He is present in His entire Entity and with all His power and attributes. For example there is the account of Jacob wrestling with God at Penuel; "...and Jacob called the place Penuel, for I have seen God face to face..."² An impersonal, spiritual Nebula cannot appear as a complete Entity or Being in time and space; but the Christian God as revealed in Scripture can "fill all in all"³ and at the same time speak with Moses on Mount Sinai in all His power and glory.

It was stated before that the Christian God is quite apart from His creation and creatures; the Bible bears this out. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."⁴ It is clear from this passage that the world had a beginning; it was not from eternity.

-
1. Zech. 8:17, Isa. 63:3, John 3:16, Eph. 2:4, Josh. 3:16.
 2. Gen. 32:30. Cf. also Ex. 19:11.
 3. Eph. 1:23.
 4. Gen. 1:1.

It had a Prime Mover, a Creator, that gave it form and beginning. From such a passage as, "And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was."⁵, it is evident that Christ existed as God Himself before the universe was in existence. The Scriptures nowhere identify the visible phenomena of the universe with the Christian God.

The so called negative attributes of God as immutability, indivisibility, etc., described in the Bible further place the Biblical doctrine of God in contradistinction to the god of pantheism. God is immutable. The world is stated as "perishing" and "waxing old"; the whole universe is in a process of continual change,⁶ but God Himself never changes.⁷

God is indivisible. He is not composed of component parts nor of a substance and qualities inherent in such substance. He is absolutely simple in His divine essence.⁸ On the one hand, Scripture states the power of God is in any one place at any one time in all His power and attributes; here, on the other hand, the totality of God is stressed. He cannot be divided nor separated in space.

The foregoing passages from Scripture present God as opposed to the god of pantheism. The positive attributes of God as revealed in the Scriptures eliminate the theories of Deism which make of God a Blind Force or Prime Mover who is no longer necessary to, nor active in creation or make of God a Being subordinate to the set laws of

5. John 17:5. Cf. also Col. 1:17, Ps. 102:25-27.

6. Ps. 102:25-27.

7. Mal. 3:6, Heb. 13:8.

8. Ps. 139:8.

nature.

God is just. He is His own law and norm and legislates His law to the universe and man, which man and universe must obey. If man refuses to conform to that revealed law, God will execute perfect justice upon the offender. Such a passage as the following is a good example: "Justice and judgment are the habitation of Thy throne..."⁹

God wills. He determines His own plans and carries them out without interference in the universe. "Whatsoever the Lord has pleased, that He did in heaven and in earth, in the seas, and all the deep places."¹⁰

God is powerful. He can do and does do whatsoever He purposes in heaven and earth. "...for with God nothing shall be impossible."¹¹

God is true. He is exactly as He has manifested Himself and will perform and finish His unchanging promises. "He hath said and shall He not do it?"¹²

God is life. He has life in His own Being of Himself and not dependent on any external thing for existence. "Who only hath immortality..."¹³

God is wisdom. By this wisdom He guides and rules the universe to carry out His eternal purposes both of creation and of salvation.

I am God, and there is none like Me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from the ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.¹⁴

-
9. Ps. 89:14, Cf. also Deut. 32:4, Is. 3:11.
 10. Ps. 135:6, Cf. also Rom. 11:34, Ps. 33:9,10.
 11. Luke 1:37, Cf. also Ps. 115:3.
 12. Num. 23:19, Cf. also Titus 1:2, 2 Tim. 2:13.
 13. I Tim. 6:16, Cf. also I Tim. 1:17.
 14. Is. 46:9,10, Cf. also Eph. 3:10,11.

God also exercises His favorable attributes of mercy, grace, and love towards the objects of His creation.¹⁵

Finally God is perfectly holy. By this all His thoughts, will, and actions are in perfect agreement with His pure nature and in opposition to anything contrary to His purity.¹⁶

This brief presentation of the personality of God and the negative and positive attributes of God offer a fairly complete picture of the God of the Bible, a self-sufficient Being, upon Whom the entire universe depends for its existence.¹⁷ With this Scriptural doctrine of God in mind the author of the paper will now continue with the Christian Science concept of God.

15. Eph. 2:4, Eph. 2:8,9, John 3:16.

16. Lev. 19:2, Rom. 1:18.

17. The outline of the four specific points quoted above to illustrate the personality of God are from I. M. Haldeman, Christian Science in the Light of Holy Scripture, pp. 117-134. The list of negative and positive attributes of God, some of the passages used for proof texts, and some of the explanations in regard to the attributes are from A. L. Graebner, Doctrinal Theology, pp. 24 ff.

Mary Baker Eddy claims that her concept of God is Scriptural. Before continuing with a presentation of her concept of God it is necessary to examine her principles of hermeneutics and the contradictions that appear in her writings when discussing the person of God. In Christian Science the basic assumption is that matter has no reality; everything in the universe is spiritual, and when God speaks to man in the Scriptures and uses material terminology, the material meaning of the words is to be ignored and only the metaphysical terminology of Divine Science is to be employed and accepted as the correct interpretation of the text cited or read. She says:

In Christian Science we learn that the substitution of the spiritual for the material word often elucidates the meaning of the inspired writers, ... and gives their spiritual sense, which is also their original sense.¹⁸

The two examples following demonstrate the above principle of hermeneutics which Mrs. Eddy follows:

ABEL: Watchfulness; self-offering; surrender to the Creator the early fruits of experience.¹⁹

Gen. 3:9-10 And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou? And he said, I heard Thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself...its summons may be thus paraphrased: Where art thou, man? Is Mind in matter? Is Mind capable of error as well as of truth, of evil as well as of good, when God is All and He is Mind and there is but one God, hence one Mind?²⁰

These two quotations from Mrs. Eddy's writings demonstrate the

18. Mary Baker Eddy, Science and Health with the Key to the Scriptures, p. 579.

19. Ibid.

20. Op. cit., p. 532. See also Eddy, Science and Health, pp. 16-17, 501-578. These extra references are Mrs. Eddy's exegesis of Genesis and Revelation and demonstrate her metaphysical manner of interpretation.

metaphysical manner in which she interprets Scripture. The original words are emptied of their actual meaning completely, and a "spiritual" meaning substituted. With this type of interpretation it is possible to prove any tenet of Christian Science. By it Mrs. Eddy can prove any a priori concept of her system.²¹

Christian Science also uses Scripture in a perverted way to substantiate its tenets; Mrs. Eddy twists Scriptural verses to fit her preconceived ideas of God.

The Scriptures declare, "The Lord He is God (good); there is none beside Him." Even so, harmony is universal, and discord is unreal...Remember that man's perfection is real and unimpeachable, whereas imperfection is blameworthy, unreal, and is not brought about by divine Love.²²

This is a good example of how Mrs. Eddy uses a Bible verse to establish her dogma that harmony is universal, etc.. The gross perversions of Scripture, as the example above and those referred to in the footnote twenty-two, are but samples of Mrs. Eddy's continual tampering with Scripture.

The contradictions in the writings of Christian Science likewise offer difficulties for the person trying to ascertain with accuracy a particular tenet of Christian Science. One example dealing with the justice of God will demonstrate the difficulty.

Divine Science reveals the necessity of sufficient suffering, either before or after death, to quench the love of sin. To remit the penalty due for sin, would be for Truth to pardon error. Escape from punishment is not in accordance with God's government since justice is the handmaid of mercy.²³

21. See also the similar use of Scripture in Kabbalism, Shakerism, Swedenbergianism in Engelder, Popular Symbolics.

22. Eddy, Op. cit., p. 414, Cf. also pp. 340, 429, 476.

23. Ibid., p. 36.

From this passage it is evident that God does not forgive sin, but on the contrary, teaches the necessity for suffering as a penalty for sin. Then in contradiction to this clear statement of Mrs. Eddy concerning the justice of God and the necessity of divine retribution there is the following passage from her writings.

In common justice we must admit that God will not punish man for doing what He created man capable of doing, and knew from the outset that man would do.²⁴

This quotation claims God will not punish the sinner, for in so doing, He would punish man for something for which he, man, is not responsible; for then God would be considered the Author of sin. Remembering these three difficulties in examining the writings of Christian Science, the concept of God proper in Divine Science will now be discussed.

24. Ibid., p. 357.

The standard textbook of Divine Science, Science and Health, gives the following definitions of God:

...God is incorporeal, divine, supreme, infinite, Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Love, Truth...These terms are synonymous. They refer to one absolute God. They are also intended to express the nature, essence, and wholeness of Deity. The attributes of God are justice, mercy, wisdom, goodness, and so on.²⁵

Mrs. Eddy also makes it a point to show that the abstract nouns usually used to describe God's attributes are really not attributes but God's essence. She says:

A misplaced word, ..., mistakes the Science of the Scripture..., as, e.g., to name Love as merely an attribute of God.²⁶

These definitions of God give some important clues to Mrs. Eddy's concept of God. First she says that the Being of God Itself is Mind, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love. These terms are to express the nature, the essence, the wholeness of Deity. It is apparent that Mrs. Eddy really identifies God's attributes and His very essence. Christian Science has a practice called inversion, that is, Mrs. Eddy's terms describing the essence of God may be used in a sentence as a predicate noun with the subject, God, or they may be used as the subject of the sentence and the word God becomes the predicate noun. The meaning is then supposed to remain the same. This practice of inversion further proves that Mrs. Eddy makes the attributes of God His very essence. The following example illustrates Mrs. Eddy's claim. "God is Love" is changed to "Love is God".

25. Ibid., p. 465.

26. Ibid., p. 319.

Perhaps a better word to use than "is" would be "consist", since the terms are to express the essence of God. Thus God consists of Love, God consists of Soul, God consists of Principle, etc. Mrs. Eddy very definitely uses the abstract nouns: good, love, principle, etc. to denote the very substance of God. Secondly she states that the attributes of God are justice, mercy, wisdom, goodness, etc. One becomes confused trying to distinguish between attributes and essence since the terms are the same parts of speech; truth is supposed to be an essence of God, wisdom is an attribute; both are abstract nouns of the same quality. The difficulty is self evident. Scripture nowhere states these qualities as being the essence of God, but only that God exercises these attributes.

The next point to note is that Christian Science speaks of God in the neuter gender and thus denies His personality.

...Is there more than one God or Principle?...There is not. Principle and its idea is one, and this one is God,...the varied manifestations of Christian Science indicate Mind, never matter, and have one Principle.²⁷

God is not a person to whom we should pray to heal the sick, but the Life, Love, and Truth that destroy error and death.²⁸

One concludes from the above quotations that the God of Mrs. Eddy is not a person; He is an It. She uses the word "Principle" for the Deity. "It" is explained in Webster's Dictionary as a fundamental truth, a line of policy, the ethics behind an action; but nowhere does Webster use the word "it" to describe a personal being, God or man. The word "principle" itself excludes the idea of

27. Ibid., p. 465.

28. Ibid., p. 8.

personality in God. Mrs. Eddy refers several times to God as "It"; which is never done in Scripture.²⁹ The word "It" conveys perfectly the neuter, impersonal idea. Finally, Divine Science states emphatically that God is not a person; He is the combination of Life, Love, Truth, in short, the personification of abstract nouns.³⁰

Next it is necessary to consider Divine Science's concept of God as being the sum and substance of all things in the universe. "All that really exists is divine Mind and its idea."³¹ "God is Mind, and God is infinite; hence all is Mind."³² "God, Spirit, being all, nothing is matter."³³

Christian Science reveals incontrovertably that Mind is All-in-all, that the only real realities are the Divine Mind and idea.³⁴

Apparently the God of Christian Science is the whole universe, at least nothing exists outside of God, ...all that really exists is divine Mind, ...hence all is Mind, ...the only real realities are divine Mind and its idea. It follows quite logically that if all is divine Mind, or God, then everything (that is the so-called universe) is God Himself. Nor is man excluded from this sweeping definition of God for Mrs. Eddy states, "The only I, or Us, the only Spirit, Sout, etc., ...not that which is in man, but God."³⁵ The God of Christian Science is everything, and everything that does not come under the definition of the essence of God, such as matter, is non-existent.

29. Ibid., p. 151, 469.

30. See footnote 28.

31. Ibid., p. 151.

32. Ibid., p. 492.

33. Ibid., p. 113.

34. Ibid., p. 109.

35. Ibid., p. 591.

Mrs. Eddy claims her concept of God is without parallel in any other religious or philosophical system. The fact is that Mrs. Eddy's concept of God is very similar to that found in other religious and philosophic systems. This does not necessarily mean that Mrs. Eddy copied from all these similar sources, but merely that the ideas presented in Christian Science concerning God are not unique. There are three widespread parallel concepts of God and five minor ones which are closely aligned with Christian Science.

The first and basic identical concept of God with that of Christian Science is Pantheistic. Mrs. Eddy, of course, violently denies any charge of pantheism made against her concept of God.

Christian Science Not Pantheism

Christian Science, ..., looms above the mists of pantheism higher than Mt. Ararat above the deluge.³⁶

She also has the statement, "...and Science is not Pantheism, but Christian Science."³⁷ Mrs. Eddy claims to be in violent opposition to pantheism, but in reality she identifies God and the universe and therefore is an exponent of pantheism. She says:

The Science of Christianity is strictly monotheistic - it has one God. And this divine infinite Principle, noumenon and phenomenon, is demonstrably the self-existent Life, Truth, Love, Substance, Spirit, Mind, which includes all that the term implies, and is all that is real and eternal.³⁸

According to Webster the word "pantheism" is derived from two Greek words meaning "all" and "god". His uncapitalized word "god" gives the meaning of pantheism as a

36. Eddy, Christian Science Versus Pantheism and Other Messages to the Mother Church, p. 2.

37. Ibid., p. 13.

38. Ibid., p. 12.

human opinion of "gods many", or mind in matter. "The doctrine that the universe is conceived as whole, is God; that there is no God but the combined forces and laws which are manifested in the existing universe."³⁹

First of all, Mrs. Eddy contradicts her own denial of the charge of pantheism that God is noumenon and phenomenon and then accepts Webster's definition of pantheism, - the universe conceived as a whole, is God, - the combined forces and laws which are manifested in the existing universe. It is impossible to conceive of the universe as something besides noumena and phenomena. (These terms noumena and phenomena are not used in the Kantian sense describing Idealism.) The universe is noumena and phenomena; what else is there? Christian Science may then press the point that its meaning of noumenon and phenomenon is entirely different since it rejects as real all matter, phenomenon in the popular meaning of the word.

We are ready to grant that Mrs. Eddy did not advocate pancosmistic pantheism. But she seems to be unaware of the fact that pantheism may be viewed as acosmistic. Christian Science may conceivably deny pancosmism, but acosmistic pantheism is identical with the Christian Science concept of God.

Pantheism, according to the etymology, is the view that all is God, and that God is all, but, since, thought may move either from God to all, or from all to God, it can assume two forms. If it begins with the religious belief or philosophic faith in God as infinite and eternal reality, then the finite and temporal world is swallowed up in God, and pantheism becomes acosmism, i.e. the world is an illusion in comparison with God as reality.⁴⁰

...the doctrine of acosmism implies that the universe, as

39. Ibid., p. 3.

40. J. Hastings, "Pantheism," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Vols. IX & X, 609.

known to human experience, possesses no reality in itself, but is dependent upon, or is a manifestation of, an underlying real being, ...so the acosmist holds the universe as a whole to be illusory.⁴¹

Christian Science with its denial of all matter and belief in the allness of God identifies itself perfectly with acosmism. In the discussion later when the relationship between God and the universe will be examined, the similarity between acosmism and Christian Science will be evident. Such statements as "...all that really exists is divine Mind" and "God is All-in-all." state clearly that the God of Divine Science is the god of acosmistic pantheism.

Bellwald, an eminent Catholic scholar in the field of Christian Science, reached the definite conclusion that Mrs. Eddy's God is pantheistic.

Mrs. Eddy's God, despite her protests, is pantheistical. In the beginning she objected to calling God a person, precisely because, not knowing the import of the word, she imagined it destroyed her pantheistical conception of God. Later she wrote: "As the words person and personal are commonly and ignorantly employed, they often lead, when applied to Deity, to confused and erroneous conceptions of divinity, and its distinctions from humanity. If the term personality, as applied to God, means infinite personality, then God is infinite Person, - in this sense, but not in the lower sense. An infinite Mind and a finite form do not, cannot coalesce."⁴²

That God should be called a soul is unjustifiable, except of the pantheistic principle that He is the world-soul; or on the scientific principle that there is no other soul, no other spirit...⁴³

41. Ibid., Vol. I, 74.

42. A. M. Bellwald, Christian Science and the Catholic Faith, p. 63.

43. Ibid., p. 64.

Bellwald's explanation that Mrs. Eddy confuses and tries to use two definitions for the term person, and then tries to clear up the difficulty by using the words infinite and finite, makes her definition of God pantheistic. God is either, by her definition of Soul or Spirit, the world-soul which pervades all things (noumena and phenomena), and is pancosmism; or, taking her absolute denial of matter, God is the only Soul or Being which is acosmism, both definitions still pantheism.

One other doctrine of Christian Science that demonstrates Mrs. Eddy's God is pantheistic is its doctrine of prayer. "God is not moved by breath of praise to do more than he has already done..."⁴⁴ "Prayer cannot change the Science of being, but tends to bring into harmony with it."⁴⁵ From these statements of Mrs. Eddy it is evident that prayer to an objective Deity is useless; there is no theistic Being in Christian Science. Prayer is directed inward towards the man to help him attain spiritual harmony. Snowden, a Protestant scholar writing on Christian Science, is correct when he states the following:

Her doctrine of prayer is pantheistic, for she denies that prayer has any effect on God, but has only subjective influence on us.⁴⁶

The only other possible explanation of prayer Mrs. Eddy could hold would be to deny that God will listen to prayer, that He refuses; which is, of course, negated by her pantheism. The God of Mrs. Eddy

⁴⁴. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 2

⁴⁵. Eddy, Loc. Cit.

⁴⁶. J. H. Snowden, The Truth about Christian Science, p. 157.

is the god of pantheism. Since pantheism is an old view, her concept of God is far from unique as Mrs. Eddy would have us believe.

The second widespread concept of God is that God is the absolute Idea. In philosophy this concept is known as Idealism in various forms. At the time of Mrs. Eddy Hegelian Idealism was popular. First, consider a short definition of Idealism.

Philosophical idealism is as old as Plato...it found expression in Berkley's "Principles of Human Knowledge" ...Briefly this book holds that mind or spirit is ultimate reality and matter is a mode of its activity, ...Idealism does not deny matter.⁴⁷

Dr. Powell says of P. P. Quimby, the mind-healer, of Portland, Maine..."The Bible was ever in his hands, and sometimes Berkley." He had a perverted idea of the notion of Berkley's idealism, 'error is matter'.⁴⁸

Idealism holds that mind or spirit is the one ultimate reality in the universe; and that all matter is a mode of its activity, a way of expressing itself; but, notice, pure idealism does not deny the existence of matter. Quimby, as noted by Snowden and Powell, misunderstood Berkley's idealism, and Mrs. Eddy, at least to a small degree, was influenced by this misunderstanding.

Mrs. Eddy, however, for the most part, relied on the idealism of Hegel, the great German dialectical philosopher. "Hegelianism may be termed a species of the philosophy of idealism."⁴⁹ Hegelian

47. Ibid., p. 14.

48. Ibid., p. 15. In this chapter Snowden speaks of Mrs. Eddy's plagiarism from Quimby. Since much has been written on Mrs. Eddy's dependence on the Quimby manuscripts in regard to much of her material, a discussion of the Quimby manuscripts will be omitted. See H. Dresser, Christian Science, for a detailed discussion of Quimby and his relation to Mrs. Eddy.

49. W. M. Haushalter, Mrs. Eddy Purloins from Hegel, p. 49. In an examination of the concepts of the universe, Christ, the atonement, and salvation which will be discussed later, further identity between Lieber's concept of the Hegelian God and Mrs. Eddy's God will be noted.

Idealism was propounded in New England, Mrs. Eddy's home, with a good deal of enthusiasm and interest by a German philosopher and soldier of fortune, Hans Lieber, who was considered a student of authority on Hegel. Lieber wrote a lengthy article entitled "The Lieber Document" in which he gave his interpretation of Hegelianism, but Hegelianism just the same.⁵⁰ It is from this document that Mrs. Eddy copied many of her ideas, especially concerning her concept of God.

Mrs. Eddy attempts the feat, impossible of fulfillment, of taking the Non-personal God of 'Principle', filling Him with emotion and decorating him with solicitious evangelism for every need of His creatures. With the exception of this bit of atavism Mrs. Eddy's God is the God of Hegelianism.⁵¹

Hans Lieber lectured on Hegel's Philosophy to the philosophical societies of the day in New England, and from his written manuscript, Mrs. Eddy plagiarized this peculiar brand of pantheism, Hegelian Idealism.

On the point of the Absolute and Non-personal nature of God, Mrs. Eddy succeeds in making a fairly accurate transcription from Hegel. She says: "God is incorporeal, divine, supreme, infinite, Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love. Are these terms synonymous? They refer to the one Absolute God." ...The following from Hegel establishes the identity. "God is Spirit."... "Mortal love resigns particularly and personality and moves to the universal. The abstract God is the universal Father, eternal, all inclusive. This is the height of Spirit."⁵²

The source of Mrs. Eddy's concept of God is without a doubt Lieber, who in turn copied his ideas from Hegel. A comparison of the two

50. Ibid., Chapter I.

51. Ibid., p. 52.

52. Ibid., p. 51.

following documents demonstrate this fact.

Lieber

To conclude that Life, Love, and Truth are attributes of a personal Deity implies there is something in Person superior to Principle. What then, is the person of God? Hegel makes clear that He has no personality as we narrowly view personality, for this would imply intelligence in matter. The body of God is the Idea given Him in the harmonious order of the universe and in man (male and female) formed by Him.

Eddy

To conclude Life, Love, and Truth are attributes of a personal Deity, implies there is something in person superior to Principle. What is the person of God? He has no personality, for this would imply intelligence in matter; the body of God is the idea given of Him in the harmonious universe, and male and female formed by Him.⁵³

Since Lieber wrote before Mrs. Eddy, it is evident who copied from whom. The concept of God in Christian Science is certainly not unique. Mrs. Eddy, following Quimby's mistake in regard to an idealistic view of the universe, purloined Hegel's concept of God as propounded by Lieber, added qualities of emotion, and came up with the God of Christian Science. From the general observation that Mrs. Eddy's God is pantheistic, one can narrow her concept down to New England Hegelian Idealism.

The third widespread concept of God with which Christian Science shows affinity is that of Upanishad Hinduism. It is quite probable that Mrs. Eddy never read or studied this oriental philosophy, but a presentation of its concept of God shows the antiquity of Christian Science's Deity, as Snowden points out:

53. Ibid., p. 37.

...whereas Oriental pantheism resolves the objective world into deceitful appearance or unreal illusion. It is obvious that Mrs. Eddy's pantheism, ..., belongs to the Oriental type, ..., especially that of India.⁵⁴

In Hinduism God, or Brahma, has been defined:

The absolute, infinite, eternal, omnipresent, impersonal, indescribably, neuter Being. It may also be designated as spirit, a world soul, into which the individual soul is to be merged.⁵⁵

And again Haigh, a leading scholar on Hinduism, says:

Brahma alone, a spirit, essentially existent, intelligent, and joy, void of all qualities and all acts, ..., all besides himself, the entire universe, is false, that is to say, is nothing whatsoever. Neither has it existed, nor does it now exist, nor will it exist at any time in the future. And the soul is one with Brahma.⁵⁶

Certainly Christian Science's concept of God is identical with the God of Hinduism. There is a complete denial of matter in both religions; nothing exists in Brahminism except Brahma, the world soul, and the same is true of Christian Science, only Mrs. Eddy's "God" is not named Brahma. The one difference evident in Christian Science and Hinduism is the manner in which they attempt to describe God; Christian Science tries to do it positively by ascribing positive attributes to God by using abstract nouns expressing good qualities and ends by making such nouns as Good, Love, etc. the very essence of the Deity. The Upanishads avoid this difficulty by approaching the problem negatively; they say, "Brahma is not this or that...(The Self is described as No, No.)"⁵⁷ Their difficulty is that they end by denying God for all practical purposes, and He, Brahma, literally becomes an academic

54. Snowden, Op. cit., p. 158.

55. R. E. Hume, The World's Living Religions, p. 24.

56. Henry Haigh, Some Leading Ideas of Hinduism, p. 46.

57. W. James, Varieties of Religious Experience, p. 416.

question and nothing more. Mrs. Eddy's concept of God is apparent in the Oriental philosophy of the Hindu Upanishads. Mrs. Eddy's claim that her God is unique is a falsity.

There are five other parallel concepts of God which have some point of affinity with, or influence on, that of Divine Science, that which are not identical in every detail. Dualism, or Manichaeism as it is sometimes termed, with its two principles of evil and good, is very definitely reflected in the God of Christian Science.

To judge only from appearances, nothing seems farther from the truth than an identification of Christian Science, with its insistence on the One-ness of God, and Manichaeism, with its dualism of the two irreconcilable and eternal principles of Good and Evil; and yet, is not Mrs. Eddy's anomalous teaching concerning malicious animal magnetism, which is practically omnipotent, the nearest approach to Manichaeism?⁵⁸

In her writings Mrs. Eddy expresses her belief in the evil power of animal magnetism.

Doubters of existence of the evil of mental malpractice, animal magnetism, sneerers at the probability of its methods, will at no distant day have their eyes sharply opened.⁵⁹

My husband's death was caused by malicious animal magnetism...I know it was poison that killed him, not material poison, but mesmeric poison.⁶⁰

Is there any doubt that the author of Christian Science recognizes a potent evil force in the universe that is opposed to the one Being, Who is All-in-all? Of course this is contradictory to the claim of Divine Science that there is only good and no evil in existence.

58. Bellwald, Op. cit., p. 175.

59. Eddy, Retrospection and Introspection, p. 72.

60. Riley, Peabody, Humiston, The Faith, Falsity, and Failure of Christian Science, p. 112.

But the fact remains that Mrs. Eddy recognized this evil which opposed God and man. The principles of good and evil are irreconcilable in her mind, and as she states God cannot create or permit evil, then we must draw the conclusion that she holds a dualistic view of the world. It is to be remembered, though, that she has sections in her works where she denies evil and animal magnetism altogether. "Animal magnetism has no basis. It is an illusion."⁶¹ "The foundation of evil is laid on belief in something besides God."⁶² This is an example of one of the inconsistencies with which one must work when examining religious concepts in Divine Science.

Christian Science, in so far as it accepts animal magnetism, must be classed as dualistic manichaeism.

Shakerism is a religious sect, which while having no important or positive connection with Christian Science, does contain some ideas concerning the Deity which are reflected in Mrs. Eddy's concept of God in Divine Science. Snowden points out this resemblance.

At east Canterbury, N. H., within five miles of Tilton, Mary Baker Eddy's childhood home, was the main community of Shakers, a sect founded by Ann Lee...While Shakerism and Christian Science are not closely related, they have points of affinity and contact. The Shakers have always prayed to "Our Father and Mother which art in heaven." ...The Shakers made the claim that Ann Lee was inspired; Mrs. Eddy made the same claim.⁶³

Like Ann Lee, the founder of Shakerism, Mary Baker Eddy places great emphasis on the feminine in the Deity. In her Key to Scriptures she defines the Scriptural word "Mother" as: "God; divine and eternal Principle; Life, Love, and Truth."⁶⁴ Her paraphrase of the Lord's

61. Eddy, Op. cit., p. 73.

62. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 92.

63. Snowden, Op. cit., p. 17.

64. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 593.

Prayer is another example: "Our Father-Mother God..."⁶⁵ Again and again in her writings Mrs. Eddy brings out the womanhood of God. In the same way she stresses the importance of woman over against man. "Woman is the highest species of man..."⁶⁶ "He who has faith in woman's special adaptability to lead on Christian Science."⁶⁷ Divine Science places a definite importance on the feminine. It cannot be proven that Mrs. Eddy copied from Ann Lee, but it certainly deserves attention because of the proximity of Shakerism's birth place to Mrs. Eddy's home and the similar ideas concerning the feminine in the Deity and importance of woman to the spiritual progress of man.

Mrs. Eddy lived at a time in New England when philosophical societies were the fashion of the day; it was the time of men such as Emerson, Clarke, Lieber, and others. It is extremely doubtful that one can prove a relationship between the thoughts of a man like Emerson and those of Mrs. Eddy, but in view of the religious trends of the time, it is interesting to note how the "unique" God of Mrs. Eddy is quite common to the current thought of her day. It is not at all improbable that Mrs. Eddy absorbed some of the current philosophical thoughts.⁶⁸ This seems to be true especially of Ralph Waldo Emerson's concept of God. He wrote:

Meantime within man is the soul of the whole, ..., the eternal ONE. ...We see the world piece by piece, as the sun, the moon, ..., but the whole of which these are shining parts, is the soul. ...God comes to us without

65. Ibid., p. 16

66. Eddy, Unity of Good, p. 8.

67. Eddy, Miscellaneous Writings, p. 210.

68. Snowden, Op. cit., p. 15.

a bell. That is as there is no screen or ceiling between our heads and the infinite heavens, so is there no bar or wall in the soul, where man, the effect ceases, and God, the cause, begins... We lie open... to all the attributes of God... The simplest person, who is his integrity worships God, becomes God.⁶⁹

As Snowden says, Emerson went past the current philosophers of his day to the pantheistic Over-soul.⁷⁰ Emerson claimed that God is the eternal One, the soul that pervades the entire universe. He did not deny a material universe, true, but he did make of God a pantheistic Over-soul, a point in which Mrs. Eddy followed him in her "All-in-all". He merges God and man, so there is no line of demarcation between God and man, and Mrs. Eddy does likewise. Emerson states man is one with God, man becomes God by merely desiring to be Him; so does Mrs. Eddy. "Separated from man, who expresses Soul, Spirit would be a nonentity; man divorced from Spirit, would lose his entity."⁷¹ Both Emerson and Eddy present the same pantheistic view of God, a world Over-soul, the Divine Mind that fills all-in-all. It is rather doubtful whether Mrs. Eddy's concept of God at the time of Emerson would have been labeled unique.

Christian Science presents similarity to Gnosticism with its concept of God. Gnosticism says that God is the central Being from whom all other beings - angels, man, all creation - flow as rays from the sun. These "rays" are named aeons or emanations. Like Gnosticism Mrs. Eddy says: "The sun sends forth light, but not suns; so God reflects Himself, or Mind, but does not subdivide

69. Ralph W. Emerson, Emerson's Essays, p. 262.

70. Snowden, Op. cit., p. 16.

71. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 477.

mind..."⁷², and again she says: "Man is not God, but like a ray of light which comes from the sun, man, the outcome of God, reflects God."⁷³ Man and the universe in Christian Science is an emanation from God; they are the ideas of God projected from Himself. God is the "Sun" or origin of the universal ideas of aeons.

So, likewise, is it easy to see some analogy between the Gnostic Aeons that emanate from God, and Mrs. Eddy's conception of the divine ideas, which are thoroughly spiritual.⁷⁴

God in Christian Science is a source from which flow the thoughts or aeons which compose the universe and man. This is identical with the God of Gnosticism. Mrs. Eddy makes God an emanating Principle.⁷⁵

This may not be all the sources or parallel religious systems from which Mrs. Eddy derived or reproduced her concept of God,⁷⁶ but it demonstrates just how unique her ideas are and how Scriptural! Bellwald accurately summarizes the sources of Mrs. Eddy's tenets:

The truth is that Christian Science cannot be identified with any one heresy, either ancient or modern, though undoubtedly it has incorporated elements that were distinctive of ancient sects as well as...modern thought.⁷⁷

72. Eddy, Retrospection and Introspection, p. 77.

73. Eddy, Science and Health, pp. 249-250.

74. Bellwald, Op. cit., p. 175.

75. Eddy, Op. cit., p. 112.

76. See Snowden, Op. cit., p. 78. Snowden points out that Mrs. Eddy's whole system, including her concept of God, was not original, but that she obtained virtually everything from the Quimby Manuscripts.

77. Bellwald, Loc. cit.

II. The Trinity

Actually Mrs. Eddy has no doctrine of the Trinity, but the Bible does, and to show the antithesis between Mrs. Eddy's concept of God and the Bible's, it is necessary to examine her peculiar explanation of the Trinity in the light of Scripture.

The Bible presents the doctrine of the Triune God, as three distinct Persons in one God-head;⁷⁸ there is only one God,⁷⁹ but there are three separate Persons in that God-head, which the Christian Church names the Trinity. The Father is God, but He is not the Son nor the Holy Spirit;⁸⁰ the Son is God, but He is not the Father nor the Holy Spirit;⁸¹ the Holy Spirit is God, but He is neither the Father nor the Son,⁸² yet there is only one true God. The Bible also ascribes certain works to the different Persons of the Trinity. This is not done to the complete exclusion of the other Persons in all cases,⁸³ but in some works one may not ascribe a work which is ascribed to one Person of the Trinity to all. For example, the redemption accomplished by the Son, Jesus, is not ascribed to the Father or the Holy Ghost. The Son, Jesus, suffered and died for the sins of the

78. Gen. 1:26,27; Is. 54:5; Ps. 110:1; Matt. 28:19.

79. Deut. 6:4; John 10:30.

80. John 15:26; John 15:9; John 5:20.

81. John 3:16; John 20:28; John 1:18.

82. John 14:26; Rom. 8:9; Acts 5:24.

83. See the creation account in Genesis I and the use of the Hebrew term, Elohim, for God. The word is in the plural and yet states there is one God, one Elohim. This is certainly a good proof for the doctrine of the Trinity.

world, not the Father or the Holy Spirit.⁸⁴

Divine Science does not accept the doctrine of the Trinity as presented in the Bible. Mrs. Eddy gives the following definition of the Trinity.

The theory of the three persons in one God (that is, a personal Trinity, Tri-unity) suggests polytheism, rather than the one ever-present I AM...⁸⁵

Life, Truth, and Love constitute the triune Person called God...God the Father-Mother; Christ the spiritual idea of sonship; divine Science or the Holy Comforter.

Christian Science opposes the doctrine of the Trinity, a clear teaching of the Bible, and yet insists it is in harmony with all Scripture. The Son, Jesus, is nothing more than a spiritual idea of God, not God Himself. There is no third Person of the Trinity as the Holy Ghost; the third Person of the Trinity is simply the body of knowledge contained in the writings of Mrs. Eddy, her Divine Science. The claim of Christian Science that its definition of God is in agreement with Scripture is false. The only concept in Christian Science that is related to the Biblical doctrine of the Trinity in any way is Mrs. Eddy's use of the three abstract nouns to define God.

The eternal Elohim...is in the plural, but this plurality of Spirit does not imply more than one God, nor does it imply three persons in one; it relates to the oneness, the tri-unity of Life, Love, and Truth.⁸⁷

To Mrs. Eddy the term Trinity and the passages or words in the Bible which speak of the three-in-one God merely refer to the inter-relationship of the three nouns: Life, Love, Truth. Can there be a more clear denial of the doctrine of the Trinity?

84. Matt. 27:46; Rom. 5:10.

85. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 256.

86. Ibid., p. 331.

87. Ibid., p. 515.

III.

An examination of the Persons of the Christian Trinity in relation to the works generally ascribed to the individual Persons by the Scriptures

Since the God of Divine Science is pantheistic, an examination of its concept of the universe is necessary to clearly understand how Mrs. Eddy has denied God as the Creator of the universe and man; and not only denied the physical universe and physical man, but has declared the Biblical act of creation an act contrary to the will of God and an act that would destroy His very Being.

Scripture teaches that the universe and man are creations of God and therefore apart and distinct from God the Creator. Genesis 1 teaches very clearly a real, tangible, physical universe. The Bible takes for granted the existence of matter as real and distinctly separate from the Creator.⁸⁸ Furthermore, God said, "God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good."⁸⁹ He placed His stamp of approval upon the material universe and man. In the Scriptures there is no placing matter, per se, as an opposite, an enemy, a contradiction to God. The universe is not a reflection nor an emanation from God; for God created the universe and all that is in it out of nothing by the word of His power.⁹⁰ Even the final

88. Gen. 1, Heb. 11:3, II Peter 3:10.

89. Gen. 1:31.

90. Heb. 11:3, Gen. 1:1.

destruction of the universe on the Day of Judgment is pictured as a material disintegration of the present universe.⁹¹ The universe of the Scriptures is not spiritual, it is material.

In the Scriptures the person of man is material as well as spiritual. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground."⁹² "...for out of it (ground) wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."⁹³ The physical body of man in the Bible is a very real thing. Man is also distinct from God; he is not of one essence with God. Man is a creature formed by God and dependent upon God for existence and preservation.⁹⁴

Christian Science states that God the Father is not the Creator of a material universe; there is no matter for matter is the opposite of God, and all that really exists is God. Mrs. Eddy defines matter as:

Mythology, ...illusion; ...the opposite of God; that which immortal Mind takes no cognizance; that which mortal mind sees, feels, hears, tastes, and smells only in belief.⁹⁵

And again she says:

...Life, Love, and Truth are this trinity in unity, and their universe is spiritual, peopled with perfect beings, ...of which our material universe and men are counterfits.⁹⁶

Divine Science denies that God has or could create a material universe filled with physical people. The universe is solely spiritual in Mrs.

91. II Peter 3:10, Matt. 24:29.

92. Gen. 2:7.

93. Gen. 3:19.

94. Gen. 2.

95. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 591.

96. Eddy, Rudimental Divine Science, p. 4.

Eddy's thinking. Man, who thinks he smells, tastes, feels, etc., is only the object of mental illusion, all physical senses are imaginary. Further, she states that if there were such a thing as matter, it would be the anti-thesis of God, a thing which God could not create; for in so doing, God would deny Himself. Here Mrs. Eddy identifies God and the universe as in pantheism.⁹⁷ Her concept of man is similar. Mrs. Eddy makes man, God. "...man is idea, the image, of Love, he is not physique; he is the compound idea of God."⁹⁸ "The great mistake of mortals is to suppose that man, ..., is both matter and Spirit."⁹⁹ In Divine Science there is no physical entity of man; he is nothing but a spiritual thought, an idea in the Deity. Just what is meant by the term "compound idea" is impossible to ascertain. Along with Mrs. Eddy's insistence on the spiritual essence of man is also the idea of the inseparability of man from God, they - God and man - are one Being.

Separated from man, who expresses Soul, Spirit would be a nonentity; man divorced from Spirit, would lose his entity.¹⁰⁰

In Divine Science man is part of God. God without man would cease to exist.

Continuing our definition of man, let us remember that harmonious and immortal man has existed forever...¹⁰¹

Mrs. Eddy says that man has always existed with God from all eternity and that man has always been a perfect being. "Immortal man is

97. Eddy, Miscellaneous, p. 173.

98. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 475.

99. Ibid., p. 216.

100. Ibid., p. 477.

101. Ibid., p. 302.

co-existent and co-eternal with that mind."¹⁰² In Christian Science one cannot separate man from God. Both are one, harmonious Mind, Soul, Spirit existing from all eternity. Man is God Himself in Christian Science.

Since the concept of God in Divine Science is pantheistic, a further discussion of the relationship of the concept of the universe in pantheism and Christian Science is unnecessary; the identification between the two systems was well covered in the beginning of the paper when discussing God without His relation to the universe. An examination of the concept of the universe in pantheism is mere repetition of the concept of God as both are identical. Bellwald summarizes Mrs. Eddy's position quite well. "(Mrs. Eddy) maintains a pantheistic conception of the universe, ..., call it idealistic pantheism, ..., but pantheism, just the same."¹⁰³ The concept of the universe and man in Hegelian Idealism, as in pantheism, identifies God and the universe. Any lengthy discussion of the relationship between Christian Science's concept and Hegel's would be repetitious as in that of pantheism. Several quotations will demonstrate the similarity between Mrs. Eddy and Hegel as propounded by Lieber. "That Spirit propagates matter, ..., is morally impossible. The Principle of science is God, not matter."¹⁰⁴ Mrs. Eddy's plagiarism is evident; both Hegel and Eddy deny the possibility that God could produce matter or even coexist with matter. The universe is purely a spiritual idea of God. Mrs. Eddy copies her concept of man almost word for word

102. Ibid., p. 336.

103. Bellwald, Op. cit., p. 64.

104. Haushalter, Op. cit., p. 23.

from Hegel as presented by Lieber.

Man cannot be separated from Idea and therefore soul and body, God and man are impossible.¹⁰⁵

Since man, ..., is the only true Reflection of God, then if man were not, God would be not. Separate from man who expresses God, Spirit would be a non-entity.¹⁰⁶

Both Hegelianism and Mrs. Eddy deny the existence of a material individual man; man - God's spiritual thought or reflection - and God are one and the same Being.

The concept of the universe and man in Upanishad Hinduism is consistent with Christian Science. "...and finally there is illusory, phenomenal existence..., "¹⁰⁷ "The entire universe, ..., is known as illusion."¹⁰⁸ Christian Science agrees perfectly with this Oriental philosophy in negating the existence of matter and making Brahma the All-in-all.

...the safe existence of Brahma dismisses every thing else into...realities. It is, to use a word of Hegel's, pure unrelieved acosmism.¹⁰⁹

Haigh, a scholar on Upanishad Hinduism, not only shows the similarity between Divine Science and Upanishad philosophy, but even demonstrates the connection with Hegelianism. Even in the concept of man in Upanishadism the similarity with Christian Science continues.

...man is all his qualities and capabilities and activities in the illusory creation of the illusory Isvara. But nothing and nobody...or personal man is, except Brahma.¹¹⁰

105. Haushalter, Op. cit., p. 38.

106. Ibid., p. 94.

107. Haigh, Op. cit., p. 80.

108. Haigh, Loc. cit.

109. Ibid., p. 62.

110. Haigh, Op. cit., p. 103.

That soul (Brahma); that thou art. Who-
ever thus knows, 'I am Brahma', becomes this
All.¹¹¹

Every man is Brahma or God. The physical body of man is illusion,
phantasy. Each man or soul must ultimately say, "I am God (Brahma)".
There is little doubt that Mrs. Eddy's All-in-all, which includes
God, universe, and man, is the Brahma of Hinduism.

Gnosticism is another antecedent to Christian Science when ex-
amining the concept of the universe and Man.

All Gnostic systems are based on a kind of Dualism
of God and matter. But with the Platonists some regard
matter as unreal and without form.¹¹²

So, likewise, is it easy to see some analogy between
the Gnostic aeons that emanate from God, and Mrs. Eddy's
conception of the divine ideas, which are thoroughly
spiritual.¹¹³

Her concept of man is also typically gnostic.

Man is the reflection of Soul...Man is not God,
but like a ray of light which comes from the sun, man,
the outcome of God, reflects God.¹¹⁴

In examining the concept of God in Christian Science in relation
to the Scriptures and comparing it with other religious systems, one
reaches the conclusion that pantheism is the basic tenet of Mrs. Eddy's
religion. Her pantheism is then reproduced in various concepts of
pantheism such as Hegelianism, Upanishad Hinduism, some elements of
Gnosticism, etc. Divine Science's concept of the Person of God is
certainly not Scriptural nor is it unique in any manner.

111. Ibid., p. 109.

112. Kurz, Church History, p. 96.

113. Bellwald, Op. cit., p. 175.

114. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 249-50.

In examining the Christian Science concept of God as the Savior, God the Son, it is first necessary to understand its dogma concerning sin. The Scriptures define sin as disobedience, willful violation of the immutable laws of God to man, which laws govern man's relation to God and his relation to fellow men. This may be an actual deed on the part of man or disposition of the mind and soul of man over against God's will, however, both are actually the same. The outward manifestations of sin in deed are merely the result of the enmity of man's will towards God.¹¹⁵

Sin is not excusable in the Scriptures. Every man is responsible for his hereditary and actual guilt and sin.¹¹⁶ Sin completely cuts a man off from God in this life spiritually and will cut him off bodily and spiritually in the world that is to come. Because of sin man must die temporally and eternally.¹¹⁷ No man can make any reparation to God for his sin; he is hopelessly lost. All men, for sin is universal, must stand before the Judgment seat of Christ and receive the sentence of eternal damnation for their sin.¹¹⁸

Christian Science, on the other hand, denies the existence of sin or evil. Man is a perfectly holy, sinless being. To admit sin is to have an erroneous view of God since man is a reflection of God, really is God. "Hence there is no sin, for God's kingdom is supreme and everywhere."¹¹⁹ "There is no sickness, sin, ..., what seem to be sickness, vice, ...are illusions."¹²⁰ This is a clear denial of the

115. Ja. 4:17, Gal. 5:19-21, Rom. 1, Rom. 8:7, Rev. 7, Gen. 3.

116. Rom. 2:1, Rom. 5:16, 6:23, Gen. 3:19.

117. Rom. 5:12, Gen. 2:17, Rom. 6:23.

118. Rom. 5:18, Is. 66:24, Matt. 25:41-46, Matt. 25:32.

119. Eddy, No and Yes, p. 35.

120. Eddy, Rudimental Divine Science, p. 11.

doctrine of sin in the Writings of Christian Science. Sin is named an illusion of the senses because, says Christian Science, as God's kingdom is everywhere, as God is everywhere, so there can be no "room" for sin. Mrs. Eddy has to deny sin because she believes that Good (God) and evil cannot exist side by side.

If God made all that was made, and it was good, where did evil originate? It never originated or existed as an entity. It is but a false belief...¹²¹

If God knows evil at all, He must have had fore-knowledge thereof; and if He foreknew it, he must have intended it, or ordered it...¹²²

"It (evil) is but the belief that there is an opposite intelligence to Good."¹²³ Christian Science cannot reconcile the existence of sin with the holiness and goodness of God. It attempts to explain away the problem of evil by denying its existence. In clear opposition to Scripture Mrs. Eddy states that all sin is mere illusion of the sense; there is no evil, for if there were, then God Himself would be the Author of that evil.¹²⁴

The closest parallel to Mrs. Eddy's denial of sin is Hegelianism. Again it is apparent Mrs. Eddy copied from the Lieber Document. "The idea of matter as the substratum of mind is the origin of evil."¹²⁵ This passage indicates the close tie-up between the concept of evil in Idealism and Divine Science. It is quite impossible to separate them. Hegelianism explains away evil by assigning evil to matter

121. Eddy, Miscellaneous, p. 45.

122. Eddy, Unity of Good, p. 19.

123. Eddy, Miscellaneous, p. 346.

124. Eddy, Unity of Good, p. 15.

125. Haushalter, Op. cit., p. 95.

and then denying matter. This frees the spirit of man from any attempt to ascribe sin to his person. This is exactly what Mrs. Eddy has done with her treatment of evil. Mrs. Eddy, as Lieber in his interpretation of Hegel, makes God the only reality, and therefore negates all evil. According to Haushalter, Lieber held the following:

The contrast of good and evil is destroyed in God who is the only true reality...evil has no reality...evil does not exist.¹²⁶

This quotation from Lieber is the basis from Mrs. Eddy's whole idea of sin, there isn't any. This concept of the allness of God which eliminates the possibility of evil is basic for Lieber's and Eddy's systems.

There is no misunderstanding what the Bible teaches concerning temporal death and eternal punishment. The Bible, as well as human experience, teaches that the body of man dies and decays,¹²⁷ and that this death is a result of sin.¹²⁸ The Bible also teaches that all men shall rise from the dead with a body and that with this resurrected body the soul will reunite.¹²⁹ While the body lies in the grave, the soul of the believer will be with Christ in heaven, and the soul of the damned remains in hell's prison until the day of resurrection.¹³⁰ In the Judgment of Christ on Judgment Day the sinners who have refused to accept the forgiveness of sins won by

126. *Ibid.*, p. 90.

127. II Sam. 14:4, Heb. 9:27, Job 30:23, Rom. 5:12.

128. Rom. 5:12, Rom. 5:17, Ezek. 18:20,26.

129. John 5:28,29, I Cor. 15, Matt. 25:32, Acts 24:15, Rom. 8:11.

130. Luke 23:43, Rev. 14:13, I Pet. 3:19, Acts 7:59.

the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, will receive everlasting condemnation and torment in hell.¹³¹ Those who have accepted Christ's sacrifice for sin will receive heaven and eternal life with God.¹³² These doctrines of Scripture are clear and final, and only by perverting Scripture, ignoring Scripture, and tampering with the meaning of the English language can Christian Science propound its anti-Biblical concept of the denial of death, both temporal and eternal. Since Divine Science denies sin, so it follows that it also denies the punishment for sin, and thereby negates the Atonement of Christ.

Christian Science claims that man does not die. There is no such condition as death in Divine Science; it is another error in mortal thinking.

Death: An illusion, the lie of life is matter; the unreal and untrue...; any material evidence of death is false, for it contradicts the spiritual facts of being.¹³³

"That man must be evil before he can be good; dying before deathless...is but the declaration made by pagan religion."¹³⁴

In the first quotation there is the unmistakable claim that there is no death; it is pure illusion of mortal man's thinking. The material evidences of death, a corpse, contradicts the spiritual facts of Being in Divine Science. The physical appearance in death is a false impression on the "unenlightened mind". The second quotation shows how Christian Science sets itself in opposition to the Bible. It claims that any religion teaching death to be a

131. II Cor. 5:10, Rom. 2:5, 16, I Cor. 4:5.

132. I John 3:2, Phil. 1:23, 2 Tim. 2:10, Rom. 6:23.

133. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 584.

134. Eddy, Miscellaneous, p. 187.

reality is a pagan religion. It is interesting to note that the phrase of Mrs. Eddy, "dying before deathless" as contrary to true religion, is a clear denial of Paul's famous phrase, "as dying and, behold, we live."¹³⁵ That death is an experience is admitted by Divine Science, but that it is a cessation of life is denied. The Christian Science experience of death loses its false character of cessation of life as one grows in understanding of Divine Science.

Even the pangs of death disappear accordingly as the understanding that we are spiritual beings here reappears, and we learn our capabilities for good, which insures man's continuance and is the true glory of immortality.¹³⁶

Death will occur on the next plane of existence as on this, until the spiritual understanding of life is reached.¹³⁷

Death is supposed to occur on the next plane of existence as in this life, and according to the grammar used, seems to indicate that it will continue to be an experience until the final and complete understanding of Christian Science is reached. However, Mrs. Eddy does not define the condition of death for the Christian Scientist, as to where he is and what he is. She does say that as we grow in understanding, the pangs of death disappear, meaning we die many times. Death is a transition in Christian Science, not the cessation of life.

Those who reach this transition, called death without having rightly improved the lessons of this...mortal existence..., are not ready to understand immortality. Hence they must pass through another probationary state.¹³⁸

135. II. Cor. 6:9.

136. Eddy, People's Idea of God, p. 1.

137. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 77.

138. Eddy, Unity of Good, p. 13.

The probationary states of Divine Science remind one of the concept of reincarnation in Hinduism.¹³⁹ In Christian Science no one ever dies and ceases to live.

After eliminating death, Mrs. Eddy continues to do away with hell and the final judgment. "Are frozen dogmas, persistent persecution, and the doctrine of eternal damnation from above?"¹⁴⁰ She defines "Hell" as "Mortal belief, error, lust, evil, self-imposed agony".¹⁴¹ Mrs. Eddy excludes God's judgment and condemnation upon the sinner. They are mental delusions.

The concept of death is not unique as well as not Biblical. However, Mrs. Eddy's ideas concerning hell and judgment are namely Lieber's. A faint resemblance to Hindu reincarnation is also evident. Lieber says:

Since, then, man is the Idea of His principle and the image and likeness of intelligent life, substance, and spirit, he is beyond the reach of death. In the Science of Being nothing can harm or destroy him.¹⁴²

Evidently Mrs. Eddy merely enlarged upon Hegelian Idealism in this respect also and labeled it Christian Science.

It takes little imagination to see what a denial of sin, death (eternal and temporal), and the judgment will do to the doctrine of the Atonement and the Person of Christ as defined in the Bible. The suffering, obedience, and death of Christ upon the cross as the substitute for the world's sin is an absurdity and useless in Divine Science.

^{139.} Hume, Op. cit., p. 32.

^{140.} Eddy, No and Yes, p. 14.

^{141.} Eddy, Science and Health, p. 588.

^{142.} Haushalter, Op. cit., p. 77.

The Christian religion, based on the Holy Scriptures, believes that the death of Jesus Christ upon the cross was a vicarious atonement, that God was in the flesh taking the sins of the world upon Himself and sacrificing Himself to His own eternal justice in order to earn remission of sins for all men.¹⁴³ The Christ of the Bible is the only-begotten Son of God, not in the sense that all the children of men are the sons or creation of God, but that He is the one personal Son of God, equal in power and majesty with God the Father, existing from all eternity with the Father.¹⁴⁴ He became a man in all respects like other men, only He was without sin. He retained all His divine power and majesty though He did not always and fully use it while here on earth; He suffered physical pain and mental and spiritual anguish; He was tempted as man is tempted yet He did not sin.¹⁴⁵ He is true God and true man. He died and on the third day rose from the dead, and that death of Jesus Christ made reconciliation for all the sins of mankind.¹⁴⁶ The teaching of the Bible on the Person and work of Jesus is clear, yet Christian Science presents a very different type of Christ and ascribes a very different purpose to the work of Christ.¹⁴⁷

First of all Mrs. Eddy denies the deity of Jesus Christ.

The Christians believe that Christ is God...The Christian who believes in the First Commandment is a monotheist. Thus he...recognizes that Jesus Christ

143. II Cor. 5:19, Acts 20:28, Heb. 4:14, I Tim. 2:5, Heb. 5:8.
 144. I Tim. 2:5,6, Heb. 9:14, Rom. 5:19, Is. 53:4-7, Rom. 5:6-8.
 145. I John 5:20, Luke 2:12, John 1:18, Is. 9:6, Heb. 1:5.
 146. I Peter 3:18, Phil. 2:7-8, II Cor. 8:9.
 147. Gal. 3:13, Rom. 8:34.

is not God.¹⁴⁸

The Virgin-mother conceived this idea of God, and to her ideal she gave the name Jesus, that is, Joshua, our Savior...¹⁴⁹

These statements leave little doubt as to the antichristian and anti-scriptural conception of the Person of Christ made by Mrs. Eddy. Jesus Christ is not God, for to name Him God, in the mind of Mrs. Eddy, would be to break the first commandment. Then she continues to say that Jesus was not conceived by the Holy Spirit, nor was He the God-man (as the Scriptures state). Jesus was merely the spiritual idea of or from God conceived in the mind of Mary. If one carries out Mrs. Eddy's idea of the conception of Christ, then any woman can even to this day bear a Christ; for Christ is only a perfect spiritual idea enclosed in the mind of a woman. If one connects this thought with those expressed on the birth of children in Mrs. Eddy's chapter on marriage in Science and Health, one realizes that when Christian Science is fully established, then all births will be spiritual ideas brought into being by virgin women. One may say that Jesus is the prototype of all Christian Science births. In short, Christ is not God.

Mrs. Eddy states that Jesus Christ is a man as any other man. But we note her inconsistency for she also maintains that man is not a physical being for she denies matter.

Jesus: the highest human corporeal concept of the divine idea, ...bringing to light man's immortality.¹⁵⁰

148. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 29.

149. Eddy, Loc. cit.

150. Eddy, Op. cit. p. 589.

Jesus is the name of a man born in a remote province of Judea...Therefore, Christ Jesus was an honorary title; it signified a "good man"...¹⁵¹

Christ Jesus expressed the highest type of divinity, which fleshly form could express in that age.¹⁵²

Christ: Christ never left us, Christ is Truth, and Truth is always here, ...the impersonal Savior.¹⁵³

These thoughts present the Christian Science concept of the person of Jesus Christ. First, notice that Jesus Christ was simply a "good man"; that the name itself was merely an honorary title due him because of his meritorious work. Then notice that Mrs. Eddy makes a distinction between the names Christ and Jesus. The name Jesus is used to express the highest human being containing the Divine Being.¹⁵⁴ The name Christ means the Truth in Divine Science which is always with us; it is an impersonal thing, not God and not man. Jesus was the first man to carry this understanding (Divine Science) in himself.

"Jesus represented Christ, the true idea of God.",¹⁵⁵ is the way Mrs. Eddy conceives of the Savior. Jesus was a man like other men; he was not God. He did have a complete understanding of God and the Divine Science, but in this Christ was not unique. Any other man can be Christ according to Christian Science. Christ Jesus expressed the highest type divinity, which fleshly form could express in that age. Jesus was unique in his age, but now every Christian Scientist is striving to reach that full understanding of God that

151. Eddy, People's Idea of God, p. 3.

152. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 332.

153. Eddy, Miscellaneous, p. 100.

154. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 583.

155. Ibid., p. 316.

made Jesus the Christ.

By denying the person of Christ as God, Mrs. Eddy cancels the vicarious atonement.

The wrath of God to be appeased by the sacrifice and the torture of His favorite Son, ...are some of the false beliefs that have produced sin, sickness and death, yea, that make a mysterious God and a natural devil.¹⁵⁶

It was not to appease the wrath of God, but to show the allness of Love and the nothingness of hate, sin, and death, that Jesus suffered.¹⁵⁷

In Divine Science the death, or rather apparent death, of Jesus on the cross is a false belief that only adds to the false realities of sin, death and sickness. It is a belief that makes God a God of mystery and seems to affirm the reality of the devil. All this is contrary to the clear teaching of Scripture. There is no sin to cause death in the first place and no wrath of God to appease in the second place in the mind of Mrs. Eddy. The suffering of Jesus was only to show the unreality of sin, sickness, and death, that God is All-in-all and nothing exists besides Him.

The real purpose of Jesus' life was to promote the message of Christian Science, not to die but to continue living and show the unreality of death.

Jesus came to seek and to save such as believe in the reality of the unreal; to save them from this false belief.¹⁵⁸

"Jesus came to rescue men from these illusions to which he seemed to conform..."¹⁵⁹ He desired to save men, not from sin and death, but

156. Eddy, People's Idea of God, p. 13.

157. Eddy, No and Yes, p. 35.

158. Eddy, Miscellaneous, p. 63.

159. Eddy, Unity of Good, p. 59.

from the illusions of these supposed evils. Christ Jesus did not die; he merely retired to the tomb to let his enemies think they had destroyed him. "Let men think they had killed the body. Afterwards he would show it to them unchanged."¹⁶⁰

His disciples believed Jesus to be dead while he was hidden in the sepulchre, whereas he was alive demonstrating...the power of Spirit to overrule mortal sense.¹⁶¹

Jesus was the first to prove the unreality of death according to Mrs. Eddy. While the disciples thought Jesus dead, he was in reality merely taking refuge in the tomb to think through the problem of being, Christian Science, which he propounded. His perfect life demonstrated the victory of Truth over error of mortal mind. This concept of the death of Jesus is the "Atonement" in Christian Science. This Jesus showed for the first time to all mankind that the evils of the world are mere figments of the imagination, that every man is a potential Christ, and is able to have the full understanding of Christian Science; perhaps not before his first "death", but at least progressively on each new plane of existence. The person and work of Jesus Christ the Savior of the world from sin is completely eliminated in Christian Science.

Once again Lieber's interpretation of Hegelianism forms the basis for Mrs. Eddy's ideas. "Jesus was the corporeal, human man expressing the highest mode of divinity...Christ is the spiritual idea of Being."¹⁶³ This striking parallelism shows the slavishness with which Mrs. Eddy

160. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 42.

161. Ibid., p. 42.

162. Eddy, Loc. cit.

163. Haushalter, Op. cit., p. 104.

copied Hegel. Her idea of the highest mode of divinity came straight from Lieber's document.

Jesus could be a man born according to nature or not a historical figure at all. It did not matter; the essence of Christianity is the Christ Idea which lives in every man. The Divine Image, Idea, or Christ was before Abraham, is, and ever will be united with the Divine Principle, God.¹⁶⁴

One notes that in Hegelianism, as interpreted by Lieber, the man, Jesus, is actually of no importance; the thing that counts is the Christ idea. This idea is the essence of Christianity. This idea has existed since eternity, and Jesus happened to be the man God selected in whom He could develop the idea fully. Men may still look for another Christ as was stated before. Haushalter summarizes Mrs. Eddy's view of Christ Jesus as follows:

Particularly her consent to the mythical theory of Jesus and her placing the "Metaphysical Christos" doctrine, drew the line definitely towards the movement of Strauss and the Right Wing of Hegelianism.¹⁶⁵

Christian Science's concept of the work of Jesus is also taken from Hegel.

The efficacy of the crucifixion of Jesus is the practical Truth it demonstrated for our understanding, and that ultimately will deliver mankind from sickness, sin, and death.¹⁶⁶

In Hegel the central doctrine of the Christian faith, the Atonement, becomes a demonstration of the power of the Spirit to overcome sin and death. Mrs. Eddy is in perfect agreement with this view. Divine Science and Hegelianism have watered down this fundamental doctrine

164. Ibid., p. 70.

165. Ibid., p. 7.

166. Ibid., p. 39. See also Haushalter, Op. cit., p. 104.

to a mere demonstration of the power of Mind over matter in any situation, from the smallest moral decision to victory over death itself.

Gnosticism presents another parallel metaphysical idea of the person and work of Christ to that of Mrs. Eddy. First, consider the similarities between the person of Christ in Gnosticism and Divine Science. "Christ, the most perfect aeon, who appears in the semblance of a human body (since he can have no contact with matter)...¹⁶⁷ Here Christ is the perfect aeon or emanation from God. The body of Jesus is not real, but only a semblance of human form in order to fulfill his mission of preaching and teaching the Truth. Divine Science agrees perfectly with this Gnostic definition. "Christ dwelt forever as an idea in the bosom of God, the divine Principle of the man Jesus."¹⁶⁸ Mrs. Eddy accepts the idea that Christ emanated from God and that he carried the full understanding of divine Being.¹⁶⁹

In following Hegelianism Mrs. Eddy emphasized the nothingness of sin and death as demonstrated by Christ's work. In accepting Gnosticism she presents Christ as the one who gave the gnosis, the understanding, to his followers. Gnosticism says of redemption:

...redemption is accomplished by Jesus, not connected with His death. The real purpose...was to communicate the hidden gnosis. By means of this knowledge, ...the higher natures were freed from their earthly bondage and restored to the kingdom of light.¹⁷⁰

In agreement with that statement from Gnosticism Mrs. Eddy says, "Jesus mapped out the path for others. He unveiled the Christ,

167. "Gnosticism", Concordia Cyclopedia, p. 291.

168. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 29.

169. See footnotes 71 and 72.

170. J. Hastings, "Gnosticism", Op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 234-5.

the spiritual idea of divine Love."¹⁷¹ The similarity of both systems is evident. Jesus, according to both, revealed the knowledge of the Truth which was the nothingness of all matter and the reality of God alone. This was the work of Jesus, the propagation of the gnosis he possessed from God.

Faint impressions of Manicheism and Docetism are also in Divine Science's concept of the Christ and His work. Undoubtedly Mrs. Eddy did not copy, and probably never read, from these age-old heresies, but in her reasoning and writing she incorporated these concepts of Christ into her system which are almost two thousand years old. The Manichaeans taught a universal Christus - a belief which they claimed to have founded on an apocryphal gospel of St. Peter.¹⁷² This universal Christus of the Manichaeans identifies itself with the Christ idea of Mrs. Eddy. This is the impersonal Savior, the omnipresent Truth that is always with man. There are also elements of Docetism in the philosophy of Mrs. Eddy. Bellwald points out that Mrs. Eddy divides the Christ. She made a real distinction between Jesus the man, and Christ, the divine Ideal that had taken possession of him. 'Jesus is the human man, and Christ, the divine Ideal', says Mrs. Eddy; 'hence the duality of Jesus the Christ.' In her glossary she defines Christ: "The divine manifestation of God which comes to the flesh, to destroy incarnate error." The Christ, therefore, can be as readily in Mrs. Eddy as in the prophet of Nazareth.¹⁷³ Mrs. Eddy makes of Christ a duality, two persons with no connection at all, except that God had

171. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 38.

172. Francis Grant, Oriental Philosophy, p. 245.

173. Bellwald, Op. cit., p. 176.

imparted to Jesus, the man, the divine Idea. For the man, Jesus, as the Docetist believed, was simply another man, and the Christ idea is an Ideal or manifestation from God. However unwittingly it was done, Mrs. Eddy has incorporated these two ancient heresies, Manichaeism and Docetism, in her religion. It is evident that Christian Science does not agree with the Scriptures on the person and work of Christ nor is Christian Science unique in its own presentation of the Savior, Jesus Christ.

In the Scriptures the sinner is saved by personally accepting the merits, or forgiveness of sin, which Christ has won for him by His suffering, obedience, and death.¹⁷⁴ This salvation consists in the declaration by God that the sinner's transgressions have been covered by the blood of Jesus Christ, and that now the man who believes this is perfectly holy before God.¹⁷⁵ As a consequence of this forgiveness which the sinner accepts by faith in its efficacy, God begins to live in the man; and the man with God begins to live a holy life and resist sin; man cooperates with God in overcoming sin.¹⁷⁶ Man can add nothing to this work of redemption which Christ has won for him. It is an act of God done solely through His mercy and love.¹⁷⁷ Because the believer in Christ is saved, the Christian religion teaches that the believer has the gift of heaven and eternal life now by faith and on the Day of Judgment by sight.¹⁷⁸

The Christian Science concept of salvation was covered sufficiently in examining the work of Christ, so there is no need to repeat. Salvation in Divine Science is simply the knowledge that physical man, material universe, sickness, sin, pain, death are unreal and illusions of the mind; it is the striving on the part of man to overcome all these unreal evils by merely realizing that he is one with God, Love, Life, and Truth.¹⁷⁹

174. Rom. 5:10, Gal. 3:13, Acts 20:28, Gal. 4:5.

175. Rom. 3:24,26, Rom. 5:1, II Cor. 5:18-19, Heb. 10:10.

176. Eph. 2:10, I Tim. 6:18, Tit. 2:7, Rev. 2:2.

177. Eph. 2:8,9, John 3:16.

178. I Cor. 15, I Thess. 4:16, Matt. 25:31, Phil. 3:21, Ps. 16:11, Tit. 3:7.

179. See Eddy, Science and Health, pp. 593, 258; Eddy, Miscellaneous, p. 183

The object of man's salvation, the goal for which he is striving is vital to the concept of God in Christian Science. On the surface it appears as if the sole desire of salvation for Mrs. Eddy is freedom from earthly evils; that is only part of it. Heaven in Divine Science means a final immersion with God.

Final immersion of human consciousness in the infinite ocean of Love, is the last scene in the corporeal sense...it is the disembodied individual Spirit.¹⁸⁰

...spiritualization of thought is not attained by the death of the body, but by a conscious union with God. When we have passed the ordeal called death,...and shall have come upon the same plane of conscious existence with those gone before...If...our life work has been well done, we shall not have to repeat it, but our joys and means of advancing will be proportionately increased.¹⁸¹

Mrs. Eddy's heaven consists of a continual progressive spiritual transmigration, a continual negation of material sense; until, finally, the individual spirit is swallowed up in the infinite ocean of Love. What this tantamount to is gradually becoming God Himself, that is, a part of Him. It takes little reasoning to see that the individual loses his identity when he finally reaches the goal, union with God. This concept of heaven and eternal life emphasizes the belief in Christian Science that man is God. But nothing could be more anti-scriptural.

The Christian Science idea greatly resembles Bhuddism, according to which, "Salvation consisted in obtaining freedom from rebirths."¹⁸² Dr. Hume, an eminent scholar in the field of comparative religions, says of the Bhuddistic heaven:

180. Eddy, Miscellaneous, p. 205.

181. Ibid., p. 42

182. "Bhuddism", Concordia Cyclopaedia, p. 99.

Mirvana (heaven) is represented as 'the highest happiness'. But scholars disagree on the question whether Mirvana involves complete annihilation...Mirvana certainly does mean the highest conceivable freedom from all disturbances.¹⁸³

The progressive rebirths or strivings for complete and final negation of all troubles and problems, the gradual ascent towards the Infinite, is an Oriental prototype to Christian Science's concept. Mrs. Eddy's "heaven" is far from unique; it is quite ancient. Christian Science has even closer affinity to Upanishad Hinduism.

Salvation is simply a quiet striving, realization of one's real self as free from all changes, even from transmigration, and as completely absorbed in Brahma-Atman.¹⁸⁴

Whether Mrs. Eddy was even acquainted with these Oriental philosophies is very doubtful, but the fact remains that her concept of God, considered by itself, or in relation to other religious ideas, is simply a variation on old Oriental philosophical speculations of the final mergence of the individual with the great Over-soul, pantheism pure and simple.

Lieber's interpretation of Hegel also continues to appear in Mrs. Eddy's concept of heaven. Lieber says:

Immortality is not the resurrection of the body, but the persistence of the Spirit, ...the everlastingness of spirit is brought to consciousness and is no longer emeshed in the finite, external and natural.¹⁸⁵

"Heaven is not a local habitation but the harmony of mind and body."¹⁸⁶
Heaven in Lieber's Hegelianism is not a place but the final mergence into infinite Spirit, the final withdrawal from finite, external

183. Hume, Op. cit. p. 71

184. Ibid., p. 25.

185. Haushalter, Op. cit., p. 100.

186. Ibid., p. 99.

existence. It is unnecessary to comment further on the similarity between Mrs. Eddy's concept and Lieber's concept of heaven.

The concept of heaven and salvation in Christian Science is neither Scriptural nor unique. The atonement of Christ Jesus, true God and true man, is flatly denied in the writings of Mrs. Eddy. Man's salvation is the gradual absorption into the Deity. What such a concept of heaven and salvation does to the Person of an absolute God is evident; it destroys His absolute Person. It makes man God. In every act and crisis of life from prayer to death, man must turn to himself for release and help, for he himself is the Infinite, all-pervading Spirit.

We shall now examine the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as taught in Scripture, contrast it with Mrs. Eddy's concept, and compare Mrs. Eddy's concept with those of other religious and philosophic systems.

The Holy Ghost in the Bible is the third Person of the Triune God, equal in power and majesty to the Father, and the Son.¹⁸⁷ Since sinful man is by nature spiritually dead and unable to accept the Gospel promise, Scriptures ascribe to the Holy Ghost the special work of convicting men of sin and calling them to accept the Gospel promises.¹⁸⁸ He then keeps men in that faith in the Gospel through the Word and the Sacraments.¹⁸⁹ He also is active in sanctifying the regenerate man in Christ.¹⁹⁰ Without the work of the Holy Ghost men would be unable to accept the blessed promises of the

187. Acts. 5:3,4, Matt. 28:19, II Cor. 3:16, I Cor. 3:16.

188. Acts. 2:38,41, Acts 5:3,4, Acts 7:51, Tit. 3:5, I Cor. 12:3.

189. Rom. 1:16, I Peter 1:23, I Peter 1:5.

190. Rom. 8:14, Tit. 3:5, I Peter 1:15, Eph. 5:8,9.

Gospel and so be saved.¹⁹¹

Mrs. Eddy absolutely denies the Person of the Holy Ghost in Christian Science. She reduces Him to a religious system for she says that the Holy Ghost is Divine Science; the development of eternal Life, Love, and Truth.¹⁹² Again she says:

In the words of St. John, "He shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever."
This Comforter I understand to be Divine Science.¹⁹³

The Holy Spirit in Christian Science has become a system of religious beliefs contained in the writings of Mrs. Eddy. He is not a distinct Person of the Godhead. In all the Bible passages containing the phrase "Holy Ghost" or "Holy Spirit" one must substitute "Divine Science". For example in Romans 8:14, one would read, "For as many as are led by 'Divine Science' of God, they are the sons of God." Accordingly the religious dogmas of Christian Science and the "Holy Ghost" are one and the same thing; the volumes of Mrs. Eddy's writings contain the "Holy Ghost".

As the atonement became unnecessary when Mrs. Eddy denied sin, so also conversion becomes unnecessary when she denies Holy Spirit and His work. Conversion in Divine Science is not a process whereby the Holy Ghost turns a man from sin to the Savior, but simply the gnosis or Christian Science understanding that was discussed previously. One short statement by Mrs. Eddy on the Kingdom of heaven will suffice to demonstrate her concept of conversion. "We recognize this kingdom,

191. I Cor. 12:3.

192. Eddy, Science and Health, p. 588.

193. Ibid., p. 55.

the reign of harmony, within us by unselfish affection."¹⁹⁴ The Christian Scientist begins to meditate on the facts of Divine Science and finally he is "converted". It is obvious the Scriptures and Mrs. Eddy disagree violently on the doctrine of the Holy Ghost.

Lieber's Hegelianism on this doctrine, as well as most of the others, forms the basis for Mrs. Eddy's ideas. In the two comparisons below the plagiarism of Mrs. Eddy is obvious. "To gain the harmony of Being and be perfect even as the Father, God, Spirit must be understood." (Lieber)¹⁹⁵ The quotations, with little change in the wording, are the same. One must understand religious beliefs of Hegelianism or Divine Science to enter the Kingdom of God. Hegel ignores the Holy Ghost. Mrs. Eddy keeps the name, but applies Hegel's concept of "conversion", harmony, or whatever one wishes to name it, to the Holy Spirit and denies His personality.

While Bellwald says little about Mrs. Eddy's concept of the Holy Ghost, he implies it when he mentions two parallel religious ideas or systems which present their religions as the means to bring man back to God. These two systems are Mysticism and Gnosticism.

Men love a certain amount of mysticism; it warms and cheers the dullness of every day life, ...Mrs. Eddy has succeeded in supplying this need of the many unchurched, ...and of such...as do not find anything equivalent to this soft and easy mysticism.¹⁹⁷

Since Mrs. Eddy makes the Holy Ghost her religious system, then

194. Eddy, Retrospection and Introspection, p. 98.

195. Haushalter, Op. cit. p. 77.

196. Haushalter, Loc. cit.

197. Bellwald, Op. cit., p. 88.

Bellwald's accusation of mysticism applies to her concept of the Holy Spirit. Her religious system, her "Holy Spirit" is a mystical religion. One cannot label Divine Science's concept of the Holy Ghost pure mysticism, but the apparent connection is worth noting. The element of mysticism is in her concept. Christian Science allies itself with Gnosticism in the same manner as Christian Science with mysticism. Gnosticism ignores the Person of the Holy Ghost and makes its religious system its faith or spiritual understanding the key to heaven. Christian Science does the same. Bellwald compares Mrs. Eddy's religious system and Gnosticism as follows:

Christian Science is akin to Gnosticism by making understanding or science its issue in opposition to faith. While the Christian Church has always exalted the act of faith as the essential act of religion, the Gnostics and Christian Science, depreciate faith, in order to exalt what they label gnosis, understanding.¹⁹⁸

The early Christian heresy contains the seeds of Mrs. Eddy's Divine Science, the Holy Spirit of Christian Science. No faith in a Savior from sin, no Holy Ghost to turn a man to Christ and regenerate him is needed. The gnosis of Gnosticism is the Divine Science, or Holy Ghost, of Mrs. Eddy. Mrs. Eddy's concept of the Holy Ghost is not unique.

198. Ibid., p. 175.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the evidence presented one must conclude that the concept of God in Christian Science is not Scriptural, but on the contrary, is antiscritptural. The God of the Bible is an independent, omnipotent Being upon Whom the universe and man depends for existence and preservation. The god of Divine Science is a pantheistic spirit of whom man himself is a part. Mrs. Eddy denies the doctrine of the Triune God. The Father, as stated above, is the pantheistic spirit of the universe. Jesus Christ, the Son of God and Second Person of the Trinity, is nothing more than a mere man demonstrating the truths of Divine Science. The Holy Ghost, the Third Person of the Trinity, is simply the body of Christian Science doctrine contained in the writings of Mrs. Eddy. The God of Christianity and the god of Christian Science are not identical as Mrs. Eddy claimed.

Secondly, the concept of God in Christian Science is not unique. Mrs. Eddy's god is the god of pantheism. The branch of pantheism to which Christian Science's god belongs is Hegelian Idealism of the Occident and Upanishad Hinduism of the Orient. Elements of Dualism, Manichaeism, Gnosticism, Shakerism, Docetism, and Bhuddism also appear in her concept of God. Christian Science can lay no claim to uniqueness for its concept of God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Eddy, Mary Baker, Christian Science Versus Pantheism and Other Messages to the Mother Church, Boston, 1917.
- Eddy, Mary Baker, Miscellaneous Writings, Boston, 1891.
- Eddy, Mary Baker, No and Yes, Boston, 1917.
- Eddy, Mary Baker, The People's Idea of God, Boston, 1917.
- Eddy, Mary Baker, Retrospection and Introspection, Boston, 1891.
- Eddy, Mary Baker, Rudimental Divine Science, Boston, 1917.
- Eddy, Mary Baker, Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, Boston, 1934.
- Eddy, Mary Baker, The Unity of the Good, Boston, 1917.

Secondary Sources

- Bellwald, A. M., Christian Science and the Catholic Faith, New York, McMillan Co., 1922.
- Dresser, H., Christian Science, New York, Crowell, 1921.
- Graebner, A. L., Doctrinal Theology, St. Louis, Mo., Concordia Publishing House.
- Grant, Francis, Oriental Philosophy, New York, Dial Press, 1936.
- Haldeman, I. M., Christian Science in the Light of Holy Scripture, New York, Fleming and Revell Co., 1909.
- Hastings, James, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, New York, Charles Scribner and Sons, 1928.
- Haushalter, W. M., Mrs. Eddy Purloins from Hegel, Boston, A. A. Beauchamp, 1936.
- Haigh, Henry, Some Leading Ideas of Hinduism, Rangoon, Colombo, Madras Allahabad, 1928.

Bibliography (cont'd)

- Hume, R. E., The World's Living Religions, New York, Charles Scribner and Sons, 1933.
- James, William, Varities of Religious Experience, New York, Riverside Press, 1902.
- Kurz, J. H., Church History, Philadelphia, 1878.
- Riley, Peabody, Humiston, The Faith, Falsity, and Failure of Christian Science, New York, Fleming and Revell Co., 1925.
- Snowden, J. H., The Truth About Christian Science, Philadelphia, 1920.
- _____, Concordia Cyclopedia, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1927.