

THE
SWEDENBORGIAN:

A NEW-CHURCH MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

VOL. III.]

SEPTEMBER, 1859.

[No. 3.

SOCIAL INTERCOURSE.

BY THE EDITOR.

“When the Divine Judge shall summon us to appear before our conscience at the end of our brief journey here below, our modesty, our weakness, will not be an excuse for our inaction. It will be of no avail to reply, we were nothing, we could do nothing, we were but as a grain of sand. He will say, I placed before you, in your day, the two scales of a beam, by which the destiny of the human race was weighed: in the one was good, and in the other was evil. You were but a grain of sand, no doubt; but who told you that that grain of sand would not have caused the balance to incline on my side? You have intelligence to see, a conscience to decide, and you should have placed this grain of sand in one or the other. You did neither. Let the wind drift it away; it has not been of any use to you or your brethren.”

Thus beautifully spake the noble and gifted Lamartine, in a letter written some twenty years ago, explaining his reasons for entering the sphere of political life, in which, for a time, he moved with such high honor, such unsullied integrity, and such disinterested devotion to the good of his country and of humanity. They are worthy the man from whom they came. We have chosen them as an appro-

priate introduction to a few remarks on Social Intercourse, —its importance, its advantages, and the spirit in which it should be conducted.

It is a solemn truth, that there is ever before us all the two scales of a beam, in one of which there is good, and in the other evil : for in all the relations in which we are called to act—political, industrial, social and domestic—there is a true and a false, a just and an unjust, a right and a wrong, course of action. And although each one of us may be but a grain of sand, yet it may be precisely that grain which is needed to incline the scale on the Lord's side. It is the grains of sand that form the hills and mountains, yea, and the earths in the universe ; and neither earths, mountains, nor hills could ever have existed, if each little grain, deeming itself of no use because of its diminitiveness, had refused its friendly co-operation. So neither could the angelic heavens, which consist of myriads of myriads of human atoms, ever have existed, if each of these atoms, deeming itself of no account, had suffered the winds to drive it away. Nor could the existence of the heavens be continued for a moment, without the harmonious and active co-operation of these same little atoms.

Planted deep in every human heart there is something which draws us towards our fellows—something which leads us to desire and seek the companionship of others. We call it the social feeling ; and there is far more of heaven in it than is commonly imagined, though, like all else that is heavenly, it is susceptible of abuse. It is one of the earliest developed attributes or principles of our nature. It is seen in its greatest strength and purity, when the best of the angels are with us—when we have most of innocence and are nearest heaven. Mark how little infants, before they are a year old, love the society of each other. They will sit there upon the floor, quiet and happy, and amuse themselves for hours together in each other's company ; when, if left alone, each one by itself, their discontent will at once reveal itself in loud and convulsive shrieks.

The same feeling is still strong in childhood. Children are never so happy as when in the society of each other. See how their eyes sparkle, and their cheeks glow, and their faces become radiant with new life, when a troop of them are collected together to sing some pretty song, or dance and play upon the green. Even the weak and sickly ones are then inspired with new animation and vigor, and seem for the time to forget that they have any infirmities.

Now as a great natural law—the law of universal attraction—among material bodies, is seen exemplified in so small an incident as the fall of an apple, so a great humanitarian law, the law of moral or spiritual attraction, is seen exemplified in the laughing faces, the exuberant life, and gleeful shouts of a party of little children. It is clear that children experience a positive delight in each other's society, and this is why they love to be together. And this delight is from the Lord out of heaven. And what is the lesson here taught? Plainly this: That we were created social beings—formed for the society of each other: That we were created to depend upon, co-operate with, and help one another: That we were not made to be happy alone; but that delights flow in from the Lord when we act *together*, unitedly, harmoniously, affectionately, even if it be only in play. Of course our delights will be of a higher and purer kind, in proportion as our aims are higher, and our harmony and union more complete. But there can be no delights, consequently no heaven, without the exercise of this social element of our nature. For every use which we perform from the love of use, in some measure involves its exercise; for it involves some thought of, and some regard for, *others* besides ourselves.

Tracing the manifestations of this social element on to riper years, we find it existing still strong in youth. And at this critical period it needs to be carefully watched and guarded, that it suffer not from abuse or misdirection. We should not attempt to curb or stifle it, but should direct it to good and healthful issues. To this end we should allow

young people to assemble together often, to give exercise to their social affections. And we should endeavor to provide them with such innocent sources of amusement as are suited to their years, and as they can engage in with delight. We should do all in our power to render their social intercourse, first, as pure and innocent, and second, as pleasant and delightful as possible.

Now while many persons can see the immediate advantages of social intercourse to children and young persons, by increasing their present amount of happiness and making them more kindly affectioned one to another, very few are apt to consider sufficiently its still greater but more remote advantages—its effects upon their after life. It serves to multiply and strengthen in their hearts the bonds which unite them to their fellow men. It lays the foundation for a more enlarged charity. It forms a plane for that higher religious or spiritual intercourse, such as exists among the angels and spiritual men, comparatively as the innocence of infancy forms a plane for angelic innocence.

Passing on from the period of youth to that of manhood, it seems too often as if the springs of social life began now to be dried up. The crystal fountains that had leaped and sparkled in the sunshine of earlier days, with such glad, refreshing murmurs, have now ceased their flow. The flowers that once adorned the landscape and perfumed the air, have lost their fragrance and their beauty. The chilling frosts of cold and calculating selfishness too often creep in and freeze up many if not all the streams of social feeling, which once flowed with such full and gushing life through all the avenues of the soul. This is more especially the case with men than with women ; for they are brought by their duties and business relations more into fierce conflict with each other. Selfishness forming the very basis of our society, as at present organized, as soon as a young man starts in business for himself, he starts on a course of rapid development and careful nurture of his individualism—his

self-hood. He finds it necessary, from the very structure of society, to look out for himself. And acting under this necessity, his selfishness, naturally too strong, soon becomes so excessive as to lead him to feel quite indifferent to, if not wholly to neglect, the society of others; or if he seeks it, to seek it not from any love of others, or of their society, but with a view to his own advancement—thus from a selfish end.

And thus that social intercourse, which, in our earliest years, when we are with the best of the angels, is so delightful, and is sought *as an end*, either loses its charms for us as we grow to maturity, or becomes a matter of indifference, or is sought merely as a *means* to some other end. And this change in our social disposition and feelings keeps pace with the development and growth of our self-hood, and is accompanied by a corresponding change in our spiritual associates. Swedenborg says :

“Man, from first infancy even to first boyhood, is introduced by the Lord into heaven, and indeed amongst the celestial angels, by whom he is kept in a state of innocence, which state, it is well-known, infants are in until the first of boyhood; when the age of boyhood commences, he then by degrees puts off the state of innocence, but still he is kept in a state of charity by the affection of *mutual charity* towards his like, which state in several instances continues even to youth, he is then amongst spiritual angels; at this time, inasmuch as he begins to think from himself, and to act accordingly, he cannot any longer be kept in charity as heretofore, for he then calls forth the hereditary evils by which he suffers himself to be led.”—A. C. 5341.

Thus the strength and purity of our social feelings, and the delight which we find in their exercise, begin to subside as our angelic associates begin to depart from us; and these take their departure, as our states of external innocence and charity subside, and our hereditary evils—our self-love and love of the world—become developed and active. When angelic spirits are near us and doing us good, we are affected with similar desires and feelings towards

others : we desire to draw near to others with a view to do them good : we wish to communicate the heavenly delights which we receive. But the opposite of this takes place when the good spirits retire, and infernal spirits draw near. And the reason is, because heavenly love in its nature is essentially social and conjunctive ; whereas infernal love is essentially unsocial and disjunctive. Agreeable to this we read in the *Heavenly Arcana* :

“ Mutual love, which reigns in heaven, consists in this, that each loves his neighbor more than himself : hence the whole heaven constitutes, as it were, a single man, all being thus consociated by mutual love from the Lord. Hence, too, it is, that the felicities of all are communicated to each individual, and those of each individual to all : and hence the heavenly form is such, that every one is, as it were, a kind of centre, whence he is a centre of the communications, consequently of the felicities proceeding from all, which take place according to all the differences of that love, which are innumerable. And as they who are principled in that love perceive the highest happiness in this circumstance, that they are capable of communicating to others what they receive by influx themselves, which they do from the heart, the communication is thus rendered perpetual and eternal. . . . Such is the kingdom of the Lord in the heavens. Nothing attempts to destroy this form and this order but self-love ; consequently all in the other life who are under the influence of self-love, partake more profoundly than others of the infernal character. For self-love communicates nothing to others, but extinguishes and suffocates the delights and felicities of others. Whatever delight flows from others into those who are in self-love, they take to themselves, centre it in themselves, turn it into the defilement of self, and prevent its further propagation. Thus they destroy everything that tends to unanimity and consociation, whence result disunion and consequent destruction. As, also, each of them is desirous to be served, worshiped, and adored by others, and loves none but himself, there hence results dissociation, which is determined or puts itself forth into lamentable states.”—A. C. 2057.

Now we are all desirous to become little children in the spiritual sense. For we are all desirous of entering the kingdom of heaven ; and the Lord has declared that we

cannot enter that kingdom unless we become as little children. And as we come into a state of internal innocence, the best of the angels will again draw near us, and we shall again find delight in the exercise of our social affections. We shall desire, and seek, and take delight in, the society of those who love the things that we love—the goods and the truths of heaven. But one means of bringing us into this state, is, to *force* ourselves frequently into the society of our brethren, and compel ourselves to exercise those kindly social feelings, which, as brethren, we ought to have towards each other. We must not wait for these feelings to spring up, as it were, spontaneously. We should not expect this any more than we should expect that evil will depart from us of its own accord, and without any labor or combat on our part. Self-compulsion is always necessary, as a first step, to the attainment of any valuable result. If our bodies are weak and languid, we must first compel ourselves to exert our muscles, before we can enjoy the delights of exercise; and this first or *self-compelled* exercise is always painful. So if our charity be cold and dead, before it can be made warm and living—before we can experience in our hearts the delights of heavenly love, we must compel ourselves to obey the laws of that love. Before we can love and find our delight in keeping the commandments, we must first learn to do them through self-compulsion. And so when the warm gush of childish affection, so social and conjunctive in its nature, becomes checked or swallowed up by the stronger tide of selfishness which usually invades the heart of us all in riper years, before we can return again to that innocent, loving, and confiding state of childhood, we must *compel* ourselves to do some of the things which little children *love* to do. We must compel ourselves to think of each other, to seek the society of each other, to care for each other, and to communicate good to each other. And the more we find ourselves disinclined to this, the greater need is there of vigorous effort on our part at self-compulsion. It is only when there exists some re-

luctance, that there is any need, or any room indeed, for self-compulsion. It may seem but a grain that each one can add to the general sphere of social enjoyment and delight ; but a grain though it be, we should remember that it may be just that grain which is needed to incline the beam of the scale, so far as we are concerned, on the side of God and heaven. Let each one regard it as his *duty* to cast his grain into the right side of the balance, or let him compel himself to do his part to strengthen the sphere of amity and brotherhood, and thus to add something to the general delight, and straightway he will find the crystal fountains again unsealed within him, and the waters of life will come bubbling up with a glad refreshing murmur as in days of yore. The sun-lit landscape of earlier years, with its streams and flowers and verdure all so rich and beautiful, will re-appear. The fruits will begin to hang in golden clusters, and the birds be flocking back again to sing among the branches. The earth within him will begin to be visited and watered by living streams from the Eternal Fountain. And thus he will begin, in some measure, to realize, in their spiritual sense, the meaning of these beautiful words of the Psalmist :

“Thou visitest the earth and waterest it ; thou greatly enrichest it with the river of God, which is full of water. Thou preparest them corn when thou hast so provided for it. Thou waterest the ridges thereof abundantly ; thou settlest the furrows thereof ; thou makest it soft with showers ; thou blessest the springing thereof. Thou crownest the year with thy goodness, and thy paths drop fatness. They drop upon the pastures of the wilderness, and the little hills rejoice on every side. The pastures are clothed with flocks ; the valleys also are covered over with corn ; they shout for joy, they also sing.”

(To be continued.)

“To be anxiously fearful what will become of us, and discontented and perplexed under the apprehension of future evils, whilst we are under the care of our Father in heaven, is not to act like *children*.—*Mason's Self-Knowledge*.

CHARITY AND PIETY.

BY JOHN DOUGHTY.

The immediate occasion of this article is a criticism,* which appeared in *The Crisis* of March 15th, of a paper in a previous number of *The Swedenborgian*, entitled "Charity as a Church." The editor of *The Crisis*, it seems, is dissatisfied with the sense in which the term *piety* is used in that article, and still more dissatisfied with the relation it is made to sustain to the principle of *charity*. The editor of *The Swedenborgian* has kindly taken the part of a far distant contributor, and shown beyond question that the sense in which the word *piety* was there used, and to which exception has been taken, is precisely the sense in which Swedenborg himself uses it. No further notice would have been taken of the criticism, nor of brother Weller's affirmation that our position is a *false* one, nor of his being so *startled* at the use of the term *piety*, seeing that he has already been very clearly set right in the columns of *The Crisis*. But the matter contained in his observations upon Mr. Barrett's communication to his paper, and also in a sermon which appears in the same number of *The Crisis*, affords a text upon which it may not be uninteresting or unprofitable to dilate.

First, a word as to the propriety of using terms in a New Church sense. Mr. Weller would not have been startled, neither would he have demurred, he says, if it had been distinctly said that by *piety* was meant the external forms of worship. His complaint is "that any writer should use a term out of its general, legitimate acceptation, without

[* In the criticism here alluded to, the Editor of the *Crisis* referring to Mr. Doughty's article in the March No. of the *Swedenborgian*, says:

"We are startled by what, to us, is a false position, at the very threshold of the article which begins thus:—

"It is a distinguishing feature of the New Church as contrasted with the Old, that it brings down religion into the every-day business of life. It makes *charity essential* and *piety subservient*, in the place of making the latter the essential.'"—ED.]

giving the exact sense in which he used it. He says that "Swedenborg is not our *Lexicographer*, although acknowledged our illuminated Seer; and although we concede to him the right to use a term in any sense he chooses, seeing he is always careful to tell us precisely how he uses it, yet such use does not destroy the fact that there is a legitimate meaning of words settled by all who use the English tongue by competent authorities, and that we are bound to speak according to such meaning, unless we qualify our terms."

There is something singularly strange in this, coming as it does from one who has for many years been urging the doctrines of the New Church from the pulpit and through the press. The idea has been broached before, but always by waiters at our gates—by those who were only *interested* in our doctrines, and who stumbled at our phraseology from want of being habituated to it—never before, to our knowledge, by one occupying the position of our critic.

The phraseology of the Church, to one nourished with it from his infancy, accustomed to hear its peculiar terms only used as infilled with its own peculiar views, accustomed to draw from them views more full, more vivid, and more concise than the rest of the world has ever dreamed of, comes to him almost as a language of heaven. He cannot write its terms in any other sense, and he would not if he could. The church that is passing away gives meanings to these words which are incomplete; the church that is coming fills them and fixes them. Swedenborg is our *Lexicographer*. Like all men called upon to broach new views, he is obliged to coin new expressions; he is forced to give to old expressions new meanings; and he is called upon to show wherein old words may have a true and a *spurious* sense. And as the New Theology advances, the successor of Noah Webster will find it necessary to quote Swedenborg to meet the demands of those who would understand the new theological language which has arisen.

When, therefore, a New Churchman addresses a New Church audience on New Church subjects, Swedenborg is

his Lexicographer. If he fails to make him so, he will fail to make himself understood. If he uses his words according to Webster, he will fail to present clearly and fully New Church doctrine ; and if he undertakes to explain in a mass of verbiage every New Church term he uses, he will lay himself open to the charge of considering his readers or hearers utterly ignorant of the theme on which he discourses. Swedenborg's expressions are a *multum in parvo*—a world of meaning in a single word. All intelligent receivers of the doctrines communicated through him, understand them. They approximate in some degree the language of the angels, which, in each expression, contains innumerable ideas ; they are more nearly of divine origin than any other terms of modern language ; instituted or chosen, under the Divine Providence, to convey to the mind through the external ear, more meaning than any other forms of expression known to the world. As such, we hold that they are to be loved, cherished, and used ; and it is to be hoped that New Churchmen in addressing New Church audiences, will not undertake to follow Mr. Weller's idea of using Webster's definitions whereby to teach the doctrines of heaven, or of using New Church words in an old Church sense. And we should greatly rejoice, if, among New Churchmen there should never arise an occasion for any harder accusation against a brother, than that he takes Swedenborg for his Lexicographer, or uses terms out of their "legitimate acceptance," but in the sense authorized by Swedenborg.

We say again ; that we regard our critic's position as somewhat singular, because we find *The Crisis* so full of Swedenborgianisms—of old words with new meanings, much more unknown to Webster than is our understanding of *piety*.

As an illustration of the changes made by our illumined author in the common acceptance of words, let us ask if any New Churchman is willing to throw away the more interior signification of the term *church* as we use it : "That which constitutes heaven with man, also constitutes the

church.”—(*H. D.* 241.) And “it is the Divine sphere proceeding from the Lord, which enters the angels by influx, and is by them received, which constitutes heaven, both in general and in particular. The Divine sphere proceeding from the Lord, is the good of love, and the truth of faith; in proportion, therefore, as the angels receive good and truth from the Lord, so far they are angels, and so far they are in heaven.”—(*H. H.* 7.) And so far as men on earth receive good and truth, so far they are in the Church. Webster cannot deprive us of the satisfaction of this definition of *church*, although he may ignore it. So also of *Charity*. “Charity is an internal affection, from which man wills to do good, and this without remuneration; the delight of his life consists in doing it.”—(*H. D.* 104.) Webster fails to give us this beautiful definition; and must we therefore cease to use it, for fear we might use terms out of their “legitimate acceptance?”

Not to multiply examples—which are innumerable—of cases in which we are obliged, when engaged upon New Church themes, to give words their New Church signification, and having endeavored to defend the practice, we would call attention to the fact that in the case of *piety*, Swedenborg has not changed its meaning from its usual acceptance. And this is done, not for the sake of defending its use, as we have used it, but for the sake of pointing out what we hold to be an error of our critic in his view of the mutual relations of charity and piety, in *any* sense of the latter term. Whatever definition Webster may give, *do* Old Churchmen consider piety in any other light than Swedenborg does? The latter says that “piety consists in thinking and speaking piously; in devoting much time to prayer; in behaving with becoming humility during that time; in frequenting places of public worship and attending devoutly to the discourses there; in receiving the sacrament of the holy supper frequently every year; and in a close observance of the various other parts of divine worship according to the appointments of the church.”—(*H. D.* 124.) True

piety would of course require that they should not be hypocritical in doing these things. And this, disinterested testimony would state to be just what an Old Churchman would consider to be the measure of his "veneration or reverence for the Supreme Being, and love for his character;" and this, in his view, "is the exercise of these affections in obedience to his will and devotion to his service," which is Webster's definition. But mingled with this, which is very good as far as it goes, and by no means to be despised or slighted, there is no thought of *shunning evils as sins against God*. There is no infillment of his service with charity, as E. S. defines it. There is no "willing to do good without remuneration, because it is the delight of the life." The reward of salvation, and a place in heaven is held up. They do not think of piety as we do of charity, "that it consists in cultivating good will to the neighbor, and endeavoring to promote his interest; in being guided in all our actions by justice and equity, good and truth, and in this manner discharging every duty; in one word, [that] the life of charity consists in the performance of uses."—*H. D.* 124. No: their idea of piety, and Swedenborg's, and Webster's, are precisely alike; only the "reverence and veneration" are given in an Old Church way and not in a New Church way; and that which Swedenborg describes as piety is their way of reverencing God. We would not deny that Old Churchmen *may* be on a higher plane than this. We speak now only of the "legitimate" Old Church "acceptation" of the term. It is also a fact that a truer piety would have place, were it infilled by a New Church understanding of charity; in the same manner that external worship is truer, when it is the result of internal worship.

Swedenborg therefore says that "actual piety consists in acting from a principle of sincerity and rectitude, and from a principle of justice and equity in every work and function, and this because it is commanded by the Lord in the Word."—(*A. E.* 325.) This, however, is piety infilled with charity, as is evident from every definition of charity which our

author has ever given. And this is said in precisely the same manner as he would say that true external worship exists only so far as it is accompanied by the life of love, charity and faith, which is internal worship. But it by no means follows as a logical consequence that the external and internal can be confounded, and the terms be used interchangeably. Yet this is what Mr. Weller asks us to do with regard to charity and piety ; when the truth is, to speak in the light of the New Church, piety bears to charity the same relation that external worship does to internal. Wherefore piety is only *true* piety when it exists from charity. Therefore we are taught that "Divine worship *primarily* consists in the life of charity, and *secondarily* in that of piety ; he, therefore, who separates the one from the other, that is, who lives in the practice of piety, and not at the same time in the exercise of charity, does not worship God."—(*H. D.* 124.) And again : "From these particulars it may be clearly seen that a life of piety is valuable, and is acceptable to the Lord, so far as a life of charity is conjoined with it ; for this is the primary, and such as the quality of this is, such is that of the former."—(*H. D.* 128.)

Here we have the true doctrine. Piety is, to a certain extent, external worship, and charity is internal worship. We therefore respectfully submit, that, when Swedenborg defines piety in the same way that Webster does, and in no place defines or uses it in any other way, one who admits, as brother Weller does, that he "gives place to no man in his adherence to the doctrines of the New Jerusalem *as taught by Swedenborg*," should not depart from both the legitimate and the New Church acceptation, and state that "by piety he means the *first* and great commandment of supreme love to the Lord ; and by charity the *second*, to love thy neighbor as thyself." Neither should he state that "this tendency to place charity above piety marks the state of a spiritual church." Particularly when a higher authority teaches "that the *most essential* worship of the Lord consists in a life of charity."—(*A. C.* 8254.) If charity is the most

essential, will brother Weller explain how, according to the *legitimate acceptation* of terms, piety can be equally essential?

Our reason for calling attention so strictly to the true definition of piety, is, that we observe a tendency in the Editor of the *Crisis* to make it *more essential* than charity, which we have already shown to be the *most essential*; as when he says: "Spiritual affection is what is called charity to the neighbor; the spiritual are pre-eminently in doctrine—thence in a life from conscience formed by doctrine Their habitations are on hills; but beyond and above are mountains, and the dwellers on mountains have the *celestial affection* most prominent, which is love to the Lord, and this constitutes *real piety*." Now this defining piety to be love to the Lord is entirely gratuitous; and in the extract which is brought forward by our friend to fortify his position, (*A. E.* 325,) no such thing is said. It is said there, however, that "the *essential* of worship is a life of charity, and its instrumental is gesture and prayer; from which consideration it is evident that they who place all Divine worship in oral piety, and not in actual piety, are in a great error," evidently meaning, as we have heretofore explained, that just as a church is not a true church unless its members are filled with the Divine Sphere, just as external worship is no worship without internal worship, so piety is only *actual* piety when existing from charity. And we aver that it *can* mean nothing else, if for no other reason, then for this one: that Swedenborg is ever consistent with himself. And he never could have meant that piety is the celestial principle and charity the spiritual, when he states positively elsewhere, that charity is primary and piety secondary.

The Editor of the *Crisis* is fond of talking about the *celestial*. He anticipates the time when piety will be placed above charity, and the celestial Church will arise. He looks upon the tendency to make charity the essential, as marking the state of a spiritual church. He thinks Swe-

denborg writes much *apparent* truth suited to the condition of the church, and that he writes *most prominently* in a manner adapted to the spiritual condition of the New Church, yet pointing most unmistakably to a higher celestial condition. He evidently is in love with the *word* celestial, and is somewhat troubled about the church dwelling upon the external portions of Swedenborg's writings, so that the mountains of celestial life are perfectly hidden. We know not what celestial Seer he looks for—whether he has already come, or whether he is yet *to* come—but, we differ from him *in toto*. We read our writings differently. Reading in solitude, and without the means of conversation with our fellow New Churchmen, we may be in error; but we are not willing to accept any evidence in proof of such error, other than that of Swedenborg himself. He never teaches falsity; he is never inconsistent; his views on every subject blend as harmoniously and shine as resplendently as the colors of the rainbow. And when he makes a positive statement, if he appears to be in conflict with what he has elsewhere said, experience has taught us that such appearance generally arises from our own imperfect knowledge of the subject, or a misapprehension of his meaning. When that particular subject is studied thoroughly, and his teachings thereon canvassed fully, his harmony and agreement with himself will usually be found complete and undeviating.

Not to take up further room with quotations, we have learned from our reading that there has existed a celestial, a spiritual, and a natural church. The Church of the Future has arisen, which is to be in neither one of these degrees peculiarly, but the Crown of perfection, combining them all in one. We do not believe that giving so much time and attention to doctrines and more external matters than *Love*, in the abstract, is to be regretted, because this church commences in externals. We are at present simply working out our manifest destiny. Fermentation is going on in a very muddy cask; and it is not to be regretted, as there is

no way to purify our wine but by fermentation. From the natural we must rise to the spiritual. We must not—cannot—begin at the celestial. We know of no way of getting to the top of the ladder seen by Jacob in his dream, except by ascending and touching in our progress its every round. This *talking* of celestial matters will not make the church in the individual man, nor the church as a larger body, one whit more celestial.

The churches of old worshiped an invisible God. We of the New, worship a visible, Divine Human Being; and herein lie our hopes of regeneration. Herein consists the peculiar glory of the Church of the Future. We worship the Lord in His Divine Human, not in His essence. We have conjunction with His essence only by means of His Human. And the essence of a thing can never be approached otherwise than through its form. For the essence, except as it is manifested by the form, is a mere abstraction.

And so it is with the spiritual and the celestial. Wisdom is the form of love; the understanding is the form of the will; thought is the form of affection; and the spiritual is the form of the celestial: Now our love to God can be gained only by the practice of charity to the neighbor. And the perfection of the latter is the full glory of the former. Charity to the neighbor is the form in which our love to God manifests itself; and as is the one so is the other. "He that hath my commandments and doeth them, he it is that loveth me." We object to this striving after the celestial, therefore, as if it were itself, and apart from the spiritual, a *form*—something to be tangibly laid hold of. We disagree with our critic so far as to believe it to be our duty to make perfect our spiritual, quite confident in the promises of Revelation, which indicate that the full regeneration of the spiritual, will bring us to the mount of Pisgah, where we may look, as Moses did of old, on the celestial Canaan.

"How conjunction is effected," says Swedenborg, "shall also be told in few words. God flows in with every man

with an acknowledgment of Him into the knowledges concerning Him, and at the same time He flows in with His love towards men. The man who receives the former and not the latter, receives that influx in the understanding and not in the will, and remains in knowledges without an interior acknowledgment of God, and his state is like that of a garden in the time of winter ; but the man who receives both the former and the latter, receives the influx in the will, and thence in the understanding, thus in the whole mind ; and he has an interior acknowledgment of God, which vivifies his knowledges concerning Him, and his state is like that of a garden in time of Spring."—*T. C. R.* 457.

Thus is to be seen how important an office charity performs, and that it is the excellence of charity which leads to most excellent love to God. In other words, the spiritual is to be perfected, whereby man becomes celestial. For we are told in the same place that "conjunction is effected by charity," and that it is so, because "God cannot do good to man immediately, but mediately by men ; therefore He inspires His love into them, as He inspires into parents love towards their children ; and the man who receives it is conjoined to God and loves the neighbor from the love of God."

Hence we do not look so strongly as does the Editor of the *Crisis* for "a new manifestation of POWER IN LOVE instead of looking for *power in doctrine* ;" because we think that the power of the celestial can be only known, felt, and seen, as it is exerted through the spiritual ;—because we learn that Divine Love itself could only exert its power for the salvation of the world by taking upon itself a still more outward and natural envelopment than it was clothed with before the first advent.

Truth compels us to acknowledge, as we believe, that *doctrine* is just what we are called upon to preach and talk about ; that the spiritual degree is the degree of reasoning about matters of faith and love ;—it is the attainment of *good from truth* ;—and that the only way for erring mortals

to find the truth is to exercise their rationality, and to think of, talk of, and learn true doctrine from the Word and the authorized exposition thereof. Thence we shall learn, and thence only, in what charity to the neighbor consists. By the exercise of that charity, and by that course alone, shall we develop the spiritual so far as to rise to the sphere of *perception*, and find that the Lord has opened within us the celestial degree. When we begin to throw our doctrine overboard, and imagine ourselves so celestial as to have no further use for it, we shall, like the man in the balloon who has cast away his ballast, find that we have risen to a region for which we have made no preparation, and that we are in an atmosphere where the mind can no longer hold its balance—for the regenerating man, one of spiritual insanity.

And we will, therefore, rest satisfied that our preachers shall preach *doctrine* so long as it be true; for even among the celestial angels, they are furnished with preachers from the spiritual kingdom, for this very reason, that "all preaching is performed from truths." (*H. H.* 225.) We shall rest satisfied also that when we reach the celestial state, we shall know it; and then, having a perception of truths, we shall have no need to speak them; (*Ib.*) and this ceasing to speak, will be a natural consequence, not one sought for. But until that period of regeneration arrives, we think it in order to con over the doctrines of truth, as by them alone we can hope to rise. And, finally, we shall rest satisfied that so long as we look for *power in doctrine* instead of power in love, if it be but true doctrine, we are on the right road, because love exerts power through truth; and those who know, that is, the angels of the celestial heavens, say, that "to live according to truths is to love the Lord." (*Ib.*) So shall our spiritual garden be one of eternal spring, and the dreadful winter of an acknowledgment of God without charity to man, be known within us no more forever!

CONNECTION BETWEEN REVELATION AND SCIENCE.

BY W. H. MULLER.

(Continued from page 96.)

We say then, that if the Bible be really the Word of God, as all Christendom acknowledge it to be, it is utterly impossible that its whole meaning can be confined to the literal sense, or that the literal sense can be all the sense contained in it. This is no more the case than the outward body of man is the entire man, or than the shell of the nut is the whole of the nut. No : The literal sense of the Bible is only its outer crust—its outward body or shell, in which is contained an exhaustless store of spiritual truth ; and these interesting and apparently simple Bible narratives just alluded to—and the allusions to and descriptions of natural events—and the phenomena in the mineral, vegetable, or animal kingdoms, however general, or however minute, and however seemingly trivial in their minuteness of detail—all these, I say, are but so many mediums whereby to convey the deepest spiritual truths. The literal sense—the literal descriptions met with in the Bible—are but as a body to contain a vast soul of spiritual truth and life ; and the literal sense does this by virtue of the correspondence or agreement, which, by the very constitution of the universe, exists between natural and spiritual things. Natural things, or the scenes, objects, phenomena and events of this natural world in every one of its departments, mineral, vegetable, animal and human, shadow forth or represent spiritual things, just as the body shadows forth or represents the soul that inhabits it, and as the varying expression of the face, or the tones of the voice, or the words uttered in speech, correspond to and represent the varying emotions and thoughts of the invisible mind. This fact of the correspondence of natural things with spiritual—this cor-

respondence of the forms of matter and of physical phenomena, with the motions and phenomena of the mind, is one of the most beautiful, comprehensive and instructive truths that man can contemplate. It is a truth which we all instinctively acknowledge and act upon every day of our lives, because it is involved in our very being. Who, for example, is not familiar with expressions like these: a warm or cold-hearted person; he rules with a strong arm; he is a clear-sighted man; such a one is deaf to all entreaties; there goes an upright man; or, such a person has fallen very low? In which instances, the heart represents affection; the arm, power; clear-sight, intelligence; deafness, mental deafness or refusal; and hearing, acquiescence or obedience; uprightness, moral perpendicularity. Or—to take a few other illustrations—who does not see that the natural sun is a glorious and most fitting emblem of God the Creator; that the sun's heat corresponds to or represents the Divine Love, which is spiritual heat, and the sun's light the Divine Wisdom, which is spiritual light? Is not a rock a good emblem or correspondence of truth, which defends and supports whatever is entrusted to it? Does not the living on a mountain well represent a state of moral elevation; living in a valley, a lower moral condition; and upon a hill an intermediate condition; while occupancy of a pit or an abyss denotes a state of moral degradation? Do not birds well represent the thoughts of the mind, denoting, by their rapidity of locomotion, the rapid flight of thought from one subject to another, and by their power to fly high or low, the analogous power of the thoughts to dwell upon earthly things or soar to heavenly? Does not a tree well typify a man? As the tree receives its sustenance from a lower and a higher source, or from the soil and atmosphere and sun's rays, so a man receives his support from the world of nature below, and from the spiritual world and God above. Leaves represent his thoughts or what he knows; blossoms, his good intentions; and fruit, his good actions.

Such are a few examples of the correspondence between natural things, or the things of sense, and spiritual things, or those relating to our inner spiritual life.

Now the Bible is written entirely according to such correspondence ; so that when natural objects are mentioned, as sun, moon, stars, clouds, seas, rivers, mountains, lakes, valleys, cities, deserts, &c., these objects themselves are not meant, when the deeper truths are to be imparted, but the spiritual facts corresponding to them.

It is just as when (to cite a lower instance of correspondence) in speaking, one utters the word *horse*, he does not intend that the hearer shall only receive the *sound* of the word *horse*, but the *idea contained in the sound*. Suppose one, ignorant of the French or German or any foreign language, to hear two persons conversing in that unknown tongue—he will perceive merely sounds, but no ideas, because the sounds have never been associated by himself with their proper ideas ; in other words, he does not understand the correspondence of the sounds with their ideas, and he hears the mere shell or husk of this conversation ; it is to him dead sound, without living ideas. Precisely then what the sound of words in a language is to the ideas contained in them, is the literal sense of the Bible to the spiritual sense contained in it.

Now, then, the connection between Revelation and Science, or between the Word of God, and His works, becomes apparent. For every natural object that science investigates, whether in the mineral, vegetable, animal, or human kingdoms, every such object, event, or phenomenon, has its spiritual significance—its correspondence in the moral world. Thus it is, that, as the volume of natural science unrolls, it more and more illustrates, by every new discovery, the volume of Revelation. Every fact, however minute, in Astronomy, Geology, Chemistry, Mathematics, Botany, in vegetable, animal, or human physiology, or in any of the sciences, is the representative of some spiritual fact behind it—of some spiritual phenome-

non or movement, that takes place in the world of mind. For matter is but the shadow and reflection of mind, and follows and indicates its movements, as shadow does substance. The countless objects in the mineral kingdom, the fertile soil, the sand, clay, and rock formations of the globe, together with their constituent parts, as the earths, alkalis, salts, metals, &c., every one of such individual substances is a distinct emblem, representative, or correspondence of its counterpart in the world of affection and thought. The same is true of everything in the vegetable kingdom, and of everything in the animal kingdom. But the mineral kingdom corresponds to the lower elements of the mental world; the vegetable kingdom to a higher degree of mental life; and the animal kingdom to a still higher. Thus the whole outward creation is but a mirror that reflects the countless affections, thoughts, diversified passions, emotions and ideas of the human mind, and their ever-shifting and changing phenomena and relations.

And the reason of all this is plain. It is because the outward, visible creation, the material world, is but an outbirth from the Divine Mind; and this Mind could produce nothing out of itself, that did not first exist within itself as some Divine affection or thought. The mind of the Creator must, it is evident, be reflected in His works; therefore the created universe is a mirror of the creating Mind; and as man is created in the image of God, possessing like powers of affection and thought, though in a finite degree, the created universe, including its material portion, must be a reflection of the human mind also. As man, however, has fallen from his first estate—as sin has entered the world, or as supreme love to God, and thence love to the neighbor has been to so great an extent dethroned by the love of self and the world, this spiritual degeneracy has shown itself also in the outward creation. Hence the existence of natural objects which correspond to this evil in the human mind, such as poisonous minerals and plants, noxious animals, and physical disease—the outward material evil typifying and springing from

the inward spiritual evil. This, then, is the connection that exists between natural science and spiritual science : that the facts of the one spring from and typify or correspond to the facts of the other ; that the works of creation as to their facts, phenomena and laws, even in the most minute particular, typify or represent the facts, phenomena and laws of man's moral and spiritual life. This connection between the great world of matter and the great world of mind, is precisely analogous to the connection which we all know to exist between the little world of matter, and the little world of mind constituting together the body and soul of each individual man. In every human being is an immaterial soul within a material body ; these are most intimately connected, and every motion of the soul, every one of its affections and thoughts, produces some corresponding change, either visible or invisible, in the body which it inhabits. As the changes of the countenance, the tones of the voice, the gestures and attitudes of the body, manifest the temper and motions of the soul, so is the great physical or material universe, with all its forms and modes of being, but the features and outward expression of the great spiritual world, or the great world of mind behind it. The connection between spirit and matter is as intimate upon the large scale of the universe, as upon the small scale of the individual human being.

It is upon this basis of the eternal, immutable, and inevitable correspondence between things natural and spiritual, that the Word of Revelation stands immovable, and is indeed the Word of God. For no human mind could possibly bring such natural and spiritual ideas together, as the science of correspondence shows *are* brought together in the Bible. It employs natural descriptions, images of objects and events in this natural world—all addressed to and first comprehended by the natural understanding—to convey to the spiritual mind spiritual instruction, or instruction in spiritual truths to which such natural images correspond. Thus, to an eye enlightened by the science of correspondence, and familiar with the facts and laws of natural

science, all nature is but one vast book of natural and spiritual truth. The sun with its dazzling splendor and quickening heat; the azure dome of sky; the tinted cloud; the green carpeted earth; the crystal spring and running stream; the lofty mountain and retired valley; the flower, the tree, the insect, the bird; the wild and domestic quadrupeds, with their habits, their food, their relations to each other and to man; the changing seasons; the dawn, noon, and twilight of the changing day; night with its starry glories, its darkness and repose; all these, the whole circle of nature with its countless beings and appearances, abound in exhaustless stores of natural truth, and are also full to overflowing of spiritual truth—of truths or principles adapted to man's spiritual growth, and which are only veiled over by these natural phenomena. A few examples of this and we will conclude.

Thus the light and heat of the natural sun are received by all objects that are exposed to his rays; but some receive more, some less. Yet each object reflects or gives out both the heat and the light which it receives, to all surrounding objects. This phenomenon illustrates beautifully the spiritual truth, that the love and wisdom, or the love of what is good and the knowledge of what is true, which man receives from God, the great Source of spiritual heat and light, are not to be kept to himself, but imparted again to others.

Again, the earth, as in its daily and annual motion it turns towards the sun, becomes bright and warm and luxuriant with beauty and active life; but as it turns from the sun, it plunges into night and darkness and wintry torpor or death of living things. In like manner man, when he turns towards God the spiritual Sun, becomes vivified throughout his whole being, and is radiant with holy affections, and luxuriant in all good deeds; but when he turns in an opposite direction and worships self, he plunges into spiritual night and winter, where neither blossoms of good intentions nor fruit of good deeds appear.

Again, winter and summer are instructive correspondences of spiritual states of mind. In winter there is light without heat, or with but little heat ; and as both are essential, the clothing of the earth with verdure and beauty cannot take place when heat is absent and the earth is bathed only in barren light. This condition, then, of the earth in winter, is the correspondence of the mind when filled only with knowledge, or intellectual light, without any affection or love for carrying this knowledge into action. Nothing results if a thing is only known, and there is no desire, no love of *doing* it ; for love is mental heat, and both love and knowledge are essential to the performance of deeds. There is, then, a mental summer ; and this union of mental heat and light produces a mental vegetation.

The rainbow is another beautiful emblem. The rainbow, it is well known, is caused by the light from the sun falling into drops of water, and being thence refracted or bent downward to the eye of the spectator. Now light, in the great system of correspondences which has been mentioned, corresponds to spiritual truth ; while water corresponds to natural truth, or the facts of natural science, such as we have been considering. Hence the rainbow represents spiritual truth *in* natural truth, or the things which pertain to God pervading and infilling the things which pertain to man's natural life. When this occurs in the mind of man, he is then conjoined to God ; and from this we see the reason why the rainbow is the sign of the covenant between God and man, as stated in Genesis, (ix. 13,) where God says to Noah, "I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth."

Thus we might go on to multiply examples to any extent. But from what has been said the connection between Revelation and science, and the nature of that connection, cannot fail, we think, to be clearly apprehended. In a future article we may attempt to show that this correspondence between things spiritual and things natural is grounded in the very constitution and essential nature of all being.

DAY BY DAY.

BY JOHN DOUGHTY.

Day by day the blush is leaving
Cheeks where roses used to glow ;
Day by day grim care is weaving
Wrinkles o'er the brow of snow ;
And old Time, who keeps before us,
Showers thickly snow locks o'er us.

Day by day the hoping spirit
Gathers roses in its cheeks ;
Day by day the strength of merit
Learns to laugh when sorrow speaks ;
And the truth we keep before us
Showers rays of beauty o'er us.

Day by day the leaf is fading,
And the grass doth lose its green ;
Day by day the cloud o'ershading
Drops its frozen breath I ween ;
But when spring comes then it showers
Warmer rains for coming flowers.

Day by day the chastened spirit
Sees its garden fairer grow,
Day by day those flowers endear it
To the land where falls no snow ;—
Where the gentle, heavenly showers
Day by day charm forth fresh flowers.

Which is better, which is dearer,
Earth which sways from death to bloom,
And again to Winter's terror,
Or the land which hath no gloom ?—
Earth where smiles and tears are given,
Or the tearless land of heaven ?

Ah, then! though the earth be dying,
 Heaven is smiling through its tears;
 And through all its winter's sighing
 Speaks the bloom of coming years.
 If the heart be growing vernal,
 Through decay beams Spring eternal!

LETTER TO REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER ON
 THE DIVINE TRINITY.

NUMBER III.

REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER :

DEAR SIR :—In my last letter I endeavored to show, that, whatever be the nature of the Divine Trinity, the image of that Trinity must be found in every regenerate or regenerating man. And permit me here to say, that I see not how you can help admitting this to be a legitimate conclusion, as well from the plain teachings of Holy Scripture as from many declarations in your sermon which I have often quoted. The Bible plainly teaches that man was originally made in God's image and likeness. And you yourself, referring to the Scripture teaching on this subject, say, that "man was made in the image of God, in order, as we suppose, that he might understand Him." How else, then, shall we learn or understand the true nature of the trinity in God, save as we see that trinity *imaged* in our own souls? You further declare that "no man can know one whit more of God than he possesses in his own being." What, then, I ask again, can we know of the trinity in God, except what we learn of its nature from the image of that trinity in ourselves? That the inevitable inference from your own admissions as well as from the declarations of Scripture, is directly at war with the popular doctrine on this subject, is no doubt as clear to you as to myself.

I will now endeavor to show, agreeable to the promise in my last letter, what that trinity is in man, from which, as

an image, we are to learn the nature of the Divine Trinity. And we must look at the spiritual nature of man—at the mind or soul—for that which shall be to us the image and exponent of the trinity in God; for “God is a spirit.” What, then, is the trinity in man viewed as a spiritual and immortal being?

Whatever system of mental philosophy we adopt, we shall find, upon a careful analysis and induction, that all the faculties of the mind arrange themselves into two great classes, the one intellectual, the other emotional. The general divisions of the brain itself, according to the disclosures of modern science, furnish a solid basis for this classification. The intellectual faculties are those by which we think, reason, analyze and judge; and together they constitute the *understanding*. The emotional, are those by which we feel, desire, purpose, and love; and together they constitute the *will*. All of love and affection, therefore, belongs to the will; all of wisdom and thought, to the understanding. In whatever we do or say or determine, we shall find that these two general faculties, will and understanding, are brought into active exercise. Every mental and bodily movement originates in the will. We cannot speak nor act—no, nor even think determinately upon any given subject, without first willing or desiring so to do. But the understanding is intimately connected with the will, so that the two act together mutually and reciprocally, like the heart and lungs. Accordingly we no sooner experience an emotion, than that emotion is transferred to the intellect in the form of some thought. We no sooner will or desire to speak or act, than this desire comes forth into conscious perception, and reveals itself in some corresponding thought in the understanding. If we desire to paint a picture, or carve a statue, or write a book, or make a machine, or embark in any enterprise, we immediately think of the kind of picture, statue, book, or machine; that we will make, or the nature of the enterprise in which we will embark. The thought is the offspring of the affection or desire, whose nature and quality

it reveals. As we feel or love, so we think. Hence it has passed into a proverb that "the wish is father to the thought." Indeed it is impossible to conceive of any thought which does not proceed or flow from some desire in the will ; and any one may know what are his dominant desires, by scanning the character of his prevailing thoughts, since these latter are the legitimate manifestations or out-births of the former. There are, it is true, different planes of thought—some higher and some lower ; and an endless variety of subjects which may be thought of, on each plane. And there are also corresponding varieties or grades of love—different degrees of elevation to the will—affections differing in kind and intensity. But as all thought, be the subject or the plane whatever it may—be it the thought of things natural or of things spiritual, of this world or of the world to come—appertains to the understanding, so all love of whatever kind or degree—be it the love of self and the world, or the love of the Lord and the neighbor—appertains to the will.

. . . But there are, you will say, many different kinds and degrees of love appertaining to the mind of one and the same individual. A man loves his wife, his children, his friends, his neighbors, his country, his occupation, his church—and all these with an affection varying both in kind and in degree. And this, I grant, is true. But then there is always, as you are doubtless well aware, some particular kind of love in every man which is stronger than all the rest, and which may, therefore, properly enough be called his *ruling* love. This ruling love constitutes his life. It enters into and imparts its own quality to all his other loves. It mingles with all his desires, affects all his feelings, shapes all his thoughts, colors all his actions ; so that a man may be said to be altogether such as his ruling love is. Thus, if a man's ruling love be the love of himself, this love will pervade his whole being—will enter into all he thinks and says and does. If he does an act that is outwardly good, he will do it from a selfish motive and for a selfish end ; and, viewed

inwardly, as to its prompting motive—viewed in relation to himself—the act is seen to be not good in reality, but only in appearance. It is inwardly defiled with the evil of self-love. His devotion to his family, his neighborhood, his profession, his country, or the church, is not genuine—is not what it seems to be. His love of self is at the bottom of it all ; and his thoughts, out-flowing from this love, are thoughts of himself and his own comfort or aggrandizement, and not of the welfare and happiness of others. Such an individual you would not call good, however good and fair his outward life might be ; for he is not good, but supremely selfish at heart. His ruling love is evil, and this infects with its poison all his other loves. This is his life. And however it may be covered over and concealed in this world under various fair pretences, it is none the less evil in itself considered ; and sooner or later—in the other world if not in this—it will come forth and manifest itself. The inward defilement will reveal itself under corresponding forms of outward evil. “For,” as the Scripture saith, “out of the *heart* [by which is denoted the will-principle where the ruling love resides] proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies. These are the things which defile a man.”

But suppose a man's ruling love to be the opposite of the love of self—suppose him to love the Lord with all his heart—this love will diffuse its sweet perfume throughout all the chambers of his soul. All his subordinate loves will partake of the same elevating character, and therefore will all be good. He will seek in all things to learn and do the will of the Lord. Supreme love to Him will beget in his understanding corresponding thoughts—thoughts of what the Lord requires him to be and to do—thoughts of those things which are well-pleasing to Him. And since the Lord requires us to love our neighbor as ourselves, this man will strive not so much to get good *from* others as to impart good *to* others. He will be animated with a desire to render himself in the highest degree *useful* in his day and generation. Such an

individual—acting ever under the influence of a controlling desire and purpose to do the Lord's will—you would call good. He is a good man, because his *heart* is right in the sight of God ;—because his ruling love is good, or such as the Lord desires that it should be—love to Him ; for it is the ruling love which determines a man's real character. And yet even this good man may not realize our highest conception of a human being. To do this he must be *wise* as well as good. He must have a knowing *head* as well as a loving *heart*—an enlightened understanding as well as a good will. He must not only desire and purpose in all things to do God's will, but his understanding must be so illumined that he can see what that will is—at least in relation to himself—and how he is to do it. Otherwise—without the guiding light of wisdom—with the best of intentions, the man may often stray from the right path, and do things which a more enlightened understanding would have shown him to be wrong. Many good people, we know, often err through ignorance. Their hearts are right, but their heads are comparatively unenlightened. They have an abundance of love in their wills, but have not a corresponding measure of truth in their understandings. The errors of such people may not be sins—*are* not sins, if they have availed themselves of the opportunities of becoming enlightened which Providence has placed within their reach. Or, if sins, they are such as are not imputed to them—such as God ever “winks at”—sins of ignorance.

You will concede, then, I think, that our highest conception of human character, or of a human being, is not realized until we have a wise and enlightened head united to a pure and loving heart. Truth in the understanding must be married to love in the will, so that the two shall exist and act together *as one*, like true conjugal partners, or like the heart and lungs in man. This is the union which God designed should exist in every human soul—a union which does exist in every true and thoroughly regenerate soul—viz., the union of the head with the heart, or of truth in the un-

derstanding with love in the will. It is a union of things which God hath joined together, but which man, in his state of alienation from God, is forever putting asunder—a union of truth with its goodness, of wisdom with its love. This is the heavenly marriage—a marriage which is consummated in every soul that becomes spiritually conjoined to Him, who is revealed in Scripture as the Bridegroom and Husband of the Church. This union of love in the will with wisdom in the understanding, is, to our moral world, what the union of light with heat is to the natural world. It clothes the earth within us with living verdure, and makes our wilderness an Eden, our desert ike the garden of the Lord.

But our highest conception of a human being is not yet reached. To complete our model man, or to make him what every thoroughly regenerate man must be, it is necessary to add to our conception a third element, and that is—*action*. It is necessary that love in the will be united to truth in the understanding, and that these go forth unitedly and ultimate themselves in a life of *active usefulness*. In other words, your perfect man, or one having the measure of an angel, must not be a do-nothing or an idler in this world of ours. He must be a *worker*—must *perform uses*. Indeed he cannot help working, since it is the very nature of love and wisdom, when united in the soul, to go forth and ultimate themselves in acts of beneficence and mercy. Therefore, a good and regenerate man is, and must be, a busy man. His heart being full of love to the Lord—which involves also disinterested love to the neighbor—and his understanding full of the truths of wisdom which teach him what is really good for his neighbor, and how to do it, he cannot fold his hands and sit idle. He must be ever active—ever going forth on errands of mercy—ever engaged in the performance of beneficent deeds—ever busy about his Father's business—ever striving faithfully to discharge his duty in whatever sphere Providence has placed him; for this, he knows, is just what his Heavenly Father desires him to do. All his acts, therefore, being performed under the prompting in-

fluence of love—love to the Lord and the neighbor—and according to the truths of wisdom, must needs be good acts, tending to enlighten, improve, elevate and bless humanity.

Here, then, we have our model man complete. Here we have the angelic standard of true manhood—"the measure of a man, that is, of the angel." I quite agree with you in your remarks, that "the heart is the capitol"—that "manhood is in the heart"—also in the belief you express that true human greatness can only be reached where there is true human love. But although love is the first and highest element, it is not *all* that is necessary to perfect manhood. It is as needful that this be united with wisdom, as that heat be united with light, or the heart with the lungs. And when so united, then they must go forth and embody themselves in ultimate and useful *acts*. A man with a pure and loving will, with a good and enlightened understanding, and with a life of active usefulness in accordance therewith—does not such a man realize your *ideal* of a human being? What more is necessary to his essential and true manhood? What more do you expect in a thoroughly good and regenerate man? What more in an angel? And does not such a man fulfill your highest conception of what is demanded by that language of the Bible which represents him as originally created in the image and likeness of God? And will any thing *less* than this satisfy the demands of such language? Nay, will any thing less satisfy the demands of your own language, where you speak of the importance and necessity of "right *thinking*, based upon right *living*," to one who would truly "find out God?" If, as I suppose, in your idea of "right *living*," is involved right *willing* and right *acting*, then it is as if you had said, "Let a man *think* right, *will* right, and *act* right, then he will find out God. And why? Clearly because he will then be like Him—will then be an image of Him. And as only like ones can comprehend or see like ones, this is the only way in which God can be found out." As you have justly remarked: "That is

the way you are going to see God—by your own consciousness, and the qualities in you answering to a like consciousness and to like qualities in Him.”

These *three*, then, *will*, *understanding* and *action*, are what essentially constitute *man*. These enter into every one's idea—into your own idea—of man. And each, too, is alike essential to the idea. Take away either one of these elements, and the idea conveyed by the term *man* is destroyed. Therefore the trinity in man is the union of three *essential* elements. And although we can think and speak of each element separately, we know that they have not, and cannot have, any separate and independent existence ; just as with the sun, while we may think and speak of the heat, the light, or their proceeding operation, separately, we know that neither can have any existence apart from the other two ; and the moment we attempt to think of either as withdrawn, or as having a separate and independent existence, that moment we destroy in our minds the very idea of the sun as a luminous and calorific body. We say, therefore, that heat, light, and their proceeding operation, are each alike essential to the very existence of the sun *as a sun*. And in like manner we affirm that will, understanding and action, are each alike essential to the existence of man *as man*.

We thus see that this finite human trinity is by no means fanciful or arbitrary. It is not an invention of human ingenuity, but is founded in the very nature and constitution of the human soul. It is the union of three elements, each of which is absolutely *essential* to the existence of a human being. These three elements stand related to each other like end, cause, and effect—like love, wisdom, and use—like heat, light, and their proceeding operation—or like the heart, lungs, and their reciprocal action. Who does not know that the heart cannot exist as a vital organ, performing all the functions of a heart, without the lungs, and the activity resulting from their vital union? Neither can the lungs exist without the heart ; nor can there be any recip-

rocal action without the union of them both. The same is true of heat, light, and their proceeding operation ; for neither of these can exist without the other two. And we may say the same also of love, wisdom, and use, or of affection, thought, and action. Moreover the will is the receptacle of all that a man loves or calls good ; and the understanding is the receptacle of all that he thinks or calls true (wisdom) ; and their action is the receptacle of his use or power, or is the method by which the will and understanding seek to embody themselves in an ultimate form. So that every work which a man does, is but an effect of the combined activity of his will and understanding, or, what is the same, of his love and wisdom. And the character of every work—so far, I mean, as the individual himself is concerned—will, of course, depend upon the quality of his will, or of the love that rules therein. If his ruling love be the love of the Lord—in other words, if the prevailing desire and purpose of his heart be to do the Lord's will by performing deeds of true benevolence, or use to the neighbor—then his love is good, and of course his work also is good. But if his ruling love be the love of himself—that is, if it be his prevailing desire and purpose to do only his own will without regard to the good of others—then his love is evil and his work, in itself considered, is evil, be the outward appearance whatever it may. In the one case he is a true, in the other an inverted, image of the Lord ; for in the one instance the love is similar, while in the other it is opposite, to the love which the Lord feels and forever exercises towards His creatures.

I flatter myself that I have now succeeded in making this finite human trinity quite intelligible to your mind. And you see, my brother, that it is not a trinity of *persons*, yet one of *essentials*. It is, moreover, a perfectly rational and intelligible trinity, and one which is seen to rest upon a foundation as solid and enduring as the soul itself. Can you show, according to any fair argument or sound philosophy, that your *personal* trinity is equally essential, or that it

rests upon an equally substantial foundation? Try, and see if you can.

Now this human trinity—such as I have shown to exist in every good and regenerate man—I take to be a perfect image of the Divine Trinity. I look at this trinity in man, and I learn from it the true nature of the trinity in God. I feel that if I know any thing of God from what I find in my own being that answers to a like quality in Him—be the likeness never so faint—then I *know*, from this trinity in myself, what is the nature of the Divine Trinity. And how else, let me ask, are we to learn the true nature of that Trinity? How, even according to your own admission? For you declare that “no man can know one whit more of God than he possesses in his own being.” And if there be in man such a trinity as I have shown to exist, why should we be unwilling to admit that the Divine Trinity must resemble this human one in its essential nature? How, indeed, can the inference be resisted, since the Scripture assures us that man was originally created, and is now, since the fall, to be *re-created*, in God’s own image? How, especially, can *you* deny the justice and necessity of this inference, after saying, as you have said, “that man was made in the image of God, in order, as we suppose, that he might understand Him?” Do you say it was never intended that we should understand the nature of the Divine Trinity? What right have you to say this? What authority for so believing or so teaching? It is, I am aware, and has long been, quite a popular saying among Christians; but you, no doubt, will admit that it is none the less likely on that account to involve a popular error. How know you but a right understanding of the true nature of that trinal distinction which exists in God, may lead to most important practical results? However that may be, I feel that I have abundant Scripture warrant for believing and saying that the trinity in man, such as I have here explained, is as much like the trinity in God, as our human love, or any other attribute of our human nature, is like God’s love, or any cor-

responding attribute of the Divine nature. And you believe that Love is the grand and distinguishing characteristic of the Divine Being ; and that, in the language of the apostle, "He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God and God in him." You believe that true human love in men so nearly resembles God's love in its essential nature, that we may be said to understand and *know* God in the degree that we have this love ; and that we can truly understand Him in no other way. For, after saying—and I agree with you here entirely—"that love in me is no fit measure of the depth, or the breadth, or the length, or the versatility of the love of God," you add : "but yet it is a true criterion by which to judge of the essential quality of love in God." You also say, "that if you know what disinterested love is, then you know the kind of love that God feels." And again : "The spiritual and higher nature of man is really, absolutely like God's ;" and "we can comprehend God only to the degree that His power, in-dwelling in us, causes our higher nature to act as His nature acts, thus rendering us interpreters of Him." This is perfectly true ; and you might have cited, in confirmation of its truth, those beautiful words of the apostle, "Beloved, let us love another ; for love is of God ; and every one that loveth is born of God, and *knoweth* God. He that loveth not, knoweth *not* God ; for God is love." But is not God Wisdom or Truth, as well as Love or Goodness ? His wisdom is infinite ; and therefore we say He is omniscient. And although His wisdom does not and cannot exist apart from His love, any more than light can exist apart from heat, yet we can contemplate it as a distinct element in the Divine Being. The distinction between the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom is as clear as that between human affection and human thought, or between the will and the understanding of man. And pursuing one step further the excellent line of argument in your sermon—a step which I think you cannot consistently forbid—should we not say, that truth in a regenerate human mind is so like truth in the Divine Mind, or that the wisdom in a righteous

man's understanding is so like the wisdom of God, that the former may be taken as "a true criterion by which to judge" of the essential nature or quality of the latter? What, indeed, can we really know of the Divine Wisdom, save as that Wisdom is revealed in our own souls—in the thoughts or truths which illumine our understanding? And may we not also—going a step further—make the same remarks in reference to God's power, and the true mode of comprehending it, or forming any idea of it? The power of a good and thoroughly regenerate soul—the power of disinterested love in the will operating in conjunction with genuine truth in the understanding—can any thing give us a better idea of God's power than this? Does not the nature of this power—finite and feeble as it is—illustrate completely the nature of the Divine omnipotence? How else can we rightly understand the power of God, or where else shall we go to learn its true nature? Nor does the nature of the Divine power as thus taught us, appear to differ materially from your own idea of it as set forth in your sermon. You reject very decidedly the old idea of a God of "monarchic power and physical grandeur"—of a God, whose greatness is supposed to consist "in the great strength of his muscle." You even flout this idea, justly characterizing it as "false," "gross," "vulgar," and "barbaric." Nor do you believe that God's greatness or omnipotence consists in mere intellectual power, or that He is "a Being of immense intellect" alone. Yet you do not believe Him to be an unintelligent Being—a Being *without* intellect. On the contrary, you believe His intellect to be great and unfathomable, comprehending in its stupendous grasp, all truth, all knowledge, all wisdom. But you believe that mighty intellect to exist in close and indissoluble union with another attribute, quite distinct from it, and of a nature superior to it. You believe it to be united with a will of equal amplitude and power—with love or justice infinitely holy, pure, and perfect. How else am I to interpret your language, when you say, "Though I cannot worship a God of mere omnipotence, or vast intelligence, or

right-handed justice—yet when I see a God with omnipotence, intelligence, and justice, who could be so unselfish and so noble as to give himself for the weak, the despised, and the down-trodden, and lift them up into the majesty of his own nature, I cannot help adoring him.” By God’s justice, I suppose you here mean His love in exercise ; for you have elsewhere in your sermon spoken of love as the noblest attribute of the Divine Being ; and I cannot, therefore, suppose you meant to overlook this in the brief summary here given of the attributes of that God whom you “cannot help adoring.” Besides, what else is pure justice but pure love—love of the right, the good, and the true?—such love as finds its full satisfaction only in ultimate acts—in the *practice* of the right and the true ? God’s mercy, too,—what is this but a manifestation of His love ? And so of His goodness, tenderness, forbearance, condescension, and all the other attributes of which you speak. If such, then, be your meaning of justice in the sentence just quoted, it is as if you had said, “When I see a God with omnipotence [power], intelligence [wisdom], and justice [pure and unselfish love] united, I believe in Him, and cannot help adoring Him.” And if this shows that you already believe in, and adore—apparently without being conscious of it—the very Trinity whose nature I am endeavoring to unfold and set before you, it is all the more gratifying to me. But I would suggest for your serious consideration, whether, in that case—supposing this trinal distinction of love, wisdom, and power, to exist in each of your three *persons* in the Godhead—you have not a *compound* trinity, or a trinity of trinities, in the God of whom you are thinking ;—*nine* instead of *three* “somewhats,” to use a term which Dr. Stuart would substitute for that of *persons* in the Trinity.

Will, understanding, and action, then, constitute the trinity in every finite human being. And with every regenerate man, whose heart has become the receptacle of disinterested love, and his understanding the receptacle of heavenly wisdom, and his life conformable thereto, this trinity is the

union of love, wisdom, and use. You will concede, I think, that this trinity is exceedingly simple and easily understood. At the same time it is one about which we need have no doubt—one, of whose existence and nature we are as certain as we are of the existence of the soul itself. And what is easier than to learn from this the nature of the Divine Trinity? Why should we perplex ourselves about so plain a subject, or suffer our minds to be confused or entangled in a web of mystery and contradiction, by the speculations or decrees of men who lived many hundred years ago? Why, especially, should we do this, when the soul itself is an open book, in which we may read, if we will, the solution of this mystery? Seeing, too, that God himself, by teaching us that he made man originally in His own image, and now regenerates or *re-creates* him in the same divine likeness, has clearly indicated the direction in which we ought to look, if we would learn His true nature and character. To see clearly the nature of the trinity in God, we have only to look at the image of that trinity in ourselves. We have only to conceive the trinity existing in every regenerate or regenerating man to be infinitely expanded, and we have the Divine Trinity. Let our finite human love—such love, I mean, as dwells in the heart of a regenerate man—be increased without limit, let it be infinitely augmented in purity, amplitude, and power, and what have we then but the Divine Love? Let our finite human wisdom (the truths in our understanding) be augmented in like manner and degree, so as to embrace all truth and all knowledge in all spheres and throughout all worlds, and what have we then but the Divine Wisdom? And let our finite human power—the power of a good will operating in conjunction with a wise or enlightened understanding, and so ultimating itself in useful acts—in deeds of kindness, beneficence, and good will to men—be increased to infinity, and what have we then but the Divine Power?

Divine Love, Divine Wisdom, and Divine Power, therefore, or what is the same, Divine Goodness, Divine Truth,

and their Divine Proceeding Operation, constitute the Divine Trinity. And since the love in the heart of a regenerate man is an image of the Divine Love, and the wisdom in his understanding is an image of the Divine Wisdom, and his sphere of active usefulness is an image of God's operative energy, or of the sphere of the Divine Activity, therefore such a man is a true image and likeness of God, having in himself a complete image of the Divine Trinity.

Pardon me, my brother, if, in my anxiety to make myself understood, I become somewhat tedious. The subject is of too great magnitude and importance, and involving, as we shall see in the sequel, issues of two great moment as affecting the popular theology, to be hastily passed over, or properly discussed within narrow limits. I have something further to say on the point argued in this letter—further illustrations to present, and further Scripture evidence to offer. But the already excessive length of this epistle, admonishes me of the propriety of postponing to another time what further remarks I have to make on this point. Hoping, therefore, that you will give to what I have here said that candid consideration which it merits, I remain, as ever,

Your Friend and Brother,

B. F. BARRETT.

Orange, August 3d, 1859.

DREAMS.

“Of what stuff are dreams made?”

Swedenborg has revealed to us the true nature of dreams. The question is answered. We now know of what stuff dreams are made; and we recall our dreams now with a new interest and significance.

Swedenborg tells us that dreams are of two kinds: the one real, the other fantastic—induced by evil spirits. All this is very simple when we realize the organism of the hu-

man mind. We are forms within forms—a man within a man ; and when the outer man is unconscious—in sleep—the inner man is awake, living an interior real life. A partial break in the outer unconsciousness may give us glimpses of the real life ; these are *real* dreams, actualities and experiences. But then again the outer organism may be disordered, not in harmony with its man ; and this want of true order induces an influx of evil spirits, who enter the house or will, and bind the strong man ; then he is subject to fantasies induced by evil spirits. They lead him through unreal scenes. They get up sensible representations—panoramas—of life's horrors. They delight to torture the human spirit whom they hold in bondage—to induce fears and despair and agony. Often the very torture arouses the body to consciousness. The reason of man then comes to the aid of his will, and he loosens himself from the grasp of evil spirits by appealing to the Lord in the full freedom of his rational faculty.

A few days since, I passed through such an experience. I was out of health—having chills ; and the night preceding the chill was given up to horrors. I was led whither I would not. It was an indistinct, obscure consciousness of awful and intense suffering, and loathing dislike. But the consciousness gradually drew near to the outer life, and I felt that the experiences of my yesterday's life were being seized upon and woven as it were into images. I had received a letter from Europe. It brought with it a bright vision of a boy walking over the Alps. Yes, there he was ! I saw him in the dream toiling and climbing up the Pass of St. Bernardus. The white-robed Alps towering around him, gleaming only now and then through the drifting mists of a storm. But what cared that bold, bright, resolute boy for the storm ? Ah ! Did I not know that he rejoiced in it ?—that the struggle to him was a triumph ?—that the wild, weird majesty of the Alpine storm, was an outward exhibition of an interior state ? Did I not know that he rejoiced that the sun was shining serene above the storm ? The spirits could

not conquer me with that vision. I knew the boy's soul, and I said, Our Lord will adjust outer circumstances to interior states ; let him battle with the storm.

Then the scene changed. Oh, stifling change ! From the icy cold mountains, and the wild winds, I was hurled down, down, into the hot plains of Italy. The July sun scorched and burned, and a wailing cry arose upon my soul. Why did it echo one word written in my memory ? Why did it sigh and sigh away into "Abbate Grasso ! Abbiate Grasso !" Ah ! there it was written in my memory, from reading in the newspaper the day before, that the stench of the battle-field of Magenta could be perceived as far as Abbiate Grasso ! A dreary, dull horror was upon me. Yes, there are the low, marshy grounds ! And there is the Ticino ! There the bridge of Buffalora—yes, I knew it all. Years ago I had passed over the route, and now the boy from the Alps with his knapsack on his back is toiling over the bridge. Then the horror of a great darkness, like a tossing, restless anguish of disease overwhelmed me. And the darkness opened, and in the black shadows, cypress trees ! A thick, dark grove outlined themselves oppressively—to me—and under their deep black shadows, a grave grew upon my sight. But the quivering anguish was over ; for suddenly the dark scene was flooded with the heavenly sunshine. I felt that it was light from God. And then I was awake !

Oh ! how vivid the dream was ! how easily I recalled it ! and how gratefully I remembered the blessed sunshine !—All the next day that dream was used as a temptation to induce sadness and anxiety. I said to myself, If I yield, I shall become subject to evil spirits, and thus they will gain their object. But they would then suggest, What if God permitted the fantasy as a warning to prepare you for an event ? I said, let it be so. But the sunshine from heaven was there. And if I rejoiced that my boy was marching in joy over the mountains of Switzerland, and was delighting himself in the soft beauties of the plains of Italy—why

should I not rejoice if he is walking over the celestial mountains and in the "gardens of God?" So I said to the evil spirits, Be it a fancy or a reality—I am not your subject. My love for the Divine Father of my boy delivers me from the bondage of my anxiety. "The truth shall make you free."

*

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE SOUL.

BY L'INCONNU.

PART I.—CHILDHOOD.

"Do you hear the children weeping, O my brothers?
 Ere the sorrow comes with years
 They are leaning their young heads against their mothers',
 And that cannot stop their tears.
 The young lambs are bleating in the meadows,
 The young birds are chirping in the nest,
 The young fawns are playing with the shadows,
 The young flowers are blowing towards the west,
 But the young, young children, O my brothers,
 They are weeping bitterly!
 They are weeping in the playtime of the others,
 In the country of the free."

— BROWNING.

I *am* ambitious. I have a destiny, but it is yet unfilled. In fact I can hardly tell what it is, and here is my greatest trouble. I sigh to Be and to Do. I wish to be remembered a little while after the curtain has dropped upon the drama of life. I am still in my prime. As the world measures a man I am fortunate. My worldly prospects are good. I have money, lands, and houses, I had almost said, friends, but of that I am not so sure. We can speak of things that are inanimate with confidence; of God's image, but doubtfully. I look at the long years that have passed and I shudder. How quickly they have sunk into the vortex; and yet it cannot be said they have passed away. Nothing can be forever lost; certainly not the years that are so closely

allied to memory. No. They come to us at times like the great sullen waves of the ocean. They beat upon the shores of the soul and demand their fulfillment. They plead for the realization of the hopes and yearnings with which their opening hours were crowned ; but it is too late.

An old Atlas is in my possession : one of its maps represents the world with its different countries, in light, in shadow, and in deep black ; representing Civilization, Ignorance, and Barbarism. It seems to be a picture of my inner self. I can dissect the map of my soul almost as readily, placing my finger upon its mountains and rivers, its green valleys and its arid planes, its Arctic and its Torrid zones. Especially can I note its light and its darkness ; its regions over which the spell of midnight seems to be resting, and others where, thank God, there is, or has been, a warfare progressing ; where the light begins to shine, and the lurid clouds are but dimly seen. I cannot say that on any portion of this spiritual land the Sun of righteousness shines with unclouded splendor. In every part may yet be found those abysses into which have rolled and disappeared so many bright hopes of my own, so many warm anticipations of others. A map of the soul, with its glittering snow-capped mountains, its ravines, its precipices ! How often we fall in spirit, how seldom rest on the fertile plains and beneath the shade of the green trees, or in those quiet nooks where Peace is found at home !

We cannot call to remembrance our birth into the natural world ; but *my* birth, the birth of the spirit, it seems to me I can easily remember. It was a sad and quiet awakening. I had all that yearning for love, the love of my kind, which seems so natural to the infant mind. I realize that the body was steeped in poverty ;—that its natural protectors were hard workers in a working world, and shut out from intercourse with the high-born, the educated and refined. I felt that I, poor soul, had no soul-affinity ; that no chords of the heart answered to my own, and sang the song of life in unison.

Do we, who have the souls of children given us to mould and form after the image of God, ever call to mind our own states when young, and remember just how plastic they were, how ready to receive the impress of every thought? The sun never impresses itself more decidedly upon the daguerreotype plate than do our words and actions upon those little soul-forms around our own. We succeed after a fashion in moulding those ethereal essences after some pattern, but is it the pattern of Heaven? We render them subject, as we may say, to parental control, and obedient to strict discipline; but how much better are such souls when released from irksome thralldom, than those that grow up wild, untamed, and undisciplined? My first experience of life resulted in this observation, that spirits grow old as well as bodies, and that every effort made by such old and indurated spiritual forms is to make the tender infant souls just like themselves as soon as possible. My childish deduction was simply this: O! if these old folks were only young; O! if they were only innocent and loving and tender, then they would be merciful.

I had hardly begun to peep through the windows of the body and take a glance at the outward world, when I shrank from its appearance. It was so great a world and so busy! People were rushing to and fro, and I knew they had no time to look at, or talk to, poor little me; so I hardly ever ventured from the door-step; and when I did, I frequently suffered for my temerity. I was absent-minded, folks said;—always thinking of something. I never thought I was absent-minded—far from it; that part of my nature was fully alive, although to tell the truth it took very poor care of the body, and not unfrequently the natural life ran risks of coming to a violent termination. I call to my mind one instance in which a spirited horse and his rider jumped fairly over me while crossing a street, coming upon me quietly and being unable to stop in season.

At another time I narrowly escaped from drowning. So I acquired a habit and a liking for the chimney corner,

where I could commune with my own thoughts securely and grow in mind if not in body, becoming daily more of a wonder to my few companions for the quietness of my habits, and my general distaste for boyish sports. I had my little lapses from perfect solitude—my occasional temptations.

A mammoth kite drew me out one day, and the present of a sled awoke a momentary enthusiasm; but my fingers soon became pinched with the cold in holding the first, and the last was quickly borrowed by an admiring neighbor, who forgot to return it; so I, without regret, fell back again to my own nestling place in the chimney corner.

I believe I might have been easily enticed with the ordinary games and sports of the children around me, if I could have found something besides the mere enjoyment of play itself. I did not lack ambition or agility, but I shrank instinctively from the rudeness of nature and that coarseness and vulgarity which are so often found even among children. Profanity shocked me. I, who, seeking out quiet corners and dark rooms, dropped on my little knees and tried to imitate the grown men I had seen in the primitive meeting houses;—I, who dared not count the stars for fear of a judgment, and who, by seeming intuition, knew and recognized God in every flower and tree—I could not hear His name used irreverently without a shudder. Had I found even one, however, who would have kindly taken me by the hand, and, feeling a sympathy for my state, have drawn me gently out into the world, I should have gone gladly; I so longed for help, for condolence, for warm, heart-giving love.

I remember noticing in the primary school I attended a new comer, double my age perhaps, stout and ruddy, with a mass of black hair that gave him a fine manly appearance. My heart seemed to cling to him at once. There was a fascination as new as it was agreeable; and during all the long hours of that school-time he was my Apollo.

No sooner was school dismissed than I sought him. I drew up close to his side, and timidly looking up into his

face, called his name gently. He looked upon me and smiled, as a rich relation generally looks patronizingly upon a poor one, and then gaily ran away without a word. How well do I call to mind the exquisite sensation of grief that filled my being. I, poor little soul, was still alone in the wide world. I did not weep, but I crept away lonely and sad. You, who are wrestling with mighty fate, and going up and down with the surging billows of time, think, perchance, that childish griefs are nothing compared with those your great heart suffers. Perhaps you had none of your own when young, or may have forgotten them; but they are real nevertheless. And if you have the care of infant souls, do not forget it. You would shed tears, perhaps, over a pet lamb exposed to the tempest, because you recognize its innocence and incapacity to endure suffering. Will you not think and weep more intensely over the woes of the lambs of your own flock, and shield them from the more terrible spiritual storms by which they are assailed? God help you and them, if not!

Do not, I pray you, dear soul, enshrined in manly or womanly body—well-dressed, no doubt, and *au fait* in all worldly wisdom—do not, I pray you, crush my humble thoughts with proud disdain. I will allow that I am speaking as a mere child; it is the prattle of the infant whose nurse sings it to sleep with a lullaby and the usual melodies; but remember you were all children once, and thought and spoke just so perhaps, or at least I hope you did. I am no egotist in this; and if I say in my homely way that I could never crush a worm beneath my heel, that I ran with all my might from the sight of blood, and that I was in that impressible state that I might have been led by any kindly fibre reaching from my heart to another's, I only say what I think can be said of many, many children, who are neglected, and ruined by neglect, or pampered and spoiled by over indulgence and every kind of artificial stimulus. I do not plead for the recognition of my infant wants; alas! it is too late for *that*; but I hold up both

hands for those for whom it is not too late—for those whose infant knees are pliable—for those whose sweet voices fall as gently on the ear as the sighing spring-air through the jessamine bower. If you do not *love* little children—if you merely *endure* them—if you like them when they are *good* and playful, and when they begin to fret and show their need of your love, if you shake your wise head and say, Children should go to bed early ; then, I can do naught with you. If you are so lost to heaven, so immersed in the world, that you have rubbed out from your heart what God so early implanted there—the innocence of infancy—then I must look for those who can be reached even by childish words, and are willing to say with their Lord, “Suffer the little ones to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.”

It may be supposed that, as soon as I could read—and this art came to me almost spontaneously, for I can hardly go beyond the day when I could not read—that I found great solace in books. And it was so. I do not remember having the picture or story books which fall so plentifully to the share of most children. Occasionally a spare penny would be invested in some trifle, whose “frontispiece,” temptingly placed against the glass window of the toy-store, attracted my wondering gaze ; but this was the exception, not the rule. My taste seemed to adapt itself to any book that fortune favored me with, and even the profound works of Josephus and Rollin’s History had a fascination for me and were eagerly read at an age when boys are usually slowly poring over their primers and Bible lessons. I do not know how it could be that with my tenderness of heart I could calmly read of the ancient wars and the attendant cruelties ; but so it was. I suppose they were to me panoramic pictures of strange scenes, men and customs ; and I was too young, no doubt, to realize all the horrors detailed in such books. With those volumes of a different kind, narratives of personal devotion, and especially stories of the love sacrifices and sufferings

of children, I was intensely interested. There was a book of the latter description that I remember hearing described. A relative, knowing my fondness for such works, promised me a copy on a certain day. I waited for the messenger the whole afternoon on the front stoop of my humble home. As the shades of evening fell I descried her in the distance, and my heart bounded with delight. Alas ! how our hopes are crushed ! The edition was exhausted : not a copy to be had. Words cannot express my childish disappointment. Subsequently I was taken to the printing-office, where the work was issued, and a copy was placed in my hands. Hurriedly I crouched upon the floor, and amid the noise of printing-presses; the clang of human voices, and the hurrying pace of business men, I read that book through. The soul knew no body, no world, no outer life. All these were dead and lost. Since I have become a student of Swedenborg, many of these early soul-states are recalled vividly by his own experience and narratives.

The pedagogues of those days with whom I came in contact were of a very common order, and their principal business appeared to be to "set copies" for the children, and to mend the quill pens by which their chirographic efforts were accomplished. The madam of my establishment—a venerable lady in portentous spectacles—heard the boys spell and read. She had made a present of a couple of cents to a boy who had committed a chapter in the Bible to memory. This aroused my pride. I had a tenacious memory and committed rapidly. The next day I astonished the old lady by reciting three chapters ; and as verse after verse flowed from my fluent tongue, she smiled her approbation and audibly expressed her surprise. After school I proudly bore away a financial testimony to my success.

May I add here a few further words of caution and advice. Let your children only learn, while yet children, such lessons as they show delight in ; and of all lessons only as much as they can easily, without being stimulated into

successful efforts, or running the risk of being blamed for failures. Do with the mental food as you would with the natural.

Place that within the child's reach which is healthy, and which your knowledge of his opening character leads you to believe best adapted to him. With a child be a child, at least in heart ; show your firmness when necessary, your intellectual superiority also ; command his respect, but let love be his guiding star by day and night. But what is love ? Can you tell me ? Do I know myself ? There is much that passes for it which is pure, pure counterfeit. Animals have an instinct which is analogous to love, man's love usually is but a grade above it. I seemed to feel in childhood the want of something which I did not possess ; and I dare say that many can more clearly realize the nature of that which they have not, than those can who think they possess it. I felt the want of an all-pervading, sanctifying, irradiating influence ; of something which should lift me up beyond the dull level of the poor world around me, and enable me to bask my soul in the mellow beams of an unknown sun ;—to see afar off the silver streams and golden pastures of a soul's paradise. Too diffident to seek the world without me, I yet yearned to bless it, and only wished for the power ; for the translucent streams of love to flow into my spirit with such sweetness and strength that I might give it forth again with unsparing profuseness.

Here, then, it seems to me, is the key to the question. When parents enlarge their own hearts—bare them as it were to the Sun of heaven—receiving the Divine life in all its glorious fullness, then they will know what love is, and how to impart it to the young. Selfishness is not akin to love. The fondness we show for the tender plants God has given into our keeping, our jealous watchfulness of their daily wants, even our unwearied assiduity for their moral preservation, is nothing so long as the world has such a paramount influence over our actions, and we look to its laws as our guide, its approval as our stimulus, its re-

wards as our children's gain. No, little ones ! chosen types of the kingdom of heaven ! I would fain surround your young souls with such an atmosphere of purity and truth, that, with the firmest tread upon mother earth, you would still ever walk with the veil rent assunder, and with your eyes ever gazing upon the brightness of the heaven beyond and yet within you.

If I ramble somewhat in this history, you must remember that I profess mainly to give an insight into the spiritual workings and progressive journeyings of the soul. I wish to impress, from the experience of my own actual inner life, upon the minds of the young, that there *is* a world within, and that it is of far more importance to watch our soul's footsteps than those of the body. The natural events of worldly life must make a portion of all history ; but I trust that I shall bear in remembrance that all such incidents, as they are the outward manifestations of the soul's workings, must all be made subservient to the soul's progress.

From reading to writing the transition was easy ; and I seized with delight the pen as well as the book. My thoughts found here a most congenial channel for utterance, and the making of rhymes (I cannot call them poetry) seemed to be more natural and easy than ordinary prose composition. Visions of a Parnassus on which my future dwelling was to be, filled my child's brain, and I have since both smiled and sighed over my shipwrecked fancies. I confidently present a specimen of these verses, and thus bring to a close this first chapter of my soul's experiences.

Sweet stars that shine above me
From the mild blue sky,
Teach me how to love thee,
Ere I close my eye.
Are they rays from Jesus ?
Then forever shine,
Teach me how to love Him—
Let His love be mine.

Though golden-hued the morning,
 Though bright the summer day,
 I long for the dews of evening,
 And for the stars' array :—
 They speak to me divinely
 Of joys that never cease,
 Their mellow light falls on me,
 And brings a heavenly peace.

Then teach me how to love thee,
 Ye orbs with His love crowned ;
 With one accord shine on me ;—
 A child of earth is found,
 Who loves the Lord his Master,
 Who loves to do His will ;
 Hear his child's voice imploring,
 Dear Father, love me still !

THE MEASURE OF A MAN.

NOTICE OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION AND ITS LATE PROCEEDINGS.

Among the many interesting and important subjects treated of in the writings of the New Church, few occupy a more conspicuous place than the subject of *uses*. The Lord's kingdom, we are taught, is a kingdom of uses, and every subject of that kingdom is, and must be, a form of use. The active life of heaven consists in the performance of good uses from a genuine affection ; and the angels have all their happiness from uses and according to uses. Every one in heaven is respected and loved according to the nature and extent of the use he performs, and the delight he finds in its performance. There, the faithful performance of good uses from love of the Lord and the neighbor, or from the love of use, is regarded as the highest worship ; for "the real worship of the Lord consists in the performance

of uses." Neither can charity towards the neighbor be exercised in any other way than in the performance of uses ; "for charity is nothing unless it manifest itself in works of charity, since it consists in exercise or *use*;" and "he who loves his neighbor as himself, never perceives the delight of charity except in its exercise ; wherefore a life of charity is a life of uses." So say the heavenly doctrine.

Now in the light of this heavenly teaching, it is plain enough that *use* is the true measure of a man, as it is the measure of an angel. We mean to say that this is the spiritual or heavenly standard by which we should estimate a man—viz., the *use* he performs in this world of ours. We should respect and love him, not for his bodily strength or dimensions, not for the dignity, comeliness, or fair proportions of his person, not for his wealth, power, age, official station, intellectual culture, or social refinement, but for the quality and extent of the *use* he performs. This is the "golden reed" which the angels apply in measuring or estimating a man ; and if we would act like the angels, we must apply the same. Nor is it sufficient—though this, indeed, is indispensable—that a man be merely in the *love* of some particular use, or that he be very busy and active about its performance ; he must also be in the *wisdom* needful to enlighten and guide that love, else his activity, being misdirected, will bring about results either of no value, or of far less value than might otherwise have been produced. And as with an individual, so with any body of individuals, who are but a larger man.

We cannot, then, be wrong in applying this heavenly standard of measure to any institution or organization of men, whether for civil, social, industrial, financial, literary, or religious purposes. It is right—nay, it is our duty—to look at the works or *uses* actually accomplished by such organization, and not at its size, its wealth, its dignity, its venerableness, or the number or character of the individuals composing it. We should judge it by the quality and ex-

tent of the *uses* it performs, and the wisdom and economy it exhibits in their performance.

Let us, then, briefly apply this authorized heavenly standard to "The General Convention of the New Church in the United States," whose Journal of Proceedings at its late annual meeting in Philadelphia, is now before us. Let us sum up the results of its last year's labors, as given in its official report—for these will show us both the nature and extent of the uses it has performed. And we *do* hope, that, for doing this, we shall not be charged with "making war on the Convention." We hope there exists enough of the spirit of the New Church in that body, to allow one briefly to sum up its annual doings, and even to make a few criticisms upon its peculiar organization, provided they be made, as we trust they will be, in the spirit of true charity. We are the more impelled to do this, because the Convention assumes to be *the* New Church in the United States, and seeks to be so known and acknowledged;* and because it shows a disposition to ignore the very existence of other New Church organizations in our country, having never given the slightest sign of brotherly love or respect for either of those sister institutions (the American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society, and the American New Church Association)—no, nor even a token of friendly recognition, since their organization.

First, What is the purpose for which the Convention exists? What works of charity does it intend to do? What are the *uses* which it contemplates? These are stated in the following vague and indefinite terms in the Preamble of the Convention's Constitution: "And they [members of that body] unite together for the purpose of promoting the

* The first article in the proposed new Constitution, brought forward in the printed report of a Committee of six ministers (including President Worcester), presented to the Convention at its late meeting, but not acted upon, is reported in the *New Church Herald* to be as follows: "*This Body shall be called the New Church in the United States of America;*" language revealing conclusively a settled purpose not to recognize any one in our country as belonging to the New Church, who does not belong to the body that calls itself "the General Convention."

establishment and extension of the Lord's kingdom on the earth, by learning and performing those uses, which appropriately belong to a general body of the Church." But the President, in his Address before the Convention, June, 1853, has been more explicit, and told us *what* "the most prominent" of these uses are, "which appropriately belong to a general body of the church," or to the Convention, otherwise designated in this Address as our "Spiritual Mother." We will briefly enumerate these general uses in the order in which they were stated by the President.

1. The "first duty" mentioned, is, "to receive, to preserve, and to communicate the Revelations which have been made to us by the Lord"—meaning by Revelations, as he afterwards explains, "the Sacred Scriptures," and "the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg," in their external or printed form.

2. The second duty of the Convention is, "to place these Revelations in proper depositories, and to print and publish them"—meaning, we presume, by "proper depositories," well-conducted public libraries.

3. Third, translating: "As these Revelations are all given in foreign languages, it is our duty to have them well translated."

4. Fourth, donating them where they will be useful: "Besides, we should give them without price, when spiritual charity and spiritual prudence find proper opportunities."

5. A fifth duty specified is "to provide such works," "besides those of Swedenborg," as "would be useful in defending and explaining the doctrines of the Church, and in adapting them to the successive states of men in relation to them." An entire page of the Address is devoted to the enforcement of this duty; and in the course of his remarks the President says; "Accordingly, if we, as a spiritual mother, are convinced that it would be useful to explain more fully the Revelations which our heavenly Father has made to his children, then we should assign the work to those who are capable of doing it well, and not leave it to be done by those who imagine themselves most capable."

6. Sixth : The publication of a Periodical. "One of the duties of the Convention is to publish a periodical magazine."

7. "Another duty of the Convention is to provide a Liturgy to be used by itself in its meetings, by associations, and by societies."

8. "Another duty which the Convention has always regarded as belonging to itself, is that of regulating its ministry. The importance of this duty can hardly be over-estimated."

9. Ninth : Educating young men for the ministry. "In connection with this duty [the last mentioned] is that of educating and preparing young men for the ministry."

These are all the duties of the Convention referred to by the President in his Address, and which he says are "the most prominent ones" that have occurred to him. We may, therefore, take the duties as here defined, to be the Convention's meaning of "those uses which appropriately belong to a general body of the Church;"—adding, what the President himself rather amusingly (if not ironically) adds in his Address of 1854, when he says: "To the above-mentioned uses it may be well to add another; namely, the use of ascertaining what are the proper uses of the Convention, and what are the proper means of accomplishing them." The amusing fact here confessed, is, that this body had existed in an organized form for *thirty-six years* without having learned for what *end* it existed—what its "proper uses" were, or what "the proper means of accomplishing them." This, we say, is somewhat amusing, because one of the first things which organized bodies generally do, is, to state definitely the *object* for which they are organized, or the *uses* which they contemplate. And if they *have* no definite and settled purpose, their action cannot be otherwise than aimless.

But most of the above uses contemplated by the Convention will be admitted by all New Churchmen to be good. Let

us now see what progress that body made towards the accomplishment of these uses during the past year, according to its own report of its doings.

Its Journal of Proceedings, including letters, reports, addresses, &c., is quite voluminous, occupying ninety-six closely printed octavo pages. The number of ministers and delegates present at its late meeting, is reported to have been sixty-six, of whom the single State of Massachusetts sent thirty-one—nearly half the whole number. The rest were from seven other different States. The imposing size of the Journal, and a hasty glance at the "Proceedings," might produce the impression upon some minds that the Convention has been very active, and has really accomplished a great deal during the past year. It *has* been active; but a critical examination of its doings, and a careful summing up of results, fails to convince us that its activity has been directed by the highest wisdom. Indeed, candor compels us to say—and we say it in the spirit of brotherly kindness and charity—that, considering the number belonging to the Convention, the amount of machinery employed, the money expended, and the evident activity of its multitude of officers and committees who constitute its working force, the solid and tangible results seem to us to make but a meagre show.

The Treasurer reports \$4,097 45, as the amount of funds received during the year from contributions, interest on legacies, &c.—including a cash balance in the Treasury, June 1, 1858, of \$236 69. A clever sum, and sufficient, if wisely applied, to accomplish many important uses.

Respecting the *first* use, as given above in the President's list of Conventional "duties," we find nothing reported as done during the last year.

Respecting use or "duty" No. 2, nothing is reported as done towards placing the Revelations we have received "in proper depositories." Not a single library appears to have been supplied by the Convention during the year, with a single volume of the Writings. But something has been

done in the way of "printing and publishing them." Editions—some of five hundred and some of one thousand copies—of some of the smaller works, viz., "Intercourse," &c., "Earths in the Universe," "Heavenly Doctrines," "Doctrine of the Lord," "Faith," "Scripture, Charity," and "Life," have been printed; also an edition of five hundred copies of "Heaven and Hell"—making in all about 695,000 pages, taking as the standard page the A. S. P. & P. Society's edition, and at an outlay of \$375 86. It has also stereotyped the Index to "Heaven and Hell," and the "Doctrine of Life" in German, at a cost of \$140 75. Now, while we are disposed to give the Convention due credit for this work, and especially for supplying our German brethren with editions in their own language, we are constrained to add that it is extremely meagre in amount, in view of the dimensions and pretensions of the body that did it. The pages of the Writings printed by the Convention during the year, are but little more than *half* the number printed by the American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society during the same time—this latter having printed 1,246,000 pages, as may be seen from the last Annual Report of its Board of Managers.

Of "duty" or use No. 3 in the above list—translating the Writings—we find nothing reported as done by the Convention during the past year.

Of "duty" No. 4—donating books—nothing appears to have been done by the Convention, unless the German works sent to Mr. Ragatz of Chicago, Mr. Brickman of Baltimore, and Mr. Türk of Berlin, C. W., may be set down to its credit. But we find no mention made of these in the disbursement of the Treasurer; and the Report says that the funds with which these works were purchased, "were raised by the voluntary contributions of several members," apparently for this specific purpose, and are not mentioned in the Treasurer's receipts. Neither are we told definitely how many or what works were thus donated, only that they were "collateral writings in German," and the larger por-

tion of "about four hundred volumes." But from the best information we have been able to gather, only a small proportion of these works were of such a size as to deserve the name of "*volumes*." Possibly the donations may have been altogether equal in quantity of matter to sixty or seventy volumes of "Heaven and Hell"—we should think not more.

Of "duty" No. 5—providing works "useful in defending and explaining the doctrines of the Church"—we do not find that anything has been done during the year, unless we reckon the "Centenary Addresses" of this character, of which an edition of five hundred copies is reported as published. But this volume does not satisfy the requirements of the President's language defining this "duty." It is not a work endorsed by the Convention, although published under its auspices. So far from it, the Convention, as if wishing to rid itself of all responsibility in regard to the doctrines taught in these "Addresses," took especial care to resolve that they "*should be regarded only as the individual views of their authors*," and to have this resolution printed at the very commencement of the volume. These "Addresses," then, although doubtless regarded as of a harmless character, are not to be considered as food which our "Spiritual Mother" has provided, or which she recommends to her children.

In respect to "duty" No. 6—the publication of a periodical—the Board of Publications report that the monthly organ of the Convention (the N. J. Magazine) has been continued at a loss of \$67.41—the receipts from subscriptions falling short of the expenses during the year by this amount. The Board also report the continuance of the "Messenger" at a loss of \$1,027.76—this being the amount that the receipts for that paper during the year fell short of its expenses. They also report "total loss on 'Messenger' and merchandize—\$1,187.39." By comparing the reported circulation of the N. J. Magazine a year ago with the late report, we find it to be less now than last year by 106,—777 being given as the entire circulation now, and 883 the circulation last year—although the Board tell us "there

has been a small increase of the subscribers"—a discrepancy which we are unable to explain. They also report \$1350 as the amount due from delinquent subscribers on the "N. J. Magazine," and \$1400 due on the "New Church Magazine for Children"—amounting in all to \$2750. This ought to show to all our friends the importance of the rule adopted by the A. N. C. Association of *payment in advance* for the "Swedenborgian." The "N. C. Magazine for Children," which is now the property of the Convention, has a circulation of 915, and more than pays expenses, or *would*, we presume, but for delinquent subscribers.

Of "duty" No. 7, nothing has been done except to print the new "Order of Worship presented at the last Convention," and an edition of 500 copies of the "Sabbath School Manual," a clever Liturgy for children, of 142 pages.

The Convention authorized Rev. J. R. Hibbard, of Chicago, to ordain Mr. John M. Hofer, of New Orleans. This is all we find reported as done during the year in the way of "regulating the Ministry"—"duty" No. 8.

Of "duty" No. 9—"educating and preparing young men for the Ministry"—nothing is reported to have been done for the past year. Neither does anything appear to have been done in regard to that additional duty to which the President invited the attention of the Convention in his Address of 1854—"the use of ascertaining what are the proper uses of the Convention, and what are the proper means of accomplishing them." From all that appears, therefore, the proper uses of the Convention have not yet been ascertained by that Body itself, nor the proper means of accomplishing them. In other words, the Convention, after existing as an organized body for forty years, is unable to say *for what purposes it exists, or what are the uses which it contemplates, and what the proper methods of performing them!* Can we wonder, therefore, that a Body, whose aims and methods are thus confessedly undetermined, should spend money not always in the wisest or most economical manner, or that the substantial results, annually wrought out,

should be so out of proportion to its claims, its size, its available means, and the amount of machinery brought into active operation?

The Convention has latterly shown itself favorably disposed towards "a system of colportage and missionary labors," and has for several years had a "Missionary and Colportage Committee" among its "Standing Committees;" and its "Committee on Ecclesiastical Affairs" have reported "that it would be of very great use for the Convention to support such a system, if judiciously devised, and wisely and effectively carried into operation." But the late report of its "Missionary and Colportage Committee" (consisting of only *eight lines*) informs us that the whole amount drawn from the Convention's Treasury and applied to these uses during the last year, is only \$123—being considerably less than one-half the amount appropriated to the same uses during the year by the American New Church Association—a body yet in its infancy, and whose very existence the "General Convention" does not deign to recognize.

Such is a brief summary of the real and tangible results wrought out during the year ending June 8, 1859, by the "General Convention"—a body now more than forty years old, and which seeks to be known and acknowledged as "*the New Church in the United States of America.*" And while we would by no means disparage these results—while we even rejoice that this little has been done—we ask, in all seriousness and kindness, if the results be proportionate to the age, pretensions, numerical strength, working force, and pecuniary resources of the Convention? Are they such results as might reasonably have been expected from the amount of the annual receipts reported by the Treasurer—\$4,097.45? Are they such as our brethren of the Convention themselves, or any sincere friends of the New Church, ought to be quite satisfied with? If not, then it is clearly our duty to institute an inquiry into the cause. Every New Churchman, especially every member of the Convention, should seek to know *why it is*, that, with such generous feel-

ings and good desires as are no doubt cherished by the individual members of that body, and with an annual expenditure of so much time, talent, labor and money, such comparatively meager results are exhibited. We apprehend, and in a future article we hope to show, that the chief cause of this is to be found in the peculiar organization or polity of the Convention. While its aims and methods are undetermined, and its officers and Committees are distributed in the manner they usually are—hundreds of miles apart—we see not how it is possible for that body to accomplish much, or to exhibit much wisdom, efficiency, or economy in the little it does accomplish.

We would simply add, in reference to this subject of Conventional doings, that, if it be right to measure an individual by the uses he performs—to respect and love him according to the nature and extent of his use—it surely cannot be wrong to apply to the “General Convention” the same just rule. And no one should shrink from any estimate of that Body, or acknowledge, even to himself, the injustice of any estimate, which is reached by a fair application of this heavenly standard.

Then there are some things in the late “Journal of Proceedings” which strike us unpleasantly. Take, for example, the following preamble and resolution, which, although “laid upon the table” by the Convention, were presented, we are told, by “Rev. Mr. Benade, from the Committee on Ecclesiastical Affairs,” whose chairman is the President himself.

“*Whereas*, the subject of the use of an official dress by ministers, when engaged in the performance of their ministerial duties, has much occupied the attention of ministers and societies in the church, and a desire has arisen on the part of several to introduce such a dress ; therefore—

“*Resolved*, That this Convention approves of the use of an official dress by ministers, when engaged in the performance of their ministerial duties.”

Now we confess ourselves rather friendly to an “official dress ;” but this bringing of such a subject seriously before the Convention with a view of obtaining its sanction

or permission, seems hardly worthy its "Committee on Ecclesiastical Affairs." It is giving to the subject an importance which does not belong to it. Why ask the Convention to "approve of an official dress?" Is not every minister already at liberty to adopt such a dress if he chooses, without the sanction of the Convention? And would such a dress be any more "orderly" or proper, if worn with, than if worn without, the Convention's approval? Would it sound well, or look well, for a minister to ask the Convention whether he may wear a black coat, or snuff-colored—a white cravat or brown—when in the pulpit? Why not leave all such unimportant and trivial matters for each minister and his society to settle in whatever manner they think proper? Why seek for such perfect uniformity in these external and non-essential things? As if the unity or welfare of the Lord's New Church is in any way dependent upon, or to be promoted by, an outward uniformity of this sort! Or as if *uniformity* in such matters were nearer to true and heavenly order, than *variety*! (See *H. H.* 56, 57.)

Neither can we commend the spirit which obviously dictated the omission of our own little town from the Convention's list of "Places containing Societies and Receivers" Every other town in the state of New Jersey where there are known to be any receivers—even if there be but a single individual—is carefully registered. But Orange—although it is the only town in the state in which a New Church minister resides, and although the society here is more than twice as large as any other New Church society in the state, and the attendance on our Sabbath worship more than five times as large—is carefully omitted. Attention was publicly called to this omission a year ago, in the columns of our Magazine; so that the supposition of a possible mistake or oversight is inadmissible. It is pretty generally known that none of the receivers in our town sympathize with the peculiar polity of the "General Convention;" so the Convention omits, in its list of "places containing receivers," the town of Orange, there being no one here, we

suppose, whom it can recognize as a "receiver!" Well:—we hope to live to see that body exhibit a larger and better spirit,—one more akin to that which rules in heaven.

We regret also that the Convention should in any way appear to countenance the use of unkind and discourteous language in reference to other religious organizations. The Methodist Church of our country has its rules of order and of discipline, and has, we submit, the same right to them as the "General Convention" has to its rules. And when a minister of the Methodist Church reads and believes the writings of Swedenborg, but *creates disturbance* by circulating these writings among his Methodist brethren, it is proper and orderly that he should be called to account for his conduct. Nay, it is quite proper, and according to Swedenborg's own teachings, that he should be separated. And it is therefore wrong, in our judgment,—it is uncharitable, unchristian, and discourteous, for such individual to characterize the church that is only seeking faithfully and honestly to carry out its own rules of discipline, as "this assembled Sanhedrim of Scribes and Pharisees." Yet this is the language applied to a properly constituted Methodist tribunal, by one duly summoned to appear before it and account for his violation of its rules of discipline, and who is about to be ordained as a minister of the "General Convention." And, for anything that appears to the contrary, this language is approved of by the Convention. Oh! when shall we realize that charity is no charity save as it is exhibited *in our words and actions!* And when shall we learn to speak of and to treat other religious organizations—all, indeed, who differ from us—with something like Christian kindness, courtesy and respect! May the Lord in his mercy hasten that time!

B.

CORRESPONDENCE.

WE are much gratified at the cordial reception with which our letters to Mr. Beecher have been received, and the very favorable terms in which they have been spoken of, not only by our New Church brethren, but by some intelligent people in Mr. Beecher's own denomination. We cannot but hope that the Lord will graciously enable us so to unfold and present His truth on this great subject as to impress many candid and serious minds who may read these letters, and so help to bring them ultimately to the glad and glorious light of that city "which hath no need of the sun neither of the moon to shine in it, for the glory of God doth lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof." We thank our friends, one and all, for the kind and encouraging words they have sent us; and as *use* is the end for which we write, and as these "Letters" are chiefly intended for our Orthodox brethren—for such of them, we mean, as are free enough, and liberally enough disposed, to read them—we would suggest that such of our subscribers as feel so inclined, may help us in the performance of this use in the way that some have done already, as will appear from the following extracts from letters lately received. A subscriber writing us from Dubuque, Iowa, says:

"Please find herein the subscription for six extra copies of your Magazine, from July to January, 1860, for distribution. I want these copies containing your letters to Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, for circulation among some of his many admirers (and they are truly *very many*) who are, perhaps, entire strangers to the New Church doctrine of the Trinity. My July number of the *Swedenborgian* has been read and re-read until I am satisfied no greater use can be performed with the same amount of money, than to increase my subscription for the present volume a half dozen additional copies."

Another subscriber, writing from one of the New England States, under date of August 1st, says:

"Enclosed is \$1.00 for the *Swedenborgian*, commencing with the July Number—which you will please send to Mr. ———, care of ———, ———."

"I have been a reader of the *Swedenborgian* since its commencement,—have watched its growth with unabated interest, and in my opinion it stands at the *head* of all the New Church periodicals. Your letters to Rev. Henry Ward Beecher on the 'Divine Trinity,' commencing with the July Number of the present Volume, cannot fail to excite the attention of every intelligent and liberal mind who is really seeking to know the truth; and it seems to me it would be well for each of your regular subscribers to add one, two or more copies to their list, to

distribute among their Orthodox friends—showing clearly, as these letters do, the error of the doctrine of ‘three *Persons*’ at the same time so clearly pointing out the consistency, harmony and beauty of the New doctrine on this subject. May you prosper in your good work, scattering seed here and there to spring up and bear fruit an hundred fold.’

Other letters from New Church brethren, equally kind and encouraging, have been received, but which it is unnecessary to publish—though we tender our hearty thanks to each and all, assuring them that their friendly words are precious to us, and such as we hope will enable us in future to do better service for the Divine Master. But we have received one letter from a distinguished and highly esteemed member of an Orthodox church (nor is this the only letter of thanks lately sent us from that quarter), which has afforded us so much pleasure, and which we know our readers will enjoy not less than we have, that we have obtained the author’s permission to publish it entire, suppressing only his name and place of residence, and giving in place of the former, “an ordained Elder in the Presbyterian Church”—a signature authorized by himself. We would add that this gentleman has not hitherto been a subscriber to the *Swedenborgian*, but has enjoyed the reading of it through the kindness of a friend. If every subscriber, cherishing an earnest desire to aid his Master’s cause according to his ability, would seek out one or more among his orthodox friends, who would read these letters to Mr. Beecher if politely requested to do so, and if the volume were subscribed for on his or their account, we cannot doubt but much good might be accomplished through this humble instrumentality, and at a trifling expense. Perhaps our subscribers will watch “the movings of the spirit” in this direction, and heed its friendly intimations.—But here is the letter from our excellent and candid Presbyterian brother, which cannot fail to be read with lively interest.

— August 5th, 1859.

Rev. B. F. Barrett:

DEAR SIR :—Will you allow one who claims not to be a theologian, or even to be able to define with any considerable degree of accuracy the doctrinals which mark the different schools of Old and New, to express the very great gratification he has received from the perusal of your Letters to Rev. H. W. Beecher contained in the numbers of the *Swedenborgian* for July and August, on the subject of the Divine Trinity. Even these first letters seem to throw a flood of light upon this, hitherto regarded, dark and mysterious subject, and to open a door by which the true Christian, although restored but in part to the

“similitude of God” may find a much nearer access to his heavenly Father, than heretofore under the commonly received view—and in some degree “see Him as He is.”

Although the writer is not connected with the ecclesiastical body denominated the “New Church,” he sympathizes deeply in the views you have so clearly expressed; and he has reason to know that there are many persons in connection with the Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, and other Churches, to whom they will be equally acceptable and enlightening. Take courage, then, dear sir, go forward, and accept the thanks of

AN ORDAINED ELDER IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

We give below so much of our English brother’s communication as contains the points objected to in the article criticized—together with Mr. Fernald’s reply, which we trust will prove satisfactory. The larger portion of our friend’s communication is omitted, because we do not think it adds anything to the force of the objection as here presented, and therefore seems unnecessary. But if there still remains, to his mind unanswered, any difficulty on the point in question, we shall be happy to hear from him again on the subject. We conclude that Mr. Fernald’s meaning in the article referred to, was misapprehended by our correspondent.

INQUIRIES RESPECTING THE HEREDITARY PRINCIPLE.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, ENGLAND.

MR. EDITOR:—In the May number of your Magazine, the first paper is on “Divine Providence in Earthly and Heavenly Riches;” by Rev. W. M. Fernald.

Of the general scope of the article, we have nothing to say, except that there are many beautiful thoughts expressed, and doubtless, in the next portion of the paper our friend will have well elucidated his subject. Incidentally to the general argument, however, at page 272, the following thoughts occur.

“If the simple distinction had been made among theologians between hereditary sin and hereditary organization, everybody would have understood it. Yet this is a most wise law—this law of hereditary descent: for as before observed, it is the same law which transmits all the good and all the evil. It is one law which makes both heaven and hell. Obeyed, it is the acquisition and perpetuity of all good: disobeyed, of all evil. Therefore it must remain, and therefore individuals must suffer for the sins of others.—The hope is, however, nay, the faith and Divine assurance are, that this train of hereditary evil shall one day be broken—that the time shall come when children shall be born into this world, *without* any hereditary evil—that the power of regeneration shall be so in the ascendant, that it shall no longer be said in any sense, ‘The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge;’ for there shall be nothing of evil in the child’s hereditary for him to appropriate.”

We felt the strain of thought in this quotation to run counter with our impressions as received from Swedenborg ;

First, because the Word is Divine, and therefore the sense of the above passage can never be obliterated ;

Second, because we understand Swedenborg to say that, "there is no such thing as hereditary good," and that the (evil) "hereditary principle of the father (in man's case) can never be regenerated to eternity." Consequently,

Third: It cannot be the same law which transmits both good and evil.—* * * * *

R. C.

MR. FERNALD'S REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

As to the matter of hereditary good, which is so plainly denied here, it is unaccountable to us how any New Churchman or any other person could possibly take this position, in face of fact and truth everywhere apparent. What is plainer than that both the good and evil qualities of parents descend to their children? I was speaking simply of *natural good*. And is it not a truth, and a great and valuable truth, that by living rightly—according to the laws of God—we not only reap the advantages ourselves, but our children also are born into the world with better constitutions, with less and less hereditary evil, and more and more tendency to good? And so on to all generations—thus giving the possibility of finally securing an *entire good*—when "in those days they shall no more say, The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge," but the whole human race may be born of pure material, and this great curse of sin be stayed upon the earth. I quoted this passage of the Word because it is there, and because I suppose it will one day come to be, that the contrary is "not true in *any sense*."

But this will not, as our author suggests, do away with the necessity of regeneration; man would have needed to become regenerate if he had never sinned; that is to say, his natural good would have required to be made spiritual; but the difference would be, regeneration would then have taken place *without conflict* and without combat, passing from one degree of spiritual truth and good to another, by an easy and gradual process in the soul. So, I suppose, it will be in the future when all children may be born without evil.

But if any thing more were necessary on this subject, it may be sufficient to quote the following passage from Swedenborg.

"Natural good, or what is innate with man, is in its kind four-fold, viz., natural good grounded in the love of good, natural good grounded in the love of truth, also natural good grounded in the love of evil, and

natural good grounded in the love of what is false; for the good into which man is born is derived to him from his parents, either father or mother; for whatever principle parents have contracted by frequent use or habit, or have been tinged with by actual life, so as to render it familiar to them till it has the appearance of being natural, this is derived down to their children, and becomes hereditary."—*A. C.* 3469.

As to the evil from the father never becoming eradicated to all eternity, I can only say this: such evil, if it so remains, must be either quiescent or active. It cannot be active, commonly speaking, in the angels of heaven; it must therefore be quiescent, and this is no more than is said of any other evil. What can it be but a certain *peculium* or *proprium* which may be broken or bent by regeneration, and most thoroughly subdued, yet still giving somewhat of character to the angel, and which regeneration may lessen and lessen forever? In another place it is said it "*cannot easily be eradicated,*" *A. C.* 4317. But whatever it be, it alters not materially the point in debate, as I was speaking of natural good, which is certainly hereditary, and which may finally come to be tinged with nothing of evil in the malignant sense, by the same law, so far as *this* is concerned, as that which transmits all the good. For it is a poor rule that won't work both ways.

W. M. F.

LITERARY NOTICES.

Dissertations on the Regenerate Life. By JAMES ARBOUIN, Esq. First complete American Edition. Savannah: Edward J. Purse, Publisher. Boston: Otis Clapp. 1859. pp. 172.—All who have read these excellent Dissertations will be glad to hear of this new American edition; and we advise all who have *not* read them, to procure a copy without delay. The work is of an eminently *practica* character, tending directly to elevate the understanding and improve the heart—to exhibit some of the inner glories of the Divine Word, and show the nature as well as the need of a regenerate life, and the steps by which alone that life can be attained. It consists of about forty chapters upon important spiritual themes, such as "Charity," "The Divine Providence," "The Lord's Prayer," "Necessity of acquiring a mild and gentle spirit," "The power of retaining truth," "The delights and progress of Religion," "Self-Examination," "The happiness of a state of Order," "Association of Angels with Men," "The Love of God and our Neighbor," &c.—all treated in an easy, attractive and graceful manner, calculated at once to convince the understanding and impress the heart. It is an excellent work to place in the hands of a friend re-

ligiously inclined, and not much acquainted with the heavenly doctrines—
—a work which no one, indeed, can read without profit. We cherish the hope, modestly expressed by the author in his Preface, “that some persons may be led by these scattered rays to the fountain of light from whence they were originally derived—the theological writings of Emanuel Swedenborg;” for these, more than any other uninspired writings, lead the mind directly to Him who is the Light of life.

Cranston House. A Novel. By Mrs. H. A. Ropes. Boston, Otis Clapp. 1859.

This is a novel which we can commend to the New Church public, as well as to all others. It is written from a high stand-point of life and experience, and is of sufficient interest to arouse the attention and inform the heart. The pictures of life here given are not overwrought, and have a naturalness which commends them to all lovers of the true and beautiful. One may very easily perceive that the writer of this story has dipped her pen largely into the fountains of experience, where it will be found that “the beauty and fit proportion” of much that is lovely and graceful in character, “upon which is placed the signet of immortality, is wrought in the furnace of human affliction.” The characters of Aunt Mary and Cousin Sallie, and Max Wortemborg, are particularly well wrought, and their fate is very interesting. We can commend this novel with perfect safety to the friends of the Church, as having nothing in it injurious to morals, but much that is interesting, edifying, and uplifting. We are glad to see stories of this kind multiplying. It is written with marked ability, and with a high purpose, by a well known member of the New Church, and we hope it will have a large circulation.

W. M. F.

First Religious Lessons for Little Children.—This is the title of a little work prepared by Rev. Samuel H. Worcester, of Baltimore, and published by request of the Maryland Association of the New Church. It is designed to aid the parent and teacher in the religious instruction of very young children, by suggesting a simple and easy method of engaging them in conversation upon religious subjects. When we consider how important to the future spiritual welfare of the child are the first few years of its existence, and the remains that are then stored up, we feel that every additional help in the great work of education should meet with a cordial reception. The book suggests an easy mode of imparting to very young children some valuable religious instruction. We are happy to learn that a German translation of it has also been published.