

By permission excerpted from:
KAPPELER INSTITUTE FOR THE SCIENCE OF BEING (Germany and Switzerland)
INFORMATION LETTER NO. 21 (in German), Berlin and Zürich, Nov./Dec. 2005

© Kappeler-Institut Publikationen, Zürich and Berlin, May 2009

**Article: The principle of spiritual synonymity –
the foundation of the system of Christian Science**

Collated and prepared by Hanns D. and Eva-M. v. d. Steinen according to notes from the Kappeler Archive

Translated by: Peter A.W. Rosenthal (May 2009)

A paradigm shift in language

If, during the course of the history of science, a fundamentally new discovery breaks through and establishes itself such that it generates a paradigm shift, then this is naturally also reflected in language. This is a law in the development of consciousness which is also most closely interrelated with language; language and consciousness are bound up in an indissoluble interrelationship.

In Christian Science this proved to be the case even at the very start of its discovery. The language used by Mary Baker Eddy was widely felt to be absolutely original. Due to this new, never before existing, language there reigned quite a bit of confusion not only in the general public but also amongst her followers. Whilst Mrs Eddy knew exactly *what* she wanted to say, the *how*, the "language of spirit" or the "new tongue", as she called it according to the Bible, only developed slowly in her consciousness. It took her more than 40 years to clothe the unique vision of a scientific Christianity into a new adapted terminology such that spirit and letter became congruent, and a translated form of language had arisen which was understandable to thought. Mrs Eddy talks about the great difficulties she had because she could not adequately express the new spiritual idea with the existing linguistic means. And for her, the options that are used in other areas of knowledge were helpful to a limited extent only. She knew of course the various methods of definition, drawing conclusions, reversal, etymology, creating new words etc, and she also used them; but in spite of all that this did not suffice. Sometimes, she therefore pondered for days and weeks until she could end a sentence in the Textbook or insert a word. In so doing she had to submit to and let in the constant flow of revelation which accompanied her over the decades after 1866 and which gradually became reconciled in her consciousness with her own scientific reason, so that the proofs of demonstration arose from this connection (see S&H 110).

Synonymity as a principle of language

Finally, after more than 40 years a Textbook had been written which is available to us today fully detailed in its spiritual structure¹. This structuring was possible because Mrs Eddy used a completely new linguistic principle; to this very day, classical linguistics calls this linguistic principle a "stylistic device" only (if that), it does not regard it as a scientific problem and not at all as a principle. It is only very slowly that there are some weak

¹ Max Kappeler: The Structure of the Christian Science Textbook – Our Way of Life, ...

approaches in modern linguistics toward a closer investigation of the phenomenon of synonymy. Although Mrs Eddy used synonym dictionaries for her work, synonymy as a spiritual linguistic principle was actually given to her by revelation in the same way that the idea of a new concept of God itself was revealed to her. The interrelationship of revelation and reason, of vision and scientific rigour, which showed very early in Mrs Eddy's consciousness, shows that the spiritual idea has given itself form by developing itself continuously and purposefully on the level of language also. Therefore, the Textbook speaks of "divine" synonyms and "infinite" meanings.

Linguistic excursus

What really are synonymous terms? Language, the everyday language that we all use but also a specialist language used by just a few, lives by synonymous expressions in order to emphasise certain specific shades of meaning and sense. The very first German book (designated as *Abrogans*²) was a synonym dictionary. Let us take for example the word "horse". The term "horse" allows all kinds of images in thought as well as interpretations; it is too imprecise and only suffices for very general statements. We need to remind ourselves of some other terms belonging to this word field or area of meaning in order to realise immediately that each one of these contains an additional variation on the meaning of the content, which in a corresponding text is more important and meaningful than just "horse". Let us consider that a horse may also be called something different, and why: nag, hack, steed, mare, mount, stallion, gelding, filly, colt, foal, pony, cob, jade, dobbin, gee-gee, chestnut, Trakehner, Lippizaner, Holsteiner, Haflinger, black horse, white horse, thoroughbred etc. Such variants make language more exact and more meaningful in its statements as the respective context requires either the one or other term to be chosen. Various different properties or contents of these terms make the statement more precise.

But our collection of expressions for the term "horse" now shows a simple synonymous interrelationship: all expressions are synonymous with the term "horse". However, in relation to one another these terms are not synonymous, or only very rarely; stallion and mare, for example, are not synonymous. Foal and mare are not synonymous either, but foal and chestnut *may* be synonymous, but need not be. Synonymy is not a continuous principle in everyday language but rather an atomistic phenomenon, dependent more or less at random on the existing linguistic resources, the will and choice of the speaker as well as his view of the situation, that is, it is not exact at all.

The development of spiritual synonymy in the case of Mrs Eddy

This short excursion into linguistics is only important here for one reason: it helps us to understand the distinctiveness and high precision of the language in the Textbook in which there are no contradictions as in the human sphere. How did synonymy as a linguistic principle develop in Mrs Eddy's consciousness? Her revelation came, as she emphasised, direct from God but it originated in the Bible. Already at a very early stage, Mrs Eddy wrote down the findings of her Bible studies in order to explain the text of the Bible metaphysically/spiritually. She originally intended to work through the entire text of the Bible but eventually stopped and then limited herself to Genesis, the beginning of the Bible, and Apocalypse, the end of the Bible. Like two belt buckles, the beginning and the end of the Bible engage with each other; and their symbols: the seven days of creation, and the four sides

² *Abrogans* (Latin), late Latin synonym dictionary, named after its first Latin word entry, rendered into German ca. 765, the oldest known book in the German (Old High German) language [see Bibliographisches Institut & F. A. Brockhaus AG, 2007 – (in German)]

of the holy city embrace and permeate the Bible in its entirety. The key to the Bible had been found. Mrs Eddy no longer needed to explain the voluminous Bible text on a verse by verse basis³; rather she could turn to the Textbook itself.

In the 17th chapter of the Textbook, entitled "Glossary", we find impressive examples for the beginnings of a spiritual synonymy in Mrs Eddy. Using the terms explained there, we can see clearly how the method of the synonymization of spiritual content initially developed for Mrs Eddy quite tentatively. For example, *Abel* is first equated with *watchfulness*, *Abraham* with *fidelity*, *Adam* with *error*, *Ark* with *safety* etc. This is then followed by a more or less detailed metaphysical explanation. In this way, a biblical name or a term is replaced by another and then synonymized with a new metaphysical content. Using this inspired way of equating and synonymization, complete synonym series are produced, for example: sin/disease/death = evil = error = nothingness. This leads to *completely new spiritual-logical conclusions* which are all strictly found to be originating in the Bible but largely exceed the original context toward a higher spiritual level. With great courage Mrs Eddy used such a method of definition by synonyms, which was neither valid nor accepted in the academic sense and which even today is not recognised by strict linguistic logic. In this way, she was able to logically derive new spiritual conceptual content and to interpret the 2000-year-old Bible text in a completely new way, thereby updating the same. In this way, the exceedingly vast revelation for her day, namely that there is no matter, found its linguistic form:

Matter = mortal mind = erroneous mind = error = nothingness,

logically derived from the basic principle:

God = divine Mind = Truth = Spirit = All-in-all

The greatest conclusion which Mrs Eddy gradually arrived at by revelation, and which was supported by her Bible studies, was the new concept of God which she characterised by the seven synonyms as the definition of God. These seven synonyms in the known sequence (465) are Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, and Love. There is a sufficient body of literature on these and other orders of the synonyms. It is only possible here to refer the reader to this literature.

Synonymy in the concept of God as found in the Bible

If we ask the Bible, we find clear synonymizations in the New Testament - in John and also in Paul. There it is said of God that He is love (1 John 4:8), and also that He is spirit (John 4:24). Consider one of the earliest mathematical-logical insights: "If two quantities equate a third, then they are equal in relation to one another." That is, if love is God, and spirit is also God, then love and spirit must be equal in relation to one another. The Bible states further that this spirit quickens, that it is life therefore (John 6:63). We read about the spirit of love and also about the spirit of truth (John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13) and that God must be worshipped in spirit and in truth (John 4:23). The most impressive statement is: "...because the Spirit is truth" (1 John 5:6).

Spirit, Life, Truth, and Love are the biblical names for God which Mrs Eddy refers to (S&H 275). Now, what about the other three - namely Mind, Soul and Principle - which Mrs

³ Note: A project which John Doorly was later able to complete after he had discovered the system of the synonymous terms in the Textbook.

Eddy added? *Soul* has always been regarded as the immortal aspect of man in God and is thus an ancient biblical term. But the human soul has also always been associated with the shadow of possible sinfulness and mortality, and that is why soul cannot be a clear biblical synonymous term for God. This term only becomes the divine synonym Soul as a result of Mrs Eddy placing it in its systematic contextual relationship to God, and the other synonyms, and explaining it accordingly. In this context Soul cannot be sinful, not earthbound, bound in a body and mortal because Soul is God, that is, Spirit, Life, Truth, Love.⁴ What about *Mind* and *Principle* in relation to the Bible? And what about the term *Science*? We should like to take this opportunity here to consider these questions in some more detail.

Ancient roots

The canonisation of the Bible took place at a very late stage only. We know from John Doorly that the result is a wonderfully structured and systematic history of ideas, which the canonised Bible text presents to us today and which confirms a Christian Science system of reference. But we must not forget that our Christian and - yes, also our scientific roots - are found in ancient Judaism! Jesus referred to the "Scripture". This did not mean the canonised Holy Scriptures of today. In addition and in parallel to this Scripture, there was a very large body of oral and written Hebrew tradition, recorded by rabbinical authors, the traces of which are found even in our day, although presented in a mystical language difficult to understand today. This Israelitic-Hebrew tradition understood itself as a holy science where impressive statements are found, which can only be quoted in the form of single statements here - for example: "...Jehova is the principle of all things" - "Being is. ... the exact idea of Being is truth; its understanding is science..." - "Without faith, science leads to doubt; without science, faith becomes superstition. But science and faith in conjunction give certainty, and in order to join them, they must not be mixed." - "The highest reason ... is called - God." These and other formulations are impressive in terms of their closeness to Christian Science.

The words *principle* and *science* are not easy to derive from the canonised Bible and hardly to be found anywhere. The word *principle* exists only in certain translations of the Bible, such as e.g. in the English Bible (Hebr. 5:12 and 6:1 - but also in the plural and with reference to the teaching; Luther translates this term with "Anfangsgründe" ("Rudiments")). But the themes of government, justice, dominion, kingship, fundamental statement etc all carry the tone of principle. Even when it is said that God does not regard the person, the tone of principle is clearly to be heard. For example, the German Bible states: "In the beginning God created...". The Latin Bible states: "in principio...", this means as much as stating "Fundamentally (in principle, initially) God created ...". The word *science* is used in the Catholic Bible by Allioli (1967) in the phrase "Richtschnur der Wissenschaft" ("form of science") (Romans 2:20); it is also used in the Zürcher Bible (Dan. 1:4) as well as in the English Bible (Dan. 1:4 and 1 Tim. 6:20), that is, only in some isolated cases. But be that as it may, Mrs Eddy had sufficient spiritual sense to be able to hear the spiritual tonality of both terms *thematically*, and introduce the same as being characteristic for her scientific age.

The word *mind* is also a term consciously chosen by Mrs Eddy, and a term in correspondence with the beginning age of mentalism. However, there are some errors about the occurrence of the word *mind* in the Bible. Usually only Paul is quoted in this connection (Phil. 2:5, English Bible) who talks about the *mind of Christ*. Very impressively, however, the word *mind* is even used in the Old Testament, and in direct relation to God (Leviticus 24:12, Jer. 44:21 - English Bible). In the new Testament *mind* occurs several times; here, the most

⁴ See S&H 71, 468, 482

important statement for our subject of synonymity is the statement of Paul about "the mind of the Spirit" (Romans 8:27, English Bible).

What is so important here for our subject? Mrs Eddy had foreseen that her discovery would continue to unfold scientifically. Even at the start of the Textbook she already states that she has discovered Christian Science as a system⁵; but she has never described this system exactly, probably because she also had to study the Textbook herself. In order to be *scientific* a science requires an adequate systematic foundation. This was found by John Doorly in the key terms – the synonymous terms - of the Textbook. This provided proof for the scientific nature of Christian Science, the pure Science of Christian Science. Following the initial discovery of 1866, which Mrs Eddy experienced, the discovery and elaboration of this system was the next great paradigm shift which did not only expand enormously the horizons of Christian Science after 1910 but also led to the further discovery of completely new insights into the infinite interrelationships of a spiritual universe, as found in the works by Max Kappeler.

This system of Christian science is based on the synonymity of its fundamental categories.

A short description of the system

Those who know something of our literature are also aware that, if possible, we repeat in each book (usually at the start) the three fundamental categories of this system with its 15 root notions. Otherwise a new readership would not be able to understand our topic. (Advanced readers should be able to skip easily and generously across such repetitions.)

The three fundamental categories of the *system of divine metaphysics*, as it is called by Mrs Eddy (S&H 146) are:

I. The *seven synonyms* by means of which the Textbook (465) describes the nature of God:

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

These seven terms are common in everyday language but nobody would think of understanding them as synonyms. Mrs Eddy now synonymizes these terms, that is, she sets up a conscious equivalence. She can do this by relating each term to God. Each of the seven terms is characterised by the four preceding adjectives as *incorporeal, divine, supreme, infinite*, and thereby lifted out of general linguistic use. All refer to God, the core of their meaning, and at the same time all relate to one another so that they form a network of infinite meanings. These infinite meanings are ideas, which make up the nature of God and which are also synonymous in relation to one another, as they refer to the respective synonym for God which they express and whose manifestation they are. These *ideas* can be recognised by the way in which the synonyms are used in the text of the Textbook. They differentiate the synonyms for God depending on theme and context.

II. The *four modes of operation of God*: Word, Christ, Christianity, Science.
These show how God operates, namely as the -

incorporeal Word of the revelation of God (S&H 465),

⁵ S&H VIII:27

divine idea of the Christ, which translates the divine Word - in the adapted form of divine ideas – to man (S&H 115/116),
supreme Christianity (S&H 587) which fills the universe with these ideas,
and
infinite Science (S&H 465: the Word order seen as the seven-armed candlestick of Principle, viewed from the central shaft), which declares these spiritual processes as being understandable and anchored in Being.

The differences in the modes of operation are made clear by the various different combinations of the synonyms, in which these appear in the Textbook. Initially, these combinations yield for fundamental orders in which the seven synonyms occur, with the first order and the fourth order looking optically the same but being structurally different (465, 115/116, 587). There are further fundamental combinations consisting primarily of three or two synonyms, which combinations indicate a higher level of science. These four fundamental terms for the divine modes of operation also originate in the Bible.

III. The *four dimensions of Science* which show that the system forms an infinite structure of meaning in which all is interrelated with all in law-governed interdependencies. Spiritual consciousness can operate on four levels without losing its inner cohesion for the seven synonyms with their four modes of operation are Principle-immanent (Science itself) and all-inclusive (divine Science). Thanks to their divinity they dissolve latent error (absolute Christian Science) as well as manifested error (Christian Science).

The synonymity principle is system-generating

The fundamental aspect of the above-described system of Christian Science is the synonymity of its categories. If one talks about "the synonyms", one initially means the seven synonyms that describe the nature of God. But it is vitally important to keep in thought the fact that the other categorical fundamental terms, that is the four modes of operation and four dimensions of science are also *synonymous*. The system comprising these three fundamental categories contains 15 root notions (7+4+4) which are all synonyms. They all refer to God, they are the "capitalized terms", special terms emphasised by Mrs Eddy through the use of capital letters.⁶

This synonymity is system-generating. The fundamental categories with their root notions form a network of law-governed interrelationships and references of meaning which present themselves through infinite ideas in very specific forms. The synonymity is fundamental for the infinite meanings arising from the ideas, that is, the elements of the system and their interrelationships within the system. The divine synonymity⁷, first and only found by Mrs Eddy as the linguistic principle of Spirit, is the equality of value of the root notions. Naturally, their infinite meanings are not equal; rather, depending on function, that is, on the place value of the statement in the respective context, their content is different. Otherwise there would be no need for different expressions (just remember our example "horse"). The equivalence does not refer to the *content* of the terms but rather to the core area which they all refer to, the weight which each of the root notions has within the system, namely the core area "God". They differ in content but are of equal weight in terms of their divinity. This equal weighting within the system provides the basis for infinite harmony. As a result of the fact that the root

⁶ With regard to the special meaning of these capitalized terms, see Misc p. 225 f.

⁷ Max Kappeler: The seven synonyms for God – Analysis of the concept of God in the Textbook of Christian Science, ...

notions have infinite meanings, there results an interplay of categories and ideas from within the interrelationships of the system and its laws; this is designated in the Textbook as the "divine infinite calculus"⁸. Infinite systems of meanings and laws form the spiritual structures and idea systems⁹ of Being. We can find them in the deep layers of the revealed texts as given in the Bible and the Textbook, for these revelatory books release their spiritual treasure as soon as their texts are scientifically interpreted using the framework of the system of synonymity immanent in these texts. The result will be the divine basic patterns according to which the universe, the world, man and his life are infinitely individualized. These are the basic patterns of consciousness which need to be understood because they allow us to experience practically the unity and harmony of all of Being. The enormous work of text interpretation in Bible and textbook, that was necessary at this point, has been done by John Doorly and Max Kappeler. Today, Bible and textbook are transparent; their linguistic surface structure is no longer a mystery. The potent power of their spiritual statements has become practically applicable.

Divine synonymity not understood

One might think that all Christian Scientists should be jubilant in their enthusiasm and gratitude in view of the above-described research results. But no, unfortunately, we experience that there are still Christian Scientists who do something that one can observe in children: metaphorically speaking, these Christian Scientists go for colourful images and stories as children would for well-loved and familiar toys, even if they are no longer at the right age for them. That is: there are Christian Scientists who go for Christian Science publications (even of a more recent date but with *ancient* content), probably because these publications are nicely packaged for effective publicity in colourful and beautiful covers. Or because they suggest that knowing hundreds of talks and lectures, class notes, articles by Christian Scientists well-known in their time, lecturers, teachers, practitioners, etc, could somehow bring progress in spiritual understanding. But in this way students lose valuable time because, if these old writings are studied with dedication for months and years (and remember most of these are close on 100 years old), then this is a backsliding into the time before John Doorly, frequently even a backsliding into the time before Kimball or Young or even into the earliest period of Christian Science in which the Textbook itself had not yet fully unfolded itself. This is a clear breach of the law of progress. Naturally, all these old writings are historically important, and it is wonderful that they exist. It is the great contribution of the Bookmark in America to collect these early witnesses from the history of Christian Science and even to publish them. For historic research they are an important source but for a spiritually scientific study they are more of a hindrance. Students must really learn to make the right distinctions at this point and to take the right decisions. It is against the law of Life, which means progress and unfoldment, if we allow ourselves to be tempted by the thought that we would need to know and must have read everything that was ever said or written about Christian Science. We only need to use the true pioneering works as our sources, and these sources never run dry and will never be out of date.

⁸ S&H 209 and 520 (see also Misc 22 and 104 as well as '01, 22)

⁹ S&H 209

Learning from history

Marie Schön: Misguided esteem of the first edition of the Textbook

It is also disobedience to Mrs Eddy if - as said above, even today! - the first edition of the Textbook from 1875 is regarded as the original and pure revelation, and if this first text is recommended for study. An early representative of this view was Marie Schön, a lady from Berlin from the turn of the 19th to the 20th century, when the German translation of the Textbook did not yet exist. Mrs Schön was an eager Christian Scientist, had a significant circle of students, produced translations of Mrs Eddy's works, published a Christian Science magazine and study letters, studied the Textbook and engaged in a major comparative effort using the different editions of the Textbook (even before the US American Alice Orgain). Mrs Schön had come to the conclusion that the first Textbook of 1875 contained the full revelation and that all following editions were watered down, even falsified. As she could not find acceptance for her translations and views from Mrs Eddy, she wrote her own (incomprehensible) book and finally left the path of Christian Science. The *Christian Science Movement, German Branch*, which she founded with a German, the physician Louis Passavant, still existed in the 1930s, briefly appeared again after the Second World War and then soon disappeared from view.

The attitude to gain inspiration from the first Textbook as the "purest product of revelation" is in contrast to Mrs Eddy's instruction that only the respectively most recent edition of the textbook is to be authoritative although the earlier editions should be regarded as valuable milestones in the unfoldment of the idea. Naturally, text comparisons with the earlier editions are helpful but only inasmuch as these comparisons support and elucidate the final edition which is authoritative for study. Mrs Eddy knew that the revelation she had experienced in the year 1866, and which received a first but still raw form in the first edition of the Textbook of 1875, had not been a single event but rather was an ongoing process for the remainder of her entire subsequent lifetime. The textbook revisions and Mrs Eddy's own statements confirm this circumstance. What is the explanation? The concept of revelation in Christian Science is not mystical but scientific. The concept of revelation in Christian Science does not signify a single inexplicable influence of unknown forces from beyond, but rather there are many references in the textbook that state absolutely clearly that it is Science which reveals. Science is the form by means of which the divine Being makes itself understood, and Science uses all paths of insight and understanding, even the path of gracious preparation as Mrs Eddy calls her life before 1866, and also the path of temporal unfoldment.

What holds for Mrs Eddy, who said that what she wrote 25 years earlier was not authoritative¹⁰, applies surely in even greater measure to those who have rendered outstanding services to the Cause during the early period of Christian Science. Their writings may be historically illuminating - however, they are hardly suitable for the advanced study of our day. The direct line of unfoldment of the spiritual idea went from Mrs Eddy via Kimball and Young to Doorly and Kappeler. All the many lecturers, teachers, directors and authors in Journal, Sentinel, Monitor etc certainly had their own very high insights but they did not cause any progress in the line of unfoldment of the spiritual idea as such. This must be clearly seen. Naturally, the spiritual idea revealed itself individually to each one of these devoted thinkers but only to the extent that the time and the respective consciousness were ready for it. These were not the great steps in development. This can be seen very clearly in the historical

¹⁰ See Misc 237

retrospective. We should therefore dedicate ourselves to the highest possible stage of development which presents the most recent (however, only an established!) stage of the unfoldment of the idea.

The synonyms for God as seen by the Movement

Already at the time of Mrs Eddy, and since then again and again, the great significance of the synonyms for God was felt and recognised in the Christian Science Movement. It was known of course that Mrs Eddy herself had emphasised the importance of the synonyms¹¹, and so one repeated her statement without knowing at all what it was all about. This is still the case even today: Reading well-known authors of the church, one finds almost always a statement on the importance of the synonyms.¹² However, if one regards these statements in the light of what we have today in terms of established understanding, then these statements seem at best serious, certainly, but unfortunately also quite superficial and misleading in an almost criminal manner. One also gets the feeling that these statements are only a kind of response to the subject as found in Doorly and Kappeler, in response to the many pertinent questions that are asked by the field in this regard to this very day, and without such authors really being able to answer them. Only John Doorly and Max Kappeler asked the determining questions and were also able to use the right method, which then led to the discovery and elaboration of the synonymy principle. This method, namely to ask the Textbook itself as a book of revelation, not with the human capability of reading (attached as it is to individual sentences) but rather with spiritual scientific text analysis, then also led to a new practice, a practice starting from God itself, the holy name, the synonyms of God, not from the naturally limited understanding, or even the power of thought, of someone "practising" Christian Science.

John Doorly and Martha Wilcox

Let us consider how it all started. In 1910, John Doorly took part in the last teacher instruction class (normal class) which had still been legitimised by the signature of Mrs Eddy herself. John Doorly's teacher was Bicknell Young. This class was also attended by Martha Wilcox, a young lady who had served in Mrs Eddy's household for some time. She was a very promising young Christian Scientist who had been recommended by Mrs Eddy for Bicknell Young's class. From 1911, Martha Wilcox was a very devoted teacher and practitioner for 36 years. Her class instruction, the association addresses and her articles reach into the late 1940s, thus providing a wealth of reading material, all published today.

In the address to her class association of 1923, which was entitled "The synonyms", Wilcox emphasised the importance of the synonyms for Christian Science practice and attempted to explain six of them in their meaning. However, this was not a revolutionary new step for the fact that the synonyms are important had been known to Christian Scientists for a long time already. The attempt by Wilcox, quite worthy of acknowledgement and recognition, shows the correct attempt to explain the content of the synonyms by means of certain specific ideas; what this attempt does not include, however, is the *order* of the synonyms. Although she takes the order in which the synonyms are listed in the Textbook (465) as the starting

¹¹ See Max Kappeler: The seven synonyms for God loc.cit ... (p. 17-19)

¹² Thus e.g. in DeWitt John, *The Christian Science way of life*, Boston 1962, p. 37-46
also: Richard E. Nenneman, *The New Birth of Christianity*, San Francisco 1992, p. 127 ff.

Both authors endeavour to avoid as much as possible any thought in relation to the Doorly-Kappeler research which possibly might urge itself upon the reader. This endeavour makes them let their explanations become blurred on the surface by personal associations. In addition, Nenneman indulges in subversive unqualified criticism. For additional information see below: p. 27.

point, she quite incomprehensibly leaves this order and suddenly changes not only the sequence of Life and Love, but also omits Truth. And this then is the end of the subject for her. As far as we know, it later never reappears again in Wilcox's works - and naturally there is nowhere a systematic approach either. And naturally the characteristic ideas of the synonyms have been selected quite at random as no clear method of text analysis was known. Without the key function of *order* this was not possible, for if one disregards the factor *order* any explanation attempt with regard to the synonyms must end up without result. One does ask oneself whether Wilcox was among those colleagues of John Doorly about whom he reports that they did not want to deal at any cost with the question of *order* which he himself emphasised so much.

How very much different was John Doorly's approach! Right from the start he saw *interconnections and interrelations*. He began studying the synonyms¹³ before 1907, that is before the final definition of God had even appeared in the textbook. In 1916, he described in a talk how the synonyms represent different aspects of God. In 1914 already, he had recognised an *order* in the seven days of creation; and when he thought about this, and as the subject unfolded in him, he became conscious of the fact that the days of creation coincide with the final order of the synonyms for God. It became clear to him that it was the order which determined the place value and thus the significance and meaning of the individual synonym. The best example for this is the sequence of numbers from 1 to 10: a 3 is determined in its value by its position between 2 and 4.

In 1916, John Doorly also gave a talk on the days of creation, and the people in the audience said that they thought his explanations were good, although they had not understood everything. When John Doorly then pointed out the fact that this was a *definitive order*, the problem started (as he later told the story). Mortal mind did not want to accept or give way to any order.¹⁴ He was faced again and again with this phenomenon. Naturally, all his colleagues - into the highest echelons of the Church Organisation - thought that the synonyms for God were important and did not even reject a special study either, although their relevant statements remain nebulous to this very day. Of course it would have been difficult to give a good reason for rejecting such a special study, in view of the fact that the synonyms were the first subject of the 14th chapter intended for elementary class instruction. However, what simply went too far for all colleagues in the church and what they could not understand was the thought of order and the interconnections and interrelations resulting therefrom in a compelling and conclusive fashion. The systematic investigation of the Textbook using the concordance method, which had been set out by Mrs Eddy in the lesson sermons, was explained by John Doorly for the first time in his class association meeting of 1923. In 1925, he then pointed out that it was necessary to study the synonymous terms. When the thought of order led to a system of several orders into which the fundamental 15 synonymous root notions from Bible and Textbook integrate themselves, there was no longer any way in which the Church would accept this: John Doorly was excommunicated irrespective of the results of this method of investigation, proven by means of the actual text in the Textbook. The only teacher who stood with John Doorly at the time and allowed himself to be excommunicated together with him was John Laurence Sinton to whom the career in the Church Organisation meant less than the new vision of a scientific method of study. Together with Sinton, Max Kappeler - who was then quite young - worked on the text analysis of the Textbook, the result of which was a watertight list of terms or "ideas" which characterise each of the synonyms for God.

¹³ John W. Doorly: Oxford Summer School 1948, Vol. I, p. 16 f.

¹⁴ John W. Doorly: Talks on the Science of the Bible, Vol. I., p. 38 and 95

Let us consider again Martha Wilcox. She did not follow up and continue her 1923 approach. Perhaps because she could not follow through the thought of orders in spiritual Being or because she was not aware of the right method, which however could only be identified after 1938, or because she felt more drawn toward individual topics, or even because her practice did not allow her the time. We do not know; what we do know is that the way to a God-conscious being must lead via the synonyms; and these lead us inescapably into the system of orders and synonymous root notions running through all texts in the Bible and the Textbook.

If one still wants to study Martha Wilcox today, one is at liberty to do this of course; everyone has the freedom of choice. But one should not wonder if one's consciousness remains stuck at the lesson-type atomistic understanding of Christian Science. One will surely learn something, but one does not get to know the infinite meanings of God such as emerge and become evident from the interrelations of the synonymy of the divine root notions within the system of Christian Science. One will still learn something *about* God in human language.

It is completely different in the language of Spirit which only uses divine terms and purely spiritual meanings. Here, synonymy has the character of a law; it is governed as it were "by God", by the divine synonyms. Whoever structures his consciousness by means of these laws, no longer thinks *about* God, but - in consciousness - is at one with God in His image (the synonyms).

The development of the absolutely new linguistic principle of synonymy in Christian Science makes it possible that it is not only individual words or sentences which stand in a synonymous relationship to one another, such as is known from everyday language, but that a completely new system of reference manifests itself from a *spiritual* synonymy existing between the categories of Being itself: namely, that divine system which is hidden in the deep structures of our revelatory books, the Bible and the Textbook. The full and complete synonymy of the categories of Being provides the foundation for the law-governed unity of Being.

If we want to experience this unity with divine Being, then the way starts with the first step, and that is the study of the synonyms and their ideas in the text of the Textbook by means of the Compendiums and the Concordance. The subsequent elaboration and working out of the spiritual tonality of the synonyms is best done by means of the actual texts in the Bible and the Textbook. Nobody can do without this study inasmuch as one is not content with individual truths. However, if one is content with individual truths, one need not study Christian Science and the Textbook. Wonderful individual truths are found everywhere. Unfortunately, in the circles of the Christian Science Church officers, one prefers to close one's eyes to the evidence of synonymy but affirms at the same time that one does recognise and value the synonyms rightly, only to immediately play down again their significance.

If the Church, which is still quite important for many people, wants to survive then it must remember what the core of Christian Science is: the new concept of God unique in the history of mankind.

Whoever does not understand the high significance of synonymy in the language of Christian Science, cannot understand its system either. This is the reason we are still rejected by the established Church of Christian Science, *although they have not been able to tell us for 60 years what exactly we are doing so very wrong!* But there are proud writers who – in commissioned work – handle the subject of the synonyms quite sophisticatedly. Here, one encounters thoughts and formulations that seem to be very well known, and which they have taken over from us, but only to distort them quite consciously into an opposite meaning. On the one hand, for example, it is emphasised there that everything Mrs Eddy has to say originates from her definition of God. One reads this and is pleased. However, immediately thereafter the synonyms for God are designated as "words" which were lacking in practicability unless we would give it to them. In accordance with this view, the synonyms for God - merely designated as "words" - are in no way different from human language. This opens up a duality between the synonyms on the one hand and a practice made dependent upon man; this duality denies the revelation quality, divinity and supremacy which Mrs Eddy assigns to the synonyms. But as a result of the research work carried out by Doorly and Kappeler, we know meanwhile about the unity of symbol and reality, as Jesus demonstrated the same; we know that the synonyms are more than "mere words", on the basis of the contents assigned to them by the Textbook. The synonyms are symbols of a very special type in which the idea - through the principle of synonymy in its manifold wholeness - presents itself to human consciousness in a translated form such that idea and consciousness can melt into one another. From this unity of divine consciousness, there manifests itself a practice of the divine type, not a human type, which lifts us onto a higher level, away from a childish attachment to concrete (material) forms, images, and stories in our thinking and experience. Would Mrs Eddy otherwise have spoken of the language of Spirit? The language spoken by God, Spirit?

If someone writes in this way against the innermost essence of Christian Science, he naturally also somehow needs to polemicize away its systematic nature. This is done by stating very suggestively about Mrs Eddy that she neither had had an intellectual nor a theological interest to construct a system of metaphysics as such. This begs the question: how does the writer want to know this? Did he ask Mrs Eddy? Surely not. Did he investigate her writings scientifically with content-analytical methods? Hardly, otherwise he could not put forward such unqualified assertions. The choice of words alone: "intellectual", "theological", "constructed" uncovers the underlying intention. To top it all, the blurb on the cover of his book asserts that the writer has given a most careful overview of Christian Science and its metaphysical system. During the course of 190 pages in total, Nenneman develops his own subjective opinion on just seven pages, truly sufficient space for someone who - as a former journalist - is well-practised to make a serious impression superficially with a fast pen, and to cover up the lack of research work and understanding by means of skilful phrases. But is it really possible that this is also sufficient space to bring 60 years of intensive research work on the subject, and using the original sources, into discredit? Probably, this approach will succeed only in the case of those readers who think just as superficially and prefer to stick with material church habits, and their deceptive external safety, rather than to submit themselves to the efforts of a scientific study of the Textbook.

¹⁵ see footnote 23, Nenneman, p. 127-133

The system is where views differ

There is another subject which we must deal with if we want to understand consciously how immensely valuable it is to be allowed to know and comprehend the system of spiritual synonymity.

It is known that, in the history of Christian Science after Mrs Eddy, there have been attempts to find the system of metaphysics which the Textbook talks about (144). Evidently, the time after 1910 was ripe for this new step in the development of the idea. As happens frequently when an idea is ripe there was not just one attempt for the light of understanding to penetrate into consciousness. But the breakthrough can only happen where there is the least resistance. In order to use an image by Mrs Eddy: the light can only shine through a window whose glass is absolutely clear and pure.

The proven beginnings of the discovery of the system lie with John Doorly in the years 1914/16. As he never held back with his insights, it is likely that he became the initiator for those who later thought to have developed their own "systems" as "the" system of Christian Science. Naturally, there may be different systems within an area of knowledge, depending on the humanly preferred classifications. But these are human-made subdivisions and classifications. If we want to understand Being in its own self-immanent orders we must only ask Being itself. The system of Being self-generates from the divine categories of the synonymous root notions, and *only* from these. Naturally, the texts in the Bible and the Textbook can be systematised, categorised, subdivided and structured in many different ways. In theology as well as in psychology and the scientific study of literature, we find relevant examples. However, all results in this regard do not deserve the designation *system* within the meaning of Christian Science.

The above example of Martha Wilcox has shown us how a correct attempt to place the synonyms for God into the focus of consideration remained stuck in its beginnings due to an incorrect or missing method. In order to arrive at the right understanding, the right method is needed, that is, the method adapted to the task in hand.

Alice Orgain

With reference to the lack of the right method as regards the systematics of Christian Science, another well-known Christian Scientist is a good example. For all those who do not know the name Alice Orgain, we want to provide a few short notes on the person and her work.

Alice Orgain became known due to some very voluminous books and some shorter writings, all of which she published between 1929 and 1952. Already during the lifetime of Mrs Eddy she was a well-known practitioner in New York, registered in the Journal. Following publication of her first book, she was excommunicated in 1930. She was very much supported by her cooperation with the owners of the Rare Book Company in New York, in particular the later owner Ralph Geradi. As a result of this cooperation she had access to all earlier editions of Mrs Eddy's works, which were collected, and in part re-printed, by the Rare Book Company so that her interest in historical interrelations was supported above all by possible text comparisons. She had a circle of readers which, in part, continues to the present day, above all because Ralph Geradi - as her devoted follower - endeavoured until the early

1990s to keep up her memory by some of his own publications, and because he put everything into tracing back the discovery of "the system" to Orgain and his co-operation with her.

We remember several personal meetings with Ralph who also visited Max Kappeler's summer schools in America. He was a very lively and friendly self-made man with an overwhelming enthusiasm for Christian Science and the thought of a system in the Bible and the Textbook, which - as he knew from the Doorly/Kappeler line of study - can be proven in the text. At the same time he was fully occupied by his own story which, as a "close friend and collaborator" of Alice Orgain, he told time and again in full detail. This probably explains also why his own writings about the "discovery of the system" by Orgain show obvious similarities with that vocabulary which, as an eager participant in Kappeler's summer schools, he very likely took in there unconsciously and used for the formulation of his own writings, by means of which he attempted to prove that the discovery of "the" system can be traced back to Orgain. Naturally, this "system" has nothing whatever to do with the system of ontological fundamental categories verified by Doorly and elaborated by Kappeler, which can be proven from the Bible and the textbook on the basis of scientific text interpretation.

Why is this story of any interest here? Alice Orgain has without doubt made a great contribution to the analysis of Christian Science history, not only with regard to text comparisons but also with reference to questions of church organisation as found in the different editions of the Church Manual. Her excellent historical knowledge allowed her to do groundbreaking work also with regard to the different editions of the textbook. Even today, these works are worth reading as so many specific historical milestones. Much else however seems to remain stuck too much in mere Biblical symbolism. This is not a rejection of the works by Orgain but rather an indication of the unfoldment of the idea that has meanwhile taken place and which for consciousness rising upwards enforces an eventual disappearance of the old symbols. Meanwhile the development from symbol to idea has become understandable and can be comprehended consciously for one's own consciousness, whilst staying too long with the old symbols prevents progress.

If we enquire in more detail about "the system" by Orgain, we have to rely on Geradi's short description.¹⁶ It is namely almost impossible to study the relevant books by Orgain, with their almost 1500 pages, without drowning in the wealth of the symbolism described, coupled with impressive historical facts. The Orgain system, as described by Geradi, is characterised by its strong dependence on symbolism. The systematics are developed by means of a Jacob's ladder using the 12 tribes of Israel, out of which in combination with the seven days of creation, the seven synonyms for God, the four sides of the holy city etc., a "model" is developed whose elements do not stand in any spiritually comprehensible interrelationship. Unfortunately, Geradi's description lacks detailed references. Where such references are found, it seems difficult to derive the proof for "the system". One cannot help feeling that the "Students of Christian Science", who anonymously assume responsibility under the name of the Rare Book Company (Geradi), have made up their very own "System of Evolution", as it is called, from Doorly/Kappeler and Orgain.

*Henry W. Steiger*¹⁷

Another negative example of a humanly constructed "system" of Christian Science is the philosophical work by a Swiss author who - exactly at the time when John Doorly and Max

¹⁶ Publ. Rare Book Company: *The Scientific System of Spiritual Evolution in Science and Health*, New York 1989

¹⁷ Henry W. Steiger: *Christian Science and Philosophy*, New York 1948

Kappeler were the subject of very heavy attack by the Church - went to America where he published an "academically" researched and elaborated "System of Christian Science". Steiger's work is more an embarrassing attempt to present "Christian Science for the first time as a philosophical system". The book appeared in 1948, that is, at a time when John Doorly's research results had already been known for three years. John Doorly had published his "Statement" in January 1945, his "Pure Science of Christian Science" in November 1946, and he had started his public Bible talks in the autumn of 1947. Steiger of course emphasises that he had presented the subject already in 1946 in the form of a dissertation. His preface shows that he wrote by agreement with the Church and this is noticeable on every page. Although Doorly's thesis was talked about by all in those days, Steiger does not mention Doorly anywhere but only "refutes" him subversively. The book is dripping with "academic" pride, polemics, and - if one knows how to read - is full of cases of plagiarism. Today, it is hardly known and worth mentioning for one reason only: it shows us clearly that, based on just academic subtleties without inspiration, without spiritual understanding and without the deep inner conviction that the text of Textbook alone can reveal its own system, any human attempt to want to understand the divine must fail.

Conclusion

For our present-day scientific consciousness, all this is hardly comprehensible. The purely spiritual interconnections and interrelations within the idea-system discovered by Doorly and in the "Model of Being" resulting therefrom have long since been freed from the limiting symbols. The spiritual laws on the various different levels of scientific consciousness, which Max Kappeler explained and made accessible for us - the purely spiritual structures in the Bible and the Textbook based on the foundation of the synonymity principle - show us how the Christ-Mind can be our daily consciousness without having to use the detour via old symbols. Certainly, the 15 synonymous root notions are still a type of (linguistic) symbol; but these are symbols in which the image and likeness of God as idea is present; symbols in which the unity of consciousness with idea is possible. As stated at the beginning, language and consciousness are closely interrelated. Via the idea-language of Spirit it is possible to free our consciousness from the limitation of human images. What could be more important in our time with a constant stream of images that attempts daily - and around the clock - to trap our consciousness within the limits of a three-dimensional earthly existence?

There is nothing more important than to understand the principle of spiritual synonymity because this makes the cohesion and interrelation within the divine system of reference, and thus the unity of Being, comprehensible to us such that we can experience it. No image and symbol, be it as interesting as can be, can do what a single idea embedded within the system of synonymity can do for us. Therefore, there is no more important study than the study of the synonyms for God, their qualities and ideas, their orders and their laws, and all that in the methodically correct sequence.

We should all ask ourselves as often as possible: what will we take with us one day when we leave this plane of existence? Our memory filled with wonderful stories, symbols, sentences and words? This is very unlikely for our memory is located in the physiological condition of the so-called "grey matter" which will turn into dust. We will only take with us as much Christ-Mind consciousness as we have built up in us. This true substance is immortal, and we should put our all into building up this Mind of Christ in us. Let us pay heed to the synonymity of the root notions *Mind* and *Christ* by whose interconnection we can grasp (comprehend) more the understanding (Mind) of our unity with God (Christ).