6

LOGICAL REASONING IN CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

MAX KAPPELER

Translated from the German by Kathleen Lee



Kappeler Institute Publishing PO Box 99735, Seattle, WA 98139-0735

Phone: (206) 286-1617 FAX: (206) 286-1675 E-mail: mail@kappelerinstitute.org Website: www.kappelerinstitute.org

Copyright 1980 Kappeler Institute for the Science of Being Wilmington, Delaware (USA) Abbreviations for the works of Mary Baker Eddy:

S. & H.	Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures
Un.	Unity of Good
No	No and Yes
My	The First Church of Christ, Scientist, and Miscellany

LOGICAL REASONING IN CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

Understanding through logical reasoning

In the very first sentence of the Christian Science textbook, 'Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures', Mary Baker Eddy points out to the reader that it is only through understanding that he can find the right approach to God and thereby receive divine blessings. "The prayer that reforms the sinner and heals the sick is an absolute faith that all things are possible to God, - a spiritual understanding of Him, an unselfed love." (S.& H.1:1)

The necessity for this "spiritual understanding of Him" is constantly stressed by Mary Baker Eddy. Why is understanding so important? The answer given in the textbook is that only an understanding of Truth can overcome a belief in error and thereby prove its nothingness. Readiness to accept divine Truth, and hopeful faith in Truth, are necessary preliminary steps; but they must lead onward to an understanding of Truth, for: "It is well to be calm in sickness; to be hopeful is still better; but to understand that sickness is not real and that Truth can destroy its seeming reality, is best of all, for this understanding is the universal and perfect remedy." (S.& H.393:32)

Understanding brings demonstration. The close connection between understanding and demonstration is also brought out by Mary Baker Eddy in an article on her textbook, in which she says: "The earnest student of this book, understanding it, ...knows that it contains a Science which is demonstrable when understood, and which is fully understood when demonstrated." (My 112:16) This is a remarkable declaration, which furnishes much food for thought. Science, she states clearly here, as elsewhere, is demonstrable when it is understood. Our not understanding Science does not alter the ever available potency of Truth, but Truth does not then become apparent to us, because we - being without understanding - are blind to it. Understanding, therefore, is not a means of making Truth work; Truth does that in any case, even when we do not understand. Understanding, rather, leads the way for our eyes to be opened, step by step, to the working of Truth.

Logic: an aid to understanding. Aristotle (384 - 322 B.C.) realized, already in his day, that we can get a mental grasp of our world, and

reach an understanding of it, only by thinking in ordered steps, according to very definite rules. He defined these rules and has been regarded ever since as the founder of classical logic. This Aristotelian logic, on which the thinking of the whole Western world is built, can be defined as the method of correct reasoning. It shows the mental process one must follow, starting from a given premiss, in order to arrive at the right conclusion.

Why is it important for the Christian Scientist to think 'logically'? Correct reasoning shows us two things: first, it shows thought to what conclusion an assumed premiss leads: and, second, it also shows why the conclusion must be thus and not otherwise. In Christian Science, therefore, we learn through logical reasoning what true conclusion results from a right premiss; and we learn why this conclusion is the only correct one. This second aspect is even more important for the student than the first. For Truth itself is presented in the textbook, to be read at any time. But this alone, in the long run, does not bring us essentially farther forward. For, as long as absolute Truth remains purely theoretical to the student, as long as he is unable to reason with the exact logic which leads to Truth, he will not be able to experience the demonstrability of Truth in actual practice. We do know the truth; we know, for instance, that man in the image and likeness of God can only express perfection and that sin, disease and death are not realities. Often, however, we do not understand why this is true, merely believing it because it says so in the textbook. But to prove Truth for ourselves in our daily lives, we must above all be able to think in the distinct, spiritually logical steps which make this possible. This is the true remedy. Mary Baker Eddy makes this clear in her instruction to the student in case of accident: "When an accident happens ... Declare that you are not hurt" - we must know what is true - "and understand the reason why ...'' (S.& H.397:12,17) - and we must, in addition, know why it is true. Logic shows us this 'why'.

Here, in fact, we already have the answer to the question, which frequently arises, why no solution could be found in a particular situation, although the truth about it had been declared. It is not enough to know the truth merely as an assertion; the student must, rather, come to that 'spiritual understanding of Him' which ''reforms the sinner and heals the sick'', when he has learnt how to draw divine conclusions and thereby progressed from mere acceptance of Truth to an understanding of Truth. Correct reasoning is essential in Christian Science, for: "Incorrect reasoning leads to practical error." (S.& H.452:4)

The textbook demands logical thinking. Fundamentally the whole textbook is orientated towards leading the student to the realization that all discord is merely the consequence of incorrect reasoning and that the error which arises from this false logic must be corrected by divine logic. To introduce the divine logic of Christian Science to the reader, Mary Baker Eddy first appeals to the student's own logical thinking. She challenges his intelligence rather than appealing to his religious sense; she argues, weighs one thing against another, makes the reader stop and think, tries to convince, instructs, explains - in short, she speaks to reason, which she calls "the most active human faculty" (S.& H.327:29). Naturally this does not mean that Mary Baker Eddy bases herself on human reasoning. Yet she does make use of man's peculiar gift of arriving at new findings through step-by-step reasoning, and puts it to use for "the right education of human thought" $(S_{\star} \oplus H_{\star}^{234:23})$. In what way does the textbook educate thought up to an understanding of Truth?

In order to reach her reader with her argumentation, Mary Baker Eddy meets human thought on its own ground - the classical two-valued logic in which we have all been trained. What are the most important characteristics of this logic?

Classical two-valued logic

Mary Baker Eddy deliberately uses the method of correct reasoning inherited from the Greeks. She also emphasizes the importance of being able to think logically when working in Christian Science. Thus she explains, for example, that in Christian Science both the major and the minor propositions of a syllogism must be correct (see S.& H.128:31).

The art of reasoning correctly. Central to classical logic is the form of correct reasoning known as the syllogism. With the use of a simple formal argument it can be shown how, from a given premiss, a correct, valid conclusion can be drawn, leading to new insights. To the Western-

educated this form of reasoning is so familiar that it is applied to all situations in daily life, even if not always quite correctly. They are not generally aware that the conclusions they come to in their deductions rest on any particular mental steps. Let us now briefly run through these steps, so that later on we can determine more easily the points at which, without realizing it, we frequently make mistakes.

A syllogism consists of premiss and conclusion. The premiss, from which one starts, comprises a major proposition, which makes a general statement, and a minor proposition, which presents a specific case of the major proposition.

Most famous example:

All men are mortal		<i>major proposition;</i> an evaluation or statement which states something generally valid.
Socrates is a man	egnileni =+ tanobe riig doroteest	<i>minor proposition;</i> an evaluation or statement which presents a specific case of the major proposition.

The minor proposition, therefore, must not contain just any arbitrary assertion; it must indicate a very definite case for which the statement contained in the major proposition holds true.

The word 'man' appears in both the major and the minor propositions of our example. It is the so-called middle term. To reach the correct conclusion from the premiss, one simply leaves out this middle term, which is common to both major and minor propositions, thus:

All men are mortal	= major proposition				
			>	premiss	
Socrates is a man	\equiv	minor proposition	J		

from which it follows, leaving out the middle term 'man':

Socrates is mortal =

conclusion

Within the meaning of classical logic this conclusion is correct, and is said to be "true".

Another important characteristic of this logic is that it is two-valued. What does this mean?

Two-valued reasoning in classical logic. It was also Aristotle who showed that reality may be divided into two great components: "form and content", "object and subject", "spirituality and materiality", "positive and negative", "true and false". Consequently, all statements that we can make regarding the universe have the value of either 'true' or 'false'; there is no third possibility.

This dualistic logic provided man with a very simple system of ordering, based on the evaluation of all phenomena according to two values. We therefore speak of two-valued or dualistic logic.

The use of the two values in the textbook. The textbook makes use of this peculiarity of our dualistic thinking, which is trained to divide everything it encounters into pairs of opposites, so far as here, too, there are countless passages where 'true' is opposed to 'false'. Thus we find in the textbook a great number of apparent opposites which are familiar from daily experience, such as health - sickness, joy sorrow, harmony - discord. On closer consideration it becomes clear that these are all modifications of seven great pairs of opposites, namely the seven synonymous terms for God and their counterfeits: Mind mortal mind; Spirit - matter; Soul - body and the testimony of the physical senses; Principle - personal theories; Life - death; Truth error; Love - hate. In short, the textbook presents the great antithesis between Being, God, and not-being, illusions.

The value of dualism. The dualistic logic developed by Aristotle greatly contributed to human thinking. Before that the world had appeared to man more as an undifferentiated whole, of which he had only an intuitive, totally indefinite, rather mystical conception. He lacked the scientific tool for controlling and evaluating his experiences. The discovery of two-valued logic changed all this. The division of all phenomena according to two fundamentally opposed values is the simplest and most natural form of differentiation, for the primitive dualism of I and not-I was, so to speak, "innate" in man from the earliest emergence of human consciousness. This dualistic splitting of existence then found its rational expression in dualistic logic, which

in its further developments became the foundation of modern science in the West.

It is therefore important to recognize this dualistic, two-valued logic as an essential stepping-stone for man in the gradual process of learning how to think. We should also realize how strongly ingrained in ourselves this dualistic thinking still is. We divide everything we come across - usually unconsciously - into pairs of opposites, such as 'good - bad'; 'beautiful - ugly'; 'healthy - sick', and so on. It helps us to begin to take our bearings within the unlimited abundance of all phenomena and events. In this respect two-valued logic has become an indispensable help to us, enabling us to grasp and control the world around us.

But, at the same time, one important point must not be forgotten: Aristotle provided only *one* rational method of understanding being. Dualistic logic can tell us nothing definite about the nature of being itself. This has been proved by advances in such modern sciences as psychology, cybernetics and nuclear physics, in which other kinds of logic are discussed, other possible ways of gaining an understanding of being.

Mary Baker Eddy already saw, a hundred years ago, that the classical logic of the Greeks is not a suitable medium for comprehending the nature of being. The way to an understanding of being as presented in her textbook, therefore, goes far beyond two-valued logic and embraces several different kinds of logic. But for all the deductions made in the textbook one thing holds good: the logic of Christian Science never reasons from human beliefs, but always on the basis of divine concepts and statements. The first concern of students of Christian Science is therefore to become familiar with these concepts and statements, so that they can follow the logic used in the textbook.

The way to understanding

The necessity for forming new concepts. The question thus arises: what can a mortal do to free himself from beliefs, which according to Christianly scientific logic have no reality. First of all he must change his way of looking at things, not investigating being with mortal mind, but choosing a medium which can help him to find the true conception. This is one of the first great requirements demanded of the student of Christian Science. He must, little by little, relinquish the models of mortal thought and learn to accept divine conceptions (see S.& H.259: 26-31). Mary Baker Eddy says that true concepts, ideas, are transmitted to us by Science. This means that we can acquire the new way of looking at things, the divine Mind's way, and thereby attain an understanding of divine statements.

How do we attain divine concepts? The sure way to reach true concepts about being (with consequent harmonious results in our daily experience) is by studying the seven synonyms for God. Infinite Being is divinely defined through Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth, Love and their ideas. A thorough acquaintance with this divine definition of reality constitutes the first step from a purely human logic to a spiritual form of reasoning.

This synonym study brings about a marked development in the student. More and more clearly he begins to see that the seven synonyms for God not only affect his thinking, but gradually make their impact on his whole consciousness. He awakes to a deeper understanding of the nature of Being.

The understanding which comes from Spirit. The understanding which takes place in us in proportion as we gain a more and more exact conception of the seven synonyms for God is not however our understanding; it is not human, but divine. We cannot force it or acquire it by ourselves. We can only help it to unfold in ourselves unhindered. This is important. Why? We know that only like can understand like, and that with our human understanding of reality we could therefore never grasp the reality which is in its nature divine. To be able to understand being as it really is, we need the understanding which stems from Being itself, from Spirit - not from human thinking. "Spirit imparts the understanding which uplifts consciousness and leads into all truth." (S.& H.505:16)

There is a means of grace open to mortals, whereby they can break free from duality and gain a divine understanding of the facts of being. We may wonder how this is possible. It is possible because the reality of the seven synonyms for God permeates all stages of conscious experience; and because the synonyms for God, therefore, without our being aware, penetrate even that realm which we call human mortal existence. Hence it is not mortals themselves, searching of their own accord, who turn to the new definition of God (through the seven synonyms for God); rather it is Mind itself which, without their knowing, puts into their hearts the fervent desire for increased understanding, which makes them seek and search - makes them willing to be open to new concepts, so that eventually they let these true concepts of the seven synonyms for God dwell within them. Our consciousness, constantly culturing this true concept of reality, is finally so pure and receptive to truth, that understanding meets with no more resistance. Then our thinking is no longer human, but divine. Then we are spiritually prepared for reasoning according to the logic of Christian Science.

The logic of Christian Science is based on understanding. The logic of Christian Science is based on this understanding which comes from Spirit. Its premiss is always a statement about the reality of God and His ideas; its conclusion always leads to the demonstration of this one reality.

The comprehensive logic of the textbook. The logic with which Christian Science leads the student to the demonstration of reality embraces all levels of conscious experience. It is a comprehensive logic, which is multi-dimensional. What does this imply?

In the textbook we can distinguish four different basic levels of conscious experience: Science itself, divine Science, absolute Christian Science and Christian Science. From each of these levels being presents itself differently; thus each of them accentuates a different question about being. 1. On the level of Science itself it is a question of how the infinite One knows itself. 2. The level of divine Science deals with the question of the oneness of God and His creation - the oneness of Principle and idea. 3. On the level of absolute Christian Science it is a question of the relationship between this Principle and its idea. Here the accent is on the infinite calculus of ideas and the handling of the noumenon of evil, latent error, through the infinite calculus of being. 4. The level of Christian Science answers the question concerning the relationship of Truth to error. It shows how concrete error can be destroyed through the healing Truth. (See: Max Kappeler, 'The Four Levels of Spiritual Consciousness')

The textbook does not tackle these very different questions with a single method of correct reasoning. On the contrary, for each level or

dimension it uses a different and appropriate logic; it works with a multi-dimensional logic, which provides different forms of reasoning for each level.

This explains why the textbook is so often misunderstood and even thought to be self-contradictory. For we generally try to approach every theme with the same logic, usually our own human, two-valued logic. Not until the appearance of quite new sciences in our own day has our attention been drawn to the fact that not all problems and questions can be solved with the same logic; that nuclear physics, for instance, researching in the sub-atomic field, has to use a different method of reasoning from that used in classical physics. It is the same in Christian Science. Here the level of consciousness on which the question is asked determines which logic is appropriate, that is to say, which kind of reasoning can supply a conclusive answer. Thus spiritual understanding employs a different kind of argumentation for each of the four levels of consciousness; for on each level it has to solve different questions about being.

Anyone who is not familiar with this dimensional use of logic in the textbook feels irritated by the varying methods of reasoning. The textbook as a whole, and the wide range of problems discussed in it, can be understood only when we see clearly which kind of reasoning is needed for which level of consciousness. So let us now examine which logic is used by spiritual understanding on each of the levels.

One logic overlaps the other. In doing this, however, we must naturally remember that being itself is one indivisible whole; and that the different levels of consciousness (which we impose on this being like a grid in order to understand it better) do not therefore exist disconnected from each other, side by side. Similarly, the different kinds of logic belonging to the various levels overlap each other and always work together simultaneously. Because of this we often find in a single sentence several statements which can be ascribed to very different levels. In practice also the transitions are fluid. But for a better grasp of the subject it is helpful and permissible to treat each level, together with its own specific logic, separately.

Logic on the level of Christian Science

The level of Christian Science is that level of conscious experience

on which the duality of material existence must be resolved. We see, hear and feel sickness, sin, death, and discord of every kind. However, here we do not tackle this mortal existence with classical two-valued logic, which takes as true everything to which the physical senses testify. Rather we regard this level of being with spiritually scientific understanding. What conclusions does this understanding show us, to free us from duality?

The correct premiss. That the two great opposites, Truth and error, appear to rule our lives is not at first refuted. Science proceeds very slowly and wisely. It does not shock the student suffering from error by declaring that there is no error or sickness, the opposite of Truth, but it first of all examines these opposites and comes to grips with them.

In this connection Mary Baker Eddy points out quite clearly that in scientific logic "both the major and the minor propositions of a syllogism" must be "correct". "Truth", she says, "can tolerate no error in premise or conclusion." (S.& H.128:31,129:5) But what is a correct premiss? On this point, too, the textbook leaves us in no doubt. "A logical and scientific conclusion is reached only through the knowledge that there are not two bases of being, matter and mind, but one alone, - Mind." (S.& H.279:26) "For right reasoning", therefore, "there should be but one fact before the thought, namely, spiritual existence." (S.& H.492:3) So in all our reasoning we draw a correct conclusion only when we follow the very clear instruction: "Reasoning from cause to effect in the Science of Mind, we begin with Mind, which must be understood through the idea which expresses it and cannot be learned from its opposite, matter." (S.& H.467:29) Therefore, even when we are considering opposites, our starting-point is always spiritual Being, the seven synonyms for God.

The wrong syllogism of two-valued logic. The necessity of always starting from spiritual being, and setting no other sort of premiss, is a particular characteristic of the logic of Christian Science. In classical two-valued logic it is quite admissible to take any statement one likes as the premiss. In fact, our syllogism on p.4 is a typical specimen of correct reasoning. In Christian Science, however, this syllogism is wrong. Why? Because the premiss - 'All men are mortal' - is wrong. It does not start with a fact which is divinely true, but with a fallacy of human thinking. This fallacy, that all men are mortal, is stated in the classical example as the starting-point for further argument, and the result can therefore only be a false conclusion, namely: 'Socrates is mortal'. This bears out the statement that 'an error in the premise must appear in the conclusion' (S.& H.167:16).

Scientific reasoning on the level of Christian Science. The Christian Scientist, moulded by the understanding of the seven synonyms for God, tackles the phenomena which arise from duality, such as sin, disease and death, with a different logic. Although, like the classical logician, he may also experience the disharmony of mortal existence, he never makes it the starting-point of his argumentation. On the contrary, he starts always from a premiss which the textbook admits as correct for a divine conclusion: from a spiritual fact, hence from that which is grounded in the true nature of being.

Gentle progress. In the beginning, however, those who still cling to dualism labour under the delusion that evil is just as real as good. "Sickness is more than fancy: it is solid conviction." (S.& H.460:15) Here Science proceeds very carefully, introducing an orderly process of learning. Thus, for example, the invalid suffering from error is not buffeted "with the superficial and cold assertion, 'Nothing ails you'" (S.& H.460:22). He is brought, rather, by degrees to the realization of truth. The first step in scientifically logical reasoning on the level of Christian Science consists in giving the student a clear conception of that which is true and at the same time giving him a keener spiritual sense for what is not in accordance with truth. So when we study the seven synonyms for God we are also learning how to see through their counterfeits or opposites more clearly. This is very important; for only when we know what error is, and how it operates, are we ready to free ourselves from it. Understanding then comes to us as the "line of demarcation between the real and unreal" (S.& H.505:21).

The scientifically correct conclusion. Here Spirit and matter, Truth and error are diametrically opposed to each other. In this respect, on the level of Christian Science we are still in the realm of dualism. But, in contrast to classical logic, we only ever set out from premisses of Truth and therefore reach within this dualistic realm completely different conclusions with regard to error; for spiritual understanding makes quite a different evaluation of the clearly differentiated opposites. Error and matter never appear in the premisses as true or real, and they never form part of the scientific conclusion as they do in classical logic. But in the course of the spiritually logical argumentation they are not just left out of consideration; they are shown as valueless in contrast to true values.

The Christian Scientist does not, for instance, simply declare that there is no such thing as body or disease, nor act as though he never suffered from the claims of corporeality. He does deal with the phenomenon rightly, in accordance with spiritually scientific logic; which means that he does not allow the phenomenon of body, or of disease, to appear as a value in either the premiss or the conclusion of his argumentation. He starts, rather, with a divinely true premiss, which shows him in the conclusion how body and disease must be regarded.

Starting with the wrong premiss that all men are mortal, classical logic comes to the conclusion that individual man (Socrates) is also mortal. Logic on the level of Christian Science, on the other hand, is not concerned with the experience of mortality in its syllogism. It states the fundamental proposition: 1. All men are immortal, because God, Life, cannot create its opposite, mortality (major proposition of the premiss). 2. Socrates is a man (minor proposition of the premiss). 3. Therefore Socrates, like all other men, is in reality immortal (conclusion).

Only after this divine method of reasoning has been established, can the question of death, which we all must face, be answered logically. The argument is as follows:

God, Life, never tolerates its suppositional opposite

major proposition

premiss

Death is the suppositional opposite of God, Life

= minor proposition

from this it follows:

God, Life, does not tolerate death

or: = conclusion Life overcomes death This type of spiritual reasoning is to be found in countless passages in the textbook. Whenever either error or matter is mentioned as the opposite of true being, the conclusion always follows that, as God's unlikeness, it must be destroyed. For instance, Mary Baker Eddy says of the leaven of Truth: "It must destroy the entire mass of error..." (S.& H.118:10), or she describes error as a "material condition to be overcome by Spirit" (S.& H.410:15).

Two-valued versus spiritual reasoning. Looking once again briefly at the differences between classical, two-valued logic and logic on the level of Christian Science, we notice that they have one point of resemblance. but otherwise differ from one another widely. The point of contact is in the use of the opposites of good and evil. As we have already seen, the separation of the two opposites of true and false is a characteristic feature of Aristotelian two-valued logic. We have also seen that it plays an important part in the method of argumentation used on the level of Christian Science. Only Mary Baker Eddy uses this medium of differentiation, which has been in use ever since classical times, for a completely different purpose. It serves her as a jumping-off ground for developing the higher logic, which admits of nothing opposed to truth in either premiss or conclusion. The basis of the classical syllogism is the illusion of the physical senses; the syllogism which we use on the level of Christian Science rescues us from the vicious circle of dualistic thinking. For it does tackle the opposite error and deal with the question of error, but then it immediately points to the solution through the understanding of Spirit - namely, that the opposite, error, must not be regarded as true, but must be destroyed.

Only the understanding which comes from Spirit can truly distinguish between good and evil. There is another very important way in which spiritual reasoning differs from two-valued logic. The sharp distinction between the opposites, good and evil, correct and incorrect, is common to both. Yet the two logics do not by any means lead to the same conclusion, and this is specially important in practice. If we look at a concrete situation from the view-point of two-valued logic, we reason from the humanly material system of reference and judge the event by whether it appears good or bad to the human mind, to material sense, the physical senses, individual persons, our own small lives, our own human notions of an ideal situation; we do not really aim at a solution helpful to all. The same event, however, appears quite differently when we look at it with the understanding which Spirit imparts. This understanding always sets out from the one-value of the divine system of reference, and therefore measures the value of an experience by a completely different standard of comparison. It asks the question, is what I am experiencing good or bad from the standpoint of the seven synonyms for God? Very often it then becomes clear that what appeared harmful and bad to the human mind can be good from the standpoint of understanding. "The very circumstance, which your suffering sense deems wrathful and afflictive, Love can make an angel entertained unawares." (S.& H.574:27)

Each one of us frequently has the experience that a difficult problem, which he had thought of as the greatest misfortune, looks quite different to him after several years. He has matured meanwhile to a new standpoint and now no longer evaluates the problem from the narrow view-point of the human system of reference; he can now see the true place value of the event in the overall plan of his whole development. It is only then that he can often see it as an angel in disguise.

With dualistic logic we cannot tell, in times of need and suffering, whether what we feel to be a catastrophe overtaking us comes from mortal mind and must be destroyed, or whether the Christ-operation is at work. And conversely, we cannot decide, by means of dualistic logic, which pleasant and humanly harmonious situation is unhelpful for our spiritual development, and therefore not good from a spiritual point of view, and consequently must be overcome.

Logic on the level of absolute Christian Science

In absolute Christian Science understanding no longer considers the level on which concrete error appears, but deals with the question of the noumenon of evil. Hence, the task of understanding is no longer to act as a line of demarcation between Truth and error, leading to a knowledge of true and false. Here the task is to answer the fundamental question why we experience anything false and erroneous; why are we aware of anything erroneous?

Over-forming two-valued logic into dual-conceptional logic. Our answer to this question is based on what the logic of Christian Science has shown us: Error is destroyed by Truth; therefore it exists in our experience only so long as we do not meet it with the understanding of Truth.

Logic on the level of absolute Christian Science takes this realization further and declares: That which understanding on the level of Christian Science uncovers as the opposite of Truth cannot be something real; otherwise it could not be destroyed by Truth. Therefore it is not a value, existing side by side with Truth.

Here we come to a central point in the teaching of Christian Science. Spirit and matter, Truth and error, are indeed described as opposites. But whereas in classical logic these opposites are regarded as two co-existing equally real values, in the textbook that which opposes the seven synonyms for God is never given the status of a value. In Christian Science Spirit and matter do not represent two values; they are merely two different concepts of one and the same value, God. What classical logic takes as two opposing realities are in Christian Science only states and stages of consciousness, as Mary Baker Eddy declares: "What the human mind terms matter and spirit indicates states and stages of consciousness" (S.& H.573:10).

One value - two concepts. This new way of looking at being is so central to the message of Christian Science that Mary Baker Eddy chose as one of the three mottoes for the whole textbook Shakespeare's well known words: "There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so." This new model of reasoning may be called a dualconceptional logic, as opposed to a two-valued logic. It helps us to arrive at the conclusion that there is only one reality, Spirit. But there are two possible ways of looking at this reality, a right way and a wrong way. The right way leads us to the true concept of reality and shows us Spirit. The wrong way conveys a false, distorted, erroneous concept of the same one reality, and then the one value, Spirit, appears as matter. But Being itself, the one value, is never affected by the way we look at it. It is and always remains the one reality. Spirit. However, our human experience is determined by our way of looking. If we look at Spirit rightly, we get the true concept, and experience spiritual good; if we look at Spirit wrongly, on the other hand, we get a false concept of Spirit, and then we see matter and all the discord it produces. The logic which explains this is therefore one-valued, but dual-conceptional.

We are still faced, it is true, with two opposites, Spirit on the one

hand and matter on the other. But now, through dual-conceptional logic, we have taken a crucial step forward. We now know that what appears as the opposite of Spirit is not a second value, to which we are helplessly subjected, but that we are not yet looking at the one reality in the right way, that we have only a false concept of it. But every false concept can be rectified.

According to this logic, "To the Christian Science healer", - that is, to the understanding which has progressed from two-valued thinking to dual-conceptional reasoning - "sickness is a dream" (S.& H.417:20). On the other hand, "to the frightened false sense of the patient" - that is, to the false concept - "Sickness is neither imaginary nor unreal" (S.& H.460:14).

That we never have to do with two values, but only ever with two different concepts of one and the same value, becomes particularly clear in the Glossary, where not infrequently, side by side with the metaphysical interpretation of biblical expressions, Mary Baker Eddy also gives the material definition of some key-words, which has to be replaced by the spiritual definition (see S.& H.579:1). Thus, under the key-word "Earth", for example, she explains: "To material sense, earth is matter; to spiritual sense, it is a compound idea." (S.& H.585:7)

Reasoning in dual-conceptional logic. The reasoning attained through dual-conceptional logic opens up new perspectives for us. Again we take the one value as our premiss, the truth about man, namely: All men are immortal. Understanding starts with this fact. But now it no longer translates itself to the level of dualistic thinking. On this level, therefore, it no longer argues that mortality, as the opposite of immortality, must be overcome by Life (as it did on the level of Christian Science), but it shows that error is nothing more than a mis-understanding of Truth. "To say that Mind is material ... is a misapprehension of being ... Man's individuality is not a mortal mind or sinner" (Un. 53:12 and 21).

Dual-conceptional logical reasoning, therefore, can no longer argue that matter is an error and that the leaven of Truth "must destroy the entire mass of error". Rather it shows that matter exists only in the human consciousness - as a false concept of Spirit. The understanding of Truth no longer acts as a line of demarcation, but replaces the material concept and "demonstrates the divine sense" (S.& H. 505:23). On this level thought deduces the following conclusion:

All that does not come from God, Life, is a false belief	=	major proposition	> premiss
Death does not come from Life	=	minor proposition	to a second
therefore it follows:			
Death is only a false belief	=		conclusion

This process of reasoning is very well illustrated in Mary Baker Eddy's description of how Jesus worked. "Jesus beheld in Science the perfect man, who appeared to him where sinning mortal man appears to mortals. In this perfect man the Saviour saw God's own likeness, and this correct view of man healed the sick." (S.& H.476:32) Thus Jesus saw man "in Science", which means he had the right concept of him; in this way he demonstrated that man is perfect. The same perfect man, however, is misunderstood by mortals, and the same value, namely the perfect man beheld by Jesus, to them appears sinning and mortal.

The new realization, that what we call evil and erroneous is only our false concept of that which is true, sounds throughout the textbook like a fundamental chord, which cannot be ignored. Anyone reading 'Science and Health' attentively can see that, even when she is speaking of error as the opposite of Truth, Mary Baker Eddy often immediately uses certain phrases which make it clear that she is not referring to a second value, but only to an erroneous concept of mortal mind. That is why we so frequently find such expressions as 'suppositional error', 'illusion of belief', 'the so-called second power, evil', and so on. She also describes error as 'erroneous theory', 'a self-evident absurdity', 'supposed reality'; and she calls evil 'a suppositional lie'.

This dual-conceptional logic is particularly important in healing. With its help we are able, again and again, to deduce the fact that there is only *one* value, only *one* reality. This spiritually scientific method of reasoning always leads us to the one-valued nature of being. We find that we can have the best preventive practice by working to bring our concept of being step by step nearer to the divine, thereby losing every false belief. In this way we handle the noumenon of evil. Then our main object is no longer to try to change human conditions and situations or to alter persons, for it becomes clear to us that our state of consciousness alone determines our experience. Whether we see before us a sinning mortal, or the perfect man, does not therefore in any way depend on the man we are looking at. It depends on whether we see this man "in Science", as Jesus did, or not. Interest now becomes focused on something which is of great significance in logic, especially on the level of divine Science - namely, understanding.

Logic on the level of divine Science

We have seen how important it is for correct reasoning in the Christianly scientific sense always to start from the right premiss, that is, from the one-value. We also stated early on that only the understanding which Spirit imparts can lead us to this right premiss. If we look with this understanding at the realm of duality (level of Christian Science), where sin, sickness and death must be conquered, then understanding comes to us as the "line of demarcation between the real and unreal" and makes us willing to let go of error. If we look with understanding on the level where latent error is fundamentally handled (level of absolute Christian Science), we realize that good and evil only represent two different concepts of one and the same value, Truth; understanding then demonstrates "the divine sense", that is, the true concept.

Duality resolved. What is the significance of this new model of understanding? The realization, that fundamentally it is only a matter of understanding, finally leads thought away from all duality to the oneness of being. On the level of absolute Christian Science, as well as on the level of Christian Science, our thinking does still move within a certain duality. For on the one hand we think of man as the subject looking and, on the other, we see being as the object being looked at. It is always a question of how we must look at being, in order to recognize truth. We all still have a secret feeling that we are outside this being; as though man had a consciousness of his own with which he must try to reach divine being. In the divine one-valued logic, with which we work on the level of divine Science, this last form of dualism is also removed. Here it is no longer a matter of the consciousness of a man studying the consciousness of the divine, in order to understand divine being. Here it is a matter of only one thing - the understanding consciousness of being, imbued with Truth.

The logic of divine Science shows that in the oneness of being, there is no longer any question of God and man, creator and creation or Principle and idea as two separate factors in being, but that God and man, creator and creation, Principle and idea, are one - "Principle and its idea *is* one" (S.& H.465:17, author's italics). Here understanding dwells in the contemplation of the one being.

Disappearance of false beliefs. The understanding which reasons from this level no longer explains what concrete evil is (the opposite of Truth, which must be overcome, as shown on the level of Christian Science) or what the noumenon of evil must be recognized as (a false belief, which is not in itself a value, as the level of absolute Christian Science shows). Rather, understanding on the level of divine Science explains what divine being is - namely, All-in-all. From this it necessarily follows that error is excluded and unknown. "God, good, being ever present, it follows in divine logic that evil, the suppositional opposite of good, is never present." (S.& H.72:21) Questions about the meaning of error and matter are answered on this level by the following statement: "Divine Science ... excludes matter" (S.& H. 123:12).

That matter cannot actually appear as a value, but only as a false, erroneous concept, was already demonstrated in the two-conceptional logic of absolute Christian Science. In the realm of divine Science, however, in which there is only *one* consciousness, only one understanding of being, conscious of its own infinity, error and matter no longer arise as false belief. Here error is excluded both as a suppositional opposite and as an erroneous concept. Here understanding moves on the level where error "ceases to be even an illusion" (S.& H.97:16); it is simply not there.

One-valued logic is seven-valued. The understanding which reasons from divinely one-valued logic, always revolves round the one value, God, and dwells constantly in the contemplation of that which constitutes this great One. But this one value, namely God, is only understood when it is defined through the seven great values of the seven synonyms for God, that is, through Mind, Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth and Love. These are, in fact, seven distinct divine values, for they all stand for the one value, God. Therefore, the understanding which reasons from the seven synonyms for God is using, as it were, a seven-valued logic.

This art of spiritually logical calculating and reasoning is of great practical importance in our study. Indeed, the training we get in the course of studying the seven synonyms for God serves the very purpose of helping us to look at every constituent fact in the light of all the synonyms, in order to understand it fully. For instance, in order to understand the fact of divine intelligence, we see this not merely as a value of Mind, but also as a value of Spirit, of Soul, of Principle, of Life, of Truth and of Love. In this way we can, for example, without inconsistency see the one fact of intelligence simultaneously as seven distinct divine values - namely, as the intelligence of divine Mind, as the intelligence of Spirit, the intelligence of Soul, the intelligence of Principle, the intelligence of Life, the intelligence of Truth and the intelligence of Love.

Logic on the level of Science itself

The infinite logic of Science itself. If we have seen how spiritual consciousness on the level of divine Science includes all the facts of being in its seven-valued logic, then we immediately arrive at the concept of infinite logic, which we can use on the level of Science itself. Infinite logic, of course, no longer implies a thought process in the sense of reasoning from cause to effect. Rather, it denotes the way in which the infinite One infinitely contemplates itself. "This infinite logic", says Mary Baker Eddy, "is the infinite light ... forever giving forth more light" (No 16:15). Thus infinite logic shows that the One is not something static, but that it is continuously, infinitely, ever newly conscious of itself. In this infinity there can be no repetition. Every value which exists in being is continuously manifested in a new and different way; this is because of the infinite interreflections within the whole, through which the one Being expresses itself. It is the divine, infinite calculus, which constantly calculates afresh every value of being spiritually, with the infinite logic. Here the state of consciousness is that of the infinite oneness of being, which includes and penetrates all the other levels of consciousness. Hence, from this standpoint it can see every event as a divinely logical new calculation of the infinite One. It is in this sense, therefore, that Mary Baker Eddy speaks of the "logic of events [pushing] onward the centuries" (My 272:4). Here she points to the fact that everything which is going on in being springs from that infinite logic of the divine Logos, which never repeats itself in its calculations, but remains always embedded in the one conscious divine Being.

It is also clear from this divine logic that in practice no case repeats itself. However much the circumstances of a happening, the symptoms and material causes of a condition, the course of an event, may resemble others we have experienced, in reality every case is unique. For in the infinitude of being nothing repeats itself, nor can error, therefore, the distorted image of this being, produce any repetitions. Hence no case can be compared with another; rather every life-problem that presents itself to us, must be evaluated in a completely new way.

Conclusion

Looking back over the question of what constitutes the reality of being, we can briefly recapitulate what logic shows us from the standpoint of the four levels of spiritual consciousness as follows:

Fundamentally the logic of Christian Science, unlike classical twovalued logic, always starts with true premisses of divine being, actually true and not just correctly stated. According to the respective level of consciousness, however, this logic, though starting from the same premiss, comes to four different conclusions with regard to the solving of problems.

On the *level of Christian Science* the understanding which sets out from the one-value of divine being acts as a line of demarcation and gives us spiritually correct definitions of what truth is, and of what error is. It shows that Truth "must destroy the entire mass of error" (S.& H.118:10). With this knowledge we can tackle concrete error.

On the *level of absolute Christian Science* understanding leads us to the knowledge that error does not represent a value of equal worth, a second reality, but is merely a misunderstanding, a false concept of truth. On this level understanding demonstrates the true concept, the "divine sense"; with this it handles the noumenon of evil, latent error.

So far understanding has permitted us to see that error is nothing,

but on the next two levels the accent shifts, bringing into focus the question: What is the reality of being?

On the *level of divine Science* we see this reality as the consciousness which excludes error, both as suppositional opposite and as false belief. Here understanding reasons from the seven synonyms for God and thereby sees every fact of being relative to a particular question as a value of Mind, as a value of Spirit, Soul, Principle, Life, Truth and Love, but remaining always in the one-valued realm of the divine One.

On the *level of Science itself* infinite logic gives us a glimpse into the infinite blendings of the One, where the question of error or of counterfeits no longer applies. On this level logic serves the sole aim of consciously experiencing the infinite values of being as oneness and recognizing every happening, in the light of infinity, as a unique, never repeated event within the whole. Here consciousness soars in the infinite "logic of events", in the infinitude and oneness of divine happening.

Scientific reasoning tolerates no mistakes

In the practice of Christian Science an understanding of the appropriate logic is of the greatest importance. We should constantly check to see whether our conclusions are scientifically correct or whether mistakes are creeping into the argument here and there, so that we cannot find the right answers to our questions. Many questions in our lives seem insoluble to us only because we are not employing the right method of spiritually logical reasoning.

Setting the right premiss. One of the most frequent and also most serious mistakes comes about through the tendency of human thinking to start from a premiss which, from the standpoint of Christian Science, is wrong: from the phenomena belonging to the human material system of reference. Time and again we succomb to the false testimony of the senses and automatically assume from the start that what we are experiencing as mortals is real. This fallacy, which we take to be truth, we then accept as the premiss for our further argumentation. The conclusion must therefore be as wrong as the premiss, for "Human logic is awry when it attempts to draw correct spiritual conclusions regarding life from matter." (S.& H.300:1) It makes no difference that the evidence of our physical senses will corroborate and justify this wrong result. Using the syllogism of two-valued logic, where it is possible to start with a premiss which is incorrect in the spiritually scientific sense, we shall never get out of the vicious circle of dualism.

For instance: We are deluded into believing that all men may at some time become sick. Without investigating whether in Christian Science this is a true statement or merely the incorrect view of mortal mind, we make this invalid proposition the starting-point of our reasoning and then, naturally, come to the conclusion that we, too - because we are men - are constantly prone to sickness and accident. The conclusion is wrong, but it has been ingrained for centuries in our thinking and feeling, and we experience sickness and accident accordingly - not that the conclusion is actually true, but just because we cling to the wrong conclusion in consciousness. But today it is becoming generally accepted that our experience of life is determined by what we hold in our consciousness.

For us the premiss must be a divine statement of 'true' validity, not merely a hypothesis. We must begin with a correct premiss. "Reasoning from cause to effect in the Science of Mind, we begin with Mind, which must be understood through the idea which expresses it and cannot be learned from its opposite, matter." (S.& H.467:29) But Mary Baker Eddy at the same time makes it clear that for us a true premiss - Mind - must not be just a correct belief about Mind. Beliefs, even when true, cannot form the basis for spiritually scientific deduction, nor, consequently, for demonstration. What is required is understanding. Only through understanding does truth become a value in our reasoning.

We see this daily in our practice. Whenever we set out from a truth which we do not understand, we are standing on shaky ground and are not certain of reaching the true key to our problems. Not infrequently we set out from a true premiss, but have not sufficiently digested the meaning of the truth we have stated. And yet we are surprised when we get no results, and wonder what the reason could be, seeing that the premiss was right.

The answer to these questions is plain. In Christain Science the truth given in the premiss must not in our case be a vague theory or mere information; it must represent a vital value to us, so intimately familiar to our thought that it determines our whole consciousness.

The question how we can gain this close relationship with the divine facts of being is answered again through the study of the synonyms for God. This intensive research into true being does indeed lead us from the initial stage of culturing concepts to the point where our whole inner being is restructured and moulded anew by what we have learnt of truth.

Reasoning in Christian Science is therefore not an intellectual game. This is another essential difference between it and classical logic. Our premiss is never a purely theoretical thought model, which we can change at will. The premiss from which we reason must always represent the conscious outlook of Truth, Truth which has become an actual value in consciousness, not merely an intellectual hypothesis.

Unbiased openness to the solution. Human thought, learning step by step to reason in the logic of Christian Science, must also consciously train itself to take the right attitude towards the scientific solution. In this the student is frequently inconsistent and could learn from the example of any student of arithmetic. In what way?

If, in arithmetic, we give a student the task of multiplying two 4-digit numbers together, for example, he will not know the answer by heart beforehand, as though he were saying his tables. He must calculate the answer, according to arithmetical rules of multiplication. Our procedure in Christian Science is similar. We likewise are incapable of knowing in advance the solutions to our daily problems, but must wait and see what result emerges as the correct conclusion on the basis of divine reckoning. Obviously the student of arithmetic attaches no thoughts, wishes or hopes to the final solution. For us, on the other hand, it is often very difficult to "detach mortal thought from its material conceptions" (S.& H.463:8) and not wish to decide beforehand how the right solution is to work out. Often, when trying to find the answer spiritually to an important problem, we are not sufficiently open-minded: from the start we want to influence the form the solution will take, because we picture to ourselves how a right solution should turn out humanly.

Yet - from whichever level of consciousness we are working - the logic of Christian Science demands no less open-mindedness than arithmetic. When reasoning starts out from Mind and stays pure throughout its deductions, then the solution must be scientifically correct. Even when it runs counter to all our human wishes and does not coincide at any point with what we have been hoping, we should accept it as the spiritual answer and learn to love it.

The danger of mixing different logics. We have seen already on p.8 that in Christian Science we are concerned with a dimensional logic, a logic of different dimensions or levels. The spiritually scientific syllogism appears differently on each level of consciousness.

To be able to recognize which reasoning and argumentation belong to what level in the textbook is an indispensable prerequisite for the understanding of Christian Science. Otherwise the student cannot grasp the textbook in its full spiritual range and in practice works with entirely incorrect and unscientific syllogisms. Let us take as examples two passages from the textbook which, like so many others, seem contradictory, if we do not see that the two statements belong to different levels and therefore have their place in two different logics, which must not be mixed together.

First, this statement from Mary Baker Eddy:

- a) "Mind produces all action." (S.& H.419:20) But she also states:
- b) "... erring, mortal, misnamed *mind* produces all the ... action of the mortal body" (S.& H.108:30).

Anyone unaware of the dimensional use of logic in the textbook certainly finds these statements wholly contradictory. The first sentence (a) declares that all action comes from Mind, God; the second (b) maintains that something different from the Mind which is God can produce action of another kind. If Mind (God) produces all action, then - says the reader to himself - the statement that the action of the mortal body is produced by something other than God, namely erring mortal mind, must be contradictory. But the textbook is "one web of consistency without seam or rent" (S.& H.242:25), in which every statement has its logical relevance, without disproving any other statement. In the textbook "there are no contradictory statements" (S.& H.345:14).

Therefore both statements are logically correct; they are only contradictory when we cannot fit each one into the specific logic to which it belongs. Sentence (a) - Mind produces all action - belongs to the level of absolute Christian Science; sentence (b) - mortal mind produces all the action of the mortal body - is a statement on the level of Christian Science. In order to resolve the supposed contradiction, we only have to go through the complete reasoning applicable to each of these statements:

a) Mind produces all action. Statement (a) belongs to the level of absolute Christian Science. On this level we see that Mind produces all action; this is the only value. Thus any other action only seems to be action and this seeming action is therefore a belief, a false concept of mortal mind. Consequently we must awaken to the true concept, "rise into higher and holier consciousness" (S.& H.419:30), and thereby handle fundamentally the belief that something else besides Mind can act. This is, in fact, the conclusion to which this statement (a) leads in the textbook.

b) Mortal mind produces the action of the mortal body. This statement (b) does not belong to the same level as statement (a); it belongs to the level of Christian Science. Moreover, statement (a) is used in the passage concerned as premiss, whereas statement (b) appears as conclusion. These two statements cannot therefore be compared without further explanation. Looking at statement (b) in its context we see that the passage immediately preceding deals with the question as to what error - sin, sickness, disease, death, - is. Here it is first of all declared to be "the opposite of Truth" (S.& H.108:24), and from this recognition the conclusion is drawn that all the action of the mortal body cannot therefore come from Truth, but that it is erring, mortal mind which produces this false action. But the explanation does not finish here. The argument is taken still further by the reference to this erring mind as being merely misnamed mind. Statement (b) is accordingly only one link in a whole chain of spiritual conclusions which ultimately lead to the "demonstration of the proposition that Mind is All and matter is naught" (S.& H.109:1).

Thus within the framework of these two different levels each sentence is a scientifically logical statement. But we must not take them out of the context of their appropriate syllogisms and try to relate them to each other as two isolated assertions.

The major and minor propositions must belong to the same level. Just how frequently we fall into this mistake is seen most clearly when we are making statements about matter. Very often we argue to ourselves as follows:

1. All that exists is created by Spirit (major proposition of the premiss). 2. Matter exists (minor proposition of the premiss). 3. Therefore matter is created by Spirit (conclusion). It is, in fact, the general view that matter is a creation of God, especially when it appears harmonious and beautiful (nature, for instance). Yet this is a wholly incorrect syllogism.

'All that exists is created by Spirit' is a correct assertion from the standpoint of an absolute level. 'Matter exists' is likewise correct, but only when viewed from that level on which matter still seems a reality to mortal sense. These two statements, then, belong to two different levels and must not, therefore, be taken as the major and minor propositions of one and the same premiss. The major and minor propositions of a premiss must both belong to the same level. Only then is a scientifically correct conclusion possible.

Logics do not mix, but become integrated through translatability. It is just as natural and correct to recognize the interdependence between the logics of the different levels, however, as it is dangerously incorrect to mix them. This means that the conclusion reached by understanding on the level of divine Science, for instance, cannot fail to influence the other levels. Hence, what logic on the level of divine Science shows us as a correct conclusion can serve us as a true premiss for our reasoning on the level of absolute Christian Science. The entire textbook teems with such transitions from one logic to another, like harmonic modulations within a symphony. This can be illustrated by taking just one short passage which shows how seamless the transition from one logic to another can be. It also shows clearly how the line of reasoning in the textbook does not keep to a strict sequence of levels, but chooses the appropriate level and its corresponding logic according to the requirements of the theme.

Mary Baker Eddy says of Jesus: "Understanding the nothingness of material things" - here thought moves on the level of divine Science, and from this standpoint logic declares that matter is nothing - "he spoke of flesh and Spirit as the two opposites" - now the divine premiss of the nothingness of error is translated to the level of Christian Science. Understanding comes in as the necessary line of demarcation and declares that flesh and Spirit certainly do not come from the same divine source, but are opposites; further, that they are "error and Truth" (level of absolute Christian Science where flesh is seen to be mere belief) and therefore "not contributing in any way to each other's happiness and existence". Jesus could detect and resolve the antithesis of flesh and Spirit on the level of Christian Science so uncompromisingly only because he understood the nothingness and erroneousness of material things, reasoning, as he did, from the higher levels. Thus he could control "sickness, sin, and death on the basis of his spirituality" (S.& H.356:9).

It is this dimensional aspect that the logic of Christian Science emphasizes particularly. The dimensionalism of Christianly scientific logic makes it possible for all the specific questions of the different levels of consciousness in the textbook to find their respective spiritually logical answers.