



Printed
P

AN ANSWER

TO THE

LETTER OF REV. J. A. WILLIAMS, ENTITLED,
"WHY I AM NOT A SWEDENBORGIAN."

BY

JOHN PARKER.

"Prove all things ; hold fast that which is good."—Paul.

228633
11.1.29.

TORONTO :
JOHN PARKER,
148 YORK STREET,
DEPOT FOR NEW CHURCH BOOKS, ETC.
1867.

TORONTO:
PRINTED BY THE GLOBE PRINTING COMPANY,
26 & 28 KING STREET EAST.

AN ANSWER

TO THE

LETTER OF REV. J. A. WILLIAMS, ENTITLED, "WHY I AM
NOT A SWEDENBORGIAN."

BY JOHN PARKER.

FIRST PART.

WE have issued this small tract, to the candid and reflecting, in the hope that they will give it a careful examination. The cause of its appearance is a Letter addressed to a Friend (bearing the title, *Why I am not a Swedenborgian*), by the Rev. J. A. Williams, the publication of which was sanctioned by the body of the Association of Wesleyan Ministers of this City; thus giving the Letter the weight and authority of the Church. Such authority is alone sufficient to induce many to believe its contents to be a true and fair statement of the principles taught in the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg. Those who know nothing of the principles of the *new* Church we shall have considerable difficulty in approaching; but should such be led to make a further and careful inquiry, we have no fear of the results. On the other hand, those who know nothing of us but what they hear through such mediums as the above Letter, and who are unwilling to apply for intelligence to Swedenborg's own writings, or to those who intelligently acknowledge his teachings, we have little hope of influencing by this or any other effort that may be made to correct the erroneous impressions they have adopted.

The writer has taken us over a wide field, too extensive for us to do entire justice to the subject, as this reply must necessarily be short. We can, however, state for the benefit of

the inquirer, that all the questions or objections that are truthfully stated in Mr. Williams' Letter have already been completely answered by very able writers, who have fully examined the subject, both for their own satisfaction and the Church at large.

At the beginning of his letter, the writer confesses a little embarrassment, as though aware of the colossal proportions of the man he is about to criticise ; and such, indeed, he was, as testified by many great contemporary and subsequent writers. We quote briefly from the Rev. E. P. Wood, a distinguished Minister of the Congregationalist Church in England : "Shall we insult his memory by glancing at any of the other charges preferred against him? 'He was a Fanatic.' What, then, is a Fanatic?—one of the profoundest mathematicians of his age, a deep and acute thinker, a subtle logician, a varied and versatile scholar, above all, a calm and most quiet bookman and penman, indisposed for any company, and never seen to court the company of the ignorant and vulgar, a man of few words, until compelled to talk, or talking for a purpose ; cool in temperament ; never rocked by passion or impulse ; always, as far as humanity can be, in a state of equilibrium, weighing all his thoughts and all his actions, perpetually bent on giving reasons for things ; a man of strong inductive habits, and consistent ; a whole life of invariable rectitude, and doctrine, and principle ; ever above the hour, and even from the period of his illumination the same—is this the portrait of a Fanatic?" This is a noble tribute from a Christian Minister. But when approached by one who is ready to misrepresent and slander, like the truth, he disappears, and an imaginary Swedenborg of his own fashioning takes the place of the true one. We cannot wonder, however, knowing the power of early impressions, that the writer of the letter should compare the writings of the immortal Swedenborg to his juvenile studies, viz. : the wonderful story of Jack the Giant Killer.

The summary treatment which he gives to Swedenborg may be best suited to his own bewildered state ; but the friend who possesses more than the average amount of intelligence, and has a taste for philosophy withal, will not be disturbed by such a summary notice, containing so many untruthful statements and false references. But it is to be regretted that, while it has no effect upon such individuals, there is another class, for which it appears to be specially written—those who are below the average in intelligence, and who have no taste for philosophy. Such minds are willing to receive for truth that which is supported by authority alone, and when they see that the above letter is written and published by the Association of Wesleyan Ministers of this city, it will be sufficient to stamp it with the character of infallibility.

The writer of the letter associates the writing and teachings of the New Jerusalem Church with spiritism. Here, as in almost everything that he charges us with, he is gone astray. The relation of spiritism to the teachings of the New Jerusalem Church is so distant, that it may be termed the very opposite. Spiritism denies a *personal God*; the New Jerusalem acknowledges the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ as the one only true God and proper object of Christian worship. Spiritism denies the Bible; the New Jerusalem Church derives its doctrine from the Word of God, regarding it as the only source of genuine wisdom. The Spiritists place themselves in communication with spirits for instruction in doctrine and life, during which time they surrender up their liberty, and in some cases their rationality also; but the members of the Lord's New Church are taught to approach the Lord through the Word in a state of true liberty, by means of a rational faith deduced from the doctrines of the Holy Word. Besides these essential marks of distinction, there are many others which show to the intelligent mind that they arise from quite opposite fountains. Did the

Rev. gentleman who wrote the letter, and the association of ministers by whom it was endorsed, know these facts? If they plead ignorance, then they are the "*Blind leading the Blind*;" if they do not plead ignorance, it necessarily follows that they have knowingly testified to what is false. That there is a great gulf fixed between Modern Spiritism and the doctrines of the New Jerusalem Church is quite well known to all who have paid even a very little attention to the subject.

Let us now follow the writer in the order in which he states his objections. In the first paragraph he quotes from Prof. G. Bush, a passage in which he states "that there is a profound philosophy lying at the basis of all his revelations." Now our critic, speaking doubtless from his profound acquaintance with his juvenile literature, saw what he deems good reasons for calling the facts trivial and silly, extravagant and disgusting. It would appear very trivial and silly to a man not accustomed to reflect upon the phenomena of nature, to have seen the young philosopher Newton leaping boy-like backwards and forwards to test the force of the wind, or to see a man blowing soap-bubbles to get at the knowledge of the different colours in light. Thus we see it frequently happens that what is trivial and silly to one is profound to another. The fool sees nothing worth his attention in the dust of the street, while some theologians regard it as the material of which Adam was made; but modern science and philosophy has proclaimed it to be the store-house of the sun's rays, where they are laid down as it were to rest, having left the ancient sphere in ancient times, waiting here in readiness to unlock their treasures in due season for the blessings of man. Swedenborg, in his position as a Seer, revealed this great fact, and his writings enable us to see the arcana of nature in a deeper and wider sense than can be met with in any other works.

In paragraph 2, Swedenborg is made to say: "The

planet Saturn is farthest distant from the sun, and that is the reason why it is furnished with a large luminous belt." It is only just, before any writer attempts to criticise an author (Swedenborg herein is evidence of the fact), that he be able to read and comprehend his language. The original of Swedenborg is "Quia longissime a sole distat," which properly signifies, because it is very distant from the sun. Thus you see our first fact is not a fiction, but one from which you may safely reason.

In Paragraph 3 he does not tell us where we are to find what he objects to respecting the sense in which he, Swedenborg, uses the word *element*, but there is no doubt that he used the word in a popular sense, that is, earth, atmosphere and water, are the common principles or elements from which all things are composed (does the writer of the letter know anything that exists on the earth without these elements?) Speaking in popular language, it is right to say that a fish in the water is in its element, a bird in the air is in its element. The mole when under ground is also in its peculiar element, and furnishes an apt correspondence of those in the Church who wilfully falsify truths. Perhaps among the Association of the Rev. gentlemen there was not one aware of the great scientific attainments of Swedenborg. For their information I will here give a quotation from the Cyclopædia of Universal Biography. The writer is here speaking of the Principia of Swedenborg: "This work explains the productions and nature of the elements, the formation and laws of the *Solar Vortex*, and the sublime analogy between the starry heavens and the magnetic sphere; it will be found to *antedate many important discoveries*, especially in the correlation of magnetism, electricity, light, gravitation, and all the physical forces; while the practical part in mineralogy has been pronounced in Cramer's Art of Assaying Metals, magnificent and laborious.

In paragraph 4 the writer objects to the statement of

Swedenborg "that the soul of man is a nervous, a spirituous fluid." At such a statement "his common sense reluctates;" but why does his common sense reluctate? Is it from what Swedenborg the Seer has said, or Swedenborg the mere philosopher? Now a right understanding, as to when and under what circumstances the above idea was advanced, would have saved the writer from such a state of *reluctation*. The work from which the quotation is taken was published in Amsterdam in the year 1740, five years before he lays claim to illumination, and seven years before he publishes his first volume of Arcana. For the writer to thus quote from works published before his illumination, is as absurd and futile as it would be for an infidel to quote the acts and opinions of Saul of Tarsus against Paul the Apostle, to invalidate the Apostolic writings. In the first instance he was a mere philosopher searching for the soul, and in his search after the soul had advanced as far as unaided intellect could go, as he himself states in a subsequent work written under illumination (*Divine Love and Wisdom*, 394). "Many in the learned world have labored in investigating the soul; but as they knew nothing of the spiritual world, and of the state of man after death, they could not do otherwise than construct hypotheses, not respecting the soul's nature, but its operation in the body; of the soul's nature they could have no other idea, than as of something most pure in ether, and of its continent as of ether. On this subject, however, they durst not publish much, for fear they should attribute anything natural to the soul, knowing that the soul is spiritual. Now having such a conception of the soul, and yet knowing that the soul acts on the body and produces everything in it that has relation to sense and motion, therefore they labored, as we before observed, to investigate the soul's operation on the body, which some said was effected by influx, and some, by harmony; but have thus discovered nothing in which a mind desirous to see the

ground of things can acquiesce. Therefore it has been given me to converse with angels and to be enlightened by other wisdom on this subject, that the soul of man, that lives after death, is his spirit, and that this is in perfect form a man, and that the soul of this form is the will and understanding, and that the soul of these is love and wisdom from the Lord, and these two constitute the life of man, which is from the Lord alone, and that the Lord, for the sake of reception of himself by man, causes life to appear as if it were man's." This paragraph contains the teaching of the New Jerusalem Church concerning the nature and form of man's soul, in which I can see nothing for my common sense to "*reluctate.*" Does not Mr. Williams offend both against the man and the public good, when, perverting the true spirit of criticism, he seizes upon those principles adopted by the Philosopher, and rejected by the Seer, from a higher and more interior plane of observation, and uses them to excite prejudice against the subsequent theological writings? The Pharisees and Scribes in the time of our Lord resorted to every means to lower the character of our Lord in the eyes of the people, so that on one occasion, when the people were astonished at his wisdom and mighty works, it is said they were offended at him, and said "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" Such is ever the language of the Pharisee, who is ever blinding himself to superior things by the interior. Of such our Lord pronounces "Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men, for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in." The candid inquirer will perceive that the quotation from the theological work teaches principles that are sound and scriptural directly opposite to the passage quoted from the *Animal Economy* by the Rev. J. A. Williams. The *Animal Economy* was written in the year 1740; *Angelic Wisdom* in the year 1763, twenty-three years afterwards, and by him as the professed

servant of the Lord Jesus. The reader will also observe that the Rev. gentleman could not be ignorant of these facts, seeing he has referred to the book several times in his letter. Why did he not give *Swedenborg's true doctrine*? I leave the readers to judge. His next objection is to "that kind of philosophy that makes the body and the soul together distinctly and inseparably one."

His authority for this "pitiable philosophy" is Wilkinson's tracts. We have no copy of these tracts, and therefore we cannot refer to them. Are we to regard the writer as holding the doctrine that the body and the soul make *two*, that is, *two* persons or individual beings? If this is his doctrine, we shall for the present hold on to the philosophy that soul and body make one man, however pitiable it may appear to him and his colleagues.

In paragraph 5, he quotes Swedenborg: "that the reason why the blood is red is owing to the correspondence of the heart and blood with love and its affections." He asserts that the almost universally received opinion is that this is caused by the presence of iron in the system. He evidently is forgetting, or if not forgetting confounding, instrumental causes with the more efficient cause. If iron causes blood to be red, how is it that it does not retain its redness after the life has left the body? Is not life something distinct from the blood, and when present in it in fulness has not the blood an arterial redness, and when absent does it not lose that redness? Now in the language of Swedenborg, love and life are synonyms. Thus in the soul there is a circulation of love and its affections, while in the body there is a circulation of blood and its affections; and just as the blood draws into itself things suited for the use of the body, the soul in its kingdom does the same for its preservation and nourishment; and thus in these two kingdoms there is a correspondence, so that every *thing*, principle, and affection of the body exists from the things, principles, and

affections of the soul. Is it not then a sounder doctrine to say that the life principle is the more efficient cause of all the changes and variations through which the system with all its members and organs pass, than that the material particles (iron for instance) the life makes use of for its purposes should control the life? Is it the fire of affection that is present in the blush of the young maiden, or is it the force derived from iron that causes the redness of her face? The ancients as well as moderns have seen and acknowledged a relation between the color red and the affection love. Sacrificial fire, says the Yajur-Veda, is a symbol of the celestial fire which reposes in the heart. Among the Greeks, as also in India and Egypt, the color red designates love, the sanctifier and regenerator. In the Bible the Holy Spirit baptizes with *fire*, hence the color red has its essence in love throughout universal nature. For the sake of the candid and reflecting, we must state that the Rev. gentleman is altogether out in his reference, for there is not a single reference to the redness of the blood in the whole paragraph, A. C. 6,190. Evidently the writer could not have referred to the work, but has allowed himself to be led by a blind guide; and if the blind lead the blind they both fall into the ditch.

Swedenborg says in the paragraph referred to: "From the influx of heat from the sun into all things of the earth, whence comes vegetative life, and from the influx of light into the same things, whence comes what aids that life, and also colors, and appearances of beauties in like manner, from the influx of sound into the ears, and from others of a similar kind, it may be comprehended what is the influx of the heavenly heat which is the good of love, and heavenly light, which is the truth of faith. The influence of these principles is also manifestly felt; for the heavenly heat, which is love, constitutes the vital heat which is in man, and the heavenly light, which is truth, constitutes the understanding; for the truth

which is of faith, which proceeds from the Lord, enlightens his intellectual principle, but in both cases with much variety, for the effect produced is according to reception on the part of man." There is something said in relation to the origin of vital heat in man, but not one word about the redness of the blood being caused by love and its affections.

The blood does not owe its colour to iron.*

In paragraph 6, he says that Swedenborg, upon the authority of an Angel, taught that the blood in the lungs purifieth itself from chyle, and nourisheth itself with odours, fragrant or offensive, corresponding to the character of its love. For this statement he refers his readers to paragraph 153, Wisdom of Angels. This is another error. For the benefit of our readers we will give the actual words of Swedenborg ; No. 420, Divine Love and Wisdom.

"That the blood of the heart purifies itself of *crude matters in the lungs* (not chyle), and also nourishes itself with suitable matters from the air that is inspired, is evident from much experience. That the blood purifies itself of *crude matters* in the lungs, is evident, not only from the influent blood, which is venous, and hence full of chyle collected from the food and drink, but also from the humidity of the expirations, and from their smell, as well as from the diminished quantity of the blood returned into the left ventricle of the heart. *That the blood nourishes itself with suitable matters from the air inspired*, is evident, from the immense abundance of odours and exhalations that are continually issuing from shrubberries, gardens and plantations, and from the immense quantity of salts of various kinds issuing with water from

* Neil & Smith's Compend. of Medicine : Mulder, Sherer and others account for the change of colour by the hypothesis of a change of *form* in the red corpuscles, which are supposed to be *bi-concave and reflecting bodies in arterial blood*, and *bi-convex and refracting bodies in venous blood*. Mulder shows that the colour is *not dependent on the presence of iron*, since it is retained when all the iron has been entirely removed. In this science has only proved what is not the cause.

land, rivers, and lakes, and from the immense quantity of human and animal exhalations and effluvia with which the air is impregnated. That these enter the lungs with the air, cannot be denied ; and as this is the case, it cannot be denied that the blood attracts therefrom such things as are serviceable to it, and those things are serviceable that correspond to the affections of its love. Thence, in the air-cells, or inmost parts of the lungs, there are multitudes of small veins, with little mouths, which absorb such things ; and hence the blood returned into the left ventricle of the heart is changed into arterial and florid blood. These considerations prove that the blood purifies itself of heterogeneous things, and nourishes itself from homogeneous ones. That the blood in the lungs purifies and nourishes itself correspondently to the affections of the mind, is not yet known, but it is very well known in the spiritual world ; for the Angels in the heavens are delighted only with odours that correspond to the love of their wisdom ; whereas, the spirits of hell are delighted only with odours that correspond to some love in opposition to wisdom ; the latter odours are stinking, but the former odours are fragrant. That men in the world impregnate their blood with similar things, according to correspondence with the affection of their love, follows of consequence ; for what a man's spirit loves, that, according to correspondence, his blood craves, and attracts in respiration. From this correspondence it follows that a man is purified as to his love if he loves wisdom, and that he is defiled if he does not love her ; all a man's purification being affected by the truths of wisdom, and all his defilement by the falses that are opposed to them."

The Rev. gentleman is nowhere asked to believe this upon the authority of an Angel, as stated in his letter, *but its philosophy is as true as it is profound*. Liebig, in his *Animal Chemistry*, 3rd edition, part 1, page 7, says : "All parts of the animal are produced from a peculiar fluid, circulating in its organism, *by virtue of an influence residing in every cell,*

in every organ, or part of an organ. Physiology teaches that all parts of the body were originally blood, or that at least they were brought to the growing organ by means of this fluid." The Professor, you will observe, says that this is accomplished by virtue of an influence residing in every cell, organ, and part of an organ. Now, science has not, and cannot determine what this influence is that resides in every cell, organ, or part of an organ. Swedenborg says that a man's soul or spirit is present in every part of the body, consequently in every cell, organ, or part of an organ, and that within this again is the human will and understanding. Within this again is the Lord's love and wisdom, giving life and activity to every degree or circle of life, from the inmost to the very extremes, even where we now dwell, sustaining our natural bodies with meats and drinks. In the language of Scripture it is thus expressed: "Heaven is God's throne, earth is his footstool;" and the time has arrived in which he will make the place of his feet glorious, by the light that constitutes his throne descending into extremes, or his footstool, illuminating the natural mind, and giving it a perception of the glories into which the good of all religions enter on their exit out of this world. From the light in extremes it is seen that all power originates from the throne of God. Now, as it is in universal nature, so it is in individual man. Let us illustrate. Suppose two boys, born of the same parents, under similar conditions; they shall both be supplied with the same food, but their affections and thoughts shall be actuated and led out into life differently; the one shall be taught to have respect to the Divine commandments, (we mean the moral law); he shall cherish kind and gentle affection towards parents, brothers, sisters, and playmates, indeed his affections we will suppose to be constantly under the controlling influence of good; the other shall cultivate the opposite affections; the spring of his life, (that is where liberty, reason, and consci-

ousness dwells, for this is where the stream of life is deflected, above is pure, below is impure,) we suppose to be self-love, self-gratification, etc. Both these individuals sit down to the same table, partake of the same fare, but the idea that is present in the mind of the latter, while he is eating for the nourishment of his body, is that of a pugilist or a sensualist. The inmost of his conscious life is sensuality and brutality; while the inmost life of the other, where it falls upon the plane of his own consciousness, he, from the freedom with which he is endowed, chooses this life in its innocency and purity, and from that liberty, according to his rational perception, establishes it in his outer life, even to the very activities of his body, in innocency and love. Now, there is no difference outwardly. The evil and well-disposed appear alike, so far as the nourishing of the body is concerned, and yet we are all aware that there is a difference produced in the course of time, even in the taste for food, where opposite affections are cultivated. Does not our daily experience show that cheerfulness and hope are powerful stimulants in the preserving of the corporal body, and that depression, gloom and base passions, as truly ultimate in the degradation and destruction of the animal economy; thus clearly showing it is not merely physical elements that are needed to preserve a healthy organization, but healthy mental and spiritual conditions as well. Medical science is full of confirmation of this fact. Thus the affections act upon the body by correspondence.

In paragraph 7 the Rev. gentleman represents Swedenborg as saying that conscience is an acquired habit of mind, is peculiar to the present life, and that there is no conscience in the other world. In support of this he refers his readers to Swedenborg, True Christian Religion, 665. We have looked in vain for such language in the paragraph, also on page of the above mentioned number. And what is more, the language is his own, and not to be found anywhere throughout Swedenborg's theological writings. Surely such a body

of Rev. gentlemen who endorsed such a statement knew not what they were doing. Statements coming from those who occupy Moses' seat, in order to have a good effect upon those for whom they are purposely written, should at least be truthful; or the friend possessing more than an average amount of intelligence, and a taste for philosophy withal, may hurl them back as a gross slander, originating in some base and improper motive. The real language of Swedenborg is as follows: True Christian Religion, 666.

“Conscience is a spiritual willingness to act according to the requirements of religion and faith; hence it is that those who enjoy conscience, when they act according to its dictates are in the tranquility of peace and internal blessings, and suffer uneasiness or want of tranquillity when they act contrary to it. *A Priest (says Swedenborg) possesses conscience who has a spiritual willingness to teach truth that he may promote the salvation of his flock; but if he does it from any other view, or to any other end, he is without conscience.* All who have conscience speak and act from the heart, in all they say and do, for their minds not being divided, they speak and act that which they understand and believe to be true and good.” In the Arcana, 978, He says “conscience is implanted by the Lord in the internal man, where there is nothing but goods and truths.” Such is the doctrine of Swedenborg concerning conscience. Now, what is that which the association of Wesleyan ministers of this city would have us believe as a substitute for this? It is that of a natural conscience, a conscience arising out of our natural mind; for says the writer of the letter (also the endorsers), “The ablest thinkers and writers call it a natural endowment of the human mind.” A natural endowment of the human mind! Does nature endow man with this noblest of faculties—the faculty by which he judges of right and wrong? Is not the conscience like a mirror, on which the eternal principles of right and wrong are reflected, and is not this mirror bright

or dull, according to the quality and nature of the truths by which it is formed? For every man has a conscience according to his religious tenets, for there is a great difference between the Pharisee's conscience, who looks at outward forms as religion, and that of the man who looks to doing justly and loving mercy. The former is formed from the traditions of men, and is a spurious conscience. The latter is formed by the truths of the Word implanted by the Lord in the internal man, sitting as a judge over the actions of the external man, condemning or else approving of every individual action in the body. But what of those who have a conscience formed from nature? The dictates of nature are self. This law of nature is the first law. So, as that which is first is natural, afterwards that which is spiritual. Now the Lord has come to give us a new heart and a right spirit, and in this new heart and right spirit a new conscience is to be formed; this is the inward man, that is to receive the *law of the Lord written upon the inward parts*. Dear readers, turn your attention from the traditions of men to the Lord's most holy word, for it is the only source from whence a true conscience can be formed. How do Swedenborg's facts now appear? Are they real or imaginary? Do they stand in contradiction to well-established facts in science? A little reading with average intelligence, and a taste for philosophy, would lead many more to countenance the system propounded by him, as well as surprise them by its stupendous compass. Garbled quotations from any author (to say nothing of fictitious statements) can be made to misrepresent and distort his meaning. Let those who really enquire for the truth read the author's own writings with a sincere desire to comprehend his meaning, and they will find that he was neither a fanatic, madman, or impostor.

SECOND PART.

LET us now examine what the Rev. gentleman has to say on "matters of greater moment." And even here it does not appear that the importance of the subject deters him from misstatements. Surely he must think all humanity are intellectual pigmies, and we especially must so appear to him, when he tells us that he cannot receive the New Jerusalem doctrine because it sets aside the Bible! Why where has the writer of the letter been living this last quarter of a century? What has he been reading. Surely not the writings of Swedenborg. May not the writer be a little confused with what he has in his own manuscript sermons, or have heard the Rev. Mr. Pollard state when speaking on the inspiration of the Bible, viz., the writers needed not the spirit of God to inspire them when recording facts which happened during their own time, of which they were eye witnesses. This is what we have ourselves heard preached in Richmond St. church. What is this but denying at least the inspiration of part of the Word? It is the New Jerusalem Church that *truly receives the word of God, as coming from him through the heavens down to fallen humanity. The Word is made flesh, dwelling amongst us.* And the written Word is near to us, addressing our souls through the senses, proclaiming the necessity of repentance and reformation, as the door to the Lord and the kingdom of heaven. The doctrine of the New Jerusalem Church teaches that the Lord is in every single expression of his Word, and it is only as Christians approach through his Word that he is properly worshipped. In True Christian Religion, No. 229, Swedenborg states, "That doctrine ought to be drawn from the literal sense of the Word, and to be confirmed thereby. The reason of this is because the Lord is present in that sense, teaching and enlightening the mind. For all the Lord's operations are performed in fulness; and the Word in its letter is in its fulness." This is the true ground why doctrine ought to

be drawn from the sense of the letter. We feel emboldened to further reply to this charge by stating that what are termed Evangelical doctrines are nowhere to be found in the letter of Scripture, as is shown at the end of this Tract. They have their origin in the self-derived intelligence of the Church, developing itself into two diabolical loves, viz.: the love of dominion and the love of wealth; but, thank God, the night is far spent and the day is at hand when the brood of traditional ideas that hang like a night-mare upon the souls of the people shall be dissipated, and like the birds of the night and the wild beasts of the forests they shall retire to their hiding places, as described in Revelation, "saying, mountains and rocks fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb." Light proceeding from the throne, and truth grounded in innocency advancing in a sphere of disinterestedness, is as the fire of hell to a system grounded in the love of dominion and the love of wealth, which in Scripture language is the wrath of the Lamb. The so-called Evangelical teaching, originating in self-derived intelligence, is at variance with the teachings of the New Jerusalem; and its receivers approach the Lord altogether differently; the former through tradition of men, the latter in truths contained in the letter of the Word. Hear the language of the man of whom the writer declares that he rejects the Bible: "The truths from which the Lord is to be worshipped ought to be drawn only from the Word, for in the minutest things of the Word there is life from the Divine," see Arcana 8941. The candid and reflecting will perceive that true worship is according to the Word, that false worship is that which is not according to the Word. Let any one test our doctrines by the sacred oracle, comparing them one by one with the doctrines of either the Catholic or Protestant Church, and we have no fear for the results.

The Rev. gentleman further states, "That a new dispensation of truth has been given to the world in the Theological

writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, distinct from every former dispensation, and contrary to the teachings of the Christian Scriptures." We deny that the writer of the letter has ever read in any writings by an expositor of Swedenborg, or in Swedenborg himself, any such statement as the above. Such a statement may be found in that virulent attack by Dr. Pond, and in the gentleman's letter, which is an offshoot from his. True, the writer of the letter refers to Clissold's letter, page 95. There is a Rev. A. Clissold, M. A., formerly of Exeter College, Oxford, a voluminous writer in the Church, who is the author of several letters, one to the Archbishop of Dublin, containing 500 pages, and one to the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, and one to a Mr. Bonwell. Now we are confident that no such statement occurs in any letter of Mr. Clissold. The New Church teaching is that truths hitherto obscure are now made plain; that the glory of the Divine Word, which is veiled in the letter, has been manifested.

That the written Word within is glorious is as certain as that the Word incarnated was glorious; and to deny the glory in the letter leads to the denial of the Divinity and glory of the Son of man himself, who is the Word made flesh; for there is a perfect analogy between the two. In the letter of the Word there is pasture for the natural mind, but within the letter, where the Lord is seen in his glory, there is a fullness of satisfaction and delight that can only be realized by the spiritual rational mind. It is so in relation to the Lord himself. The humble mind who acknowledges the Lord as his Saviour, without entering into other mysteries of faith, providing the life is good, is led into green pastures and by still waters. On this subject we quote from Clissold.

Rev. A. Clissold. Letter to Archbishop Dublin, 2nd ed., page 220. "Swedenborg would, therefore, recall the Church to its ancient principles of inspiration. 'I saw in the right hand of him that sat upon the throne, a book written within and on the back side, sealed with seven seals.' What book?

Let the ancient writers of the Church testify. (*I here quote only one, Richard of St. Victor.*) 'The book which is held in the right hand of God is the Holy Scriptures; in which is contained all knowledge conducive to salvation. Of this book well is it said, that he held it in his right hand; because God is a God of knowledge, and to whomsoever He will He offers it. It is held not in the left hand, but in the right; because the spiritual good which is latent within it is hidden from the evil and manifested to the good. Of this right hand and of this book it is written, in his right hand was the fiery law. For Scripture is a law of fire; a law because it binds our nature by restraining it; fiery, because it ardently inflames us to a love of the Creator. It is written within and without; within in regard to *its allegorical sense*, without in regard to its historical sense; within in regard to its spiritual meaning; without in regard to its literal; within for the exercise of those who are matured in spiritual things; without for the instruction of the simple and those of lesser understanding; within that the secrets of Divine Wisdom may be concealed from the impure; without in order that truth may be made known to the pure.'"

We will not trouble the reader with further quotations. But it is to be lamented, when a writer like the above acknowledges a spiritual sense in the Scriptures, that forthwith the natural-minded interpreter cries out he is teaching things contrary to the Christian Scriptures. Let the candid reader reflect upon the following names and characters of our Lord. He is called a Sun and a Star, a Lion and a Lamb, a Door and a Way, a Father and a Son, a Man and the Son of Man, the Creator and husband of the Church; besides these there are a great number of names too numerous to mention. Is it at variance with Scripture and sound reason to believe that each title or name contains within itself some spiritual idea or sense distinct from the letter without destroying the letter? such for instance as the word Lamb, containing the idea of innocency; Lion, Strength; Father, Love, or the principle of

fecundity; and so on with each expression of the Divine Word. If man is capable of thinking from the two planes of thought, the natural and spiritual, the Bible must possess the two classes of objects, one natural and the other spiritual. Now this is what the members of the New Church believe concerning the Scriptures or Word of God. Paragraphs 9, 10, 11, 12, can be dismissed by a few quotations. In the 9th he charges us with having "openly and avowedly rejected nearly one-half of the Bible." We do not reject any of what is called the Bible, we rather attach a more exalted meaning to *the Word Proper* than Christians generally do.

Some parts of the Bible we believe to be absolutely Divine, containing the Divine Truth itself. But as to the epistles, we regard them in the same light as other Churches regard the whole Bible, as containing one sense, viz., the literal, and teaching true doctrines, but written by the Apostles specially for the first Christian Church. For when the Christian Church was founded they required the doctrines to be written in a plain and simple style, so that the Church might be edified. On this subject Swedenborg says: "The reason why the Apostles wrote in this style was that the new Christian Church was then to begin through them; consequently, the same style as is used in the Word would not have been proper for such doctrinal tenets, which required plain and simple language suited to the capacities of all readers." See Bush's reasons, page 85. On the subject of the Canon we will repeat Dr. Milner's question, in his "End of Controversy," in which he asks his Protestant opponent, "By what means have you learned what is the Canon of Scripture, that is to say, which are the books written by Divine inspiration, or indeed that any books at all have been so written?" It is somewhat surprising that those who know that the present Canon is of human origin, and that not by the unanimous consent of the Church, should open up the question in the manner it is done in the letter to which this is intended for a reply. The

writer would have us to believe that the Canon is a settled question; also that the Church is agreed upon what constitutes inspiration, and that the common law of interpreting human language must be applied to explain the Divine. The Canon of Scripture settled! The nature of interpretation determined! And the Bible only to be explained as the writings of Josephus—that is, by the common law of human language, so that when the same language is used in a profane author, the words are to yield the same significance! Martin Luther had a ready way of settling what were the inspired Books. Assuming the dogmatic ground, he made the canonical authority of a Book depend upon the evidence it bore of Christ and *the dogma of Justification by faith alone*; hence, he does not reckon the Epistles to the Hebrews, James, Jude, and the Apocrypha, among the Canonical Books. On the subject of inspiration, the Archbishop of York says, in his pastoral letter: “The Church has laid down no theory of inspiration; she has always had in her bosom at least two different theories.” The *Quarterly Review*, for April, 1864, says: “It must be borne in mind that the Church universal has never given any definition of inspiration. Thus the Christians are without a Divinely authorized Canon upon which they are unanimous; neither can they tell what is to be understood by inspiration. What the first Christian Church lacked in this respect, is revealed for the New Church, constituting its glory. They are thereby taught that there is an analogy between the spiritual and the natural worlds, and that the Word is written according to that analogy. Again, that the Holy Scriptures are not of private interpretation, but that the key of explanation lies in the bosom of nature, and that as this science of analogy is developed, mankind will know that the Bible and the works of nature are from one and the self-same Divine Being, the God and Father of us all.

The Rev. gentleman, in paragraph 12, seems to be in a great

difficulty about the science of correspondence, but unhappily without anxiety. He is unable to see any connection between spiritual causes and natural effects; yet, we suppose he would not tell us that God, who is the first cause, and from whom everything is produced, is not the originator of ideas, and that man, into whom ideas flow, reproduces them in things formed for use and comfort, and that the things thus produced represent his ideas and correspond to them. Now, inasmuch as things on this earth are produced from and by God, and as ideas do not really exist here, but are only representatives of ideas, it follows that ideas, because they belong to the mind, exist in the realm of mind, which is the world of causes. This could be illustrated by the Rev. gentleman's own letter, were it original, but inasmuch as it is copied from Dr. Pond, it had to ascend from the pages of his book into the Rev. gentleman's mind, where it could have a place to dwell in, *like the birds of the air* and the *foxes* of which our Lord spake, whilst the Son of Man (or truth) had not where to lay its head. From their dwelling-place they descended into the natural world, clothed in material form, and coloured with the quality of the writer's mind. When the mind comprehends this descent and ascent, the light of the science of correspondence has already begun to shed its light upon the mind, and the following text may be read with a little interest: Habak. 3 ch., 8, 9 v.—“Lord, thou didst ride upon thine horses and thy chariots of salvation. Thy bow was made quite naked, according to the oath of the tribes even to thy word.” Jeremiah, 9 ch., 3 v.—“And they bend their tongues *like* their bow *for* lies, but they are not valiant for the truth upon the earth, for they proceed from evil to evil and they know not me, saith the Lord.” Swedenborg translates this verse: “They stretch their tongue; *their bow is a lie*, and not for truth, they prevail in the earth, because they have gone forth from evil to evil, and have not known me.” Who cannot see that the above language contains ideas of which

the things mentioned are representatives and correspondencies? Let us instance an example: Lord, signifies the Lord as to his essential nature, which is, *Divine Love*. Ride,—the going forth or advancement of his love. Horse,—the human understanding into which his love flows, and in which it is perceived as coming from the Lord, and as being the only source of good. Chariot, is that which the understanding arranges and fixes in an orderly form, and which may be termed *doctrinal principles*, derived from truths which are of the Lord's love, and when arranged in their order and series they are productive of an heavenly life, which is here expressed by salvation. Thus the above verse represents the Lord coming to his Church, in the truth, in a manner that shall be rationally perceived in the human understanding. Then follows what is described in the 9-17 ver., that truth from the Lord, flowing into the human understanding, where there is affection for truth for its own sake, dispelling and dissipating the false doctrines of a fallen Church, by shedding its light into every dark corner of falsity and evil, bringing every state and principle to judgment to be tested by the Lord's most holy word, for at his coming a two-edged sword goes forth out of his mouth.

Paragraph 13. He endeavours to avoid a difficulty by a very ambiguous sentence. He speaks of the "Divine personality of the Godhead. If by this he means that the Godhead dwells in one person, and that this one person is the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, he is both Apostolic and Swedenborgian in his view of God. But if he intends us to understand that the person of the Godhead is a Being resulting from the union of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, whose being is not identically the same in person as the Father, nor as the Son, nor yet as the Holy Spirit, why then he has four personalities, viz.: the personality of the Father, the personality of the Son, the personality of the Holy Spirit, and the personality of the Trinity also, making in all, four; and which he says has

been the common doctrine of the Church in all ages. People who have not the average intelligence, and no taste for philosophy, and we might say without a smattering of Church history, may believe his last sentence; but we have no doubt that some of his readers have already come to the conclusion that the Wesleyan Methodists have four personal Gods, if not four real self-existing ones. We all understand by personality that which constitutes *individuality*, or a thinking, intelligent being. In this sense the word is used by Lord Bacon, Locke, Rogers, and others. If the writer of the attack upon us understands something else, let him inform us in his next attempt to prove the tri-personality of the Godhead. Personality, he says, is taught in Genesis i. 26 v. We have no doubt that he is aware, (or should be,) that the word *us* refers to that which was active in the making, and which also constitutes the essential nature of man. The nominative to which this is the pronoun is *Elo-him*, so that the nature and quality of the latter is determined by the former. *Elo-him* is the plural of *El*. Now Dr. Adam Clark, on Exodus xxxiv, 6 v., where the Lord passed by and proclaimed his name the Lord, the Lord God, &c., says: "These words contain the proper interpretation of the venerable and glorious name Jehovah. *El* signifies the strong or mighty God;" and it is admitted by biblical critics that *Elo-him* signifies the omnipotent one, or omnipotent powers, but as *El* expresses strength or might in the singular form, may it not be reasonable to consider that the Word *Elo-him*, which means Gods or Powers, signifies the aggregate of truths or laws that were in operation in forming all things in creation, all of which laws or truths are gathered into man, giving him the pre-eminence over all things? We will here recite a passage from Swedenborg, as it may be of use to some of our readers. "That *El* involves one thing, and *Elo-him* another, every one may conclude from this, that the word is Divine, and that it is hence inspired as to all expressions, yea as to the smallest apex; hence it is that by *El*

and Elo-him, in the supreme sense, is signified the Divine Spiritual, for this is the same with Divine Truth, but with this difference, that by El is signified truth in the will and act, which is the same thing with the good of truth. Elo-him in the plural is used, because by the Divine truth is meant all truths which are from the Lord ; hence also angels in the Word are sometimes called Elo-him or Gods." See also Dr. Hengotenberg's Dissertation on the Pentateuch, in which he has investigated the names of God, as they occur in the Books of Moses, with singular felicity. The plural form of Elo-him, he suggests, may intimate that the true God possesses in himself *what men were disposed to divide* among a plurality. On account of the signification of this word it is applied to kings, judges, and angels, because they are the embodiment of power from the Lord. The very same principles produce by their operation in man the corresponding effects under the Christian dispensation, viz.: *a new man*. For in their silent operation the truths of faith, (or Elo-him,) are ever saying let us make a man after our image and likeness, for a man is a true man when he is a true image and likeness of the Eternal Word ; "being born again not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. And this is the Word whereby the Gospel is preached unto you." This Word was in the beginning, creating and forming all things ; from it is derived all truth, all law, all order, and it is the essence of all power, so that what is called Elo-him, in Genesis, is Logos in the Gospel of John, the only power in creation. If the reader will elevate his mind above natural things, so as no longer to think of the Divine Trinity from the personality of corporeal man, he may be led to a perception of the divine and spiritual things of the Word. Cudworth, in his Intellectual System, speaking of the three essentials of the Deity, says : "The first whereof is infinite goodness with fecundity, the second infinite knowledge and wisdom, and the last infinite, active, and

perceptive power!" From these three essentials in the Deity, man has derived into him the faculties to love, to become wise, and to live a life of activity according to the dictates of love and wisdom flowing into him from the Lord; and when those principles are obeyed, man is an image and likeness of God. In this sense and in no other can man be an image and likeness of God. If God is three, or, as taught in the letter, *four persons*, how is man, who is one person, an image and likeness of the Deity?

In paragraph. 14, the writer informs us that he is not so favorable to materialism as to receive the statement *that God is a man!* From the sense of the above sentence, the writer evidently has his ideas mixed, and it reminds us of what Lord Monbodo says in his ancient metaphysics. Speaking of the beginning of all things and of man's perceptions of them, he says "they are all perceived by our senses, which are our only inlet to knowledge in this state of our existence, but the senses perceive them altogether in a lump, and as they exist in nature; but in order to form ideas of them, we must arrange them and perceive their several relations and connections. This is done by the two great faculties of the human intellect, abstraction and generalization, that is dividing, and uniting." Hence, before a man can form a true understanding he must possess the above faculties, and studiously apply them to the subject he has in hand, or he will find his wisdom consists only in phrase-mongering in which there will be no idea, or if an idea, a very erroneous one. Had not the writer read Swedenborg from a kind of chaotic mind in which he mixed the garments of things with the things themselves, he would have arrived at a truer conclusion. For those who can separate things in their mind by those two great faculties above mentioned, viz., abstraction and generalization, may be led to perceive that the dust of which it is said Adam was made is one thing, and the breath breathed into him

was another; and if he will advance a little in thought he may be able to perceive that the breath from the Lord is that which constitutes the human principle; seeing that it is not said that the Lord breathed into the nostrils of beasts the breath of life. As to the materiality of man's body, it differs in no respect from the beasts of the field in its constituent elements and natural sensations. The soul, which is the real man dwelling within, is what constitutes the imperishable and immortal nature. The writer of the tract and the Rev. gentlemen who endorsed it would have us believe that flesh and blood (or bones) make the man. In proof of this they refer us to two texts of Scripture. St. John's Gospel, 4, 24, "God is a Spirit." This is given to prove the nature of God. The other text is from Luke 24, 29. "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have. This is quoted to prove that God is not a *material man*. Let us put it in the following form :

God is a spirit, Christ is flesh and bone that can be handled and seen by the organs of sense; therefore he is not God. Here we have two substances, one spiritual the other material; one is of God, the other of Christ. So that the Rev. gentleman has a Spiritual God unmanifested, and a material Christ, that can be seen and felt with the organs of sense. Let us hear what the Great Apostle says about flesh and blood, 1 Cor. 15, 47—50. "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from Heaven. *As is the earthy such are they also that are earthy*, and as is the heavenly such are they also that are heavenly; and as we have borne the image of the earthy we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of Heaven." It is evident to the unprejudiced mind that the Apostle Paul is here speaking of a humanity that came from Heaven, and that this is the *Lord of Heaven*. Is the Lord of Heaven, who visited this earth, and is here called the second man by

Paul, made of dust? Surely the true man is of an heavenly origin, but that which has deceived humanity and led us all astray is of the earth, earthy. Christian readers, let not the first Adam blind you from looking up to the second man, who is the Lord God Almighty. Is Swedenborg in error when he states that our Lord is a divine man, and the association of Wesleyan Ministers right when they say he is material flesh and bone—that his humanity is like Adam's, viz., *made of dust?* *It looks as though they mistook the Scriptures.* We will here quote from Swedenborg. "The Lord alone is man, and all others are men in their degree from him," 565 Arcana. "The Lord is the only man, and men are only so far men as they are his image, that is, so far as they are in good." There is nothing here calculated to lead a reflecting mind to the belief in a material God. Evidently the writer of the letter has put out the lights, and is looking at humanity and spiritual things from an earthly state of the first Adam; but those in whom the lights are burning are enabled to see that their humanity is an offspring of the one humanity who is the man from Heaven, for the human principles, or those which constitute a man, are *liberty and rationality*. Liberty is of the will, rationality is of the understanding. These two faculties enable man to know and love his Creator, which beasts cannot do; nevertheless, these two faculties of and from themselves could not know and love the Creator, for they are only finite receptacles into which the Divine love and wisdom flow. The Divine love is infinitely free, the divine wisdom infinitely knowing; from these two essential principles in the divine, the finite human principles are formed, and these principles make him an image and likeness of God. It necessarily follows that because the essential human principles are love and wisdom, the Divine in whom these principles are infinite is an infinite man. In the book of Gen., we read that the "Lord God

breathed into man the breath of life (lives) (life into his will and life into his understanding), and man became a living soul." This breathing is still going on, "for in him we live, move, and have our being." The candid and reflecting will see that our views of God and man are in keeping with Scripture and sound reason. The New Church knows nothing of a God out of Christ (or a God without humanity). When the mind attempts to think of God out of Christ or without a humanity it is confounded.

The writer appears to be able to think of two personal Gods out of Christ—the Father and the Holy Spirit, whereas the Bible declares God in Christ, the Father in the Son, *the Spirit of God*. From God, his Spirit, that is God's Spirit. Jesus said "he that seeth and knoweth me seeth and knoweth the Father. I and my Father are one." Jesus is a divine man, and in him the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily. The divine and human make one Christ, as soul and body make one man. To this divine being shall every knee bow and tongue confess that he is Lord of all, and the time will come when the Church on earth will join in concert with the Church in Heaven, to sing "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing; and every creature which is in Heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lord for ever."

In paragraph 15, Swedenborg is charged with Pantheism. The book referred to for this is the *Animal Economy*, see paragraph 4th. The teaching of the New Church on this subject is "that by the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." The Lord's word *is life*, and from life something may be produced, but out of nothing, nothing comes. It is no proof

that the world was not made from the Word of God, because (as the writer asserts) Adam was made from dust. St. Paul, quoting from a Greek poet, perhaps may help our opponent out of his difficulty: "For in Him we live and move and have our being," as certain also of your poets have said, "For we are also His offspring." But our opponent entertains the idea that creation was from nothing, and that Adam was from dust; so that, according to his idea, we are the offspring of nothing. *What a ridiculous absurdity.* Humanity without a root; without a parent; by parity of reasoning without a God; we *sprang from nothing!* Dr. Adam Clark, on the above text, says: "God is the very source of our existence; *the principle of life comes from Him; without God we not only can do nothing, but without Him we are nothing.*"

Paragraph 16 is answered in Paragraph 13, in which he has both confused and confounded Father, Son and Holy Ghost in what he terms the Divine Personality of the God-head.

Paragraph 17. The reverend gentleman charges us with teaching that Christ had no human soul, and was not properly a human being. For this statement, he refers to Mr. Noble's Appeal, p. 388. If the writer ever read Noble, it was with the veil over his eyes. We would rather think he has been drinking at Dr. Pond's, and reproduced his garbled statement, for it is not to be found in page 388 in two editions we have lying before us, but in page 372. He says: "Now let it be observed, that there was a difference between the Lord Jesus Christ, while in a body of flesh on earth, and all ordinary men. That whereas they take their soul or spiritual part from a human father, as well as their body or material from a human mother, and thus are finite human beings, as to both; Jesus Christ having no father but the *Divine Father*, had his soul or internal part from the Divine essence itself; or the Father was in fact his soul or internal part, while his body or external part, *including the affections of the natural*

man, was all that he took from the mother. That this was so is evident from what the Angel said to the Virgin: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore, also that *Holy thing* which shall be born of thee shall be called *the Son of God.*" Here is a son born in time begotten of the *Holy Ghost*, but neither here, nor anywhere else in Scripture, is the doctrine taught of a Son of God begotten from eternity. It is the *Holy thing* called the Son of God that constitutes the soul; and as Mr. Noble further says, "that inasmuch as the Divine Essence cannot be divided, it was the Father." In the meantime, there was a manifestation or descent of Divine Truth first. Just as the human mind manifests itself in speech; the speech is the first that is heard or seen—afterwards the idea. Thus the Lord manifested himself as the Word, or Logos, which was made flesh, dwelt amongst us, and in this *Word* or Logos the Father dwelt, which is the Divine principle of Love, or as Cudworth states, *fecundity*. The two principles in the Divine cannot be separated; therefore, the "*Holy thing born of the Virgin,*" which was the Word made flesh, contained the Divine Love or principle of fecundity. Thus in the incarnation of God there was the very essential Deity, Emanuel, God with us. Now, if the reader will endeavour to separate in his mind the Holy thing called the Son of God from the corporeal organism derived from the Virgin, and in which dwelt, and to which adhered, the creaturely and depraved affections of our fallen humanity, he will be prepared to admit the doctrine of the New Church, viz., that God was his Father. This view of our Lord does not deny Him a proper humanity, but rather regards Him as a perfect man—the *man type, the man from Heaven*. This view is irrefutably stated in the Gospel of St. John, 1 ch., 14, 16, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory as of the *only begotten Son of God*, full of grace and truth, and of his fulness have we received, and

grace for grace." This we believe is the Scripture view of the great doctrine of God incarnate, God with us. If our Lord possessed in Him that particular nature and quality that is derived from a human father, it follows that he must have had a human father ; but this is contrary to the plain teachings of Scripture, which says that God was his Father.

Paragraph 18. The Rev. gentleman "shudders at the doctrine that the Lord was subject to moral infirmities and imperfections ; that he was full of impure and unhallowed principles." This is a phantasy of the writer's own mind, or one from the pond in which he has unfortunately been fishing for what he calls Swedenborgianism. Had the writer gone to the author himself, he might have seen it otherwise, as there is no such language in the Summary Exposition by Swedenborg. Barrett says, page 227, (not page 305, as referred to by Mr. Williams,) "The Lord came into this world in a bodily form, clothed Himself with the natural humanity, defiled, borne down, and oppressed with evils of all kinds as that humanity was, and by degrees purified it from all defilements, and filled every region of it with his own Divinity ; thus he glorified it or made it Divine." The above doctrine is what the Scriptures teach. Isaiah 53, 6—"The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." The New Church believes that our Lord assumed the human nature, and purified it of all its defilement ; sanctified, perfected and glorified it, so that it for ever sits at the right hand of God ; or in other words, being filled with all the fulness of the Godhead, bodily, the Lord is Omnipotent in His humanity.

Be careful, dear reader, not to confound the Lord's humanity with that which is ours, and which the Lord received from the Virgin. The one is infinitely pure, the other is evil itself. All the texts that the writer mentions—Luke 1—35 ; Heb. 7—26, 1 ; Peter 1—19, 2, 22,—refer to Him as the Son of God, and not as the son of Mary. He died as the son of Mary, but we shall know Him no more as

such, for St. Paul says in Cor. 1, Epistle 5—16: "Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more." In another place Paul says, "He is declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." He died the son of Mary, and rose the Son of God, and in the fact of the incarnation Jehovah had stretched out his arm and come near to save.

In Paragraph 19, his objection to Swedenborgianism arises from a mistaken idea of the atoning work of Christ. He asserts that "Whatever spiritual advantages come to man through Christ, *come through his death.*" The New Church not only regards the Lord laying down the natural life on the Cross as being necessary, but as only one of a series of events, all of which were equally necessary; for instance, His birth, circumcision, flight into Egypt, speaking with the doctors in the Temple, baptism, His betrayal by Judas, and His treatment in the Judgment Hall, and above all, His resurrection and ascension; yea, all His teaching and miraculous works in healing and feeding the people, for He came to fulfil the Scripture, and blessed are they who see the Bible full of Him. The efficacy of Christ is present in every part of His Word; but the question of difference is, did Christ die to reconcile God to man, or man to God? The New Church teaches that it was man that was the object of reconciliation. Methodism says, no—the work of *atonement was to reconcile God.* This is seen to be so heathenish and immoral, that the best writers and educated among Protestant Churches are giving it up; and Rome itself is feeling the change, as is evident from recent works on the subject.

Objection 20 is partly disposed of in the preceding (see 13th); but with regard to the latter part, viz.: "that influence which is usually referred to the Spirit of God is imparted through the agency of created spirits"—were not the Apostles created spirits? and did not the Lord breathe upon them

His Spirit (not a Personal God)? and were not they agents to bear that influence to the world? Again, on the day of Pentecost were they not agents of His Spirit, testifying to His resurrection and ascension? The Power was in the truth; the Lord is the Truth, and every receiver of truth, be he in Heaven or on earth, is an agent of the Lord, for the Lord works through agents, and He has more agents than Mr. Williams can see. "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation?" St. Paul was a created spirit, and he performed miracles through the Holy Ghost, given unto him. Can the Rev. gentleman tell us how the Infinite Personal God, which he calls the Spirit, operates man's regeneration without agents or mediums?" Have we not the Lord's humanity, His Divine Word, the Heaven of Angels, and the ministers of his Word on this earth, all of which are conjoined in one great work, the regeneration of man, and the Lord Jesus the Life of all? First in His own humanity, without measure, and in the Church according to its capacity of reception, so that the Lord is all and in all. It is unscriptural to separate God into three, and apportion them their separate works. This is naturalizing Divine and Spiritual things.

Paragraph 21. Mr. Williams objects to the statement "That the sins and corruptions of man are in no way connected with the fall of Adam." In this quotation, Mr. Williams has given Dr. Pond's words, not Swedenborg's. I quote from Sw. True Christian Religion, 521—"Hereditary evil is derived solely from a man's parents; not, indeed, that very evil which he actually commits, but his inclination to it. Hence it follows that a man is not born in evils themselves, but only with an inclination to them, yet with a greater or less bias to particular evils; therefore, after death no one is judged or condemned for any hereditary evil, but only for those which he has actually committed. This is evident from this statute of the Lord: 'The father shall not be put to

death for the son, neither shall the son be put to death for the father ; everyone shall be put to death for his own sin.” The Rev. gentleman would have us all put to death for Adam’s sin. To prove this, he quotes Paul, Rom. 5, 18–19, wishing us to believe that by one single act of Adam *the whole human race sinned*, and, as a consequence, we are all under the wrath of God. I simply say, that no Swedenborgian believes this, nor is it rationally believed by anyone ; for we are all the creatures of His love, under His kind and merciful government. Our Lord is not a God with two mouths and a double face, out of one spitting fire and brimstone, indignation and wrath, and from the other sending love, mercy and compassion. And not holding the above doctrine, we do not require to resort to another awkward device, viz., a belief in one God called the Father, the avenger of a violated law, and another God called His Son, the pacifier of his excited wrath. These heathenish ideas we brush away out of our vocabulary, leaving them for the moles and the bats, according to a Divine command. If the doctrine of the fall, as taught by the evangelical school, is true, how is it that our Lord says not one word about it in any of his discourses ? Nor do the Twelve Apostles mention it. All that is said is by Paul. What does Paul mean by Adam ? A careful reading of the Apostle will prove to a demonstration that he uses the word in a generic sense, and of the natural man. “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” Of this Adam he says—“*And so it is written*, the first Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam a quickening spirit. Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual.” Paul evidently uses the term Adam to signify the natural *mind* ; but when he applies it to Christ, it signifies the spiritual mind—the one heavenly, the other earthy. On this subject the New Church teaches that in the natural mind things of the earth are collected ; in the spiritual mind, things of Heaven.

When the natural mind is subordinate to the spiritual, man is in the order of his life, but when the natural mind rules, then he is in a state of disorder. The natural mind is where natural affections and thoughts dwell. In the most ancient church, which is called Adam in Gen., the natural mind was properly subordinated to the spiritual, causing man to dwell in a state of peace and blessedness. The natural mind being formed of the earth, the most external faculties are represented by the serpent, so that the serpent is the symbol of the sensual mind. Through the senses it appeared to man that his life was self-derived ; from this appearance he fell into the persuasion that it really was so. The fall was not consummated in one single act, but rather gradual, and came to its consummation at the fulness of time, when Christ came into the world. At this state the natural man was triumphant, and man would have perished forever. *So that in Adam all died*, but in Christ all are made alive. He is the Spirit that quickens. The natural man now is the seed of lust, from whence the act of sin springs, the den of vipers and serpents, from whence it has usurped the authority of the spiritual, so that it either denies spiritual things, or makes them subservient to self. The self-hood of the natural man being the father of all carnal affections and thoughts, the Lord calls it the *Devil, Sin, Fornication*, when disputing with the Jews concerning their parentage ; He said to them, " Ye are of your father the Devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." The Bible speaks of the genealogy of principles, one class emanating from the self-hood of the natural mind, the other emanating from a new will which is spiritual, and is implanted by the Lord from heaven. The former is designated by the serpent, the carnal mind, *lust*, the *Devil*, and by Paul, the first, Adam ; the latter the serpent-bruiser, a new mind, the mind of Christ, a new will, a new heart; all of which emanate from the second Adam, the Lord from heaven. This view is in harmony with Gen. concerning man's creation.

As Paul says, "It is written." How written? A woman talking with a literal serpent, conversing upon the character of the Divine Being, upon the laws of life and death, and at last yielding to the serpent's advice by eating of some literal fruit, called "the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, of Good and Evil!" A tree bearing a fruit called the knowledge of good and evil! What conception can the mind have of such a tree? none, if it is regarded as literal; and what connection between the fruit and the poison of sin? *none*. But if the serpent is regarded as the alluring power of the senses, contending with the internal perceptions and acknowledgement of spiritual things, and the fall as consisting of the dominion of the serpent over the spiritual, we not only see it to be consistent and rational, but we feel its truth, and the whole Bible appears radiated with a new light. And the second Adam, the serpent-bruiser, is recognized throughout the whole Word, as also in the experience of every man undergoing regeneration. So that in this life every Christian can testify to the first and second Adam—the one warring against the other.

The Rev. gentleman says that it cannot be true "that regeneration is a work commenced in this life, and perfected after death," because it is at variance with Scripture, and here he quotes from John, "Ye must be born again." This proves the fact of a birth being necessary, and we suppose if he will reflect he will see the absurdity of a still birth, that is, one that *cannot grow spiritually*. The writer is evidently not aware that the Lord's truth is a living word, and that every truth received into life is the cause of growth, as Paul teaches in Eph. 4 ch. 15 v., "Speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things." It is something new in Methodism to oppose the spiritual growth and improvement of the soul in this life and the life to come. Regeneration, which is the constant renewing of our mind after the image and likeness of Christ's glorious nature, is something so excellent in itself, that it is astonishing how it can be objected to.

Paragraphs 23, 24. Mr. Williams says: "If I listen to the teachings of Swedenborg, &c., I must believe 'that the doctrine of justification by faith is contrary to the word of God, and to the nature and constitution of things'—that it is a dreadful doctrine, the abomination of desolation." This quotation is a mistake, so also the one in No. 24, viz.: "All who hold the doctrine of salvation by faith, will consociate with infernal Genii after death." The writer refers to Parson's Essays and Clissold's letters. Such language is not to be found *in them*. He also refers to Swedenborg's Apoc. revealed, 163, in which there is not one word about faith, but he, Swedenborg, refers the reader to 158 of the same book for an explanation of watching, in which he says "Be watchful" signifies that they should be in truths and a life according to them. By watching in the Word, nothing else is signified; for he who learns truths and lives according to them is in a state of watchfulness.

Mr. Williams has mistaken faith for *faith alone*. It is faith alone that Swedenborg says is contrary to the word of God—faith without repentance and reformation of life; all that are found to hold such a faith in heart and life will undoubtedly consociate with infernal Genii after death. A true faith is always united to charity. To believe on the Lord Jesus Christ is the teaching of the New Church; to believe on the Lord is to believe what the Word teaches, and the Lord, who is the Word, says, "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, this is the law and the prophets; enter ye in at the strait gate, for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Dr. Adam Clark, in his notes on the strait gate, says "The words in the original are very emphatic. Enter in (to the kingdom of heaven) through this gate, i.e., of doing to everyone as you would he should do unto you,

for this alone seems to be the strait gate which our Lord alludes to." Here is Swedenborgianism full ripe, which Mr. Williams has such an abhorrence of. If the Church at large had a little more of this doctrine, and less of faith alone, in which they seem so much to glory, we might expect an improvement in the moral condition of society.

In Paragraph 25, Mr. Williams says that Swedenborg teaches in No. 326, of heaven and hell, that believers in justification by faith alone have no respect to the life and deeds of love, &c. What a careless slanderer this man is. In the paragraph referred to there is not one word on the subject. Nevertheless, it is a doctrine of the New Church, because it is a doctrine of the Bible, and not because Swedenborg or an angel has taught it. The doctrine of the Bible is, that faith alone is dead, *being alone*; that is, it has no repentance, no Godly sorrow for sin, no forsaking of sin, consequently no reformation and regeneration. It is *faith only*. The Rev. gentleman thinks he has upset the doctrine that it is faith united to a good life that saves, in his quotation from Paul: "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." Now there is not one word here about faith alone saving, but a fulfilling of the law of righteousness by *walking after the spirit*. To live according to the law of righteousness is right doing, or doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with our God. Those who hold not this doctrine cannot have heaven implanted in them, as Swedenborg says.

Paragraph 26. Resurrection of the man we believe, but not the resurrection of the *dead* body. "He that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more." This truth science demonstrates, and our Lord says, in Luke 20 ch. 37 v., "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush,

when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob—for he is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living, for all live unto him." Seeing that Abraham, &c., are alive and doing very well without bodies of flesh and blood, it would be a useless work to call them from heaven to take up their abode here again, to say nothing of the inconvenience of so many dwelling in bodies of flesh, for the reader must remember that flesh and blood cannot enter the kingdom of heaven, and there is not room on this earth for all the descendants of Adam.

Paragraph 27. The Rev. gentleman objects to Swedenborg's doctrine, that this world will never be destroyed. The phrase, *end of the world*, means consummation of the age, or end of a dispensation; the end of the age or Christian dispensation is now come, and a new order of things is already set in, and every eye can see it; yes, and those who deny can see, and when they speak in a state of freedom, bear testimony to it. Mr. Williams little thinks that he is fighting against the Bible, Eccl. 1, 4 v.: "One generation passeth away, and another cometh, *but the earth endureth for ever*;" Psalms 78, 69 v.: "He that buildeth his sanctuary like high places, *like the earth which he hath established for ever*;" Psalms 100, 5v: "Who laid the foundations of the earth, that it shall not be moved for ever."

Paragraph 28. The subject of marriage, as taught in the New Church, Mr. Williams knows nothing about; and so long as he confuses proliferations of Love and Wisdom with the birth of children, he is not likely to learn. Swedenborg nowhere says they have children in heaven. The marriage that Swedenborg speaks of, is the union of two minds by the Lord during the work of regeneration, in which case neither rules, but both mutually love each other, from an internal principle of religion, implanted by the Lord alone, so that they are spiritually united. Such the Lord joins together, and they will never be separated. These principles are per-

ceived where there is mutual love and regard for each other's good in all things, but they cannot be seen where lust seeks dominion. The marriage principle is heaven, its opposite is hell.

Paragraph 29. He makes Swedenborg say that those he saw in heaven were unchaste and wanton in their desires. For this statement he refers his readers to 611 Apoc. Revealed. We are sorry the paragraph is too long to quote ; we will give a little from it. Swedenborg, after mentioning some particulars which occur in the middle state, with those who are preparing for heaven and those who are preparing for hell, says : " There is a communication of affections in the spiritual world. Man being then a spirit, and the life of a spirit being affection, from which, and according to which, thought proceeds ; and that homogeneous affections conjoin, and heterogeneous affections disjoin, and that *heterogeneity would torment a devil in heaven, and an angel in hell* ; for which reason they are separated, exactly according to the diversities, varieties and differences of the affections which are of love." Unchaste and wanton desires constitute hell, so that the Rev. gentleman was looking in the wrong place for heaven.

In Paragraph 30, Mr. Williams quotes from Swedenborg's Divine Love and Wisdom the following : " Some who enter there (that is, heaven) experience at times severe suffering." This passage is so presented that it cannot but mislead those who are not familiar with his writings. Our opponent does not appear to be aware who they are that experience severe suffering at times in heaven. Had he read the author carefully, *we think he would have concluded that such persons as Swedenborg speaks of as suffering at times, had no right there at all, and, according to Mr. Williams' doctrine, they ought to suffer in fire and brimstone for ever.* Let us hear Swedenborg : " The lot of those after death in whom the spiritual degree is not opened and yet not shut, and who are still natural and not spiritual, is that they are in the lowest part of

heaven, where they sometimes experience severe sufferings, or they are in the boundaries of some superior heaven, as it were, in the light of evening, for in heaven, and in each society there, the light decreases from the middle toward the boundaries, and those are in the middle who excel others in Divine truths, and those have few truths who know no more of religion than simply that there is a God, and that the Lord suffered for them, also that charity and faith are essentials of the Church, but do not know what charity and faith are ; when, nevertheless, faith in its essence is truth, and truth is manifold ; and charity is every duty of a man's office that he does from the Lord, when he shuns evils as sins." The principles taught in the above quotation cannot be seen by those who are confirmed in the idea of heaven as a place located somewhere in the natural universe, and the redeemed entering it as we in this world enter a city or a large hall. From the natural mind the redeemed are viewed as an immense multitude crowded together, without order or arrangement, without habitations or apartments. All the social ties formed in this life amongst the good are supposed to end with this life ; our present nature and sympathies are to cease, and we are to be something quite different there to what we are here. We believe heaven to be a social heaven, and that a truly good life here is a type of the heavenly life ; so that if we will allow our mind to contemplate heaven from the life we are now in, tracing out the analogy in all good and useful things, as correspondences to the heavenly, we should soon come to the conclusion that there was more than mere words in the Lord's language when he taught his disciples to pray : "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is done in Heaven." The laws that regulate Heaven are those of goodness and truth ; and each Angel being a form of goodness and truth, it follows that they are all governed by the same laws. Now, goodness and truth are infinite, because they form the Divine itself ; but

it is different in each individual Angel, because differently received. Some of the Angels receive the law in the inmost of their nature, and from thence (as of appearance) rule themselves ; others in the more intermediate part of their nature ; while others receive the law in the very external of their life. This arrangement of the Heavens is represented in our religious and civil institutions. In each there is a chief or head, with different subordinate magistrates, all for the sake of order and good government ; while the great mass of the people, who have little or no desire to enquire into the nature of causes, or the motive from whence actions spring, are in the lower part, or in the extremes of the body politic. It is here where the waves of passion and prejudice roll and rock, and at times are very boisterous ; while within is calm and safety. On this earth there are good people existing in the various degrees mentioned above ; but those who see less into the causes of things are more likely to be disturbed than those who can trace the causes, and know from superior light how to remove them. That which is shadowed forth on the earth, and is in itself good and true, comes from Heaven ; and if it only affects our natural mind, so as to produce only an external reformation, and that *from fear*, leaving the internal spiritual mind unreformed, the lot of such will be with those who dwell on the boundaries, in the shade of evening as to Heavenly things.

Our Methodist friends entertain a similar idea, only less scientific ; for they speak of those who have spent a good life in the service of the Lord as being near the throne, and as having many stars in glory ; but to those who have lived a life of evil, but at last get religion by the exercise of faith in their dogma, they give a place less glorious ; sometimes they are represented as just gaining admittance. So that, according to Methodism, some are in the centre, and some at the boundaries. In the New Church, the rationale of this is seen, while the truth of it is conceded by the common sense

of mankind. Who cannot see the manifold types of mind, some suited to rule, some to serve, some to occupy prominent and useful positions, while others are not; some for honour, some for dishonour; nevertheless, all are happy according to their reception of the Lord. The Church is His body, and every member has its use to perform.

Paragraph 31. Mr. Williams objects to the doctrine, "That no one suffers pain in hell on account of the evils which he had done in this world, but on account of the evil he there does." For this he refers his readers to paragraph 599, Heaven and Hell. This is another specimen of Mr. Williams' carelessness, and shows that his prevailing desire was to injure the character of Swedenborg, and hold those who embraced the doctrines contained in his works up to ridicule. In the paragraph referred to there is not one word on the subject. Swedenborg says, 599, "In order that man may be in freedom, as a means of his reformation, he is conjoined as to his spirit with both heaven and hell; for spirits from hell and angels from heaven are attendant on every man; by spirits from hell he is in his own evil, and by angels from heaven he is in good from the Lord, and thus in spiritual equilibrium, which is freedom." All are judged according to the deeds done in the body; but there is no vindictive punishment inflicted by God on anyone.

When Swedenborg says that no one suffers pain in hell on account of evils done in the world, he means that the Lord does not take into account the acts of sin singly, and inflict punishment upon the sinner from a spirit of vindictiveness or the love of punishing. He regards sin to be of such a nature that every time that a man commits it, it increases in strength and volume; so that if it is not arrested in the man during his life in this world, he becomes a form of the evil he made choice of, and so remains to eternity. It is in this sense that a man's works go with him, and that he also suffers in the

next life from a confirmed life of evil, not from anything that God does to him, for evil punishes itself.

In Paragraph 32, Mr. Williams charges Swedenborg with slandering the whole Church of Christ, and vilifying the most sainted characters the world has ever been privileged to see. We think that we should be careful what we have to say on these matters, for who can tell the real state of man. Our Lord has said that there would be wolves in sheep's clothing. The Church then would have those who would appear to us as saintly worthies, but inwardly may be ravening wolves. The Lord only, who judgeth the heart, knows their real state ; and if Swedenborg has been permitted to see the dreadful lot of some in the other life, whom the Church on earth thought had arrived safe home, let us take warning. Remember we are not called upon to believe such statements as a condition of our own spiritual welfare ; but while the disingenuous laugh such statements to scorn, and are not content with the simple facts stated, but rather exaggerate some, and record others that are utterly false, as is done by Mr. Williams in his letter—offending against the Lord's commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour"—the good and well disposed are always unwilling to misrepresent or exaggerate the opinions of those who differ from them. Mr. Williams forgot his argument, in Paragraph 31, against Swedenborg, where he tries to prove that men suffer in hell for sins committed in this world, by quoting 2 Cor. 5, 10, "We must all appear at the judgment seat of Christ, *that everyone may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.*" Before this tribunal the most saintly characters that Mr. Williams refers to must appear. It was in the world of spirits, where the evil is separated from the good, that Swedenborg declares he saw some of the saintly characters, like other men, to be judged according to the deeds done in the body, as proved by Mr. Williams himself. Looking at David through his actions, does he ap-

pear as one of the most saintly characters the world ever saw? Did David ever appear insane and outrageous on the earth's plane? Read your Bible for evidence. With whom was he then associated? As David held the doctrine that it was right to *love neighbours and hate enemies*, could the heart be pure where such opposite principles dwelt? Is not hatred of and from the *Devil*? And may it not be on account of such a mixed state in David's character that Peter said of him, many hundred years after he left this world, Acts 2 ch., 34 v., "For David is not yet ascended into the heavens." No doubt he was below the heavens at that time, associated with his like; or, like Judas, in his own place or state, for every one is located in spiritual space in the other life according to his life in this world. If his life has been evil, in hell; if good, in heaven; and no amount of singing pious hymns or writing religious psalms, or any amount of pious acts, if the life is evil, will save him. "*According to the deeds done in the body,*" as quoted by Mr. Williams, "*a man is judged.*" Let it be so; we have no wish to dispute the point. The same rule is applicable to Paul as to David; they were both Jews, educated in the doctrine that it was right to hate those who differed from them; and the former part of Paul's life proves how deeply this doctrine entered into and formed his character, 9 chap. Acts., 1 v., "Saul yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord." He testifies himself also to an intense hatred towards the disciples; yet he loved his friends.

After this time Paul's opinions change; and according to the experience of the Church, and the bloody struggles through which it has passed, the principle of loving those of a similar faith, and hating those who differed, has been too much its practice. Evil is so deeply rooted in our nature, that experience has proved a thousand times that a change in our opinion is comparatively easy, whilst a change in the heart is very hard. When Paul preached Jesus he became

the *persecuted*—one of a despised few ; but supposing Paul to have been converted to another powerful body ; or supposing there had been such an increase of numbers to the Christian standard during Paul's life, is it not possible that the native character of Paul would have showed itself in an overbearing manner toward those who differed from him in those things that he considered of great moment ? It is not for us to judge ; but the Church, whenever it had the ascendancy, has done so. The evils of the human heart can only be removed as they are known and brought to light, when the true man, by spiritual combat, removes them. A simple consent to a certain dogma does not, and cannot, remove them, any more than a persuasion that we are good will cause us to be good. These principles apply to all the characters Mr. Williams refers to. Now, allow us to correct Mr. Williams' false statement: He says Swedenborg states that Martin Luther is shut up in Hell. This is a misrepresentation. Luther is in Heaven—is the teaching of Swedenborg, because he was good at heart ; and from a good heart he was prepared to *reject the doctrine of faith alone*. What is said concerning Paul and David is said in his diary, a work that he never intended for publication. That he saw Paul in the World of Spirits or Hades is true, we have no doubt ; but after the last judgment was accomplished—that is, after the chaff of his life was separated from the wheat—he ascended into Heaven ; and from Swedenborg's published theological works we learn that he is in Heaven. These things do not form a part of the faith of the New Jerusalem Church, but they stand as most awful warnings to those who say and do not, declaring unto us all, “ Not everyone that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of the Father who is in Heaven.”

Paragraph 33 is such vile slander that it is not worthy of a reply.

Paragraph 34. Mr. Williams says man is not free, because

he is in equilibrium,—that is, he is not free because he is not forced ; so that Mr. Williams' idea of freedom must be compulsion, or not equally balanced.

Swedenborg nowhere says that the Trinity, as existing at the incarnation, existed in the time of Abraham. This is another wrong quotation.

The contradiction in Swedenborg, when he says that children are evil (that is, as to what they receive from their parents,) but innocent in what they receive from the Lord, is no more a contradiction than it is one to say that a saint is one that has received a new nature from the Lord, but that the old nature is evil ; *making him a sinner and a saint.*

Paragraph 35. Mr. Williams objects to Swedenborg's teaching because it lowers the standard of morals ; " that a life of prayer, devotion, and self-denial, is not only not conducive to spirituality, but embarrassingly inconsistent with it ;" and what is still more strange, he objects to the doctrine " that a man must live in the world to become spiritual." We suppose Mr. Williams, and all spiritual Methodists, are living in the world. Is he in earnest when he says that those living in the world are under the wrath of God ? If a man, desirous of being made spiritually-minded, is not to live in the world, will the Rev. gentleman tell him where he is to live ? He is so blind to what constitutes a truly spiritual man, that he quotes the following text to prove that it is not in this world that the spiritual-minded live : " Because of these things the wrath of God cometh upon the children of disobedience." Now, the Apostle Paul is called by the writer of the letter a saintly character ; yet he lived in the world, worked at tent-making, and preached the Gospel also. But if Mr. Williams is right, Paul was under the wrath of God, because he lived in this world, and became spiritual. If those who live in the world and become spiritual are under the wrath of God, perhaps it is thought by the Rev. gentleman that a natural mind is safe. It is the disobedient that is under the wrath of God.

Spiritual-mindedness and disobedience are at variance ; but obedience is the foundation to spiritual mindedness. It is in the world that we first learn obedience ; first the child to its parents, the servant to his employer. These things prepare us to respect the law of our country ; these, again, to respect the higher and Heavenly laws ; so that the Lord leads us, step by step, into His Kingdom. This world is disciplinary for the next ; therefore, as Swedenborg says, a man must live in this world to become spiritual. But Swedenborg's teaching "lowers the standard of morals." To prove this, he refers his reader to 494 Noble's Appeal. Hear what Nobie says : " A good life, or a life of righteousness seriously commenced in this world, is the only life that can endure the sphere of Heaven and the presence of the Divine Judge. On this account, *a life according to the ten commandments is one of the two essentials to which the doctrines of the New Church reduce the whole of religion.* The other is the acknowledgment of the Lord ; and these two are incapable of being separated in act, though they may be thought of separately in idea ; for no one can live a life of obedience to the commandments from an internal ground, as well as in outward form, from himself ; it is only possible by and from the Lord, and by power communicated from him. Let none, therefore, suppose that when insisting upon a life of righteousness we go about to establish our own righteousness. It being only possible by power communicated from the Lord, all the merit of it belongs not to man, but to the Lord alone." This is a righteousness that exceeds the righteousness of modern Scribes and Pharisees, and is essential for admittance into Heaven. The Pharisaical righteousness is altogether different. It says in its heart, "stand away and come not near, for I am holier than thou ;" and the professors of which, in the language of the Gospel, "trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others." It was a righteousness that made clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, while within

they were full of extortion and excess. It was a righteousness which paid tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin, and omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith. The New Church admits prayer and devotion as contributory to man's spirituality, when connected with the Golden Rule given by our Lord, "What ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so unto them." But when it is according to the prescribed rule of a Pharisaical over-bearing Priesthood, unattended with a good life, it tends towards the profanation of holy things, and is denounced by the Lord. "Hear ye the word of the Lord ye rulers of Sodom, give ear unto the law of our God, ye rulers of Gomorah; to what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord; I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts, and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of goats." Outward form and ceremony only, avail nothing, except to confirm a Pharisaical pride; but to "wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes, cease to do evil, learn to do well, seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow," is the teaching of our Lord, and is what is taught and inculcated throughout the writings of the New Church more than can be found anywhere else. Does such teaching lower the standard of morals. Contrast it with what the Faith-alone preachers teach? You may be a good father, an affectionate and kind husband, an honourable member of society, but unless you receive this faith that I now set before you, and that without understanding it, you will be damned everlastingly. Such is the common teaching of the Methodists. Yet these men, who teach faith alone as saving, have the blind audacity to publish a letter, charging the New Church people with lowering the standard of morals, who openly and constantly proclaim the union of charity and faith, as being necessary for salvation.

Paragraph 36. He charges Swedenborg with teaching con-

cubinage and adultery. This could only have come from the bottomless pit, and is such a foul and false charge that I shall only quote Swedenborg, recommending Mr. Williams to read Swedenborg again (if he ever has read him) when he has learned to judge between the christian and unchristian man, the man-beast and the truly christian man, for Swedenborg speaks of the two, and unfortunately for Mr. Williams, he has mixed them.

Conjugal Love, 69, "Adulteries are profane and infernal."

147, Conjugal Love, "The chastity of marriage exists by a total abdication of whoredom from a principle of religion."

Doctrine of Life, 74, "Adultery is so great an evil that it may be called essentially diabolical."

Sec. 500, Con. Love, "*As soon as a man actually becomes an adulterer heaven is closed against him.*" Does this look like teaching adultery? Men who could circulate such uncalled for slander against a people living in their midst, must be past all hope of being brought to a sense of truth.

"A great deal more could be said against the system which is called a rational religious belief." I have no doubt whatever, that there is plenty more where such misrepresentations came from as are contained in Mr. Williams' letter to a friend. The human mind is bottomless, and in this instance has proved to be fiery and dark; I, however, have no desire to excite the man to injure himself by circulating more slander against a man he has betrayed such ignorance of. But when he says the New Church teaching is not Christianity, because it has one God in one person, I think he misreads history as well as Swedenborg. For, like the ancient Christians, we worship Christ as God. From Christ the Christians derive their name; so that Mr. Williams, denying this great truth, is not so much entitled to the name as New Church people. He believes in a God the Father, and a God the Spirit, out of Christ; so that to him the name is not appropriate; Tripersonalist is better.

“Its Bible is not our Bible.” True, for Mr. Williams has no proof what books are the real Word of God. Christ himself is the Word to us, and He is Lord and Master; from Him the creation and the letter of Scripture emanated, and they fit each to each, for the Lord is the life of both. To say that we supplement the Word by Swedenborg’s writing, betrays his ignorance, for we do no such thing. “Its rock is not as our rock.” True. The Lord Jesus is our rock; we don’t require three rocks. If it is not Jewish, it is Christian, as shown above. “It has no pardon nor regeneration,” says Mr. Williams. True; it has no Methodist pardon, nor yet regeneration, neither does it want to be self-deluded; for the system of getting pardon, as practised in protracted meetings, is of the same kind as getting influenced by spirits at seances and spirit circles, only instead of surrounding a table, the individual is surrounded with enthusiasts, and animal magnetism and spiritism induce the persons to surrender up their freedom. The men and women of strong will, and lung power, surrounding women and girls, can readily produce corresponding changes in those who place themselves in their company with a manifest desire to become like-minded. Such things are common all the world over; it is not simply in a Methodist prayer-meeting that people get “saved,” as the phrase goes. The Mormons can far surpass the Methodists in inducing spirit influence, and the spiritualist can outdo all that has ever gone before. I have been in spirit circles, and in Methodist Revival meetings, and I have met with a number of *Methodists who have conducted their service under spirit influence*; and I pronounce, from the best of my judgment, all those excited meetings, where men, women and children are howling and screaming for pardon to a God the Father, full of wrath, to look upon His Son’s bleeding side and hands, and for His sake give them a sense of pardon, to be a wild state of enthusiasm, a mixture of heathenish ideas and spiritism; and

the sooner they cleanse their temples of such abominations the better for society at large. The candid and reflecting do not want to get religion through such means. They know that religious truth is the highest and noblest thing in the world, and ought to be presented in a manner to excite the noblest faculties of our nature—*rationality and liberty*. What liberty or rationality is there active when pardon is being sought in such an excited state? True, we have none of these things; but we strive to teach religious truth as our Lord taught it from the mount, addressing the heart through the intellect, and inculcating a life according to the Lord's commandment. With this we are perfectly satisfied, knowing that at last we shall be judged according to our works, and if we have lived well, we shall go to heaven, but if evil, we shall go to hell.

True doctrine should be expressed in the letter of the word :

BIBLE DOCTRINES OR PRIMITIVE TRUTHS.

In Jesus Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, consequently the whole Trinity.

Jesus said, the Father dwelleth in me; he that seeth and knoweth me, seeth and knoweth the Father; no man cometh to the Father but by me; I and my Father are one; all should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.

Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. In that day there shall be one Lord, and His name One.

"God was in Christ reconciling (or atoning) the world unto Himself." Thus the Father was the reconciler, the world the reconciled, and Christ, not the reconciler, but the medium through which the reconciler operated.

"The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins." The Father hath made the Son (or the Divine nature hath made the human nature named Jesus Christ) "a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and remission of sins;" thus is "Christ made unto us of God, wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." "All power," said Jesus

TRADITIONAL TEACHING OR PREVALENT ERRORS.

In Jesus Christ we behold one of three Divine persons, or one-third part of the Deity.

The Father is to be addressed separately from Jesus Christ, and as a perfectly distinct individual; consequently, to worship Jesus Christ exclusively, or without worshipping the Father *in addition*, as a superior Divine person, is actual idolatry.

God is not one Lord, in the sense of one person or individual being, for he is three Divine persons, or individual agents.

Christ, as a separate person, reconciled God (here one person only, not three persons) to the world: thus Christ was the reconciler, God (meaning here the first person only) the reconciled, and the world the pardoned.

The Son is not to be asked to forgive sins, but the Father for the sake of the Son. The Father is, to be exclusively petitioned to grant repentance, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption, as the exclusive giver and dispenser of all good; and Jesus Christ (although the Father in a human form) is to be passed by entirely; thus, *prac-*

Christ, after His resurrection, "is given to Me in Heaven and on earth." "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." "I am He that searcheth the heart."

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," for "God is love," and "His tender mercies are over all His works." "He changes not." "He is the same (*Love*) yesterday, to-day, and for ever." "He is good to all."

"For this purpose, the Son (or humanity) of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil;" and the Son (or humanity) being "glorified," and so become possessor of "all things" of the Father, pours out His spirit to communicate His nature, according to His own saying, that "the Spirit should take of His, and show it unto us," because "all things that the Father hath are His."

Jesus being "made perfect through sufferings," and having thus "purchased the Church with His own blood," has become the "author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him." Having become *Himself* the author of salvation, the day has arrived of which he spake—"At that day I say not that I will pray the Father for you; but whatsoever ye shall ask in my name (that is, of God, as bearing in His humanity the name of Jesus Christ), *that will I do*, that the Father may be glorified in the Son."

It is declared by Isaiah, that Jehovah blesses out transgressions for His *own sake*: and by David, that He saves for His *mercy's sake*, and pardons for His *name's sake*, and that he is *ever ready* to forgive.

The Apostle says, "Now abideth faith, hope, and charity, but the *greatest* of these (because it is "the end of all the commandments" to believe and do) is charity. He also declares that charity comprises, because it practises, all the virtues; and that without charity a Christian is "nothing," whatever his faith, and whatever his works.

"We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that everyone may receive according to the things done in the body, whether they be good, or whether they be evil." Judgment is according to works, and not according to opinions, because such as are a man's works, such is his ruling affection and essential character, according to which he is fitted either for Heaven or for Hell.

tically, the Father, as a separate person from the Son, is to be considered as *God alone*, and the exclusive possessor of Divine power and only forgiver of sins, and granter of prayer.

Part of God, called the Father, is dreaded for His wrath; part of God, called the Son, is loved for His mercy; and the other part, called the Holy Ghost, is neither feared, nor loved, nor worshipped, except at Whitsuntide, and once in the Litany.

The Son is usually thought of and treated as the mere dependent of the Father. The three persons, although co-equal, are yet unequal. The Father was wrathful against sinners, the Son was not, and the Holy Spirit was not. Since there exist three Divine persons, there exist three infinites—three Almighty—three possessors of all things, who are three objects of worship; but (it is said) not three Gods!

Although Christ has purchased salvation for ALL that believe IT, it is necessary that he should *for ever* be showing his bleeding wounds, in order to induce his Father to be merciful. It is thus that he intercedes continually for those who believe (*what is called*) true doctrine. It is not considered that God the Father's faithfulness and foreknowledge are sufficient to rule and guide Him, apart from the intercession of the Son for the performance of the purchase of His vicarious sufferings.

Christians pray to God to have mercy upon them, and to blot out their transgressions, not for *His own sake*, but altogether for His Son's sake, or because of His sufferings and meritorious death on the cross.

Charity is not denied, in words, to be the greatest of the Christian graces, but faith is always virtually set *above it*, for it is said, that a man *may* be saved merely because he has faith, but that he cannot be saved merely because he has charity, unless he believes certain unintelligible opinions called "orthodox."

No evils that are past will condemn those who die in a right, or "orthodox" faith, or doctrine. If a sinner should spend a whole life in sin, and at the last moment believe *this* doctrine, he will not be judged according to his works, for he will be saved by his faith. Thus it is virtually taught that judgment will not be according to works, but according to opinions, or what is called faith.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

