

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

- 1938 *Consciousness Creative.* An Outline of the Science, Religion, and Philosophy of Universal Integration.
- 1941 *Vision and Organization.* Periodicity in Social Structures.
- 1942 *The Covenant, By-Laws, and Form of Communion of The Society of Life*

A. A. BEAUCHAMP, *Publisher*  
603 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

# CHRIST THE SEED

BY  
FRANCIS J. MOTT



THE GATE PUBLISHING CO.  
6 Gate Street, Kingsway  
LONDON  
1939

*Copyright, 1939*  
By FRANCIS J. MOTT

All rights, including translation into all languages and the right of reproduction, in whole or in part, in any form, reserved in all countries. Imperial and International Copyright secured. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except short extracts for use in review.

41. 63

TO GWENDOLEN AND HER CREATIVE SILENCES

Nobody will deny that, in so doing, she showed a certain creative realization of the principles of idealism common to them all. It is clear that Christian Science is neither Quimbyism, nor Hegelianism, nor yet even Christian in the ordinary sense of the term. That is to say, Mrs. Eddy's product possesses a certain uniqueness. She undeniably produced a new compound. Einstein used Newton's conclusions, Riemann's geometry, and the data provided by thousands of other workers and thinkers, and yet provided something that was essentially Einsteinian; so Mrs. Eddy took a lot of existent religious and philosophical material and passed it through her consciousness to produce a new religion. What was so very foolish and tragically absurd was that she denied the diverse origins of the thing she had created. Aptly enough was one biography of her entitled "The Biography of a Virginal Mind," for she tried hard to pretend that she had borne her brain-child parthenogenetically; that it was a virgin-born child, having no paternal genealogy. This cut off her work from the thinking world altogether. Mrs. Bill, in trying to show that Mrs. Eddy must have a successor, had to encounter the fact that she (Mrs. Eddy) did not even admit of a *predecessor!*

The growing volume of the revelation of Mrs. Eddy's own unreliable treatment of other writers and thinkers might have been expected to awaken Christian Scientists, who had been taught by Mrs. Eddy the danger of plagiarism. She wrote: "The various forms of book-borrowing without credit spring from this ill-concealed question in mortal mind, Who shall be greatest? This error violates the law given by Moses, it tramples upon Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, it does violence to the ethics of Christian Science."\*

But the Christian Science officials were not affected by these revelations. They proceeded at once to the rationalization of their position, and to the defence of Mrs. Eddy. Truth was made subservient to a dogma and to the organization of which the dogma was the lifeblood. Those who read the pages which follow will see that exactly the same attitude was taken up (in essence) by Christian Scientists as was adopted by the Christians when they were faced with similar charges of plagiarism

\* *Retrospection and Introspection*, page 75.

from the pagan cults and from the Gnostic doctrines. There is little doubt that, in exposing Mrs. Eddy's plagiarisms, Mrs. Bill was revealing a process of the mind at work in modern times which has always worked in the creation of all the world religions. Both Christianity and Buddhism owe a good deal of their doctrine to dishonest (perhaps unconsciously dishonest) syncretism. And we shall see further on in this book how literally it worked in the mid-nineteenth century in Persia, in regard to the "evolution" of the Babi religion. But it remained for Mrs. Eddy, working right under the critical eyes of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, to reproduce the process by deliberate intent, fully aware that it was a dishonest method, and fully capable of preparing a smoke screen to hide her method from the light of day.

When the Christian Science Church was faced with the publication of these various exposures of Mrs. Eddy's dishonesty, some surprising defences were made. For instance, Dr. Lyman Paterson Powell has written of Mrs. Eddy the following:

"Christian Science as it is to-day is really its founder's creation. Where she got this idea, or where that, little matters. As a whole the system described in *Science and Health* is hers, and nothing that can ever happen will make it less than hers."

The above passage was quoted approvingly by Judge Clifford P. Smith in a report of the Committee on Publication. (See the *Christian Science Sentinel*, June 15, 1929.)

It has even been alleged that, since Mrs. Eddy had all truth, it is not surprising that her revelation was foreshadowed by some of the "gropings" of the Kants and Hegels.

Here is precisely the same attitude of mind as that which the Christian Fathers exhibited centuries ago when the pagans charged them with imitating pagan gods and worships. Even if Christianity had in it pagan elements, said the Christian Fathers, in effect, that proves the true religion to have been foreseen by heathen before Christ came; or it proves that devils have been at work trying to steal Christian thunder by their wicked impostures. The attitudes are fundamentally alike in this: both assert that here is a new thing which is unlike anything ever seen on earth before. *We are determined to believe*

small Jewish sect, as to the character of a man who, they claim, fulfilled the dual rôle of Jewish Messiah and "Son of God."

However, we do not need to look into the past for examples of the emotionally religious mind at work, for we have examples of it even in our own relatively educated and enlightened times. Anyone who is acquainted with the strange ideas that can emanate from the members of various modern sects and cults knows the kind of mental state in which such a book as the Gospel of Mark could be written.

Quite apart from such considerations, however, the historical reliability of Mark is gravely impaired by his obvious anxiety to see that his story fulfils, at any cost to reason and historical sense, what he believes to be Old Testament prophecies. He commences, for example, with one quotation from Malachi and another from Isaiah which only by the wildest stretches of imagination can be used as Mark uses them.\*

In assessing the historical worth of this "most historical of all the Gospels," we must not overlook the question of fraud which, as we have seen, is not to be discounted in the New Testament writings. Indeed, we have seen that a part of the last chapter of Mark (from verse 9 to the end) is generally regarded as a late addition. What proof is there that such fraud stopped at that point? If the priestly scribes could "improve upon" their church's "infallible writings" in order to make them "still more infallible," at what point did the process of improvement upon infallibility find its saturation? What assurance can we have that the whole record has not been tampered with? The answer must be that we can have no such assurance. There are no documents prior to the fourth century. The record is blotted out.

Now, it is true that we have no *proof* as to why there are no

\* In this respect, however, Mark is not so obviously biased as Matthew, who uses Old Testament passages and calls them prophecies of events with which they are plainly unconnected. For example, in Matthew we read that the infant Jesus was in Egypt until the death of the murderous Herod in order that the prophecy might be fulfilled: "Out of Egypt have I called my son." Manifestly, the words quoted, which appear in Hosea, had absolutely no such significance as attributed to them by Matthew. Exactly the same thing may be said of the use in Matthew 2: 18 of a prophecy by Jeremiah; and of the particularly tendentious use of the passage in Judges 13: 5 concerning the promise of Manoah's wife, which is utterly twisted about in order to give point to Matthew 2: 23.

documents prior to the fourth century; but we can *guess* the reason, and our guess will find much internal and external evidence to support it. The guess is, of course, that the Christians themselves destroyed any documents which they supposed would reveal the occasion and the extent of the tampering which these ancient records had suffered. We are here reminded of Jerome's Aramaic Matthew, which he declined to publish because it differed so markedly from the established canon.

As Gerald Massey wrote in *The Logia of the Lord*, "It is impossible to determine anything fundamental by an appeal to the documents which, alone out of a hundred Gospels, were made Canonical. And when Eusebius recorded his memorable boast that he had virtually made 'all square' for the Christians, it was an ominous announcement of what had been done to keep out of sight the mythical and mystical rootage of historic Christianity. The Gnostics had been muzzled, and their extant evidences, as far as possible, masked. He and his co-conspirators did their worst in destroying documents and effacing the tell-tale records of the past, to prevent the future from learning what the by-gone ages could have said directly for themselves. They made dumb all Pagan voices that would have cried aloud their testimony against the unparalleled imposture then being perfected in Rome."

The Gospels bear the marks of their production. They do not read like homogeneous writings. They reveal that they have been worked over and over by many hands. They seem to tell basically the story of an inspired young Hebrew who in all probability may have been killed because he opposed the existing order.\* This story appears to have been overlaid with Gnostic and pagan ideas which became welded together and adapted to suit a growing organization and a growing theology.

Any reader who thinks that such a sequence as this could not happen, and that an elaborate story of a god-man *could* not develop out of the record of an inspired teacher, obviously knows

\* The Bishop Papias appears not to have believed that Jesus was crucified as a young man, but that he died in old age. *Irenæus Against Heresies* indicates that the death of Jesus in old age was believed by "all the elders"; this information was said to have been conveyed by John (the disciple of the Lord) to those in Asia who knew him.

little of the way in which the more primitive mind (and the Eastern mind) works. It might be well, therefore, at this point to give a brief authentic account of the story of the Persian Bab. In the year 1820 was born at Shiraz, in Persia, a child destined to found a new religion. His name was Mirza Ali Muhammad ibn Radhik, but at the age of about twenty-five he adopted the title of Bab-ud-Din — becoming known simply as the Bab, which signifies in Arabic “The Gate.” In the manner of Eastern teachers he gathered to himself disciples, and after a time naturally came into conflict with the orthodox Mohammedans. These denounced him to the Turkish authorities as an agitator, and in the year 1850 (at the age of thirty) he was shot at Tabriz. About the date of his death a small book was issued containing the story of his life and death.\* It was written by one of his wealthier disciples. A stormy period ensued, during which the followers of the Bab were persecuted and some horribly martyred, a fate which they bore with fortitude and even with rejoicing. The rest were dispersed, but after a time they began to come together again, and eventually formed a church. The church, however, did not for long tolerate the plain story of the Bab’s life which had been put into circulation. This book was hunted down and destroyed, all but completely, while in its place the church issued a new “official” life of the Bab, complete with miraculous events entirely lacking in the first book.† It so happened that the sole surviving copy of the *first* book eventually turned up in France, and there an English professor was able to compare the two Babi “Gospels” and to write a commentary upon them. The reader will learn from this fragment of modern religious history how a religious myth can originate and develop. We get a clear idea as to the kind of process which may have produced for us the illusory records of orthodox Christianity.‡

This brief chapter, whilst it but summarizes some small part of the knowledge gained in recent years by critical study of the Gospels, nevertheless should suffice to indicate to the reader how

\* It was called *The Point of Kaf*.

† The new book was called *Tarikh i Jadid* — “The New Way.”

‡ See the *Societon*, October, 1938.

fruitless is the historical search for the Hebrew who became the Christian Christ. The trail has been so well destroyed in order to cover up the human origins that, unlike the book of the Bab, not one single copy of any document has ever turned up to light the historical path. And even if some such document did turn up, who would be able to prove its validity? And how many are there who would deliberately repress it? The editor of a leading London newspaper said to a dear friend of the writer: “Even if you brought me undeniable proof that there never existed such a person as Jesus Christ, I would not print it.” This man’s reason was simply that he did not wish “to destroy people’s faith.” Is it not an incredible weakness of the human mind that lies should be tolerated in the name of religion!

With the documentary evidence thus deliberately destroyed, it is obvious that expert research into the existing fragments can never uncover the true historical facts about the shadowy figure of the Gospel Jesus. Even more tragic than the destruction of ancient documents is the creation of a state of mind which pre-fers the illusion rather than the truth.

Our knowledge of the group and seed process enables us, however, to lay hold of certain principles which throw a good deal of light upon the Gospels.

The first of these we may call “the principle of organized illusion,” and the second we can recognize under the heading of “the principle of seed and integration.” Let us consider what we mean by these principles, and how they help us to maintain our balance in the elusive atmosphere of the Gospels.

The principle of organized illusion teaches us *why* it is that the Gospel story has become so fraudulently changed. It reveals to us the  *motive force*  which can cause men over whole centuries to falsify the history of an organized religious movement.

After having, in the next chapter, discussed this principle of organized illusion, we shall then go on to show, by means of our second principle (of the GROUP and the SEED), that the Gospel figure takes on a certain undeniable reality. This it does from the fact that his teaching was really a presentation of Israel’s essential spiritual message of the group and the seed in a higher and more personal form than ever before.

around the physical seed of a royal line, but should be fluid and creative, ever projecting out of itself leadership by vision, so that the outer collective habits of the group always might be under the impulsion of the inner kingdom of consciousness.

In the teaching of Jesus, Israel's message is applied to the inner world, and becomes an exhortation to keep the inner life fluid — free from the curse of fixation. The story and struggle of Israel are, in the teaching of Jesus, brought out into a technique of personal feeling and thinking towards the Creator — charged with an apocalyptic power.

If Jesus were in any degree trying to teach the dimly perceived science of Israel's destiny, we can appreciate how little his message was understood. This being so, we can also comprehend how imperfectly it would now be available to us, after it had been through the minds of uninspired Hebrews; by them handed down by word of mouth through long years; interpreted by converted pagans such as Papias; and then revised to suit the demands of a growing cult. We can well imagine that much of the message may have been lost. Such as was preserved would be unconsciously moulded by those who held pagan views of the world, or deliberately modified by those who, like the followers of the Bab, wanted to make sure that their Church had a scripture which in its appeal to the popular mind was not inferior to its rivals.

That the words of Jesus would have been changed unintentionally as well as deliberately we may infer from the fact that no man can pass on that which he does not comprehend. Those who heard him would be able to pass on only as much as they could understand, and if their understanding was deficient, then they would pass on an erroneous interpretation. The Church Fathers, and those associated with them, naturally also would apply their own interpretation to such sayings and doings as they translated or collated. The mental development of the Fathers of the Church (and the consequent character of their effect upon the Gospels) may be gathered from their writings which, in parts at least, manifest astonishing credulity and fantasy. Anyone doubting this might read with profit some of the extant writings of the early Fathers.

The attempt by these lesser minds to record the doctrine of Jesus in terms familiar to themselves would lead to a peculiar but logical result. There would be two aspects to the chronicle. On the one hand, we should have a fragmentary record of a teaching, recognizable by its adherence to a central principle; while, on the other hand, we should have a composite structure of legend, myth, and misinterpretation, added piecemeal by a hundred pens. Such a superimposed structure would take shape according to the general pattern of the ideas governing the minds of its creators. In the case of the Christian Gospels it follows a pagan pattern, for there is no doubt that the Gospels have passed down to us largely through the hands of ex-pagans.

Let us take one instance of this dual-aspected character of the Gospels; and let us see how a teaching, presented from the standpoint of Israel, has taken on a pagan superstructure — the original being *evolutionary*, whereas the subsequent interpretations bear that Greek-drama stamp which characterizes *pre-evolutionary* philosophy.

Jesus refers to a day of harvest, a time of the "coming of the bridegroom," an end of activity, a Day of Judgment. This, we can see, emanates quite naturally from his teaching, and is implicit in the whole idea of group integration and seed. It is the idea of repeated seedtime in nature, in the human consciousness, and in society. It refers to the time when outer-world structures grow to a point whereat they must be referred back to the inner world of the spirit. In the organisms of nature this is achieved largely through the action of the seed. The seed is the vehicle by which the outer world is referred back to the inner world. In human society the same process is effected through creative vision and leadership. The collective social group behaviours find a new and refreshing connection with the Creator, through the inner being of one inspired individual acting temporarily as agent for all. At such a moment it seems as if the very inner kingdom is born into the world. The old organized forms are challenged. A new message is abroad. The old order is put upon its defence, and with it men likewise are judged, for the new thing disposes the goats upon the left hand and the sheep upon the right. Thus the

we shall see that it may be more meagre even than it now appears. If the last twelve verses of Mark are unhistorical, then we must infer that the post-mortem appearances of Jesus may have been subsequent additions to the Gospels. If the whole of chapter sixteen of Mark is missing from the oldest manuscripts, the possibility of an even greater forgery is indicated. Certainly it would appear that if Mark is tampered with, and if Matthew and Luke are largely based on Mark (John being manifestly less "historical"), then the historical evidence for the supernatural phenomena of the Resurrection is extremely slight.

The remarkable thing about all the Gospel references to the post-mortem appearances of Jesus is the wide disagreement between the different accounts. Not one of the Gospels entirely agrees with the others, and this confusion is heightened by the fact that Paul's accounts in the Epistles differ widely from the Gospels. Jocelyn Rhys, whose book *The Resurrection Doctrines* is an extremely valuable commentary on the whole matter, lists the different records in a helpful manner, which we have partly reproduced here.

	Appearance At Tomb	First Appearance Elsewhere *	Second Appearance Elsewhere	Third Appearance Elsewhere	Fourth Appearance Elsewhere	Fifth Appearance Elsewhere	Sixth Appearance Elsewhere
Matthew	None	To the two Marys	To the Eleven	—	—	—	—
(pseudo) Mark	? †	To Mary Magdalene	To two disciples	To the Eleven	—	—	—
Luke	None	To Cleopas and another	To the Eleven	—	—	—	—
John	To Mary Magdalene	To ten disciples	To the Eleven	On the sea to seven disciples	—	—	—
Paul	? †	To Peter	To the Twelve	To five hundred	To James	To all apostles	To Paul

\* By "appearance elsewhere" is meant, of course, appearance elsewhere than at the tomb.

† The two question marks in the first column indicate that the "first appearance" might possibly have taken place at the tomb, and not elsewhere.

Manifestly such conflicting reports do not constitute history. They are not even reliable hearsay. Rhys makes the following interesting comment upon them:

"It . . . appears highly probable that the original tradition was that Mary Magdalene, by herself or accompanied by some other women, visited the tomb and found it empty, and that at some later period the assembled disciples believed that they had actually seen Jesus in a spirit form. Out of that original tradition all the Gospel stories might very easily have arisen in days when it was regarded as the business of the historian to improve upon facts."

In a footnote Rhys moots the thought that *this* may have been the story told by the original Mark, and that the new ending to Mark was substituted because the old one did not support the growing theology of the new church. Remembering the fate of the original life of the Bab, and the mysterious "disappearance" of early Christian documents, we can quite accept the possibility of such a procedure.

We cannot ignore the circumstances which rendered the Resurrection a desirable dogma. Christianity had to compete in a world familiar with gods of the seed, vegetation, or sun — gods who rose from the dead. To enable Christianity to compete, its god had to be no whit less miraculous. Furthermore, there would be a need to reconcile the Messiah's apparent failure to accomplish the tremendous things expected of him. This omission could be filled by asserting that he had gone away in order to come again in glory.

Rhys' suggestion that the disciples may have believed they saw Jesus in spirit form is one which cannot be dismissed. Several things conspire to make it an extremely reasonable suggestion. First of all, we have the fact that both Peter and Paul were manifestly men of psychic character, given to falling readily into trances. Peter (Acts 10: 10) goes into a trance and sees visions. Paul (II Cor. 12: 2, 3) confesses that he is unable to separate his objective experiences from his trance experiences. Little reliance can be placed upon the testimony of such people who are, it is well known, notoriously unre-