


BX
8701
S9

B476400 C

PRICE 50 CENTS.

——
Nos. 42—49.

THE SWEDENBORG LIBRARY.

PART I.

THE
MEMORABILIA
OF
SWEDENBORG:
OR
MEMORABLE RELATIONS
OF
THINGS SEEN AND HEARD
IN
HEAVEN AND HELL.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION
BY GEORGE BUSH.

NEW YORK:
JOHN ALLEN, 139 NASSAU STREET.
BOSTON: OTIS CLAPP, 12 SCHOOL STREET.

1847.

NOTICE.

Our readers are at length furnished with the present Reply completely grown upon the author's hands far beyond his original intention. But not where to stop till he had reached the end of Dr. Woods' objections has consequently the satisfaction of believing that not one of any importance has been left unnoticed. For this, however, he claims little credit, as appropriate answers are all involved in a clear presentation of the leading principles of the system itself. He must acknowledge himself to have been surprised, in the course of the discussion, to find to what extent every form of objection has been anticipated and virtually replied to by the provision of the author. The clear exposition of the *principles* on which the doctrines and disclosures rest affords, in the main, an adequate response to the opposing allegations.

We are happy to state that the kindred work of Dr. Pond is to be announced in the course of the ensuing summer by Mr. Crallé of Lynchburgh, Va. a man, we believe, every way competent to the task. The assaults of our opponents will at least have the effect of drawing out the strong points of the system, and it may reasonably be presumed that such writers will even concede the propriety of arguing the doctrines on the ground of their abstract truth, independent of Swedenborg's claims to a divine revelation, instead of setting them aside for the simple reason of their differing from what are termed the orthodox standards, which we are ready to grant in the outset without argument. We distinctly take our stand in the assertion, that the *commonly received* doctrines of the Trinity, Atonement, Justification by Faith alone, Predestination, Regeneration, and Regeneration are intrinsically unscriptural and false, and that a compromise between us and our opponents can only be made up on these points. We probably we cannot anticipate, as the truth on these heads is commonly held to have been long since incontrovertibly settled, and all farther discussion is conceding the possibility of a mistake, which does not suit the general system professedly founded upon the infallible doctrines of the Reformation. Only remains, therefore, for the New Church to maintain its stand and on an occasion arises to vindicate, as best we may, our distinguishing testimony by referring it to the results of time and providence to bring forth a verdict according to truth.

The present issue completes the third series of 16 Nos. of the "Swedenborg Library," and comprises in addition two of the fourth. It is proposed to continue the work so long as our subscribers are sufficiently satisfied with the execution to continue their support. In making his selection the author has been governed by the consideration of two classes of readers—members of the New Church, who could not be expected to find novel and Memorable Relations except so far as the prefatory remarks are concerned, who may be supposed have taken them mainly for the sake of others, and they would desire to make known the views embodied in Swedenborg's

Presented by
Mrs. James Huntley Campbell
2-16-1932

sedness from him. And if divine wisdom had not found a method of reconciliation, human nature would and must have sustained whatever can be conceived under the awful idea of damnation, or the state of absolute rejection from the presence of God. By these considerations it might appear, were it necessary to extend them, that enmity, sin, wrath, and misery, with other words of the like import, are all correlative terms, which only variously express the nature or effects of man's alienation from God, &c. 'On the other hand, the word love is also correlative, and entirely connected with every other divine attribute and perfection, or with whatever may be called by those names: it has, and can have, no difference from them, however distinguished by a merciful condescension, for the better comprehension of our minds. Righteousness, for instance, is only a name for this love in act and exercise; for the love of God in its energies does only what is right or righteous. Love is the motive of all his actions, according to the Scriptures; and by communicating this love, he renders it the essential principle of all righteous action in man (John iii. 16; 1 Cor. xiii. 4, &c). Truth, purity, and the like, are also but love in particular forms, actions, or aspects. In short, all the attributes and perfections of the Divine Nature have their essence in love, and the term love is but a glorious title for the grand assemblage of them, denominating (as the Bible hath) the first and supreme nature. God is love, then; uniting, as in that one attribute, all the other predicaments and glories of his majesty and goodness, not *per accidens*, but in essentiality; and with respect to his creatures, there is no grace nor act of righteousness but what is an emanation from the same principle, enlivening, invigorating, and making them happy.'—*Hor. Solit., Art. LOVE.*

The object to be accomplished in the counsels of the Divine Clemency, is the restoration and reconciliation of man's alienated heart to his Maker. So long as this enmity continues it will operate to work an internal consciousness of opposition between the soul and its Divine Source. Being placed by his moral state in a posture of antagonism with the perfections of Jehovah, the sinner *feels the Divine Love itself to be to him an attribute of consuming wrath*. But the Lord's love is Love still; its nature is not changed; and what atoning sacrifice does Love demand? To say that this Love is felt by sinful man as avenging Justice is but another form of saying that the Divine Love *appears* to him as avenging Justice or wrath, and, consequently, as we have already seen that the language of Scripture is constructed very much on the principle of *appearances*, we find numerous passages which savor indeed in the *letter* of the spirit of an angry Deity, prompted by vindictive Justice, but as we rise above the literal semblances of truth into its essential reality, this apprehended attribute of Jehovah disappears and is lost in that of Love. By the same process the dogma of Atonement, as popularly held, disappears likewise, and nothing remains but that of *actual reconciliation*, which is, in fact, the true Scriptural idea of Atonement.

I will here adduce a few paragraphs from "Law's Spirit of Love," a work which, notwithstanding its occasional sprinklings of mysticism, contains a vein of the strongest reasoning in regard to the true nature and grounds of the Atonement which I have any where seen out of the New Church writings.

"The doctrine of the atonement made by Christ, and the absolute necessity and real efficacy of it, to *satisfy* the righteousness, or justice of God, is the very ground and foundation of christian redemption, and the life and strength of every part of it. But then, this very doctrine is so far from favoring the opinion of a wrath in the Deity itself, that it is an absolute full denial of it, and the strongest of demonstrations, that the wrath or resentment, that is to be pacified, or atoned, cannot possibly be in the Deity itself.

“For this wrath, that is to be *atoned* and *pacified*, is, in its whole nature, n else but *sin*, or *disorder* in the creature. And when sin is *extinguished* in the ture, all the wrath that is *between* God and the creature, is *fully atoned*. & all the Bible, from one end to the other, and you will find, that the atonem *that*, which is called the divine wrath or justice, and the *extinguishing* of the creature, are only different expressions for *one and the same individual* t And, therefore, unless you will place sin in God, that wrath that is to be at or *pacified*, cannot be placed in him.

“The whole nature of our redemption has no other end, but to remove, o tinguish the wrath that is between God and man. When this is removed, is *reconciled* to God. Therefore, *where* the wrath is, or *where that* is which w to be atoned, *there* is that which is the *blameable cause* of the separation betw God and man; *there* is that which Christ came into the world to extinguish quench, or atone. If, therefore, this wrath, which is the *blameable cause* of separation between God and man, is in God himself; if Christ died to atone extinguish a wrath that was got into the holy Deity itself, then it must be s that Christ made an atonement for God and not for man; that he died for a good and benefit of God, and not of man: and that which is called *our redempti* t, ought rather to be called the redemption of God, as saving and delivering h a, and not man, from his *own wrath*. This blasphemy is unavoidable, if you su p- pose that wrath, for which Christ died, to be a wrath in God himself.

“Again, the very nature of *atonement*, absolutely shows, that *that* which is to be atoned, cannot possibly be in God, nor even in any good being. For atonement implies the *alteration*, or removal of something that is not as it ought to be. And therefore, every creature, so long as it is good, and has its *proper state* of goodness, neither wants, nor can admit of any atonement, because it has nothing in it that wants to be *altered*, or *taken out* of it. And therefore, atonement cannot possibly have any place in God, because nothing in God either wants, or can receive alteration; neither can it have place in any creature, but so far as it has lost, or altered *that* which it had from God, and is fallen into disorder; and then, that which brings this creature back to its first state, which alters that which is wrong in it, and takes its evil out of it, is its *true* and *proper atonement*.

“*Water* is the proper atonement of the rage of fire; and that which *changes* a tempest into a calm, is its true atonement. And, therefore, as sure as Christ is a *propitiation* and an *atonement*, so sure is it, that *that* which he does, as a *propiti-* ation and atonement, can have no place but in altering that evil and disorder, which, in the state and life of the fallen creature, wants to be altered.

“*Hell*, *wrath*, *darkness*, *misery*, and *eternal death*, mean the same thing through all scripture, and these are the only things from which we want to be redeemed; and where there is nothing of hell, there, there is nothing of *wrath*, nor any thing that wants, or can admit of the benefits of the atonement made by Christ. Either, therefore, all hell is in the essence of the holy Deity, or nothing that wants to be atoned by the merits and death of Christ, can possibly be in the Deity itself.

“The apostle saith, that ‘we are by nature, children of wrath;’ the same thing as when the Psalmist saith, ‘I was shapen in wickedness, and in sin hath my mother conceived me.’ And, therefore, that wrath, which *wants* the atonement of the sufferings, blood, and death of Christ, is no other than that *sin*, or *sinful*

state in which we are naturally born. But now, if this *wrath* could be supposed to be in the Deity itself, then it would follow, that by 'being by nature, children of wrath,' we should thereby be the *true children* of God, we should not want any atonement, or new birth from above, to make us *partakers of the divine nature*, because that wrath that was in us, would be our dwelling in God, and he in us.

"Again, all scripture teaches us that God *wills* and desires the removal, or extinction of *that wrath*, which is *betwixt* God and the creature; and therefore, all scripture teaches, that the wrath is not in God; for God cannot will the removal, or alteration of anything that is in himself; this is as impossible, as for him to *will* the extinction of his own omnipotence. Nor can there be anything in God, contrary to, or against his own will: and yet, if God *wills* the extinction of a wrath, that is in himself, it must be in him, contrary to, or against his own will.

"This, I presume, is enough to show you, that the atonement made by Christ, is itself the greatest of all proofs, that it was not to atone or extinguish any wrath in the Deity itself; nor, indeed, in any way to affect, or alter any quality, or temper in the divine mind, but purely and solely to overcome, and remove all that death, and hell, and wrath, and darkness, that had opened itself in the nature, birth, and life of fallen man."—*Law's Spirit of Love*, p. 67-71

The grand purpose, as we have remarked, of the Divine Mercy is the re-conjunction of the sundered soul of man with Jehovah, the only source of Life and Bliss. But how was this to be effected? In the nature of the case it could not be by the substitution of an intermediate being between the Creator and the creature, who should take upon himself the penalty due to sin, for there neither is nor can be such a being in the universe, and even if there were, it is impossible to show how the translation of punishment from the guilty to the innocent satisfies the demands of Justice, whose language is, "The soul that sinneth *it* shall die." Nor have I ever seen, in all the multitudinous volumes and tractates which have come under my eye in reference to the current doctrine of the Atonement, any clear development of the *precise mode* in which the expiatory work of Christ is made to redound to the benefit of the sinner. We are not told *how* it is that the *satisfaction satisfies*. On the contrary, it is rather represented as an *ultimate fact* in the moral history of the universe, into the rationale of which it is not proper to push inquiry.

Still the question recurs, How is man to be again conjoined—brought to *at-one-ment*—with his Maker, from whom he has become separated by sin? This question can only be answered by first attaining a correct view of the *state* to which man had reduced himself by his iniquities, for as the Atonement was intended to remedy the consequences of the apostacy, the means employed must be such, in their own nature, as to answer this end. Now nothing is more evident from the infallible oracles, than the fact of the existence and agency of evil spirits, and that these spirits live and act in conjunction with the ruling loves of man; for likeness of affection necessarily conjoins, while contrariety of affection necessarily dissevers. While man retained his primeval purity, he was *united* to God by loving and abiding in good. By forsaking good and imbibing the love of evil, he became *separated* from God, and from the same cause became conjoined with the infernal spirits, who were in similar loves. He thus rendered himself liable to be acted upon, tempted, governed, made captive, and bound by them, as a complete minion of hell. From this fearful bondage he was una-

ble to liberate himself, for no being can *directly* will opposite to a dominant evil love. In these circumstances, the paramount evil in man and the power of hell mutually strengthened each other. Delighting in his chains, they were continually drawn closer and closer around him, till a voluntary release became utterly hopeless. The ever merciful Jehovah still purposed his recovery, but this could not be effected except by his deliverance from the thralldom of the infernal hosts by whom he had been enslaved. But an *immediate* approach, by the ardors of the Infinite Love, either to fallen spirits or fallen men would have been followed by their instant destruction. In this sense it is emphatically true, that "God out of Christ is a consuming fire." The bright and burning beams of the Sun of Heaven must be shrouded and tempered through some interposing medium ere they can safely penetrate to the infernal abyss and reach the inmost spirits of its tenants. In this emergency the assumption of the Human by the Divine was the sublime resort. Jehovah became incarnate and by clothing himself with our nature, in its lowest principles and at the very extreme of its infirmities and degradation, put himself into the capacity of entering into combat with the powers of hell and by receiving into himself and overcoming their temptations, to achieve the very victory which was requisite for man's deliverance from their chains. This then was the *first great work* of his mediation—the subjugation of the hells in his own Divino-human person, and the removal from man of their soul-destroying influences, to such a degree as to render him capable, by the aid of the divine influx, of counter-willing their hellish promptings and of a new reception of Truth, Goodness, and celestial Life. This was the essence of the Atonement, which in the nature of things could be of no efficacy except so far as it resulted in *actual reconciliation*. The passion of the cross, so far from having concentrated in it the chief and essential virtue of the Atonement, was merely the last stage—the closing scene—of temptation and combat in which, during his whole earthly life, the Divine Redeemer was engaged. The blood-sweating at Gethsemane, and the blood-shedding at Calvary, were but part and parcel of the same atoning work which he was all the time accomplishing from the manger to the tomb.

In this process of combat and conquest, and running parallel with it, was the progressive Glorification of our Lord's Human nature, which is faintly imaged forth in the onward course of man's regeneration. Every victory achieved was an advancement of the Human towards the Divine, just as with the regenerating Christian every accession to his spiritual graces is a real bringing down of the divine principles into the ultimates of his earthly and corporeal nature, and a consequent lifting up or sublimation of that nature to a likeness to the divine, which must necessarily result in the glorification even of his "body of vileness." But this point is developed with so much clearness and the whole polity of Atonement set forth in so striking a manner by Mr. Noble in his recent volume of doctrinal Lectures, that I shall draw upon his pages for a better view of the subject than I could myself present.

"The true view of the doctrine of Atonement, that is, Agreement or Reconciliation, is this; That by the assumption of human nature by Jehovah in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, the opposition or contrariety which previously existed between man and God was removed, first in his own assumed Humanity, and then, by the influence of his Spirit proceeding from his Humanity when

fully glorified and united to the Essential Divinity, in those who should acknowledge him and accept his mercies. The sacrifice of Jesus Christ consisted in the total sanctification and dedication of his human nature, till it was entirely assimilated to his Divine Nature, rendered itself Divine, and made the proper organ for the indwelling of the whole fullness of the Godhead, and for the exercise of all the energies of the Divine Omnipotence; just as man's body is the proper organ for the indwelling of the soul, and for the exercise of all the powers belonging to the compound man. By our salvation by the blood of Jesus Christ, is meant, in a natural sense, by his death: without which we could not have been saved, because without it his Humanity could not have been glorified; it being absolutely necessary that the merely human life should be extinguished before the purely Divine life could descend and take its place. And the Mediation, Intercession, and Advocateship of Jesus Christ, include, both the access which is afforded for man to God by the Medium of the Glorified Humanity of Jesus Christ; and the communication from God to man, by the same blessed Medium, of all the gifts necessary to his salvation. Thus most true it is, that by the assumption and glorification of his Humanity, He made atonement for us,—that is, effected agreement between man and God, by clothing Himself with a Divine Manhood and uniting this with the Essential Godhead, and by enabling created man to desist from that which was the cause of his separation. The prophet says, 'It is your iniquities which have separated between you and your God:—the removal then of these iniquities, and the reception by man of heavenly grace, from God to adorn his mind in their place, is the making of an atonement, an *at-one-ment* or *agreement*. This would ever have been impossible, had not the Lord presented the graces of his Spirit in a form, and with a power, capable of reaching man in the state of separation in which he stood; and this could only be, by the Holy Spirit, or divine influence, proceeding from his Divine or Glorified Human Person. Before, then, such a Holy spirit could be given, or such a divine influence be imparted, it was necessary that the Humanity should be assumed by the Lord, and united to the Divinity. That the consequence of this, to those who look to the Lord in this his form of accommodation to their state, would be, the communication of every grace necessary to their reception of spiritual life, is declared by the Lord when, in a sublime passage quoted in a former Lecture, He 'stood and cried' (as it is expressed, to denote the ardor of his Divine Love, and the earnestness of his desire for man's salvation), 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink:—to thirst, is ardently to desire the truths of salvation: to go to Jesus, is to apply to Jehovah in his Humanity as their only Source: and to drink, is to receive and appropriate them. The effect hereof, in enlightening the mind and imparting spiritual life, He expresses by going on to say, 'He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water;' which the evangelist explains by adding, 'This spake he of the Spirit, which they who believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet, because that Jesus was not yet glorified.' If then his glorification, which took place at his resurrection and ascension, and of which his death, as to the maternal humanity, was a necessary preliminary, was requisite for the impartation of the saving mercies here offered, how easy is it to see what was the nature of the Atonement thus accomplished!—namely, agreement or concord between God and man, effected by

the removal of the enmity in man's heart, by the communication of that spiritual drink, which the Lord here declares is to be received from his Glorified Humanity,—that is, of those graces of the Spirit, that living water, which the evangelist affirms could not be given till his Humanity was glorified.”—*Nobles Lectures, p. 378-380.*

Such then is the view of the Atonement presented in the Theology of the New Church. While it ignores the common theory of *substituted punishment*, it recognizes and insists upon the absolute and indispensable necessity of the Lord's assumption of human nature and of his suffering and dying *for us—in our behalf—but not in our stead.** We recognize the Lord in his Humanity, as a real sacrifice offered *for us*, to effect atonement or reconciliation between man and God, as Jesus says, “*for their sakes I sanctify myself;*” and as Paul declares, “*Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us;*” not that the Father's anger required appeasement by the sight of the sufferings of his Son, but because, when the Humanity was thus sacrificed, that is, sanctified, and united to the Essential Divinity, the divine influences were accommodated to man's state, so as to be operative to the renewal of his heart and mind—to *his* sanctification also. Thus “he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.”

Let me here remark that we confess to no departure, in this view, from what the Scriptures so frequently declare respecting our being saved “by the blood of Christ.” So far as “blood” stands as an equivalent for the sufferings and death of Christ, which we are taught to regard as the appointed and indispensable *means or medium* of our salvation, we fully recognize the great truth involved in the expression. But this is not its dominant sense in our vocabulary, nor do we by any means affix the ordinary ideas of the religious world to the phrase. We cannot conceive of the mere shedding of our Lord's material blood as making atonement for sin or washing away its stains. We are forced to read the term, for the most part, as a symbol of some spiritual and divine principle which puts forth its efficacy upon the inner man. Nothing can be more palpably obvious than this from the words of the Saviour himself. “Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you: Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day: For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed: He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.”—*John vi. 53-56.* These passages we feel

* “The God of christians is so far from being *implacable* and *revengeful* that you have seen it proved, from text to text, that the whole form and manner of our redemption comes wholly from the free, antecedent, infinite love and goodness of God towards fallen man—that the *innocent Christ* did not suffer to quiet an angry Deity, but merely as *co-operating, assisting, and uniting* with that love of God, which desired our salvation—that he did not suffer in *our place or stead*, but only *on our account*, which is quite a different matter. And to say, that he suffered in *our place or stead*, is as absurd, as contrary to Scripture, as to say, that he rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven, in *our place and stead*, that we might be excused from it. For his sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension, are all of them equally on *our account*, for our sake, for our good and benefit, but none of them possibly to be in our stead.

“And as scripture and truth affirm, that he ascended into heaven *for us*, though neither scripture nor truth will allow it to be in *our place and stead*: so, for the same reasons, it is strictly true, that he suffered, and died *for us*, though no more in *our place or stead*, nor any more desirable to be so, than his ascension into heaven for us should be in *our place and stead.*”—*Law's Spirit of Love, p. 96.*

ourselves authorized to make a general standard of interpretation for other passages which declare the dependence of our salvation upon the blood of Christ. *We are saved by a blood which can be drunk.* So also in regard to a multitudinous class of kindred passages which ascribe our salvation to the sufferings and death of Christ—which speak of the ransom that he paid for us—which refer us to the stripes and wounds inflicted upon him by which we are healed—and which teach us to glory in his cross. All such language is in perfect harmony with the above view of Christ's mediatorial and atoning work, because everything of this nature entered into that economy of *means* by which our recovery from sin and death was to be effected. And we hesitate not to say that the diversity of application in regard to this term which obtains in the various defences of the popular dogma of Atonement is wholly unwarranted. On what grounds are the plain declarations of our Lord in the Gospels to be strained to accommodation with the occasional apostolic usage rather than the reverse? We perceive, I repeat, no violence done to the true import of the Word by our construction.*

I regret that my limits do not admit of a more extended detail of the various features of the scheme of Atonement as presented by Swedenborg. I am aware that your mind will still be apt to labor under some difficulty of apprehension as to the precise manner in which this doctrine of the progressive Glorification of our Lord's Humanity bears upon the process of regeneration in the souls of the saved. But deeper reflection will probably lead to a clear perception of the fact, that the requisite renewing influence which is to implant the Divine Life in the soul of man could only emanate from God *as man*, and though this influence is in ordinary theological parlance ascribed to the Holy Spirit as a Person, yet you will scarcely fail to conclude, that it is in fact nothing else than the Divine vivifying Sphere proceeding from the Glorified Humanity of God-man Mediator, who, as the second Adam, becomes the true source and fountain of spiritual life as really as the first Adam was to the race the author of natural life.† You will consequently perceive that the grand character of this scheme, so to term it, is, that it makes the whole matter of Atonement essentially *subjective*. It divests

* "Made them white in the blood of the Lamb."—In the literal sense of the Word, by the blood of the Lamb is understood the passion of the cross, but in the internal or spiritual sense is understood the divine truth proceeding from the Lord; for by this man is purified from falsities and evils, that is, his garments are made white. The passion of the cross was the last temptation of the Lord, by which he fully subjugated the hells, and glorified his humanity; which things being accomplished and completed, the Lord sent the Comforter, the Spirit of Truth, by which is understood the divine truth proceeding from his glorified humanity, as the Lord himself teaches in John (vii. 39). The same truth is taught by the Lord in many other parts of the Word. By this, therefore, namely, by divine truth, when it is received, man is reformed and regenerated by the Lord, and saved, but not (merely) by the shedding of blood on the cross."—*A. E.* 476.

† "The matter stood thus; the seed of all mankind was in the loins of fallen *Adam*. This was unalterable in the nature of the thing, and therefore all *mankind* must come forth in his fallen state. Neither can they ever be in any state whatever, whether earthly or heavenly, but by having an earthly *man*, or a heavenly *man*, for their father. For *mankind*, as such, must of all necessity be born of, and have that nature which it hath, from a *man*. And this is the true ground and absolute necessity of the one Mediator, the *man* Christ Jesus. For seeing *mankind*, as such, must have that birth and nature which they have, from *man*, seeing they never could have had any relation to paradise, or any possibility of partaking of it, but because they had a paradisaical man for their father; never could have had any relation to this earthly world, or any possibility of being born earthly, but because they had an earthly man for their father; and seeing all this must be unalterably so for ever, it plainly follows, there was an utter impossibility for the seed of *Adam* ever to come out of its fallen state, or ever have another, or better

it entirely of the aspect of a merely *extraneous* and *forensic* transaction—a sort of *governmental commutation*—a certain something wrought in honor of *abstract law*, the effects of which are *judicially accounted* to the benefit of the penitent offender. In a word it comes near to making what you would probably term the *application of the Atonement to be the Atonement itself*. It views it incessantly in the most indissoluble connection with the *life* which it imparts. The Atonement can scarcely be said to exist for him who is not positively, by means of it, *reconciled* to God by becoming partaker of the *love* of God. Its object was not so much to take away the punishment of sin by suffering its penalty, as to destroy the power of sin and to infuse a new and divine life into the soul. By the view now presented we can see *how* it is that the Atonement has this effect. On the common view I believe it to be impossible to obtain a perfectly clear apprehension of the *mode* in which Christ's Atonement is made available to salvation; and accordingly Dr. Magee himself, the champion of the orthodox doctrine, remarks;—"I know not, nor does it concern me to know, *in what manner* the sacrifice of Christ is connected with the forgiveness of sin." To us it is the very climax of all theological paradoxes, that we are called to receive and rest in a scheme of salvation of the true nature and grounds of which we cannot gain a distinct intellectual conception. If others think it their *duty* to content themselves with a mere implicit faith in a matter involving interests so vast, we do not.

From what has now been said you can scarcely fail to be convinced of one thing—the immense diversity of the Atonement taught by Swedenborg from that exhibited in most of the Christian schools with which you are familiar. This is too palpable to need further enlargement at my hands. I will leave it for Swedenborg himself to display it in his own language.

"What doctrine doth more abound in the books of the orthodox at this day, or what is more zealously taught and insisted on in the schools of divinity, or more constantly preached and cried up in the pulpit, than this—that God the Father, being full of wrath against mankind, not only separated them from himself, but also sentenced them to universal damnation, thus excommunicated them from his favor; but because he was gracious and merciful, that he persuaded, or excited, his Son to descend, and take upon himself the determined curse, and thus expiate the wrath of his Father; and that thus, and no otherwise, could the Father be prevailed upon to look again with an eye of mercy on mankind? As also, that this was effected by the Son, who, in taking upon himself the curse pronounced against men suffered himself to be scourged by the Jews, to be spit upon, and lastly, to be crucified as the *accursed of God* (Deut. xxi. 23); and that the Father was by this means appeased, and, out of love towards his Son, cancelled the sentence of damnation, yet only in favor of those for whom the Son should intercede, who was thus to be a perpetual Mediator in the presence of the Father? These and the like doctrines are at this day trumpeted forth from the pulpit, and re-echoed from the walls of the temple, as sound is re-echoed in a wood, so that the ears of all present are filled with it. But who, that hath his reason enlightened and restored to health by the Word, cannot see that God is mercy and clemency itself, because he is love itself and goodness itself, and that these constitute his essence; and consequently, that it is a contradiction to say, that mercy itself, or goodness itself, can behold man with an angry eye, and sentence him to damnation, and still abide in his own divine es-

life, than they had from *Adam*, unless such a son of man could be brought into existence, as had the same relation to all mankind, as *Adam* had, was as much in *them all*, as *Adam* was, and had as full power, according to the *nature of things*, to give a heavenly life to all the seed in *Adam's* loins, as *Adam* had to bring them forth in earthly flesh and blood."—*Law's Spirit of Love*, p. 114.

sence? Such dispositions are never ascribed to a good man or an angel of heaven, but only to a wicked man and spirit of hell; it is, therefore, blasphemy to ascribe them to God. But, if we inquire into the cause of this false judgment, we shall find it to be this, that men have mistaken the passion of the cross for redemption itself: hence have flowed those opinions, as falses flow in a continued series from one false principle; or, as from a cask of vinegar nothing but vinegar can come forth; or, as from an insane mind we can expect nothing but insanity. For one point being taken for granted, the conclusions that are made from it must be of the same family, because they are included in it, and are severally and successively produced from it; and from this one point concerning the passion of the cross, as constituting the sum of redemption, many more shocking and impious opinions, scandalous and disgraceful to God, may still take rise and go forth into the world, until that prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled, where it is said, 'The priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they stumble in judgment; all tables are full of vomit and filthiness' (xxviii. 7, 8).

"From this idea concerning God and redemption, the whole system of theology hath lost its spirituality, and is become in the lowest degree natural. This was the necessary consequence of ascribing to God merely natural properties and attributes; and yet on the idea entertained of God, and that of redemption, which makes one with salvation, everything that hath relation to the church depends. For that idea is like the head, from which all parts of the body are derived; when, therefore, that idea is spiritual, everything that belongeth to the church becometh spiritual also; but when that idea is natural, then everything belonging to the church becomes natural. Now, forasmuch as the idea of God and of redemption is become merely natural, that is, sensual and corporeal, it follows that all those things are merely natural, which the heads and members of the church have maintained, and do maintain, in their systems and forms of doctrine. The reason why that idea must of necessity give birth to nothing but falses is, because the natural man is in continual opposition to the spiritual man, and thus regardeth spiritual things as airy and visionary phantasies. It may, therefore, be truly said, that in consequence of that sensual idea concerning redemption, and thence concerning God, the ways toward heaven which are those that lead to the Lord God the Saviour, are beset with thieves and robbers (John x. 1, 8, 9), and that the doors of the temple are thrown down, so that dragons and owls, and the *tzjim* and *jim* have entered, and make a concert of dreadful discord. That this idea concerning redemption, and concerning God, pervades the faith which prevails at this day throughout all christendom, is an acknowledged truth; for that faith requires men to pray to God the Father, that he would remit their sins for the sake of the cross and blood of His Son; and to God the Son, that He would pray and intercede for them; and to God the Holy Ghost, that he would justify and sanctify them; and what is all this, but to supplicate three distinct Gods, one after another? And, in such a case, how can the notion which the mind forms of the divine government differ from that of an aristocratical or hierarchical government? or from that of the triumvirate which once existed at Rome, if only instead of a triumvirate it be called a tripersonate? And in such a government, what is easier than for the devil to put in practice the old maxim, *divide and govern*? that is, to distract men's minds and excite rebellious notions, sometimes against one God, and sometimes against another, as hath been his practice since the time of Arius to this day; and thus to thrust the Lord God the Saviour from His throne, 'who hath all power in heaven and in earth' (Matt. xxviii. 18), and to exalt some creature of his own in His place, and to enjoin men to worship him, or, when the folly of this is detected, to destroy the worship of the Lord Himself together with that of the imaginary idol."—*T. C. R.* 132.

* IV. *Justification by Faith alone.* "Swedenborg utterly discards the doctrine of *justification by faith alone without the deeds of the law*:—He rejects not only the perversions of the doctrine, but the doctrine itself—the doctrine taught in Scripture, and confirmed by the sober consideration of the most enlightened believers, that we are forgiven and saved, not for any works of righteousness which we have done, but by the grace of God through the blood of the cross; that we are justifi-

fied by faith through the mediation of Christ, who died for us, and bore our sins in his own body on the tree." In a subsequent paragraph you aim to cut off all retreat from the ground of the broadest denial of the doctrine in its truest forms.

"It may perhaps be said, that he meant only to discard the doctrine, that we are justified by a dead faith, a faith not productive of good works. But it is a sufficient reply to this, that he expressly discarded the doctrine of justification, *as held by Luther and the Reformed Churches*, and it is well known, and he ought to have known, that this was not the doctrine which they maintained. The doctrine which he opposed was the very doctrine which Paul taught, and which results from a just view of man's sinfulness, of the death of Christ, and of salvation by grace."—*p.* 124.

It is, with the receivers of Swedenborg, a matter of very small moment what Luther or the Reformed Churches may have held upon this or any other subject, when we have direct access to the fountain of truth, and are competent to judge for ourselves of its genuine teaching. Nor should we here feel at liberty, were we forced—as we are not—to acknowledge any conflict on this head between Paul and Christ, to postpone the authority of the former to that of the latter. We cannot consider ourselves precluded from the privilege and duty of viewing every Christian doctrine in the light of its own intrinsic nature, in its just relations to the attributes of God, and in its legitimate bearings on the principles of our moral being. In all these respects we are sure that the genuine doctrines taught by the Saviour of men will stand the most rigid ordeal to which they can be submitted, and they, of course, must be the standard to which every other enunciation, whether inspired or uninspired, is to be referred. As to Luther, the world is doubtless very much indebted to him for the noble stand which he took in opposition to the errors and corruptions of the Romish Church, but his determined purpose to break with that Church, and to erect an impassable barrier between Papist and Protestant, caused him to go, in one respect, too far. He might have performed an invaluable service to the truth by reforming the error of a Trinity of Divine *Persons*, which has poured a deluge of falsities over Christendom, but in an evil hour he proclaimed the doctrine of justification by faith alone, as the grand article of a standing or falling church, instead of that of three Essentials in the one Person of our Lord, and thus infixed a pernicious tenet in the very heart and core of Christianity. This will doubtless strike you as a very heavy and almost sacrilegious charge against the memory of a great and good man. But I abate nothing of the strength of the assertion. I cannot regard any *mere* man—any man left solely to his own resources—as infallible, and in the case of Luther and his Protestant followers, I scruple not to say that they have built their doctrine of Justification mainly on a single passage of Paul (Rom. iii. 28), and that too erroneously understood;—"Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Here it is taken for granted that the word "law" means the law of the Decalogue, the moral law, instead of the ceremonial law, or the Jewish religion in general, which is its frequent sense in his epistles. Again, it is assumed that "faith" imports the individual grace so named, instead of the *general Christian system*, which is named from one of its principal features. When he speaks of faith as one of the distinguishing graces of the individual Christian, he is very far from making it the whole groundwork of Justification. "Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." This surely has very

little the air of one who designs to teach that man is justified by faith alone. It is charity and not faith which constitutes the foundation of a justified state. Thus again elsewhere; "And now abideth faith, hope, and charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity." Here we have the apostle's expressly declared estimate of the comparative value of the individual graces of charity and faith. What can be plainer? And who can suppose that he ever thought of teaching, that man is to be justified by the single grace of faith, and nothing else? It is clear, moreover, that in making the apostle teach the exclusive pre-eminence of faith when he says, that "a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," it is strangely forgotten that the same apostle asserts, and in the same epistle, that "not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the *doers* of the law shall be justified." Does the apostle contradict himself? Or are we not forced rather to the inference, that there is something more requisite to constitute a justified state than mere faith? The truth is, we are, as we conceive, correctly taught that the distinction so studiously insisted upon in the Protestant creeds between *justification* and *sanctification* is little else than a theological fiction. We, at least, are unable to perceive any essential difference in the interior nature of the two. To *justify*, as ascribed to God, is to *make just*, to *sanctify* is to *make holy*. How does the *justice* or *righteousness* of a Christian differ from his *holiness*?

In all that we have above said respecting the teachings of Paul on this subject, we regard him as holding and inculcating a doctrine precisely in accordance with that of the Saviour himself. The tenor of His announcements uniformly is, that man is to be judged by the character of his *works*, and his *works* are the faithful index of his *life* or *love*, which if good is the very essence of *charity*. It is by this principle that he is saved, and by no other principle can he be justified than that by which he is saved. I adduce the following out of hundreds of passages speaking the same language.

"'EVERY TREE WHICH BRINGETH NOT FORTH GOOD FRUIT, is hewn down, and cast into the fire' (Matt. vii. 19, 20, 21). 'He that receiveth seed into the good ground, is he that heareth the Word, and understandeth it, WHICH ALSO BEARETH FRUIT, AND BRINGETH FORTH' (Matt. xiii. 9 to 23). 'Jesus said, My mother and My brethren are they which hear the Word of God, and do it' (Luke viii. 21). We know that God heareth not sinners, but if any man be a worshiper of God, and DOETH HIS WILL, him He heareth' (John ix. 31). 'If ye know these things, happy are ye IF YE DO THEM' (John xiii. 17). 'He that hath My commandments, and DOETH THEM, he it is that loveth Me, and I will love him, and will manifest Myself to him' (John xiv. 15 to 22). 'Herein is My Father glorified, THAT YE BEAR MUCH FRUIT' (John xv. 8. 16). 'Not the hearers of the law are just before God, BUT THE DOERS OF THE LAW' (Rom. ii. 13; James i. 22). 'God, in the day of wrath, and of just judgment, will render to every man ACCORDING TO HIS WORKS' (Rom. ii. 4, 6). 'For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive THE THINGS DONE IN HIS BODY, ACCORDING TO THAT HE HATH DONE, whether it be good or bad' (2. Cor. v. 10). 'The Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father, and then He shall reward every one ACCORDING TO HIS WORKS' (Matt. xvi. 27). 'I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and THEIR WORKS DO FOLLOW THEM' (Rev. xiv. 13). 'A book was opened, which is the book of life, and the dead were judged according to those things which were written in the books, ALL ACCORDING TO THEIR WORKS' (Rev. xx. 12). 'Behold, I come quickly, and My reward is with Me, to give every man ACCORDING TO HIS WORK' (Rev. xxii. 12). 'Jehovah, whose eyes are open upon all the ways of the sons of men, to give every one according to his ways, and ACCORDING TO THE FRUIT OF HIS DOINGS' (Jer. xxxii. 19). 'I will pun-

ish them for their ways, and VISIT UPON THEM FOR THEIR DOINGS' (Hosea iv. 9). 'According to our ways, and ACCORDING TO OUR DOINGS, so hath he dealt with us' (Zech. i. 6)."

What can be plainer from all this, than that a man's *works* or *doings*, the natural product and expression of his internal state as to love, are indispensable requisites in the article of Justification? Can it be for a moment supposed that judgment shall hereafter be regulated *according to man's works*, while those works have, at the same time, nothing in them to affect judgment, consequently neither to justify nor condemn? To *justify*, when spoken of a human judge, is to *pronounce just* in view of evidence. When spoken of God, who needs no evidence, but reads the heart, it denotes to *pronounce just on the ground of being made just*. It is with Him a judgment according to truth, and to suppose that all this proceeds simply on the naked ground of *faith* is to contravene the whole tenor of Scripture, as well as to set aside the clearest perceptions of the human mind. It is nothing short of the rankest Solifidianism—an error which has pervaded what are termed the *evangelical churches* to their very core, and is continually working out the most deplorable evils in legionary multitude. You will be at liberty to complain of this as an unjust and unchristian sentence when the *truth* of my position, theologically considered, is disproved.

Indeed I am forced for myself to believe that in the controversy between the Catholics and the Protestants on this doctrine of Justification, the advantage redounds beyond all question to the former. I speak of course of the Catholic doctrine as *theoretically* and not as *practically* held. The following contrasted view of the two schemes is taken from "Moebler's Symbolism." "The notions which the Protestants form of justification, is thus briefly defined in the Formulary of Concord: 'The word "justification" signifies, the declaring any one just, the acquitting him of sins, and the eternal chastisements of sin, on account of the justice of Christ which is by God imputed to faith; and it expressly says, our justice is not of us. With these declarations Calvin perfectly coincides. Justification, in the Protestant sense, is a judicial act of God, whereby the believing sinner is delivered from the punishments of sin, but not from sin itself: while Catholics teach that, on one hand, the remission of sin, the debt as well as the penalty, and on the other hand, positive sanctification, follows in a like way, through the divine act of justification. The great difference between the Confessions consists, accordingly, in this,—that, according to the Catholic doctrine, the justice of Christ, in the act of justification, is immediately appropriated by the believer, becoming part of his inward self, and changing his whole moral existence; while, according to the Protestant system, justice remains in Christ, passes not into the inward life of the believer, and remains in a purely outward relation to him; covering his injustice, not only past, but still outstanding, since by justification the will is not healed. We therefore may say, according to Catholic principles, Christ, by justification, stamps inwardly and outwardly his living impress on the believer; so that the latter, though a feeble and imperfect, becometh yet a real, copy of the type. On the other hand, according to the Protestant doctrine, Christ casts on the believer his shadow only, under which his continued sinfulness is merely not observed by God. Hence the explicit remark of the Formulary of Concord, that the faithful, on account of the obedience of Christ, are looked upon as just, although by vir-

tue of corrupt nature they be truly sinners, and remain such even unto death.'"
—*Mohler's Symbolism*, p. 194.

That Swedenborg's view of the doctrine is much more in accordance with the Catholic than the Protestant, is beyond question. If this fact shall of itself be deemed sufficient to condemn it, I am sure the sentence will be pronounced by men of narrow minds, who are incompetent to see *any* truth where they cannot but see a great deal of error.

One who has been conversant, as I have been, with the distinguishing doctrines termed *doctrines of grace*, among *evangelical* Christians, will of course anticipate the objection that will at once utter itself against what I have now advanced. It proceeds upon a total disregard of the great principle of Atonement by which the demands of the law were satisfied by the death, sufferings, and merit of Christ, and an everlasting righteousness by this means brought in, the imputation of which to the believer is the only possible ground of his Justification—an imputation which is received by faith alone, as otherwise it could not be of grace. This grand cardinal principle you understand Swedenborg as denying, and in this you are undoubtedly correct, as the system which he has propounded knows nothing of any such scheme of diplomatic redemption as shall save man by a putative transfer of moral character. It declares this scheme to be not only in the highest degree unscriptural and unreasonable, but intrinsically impossible. "That the merits of the Lord," says Swedenborg, "are imputed to men, which doctrine is maintained at the present day, is an entire impossibility; the merits of the Lord are in general two—first, that of having subjugated the hells, and second that it glorified His Humanity, or of having made it divine; these merits could not possibly be imputed to any man, for they are infinite and divine; but by them the Lord has acquired the power of saving all them who come unto Him, who address their worship and prayers to Him, and who examine themselves, and shun all evils they experience in themselves as sins against God." The doctrine of the New Church is, that "he that doeth righteousness is righteous." It sees no possibility of one's being saved by a righteousness which is merely *imputed* without being *appropriated*, nor can it conceive it of such appropriation by faith alone without the co-operation of love, and consequently it knows nothing of a justification in which *simple faith* is the only principle concerned. Still it acknowledges no *merit* in the act of *loving affiance* by which the soul cleaves to Christ as a Saviour. It is all the fruit of his abounding grace and goodness—all the result of his mediatorial life, sufferings, and death. If we believe, love, and obey, it is solely because we receive from Him the ability to do it. And is not this putting honor upon his offices and giving Him the full glory of our salvation? How otherwise shall we do it? If this view of the subject is deemed derogatory to anything He has wrought in our behalf, may I ask in what respect? As we are very tender upon the point of rendering all due honor and glory to our Divine Redeemer, we would fain be informed in what particular any one of our tenets comes short of it.

It would seem that you intended to utter a very emphatic condemnation of Swedenborg's teachings on this subject when you say, that "he expressly discarded the doctrine of Justification, as held by Luther and the Reformed Churches, and it is well known, and he ought to have known, that this was not the doctrine which they maintained." If you will read the treatise entitled "Brief Ex-

position," I think you will be forced to admit, that if there ever was a man who understood, to their minutest tittle, the peculiar and distinguishing doctrines of the Reformers on this subject, and the precise shades of their difference from the Romish formularies, that man was Swedenborg. The work in question is an elaborate *examen* of the precise points of difference between the Romish and Protestant symbols of faith, and for acute discrimination and masterly analysis, it is unrivalled. A body of flesh was never more skillfully dissected by the scalpel of the anatomist than is the body of divinity contained in these two creeds by the pen of our author. The conclusion to which he comes is thus stated, after quoting largely from the Augsburg Confession.

"What nation is there upon the face of the earth, possessed of religion and sound reason, that does not know and believe, that there is one God, and that to do evils is contrary to Him, and that to do good is well pleasing to Him, and that man must do this from his soul, from his heart, and from his strength, although it is by influx from God; and that herein consists religion? Who therefore does not see, that to confess three Persons in the Godhead, and to assert that in good works there is nothing of salvation, is to separate religion from the Church? Yet so it is asserted in these words, 'That faith justifies without good works,' 'that works are not necessary to salvation, nor to faith, because salvation and faith are neither preserved nor retained by good works,' consequently, that there is no bond of conjunction between faith and good works: it is indeed said afterwards, 'that good works nevertheless follow faith, as fruit is produced from a tree,' but then let us ask, who does them, nay, who thinks of them, or who is spontaneously led to perform them, while a person knows or believes that they do not at all contribute to salvation, and also, that no one can do any good thing towards salvation of himself, and so on? If it be alleged that the leaders of the church have still conjoined faith with good works, it may be said in reply, that this conjunction, when closely inspected, is not conjunction, but mere adjunction, and this only like a superfluous appendage, that neither coheres nor adheres in any other manner than as a dark background to a portrait which serves to set off the figure represented, and give it more the appearance of life: it may be said further, that inasmuch as religion has relation to life, and this consists in good works according to the truths of faith, it is evident that real religion is the portrait or figure represented of itself, and not the mere shady appendage; yea, that when good works are regarded as such an appendage, they must be reputed by many as of no more account than the tail of a horse, which, as contributing nothing to the horse's strength, may be cut off at pleasure. Who can rationally conclude otherwise, while he understands such expressions as these according to their obvious meaning: 'That it is a folly to imagine that the works of the second table of the Decalogue justify in the sight of God,' and these: 'That if any one believes he shall therefore obtain salvation, because he hath charity, he brings a reproach upon Christ;' as also these: 'That good works are utterly to be excluded, in treating of justification and eternal life;' with more to the same purpose? Who, therefore, when he reads afterwards, that good works necessarily follow faith, and that if they do not follow, the faith is a false and not a true faith, with more to the same purpose, attends to it? or if he attends to it, understands whether such good works are attended with any perception or consciousness? Yet good which proceeds from man without his having a perception or consciousness of it, has no more life in it than if it came from a statue. But if we inquire more deeply into the rise of this doctrine it will appear as though the leading Reformers first laid down faith alone as their rule, in order that they might be severed from the Roman Catholics, as mentioned above, and that afterwards they adjoined thereto the works of charity, that their system might not appear to contradict the Sacred Scriptures, but have the semblance of religion, and thus be saved over."—*Brief Expos.* p. 46.

The question now arises whether this is a just and true exhibition of the Protestant doctrine on this head. If not, in what respects is it erroneous? What is the real relation which works bear to faith in the matter of Justification? Do

works contribute *anything* towards placing the sinner in a justified state? If so, how is it that a man is justified by faith alone? If they are *not* brought into the account in this transaction, how has Swedenborg misrepresented the doctrine? And what am I to understand by the terms of your own explicit charge, that he “utterly discards the doctrine of justification *by faith alone without the deeds of the law*?” If you regard him as in error on this head, it can only be because you, at least, exclude everything but faith from the requisites to Justification. Is this the fact? Do you maintain that Charity, or works of charity, have absolutely nothing to do in the process by which a man is *declared to be just* in the sight of God? If not—if you contend for something more—what is it, and what is its precise relation to the justifying faith? What, moreover, do you mean by saying that the doctrine which Swedenborg discards is not the doctrine taught by Luther and the Reformers? Did not Luther deny that charity, or works of charity, had anything to do with a believer's Justification? Hear his own words. “Our papists and sophists have taught the like, to wit, that we should believe in Christ, and that faith was the ground-work of salvation; but, nevertheless, that this faith could not justify a man, unless it were the *fides formata*; that is to say, unless it first received its right form from charity. Now this is not the truth, but an idle, fictitious illusion, and a false, deceitful misrepresentation of the Gospel. On this account, what the senseless sophists have taught respecting the *fides formata*, that is to say, the faith which should receive its true form and shape from charity, is mere idle talk. For that faith alone justifies which apprehends Christ by the word of Scripture, and which adorns or decorates itself with Him, and *not the faith which embraces charity*.”—(*Works, Part 1, p. 47. Ed. Wittemberg.*) This is certainly very explicit, and much more of a like stamp could easily be drawn from the same source. I cannot but ask, then, how Swedenborg has misrepresented the doctrine, and if he has, what *is* the doctrine, in its true character, which is to be considered as adopted by the Protestant churches? I wish to know whether they adhere to the Augsburg Confession, the *Formula Concordiæ*, which teaches that good works, which are said freely and spontaneously to follow faith, and are called the fruits of faith, the works of the Spirit, and the works of grace, and which are performed in a state of justification, have no real connexion with faith, and accordingly do not contribute at all to salvation. Is it your belief that these works are merely the *signs and manifestations* of a justifying faith, but not entering at all into its essence and efficacy? I can truly say, that I am exceedingly anxious for light on this point, for in no department of Protestant Theology, excepting perhaps that of the Trinity, do I find myself so beset with mystery and confusion as in regard to the fundamental principle of a sinner's Justification. On the one hand, it is ascribed to faith to the exclusion of works, or of the moral element from which good works proceed; on the other, it is said it must not be a dead faith, or a faith not productive of such works. But a dead faith is not properly any faith at all, and no one supposes a man can be justified without a faith that is alive. But what is it that constitutes the life of faith—such a faith as actually produces Justification? Is it not love or charity, and is not this element to be taken into account in the justifying function of faith? * Is not its exclusion like ascribing a moral character to an act of the

* “That faith, separate from charity, is not faith, is because faith is the light of man's life, and charity is the heat of his life; wherefore, if charity is separated from faith, it

body with which the soul has nothing to do? What is a mere intellectual belief of the truth, however strong or confident, which is not pervaded and vitalised by the affection of love? And what a strange anomaly must it be in the Divine proceedings to account a man just in the absence of the only principle which can make him just?—to insist upon a faith which can only be a *living* because it is a *loving* faith, and yet exclude from consideration the very love which is its life? It must be confessed that we encounter a very strange theology in the accredited doctrine of Justification. While it is in one breath strenuously maintained that the faith which justifies must be *united with* charity and good works, or it is dead and worthless, yet in the next it is contended that these principles do not *conspire* to the result, but that it is effected by one of them singly, to the exclusion of the others! But look for a moment at the intrinsic necessity of the case. Man is composed of three grand constituent principles, viz. *Affection*, or a *Will-principle*, by which he can love God and his neighbor; *Understanding*, by which he can discern what the love of God and his neighbor requires of him; and *Operation* or *Action*, by which he can bring into outward effect what his will chooses and his understanding dictates. Now since these three parts or principles *together* constitute the man, and not any of them singly, or in separation from the others, therefore no man can be said to be *justified*, or *made just*, until he be renewed in all those several parts or principles of his constitution according to *justice*, that is to say, according to the pure love of God and his neighbor. This is the doctrine of Justification according to Swedenborg, for establishing which you intimate that he was driven to such straits of interpretation as to lay him under a kind of necessity of rejecting the Apostolic Epistles. “It is not difficult to see that he must have found many parts of the Acts and the Epistles very hard to be moulded according to his system. It must have been a severe and comfortless task for him, with all his learning, and with all the help he had from angels, to do away the doctrine of justification by faith from the writings of Paul, and the doctrine of the Atonement from the writings of Paul, Peter, and John. Indeed the Epistles generally, in their obvious meaning, are so much at variance with the scheme of Swedenborg, that he could not consistently do otherwise than reject them.”—p. 129. Again, “It is not strange that Swedenborg, with his view of the subject, and acting as he thought under a divine commission, should think unfavorably of the Apostolic Epistles, and exclude them from the word of God.”—p. 124.

Now granting this, for the sake of the argument, to be true, how far does it differ from the conduct of this same venerated Luther, whom you vaunt as the cham-

is as when heat is separated from light; thence the state of man becomes such as the state of the world is, in the time of winter, when all the things upon the earth die. Charity and faith, that charity may be charity, and faith may be faith, can no more be separated, than the will and the understanding; and if these are separated, the understanding becomes nothing, and presently also the will: the reason why it is similar with charity and faith, is, because charity resides in the will, and faith in the understanding. To separate charity from faith, is like separating essence from form: it is known, in the learned world, that essence without form and form without essence is not anything; for essence has no quality except from form, nor is form any subsisting entity, except from essence; consequently, there is not any predication concerning either, when separated from the other. Charity also is the essence of faith, and faith is the form of charity; just as it was said above, that good is the essence of truth, and truth the form of good. These two, namely, good and truth, are in each and everything that exists essentially.”
—T. C. R. 367.

pion of the true scriptural doctrine, in question? In the *Prolegomena* to Wets-
 tein's edition of the Greek Testament you find him cited as using the following
 language :—"I do not wish to force my opinion on others, but I must say, that
 I do not think the Epistle of James to be an Apostolic writing, chiefly for this
 reason, that in direct contradiction to Paul and the whole of the Scriptures, he
 attributes justification to works. Besides, that James makes such a jumble and
 confused mixture of all that he treats upon, that I look upon him to have been
 some good simple soul, who merely committed to paper some sayings he caught
 hold of from some of the disciples of the Apostles."* Is not this at least some-
 what of a parallel to the alledged audacity of Swedenborg in ostracising certain
 books of the Bible? He, however, is under no necessity of giving up Paul in
 order to establish a view of Justification which he finds set forth in the whole
 tenor of the teachings of Christ and of the Sacred Writings at large. But I ex-
 piate no further upon the subject at present. When you or any other defender
 of the current doctrine shall see fit to state *distinctly* what you believe and what
 you do not believe respecting it, I shall hope to gain the information which will
 enable me to discuss the theme more *in extenso*. Meantime I will conclude
 this article by adducing two of the Memorable Relations, the one setting forth,
 in strong, indeed, but I think, true colors, the prevalence and pre-eminence of
 the Solifidian doctrine in the Reformed Churches, and the other an attempted
 explanation of the *act* of justifying faith. You will, of course, exercise your own
 judgment as to the credibility of the matter of fact affirmed in regard to the oc-
 currence of such a conversation in the other world. The essential question is
 in respect to the *intrinsic truth* of what is conveyed in the relation. This can
 be viewed independently of everything about it that you would probably term
visionary costume.

"What a desolation of truth and theological leanness there are at this day in
 the Christian world, was made known to me from conversing with many of the
 laity and with many of the clergy in the spiritual world. With the latter there is
 such a spiritual indigence, that they scarcely know anything else than that there is
 a Trinity—the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; and that faith alone saves; and con-
 cerning the Lord Christ, only the historical things concerning Him in the Evange-
 lists; but as to the other things which the Word of both Testaments teaches con-
 cerning Him, as that the Father and He are one; that He is in the Father and the
 Father in Him; that He has all power in heaven and in earth; that it is the will
 of the Father that they should believe in the Son, and that he that believeth in
 Him hath eternal life, besides many other things; these are as unknown and as
 hidden from them as those things which are at the bottom of the ocean; yea, as
 those which lie in the centre of the earth; and when those things are produced
 from the Word and read, they stand as if they heard and did not hear; and they
 enter into their ears no deeper than the whistling of the wind, or the beating of a
 drum. The angels, who are at times sent forth by the Lord to visit the Christian
 societies which are in the world of spirits, thus under heaven, lament exceed-
 ingly, saying, 'That there is almost as much dulness, and thence darkness, in
 the things of salvation, as in a speaking parrot; they say also that the learned
 among them understand, in spiritual and divine things, no more than statues.
 An angel once related to me the conversation which he had with two of the
 clergy, one who was in faith separate from charity, another who was in faith
 not separate. With the one who was in faith separate from charity he spoke

* I am aware it is said that Luther retracted this opinion at a later period, but as I
 have never seen the passage of his works which asserts it, and know not upon what
 authority the intimation rests, I cite the above with the expression of my entire willing-
 ness to give him the benefit of any such retraction when the proof of it shall be adduced.

thus: 'Friend, who are you?' He replied, 'I am a Reformed Christian.' 'What is your doctrine, and thence religion?' He replied, 'It is faith.' He said, 'What is your faith?' He replied, 'My faith is, that God the Father sent the Son to take upon Him the damnation of the human race, and that we are saved by that.' He then questioned him, by saying, 'What more do you know concerning salvation?' He replied, 'Salvation is effected by faith alone.' He said, further, 'What do you know concerning redemption?' He replied, 'It was made by the passion of the cross, and the merit of it is imputed by means of that faith.' Again, 'What do you know concerning regeneration?' He answered, 'It is effected by that faith.' 'Tell what you know concerning love and charity.' He replied, 'They are that faith.' 'Tell what you think concerning the precepts of the decalogue, and concerning the other things in the Word.' He replied, 'They are in that faith.' Then he said, 'You will therefore do nothing.' He replied, 'What shall I do? I cannot do good, which is good, from myself.' He said, 'Can you have faith from yourself?' He replied, 'I do not inquire into this, I shall have faith.' At length he said, 'Do you know anything at all more concerning salvation?' He replied, 'What more, since salvation is by that faith alone?' But then the angel said, 'You answer like one who plays with one note of a harp; I hear nothing but faith; if you know that, and do not know anything besides, you know nothing. Go and see your companions.' He went and found them in a desert, where there was no grass, and he asked why it was so; and it was said, 'Because they have nothing of the church.'

"With him who was in faith conjoined to charity, the angel spoke thus: 'Friend, who are you?' He replied, 'I am a Reformed Christian.' 'What is your doctrine, and thence religion?' He replied, 'Faith and charity.' He said, 'These are two things.' He replied, 'They cannot be separated.' He said, 'What is faith?' He replied, 'To believe what the Word teaches.' He said, 'What is charity?' He answered, 'To do what the Word teaches.' He said, 'Have you only believed those things, or have you also done them?' He replied, 'I have also done them.' The angel of heaven then looked at him and said, 'My friend, come with me and dwell with us.'—*T. C. R.* 391.

"I once heard a noise as of two mill-stones rubbing against each other. I went to the sound, and it ceased; and I saw a narrow gate leading obliquely downwards to a certain vaulted house, in which were many chambers, in which were little cells, in each of which sat two persons, who were collecting from the Word confirmations in favor of justification by faith alone: one was collecting and the other was writing, and this by turns. I went up to one cell, which was near the door, and asked, 'What are you collecting and writing?' They said, 'Concerning THE ACT OF JUSTIFICATION, OR CONCERNING FAITH IN ACT, which is itself justifying, vivifying and saving faith, and the head of the doctrines of the church in our Christendom.' And then I said to him, 'Tell me some sign of that act, when that faith is introduced into the heart and into the soul of man.' He replied, 'The sign of that act is in the moment when a man is pierced with anguish on account of his condemnation, and when, in that contrition, he thinks of Christ, that He took away the condemnation of the law, and lays hold of this his merit with confidence, and with this in his thought goes to God the Father and prays.' Then said I, 'Thus the act is made, and this is the moment.' And I asked, 'How shall I comprehend what is said concerning this act, that man contributes nothing towards it, any more than he would if he were a stock or a stone; and that man, as to that act, has no power to begin, will, understand, think, operate, co-operate, apply and accommodate himself? Tell me how this coheres with what you said, that the act then happens, when man is thinking concerning the justice of the law, concerning its condemnation removed by Christ, concerning the confidence in which he lays hold of this his merit, and in thought concerning this goes to God the Father and prays. Are not all these things done by man?' But he said, 'They are not done by man actively, but passively.' And I replied, 'How can any one think, have confidence, and pray passively? Take away from man what is active and co-operative, then do you not also take away what is receptive, thus all, and with all the act itself? What then does your act become, but purely ideal, which is called an imaginary entity? I hope that you do not believe, with some, that such act, is given only with the

predestinated who know nothing at all about the infusion of faith into themselves. These can play at dice, and thereby inquire whether faith has been infused into them, or not. Wherefore, my friend, believe that man, as to charity and faith, operates of himself from the Lord, and that without this operation, your act of faith, which you called the head of all the doctrines of the church in Christendom, is nothing else than the statue of Lot's wife, tinkling from mere salt, when touched with a scribe's pen, or his finger nail (Luke xvii. 32). This I said, because you make yourselves, as to that act, similar to statues.' When I had said this, he took a candlestick, intending to throw it with all his might into my face, and the candle then suddenly being extinguished, he threw it at the forehead of his companion."—*Id.* 505.

V. *Human Depravity*.—"He rejects the doctrine of human depravity, as commonly understood. He does indeed assert that there is nothing but evil in man from his birth; that his proprium, or selfhood, as he calls it, is evil and only evil. But he does not regard this evil as belonging to man himself, so as to render him personally sinful and ill-deserving. So far as I have been able to understand him, without coming into the clear light of the New Jerusalem Church, he holds that man in himself, originally and afterwards, is a mere recipient, and that the evils found in him, come from evil spirits, and consist of the influxes which these spirits inject into his mind. True, man has influxes also from good spirits, and he has a will to choose between the good and bad influxes, and to determine which he will receive;—a little like Coleridge's notion, who holds something like this, that original sin comes to the mind of man at the beginning of his existence, and offers itself to him, and that he then wills whether to admit or reject it; though, mysterious as it is, the will always goes one way, and that the wrong way. According to Swedenborg, it is the great, leading fact in the history of man on earth, that angels, good and bad, are constantly making influxes into his mind, the influxes of good angels exciting good thoughts and desires, and leading to the truths of faith and the goods of charity, while the influxes of bad angels lead to falses and evil affections. And this process, this strife of good and evil angels, with their different influxes, continues not only through the present life, but for a long time in the future world, until men, during that second probation, are confirmed either in the truths of faith and the goods of charity, or in the contrary; when they go to heaven or to hell according to their respective loves. After this, those who are confirmed in good, have influxes only from good angels; and they themselves are angels, and are much employed in making influxes into the interiors of other angels, and thus their good influxes are reciprocal. These reciprocal influxes constitute a most important part of the employments of the ever active spirits in heaven; while the counterpart of all this goes on in hell; for wicked men there become evil angels or devils, and while they receive evil influxes from other devils, they impart the same to them."—*p.* 125-6.

All this is presented without the least attempt to point out its errors or fallacies, evidently under the impression that it would be intuitively seen to be false, because differing, in some way, from the prevailing creed respecting the innate depravity of man. Without any purpose of denying that there is a real and important diversity in the two classes of views on this subject, I must still be permitted to say that had you come a little more fully "into the clear light of the New Jerusalem," you would have given a very different representation of Swedenborg's doctrine on this head. "He does indeed assert that there is nothing

but evil in man from his birth; that his *proprium*, or selfhood, as he calls it, is evil, and only evil. But he does not regard this evil as belonging to man himself, so as to render him personally evil and ill-deserving." And where, pray, did you learn this? I am somewhat conversant with Swedenborg's writings, and I can safely say that I have never met with a sentence having the slightest approximation to such a sentiment as you have here ascribed to him. The influx and operation of spirits upon the minds of men he does indeed assert in the most unequivocal terms, but he never intimates that this influence interferes with man's moral freedom so as to exempt him from personal responsibility, or to take away his sinfulness and ill-desert? Why should it, any more than the suggestions and temptations of his fellow-men on earth? If one man can work upon and inflame the concupiscences of another, and thus entice him to sin without invading his moral freedom, why may not the same thing be done by spirits who have more immediate access to his interior affections and promptings? Indeed with a strange kind of *consistency* you have expressly acknowledged this, for you say that according to him, though man in himself is "a mere recipient, and the evils found in him come from evil spirits and consist of the influxes which these spirits inject into his mind, yet he has influxes also from good spirits, and a will to choose between the good and bad influxes, and to determine which he will receive." And I would fain inquire whether you do not believe this also? Is your edition of the Bible lacking in those numerous intimations of angelic and diabolical suggestion, which pious people have always been in the habit of reading in it? And have they ever supposed that these spiritual influences barred the fact of their evils "belonging to themselves and rendering them personally sinful and ill-deserving?" It must certainly be admitted to be a novel mode of controverting certain religious doctrines, to urge against them, as objections, tenets which the objector himself fully admits in his own system. If you deny the fact of such admission, you will of course be free to say so; but if you concede it, you will be bound, I conceive, to state precisely in what respects your ideas of angelic and satanic agency differ from those presented by Swedenborg. That you may know precisely what he teaches on this head, I will adduce a few extracts. They naturally arrange themselves, in reference to your remarks, under heads, showing, (1) that man's *proprium*, or selfhood, is altogether evil and depraved, and how this is inherited; (2) that man is continually operated upon by influxes from both good and evil spirits; and (3) that this fact does not at all do away his freedom as a moral agent.

I. "Nothing evil and false exists which is not *proprium*, and derived from *proprium*; for man's *proprium* is essential evil, in consequence whereof man is nothing but what is evil and false; this was made clear to me from this circumstance, that when the *propriums* are rendered visible in the world of spirits, they appear so deformed, that it is impossible to paint anything more so, yet with a diversity according to the nature of the *proprium*; this deformity is so striking, that he who seeth his own *proprium* is struck with horror at himself, and wisheth to fly from himself as from a devil."—A. C. 154.

"It has been shown me by lively experience, that a man and a spirit, yea, an angel, considered in himself, that is, all his *proprium*, is the vilest of all, and that left to himself he would breathe nothing but hatred, revenge, cruelty, and the most foul adulteries; these things are his *proprium*, and his will. This may appear to every reflecting person only from this, that man when he is born, is

the vilest living thing amongst all wild beasts; and when he grows up, and is left to his own government, unless he were prevented by external restraints, which are of the law, and by restraints which he lays upon himself in order to be the greatest and richest, he would rush headlong into all wickedness, and would not rest until he had subdued all in the universe, and had amassed to himself the wealth of all, nor would he spare any but those who submitted themselves as vile slaves. Such is the nature of every man, though he does not perceive it by reason of his inability to accomplish his evil purposes, and of the impossibility of their accomplishment; nevertheless, if he had ability, and possibility, and all restraints were removed, he would rush headlong as far as he had power. Beasts are not at all such; they are born to a certain order of nature; such as are wild and rapacious commit violence on others, but it is only for the sake of preserving themselves; and that they devour others, to appease hunger, which being appeased, they cease to do harm: but it is altogether otherwise with man. Hence it appears what the proprium of man is, and what is his will. Man then being such and so great evil and pollution, it is evident that he can never of himself have dominion over evil: it is altogether a contradiction to suppose that evil can have dominion over evil, and not only over evil, but also over hell, for every man has communication with hell by means of evil spirits, whereby the evil which is in him is excited: from these considerations every one may know, and he who is of a sound mind may conclude, that it is the Lord alone who has dominion over evil in man, and over hell which is with man. That evil may be subdued in man, that is, hell, which is every moment attempting to rush in upon man, and to destroy him eternally, man is regenerated by the Lord, and is gifted with a new will, which is conscience, by which the Lord alone operates all that is good. These things are of faith, viz., that man is nothing else but evil; and that all good is from the Lord; wherefore man ought not only to know, but also to acknowledge and believe them: if he does not acknowledge and believe them in the life of the body, in another life it is shown him by living evidence."—*A. C.* 987.

"I have discoursed with the angels concerning infants, whether they are pure from evils, inasmuch as they have committed no actual evil, like the adult; but it was said to me, that they are alike in evil, yea, that they are nothing but evil; nevertheless that they, like all the angels, are withheld from evil, and preserved in good by the Lord, and this in such a sort, that it appears to them as if they were in good from themselves; wherefore also infants, after that they become adult in heaven, lest they should be in this false opinion concerning themselves, that the good with them is from them, and not from the Lord, are remitted at times into their own evils, which they have received hereditarily, and are left therein, until they know, acknowledge, and believe that the case is so. That infants, when grown adult, are remitted into the state of their hereditary evil, is not that they may suffer punishment, but it is in order to convince them, that of themselves they are nothing but evil, and that by the Lord's mercy they are raised out of hell, which is with them, into heaven, and that they are not in heaven from their own merit, but from the Lord; and thus to prevent their boasting themselves before others, for the good which they possess; for this is contrary to the good of mutual love, as it is contrary to the truth of faith."—*A. C.* 2307-8.

"Every actual evil in parents assumes an appearance of nature, and when it often recurs, it becomes natural, and is added to what was hereditary, and is transplanted into their children, and thus into their posterity, so that there is an immense increase of hereditary evil in succeeding generations; and this every one may know from the evil dispositions of children being like their parents, and forefathers. It is a most false idea to suppose with some, there is no hereditary evil but what was implanted, and as they say, by Adam; when yet every particular person, by his own actual sins, causes hereditary evil, and makes an addition to what he received from his parents, and thus accumulates what remains in all his posterity; nor does this suffer any check, except in those who are regenerated by the Lord. This is the primary cause that every church degenerates; so also with the Most Ancient Church."—*A. C.* 494.

“Every man is born of his parents into the evils of the love of self and of the world: every evil, which by habit as it were hath contracted a nature, is derived into the offspring; thus successively from parents, from grandfathers, and from great-grand-fathers, in a long series backwards: hence the derivation of evil is at length become so great, that the all of man's proper life is nothing else but evil. This continued derived evil is not broken and altered except by the life of faith and charity from the Lord. Man continually inclines and lapses into what he derives hereditarily from his parents: hence he confirms with himself that evil, and also of himself superadds more evils. These evils are altogether contrary to spiritual life, they destroy it; wherefore unless man, as to spiritual life, is by the Lord conceived anew, born anew, and educated anew, that is, is created anew, he is damned, for he wills nothing else, and hence thinks nothing else, but what is of hell.”—A. C. 8550-52.

It would seem from the above that the *fact* of a deep, desperate, and universal depravity is held as strongly by Swedenborg as by Edwards himself, or any other Calvinist, divine who has written on the subject. I do not see that he can be regarded as coming short of the most stringent demands of orthodoxy on this head, unless perchance there should be something in the *manner* of his holding the doctrine which goes to nullify the legitimate import of the admissions now made. If this is alleged, it must be upon the ground of what he says concerning the influxes from the spiritual world. The testimony on this score is so immensely voluminous in his writings that I scarcely know how to make the most apposite selections. The following however may serve as a specimen.

II. “It is known in the church, that all good is from God, and none from man, and that therefore no one ought to ascribe any good to himself as his own; and it is also known that evil is from the devil: hence it is, that those who speak from the doctrine of the church, say of those who act well, and also of those who speak and preach piously, that they are led by God; but the contrary of those who act ill and speak impiously. These things cannot be so, unless there be to man conjunction with heaven and conjunction with hell, and unless those conjunctions be with his will and with his understanding; for from these the body acts and the mouth speaks. What that conjunction is, shall now be told. With every man there are good spirits and evil spirits; by good spirits man has conjunction with heaven, and by evil spirits with hell. Those spirits, when they come to a man, enter into all his memory, and thence into all his thought; evil spirits into those things of the memory and thought which are evil, but good spirits into those things of the memory and thought which are good. That there is such conjunction of spirits with man, has been made known to me from the continual experience of several years, so that nothing is better known. What the communication of heaven with good spirits is, and what the communication of hell with evil spirits is, and thence what the conjunction of heaven and hell with man is, shall also be told. All the spirits, who are in the world of spirits, have communication with heaven or with hell; the evil with hell, and the good with heaven. Heaven is distinguished into societies; in like manner hell. Every spirit belongs to some society, and also subsists by influx thence; thus he acts as one with it. Hence it is, that as man is conjoined with spirits, so he is conjoined with heaven or with hell, and indeed with that society there in which he is as to his affection, or as to his love; for all the societies of heaven are distinct, according to the affections of good and of truth, and all the societies of hell according to the affections of what is evil and false.

“Such spirits are adjoined to man as he himself is as to affection or as to love; but good spirits are adjoined to him by the Lord, whereas evil spirits are invited by the man himself: but the spirits with man are changed according to the changes of his affections: thence some spirits are with him in infancy, others in childhood, others in youth and manhood, and others in old age. In infancy spirits are present who are in innocence, thus who communicate with the heaven of innocence, which is the inmost or third heaven; in childhood are present spirits who are in the affection of knowing, thus who communicate

with the ultimate or first heaven; in youth and manhood are present spirits who are in the affection of truth and good, and thence in intelligence, thus who communicate with the second or middle heaven; but in old age, spirits are present who are in wisdom and innocence, thus who communicate with the inmost or third heaven. But this adjunction is effected by the Lord with those who can be reformed and regenerated. The case is otherwise with those who cannot be reformed and regenerated: to these also good spirits are adjoined, that by them they may be withheld from evil as much as possible; but their immediate conjunction is with evil spirits, who communicate with hell, whence they have such spirits as the men themselves are. If they be lovers of themselves, or lovers of gain, or lovers of revenge, or lovers of adultery, similar spirits are present, and as it were dwell in their evil affections; and as far as man cannot be kept from evil by good spirits, so far these evil spirits inflame him; and as far as the affection reigns, so far they adhere and do not recede. Thus a bad man is conjoined to hell, and a good man is conjoined to heaven."—*H. & H.* 291–295.

This then is Swedenborg's doctrine of angelic and diabolic influx, and the question at once occurs whether his teachings on this head represent man as a "mere recipient" to such a degree as to take away his freedom as a moral agent and to prevent our regarding him as "personally sinful and ill-deserving." Out of scores of paragraphs of similar purport I adduce the following.

III. "The Lord through the angels could lead man into good ends by omnipotent might; but this would be to take life away from him, for his life is a life of loves altogether contrary to such ends. Wherefore the divine law is inviolable, that man shall be in freedom, and that good and truth, or charity and faith, shall be implanted in his free state, and in no case in a forced state; for what is received in a forced state, does not remain, but is dissipated. For to force man, is not to insinuate into his will [*velle*], inasmuch as it is the will of another, from which he then would act, and therefore when he returns to his own will, that is, to his freedom, what had been insinuated is extirpated. On this account the Lord rules man by his freedom, and as far as possible withholds him from the freedom of thinking and willing evil; for man, unless he was withheld by the Lord, would continually precipitate himself into the deepest hell. It was said, that the Lord through the angels could lead man into good ends by omnipotent might, for evil spirits may in an instant be driven away, even if myriads of them should encompass man, and this by one angel; but then man would come into such torture, and into such a hell, as he could by no means sustain, since he would be miserably deprived of his life. For the life of man is from lusts and fantasies contrary to good and truth, and unless this life were supported by evil spirits, and were thus amended, or at least guided, he would not survive a single moment, for nothing else has place in him but the love of self and of gain, and of reputation for the sake of self and gain, thus whatsoever is contrary to order; wherefore unless he were to be reduced into order moderately, and by degrees, by the guidance of his freedom, he would instantly expire."—*A. C.* 5854.

"Man, so far as he partakes of what is hereditary and thence of self, would have no life, if he were not allowed to be in evil, and none also, if he were not in freedom; and moreover, that he cannot be forced to good, and that which is forced does not adhere; as also that the good which man receives in freedom, is implanted in his will, and becomes as his own; and that hence it is that man has communication with hell, and communication with heaven."—*H. & H.* 293.

You have now the data before you on which to judge how far the doctrine of *human depravity*, as you understand it to be taught in the Scriptures, is denied by Swedenborg—consequently how far it is justly subject to the odium which your remarks are calculated to draw upon it, unaccompanied as they are with any intimations of what you conceive the real doctrine to be, or, in other words, of what he *ought* to teach on this subject in order to be consistent with truth. He certainly holds that man is by nature altogether evil and depraved, and this I

presume you also hold. He holds too that man is continually subject to infernal and celestial influxes, in which I cannot doubt that you agree with him, if you take the Scriptures as the rule of doctrine on this head. He maintains moreover that man is under no absolute compulsion as to yielding to those influences, and therefore still remains a free moral agent and of course "personally sinful and ill-deserving" as far as he complies with the promptings of evil spirits and resists those of the good. Do you not maintain the same? If you still object that there is some flaw in his reasonings on this topic, I would respectfully suggest whether it be not in some point on which your own system is equally assailable. Does not the following extract disclose the real *nodus* in the whole matter, and have you any conclusion on this head different from his?

"He who desires to investigate only the hidden things of nature, which are innumerable, with difficulty discovers a single one, and in the course of his investigation is liable to fall into many errors, as experience teaches; and how much more likely is this to be the case, in investigating the hidden things of spiritual and celestial life, where myriads of mysteries exist for one that is to be found in invisible nature! For the sake of illustrating this point, let us take the following instance; man of himself cannot do otherwise than commit evil, and turn himself away from the Lord; yet it is not man who does this, but the evil spirits who are attendant on him; nor do the evil spirits do it, but the evil itself which they have appropriated to themselves; nevertheless man does evil, and turns himself away from the Lord, and is in fault; and yet he does not live but from the Lord. So on the other hand, man of himself cannot possibly do good, and turn himself to the Lord, but by the angels; nor can the angels do this, but the Lord alone; and yet man may as of himself do good, and turn himself to the Lord: that this is really the case, neither the senses, nor science, nor philosophy can conceive, or apprehend, and therefore if they are consulted as to the truth of such propositions, they reject and deny them, when nevertheless in themselves they are most true; and thus it is also in all other cases respecting things spiritual and celestial."—A. C. 233.

The grand problems connected with this subject do undoubtedly resolve themselves at last into the *mystery of dependent life*, and although Swedenborg's disclosures lay open a world of wisdom on this theme, I cannot now enlarge upon it. If, however, you will take any of his Indexes and turning to the article *Life*, consult the references, I shall be greatly mistaken if you do not find there a depth of philosophy on that matter such as you have never met elsewhere.

VI. *Predestination*.—"The doctrine of *predestination*, as held by the Reformed Churches, is clearly demonstrable by reason, and is fully taught in the Scriptures, particularly in that part of the New Testament which Swedenborg discards. This doctrine both he and his angels grossly misrepresent, much in the manner of Tomline and Whitby, and the most violent cavillers among the Unitarians and Arminians. According to him, it implies that we have no agency in spiritual things; that man is like a stock, and is converted as inanimate, and that afterwards he does not know whether he be a stock vivified by grace, or not." Permit me here to remark, that the advocates of Swedenborg's doctrines are often thrown by their opponents into a position which is embarrassing because it is in fact a *false position*—one to which they are reduced solely by the most unjust arts of controversy. They are called upon to defend a system which is charged with contravening certain doctrines that are claimed to be the doctrines taught by the Reformers and held by what are termed *evangelical churches*. Still no reference is made to any authentic *standard* of these doctrines. We are nowhere

instructed as to what is the genuine and accredited form in which they are pronounced—no affirmative statement is given of the sense in which the tenet is, or is not, to be understood by its espousers. In a word, we are left in the dark as to what the *real doctrine* is which is said to be impugned by the contrary doctrine of Swedenborg. If we turn to the Westminster Confession or Catechism, or any one of the established formularies of faith, we are met upon the threshold by the reply that that is not the form of the doctrine which the objector holds himself pledged to defend. And so let us seek it where we will, it still eludes our grasp. It assumes a thousand Protean forms. Our enemy does not meet us in the open field or in his own proper person, but hurls his missiles from behind the trees. We know not where to look for him. In the mean time the vague general charge is producing its effect in creating odium. The honest and simple-minded reader is horrified at the idea of the venerable dogmas of his church being rudely assailed, not dreaming probably that these very dogmas have been again and again called in question by multitudes who yet profess to receive them, but who feel at liberty to interpret them in a sense quite different from that which they bear on their face.

Thus in regard to the present point—that of *predestination*, by which I suppose you intend what is generally understood by the doctrine of the *divine sovereignty* in the salvation of men. You leave me wholly unresolved as to what you understand to be the genuine doctrine of the Word on that subject, or where I am to seek for an accredited exposition of it. There is a tremendous heresy somewhere, but what it is I am left to guess. You virtually charge Swedenborg with misrepresenting the doctrine, because “according to him it implies, that we have no agency in spiritual things; that man is like a stock, and is converted as inanimate.” Now I must confess for myself, that, taking the tenet as it seems generally to be apprehended and set forth, I am unable to see why the implication alleged is not well founded, with the abatement that by “no agency in spiritual things” is to be fairly understood no active agency in the particular matter of which he is treating—the conversion of the soul to God. If I understand the commonly received doctrine it is, that God, for infinitely wise reasons existing in his own mind, determined from eternity, by a decree of election, to save a certain specific number of the human race in virtue of the atoning work of Christ, and that too wholly irrespective of their own prior merits or demerits; and in this consists essentially the *sovereignty* of the saving purpose. These persons are brought successively into being, and by the peculiar orderings of Divine Providence are brought under a system of means and influences, which, though well adapted in their own nature to work efficaciously on their hearts and to result in their renewal, are yet in themselves powerless to produce that issue without the special putting forth of an act of the divine power, which shall quicken them from the death of trespasses and sins into newness of life. This is held to be an instantaneous act, though usually, perhaps always, preceded by a series of mental exercises, more or less distressing, termed *convictions*, but which have not in their own nature any intrinsic efficacy to work the requisite change, and to translate the soul from darkness into light. In this emergency the Omnipotence of grace interposes, and, in compliance with the eternal decree of election, by the infusion of a principle of divine life enables the trembling sinner to avail himself of the provided remedy and to believe to the saving of

his soul. In all this process there is indeed involved the agency of *truth* as an instrumental means to the designed end; but still in the very act and article of being born again the soul is necessarily passive, and believes and loves simply because it is enabled to do so in consequence of the present transforming influence of the Holy Spirit which makes the man a new creature in Christ Jesus. In virtue of this process all boasting on the part of man is excluded, and a ground laid for the ascription of all the glory of his salvation to the gratuitous mercy of God in Christ Jesus, and the top stone in the fabric of his praise, is laid with crying, "Grace, grace, unto it."

This, I believe, is a fair exhibition of the orthodox doctrine on this head, and I am wholly at a loss to perceive in what respect injustice is done to it by the use of language implying the utmost degree of *passivity* in the subject *at the moment of the transition*, and this moment is the hinge on which his eternal destiny turns. The doctrine certainly holds that the sinner, up to the instant of the change, is spiritually dead, and from the instant of the change, is spiritually alive; there can be, on this view, no medium between death and life. The change too is wrought by a power entirely *ab extra* to the soul itself. It is the direct act of Omnipotence. Must not the soul, then, be passive in the true regenerating process? Regeneration is on this view *re-birth*, and what active agency has the soul in this process more than the infant has in the process of natural birth? I am well aware of the various refinements which theologians have spun and woven in regard to this subject, and by which they would fain escape the conclusion of this entire and absolute *passivity* in the act of the soul's being born again, but "to this complexion it comes at last." If the subject of the work is at one moment spiritually dead, and the next spiritually alive, and the quickening has been effected by the power of God and not by the free agency of man, then I would respectfully inquire in what particular Swedenborg has misrepresented the doctrine, when he says that man in this matter is "like a stock and is converted as inanimate?" The question, you will observe, is not whether the doctrine is theologically true or false. It is simply whether he has given an unfair and distorted account of it. Of this let the candid and intelligent judge. I have very little doubt as to the verdict. The point is so palpably obvious in itself, that the infusion of divine life into a soul spiritually dead is effected without any real co-operation on the part of the subject, that there is no possibility of questioning it, nor do I anticipate from yourself the least gainsaying on this head. On the contrary, what I anticipate is the direct interrogatory, "If the fact be not so, how is it? To what is man's regeneration owing if not to the mighty power of God immediately and sovereignly exerted, and how can this be but in accomplishment of a previous *purpose* to that effect, or, in other words, in consequence of an eternal decree of election, which is but another name for the doctrine of predestination?"

This is a fair question, and though my contracted limits will prevent my doing any but a very partial justice to the subject, I will still endeavor to present Swedenborg's teachings on this point in such a light that, whether or not they shall carry with them a constraining evidence of truth, they shall at least appear in very marked contrast with the established tenet, and may possibly also produce the conviction that what he says of the *internal state* of the members of the Synod of Dort is not so very far from the truth.

And first as to *Predestination*; so far as this doctrine coincides with the doctrine of a universal Providence acting by specific means, in accordance with the moral freedom of creatures, and with a view to eternal ends of Love and Mercy, Swedenborg instead of rejecting, unequivocally asserts it, and his elaborate treatise on "Divine Providence," of which you speak respectfully, abounds in illustrations of it. But so far as the term is employed in a technical theological sense, implying the selection, by a fixed and arbitrary decree, of a certain portion of the human race, as the subjects of salvation to the exclusion or preterition of the rest, he does indeed most emphatically discard it, as I think every one will who allows himself to reflect calmly upon the subject, and who ventures to ask himself the question, whether he can conceive the possibility of the existence, in the Divine mind, of any reasons consistent with his perfections, which should have dictated the purpose to save a part of a fallen race on the bare ground of election, when they were all in *precisely the same circumstances*, and the value of one soul, in view of its stupendous destiny, as great as that of another. I am unable to perceive, for myself, any possible way of reconciling this with the promptings which would naturally move the infinite Benevolence, on the same principles on which it could determine to save a part, to save the whole. By the very supposition, there could be no greater intrinsic obstacle to be overcome in the recovery of the whole than in that of a part. Why then should not the purpose of salvation comprise the whole? The opposite view involves the necessity of ascribing to the Most High a *partiality* which, on the ground assumed, is wholly repugnant, not only to our instinctive, but to our most enlightened, notions of the divine attributes.

I cannot, of course, be ignorant of the reply which will naturally be made to this, viz. that inasmuch as the *fact* is indisputable that a part only of the race are saved, and as they are saved by omnipotent grace, which cannot be supposed to act without a previous purpose, we are therefore shut up to the conclusion of such a purpose, and this purpose can only be regarded as eternal, and if eternal, therefore sovereign. To this I answer, that the proposed solution of the problem inevitably necessitates the consequence, that man is *absolutely passive* in the turning point from death to life, as much so as a stock or a statue, and therefore what Swedenborg has said of the doctrine in that respect is demonstratively confirmed. Are you willing to admit this? But suppose a man to be saved on this principle—suppose he finds himself in heaven, as heaven is commonly conceived, in virtue solely of a sovereign act of grace—though he may be constrained to acknowledge a discriminating mercy in his own happy lot, yet will it be no diminution of his bliss to think that he is there, while thousands of others, of equal claims with himself—that is, of none at all—are left to perish? With his mind enlarged to apprehend more fully the genius of the divine counsels which have secured his salvation, will not the thought that this amazing weight of glory is the result of a purely *arbitrary decree* of Jehovah send an inward chill upon the fervor of his grateful praise? Can the highest raptures imparted by the effluence of the divine Love to his soul, obscure his perceptions of the demands of the divine Wisdom, or blind him to the fact that that Love has wrought its issues in his behalf at the expense of Wisdom? For what idea can he have of a Wisdom which does not act from adequate Reasons? But what Reasons can he assign to himself for his being in heaven while so many others

though no more hell-deserving than himself, are yet in hell? Can he help seeing that it is in consequence solely of an *arbitrary decree*? And will not an inward shudder come over him at the bare thought of a God of infinite perfections being prompted by nothing higher than mere *arbitrary* motives to any action whatever? Would not such a conclusion mar the life of all his joys? Must not infinite Excellence suffer in his esteem? That *he* is made the beneficiary of this electing grace—that this astounding favoritism is made to redound to *his* advantage—will not of itself relieve his mind as to the overwhelming problem involved in the mode of its being conferred upon him. Neither will the assurance that no *injustice* has been done to the lost silence, the irrepressible voice of his bosom in view of the unmeasured diversity in their lot and his. His illuminated reason will never cease to demand why the same justice that *has* been meted out to them *has not* been awarded to him also; and the assertion of a mere design to illustrate the *Divine Sovereignty*—to show forth the simple *good pleasure* of the Most High—will be far from satisfying him. He can conceive of no object to be gained by the simple display of *sovereignty*, though the sovereignty of a God, which will be sufficient to countervail the disparagement that must, from such a source, accrue to his general attributes.

The only rejoinder which I can conceive as being made to this is, that such a procedure on the part of God, cannot properly be termed *arbitrary*, since, although we may be unable to apprehend them, yet we must necessarily take for granted the fact of some adequate reasons existing in the Divine mind as the basis of its determinations. But this is the very point in debate. I contend that the human mind cannot conceive the possibility of any other reason than *the bare display of sovereignty*. That is to say, that God resolves to make one to differ from another in respect to his eternal destiny simply to show that *he can* make him to differ. And how unlike is this to the case of a man who, with a chess-board before him, touches one of the squares rather than another, merely in order to evince the fact that he *can* touch any one of them that he pleases? If this is not the doctrine, what is it? What else is assigned, as the ground of election than the design to show that God may do what he will with his own? Is it affirmed that he may have other motives which he has not seen fit to reveal? If so, I ask where this is taught? Do the Scriptures declare anything of the kind? Do they give the slightest intimation that the salvation of a human soul is owing to anything else than the pure self-moving love of the infinitely benignant Jehovah, who is moved to goodness for goodness' sake, and who must, from the necessity of his nature, be as kindly affected towards one of his creatures as towards another, provided their moral position in regard to Him is the same? What possible reasons then can be, for one moment, imagined in the Divine mind on which to found a decree of election? We admit not the charge of presumption in such a sentence. While we do not assume to fathom the depths of the Infinite Wisdom, there are some conclusions which we hesitate not to affirm respecting them, because they grow directly out of the clearest intuitions of the intellect of man as constituted by its Maker; and this is one, that there could not possibly be any other than *arbitrary* reasons, which should dictate the salvation of Paul in preference to that of Judas, *when both are previously supposed to be in precisely the same circumstances*. The same promptings which would embrace one in a saving purpose must necessarily embrace the other.

But are *all* saved? Certainly not; but the reason why they are not is the farthest possible from any absolute or sovereign decree securing the salvation of one and pretermittting another. The boundless benevolence of the Deity predestinates all to heaven by the very fact of having provided a redemption which is available to all, but the scheme of this redemption is such as has respect to the *moral freedom* of its subjects. It must be *voluntarily* accepted and appropriated, inasmuch as this very appropriation is the grand constituent element of heaven. There neither is nor can be any other heaven than what consists in the right moral state of the inner man. Such a state can now be restored to man in consequence of what the Lord has done as Mediator, but the restoration can never be effected on any scheme which involves the suspension, for a single instant, of his entire freedom as a moral agent. His own active co-operation is imperatively requisite in every stage of the progress of his regeneration, or in other words, of his salvation, because the very essence of this salvation is in the state and actings of his will. To the question how the progress can begin at all, on Swedenborg's principles, when man is by nature, as he teaches, altogether evil and averse to God and goodness, and unable to originate volitions directly contrary to his ruling love, I reply, that it is essential to his freedom that he should have the power of *compelling himself* to abstinence from particular acts of evil, and of shunning them as sins against God, and when he does this there follows not merely the negation of so much evil, but the inflowing of so much positive good from the Divine fountain of good, which is like the light of the sun that is ever pressing for entrance into the least crevice or opening that will allow it to penetrate. "The life of love and charity," says Swedenborg, "opens the interior mind by the influx of light from heaven, the life of love and charity being the divine life itself; for the Lord loves every one and does good to every one from love; wherefore when that life is received, then the Lord is present, and is conjoined to the recipient, consequently he flows into his superior mind, which is called the spiritual mind, and by light from himself opens it." Every influx of this nature, though perhaps inappreciably slight at first, does *something* towards weakening the reigning power of evil, and communicating strength to resist its further encroachments. Every act of *self-compulsion* of this kind opens the way for fresh supplies of the Divine Love and Life to flow in, whereby the soul becomes more and more re-inforced by heavenly impulses and tendencies, and voluntary action in the right direction more easy and habitual. This we regard as the usual commencing process of *regeneration*, which far from being an instantaneous, is an everlasting act. The true Christian is for ever regenerating; that is, becoming more and more conformed and conjoined to the Lord. The process of the work is never, indeed, entirely uniform and equable. It proceeds by alternations and crises—by temptations and combats—by advances and recessions—but the course is on the whole onward, and the believer's removal to heaven is but one stage in this course, for he has here entered upon his true immortal life, and heaven, as a state, is but the normal form of its development. "The common idea," says Mr. Clissold, "with regard to Regeneration, is, that it signifies re-birth, or being born again, and that, as a man can be naturally born but once, so he can be spiritually born but once; the consequence is, that Regeneration, whether supposed to take place at baptism, or in subsequent life, is considered to be a simple or single act, 'incapable of latitude or increase.'"

This error arises, as we conceive, like all others in theology, from a spiritual truth being naturalized, or degraded to the level of the merely natural mind. For, though a man can be born but once naturally, and hence also naturally can die but once; yet, because the body can die but once, it does not hence follow that the soul can die but once. The life of the natural body is but of one nature, which never ascends beyond that which it originally was; it can never be elevated out of itself into a life of a higher order, for animal or corporeal life is but one, and hence the body is but once born, comes to but one perfection, and dies but one death. The case is altogether different with the life of the spirit, which, while we are living in this world, may be elevated out of its plane or level, into another that is higher, and this unceasingly. Every sinful habit to which the soul dies is the occasion of a distinct death; and it may have to die as many deaths as it has sins unto which it must die. The same is true with regard to the evils inherited by birth before they descend into ultimate acts. As every evil has its own life in the soul, so also, in being destroyed, it must undergo its own death; hence the soul may die daily; and as it may die daily, so, in a corresponding sense, it may be said to be born daily; hence, as there may be a perpetual death, so may there be also a perpetual birth, hence a perpetual generation, and hence a perpetual regeneration. This state of generation and regeneration is the eternal spring of the soul; and hence we see the true reason for which, to angelic beings, heaven is a season of perpetual spring. Besides, it is to be remembered, that we cannot but affix to the term regeneration a sense more enlarged than the one it commonly bears, and which appears to be its more immediate sense; for, properly speaking, it does not signify *re-birth*, but *re-generation*, *re-beggetting*, or *re-production*. Now, as all the processes of growth which take place in a plant or animal, may be said to be the processes of generation, in the more enlarged sense of that term, so every progression of the soul in spiritual life, we consider to be a process of generation; hence spiritual affections and thoughts are the result of spiritual generation, and the way to purify or exalt their nature is by a perpetual process of regeneration. This is no merely speculative or metaphysical doctrine, for it necessarily originates this practical truth, that evil is not removed from the soul in an instant, as filth is washed from the body; evil can be removed only by a death, and good can be received only by its being generated within us; hence there is no such thing as righteousness being imputed without being imparted, and the popular doctrine of Justification by Faith, is one which we consider to be contrary to God's Word, and contradictory to the real nature and constitution of things."—*Clissold's Letter*, p 48.

In following the regenerate soul ideally onward to the consummation of its bliss in the heavenly mansions, I have asked myself again and again what is lost or lacking to it, as a ground of thanksgiving and praise, on the view now presented. Is not the man saved by grace? Is he not raised to angelic beatitude solely in consequence of the gracious, unbought, unsought intervention of the Divine love and mercy in his behalf? Must he not otherwise have perished in his iniquities? Will his golden harp send forth one note less to swell the symphony of heaven, that he has been saved, not by an arbitrary act of mercy, but by a method perfectly in accordance both with the highest attributes of his Maker and with the constituent principles of his own nature—a method which has left his freedom inviolate and the perfections of the Deity unimpeached?

Nothing, meantime, is involved in the scheme now presented which derogates at all from the prescience and the *true* predestination of Jehovah. In the nature of the case he *foreknows* the moral history of every individual of the race, and the issue of every event, but he *foreordains* or *decrees* only his own acts, and not the volitions of his creatures, as this would bring him into immediate concurrence with voluntary acts opposed to his own will and which he has expressly forbidden.

Such then is the ground on which you charge the system of Swedenborg with misrepresenting and denying the received doctrine of Predestination. I do not admit that he has misrepresented it and if he has not, he ought, I conceive, to deny it, as all his adherents most unequivocally do. Still, we will reconsider our ground whenever you or any one else will show us adequate cause.

VII. *The Resurrection of the Body.*—"Swedenborg rejects the common doctrine of the resurrection. The Scriptures represent the resurrection of all who have died as a *future event*; and they describe the manner in which they will be raised, and the great change which will be made in the resurrection body, and the corresponding change which will be made in those who will be alive at that time. But our author denies such a resurrection, and with some false teachers mentioned by the Apostle, holds, that the resurrection of all who have died, 'is already past.' Death and resurrection take place, he says, at or near the same time. This he learnt partly, it seems, from philosophical reasoning, as Professor Bush did, and partly from the conversation of angels. But philosophical reasoning is by no means infallible; and Swedenborg's angels were only dead men, who often betrayed their ignorance, and committed many mistakes, and did not pretend to be divinely inspired, and sometimes needed and received information from Swedenborg. Both he and his followers are exceedingly confident in their denial of the future resurrection of the body, though this has been believed by the Christian Church from the days of the Apostles to the present time."

This is a point which I shall not attempt to argue. I have already dwelt somewhat upon it in a previous letter, and have through various other channels presented my own and Swedenborg's views with sufficient distinctness to the public. I content myself with simply offering one or two additional paragraphs in opposition to the current doctrine, leaving it to the reader to judge which theory carries with it the most constraining evidence of truth. As to the alleged fallibility of philosophical reasoning, so far as it implies that the results of that reasoning are not *always* sound, I have no disposition to dispute with you: but I venture to make the same assertion respecting *Scriptural interpretation*. It does not strike me that even a tenet which "has been believed by the Christian Church from the days of the Apostles to the present time" is necessarily infallible, nor do I think *any* construction of the Sacred Oracles can be either infallible or correct which conflicts with the results of *just* philosophical reasoning. And as to the mistakes and ignorance of "Swedenborg's angels," I shall be prompt to admit them when they are pointed out. You seem frequently to lose sight of the distinction which he continually makes between the angels of heaven and the spirits of the world of spirits, who are in a far inferior degree of illumination. I am not aware that Swedenborg anywhere represents the angels as needing or receiving information from him. I should certainly think, however, that they *did*

need it, and probably received it, if they taught that the doctrine of the resurrection was the doctrine of the resurrection of the material body to be accomplished at some future period.—But I yield my space to a higher authority.

“ I have discoursed with some within a few days after their decease, and because they were then recently come, they were in a light there, which differed little in their sight from the light of the world. And because the light appeared such to them, they doubted whether they had light from any other source, wherefore they were taken into the first of heaven, where the light was still brighter, and from thence speaking with me, they said, that they had never before seen such a light; and this took place when the sun was already set. They then wondered that spirits had eyes by which they saw, when yet they believed in the life of the body, that the life of spirits was merely thought, and indeed abstractedly without a subject, by reason that they had not been able to think of any subject of thought, inasmuch as they had not seen any; and this being the case, they had not then perceived otherwise, than that because it was mere thought alone, it was dissipated, together with the body in which it was, just as any aura or any fire, unless it should miraculously be kept together and subsist from the Lord. And they saw then how easily the learned fall into error concerning life after death, and that they more than others do not believe except in things which they see. Therefore they were surprised now, that they not only had thought, but also sight, and likewise the other senses; and especially that they appear to themselves altogether as men, that they mutually see and hear each other, converse together, feel their own members by the touch, and this more exquisitely than in the life of the body. Hence they were amazed that man is altogether ignorant of this, while he lives in the world; and they pitied the human race, that they know nothing of such things, because they believe nothing, and more especially they who are in superior light, namely, they who are within the church, and have the Word. Some of them believed no otherwise, than that men after death would be as ghosts, in which opinion they confirmed themselves from the spectres of which they had heard; but hence they drew no other conclusion, than that it was some gross vital principle, which is first exhaled from the life of the body, but which again falls back to the dead body, and is thus extinguished. But some believed, that they were first to rise again at the time of the last judgment, when the world was to perish, and then with the body, which, though fallen into dust, would be then collected together, and thus they would rise again with bone and flesh. And whereas mankind have in vain for many ages expected that last judgment or destruction of the world, they have fallen into the error that they should never rise again; thinking nothing in this case of that which they have learned from the Word, and from which they have also sometimes so spoken, that when man dies, his soul is in the hand of God, among the happy or unhappy according to the life which he had acquainted himself with, and was become familiar to; neither of what the Lord said concerning the rich man and Lazarus. But they were instructed, that every one's last judgment is when he dies, and that then he appears to himself endowed with a body as in the world, and to enjoy every sense as in the world, but more pure and exquisite, inasmuch as corporeal things do not hinder, and those things which are of the light of the world do not overshadow those which are of the light of heaven; thus that they are in a body as it were purified; and that after death, the body cannot possibly partake of what is bony and fleshy such as it had in the world, because this would be to be again encompassed with earthly dust. With some I conversed on this subject on the same day that their bodies were entombed, who saw through my eyes their own corpse, the bier, and the ceremony of burial; and they said, that they reject that corpse, and that it had served them for uses in the world in which they had been, and that they live now in a body which serves them for uses in the world in which they now are. They wished also, that I should tell this to their relations who were in mourning: but it was given to reply, that if I should tell them, they would mock at it, inasmuch as what they cannot themselves see with their own eyes, they believe to be nothing, and thus they would reckon it among the visions which are illusions. For they cannot be brought to believe, that as men see each other

with their eyes, so spirits see each other with theirs, and that man cannot see spirits unless with the eyes of his spirit, and that he then sees them when the Lord opens the internal sight, as was done to the prophets, who saw spirits and angels, and also many things of heaven. Whether they who live at this day would have believed those things, if they had lived at that time, there is room to doubt."—A. C. 4527.

VIII. *Rejection of a Portion of the Scriptures.*—"I must here notice again the doctrine of Swedenborg respecting the Scriptures; a doctrine which must be regarded as of more consequence than almost any other. He excluded from the word of God about one sixth part of the Old Testament, and about one half of the New. The books he received as the word of God are those which he found to have the *internal or spiritual sense*. He rejected so many of the books contained in our Scriptures, because he found them incapable of the internal sense or senses. All parts of what he acknowledged to be the word of God, every word, every letter, and every point had three senses, a natural sense, a spiritual sense, and a celestial sense. Why those parts of Scripture which he rejected were, in his judgment, incapable of the higher sense, more than some other parts, we are not informed. * * * The attempt of Swedenborg to propagate an opinion concerning the Scriptures so contrary to the teachings of the New Testament, is sufficient completely to undermine his authority, and to cast an air of suspicion on all that he wrote."

The grounds of this accusation have already been considered. It will be unnecessary to re-adduce them. He *excludes* nothing from the Scriptures in any other way than by indicating the fact of an interior spiritual sense pertaining to some books which he says does not attach to others; and the reasons assigned for this assertion I have already brought before you. If the present virtual charge of garbling and mutilating the Word should ever be repeated, I hope it will not be without bestowing some consideration upon the arguments urged in behalf of his positions. I merely add an extract relative to the fact of a three-fold sense which finds so little favor in your eyes and so little refutation in your logic.

"That there is an internal or spiritual sense in the Word, in its external or natural sense, as a diamond in its matrix, or as a beautiful infant in its swaddling clothes, is a truth which has heretofore been altogether unknown in the Christian world, and hence also it is altogether unknown what is meant by the Consummation of the Age, the Coming of the Lord, the Last Judgment, and by the New Jerusalem, on which subjects many things are spoken and predicted in the Word of each Testament, both Old and New. Without the unfolding and unswathing of the literal sense of the Word by its spiritual sense, who can know intellectually what is signified by the things which the Lord predicted in Matthew xxiv., and also in the Revelations, and in like manner in Daniel, and in the Prophets, in many passages? Make the experiment yourself, if you are so disposed, by reading those pages of the prophetic Word, which treat sometimes of wild beasts and cattle, sometimes of forests and brakes, sometimes of valleys and mountains, sometimes of bats, of ochim, tziim, satyrs, &c. &c.; try whether you can perceive any thing divine therein, unless you believe it to lie concealed inwardly, inasmuch as it was inspired of God, just as a diamond lies concealed in its matrix.

"To the above, I shall add somewhat new from the spiritual world. The rulers of the church, who flock into that world after death, are first taught concerning the Sacred Scripture, as containing a spiritual sense, which in the world was unknown to them, and they are also told, that the angels of heaven are in that sense, whilst man is in the sense of the letter; and further, that a translation, or change, of the latter sense, into the former, is effected with man, whilst

he reads the Word under holy influences, and that there is a kind of unfolding or unswathing, somewhat like the breaking of the shell encompassing an almond, and the casting away the shell, so that the naked almond passes into heaven, and is received by the angels; and also like a seed cast into the earth, and being there stripped of its outward coats, puts forth its germ. That seed is the Word in the sense of the letter, and the germ thence put forth is the spiritual sense, and this latter passes to the angels, but the former rests with man; still, however, that seed remains with man in his mind, as in its ground, and in time produces its germ, and fructifies it, if man, by the seeds of life, which are the truths of faith, and the good things of charity, is conjoined with the Lord, and thereby consociated with the angels."—*Hob. Life of Swed.* p. 159–161.

"The word, which is divine truth descends from the Lord through the heavens, into the world, wherefore it is adapted to the wisdom of the angels who are in the three heavens, and is also adapted to men who are in the natural world. Hence also it is, that the Word in its first origiu is altogether divine, afterwards celestial, then spiritual, and lastly natural; it is celestial for the angels of the inmost or third heaven, who are called celestial angels, spiritual for the angels of the second or middle heaven, who are called spiritual angels, and celestial and spiritual-natural for the angels of the ultimate or first heaven, who are called celestial and spiritual-natural angels, and natural for men in the world, for men, so long as they live in the material body, think and speak naturally; hence then it is, that the Word is given with the angels of each heaven, but with a difference according to the degree of their wisdom, intelligence, and science; and although it differs as to the sense in each heaven, still it is the same Word. The Divine principle itself, which is in the Word from the Lord, when it descends to the inmost or third heaven, becomes divine celestial, when it thence descends to the middle or second heaven, it becomes divine spiritual, and when from this heaven it descends to the ultimate or first, it becomes divine celestial, or spiritual natural, and lastly, when it thence descends into the world, it becomes a divine natural Word, such as it is with us in the letter: these successive derivations of the divine truth proceeding from the Lord himself, exist by virtue of correspondences established from creation itself between things superior and inferior, concerning which, the Lord willing, more will be said hereafter. The reason why all strength, and all power are in the ultimates of divine truth, thus in the natural sense of the Word, which is the sense of the letter, is, because this sense is the continent of all the interior senses, viz. of the spiritual and celestial, spoken of above; and since it is the continent, it is also the basis, and in the basis lies all strength; for if things superior do not rest upon their basis, they fall down and are dissolved, as would be the case with the spiritual and celestial things of the Word if they did not rest upon the natural and literal sense, for this not only sustains the interior senses, but also contains them, wherefore the Word or divine truth, in this sense, is not only in its power, but also in its fulness. From these considerations, it also follows, that the all of the doctrine of the church ought to be confirmed from the literal sense of the Word, and that all the power of doctrine is thence derived."—*A. E.* 593.

Take the Scriptures, as we have them, in the literal sense, and trace them back to their original source in the mind of the Deity, and you are brought to the very primary element of which they consist, viz. Love and Wisdom, or in other words, Affection and Intellect. That is to say, they resolve themselves into the essential nature of their Author, with whom there can be no Truth but it is vivified and pervaded by its appropriate Good. The Truth therefore that is to us embodied in the written oracles must previously have existed in his own mind independent of human language, and supposing that Truth to go forth from him, or to descend to the spheres of created intelligences intermediate between himself and man, it must utter itself of course in the form of thought independent of vocal speech or written language; for there are no books of paper or parchment in the heavens. The divine communications as they flow down-

word must first be published in the *interiors* of the spirits who receive them, and if you suppose an order of spirits who stand nearer to the Most High than others by reason of their being more deeply imbued with *affection* or *good*, they will naturally, from their predominant state, receive most readily that element of the descending Word which is kindred with the ruling element of their own nature, or the principle of *good*, which has relation to *uses* and *ends*, the distinguishing character of the highest or celestial degree. In this we see the basis laid for the *celestial sense* of the Word. It is the sense which has respect to the *affection* that necessarily enters in as the life and soul of all thought. In this sense are the celestial angels by the very constitution of their nature. But the Divine Word in its descent, meets with another order of beings, who, though partakers of good are yet more distinguished for *wisdom*, and therefore are not so much in *ends* as in *causes*, which are intrinsically secondary to *ends*. To them also the Word, in its progress, accommodates itself, according to the dominant principle of their nature, and the sense which yields an appropriate pabulum to them is the *spiritual*, as they are in the *spiritual degree*, which is the degree of *causes*. We are still, however, as yet above the region of *language* and *written speech*, because above the sphere of *nature*, or that of *effects*. Following the Word downward to this sphere we see it coming into *ultimates* by clothing itself in human language and yielding what is termed a *literal sense*, a sense accommodated to those who, as living in the flesh on earth, are in the *ultimates of nature*, where the *causes* operating from the spiritual sphere produce their *effects*.

Thus then we have the philosophy of the three senses of the Word, founded upon a threefold distinction in the orders of intelligent beings, and in close affinity with Swedenborg's sublime *doctrine of degrees*, the importance of which as a key to all sound knowledge in every department of the universe, the world has yet to learn. In view of the explanation now given I do not see why I am not entitled to pronounce the grand problem solved as to the grounds of his assertions respecting the existence of this threefold sense. Must not the fact *necessarily* be as he asserts? Is not the principle virtually to be recognized in the very book, the product of your own mind, which I am now reviewing? Were you not prompted, in the first instance, by an *end of affection* to the inditing of the volume? Your supreme regard to what you deem the truth of God—your love for the souls of your fellow-men—your anxiety to guard them from the inroads of error—were undoubtedly your moving impulse; and thus far you were in the sphere of *ends*. This impulse, however, you can easily perceive, is something superior, or rather interior, to thought. By it your thought or understanding was excited to put forth its activity and institute a course of mental reasoning designed to bear upon the apprehended errors and fallacies of the system that you would expose. In doing this you were operating in the sphere of *causes*. But your purpose was still lacking completion. In order to the attainment of the *end* the *cause* must pass into *effect*, and this could only be done by the writing and publishing of the book. In this act your love and wisdom really descend into *ultimates* and assume a *natural form*, and in this form the *end*, *cause*, and *effect* actually co-exist together and manifest the fulness of their power. How pertinently this illustrates Swedenborg's doctrine of the Divine Word you can scarcely fail to see, nor will you refuse to admit that it is at least somewhat curious, that the very principles on which your book is constructed—a book written, in great measure, to expose the falsities of

Swedenborg's positions respecting the nature of God's Book—afford all but a downright demonstration of his truth.

As to what you say of Swedenborg's "authority being undermined" in consequence of what he has affirmed respecting the Scriptures, I would simply remark, that as he neither claims for himself, nor his adherents for him, any other authority than that which is essentially inherent in the truths that he proclaims, so that authority can be "undermined" by nothing else than a demonstration that those asserted truths are in fact fallacies and falsities. This, I venture to say, has not yet been done, nor do I see any immediate prospect of its being done.

IX. *The Corruption and Desolation of the Old Church and the Purity and Perfection of the New.*—"Swedenborg maintains that, unless the New Jerusalem Church had been established, no flesh could have been saved; that the Protestant Church as well as the Catholic, was universally corrupt, and destitute of the faith and charity which are essential to salvation. He says, so long as the dragon and his crew continue in the world of spirits, no divine truth, united to divine good, can pass through to the men of the earth without being perverted or destroyed. And by the dragon, he says, are meant those who are in the faith of the present church. According to his teaching, all the best men of the Reformed Church, the Luthers, the Melancthons, the Calvins,—all that suffered martyrdom for their attachment to Christ in different countries,—all the Leightons, and Baxters, and Scotts, and Wilberforces, and Howards, and Martyns of Great Britain,—all the Hookers, and Mathers, the Edwardses and Brainerds and Paysons of America, belonging to the dragon and his crew. And he often expresses it as his judgment, that none, except those who constitute the New Church, have any knowledge of the true spiritual sense of the word of God, or any title to the blessings of the gospel. All except the few who belong to the Swedenborgian church, are in darkness. The disciples of Swedenborg are in the truths of faith which are from the goods of charity; but the rest are in falses, because in the use of their free will, they have opened their interiors to the influx of evil spirits."—p. 130.

There is in all this a strange mixture of truth and error, by which the reader is sadly mystified and misled. That there was a necessity for the establishment of the New Jerusalem Church is indeed affirmed by Swedenborg, because God had expressly announced it in Isaiah and the Apocalypse, and his counsel must stand of course. The fact of the ushering in of such a dispensation at some time you cannot, as a believer in Revelation, question. But you may be less ready to admit the identity of the New Jerusalem of John with that of Swedenborg, and on this head I cannot enter into a full discussion till I learn that you have satisfactorily acquainted yourself with the fundamental grounds on which he affirms this identity, and are prepared to give your reasons, as an interpreter of Scripture, for denying it. He has given the most abundant reasons for his assertion, and among them is undoubtedly the alleged fact, that at the period when this dispensation commenced (about the middle of the last century), the pre-existing Christian church, both Catholic and Protestant had lapsed into a deep and wide-spread degeneracy in consequence of the prevalent tenets of a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead—of an Atonement effected by a vicarious substitution of

the innocent for the guilty—and by the separation of Charity and Faith in the matter of Justification, all which enter into the very vitals of Christian Doctrine and Life, and an erroneous view of which must necessarily corrupt and devastate the Church. The question becomes, as you will perceive, in the first instance, a simple question of fact—have these doctrines been generally taught under the aspect in which I have presented them, and then, secondly, are they under this aspect true? If not, they must assuredly be pernicious, and I do not think it an easy matter to overstate their mischievous and ruinous effects. That they are not true—that they are pre-eminently untrue—it has been the drift of my previous reasoning to evince—with what success I leave it to yourself and others to judge.

But we are pressed by the consequences. If the doctrines held and taught by such men as Leighton, Baxter, Scott, Edwards, Brainerd, Payson, and others of similar stamp, really involved grand and essential errors, do we not, by the very force of the allegation, pronounce sentence upon the men, and cut them off from all hope of heaven? Do we not consign them over to a fatal fellowship with “the dragon and his crew?” No other inference could well be drawn from the above presentation of the subject, and yet no inference could be more unjust and injurious to our author and to the true character of his system. Not the least striking among its wonderful features is that of the enlarged and catholic Charity which it breathes towards every degree of real *good*, with whatever error of understanding it is found in conjunction. The fundamental distinction upon which it every where insists between the *love or life principle* and the mere intellectual conviction of *truth*, upon the former of which and not upon the latter, salvation is suspended, enables him to recognize the heirs of eternal life in multitudes of those whose doctrinal belief is widely at variance with that which he inculcates. Indeed I have often been deeply and admiringly impressed by the *tender solicitude* he evinces so to discriminate between the falsities of the head and the heart as to embrace as many as possible within the range of the Lord's saving goodness. Nothing approaching to a spirit of stern and gloomy denunciation is to be found in his writings. It is only when falsities are intelligently *confirmed* and thence wrought into the texture of the *life*, that he despairs of a happy result. And it would certainly be strange if one who assures us that even the well-disposed heathen, who lives up to the light of his convictions, is saved as far as his goodness and truth will admit, should still exclude from the prospect of heaven such men as the pious worthies whose names you have recited. That their *faith* was at fault so far as it coincided with the leading popular dogmas upon which I have dwelt, is undoubtedly true, but you will see from the extracts which follow that their errors might still consist with a *salvable state*, though they must necessarily detract from that completeness and symmetry of character, which results from the fair and full conjunction of Goodness and Truth.

“The subject here treated of is those who are saved, although from the doctrine of their religion they were in falsities; for all are saved who are in the good of life according to the dogmas of their religion, which they believed to be truths, although they were not truths, for what is false is not imputed to any one who lives well according to the dogmas of his religion; for the good of life according to religion contains within itself the affection of knowing truths which such persons also learn and receive when they come into another life, for every affection

remains with man after death, and especially the affection of knowing truths, because this is a spiritual affection, and every man when he becomes a spirit is his own affection, of consequence, the truths which they desire they then imbibe, and so receive them deeply in their hearts."—*A. E.* 455.

"Inasmuch as they lived in love to God and in charity towards their neighbor, the falsities of their religion were accepted by the Lord as truths, because inwardly in their falsities there was the good of love, and the good of love qualifies all truth, and in such case qualifies the falsity which is believed by such to be truth; the good also, which lies concealed within, causes such, when they come into the other life, to perceive genuine truths, and to receive them. Moreover there are truths which are only appearances of truth, such as are those of the literal sense of the Word, which are also accepted by the Lord as genuine truths when there is in them the good of love to the Lord, and the good of love towards the neighbor, or charity; in the other life also the good which is inwardly hid with them dissipates the appearances, and makes bare the spiritual or genuine truths."—*A. E.* 625.

"They within the Church are in falses and at the same time in good, who are in heresies and in the life of good, and all out of the Church [are in falses and at the same time in good] who are in good; but falses with these do not damn, unless they be such falses as are contrary to good, and destroy the very life of good; but the falses which are not contrary to good, in themselves indeed are falses, but in respect to the good of life, which they are not contrary to, they almost put off the quality of the false, which is effected by application to good; for such falses can be applied to good, and be applied to evil; if they are applied to good, they become mild, but if to evil, they become hard; for falses can equally be applied to good, as truths to evil, for truths of every kind by applications to evil are falsified: to illustrate this by an example; it is said that faith alone saves, which in itself is false, especially with the evil, who thereby exclude the good of charity, as if it contributed nothing at all to salvation; but this false grows mild with those who are in the good of life, for they apply it to good, saying that faith alone saves, but that is not faith unless together with its fruit, consequently unless where good is; so in other cases."—*A. C.* 8311.

"The fifth cause that they who in doctrine and life confirm with themselves that faith produces good works as a tree does fruit, do not shut heaven against themselves, is, because they do not falsify the Word, like those who believe in justification and salvation by faith without good works; for they who believe in faith as justifying without good works, falsify all those parts of the Word where love, charity, goods, works, deeds, working and doing, are mentioned and commanded, and this even to the destruction of divine truth in the heavens, understanding by those expressions either faith, or the moral and civil goods of the world, or that they are said only for the vulgar, on account of the simplicity of their faith; thus destroying divine truth itself by argumentations drawn from the impotency of man to fulfil the law, from the nature of the good which is done by man, as not being good, and the merit which is inherent in such good: but they who in simplicity adjoin good works to faith, do not falsify those parts of the Word, and hence do not remove faith from love to God, and thereby admit the divine operation in everything which man is to do, as well as in everything which he is to believe? for they think and say that good works are to be done as from man, inasmuch as he who does not act and believe as of himself, believes and does nothing, and can have no religion; but still, inasmuch as they are not in genuine truths, though they do not indeed shut heaven against themselves, they cannot advance further than to the threshold of heaven: howbeit to such of them as have loved truths for the sake of truths, heaven is opened when the divine order is restored with them, which is when charity and its good is in the first place, and faith and its truth in the second, for they are then like those who go on in a straight way with the face looking forward, whereas before they were like those who go with the face looking backward."—*A. E.* 798.

The section of the "Apocalypse Explained," from which the last of the above extracts is taken, contains an extended train of admirable discriminations on

this head going to show under what circumstances falsifications may be made of the truths of the Word which still do not proceed to the extreme of closing heaven against their authors. So also in the following list of references to the "Arcana" by Swedenborg himself, you will see that he has given large consideration to the subject.

"That there are falsities of religion which agree with good, and falsities which disagree, n. 9259; that falsities of religion, if they do not disagree with good, do not produce evil, except with those who are in evil, n. 8318; that falsities of religion are not imputed to those who are in good, but to those who are in evil, n. 8051, 8149; that truths not genuine, and also falsities may be consociated with genuine truths with those who are in good, but not with those who are in evil, n. 3470, 3471, 4551, 4552, 7344, 8149, 9298; that falsities and truths are consociated by appearances from the literal sense of the Word, n. 7344; that falsities are verified and softened by good, because they are applied and made conducive to good, and to the removal of evil, n. 8149; that the falsities of religion with those who are in good, are received by the Lord as truths, n. 4736, 8149; that the good whose quality is from a false principle of religion, is accepted by the Lord, if there be ignorance, and if there be in it innocence and a good end, n. 7887; that the truths which are with man are appearances of truth and good, tintured with fallacies, but that the Lord nevertheless adapts them to genuine truths with the man who lives in good, n. 2053; that falsities in which there is good exist with those who are out of the church and thence in ignorance of the truth, also with those within the church where there are falsities of doctrine, n. 2589-2604, 2861, 2863, 3263, 3778, 4189, 4190, 4197, 6700, 9256."

And now, in view of the above citations, I must be allowed to ask what possible ground you could have had for conveying to your readers the impression they will naturally receive from your language, that "he often expresses it as his judgment, that none except those who constitute the New Church have any knowledge of the true spiritual sense of the word of God, or any title to the blessings of the gospel?" Do these extracts sound forth a sentence of excommunication from the true Church and of exclusion from heaven against all who have not given in a formal adhesion to the doctrines I am advocating? Do the following paragraphs sound like it?

"The doctrine of charity, which is the doctrine of life, was the essential doctrine in the ancient Churches; and that doctrine conjoined all Churches, and thereby formed one Church out of many. For they acknowledged all those to be members of the Church, who lived in the good of charity, and called them brothers, however they might differ in truths, which at this day are called matters of faith. In these they instructed one another, which was amongst their works of charity; nor were they angry if any one did not accede to another's opinion, knowing that every one receives truth in such proportion as he is in good."—*H. D. N. J.* 9.

"There are two things which conjoin the men of the Church, viz.; life and doctrine; when life conjoins, doctrine does not separate; but if only doctrine conjoins, as at this day is the case within the Church, then they mutually separate, and make as many Churches as there are doctrines; when yet doctrine is for the sake of life, and life is from doctrine. That they separate themselves if only doctrine conjoins, is evident from this, that he who is of one doctrine, condemns another [of a different doctrine] sometimes to hell; but that doctrine doth not separate, if life conjoins, is evident from this, that he who is in goodness of life doth not condemn another who is of another opinion, but leaves it to his faith and conscience, and extends this rule even to those who are out of the Church, for he saith in his heart that ignorance cannot condemn any, if they live in innocence and mutual love, as infants, who are also in ignorance when they die."—*A. C.* 4468.

"It is provided, that every one in whatever heresy he is as to the understanding, may still be reformed and saved, provided he shuns evils as sins, and does not confirm heretical falsities with himself; for by shunning evils as sins, the will is reformed, and through the will the understanding, which then first comes out of darkness into light. There are three essentials of the Church, the acknowledgment of the Divine of the Lord, the acknowledgment of the sanctity of the Word, and the life which is called charity; according to the life, which is charity, every man has faith; from the Word is the knowledge of what life must be; and from the Lord is reformation and salvation. If these three had been as the essentials of the Church, intellectual dissensions would not have divided, but only varied it, as the light varies the colors in beautiful objects, and as various diadems make the beauty in a king's crown."—D. P. 259.

I beg that neither you nor any one else will infer from this, that Swedenborg represents the *truth of doctrine* as a matter of little or no importance. He is as far from this as possible. But he is, as he designs to be, very explicit in his teaching that doctrinal belief is no infallible test of moral character, and that as evil of life may co-exist with the acknowledgment of many truths, so the good of life may be found in conjunction with many falsities of doctrine.

"All except the few who belong to the Swedenborgian church are in darkness. The disciples of Swedenborg are in the truths of faith which are from the goods of charity; but the rest are in falses." Swedenborg knows no disciples, in the sense in which your language would naturally be understood. The receivers of Swedenborg's doctrines know no master but the Lord himself. Would you be willingly termed a disciple of Paul, simply because you regarded Paul as an illuminated expounder of the doctrines of Christ? Would you consent to be called a disciple of Calvin, however you might look upon him as a well instructed scribe in the mysteries of the kingdom? Would you not deem it as implying a derogation in some degree from that supreme deference which you would always desire to pay to the words of Him who has said "Call no man Father?" We respect, and honor, and reverence Swedenborg as a highly favored medium of divine communications to men; but we do not profess to be his *disciples*. The very sentiments we cherish towards him forbid the thought of assuming in regard to him a relation which, if anything could, we are sure would inflict a pang of pain upon his beatified spirit. So also in regard to what you say of the "Swedenborgian church." We know no such church. We have again and again disclaimed the denomination before the world, and though we can scarcely hope that the use of it will be waved, and though we doubt not it may be sometimes employed simply by way of characteristic designation, yet we would fain have the world distinctly understand, that we repudiate every term and title which has a *sectarian* aspect, since if our doctrines are *true* they are emphatically *the* doctrines, and the *only* doctrines which the Lord acknowledges as constituting, with the appropriate *life*, the Church, which is "the Bride, the Lamb's wife," and this is the Church of the New Jerusalem.

I am sorry to be compelled to recognize, in the foregoing paragraph from your work, a certain *ad invidiam* air and tone which comes somewhat gratefully over the feelings that I like to cherish when conversing with the products of your pen. It is not, in truth, a fair representation of the fact. It does injustice to the tenor of his teachings. It attributes, moreover, a claim to the receivers of these doctrines *on the score of their personal character* which they do not venture to make for themselves. They have a strong, I may say an undoubting, intellectual con-

viction that the doctrines in the abstract are true; but they see, by the same light, that the demands of these doctrines on the *life's love* are so high and imperative, that it is only with a trembling confidence that they presume to look within for the evidence of their *power*. They are taught the fact of a heaven-wide difference between a correct *knowledge* of the "truths of faith" and a living *experience* of the "goods of charity." They find therefore a perpetual ground of humiliation and holy fear in their conscious failures to reach the high mark of their calling, and are, as a body, utter strangers to any such language of assurance or self-complacency as one would think from your remarks to be the vernacular dialect of their faith. But I would not meet such insinuations with acerbity of spirit. I would simply enter a meek protest against the view you have presented of our position as a Church. I could not desire to excite any other sentiments than those which will spontaneously spring up in any candid and ingenuous mind on a clear perception that it has wronged an opponent. Least of all could I think of doing this in dealing with a spirit which I know to be, in its general actings, so tender of truth—so studious of justice—so prompt of reparation—as yours. That your statements on this head compel me to seek for them some apology, is undoubtedly true, but I find it in the inward conviction that your impressions were taken up from a partial and imperfect survey of the genuine character of the system. I do not recognize the least intention to present it under a distorted aspect.

X. *Purgatory*.—"The doctrine of a *purgatory* is found in the writings of Swedenborg,—not exactly in the Popish form, but equally contrary to the common faith of the Protestant Churches. He teaches that men are as really in a state of probation after death, as before; that in the world of spirits they go through a course of discipline more particular and thorough, than in the present state, and that, after their predominant affection has been clearly manifested,—after the remains of evil have been abstracted from those who are regenerated, and the seeming good from the rest, which requires no inconsiderable length of time, the former pass into heaven, the others into hell. This doctrine of another state of trial after death is, we think, very different from the doctrine taught by Christ and the Apostles, so that if Swedenborg was right, they were mistaken."

I deem it expedient here, as elsewhere, whenever possible, to array Swedenborg's own declarations against the counter-statements which are proposed by his opponents. A writer's own *confession of faith*, when clearly and unequivocally expressed, is to be taken as a *prima facie* exponent of his real sentiments on any particular point, though the attempt is entirely legitimate, on the part of an opponent, to show that this is inconsistent with itself, or with something else, taught by himself or others, that is beyond the reach of controversy. I am not aware that Swedenborg's writings contain anything inconsistent with the following statement.

"With respect to purgatory, I can aver, that it is a pure Babylonish fiction, invented for the sake of gain, and that no such place does or can exist. Every man, after death, first comes into the world of spirits, which is in the middle between heaven and hell, and is prepared there either for heaven or hell, every one according to his life in the world; and in that world no one is tormented, but the wicked then first come into torment, when after preparation, they go to hell. There are innumerable societies in that world, and enjoyments in them similar to those upon earth, by reason that they who are there are conjoined

with men upon earth, who are likewise in the midst between heaven and hell. The externals of such are successively put off, whereby their internals are laid open, till at length the ruling love, which is the life's love, and the inmost, and which governs the externals, discovers itself; when this is revealed, then the true quality of the man appears, and according to the quality of that love, he is sent forth from the world of spirits to his own place, if good, into heaven, and if bad, into hell. That this is the case, it has been given me to know of a certainty, because it has been granted me by the Lord to be with those who are in that world, and to see everything, and thus to relate all from actual experience, and this now for the space of twenty years. Wherefore I can assert that purgatory is a fiction, which may be called diabolical from its having been invented for the sake of gain, and for the sake of obtaining power over souls, even after death."—A. R. 784.

Here we see that he expressly denies the Popish doctrine of Purgatory, and yet you assert that the doctrine of a Purgatory is found in his writings, and you seem to rest the charge upon his alleged teaching that "men are as really in a state of probation after death as before." How this is to be made clearly consistent with what immediately follows, that men go through a course of discipline in the world of spirits in order to *manifest their predominant affection*, I am somewhat at a loss to understand, as the *manifestation* of such an affection would seem fairly to imply its previous *formation*, which of course is to be referred to the present life. But I have still greater difficulty in reconciling the statement with what Swedenborg says in the following paragraphs.

"The life of man cannot be changed after death; it remains then such as it had been; nor can the life of hell be transcribed into the life of heaven, since they are opposite. Hence it is evident that they who come into hell, remain there to eternity; and that they who come into heaven remain there to eternity."—A. C. 10,749.

"The man who, in the world, has begun the first state (reformation), after death can be introduced into the other (regeneration); but he who has not entered into the first state in the world, cannot, after death, be introduced into the other, thus cannot be regenerated."—T. C. R. 571.

"Man after death remains to eternity such as he is as to his will or reigning love.—It was said by the angels that the life of the reigning love is never changed with any one to eternity, since every one is his own reigning love; wherefore to change that love in a spirit would be to deprive him of his life, or to annihilate him."—H. & H. 480.

Now a man's "reigning love" is no other than his "predominant affection," and this, though "manifested" in the other life, is never changed. How then can you say that Swedenborg teaches that "men are as really in a state of probation after death, as before?" Does he not in fact, teach directly the reverse? There is, I admit, a sense of the term "probation," namely, that of *trying or testing*, for the purpose of *ascertaining the qualities* of anything, in which it may be said that every spirit comes at death into a state of *probation*, for he enters immediately upon a process which shall *prove and bring out* his interior moral character—his dominant loves and delights—by means of the spiritual associations, into which he comes; but this, as you are well aware, is not the sense which the term bears in ordinary theological usage. It there has the import of an incipient *forming or determining* the character to good or evil, to heaven or hell, according to the direction of a man's volitions. What else than this can you mean by calling it "the doctrine of another state of trial after death," and speak-

ing of it as something "very different from the doctrine taught by Christ and the Apostles?" Yet how is it different, if he, as well as they, teaches that there is no change, except in degrees of development, in a man's moral character after death? As you seem to have precluded yourself from all future opportunity of complying with the demands of justice in rectifying erroneous statements in regard to Swedenborg's doctrines, you will allow me, in the present instance, to "supply your lack of service" in this respect.

But does not Swedenborg, you will ask, distinctly teach, in contrariety to the whole current of Protestant creeds, that the spirits of men do not, after death, go immediately to heaven or hell, but enter into a mixed and intermediate state, where they are severally *prepared* for their final allotment of happiness or misery? He does; and all his adherents firmly believe it, because they are satisfied that he was supernaturally empowered to disclose the truth on this head, and because they perceive a rational ground for the doctrine in the elemental principles of their being. They see nothing in the nature of the change wrought by death that is especially calculated of itself to work a separation of the mingled qualities of good and evil, truth and falsity, which go to form the characters of the great mass of mankind. This elimination, however, they are convinced must take place, and in a way too that shall not suspend for a moment the free and voluntary actings of the soul. Of course they regard the process as gradual, and they not only accord most fully with the statements which Swedenborg has given in the following paragraph, but they recognize the process as based upon the soundest philosophy of our moral and intellectual constitution.*

"As far as the truths which are of the understanding, are conjoined to the goods which are of the will, thus as far as a man wills truths and thence does them, so far he has heaven in himself, since the conjunction of good and truth is heaven: but as far as the falses which are of the understanding are conjoined to the evils which are of the will, so far man has hell in himself, because the conjunction of what is false and evil is hell: but as far as the truths which are of the understanding are not conjoined to the goods which are of the will, so far man is in a middle state. Almost every man at this day is in such a state, that he knows truths, and from science and also from understanding thinks them, and either does much of them, or little of them, or nothing of them, or contrary to them, from the love of evil and thence the faith of what is false; therefore, in order that he may have either heaven or hell, he is after death first brought into the world of spirits, and there a conjunction of good and truth is made with those who are to be elevated into heaven, and a conjunction of evil and the false with those who are to be cast into hell. For it is not permitted to any one, in heaven nor in hell, to have a divided mind, that is, to understand one thing and to will another; but what he wills, he must also understand, and what he understands, he must also will. Wherefore in heaven he who wills good must understand truth, and in hell he who wills evil must understand what is false; therefore with the good falses are there removed, and truths are given agreeable and conformable to their good, and with the evil truths are there removed, and falses are given agreeable and conformable to their evil. From these things it is evident what the world of spirits is."—*H. & H.* 425.

I add to this no comments of my own. If you do not see it to be true upon the simple perusal, I should have little hope of your being convinced by the most voluminous array of reasoning. If you demand the superadded testimony

* See this subject discussed at considerable length in the third and fourth Nos. of the "Swedenborg Library."

of the express chapter and verse of Scripture in support of the doctrine, I cannot give it; nor for myself do I feel the need of it. If a professed revelation respecting the conditions of the human spirit in another life appeals, for the establishment of its credibility, to the soundest rational inductions of my own mind, and contains nothing *contrary* to what I read in the general tenor of the Scriptures, why should I refuse it assent? Has truth upon these subjects no evidence whatever except what is derived from the literal affirmances of the inspired oracles? What is the authority for a thousand pulpit representations of the particular forms of the happiness of heaven and the misery of hell to which you and I have often listened? They may not be always correct—indeed I am persuaded they are generally incorrect—but they are obviously made on the assumption of the soundness of certain general principles, which are deemed sufficient to warrant the recital of various specific details growing out of them. May we not recognize as much certainty in the fundamental principles of our nature as laid down by Swedenborg, and upon which he builds all the details of his disclosures?

XI. *All Angels and Spirits from the Human Race.*—“This leads me to say, more particularly, in the 11th place, that Swedenborg’s ideas of the future world, and the character and state of its inhabitants, are in various respects, at variance with the teachings of God’s word. He holds that all the angels in heaven and all the devils in hell are from the human race, and once lived in this world as we do now. Of course he makes the history of paradise a mere allegory, as there could have been no wicked being to tempt the parents of the human race, and no such beings as Jude and Peter speak of, namely “the angels who kept not their first estate,” and “the angels that sinned.” When Christ says that, in the future world, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are *as* the angels of God in heaven, the meaning according to Swedenborg must be, they *are* angels. But this, he thinks, does not prevent their marrying; for he says they are men and women after death, as they are before, that they have conjugal love, and are joined, as male and female, in marriage—though it is all spiritual.”

As you do not intimate in what respects you regard Swedenborg’s ideas of the future world, and the character and state of its inhabitants, to be at variance with the teachings of the word of God, except it be in respect to the true nature of angels and devils, I presume I am at liberty to consider this as the point which you had especially in your eye in making the assertion. Upon this I have first to correct an error in your statements, and, secondly, to consider how far the alleged error in Swedenborg’s statements is an error. “He holds that all the angels in heaven and all the devils in hell, are from the human race, *and once lived in this world, as we do now.*” The clause in Italics is entirely a mistake, and one of so gross a nature that I am not a little at a loss to conceive how it could have originated. I do not well understand how a writer could have acquired sufficient knowledge of the system to feel authorized to make any denial on this subject, and should yet have failed so utterly to represent the fact as it is. Swedenborg indeed informs us that all angels and devils are from the human race, but then he expressly asserts, over and over again, that the human race is not confined to our earth, but extends throughout all the habitable earths in the universe; and, what is singular enough, you have yourself, in a previous

part of your work, made copious extracts from the little volume entitled "Earths in the Universe," in which you speak of his descriptions "of the *men and women* who live there, the form of their faces, their clothing," &c. You must have known, moreover, that he distinctly affirms that he gained his information respecting these various worlds and their inhabitants from the spirits that once dwelt in them, with whom his spirit had intercourse. All these spirits become angels or demons in the spiritual world. Can I then but wonder exceedingly that you should here represent him as holding, that all these beings, "once lived in this world, as we do now!" You can easily imagine how greatly my ingenuity is taxed to frame an adequate solution of the problem involved in your statement on this head.

As to the objection that he is compelled to "make the history of Paradise a mere allegory, as there could have been no wicked being to tempt the parents of the human race," methinks this does not come with the very best grace from one who insists so strenuously upon the rigor of literal interpretation, for the letter of the narrative speaks only of a *bona fide* serpent as the tempter, and says not a word of any spirit good or evil as having anything to do in the transaction. You must either, therefore, suppose the word *serpent* to denote an evil spirit, while no literal serpent was present, or you must hold that such a spirit employed an actual serpent as an instrument and miraculously spake through him, which, though I once believed it to be the true solution, I now, upon the ground of clearer views, reject as totally inadequate and inapposite. It is to me altogether incredible that a serpent should have uttered articulate sounds under the promptings of an intelligent agent, and that the woman should have been deceived by the machinations of a being of so much power, but of whose existence she had received not the slightest intimation. If it be replied that the whole matter is to be resolved simply into the power of the Most High, I can only say that Omnipotence alone can never solve the problems which involve the other Divine perfections, or silence the voice of our cool and reverential reason. Still I deem it probable that you have no difficulty in receiving the solution, although it is certainly advancing beyond the strictness of the letter into the region of allegory to understand by *serpent* anything but a serpent.

As to what is said by Jude and Peter of "the angels who kept not their first estate," and "the angels that sinned," I am prepared to show, upon the strictest principles of exegesis, that these passages have no reference to an event that transpired in heaven, and answering to what is termed "the fall of angels," but that it relates entirely to the apostacy of the antediluvians. I reserve the discussion however to another contemplated work.

You will not, I trust, understand me as affirming that Swedenborg adheres to the literal sense of the Mosaic narrative of the fall. Far from it. He makes the serpent to be merely a symbol of the sensual principle in man, which is continually tending to seduce his higher nature to a compliance with its dictates, and teaches that it was in this way that the fall was effected, just as every man falls at the present day. If there were diabolical influxes operating upon the sensual lusts at that time, which he does not expressly affirm, there were no doubt evil spirits in existence from some part of the universe, to act the part which they ordinarily do in tempting man to sin.

But the head of this heresy is no doubt in the position, that all angels and

spirits are from the human race, of our own or some other earth. As I propose, if life and health are spared, to treat this subject at length in a future publication, I shall at present content myself with a brief extract from "Noble's Appeal," which will lay open the grounds of the New Church doctrine in regard to the origination of angels and spirits. "What is man? The Scriptures assure us, that he is a being created in the image and likeness of God. This is the proper and intrinsic nature of *man*, however he may have departed from it: and is it possible to employ any other language that will accurately define the intrinsic nature of an *angel*? Is an angel *more* than an image and likeness of God? This would be saying that angels absolutely *are* Gods. An image and likeness of God is a being who receives life, love, and wisdom, of a genuine and heavenly nature, from God: and is not this the definition both of a man and of an angel? To possess life, love, and wisdom, in himself, is the prerogative of God alone: to possess life derivatively, accompanied with a species of love of a merely natural kind, and with instincts supplying the place of wisdom, without a capacity to recede from or alter them, belongs to the brute creation alone: and to possess life derivatively, accompanied with a power of rising from natural love to spiritual, and attaining to the enjoyment of a love and wisdom truly human, imaging the divine love and wisdom from which they are derived, belongs to the only other conceivable order of animated creatures,—the only species of being that can exist between the all-perfect, the infinitely wise and good God, and the irrational animal. Such a being is man: and such a man, when he has passed from this natural into the spiritual sphere of existence, is an angel."—p. 282.

To this I add the following from Swedenborg, as to which you will of course act your pleasure whether to regard it as a sober and veritable relation, or as the dreaming or raving of a wild hallucination. I suspect that to many of my readers it will have a certain air of rational probability that will at least create a *suspicion* that it is not very far from the truth.

"But to proceed now to experience. That angels are human forms or men, has been seen by me a thousand times. For I have spoken with them as man with man, sometimes with one, sometimes with several in company; nor have I seen with them anything different from man as to form; and I have repeatedly wondered that they were such. And lest it should be said that it was a fallacy, or a vision of phantasy, it has been given me to see them in full wakefulness, or when I was in every sense of the body, and in a state of clear perception. Frequently also I have told them, that men in the Christian world are in such blind ignorance concerning angels and spirits, that they believe them to be minds without form, and pure thoughts, concerning which they have no other idea, than as of something ethereal in which there is something vital; and because they thus ascribe to them nothing of man, except a thinking principle, they believe that they do not see, because they have no eyes, do not hear because they have no ears, and do not speak because they have not a mouth and tongue. To these things the angels said, that they knew that there was such a belief with many in the world, and that it reigned with the learned, and also, what they wondered at, with the priests. They also said the cause was, that the learned who were the leaders, and first broached such an idea concerning angels and spirits, thought from the sensuals of the external man concerning them; and they who think from those, and not from interior light, and from the general idea which is implanted in every one; cannot do otherwise than construct such fictions; since the sensuals of the external man comprehend nothing else than what is within nature, but not what is above it, thus nothing whatever concerning the spiritual world. From these leaders as guides was derived the falsity of thought concerning the angels to others, who thought not from themselves but

from them; and they who first think from others, and make those things matters of their faith, and afterwards view them with their own understanding, can scarcely recede from them; wherefore most acquiesce in confirming them. Moreover they said that the simple in faith and heart are not in that idea concerning angels, but in an idea concerning them, as concerning men of heaven, because they have not extinguished by erudition what was implanted in them from heaven, nor do they comprehend anything without a form. Hence it is, that the angels in temples, whether carved or painted, are not represented otherwise than as men. Concerning what is implanted from heaven, they said, that it is the Divine flowing in with those who are in the good of faith and life.

“From all my experience, which now is of many years, I can say and affirm, that angels as to their form are altogether men; that they have faces, eyes, ears, a breast, arms, hands, feet; that they see and hear each other, and converse together; in a word, that nothing at all is wanting to them, which belongs to man, except that they are not clothed with a material body. I have seen them in their own light, which exceeds by many degrees the meridian light of the world; and in it all things of their face were seen more distinctly and clearly than the faces of the men of the earth. It has also been given me to see an angel of the inmost heaven: he had a brighter and more resplendent face than the angels of the lower heavens; I surveyed him, and he had a human form in all perfection.

“Good spirits, with whom I have spoken also upon this subject, grieved in heart that such ignorance concerning the state of heaven and concerning spirits and angels, should be within the church: and being indignant, they said that I should certainly declare, that they are not minds without form, nor ethereal spirits, but that they are men in form; and that they see, hear, and feel, equally as those who are in the world.”—*H. & H.* 74, 75, 77.

XII. *The Marriage Relation.*—“Swedenborg’s ideas respecting the marriage relation rose to a marvellous height. He says, that conjugal love belongs to angels, both of the superior and the inferior heaven; that it is the head of all other loves; that it is the fundamental love of all heavenly, spiritual and natural loves; that into this love are gathered all joys and all delights from first to last; that it was the love of loves with those who formerly lived in the gold and silver and copper ages. He says, that ‘true conjugal love, which is a primary characteristic of the New Jerusalem Church, is more *celestial, spiritual, holy, pure, and clean*, than any other love in angels or men.’”

‘To this you object as follows.

“To such a statement as this we demur. True conjugal love is indeed a pure, virtuous and honorable affection, and is designed by our Creator for exceedingly important purposes in the church, and in civil and domestic society. But where is it spoken of in the Scriptures, as the head-spring of all holy affections, and as more celestial, spiritual, holy, pure and clean, than any other affection in heaven or earth? The first and great commandment is not that which requires love between husbands and wives, but that which requires *supreme love to God*. We must of course conclude, that this affection is of superior excellence to any other. And the second command, which requires love to our neighbors, is like the first; and this love must be considered as next in excellence to the love of God. We have regarded supreme love to God, and equal or impartial love to man, as the chief of the Christian graces. And if we change our opinion on the subject, it will be because we consider Swedenborg as invested with higher authority than Christ and the Apostles, and as commissioned to teach doctrines widely different from theirs.”—*p.* 133.

It is undoubtedly true that Swedenborg gives a most exalted character to true conjugal love, and equally true is it that he gives the most ample reasons for so doing. The subject is too vast to admit of justice being done to it in the limited compass which yet remains to me, and I shall therefore attempt little more

than a brief statement, in his own words, of the grounds on which he ascribes such a pre-eminent sanctity to the marriage relation. Beginning with the citation of numerous passages in which the Lord is represented as the Husband and Bridegroom of his Spouse, the Church, he goes on;

“The reason why conjugal love considered in its essence is the foundation love of all the loves of heaven and the church, is, because it originates in the marriage of good and truth, and from this marriage proceed all the loves which constitute heaven and the church with man: the good of this marriage constitutes love, and the truth thereof constitutes wisdom; and when love accedes to wisdom, or joins itself therewith, then love becomes love; and when wisdom in its turn accedes to love, and joins itself therewith, then wisdom becomes wisdom. Love truly conjugal is the conjunction of love and wisdom. Two married partners, between or in whom this love subsists, are an effigy and form of it; all likewise in the heavens, where faces are the genuine types of the affections of every one's love, are likenesses of it; for it pervades them in the whole and in every part, as was shown above. Now as two married partners in effigy and form are this love, it follows that every love which proceeds from the form of essential love itself, is a resemblance thereof; wherefore if conjugal love be celestial and spiritual, the loves proceeding from it are also celestial and spiritual. Conjugal love therefore is as a parent, and all other loves are as the offspring. The same is evident from the creation of man: in that he was created for this love, and from his formation afterwards by means of this love. The male was created to become wisdom grounded in the love of growing wise; and the female was created to become the love of the male grounded in his wisdom, and consequently was formed according thereto; from which consideration it is manifest, that two married partners are the very forms and effigies of the marriage of love and wisdom, or of good and truth. Since natural loves flow from spiritual loves, and spiritual from celestial, therefore it is said that conjugal love is the foundation love of all celestial and spiritual loves, and *thence of all natural loves*. Natural loves relate to the loves of self and of the world; but spiritual loves to love towards the neighbor: and celestial loves to love to the Lord; and such as are the relations of the loves, it is evident in what order they follow and have place in man. When they are in this order, then the natural loves live from the spiritual, and the spiritual from the celestial, and all in this order from the Lord, in whom they originate. Into this love are collated all joys and delights from first to last. All delights whatever, of which man has any sensation, are delights of his love; the love manifesting itself, yea, existing and living thereby. That the delights are exalted in the same degree that the love is exalted, and also in the same degree that the incident affections touch the ruling love more nearly, is a known thing. Now as conjugal love is the foundation love of all good loves, and as it is inscribed on all the parts and principles of man even the most particular, as was shown above, it follows that its delights exceed the delights of all other loves, and also that it gives delight to the other loves, according to its presence and conjunction with them; for it expands the inmost principles of the mind, and at the same time the inmost principles of the body, as the delicious current of its fountain flows through and opens them.

“I am aware that few will acknowledge that all joys and delights from first to last are collated into conjugal love; because love truly conjugal, into which they are collated, is at this day so rare, that its quality is not known, and scarcely its existence; for such joys and delights exist only in genuine conjugal love; and as this is so rare on earth, it is impossible to describe its super-eminent felicities any otherwise than from the mouth of angels, because they are principled in it. It has been declared by them, that the inmost delights of this love, which are delights of the soul, into which the conjugal principle of love and wisdom, or of good and truth from the Lord, first flows, are imperceptible and thence ineffable, because they are the delights of peace and innocence conjointly; but that in their descent they become more and more perceptible: in the superior principles of the mind as beatitudes, in the inferior as satisfactions, in the breast as delights thence derived; and that from the breast they diffuse themselves into every part of the body, and at length unite themselves in ultimates and be-

come the delight of delights. Moreover the angels have related wonderful things respecting these delights; adding further, that their varieties in the souls of conjugal pairs, and from their souls in their minds, and from their minds in their breasts, are infinite and also eternal; and that they are exalted according to the prevalence of wisdom with the husband; and this, because they live to eternity in the flower of their age, and because they know no greater blessedness than to grow wiser and wiser."—*C. L.* 65–69.

It would seem from this that there can be no real conflict between the demands of this love and of that supreme love to God and the neighbor which lies at the basis of a true heavenly state. The *character* which is the subject of celestial bliss is necessarily made up of the union of goodness and truth, or love and wisdom, and this union is the very essence of the marriage relation, the man being from his nature the impersonation of the Wisdom principle and the woman of the Love principle, the actual conjunction of both being requisite to a perfect image of Jehovah, who is infinite Wisdom and infinite Love in indissoluble union. Here, then, as elsewhere, the doctrine of Swedenborg can only be denied by denying the fundamental principle on which it rests. And I would ask whether a view of this tender relation, exalting it to a dignity and sanctity which had never before been conceived of, does not entitle its author to the reverence and esteem of all those who devoutly value the Divine institutions? Could you be induced to give a candid perusal to the treatise on "Conjugal Love," you would find, I think, that however it might be on other points, yet on this your objections were super-abundantly answered.

XIII. *Enjoyments and Pleasures of Heaven.*—"And here I cannot but remark, that the general description which Swedenborg gives of the employments and pleasures of heaven falls immeasurably short of what we find in the Scriptures. He seems to attach but little importance to the Scriptural idea, that the spirits of just men in heaven are perfect in holiness; that they are with Christ, and see him face to face, and are like him; that they inherit glory, honor and immortality—an exceeding and eternal weight of glory. His heaven, as he commonly describes it, is too earthly. Its employments and pleasures are, for the most part, but little above those which are found among Christians here. The inhabitants are not united in one happy society, having the same holy and happy affection. Their opinions are different; and their characters and tastes uncongenial, and they are led to form innumerable societies, so that those who go there from different countries, as England, Holland, Germany, &c. and those who had been under different forms of religion, as Christians, Mahometans, Pagans, &c., and those who had been engaged in different occupations, as preachers, philosophers, mathematicians, &c., those who had entertained different views of religion, those who had been wise and those who had been ignorant, in short, every variety of men and women may, after a sufficient number of trials, find their proper place, and live in a society suited to their dispositions and habits.—Now, as to the heaven generally described by Swedenborg, I would seriously ask, what is it compared with the blessed state briefly described in the prayer of Christ: 'Father, I will that they whom thou hast given me *be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory.*' Cudworth, and Howe, and Baxter, and other eminent divines, who have formed their habit of thinking, not from visions, but from the word of God, have

entertained views of the heavenly state unspeakably more pure, and spiritual and exalted, than those of Swedenborg."

The grand characteristic of Swedenborg's disclosures on this head is their congruity with the constituent principles of our nature as composed of Affection which has relation to Good, and of Understanding which has relation to Truth. A heaven which does not recognize these principles as its very basis in the soul of man must be the merest phantasy that can be imagined. Such undoubtedly is every idea of heaven which regards it mainly as a *place of assemblage*—the *locale* of an immense society gathered out of all nations, kindreds, and tongues—and promiscuously convened in one vast redeemed concourse. Every conception of this nature we are taught by Swedenborg to regard as the product of mere sensuous thought and partaking infinitely more of the worldly and corporeal element than that which he affords us. Nothing can be more inapposite than to regard heaven in the light of a *place*, instead of that of a *state*, from which all ideas of *place* and *space* are necessarily to be excluded. There is of course a principle of union in the common love which reigns in all the good, but as this principle co-exists with truth in its innumerable varieties of intellectual form, it must inevitably prompt to conjunction on the ground of mental sympathies and predilections, and thus give rise to societies of countless number, all which, being governed by the predominant *human* tendency, must arrange themselves into the form of the Grand Man of heaven. The prevailing idea of a kind of general fusion or amalgamation, to be effected by death, of all the diverse elements of character in those who have been born again, is to our apprehension one of the crudest that can enter the human mind. Reflect for one moment whether you are not acquainted with those of whose piety and prospects you cannot doubt, while at the same time you would shrink from the idea of a perpetual intimacy with them of the nearest kind, from the consciousness that in a thousand particulars their attainments, tastes, habits, &c. were not fully congenial with your own. You would not feel this to be any disparagement to them, or to the work of the Divine Spirit in their souls. The love in your heart must answer to the love in theirs, because it flows from the same source and tends to the same centre. But this fact cannot annul the intellectual differences by which you are severally distinguished, nor can it prevent your yielding to the attraction of more congenial spirits as your abiding associates. The reply to this will no doubt be, that we have reason to believe that the mighty leveller death will sink at once all these inequalities and bring all the good into the most perfect harmony with each other, without reference to any prior barriers to union which may have existed here. But *what* reason have we to suppose anything of the kind? Does death destroy a man's identity? Will *you* not enter the spirit-world with the same *mind* and the same *personal character* which you bring to the last moment of life? Will not your pious servant maid do the same? What solid reason then, I repeat, have you for believing that the same causes which govern your respective associations here shall not operate there also? Will the *translation*, in either case, necessarily be a *transformation*? Will she be instantaneously lifted up to the heights of your theological science, or will your elevation be depressed that you may meet on a common plane? The real *man* of the other life is the actual *mind* of the present life, and how violent the supposition that the mere transition from the one sphere of existence to the other is to effect such a stupendous

change in the fixed and characteristic attributes of the individual? Why then should not the constitutional differences of various peoples and races lay a foundation for that species of moral grouping which Swedenborg says obtains in the heavens? Why should not the pious Hindoo, the Chinaman, the Sandwich Islander, if in the good of Christian life, be more strongly attracted to kindred souls of their own respective nations, than to others whose entire course and habits of thought have been cast in a different mould? The infinitude of the Divine Good can easily flow in and accommodate itself to the various recipient forms and faculties by which they are severally distinguished, and this is of course the essence of heaven under any supposition. If Swedenborg did not represent this as the fact, we might well question the truth of his disclosures. But I beg you to run your eye over the following items, referring to the "Arcana," where the subjects are treated at length, and see if you can conceive that he lowers or lessens our *rational* ideas of the dignity, purity, blessedness, or glory of the heavenly state.

"Experiences to show that men have so general an idea concerning heaven and heavenly joy, that it amounts to none, n. 449. That the least is the greatest in heaven, because the happiest, n. 452, 1419. But that heaven consists in being least, not greatest, n. 452. Some suppose that they are to be admitted through a door into heaven, n. 453. Some that it consists in an idle life, not aware that it consists in active life, and in performing works of charity, as the angels do, n. 456, 457. That the universal heaven in itself hath reference only to the Lord, n. 551. That all and singular things of heaven, and heavenly joys, are from the Lord, n. 551, 552. That they who are in mutual love continually advance in heaven towards the spring-time of their youth, n. 553. That the evil cannot even endure the presence of an angel, n. 1271. That the evil cannot even approach to heaven, n. 1397. That heaven is never shut to eternity, but that happiness increases according to numbers, n. 2130. That the glorification of the Lord in heaven was heard and seen, n. 2133. That heaven is not on high, but within man, n. 8153. That man is heaven and the church in the least form, n. 9279. That evils and falses are removed from those who are elevated into heaven, and goods and truths from those who are cast down into hell, n. 9331. That divine truth from the Lord makes heaven, n. 9408. That in the other life all things are communicated, are received or rejected according to loves, n. 10,130. That the Lord is heaven and the church, thus all in all there, because he dwells there in his own, n. 10,125. The love of good and the faith of truth, the life of heaven, n. 10,715. That they who receive heaven in themselves come into heaven, n. 10,717. That they will good to all for the sake of good and truth, n. 10,718. That in the other life the internal is laid open, whereby it is evident whether heaven or hell be in it, n. 10,270. That love and faith have in them heavenly joy, n. 10,722. That in heaven there is a communication of all goods, and hence so great peace, intelligence, wisdom, and happiness, n. 10,723. That they who are in the loves of self and of the world do not apprehend these things, and that in them is so great happiness, n. 10,724. That the heaven of the Lord is immense for myriads of earths, n. 10,784.

In all this it will be difficult, I think, to detect an air of extravagance, or to designate any particular which is not in accordance with the *spirit* of the Scriptures, however it may transcend the *letter*. But you say, "What is all this compared with the blessed state described in the prayer of Christ, Father, I will that they whom thou hast given me *be with me, where I am, that they may behold my glory.*" And what I would ask, is the beholding the glory of Christ? Is it looking upon a divine splendor, or basking in the beams of what is termed the beatific vision? Is it not an intellectual converse with the high themes of heaven? Is it not a spiritual perception of the truths and the goods flowing

through redemption from the Lord to the souls of "just men made perfect?" And is not this the very employment which Swedenborg ascribes to the heirs of the heavenly kingdom? How then are his representations a disparagement of the Scriptural teachings on this head? If you do not wholly doubt their competency to bear witness in the case, ask any of his adherents whether they have found his statements to be attended with such effects as you intimate? Are they conscious of the least weakening of the power of the motives to a holy life drawn from the views of heaven which Swedenborg presents? Be assured they will, with one voice, declare, that it is increased an hundred fold. The vague generalities of their former belief were comparatively inert and lifeless. They have now a heaven set before them which is the mere crowning development of the heaven that has been implanted within them. They know what it must be, because they feel what it is. You will therefore very rightly infer that I am at the farthest possible remove from admitting the justice of your strictures on this feature of our system.

XIV. *The Sufferings and Miseries of Hell.*—"There is the same palpable difference between his ideas of hell and those of the sacred writers. The sufferings of hell, as described in the word of God, are suited to awaken the deepest emotions of fear and dread, and so to deter men from wickedness. Those who are doomed to that wretched place, are represented as *under the wrath of God, as banished from his presence, as in the blackness of darkness, as cast into unquenchable fire, where there is weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth.* The most dreadful things in creation are seized upon to set forth the miseries of the infernal abode. But what is Swedenborg's hell? Why, it is a great work-house, where the people have tasks assigned them, not extremely hard,—which they are obliged to do in order to get food. It is somewhat like our State-Prison; though in some respects less dreadful to its depraved and guilty inmates."

I might here easily and properly remand the course of discussion back to the fundamental question of Swedenborg's illumination, and rest the truth or falsehood of his statements on this head upon the truth or falsehood of his general claim. If he actually *saw* the verities of heaven and hell, has he not truly described them? Can you possibly reject his statements without first disproving his pretensions? And can you discard the *improbable* in his revelations without offering some more adequate solution of the *probable* than has yet been given? But I am willing to wave this form of reply and to attempt to sustain the truth of his disclosures on the ground of their own intrinsic character. And here we are not to forget that Swedenborg lays it down as a fundamental principle, that both the celestial and infernal scenery, which appears objectively to spirits, is the mirrored representative of their internal states as to affection and thought. The scenery is, as it were, the visible form of the states, and the state of the infernals is a state constituted by the character of their ruling loves. These are the loves of self and of the world, existing in the intensest degree and at once including every wicked and baleful passion akin to them, and excluding every good and heavenly prompting opposed to them. Every spirit of hell, therefore, is a complex of the fiendish dispositions of malice, hatred, anger, envy, revenge, cruelty, lust, desire of dominion, and goaded on by a continual impulse to *act out* these horrid tempers by inflicting all possible misery upon others. Such being their dominant loves, their thoughts must correspond with them, and

as thought assumes form in the other life, and as these forms become realities from the necessity of the case, what must be the outward bodyings forth of these internal states but a complication of just such hideous and revolting scenery as Swedenborg has described? As they have no genuine truth in consequence of having deprived themselves of the kindred good, they have no true wisdom, and being destitute of true wisdom, they are destitute of true rationality, or in other words are virtually insane, though still able to exercise an infernal subtlety and cunning in compassing their pernicious ends. In this condition they must necessarily be in the indulgence of the wildest phantasies and imaginings, and consequently surrounded by mental creations of to us the most loathsome and terrific description, yet in many of which they, from the perverted actings of their moral nature, experience a certain kind of hellish delight. Hence, as their imaginings are turned into correspondent realities, their tossings upon furious horses—their wounding by venomous serpents—their rending by ravenous beasts—their murdering and being murdered by deadly weapons—and all the sad variety of tortures to which they are subject under the outbreak of their evil passions; for in proportion as they put a restraint upon their infernal impulses, the severity of their doom is mitigated, while at the same time no radical change in their nature is effected.

If such then be indeed the real internal state of the wicked in hell—if the very breathing of their souls is toward evil and destruction—shall we suppose them to be left without check? Will the infinite Love and Wisdom leave even hell itself to become a perfect chaos of conflicting elements—a raging volcano of infernal fires? Do not our best conceptions of the Divine attributes compel the belief that the hells shall be kept in some kind of order? May not the compassion of a God extend even to their wretched inmates? May he not, as far as possible, moderate and mitigate the extremities to which their evils are constantly prone to rush? But how shall this be done, consistently with their free agency, except by means of moral bonds, such as fears, threats, and punishments? And even suppose they are so far overruled as to be made subservient to certain kinds of *uses*, ought this to derogate in our esteem from the perfections that are manifested in their lot? Is it any disparagement to our criminal codes in this world that the inmates of our State-Prisons are made to labor in various useful arts and callings as a part of their penal discipline? And do we think it wrong that extra punishments should be visited upon them for extra misdemeanors during their incarceration? I should almost suppose from the following passage that your mind shrank from the idea of any kind of alleviation, from any source, of the utmost intensity of anguish among these heirs of perdition.

“Swedenborg thinks, that the Lord, being exceedingly kind and compassionate, endeavors, in all possible ways, to gratify the inclinations of the wicked in the other world, and will sometimes, at their request, admit them to heaven as a matter of trial. His indignation and wrath, i. e. his holy displeasure, against sin, is not, according to Swedenborg an *objective reality*, but an illusive apprehension, a phantasy of the guilty mind of man.”—p. 136.

It is to me, I confess, in my better moods, a subject of rejoicing to think, that the Lord is “so exceedingly kind and compassionate” as to allow such a trial as you speak of to be made; for the effect of it is plainly to evince that the Divine Mercy is conspicuous in the hells, inasmuch as if it were the design to make the

wicked as miserable as possible, they would be violently urged into heaven, which would be to them a far severer torture than they experience in hell. We see then in this a demonstration of the awful wickedness of the infernals in having acquired a character which renders the bliss of heaven an element of intolerable misery to them, and on the other hand a clear proof of the Divine clemency in having provided for every one a state best suited to his internal quality, and therefore more congenial to his tastes and wishes than any other.

But you say that according to Swedenborg, "his indignation and wrath, i. e. his holy displeasure against sin, is not an *objective reality*, but an illusive apprehension, a phantasy of the guilty mind of man." The evident implication is, that you believe in a *real* indignation and wrath in the mind of God against sin or the sinner, however the idea is apparently softened down by the somewhat milder appellation of a "holy displeasure." The receivers of Swedenborg find no authority for ascribing to the Deity any such passion as *absolute anger* or displeasure, while at the same time they clearly perceive and expressly affirm that the contrariety between the evil that is in man and the goodness and love that is in God has, to the consciousness of the offender, the same positive *effect* as if that which is *apparent* were *real*. But I have already presented our views on this point with sufficient distinctness.

"Swedenborg was indeed led, by his longer residence in the hells, to entertain other views, and to represent the punishments of the wicked as more appalling and disgusting, than the labors and sufferings of the great work-houses above-mentioned; although the punishments arose from the creations of their own dis-tempered minds, like what often takes place in delirium or insanity. He says: 'All who are in the hells, appear with their face backwards from the Lord,—and with the feet upwards and the head downwards.'—p. 136.

I do not know precisely what you would have the reader understand by Swedenborg's "longer residence in the hells." I have not learnt from his own statements that he *resided* there at all. The term is certainly a very singular one to apply to that spiritual perception and insight, by which he was made acquainted with the condition of things in the spiritual world, including both heaven and hell. I can scarcely believe that you intended to endorse Mr. Emerson's verdict, that Swedenborg had a morbid propensity to be continually peering into infernal glooms and horrors, for, as I have shown in my reply to that gentleman, the whole tenor of his writings is directly the reverse. Yet you speak as if he had *taken up his abode* in those doleful regions, and by a long sojourn there had made himself by degrees fully acquainted with all the circumstances of the lot of their inhabitants.

Again you quote him as saying:—"All who are in the hells appear with their face backward from the Lord,—and with the feet upwards and the head downwards." These indeed are his words, but how differently does the whole matter strike the reader when he is informed, that it is only to the angels of heaven that they have this inverted appearance, whereas in their own eyes, and as seen by each other, they seem to stand normally erect, with their heads upwards and their feet downwards. The light of heaven is the light of truth, which reveals things as they are. The light of hell is a mere *fatuous lumen* which falsifies realities, for there all truth is perverted and all order inverted.

In this connection I meet with the following paragraph:—

“According to Swedenborg, these various punishments of hell are *phantasies* or *illusive apprehensions*, created by the disordered fancy of the sufferers, like the frantic and frightful conceptions of maniacs. Now is there not reason to think that the *ideas* of these things, which arose in the mind of Swedenborg, were also *phantasies*, the creations of a lively and fruitful mind, under the influence of a very singular, protracted, and profound delirium,—still resulting in a great measure, from his previous speculations on the subject of future punishment?”—p. 138.

This convenient theory of “previous speculations” has met us several times before, and I very much doubt whether any creation of Swedenborg’s mind is more fully entitled to be termed a *phantasy* than is such a conceit in your own. But to turn for a moment to the reasoning;—because Swedenborg declares that a great portion of the punishments among the spirits of the pit originate in *phantasy*, you would therefore have us believe that his representations themselves come into the same category. This implies at any rate that you admit the *fact* of such *phantasies*, and consequently admit the possibility of their obtaining among infernal spirits, for in granting that Swedenborg may have been imposed upon by phantasies, *because* that phantasies reign in the spiritual world, you of course concede that what he says on this subject *may* be true. The question then arises as to the *probability* of the punishments of hell originating, in great measure, from this source. Now you are aware that the use of the term, on Swedenborg’s principles, does not imply that the objects of phantasy, thus mentally projected, are not *real to the percipients*. A phantastic hydra to a lost spirit is in *effect* a real hydra, because it is really seen by him, and its bite produces a real sensation of pain. The mental things of the other life are to spirits real things, and if they suffer at all from anything that is *objective* to them, why should it not be from this cause as well as any other? Is there not therefore an adequate and philosophical ground for Swedenborg’s assertion on this head, and how can you fairly deduce an inference of delusion in his case from premises involving a positive truth? Is the enunciation of a sound and rational principle the proof of an unsound and *phantastic* state of mind in him who makes it? Besides, if he were the mere dupe of “illusive apprehensions” in these statements, they were no doubt injected into his mind by these very spirits whose character and condition he is setting forth, and as they live, move and breathe, in an element of falsities, it were a much more probable supposition that if they designed to play upon him by phantasies, they would never have prompted an *expose* of their state so marked by an air of intrinsic truth—so well calculated to stand the test of rigid psychological inquest. If they continually pour forth falsities on every other subject, why not on this also? “Let every one,” says Swedenborg, “take heed to himself when he comes into the other life, lest he be illuded; for evil spirits know how to present various illusions before those who have recently come from the world, and if they cannot deceive, still they try, by those illusions, to persuade that nothing is real, but that all things are ideal, even those which are in heaven.” How much more then these which are in hell!

Again, you object to that feature of his revelations respecting the hells which denies the actings of *remorse*—the pain inflicted by a guilty conscience—in the bosom of infernals. And this, you say, is very remarkable. He labors abundantly in other ways to teach us, that man in the next world will be *man still, man altogether*, possessed of all the faculties and senses and affections, which he has here; and yet he holds that the sinners in hell will be destitute of that

which is such a constant and dreadful accompaniment of guilt in the present world." Now it is in fact upon this very basis of the *permanence of man's nature and character* in the world to come, that the position in question rests. The wicked in hell are not tormented by remorse of conscience because, the very effect of their wickedness is to destroy conscience, as we see evinced beyond all question in the present life. Who but is aware that every act of crime deadens more and more the sense of guilt, till in some cases there results a perfect obtuseness of the moral sensibility? The career of iniquity does not perhaps often reach this point in the present world: but the inherent and inevitable *tendency* of all evil is to *extinguish conscience*, and consequently *remorse*, which acts by means of conscience. How often do we learn from the confessions of those who have become monsters in crime, that the inward voice of remonstrance which rebuked the first stages of their transgression, became fainter and fainter as they advanced, till at last it died away in their ear, and conscience became seared as with a red hot iron? But you will probably say of conscience in such cases that it "is not dead, but sleepeth," that its function is merely temporarily in abeyance, and that it will eventually awaken and speak in thunder tones to the ear of the soul. Yet what solid reasons have we for this opinion? I readily admit that the worst men, particularly in Christian countries, where the moral sense of the community creates a kind of *conscientious sphere* that is widely pervasive, will often experience transient pangs and checks in the progress of crime, but this is owing to the influence of *remains*, or sentiments of goodness and truth stored away in the mind in infancy and childhood, which are slow in being extinguished, but extinguished they may be, and eventually are, in all the irreclaimably evil, either in this life or the next. I admit too that when crime has lost its impunity and the offender is brought up and called to face the prospect of punishment awarded by the law, and to cast his eye directly forward into what he has been taught to consider hell—as a place of intolerable misery—he will, in conjunction with the acting of remains, be visited by a "certain fearful looking for of judgment," which is ordinarily termed the operation of *remorse*, but the emotion when analysed will be found to be mainly *prospective* in its intimations and of the same nature with *fear*. So far as it is *retrospective* it is merely the perception of the *causes* which have led to certain *effects*, from the experience of which the soul instinctively shrinks. But it does not necessarily imply any real regret—any godly sorrow—for sin as sin, since this would be a germ of repentance and reformation. All this must of course become extinct when the ultimatum is reached, and the soul is let fully in to its ruling principle and the delight of its love, as it is in hell. It is there in its very element and life, and it can have no more prompting or desire to change the current of its *life's love* than a flowing stream can have any tendency to reverse its current and flow backward. The following will be seen to be a very impressive paragraph as viewed in this connexion.

"As to what concerns resistance from the will, it is to be known that the will (i. e. the love-principle) is what rules the man. It is believed by some that the understanding rules, but the understanding does not rule unless the will inclines; for the understanding favors the will, inasmuch as the understanding, considered in itself, is nothing else but a form of the will. When it is said the will, the affection which is of the love is meant, for the will of man is nothing else; this affection is what rules man, for the affection of love is his life. If

man's affection be that of self and the world, then his whole life is nothing else, nor can he strive against it, for this would be to strive against his own life; principles of truth effect nothing; if the affection of those loves has dominion, it draws truth over to its side, and so falsifies it, and if it does not so favor, rejects it. From these considerations it may now be manifest, that man in no case sets his heart to any truth, if the will resists: hence it is that the infernals, inasmuch as they are in the affections or lusts of evil, cannot receive the truths of faith, consequently cannot be amended."—A. C. 7342.

Remorse can only arise when the soul is still in a condition to array before itself, by an intellectual process, the antagonism existing between the evil which it loves and the good for which it was designed. This is the plane on which conscience can generally act in the present life, but this plane perishes when the soul passes into hell, and the evil love becomes so overwhelmingly predominant that all the opposing judgments of the intellect melt away and are absorbed into it, and the very sense of the contrariety between its present state and its original destination to a better is utterly lost. Where then is the ground for the actings of remorse? How can a soul feel remorse that has reached the point of saying, "Evil be thou my good?" "I have occasionally discoursed," says our author, "with those in another life who have been in the delights of evil and the false, and it was given me to tell them, that they have no life till they are deprived of their delights. They replied, as such people in the world say, that if they were deprived of those delights, there would be nothing of life remaining with them. But it was given me to answer, that life then first commences, and is attended with such happiness as is enjoyed in heaven, which is comparatively ineffable. *This, however, they were unable to comprehend, because what is unknown is believed to be nothing.*" It seems, therefore, that they had lost the very perception of a contrary kind of life, that is, of a contrary love.

And now permit me to ask, what there is in all this that tends to lower an intelligent estimate of the real constituents of hell? What that goes to weaken the moral power of the sanctions drawn from this source to enforce the claims of a holy life? Can a reflecting mind conceive a more terrific idea of perdition than when viewed as a state in which not only conscience and remorse have become extinct, but their very ground-work destroyed, and even the *sense* of an opposite internal state of the soul annihilated? Not but that these wretched spirits know, by a barren intellection, that there is a heaven, and that they are not in it, just as a supremely wicked man may *know* that there is such a form of character as that possessed by a devout and humble Christian. But what kind of *knowledge* is this? Does it approach to anything like a *realizing sense* of the difference between the two characters? Can it consist with the least true desire for an inward change in himself, so long as he remains under the full power of his evil, selfish, and sensual love? There is to me something inexpressibly awful in the representation given on this head in what follows, particularly the relation at the close:—

"Delight is the all of life to all in heaven, and the all of life to all in hell. Those who are in heaven, have the delight of what is good and true, but those who are in hell have the delight of what is evil and false; for all delight is of love, and love is the *esse* of the life of man; wherefore, as man is man according to the quality of his love, so he is man according to the quality of his delight. The activity of love makes the sense of delight; the activity of it in heaven is with wisdom, and the activity of it in hell is with insanity; each in its subjects

exhibits delight. But the heavens and the hells are in opposite delights; the heavens being in the love of good, and thence in the delight of doing good; but the hells, in the love of evil, and thence in the delight of doing evil. If, therefore, you know what delight is, you will know what heaven and hell are. The will, from which man is man, is not moved even a single atom, except by delight; for the will, viewed in itself, is only an affection of some love, thus of delight; for it is some pleasure, and thence satisfaction, which causes it to will; and because the will impels the understanding to think, there is not given the least of thought but from the influent delight of the will. The reason that it is so, is because the Lord, by influx from Himself, actuates all things of the soul and all things of the mind with angels, spirits and men; and He actuates by an influx of love and wisdom, and this influx is the very activity from which all delight is, which in its origin is called blessed, prosperous and happy; and in its derivation, delightful agreeable and pleasant; and in a universal sense, good. But infernal spirits invert all things with them: thus they turn the good into evil, and the true into false, delight still remaining, for unless delight remained, they would not have will, nor sensation, thus not life. Hence it is manifest, what and whence is the delight of hell, and also what and whence is the delight of heaven. * * * The earth then opened, and through the opening three devils ascended, appearing ignited from the delight of their love; and because the angels who were consociated with the novitiate spirit, perceived that those three providentially ascended from hell, they cried to the devils, 'Do not come any nearer, but from the place where you are, tell something concerning your delights.' And they replied, 'Know that every one, whether he be called good or evil, is in his own delight; the good, so called, in his, and the evil, so called, in his.' And the angels asked, 'What is your delight?' They said that it was the delight of committing whoredom, of revenging, of defrauding, and of blaspheming. And again they asked, 'What is the quality of those delights of yours?' They said, that they were perceived by others as fetid smells from dunghills, as putrid smells from dead bodies, and as noisome smells from filthy pools. And they asked, 'Are those things delightful to you?' They said, 'They are most delightful.' Then said they, 'You are like the unclean beasts that live in them.' And they replied, 'If we are, we are; but such things are the delight of our nostrils.' And they asked, 'What more?' They said, 'It is lawful for every one to be in his own delight, even the most unclean, as they call it, provided he do not infest good spirits and angels; but because, from our delight, we could not do otherwise than infest them we were cast into work-houses, where we suffer hard things. The hindering and withdrawing of our delights there are what are called the torments of hell; there is also interior pain.' And they asked, 'Why did you infest the good?' They said that 'They could not do otherwise. It is as if fury seized us, when we see any angel, and feel the divine sphere of the Lord around him.' To which we said, 'Then you are also like wild beasts.' And presently, when they saw the novitiate spirit with the angels, fury came upon the devils, which appeared like the fire of hatred; wherefore, lest they should do harm, they were cast back into hell."—*T. C. R.* 570.

You will read therefore in what I have now said an answer to your inquiry in the ensuing paragraph.

"The inquiry presents itself for our consideration, whether these detailed accounts of the various forms of punishment in hell—accounts so minute, and spun out to such a length, and often, described in language which is so indecent and offensive,—whether they are likely to make as suitable and salutary an impression on the minds of men, as the brief, but striking and awful representations of future punishment which were made by Christ and the Apostles. It is sufficient for us, that they are not found in the Scriptures—that they are additions to the word of God.—*p.* 138.

Permit me to inquire whether you do not believe there will be many things found in the experience both of heaven and hell, which are not expressly mentioned in the Scriptures? The true question is, whether the grounds of this

experience are not laid in the constitution of man's nature, so that the experience itself shall be absolutely inevitable. I have for myself much more than a *suspicion* that all that Swedenborg has declared on this subject will be found in the issue to be true.

XV. *Miracles*.—"We have seen that Swedenborg made no pretensions to the power of working miracles, and held that miracles are not to be expected at the present day. I will not stop to inquire, how the visits he made to heaven and hell, and to the planets, and the starry worlds, and the revelations made to him there, differ essentially from miracles. My design is merely to notice the reason he gives, why miracles are not to be expected at the present day; namely, 'that they carry compulsion with them, and take away man's free will in spiritual things.' I cannot admit this reason to be valid. For if this is the nature and tendency of miracles, then all the miracles wrought by Christ to prove his Messiahship, and all those wrought by the Apostles to confirm the truth of the gospel and the faith of Christians, carried compulsion with them, and took away man's free will; and, of course, those who witnessed the miracles, so far as they experienced the designed effects of them, were under a compulsory influence, which deprived them of their free will, and rendered them incapable of anything morally excellent or praiseworthy. If such be the case, how strange it is, that Christ did so many miracles himself, and gave miraculous powers to so many of his disciples, and that such an important use was made of miracles in the propagation of the Christian religion! What a groundless fancy, that miracles such as were wrought by Moses and Joshua and Elijah, and by Christ and his Apostles, 'carried compulsion with them, and took away man's free will!'"

The use and design of miracles in connection with a revelation from heaven is often, I think, very crudely considered by theologians, and for one I feel greatly indebted to Swedenborg for the light which he has thrown on the subject. The drift of his teaching is, that the design of miracles is mainly to *compel attention* to a divine message, the constraining evidence of which is, at the same time, really in the truth itself announced. This evidence the mind must receive by the light inhering in the evidence in order to command *faith*. The intrinsic effect of miracles falls short of this, and merely produces a kind of *persuasion* affecting rather the external than the internal region of the mind. As a confirmation of moral truth a miracle undoubtedly does a species of violence to the tranquillity of rational belief, and it is only in this way that Swedenborg represents it as militating with free agency. The mind is conscious of a certain astounding and confounding effect produced upon it by an exhibition to the senses of a supernatural power, which tends to suspend, to a degree, the free and calm exercise of the judgment in view of the internal character of the doctrine proposed to be established.

But in order to assure myself of not doing an imperfect justice to Swedenborg's enunciations on this head and to give the reader the fairest opportunity to judge of their soundness, I shall make him the expounder of his own doctrine.

"That no one is reformed by miracles and signs, because they *compel*.—That man has an internal and an external of thought, and that the Lord flows in through the internal of thought into its external with man, and thus teaches and leads him, was shown above: also that it is from the Divine Providence of the Lord that man should act from freedom according to reason: both of these would perish

with man, if miracles were done, and man was driven by them to believe. That it is so, may be seen rationally thus: it cannot be denied but that miracles induce faith and strongly persuade that that is true which he who does the miracles says and teaches; and that this in the commencement so occupies the external of man's thought, that it as it were binds and enchants: but man is thereby deprived of his two faculties, which are called rationality and liberty, so that he cannot act from freedom according to reason, and then the Lord cannot flow in through the internal into the external of his thought, except only to leave to man to confirm that thing from his rationality which was made of his faith by the miracle. The state of man's thought is such, that by the internal of thought he sees a thing in the external of his thought, as in a certain mirror; for, as was said above, man can see his thought, which cannot be given except from interior thought.

"From these things it may be evident, that faith induced by miracles is not faith, but persuasion; for there is not any rational in it, still less any spiritual; for it is only an external without an internal: it is the like with all that man does from that persuasive faith, whether he acknowledges God, or worships Him at home or in temples, or does kindnesses: when a miracle alone induces man to acknowledgment, worship and piety, he acts from the natural man, and not from the spiritual; for a miracle infuses faith through an external way, and not through an internal way; thus from the world, and not from heaven; and the Lord does not enter through any other way with man but through the internal way, which is through the Word, doctrine and preachings from it: and because miracles shut this way, therefore at this day no miracles are done.

"But the effect of miracles is other with the good than with the evil; the good do not wish miracles, but believe the miracles which are in the Word; and if they hear anything concerning a miracle, they do not attend to it otherwise than as to a light argument which confirms their faith; for they think from the Word, thus from the Lord, and not from a miracle. The evil do otherwise; they indeed may be driven and compelled to faith, yea, to worship and to piety, by miracles; but only for a little time; for their evils are shut up, the concupiscences of which and the delights thence, continually act into the external of their worship and piety; and that they may get out of their confinement and burst forth, they think concerning the miracle, and at length call it a mockery and an artifice, or the work of nature, and thus they return into their evils; and he who returns into his evils after worship, profanes the truths and goods of worship; and the lot of profaners after death is the worst of all: these are they who are understood by the words of the Lord in Matt. xii. 43, 44, 45; whose latter state becomes worse than the former. Besides, if miracles were done with those who do not believe from the miracles in the Word, they would be done continually and before the sight with all such. From these things it may be evident whence it is that miracles are not done at this day."—D. P. 130-133.

The application of the general principle is made, in the ensuing extract, to the case of the Jewish nation, whom he uniformly represents as an eminently *external* people, and requiring, from their peculiar genius, a system of moral discipline that is neither called for nor appropriate under the Christian economy,

"As to what concerns prodigies and signs, which are treated of in what now follows, it is to be known that they were done amongst such as were in external worship, and did not desire to be acquainted with internal. They also who were in such worship were to be driven by external means; hence it is that miracles were done amongst the Israelitish and Jewish people, for they were solely in external worship, and in no internal; and also external worship was what they ought to be in, when they were not willing to be in internal worship, to the intent that in externals they might represent holy things, and so communication might be given with heaven, as by somewhat of a church, for correspondences, representatives, and significatives conjoin the natural world to the spiritual: hence now it was, that so many miracles were done amongst that nation. But amongst those who were in internal worship, that is, in charity and faith, miracles are not done, for they are hurtful to them, inasmuch as miracles

compel to believe, and what is of compulsion does not remain, but is dissipated. The internal things of worship, which are faith and charity, are to be implanted in a free principle, for then they are appropriated, and the things which are so appropriated remain; but the things which are implanted in a state of compulsion, remain out of the internal man in the external: for into the internal man nothing enters except by intellectual ideas, which are reasons [rationes], for the ground which there receives is the rational illustrated: hence it is that no miracles are wrought at this day. That they are also hurtful, may hence be manifest: for they drive men to believe, and fix ideas in the external man that it is so; if the internal man afterwards denies what miracles have confirmed, then an opposition and collision of the internal and external man takes place, and at length, when the ideas derived from miracles are dissipated, there is effected a conjunction of the false and the true, thus profanation. Hence it is evident, how hurtful miracles are in this day in the church, in which the internals of worship are discovered. These things are also signified by the Lord's words to Thomas, 'Because thou hast seen Me, Thomas, thou hast believed; blessed are they who do not see, and believe' (John xx. 29): so also they are blessed, who do not believe by miracles. But miracles are not hurtful to those who are in external worship without internal, for with such no opposition can be given of the internal and external man, thus no collision, consequently no profanation. That miracles do not contribute anything to faith, may be sufficiently manifest from the miracles wrought amongst the people of Israel in Egypt, and in the wilderness, in that they had no effect at all upon them: for that people, although they so lately saw so many miracles in Egypt, afterwards the Red Sea divided, and the Egyptians overwhelmed therein, the pillar of the cloud going before them by day, and the pillar of fire by night, the manna, daily showering down from heaven; and although they saw Mount Sinai in smoke, and heard Jehovah thence speaking, with other miracles of a like kind; nevertheless, in the midst of such things, they declined from all faith, and from the worship of Jehovah to the worship of a calf (Exod. xxxii. 1 to the end): hence it is evident what is the effect of miracles. Still less would be their effect at this day, when it is not acknowledged that there is anything from the spiritual world, and when everything of the sort which takes place, and which is not attributed to nature, is denied: for a principle of denial universally reigns against the divine influx and government in the earths; wherefore at this day the man of the church, if he were to see the veriest divine miracles, would first bring them down into nature, and there defile them, and afterwards would reject them as phantasms, and lastly would laugh at all who attributed them to the Divine, and not to nature: that miracles are of no effect, is also evident from the Lord's words in Luke; 'If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead' (xvi. 31)."—A. C. 7290.

The subject is still farther prosecuted in the paragraph annexed, in which you will probably dissent from what he says respecting the church of the present day having virtually taken away the free agency of man by a formal *decreeing* of his impotence in spiritual things. But his proofs on this head are given in another part of the volume, where they challenge refutation, and in the mean time the burden of his doctrine on the general subject may be viewed apart from his sentiments on this special topic.

"It is asked at this day, why miracles are not done, as formerly; for it is believed that if they were done, every one would, in heart, acknowledge. But the reason that miracles are not done at this day, as before, is because miracles force, and take away free agency in spiritual things, and from spiritual make man natural. Every one in the Christian world, since the coming of the Lord, may become spiritual, and he is made spiritual solely by Him through the Word; but the faculty for this would be lost, if man were brought by miracles to believe, since these, as was said above, force and take away from him free agency in spiritual things; and everything forced in such things, brings itself into the natural man, and shuts up, as with a door, the spiritual, which is truly the internal

man, and deprives this of all power of seeing any truth in the light; wherefore afterwards he reasons concerning spiritual things from the natural man alone, which sees everything truly spiritual upside down. But the reason that miracles were done, before the coming of the Lord, was, because then the men of the church were natural, to whom spiritual things, which are the internals of the church, could not be opened; for if they had been opened, they would have profaned them. Wherefore also all their worship consisted in rituals, which represented and signified the internal things of the church; and they could not be brought to perform those rightly, except by miracles; and that they could not even by miracles, because in those representatives there was a spiritual internal, is manifest from the sons of Israel in the wilderness, who, although they had seen so many miracles in Egypt, and afterwards that greatest one upon mount Sinai, still, after a month of days, when Moses was absent, they danced around a golden calf, and cried that that had brought them forth out of Egypt. Very similar things were done by them in the land of Canaan, although they saw the excellent miracles done by Elijah and Elisha, and at last those truly divine by the Lord. Miracles are not done at this day, especially for this reason, because the church has taken away all free agency from man; and it has taken it away by this, that it has decreed that man can contribute nothing at all towards receiving faith, nor anything to conversion, and in general to salvation (see above, n. 464). The man who believes these things, becomes more and more natural, and the natural man, as was said above, beholds everything spiritual upside down, and thence thinks against it. The higher region of man's mind, where free agency in spiritual things primarily resides, would be closed up, and spiritual things, which have been, as it were, confirmed by miracles, would occupy the lower region of the mind, which is merely natural; thus above this there would remain falses concerning faith, conversion and salvation."—T. C. R. 501.

I can scarcely deem it necessary to enlarge farther upon this point. My object has been, as generally elsewhere, to exhibit Swedenborg's genuine teachings in contrast both with the erroneous presentation often made of them and with the objections urged against them when rightly presented. In the department we are now considering, I must regard his positions as intrinsically sound, and so far as he declares the absence of miraculous attestation a distinguishing feature of his mission, it commends itself more powerfully to my acceptance, and that too not only for the reasons he has assigned, but because also of my full conviction that no external miracles would be believed to be miracles by the great mass of men in christian countries. They would infallibly be dealt with as you deal with the remarkable occurrences which are referred to, but not appealed to, as having taken place in regard to Swedenborg himself. While you have not a word to say by way of impeaching the testimony on which the facts are affirmed, and while the sun in the heavens is not more obvious to the eye than the inference is to the reason, that if the facts are true they are supernatural—particularly those relating to the disclosures made to the Queen of Sweden, and to the fire occurring at Stockholm—yet they evidently have not the slightest effect on your mind in begetting a conviction of what we maintain to be their true character. And as it is with yourself, so doubtless would it be with the majority of mankind. Nothing short of a miracle within can make them believe in the occurrence of miracles without, and it is not according to divine order to produce conviction in this manner.

The view which Swedenborg has given of this subject may be illustrated by a supposition. Suppose, then, that Sir Isaac Newton, with all his scientific attainments, had risen up in the days of Plato and announced to him the true structure of the solar system, and in confirmation of the truth of his announcement, had been enabled to work one or more miracles. What would have been

the precise effect of the miracles, supposing them incontestable, on the mind of the philosopher? Would it not at once have produced a severe conflict between what we may term the *man of the senses* and the *man of the reason*?—a conflict extremely unfriendly to the full exercise of his mental freedom. On the one hand his senses are appealed to by a supernatural demonstration which he knows not how to resist; and on the other, his educated belief and the whole current of his convictions pronounce against the truth of the alleged theory. He is thus indeed brought into “a strait betwixt two.” He knows not what to think, and probably at first fails to think at all. A kind of paralysis has fallen upon his intellectual powers, an effect which in the parallel case Swedenborg describes as a sort of suspending of a man’s free agency—a phrase, however, which is evidently not to be pushed to the utmost extremity of its import. Suppose again that the astronomer consents to wave all appeal to the miracles, and proceeds to unfold to the philosopher on purely scientific and mathematical principles the grounds of his announcement. By a consecutive process of reasoning he leads his mind along from step to step in the demonstration, submitting every thing to the light of his understanding, till at length his hearer stands convinced that the conclusion is irresistible—that the earth revolves around the sun, and that the assumed law of gravitation is established beyond dispute. Which of these modes of proof, the miraculous or the rational, is most valuable in itself? Which state of mind the most desirable to be wrought in view of the truth proclaimed? Is there any room to hesitate in pronouncing a verdict? The miracles might be usefully available in arresting the philosopher’s attention to the proposed scientific development, if he were otherwise disposed to treat it lightly, but it is plain that the internal evidence *does the execution*. From this illustration you can at once see the grounds on which the receivers of Swedenborg’s doctrine easily and readily dispense with all miraculous testimony in support of their truth. They feel the want of no higher miracle than they perceive in the system itself.

XVI. *Swedenborg’s Intercourse with the Spiritual World*.—“In the life of Swedenborg various testimonies are given to the reality of his intercourse with the spiritual world, and of his supernatural knowledge. From these the following are selected as the most remarkable. The stories are contained in a letter of Kant, the German Philosopher.”

You go on briefly to recite these “stories,” as you are pleased to term them, namely, that which relates to Swedenborg’s divulging to the Queen of Sweden the private conversation which he had with her brother the Prince Royal of Prussia shortly before his death, which she positively affirmed that she never *had* repeated and which she was confident that he *would not*—that relating to the discovery by Mad. Harteville of a lost receipt given her deceased husband before his death, and which was found precisely as indicated by Swedenborg—and that concerning the fire which Swedenborg declared, at the very time, to have broken out at Stockholm, though he was 300 miles distant at Gothenburg, and the correctness of which, as to the time and place of its commencement, the extent of its ravages, and the period of its cessation, was minutely confirmed three or four days after.

Of these various asserted and attested facts, into which the philosopher Kar+

instituted a rigid inquiry and found nothing to countervail the testimony, you remark :

“ Now I shall not undertake to search out the hidden causes of such marvellous events. The means of doing this are not in my power. But what then? We have heard stories of fortune-tellers, jugglers, and dreamers, and persons magnetized, quite as unaccountable and astounding as these. And who can account for some of the feats of insanity?—I would not undertake to disprove the authenticity of the stories related of Swedenborg. And what then? In all ages wizards and witches have said and done things seemingly preternatural and very astonishing.—Many such things have taken place; and they are certainly marvellous phenomena. But the world in general, in harmony with the sacred writers, have always looked upon persons practising such curious and wonderful arts, as deriving their extraordinary power from a very suspicious source. And who thinks of yielding himself to a fortune-teller, or a juggler, or a magnetized woman, as a *religious guide—a teacher of new doctrines, or new moral precepts*? ‘ He that hath a dream, let him tell a dream. And he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord.’ And what are all the strange workings of the human mind above referred to, whether preternatural or not, that they should turn off our affection and confidence from the sure word of God ?”—p. 142–144.

It is very certain that the parallel fails, in regard to Swedenborg, in one very important particular, and that is, that the “ workings” of his mind whether preternatural or not, so far from tending to “ turn off our own affection and confidence from the sure word of God,” tend directly to draw them to it and fix them supremely upon it. The whole scope of his writings is to inspire the most lofty, reverential, and devout conceptions of the Divine Oracles, as must have been apparent to every candid reader who has perused the foregoing series of extracts. This, methinks, should go not a little to do away the impression of their having originated from the “ suspicious source” to which you allude, for it does not exactly consist with our ideas of diabolical suggestions that they should aim to exalt to the highest possible pitch of spirituality and sanctity our notions of the Scriptures of truth. The policy of infernal promptings would doubtless be very different, and I must think that the undeniable fact that Swedenborg’s writings have a scope so pre-eminently scriptural renders his case an insoluble enigma in all the common modes of accounting for it. *Would* the spirits of darkness and illusion dictate such a body of disclosures and doctrines as that of which I have given so many specimens in the preceding pages? Do you not feel your mind pressed by the difficulties which crowd upon any supposition but that of their divine origin and their absolute truth? *Why* may not the system be true? Can you adduce stronger reasons against it than it spontaneously offers in its own support? *Is* there not an astonishing plausibility in its developments of our interior nature when viewed in connection with the interior purport of the Word? Does it not involve a psychological problem which *must* be solved before it can be intelligently rejected? Can you not at least perceive *so much* evidence in its favor as to account for the fact of its cordial reception by multitudes of deeply reflecting and well-balanced minds? And is a system that wins its way to assent in such circumstances deserving of the unmeasured odium and contempt which has so often been showered upon it? Do we not offer *reasons* for our belief that are well worthy of profound consideration? If Swedenborg was not favored with spiritual intercourse how—how—how—shall the amazing character of his developments be accounted for? Insanity will not do

it—dreaming will not do it—Mesmerism will not do it. What then remains but the alternative of its *truth*? Can the mind rest with the least assurance or satisfaction on any other theory?

But I have not yet done with the matter of miracles.

“But how singular it is, that the followers of Swedenborg should make use of any such arguments as those above mentioned! Do they not know that Swedenborg never attempted to support the truth of his pretensions by miraculous evidence? Do they not know that he expressly discarded such evidence, saying that it interfered with man’s free agency? We should expect that Swedenborgians would all be true to their Leader, as Professor Bush is, and would be careful not to resort to arguments which he rejected. The case of *Christians* is very different; for their Lord and Saviour often appealed to his miraculous works as proof of his Messiahship. And *such miracles as he wrought* did indeed bear witness of him, that the Father had sent him. And his disciples act consistently, when they appeal to his works for the same purpose. But why should the disciples of *Swedenborg* attempt to support his authority by such proofs as he declared to be inadmissible? Why should they wish to make proselytes by a kind of evidence, which would work by compulsion, and would take away man’s free will? If they yield to Swedenborg’s authority in other things, why not in this?”—p. 144.

We have here the most distinct intimation, that the “followers” of Swedenborg endeavor to support the truth of his pretensions by miraculous evidence and a grave lecture is read to them on the inconsistency of the proceeding. But where has this been done? What single instance can you cite in which any defender of his doctrines has taken any other ground than that which you are pleased to attribute to myself? I know not one. They could not do it without doing at the same time the most downright violence to the genius of the system. That they *refer* to the extraordinary incidents alluded to—that they challenge a refutation of the facts—that they hold them as offering a strong collateral confirmation of his claim—is most true. But that they ever make these occurrences prominent as “proofs to support his authority”—that they ever hold them forth as a fundamental ground on which to urge belief—is most untrue. They deem it the glory of their credence that it can freely dispense with everything of the kind. The fabric of their faith can stand firm with the aid of any such miraculous undershoring. As nothing more, therefore, is requisite on this head than a simple negative to the statement of fact, I bring the present letter to a close with the assurance of the respectful regards of

Yours, &c.

GEO. BUSH.

LETTER VIII.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:

Your fifth and last Lecture is devoted to what you term “the moral code of Swedenborg,” implying, however, not as the reader might suppose from the announcement, the consideration of any *general ethical system* which you regard him as teaching, but that particular department merely which relates “to the intercourse of the sexes in particular cases.” The true character of his doctrines, viewed under any aspect, is undoubtedly a fair theme of inquiry, but it is proper that the reader should be advised, that Swedenborg delivers no *moral code separate from his spiritual code*. He treats largely indeed of *life* in its vari-

ous duties and relations, but simply as the expression of internal spiritual principles, whether of goodness and truth, or their opposites. The distinction often made in other systems between what are termed *credenda* and *agenda*—things to be *believed* and things to be *done*—almost wholly disappears in the doctrines of the New Jerusalem. Truth, according to them, is addressed to the love-principle as much as to the understanding-principle, and is therefore as much to be *done* as to be *believed*, and with the angels of the highest heavens, Swedenborg informs us that truth is never a matter of reasoning, or even of conversation, but always of *practice*. What you term therefore “the moral principles of his writings” are in fact no other than the spiritual principles flowing from the constitution of the Divine and human nature, and which characterise alike every portion of his teachings and disclosures. No one part of them can be justly regarded as embodying a “moral code” more than any other. By elevating the conjugal relation, for instance, as he does, into the very highest form of religious affection, making its fundamental principle essentially the same with that which effects conjunction with the Lord himself, he must necessarily treat its opposite, not only as the breach of a moral institute established by divine authority among men, but as a violence done to the very inmost life and soul of celestial bliss. It is, in fact, impossible to conceive anything of higher sanctity in matters of *faith*, than what Swedenborg affirms of the actings of *life* in its various spheres of operation, for the *life* is as the *love*, and the *love* is the ground-element in all the relations which man sustains to his Maker.

The subject which now comes under discussion is undoubtedly one of the greatest importance in its bearings on the general estimate formed of the system, which has probably suffered more from impressions derived from this source than from those originating in any other. It is a very easy matter, as experience has shown, by overlooking or suppressing the general scope of the work which especially treats of this theme, and by disregarding the various qualifications, the nice discriminations, and the solicitous cautions, which accompany his teachings on this head, to present them under an aspect odious and shocking in the highest degree; and on the same principle the Bible itself might be made out to be one of the most immoral books in existence. Nothing, however, is plainer than that every man is entitled to the fairest exhibition of his real sentiments on any subject—especially when those sentiments may be likely, on a superficial survey, to subject him to censure, or to mar the effect of other inculcations to which no exceptions are taken. The claim, in such cases, to the most rigid justice would seem to be imperative in proportion to the evidence afforded of an otherwise blameless character, of a devout spirit, of an upright aim, and of a dominant salutary tendency in the general vein of a man’s writings. If he is one whose private and public life has been beyond reproach—whose grand object has been, as far as the testimony of his friends and the spirit of his works can attest, to promote the interests of solid virtue, to exalt the “blessed and only Potentate” in the universal esteem of mankind, to lead all classes and degrees of his fellow-men to prefer the glories and bliss of another life to the vain phantoms of the present world, and to display before them the most constraining motives to the pursuit, then it is obviously due, not only to the personal character of such a man, but to the most sacred claims of Truth and Charity, represented in him, that a peculiar tenderness shall be evinced towards his reputation, and that

no sinister impression shall be taken up respecting himself or his doctrines but upon the most ample grounds. If any imputations are cast upon his teachings, let him be heard to the fullest extent in his own defence; let the most patient audience be given to the statement which he makes of the elemental *grounds* and *reasons* of every decision; and freely accord to him the advantage of every sound distinction, of every just limitation, of every prudent reserve, of every wholesome admonition, with which he would surround, and guard, and sanction his positions. All this is the dictate of that common equity to which no Christian mind can be insensible, and before a tribunal constituted of those with whom such considerations shall weigh, the adherents of Swedenborg are perfectly willing that his doctrines of Conjugal and Scortatory love should be cited! They regret to say, that, out of the bounds of the New Church, such a tribunal they have not yet been so happy as to find, nor are they by any means sanguine of being more fortunate in time to come. Still they are prompted by the duty of expounding and the hope of vindicating the doctrines of their teacher on this as well as all other points, and if they are discarded and denounced, it shall not be our fault if this is done upon a false and mistaken view of their true character.

And let me here remark, in the outset, that some consideration is obviously due to the *state of mind* in which this feature of Swedenborg's system has been received by the great mass of those who adopt it. In view of the revolting nature of the principles set forth in their *prima facie* character, or as usually presented by opponents, it can scarcely be conceived that they should be insensible to the shock which they are calculated to give to all those settled preconceptions which they would naturally entertain on this department of the rigid *morale* of the Gospel. The individuals who have, one after another, yielded their assent to the claims of Swedenborg, have been mostly from among the members of what are termed evangelical churches, and who cannot fairly be supposed to have adopted a more lax standard of morals on this subject than the majority of their brethren. What reason then is there to believe that they should fail to be equally outraged and scandalized by the naked assertion that Swedenborg allows the "keeping a mistress and a concubine" with the mass of the Christian community? How were it possible that they should be blind to the absolute atrocity of the doctrines charged upon Swedenborg on this subject, provided the charge were true? Is not the very supposition a virtual reflection of the gravest character either upon their understandings or their moral principles? Does it not impeach them of a mental weakness transcending belief, or of a moral corruption more to be detested than deplored? Yet here is the obvious fact, that these persons have actually embraced the system as a whole, and that too in full view of all the alleged abominations on this score which it is said to involve. We have therefore a problem to be solved. How is this admission of the system to be explained consistently with a charitable construction as to the mental and moral state of its subjects? How have they been able to overcome, to their own satisfaction, the force of objections which appear so formidable to others—objections which they *must* have felt in all their weight? To say that they have been strongly drawn to the doctrines by certain of their attractive features, and that, blinded by favoritism, they are morally unable to perceive the enormities in question, is to impute to them the grossest mental imbecility—a charge as unworthy the charity of those who make it, as it is re-

voluting to the consciousness of those against whom it is brought. Some other solution is imperatively called for, and, I am happy to say, can easily be given. The process of conviction has been with them entirely rational and logical, and their conscious experience will generally respond to their accuracy of the ensuing description of it.

(1.) On revolving the pages of Swedenborg and pondering the general import of his revelations, they were compelled to the belief, from their intrinsic character, that they were of God. They became satisfied in their own minds that nothing short of a supernatural opening of his spiritual senses could have enabled him to make those astonishing disclosures of the interior nature of man, and of the spiritual world, which everywhere abound in his writings, and which they felt to be so perfectly in accordance with the higher oracles of their own reason. But this conviction they saw could not stand for a moment by the side of the suggestion, that the subject of a divine illumination—the selected instrument of a message of truth to the world—should, at the same time, be left so far to the falsities of his own mind, as to be allowed to give forth to his fellow-man, under the alleged impulse of the Deity, a code of moral conduct on a particular subject, founded upon the most erroneous principles, and tending to work incalculable mischief to the best interests of society. They could not conceive the possibility that a messenger of Jehovah should be permitted to convert himself into a minister of sin, and under the very plea of elevating the law of the sexual relation to a pitch of angelic purity, pander to the vilest corruptions of the human heart, open the floodgates of the foulest iniquity, and eventually degrade man to a condition below that “in which God had created him or to which sin had sunk him.” Could such sweet and bitter waters proceed from the same fountain? Just in proportion, then, to the strength of the evidence in favor of the divine origin of his doctrines is the fulness of their assurance that no part of them can be, *when rightly understood and estimated*, of the character usually attributed to the “Scortatory Love.” The supposition instantly confounds all their best ideas of the counsels of Infinite Wisdom. That you felt yourself the pressure of the problem on this head is evident from the drift of the following paragraph.

“Here in regard to the particular subject referred to, we meet with painful disclosures—disclosures which it is difficult to reconcile with the justness and purity of his general remarks on conjugal affection and the conjugal state. Who can account for some things which he has written on this point, without supposing, what the Apostle speaks of as sometimes taking place, that Satan transformed himself into an angel of light, and that our author, amidst the throng of angelic beings that surrounded him, was sometimes so far off his guard, or so confused, that he actually mistook the influxes of evil spirits for those of good spirits? And we are sure that those infernal beings, who are enemies to all that is pure and just and of good report, will be able very easily to dispose of all the high and deep things, and all the right things, which Swedenborg has taught respecting conjugal love, if men can only have the license which he gives for the indulgence of their passions in other ways.”—p. 148.

I say nothing at present of the solution you propose by which to account for the apparent inconsistency between the general vein of his sentiments on the subject of conjugal love and that which is evinced on the particular topic we are now considering. You may ascribe it, if you please, to the delusive agency of evil spirits; but the point which I would especially urge is, the *fact* of such an apparent incongruity as I have dwelt upon, and the *fact* too that his “followers” could not but

have been equally aware of it, and must therefore have had some mode of explaining it to their own satisfaction. Whether this would be satisfactory to you, is another question. But I strenuously insist that the most latent implication, that here is a formidable objection meeting us on the very threshold of the system which has been overlooked or disregarded by his friends, is the height of injustice. Such an implication is undoubtedly conveyed in the entire absence of all allusion to any reasonings or apologies they may have offered, or could be supposed to offer, in behalf of their faith, as if nothing more were necessary to satisfy the demands of truth than the naked statement of the objection.

(2.) Their conclusion on this head was vastly strengthened by what they actually found to be the prevailing tone and spirit of his writings. They know not how to conceive anything on this head more pure, more sacred, more holy, than the vein which pervades the entire mass of his voluminous expositions of Scripture, and his other theological works. Referring the essence of all true religion to the actings of Divine love in the soul of man, he is perpetually aiming to impress upon him the indispensable necessity of putting away every evil of heart and life which prevents the fullest conjunction with the Lord as the only source of true blessedness, as the only preparation for heaven, as the only mode of fulfilling the great ends of human destiny. The character formed under the genuine influence of his doctrines cannot be otherwise than pure and heavenly in an eminent degree, for the love of God cannot subsist apart from the love of the neighbor, and the love of the neighbor must necessarily lay an everlasting interdict upon any single act or any course of conduct that is at war with his truest and highest good. And yet if the representations often made by his opponents are well founded, Swedenborg not only sanctions, but expressly inculcates, principles diametrically opposite to all neighborly love, and calculated to poison the fountains of domestic peace and purity, and to pour a deluge of abominations over the bosom of society! Can this be possible? How is the astounding paradox to be explained? What is the solution of this huge inconsistency? What conceivable motive can be assigned for thus zealously building up with one hand, and ruthlessly throwing down with the other? Was he incapable of perceiving that all the lessons of all the angels, on the demands of a holy life, would be utterly nullified, and become a solemn mockery, if wound up with a grave license to give loose to the promptings of unbridled lust, only with the reserve of certain conditions which would be a mere spider's web before the sophistry of rampant appetite? Was not Swedenborg in possession of common sense? Had not the ordinary principles which govern men in the adaptation of means to ends a place in his mind? Was he not prompted by rational motives? If he were, what possible end could he have proposed to himself, in the labors of a long and virtuous life, directed supremely to the moral improvement of the race, and under the full faith of a divine commission, while yet in a single treatise of 90 pages he completely stultifies himself, and virtually renders void the salutary effect of scores of volumes of the most elaborate morality replete with the professed wisdom of angels? Who does not see that here is a solecism that staggers all belief? Who that is acquainted with the tenor of his writings will for one moment admit that he ever *could* have penned what he has, if, at the same time, the state of his mind had been such as to originate so corrupt a system of sexual ethics as his opponents charge upon him? It is utterly in vain to

slur over this stupendous anomaly with the idle intimation of a brain disordered by excess of study on mystical themes, or of a mind natively given to dreaming rhapsodies. Such a solution denies the asserted intrinsic character of his other works, and such a denial we know can proceed only from an ignorance which in the eye of right reason utterly incapacitates a man from making it. We appeal to the only true standard of judgment—the writings themselves. We challenge the production of a single sentence from his voluminous composures on every other subject of doctrine and duty which goes to relax the bonds of wholesome restraint on the passions, or to weaken the sentiments of the most rigid virtue. If our position on this point be unassailable, then we demand that some rational solution be given of the phenomenon of a strain of teaching so wholly at war with everything else that has proceeded from his pen, and so outrageously abhorrent to every better feeling of the Christian bosom. We urge this demand as founded upon an obligation that presses universally and equally upon all good men. The claims of Truth are of no restricted application. If Emanuel Swedenborg, in the great body of his writings, has but reasserted the eternal Truth of Jehovah, it is vain to suppose that those who are termed his "followers" are alone concerned in them, or that it devolves upon them only to attempt to reconcile their apparent inconsistency with other truths or principles regarded as settled beyond debate. If, as I affirm with all assurance, this wonderful man, in the general drift of his doctrines and developments, has spoken to the world what God, by inward teaching, spake to him—if, as I again affirm, you are unable to invalidate the essential verity or to gainsay the ineffable importance of what he has uttered—then I appeal, reverend sir, unhesitatingly to the tribunal of your own bosom, and call upon you to make common cause with me in clearing up every apparent discrepancy between what he *has* taught, and what he *ought* to have taught. I have no deeper concern in this matter than you have. Swedenborg has said nothing to me which he has not said to you. From the bonds of this obligation you can be freed only by the most clear and intelligent assurance of the fallacy and insanity of his claims to a divine mission; and this assurance can never be reached but by means of a thorough and searching examination into the real character of these claims. Of the result of *such* an examination, even in your own case, I have no fear. In nothing is my confidence stronger than in the conviction, that no candid and enlightened mind can really and truly understand the system, and yet reject it. The grand difficulty is in persuading men to bestow upon it sufficient attention to enable them to master its *principles*, which, unless they do, they will reject the *details* as a matter of course.

(3.) In addition to the foregoing evidence of a *presumptive* kind, the practical effect actually wrought upon their own minds by Swedenborg's presentation both of the nature and consequences of all illicit sexual indulgence confirmed amazingly their faith in its truth. It must indeed be admitted that this effect can only be expected to follow where the conviction has taken root that the *law of connection* between character and destiny as developed by Swedenborg is indeed founded in the very elements of our nature. But of this they usually become assured before entering upon the close study of the Conjugal and Scortatory doctrines. When they do this, with the requisite pre-acquaintance with the system, it is impossible for language to describe the horrifying effect produced upon them by the fearful unveiling of the doom that awaits the transgressor in the life beyond death. If

they had ever wavered for a moment before, they are fixed beyond deliberation now. So profound is the philosophy of sex as unfolded in these wondrous pages—so clear is the discovery of the celestial origin and the pre-eminent sanctity of the conjugal principle—that they see beyond question that everything opposed to it must of necessity proceed from hell as its source and lead to hell as its issue. Its very soul and essence and acting is all hellish. And with their general views of the relation between the present and the future life can they but be keenly alive to the practical impression resulting from such developments as he makes of the consequences? As the true measure of every evil is the preciousness of the good to which it stands opposed, the bare thought of doing violence to a principle which lies so near to the very life of the heavenly beatitudes strikes an ineffable awe upon their spirits, and makes them shudder as over the opened pit of perdition when tempted to parley with passion.

In all this, I beg you to be assured, I am merely exhibiting what will be universally affirmed, by the adherents of Swedenborg, to be the native and legitimate effect of his teachings on the point in question. It is impossible that it should be otherwise, if they really *believe* what they profess to believe respecting the condition of human spirits in the other life, as the inevitable result of character and conduct in the present life. If you are at a loss to conceive it, it can only be from a failure to apprehend, as they do, the overwhelming evidence of the truth of these revelations viewed as a whole.

Such I believe to be, in the main, a correct exhibition of the process through which all those have passed who now stand forth as the avowed receivers of what we venture to denominate the Heavenly Doctrines proclaimed by Swedenborg, and who assent as cordially to what he has taught on this particular topic, as to any other part of the system. How far the considerations cited are entitled to weigh, I leave it to the candid censor to judge. To me they appear to possess great intrinsic weight. I am wholly unwilling to admit the virtual implication, that the members of the New Church are incompetent to feel the force of the objections urged, or that they have not been governed by adequate reasons in obviating them to their own minds. These reasons I have as yet however but very partially presented, nor can I do anything like justice to the subject without entering into a more detailed examination of those features of the system to which exceptions are taken. This is fully warranted by the importance of the theme.

And let me here remark in the outset, that I wholly deny and repudiate the charge constructively made in the inuendos respecting the immodesty and indecency of Swedenborg's style in treating of this subject. From some sentences in your own and Dr. Pond's work the uninstructed reader would infer, that the treatise was marked by a baldness and grossness of language outrageously revolting to the refined and virtuous ear. Nothing can be farther from the truth. Indeed I cannot well conceive the possibility of a more faultless mode of treating the subject than Swedenborg has evinced. There is a delicacy of tact—a studied chasteness of phrase—a felicity of *allusion* where plainness of speech would be offensive—that I do not believe is paralleled by any other writer. The subject itself is undoubtedly of a peculiar character, but *if it is to be treated at all*, I question if it could be done in a more unexceptionable manner than it is done in the work we are now considering. And this probably will be after all re-

garded as the "head and front of his offending," that he has said anything whatever on the theme. But why shall this be a *tabooed* subject in a *scheme* of theology and morality so comprehensive as that of Swedenborg? Does it not involve questions of the most momentous bearings upon the interests of religion and sound morals? Is there any form of evil more rife in all communities than those which grow out of the relation of the sexes? Is not a fearful lesson on this subject taught to every man who walks the streets of our great cities after night-fall? And is not a light estimate of the true nature and ends of the conjugal principle evermore at the bottom of these abominations? How shall the root of the evil be reached but by an impressive display of the pre-eminent and inviolable sanctity of the relation of the sexes as founded upon the law of their creation? Such a discovery Swedenborg has made. He has elevated the love of man and woman from the sensual to the spiritual, and even celestial, degree of affection, and brought it into the closest affinity with the principle that conjoins the soul to the Lord himself. He has clothed it, in fine, with all the sacredness pertaining to the highest religious actings of the mind, and in so doing has presented a standard by which to judge of the moral character of its least violation. And is not this the true method of procedure? Is not the conviction of sin wrought by the knowledge of the law? Is there any mode of displaying the true character of evil so effectual as that of arraying over against it the good to which it is opposed? Or, on the other hand, can the claims of any form of good be, by any means, so powerfully set forth as by contrasting it with its opposite evil? Are not the blessings of peace most loudly proclaimed by the horrors of war—the value of freedom by the bitterness of bondage—the advantages of temperance by the woes of ebriety—the beauty of benevolence by the deformity of selfishness—the excellence of justice by the foulness of wrong—and so, *vice versa*, of the whole catalogue? Why then shall not the Christian moralist be permitted to depict the hideousness of lust and debauchery by contrasting it in like manner with the superlative loveliness of a chaste and pure and well-ordered intercourse between the sexes? Or why, on the other hand, shall he not be allowed to commend the angelic attributes of a true conjugal love by exposing the infernal quality and infinite mischiefs of all scortatory promptings? This is what Swedenborg has done. His grand aim is to show that the conjugal principle is from heaven and essentially allied to its highest bliss, while everything opposed to it is from the pit of hell and fraught with its direful and loathsome influxes. Is this wrong? Is it a fair ground of impeachment? Has the theme no claims upon the profoundest consideration of good men? But could he or any one else respond to those claims without speaking intelligibly on the subject? Is it not a mawkish and affected sensibility which, under the plea of indelicacy, would inhibit the free exposure of the intrinsic nature and the baleful effects of licentious indulgence? Must the physician stand aloof from the "putrifying sore" because the sight of it is disgusting, or because the removal of the bandage would offend any other sense? If Swedenborg is condemned for his bold and explicit utterances on this subject, let it be shown that the root of the evil can be reached in any other way. And before the charge of grossness of phrase is preferred, let it be shown that if the *thing* is to be treated at all it would be possible to do it in more guarded and unexceptionable language than he has employed. This, I am confident, can never be done, and I therefore unhesitat-

ingly affirm, that *there is nothing more objectionable in his phraseology than in the subject-matter itself*, and that this is pre-eminently worthy of being treated distinctly and emphatically in the great doctrines of faith and life. I am compelled, therefore, to regard all insinuations about a revolting baldness and indecency in his expressions—all pretences to the necessity of suppressing his own *ipsissima verba*—all intimations of the danger of defilement by coming in contact with his disclosures—as a positive slander and defamation, as intended to create an odium for which there is no sufficient ground. And I must be permitted to remind the authors of such intimations, that it is as much a command of the decalogue that “thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor” as it is that “thou shalt not commit adultery.” The effect of all verbal exhibitions of this subject is generally governed by the state of mind of the reader. “To the pure all things are pure,” but to the prurient imagination all things are defiled. Even the sanctity of holy writ will not prevent some minds from feeding their depraved fancies upon the images suggested by the language employed in it. How much more then in the case of a merely human writer, however pure his inward thought, and however free from any prompting but that of stern fidelity to the sense of duty? If the parallel do not degrade the gravity of the theme, Swedenborg is entitled to say in the words of one of Shakespeare’s *dramatis personæ*—“an’ wrong thinking do not wrest true speaking, my words will offend nobody.” Why is not the same charge brought against other writers who have treated the subject of sexual morality? Is it not because they have for the most part been *silent* respecting this department of it? And yet is it a point on which *silence* is to be commended? If not, let those who are constrained to speak “show a more excellent way” of speaking than Swedenborg has evinced. Let them not take the credit of shunning his alleged faults, while those very faults arose from the discharge of a duty which they forbear to perform.

The claims of justice and truth compel me to advert to another feature of your strictures on this head. You say that you feel required to exhibit the views of Swedenborg with some particularity; and that in doing this you shall exhibit his own language, except when decency absolutely forbids it (decency does not forbid it at all). You then observe,—“The citations are made from his work on *Scottatory Love*.”

Now as you could not but have known that there is no *separate work* of his bearing this title—that it is an integral part of the general treatise on “*Conjugal Love*”—allow me to ask, whether you could have felt yourself absolved, in fairness, from giving to your reader some intimation of this fact? Were you at liberty, *in foro conscientiae*, to leave him in total ignorance of the nature, design, and relations of that treatise, and to deprive the author of the advantage that might accrue from a clear and accurate understanding of the object he had in view in writing it? Does this procedure savor more of the frankness and candor of a Christian censor, or of the sinister spirit of an unscrupulous opponent, who would overwhelm with obloquy what he regards with aversion? Suppose the case made your own—should you not protest against the manifest unfairness of such a garbled and distorted exhibition of your views as would be made by violently dislocating one part of your argument from another, and suppressing a statement absolutely necessary to put the reader in full possession of

your scope? Yet this is precisely the effect of dealing as you and others have done with Swedenborg's doctrine on the relation of the sexes. That you have *intended* to do him injustice, I do not assert; but still injustice has been done, and this makes it necessary for me to endeavor to re-poise the scales by going into a somewhat fuller display of his genuine teachings than would otherwise be called for.

The general title of the work in question is—"The Delights of Wisdom concerning Conjugal Love: after which follow the Pleasures of Insanity concerning Scortatory Love."* It is palpably *one work* treating its main subject under two distinct heads, just as a writer might indite a treatise on Temperance and divide it into two branches, the one treating of the blessings of Temperance, and the other of the miseries of Intemperance. You can easily perceive that if the author, in the course of his discussion, should perchance have intimated that when a man *would* drink, at all events, if no inducement he could hold out would persuade him to abandon his cups and become a sober man, it were better that he should drink wine than brandy—nothing could be more unjust in an opponent than on this ground to represent the writer as an advocate for the use of intoxicating liquors, and in order to prove it should quote the latter part of his work without alluding to the former, or giving the reader any intimation of its existence. It may indeed be a question in casuistry how far it were proper in such cases even to *speak* of anything short of total abstinence, but it is evidently calumnious, on this ground alone, to charge a writer with abetting the very vice which it is the grand object of his work to arrest, and that mainly by a powerful exhibition of the opposite virtue. Yet this is a perfect parallel to the measure which has been dealt out to Swedenborg in view of his enunciations on the subject of Scortatory love.

But to return to the book. The edition now lying before me (Lond. 1841) consists of 430 pages, of which 344 are devoted to Conjugal Love, and the remainder, 86 pages, to Scortatory Love.† The latter part, therefore, bears comparatively a small proportion to the former, yet it is an integral and inseparable portion of it, and this fact ought always to be made known to those who are appealed to by any statements or remonstrances in regard to it, and whose prejudices it is intended to enlist against it. The truth gains nothing in the end by such palpable infractions of its own laws, and justice outraged by controversial tricks will be sure to make heavy reprisals at last. It would have given me pleasure could I have managed this part of my reply without reminding you of so injurious an omission in your statements and strictures on this head.

As I have already remarked, the scope of the entire treatise is to heighten to the utmost our estimate of the nature and ends of the marriage relation by a most elaborate development of the interior principles on which it rests. It is for the most part occupied with a profound exposition of the laws which govern the union of the sexes. It sets the divine institution of marriage in its true light. It lays it down as a fundamental principle, that love truly conjugal, or the

* "Delitiæ Sapientiæ de Amore Conjugalî; post quas sequuntur Voluptates Insaniæ de Amore Scortatorio."

† For the reason of the use of the term "conjugal," instead of "conjugal," in all that Swedenborg says on this subject, see "Swedenborg Library," Nos. 12 & 13, on "The Conjugal Relation and the Distinction of Sex in Heaven."

chaste love subsisting between one husband and one wife, originates in the marriage or conjunction of good and truth; that it corresponds to the marriage of the Lord and his Church; that it is thus love celestial, spiritual, holy, pure, and clean, in a pre-eminent degree; and that it is the foundation of every species of heavenly love and affection, with all their innumerable felicities. But I shall feel at liberty to demand special attention to his own language in propounding the doctrines which he has given forth to the world on this point. It is proper that the Christian community should at least know what he has actually advanced in his writings relative to the general subject of Conjugal Love, since the soundness of his doctrines here must first be disproved before any headway can be made against the general principles embodied in the Scriptural Love. As my object is simply to exhibit a perfectly faithful view of what Swedenborg has taught, not in one place or one work only on this subject, I shall not deem it necessary to draw my extracts solely from the single volume in question.

“The reason why none can be principled in love truly conjugal but those who receive it from the Lord, that is, who come directly to him, and by derivation from him live the life of the church, is, because this love, considered in its origin and correspondence, is celestial, spiritual, holy, pure, and clean, above every love implanted in the angels of heaven and the men of the church; and these its distinguishing characters and qualities cannot possibly exist, except with those who are conjoined to the Lord, and by him are consociated with the angels of heaven; for these shun extra-conjugal loves, which are conjunctions with others than their own proper conjugal partners, as they would shun the loss of the soul and the lakes of hell; and in proportion as married partners shun such conjunctions, even as to the libidinous desires of the will and the intentions thence derived, so far love truly conjugal is purified with them, and becomes successively spiritual, first during their abode on earth, and afterwards in heaven. The reason why none can be principled in spiritual conjugal love, but those who are of the above description by virtue of conjunction with the Lord, is, because heaven is in this love; and the natural man, whose conjugal love derives its pleasure only from the flesh, cannot approach to heaven, nor to any angel, no, nor to any man principled in this love, it being the foundation love of all celestial and spiritual loves.”—C. L. 71.

“That marriage is heaven, and that adultery is hell, cannot be better seen than from their origin. The origin of love truly conjugal is the love of the Lord towards the church, whence the Lord is called, in the Word, the Bridegroom, and Husband, and the church bride and wife: from this marriage the church is a church in general and in particular; the church in particular is the man in whom the church is: hence it is evident, that the conjunction of the Lord with the man of the church is the very origin of love truly conjugal. But how that conjunction can be the origin shall also be explained: the conjunction of the Lord with the man of the church is the conjunction of good and truth; from the Lord is good, and with man is truth; and hence is the conjunction which is called the heavenly marriage, from which marriage exists love truly conjugal between two married partners, who are in such conjunction with the Lord: hence it is first evident, that love truly conjugal is from the Lord alone, and with those who are in the conjunction of good and truth from the Lord: inasmuch as this conjunction is reciprocal, it is described by the Lord, that ‘*They are in Him and He in them*’ (John xiv. 20). This conjunction or this marriage was thus established from creation: the man [*vir*] was created to be the understanding of truth, and the woman [*femina*] to be the affection of good, consequently the man to be truth and the woman good; when the understanding of truth, which is with the man, makes one with the affection of good, which is with the woman, there is a conjunction of two minds into one; this conjunction is the spiritual marriage, from which descends conjugal love: for when two minds are conjoined to be as one mind, there is between them love, and this love, which is the love of

spiritual marriage, whilst it descends into the body, becomes the love of natural marriage. That this is the case, any one may, if he be willing, clearly perceive: the married pair, who interiorly as to their minds love each other mutually and interchangeably, also love each other mutually and interchangeably as to their bodies: it is well known, that all love descends into the body from the affection of the mind, and that without that origin not any love exists. Now inasmuch as the origin of conjugal love is the marriage of good and truth, which marriage in its essence is heaven, it is manifest that the origin of the love of adultery is the marriage of evil and the false which in its essence is hell. The reason why heaven is marriage, is, because all who are in the heavens are in the marriage of good and truth; and the reason why hell is adultery, is, because all who are in the hells, are in the marriage of evil and the false: hence it follows of consequence, that marriage and adultery, are as opposite to each other, as heaven and hell."—A. E. 983.

"They who are in love truly conjugal, after death, when they become angels, return into youth and adolescence; the males, however worn out with age, become young men; and the wives, however worn out with age, become young women; each conjugal partner returns into the flower and into the joys of the age in which love conjugal begins to exalt the life with new delights, and to inspire sportiveness for the sake of proliferation: into this state, first exteriorly, afterwards more and more interiorly to eternity, comes the man who had fled adulteries as sins, and was inaugurated by the Lord into conjugal love whilst he lived in the world. Inasmuch as they are always growing young more interiorly, it follows that love truly conjugal increases and enters into its delights and satisfactions, which were provided for it from the creation of the world, and which are the delights and satisfactions of the inmost heaven arising from the love of the Lord towards heaven and the church, and thence from the love of good and truth between each other, from which loves is derived every joy in the heavens. The reason why man thus grows young in heaven, is, because he then enters into the marriage of good and truth, and there is in good an effort of continually loving truth, and in truth there is an effort of continually loving good, and then the wife is good in its form, and the man is truth in its form: from that effort man puts off all the severity, sadness and dryness appertaining to age, and puts on the liveliness, gladness and freshness of youth, from which the effort lives and becomes joy. It has been told me from heaven, that they have then a life of love, which cannot otherwise be described, than as being the life of joy itself."—A. E. 1000.

"THE CHASTITY OF MARRIAGE EXISTS BY A TOTAL ABDICATION OF WHOREDOMS FROM A PRINCIPLE OF RELIGION. The reason is, because chastity is the removal of unchastity; it being a universal law, that so far as any one removes evils, so far a capacity is given for good to succeed in its place; and further, so far as evil is hated, so far good is loved; and also *vice versa*; consequently, so far as whoredom is renounced, so far the chastity of marriage enters. That conjugal love is purified and rectified according to the renunciation of whoredoms, every one sees from common perception, as soon as it is mentioned and heard; thus before confirmation: but as all have not common perception, it is of importance that the subject should also be illustrated in the way of proof by such considerations as may tend to confirm it. These considerations are, that conjugal love grows cold as soon as it is divided, and this coldness causes it to perish; for the heat of unchaste love extinguishes it; as two opposite heats cannot exist together, but one must needs reject the other, and deprive it of its potency. Whenever therefore the heat of conjugal love removes and rejects the heat of scortatory love, conjugal love begins to acquire a pleasant warmth, and from a sensation of its delights to bud and flourish, like an orchard and garden in the time of spring; the latter from the vernal temperament of light and heat from the sun of the natural world: but the former from the vernal temperament of light and heat from the sun of the spiritual world."—C. L. 147.

"As few know the distinction between the love of the sex and conjugal love, it may be expedient briefly to point out this distinction. The love of the sex is a

love directed to several, and contracted with several of the sex; whereas conjugal love is only directed to one, and contracted with one of the sex. Moreover, love directed to several and contracted with several is a natural love, for it is common to man with beasts and birds, which are natural; whereas conjugal love is a spiritual love, and peculiar and proper to men, because men were created, and are therefore born to become spiritual; wherefore so far as man becomes spiritual, so far he puts off the love of the sex, and puts on conjugal love."—*C. L.* 48.

"But no others come into this love, and can be in it, except such as come to the Lord, and love the truths of the church, and practise its goods. The reason of this is, because monogamical marriages, which are of one husband with one wife, correspond to the marriage of the Lord and the church, and because such marriages originate in the marriage of good and truth. Hence it follows, that conjugal love with man is according to the state of the church with him."—*C. L.* 70.

"The Christian conjugal principle alone is chaste. Christians, in case they marry more wives than one, commit not only natural, but also spiritual adultery."—*C. L.* 142.

The question now arises, are these principles sound? Is such in fact the essential nature of Conjugal Love? Are you prepared to deny or dispute a single position here advanced? If not—if the ground-work is unassailable—then I would ask if what follows respecting the opposite of this love be not equally sound and impregnable?

"Scortatory love is opposite to conjugal love, as hell is opposite to heaven."—*C. L.* 429.

"The delights of conjugal love ascend to the highest heaven, and join themselves in the way thither and there with the delights of all heavenly loves, and thereby enter into their happiness, which endures for ever; the reason is, because the delights of that love are also the delights of wisdom. But the pleasures of scortatory love descend even to the lowest hell, and join themselves in the way thither and there with the pleasures of all infernal loves, and thereby enter into their unhappiness, which consists in the wretchedness of all heart-delights; the reason is, because the pleasures of that love are also the pleasures of insanity."—*C. L.* 294.

"Forasmuch as adultery is hell with man, and marriage is heaven with him, it follows, that in proportion as man loves adultery, in the same proportion he removes himself from heaven, consequently that adulteries shut heaven and open hell; this they do in proportion as they are believed to be lawful, and are perceived as delightful above marriages; wherefore the man who confirms adulteries with himself and commits them from leave and consent of his will, and is averse from marriages, shuts heaven against himself, until at length he does not believe anything of the church or of the Word, and becomes altogether a sensual man, and after death an infernal spirit; for, as was said above, adultery is hell, and hence an adulterer is a form of hell. Inasmuch as adultery is hell, it follows, that unless man abstain from adulteries, and shun and be averse from them as infernal, he closes heaven against himself, nor can he receive the least influx thence; he afterwards reasons that marriages and adulteries are similar, but that marriages are to be guarded in kingdoms for the sake of order, and the education of the offspring; and that adulteries are not criminal, inasmuch as an offspring is born from them equally as from marriages, and that they are no injury to women, because they can endure them; and further, that by them the procreation of the human race is promoted: not knowing that such reasonings, and similar others in favor of adulteries, ascend from the Stygian waters of hell, and that the libidinous and bestial nature of man, which he has inherent from nativity, attracts and sucks them, as a hog does the filth of a dunghill, with delight."—*A. E.* 982.

“Man is born into the love of evil and the false, which love is the love of adultery, and this love cannot be converted and changed into spiritual love, which is an image of God, and still less into celestial love, which is a likeness of God, except by the marriage of good and truth from the Lord, and not fully except by the marriage of two minds and of two bodies. Hence it is evident whence it is that marriages are celestial and adulteries infernal; for *marriage* is an image of heaven, and love truly conjugal an image of the Lord; and *adultery* is an image of hell, and the love of adultery an image of the devil: love conjugal also appears in the spiritual world in form as an angel, and the love of adultery in form as a devil. Reader, treasure this in thy mind, and inquire whether it be true when thou livest a man-spirit after death, and thou wilt see.”—*A. E.* 984.

Such is an extremely general and cursory view of Swedenborg's teachings as to the intrinsic character of these opposite and antagonist loves. In his mode of presenting them, they cannot possibly be viewed apart from each other. To pretend to exhibit a correct idea of his sentiments on the subject by quoting detached portions of the latter treatise, without affording any hint of the purport of the former, would be as clamant an act of injustice as to adduce a dozen sentences from the latter part of the work on “Heaven and Hell,” containing a description of the hells, and to palm them upon the world as affording a specimen of his ideas of *heaven*. What could be imagined more utterly at war with all the dictates of Christian equity?

Have we then, thus far, encountered anything on this subject that can justly be deemed open to censure?—anything which goes counter to the laws of a sound and irreproachable morality? Has he given an overwrought estimate of the sanctity of what he terms the “conjugal” principle, and of the marriage relation which is founded upon it? Has he either too darkly, or not darkly enough, colored the portrait of the opposite principle in its essence and actings? Do not our inmost minds respond to the substantial truth of his representations? If the one principle be angelic and heavenly, *must* not the other be devilish and hellish? And is it any disparagement to this view, that he draws his sanctions, on either head, from the *intrinsic nature* of man viewed in reference to this grand department of his being? I am well aware that theologians are prone to rest the stress of obligation to moral duties upon the *naked authority of the Divine law*. The *uttered will* of Jehovah they seem to regard as the all-sufficient basis of every precept and prohibition, and any reference to the laws growing by necessity out of our constitution as creatures, they are prone to look upon as in some way derogatory to the honor of the Supreme Lawgiver. Jehovah's *legislative glory* is virtually made the foundation of every claim upon human obedience, and little or nothing is thought of the grounds laid in the very structure of our being for right feeling and action. Now it is to be known that, whether sound or unsound, Swedenborg's theology is built throughout upon the *laws of creation*. He knows nothing of *mere abstract law*—of *simple authoritative volition*—as the basis of moral obligation. He shows a reason in the constitution of things for every form of legal enactment proceeding from the Deity, and to this view of the matter his advocates cordially assent. If the principle is unsound, they demand it shall be shown in what respect. It is in their esteem a principle of pre-eminent importance, and one, the fallacy of which, if it be fallacious, deserves to be distinctly pointed out at the hand of their opponents. Yet, where has the slightest attempt at this been made, notwithstanding the principle lies at

the foundation of all that Swedenborg has taught on the subject of Conjugal and Scortatory love?

I must then, at this point, again repeat the question, whether we have thus far met with anything that can be validly objected to on the score of a lax morality, or of an erroneous exhibition of the physical and psychological principles which underlie the whole subject? Can the most critical inspection detect aught in these principles which strikes at the root of any Scriptural precept bearing upon the commerce of the sexes? If so, I am eager to be informed wherein.

The reply will doubtless be, that although there may be nothing objectionable in the principles thus far laid down, yet as we proceed to the sequel we come upon doctrines and applications of quite another aspect and fraught with the most pernicious results so far as they are acted upon. This would certainly be a well founded charge if in what you say of his allowance of mistress-keeping, you had conveyed to your reader a correct and fair impression of the real drift of his statements on that head. This, however, I shall hope to show is far from being the case, notwithstanding that you have quoted, in some instances, his own express words; for a partial quotation from any writer may give but a partial view of his sense, and thus do him great injury. Now it is certain that the tenor of your remarks conveys the impression that Swedenborg unqualifiedly *approves* and *sanctions* a resort to pellicacy in the case of those who, while they are from various causes prevented from entering into the marriage state, are yet the subjects of strong sexual passions. But how is this credible in view of what he is perpetually insisting upon, that "scortatory love is opposite to conjugal love as hell is to heaven"—that, "the impurity of hell is from scortatory love"—that "adulterers become more and more not men, but demons"—that such as are intent upon making a prey of female innocence are atrocious robbers and pirates—that heaven is entirely closed against them—that they come into the most grievous hells—and that their lot after death is unspeakably terrible? Is this the view of one who is at the same time an open advocate of licentiousness *per se*, and who industriously lays down a method of perpetrating systematically and with impunity the very evils which he denounces as the out-birth of hell and the seal of condemnation to its fiercest wrath? Is the same breath to be supposed to blow hot and cold in this manner at the same time?

But how is his own language to be explained? Does he not expressly say that in cases where a man cannot contain, and where from various causes, he cannot marry at an early age, there is found a sort of "refuge or asylum" in a provisional compact of pellicacy with a single female, who is neither a virgin nor a married woman? This he undoubtedly does say, and in view of his language I beg the reader to suspend his judgment till it be fairly weighed. Nothing can be more just than that the words shall be interpreted, *if possible*, consistently with what is said above, and with the obvious design and drift of the whole book. I say *if possible*, because I do not scruple to affirm that with the evidence already arrayed before us, in regard to the dominant scope of the "Conjugal Love," no man can justly impute to Swedenborg an *intention* to inculcate doctrines on this head at war with good morals. A purpose so suicidal to his manifest aim, so absurd and monstrous, cannot be attributed to a writer governed by rational motives, and whose general enunciations on this and other themes, are marked by so profound a wisdom. If then he is absolved on the score of *intention*, the most that

can be said is, that he has *erred in judgment*, that he has been in some way *misled* in his casuistry, and that while aiming at a good end, he has still been betrayed by a mistaken leniency towards human frailty, to lay down principles of action contrary to the strict requisitions of the Gospel law. Even admitting this to be the case, the purity of his *intention* is entitled to weigh somewhat in abating the severity of the sentence that shall be pronounced upon his *errors*. I do not say that it will excuse them, but it certainly goes to palliate them. But I do not propose to rebut the force of the charge on this ground. I believe there is a much stronger.

To a candid mind, I am persuaded, nothing can be more obvious than that Swedenborg is here to be understood as speaking of *providential permissions* in respect to worldly and natural men, who are not yet brought under the government of sound religious principle. As a sensible man, he could not be blind to the fact, that there are those who are so immersed in sensuality, so obsequiously led by their lusts, so deaf to the voice of conscience, and so dead to the sentiments of piety, that, *in their present state*, they cannot be expected to feel the force of the motives which address themselves to men who fear God and love righteousness. Goaded on by powerful passion they *cannot*, because they *will not*, control its actings. The inability does not excuse their indulgence, nor will you find a sentence in Swedenborg which declares the *innocence* of such persons in yielding to their impulses. Yet he uses the term *cannot* just as the sacred writers use it in reference to precisely the same prompting: "Having eyes full of adultery which *cannot* cease from sin;" "If a man *cannot* contain," &c. Here is the simple recognition of a *fact*, which no one will deny, and which may be spoken of as a *fact* without special reference to its moral character, much less without any implied approval or sanction of it. It is a *fact* that there are such men; it is a *fact* that they act from such instigations; it is a *fact* that the Divine Providence does not prevent it, that is, that it *permits* it; inasmuch as the world is not governed on the principle of *forced* but of *voluntary* obedience. The Most High does not command his lightnings to kindle upon the houses of ill-fame in our large cities. He does not come forth "terrible from his holy places" and smite the frequenter of these houses as he puts his foot upon the threshold. In accordance with the general scheme of his administration, He leaves every one to the freedom of his own will, and to construct his destiny by forming his *life* according to his *love*. He holds out every variety of motive—admonitions, warnings, invitations, threatenings—to induce him as a free rational being, to "cease to do evil, to learn to do well"—to repent, believe, and be saved—but he will not *violently compel* him to renounce iniquity and cleave to good. In other words, he *permits* the evil to do evil.

The question now arises, whether the Christian moralist is warranted in recognizing the fact of these *permissions*, and in speaking of one form or degree of evil as less heinous than another, when all are bad. The answer to this question will determine the character of Swedenborg's teachings on the point under consideration. If it be in no circumstances lawful to discriminate between the relative degrees of moral turpitude, or to assume to show that one kind of vice is less grievous and destructive of happiness than another, then doubtless a verdict must be pronounced against Swedenborg, for this is precisely what he has done. His offence "hath this extent, no more." He has done what you would do if

you should say to an incorrigible drunkard, "If you *will* drink in spite of every remonstrance, then I beseech you to confine yourself to wine instead of a beverage more fully drugged with the poison of alcohol." Would you feel that you were guilty of a moral wrong in uttering these words? Would you deem it a just imputation that you were hereby countenancing intemperance? What would be your crime in the case? You tell the man that entire abstinence were infinitely better than drinking at all; you do all in your power to dissuade from giving way to his appetite, but if in spite of everything he will still persist—if neither the fear of God nor regard for man will weigh with him—would you feel that you were wronging the interests of law or righteousness by saying to him that of two evils he had better choose the least? If you cannot save him entirely, is it wrong to endeavor to save him as far as you can? Now this is what I understand to be the principle on which Swedenborg proceeds in treating the subject of scortation. There is not the slightest approach to anything like an *absolute* approval or countenance of licentious indulgence, and this is confirmed by his own express declaration, that "these things are not said to those who are able to restrain the heat of lust, nor to those that are able to enter into marriage immediately upon their becoming mature." In the latter case he would undoubtedly prescribe the apostle's remedy—"If they cannot contain, let them marry." But suppose a man who is not yet principled in religion is unable, from various causes, to marry, while still the sexual stimulus is strong and urgent within him, prompting to promiscuous indulgence; although entire continence were every way preferable, yet inasmuch as religious considerations do not bear sway, may it not be said to him, or rather may it not be said of him, that it were better that he should confine himself to one mistress, than that he should give loose to his passions in roaming and unlimited amours?

But I anticipate the obvious reply. We are to make no allowances—we are to give no quarters to any form or degree of what is intrinsically evil—we have nothing to do with drawing nice distinctions which will be perverted to the accommodation of depraved men in the indulgence of their lusts. It is all evil—evil only—evil continually. What have good men to do with the accursed thing but to denounce and condemn it under every conceivable aspect? This has doubtless a plausible air, but it is not, I think, beyond question. I am at any rate unable for myself to refuse assent to the soundness of what is contained in the following paragraph.

"There are degrees of the qualities of evil, as there are degrees of the qualities of good; wherefore every evil is lighter and more grievous, as every good is better and more excellent. The case is the same with fornication; which, as being a lust, and a lust of the natural man not yet purified, is an evil; but as every man is capable of being purified, therefore so far as it accedes to a purified state, so far that evil becomes a lighter evil, for so far it is wiped away; thus so far as fornication accedes to conjugal love, which is a purified state of the love of the sex, [so far it becomes a lighter evil]: that the evil of fornication is more grievous, so far as it accedes to the love of adultery, will be seen in the subsequent article. The reason why fornication is light, so far as it looks to conjugal love is, because it then looks from the unchaste state wherein it is, to a chaste state; and so far as it gives a preference to the latter, so far it is also in it as to the understanding; and so far as it not only prefers it, but also pre-loves it, so far it is also in it as to the will, thus as to the internal man; and in this case fornication, if the man nevertheless persists in it, is to him a necessity, the causes whereof he well examines in himself. There are two reasons which

render fornication light with those who prefer and pre-love the conjugal state; the first is, that conjugal life is their purpose, intention, or end; the other is, that they separate good from evil with themselves. In regard to the *FIRST*,—that conjugal life is their purpose, intention, or end, it has the above effect, inasmuch as a man is such a man as he is in his purpose, intention, or end, and is also such before the Lord and the angels; yea, he is likewise regarded as such by the wise in the world; for intention is the soul of all actions, and causes blamableness and unblamableness in the world, and after death imputation. In regard to the *OTHER* reason,—that those who prefer conjugal love to the lust of fornication, separate evil from good, thus what is unchaste from what is chaste, it has the above effect, inasmuch as those who separate those two principles by perception and intention, before they are in good or the chaste principle, are also separated and purified from the evil of that lust, when they come into the conjugal state.”—*C. L.* 452.

Now if the main principle here asserted be in itself a sound principle, why may it not be *said* to be so? If the judgment of God is according to truth, and it be a truth that one evil is intrinsically greater than another, will He not so account it? Is it said that the Scriptures know no such distinction, but that all evil is by them indiscriminately condemned, and that it is relaxing the vigor of the divine law to make the slightest concessions to human infirmity, and especially to build anything upon the fact that the Lord in his providence *permits* aught that he has forbidden in his word? But it is palpably impossible to get over the fact that the Scriptures themselves do recognize the doctrine of *permissions*, and that even the positive legislation of Jehovah among the Jews was, in several points, ordered in reference to certain things which were in themselves evil, and which were *permitted* with a view to the avoidance of greater evils. Indeed a stronger term than *permission* is warranted by the facts of the case. It was a species of *winking* at the prevalence of practices which were at the same time at variance with the general scope of the divine statutes. Polygamy was in itself an infraction of the primitive ordinance of monogamical marriage. Yet polygamy was tolerated, and express laws were enacted to regulate it. Divorce, except for a single cause, was equally abhorrent to the true nature and ends of the marriage institute, and yet a clement consideration of the “hardness of heart” of that people led to an abatement of the original rigor with which the sacred covenant was enjoined. These are facts which it is impossible by any sophistry to deny, and I adduce them to show that Swedenborg has powerful precedent to plead when he makes *providential permissions* the basis of *prudential suggestions* applicable to those who are not at present accessible to higher motives. It avails nothing to say, in regard to these ancient allowances, that they are done away under the gospel. Even conceding this, still the fact that they existed is not done away, and never can be, and this fact proves the soundness of the general principle; for if polygamy and divorce for the reason intimated, are in their own nature diametrically opposite to and destructive of the conjugal union, they could no more have been allowed under the law than under the gospel, much less could they have been the subject of direct regulation on the part of the Divine Lawgiver. The reasoning of Milton on this head in his “*Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*” I regard as absolutely unanswerable. He shows by a process of moral logic too luminous to have been expected from any other *poet* than himself, that to allow absolute sin by law, is against the nature of law, the end of the lawgiver, and the good of the people, and therefore impossible in the

law of God. "Be it yielded," says he, "that in matters not very bad or impure, a human lawgiver may slacken something of that which is exactly good, to the disposition of the people and the times; but if the perfect, the pure, the righteous law, of God be found to have allowed smoothly, without any certain reprehension, that which Christ afterward declares to be adultery, how can we free this law from the horrible indictment of being both impure, unjust, and fallacious?" "If the law allow sin, it enters into a kind of covenant with sin; and if it do, there is not a greater sinner in the world than the law itself."—"Did God for this come down and cover the mount of Sinai with his glory, uttering in thunder those his sacred ordinances out of the bottomless treasures of his wisdom and infinite pureness, to patch up an ulcerous and rotten commonwealth with strict and stern injunctions to wash the skin and garments for every unclean touch; and (yet) such easy permission given to pollute the soul with adulteries by public authority, without disgrace or question? No, it had been better that man had never known law or matrimony, than that such foul iniquity should be fastened upon the Holy One of Israel, the Judge of all the earth; and such a piece of folly as Beelzebub would not commit, to divide against himself and prevent his own ends."—"The vigor of his law could no more remit, than the hallowed fire upon his altar could be let go out. The lamps that burned before him might need snuffing, but the light of his law never."

All this I have cited to show that there is such a thing in the divine government as the *kindly consideration* of certain circumstances and conditions which go to modify the character of moral actions, and to which we are not required to be blinded by the fact that they are capable of perversion and abuse. Who can suppose that the sufferance accorded to the Jews on the ground of "hardness of heart" was not sometimes abused under vain and injurious pretexes? Yet the concession was not thereby revoked. So in regard to an important item occurring in the above quotation from Swedenborg;—"In this case fornication, if the man nevertheless persists in it, is to him a necessity, *the causes whereof he well examines in himself* (in explorato apud illum sunt)." Let this be viewed in its connection with the context and it will be seen to be a case of real, but *comparatively* light, infraction of the law of chastity. It is rendered thus light by the fact, that the man really prefers and pre-loves the conjugal state, and is only prevented from marriage by the force of accidental causes. Still he has it in view as his fixed purpose and end, and is prompted solely by what *he deems*, whether correctly or not, a present *necessity* in antedating marital privileges. The grounds of such apprehended necessity are stated elsewhere, and will soon come before us. How far they are intrinsically valid, men will judge for themselves, and this is plainly hinted at in the expression—"the causes whereof he well examines in himself." As Swedenborg regards him as a natural man, it does not follow that the same reasons which satisfy him would satisfy a spiritual man, but still his imagined *causes* go to relieve his conscience, and he has not therefore the guilt of one who sins against light. The case however is not mentioned by way of approval, but simply as an instance of the operation of circumstances in rendering an act more venial than it would otherwise be. And to what Swedenborg has said it may be added, that the essence of marriage is in the mutual consent and soul-affiancing of the parties, and not in the nuptial rite performed at the altar; so that there is plainly less violence

done to the marriage tie in proportion as the fixed intention of marriage enters into the act in question.

What then is more palpable than the truth of the principle, that there are *degrees* in the evil of fornication? And if such be the fact, cannot it be stated by the moralist without weakening the sanctions of virtue or legitimating the issues of vice? The principle is undoubtedly capable of abuse—as what true principle is not?—but the abuse is not justly chargeable upon its simple enunciation. This is not necessarily responsible for the use that may be made of it. He that will pervert it to the justification of his wrongs, does it at his peril. The fact I believe to be that Swedenborg's teachings on this subject are not so much designed to lay down *rules of action as rules of judgment* in regard to actions having reference to the intercourse of the sexes. It is little else than a part of his grand doctrine of Providence, upon the interior springs of which he has poured a light never before accorded to the Christian world. In his treatise on that subject he has shown, for instance, that the Mahometan religion was specially raised up to accomplish important purposes of the Divine Wisdom in respect to the Oriental nations, more particularly in effecting the extirpation of idolatries, which could never have been brought about but by a certain degree of connivance at the doctrinal tenets embraced in that religion. But shall a Christian teacher be precluded from laying open the laws of this providential economy, because forsooth his readers might be led to suppose that he was sanctioning the Koran and setting aside the Bible? If one does not perceive somewhat of the principles upon which the Lord proceeds in the ordering of his providence in regard to the evils of evil men, controlling their conduct, while he still preserves their freedom, such an one is not in a condition to pronounce upon the purport of Swedenborg's doctrines in the work under consideration. He cannot appreciate the light of intelligence with which his receivers know themselves to be endowed in contemplating the great truths of the Divine order. Their claims on this head may be arraigned of presumption and laughed to scorn, but the perpetual hills may as soon be shaken by the breath of an infant as the strength of their interior convictions be moved.

In relation to this whole department of the subject, the following remarks from the Rev. J. H. Smithson's Letter to Rev. Mr. Gibbon, in refutation of his calumnies against Swedenborg and his writings, will be seen by the candid reader to be peculiarly appropriate and striking;—"Like a skilful physician, he marks and examines every symptom of the dreadful disease. Those symptoms which are of a less malignant character he particularly notes: upon these he rests his hopes that the patient, if he follow the prescriptions given, will eventually return to spiritual health and happiness; and yet assures him, that otherwise the disease will continue its ravages. Those symptoms, however, which are of a more grievous character he especially points out, and warns the patient, that if they are not subdued and removed, death—spiritual death—will follow; for there is '*a sin unto death, and a sin not unto death.*' For the lust of fornication, as he states, is less grievous and deadly in proportion as it verges towards conjugal love, that is, towards a regenerate state; and it becomes more grievous and deadly in proportion as it verges to adultery. Now this is precisely the point of view in which Swedenborg places this subject; and the physician and the disease exactly illustrate the nature of the case. But who in his right mind, unwarped by prejudice, or not

actuated by a hostile predetermination to condemn, was ever known to allege the grossest accusations against a physician for fully exploring the nature of a disease, and discriminating between those symptoms which, with proper treatment, afford a reasonable hope of recovery, and those which infallibly prove that the disease is destructive and deadly? Does not the skill of a physician chiefly consist in being able to make this most important discrimination, as well as in pointing out the specific remedies to restore health and happiness? The remedies in this, as in every other sinful case, are, as Swedenborg so repeatedly shows, a living faith in the Lord Himself, as the great Physician of souls, and the exercise of fervent prayer and sincere repentance: these are the means by which spiritual recovery and health can be established. Now those who would allege the grossest accusations against Swedenborg on this head, are as absurd and calumnious in their conduct, as those who would lay the grossest charges against a physician because he discriminates between the more and less grievous symptoms of a complaint, and wisely prescribes according to the exigencies of the case."—*Intel. Repos. Nov. 1841, p. 495.*

With these preliminaries let us look at a sentence which you have quoted with the evident implication of its embodying an ethical enormity of the grossest character. In order to present the subject fairly I cite at some length the context. The main object of the section is to show that *pellicacy is preferable to vague amours, provided only one mistress is kept and she be neither a virgin nor a married woman, and it be kept separate from conjugal love.*

"I. The reason why only one mistress is to be kept, is, because if more than one be kept, a polygamical principle gains influence, which induces in a man a merely natural state, and thrusts him down into a sensual state, insomuch that he cannot be elevated into a spiritual state, in which conjugal love must be. II. The reason why this mistress must not be a virgin, is, because conjugal love with women acts in unity with their virginity, and hence is the chastity, purity, and sanctity of that love; wherefore when a woman makes an engagement and allotment of her virginity to any man, it is the same thing as giving him a certificate that she will love him to eternity: on this account a virgin cannot, from any rational consent, barter away her virginity, unless in case of engagement respecting the conjugal covenant; it is also the crown of her honor: wherefore to pre-seize it without a covenant of marriage, and afterwards to discard her, is to make a virgin a courtesan, who might have been a bride or a chaste wife, or to defraud some man, and each is hurtful. *Therefore whoever takes a virgin and joins her to himself as a mistress, may indeed cohabit with her, and thereby initiate her into the friendship of love, but still with a constant intention, if she do not act the wanton, that she shall be or become his wife.* III. That the kept mistress must not be a married woman, because this is adultery, is evident."—*C. L. 460.*

The sentence in Italics is that which you have quoted, and to which you append the remark that it is to be understood as a specimen of "the more free way of thinking in spiritual things (more properly in carnal things) which Swedenborg introduced."

Now nothing more is requisite than a candid perusal of the whole extract to see that this is an exception to what is taught in its general scope. A man is not to enter into a compact of pellicacy with a virgin-mistress for the reasons stated. But *if he does*, the nature of the relation is changed. His cohabitation with her is to be distinctly on the ground of intended marriage, and though the connection in this case is by no means invested with the character of innocence, yet the sincere purpose of marriage does undoubtedly avail to bring it in the category of the lighter forms of the evil, according to the distinctions laid down. But his

main drift in the section, as is evident from what follows, is to show that the love of pellicacy is to be kept separate from conjugal love. "The reason why the love of pellicacy is to be kept separate from conjugal love, is, because those loves are distinct, and therefore ought not to be mixed together; for the love of pellicacy is love unchaste, natural, and external; whereas the love of marriage is chaste, spiritual, and internal. The love of pellicacy makes distinct the souls of two persons, and conjoins only the sensual principles of the body; but the love of marriage conjoins souls, and from the union of souls conjoins also the sensual principles of the body, until from two they become as one, which is one flesh." "If the love of pellicacy becomes the love of marriage, the man cannot, from any right, recede, without the violation of conjugal union; and if he does recede and marry another, conjugal love perishes from the breach of it. It ought to be known that the love of pellicacy is held separate from conjugal love, in that he does not promise marriage to the mistress, nor lead her into any hope of marriage." Be it observed, however, that in all this he is speaking of the natural man under the influence of natural principles; that he regards the whole thing as intrinsically a form of evil; and accordingly he winds up with saying;—"Yet it is better that the torch of the love of the sex should be kindled with a wife."

I must here be permitted to request that your eye may be turned back for a moment to the second of the reasons given in the above quoted paragraph. It is of the utmost importance as viewed in connection with Swedenborg's whole doctrine of scortatory love. You will see from it that he neither allows nor permits, in any possible circumstances, the wanton violation of female innocence. No plea of necessity or expediency can avail for one moment to justify the spoliation of the priceless pearl of maiden purity. To the same purpose he remarks on a subsequent page, that "the defloration of a virgin without a view to marriage as an end, is the villany of a robber." The grounds of this emphatic reprobation of the vile seducer exist in the fact that "virginity is not only the crown of chastity, but it is also called the certificate of conjugal love, because a certificate has relation to a covenant; and the covenant is, that love may unite them into one man, or one flesh. The men themselves also before marriage regard the virginity of the bride as a crown of her chastity, and as a pledge of conjugal love, and as the very dainty from which the delights of that love are about to commence and to be perpetuated. From these considerations it is manifest that after the zone is taken away, and the virginity is sipped, the virgin becomes a wife, and if not a wife, she becomes a harlot." Now I beg it may be considered whether his actual prohibition on this score does not in fact strike at the root of all his alleged allowances on every other. Do not his teachings on this point carry with them the germ of an eventual superseding of even every apparent and reputed license that may be said to mark or mar the system? If "where no wood is the fire goeth out," so there certainly can be no pellicacy where there are no *pellices*, and where can they be found if there are no seductions? But seductions can never occur where Swedenborg's principles are acted upon, so that whatever bane may be charged upon his precepts, they assuredly carry their own antidote with them. How then can the indictment stand against him of inculcating a lax morality on the score of the intercourse of the sexes?

"But does he not sanction pellicacy?" If so, how? As to the general proposition, that pellicacy is preferable to vague amours, under the conditions

which he specifies, I would respectfully inquire if you do not yourself pronounce the same verdict. Does not your calm reason decide, that if there is no rational ground to hope that the evil will be speedily entirely abolished, it would be infinitely preferable that the abandoned women in our populous cities should forego promiscuous intercourse and confine themselves each to a single paramour, rather than venally bestow themselves, as they do, upon every vile solicitor? And so, on the other hand, with the opposite party. I admit of course that even this is worse than something better; but is it not also better than something worse? Is there not in this a faint shadow of the conjugal relation—something in a degree conservative of the radical principle of its love, and which, with the full concession of its shortcomings, may still be regarded with *some* measure of forbearance when the strength of the sexual impulse and the political or social obstacles to marriage are taken into the account? I would not for the world advance a sentiment on this subject which could be *legitimately* construed into a sanction of vice, but I am unable to perceive anything derogatory to the true character of Christianity in supposing it capable of a certain kind and generous *consideration* of evils which have been vastly aggravated by factitious and accidental causes. May not the Gospel, as well as the Law, evince *some* sympathy with human infirmities, and may not a benevolent teacher of its doctrines, who has given so much evidence of speaking the language of superhuman wisdom, be permitted to hint at a mode of mitigating ills which cannot at be once eradicated, without exposing himself to the charge of aiming at a total subversion of the laws of moral purity? Has he not shown a higher estimate of those laws and traced them to a deeper foundation than any other man? Can he be a *real* enemy to the good which their observance is calculated to produce?

I have, I believe, in what precedes exposed to view those portions of Swedenborg's doctrine of pellicacy which are usually regarded as most exceptionable. But I would deal with the utmost fairness by my readers, and shall, therefore go still more fully into the subject, and appeal to his candid judgment in the array — of the following propositions, for the most part in Swedenborg's own words:—

- (1.) "That it is not known what is the quality of scortatory love, unless it be known what is the quality of conjugal love." Is not this a fact?
- (2.) "That scortatory love is opposed to conjugal love." Is not this a fact?
- (3.) "That scortatory love is opposed to conjugal love, as the natural man viewed in himself is opposed to the spiritual man." Is not this a fact?
- (4.) "That scortatory love is opposed to conjugal love, as the connubial connection of what is evil and false is opposed to the marriage of good and truth." Is not this a fact?
- (5.) "That hence scortatory love is opposed to conjugal love, as hell is opposed to heaven." Is not this a fact?
- (6.) "That scortatory love makes a man more and more not a man, and that conjugal love makes a man more and more a man." Is not this a fact? Is he not rendered by this vile love more and more a brute?
- (7.) "That the delights of scortatory love commence from the flesh, and are of the flesh even in the spirit; but that the delights of conjugal love commence in the spirit and are of the spirit even in the flesh." Is not this a fact?
- (8.) "That the delights of scortatory love are the pleasures of insanity, but that the delights of conjugal love are the delights of wisdom." Is not this a fact?

(9.) "That fornication is of the natural man." Is not this a fact?

(10.) "That fornication is lust, but not the lust of adultery." Is not this a fact?

(11.) "That, with some men the love of the sex cannot be, without hurt, totally checked from going forth into fornication." Is not this a fact, when understood according to its evident import, viz. that a certain constitutional aptency is often attended with injurious effects, both physically and mentally, when restrained from its *natural* mode of gratification; which is palpably all that is intended by fornication in this connection. "It is needless," says he, "to recount the mischiefs which may be caused and produced by too great a check of the love of the sex, with such persons as labor under a superabundant venereal heat; from this source are to be traced the origins of certain bodily diseases and of distempers of the mind, not to mention unknown evils, which are not to be named. It is otherwise with those whose love of the sex is so scanty, that they can resist the sallies of its lust; also with those who are at liberty to introduce themselves into a legitimate partnership of the bed, while they are young, without doing injury to their worldly fortunes, thus under the first favorable impressions." He then alludes to the difficulties often occurring on this score in the present world, "where matrimonial engagements cannot be contracted till the season of youth is past, and where, during that season, the generality live within forms of government, where a length of time is required to serve offices, and to acquire the property necessary to support a house and family, and then first a worthy wife is to be courted." And so all along he gives peculiar prominence to the fact, that the most serious obstacles to marriage exist with multitudes growing out of the governmental politics and social systems generally prevalent. Yet still these multitudes *are men*. Now of all these considerations we can only say, *Valeant quantum valent—let them weigh as much as they are entitled to weigh*. It is said by the biographers both of Swift and of Cowper that their mental diseases arose from this cause, and I believe that physicians are often consulted by those for whom they see that marriage is the proper remedy. Yet I do not plead any such necessity as an excuse for forbidden indulgence, nor does Swedenborg speak of such a resort as exempting any man from reaping the legitimate fruits of his conduct in the consequences of the transgression of a general law. Still I do not know that it militates with the higher and better movements of the Christian spirit to allow its due weight to every consideration which may fairly go to *alleviate* the criminality of moral acts. The sexual passion is in most men exceedingly strong, and when the artificial and corrupt institutions of society have interposed barriers to the lawful mode of gratifying it, this fact would seem at least to dictate as mild a judgment as possible of the infractions of a law the observance of which is made so much more difficult by man than it is by God. Even moral evils growing out of a social constitution in which *power* and *wealth* are the all-prevailing and all-moulding principles, and where man's higher interests and relations are systematically and forcibly subordinated to the low, secular, and sensual aims of the worldly mind, demand a charitable consideration. If we place ourselves in our author's circumstances *when* he wrote we may form a juster estimate of *what* he wrote. On the one hand, he could not but be aware of the strength and urgency of the passion in question, of which every man has probably a deeper sense than he often cares to express. On the other, he looked abroad over the face of society and saw it oppressed by governmental systems bearing so heavily upon thousands of the more

numerous classes, that the resort to marriage was frequently next to impossible. But a free scope to licentiousness is the destruction of the conjugal principle, and the source of ineffable evils. Is there then no remedy? God has implanted the passion; man has virtually interdicted its legitimate gratification. The proper exercise of religious principle would even in these circumstances impose the requisite restraint; but this could not reasonably be anticipated in regard to the great mass of men, for the very genius of the despotisms which are the occasion of the abounding of sexual immoralities is essentially adverse to the prevalence of true piety. Yet the civil interests of all communities demand that some remedy should be prescribed to the ravages of lust. In this condition of things, with a broad survey and a benevolent consideration of the *causes* which were mainly operative in producing the evil, Swedenborg comes forward, and in view of the certainty that some men would be inaccessible to all higher motives to continence, suggests an expedient, addressing itself to lower principles, but by which a host of evils otherwise inevitable might be avoided, and the sacred conjugal germ, the jewel of the soul, still be preserved from utter extinction. In doing this he speaks in the character of a *Christian Montesquieu* unfolding "the spirit of" ethical "laws," and propounding to rulers measures to check *as far as possible* the progress of a moral pestilence of the deadliest type. Freely conceding that something higher and better is infinitely desirable, yet who will say that the remedy is worse than the disease, and who is entitled to denounce the propounder, while *he* simply contents himself with deploring abominations too mighty for human conflict, because too deeply entrenched behind the bulwarks reared around them by the traitorous servility of a false public sentiment which decks itself with the name of *delicacy*. But to return to the propositions.

(12.) "That therefore in populous cities public stews are tolerated." Is not this a fact, and is anything more than the fact asserted? I will give the whole section. "This is adduced as a confirmation of the preceding article. That they are tolerated by kings, magistrates, and thence by judges, inquisitors, and the people, at London, Amsterdam, Paris, Vienna, Venice, and Naples, and even at Rome, besides many other places, is well known; among the reasons of this toleration are those also abovementioned." This is all. There is no absolute approval of the toleration, yet there is doubtless the implication of a latent sense in the minds of the rulers of these countries that *in existing circumstances* this toleration is the least of two evils. And here it will be proper to recite the reasons which Swedenborg specifies as assignable for the policy suggested. "That in kingdoms, where forms and orders of government prevail, matrimonial engagements cannot be contracted by many, till the season of youth is past; for offices are first to be served, and property is to be acquired necessary for the support of a house and family, and then first a worthy wife is to be courted; and yet in the preceding season of youth, few are able to keep the springing fountain of virtue closed up, and reserved for a wife; *it is better indeed that it should be reserved*; but if this cannot be done on account of the unbridled power of lust, a question occurs, whether there may not be an intermediate means, whereby conjugal love may be prevented from perishing in the mean time. That pellicacy is such a means, the following considerations advise: I. That by this means promiscuous inordinate fornications are restrained and limited, and thus a more constricted state is induced, which is more nearly related to conjugal life.

II. That the ardor of venereal propensities, which in the beginning is boiling hot, and as it were burning, is appeased and mitigated; and that thereby the lascivious passion for the sex, which is filthy, is tempered by somewhat analogous to marriage. III. By this means too the strength is not cast away, neither are weaknesses contracted, as by vague and unlimited amours. IV. By this means also disease of the body and insanity of mind, are avoided. V. In like manner by this means adulteries, which are whoredoms with wives, and debaucheries, which are violations of virgins, are guarded against; to say nothing of such criminal acts as are not to be named. VI. By pellicacy neither is access given to the four kinds of lusts, which are in the highest degree destructive of conjugal love,—the lust of deforation, the lust of varieties, the lust of violation, and the lust of seducing innocences, which are treated of in the following pages. But these observations are not intended for those who can check the tide of lust; nor for those who can enter into marriage during the season of youth, and offer and impart to their wives the first fruits of their ability.”—*C. L.* 459. Intimations of this nature can of course be deemed little requisite to Christian men, who have a deeper insight into the grounds and sanctions of moral obligation, but think for a moment of the immense numbers of those who know no such restraints, and whom yet it is so vastly desirable to have restrained by rational checks.

How far these reasons have weight, is left for every one to judge; but I know of nothing in the treatise more likely to encounter reproach than this. In forming an opinion it will be important to bear in mind his own cautionary remarks, that “it is better that the fountain of ability should be reserved,” and that what he says is “not said to those who are able to restrain the heat of lust, nor to those who can marry early.” It is not therefore a general license, but a provisional expedient, founded upon contingent circumstances occurring under the Divine Providence, and which he regards as calling for adapted remedial measures of some kind. That the evils which the measures contemplate are really of the most stupendous magnitude, I think no one can deny. That the universal prevalence of right religious sentiment and action would effectually abolish them, is equally beyond dispute. But seeing such a state of things does not at present exist, and is not soon to be rationally anticipated, the question is doubtless a fair one in morals, whether a Christian teacher is not at liberty to *suggest*, under due limitations and cautions, a palliative remedy which, though it does not accomplish all that could be desired, does yet go to lessen immensely the evils at which it aims. It appeals to lower motives in those whom it contemplates simply because, in their present state, no higher motives can be expected to reach them. Might we not on the same principle say to the slaveholder that although we were constrained to regard the system as entirely wrong, and that all selling and buying of human beings is contrary to the fundamental law of Christianity, yet if he could not be made to feel the force of the obligations requiring the total abandonment of the traffic, we would still suggest that he should never sell a slave except when he had good reason to believe that he would be well treated by his master? Could not this be said by a Christian minister without a virtual surrender of his judgment respecting the moral character of slavery, and without a criminal recreancy to the testimony which he was called to bear against it? This is doubtless a question involving a grave general principle in casuistry, and this

principle obviously lies at the foundation of all that Swedenborg has said on the subject of pellicacy. His doctrine is proclaimed in respect to a particular class of men in a peculiar state of mind. It is easily capable of abuse; it is capable also of being acted upon *comparatively* without abuse *in the state of mind supposed*.

If now it be replied that such doctrine is false, pernicious, and destructive to the interests of religion and virtue, the question, I think, may be proposed, who will be likely to be injured by being influenced by it when viewed in its alleged character? The charge is brought, that Swedenborg, under the claim to a divine commission, inculcates a most lax morality, that he gives the reins to lust, that he virtually sanctions unlimited indulgence. How is this teaching to be practically productive of its legitimate results? Can it be without some kind of belief in his *authority* as an illuminated guide to moral and religious truth? But the moment this belief is established in any mind a new and impressive view of the whole subject of scortatory love is begotten, which completely nullifies the force of any imaginary license which he may have thought himself to have found in his writings. With such a presentation of the nature and effects of that love as Swedenborg sets before him, one *cannot* avail himself of any immunities which he may fancy held out to him without at once proving his faith hypocrisy. So far as he is from this possibility, so far is your statement on this head from the truth. "These are the directions which his admirers are to feel themselves at liberty to follow. And if they do not follow them it is for some other reason than a regard to his principles." Nay, verily, it is for no other reason whatever; for they cannot even begin to conceive any stronger dissuasive than they meet with in these very principles. This you could easily understand if you were once to put yourself in possession of the evidence which has wrought, in their minds, so profound a conviction of his truth in what he has delivered on this head.

It is not the New Churchman then whose moral code or whose practical conduct will be apt to be injured by the exceptionable doctrines of this book. Nor will injury be likely to accrue to any one who really *believes* in the tissue of spiritual developments which are as fully brought out in this as in any other part of Swedenborg's writings. Who then is the threatened victim to the disastrous doctrines of the "Pleasures of Insanity concerning Scortatory Love?" Is it the man, however sensual and depraved, who neither believes nor respects Swedenborg in his assumed character of an illuminated seer? Will he not share in the general estimate of the man as a crazed enthusiast? And are the utterances of such a man likely to be pleaded by him as a warrant for a carnal career? Will they be apt to countervail in any degree the force of those vague and slight, yet scarcely effaceable, impressions of sinful wrong, which in a Christian country float, as it were, about the consciences of the worst of men, and which are to be traced to the *moral sphere* emanating from the Bible? The matter then, as it strikes me, is reduced to a very narrow compass. If a man really believes that Swedenborg speaks on this subject with *authority*, he *cannot* be injured by what he says; if he does not believe this, he *will not*; for what reason can be assigned why any one should be influenced by a reputed license to do wrong when he sees no credentials of authority in the licenser?

But if neither the adopters nor the rejectors of Swedenborg's doctrines on this head are liable to be practically influenced by them, for what purpose were they given? Upon what class of men are they designed to bear? Is not a great amount

of logical and casuistical refinement thrown away? I am not sure that I shall answer this question precisely in the manner in which it would be answered by most of my brethren in the faith, but I can see for myself an important end accomplished by enabling us to form a *proper estimate* of the evils in question. His teachings elevate us to a region whence we can look down upon the field before us, and intelligently contemplate the workings of the Divine Providence in regard to men of all classes and characters, and as prompted by all kinds of motives. In this survey we are enabled to perceive that according to the state of mind and the force of circumstances in which actions are put forth by merely natural men, they are marked by various degrees of criminality, and are therefore to have accorded to them various degrees of toleration in the legislative and judicial economies which come into the grand system of moral machinery, by which an all-wise Providence governs the world. There is indeed an interior kingdom, composed of spiritual men, and under the direct governance of spiritual laws, which brook no known infractions by their subjects; but there is also an *external* kingdom, composed of worldly men, unsusceptible in their present state of being controlled by the highest class of motives, but whose welfare is yet regarded by the Universal Father, and whose policies are secretly overruled by the Divine Wisdom in such a manner as to prevent the extinction of all order and of all evil, and social good. This end is sometimes attained by the permission of a lesser evil in order to the warding off of a greater, and the present moral state of the agents, which is evermore exquisitely perceived and regarded by the Lord, being such as to prevent the peril of *profanation*, we can see the quality of the permission. Without the least stain to his own immaculate rectitude, the Most High *looks into* without *entering into, necessitating, or patronizing* the allowed volitions and actions of his free creatures, and in another life will *judge, by active imputation*, and with unerring justice, the moral character of the one and the other. The spiritual man, who is truly conjoined to the Lord in his affection, is gifted with some measure of his own divine perception of motives and ends. He looks forth from his elevated interior sphere into this exterior kingdom of providence, somewhat as the soul contemplates the things of its body, and judges of whatever is below it, while it remains itself unjudged except by the Omnipotent. In the more advanced state of things in the present world which Swedenborg's system all along interiorly respects, I have little doubt that civil rulers will see in his developments a *measure of judgment* by which they shall be governed in administering the interests of justice among men, and that too without compromising the demands of a more spiritual law applicable to spiritual men. Just in proportion as the conjugal element of our nature shall rise in general appreciation, will be the estimate formed of the provisions suggested for its preservation.

The course of discussion brings me to the consideration of another department of the general subject of Scortatory Love—that of *Concubinage*, in regard to which you remark :

“With a most remarkable philanthropy, he extends his care over the conjugal state, and makes provision, which will be welcome to a certain class of men, for cases which not unfrequently occur. He objects strongly to a man's cohabiting with a wife and a mistress *at the same time*. But if men have what he calls ‘legitimate, just, and truly conscientious causes to separate themselves and keep apart from a wife as to actual love,’ he allows them ‘to have another woman in keeping.’ He specifies a variety of these causes, that is, causes for keeping

apart from a wife and having a mistress; such as vitiated states of the wife's body, fevers, leprosy, cancers,—offensive diseases inward or outward, especially those which defile the face, faintness epilepsy, rupture, &c.—also intemperance, telling family secrets, disputing, striking, internal dissimilitude, antipathy, coldness, &c. In these cases, a man may very justly and conscientiously separate himself from his diseased and suffering, or offending wife, and keep a mistress. And our author goes still further, and palliates the crime of adultery in other circumstances; namely, 'when a wife by craftiness captivates a man's mind, enticing him into her bed-chamber, and inflaming his passions,' or when a man entices another man's wife, and inflames *her* passions. These and like circumstances, he says,—operate as reasonable apologies in favor of the party seduced."—p. 149.

The only reply to this is to be drawn from a full and accurate exhibition of what Swedenborg has said on the subject of the concubinary relation, especially as viewed by the light of his general doctrine concerning the conjugal principle, apart from which it cannot be, by any means, properly appreciated. And, first, let it be observed that he lays it down in several propositions, that "concubinage conjointly with a wife is unlawful to Christians, and detestable"—that "it is polygamy, which is condemned, and to be condemned, by the Christian world"—that it is "unlawful because it is against the conjugal covenant; and that it is detestable, because it is against religion, and what is against the latter and at the same time against the former, is against the Lord"—that "as soon as any one, without real sufficient cause, adjoins a concubine to a wife, heaven is closed to him, and by the angels he is no more numbered amongst Christians." He then proceeds to state, that concubinage apart from the wife, when engaged in from just, legitimate, and truly sufficient causes is not illicit. In the distinct specification of these causes, he classes them under three heads, the first of which he terms *legitimate*, as being identical with the causes that warrant divorce understood as the abolition of the conjugal covenant, and thence plenary separation, leaving the man at entire liberty to marry another wife. The sole cause of this total separation, or divorce, he says, "is scortation, according to the precept of the Lord, Matt. xix. 9. That scortation is the sole cause of divorce, is because it is diametrically opposite to the life of conjugal love, and destroys it even to extinction." He then goes on to observe that there may be cases where, although actual ground for plenary divorce exists, yet particular reasons may operate for "retaining the adulterous wife at home." A number of such reasons he particularly recites, which it is not necessary here to mention. The fact however of the scortation actually dissolves the *vinculum matrimonii*, and the man is therefore left in circumstances that release him from any marriage tie which would stand in the way of such *permitted* cohabitation as might take place if he had never been married at all. Concubinage then with him would be but another name for the pellicacy already treated of, and the requisite conditions of which have been distinctly stated. But the point especially to be noted in this connection is, that the *legitimate* causes of plenary divorce are the *legitimate* causes of concubinage or, in other words, of pellicacy, which concubinage in this instance becomes. These causes however are to be established "by the edicts of judges," that is, decided and proclaimed by the proper courts of law, and not left to his own private or personal adjudication. This is the first head of the causes of concubinage, and no one, I think, can deny that if there are *any* legitimate causes for such a relation, the legitimate causes for a full divorce are among them.

But he remarks farther, that in addition to what he terms *legitimate* there are also *just* causes of concubinage, which are to be adjudged by the man alone, acting however under the influence of sound and conscientious principles. These causes are the "just causes of separation from the bed," while at the same time, the conjugal bond is not dissolved, nor the wife abandoned, nor any of the domestic duties of a husband relaxed or intermitted, except it be a case, for instance, like that of confirmed lunacy or idiocy, where a wife is removed to a hospital or asylum. In the following paragraphs are enumerated at considerable length the causes of thoral separation and consequent concubinage, which he denominates *just*, and of which every man is to judge for himself in the fear of God. I quote from "Conj. Love," 251-254.

"There are given separations from the bed and separations from the house; the causes of separation from the bed are numerous, equally so are the separations from the house; but here it is treated of legitimate ones. (In the subsequent treatise he terms these causes *just*.) Since the causes of separation coincide with the causes of concubinage, concerning which in the following part of this work, in its own chapter, therefore the reader is referred thither that he may see the causes in their order. The legitimate causes of separation are those which follow.

"**THAT THE FIRST CAUSE OF LEGITIMATE SEPARATION IS A VITIATED STATE OF MIND.** The reason of this is, because conjugal love is a conjunction of minds; wherefore if the mind of one of the parties takes a direction different from that of the other, such conjunction is dissolved, and with the conjunction the love vanishes. The states of vitiation of the mind, which cause separation, may appear from enumerating them, and which for the most part are as follow: madness, frenzy, furious wildness, actual foolishness and idiocy, loss of memory, violent hysterics, extreme silliness so as to admit of no perception of good and truth, a high degree of stubbornness in refusing to obey what is just and equitable; a high degree of pleasure in talkativeness and discoursing only on insignificant and trifling subjects; an unbridled desire to publish family secrets, also to quarrel, to strike, to take revenge, to do evil, to steal, to tell lies, to deceive, to blaspheme; carelessness about the children, intemperance, luxury, excessive prodigality, drunkenness, uncleanness, immodesty, application to magic and witchcraft, impiety, with several other causes. By legitimate causes are not here meant judicial causes, but such as are legitimate in regard to the other married partner.

"**THAT THE SECOND CAUSE OF LEGITIMATE SEPARATION IS A VITIATED STATE OF BODY.** By vitiated states of body are not meant accidental diseases, which happen to either of the married partners within the time of their marriage, and pass away; but by vitiated states of body are meant inherent diseases, which do not pass away. The science of pathology teaches what these are. They are manifold, such as diseases whereby the whole body is so far infected, that the contagion may prove fatal; of this nature are malignant and pestilential fevers, leprosy, the venereal disease, gangrenes, cancers, and the like; also diseases whereby the whole body is so far weighed down, as to admit of no consociability, and from which exhale dangerous effluvia and noxious vapors, whether from the surface of the body, or from its inward parts, in particular from the stomach and lungs: from the surface of the body proceed malignant pocks, warts, pustules, scorbutic phthisis, virulent scab, especially if the face be defiled thereby: from the stomach proceed foul, fetid, rank, and crude eructations: from the lungs, filthy and putrid exhalations, arising from imposthumes, ulcers, abscesses, or from vitiated blood or lymph therein. Besides these there are also various other diseases, as lipothamia, which is a total faintness of body and defect of strength; paralysis, which is a loosing and relaxation of the membranes and ligaments which serve for motion; certain chronic diseases, arising from a loss of the sensibility and elasticity of the nerves, or from too great a thickness, teaucity, and acrimony of the humors; epilepsy; fixed weakness arising from apoplexy; certain phthical complaints, whereby the body is wasted; the cholick, cæliac affection, rupture, and other like diseases.

“ THAT THE THIRD CAUSE OF LEGITIMATE SEPARATION IS IMPOTENCE BEFORE MARRIAGE. The reason why this is a cause of separation is, because the end of marriage is the procreation of children, which cannot take place where this cause of separation operates; and as this is foreknown by the parties, they are deliberately deprived of the hope of it, which hope nevertheless nourishes and strengthens their conjugal love.”

The remaining class of causes are what he terms *sontica*, or *vere sontica*, which although rendered in the earlier translation of the “*Conjugal Love*,” *conscientious*, and *truly conscientious*, are undoubtedly more correctly represented by *sufficient* or *valid*, a rendering which has been adopted in the later revised American edition. These are thus specified, with preliminary remarks.

“ THAT THE SUFFICIENT CAUSES OF THIS CONCUBINAGE, ARE REAL AND NOT REAL. Since besides just causes which are just causes of separation, and thence become just causes of concubinage, there are also sufficient causes, which depend on judgment and justice with the man; therefore these also are to be mentioned: but as the judgments of justice may be perverted and be converted by confirmations into the appearances of what is just, therefore these causes are distinguished into sufficient causes real and not real, and are described separately

“ THAT THE REAL SUFFICIENT CAUSES ARE SUCH AS ARE GROUNDED IN WHAT IS JUST. To know these causes, it may be sufficient to recount some of them; such as no natural affection towards children, and a consequent rejection of them, intemperance, drunkenness, uncleanness, immodesty, a desire of promulgating family secrets, of disputing, of striking, of taking revenge, of doing evil, of stealing, of deceiving; internal dissimilitude, whence comes antipathy; froward requirement of the conjugal debt, whence the man becomes a cold stone; application to magic and witchcraft; an extreme degree of impiety; and other similar evils.”

Aware, however, of the strength of corrupt nature and the tendency of its pleadings to falsify and sophisticate sound principles, he proceeds to designate the not real or fictitious causes which men would be very apt to assign to themselves by way of justifying a conduct prompted by passion and at war with morality and religion.

“ THAT CAUSES SUFFICIENT NOT REAL ARE SUCH AS ARE NOT GROUNDED IN WHAT IS JUST, ALTHOUGH IN THE APPEARANCE OF WHAT IS JUST. These are known from the sufficient real causes above mentioned, and, if not rightly explored, may appear as just, and yet are unjust; as that times of abstinence are required after the bringing forth of children, transitory sicknesses of wives, from these and other causes a check to profligation, polygamy permitted to the Israelites, and other like causes of no weight as grounded in justice. These are fabricated by the men after the contracting of cold, when unchaste lusts have deprived them of conjugal love, and have infatuated them with an idea of its likeness to scoratory love. Such men, when they engage in concubinage, to prevent defamation, make such spurious and fallacious causes real and genuine, and very frequently also forge and charge them against the wife, their companions, assenting to and re-echoing them according to favor.”—*C. L.* 474.

I have now stated the grounds on which is built the proposition, that *concubinage apart from a wife, when engaged in from causes legitimate, just, and truly sufficient, is not illicit*. The bare announcement of this proposition is undoubtedly calculated to occasion a shock to the prevailing sentiments of the Christian world, and perhaps to a degree that may close the mind against even any attempted *explanation* of what is really and truly intended by it. The very term *concubine* awakens at once a train of revolting associations, and the idea of any poe-

sible form of toleration allowed to this kind of sexual relation operates with a species of torpedo touch upon all the virtuous sensibilities of the bosom in which piety and refined intelligence have found a home. The spontaneous verdict is prone to be, that nothing—not a syllable—can be uttered in its defence without meeting an instant repulse and condemnation from the spirit which has been formed by the pure precepts of Christianity, or without betraying, on the part of the utterer, an open or latent design to sap the very foundation of everything lovely and of good report in the sphere of life's tenderest and most hallowed relations. I should be sorry to think that I failed in any measure to appreciate the value of such sentiments, or that I had assumed the advocacy of doctrines which went legitimately to disturb or outrage them. But I have ventured to think it possible so to present the views advanced by Swedenborg as to divest them of that character of extreme repugnancy to preconceived ideas with which they at first blush array themselves before the mind. And to this end I observe,

(1.) That it is proper to refer everything said on this head to the general aim and object of the whole book, which is to elevate and consecrate the conjugal principle and the conjugal relation above all the ordinary estimates which have ever been formed on the subject. It is impossible, I think, to doubt that this is our author's real and supreme intention, and that everything he has said on the opposite or scortatory principle is designed to act, in a reflex way, in heightening our conceptions of the superlative worth and excellence of that element of our being to which it stands opposed. In the endeavor to compass this end it may be said that he has enlisted false principles—that he is inconsistent with himself—that his reasoning destroys his conclusions—and that consequently the results are not only fallacious, but pernicious. This remains to be seen; but what I at present insist upon is, that the entire drift of his discussion in the body of the work, as well as innumerable passages in his other writings, cannot in fairness be otherwise viewed than as aiming at a good end or, in other words, as evincing a good intention. If notwithstanding he can be shown, on adequate grounds, to have been mistaken, the mistake, I should suppose, may still be affirmed in such a manner as to leave unimpaired all the credit due to a worthy and unexceptionable object.

(2.) It is to be constantly borne in mind that Swedenborg plants himself most distinctly and emphatically on Scripture ground in maintaining but one sufficient cause of plenary divorce, viz. that of adultery. It is impossible for language to be more explicit than that which he employs on this head. He cannot, therefore, be justly charged with teaching doctrines that go to countenance a light esteem of the legal bond of matrimony, or to favor a facility in obtaining release from its obligations. This is still more evident from the following paragraph from another work which is palpably the language of a very serious mind. "From what has been said it may without difficulty be concluded and seen, whether a man be a Christian or not, yea, whether he has any religion or not: for whosoever does not regard adulteries as sins, in faith and life, is not a Christian, neither has he any religion. But on the other hand, whosoever shuns adulteries as sins, especially if he holds them in aversion by reason of their being sins, and still more, if he abominates them on that account, has religion, and if he be in the Christian Church, is a Christian."—*Doct. of Life*, 77.

(3.) It is of the utmost importance that a correct idea should be formed of what Swedenborg understands by the *concubinage* of which he speaks, and of its true relation to the conjugal union. In our common parlance a *concubine* is little less than a *harlot*, but the term has not that opprobrious sense in the sacred writings, where it is used to denote a lawful wife, but of secondary rank, one who enjoyed no conjugal right but that of cohabitation, and whom the husband could repudiate and send away with a small present. The *concubine* of Swedenborg, however, is not properly a *wife*, as this would be *polygamy* which he pointedly condemns as illicit to Christians under any circumstances whatever, as being directly subversive of the true conjugal relation which can only subsist between two. The nature of these secondary marriages and the grounds of the permission on which they were founded, are thus unfolded by him in the commentary on Gen. xxv. 5, 6.

“In order that both the celestial and the spiritual might be represented in marriages formerly, it was allowed besides a wife to have also a concubine; such concubine was given to the husband by the wife, and was then called his woman, or was said to be given to him for a woman, as when Hagar the Egyptian was given to Abraham by Sarah, when Bilhah the handmaid was given to Jacob by Rachel, and the handmaid Silpah given to Jacob by Leah, where they are called women, but in other places concubines, as Hagar the Egyptian in this verse, and Bilhah, also Keturah herself. That these ancients had concubines besides a wife, as not only Abraham and Jacob, but also their posterity, as Gideon, Saul, David, and Solomon, was of permission, for the sake of representation, viz., of the celestial church by a wife, and of the spiritual church by a concubine; it was of permission, because they were such that they had no conjugal love, thus neither was marriage to them marriage, but only carnal copulation for the sake of procreating offspring, and to such there might be permissions, without the injury of conjugal love and the covenant thence derived, but in nowise to those who are in good and in truth, and who are internal men or can become so; for as soon as man is in good and truth, and in things internal, such things cease; hence it is not allowable for Christians, as for Jews, to take to themselves a concubine with a wife, and that this is adultery.”—A. C. 3246.

From this it appears very evident that what may be termed the *license of concubinage* is not granted by him to *real Christians*, or men in a spiritual state of mind, but *permissively* to those who have not yet advanced beyond the state of natural men. I am aware that the propriety of any such species of teaching on the part of a Christian will be vehemently protested against, but as I have already dwelt upon this point and may advert to it again in the sequel, I wave all discussion at present, and proceed to remark, that Swedenborg alone has drawn the true distinction between *concubinage* and *polygamy*, the former of which was permissively granted to the sons of Jacob, and the latter to the sons of Ishmael. Polygamy is a kind of diffusion or dissolution of the conjugal love over the sex in general, whereby it in fact loses its peculiar distinctive character, and is resolved into a mere prompting of lasciviousness. “The reason is, because the love thereof is divided amongst several, and is the love of the sex, and the love of the external or natural man, and this is not conjugal love, which alone is given chaste. That polygamical love is a love divided amongst several, is a known thing, and divided love is not conjugal love, for this latter love is not to be divided from one of the sex, hence the former love is lascivious, and polygamy is lasciviousness.” (C. .L 345). He accordingly affirms that “with polygamists conjugal chastity, purity, and sanctity cannot be given, nor can a polygamist, so long as he remains a polygamist, be made spiritual.” Polygamy,

however, is permissively allowed to the Mahometans because love "truly conjugal which subsists only between one man and one wife, could not be given, inasmuch as they do no not, from a religious principle, acknowledge the Lord (i. e. Christ) as equal to God the Father, and thus as the God of heaven and earth." He also in the same connection lays down the following principles, which will be seen to have an important bearing upon the whole subject, particularly so far as moral conduct is related to the prevailing state of mind of the agent.

"THAT POLYGAMY IS NOT SIN WITH THOSE WHO LIVE IN IT FROM A RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLE. All that which is contrary to religion is believed to be sin, because it is contrary to God; and on the other hand, all that which agrees with religion, is believed not to be sin, because it agrees with God; and as polygamy existed with the sons of Israel from a principle of religion, and in like manner at this day with the Mahometans, it could not, and cannot, be imputed to them as sin. Moreover, to prevent its being sin to them, they remain natural, and do not become spiritual; and the natural man cannot see that there is anything of sin in such things as appertain to received religion; this is seen only by the spiritual man. It is on this account, that although the Mahometans are taught by the Alcoran to acknowledge our Lord as the son of God, still they do not come to him, but to Mahomet; and so long they remain natural, and consequently do not know that there is in polygamy any evil, nor indeed any lasciviousness. The Lord also saith, '*If ye were blind ye would not have sin; but now you say we see, therefore your sin remaineth*' (John ix. 41). Since polygamy cannot convict them of sin, therefore after death they have their heavens, n. 343; and therein have joys according to their life.

"THAT POLYGAMY IS NOT SIN WITH THOSE WHO ARE IN IGNORANCE CONCERNING THE LORD. This is, because love truly conjugal is from the Lord only, and cannot be imparted by the Lord to any others than those who know him, acknowledge him, believe on him, and live the life which is from him; and those to whom that love cannot be imparted, know no other than that the love of the sex and conjugal love are the same thing; consequently also polygamy. Add to this, that polygamists, who know nothing of the Lord, remain natural: for a man is made spiritual only from the Lord; and that is not imputed to the natural man as sin, which is according to the laws of religion and at the same time of society: he also acts according to his reason; and the reason of the natural man is in mere darkness respecting love truly conjugal; and this love in excellence is spiritual. Nevertheless the reason of polygamists is taught from experience, that both public and private peace require, that promiscuous lust in general should be restrained, and be left to every one within his own house: hence comes polygamy."—C. L. 348, 349.

More will probably be said upon this point hereafter. At present I remark that polygamy, strictly speaking, is a divided bestowment of whatever conjugal love a man has upon several objects instead of one. Concubinage, strictly speaking, is a separation or segregation of the true conjugal principle, which is inwardly stored up in the mind, and the allotment of the merely external and sensual principle, from motives of physical necessity, to the person of a *succuba lecti*, or substituted partner of the bed. The propriety of this relation will of course be judged of according to the validity of the reasons urging it, and according to the state of mind of the parties having recourse to it. The positions advanced in the preceding extracts are certainly entitled to enter into the estimate formed of the *morale* of such connections, while the very fact that a man is able to appreciate them, renders any practical decision in regard to his own case extremely perilous; for it supposes his understanding to be elevated out of its native darkness into a degree of rational and moral light which confers a higher responsibility on all his acts.

Still it must be said that your representations on the subject give a very distorted view of the teachings of Swedenborg. The concubinage of which he speaks, and which, under the specified conditions, he declares not to be illicit, is the farthest possible remove from an authorized sundering of the relation between husband and wife, or an exemption from the discharge of its duties. The impression which would be naturally conveyed of his teaching by the following extract from your work is exceedingly wide of the truth.

“And shall I advert again to the other case? A man has a wife, whom he has solemnly promised and vowed to love and cherish and comfort while life lasts. She is the wife of his youth, his faithful, affectionate partner, and the loving mother of his children. But she is visited with painful and exhausting sickness, it may be with fever, or cancer, or epilepsy, or paralysis, or consumption. Her low and suffering state calls for the kindest attentions and the tenderest sympathy of her husband. But instead of these kind and solicitous attentions and this tender sympathy towards his innocent and faithful, but suffering wife, he is to turn away from her to enjoy the society of a kept mistress! What shall we say to these things? Why, if a book containing these principles should be published in Massachusetts, the author would be liable to punishment for violating the wholesome laws of the Commonwealth.”—*p.* 152.

If such an indictment were drawn up against the real purport of Swedenborg's doctrine on this subject, it would be simply upon this ground—that in cases where the physical or mental condition of a wife was such as to preclude entirely the possibility of that connubial commerce which enters so deeply into the design and the delights of marriage, an emergency arises for which, as some provision is naturally felt to be desirable, so it is suggested in the temporary expedient, which, for want of a better term, is here denominated *concubinage*. It is an expedient suggested by the fact, that the causes which incapacitate a wife from rendering that “due benevolence” to a partner which he may properly seek, still leave the husband under the full promptings of a constitutional appetite which craves the indulgence that was among the lawful motives to marriage. These promptings, however strong, he had no thought of gratifying in any other than the appointed way so long as the opportunity remained to him. He cherishes the most unfeigned and devoted affection for his suffering companion. He relaxes in no duty of the most tender friend. With a sedulous sympathy he waits upon her wants, and with yearning anxiety hails every symptom of returning health or sanity. But his temperament allows him not to forget, meantime, that he is a man, or, to suppress the query, whether any other course remains than a calm submission to a privation which unforeseen circumstances have brought upon him. This query is undoubtedly proposed in a thousand instances in the depths of the soul, and no answer is returned that fully satisfies the interrogating spirit. The action will usually be according to the dominant character of the individual concerned. With a religious man, governed by a tender conscience, the conclusion will scarcely fail to be, that he is to recognize in such an extremity, a special ordainment of the Divine providence, intended as a trial of his faith and patience, and that the only alternative is a meek acquiescence in the wise will of his Heavenly Father, and when the affection for his wife is deep and intense, he will find, I presume, comparatively little inconvenience in submitting to his lot. It is at any rate, on all accounts the soundest and safest course, and he that adopts it will be acting on the true principles of Swedenborg's conjugal doctrines.

But suppose the case of one of a different character, a man whose breast is not profoundly penetrated by religious principles, but who is yet of kindly affections, of fair external deportment, and unexceptionable in his civil and domestic relations—one who, in ordinary parlance, would be termed a good citizen, a good neighbor, a good husband, but who at the same time has not come under that peculiar *experimental* influence of religious truth which we usually associate with the highest type of moral character. He is not devoid of conscience; he feels and acknowledges the obligation of the marriage tie; he has no disposition to slight the claims of an affectionate wife; but he is still conscious of the pressure of natural promptings, and he is inwardly sensible to what he deems an urgent “necessity” on this score, to the demands of which he feels that he might yield without detriment to his conjugal love, provided it could be done, without at the same time, doing violence to his conscience. It is doubtless such a case that Swedenborg’s suggestions more particularly contemplate, and the question is how far he is warranted in even *hinting* at a course made permissible only in very peculiar circumstances, and in a state of mind that comes short of the full requirements of a spiritual law. I am well aware of the delicacy and the difficulty of the subject, and my grand reliance, in attempting to rebut the force of your objections, is in presenting distinctly the views of Swedenborg, and the reasons which he urges in their support. Judgment will then be pronounced upon their intrinsic merits.

That there is at least something *hard* in the compulsory seclusion supposed, especially with men of ardent temperament, will doubtless be generally admitted, even when it is still looked upon as an allotment that admits of no remedy, as, for instance, in the case of one whose wife has become the hopeless inmate of a lunatic asylum. That it is moreover, a case in which inquiry often arises as to the possibility of a dispensation consistent with human and divine laws, is beyond doubt. Equally indubitable is the fact, that both civil and ecclesiastical tribunals have, in many instances, been prone to lean to the side of lenity in deciding upon extreme cases of this kind.* It has indeed for the most part assumed the form of a question respecting the right of polygamy where the ends of a prior marriage were frustrated, and in this form it came prominently before the Reformers, who were evidently greatly perplexed by it. The following extract from Michelet’s *Life of Luther*, will serve as a specimen of the *cases of con-*

* The subjoined extract does not present a case entirely parallel to that we are now considering, but it shows that *concubinage* has not been altogether unknown in the Christian church.

“The first council of Toledo (A. D. 400) has this canon:—‘*He who with a believing wife, hath a concubine is excommunicated; but if his concubine is in stead of a wife, and he adheres to her alone, whether she be called a wife or a concubine, he is not to be rejected from communion.*’ ‘This Canon,’ says Fleury, ‘shows that there were concubines approved by the Church. According to the Roman laws, every woman could not be the legitimate wife of every man. Both were to be Roman citizens and of a suitable condition. A senator could not marry a freed woman: a free man could not marry a slave; and the cohabitation of slaves was not called by the name of marriage. But a woman who could not be taken as a wife, might be taken as a concubine; and the laws allowed it, provided the man had only one concubine, and was not a married man. The children of such marriages were neither legitimate nor bastards, but natural children acknowledged by the father, and capable of receiving legacies. The Church meddled not with these distinctions of the civil laws; but regarding only the law of nature, approved of every conjunction of one woman, if it was one woman only, and perpetual; and the more so, because the Holy Scriptures employ the name of wife or of concubine indifferently.’—(*Jortin’s Rem. on Eccles. Hist. Vol. 1. p. 422.*)

science that were sometimes brought before them. The letter of the Landgrave of Hesse shows a curious and even amusing conflict between the promptings of the lower and the dictates of the higher nature.

"We noticed at an early period of this narrative, the melancholy state of dependence in which the Reformation was placed on the princes that espoused the cause. Luther had time to foresee the results. These princes were men, with men's caprices and passions. And hence concessions, which, without being contrary to the principles of the reformation, seemed to redound little to the honor of the reformers. The most warlike of these princes, the hotheaded landgrave of Hesse, submitted to Luther and the Protestant ministers, that his health would not allow of his confining himself to one wife. His instructions to Bucer for the negotiation of this matter with the theologians of Wittemberg, are a curious mixture of sensuality, of religious fears, and of daring simplicity. 'Ever since I have been married,' he writes, 'I have lived in adultery and fornication; and as I won't give up this way of living, I cannot present myself at the holy table; for St. Paul has said, that the adulterer shall not enter the kingdom of heaven.' He proceeds to state the reasons which drive him into this course: 'My wife is neither good looking nor good-tempered; she is not sweet; she drinks, and my chamberlains can tell what she then does, &c. I am of a warm complexion, as the physicians can prove; and as I often attend the imperial diets, where the body is pampered with high living, how am I to manage there without a wife, especially as I can't be always taking a seraglio about with me? . . . How can I punish fornication and other crimes, when all may turn round and say, "Master, begin with yourself?" . . . Were I to take up arms for the Gospel's sake, I could only do so with a troubled conscience, for I should say to myself, "If you die in this war, you go to the devil." . . . I have read both the Old and New Testament carefully, and find no other help indicated than to take a second wife; and I ask before God why cannot I do what Abraham, Jacob, David, Lamech, and Solomon have done?' The question of polygamy had been agitated from the very beginning of Protestantism, which professed to restore the world to scriptural life; and, whatever his repugnance, Luther durst not condemn the Old Testament. Besides, the Protestants held marriage to be *res politica*, and subject to the regulations of the civil power. Luther, too, had already held, theoretically, and without advising it to be put in practice, the very doctrine advanced by the landgrave. He had written years before: . . . 'I confess, I cannot say that polygamy is repugnant to Holy Scripture, yet would not have the practice introduced amongst Christians, who ought to abstain even from what is lawful, in order to avoid scandal, and in order to maintain that *honestas* (decorum) which St. Paul requireth under all circumstances.'—(Jan. 13th, 1524.) 'Polygamy is not allowable amongst Christians, *except in cases of absolute necessity, as when a man is forced to separate from a leprous wife,*' &c.

"Luther was greatly embarrassed by the landgrave's message. All the theologians of Wittemberg assembled to draw up an answer, and the result was a compromise. He was allowed a double marriage, on condition that his second wife should not be publicly recognized. 'Your highness must be aware of the difference between establishing a universal and granting an exceptional law. . . . We cannot publicly sanction a plurality of wives. . . . We pray your highness to consider the dangers in which a man would stand who should introduce a

law that would disunite families, and plunge them into endless law-suits. . . . Your highness' constitution is weak, you sleep badly, and your health requires every care. . . . The great Scanderbeg often exhorted his soldiers to chastity, saying that nothing was so injurious in their calling as incontinence. . . . We pray your highness seriously to take into consideration the scandals, cares, labors, griefs, and infirmities herein brought under your notice. . . . *If nevertheless your highness is fully resolved to take a second wife, we are of opinion that the marriage should be secret.* . . . Given at Wittemberg, after the festival of St. Nicholas, 1539.—**MARTIN LUTHER, PHILIP MELANCTHON, MARTIN BUCER, ANTONY CORVIN, ADAM, JOHN LENING, JUSTIN WINTFERT, DIONISIUS MELANTHER.**'—p. 169-171.

Here is certainly a concession made to virtual *concubinage* by these grave and reverend men, and that too on the ground of the urgent solicitations of the flesh to which, in natural men, Swedenborg intimates that some clemency may be shown. And that Luther himself had a tolerably high idea of the strength of these propensities is very clear from the extracts which follow. "Luther being asked whether a Christian preacher, who is bound to suffer imprisonment and persecution for the word's sake, ought not much more to do without marriage? replied; 'It is easier to endure imprisonment than desire, as I know in my own person. The more I strove to macerate and subdue the flesh, the more I lusted.'" To a friend he writes; "If you lust, marry . . . No one will ever have to repent rising early and marrying young It is no more possible to do without a wife than without eating and drinking. Conceived, nourished, and born within the body of woman, our flesh is mainly hers, and it is impossible for us ever to separate wholly from her."—(*Mitchelet*, p. 175, 176).

It will be observed that in the sentence of the venerable conclave at Wittemberg the matter is put very much upon the basis mentioned by Swedenborg. *He* says it is better that one should be wholly continent, but if, from the ardor of his temperament, he *cannot* contain, then let the intercourse be restricted to one woman rather than let passion run riot with many. So in the Wittemberg decree; although a rigid self denial would be vastly preferable, yet "nevertheless *if* your highness is fully resolved to take a second wife, we are of the opinion that the marriage should be secret." The "Antichristicide" and his associates herein display a complaisance to the prince and an estimate of the pressure of "the present necessity" which, I doubt, would hardly meet a favoring *réponse* from their most fervent admirers of later times.

The dubious Landgrave was at a loss, it seems, to know why the license accorded to Abraham, Jacob, David, Lamech, and Solomon, could not be granted to him also. Had the "Conjugal Love" then been written, and had Luther been somewhat more of a Swedenborgian than Swedenborg was a Lutheran, he would have been very apt to quote for the querists' edification the ensuing paragraph.

"THAT THE ISRAELITISH NATION WAS PERMITTED TO MARRY A PLURALITY OF WIVES, BECAUSE THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH WAS NOT WITH THAT NATION, AND CONSEQUENTLY LOVE TRULY CONJUGIAL COULD NOT EXIST THERE. There are some at this day whose thoughts are fluctuating respecting the institution relative to monogamical marriages, or those of one man with one wife, and who are distracted by opposite reasonings on the subject; being led to suppose that because polygamical marriages were openly permitted in the case of the Israelitish nation, and its kings, and in the case of David and Solomon, they are also in themselves permissible to Christians; but such persons have no distinct knowledge concerning the Israelitish nation and the Christian, nor concerning the externals and internals of the

church, nor concerning the change of the church from external to internal by the Lord; consequently they know nothing from interior judgment concerning marriages. In general it is to be observed, that a man is born natural in order that he may be made spiritual; and that so long as he remains natural, he is in the night, and as it were in sleep concerning things spiritual; and that in this case he does not even know the difference between the external natural man and the internal spiritual. That the Christian church was not with the Israelitish nation, is known from the Word; for they expected the Messiah, as they still expect him, who was to exalt them above all nations and people in the world; wherefore if they had been told, and were still to be told, that the Messiah's kingdom is over the heavens, and thence over all nations, they would have accounted it an idle tale; hence it was, that they not only did not acknowledge Christ or the Messiah, our Lord, when he came into the world, but also barbarously took him away out of the world. From these considerations it is evident, that the Christian church was not with that nation, as neither is it at this day; and those with whom the Christian church is not, are natural men both externally and internally; and to such polygamy is not hurtful, since it is inscribed on the natural man; for, in regard to love in marriages, the natural man perceives, nothing but what appertains to lust. This is meant by these words of the Lord: *That Moses because of the HARDNESS OF THEIR HEART suffered them to put away their wives; but that from the beginning it was not so* (Matt. xix. 8).—C. L. 340.

If this be sound reasoning, there was an actual concession made, under the ancient economy, to the infirmities of human nature, and yet it was one which had special relation to the state of mind of the parties concerned, and one which could only receive toleration on the ground of that state. It would seem that Luther was at a loss to perceive why the *principle* thus recognized under the divine administration should not operate where the original grounds and reasons for it were equally cogent. He would probably have been strongly predisposed to side with the reasoning of Milton; "If the law will afford no reason why the Jew should be more gently dealt with than the Christian, then surely the gospel can afford as little why the Christian should be less gently dealt with than the Jew. The gospel indeed exhorts to highest perfection, but bears with weakest infirmity more than the law. Hence those indulgences, 'all cannot receive this saying; every man hath his proper gift,' with express charges not to 'lay on yokes which our fathers could not bear.'" "The nature of man still is as weak, and yet as hard; and that weakness and hardness as unfit and as unteachable to be hardly used as ever." . . . "If those indulgences were safe and sinless, out of tenderness and compassion, as indeed they were, and yet shall be abrogated by the gospel; then the law, whose end is by rigor to magnify grace, shall itself give grace, and pluck a fair plume from the gospel." . . . "If the gospel require perfecter obedience than the law as a duty, it exalts the law and abases itself, which is dishonorable to the work of our redemption. Seeing therefore that all the causes of any allowance that the Jews might have, remain as well to the Christians; this is a certain rule, that so long as the causes remain, the allowance ought."

That there actually was something in the Jewish code analogous to the expedients pointed out by Swedenborg, is beyond all question. Thus from Ex. xxi. 9, it appears that parents, in order to guard their adult male offspring from debauchery before marriage, used to give them one of their female slaves as a concubine. This was undoubtedly on the principle of consulting just such an *apprehended necessity* as Swedenborg speaks of in what he says of pellicacy, and this provision stands indelible in the book of God, and as an integral part of that system of enactments which he gave to the chosen people. I do not refer

to it with the design to imply that *Christian men* are now at liberty to avail themselves of such a provision, but simply to show that the grand *principle* which lies at the foundation of these scortatory doctrines has been distinctly recognized in the Divine economy as set forth in the inspired writings, and consequently that there is some sense in which such permissions are not irreconcilably at war with the will of Jehovah. If they were intrinsically in absolute antagonism with the moral precepts of the Decalogue they could no more have been allowed under the law than under the gospel, nor will it be easy to say why they should be any *less* allowed under the gospel than under the law. The matter then resolves itself into the question, whether the strength of the rational conviction on this head may not be such as to make it at least very difficult to conceive that our Lord, who himself gave the Jews their laws, really *intended* to do away all such permissions, *not in regard to his own true disciples*, but in regard to those who were not at present sufficiently in the light of truth or the love of good to heed the demands of a higher precept. If, notwithstanding, it be maintained that the strictness of the letter on this point is to be unabatingly adhered to, how shall we suffer ourselves to relax the rigor of the requisitions which occur in the same connection, in the Sermon on the Mount? "If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out. If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off." Who understands this literally? "I say unto you, swear not at all. Let your communication be yea, yea; nay, nay." Is this literally acted upon by the mass of Christians? Are not oaths every where in use? "Whosoever shall smite thee upon thy right cheek turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." Is this precept ever looked upon as literally binding? "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth." What kind of commentary do we read upon this text in the daily lives of professed Christians? It will doubtless be said that in all these cases the mind readily perceives the *general spirit* of the lesson taught, and acknowledges no violence done to the Saviour's scope, though the express terms of the letter are not punctiliously adhered to. A *principle* is elicited, and even the very principle which was virtually inculcated in the Mosaic law, but which had been perverted and abused by the national usage. Why then shall we any more insist that the *principle* which dictated certain permissions in certain circumstances under the former economy shall not be allowed to operate, in the same circumstances, under the gospel dispensation? Are "the letters to be turned into palisadoes to stake out all requisite sense from entering into their due enlargement?"

As I have quoted Martin Luther, I will here adduce the words of Martin Bucer, one of his illustrious compeers in the work of the Reformation. He is indeed urging a plea for *divorce*, which I do not endorse, but the grounds of his plea are equally applicable to the *separation* of which I am treating; and the same remark I would make in reference to all my citations from Milton. His *reasonings* I consider valid, but I do not agree with his *conclusions* respecting the proper remedy. "It cannot be doubted by them to whom it is given to know God and his judgments out of his own words, but that, what means of peace and safety God ever granted and ordained to his elected people, the same he grants and ordains to men of all ages, who have equally need of the same remedies. And who, that is but a knowing man, dares say there are not husbands and wives now to be found in such hardness of heart, that they will not per-

form either conjugal affection, or any requisite duty thereof, though it be most deserved at their hands? Neither can any one defer to confess, but that God, whose property it is to judge the causes of them that suffer injury, has provided for innocent and honest persons wedded, how they might free themselves by lawful means of divorce, from the bondage and iniquity of those who are falsely termed their husbands or their wives. This is clear out of Deut. xxiv. 1; Mal. ii; Mat. xix. 1; 1 Cor. vii; and out of those principles which the Scripture every where teaches, that God changes not his mind, dissents not from himself, is no acceptor of persons; but allows the same remedies to all men oppressed with the same necessities and infirmities; yea, requires that we should use them. This he will easily perceive, who considers these things in the spirit of the Lord.—*Judg. of Divorce*, ch. xxxvi. The sentiment here advanced may not perhaps find general assent in the present state of religious opinion, but it is worth inquiry whether those who reject it may not mistake a “letter-bound servility to canon doctors,” for the voice of God speaking through the living oracles of the word-enlightened spirit. The permissions conceded in the Mosaic law, or rather the causes on which they are founded, appear to be occasionally recognized in the subsequent Scriptures, as where Solomon says, for instance, “It is better to dwell in a corner of the house-top than with a brawling woman in a wide house.” And again, “It is better to dwell in the wilderness, than with a contentious and angry woman.” This surely means something, and I see not how it can amount to anything less than a warrant for domiciliary separation, which goes at least *so far* towards sustaining what Swedenborg has said on that subject. As to any ulterior resort in such a case, this must be judged of by the sufficiency of the grounds alleged for it. By a Jew it would doubtless be understood as authorizing recourse to divorce on the basis of Deut. xxiv. 1. It is cited here simply as an illustration of the *principle of concession*, of which it is difficult to see why it should not always operate where the original causes operate. So also, Mal. 2. 16, “For the Lord, the God of Israel, saith that he hateth putting away.” This is undoubtedly an erroneous rendering instead of the genuine, “He that hateth, let him put away,” as the great current of versions and commentators have it. Venema has elaborately shown that the words come in as a counterplea of the Jews, to whom it is said in the preceding verse, “Take heed to your spirit, and let none of you deal treacherously against the wife of his youth.” “But,” reply the reprimanded people, “the Lord, the God of Israel, saith, He that hateth his wife let him put her away.” “Nay,” rejoins the Prophet, “although that is true, yet this is an abuse of the divine clemency; ye have made it a plea for the grossest wrong which ye would fain cloak under the alleged license; but such a plea will no more conceal it than will a garment an act of violence. Therefore take heed to your spirit, that ye deal not treacherously.” The principle is allowed, but its perversion condemned. Again, we find something analogous in the words of Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 15, “But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases.” The supposed cause of separation here is a difference of religion, but the principle involved is substantially the same. It is a relaxation of the iron rigor of the law of marriage in accommodation to the force of circumstances.

(4.) Having thus obtained a tolerably correct view of the *nature* of the relation which Swedenborg denominates *concupinage*—having seen that the term indi-

cates a species of connection which has not, in Scripture, the opprobrious character that in our ordinary parlance attaches to it—and having learnt that it does not imply that heartless abandonment which you have ascribed to it—it remains to advert to the *causes* which he, with so much caution and discrimination, pronounces “legitimate, just, and really sufficient.” These he says are various “vitiating states of mind and body,” which he enumerates, and of which a man is constituted himself the sole judge. I have little to say in regard to these causes in addition to what I find said by the author himself. In regard to most of them they do, I confess, strike me as answering to the character described; as going to frustrate some of the important ends of marriage; and therefore as entitled to weigh in the case of a resort to the alternative suggested. In respect to some others, such as “loss of memory,”—“extreme simplicity,”—“unbridled eagerness to talk upon insignificant and trifling things, and to publish the secrets of the house”—“detrimental effluvia exhaled from the body or the lungs,” &c., I am somewhat less clear in my mind from not knowing precisely the extent of the author’s meaning, or the *degree* in which he supposes the different ailments should exist in order to legitimate them as grounds of separation from the bed, which, by the way, is all that he speaks of in the former part of the work where he first enumerates them. Still, if I were better instructed as to the real meaning of Swedenborg, I presume I should have little difficulty in conceding the validity of all the causes cited; but as it is, I have no difficulty in assenting to the position, that the man himself, or, on the other hand, the woman, is to be the exclusive judge of the supposed necessity of the case. A married partner may sometimes be reduced to a state of living martyrdom by a complication of grievances and vexations which he could never think of divulging to the world, or it may be to the most intimate friend. He can only say with the old Roman, Paulus Emilius, when asked why he would put away his wife for no visible reason; “This shoe,” said he, holding it out on his foot, “is a neat shoe, a new shoe, and yet none of you can tell where it pinches me.” The secrets of the parlor or the bed-chamber are not to be proclaimed upon the house-tops. The design of marriage is to promote the mental and corporeal happiness of the wedded pair. If this end is, in either department, defeated by the hopeless infirmities or the ingrained and incurable perversities of a partner, and the religious principle is not sufficiently strong to dictate an uncomplaining submission to the cross, Swedenborg says of such an one—not to him—that recourse *ad exigentiam* to concubinage is not illicit. It is made *licit* by his present state of mind, on the same principle on which he says that polygamy is not a sin, to those who practise it under the sanction of the religion in which they have been reared, for “to him that thinketh anything to be sin, to him it is sin.” The permission is clearly liable to abuse, and a man may capriciously endow himself with a license at which strict justice would revolt. On this head he is to be studiously on his guard. Thus as to bodily diseases, he *may* take undue advantage of a mere transient indisposition, whereas Swedenborg is very express in saying, that “by vitiating states of body are not meant accidental diseases which befall one or other conjugal partner within the time of their marriage, and pass away; but by vitiating states of body, are meant inherent diseases, which do not pass away.” And so, by parity of reasoning, of all other causes assigned, a man is to “judge righteous judgment,” and the more so, if possible, inasmuch as he acknow-

ledges no other tribunal than that of his own conscience before God. With a man of honorable and generous sentiments it may be presumed that he will shrink from anything really injurious to the feelings of a wife whom he tenderly esteems, and it is very conceivable that on her part she may, in peculiar circumstances, so far appreciate the force of a partner's plea, as voluntarily to accord to the promptings of the *man* a privilege which she deems would not necessarily withdraw from her the affections of a *husband*. We can scarcely suppose that Sarah in giving her maid Hagar to Abraham, or Rachel in giving Bilhah to Jacob, or Leah in giving him Zilpah, regarded themselves as signing away their title to their husband's love.

If it be said that this is a vein of remark utterly *inapropos* to anything that can be conceived of the workings of a Christian mind, I have only to say in reply, that this entire discussion has reference to the *opposite* of true conjugal love, and of course to the exercises and judgments of truly regenerate men. It is not supposed that they apply to Christians acting as Christians. All scortatory demonstrations are a form of evil, and falling without the sphere of genuine good, and are viewed by Swedenborg in this light throughout every page of his treatise. Still he does not consider himself precluded from speaking of them, from characterizing them, or drawing important distinctions concerning them. If a missionary of the New Church were to go to the Mahometans to preach to them its doctrines, he would undoubtedly assure them that their polygamy was directly at war with the essential genius of the conjugal relation, and consequently with the laws of their spiritual being, and that without renouncing it they could never enter the Christian's heaven; and yet he would not feel disposed to cancel a page of the work on "Conjugal Love," nor to conceal from any one who could intelligently receive them the principles it contains respecting the bearing which the dominant mental and moral state of every individual has upon the character of his actions and the determination of his destiny. He would doubtless feel bound to exercise a wise discretion, but if duly called upon, and especially if unjustly accused in regard to the scope of his teachings, why should he shrink from the enunciation of positive truth? And under parallel circumstances why should not the course which would be proper at Constantinople, be proper also at London or New York? Let it be clearly shown that a Christian moralist has in no case a *right* to discriminate between the different degrees of evil—to treat of the laws of permission as well as the laws of command—to point out, in reference to a certain class of men, the mode by which a great evil may be coerced, limited, and reduced to a less, while there is no rational prospect of its being at present extirpated—and we shall then begin to question in earnest the propriety of upholding Swedenborg's doctrine respecting the intercourse of the sexes. But till this is done, we see not why his leading positions, which are in full accord with the fundamental doctrines he has taught, should not be regarded as sound. They can only, however, be justly appreciated by being viewed in connection with what he has said of the grounds on which judgment on human actions is pronounced in the other life. To this point I shall soon advert.

(5.) As I have before remarked, the true character of the conjugal principle is the true measure of judgment in respect to all that he has said on the subject under discussion. This principle he treats as a strictly religious element in our

being, receiving its character from its origin in the union of love and wisdom, or truth and good, by which alone the soul is conjoined or *married* to the Lord, on the ground of which He is pleased to style himself the Husband and the Church his Bride or Wife, and to which Paul evidently alludes as a "great mystery" shadowed forth in the marriage relation.* I am well aware that such language as Swedenborg employs in the following paragraphs will be deemed extravagant by those who have never been in the habit of referring natural loves to spiritual principles, but let the assertions be tried by the reasons adduced in their support, and then see if their truth can be gained.

"INASMUCH AS THE CONJUGIAL PRINCIPLE OF ONE MAN WITH ONE WIFE IS THE STORE-HOUSE OF HUMAN LIFE, AND THE RESERVOIR OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. These two things are what have been demonstrated universally and singularly in the whole preceding part concerning conjugal love and the delights of its wisdom. The reason why it is the storehouse of human life is, because a man's life is of a quality according to the quality of that love with him; since that love constitutes the inmost principle of his life: for it is the life of wisdom cohabiting with its love, and of love cohabiting with its wisdom, and hence it is the life of the delights of each; in a word, a man is a soul living by means of that love: hence it is, that the conjugal tie of one man with one wife is called the storehouse of human life. This is confirmed from the following articles above adduced, That with one wife there exist truly conjugal friendship, confidence and potency, because a union of minds, n. 333, 334. That in a union with one wife, and from it, exist celestial blessednesses, spiritual satisfactions, and thence natural delights, which from the beginning have been provided for those who are in love truly conjugal, n. 335. That it is the foundation love of all celestial, spiritual, and derivative natural loves, and that into that love are collated all joys and delights from first to last, n. 65 to 69; and that viewed in its origin, it is the sport of wisdom and love, has been fully demonstrated in the DELIGHTS OF WISDOM CONCERNING CONJUGIAL LOVE, which constitute the first part of this work.

"The reason why that love is the reservoir of the Christian religion is, because this religion makes one with that love, and cohabits with it; for it was shown,

* "I spake with them concerning marriages—that marriages or conjugal love was the foundation of all loves, which is confirmed from the consideration, that thence is the propagation of human society, and consequently of celestial societies, wherefore it has imparted to it a corporeal pleasure surpassing all others, for delights are adjoined according to the necessities of ends, and conjugal love is pleasanter and happier than any other love, so that a right conjugal union is heaven upon earth, thus is celestial love, from which flow all other loves, being originally derived from the love or merely of the Lord towards heaven, the church, and the universal human race, and descending from Him alone; from which it appears how sacred marriages ought to be held."—S. D. 3778.

"After this I conversed with the angels, informing them, that somewhat further is revealed in the world by the Lord. They asked, 'What further?' I said, 'Concerning love truly conjugal, and concerning its heavenly delights.' The angels said, 'Who does not know, that the delights of conjugal love exceed the delights of all loves? and who cannot see, that into some love are collated all the blessednesses, satisfactions, and delights, which can possibly be conferred by the Lord, and that the receptacle thereof is love truly conjugal, which is capable of receiving and perceiving them to a full sensibility?' I replied, 'They do not know this, because they have not come to the Lord, and lived according to his precepts by shunning evils as sins, and by doing goods; and love truly conjugal with its delights is solely from the Lord, and is given to those who live according to his precepts; thus it is given to those, who are received into the Lord's new church, which is meant in the Apocalypse by the New Jerusalem.' To this I added, 'I am in doubt whether in the world at this day they are willing to believe, that this love in itself is a spiritual love, and hence grounded in religion, because they entertain only a corporeal idea respecting it.' They then said unto me, 'Write respecting it, and follow revelation; and afterwards the book written respecting it shall be sent down from us out of heaven, and we shall see whether the things contained in it are received; and at the same time whether they are willing to acknowledge, that that love is according to religion with man, spiritual with the spiritual, natural with the natural, and merely carnal with adulterers.'—C. L. 534.

that none come into that love, and can be in it, but those who approach the Lord, and do the truths of his church and its goods, n. 70, 71. That that love is from the Lord alone, and that hence it exists with those who are of the Christian religion, n. 131, 335, 336. That that love is according to the state of the church, because it is according to the state of wisdom with man, n. 130. That these things are so, was confirmed in the chapter throughout, concerning the correspondence of that love with the marriage of the Lord and the church, n. 116 to 131 : and in the chapter concerning the origin of that love from the marriage of good and truth, n. 83 to 102."—*C. L.* 457-458.

No slight confirmation is afforded to this by what Paley says of the natural effect of licentiousness. "However it be accounted for, the criminal commerce of the sexes corrupts and depraves the mind and moral character more than any single species of vice whatsoever. That ready perception of guilt, that prompt and decisive resolution against it, which constitute a virtuous character, is seldom found in persons addicted to these indulgences. They prepare an easy admission for every sin that seeks it, and are, in low life, usually the first stage in men's progress to the most desperate villanies ; and in high life, to that lamented dissoluteness of principle which manifests itself in a profligacy of public conduct, and a contempt of the obligations of religion and of moral probity. Add to this, that habits of libertinism incapacitate and indispose the mind for all intellectual, and moral, and religious pleasures."—(*Mor. Philos.* B. III., P. III., Ch. II.)

Who but will subscribe to the truth of this, though Swedenborg alone has solved the problem of its rationale? Who can be insensible to the immense difficulty of obtaining a lodgment for the claims of the gospel in a mind thus depraved and abandoned to the dominance of sensual appetites? The moral sense, which in other cases we may hope to reach and awaken, is in such persons well nigh annihilated. The plane into which the Divine good and truth may flow as the ground of regeneration has with men of this stamp all but perished, and it is a forlorn hope indeed which encourages any appeal to their inner man. And if this be so, is it not a great object to preserve, if possible, the life of the conjugal love? And where there is danger of its being lost, does it not warrant the striking a balance between the evil of the extinction of such a principle, and the evil of the *permitted* yielding, by natural men, to the promptings of the mere animal or corporeal instinct, in which the spiritual principle is enwrapped? In other words, is there not an intrinsic weight in what is said in the ensuing extract in reference to the reasons on which the provisional permission is founded, and in respect to the true relation which the disorderly bears to the orderly acting of this radical love? "This concubinage is not a separation from conjugal love; for when legitimate, or just, or real sufficient causes intercede, persuade, and compel, conjugal love is not separated with marriage, but is only interrupted; and love interrupted, and not separated, remains in the subject: this case is like that of a person who is in a function which he loves, and is withheld from it by company, or by public shows, or by travelling; still he does not lose the love of the function: and it is like that of one, who loves generous men; still, while he drinks that which is not noble, he does not lose the taste and appetite for that which is generous. That this concubinage is only a covering around of conjugal love is because the love of concubinage is natural, and the love of marriage spiritual, and natural love covers over the spiritual, while the latter is intercept-

ed; that it is so, the lover does not know, because spiritual love is no sensibly perceived of itself, but by means of natural; and it is felt as delight in which is blessedness from heaven; but natural love, by itself, is felt only as delight."

Intimations like these could never have proceeded from the pure pen of the apostle of the New Church, were they not founded upon a fundamental doctrine of conjugal love drawn from the very depths of celestial wisdom—a doctrine which makes that love the gem of the soul and the "reconditory" of the Christian religion. The doctrine may be taxed as the wildest of the reveries incorporated into a strange fabric of spiritual mysticisms, but the system knows well how to account for such an imputation. "With those who reject the holy things of the church, there is not any good love; . . . for all things of the church which they reject are spiritual; and because love truly conjugal is the fundamental of all spiritual loves, it is manifest that there is an intrinsic hatred against that, and that the intrinsic or proper love with them is in favor of the opposite, and is the love of adultery; wherefore those more than others will laugh to scorn this truth, that conjugal love with every one is according to the state of the church (with him); yea, at the naming of love truly conjugal they will perhaps laugh outright; but be it so: nevertheless they are to be forgiven, for it is as impossible for them to distinguish in thought between the marriage embrace and the scortatory embrace, as it is for a camel to go through the eye of a needle."

We have here the true point against which all severity of censure, all fierceness of condemnation, on the score of Swedenborg's scortatory teaching must spend itself. The intensest power of the *virus* of his doctrines concentrates itself in the assertion of the religious nature and the transcendent purity and sanctity of the conjugal principle. This is the central and vital position of the whole doctrine, and if it be said of the system that thus viewed "the whole head is sick and whole heart faint; that from the sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness in it, but wounds and bruises and putrifying sores," here is the real seat of the deadly gangrene, in the distinct declaration of the heavenly origin, the spiritual character, the angelic affinities, of *the love of marriage*. Let this position be overthrown, and we may well waver in our defence. But our feet know no titubation so long as they stand upon the immovable rock on which we feel that they are planted. Meantime we have the satisfaction of the assurance, that we are not called to the vindication of a scheme of ethics which transforms the evils of pellicacy, adultery, and concubinage into the goods of Christian or civil life. They are all the evils of "scortation" in some of its forms; they all pertain to the natural and not to the spiritual man. The man who is formed by the genuine doctrines of Swedenborg has nothing to do with them. He is a *spiritual* man. "He does not," says Mr. Bailey, "indulge his flesh; he subdues it. His motives are pure, because derived from love to God, and pregnant with love to man. His life is pure, because inspired by these. To restrain him from sin, it is not necessary that all the shades of evil should be declared condemnable in the same degree. He can judge justly even of the depraved, without partaking of their depravity. He can admit that fornication is a less evil than adultery, without being enticed to either. He can acknowledge concubinage to be less interiorly base than incest, without being attracted by concubinage. He knows that though this latter would not plunge him into an

abyss of impiety so abominable as many other evils, yet it is of the earth, earthy. It would retard him in his upward career. It would make him the creature of his natural propensities; not their lord. It may be an evil less heinous than some others, but he is to love no evil. He is daily to increase in the possession of goodness. It is an insanity of a lighter kind, but he is the follower of wisdom. The world has doubtless its various degrees of vice, but his aim is, to higher states of purity, more full communion with God, a more glorious impress of heaven. He soars, therefore, above *all* the walks of vice, and daily makes it his study to acquire more fully the image, likeness, and spirit of his Master. . . Does any one ask whether we can judge of the degrees of evils, and assign the relative iniquity to each, without being allured by the love of any? We reply, look at our lives. Where is there a real New Churchman who lives in concubinage? Had Swedenborg really recommended concubinage, is it conceivable that out of so many who have embraced his views, not one should practise it? When John said, 'All unrighteousness is sin; and *there is a sin not unto death*?' was he preaching up these sins? He was but discriminating truly. And when Swedenborg distinguishes one crime from another, he does not sanction the commission of any, but accords to each its proper condemnation."—(*Bailey's Reply to Roebuck*, p. 34.)

(6.) Another consideration of the utmost moment to a fair estimate of Swedenborg's averments on this subject, is the doctrine of *imputation*, or the *ground of judgment*, by which the whole matter is wound up, elucidated, and guarded, and which yet is next to never adverted to by his opponents. There is obviously no question of more importance to a candidate for eternity than that which concerns the grounds and reasons of the judgment that fixes unalterably his state in the other world. That these have relation to his *character* as good or evil, can admit of no doubt; his works and deeds enter into the account no farther than as they are a true index to the *internal man*, or, in one word, to the *heart*.

"It is well known, that there are two principles which make a man's life, the will and the understanding; and that all things which are done by a man, are done from his will and his understanding; and that without these acting principles a man would not have either action or speech, otherwise than as a machine: hence it is evident, that such as a man's will and understanding are, such is the man; and further, that a man's action in itself is such, as is the affection of his will which produces it, and that a man's discourse in itself is such, as is the thought of his understanding which produces it: wherefore several men may act and speak alike, and yet they act and speak unlike; one from a depraved will and thought, the other from an upright will and thought. From these considerations it is manifest, what is meant by the deeds or works, according to which every one will be judged; that will and understanding are meant, consequently that by evil works are meant the works of an evil will, whatever has been their appearance in externals, and that by good works are meant the works of a good will, although in externals they have appeared like the works wrought by an evil man. All things which are done from a man's interior will, are done from purpose; since that will proposes to itself what it acts by its intention; and all things which are done from the understanding, are done from confirmation, since the understanding confirms. From these considerations it may appear, that evil or good is imputed to every one according to the quality of his will therein, and according to the quality of his understanding concerning them. These observations I am allowed to confirm by the following relation: In the spiritual world I have met several, who in the natural world had lived like others, being sumptuous in their apparel, costly in their entertainments, frequenting the exhibitions of the stage, jesting on love topics as from a libidinous principle,

with other like practices; and yet the angels charged those things to some as evils of sin, and to some they did not impute them as evils, and declared the latter guiltless, but the former guilty. Being questioned why they did so, when yet all had done alike, they replied, that they view all from purpose, intention, or end, and distinguish accordingly; and that therefore they excuse or condemn those whom the end either excuses or condemns, since an end of good influences all in heaven, and an end of evil all in hell."—C. L. 527.

The character of the man, then, is the character of his will, or in other words of his ruling love, and this character is continually being formed and *inscribed* upon his inmost being, by the course of his acting in the present life. This character is latent to human view while man sojourns upon the earth, and therefore it is evermore unlawful for a fellow-being to pronounce upon it, as we are taught in what follows:—

"The Lord says, JUDGE NOT THAT YE MAY NOT BE CONDEMNED (Matt. vii. 1); by which words cannot in anywise be meant judgment respecting any one's moral and civil life in the world, but judgment respecting his spiritual and celestial life. Who does not see, that unless it was allowed a man to judge respecting the moral life of those who live with him in the world, society would perish? What would society be, if there were no public judicature, and if every one did not exercise his judgment respecting another? But to judge what is the quality of the interior mind, or soul, thus what is the quality of any one's spiritual state, and thence what his lot is after death, is not allowed, since it is known to the Lord alone; neither does the Lord reveal this till after the person's decease, to the intent that every one may act from a free principle in all he acts, and thereby that good or evil may be from him, and thus in him, and that thence he may live to himself and live his own to eternity. The reason why the interiors of the mind, which are kept hid in the world, are revealed after death, is, because this is of concern and advantage to the societies into which man then comes; for all in those societies are, spiritual. That those interiors are then revealed, is manifest from these words of the Lord, 'There is nothing concealed, which shall not be revealed, or hidden, which shall not be known; therefore whatsoever things ye have said in darkness, shall be heard in light; and what ye have spoken to the ear in closets, shall be preached on the house-tops' (Luke xii. 2, 3). A common judgment, as this for instance, 'If you are such in internals as you appear to be in externals, you will be saved or condemned,' is allowed; but a particular judgment, as this for instance, 'You are such in internals, therefore you will be saved or condemned,' is not allowed. Judgment concerning the spiritual life of man, or the internal life of the soul, is meant by the imputation which is here treated of. Can any human being know and decide who is a scortator in heart, and who is a conjugal partner in heart? And yet the thoughts of the heart, which are the purposes of the will, judge every one."—C. L. 523.

This then discloses to us the true nature of that *imputation* which awaits every one in the world to come, and which our author teaches is as far as possible from a mere judicial *reckoning* or *accounting* any one to be either good or evil on any other ground than the actual intrinsic quality of the man. It is no other in fact than the simple manifestation of the truth as it is. The character in its inmost attributes is necessarily revealed, in the world of spirits, by the very law of our being, and consequently the man virtually *adjudges himself* to heaven or hell by the development which is made of his interior affinities with the one or the other. Swedenborg speaking on this head, remarks:—

"In order that this may be understood, I will relate an arcanum: Heaven is distinguished into innumerable societies, in like manner hell, derived from an opposite principle; and the mind of every man, according to his will and consequent understanding, actually dwells in one society, and intends and thinks in

like manner with those who compose the society. If the mind be in any society of heaven, it then intends and thinks in like manner with those who compose that society; if it be in any society of hell, it intends and thinks in like manner with those who are in the same society; but so long as a man lives in the world, so long he migrates from one society to another, according to the changes of the affections of his will and of the consequent thoughts of his mind; but after death his peregrinations are collected, and from the collection thereof into one, a place is allotted him, in hell if he is evil, in heaven if he is good."—C. L. 536.

As therefore the internal character there *stands out*, as it were, in legible aspect, it is subject to the *exploration* of good spirits, whose judgment of the man coincides with that of the Lord himself, because they are, in their measure, in the divine good and truth which becomes the criterion that determines his final allotment.

"That every one's own life remains with him after death, it is known in the church from the Word, and from these passages therein; 'The Son of man will come, and will then render to every one according to his deeds' (Matt. xvi. 27). 'I saw the books open, and all were judged according to their works' (Rev. xxi. 12, 13). 'In the day of judgment God will render to every one according to his works' (Rom. ii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 10). The works, according to which it will be rendered to every one, are the life, because the life does the works, and they are according to the life. As I have been permitted for several years to be together with the angels, and to converse with the deceased, I can testify for certain, that every one is then explored as to the quality of the life which he has lived, and that the life which he has contracted in the world, abides with him to eternity. I have conversed with those who have lived ages ago, whose life I have been acquainted with from history, and I have known it to be like the description given of it; and I have heard from the angels, that no one's life after death can be changed, because it is organized according to his love and consequent works; and that if it were changed, the organization would be rent asunder, which cannot be done in any case; also that a change of organization cannot possibly be effected except in the material body, and is utterly impossible in the spiritual body, after the former has been rejected. That to an evil person is then imputed the evil of his life, and to a good person is imputed the good of his life, it is to be observed, that the imputation of evil is not accusation, incusation, inculpation, and judication, as in the world, but evil itself produces this effect; for the evil, from their free principle, separate themselves from the good, inasmuch as they cannot be together. The delights of the love of evil are averse from the delights of the love of good; and delights exhale from every one, as odors do from every vegetable in the world; for they are not absorbed and concealed by the material body as heretofore, but flow forth freely from their loves into the spiritual *aura*: and whereas evil is there made sensible as in its odor, it is this which accuses, incuses, fixes blame, and judges—not before any judge, but before every one who is principled in good; and this is what is meant by imputation. Moreover, an evil person chooses companions, with whom he may live in his delights: and because he is averse from the delight of good, he spontaneously betakes himself to his own in hell. The imputation of good is effected in like manner, and takes place with those who in the world have acknowledged that all good in them is from the Lord, and nothing from themselves. These, after they have been prepared, are let into the interior delights of good, and then there is opened to them a way into heaven, to the society where its homogeneous delights are: this is effected by the Lord."—C. L. 524.

The result of the whole is summed up in what follows, from which it appears that judgment proceeds according to the real internal state and quality of the will by which action is prompted, for it is from this that their character is viewed and estimated by Him who "searcheth the hearts and trieth the reins of the children of men."

“Now since all in hell are influenced by a will of evil, all are viewed there from that will; and since all in heaven are influenced by a will of good, all are viewed there from that will; wherefore imputations after death take place according to the quality of every one’s will and understanding. The case is similar with scortations, whether they be fornications, pellicacies, concubinages, or adulteries; for those things are imputed to every one, not according to the deeds themselves, but according to the state of the mind in the deeds; for deeds follow the body into the tomb, whereas the mind rises again. Appearances in externals conclude nothing concerning imputation: the one single thing which concludes is the conjugal principle, in that it abides in every one’s will, and is guarded, in whatever state of marriage a man is. That conjugal principle is like a scale, in which that love is weighed; for the conjugal principle of one man with one wife is the storehouse of human life, and the reservoir of the Christian religion; and this being the case, it is possible that that love may exist with one married partner, and not at the same time with the other; and that it may lie deeper hid, than that the man himself can observe anything concerning it; and also it may be inscribed in a successive progress of the life. The reason of this is, because that love in its progress accompanies religion, and religion, as it is the marriage of the Lord and the church, is the initiament and inoculation of that love; wherefore conjugal love is imputed to every one after death according to his spiritual rational life; and for him, to whom that love is imputed, a marriage in heaven is provided after his decease, whatever has been his marriage in the world. From these considerations then results this short concluding observation, that no inference is to be drawn concerning any one, from appearances of marriages, nor from appearances of scortations, whereby to decide that he has conjugal love or not; wherefore *Judge not, lest ye be condemned* (Matt. vii. 1).”—C. L. 530, 531.

I know not that any special comment upon these extracts is called for. If they do not approve themselves by their own evidence to the reflecting mind, it is not probable that their claims to belief could be enforced by any remarks of mine. Yet the principles advanced in them obviously lie at the foundation of the whole subject. The leading drift of Swedenborg’s doctrine is, that although Truth is in itself as immutable as its source, yet in its descent into the minds of all created beings it is accommodated to their states of reception. The degree of every man’s *duty* is measured by the degree of *truth* of which he is in possession; he fulfils his duty in proportion as he is faithful to that truth. Thoughts and actions are regarded as more or less sinful according as they are more or less opposed to revealed truth, and according also to the purity and elevation of the truths to which they are opposed. In judging, therefore, of the character of the moral actions of different men, we are led to inquire as to the degree in which their minds are opened to the light of truth, which involves an admission of the fact, that truth is variously accommodated to the state of mind of the recipient, and that the same measure of virtue, or exemption from vice, is not to be expected of all. Whatever degree of truth, however, be actually received, it is adapted, in its own nature, to raise every man from the state of evil in which he may be to a higher state. Its office is continually to lessen the interval of separation or spiritual distance from the Lord, and to elevate and bring back and save the soul as far and as fast as it can be done consistently with the preservation of freedom. The message of truth is essentially the same to men of all characters and conditions. It says to all; “Repent; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; if any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.” But in accordance with the internal state of every one, it requires of him less, for the time being, than of one who is

in a higher state. But one degree of obedience to truth received prepares the way for a higher and purer form of it, and for a corresponding obedience; and in the other life *judgment* or *imputation* will be strictly according to the degree of obedience rendered to the light of truth enjoyed. "A man," says Swedenborg, "from rational conviction, according to circumstances and contingencies, may absolve a person when a judge, whilst he sits in judgment, cannot absolve from the law; and also a judge may absolve a person who after death is condemned. The reason is, because a judge gives sentence according to actions done, whereas after death every one is judged according to the intentions of the will, and thence of the understanding, and according to the confirmations of the understanding and thence of the will. These intentions and confirmations a judge does not see; nevertheless each judgment is just, one for the sake of the good of civil society, the other for the sake of the good of heavenly society." The leading idea is well expressed in the following paragraphs:—"To those who are in a less degree of evil, or are less confirmed in evil, truth is accommodated so as to teach just so much as they are in a state to comprehend and *improve*. It teaches them to repent, and how to repent. It does not at first, disclose to them the highest degrees of purity, nor any degree distinctly, except that which is the next above their own state. It teaches them to fear becoming more evil, and how to avoid it; and it also shows them plainly what is the next less evil state, and how to shun their present measure of evil and advance to that state.—I do not mean to be understood strictly as saying that this is the exact order in which men are enlightened. Some who are very evil, do understand truth which they will not improve, and hence are made worse by it. But the Divine Providence guards evil men against being thus enlightened, so far as it can guard them and still allow their free agency. Truth as it thus comes down to the conditions of men in various degrees and kinds of evil, does, at first, exact greater degrees of holiness or purity of some, than of others; but its end with each one is the same. It teaches each one to *rise*; and having taught him and enabled him to rise *one* degree, it teaches and enables him to rise *another* degree. It indulges less evils to prevent greater; and teaches man continually that, although he can never become absolutely *good*, yet he can shun evils, and receive good from the Lord. And by shunning the evil actions to which his present evil affections lead, he will continually advance in the work of repentance and reformation, provided he shuns them because they are sins against God.

"To the Jews many laws and permissions were given, not because they were right or orderly in themselves, but because the state of Jewish minds required them. They could not receive purer truths or precepts of life. Because of the hardness of their hearts Moses wrote those things. Such were the laws respecting sacrifices, and some of the laws respecting retaliation. Such also were the permissions concerning concubinage, and putting away their wives for slight causes. (See Matt. xix. 3-12). Without proceeding farther with this view, I say that Divine truth, in that degree of it which descended to the Jewish state of character, required a less degree of purity than it requires of angels, or of any men who are elevated in any degree above Jewish character. Men of every religious sect act on this principle, so far as they follow the Lord, in judging of their fellow-men. Who is there, who is regarded as judging fairly, that does not *make allowance* and *excuses* for his neighbor on account of his strong hereditary

propensities to certain evils,—his bad education,—his long habits of sin before he commenced reformation,—the short time that he has had for reformation since he commenced it—and on many other considerations. And where is the wrong of saying to our neighbor, ‘My friend, you are greatly immersed in evil, and are sadly enslaved by it. You can, however, do better than you are accustomed to do: You can avoid the present gross degree of your evil, and do thus and so to mitigate it, and elevate yourself above your present state, even if you cannot avoid the whole evil; and by such improvement you will be prepared for still greater reformation, and will avoid sinking lower: *Do as well as you can*; and if you cannot be perfect, or rise at once even to the purity of the best of men, *yet rise as much as you can, and keep on rising.*’—(*Remarks on Several Common Errors respecting the Writings of Swedenborg*, p. 42, 46.)

The principle in all this is, I think, easily perceived to be a sound one, and that it is Scriptural appears from its being said of the servant that knew his Lord’s will and did it not, that he should “be beaten with many stripes,” while “he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes.” The law of this proceeding is then stated; “Unto whom much is given, of him shall be much required.” So again, our Lord says to the Jews, “If ye were blind, ye should have no sin; but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth.” This principle evidently lies at the foundation of all that Swedenborg has taught concerning the grounds of *judicial imputation* in respect to the class of sins and evils treated of in the work on *Scortatory Love*, and I leave it to be pronounced upon according to the verdict formed in your own and every intelligent mind.

I had intended to notice, at an earlier stage of the discussion, one other passage occurring in the preface to your work, and to which I cannot but advert, though it must be briefly. It bears directly on the topic which I have last considered.

“The precepts of Swedenborg respecting works of charity and various other duties, are generally what they should be. But his precepts, or rather the *permissions* he gives, respecting the intercourse of the sexes in particular cases, must be reprobated by every pure and pious mind. And I should by no means have deemed it proper to publish them in these Lectures, had not judicious men who have been consulted, given advice in favor of it, and had it not been plainly demanded by fidelity to the cause of truth. And should any admirer of Swedenborg attempt to apologize for him by saying, that the principles of *Scortatory love* which he has published, come up from the hells, or are dictated by evil spirits; my reply is, that we are far from wishing the morals of the hells to be published for the use of men on the earth, who are quite enough inclined to travel the downward road, without the help of a book, written by the Prophet of the New Jerusalem church, and containing the precepts or permissions of devils. Nor can we think it any credit to Swedenborg, that he should have a voluntary agency in bringing out principles of such an infernal character before the face of the world, and should do it not only without blushing, but expressly with his own sanction.”—p. 6.

I should probably be greatly at a loss to point to any single paragraph in your book, so laden with matter of astonishment as this. I can scarcely doubt that you will yourself share in the astonishment upon a cool review. The development of hellish promptings equivalent to teaching, i. e. inculcating, the morals of the hells! The intimation has but to be named to make palpable its absurdity. Who ever heard of such a charge before? It is no credit, you say, to Sweden-

borg that "he should have a voluntary agency in bringing out principles of such an infernal character before the face of the world." And what then, I pray you, becomes of the credit of Paul in reciting such a catalogue of the works of the flesh as the following,—“Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like; of which I tell you before as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” Are not these things from hell? Are they not the inbreathed lustings of the devil, the “god of this world, who rules in the children of disobedience?” But is the apostle in reciting them inculcating upon his fellow-men a system of infernal morality? Does he endorse “the doctrines of devils,” and endeavor to make them pass current among good Christians by the weight of his sanction and authority? Is it the same thing to *detect* and *expose* and *characterise* the subtle influences of the spirits of darkness, in order to put men on their guard against them, and to *approve*, *patronize*, and *enjoin* them? Does not the wisdom of Solomon inform us, that “in vain is the net spread in sight of any bird?” Can men be secured against the assaults of hell unless its diabolical wiles and influxes are clearly pointed out? Must we be left ignorant of Satan’s devices for fear that the exposure of them will be mistaken for a commendation of their cunning and craft? Is the man who publishes a “counterfeit-detector” liable to an indictment for endeavoring to palm bad bills upon the community? I confess myself altogether nonplussed by your logic in this passage. What *can* be your meaning in speaking of Swedenborg’s work on this subject as “containing the precepts or permissions of devils?” It contains no *precepts* at all, and as to *permissions*, he speaks of the permissions of heaven, and not of hell. How this is to be understood, I have already explained. It is a doctrine which cannot be objected to without arraigning at once the clearest demonstrations of the Divine providence and the most express letter of the Old Testament. Do you suppose that Moses was teaching “the morals of the hells” when he authorized the giving of a concubine by a father to his son, as a succedaneum for a wife till he became subsequently married to another? Let it be shown that Swedenborg has uttered one sentence by way of *absolute approval* of any of the forms of scortation which he declares to originate from infernal sources, and we shall then admit the charge in all its *gravamen*, but not till then.

On the subject of *Adultery* and the remaining forms of Scortatory transgression, I do not deem it needful to enlarge. They all come into the same general category with the preceding, and I believe that as Swedenborg condemns adultery in all its forms, and degrees, as also all kinds of violations of female innocence, and that too under the most fearful sanctions, comparatively little fault is found with this department of his work. To one sentence, however, quoted above from your Lectures, I must for a moment advert. It refers to the fact of Swedenborg’s maintaining that the crime of adultery is distinguished by different degrees of mildness and aggravation. “Our author goes still further, and palliates the crime of adultery in other circumstances; namely, ‘when a wife by craftiness captivates a man’s mind, enticing him into her bed-chamber, and inflaming his passions, or when a man entices another man’s wife and inflames *her* passions. These and like circumstances, he says,—operate as reasonable apologies in favor of the party seduced.’” This, however, is not his language. “That

these and like contingent circumstances lessen the grievousness of adultery, and give a milder turn to the predications of the blame thereof, in favor of the party seduced, is agreeable to the dictates and conclusions of reason." And, pray, is it not? Does not every man assent to the truth of the principle? I do not ask whether such circumstances excuse the crime, but do they not palliate it?—which is all that Swedenborg affirms. Let the reader judge for himself of the soundness of what follows.

"There are two principles, which, in the beginning, with every man who from natural is made spiritual, are at strife together, which are commonly called the spirit and the flesh; and since the love of marriage is of the spirit, and the love of adultery is of the flesh, in such case there is also a combat between those loves. If the love of marriage conquers, it gains dominion over and subjugates the love of adultery, which is effected by its removal; but if it happens, that the lust of the flesh is excited to a heat greater than what the spirit can control from reason, it follows that the state is inverted, and the heat of lust infuses allurments into the spirit, to such a degree, that it is no longer master of its reason and thence of itself: this is meant by adulteries of the second degree, which are committed by those who indeed are able to consult the understanding, but by reason of contingent causes at the moment are not able. But the matter may be illustrated by particular cases; as in case a meretricious wife by craftiness captivates a man's mind enticing him into her bed-chamber, and inflaming his passions to such a degree as to leave him no longer master of his judgment; and especially if, on such occasion, she threatens to expose him if he does not consent: in like manner, in case any meretricious wife is well skilled in deceitful allurements, or by powerful stimulants inflames the man to such a degree, that the raging lust of the flesh deprives the understanding of the free use of reason: in like manner, in case a man, by powerful enticements, so far works upon another's wife, as to leave her no longer mistress of herself, by reason of the fire kindled in her will; besides other like cases. That these and similar contingent circumstances lessen the grievousness of adultery, and give a milder turn to the predications of the blame thereof in favor of the party seduced, is agreeable to the dictates and conclusions of reasons."—C. L. 488.

Is it possible that you should have any question as to the truth of the distinction here asserted? Is it not the universal sense of mankind, that every crime is more or less aggravated according to the circumstances accompanying it? Does not every judge in the land act on this principle, and do not all laws recognize its validity? Who does not know that even the taking of human life, is regarded as more or less a heinous crime according to its circumstances? Does not a fixed and deliberate purpose, prompted by *malice prepense*, constitute the slayer a murderer, whereas if the rash act has been perpetrated in a moment of sudden excitement, when the judgment was overthrown by the violence of passion, a verdict of manslaughter only is rendered? Do you really suppose that no heavier condemnation should be awarded to David, who committed adultery with Bathsheba of set purpose, while her husband was fighting the battles of his country, and who procured that husband to be slain to conceal his baseness, than *should have been* meted out to Joseph, had he fallen before the enticements and threatenings of his mistress? If so, your standard of the criminality of actions must be a very strange one; and yet I am unable to see upon what other grounds you can object to the positions of Swedenborg, which are more distinctly enounced, in the ensuing paragraph.

"All evils, and thus also all adulteries, viewed in themselves, are together of the internal and external man; the internal intends them, and the external does

them; such therefore as the internal man is in the deeds done by the external, such are the deeds viewed in themselves: but since the internal man with his intention does not appear before man, every one must be judged in a human court from deeds and words according to the law in force and its provisions: the interior sense of the law is also to be regarded by the judge. But to illustrate the case by examples: if adultery be committed by a youth, who does not know as yet that adultery is a greater evil than fornication; if the like be committed by a man of extreme simplicity; if it be committed by a person who is deprived by disease of the full powers of judgment; or by a person, as is sometimes the case, who is delirious by fits, and is at the time in a state of actual delirium; yet further, if it be committed in a fit of insane drunkenness, and so forth; it is evident, that in such cases, the internal man, or mind, is not present in the external, scarcely any otherwise than in an irrational person. Adulteries in these instances are predicated by a rational man according to the above circumstances; nevertheless the perpetrator is charged with blame by the same rational man as a judge, and is punished by the law; but after death those adulteries are imputed according to the presence, quality, and faculty of understanding in the will of the perpetrators."—*C. L.* 486.

And here my limits compel me to waive any farther discussion of the present topic. I have aimed to exhibit fairly and faithfully the teachings of Swedenborg, even in their most offensive features, together with the fundamental principles on which his positions are founded, relative to those *laws of permission* which he declares applicable, in certain circumstances, to the intercourse of the sexes. In doing this I beg to be understood as *assuming* nothing more than the attempt to present, in their just bearings, an expose of his real sentiments and inculcations on this subject. I *adopt* nothing more of his doctrines on this, nor in fact on any other head, than I see to be sustained by satisfactory evidence of truth as addressed to my calm and unbiassed reason. In regard to everything that Swedenborg has written, it must eventually stand or fall by its own intrinsic merits. The labors of his adherents may subserve its interests by setting his utterances occasionally in a clearer light—by confirmations and illustrations drawn from other quarters—by disabusing the public mind of false impressions as to their genuine drift—but originating, as, in our esteem, they do, from a source incomparably higher than human reason, human reason can add nothing directly to the internal evidence, much less to the authority, with which they address themselves to the seriously pondering mind. We have *defended* them most successfully when we have *propounded* them most clearly. As the result, however, of a careful, deliberate, and, I think I may say, impartial, inquiry into the purport and scope of the treatise on "Scortatory Love," I am free to declare myself unable to see the peculiar dangerous tendency charged upon it. Provided it be understood in its true-meant design and drift, and received with all the accompanying limitations and cautions, and especially as viewed in its connections with the fundamental principles that distinguish the entire system, I do not perceive the point in which its mischief is concentrated. It is impossible that it should be a directory to govern the practical conduct of the member of the New Church, for the reasons already specified, and upon those who reject the doctrines and the claims of Swedenborg it can of course have no influence. The true question involved in regard to it is, mainly a question of fact—whether the Lord, in the conduct of his Providence, does act on the asserted principle of *permissions*, in view of the present state of mind of certain classes of men, and whether it be right and proper for a Christian teacher to state distinctly this fact. If it be said

that Swedenborg has done more than this—that he has not only laid down the abstract proposition, but has also assumed to designate the specific kinds of these permissions, and so to discriminate the various grades of evil in point of demerit as in effect to *authorise* and *allow* the lesser, I can only say in reply, that this charge cannot be made good against him on any other grounds than those on which it may be preferred against Moses. A *providential allowance* is indeed asserted, but its moral conditions are so expressly defined that whoever avails himself of it must do it upon his own responsibility, and this is attended with extreme peril. Yet even this I think could never have been properly attempted in the full and specific manner which Swedenborg has done, but upon the ground of a conscious illumination enabling him to lay open the principles on which all actions coming under this head are judged in the other life. There is frequently an explicit, and all along through the treatise a tacit, reference to those principles which are embodied in the closing chapter on Judgment and Imputation, and from which I have quoted so freely in the preceding pages. This chapter is a kind of rear-guard to the marshalled array of propositions forming the body of the work, and the task of refutation must be commenced in the denial and disproof of these principles. For ourselves we are assured that the disclosures it contains could never have proceeded from one who had not been supernaturally instructed in the sublimest truths of the spiritual world, and consequently that they cannot be viewed apart from a *character of authority* on this and all other subjects on which he has treated.

With sentiments of respect,

Yours, &c.,

GEO. BUSH.

LETTER IX.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:

The extent to which I have followed out the train of your strictures on the doctrines of Swedenborg, and the minute attention which I have hitherto paid to every important objection urged, have already carried me so far beyond the limits that I had originally proposed to myself, that I am compelled to a somewhat abrupt conclusion of my remarks. There are several additional items in your Lectures to which I should have been glad to be able to reply at length, as I am not aware of a single point of objection in the whole volume which I should hesitate for a moment to meet on the ground of the fairest argumentation. But I must content myself mainly with what I have already written, and this, I am happy to think, embraces an answer not only to all the important objections against our system urged by yourself, but also to all the more standing and popular protests which are every where bruited by our opponents against the doctrines in question. Many of these have already been answered, and probably in a more able manner, by former apologists, and in ordinary cases I should say that there was an obligation on the part of new assailants to bestow some attention upon the replies already given by New Churchmen to the very arguments which they perpetually bring forward, as if they had never before been propounded or responded to. Thus your own volume, for instance, does not seem to recognize the fact that substantially the same things that you have said have

been said again and again by your predecessors in the controversy, and have been again and again replied to. Why do not the just laws of polemics require you to advert to those replies, and to show wherein they fail to annul the force of the objections urged? Yet the whole tenor of your Lectures is just what it might have been if Clowes, and Hindmarsh, and Noble, and Bailey, and Smithson, and Goyder, had never penned a syllable on the subject. It evidently *knows* nothing of any prior assault or any prior defence; and the case is very much the same with the kindred work of Dr. Pond, although as his line of investigation is more original, he has made several new points of objection, particularly in the scientific department. I think we have reason to complain of this, as an act of injustice, as you would probably yourself complain if a Unitarian writer were to repeat all the common arguments against Orthodoxy to which you replied some years ago in your letters to Dr. Ware, and that without paying the least attention to your published defence. Still I do not intimate any regret that an occasion has arisen which has led to the present Reply to your pamphlet. It has doubtless given me an opportunity of saying some things which had not been said before—of putting some things in a true light which had been wrongly represented—and above all of making Swedenborg the pleader of his own cause in the extended array of citations from his works, which may find their way to numerous inquiring minds with some degree, I trust, of useful effect. They can, at any rate, scarcely fail to correct many false impressions, and to beget the belief that the system he has announced is marked by features of so wonderful a character, that its claims to investigation can no longer be properly staved off. This is the grand point upon which his advocates insist. They do not challenge *reception* forthwith, but they do demand *inquiry*. They most confidently affirm that the phenomena connected with the man, and the problems involved in the system, imperiously call for some solution other than that which has hitherto been offered by the deniers of his high assumptions. The plea of *insanity* has for the most part been condescendingly put in, in his behalf, by such of his opponents as have seen too much obvious sincerity and profound sense in his works to allow the open charge of sheer imposture. But nothing more, I am persuaded, is necessary than the simple perusal of the extracts I have given to compel the testimony from every candid mind that “these are not the words of one that is mad, or of him that hath a devil.” No madness that the world has witnessed ever uttered itself in the language of such surpassing wisdom; and that it *is* wisdom I defy any one to deny who has given it more than a cursory glance.

Here too is the indubitable fact that growing numbers of intelligent and cool-judging minds—minds of the most serious complexion, at the farthest remove from enthusiastic tendencies, and trained to habits of rigid requisition of evidence—are everywhere awaking to the conviction, that both the man and the doctrine have been misapprehended, misrepresented, and condemned without a fair hearing, and are embracing the system without reserve. They are ready at once to declare that however formidable appears the *prima facie* evidence against it, and of which they are no less sensible than others, yet to their calmest judgment the evidence in its favor overwhelmingly bears down the evidence against it. This, I maintain, is a fact that requires in some way to be accounted for. How have they come to this result? It cannot be said to be from a cursory and superficial view of the revelations; for they will with one accord declare that

upon such a view of the system they would infallibly have rejected it. It is precisely *because* they have thoroughly examined and tested it, that they adopt it. And who, they ask, that has not gone through a similar process is entitled to sit in judgment on their decision? How is one competent to pronounce a fair verdict on the conclusions to which they have come, if he has not studiously weighed the *reasons* that have determined them? Now we *know* that our opponents have not done this, because we invariably see that in all their assaults they do not treat the *reasons*, but wage their war with the *conclusions*. Thus, for instance, not a syllable is ever uttered on the subject of Swedenborg's psychology. Yet this lies at the foundation of the whole scheme. Nothing is said on the principle of *correspondence*, while this is the fundamental law of the spiritual sense of the Word, which constitutes a prime feature of his disclosures. And so of numerous other items which mark the system. Let us be encountered on the *primary grounds* of our belief by those who really understand what they are, and somewhat of a true issue will be made. But I must be allowed to say, that upon this basis we anticipate few adversaries. It is not from those who have fully put themselves in possession of our creed, and of the grounds of it, that we count upon opposition. This will doubtless ever be dictated, as it ever has been, by a *prejudice* that refuses to invoke *knowledge* into its counsels. In regard to your own work, while I do not retract the concession made in the outset, that it does not deal in vituperation, nor dispense with argument, I am still constrained to say that it does not, in the main, touch the true merits of the theme. It *supposes* the error of Swedenborg's system, on a multitude of points, simply because it differs from accredited tenets. On these heads you evidently deem the system unworthy of being reasoned with. On other points it fails to convey the right impression on the score of facts as to what he does really teach. In confirmation of all this I have only to appeal to your concluding remarks, in which you specify to your pupils what they must do "if they would yield themselves up to Swedenborg as a divinely commissioned teacher, and confide in him as the great prophet of the only true church."

(1.) "You must exclude from the word of God one sixth part of the Old Testament and half of the New." Not a syllable is to be excluded from either. A distinction in the *degree* of inspiration is maintained in reference to the several books, but the fact of their all being inspired in some degree is not denied.

(2.) "You must hold Swedenborg as superior to all the inspired teachers who were raised up before him." No such comparison is required to be made. It is simply requisite to recognize such claims as are established by appropriate evidence. Whatever the degree of his illumination, it was such, we hold, as the Lord saw fit to impart to him, and whether the measure of it were superior or inferior to that of apostles and prophets, is a question in itself of comparatively little moment. Like them, we hold that he spake "according to the wisdom given him." Our only question concerns the truth of what he has said and the source of it. He institutes no such comparisons himself, nor do we.

(3.) "You must receive all his interpretations of the word of God as infallible." And why not, if we admit that they are the product of a supernatural state into which he was brought by God himself, and for the express purpose of laying open the laws of a spiritual interpretation vastly transcending that of the letter? The evidence of the truth of his interpretations depends upon the evidence of the reality of his illumination, and when it can be shown that the *ends* of such

an illumination could be consistent with a fallacious mode of unfolding the interior purport of the Scriptures, we shall feel at liberty to doubt whether it be indeed infallible. Meantime we shall continue to regard his interpretations as infallible, till some stronger reason is given for believing the reverse.

(4.) "You must follow him in regard to the doctrines of religion." These you go on to specify as follows;—"As he rejects the common doctrine of the Trinity, denying the distinct personality not only of the Holy Spirit, but also of the Father and the Son; so must you. As he rejects that centre-doctrine of the Gospel, the doctrine of the atonement, or the vicarious sufferings of Christ as a propitiation for sin; so must you. As he rejects the doctrine of Justification by Faith, that great doctrine of the New Testament and of the churches of the Reformation; you must do the same. As he rejects the evidence of miracles as what carries compulsion with it and takes away man's free will; so must you. As he rejects the worship of an *invisible* God, a pure and perfect Spirit, and maintains that God is *very man*, and is worshiped as *a man* by all in heaven, and by all the men of the church; you must do likewise. As he sternly rejects the common doctrine of Native Depravity, and the doctrine of Divine Sovereignty and Predestination; so must you. As he holds a doctrine very like the Popish doctrine of Purgatory; so must you. That the present life is the only time of probation, you can no longer believe. And you can no longer say to men, with the awakening emphasis which the language usually carries with it, *Behold now is the accepted time! Behold now is the day of salvation! Repent, and prepare to meet your God.*"—p. 163. Now in regard to every one of these points I would respectfully submit whether I have not shown in my preceding pages that your allegations are calculated to convey an entirely erroneous impression of the truth. He does indeed reject the "common doctrine of the Trinity, denying the distinct personality, not only of the Holy Spirit, but also of the Father and the Son," and I trust to have shown that he had very good reasons for so doing, and that not Swedenborg, but yourself and the *soi-disant* orthodox churches, take unscriptural ground on this head. But as to all the other items, I am unable to see wherein I have failed in showing either that you have not represented the *fact* of his teachings correctly, or that where you have, the *intrinsic truth* is on the side of Swedenborg, and not on that of his gainsayers. I leave it, however, to the judgment of the reader.

(5.) "You must follow your teacher also in the denial of the Resurrection of the body." Certainly we follow him in the denial of the resurrection of the *material* body, because we follow him in the assertion of the resurrection of the *spiritual* body, other than which we know nothing of any body at all after death. If you *do*, and can enlighten us by the light either of Scripture or reason on the subject we shall "lend an attent ear" to all such elucidations. As at present advised, we find in the sacred writers no announcement of any body to be raised but a *spiritual* one, and as all our rational inductions agree with Swedenborg in assuring us that such a body is actually involved and enwrapped in the *material* body, and as the separation of these bodies takes place at death, we infer that the only resurrection ever to occur will occur at death. We are not disturbed by any intimation that this view is contrary to the plain language of Scripture, for our concern is no less with what Scripture *means* than with what it *says*.

(6.) "You must adopt his code of morals, which, though abounding in sound

principles respecting the love of our neighbor, and the duties of morality flowing from it, and in general respecting the domestic relations, does, after all, allow unmarried men, in cases which often occur, to keep a mistress, and accommodates married men in the same way, when they have 'just and conscientious reasons,' as he thinks they frequently have." My reply to this must be fresh upon the reader's mind. He has by this time found himself able to judge how far Swedenborg grants *allowance* and *accommodation* either to married or unmarried men. But you add, "I do not say that the followers of Swedenborg must, in their own practice, conform to what is corrupt and abominable in his moral code; but I say they must admit it as a part of Swedenborg's theory, and must hold that it is *allowable* to conform to it." Allowable to whom, and under what conditions? This is the core of the whole matter, and on this point you have, whether *wisely* or *otherwise*, suppressed all qualifications, and thus presented a glaringly distorted view of the whole scope of his statements. But the grounds of a truer judgment are now before the reader, and it may be presumed that he will give them their due weight.

You sum up the whole in the following words:—

"Such as I have mentioned, are the doctrines of Scripture and of the Christian church, which you must reject, and such the moral and religious principles which you must embrace, if you become consistent followers of Swedenborg. In some respects your principles must nearly agree with those of Sabellians; in some respects, with those of Unitarians; in some respects, with those of libertines; and in some respects, you must adopt principles, which neither Prophets nor Apostles, neither men nor angels, ever before taught in our world, but which were revealed to the great Teacher of the New Jerusalem church."—p. 164.

Our affinities, according to this, are quite multifarious, and so far as the elements of goodness and truth exist in any system of religion, we should probably admit a harmonizing tendency even to a greater extent than you have indicated, with the exception, however of the *sect* of "libertines," with which we are unable to recognize the points of contact. Indeed we see for ourselves rather more relationship in that direction in Luther's grand doctrine of justification by faith alone, at least as held by himself. "Now thou seest how rich is the Christian or the baptized man; for though he will he cannot lose his salvation, *however great his sins may be*, unless he refuses to believe. No sin can damn him, but unbelief alone."—(*De Captiv. Bab. Tom. II. fol. 264.*) "Sin lustily, but be yet more lusty in faith, and rejoice in Christ. From him no sin will sever us, *though a million times a day we should fornicate or commit murder.*" (*Epist. ad Aurifab. Tom. I. p. 545.*) "If in faith an adultery could be committed, it would be no sin." (*Disput. Tom. I. p. 523.*) This has at least, I think, as much of a *squinting* towards libertinism as anything in Swedenborg. I am aware it is but hypothetically put, yet it is clear that the hypothesis is very wild, very useless, in superlatively bad taste, and not altogether free from bad tendency. Melancthon falls but little short of this. "Whatever thou mayest do, whether thou eatest, drinkest, workest, teachest, I may add, shouldst thou even sin therewith, look not to thy works; weigh the promise of God." This is like supposing the co-existence of day and night, which were hardly to be expected from a wise man.

But I will not bandy imputations of this kind. We are neither of us sworn to the maintenance of any tenets but those that we see, by the light of right reason, to be *true*. In the brief space that remains to me I would prefer to appeal, in

behalf of the cause for which I plead, to those sentiments of devout reverence for whatever "God the Lord hath spoken," which I am sure pervade your bosom. I cannot do you the injustice to doubt, that you would not knowingly turn a deaf ear to any message that you had the least reason to believe was really from God and designed to make known his mind to his creatures. You would not need to be previously assured that every such communication was dictated by infinite benevolence, was intended for our highest good, and, coming from the Most High himself, was pre-eminently worthy of all acceptance. I can easily picture to myself the retrospective regret of a devoutly ingenuous and deeply pious mind in case it should ultimately receive the conviction that it had unwittingly put away from itself a *bona fide* revelation from the Lord of hosts, and that too under the influence of a general state of mind which would have leaped to the recognition of the truth, had it but rationally perceived it. Now in the present case I think you must admit that there is at least a *possibility* that Emanuel Swedenborg may have been a veritable messenger from God to man. You cannot, I am persuaded, put your finger upon any express declaration of the Word which absolutely forbids the expectancy of any farther disclosures by the Lord himself of the spiritual world, the scene of our immortal existence. Such disclosures *may* then be made, and if so, what more probable than that they should be made through the agency of some individual raised up and remarkably endowed as a selected medium for the purpose. The question then occurs as to the nature of the *evidence* by which such a claim is to be substantiated. I think I have proposed some valid reasons for doubting whether the evidence of miracles would be fairly to be expected at this day, in proof of a divine mission. It would be rather an evidence involved in the intrinsic character of the doctrines announced; and one of its distinguishing features would be apt to be the development of the relation between the inner constituent principles of our nature and the great truths of revelation—a development unfolding the precise *manner* in which our future destiny is controlled by our present character. But this could scarcely be done without at the same time disclosing the fundamental relation between *all* natural and spiritual truth, between the two worlds of matter and of mind, and this is virtually showing the indissoluble connection between science and revelation. It is clothing theology with the character of a divine philosophy. And this we believe has been accomplished in the sublime apocalypse of which Swedenborg has been made the instrument. The great problems of Creation, of Life, of Affection, of Thought, of Free Will, of Redemption, of Regeneration, of Providence, have been solved, if he has uttered truth. The enucleation of the profounder mysteries of our being in all its ramified relations is no longer banned by the inscription, hitherto read over the entrance of the Temple of Truth, "NON LICET," but is ceded by the cheering title, "NUNC LICET."* The door is open, and he that is reverently disposed to worship and learn within the sanctuary is freely permitted to enter.

This then is the leading character of the evidence which Swedenborg affords

* Swedenborg in one of his visions in the spiritual world, beheld a splendid temple illuminated by the light flowing from the interior sense of the Word, after describing which he says;—"When I came up nearer, I saw these words written on the gate, NUNC LICET, now it is lawful; which signified that now it is lawful to enter intellectually into the secrets of faith."—T. C. R. 508.

of the truth of his mission. To a calm reflection I think it must appear as the most appropriate and convincing species of evidence that can be adduced. At the same time I am fully aware of the obstacles with which the reception of such a claim as his must inevitably have to contend. It is adverse to all our settled preconceptions—it makes a kind of havoc of our most cherished notions on the constitution of the universe, the doctrines of religion, and the state after death—it strikes us, at first blush, as an actual superseding of all prior knowledges on the subjects of the Christian revelation—in a word, a sort of moral paralysis seems to fall upon the entire body of our faith on the supposition that Swedenborg is true. Still he *may* be true, and his truth may be of the most transcendent moment to the world. Our own conviction on this head arises in great measure from the utter impossibility we find of accounting for the facts of Swedenborg's case on any other theory than that of the reality of his supernatural insight, and of conceiving the truth on the various subjects he has treated to be otherwise than he affirms. And we feel strongly, in reference to any attempt to refute our positions, the force of Mr. Mill's remark in his *Logic* (p. 551), that "it is a rule both of justice and good sense, to grapple not with the absurdest, but with the most reasonable form of a wrong opinion." The more deeply we have investigated, the more firm the assurance that prompts the exclamation;—"Plato, thou reasonest well; *it must be so.*" To our faith rendered under such circumstances we may apply the remark made by Swedenborg himself in one of his scientific works, that "if any one tells me the same thing that I have myself arrived at, I am bound to believe him on the simple ground that I believe myself."—(*Philos. of the Infinite*, p. 64.)

With men of advanced years and confirmed opinions we can be but little sanguine in our anticipations of so great a change of views as is necessarily supposed in the adoption of this remarkable system. But I have been much impressed by the following resolution of President Edwards, a name that I doubt not carries more than ordinary authority with you as that of a profoundly enlightened and eminently holy man;—"If I ever live to years, I will be impartial to hear reasons of all pretended discoveries, and receive them, if rational, how long soever I may have been used to another way of thinking." If this appears to you a reasonable principle of action, I cannot entirely forego the hope that you may yet review the tenor of your objections, and putting them in contrast with the real character of the doctrines against which they are urged, may eventually reach the conclusion, that if they are not true, still they have so much of the semblance of truth, and are built upon principles so profoundly rational and philosophical, that no man can be justified in lightly estimating or hastily dismissing them.

In drawing my lengthened reply to a close, I have only to request that if I have in anything done injustice to your arguments, or spoken in a manner inconsistent with the spirit of a religion whose genius and motto is CHARITY, or unsuited to the respect and reverence which I have long sincerely cherished towards you, you will put it to the account of anything rather than an *intention* to disregard the least of the requisites to a truly Christian style of religious controversy. With the assurance of my high personal regard and my best wishes for your welfare I remain,

Dear Sir, Yours, &c.
GEO. BUSH.

APPENDIX.

The case of the Landgrave of Hesse, alluded to on a preceding page, exhibits so curious a chapter in ecclesiastical history, and affords so striking an instance of the practical adoption of the *principles* asserted by Swedenborg, that we have been induced to present the affair somewhat more in detail as given in "Bossuet's Variations," vol. 1. p. 231-251. As he adduces original documents, no charge of partizan injustice can be brought against the statement. The Reply of the Reformers to the application of the Landgrave considers his reasons at length, and after dwelling upon the original design of the marriage institute goes on to observe :

"Lamech was the first that married many wives, and the Scripture witnesses that this custom was introduced contrary to the first institution. It nevertheless passed into custom among infidel nations; and we even find afterwards, that Abraham and his posterity had many wives. It is also certain from Deuteronomy, that the law of Moses permitted it afterwards, *and that God made an allowance for frail nature*. Since it is then suitable to the creation of men, and to the first establishment of their society, that each one be content with one wife, it thence follows that the law enjoining it is praiseworthy; that it ought to be received in the Church; and no law contrary thereto be introduced into it, because Jesus Christ has repeated in the nineteenth chapter of St. Matthew that text of Genesis, 'There shall be two in one flesh:' and brings to man's remembrance what marriage ought to have been before it degenerated from its purity. *In certain cases however, there is room for dispensation*. For example, if a married man, detained captive in a distant country, should there take a second wife, in order to preserve or recover his health; or if his own become leprous, we see not how we could condemn, in these cases, such a man as, by the advice of his Pastor, should take another wife, provided it were not with a design of introducing a new law, but with an eye only to his own particular necessities.

"As to what your Highness says, that it is not possible for you to abstain from this impure life, we wish you were in a better state before God, that you lived with a secure conscience, and labored for the salvation of your own soul, and the welfare of your subjects. But after all, if your Highness is fully resolved to marry a second wife, we judge it ought to be done secretly, as we have said with respect to the dispensation demanded on the same account, that is, that none but the person you shall wed, and a few trusty persons, know of the matter, and they, too, obliged to secrecy under the seal of confession. Hence no contradiction nor scandal of moment is to be apprehended; for it is no extraordinary thing for Princes to keep concubines; and though the vulgar should be scandalized thereat, the more intelligent would doubt of the truth, and prudent persons would approve of this moderate kind of life, as preferable to adultery, and other brutal actions. There is no need of being much concerned for what men will say, provided all goes right with conscience. So far do we approve it, and in

those circumstances only by us specified; *for the Gospel hath neither recalled nor forbid what was permitted in the law of Moses with respect to marriage.* Jesus Christ has not changed the external economy, but added justice only, and life everlasting, for reward. He teaches the true way of obeying God, and endeavors to repair the corruption of nature. Your Highness hath therefore, in this writing, not only the approbation of us all, in case of necessity, concerning what you desire, but also the reflections we have made thereupon; we beseech you to weigh them, as becoming a virtuous, wise, and Christian Prince. We also beg of God to direct all for his glory and your Highness's salvation."

We have then a copy of the marriage contract duly attested and authenticated, of which the following is the substance. It will be seen that the measure appears to have been regarded by all the parties concerned as quite essential to the temporal and eternal well-being of his Highness.

"Whereas the eye of God searches all things, and but little escapes the knowledge of men, his Highness declares that his will is to wed the said Lady Margaret de Saal, although the Princess his wife be still living, and that this action may not be imputed to inconstancy or curiosity, and to avoid scandal and maintain the honor of the said Lady, and the reputation of her kindred, his Highness makes oath here before God, and upon his soul and conscience, that he takes her to wife through no levity, nor curiosity, nor from any contempt of law or superiors; but that he is obliged to it by such important, such inevitable necessities of body and conscience, that it is impossible for him to save either body or soul, without adding another wife to his first. All which his Highness hath laid before many learned, devout, prudent, and Christian preachers, and consulted them upon it. And these great men, after examining the motives represented to them, have advised his Highness to put his soul and conscience at ease by this double marriage. And the same cause and the same necessity have obliged the most serene Princess, Christina Duchess of Saxony, his Highness's first lawful wife, out of her great prudence and sincere devotion, for which she is so much to be commended, freely to consent and admit of a partner, to the end, that the soul and body of her most dear spouse may run no further risk, and the glory of God may be increased, as the deed written with this Princess's own hand sufficiently testifies. And lest occasion of scandal be taken from its not being the custom to have two wives, although this be Christian and lawful in the present case, his Highness will not solemnize these nuptials in the ordinary way, that is, publicly before many people, and with the wonted ceremonies, with the said Margaret de Saal; but both the one and the other will join themselves in wedlock, privately and without noise, in presence only of the witnesses underwritten."

We forbear all comment upon this unique manifesto. It is quite obvious that the exculpation of Luther is the justification of Swedenborg. The German Reformer and the Swedish Innovator are here clearly in the same ship and must, in the world's sentence, reach the haven or go to the bottom together. We shall anxiously await the effect of the wind and tide of public judgment.

ings. The other class is that of novitiate readers previously unacquainted with the doctrines. The wants of the first class have, however, been consulted in the large portion of the work comprised in the Diary and the Extras, and as his subscribers are mostly of this class, the Editor will still have a leading regard to them in all future issues.

Having announced in previous Nos. the publication of the work entitled "Documents concerning Swedenborg," which has never been reprinted in this country, we propose to enter immediately upon this, which will probably occupy the remaining 14 Nos. of this series. The volume contains 286 pages and the price of the English edition is \$1.25. In our publication, it, together with the two overrunning Nos. of the Reply, will come at only \$1, which will be due in advance as usual. We shall probably add several new documents published since the date of the original work. The whole will constitute a volume of great value to all classes of readers, and will serve to meet the growing demand for information respecting the remarkable man whose history, endowments, and claims are now pressing themselves with such urgency upon the attention of the world.

After this we wish to devote two or three Nos. to a *descriptive catalogue* of Swedenborg's various works, scientific and theological, together with an account of his Manuscripts, the materials for which have vastly accumulated within the last few years. Under this head will also be embraced a view of the present labors of Dr. Tafel in editing the unpublished works and of the plans of the "Swedenborg Association" of London, in reference to the same object.

If only sustained, we have no doubt of being able to furnish a constant supply of new and interesting matter with which our subscribers would not willingly dispense.

NEW WORK.

GUARDIAN SPIRITS; OR A CASE OF VISION INTO THE SPIRITUAL WORLD.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF H. WERNER,

BY REV. A. E. FORD.

This is the title of a work soon to be published by John Allen containing the remarkable magnetic experience of a German lady during a nervous disease prolonged for a series of years. It abounds in developments respecting the spiritual world strikingly in accordance with those of Swedenborg and confirmatory of them, although the subject was wholly ignorant of his disclosures. The translation is rendered peculiarly valuable by the citation of numerous parallel passages from Swedenborg.—It will be published early in June.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN



3 9015 06824 7660

NEW WORKS OF SWEDENBORG.

The following works, published by the "London Swedenborg Association," have recently been revised and are now offered for sale by John Allen.

I. **POSTHUMOUS TRACTS**; containing treatises on the following subjects:—1. **THE WAY TO A KNOWLEDGE OF THE SOUL.** 2. **CONCERNING FAITH AND GOOD WORKS.** 3. **OF THE RED BLOOD.** 4. **OF THE ANIMAL SPIRITS.** 5. **OF SENSATION, OR THE PASSION OF THE BODY.** 6. **OF THE ORIGIN AND PROPAGATION OF THE SOUL.** 7. **OF ACTION.** 8. **OF THE SOUL AND ITS HARMONY WITH THE BODY.**

This work is published in Nos. of which two have appeared including the first four articles indicated above. The third comprising the remainder is advertised to appear in May.

II. **THE PRINCIPLES OF CHEMISTRY, WITH OTHER TREATISES**, translated from the Latin, with an Introduction by C. E. STRUTT, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh. 1 vol. 8vo. 21 Plates, comprising 159 figures.

The main object of the work is to show that the primary particles of matter are possessed of geometrical forms, and that these forms determine the law of chemical combinations. It contains also new observations and discoveries respecting iron and fire, and particularly respecting the elemental nature of fire; together with a new construction of stoves. Also a new method of finding the longitude of places, on land or at sea, by lunar observations. Price \$3.25.

III. **OUTLINES OF A PHILOSOPHICAL ARGUMENT ON THE INFINITE, AND THE FINAL CAUSE OF CREATION; AND ON THE INTERCOURSE BETWEEN THE SOUL AND THE BODY.** Translated from the Latin, with Introductory Remarks and Index, by J. J. G. Wilkinson. 1 vol. 8vo. 160 pp. Price \$1.87.

This is an extremely valuable work, the latter part of which contains the most luminous explanation of the manner in which the soul receives sensations from the body that has ever yet been given to the world, being founded upon anatomy and physiology instead of metaphysics.

Various other Scientific and Philosophical Works of the distinguished Author are either in process of publication, or contemplated soon to be, of which we shall from time to time keep our readers apprised.

MESMER AND SWEDENBORG.

By G. Bush.—Mr. Allen has just published a second and revised edition of this work. Price in paper covers, 62½ cts., bound 75 cts.