

Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series IV: Sermons, 1914-1963, undated.

Reel Box Folder 145 51 41

Judaism and Christian Science, 1919.

AND CHRISTIAN SCIENCE," AT THE TEMPLE, CENTRAL AVENUE AND EAST 55th STREET, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1919, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Of course, I shall not lecture this morning In discussions on Christian Science. I shall lecture on Christian Science and Judaism, I shall endeavor to emphasize their points of contrast, their differences. I discuss this subject, firstbecause it falls naturally within the purves of our series of Judaism and the Other Religions; secondly, because the contention is frequently heard that Christian Science is Judaism perfected or supplemented. that it is the greatest expression of Judaism: and. thirdly, because I am frequently asked the question: "Can a good Jew be a Christian Scientist?" And I shall address myself principally to the two last contingents. I shall endeavor frankly to establish the fact that Christian Science and Judaism are not compatible, and that a good Jew cannot be a Christian Scientist. Having said that we can now go ahead.

question -- treat of the subject in the same spirit of
with which was presented all other religions. I said,
and repeatedly said, that any religion that has helped

men to be better and stronger and finer has truth in it, and must be spoken of in a spirit of reverence, and senctity; and I am the last man to say that Christian Science, any more than Christianity, or Mohammedanism or Judicion, or any other religion has no truth in it at all and cannot seriously be entertained. That is far from my mind. We shall speak of it reverently, but we shall speak of it frankly as we have spoken of other religions, frankly, and, we have spoken of other religions, frankly, and, we have spoken of other religions, frankly, and,

First of all let me take up Mrs. Eddy's attitude towards Judaism, and her conception of Judaism. It would be interesting to know what the revealer of Christian Science, the founder of the faith, has to say of Judaism. On page twenty-seven of Science and Health, Mrs. Eddy says the following: "The Jewish conception of God as only a mighty hero and king has not yet given place to the true knowledge of God. Creeds and rituals have not yet cleansed their hands of rabbinic law. Today the cry of by-gone ages is repeated. 'Crucify him.'" The Jewish conception of God is only a mighty hero and king! Surely Mrs. Eddy, who prided herself so much upon her scientific commin mind.ought to know better. It is the annual enti-semitie eithe emorance or accusation. It is a deliberate blinding of one's self to the truth. God is only a mighty hero and king! But what of the psalmist who speaks of the "Father of orphans, and the Judge of the widows"? What of the poet who speaks of God "as the father hath mercy on his children, so God hath mercy upon us." ? What of the prophet who says. -2"God is our Father and our Redeemer"? And what of

Jeremiah who says, "I have loved thee with an everlasting

love"? Why, the literature of the Jew is saturated with

a spirit of sublime love and kinship and fellowship with

God, and it is calumny of the worst sort to speak of the

Jewish conception of God as only a mighty hero and king.

You see there to bring out the glory of one faith you must try to discredit the other. That is an old pastime common to all theologians of all ages. Show the other faith up in as dark colors as you possibly can, and then use that as a background to bring out the glory and the brilliancy of your own faith. That might be theological but it is not scientific.

Eddy says, "Rabbi and priest taught the Mosaic law which said, 'An eye for an eye, and whoso shedeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed.' Not so did Jesus the new executor for God present the divine law of love which blesses even those who curse it." Rabbi and priest taught the Mosaic which said,"an eye for an eye,"but the Mosaic law in the book of Leviticus also said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Why pick out a single law of the most ancient laws that could be found in the bible and hold that up as the sum total of all that is in the bible. The lible is a collection of literature that covers a period of a thousand years, and the law "an eye for an eye"comes from the very earliest time, from the tribal period in the history of the people; but during a period

WRHS



Mis. Eddy allitude behas an ignorance rest alone of genish literature in the aportuples and the aportuly place of lent even of the Old Testament clother aportuly per

of a thousand years, there was a gradual and progressive revolution of religious ideals, so that long before the time of Jesus "an eye for an eye" had been interpreted by rabbi and scribe as a monitory find, and the law of love predominated in Jewish life, and it was not Jesus who dedared to humanity the golden rule but it Hillel before the days of Jesus. Now, these are scientific facts. Why does one who claims to speak in the name of scent for precloth theirs the truth deliberately lie?

On page 597 of Science and Health, Mrs. Eddy says, "The Judaic religion consisted mostly of rites and ceremonies. The motives and affections of a man were of little value, if only he appeared unto men to trong the fast." But where does this information come from? That New Testament 7- Course; in the religion of the Jew before the time of Jesus ritual and coremony constituted the essential feature? It betrays an ignorance of Jewish sources and knowledge of the literature of the day, and betrays the fact that the whole information of the author has been drawn from a study of the new testament books only, and the new testament writers, being interested in presenting their VIGWP and Theideas, they were of course, inimical and antagonistic to the others who refused to accept thei r ideas, and slandered them most deliberately. You remember when I spoke of 6 Jewish view of Jesus, and when I spoke of Judaism and 11 that I emphasized the thought that Christianity, and showed where the ethics of the Sermon Jewish on the Mount are rabbinic ethics through and through, that were dectarials

And only those whichare original with Jesus are really

those ethical declared which we cannot today accept.

No, we shall try to be more fair to Christian Science

than Mrs. Eddy has been to Judaism. Hearn

Then, again, what is Mrs. Eddy's attitude to Wards the bible? That is essential because so many of the her theories find proof and substantiation in the bible. Mrs. Eddy says that as the first tenet of Christian Science, as adherents of the truth we took the inspired word of the bible as our sufficient guide to eternal life, In other words, the real orthodox conception of the bi The Bible is the inspired word of God, and therefore it is our sufficient guide to eternal life. But you see that opens up the entire question of what is meant by inspiration; and it opens up the entire question of those sections and portions of the bible which on the face of them are not inspired, and it opens up the entire question equally of the manifold contradictions which we find in the Rible. Mrs. Eddy's conception of the Bible is not only a most orthodox one, but a most mystic one, because the bible is inspired. Therefore, you must find spiritual meanings hidden beneath the apparent surface of the words themselves. You must not take the words for what they mean ordinarily. You must find a deep spiritual or metaphysical implication, not alone in every story or fable or myth or legend of the bible, but in every word also thereof.

Now, for example, historical analysis of the holder has established beyond question of

-

doubt the face that the Fible is a human document, wery human, having all the weaknesses and the failings of human authorship; that it is a collection of writings of many ages, of many climes; that it has myth and fiction and legends and moral homily and ethical codes. And there is grain and there is chaff. But Mrs. Eddy takes it all as inspired, and the stories of the book of Genesis, for example, which are on the face of them myths, common to the Babylonians and the Egyptians and are taken the Hebrews and all Semitic peoples -- she takes them and are premo interprets them spiritually, and sinds hidden meanings in them and direct references to Christian Science. For example, Mrs. Eddly she takes the story of creation of chapter one of Genesis. and after interpreting that chapter to suit herself and explaining words to mean what they ought to mean and not what they really do mean, she comes up against chapter two and a contradictory of the book of Genesis, which is another account of creation. The bible sometimes has two, three or four The Story of The Flord how accounts of the same story, because they are documents a blending of three distinct keisions. all compiled by authors. The flood story, for example, has three or four distinct accounts, one earlier, one later. Now there is a later account of the creation found in Genesis, chapter one, and there is an earlier account of creation found in Genesis, chapter two the later account, being of a later date, is not as anthropomorphic as the This larlie decen earlier account, and so the second account of creat Chaples two Mrs. Eddy refuses to accept entirely, because it says there

and hundar unscreatific

She accept accept accept of dust and so the diagrees

truth and

0

0509

with the first account

the second one as mortal error. Now, this deliberate mystical and subjective interpretation of the bible was common to all the mystics of all the ages, and, of course, a hopeless thing. You can read absolutely anything into the Bible, provided you agree on a key. When you find in the Lord's Prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," you take that to mean not the simple prayer for also a prager bread, which we find in the Old testament, but to give us today our food to feed our famished convictions. And when Paul says to Timothy, "Take a little wine for thy stomach and for thy infirmities," that does not mean the study of the Bek wine, it means understanding, You see that becomes almost about hopeless. We, as critical students of the Bible, must deliberately give up the entire idea of a key to the can decip scriptures, any more than we look for a key to the works Shallerframe The only key we book for is the key which The Shedy of Comparation Religiona history and the sciences, of language and geography, and all other human sciences can give to enable us to undersuplical stand the bible. But any arbitrary spiritual interpremust tation of the bible we refuse to accept.

she repects

Mrs. Eddy gives a key to the Scriptures and a glossary. For example, Babel does not mean the fact of God, but it really does mean self-destroying arror, a kingdom divided against itself which cannot stand. And Caanan does not mean Caanan, but it means a sensuouspeople, the testimony of what is termed material sense. Dan, the son of Jacob, does not really designate mean Dan; it means animal magnetism, so-called mortal

mind controlling mortal mind, error working out the designs of error. The dove spoken of in the flood story does not mean the dove, but make a symbol of divine Schoole, purity, peace, hope and faith. The River Euphrates does not mean the River Euphrates; it means divine conscience encompassing the universe and man, the true idea of God. And the River Kishon does not mean the River Kishon; it means the rights of women, morally, civilly and socially. Why the River Kishon should mean rights of women and not prohibition, to do not know.

Now. this is not a mere incidental criticism of Science and Health. It is very vital because the Bible is constantly resorted to and called to bring testimony 70 establishing the truth of Christian Science. Now, 12 we dony, as we must deny as students of the bible, and as critics of the bible, whiless we shut our eyes to all the knowledge we have accumulated in centuries and go back to the unbridled and uncontrolled mysticism of the middle ages . -- unless we do that we must say deliberately, "We cannot accept either your key to the scripture or any key to the scripture, because the Scriptures is a sollection we human documents, some of them beautiful, some of them less beautiful, some of them ideal and some of them ritual, and we must study them as we would any other human document, and the cannot accept any arbitrary key to read our own notions into the Them thousand religions a day and find them all in the Fible.

Now, then, let's so to the metaphysics of Christian Science directly. Let us have Mrs. Eddy herey define Christian Science herself. This is page 468 of Science and Health. "What is the scientific statement of being? There is no life, truth, intelligence nor substance in matter. All is infinite Mind and its infinite manifestation, for God is All-in-all. Spirit is mortal Truth; matter is mortal error. Spirit is the real and eternal; matter is the unreal and temporal. Spirit is God and man is His image and likeness, hence man is spiritual and not material." In other words. to sum up the key-note of Christian Science, God is spirit; therefore God can create nothing but what is of the spirit; therefore matter does not exist, it is not real, it is an illusion, an error of the mortal mind. God is good; therefore everything that God creates is good; therefore evil has no realty, and sickness, disease and pain and suffering are merely errors and illusions of the mortal mind. I think that is a fair and almost complete statement of the fundamental doctrine of Christian Science.

Let me say, to begin with, this is not a revelation of Mrs. Eddy's, nor is it peculiar to Christian Science. This is a metaphysical concept which was common to the philosophic schools and theologic schools hundreds of years ago. But long before the time

known as the Eleatic school, of which Parmenides was the representative, that denied on the local grounds—not on religious grounds—the realty of matter. Matter is unreal; it is an illusion. Only the spirit is the real essence or substance. And many mystic schools in almost every religion, especially in the religion of the Mohammedans, and in the religion of the Jews during the middle ages,—many mystic sects likewise held to this concept that God, being spirit, everything that has real existence must be spiritual, and that God, being good, no evil can exist in the world.

The only contribution which Mrs. Eddy has made to this concept is not an essential contribution, but lies in this fact: that she deliberately identified this metaphysical notion with Christianity and that she emphasizes the healing quality of this principle. That is peculiar to Mrs. Eddy, and that is her contribution. But the metaphysical notion as such has absolutely nothing to do with religion, whether Christianity, Mohammedanism or Judaism. It is a philosophical concept that many groups of people accepted. Now, this is basic in Christian Science: unless you accept it you cannot be a Christian This neta plupical principle. Judaism does not accept Scientist. discuss this subject and show it is not tenable on philosophic grounds, why it is not tonable on theologic grounds, why you cannot accept is on ethical grounds you connot accept it on scientific grounds. Philosophically

this concept is known as idealistic monism; that is, nothing exists but the idea -- the spirit. But the fatal weakness of this theory, as well as of any such theory, is this: where do these errors and illusions originate? If God creates nothing that is spiritual, where do illusion or the error of matter originate? You say it is an illusion of the mortal mind. Where does mortal mind originate? You may search through all the pages of Science and Health, as I have more than once, and you may search through all the pages of all the literature of all these philosophical sects for an answer to this question and you will not find it. There is its great weakness .- nothing exists but the spirit. Granted that matter is an error and illusion, where did the illusion and the error originate? Mrs. Eddy wants to be a monist -- belief in the realty of only one principle -- spirit; but at the same time she urges you to destroy error and the illusions, implying a dualism in the actual principles of human life. does this apparent dualism originate? Moreover, and must distinguish between an illusion and an appearance. because one thing is not as real as the other, it does not follow that it is unreal entirely. Just because matter may not have the same eternal realty as spirit has, subject to the laws of change and the onslaughts of time and space . - - just because it is not as real as the eternal, unchanging spirit, it does not follow that because of that it is an illusion.

-11-

"An illusion is a belief in something that does not exist; an appearance is a belief in something which is not as simple as you think it is. For example, when you see the sun rise and you say the sun is actually moving over the brim of the earth, that is an illusion because the sun does not move. To think that I brought this light into this room at the present moment is an illusion, but that the light was brought in through an agency is an appearance; and there is a radical difference between what is illusion and what is appearance.

Philosophically you cannot accept monism because you cannot account for the existence of the illusion or the error of matter in the world. Pheologically, equally, you cannot accept it. You say God is spirit; therefore everything that exists is spirit. The universe is therefore a reflection of God; but to be a reflection it must be reflected upon something. What is it reflected upon? If God is "All-in
you are found to the abound to you again that god is all then it is abound to speak of God as a reflection upon Himself.

Moreover, Mrs. Eddy speaks of God as a creator.

What did he create? He did not create spirit because He is spirit. He created manifestations of Himself. Well, wherein do these manifestations differ from an another?

What is the difference? What accounts for the differences between the mineral kingdom, and the vegetable kingdom, and the animal kingdom, and the human kingdom? Why did these differences creep in? Who brought them into the world if all that is is merely a reflection of spirit? Where did

11)

this apparent diversity of phenomena originate? God is good; therefore he could not create evil. Well. who created the illusion of evil? Was it and devil or duality If so, then you have instead of God It must come from somewhere. Where did it come from? You say from the mortal mind. Where did the mortal mind come Ethically, the idea is untenable. You cannot have ethics unless you procuppose free will. You cannot speak of ethics to a child because a child has no free has weeligibly little got. will, or insignificantly so. You can speak of ethics only when you have a deliberate choice, a choice between alternatives -- between good and evil. between that which your lower self dictates to you and that which your higher In other words, between good self dictates you to do. and evil. If you deny evil you have to free will, and to speak of othics is but all empty phrase and morality becomes meaningless.

Moreover, we speak of good, and the text book of speaks in Christian Science of good. What is good?

No one has ever seen absolute good. What do you know about absolute good? You know good only because you know evil. If there were no evil in the world you would never know what good is. If there were no darkness in the world you would never realize what light is in the world. If there were no sweetness to taste you would never know what bitterness is. If there was not a background of silence there would be no music in the world. Consciousness in

contracto. All life is made possible through

of the same coin, Evil is not an interpolation in life, mind you, -- it is not a dissonance, it is not a false note in the scheme of life. It is part and parcel of the very harmony of life, without which life is impossible.

Ethically it is untenable, and scientifically it is untenable. To deny the realty of matter and the interaction of matter and mind is to deny all the accumulated scientific knowledge of the ages, because science is the accumulated experimentation with matter. To deny the validity of our five senses, to call our channels of cognition, our senses, illusionary, erroneous, is to call into question and deny the validity of all human knowledge because all the human knowledge is a matter of experimentation with the physical life and the world of men about us.

out to their logical conclusion, --mind you, if you want to logically and consistently carry out this Christian Science doctrine, or any of this metaphysical doctrine, you would immediately shut down or ultimately shut down every scientific school, every physical and chemical laboratory, every industrial plant; you would put an end immediately to all human intellectual effort because human intellectual effort works through matter and through the physical world.

What is the meaning of labor, of invention, of improvement, of social amelioration, of work? If you say that matter and the world about you is just an illusion and error, what becomes of the dignity of human labor? What

The Cathering the thinteenth century boldering a sime, las doctrine were much more ceresistent. •

They renormed marriage, and property and advocated

suicide.

WRHS 6990 0660



becomes of the dignity of your aspirations and your efforts?

It is all illusion, vain, erroneous. What becomes of art?

What is art? It is the attempt to express a spiritual idea is a mortal or material way—in clay, in pigments, in a time.

If all that is illusion and error, art itself is an illusion.

No: scientifically one cannot accept this doctrine; and of course it is very fortunate that Christian Scientists and believers in this philosophy who are not Christian Scientists do not carry out their contentions to their logical conclusion. They make frightful concessions to But the Scientist 4 to-day are more practical actually do eat -- all of them. but is a terrible confession of sounds rather flighty the weakness of such a contention. They all live in homes, many of them very beautiful homes, some of them using splendid machines that are characterized more by their expensiveness than by their spirituality. And they Of course even in circles not wellnesd by actually do marry. Christian Science that is regarded as a fatal error. Mrs. Eddy makes this rather hesitating concession to marriage, which is, of course, a concession to the physical life: "Marriage is the legal and moral provision for generation among human kind. Until the spiritual creation is discerned intact, apprehended, understood, and His kingdom is come as e vision of the Apocalypse, -where its corporeal sense was cast out and its spiritual sense was revealed from heaven, marriage will continue

subject to such moral regulations as will secure increasing virtue." They not only make concessions to marriage, but Mrs. Eddy apparently makes concessions to the hypodermic needle. On page 464 of Science and Health Mrs. Eddy says:
"If from an injury or from any cause a Christian Scientist were seized with pain so violent that he could not treat himself mentally—and the Scientists had failed to relieve him—he could call a surgeon who would give him a hypodermic injection, and when the pain ceased he could handle his own case mentally. Thus we 'prove all things and hold fast that which is good.'"

Why favor should be shown by Christian Science to the hypodermic needle and not to any surgical instrument, or why, on the same ground, when a tooth pains you frightfully, a dentist should not be called in to extract Chart en terenterito it, one fails to see. And they even consent to die. One would think that Christian Scientists and all believers in this theory would never die. Of course they use different words. But words do not change realities, as far as you and I are concerned; and whether a man be an initiated Christian Scientist or whether he be uninitiated, when a wan that he died people publish slander about him he is dead to dead If death is not a realty, are concerned. Eleis han Serentists why is it that they pride themselves so frequently upon the fact that they have saved people from

Now, one cannot live such a doctrine consistently because it is not human. It challenges the rational, the logical, the intellectual, the practical nature of man.

Now, what is the Jewish attitude to all of this?

Judaism does not deny the realty of matter; Judaism does not say that the senses lie. Judaism places matter in a secondary position to spirit. Spirit may dominate and control matter; matter may be subject to change, to fluctuation, to time, to space. Spirit is eternal; spirit may control my mortality, determine it, but matter is real. You may say that it is only relatively real, real to you, real to your experiences; but after all that is all that you and I are interested in. We cannot get out of our skin. It is we that experience things, and if it is relative to us it is very real to us. To set up an intellectual notion that in the presence of God there is no evil is not to relieve us of the onrushing and compelling vital experiences of our daily life.

Judaism says God is spirit, it is the. did matter come into the world? One group of philosophers in Judaism simply say this: "God is all-powerful, dea is all knowing, God created matter; to deny God the ability to create matter is to limit his omnipotence. God is allpowerful; He can do what He desires." Another group of dellar "Ceation must not be take Jewish philosophers said: "You misunderstand what we mean in a temporal or spacial sense. by the word 'creation' Creation does not mean receive creating something out of nothing. There was never a time when the world was not, because time is not a reality, it is only an incident of motion. The world always existed. God is the Spirit indwelling in the world and dominating the world, a creative, intelligent Spirit, constantly

In either case whether we assume that the winds is an actual evention of forther or only the elemand dwalling place of food who controls it - the material place of it is actumbedged. When it god is the tool and Beather the beautiful overing obeing does the period and beautiful overing obeing does the period and beautiful overing obeing does the period.

WRHS.



creating, constantly functioning and constantly dominating the universe. Only in that sense can you speak of God as a creator."

Why should God create matter? That is asking for the secret of the universe. A man is a man, finite and not God. But Judaism has even attemped to answer that question in all spirit of humility. Judaism does not speak with a cocksyreness, with a spirit of absolute knowledge. Judaism realizes that man after all, though of the divine is not the divine, just as much as a spark of the fire is not the fire; that man has his limitations in mais lans time and space. Judaism bas said that evil is of the very warp and woof of life, that it makes life possible. that it is good and evil, struggle and achievement, joy and sorrow that blend into the perfect harmony of existence. form the left and wate darkness! I wake Judaism has said, "I greated good and evil, peacepeace, and create ent (20.45.7) Judaism has said, as I read from the thirtieth and war chapter of Deuteronomythis morning: "Behold, I have set before you this day life and touth, god and evil. Choose life. " (hlat.13

that which will help you to grow. Judaism says that evil is a discipline in the world. We grow through our suffering, and through our sins, and through our failures. We climb to God's throne of glory up, the rungs of disappointment, and failure, and bereavement, and sorrow, and pain. That is got the pedagogy of God. That is how God trains and teaches His children. You know as well as I that the finest impulses in your life have come after you have experienced

the first lyrics came out of those lines that tasted the dregs of life's cup. You know that the most beautiful beautiful beautiful beautiful beautiful beautiful beautiful beautiful beautiful.

The would been racked by life. Why, even Mrs. Eddy, in an off this moment, in a careless moment, concedes that fact. On page 66 of Science and Health she says: "Trials teach mortals not to lean on an earthly staff, --a broken reed that pierces the heart.

We do not half remember this in the sunshine of joy and prosperity. Sorrow is salutary.

Through great tribulation we enter into the kingdom.

Trials are proof of God's care."

out this idea? And, but you will say the, "You have said nothing of the healing power of Christian Science."

Doesn't that prove its truth? If the principle of a faith is not sound, then any dofense said to have been produced by that principle must be traced not to that principle itself, but to some incidental agency and of that principle. If the principle of the unrealty of matter and evil is philosophically, theologically, ethically and scientifically not true, then the effects of that must be traced to some other source than to the principle. And we can trace it to another source. The healing power of Christian Science no more proves the truth of Christian Science than the healing power of Our Lady of Lourdes or St. Anne de Beaupe, or of a thousand and one sacred shrines

of today, of yesterday, and of primitive days proves the truth of the sanctity of the shrines, or of the Catholic religion or of any other religion. We accept the healing as a fact of one as of the other; of Christian Science, and the secondy of St. Anne de Beaure, and of Our Lady of Lourdes, and of prayer, and of cortain saintly men who performed healing We accept them all but we make a religion neither of one nor the other; because back of it all, back of this healing in all these cases - and if we accept one we must accept the other-is a scientific truth, and that more and were recognized and defined scientific truth is being slowly more perfected and more completed. Psycho-therapeutics, though a new science, has already established the fact that many ailments of the human body find their sources in the mind, in mental abnormality, in psychic disturbance, especially in subconscious aberrations; and when any definite impulse is brought to bear which brings the influence of the mind to play through nervous channels upon a certain, particular is engender ailment, or a definite impulse, which restores the disturbance to its normal state, and which destroys the and restores the normal state sub-conscious state of mind, a definite aberration cure is perfected. That has been demonstrated clinically. Men have been cured of blindness, lameness and tumors, and hundreds of other diseases by means of psycho-therapeutics. That is a fact - that mind controls to a large degree -- to a very large degree. Our physical self is something that no religion and no medicine has aided. Medicine today is beginning to emphasize that phase of psycho-therapeutics; -20-

18

Such faith cures way be effected by objects which are palpathy frauduleit. In objects which are palpathy frauduleit. The Heretres of Monowne, rays Paul Salather in his tife of 1st Francis of assissi, etc.

WRHS OSO

It is of course a purely arbitrary thing to identify this ocience of healing with their family.

The Herbics of huncine wade a portrait of the Trigin represen try bere as one aged and Troth less, say my that in his humilety Christ had alunen a very yly wornan for whom this. They had no diff culty in healing several Reases of disease by its mans; the unage became famous was veneraled almost every whin and accomplished many hurach until The day when the hereting develged the duething to the (faul Sabatien - Hy golf. Francis 9 amini,

but psycho-therapeutics is not a religion; it has nothing to do with the bible, or with Jesus, or with Christianity, or with Judaism. It is a science and as that science continues to develops greater boon will come to humanity.

In other words, it is not the faith, the religion, the shrine, the holy man that performs the cure; it is that release of nervous tension, or that impulse that comes to you through absolute faith in the curative power of the faith, or the things, or the object, or the man, or God himself. That is the efficacy of prayer; and hundreds of millions of men have known that for centuries, and have prayed and have been cured, and it needed no new revelation to establish that fact. At out you will say, "You pray to God to be healed and then you run to the doctor." Well, you pray to God to give us our daily food and you run to the baker. And Christian Scientists who believe in the unreality of matter also have recourse to the baker.

It is no reflection upon The mean? that we mun to the dochr is the baker Reity. On the contrary it is a realization that God works through man and through men. We do not sit back with folded arms and expect bread to drop from heaven. We go to work, we toil and labor and askoGod to give us strength; we use our hands and our mind to supply us with our need; new- whether they he and we use the hands and the mind of medicine and ballers - or much or teachers physician to supply certain needs of our lives. through men and through the channels of men

it is difficultto identify this metaphysical Christianity a very arbitrary thing / You might as well identify it

with any other religion. Jesus no more discovered these Confucius Cr. fact than any other man. We/took up a Jewish view of

Jesus sometime ago, and we took up Judaism and Christianity and we saw what biblical criticism and historical criticism has to say about the character of Jesus; and we also saw that the idea of Christ was arbitrarily associated with the figure of Jesus, not by Jesus himself but by Paul; and that the idea of Christwas not Jewish, was not found in the mind of Jesus but was agnostic and pagan. Jesus believed in the reality of evil, and even more than that, he believed that autici nated the whole world was evil an d he praye the coming of the kingdom of God to destroy the evil of the world. If we can gradit the new testament he even believed in the devil. To say that Jesus invented a science because he healed people, because he raised people from the dead, and because he was resurrected is not to establish the fact of Cheen crerile because other prophets before Jesus and other prophets of other peoples have been reputed to have healed people and to have raised people from the dead and to have been resurrected. Elijah resurrected the dead and Elijah cured ailments; and among the Greeks and the Romans there were healing deities and healing gods that performed these miracles.

essential thing as far as Judaism and Christian Science

concerned-everything the New testament has to say about

Jesus as fact; with this exception: that Jesus was not

divine, that he was not the Christ, but that he discovered

the Christ principle, the principle of truth, which means

-22-

divine healing. Christian Science accepts as fact all miracles which Jesus performed, of the healing which Jesus performed, of the raising of people from death, of his resurrection, of his transfiguration; in fact, the entire theology of Christendom, which the Jew has refused to accept for centuries. Christian Science accepts it and gives you another reason for it. It even accepts the story of the Immaculate Conception, except in a spiritual sense -- that in the mind of Mary, in the virgin consciousness of Mary was the truth begotten, namely, that man is not begotten of man but of God -- that man is spirit. But we took up the story of the Immanulate Conception and we see the entire story is based upon false translation in the biblical world, in the book of Isaiah. It is entirely a concestion echoice read into the figure of Jesus and a certain opic of Jesus because a certain man read his Greek translation and did not read his Hebrew original ..

In other words, Christian Science asks you to accept the new Testament as it stands, to throw overboard all we have learned historically and critically concerning the character of Jesus and the idea of Christ or the Togos, and to accept it windly because the New Testament says so.

I for one am not ready to do it? Judaism cannot accept Christian Science, first of all because it cannot accept the unreality of matter to the fact in life, because that would destroy all human institutions, all ethics, all morality.

Modern Judaism cannot accept Christian Science because it

(Wental sedature a Judaisin the sugar drug to bull men into haffy dealure of haffi. new, It is rather a challedge to high ludeam and entoprize, & service and sacisfice. He Judais in offers nothing to it devoters but tremending tasks
wering of only that the lateries

efforts ducht terrible struggles

or men It grows to these older

Vision of ultimate food staying and all abding fall in the their stuggles. buden and with a polis Paradis.

refuses to accept the orthodox and mystical interpretation of the Bible. And Judaism cannot accept Christian Science because it cannot accept the unhistorical figure of Jesus as found in the New Festament, which Christian Science accepts.

The creed of the Jew, then, in spite of the coming and going of creeds, inspite of the greatness or passing popularity of creeds, in spite of defections from ranks, new acres to day as it was perfected in spite of everything, - the creed of the Jew as of and as it Phase the until the lund a time, yesterday, today and tomorrow and until the end of time, remains, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one."

WRHS with with sedalin

sermon 3

Judaism and Christian Science

A Popular Discourse

Ву

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver

THE TEMPLE CLEVELAND, OHIO

No. 1

Price 10 Cents

LECTURE BY RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER, AT THE TEMPLE, CLEVELAND, OHIO, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1919.

In discussing Christian Science and Judaism, I shall endeavor to emphasize their points of contrast, their differences. I discuss this subject, first, because it falls naturally within the scope of our series, "Judaism and Other Religions"; secondly, because the contention is frequently heard that Christian Science is Judaism perfected or supplemented, that it is the highest expression of Judaism; and, thirdly, because I am frequently asked the question, "Can a good Jew be a Christian Scientist?" I shall address myself principally to the last two contentions. I shall endeavor frankly to establish the fact that Christian Science and Judaism are not compatible, and that a good Jew can not be a Christian Scientist.

I shall, of course, treat of this subject in the same spirit of reverence with which we have treated all other religions. I have repeatedly said that any religion that has helped men to be better and stronger has truth in it and must be spoken of in a spirit of reverence. I am the last man to say that Christian Science, any more than Christianity, or Mohammedanism or Buddhism, or any other religion, has no truth in it at all and can not be seriously entertained. We shall speak of it reverently, but we shall speak of it frankly as we have spoken of other religions, frankly and, we hope, truthfully.

First of all, let me take up Mrs. Eddy's attitude towards Judaism and her conception of Judaism. It would be interesting to know what the founder of the faith has to say of Judaism. On page 27 of Science and Health, Mrs. Eddy says, "The Jewish conception of God as only a mighty hero and king has not yet given place to the true knowledge of God. Creeds and rituals have not yet cleansed their hands of Fabbinic law. Today the cry of bygone ages is repeated, 'Crucify him.'" The Jewish conception of God as only a mighty hero and king! Surely Mrs. Eddy, who prided herself so much upon her scientific mind, ought to know better. It

is the common accusation. It is either ignorance or deliberate blinding of one's self to the truth. God as only a mighty hero and king! But what of the psalmist who speaks of God as the "Father of orphans" and the "Judge of the widows"? What of the poet who sings, "As a father hath mercy on his children, so God hath mercy upon us"? And what of Jeremiah who says, "I have loved thee with an everlasting love"? Why, the literature of the Jew is saturated with a spirit of sublime love of kinship and fellowship with God, and it is calumny of the worst sort to speak of the Jewish conception of God as only of a mighty hero and king.

Again, on page 30 of Science and Health, Mrs. Eddy says, "Rabbi and priest taught the Mosaic law which said, 'An eye for an eye and whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed.' Not so did Iesus, the new executor for God, present the divine law of love which blesses even those who curse it." Rabbi and priest taught the Mosaic law which said, "An eye for an eye-," but the Mosaic law in the book of Leviticus also said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Why pick out a single law of the most ancient code that is found in the Bible and hold that up as the sum total of all that is in the Bible? The Bible is a collection of literature that covers a period of a thousand years, and the law, "An eye for an eye-," comes from the very earliest time, from the tribal period in the history of the people; but during a period of a thousand years there was a gradual and progressive evolution of religious ideals, so that long before the time of Jesus, "An eye for an eye" had been interpreted by rabbi and scribe as a monetary fine. The law of love predominated in Jewish life, and it was not Jesus who declared to humanity the golden rule but Hillel before the days of Jesus. Now, these are "scientific" facts. Why does one who claims to speak in the name of scientific truth overlook them?

On page 597 of Science and Health, Mrs. Eddy says, "The Judaic religion consisted mostly of rites and ceremonies. The motives and affections of a man were of little value, if only he appeared unto men to fast." But where does this information come from? From the New Testament, of course; and the New Testament writers, being interested

in presenting their views and their ideas, were naturally, inimical to all others who refused to accept them. Mrs. Eddy's attitude betrays an ignorance not alone of Jewish literature in the Apocrypha and the Apocalypse, but even of the Old Testament itself. You remember when I spoke of "A Jewish View of Jesus," and of "Judaism and Christianity," that I emphasized the thought that the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount are Jewish—Rabbinic ethics through and through, that only those doctrines which were original with Jesus are really the very ones which society today cannot accept.

No; we shall try to be more fair to Christian Science than Mrs. Eddy has been to Judaism.

It may be of interest to learn Mrs. Eddy's attitude towards the Bible. That is essential because so many of her theories seem to find proof and substantiation in the Bible. Mrs. Eddy posits as the first tenet of Christian Science, "As adherents of the truth we take the inspired word of the Bible as our sufficient guide to eternal life." In other words, the real orthodox conception of the Middle Ages! The Bible is the inspired word of God, and, therefore, it is our sufficent guide to eternal life. But you see that opens up the entire question of what is meant by inspiration; and it opens up the entire question concerning those sections and portions of the Bible which on the face of them are not inspired; and it opens up the entire question of the manifold contradictions which we find in the Bible.

Mrs. Eddy's conception of the Bible is not only a most orthodox one, but a most mystic one. Because the Bible is inspired you must, therefore, find spiritual meanings hidden beneath the apparent surface of the words themselves. You must not take the words for what they mean ordinarily. You must find a deep spiritual or metaphysical implication, not alone in every story, or fable, or myth, or legend of the Bible, but in every word also.

Now, for example, historical analysis of the Bible and Biblical criticism have established beyond question of doubt the fact that the Bible is a human document, having all the weaknesses and the failings of human authorship; that it is a collection of writings of many ages; that it has myth, and fiction, and legends, and moral homily and ethical codes; that there is grain and there is chaff. But Mrs. Eddy takes it all as inspired. The stories of the book of Genesis, for example, which are on the face of them myths, common to the Babylonians, and the Egyptians, and the Hebrews, and all Semitic peoples, are taken and interpreted spiritually and hidden meanings are found in them and direct reference to Christian Science. For example, Mrs. Eddy takes the story of creation, of chapter one of Genesis, and after interpreting that chapter to suit herself and explaining words to mean what they ought to mean and not what they really do mean, she comes up against chapter two of the book of Genesis, which is another and a contradictory account of creation. The Bible sometimes has two, three or four accounts of the same story. The story of The Flood is a blending of three distinct versions. This earlier account of Creation found in chapter two, Mrs. Eddy refuses to accept entirely, because it states that man was created out of dust and similar "unscientific" fictions. She accepts the first account as truth and the second one she rejects as mortal error. Now, this deliberate mystical and subjective interpretation of the Bible was common to all mystics of all ages, and is, of course, a hopeless thing. You can read absolutely anything into the Bible, provided you agree on a key. When you find in the Lord's Prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," and you take that to mean not the simple prayer for bread, which we find in the Old Testament also, but a prayer "to feed our famished affections," and when Paul says to Timothy, "Take a little wine for thy stomach and for thy infirmities," Paul does not mean wine, but "understanding," the study of the Bible becomes absolutely hopeless. We, as critical students of the Bible, must deliberately give up the entire idea of "a key to the scriptures," any more than we can accept a key to the works of Homer or Shakespeare. only key we can accept is the key which history, and the science of language, and the study of comparative religions can give us. But any arbitrary mystical interpretation of the Bible we must refuse to accept.

Mrs. Eddy presumes to give a key to the Scriptures and a glossary also. For example, "Babel" does not mean the Gate of God," but "self-destroying error, a kingdom divided against itself which can not stand." And Canaan does not mean Canaan, but it means "a sensuous belief, the testimony of what is termed material sense." Dan, the son of Jacob, does not really designate Dan, but "animal magnetism, so-called mortal mind controlling mortal mind, error working out the designs of error." The dove spoken of in the flood story does not mean a dove, but "a symbol of divine science, purity and peace, hope and faith." The River Euphrates does not mean the River Euphrates. It means "divine science encompassing the universe and man, the true idea of God." And the River Gihon does not mean the River Gihon. It means "the rights of women acknowledged morally, civilly and socially." Why the River Gihon should mean rights of women and not prohibition, we do not know! .

Now, this is not a mere incidental criticism of Science and Health. It is very vital because the Bible is constantly resorted to and called to bring testimony to establish the truth of Christian Science. Unless we shut our eyes to all the knowledge we have accumulated in centuries and go back to the unbridled and uncontrolled mysticism of the middle ages, we must say deliberately, "We can not accept either this key to the Scripture or any other key, because the Scriptures are human documents and we must study them as we would any other human document. We can not accept any arbitrary key so as to read our own notions into them, else we can construct a thousand religions a day and find them all in the Bible."

'Now, then, let's look to the metaphysics of Christian Science. Let us have Mrs. Eddy herself define Christian Science. "What is the scientific statement of being? There is no life, truth, intelligence nor substance in matter. All is infinite Mind and its infinite manifestation, for God is All-in-all. Spirit is mortal Truth; matter is mortal error. Spirit is the real and eternal; matter is the unreal and temporal. Spirit is God and man is His image and likeness, hence man is spiritual and not material." In other words, God is spirit; therefore, God can create nothing but what is of the spirit; therefore, matter does not exist. It is not real. It

is an illusion, an error of the mortal mind. God is good; therefore, everything that God creates is good; therefore, evil has no reality, and sickness, disease and pain and suffering are merely errors and illusions of the mortal mind. I think that is a fair and almost complete statement of the fundamental doctrine of Christian Science.

Let me say, to begin with, that this is not a revelation of Mrs. Eddy's. Nor is it peculiar to Christian Science. This is a metaphysical concept which was known to the philosophic schools and theologic schools hundreds of years ago. Long before the time of Jesus there was a school of philosophers in Greece known as the Eleatic School, of which Parmenides was the representative, that denied on philosophic grounds-not on religious groundsthe reality of matter. And many mystic schools in almost every religion, especially in the religion of the Mohammedans, and in the religion of the Jews during the middle ages, likewise held to this concept that God, being spirit, everything that has real existence must be spiritual and that God, being good, no evil can exist in the world.

The only contribution which Mrs. Eddy has made to this concept is not an essential contribution, but lies in this fact: that she deliberately identified this metaphysical notion with Christianity and that she emphasizes the healing quality of this principle.

Philosophically this concept is known as idealistic monism; that is, nothing exists but the idea the spirit. But the fatal weakness of this theory, as well as of any such theory, is this: where do these errors and illusions of matter criginate? If nothing but what is spiritual exists, whence springs . the illusion or error of matter? You say it is an illusion of the mortal mind. Where does mortal mind originate? You may search through all the pages of Science and Health, and you may search through all the pages of all the literature of all these philospohical sects, for an answer to this question and you will not find it. Mrs. Eddy wants to be a monist-wants to believe in the reality of only one principle-spirit, but at the same time she urges you to destroy the error and illusion of matter, implying a dualism in the actual experiences

of human life. Where does this "apparent" dualism originate?

Moreover, one must distinguish between an illusion and an appearance. Just because one thing is not as real as the other, it does not follow that it is unreal entirely. Just because matter may not have the same eternal reality as spirit, just because it is subject to the laws of change and the onslaughts of time and space, it does not follow that it is an illusion. "An illusion is a belief in something that does not exist; an appearance is a belief in something which is not as simple as you think it is."

Philosophically it is difficult to accept monism because one can not account for the existence of the illusion of matter in the world.

Theologically, also, you can not accept it. You say God is spirit; therefore, everything that exists is spirit. The universe is, therefore, a reflection of God; but to be a reflection it must be reflected upon something. What is it reflected upon? If God is "All-in-all," then you are forced to the absurdity of saying that God is a reflection upon Himself.

Moreover, Mrs. Eddy speaks of God as a creator. What did He create? He did not create spirit because He is spirit. He created manifestations of Himself. Well, wherein do these manifestations differ one from another? What accounts for the differences between the mineral kingdom, the vegetable kingdom and the human kingdom? Why did these differences creep in? Who brought them into the world if all that is is merely a reflection of spirit? Where did this apparent diversity of phenomena originate?

You say God is good; therefore He could not create evil. Well, who created the illusion of evil? Was it a devil or Satan? If so, you have duality instead of unity.

Ethically, the idea is untenable. You can not have ethics unless you posit free will. You can not speak of ethics to a child because a child has no free will, or has negligibly little of it. You can speak of ethics only when you have a deliberate choice; a choice between alternatives, between good and evil, between that which your lower self dic-

tates to you and that which your higher self dictates to you. If you deny evil you deny free will

and morality becomes meaningless.

Moreover, we speak of good, and the text book of Christian Science speaks abundantly of good. What is good? No one has ever seen absolute good. What do you know about absolute good? You know good only because you know evil. It there were no evil in the world you would never know what good is. If there were no darkness in the world you would never realize what light is. If there were no sweetness to taste you would never know what bitterness is. If there were not a background of silence there would be no music in the world. All life is made possible through contrasts. Good and evil are the obverse and the reverse of the same coin. Evil is not an interpolation in life, mind you. It is not a dissonance. It is not a false note in the scheme of life. It is part of the very harmony of life, without which life is impossible.

Was it not Heracleitus who said: "We should not know there was such a thing as justice, did injustice not exist. * * Health, goodness, satiety, and rest are made pleasant by sickness, evil, hunger

and fatigue. * * * *"

Ethically it is untenable and scientifically it is untenable. To deny the reality of matter and the interaction of matter and mind is to deny all the accumulated scientific knowledge of the ages, because science is an experimentation with matter. To deny completely the validity of our five senses, to call our channels of cognition, our senses, entirely illusory, erroneous, is to call into question and deny the validity of all human knowledge because all human knowledge is a matter of experimentation with physical life and the world of men about us.

If you had the courage to carry Christian Science doctrines out to their logical conclusion, you would immediately shut down every scientific school, every physical and chemical laboratory, every industrial plant. You would put an end immediately to all human intellectual effort because human intellectual effort works through matter and through

the physical world.

What is the meaning of labor, of invention, of improvement, of social amelioration, of work? It

you say that matter and the world about you is just an illusion and error, what becomes of the dignity of human labor? What becomes of the dignity of your aspirations and your efforts? It is all illusion, vain, erroneous. What becomes of art? What is art? Art is an attempt to express a spiritual idea through a material medium, in clay, in pigments, in stone. If all that is illusion and error, art itself is an illusion.

No: scientifically one can not accept this doctrine, and, of course, it is very fortunate that Christian Scientists and believers in this philosophy who are not Christian Scientists do not carry out their contentions to their logical conclusion. They make frightful concessions to life. The Cathari of the thirteenth century, holding a similar doctrine, were much more consistent. They renounced marriage and property, and advocated suicide. But the scientists of today are more practical for they actually do eat—all of them. This is a terrible confession of the weakness of such a contention. They all live in homes. Many of them in very beautiful Some of them use splendid machines, that are characterized more by their expensiveness than by their spirituality. And they actually do marry. Of course, even in circles not influenced by Christian Science that is sometimes regarded as a fatal error. . . Mrs. Eddy makes a rather hesitating concession to marriage, which is, of course, a concession to the physical life: "Marriage is the legal and moral provision for generation among human kind. Until the spiritual creation is discerned intact, apprehended, understood, and His kingdom is come as in the vision of the Apocalypse, where its corporeal sense was cast out and its spiritual sense was revealed from heaven, marriage will continue subject to such moral regulations as will secure increasing virtue." They not only make concessions to marriage, but Mrs. Eddy apparently makes concessions to the hypodermic needle. On page 44 of Science and Health, Mrs. Eddy says: "If from an injury or from any cause a Christian Scientist were seized with pain so violent that he could not treat himself mentally, and the Scientists had failed to relieve him, he could call a surgeon who would give him a hypodermic injection, and when the pain ceased he could handle his own case

mentally. Thus we 'prove all things and hold fast

that which is good."

Why favor should be shown by Christian Science to the hypodermic needle and not to any other surgical instrument, or why, on the same ground, when a tooth pains you frightfully, a dentist should not be called in to extract it, one fails to learn.

Christian Scientists even consent to die! One would think that Christian Scientists and all believers in this theory would never die. Of course, they use other names for death. But words do not

change realities.

As far as you and I are concerned, when people publish "the slander" about a man that he died, he is dead—really. If death is not a reality, why is it that Christian Scientists pride themselves so frequently upon the fact that they have saved people from death?

Now, one can not live such a doctrine consistently because it is not human. It challenges the rational, the logical, the intellectual, the practical nature of man.

Now, what is the Jewish attitude to all this? Judaism does not deny the reality of matter. Judaism does not say that the senses lie. Judaism places matter in a secondary position to spirit. Spirit may dominate and control matter; matter may be subject to change, to fluctuation, to time, to space. Spirit is eternal; spirit may control matter, but matter is real. You may say that it is only relatively real, real to you, real to your experiences; but after all that is all that you and I are interested in. We can not get out of our skin. It is we that experience things, and if it be relative to us it is very real to us. To set up an intellectual notion that in the presence of God there is no evil is not to relieve us of the onrushing and compelling vital experiences of our daily life.

Judaism says God is spirit. How did matter come into the world? One group of philosophers in Judaism declare, "God is all-powerful. God created matter. To deny God the ability to create matter is to limit His omnipotence. God is all-powerful. He can do what He desires." Another group of Jewish philosophers declare, "Creation must not be taken in a temporal or spacial sense. Creation does not mean creating something out of

nothing. There was never a time when the world was not, because time is not a reality. It is only an accident of motion. The world always existed. God is the Spirit indwelling in the world and dominating the world; a creative, intelligent Spirit, constantly creating, constantly functioning and constantly dominating the universe. Only in that sense can you speak of God as a creator."

In either case, whether we assume that the universe is an actual creation of God or only the eternal dwelling place of God, who dominates it, the material aspect of it is generally acknowledged.

Why, then, if God is the Lord and Creator of the universe, omnipotent, does He permit evil to exist? Judaism maintains that in God's sight there is no evil. Good and evil are one. But as far as human life is concerned, evil is of its very warp and woof. Evil makes life possible. Judaism maintains that it is good and evil, struggle and achievement, joy and sorrow that blend into the perfect harmony of existence. Judaism has declared, "I form the light and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil." (Isaiah 45: 7.) Judaism has said, "Behold, I have set before you this day life and good, death and evil. Choose life." (Deuteronomy 13: 15.)

Judaism further maintains that evil is a discipline in life. We grow through our suffering, and through our sins, and through our failures. climb to God's throne of glory upon the rungs of disappointment, and failure, and bereavement, and sorrow, and pain. That is God's pedagogy. is how God trains and teaches His children. You know that the finest impulses in your life have come after you have experienced something of sorrow, and pain, and desolation. You know that the purest songs have come out of those lips that had tasted the dregs of life's cup. You know that the most beautiful sentiments of human life have come out of hearts that have known the poignancy of grief. Why, even Mrs. Eddy, in an off moment, concedes this fact. On page 66, of Science and Health, she says, "Trials teach mortals not to lean on an earthly staff; a broken reed that pierces the heart. We do not half remember this in the sunshine of joy and prosperity. Sorrow is salutary.

Through great tribulation we enter into the kingdom. Trials are proof of God's care."

But you will say, "You have said nothing of the healing power of Christian Science." Doesn't that prove its truth? If the principle of a faith is not sound, then any effect said to have been produced by that principle must be traced not to that principle itself, but to some incidental circumstance of that principle. If the principle of the unreality of matter and evil is philosophically, theologically, ethically and scientifically not true, then the effects of that must be traced to some other source than to the principle. And we can trace it to another source. The healing power of Christian Science no more proves the truth of Christian Science than the healing power of Our Lady of Lourdes or St. Anne de Beaupre, or of a thousand other sacred shrines of today, of yesterday, and of primitive days, proves the truth of the sanctity of the shrines, or of the Catholic religion or of any other religion. We accept the healing as a fact of one as of the other; of Christian Science, of the shrine of St. Anne de Beaupre, of Our Lady of Lourdes, of prayer, and of all saintly men who performed feats of healing. We accept them all, but we make a religion neither of one nor of the other, because back of it all is a scientific truth which is being more and more recognized and defined.

Psycho-therapeutics, though a new science, has already established the fact that many ailments of the human body find their sources in the mind, in mental abnormality, in psychic disturbance, especially in subconscious aberrations; and when any definite impulse is brought to bear which brings the influence of the mind to play through nervous channels upon a certain particular ailment, a definite impulse is engendered which destroys the aberrations and restores the normal state of mind, and a definite cure is effected. That has been demonstrated clinically. Men have been cured of blindness, lameness and tumors, and hundreds of other diseases by means of psycho-therapeutics. Medicine today is beginning to emphasize psychotherapeutics, but psycho-therapeutics is not a religion. It has nothing to do with the Bible, or with Jesus, or with Christianity, or with Judaism. It is

a science and as that science continues to develop greater boon will come to humanity.

In other words, it is not the creed, the religion, the shrine, the holy man that performs the cure. It is that release of nervous tension, or that impulse that comes to you through absolute faith in the curative power of the faith, or the shrine, or the object, or the man, or God Himself. That is the efficacy of prayer. Hundreds of millions of men have known that for centuries. They have prayed and have been cured, and it needed no new revelation to establish that fact.

Such faith cures may be effected by objects which are palpably fraudulent. "The Heretics of Moncone," says Paul Sabatier, in his life of St. Francis of Assisi, "made a portrait of the Virgin, representing her as one-eyed and toothless, saying that in his humility Christ had chosen a very ugly woman for his mother. They had no difficulty in healing several cases of disease by its means. The image became famous, was venerated almost everywhere and accomplished many miracles until the day when the heretics divulged the deception to the great scandal of the faithful."

But you will say, "You pray to God to be healed and then you run to the doctor." Well, you pray to God to give you your daily bread and then you run to the baker. And Christian Scientists who believe in the unreality of matter also have constant recourse to the baker.

It is no reflection upon the Deity that we run to the doctor or the baker. On the contrary it is a realization that God works through man. We do not sit back with folded arms and expect bread to drop from heaven. We go to work, we toil and labor and ask of God to give us strength. We use our hands and our mind to supply us with our need, and we use the hands and the minds of men—whether they be physicians or bakers or miners or teachers—to supply certain needs of our lives.

It is, of course, a purely arbitrary thing to identify this science of healing with Christianity. You might as well identify it with any other religion. Jesus no more discovered it than Confucius or any other man. Jesus believed in the reality of evil, and even more than that, he believed that the whole

world was evil and he anticipated the coming of the Kingdom of God which would destroy this wicked world. If we read the New Testament correctly, he even believed in the devil.

To say that Jesus invented a science because he healed people, because he raised people from the dead, and because he was resurrected, is not to establish the fact of Christian Science, because other prophets before Jesus, and other prophets of other peoples have been reputed to have healed people and to have raised people from the dead and have been resurrected. Elijah resurrected the dead and Elisha cured leprosy, and among the Greeks and the Romans there were many healing deities that performed these miracles.

Christian Science accepts—and that is an essential thing as far as Judaism and Christian Science are concerned-everything the New Testament has to say about Jesus, as facts, with this exception; that Jesus was not divine, that he was not the Christ, but that he discovered the Christ principle, the principle of truth, which means divine healing. Christian Science accepts as fact all miracles which Jesus performed, of the healing which Jesus performed, of the raising of people from death, of his resurrection, of his transfiguration—in fact, the entire theology of Christendom, which the Jew has refused to accept for centuries. Christian Science accepts it and gives you another reason for it. It even accepts the story of the Virgin Birth of Jesus except in a spiritual sense-that in the mind of Mary, in the virgin consciousness of Mary was the truth begotten, namely, that man is not begotten of man but of God —that man is spirit. But we took up the story of the Virgin Birth and we saw that the entire story is based upon a false translation of a Biblical word, in the book of Isaiah. It is entirely a fiction read into the epic of Jesus, because a certain man read his Greek translation and did not read his Hebrew original.

In other words, Christian Science asks you to accept the New Testament as it stands, to throw overboard all we have learned historically and critically concerning the character of Jesus and the idea of Christ or the Logos.

Judaism can not accept Christian Science, first of all, because it can not accept the unreality of matter as a fact in life, for that would destroy all human institutions, all ethics, all morality. Judaism, and especially modern Judaism, can not accept Christian Science because it can not accept an orthodox and a mystical interpretation of the Bible. And Judaism can not accept Christian Science because it can not accept the dogmatic figure of Jesus as found in the New Testament, which Christian Science accepts.

Judaism is not a mental sedative, a drug, to lull men into unreal dreams of happiness. It is rather a challenge to high endeavor and enterprise, to service and sacrifice. Judaism offers nothing to its devotees but tremendous tasks in an imperfect world that can be made increasingly perfect only through the laborious efforts and terrible struggles of men. It gives to these co-workers of God, the golden vision of ultimate glory and the abiding faith in the value and purposefulness of their struggles.

Judaism is a religion for men who live in "Rome and London and not in a fool's paradise."

> Copies of this Lecture may be obtained by writing to The Temple, Cleveland, Ohio