

THE
SWEDENBORGIAN:

A NEW-CHURCH MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV.]

MAY, 1860.

[No. 5.

THE PROFESSED AND THE TRUE FOLLOWERS.

BY THE EDITOR.

“Now when Jesus saw many multitudes about Him, He gave commandment to depart unto the other side. And a certain scribe came and said unto Him, Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest. And Jesus saith unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head.”—*Matt* viii. 18, 19, 20.

The deeds which our Lord performed when on earth as well as the words He spake, all have a profound spiritual significance. They are all full of heavenly instruction—all instinct with the divine spirit and life. What He did in the sphere of nature, corresponded to what He was then and has ever since been doing in the sphere within and above nature—in the higher and nobler realms of spirit. He healed the sick, gave sight to the blind and hearing to the deaf, made the dumb to speak and the lame to walk, and raised even the dead to life. Now, He performs upon the souls of men operations not less wonderful—operations which correspond to, and are therefore signified by, the miracles He then wrought upon their bodies.

All his deeds, therefore, the same as all his words, have a spiritual and eternal meaning. Seeing that they were all prompted by Infinite Love, they must needs all be filled with Infinite Wisdom. It could not be otherwise, since He, as to his internal, was Love itself and Wisdom itself—the Infinite and only God.

Men commit a great mistake, therefore, in supposing that when they understand the naked facts as observed by the immediate followers of the Lord when on earth, or as elicited from the Gospels now by means of grammar and lexicon, they know all the truth infolded there. As well might we suppose that the whole science of anatomy could be learned by an ocular survey of the human body undissected, or that a glance at the outside of animals, plants and trees were sufficient to enable us to see and comprehend the wonderful mechanism of their structure, and the still more wonderful springs and workings of the life that moulds and moves them.

No. It is with the Word precisely as it is with the works of God. Some truth—very important, nay, essential, and answering to man's more immediate wants—lies upon the surface; but mingled with it there, lie also many fallacious appearances—things that are not as they seem to be. Its greatest wonders—the richest gems and purest gold—lie deep within.

Our text contains, in the literal sense, merely a record of some facts which were natural, temporary and local; but these natural facts, like all the works of God, infold truths which are spiritual, eternal and universal—truths applicable to the spirits of men at all times and in all places. What is the spiritual instruction infolded in these words of the Lord? For we are assured that His words are spirit and life; and this is what we, as spiritual and immortal beings, stand most in need of. “The

flesh"—that is, the bare cortex of the letter—"profiteth nothing." This (the spirit) is what alone can supply food and nourishment to our souls. "It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

"Now when Jesus saw great multitudes about Him, He gave commandment to depart unto the other side." It was at Capernaum in Galilee, on the western side of the sea of Tiberias, where this commandment was given. All places mentioned in Scripture correspond to states of the mind. And this place, being some distance from Jerusalem and north of it, denotes a cold, natural, external state—a state remote from that of the true church signified by Jerusalem—an unregenerate or gentile state. The *great multitudes* whom Jesus saw about Him, were, for the most part, persons who had come together from mere motives of curiosity, or from the natural desire of *seeing* One, about whom there was so much said—and not from any serious thought or desire of becoming his disciples. These multitudes, therefore, represented that large class of persons who desire truth, and are led to it, from a merely natural love of knowledge; for even natural men desire truth, because they know it will add to their personal importance, and give them power and influence over others. It is such desire or love in which there is more or less of selfishness, that generally leads men to the truth in the first instance. Most persons, perhaps, are led at first to the truths of the New Jerusalem by some such love as this. They have a desire to know something of these truths about which so much is beginning to be said, but they think little or nothing about doing them. Thus they are led in the first instance to look upon the Lord as now revealed, from a natural desire or curiosity *to see* Him, without any thought of becoming his disciples. And many,

when the truth has been shown them, and their curiosity has been gratified, will turn away from it in utter unbelief that it is from the Lord out of heaven, as the multitudes turned away from Jesus at his first advent, and refused to believe that He was the Messiah.

To these great multitudes who are led at first by some natural love—some intellectual craving—to the truths of the New Dispensation, the Divine Love, signified by *Jesus*, is now and ever giving commandment *to depart unto the other side*. The Lord gives this commandment, and gives men the power to receive and obey it, because He cannot impart to them the loves and delights of heaven as He desires to, unless they do obey it. *To depart unto the other side*, according to the natural sense of the expression, was to cross the sea of Tiberias; and this required them to go in an easterly direction from Capernaum. Now the *East* denotes the Lord—also the celestial things appertaining to neighborly love from the Lord. Therefore to travel *east* from Capernaum represented the soul's progress towards the Lord, or towards a state of disinterested neighborly love. But there is the sea of Tiberias which must needs be crossed. *Tiberias* means *a separating or breaking asunder*. In the present instance it denotes that which separates between truth seen and understood, or mere barren knowledge on the one hand, and truth loved and obeyed, or a life of practical piety and usefulness on the other. To cross to the other side of this sea, therefore, is to pass from the former to the latter of these states—to pass from a state of cold and dead intellectualism, to one of warm and living charity. And let no one look for a smooth or easy voyage across this sea. Let him expect to encounter here dark clouds and threatening skies—many and bitter storms and tempests—boisterous winds and fearful waves.

“And a certain scribe came and said unto Him, Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.” The *scribes* were the Jewish teachers, learned men, doctors of the law, expounders of the Scripture and of traditions. In short they were the Jewish theologians, and from the sect of the Pharisees. They were men puffed up with the conceit of superior wisdom—proud, arrogant self-righteous and hypocritical. None ever surpassed them in religious observances, ostentatious professions of piety, and an outward show of devotion and sanctity. But their hearts were strangers to the true worship. They had no genuine love of goodness or truth. Filled with the conceit of their own righteousness, the Son of Man had not where to lay his head in their souls. Hence it is written, “Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.” And again the Lord saith: “Woe unto you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites! For ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men’s bones and all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.”

Such was the character of the Jewish scribes generally, and of the one mentioned in the text. And they represented the general character of the Jewish Church. That church professed the greatest love and devotion to God. They professed a profound reverence for the Scriptures, and a disposition to keep the covenant of Jehovah, while they had, in reality, no genuine love of the truth, and lived in the most flagrant violation of the divine precepts. They drew nigh unto God with their mouths and honored Him with their lips, while their hearts were far from Him. They expected the Messiah—were even looking, waiting,

and praying for his advent, before, and at the time He came. But they expected a Messiah who would flatter their selfish loves, who would gratify their pride and worldly ambition, and confirm them in the belief that they were beloved of God above all other people. They expected a mighty prince and warrior who should deliver them from Roman bondage, and make them victorious over all the nations upon earth.

Such was the Messiah whom the Jews believed in and expected, because such an one they desired ; for it is always easy for men to believe what they desire to have true. Such indeed was the Messiah whose advent the prophets, according to the gross and carnal conceptions of the Jews, had foretold. And such an one they would willingly have received and gladly followed. But the true Messiah—so different in character and conduct from the one they expected—who, instead of flattering, wounded their pride—instead of confirming, contradicted their selfish expectations—who condemned them as hypocrites and impious violators of God's covenant—who pronounced against them the most terrible woes, declaring that the kingdom of God should be taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof—such a Messiah they were not prepared to receive or to follow.

While with their lips, therefore, they professed a willingness to follow the Lord whithersoever He might go, in their hearts there was a settled determination not to follow Him at all, unless He would be to them what they desired Him to be, do for them what they desired Him to do, and go whithersoever they desired Him to go.

So was it with the scribe mentioned in our text, who represented the Jewish Church generally. He came to Jesus in an obsequious manner, professing to regard Him as a teacher, and to be willing to follow Him. Perhaps

he really imagined that he was willing ; but then he supposed the Lord would go where, and be what, and do what the Jews were expecting of their promised Messiah. He doubtless expected that he himself would be rewarded for his superior devotion by some distinguished and lucrative office in his Kingdom. When, therefore, he said : *Teacher, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest*, his real meaning was, “ Justify the expectations of the Jews concerning Messiah—confirm them in their exalted opinion of themselves—confer upon them that worldly power and greatness which they lust after and are looking for at the hand of the promised Saviour—lead us Jews whither we desire and expect to be led—to supreme dominion over all other nations—and we will follow thee. Thus was this scribe, in his heart, assuming to be himself the teacher and guide, and dictating to the Lord where He should go, and what He should do ; and promising that, upon the condition of His obeying, he would follow Him. So, while professing with his lips to look upon the Lord Jesus as the great Teacher, and a willingness to follow Him, in reality he was looking only to himself and his own preconceived notions, and was willing to follow only where his self-love, and the intelligence therein originating, might lead or point the way. So artful are the thoughts and feelings of the natural man, that they can assume any disguise which may suit their convenience, and tend to promote their purposes.

And think not that the class of persons whom the scribe mentioned in our text represented, was confined to the Jewish Church. By no means. They are to be found in great numbers among Christians also. For multitudes of professing Christians in our day pray often—pray fervently—for a higher enlightenment. They pray for a fuller and clearer manifestation of the divine truth. And many,

no doubt, imagine that their hearts really desire what their lips so fervently implore. Yet how few of all this number are willing to receive as truth—how few are willing even to examine—anything that conflicts with their present beliefs, though revealed by the Lord from heaven! While their lips devoutly pray for more and higher truth, their hearts are really asking that God will only confirm them more and more in their present views of truth;—that He will cause that which they have already accepted for the truth, to appear more manifestly true. And if they go to the Word, they go rather to find in it fresh confirmations of their preconceived opinions, than to learn what Infinite Wisdom really teaches there. And if it be shown them that the Scripture does not teach the doctrines they profess, but something quite different and far more beautiful, they will close their minds against its teaching, and refuse to accept or follow it. They who do thus, act as insanely as one, who, seeing distant objects by the dim and shadowy light of the moon or stars, imagines them to be quite other than they really are; and who, when the great orb of day arises, will shut their eyes against his all-revealing light, because it fails to confirm their previous imaginings.

The Christian church generally has lived in expectation of a second coming of the Lord. Multitudes during the last twenty years have been anxiously looking and earnestly praying for his advent. And undoubtedly they imagine that they stand all ready to welcome Him the moment He comes, and to obey his mandate, or follow Him whithersoever He may go. This they profess with their lips. But Oh! how different is the language of their hearts! For they expect Him to come in the manner described in the literal sense of the prophecy that foretells his second appearing—precisely the mistake of those who looked

for his first advent. They expect Him to appear in person upon the clouds visible to men's natural eyes. Like little children, who imagine that the clouds which float above their heads belong not to the earth, but to the sun whose face they hide, so Christians have attributed to the Lord himself those sensuous appearances of truth which hang like clouds over the face of the angelic heavens and the Spiritual Sun that illumines it, but which in reality belong to their own minds. Carrying their low and sensuous ideas of truth to the Word, they have no difficulty in making its teachings square with their own carnal conceptions of the nature and manner of the second advent.

But the Lord, for whose second coming Christians have been so anxiously looking, has already come. As once He stood among the Jews in the majesty of his own Divine Person, and they knew Him not, so now He stands among Christians, unknown and unacknowledged, in the transcendent majesty of spiritual truth from his own Divine Word. He has come, and is perpetually *coming*, like the light of the morning, and manifesting Himself to all who have eyes to see Him. He has come in the brightness and glory of the precious truths revealed for the New Church—in the light of the New Jerusalem; for of the Holy City it is said: "The glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof."

Tell those who are anxiously waiting the Lord's appearing, that here He is—that here is the fulfillment of the promise concerning his second advent, and how few are willing to believe it! How few are prepared to accept the truth which the Lord has revealed concerning Himself and his kingdom, or to follow where that truth leads? Christians are not willing to receive the Lord, or to be taught by Him, or to follow Him whithersoever He goes, because He does not come in the form and manner they had vain-

ly imagined—nor do and teach what they desire to have Him. Many see nothing beautiful, nothing lovely, nothing desirable, in the truths of the New Dispensation ; therefore they turn from and reject them. As it is written : “ He hath no form nor comeliness ; and when we shall see Him, there is no beauty that we should desire Him. He is despised and rejected of men.” So was it at the time of the first advent. The Jews, though anxiously awaiting the Messiah, refused to receive Him when He came, because He came not in the manner they had imagined. And precisely so is it now, when the promise concerning his second advent is fulfilled.

When, therefore, Christians in our day pray fervently with their lips for the second appearing of the Lord, the language of their hearts too often is, “ But justify our anticipations concerning thy advent—come in the manner that we expect and desire thee to come, else we will not receive thee. Be what we expect thee to be, teach us what we expect thee to teach, and go whither we expect thee to go, else we have no desire for thy advent, and will not follow thee nor acknowledge thee for our Teacher and Guide. So vain and foolish is the heart of the unregenerate man ! It is ever inclined to mark out a path for Infinite Wisdom to walk in ; and having made that path such as is agreeable to its own weak and false conceptions, it professes great readiness to walk therein, and thinks that, in so doing, it follows the Lord.

Nor let us, who accept intellectually the Lord as He has revealed Himself in this his second advent, imagine that this text has no application to ourselves. This would be a fatal mistake, indeed. So far from it, it is applicable to us in a higher sense than to Jews or to other Christians, and in a sense more difficult to observe.

We acknowledge our belief in the second advent of

the Lord. We accept it as an event already accomplished. We receive the doctrines of the New Church as a fuller and brighter revelation of our Father in the heavens, and of the things pertaining to his kingdom. We commend these doctrines with our lips, are earnest in our advocacy of them, and zealous in our efforts to make others see and acknowledge their truth. We print and circulate books and tracts, we build churches, we support missionaries and colporters; and in these and various other ways, we declare before the world our faith in the heavenly doctrines and our willingness to follow where they lead. We each one of us virtually say to the Lord as herein revealed, "Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest." Alas! how much easier is it to follow the Lord with the understanding than with the heart! How much easier to think right than to do right! How much easier to believe and even to *preach* the truth, than to *live* the truth! Yet this following the Lord with the head is nothing, if we do not at the same time follow Him with the heart. The Master goes in the way that his truth points out—in a way oftentimes dark and dreary to our obscure vision—in a way hedged around with difficulties and bestrewed with thorns—in the way of self-denial, and self-humiliation, and self-conflict, and self-crucifixion. And in this rough and thorny way must we all go, if we would be his true and worthy followers. "He that taketh not his cross," He saith, "and followeth after me, is not worthy of me."

Yes: when we acknowledge the heavenly doctrines, we virtually promise to follow the Lord as herein revealed whithersoever He goeth. *Whithersoever?* Oh, how much is involved in the spiritual sense of this single word! Nothing less than the soul's entire journey from Egypt to Canaan!—all those acts of self-denial, and for-

bearance, and generosity—all those terrible temptation combats and inward conflicts with the hosts of hell, whereby the heart is made rich in all graces of love and depths of tenderness and stores of patience and breathings of mercy and outgoings of benevolence, filled with all voices of noble affections, which, harmoniously blending, make life choral with goodness. Follow the footsteps of the Master as now revealed, in all the various walks of life. He goeth where the heavenly doctrines lead, for these doctrines are all from Him—are a more full unfolding of his own Word, which is Himself. They reveal to us depths of evil in the soul never before dreamed of. They unveil the natural human heart, and exhibit it in all its loathsome deformity. They show it to be by inheritance supremely selfish—“a hold of every foul spirit, and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird.” They teach us that, before regeneration we are in bondage to infernal spirits; and that the love of self and the world, or the kingdom of hell in the heart, must be overthrown, before the love of the Lord and the neighbor, or the kingdom of heaven can be established there. They teach us that religion—true religion—is no mere outward appendage or ornament to be worn on the Sabbath, at church, or at the prayer-meeting, and to be laid aside on week-days as if too sacred to mingle with secular affairs; but that it is an intensely practical thing, to be borne about with us everywhere, making our common and every-day life fragrant and rich with blessings;—that it consists in the exercise of kindness, forbearance, generosity, self-denial, tenderness, sympathy and love in our families—in sincerity, truth, and justice in our shops and counting-rooms—in fealty to the demands of duty and obedience to the great laws of Christian charity in all the walks and relations of life.

Thither is the way the Divine Master leads in the truths of the New Dispensation—a toilsome, self-denying, cross-bearing way—a way the very reverse of that which self-love leads—but conducting surely to the realms of bliss. We scarcely think of this way when we first begin to learn the heavenly doctrines, the demands of the intellect are so completely gratified. But if we walk not in this way—the way the heavenly doctrines lead—after we have been brought to acknowledge our faith in them, then are we of the number of those represented by the scribe in our text; for while virtually saying with our lips, “Teacher, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest,” our hearts and lives utter quite a different language. We follow the promptings of self-love, and not the footsteps of the great Teacher.

And so far as we look to self, and take counsel of our self-love, and suffer ourselves, in the ordinary affairs of our daily life, to be controlled and guided by the thoughts therein originating, be our *profession* what it may, the Lord in his Divine Humanity does not and cannot abide within us. His Word, which is Himself, hath really no home—no lodging-place in our hearts. As saith the Divine Wisdom to the scribe in our text, “The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.” Nothing is so cunning as self-love and the propensities therein originating. It is ever ready with a thousand arguments to persuade us, that, whatever is most agreeable to itself is proper and right. It knows a thousand ways—all so cunning—by which to blind the reason, deaden the conscience, and so make the light that is within us darkness. See how it works sometimes in ambitious priests and wily politicians, in grasping merchants and greedy brokers and lynx-eyed lawyers—nay, in all the walks and ways of men! The

selfish propensities of the natural man are everywhere and always plotting some ingenious device—meditating some crafty scheme by which to attain their own gratification ; and this they do with consummate cunning even after we profess a willingness to follow the Lord, and perhaps have really begun to do so. These are the *foxes*—spiritual foxes. And their *holes* are their places of concealment—the places where they escape the light and scrutiny of whatever of the kingdom of heaven there is within us ;—the various fair appearances, and plausible pretexts, and ingenious subterfuges, under which the selfish propensities of the unregenerate heart evermore seek to shelter and hide themselves. *The birds of the air* are the thoughts of the understanding ; for birds signify thoughts and reasonings. In the present instance they denote the thoughts and reasonings of the natural man, which all originate in the love of self, and continually aspire to self-exaltation and self-aggrandizement. And their *nests* denote the home of such thoughts—the place where they are permitted to lay their eggs and hatch—where they remain unvisited by any intrusive messenger from heaven—where they rest undisturbed, are quietly brooded over and fondly cherished, and so beget in the mind brood after brood of similar thoughts. *The Son of Man* denotes the Lord in respect to the Word, or Divine Truth. This truth is full of pure, perfect and disinterested love ; for the Lord's own life dwells in it as its animating soul. It is all from love and leads to love ; for it is from the Lord and leads to Him. It hath no home, therefore, in a fallen and degraded humanity—no abode among the scribes—no resting-place in the unregenerate human mind. For it cannot dwell in an atmosphere of pollution. It cannot abide in the heart that is full of cunning propensities and ambitious thoughts, all originating in the love of self. In such a mind, “ the

foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head."

The head of the Son of Man is the divine love embosomed in the divine truth. This love the Lord longs to give us, that we may enjoy its heavenly delights. He longs to come and make his abode in our souls. He yearns with unspeakable tenderness to pillow his head on our bosoms; for only in this way can he give us rest. But we must prepare for Him a place of reception. We must let our righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and pharisees. We must be not merely hearers and learners, but faithful *doers*, of the truth. We must follow the Lord with our hearts, and not merely with our heads. We must follow Him in health and in sickness, in prosperity and in adversity, in the family and in the market, in our business and our pleasures, and in all our intercourse with men. Otherwise, whatever we may profess, these solemn and significant words, "the foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head," will have their fulfillment in our own souls.

WHERE AND WHAT IS THE EXTERNAL CHURCH?

I have read with great pleasure the plain and luminous article by Mr. Hiller, published in the February number of the *Swedenborgian*, on the question, "Is the Convention a Church?" There is a simplicity and force, in this gentleman's arguments—a candor and precision appealing to our common sense—which to my own mind seems irresistible. He appears to have completely established the proposition he undertook to prove. He has demonstrated with

logical precision that the Convention is not a Church; and his whole argument would seem to rest on the simple affirmation, which all must admit to be true, that none but the Lord can tell who is in the reception of love and faith, or of goodness and truth. We may say in the abstract, he affirms, that the Church is composed of persons receptive of these qualities; but it is impossible for any of us to lay our hands on those persons, or to identify them by any outward marks of incontestible evidence. This argument we take to be sound and irresistible; and it has led to certain queries in our own mind, which we beg leave to present, accompanied by such remarks as have suggested themselves to us on the whole subject. These queries may be propounded in the following order:

1st. Is it possible that an external Church can exist at present, possessing anything more than an arrogated or assumed authority?

2d. Will there ever be a time when the teachings and discipline of the Church may be implicitly relied on?

3d. Will not the power of the Church in all ages, and under all its progressive changes, be advisory rather than authoritative?

1. In regard to the first of these questions, we answer it without hesitation in the negative. From all that we have heard and read on the subject—from all that we have been able to learn and observe of the social and individual character of the members of the Church—from all that others have admitted in relation to this matter—we are constrained to believe that there is no body of persons at present in the visible Church, either large or small, who could attempt to exercise an imperative dictatorship, even in regard to subjects of mere external and subordinate importance, without arrogating to themselves an authority which does not legitimately belong to them. Our deliberate

opinion is, that the Church is nowhere in a sufficiently advanced and regenerate state to attempt the exercise of an authority so momentous and questionable as the one we have named. There is no warrant for such an exercise of authority either in the writings of the Church, or in the lives of those who profess to revere and follow the doctrines which those writings teach. Its attempted exercise has been attended with all that equivocation and inconsistency which are usually incident to secular usurpations. It has repudiated to day what it claimed to have a right to do yesterday, and it has denied to-morrow what it acknowledged for truth to-day.

But the true Church is not to be the less respected and revered on that account. The evils we lament have been, as we humbly believe, the inevitable consequence of a false position assumed by a few individuals, not necessarily selfish men, but mistaken men, in regard to whom we could wish to entertain no uncharitable feelings. Something certainly may be said in their defence. They have been elevated by the writings of the Church from a very powerful degree of darkness to a very powerful degree of light. Is it wonderful, therefore, that their mental vision should have become dazzled by that excess of light to which they were so suddenly introduced? They are too apt to regard this light as their own, and in attempting to use it for purposes of extraordinary benefit, they transcend the more obvious and practical ends for which it was intended. They are like a man who has arrived at a sudden and unexpected fortune. He believes that it would be sinful to appropriate the increase of his riches entirely to his own use. He feels that he has greater opportunities than formerly of doing good. But he is at a great loss to know how to dispense his benefits. He is proud of the gifts he has received—he is vain and ostentatious in exhibiting them. The consequence is, that he

assumes an importance which does not belong to his character. Amidst a crowd of contending emotions, it is not surprising, therefore, that he should commit some serious blunders in managing his newly-acquired estate. He must become accustomed to his honors before they will sit easy upon him ; and even then it will be necessary that he should learn humility and moderation before he can expect to husband his treasures to the best advantage. We do not blame him more for his presumption than we sympathize with him in his temptations. But it is from having seen and considered the effect of what we have stated above, that we have come to the conclusion there can be no safe and legitimate assumption of authority by any combination of individuals calling themselves a Church, at the present day. This leads us to the consideration of our second question—

2. Will there ever be a time when the teachings and discipline of the Church may be implicitly relied on ?

Here again, speaking from the convictions of our own mind, we are obliged to answer in the negative. But we must not overlook what we have already conceded will be the glorious prerogative of the Church hereafter. It is to go on increasing in beauty and strength, achieving its sublime conquests amidst obloquy and persecution, combating with and foiling the spirits of the Great Dragon, and introducing in their stead, into its earthly courts, the wisest and the choicest spirits of all future ages. "The sons of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee ; and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet. For brass there will be gold, and for iron there will be silver, and for wood brass, and for stones iron." The Church will grow in wisdom and stature from day to day, until she shall have put on her beautiful garments, and shall appear to the nations of the world as "a Bride adorned for her husband."

In a word, she will become a legitimate Church, the joy of the whole earth. But what then? Will her growth in spiritual wisdom and holiness render her a monitor that may be listened to at all times with implicit reliance? Will her heavenly graces put her will beyond the possibility of erring, or her past sufferings render her altogether perfect? Will her superior intelligence impress the minds of her members with the insane and foolish idea that they are infallible, and that they are at liberty to exact implicit obedience to the suggestions of their own arrogance and presumption? We cannot think so. Let us examine this matter a little more closely.

The external Church, we are told, is composed of those who are in external worship from obedience and faith. This has been the rule heretofore, it is the rule now, and must remain the rule as long as the Church continues to exist. But as Mr. Hiller has justly remarked, Who except the Lord alone is truly acquainted with those who worship from obedience and faith? Who except the Lord alone will be truly acquainted with them when the Church shall have become more enlightened and more holy? Even when that happy period shall arrive, all will not be equally regenerate, and some will not be regenerate at all. Her members must always be more or less imperfect, or there could be no progress in spiritual life. Now what may we suppose will be the course of the Church under these circumstances? As her spiritual condition will be better than it is now—as her members individually will have advanced much nearer to that worship from obedience and faith which constitutes a true external Church—we may confidently believe she will exercise a wider and more immediate authority in teaching, expounding, and exhorting, than she does at present. But the beauty and utility of all this will consist in its charity and simplicity.

As the Church will exist nowhere fully except by representation—as each of her members will cherish but an humble opinion of his own acquirements—as every one will seriously respect and feel a generous sympathy for his neighbor—none will dare to utter a single opinion that might be regarded as absolutely authoritative, and none will be expected to ascribe downright certainty to such an opinion if it should be uttered. As will be the case with the individuals composing the Church, so will it be with the Church taken as a whole. All her enactments and regulations will appeal with maternal kindness and tenderness to the understandings of her members. There will be nothing coercive in her proceedings. There will be nothing binding in her exactions. Each of her members will be expected to receive her opinions and instruction as far as he is able, but no farther. If he cannot agree with the authority of the Church, he will be regarded neither as a heretic nor a schismatic. He will be left in freedom to exercise his own mind on every subject that may refer itself to his understanding and conscience. This exalted privilege will be one of the dearest rights of Church membership; and in nine cases out of ten it will be exercised with the strictest regard to duty and integrity of purpose.

Here then, we think, is a full and fair answer to the question, Where and what is the Church? It is precisely there where an honest and well-meaning man, who is in worship from faith and obedience, is able to place it. It is precisely that authority which a regenerate and enlightened Christian is able to sanction as the dictate and voice of truth. It cannot be anything more or less. When a good man is required to submit to that which his understanding cannot approve, it is not the Church that speaks to him, but the selfishness and haughtiness of

human pride. What he cannot understand and what he cannot sanction, whatever it may be to others, is to him anything but the Church. Yet the Church may be within him at the same time. He himself is a Church in its least form. He himself may be the only correct expounder of that which the aggregate Church has pronounced to be true, but of which no human authority can speak with absolute certainty.

We must repeat what we have ventured to express above, that the Church is not in a state to exercise a salutary authority at present, but may arrive at this desirable state hereafter, yet only so far as she accords to each of her members the right of determining and judging for himself. The obligation to consider this right, we most sacredly believe, is identified with her character as a Church. Each member must have a right to exercise his own private judgment. But it must not be forgotten that this right will be almost entirely exercised by those who have become humble and regenerate. None others could exercise it with the same degree of safety. The Church will be that, and nothing else, which the humble and regenerate, whether collectively or individually, have made it. It will be there, and nowhere else, where the humble and regenerate, whether collectively or individually, have placed it. And what a glorious Church it will be! That grand distinguishing prerogative, which is the eternal badge and inalienable birthright of humanity—man's freedom of choice in spiritual things—will be most sacredly guarded. Diversity of opinion will occasion no diminution of respect and affection. The Church as a whole will only become the more perfect on account of the variety in its subordinate teachings; and its great central truths will only shine the brighter and clearer on account of its peculiar

preferences in minor matters having their foundation in universal charity.—But to our last topic of inquiry.

3. Will not the power of the Church in all ages, and under all its progressive changes, be advisory rather than authoritative?

The remarks already made preclude the necessity of saying much on this part of our subject. If no one but the Lord can tell who is in external worship from the obedience of faith—if each sincere and regenerate member of the Church has a co-ordinate and equal right with all the rest of the members to say what and where the Church is, and to regard his own opinion, so far as respects himself, when honestly exercised, as the voice of the Church itself—if this is so now, and will continue to be so in future—then it must follow, as a matter of course, that the power of the Church hereafter will be only advisory, not authoritative. Nor can we believe that her growth in spiritual graces will ever clothe her with any greater or more authoritative power. Her case in this respect must be precisely like one of her own individual members. As she grows more intelligent and more holy, she will grow more humble and more willing to respect the rights of others. As she becomes better acquainted by experience with her own fallible character, she will the more readily concede to her separate members a part of her own sovereignty. As she will know that no one can beneficially receive any part of her teachings, except so far as he is able to make it a part of his own wisdom, she will perceive the greater need of tolerating, and even of respecting, the opinions of those who happen to differ from her. Of course, then, she will eschew with an eager earnestness all arbitrary authority, and exercise a mere advisory control; and, in pursuing this course, will trust for her security to the intelligence and honesty of her members.

Thus much we have attempted to say on a subject about which there is, no doubt, at present, considerable diversity of opinion. If our remarks should be regarded as peculiar, we have the satisfaction, at least, of knowing that they are candid, straightforward, and honest. And in this their peculiarity may consist as much as in anything else. At all events, they are but our own opinions, and, as we have already remarked, are made in the character of a learner rather than a teacher.

A few words on a collateral subject will conclude what we have to say. It may be thought by some that we have thrown out hints not very complimentary to that body of the New Church in our country commonly known as the General Convention. We are not aware of the existence in us of any uncharitable feelings towards that organization, and hope we have not exhibited any. At the same time, we are willing to confess, that we have never had a very satisfactory understanding of the principles and intentions of the members of that body. We only wish they were always as candid in expressing their supposed opinions as we have endeavored to be in expressing our own. But we have sometimes been startled, not unfrequently puzzled, and often pained, at the seeming mysticism which has covered their proceedings. It is of this we complain more than of almost anything else. We would like to see more manliness, more plainness, more openness in their proceedings. We have often asked ourselves, What *do* they mean? Do they, in reality, presume to prescribe the terms on which alone we can hold fellowship with them? Do they claim the right of coercing our wills and understandings—of making us believe what they believe—of cribbing and restraining our own mental freedom? If they do, we wish they would say so in plain and intelligible language.

But we seem to hear them exclaim, "Oh, no! this is not our meaning. You are at perfect liberty to think for yourselves, and to judge as you please. Only remember, however, that if you do not agree with us, we cannot acknowledge you as brethren in the Church. We will not undertake to prescribe a system of faith for you; but if, in our opinion, your belief on any point be erroneous, we will very civilly exclude you from the privileges of the sanctuary." Now this is hardly fair—hardly dignified—certainly not generous.

"You take my life
When you do take the means whereby I live."

You deprive us of our spiritual subsistence, at least you do violence to our spiritual peace, when you thus covertly deprive us of our standing in the Church to which we have been solemnly and affectionately united. Would it not be better to come out openly and ingenuously, and proclaim in language that all might understand, "You have violated an important part of the Lord's revealed will;—we lay our finger on the offence, and name it; and we therefore expel you from the privileges of His house?" For less than this no one ought to suffer; and language like this would be understood, and its alarming tendency might be inquired into.

INQUIRER.

"If we look around on the Christian world with candid and inquiring minds, we shall see marks of the purest piety in every denomination. Every church will exhibit to us its saints. It is a delightful thought, that religion is confined to none of those inclosures of sect and party which are so often the limits of *our* narrow charity."—*Channing*.

THE POET.

“The grandeur of the forest tree
Comes not by casting in a formal mold,
But from its own divine vitality.”

WORDSWORTH.

I had a vision of a poet, such
As heaven sends, to soothe the feverish pulse
Of men amid the noisy wrestling world ;
To keep alive the little spark divine,
Which else were smothered with the weight of gross,
Material things.

My vision had a form
Most fair to see, and tuned in harmony
To all the music rare that dwelt within.—
His mien was lofty—some might call him proud—
’Twas not the air of bold defiance, such
As seems to challenge heaven and destiny ;
But manly self-reliance, and firm trust
That God e’er helps the man who helps himself.
His voice—true index of the soul—was rich,
And full of melody as cadences
Of some not far-off waterfall, when borne
On waving wings of zephyrs.

Dwelling fit
For soul of noble mold ! a soul alas !
With grief familiar—struggling to be free.
So, as his spiritual man did grow and mount
The outer sank away, and died in song,
Like dying swan—or tree that blossoms forth
In autumn sun, foreshadowing its decay,
Like “ timely utterances ” that ease the heart of pain,
Thus singing on his lonesome way, he spurned
All petty bonds ; to him, the routine which
The world imposed, was hard, unyielding cords

And angles sharp ; but when perchance he soared
In freedom, life became all graceful curves
And beauteous lines beneath his unbound feet.
True child of genius ! living in two worlds,
He loved not to be called from th' inner one ;
Or, like a bird that trembles on the wing
About her nest when watched by stranger's eye,
He wandered to and fro, 'twixt earth and air.—
To him all lonely things did minister ;
His eye far-reaching saw their inner forms.—
'Tis not the poet's fancy that doth make
Life full of deep significance, and gives
A tongue to mountain, tree and stream ; but his
Receptive state attracts the subtle force
That dwells in all created things around,—
Anoints his inner eyes to see, his ears
To hear the secret harmonies that rise
Unceasing to their Great Creator's praise.—
Thus every breeze that fanned his cheek, or cloud
That floated up behind the distant hills,
Brought some sweet message to his listening soul.
His fate to live most where he lived alone,
He felt a fellowship with loneliness,
And loved to gaze upon the lofty peak
Uprising in its solitude, so grand,
Yet melancholy,—seeming like himself,
Without one near companionship. For he,
Though made for love's sweet offices, and with
A heart of depths unsounded, had too far
Out-stripped his fellows in the toilsome path,
To look around him for the human love
For which he sighed, yet ever sought beyond,—
Which ever seemed beyond—till life did seem
To sweep too fiercely o'er his head ; as when
A sudden breeze doth catch the topmost bough
When all the rest are still, so doth the soul

Of tow'ring height, most feel life's fitful gusts.
 And thus he touched all hearts ; for all have some
 One hidden chord of tenderness, that gives
 A wailing sound beneath true poet's hand.—
 If to the world he seemed a wayward son,
 There still were some could see him as he was ;
 As when the general form is harmonized,
 The deviations are not seen—or but
 As silvery clouds in summer sky,—or shades
 In pictures, that throw out the lights and make
 All beautiful by contrast.

He knew not,
 Nor felt it; this he only knew—his work
 Was quickly to be done, while yet 'twas day.—
 Though never seen in pulpit pouring forth
 Great thoughts of heavenly meaning, yet he was
 A high priest of the Lord ; along his way
 Where heaven allotted him to walk, choice gifts
 Dispensing freely ; gems for aching brows ;
 And melody unto the saddened heart,
 Like whispers from behind the veil. And when
 The current of his life was dried, mankind
 In wonder saw the precious treasures which
 The troubled river had so long concealed.

R. G.

“ It is known in the church, that the Lord is the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race ; but it is known to few in what manner this is to be understood. They who are in the externals of the church, believe that the Lord redeemed the world, that is, the human race, by his blood, by which they mean the passion of the cross. But they who are in the internals of the church, know that no one is saved by the blood of the Lord, but by a life according to the precepts of faith and charity from the Word of the Lord.”—*Swedenborg*.

MISTAKEN VIEWS OF BAPTISM.

A great variety of opinions concerning the nature and efficacy of the baptism administered by Christians not professedly of the New Church, have from time to time been entertained and put forth by the same as well as by different persons in our communion. And this circumstance alone is sufficient to make us view with suspicion, or at any rate to examine with care, the latest opinion entertained by these brethren. At first, *every* baptism reverently administered among professing Christians, was regarded as Christian baptism, and alike valid and efficacious. Next, *no* baptism was considered valid, or regarded as Christian baptism, unless administered by the hands of a Swedenborgian or professed New Church minister—all other baptism being regarded as null and void, because administered, as these brethren supposed, without any proper authority. Next, “Old Church baptism” (as that administered outside of our own communion was designated) was considered as possessing a certain degree of validity, and as introducing candidates into the *external* church; but as Swedenborgians were held to constitute the *internal* church, therefore it was regarded as proper and orderly for every person, on receiving the doctrines of the New Church, to be again baptized. Subsequently, this opinion was abandoned, and the old ground again taken, that “Old Church baptism” was unauthorized and a nullity; and that nothing, therefore, but “New Church baptism” could be recognized as valid, or as properly Christian baptism. And now, as we learn from the January number of the *New Jerusalem Magazine*, this view seems to have been exchanged for another, which makes baptism not merely a *Christian* ordinance, as Swedenborg on all occasions declares it to

be, but a purely *sectarian* ordinance. According to this latest view of the subject, there is no such thing as *Christian* baptism in the broad and true sense of the expression; but there is Presbyterian baptism, or Methodist baptism, or Unitarian baptism, or Swedenborgian baptism, according to the particular communion in which it happens to be administered. Thus baptism is made a purely *sectarian* rite—not a sign in the spiritual world simply that a person professes the Christian religion, or “is of Christians,” as Swedenborg invariably declares it to be, but a sign that the subject of it is a Methodist, Baptist, Episcopalian, or Swedenborgian, as the case may be. The sign, therefore, according to this view, is supposed to be different in the eyes of spirits and angels in every Christian sect; so that, whenever any one changes his ecclesiastical connections, or goes from a Baptist to a Methodist, or from a Presbyterian to a Swedenborgian church, or *vice versa*, it is as proper and orderly for him to be baptized, as it is for a Mahometan or Pagan on becoming a Christian. And if one should change his outward church relations twenty times in the course of his life, then he ought to be baptized twenty times; otherwise he would introduce disorder and confusion into the spiritual world, not having, on each change of his religious views, the corresponding or appropriate sign by which spirits and angels could recognize him! It is difficult to conceive of anything farther removed from the plain teachings of the Word or the writings of the New Church than this. And that we have not here mis-stated the views of the Boston *N. J. Magazine* on this subject, is plain enough from the following extracts:

“Baptism is . . . in the spiritual world, a sign not only of his [the baptized person’s] being of the Christian Church,

but also of the particular religious society with which, in that world, he then becomes associated." (p. 400.)

"When by baptism here a person is inserted in a society or congregation of Christians in the spiritual world, it is into one of a quality similar and corresponding to the Christian quality of those with whom he at the same time becomes associated in this world." (p. 401.)

"Those who are baptized in this world into the New Church, specifically so called, are inserted in the spiritual world among Christians of the specifically called New Heaven; and those who are here baptized in the various denominations of the former church ['Old Church' used to be the designation of all such denominations] are inserted among those Christians in the spiritual world who are of corresponding qualities." (pp. 401, 402.)

"If he is an adult, he has some kind of Christianity in him; and by being baptized, he will be inserted among those who have a corresponding kind of Christianity in the spiritual world. If he is an infant, he has no kind of Christianity in him; and consequently, by being baptized, he will be inserted among Christians of a quality corresponding to that which exists in those who have the care of him, or to that which exists in him who administers the sacrament." (*ib.*)

And another recent writer on this subject, whose sentiments agree with those expressed in these extracts, speaking of baptism, says: "It is not only a means of conjunction with that sect or society in the religious world on earth, which was in the same faith as was professed in uniting with it; but, as thought brings presence, so also it is a sign which is perceived in the *spiritual world*, and brings the person thus initiated into conjunction there also with those who are of a similar faith." (See *N. J. Magazine* for Jan., p. 431.) This same writer also speaks of the ordinance, when administered by the hands of any other than a recognized New Church minister, as "the baptism into a false faith and idolatrous worship," (*ib.* p. 432,) and says: "It must be actually injurious in

its influence on a genuine receiver of the New Church doctrines, because it becomes to him a door of influx for the infestation of falses." (*ib.* p. 431.)

So, then, according to the views here put forth, a little infant baptized in a Presbyterian or Episcopal congregation, is brought by such baptism into conjunction with spirits in the other world who are in "a false faith and idolatrous worship"—in other words, with diabolical spirits! for angelic spirits are in no such faith or worship. And if such little infant should suddenly be removed by death to the spiritual world—and hundreds of such are removed every day—it would, of course, find itself in the society of these diabolical spirits or idolatrous worshipers! And how it is ever to get liberated from such society, we are not told. Now, if in the darkest days of the old Christian or old Romish church, anything more preposterous than this was ever propounded for truth, we confess that we have never met with it.

And we marvel that men of sense, who find themselves driven by a strict logical necessity (from certain assumed data) to such absurd conclusions, should not suspect that there is a radical mistake somewhere, and so be led to a careful re-examination of their premises. To think of professed New-Churchmen—and ministers, too—gravely writing, and publishing to the world, such a ridiculous, not to say monstrous, idea as this: that little infants are, by their baptism in some Methodist or Presbyterian communion, brought "into conjunction" or "into association" with false and idolatrous worshipers! Some pretty hard things have been said of the New Church by its avowed opponents, but seldom have we met with anything harder than this grave teaching of some of its professed friends.

Nor is it necessary to show our readers that the views expressed in the above extracts are as contrary to the teachings of Swedenborg, as they are to reason and Scripture. For more than once has our illumined author declared, that all little infants are attended by some of the best of the angels, and, when they die, pass directly into their society, and become objects of their especial care; and this, too, whether they have been baptized by one in a true or in a false faith, or whether they have been baptized at all or not. And in not a single instance does he speak of baptism in the manner that these brethren have spoken of it—as a *sectarian* ordinance, or a sign in the spiritual world by which one Christian sect is distinguished from another; but he uniformly speaks of it as a *Christian* ordinance, or a sign in the other world by which the subject of it is known to be *of Christians*, as distinguished from Jews, Mahometans, or Pagans. We challenge the production of one solitary passage from all his writings that favors the narrow and sectarian view of this ordinance, adopted by some of his followers. No: it is not men's *baptism* in this or that particular Christian sect, that inserts them into, or associates them with, this or that particular Christian society in the other world. Their association with particular societies in that world depends on no such outward ceremony, but on their affinities, or the peculiar quality of each one's life; "for in that world," to cite Swedenborg's own language, "every one is inserted into societies and congregations,"—how? According as he happens to be *baptized* in this or that particular sect? By no means; but "according to *the quality of Christianity* either within him or without him," (*T. C. R.* 680); that is, whether a man be here or there—in this society or that—depends on whether this or that particular quality of Christiani-

ty be in him or *not* in him. And this is only another way of expressing that great law of spiritual affinity which determines all associations in the other world, where, as our author so often assures us, "similarity of character draws people together, and dissimilarity separates them." And through the operation of this law, the societies of spirits with whom we are internally associated are continually changing as our states change; for Swedenborg assures us, that, as a man "suffers himself to be led to an interior and more perfect good, so he is led to interior and more perfect angelic societies; the changes of his state are *nothing else but changes of societies.*" (*A. C.* 4067.) But, according to the teaching of the Boston *N. J. Magazine*, it is *baptism* which inserts every one into his particular Christian society in the other world; therefore, as often as a man's state changes, which effects or is a withdrawal from one society of spirits and an introduction into another and different society, the ordinance of baptism should be repeated on him, and administered by different hands, or among persons whose states at the time correspond to his own. And if this *be* according to divine order, and be so very important, too, is it not strange that Swedenborg should have known nothing about it? or knowing, should have failed to give us the slightest intimation of it? Or, stranger still, that he should have given so much instruction upon baptism, which is utterly irreconcilable with this view?

But it was not our intention to discuss the subject of baptism in this article. We took up our pen merely to show the different and obviously mistaken views which have from time to time been put forth in "the periodicals of the New Church." And the worst of it is, that said periodicals will never allow one syllable on the other

side of this question to appear in their columns ; so that most of their readers are probably kept in blissful ignorance of the fact that there *is* any other side. How far this policy differs from that which has so long and so successfully been pursued by the Romish Church, we leave each one to decide for himself. To our mind it certainly seems not the wise and liberal policy characteristic of that new, free, and enlightened Age, whereof Swedenborg is claimed as the God-illuminated herald.

Before closing, we will try and make our own view of the first use of baptism as plain as possible ; and this we will do by means of an illustration which all will readily understand.

Swedenborg says, " that the first use of baptism is, introduction into the Christian Church, and at the same time insertion among Christians in the spiritual world." He also calls it " the Christian sign," and " a sign in the spiritual world that the person baptized is of Christians," or believes in the Christian religion—not a sign of *what kind* of a Christian he is, whether good or bad, orthodox or heterodox, Presbyterian or Swedenborgian. Accordingly he teaches the propriety of baptizing all foreign proselytes as soon as they are " converted to the Christian religion ;" and this, too, " before they have been instructed, if they do but confess themselves desirous of embracing Christianity, *into which they are inaugurated by baptism,* (T. C. R. 677, '8 '80.) It is *into Christianity*, then, and not into this or that particular sect—not into Methodism, Swedenborgianism, or any other *ism* as such—that one is inaugurated by baptism. Now for the illustration of what we regard as the true view.

Every foreigner coming to our country, is required to submit to a certain form of initiation before he can be acknowledged as a citizen of the United States. He must

be naturalized—must take the oath of allegiance and obtain his naturalization papers. This makes him an American citizen, entitled to all the rights and privileges of citizenship wherever he may go. Now suppose his naturalization papers, instead of being carried in his pocket or laid in his drawer to be exhibited when called for, were worn upon his forehead; or that the fact of his naturalization were indicated by some other outward sign visible to all eyes. Every one, the moment he beheld that sign, would know the man to be—what? A Bostonian? New Yorker? Virginian? A Carpenter? Lawyer? Ship-builder? Merchant? Nothing of the sort, but simply *an American citizen*. This is *all* that his naturalization sign would show. To what particular community, profession, class, or society of American citizens he belonged—whether he were minister, doctor, lawyer, merchant, blacksmith, baker, farmer, or hod-carrier—would depend upon his own fitness or aptitude for one or the other profession, or upon *the quality of industrial life* in him or not in him; but his naturalization sign would indicate nothing whatever of this,—for it is not a sign of the particular class or society of Americans to which he belongs.

Now let the reader substitute *baptism* for *naturalization*—*the Christian Church* for *the United States*—*the Christian sign* for the *American sign*—and he will have our idea of the first use of baptism, which Swedenborg declares to be “a sign that the persons baptized are of the Christian church,” “into which they are inaugurated by baptism.” If this be not the true idea, then we have studied our author to little purpose on this subject; and our columns are open to any candid and courteous writer who will kindly point out our error and set us right.

In the foregoing remarks we have made one or two quotations from the Rev. George Field's Address before

the Michigan and Northern Indiana Association of the New Church, at its last annual meeting. This Address is mainly devoted to an argument in favor of re-baptism; and although it abounds in unauthorized assumptions and fallacies of the most transparent character, we propose to notice only one of them here—and that is contained in the following paragraph:

“The fallacy of the reason sometimes alleged, of *having been baptized*, when it means no more than having been duly initiated into the acknowledgment of a tripersonal God and the doctrine of faith alone, simply because *the form of inauguration* was the same as (or similar to) that used in professing a belief in the fundamental doctrines of the New Church, is equivalent to saying that—because the marriage service had been used in solemnizing nuptials, afterwards, when the wife died, or when, for the cause of adultery, the husband put her away, and united himself instead to a virgin daughter of Jerusalem—no marriage service was required on the occasion, the former one being all-sufficient; or that the new obligations would flow into the former ceremony, and fill it. Thus, to say that he has already *been baptized*, is just as pertinent as to say he has already *been married!*”—*N. J. Mag. for Jan. p. 431.*

Now, in the first place, baptism is not, and never was, among any class of Christians, what Mr. Field here alleges—an “initiation into the acknowledgment of a tripersonal God;” but it is, always and everywhere among Christians, an initiation or *sign* of initiation “into the Christian Church.” It is *nowhere* a sign of the special form of a man’s belief, or of *how he understands* Christianity, but simply that he professes this religion—“is of Christians.” So that “baptism into the faith of the Old Church,” “baptism into idolatrous worship,” “baptism into a false faith,” and such like forms of expression which Mr. Field and others are so much in the habit of using, we regard as wholly unauthorized, and as implying a totally mistaken view of the import and purpose of baptism.

Then see what a fallacy is involved in our brother's own illustration designed to show the necessity of re-baptism! The church of Christ—this is the purport of the illustration—is represented by the wife; the candidate for admission into it, is represented by the husband; and the baptismal service is represented by the marriage ceremony. Very well. Now suppose Mr. F. himself to have been baptized some forty years ago in some Episcopal, Methodist, or Presbyterian communion. He was, by that ceremony, introduced into the Christian Church and inserted among Christians in the spiritual world. His baptism has ever since been to the angels a sign of this—*not*, as he and some others imagine, a sign of his insertion among those who are in “a false faith and idolatrous worship”—not a sign that he is a bad Christian or a *tri*-personalist, any more than that he is a good one or a *uni*-personalist. And the church into which he was introduced is substantially the same now as it was then. Certainly it has not *died* since; and if it has committed spiritual adultery, that is a crime of which, I fear, none of us are entirely innocent. Surely, we cannot point to one class of Christians—those, for example, who are sometimes contemptuously denominated “the Old Church”—and say, Those are all adulterous at heart. Nor can we point to another class (Swedenborgians, for example) and say, These are all pure—“a virgin daughter of Jerusalem.” We doubt if Mr. Field himself would be guilty of any such terrible presumption. Now suppose that Mr. Field has come to have a better understanding of what the church really is or ought to be, and of his duties in it and his relation to it, than he had forty years ago; to say that he ought, on account of this better understanding, to be *again baptized*, would be like insisting that a man, after having been forty years married to a wife who still survives—supposing him

meanwhile to have obtained higher and truer views of the marriage relation and of the duties it involves—ought, on account of his increase in conjugal wisdom, to have the *same marriage ceremony* performed anew, or, in other words, to be *married over again!* It is plain to see that the fallacy involved in our brother's illustration, grows out of a totally mistaken view of the church of Christ—he, in common with some others, evidently supposing it to consist exclusively of Swedenborgians. Whereas, the truth is,—and we have Swedenborg's authority for the assertion,—that “the church of the Lord is everywhere where the life is formed according to the precepts of charity” (*A. C.* 8152);—“that it is dispersed over the whole globe, and that it is everywhere various as to articles of belief or the truths of faith” (*ib.* 3267.)

And with such like fallacies—which have been and are still a clog upon the New Church—Mr. Field's Address is filled. B.

SWEDENBORG AND THE NEW CHURCH.

All experience proves, that the cause of truth has less to fear from the open hostility of its enemies, than from the ill-judged advocacy of its friends; and that, while opposition and abuse only make its brightness in the end more resplendent, as friction polishes metals, the clumsy attempts of its supporters to adorn and recommend it often serve, like paint on the fair face of woman, to dim and hide its real beauty. The heat of controversy is not favorable to clearness of judgment, and few men have that strong confidence in their own convictions, which

enables them readily to detect the true value of every argument urged in their favor, or to forbear claiming an apparent advantage when it comes temptingly within their reach. Hence false issues are created, and the decision of them mistaken for that of the real question in dispute; unfounded assumptions made, and when finally their hollowness is exposed, it is claimed that the whole fabric of doctrine has met its downfall; and the ridicule deservedly cast on that which forms no part of a system, is extended to the whole. To tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, seems to be beyond the power of most disputants.

The case of the New Church is no exception to the general rule. Its doctrines as unfolded in the writings of Swedenborg are so absolutely and immutably founded on the Word of the Lord and His own Divine Nature, that no sophistry, no ridicule, no prejudice, and no persecution, can finally prevent their entire and hearty recognition by the Christian world. Wherever the belief in a God and in the sanctity of His Word is found, there must follow sooner or later the belief in the true interpretation of that Word, which, again, points the way directly to the fundamental principles of our faith. One would think, therefore, that those who accept and advocate this faith would be content to explain and present its essential features; and having shown their logical sequence from the teachings of the Word and their conformity to sound reason, to abide the result with patience. But this unfortunately has not been the course always adopted. The enemies of these doctrines have cunningly diverted the dispute to questions concerning Swedenborg's character and claims, his sanity or insanity, the possibility or impossibility of his asserted intercourse with spirits, his motives in publishing what he did, and a variety of similar

topics, none of which concern the real character of his teachings in the slightest degree ; and not only have the friends of the Church fallen into this trap, but they themselves have been led to adopt unworthy measures in support of their views, such as exaggeration of the doctrinal errors of their opponents, forced interpretations of apparently unfavorable passages of Holy Writ, an unfair depreciation of the Apostolic Epistles, and a reckless misstatement of the position of the opposite party. By this means our controversial literature has increased much more rapidly in bulk, than in value, and has done more to create a prejudice against the Church, than to recommend it to public favor.

This tendency to misconceive the true grounds on which the doctrines of the Church should be defended, is shown conspicuously in the false claims, urged by some of our fellow believers, for a sort of Divine inspiration in Swedenborg's works, particularly when they are called upon to distinguish them from the lucubrations of modern "spiritual mediums." It would seem, to any dispassionate judge, enough to simply contrast the quality of the two classes of writings and let the question be decided by the intrinsic merits of each. Surely Swedenborg's calm, logical, and lucid expositions of the Divine Word, have nothing to fear from comparison with the vapid, frothy trash which weak minds mistake for the vintage of heaven ; and if a man is not convinced of the right of the matter upon a bare examination of the two, he would not be likely to hear though an angel spoke with him. Nevertheless we know of New Churchmen indiscreet enough to abandon this perfectly safe position, for the untenable one we have mentioned, and thereby expose not only themselves to ridicule, but the cause they wish to serve to serious injury.

Swedenborg himself—and he must be supposed to know

at least as much as we do about it—claims no more than that the doctrines set forth by him are not of his own fabrication, but taught him by the Lord; and that his narratives of what he saw and heard in the spiritual world are not inventions, but contained facts which actually occurred. He nowhere pretends that he was divinely guided as to the method he should adopt in stating these doctrines, or the form in which he should mold his treatises. The materials alone were furnished him, and he was left to arrange them according to his own skill and judgment. For this work he was indeed providentially prepared, by a thorough scientific education and long training in the exposition of his wonderful discoveries in the realm of nature. He came to it, ripe in years, mature in wisdom, and chastened in heart, a worthy ambassador from the court of the Lord, to reveal to his fellow men the mysteries of the heavenly kingdom. But just as every plenipotentiary is furnished with no more than general instructions, leaving to his own pleasure the manner and details of their fulfillment, so Swedenborg was permitted to unfold his message in his own language and after his own peculiar style. Except where the subject matter requires it, his theological works are the same in plan, arrangement, and general treatment, as those of his earlier years. He divides the subjects into chapters, propositions and numbered sections in precisely the same way. He argues, illustrates, and confirms his points, by the use of examples in the one case as in the other. There are the same long drawn-out sentences, the same repetition of the more important truths, the same style of enforcing the importance of his teachings. To any person accustomed to judge of literary performances, the conclusion is irresistible that Swedenborg was as much self-conscious and uncontrolled when he wrote the *Arcana Cœlestia* and the

True Christian Religion as when he penned the *Animal Kingdom* or his *Elements of Chemistry*.

If there are any who see in what we have here said a concession dangerous to the authority of Swedenborg's works, and therefore injurious to the Church, we can do no more than remind them that the doctrines of our Church are founded not upon Swedenborg, but upon the Divine Word; and that, even if he had discovered these doctrines by his unassisted reason, they would be none the less true, none the less of Divine authority. He advances no proposition of essential importance without giving chapter and verse over and over again in its support. *He inculcates no law not already laid down in Holy Writ.* He teaches nothing concerning man's future state which may not be demonstrated in like manner. If, besides all this, he asserts that his mind was illumined by the Lord to see and perceive these things, and that his mission was to reveal what he had so learned, it may, indeed, excite our gratitude to our heavenly Father for thus enlightening us through His servant; but it adds nothing to the force or the obligation on mankind of these newly discovered principles. Least of all does it impose on us a slavish deference to every word that dropped from the pen of this favored scholar, or make his opinions on collateral topics the law of our lives and practice. *A belief in Swedenborg forms no part of the creed of the New Church.* He himself cautions us, that all doctrine must be drawn from the Word, and the Word alone; and we assert, without fear of contradiction, that nothing in his writings which is not supported by the direct teachings of Scripture, is binding on the faith and conscience of the weakest-minded among us. We go to him as we would to any great luminary of law, science, or medicine, for instruction and information. We know

by the experience of years of study, and so do hundreds of others, that we can always learn something from him ; that his teachings can be relied on more confidently than those of Blackstone, Newton, or Laplace ; yet we never dare to impose his authority alone, unsupported by the Bible, upon any individual whatever.

We say these things more especially for the sake of those who have recently become acquainted with the heavenly doctrines, and are just entering upon the study of these wonderful writings. We advise all such not to let their reason be overborne by any clamor about the "authority" of Swedenborg. The only authority they should heed is the Bible. Read Swedenborg, we say, as you would any other commentator ; sift his proofs ; examine his arguments and illustrations ; verify his quotations ; and then decide upon what he says, in freedom according to rationality. Above all, do not attempt to judge upon any doubtful point, by gathering together scraps from different parts of his writings, and forcing a deduction from them. Study him all through first, and master the great principles he unfolds ; and then, from the point thus gained, survey the question in all its bearings. Above all, keep in mind that no training can so invigorate the understanding and clear the mental vision as a useful life in obedience to the Lord's commandments. The constant daily effort to obey Him, and to do our duty to the neighbor, will give a health to the soul and a robustness to the mental faculties far more serviceable in the contest with error, than all the acuteness and ingenuity acquired by years of midnight study.

T. H.

"The essence of Christianity is self-renunciation ; and the discipline that brings us to feel our child-like dependence, is the perfecting of our piety."—*Huntington*.

DR. WORCESTER ON THE PASSOVER.*

It is nearly a year since Dr. Worcester's Address on the subject of "the Passover" was first published. We had intended to subject it to a friendly criticism several months ago, but have not found the time to devote to it until now. We acknowledge, however, that the high source whence this Address emanates, the personal character and official standing of its author, and the importance of the subject herein discussed, added to the fact that its doctrine seems to have been endorsed by the Convention, who voted, at the time of its delivery, "that extra copies be printed for sale and distribution," fairly entitled it to an earlier examination.

There are many things in this Address with which we heartily concur. We like what the author says of the Lord's second coming, and of the manner in which He makes himself known to us. "We know Him by the holy influence that comes forth out of Him, and by the heavenly light that shines into our minds." We agree with him as to the amount and value of the instruction now unfolded, for all who have eyes to see, in the internal sense of the Old Testament; and cordially concur with him in asking, "What could be more gratifying than to find that the Old Testament is full of spirit and life? than to see grace and truth beaming forth from the law that was given by Moses? than to see the law trans-

* The Passover, the Israelitish, the Christian, and the New Jerusalem: The Annual Address delivered before the General Convention of the New Church, Philadelphia, June 8, 1859. By Thomas Worcester, D.D., President of the Convention. Reprinted from the *New Jerusalem Magazine*, agreeably to a vote of the Convention. New York: Published by the General Convention of the New Jerusalem Church in the United States, 346 Broadway; John L. Jewett, Agent. 1859.

formed into gospel?" What he says, too, of the *humility* of those who really enter the New Jerusalem, meets our hearty approval. To our mind, nothing is clearer than this—that "we make no progress [in the regenerate life] unless we grow more and more humble." But it is not of these nor of other like things which all New-Churchmen accept, which are incidentally introduced into this Address, that we propose now to speak; but of what we understand to be the main question which the author undertakes here to discuss, and that is, Who should be invited or permitted to partake of the Holy Supper? or what is necessary to render one a worthy communicant? The discussion of this question is introduced by the following paragraph, which immediately precedes the text (Ex. xii. 43-49) that is made the theme of the discourse:

"The whole of the twelfth chapter of Exodus relates to the Passover, and the internal sense of the whole is full of spiritual instruction; but the part of the chapter which is called the ordinance or statute of the Passover, and which begins with the forty-third verse and ends with the forty-ninth, describes the classes who might, and who might not, eat of the Passover; and the same words, in their spiritual sense, describe the classes who should, and who should not, come to the Holy Supper. And in describing those who might eat of the Passover, and in stating what they should do that they might be fully prepared, they, in the spiritual sense, describe the mode of preparing for the Holy Supper."

It is proper to premise here, as it may help us the better to understand this Address, that there is a class of New-Churchmen in our country—they belong exclusively, we believe, to the Convention school—who believe in what is called "close communion." They hold that the New Church, signified by the New Jerusalem in the Apocalypse, is the only true Church on earth, and that this is a visible body of people, confined *exclusively* to

Swedenborgians ;—that, outside of this communion, there is no true church, or no “church in its special sense.” They believe that the Lord has “left” all the other sects or churches in Christendom, and now dwells, in a peculiar sense, with us Swedenborgians ; and that these sects, therefore, commonly denominated by us “the Old Church,” “have no authority or power to baptize, or to perform any other church duty”—this authority having been transferred to those who claim to be of the New Church ; and the Christian ordinances, therefore, when administered in other communions, have no proper validity, not being duly authorized.* To this school of New-Churchmen we presume Dr. Worcester is pretty generally known to belong ; and the main purpose of the Address before us seems to be, to establish the exclusive or “close communion” doctrine in regard to the Holy Supper, and have it accepted as the teaching of the New Jerusalem on this subject. Yet this purpose will be likely to escape the observation of many persons who are ignorant of what the author understands by “baptism,” and what by “the church.”

In the text chosen for the theme of the Address, it is said, “This is the ordinance of the Passover : there shall no stranger eat thereof.” And “strangers,” the author tells us, “represented those who were not in the church. And as a church consists of those who acknowledge the Lord, and receive the goods and truths that come down from Him, therefore strangers are those who do not acknowledge him, and do not receive those goods and truths. And as the Holy Supper represents the acknowl-

* See “Report of the Ordaining Ministers on Baptism,” in the Boston *New Jerusalem Magazine* for July, 1839 ; also another Report to the Convention on the same subject, published in the same Magazine for August, 1855.

edgment of the Lord, and the reception of the goods and truths that proceed from Him, therefore those who are represented by strangers—that is, those who do not acknowledge Him and receive those goods and truths—ought not to come to the Holy Supper.” Now, by the “church” in this passage, it is clear that the author means that visible body of people, or some society thereof, commonly known as the New Church. This is what he understands by “the church in its special sense;” for he tells us near the commencement of his Address, that “those who understand the Word in its internal sense, who receive the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, and who live according to them, constitute the church in its special sense.” It is important, then, to bear in mind who those persons are that Dr. Worcester means to include in his idea of “the church”—otherwise we shall fail to understand the meaning of some parts of his Address. They are Swedenborgians—those who accept the truths of the New Church as revealed through Swedenborg—all who receive and obey the doctrines of the New Jerusalem. Yet not these, unless they have received what is denominated by the school to which Dr. Worcester belongs, “New Church baptism”—that is, unless they have been baptized by the hands of some recognized New Church minister. For he says :

“In order that any one may come into a [the ?] church and thus be prepared to receive the Holy Supper, he must become acquainted with the doctrines of the church; that is, with the truths of the Word on which the church is built; this was represented by sojourning amongst the Israelites. And another thing is necessary, which was represented by circumcision, and is now represented by baptism; and that is, he must be in the effort to live according to those doctrines. Those doctrines, or truths, are represented by the water; and the work of living according to the doctrines is represented by the use of the water in baptism. No un-

circumcised person was allowed to eat of the Passover ; so no person, who has not been baptized, and who is not endeavoring to do in himself the work which is represented by baptism, should come to the Holy Supper.”—p. 15.

And in another part of this address, the author says :

“ Such persons, if they were also circumcised, were allowed to eat of the Passover. By *circumcision*, is denoted purification from evil loves ; and this is effected by obedience to the commandments, by conforming to the truth, by shunning evils as sins against God. Baptism has the same signification as circumcision ; and as circumcision was required as an introduction to the Passover, so is baptism as an introduction to the Holy Supper. When, therefore, any one has come so far under the influence of spiritual truth as to receive the sacrament of Baptism, and to purify his life by shunning evils as sins against God, then it is proper for him to come to the Holy Supper.”—p. 9.

Now, the casual reader is liable—nay, is almost certain—to be misled by this language. For any one not acquainted with the author’s exclusive views on this subject, would naturally suppose—in the absence of any explanation—that he understands by Baptism what is generally understood by it. They would suppose from these paragraphs that this sacrament, when reverently administered by any Christian minister, would be recognized by Dr. Worcester as Christian Baptism, as having “ the same signification as circumcision,” and valid “ as an introduction to the Holy Supper.” They could draw no other inference from his language. Yet those acquainted with his views in regard to Baptism, know very well that he means no such thing. They know that Baptism as administered by more than ninety-nine hundredths of the Christian ministers of our day, is not regarded by Dr. Worcester as Christian Baptism—is not the kind of Baptism of which he is speaking in his Address. They know that he makes a broad distinction between Baptism as ad-

ministered by Swedenborgian or New Church ministers, and Baptism as administered by all other ministers—a distinction, indeed, as broad as that between the doctrines of the New and those of the Old Christian church. They know that he has hitherto regarded Baptism by the hands of any other than a recognized New Church minister, as having no validity—as being, in fact, *not* Baptism; for in the very last sentence of a report which he wrote on this subject a few years ago, he said: “We regard baptism into the New Church [*i. e.* by the hands of a New Church minister] as the only real baptism.” And in another part of the same report, he declares that other ministers or churches “have no authority or power to baptize into his [the Lord’s] name, and thus to produce insertion among Christians in the spiritual world; and for this reason they have no authority or power to perform any of the duties of a church.” (*See the New Jerusalem Magazine*, Vol. xii, p. 381, ’82.)

It is plain, then, whom Dr. Worcester understands as constituting the Church of Christ “in its special sense;” Swedenborgians, as professed New Churchmen are commonly called—that visible body of people who receive the doctrines of the New Church as revealed through Swedenborg, or that portion of them who have been baptized by New Church ministers. They only, in the Dr.’s view, are to be regarded as genuine disciples of the Lord—the true Israel of God. All others are to be viewed as out of the Church—as “strangers” and “foreigners.” And as no “stranger” or “foreigner” was allowed to eat of the Passover with the Israelites, so Dr. W. is quite consistent in maintaining that none others should be invited or allowed to come to the Holy Supper,—that none others indeed are qualified to come—except baptized receivers of the heavenly doctrines. According to his view, it would

not be right for a minister of the New Church to administer the Holy Supper to any but "baptized receivers;" and we should expect that he would take special pains on every sacrament day to ascertain whether any others were present, and that he would be scrupulous in counseling any "strangers"—members of other Christian Churches who might be drawn thither—to retire. Fealty to principle, not less than consistency, would seem to require this. We have no doubt but the author of this Address is particular in excluding "strangers." And we are not surprised that he should adopt rather the language of rebuke when alluding to those whose views on this subject differ from his own; as where he says:

"We are apt to imagine that the Lord's table may, somehow or other, be regarded as our table; consequently we are liable to feel called upon to exercise feelings of hospitality, kindness, and liberality; and, besides, we are afraid of being regarded as exclusive, and as considering ourselves as better and holier than others. Hence we may be inclined to remove all obstacles and throw away all conditions, and then to proclaim that it is the Lord's table,—that it is free to all. In doing so, we forget our true position; our minds are darkened; and, in our obscurity and confusion, we take the table of the Lord from Him, and make it our own."

But we *are* a little surprised at the reference which the Dr. makes to our Lord's administration of the Supper to the chosen twelve, and the inference he would have his readers draw from that circumstance—as in the following paragraph:

"When He [the Lord] was alone with His disciples, He gave them more interior instruction, and explained to them more fully the things which he had previously said to them and the multitude together. So He frequently fed the disciples and the multitude together; and He could have taken one of these occasions to institute the Holy Supper, and thus have administered it to many thousands at once: but

He did not do so. Or He might have given public notice that He should institute the Holy Supper at a certain time and place, and He might have invited all to attend and partake who were so disposed; but He gave no such notice, and sent forth no such invitation. These circumstances are significant."

Indeed they are; and no one knows better than Dr. W. himself what they signify. No one knows better than he that they do *not* signify what he here seems laboring to impress upon the minds of his readers. For certainly these circumstances were never meant to teach us that the Lord gives, or ever will give, the right to frail and fallible men—be they priests or people—to "*elect*" members of his Church,* or to determine who are and who are not in a fit state to come to the Holy Supper. They were never meant to teach that it is right for *us* to follow literally the Lord's example in this matter, and to administer His Supper privately to twelve or twelve hundred or any other number whom *we* may elect as worthy to partake; nor that there is any impropriety in our inviting "all to attend and partake who are so disposed"—that is, all whom the spirit of the Master may so dispose. The *twelve* whom He invited, were chosen to signify *all* his worthy followers wherever they may be, and whom *He* always invites—the humble, chosen ones who know His voice. And the privacy of that first Supper was designed to represent this great truth, that none but His true followers are or can be in conjunction with Himself. These, and these alone, are always apart from the world—in that upper chamber, eating and drinking with their Divine Lord and Master.

* The General Convention, of which Dr. Worcester has for many years been President, is frequently spoken of by himself and others as "the Church"—sometimes as "the Church in a larger form;" and of this "Church" several persons, we notice, are "members by election."
—See *Journal of Convention for 1859*, p. 4.

Then we do not know but there *are* New Church ministers, who are inclined "to throw away all conditions"—to "invite all to attend and partake of the Holy Supper" without regard to their moral or religious character—and thus to "take the table of the Lord from Him" and make it their own. But if there are any such, we have never met with them—have never indeed heard of them. We have never heard of a New Church minister inviting to the Holy Supper any except those who believe in the Lord and are in charity towards the neighbor. And all such, according to the illumined herald of the New Jerusalem, should be invited, for they are worthy to come. For does he not tell us, "that those approach the Holy Supper worthily who are under the influence of faith towards the Lord and of charity towards their neighbor, thus who are regenerate?" (*T. C. R.* 722.) And the reason why these approach worthily, is, because they "are in the Lord, and He in them; consequently conjunction with the Lord is effected by the Holy Supper." (*ib.* 725). We presume Dr. W. would regard our own views on this subject as among the loosest and most latitudinarian entertained by any New Churchman in our country; yet we have never believed and never taught that the Holy Supper is for any others than those, who are here declared by God's chosen messenger to approach it "worthily;" and of course we have never invited any others, nor taught that it would be proper or useful for others to come. But what right has any New Churchman—what right has the President of the Convention—to be any more "exclusive" in this matter, than our heaven-illumined scribe? What right has he to insist, that, to be a worthy communicant, a person must "understand the Word in its internal sense," or "receive the doctrines of the New Jerusalem," in the sense in which Dr. W. means this language to be

understood? What right has he to require that he be a member, in good and regular standing, of this or that or *any* religious society? What right has he to insist on re-baptism? What right has he to affix *any* conditions which the Lord has never affixed? Is it any worse or more presumptuous to “throw away *all* conditions,” than to introduce, by the dim light of our own intelligence, *new* conditions such as are no where hinted at in the writings of our illumined author? If not, then who is it that “forget their true position?” *whose* “minds are darkened?” *who* are “in obscurity and confusion” on this subject? those who plant themselves firmly on the explicit teachings of the Lord’s chosen servant, and admit to the Holy Supper all who, he assures us, “approach it worthily?” or those, who, assuming to be wise above what is written, take upon themselves to affix new conditions, such as find no warrant in Scripture or in the authorized writings of the Church?

That the President of the Convention does affix conditions to the partaking of the Holy Supper, which neither the Word nor the writings of the New Church authorize, cannot be denied. We remember when the Convention met a few years ago in the city of New York, and the Sacrament was to be administered Sabbath afternoon, the President, at the close of the morning service, instead of inviting to the Communion all those who, according to the test laid down by Swedenborg, are worthy to come, invited only regular members, or members in good and regular standing, “of regularly instituted New Church Societies.” The consequence was, that some pious and excellent people who were present at the meeting—some who had travelled more than a hundred miles for the express purpose of attending the Convention, and who would have esteemed it a great privilege to join in celebrating

the Holy Supper, were, to their disappointment and deep sorrow, debarred from that blessed privilege, because they happened not to belong to any New Church society—for there existed no such society within a hundred miles of them. And at a subsequent meeting of the Convention, the following preamble and resolution were offered for the express purpose of preventing the repetition of such exclusive and unauthorized form of invitation.

“Whereas we learn from No. 722 of the *True Christian Religion* by Emanuel Swedenborg, ‘that they approach the Holy Supper worthily who are under the influence of faith towards the Lord, and of charity towards their neighbor,’ therefore

“*Resolved*--That, in giving public notice from the pulpit of the time and place of celebrating the Holy Supper by this Convention, the President be requested to extend the invitation to all those who humbly trust that they belong to the class of persons here designated by our illumined teacher.” (See *N. J. Magazine*, vol. xxii, p. 239.)

One would naturally suppose that a resolution like this, based as it is upon the clear and explicit teachings of Swedenborg, would have been adopted without a dissenting voice. But so far from it, its passage was strenuously opposed by all those belonging to the school that Dr. W. represents, and nearly a whole day was consumed in its discussion; and when the vote upon it was about to be taken, the President rose and stated to the Convention, that, in case the resolution should pass in that form, it would require him to do that to which he was conscientiously opposed, and therefore *could not do!* And in the course of his remarks, he stated among other things that he recognized no other Baptism—could not regard any other *as* Baptism—except that performed by the hands of an acknowledged New Church minister; and this kind of Baptism ought, therefore, in his opinion, to precede the reception of the Holy Supper.

It is important to state these things, as they help us to a better understanding of some parts of the Address we are considering. They show us what the author means when he says, that "no person who has not been baptized should come to the Holy Supper." They help us to supply the words which he has omitted; for they show his meaning to be, that "no person who has not been baptized *by a New Church minister*, should come to the Holy Supper." Believing that there is no other valid Christian baptism save that administered by an acknowledged New Church minister, consistency requires that he should believe in no other valid Christian communion, except that administered by Swedenborgians, and in the propriety of allowing or inviting none others to partake, except those "who receive the doctrines of the New Jerusalem;" for none others, in the author's view, "constitute the Church in its special sense." A *New Jerusalem* as distinct from *Christian* baptism, would necessitate a *New Jerusalem* as distinct from the *Christian* Eucharist. And the very title of the pamphlet before us—"the Passover, the Israelitish, the Christian, and the *New Jerusalem*"—shows that the author himself accepts this logical inference.

Now, as we cannot accept Dr. Worcester's views of baptism, believing them to be mistaken and unauthorized, so neither can we accept his views of the Eucharist, as set forth in this Address according to our understanding of it. We find nothing in all the writings of Swedenborg to favor the author's views on either of these subjects, but much that is clearly opposed to them. Let the reader turn to the chapter in the True Christian Religion on the Holy Supper, and after an attentive perusal of it, say if he finds a single sentence that points towards the exclusive or "close communion" doctrine. Or let him turn to the Arcana and read attentively Swedenborg's expla-

nation of Exod. xii. 43-49—the theme of Dr. Worcester's Address—and see whether the doctrine finds any better support there. Or let him take an impartial survey of our own Swedenborgian societies, and then look at the charitable and pious men and women in other communions, and say whether, in view of what may be learned from observation, he thinks it probable or possible that *all* the true Israel of God, or those who constitute “the Church in its special sense,” are included in our communion; and whether all other Christians are to be reckoned as “strangers” or “foreigners”—*outside* the Church of Christ—and, as such, not worthy to partake with us of the Holy Supper.

We regard this as a practical question, and one of no mean import. The views we form of it, together with the practice growing out of them, cannot but materially affect our own states, and our relation and feelings towards other Christians. We hold that no minister, society, association, or convention, has any right to affix conditions to the reception of the Holy Supper, which the Lord never affixed and never authorized his chosen servant to affix; and that any attempt to do this, should be promptly and firmly resisted. A minister may teach who come worthily to the table of the Lord, and what preparation is necessary—shunning to add aught on this subject from his own intelligence; but there his duty ends. Beyond that he has no right to go. Every individual should be left to judge for himself whether he be of the number of those “who are under the influence of faith towards the Lord and of charity towards their neighbor,” and therefore “worthy” to come, or not. This is not a question for any minister or society to determine, but for each one's own conscience. Therefore every one whom the Lord constrains to come to the

Supper, should be left free to do so; and if any come unworthily, on them alone must rest the responsibility. That this is the high and broad ground on which Swedenborg places this holy ordinance, will be shown more fully in another paper on this subject.

(To be continued.)

TO MY MOTHER.

BY W. H. HOLCOMBE.

No fresh green spot of Spring is found,
The wintry snow has clad the ground,
The cold air has no joyful sound,
My Mother!

Hushed is the water's note of glee,
No song comes from the birdless tree,
But yet I have a song for thee,
My Mother!

For till the light of love depart,
There is a Spring within my heart
Of which the changeless Sun thou art,
My Mother!

When chi'dhood welcomed bird and bee,
When music breathed from every tree,
When thou wert all in all to me,
My Mother!

When Nature's sunlight on my brow
Was not so tinged with shade as now,
And all things seemed as kind as thou,
My Mother!

My view of Life was like a scene
 Deep mirrored in a lake serene,
 Bright, loving skies and hills of green
My Mother!

The picture now is not so fair,
 For winds of doubt and clouds of care
 Have broke the glittering calmness there,
My Mother!

But still the memory of thy face
 All later memories can replace,
 The winds can calm—the clouds can chase—
My Mother!

And to the spirit sorrow-riven
 Restore that light so early given,
 The light that leads—with thee—to heaven,
My Mother!

CORRESPONDENCE.

LETTER FROM ENGLAND.

EDITOR OF THE SWEDENBORGIAN :—SIR—It is now some time since I did myself the pleasure of writing you. I have not written because of not having any thing of interest to communicate. Even now I write more from a sense of duty, than from an idea that I can interest you by my present communication.

It is gratifying to find from your periodical that the cause which it advocates is so successful in your country. Ecclesiastical Liberalism must triumph after a time, because it is on the side of truth. It cannot be that man is to rule over man in the New Church. The teaching of our blessed Lord, that men are not to exercise dominion over one another in His church, but that all are to be brethren with

Himself as their only Master—that all are to be servants one to another—this divine teaching is to be attended to and obeyed in the New Jerusalem. Even if Swedenborg had said—and he never has said it—that men are to rule over one another in an orderly church, the Lord's teaching is still to be preferred; for E. S. tells us that all doctrine is to be drawn from the literal sense of the Word. Swedenborg's writings are not to supersede the Word, but to help us to understand it.

How different would Christianity have been in the world, if men had always attended to the Saviour's teachings in regard to their ruling over one another, and teaching with authority. If they had done this, there would not have been the sectarianism which has prevailed, nor the dissensions, nor the persecutions, but men would have helped one another to the exercise of private judgment in the doctrines of faith, and in all ecclesiastical arrangements. Men of learning and eminence, especially preachers, would have maintained this right on the part of every man to judge for himself. They would have said to one another, Let us seek to have all men well educated, so that they may read the Bible for themselves. They would have said in their preachings, We hold the views we preach simply as our own opinions. We may err, and this of itself is a reason why we wish men to think for themselves, in addition to the commands of Jesus that men are to have no teacher but Himself. In this way the church would have continued to be one, because Charity would have been held to be the first essential of religion; and men, holding the supremacy of charity, would not have separated one from another. A trinity of persons, with its damnatory clause, would not have been put forth; no worship of the Virgin Mary would have been introduced, nor of saints, nor of images, nor of dead men's bones. Monastic institutions would never have been heard of. The Bible would never have been taken out of men's hands, but all would have possessed it, and would, like the noble Bereans, have sought therein to know the real truth. Would predestination, or solifidianism, or imputed righteousness have raised its head? No; it required Church Councils to hatch and proclaim such doctrines, and that with authority, or men would not have received them. We may be sure that, had it not been for ecclesiastical authority, the supremacy of charity would have been maintained, and the Church would have continued to be one.

But alas ! it has been far otherwise with the Church, as we learn from history. In this history we have lamentable records set before us. From it the men of the New Church should take warning. Its sad records should be an additional reason for not departing from the Saviour's teaching, and setting up Church governments. They should consider, too, that in this Church all things are to be made new ; they are not, in their ecclesiastical arrangements, or any thing else, to put new wine into old bottles. Many men, however, of the so-called New Church, have not thought in this way ; they have used too much the old leaven of the Pharisees. True, it may be said of them, by way of excuse, that they have been coming out of an old system whose very errors were venerable from long-established usage. True, the New Church has been but in a transition-state, and is not yet out of it ; still it is now time to aspire towards better things. It should aspire to a state of true order ; a state of liberty ; a state in which men shall be lifted up, and come into a true individuality ; come into that orderly state which consists in being governed, taught, and led by the Lord alone. " One is your Master, Christ, and all ye are brethren."

It is a marvel that the men of the New Church should not have chosen one and all to follow the Saviour's teaching as to all being brethren, and servants one to another. Even admitting that Swedenborg has taught the priestly government ascribed to him in *H. D.* 314, is he to be preferred to Jesus Christ ? Are his writings to be preferred to the Word ? Assuredly not. But men have lost sight of this : they have selected two or three passages from his writings to sanction the rule of man over man, especially the rule of priests, when all his writings beside, and the Word of God itself, forbid it. They are like the Solifidians, who have found a passage in Paul's Epistles appearing to teach faith alone, and have made it their leading principle, although his epistles in other places, and the whole Word of God, are replete with teaching of an opposite kind. So with E. S. He supports the teaching of Jesus Christ as to all men being servants one to another, and says the same in many passages beside. Why will not men look these facts fairly in the face ?

But enough on this subject for the present—though I may have more to say about this matter of order in heaven and

in the church, and about the discussion occasioned in this country by the liberal tone of the Address delivered before our Conference at its last annual meeting. I will now only add such items of intelligence as occur to me, and as I think may be of interest to your readers.

I said in my last letter that there would probably be much done among us this winter in the way of popular lectures ; and I am happy now to say that several of our ministers have been lecturing with zeal, and with more or less of success. Two or three preachers are trying in populous cities to see what can be done by preaching our doctrines in the open air. We must not, however, look for great results at once ; because the New Church doctrines require a careful examination before they can be received. They appeal to men who are disposed to serious thinking, and there are not many of such a disposition. And then the prejudice is great against the New Church. Our lecturers must content themselves with simply doing what they deem to be their duty in proclaiming our heavenly verities. They must cast their bread upon the waters, in the hope of seeing it again after many days.

One of our Tract Societies is now publishing small cheap tracts of four pages each, which are well adapted for being distributed at lectures, and indeed for general distribution.

Those of your readers who see our periodicals will have learned with gladness that our doctrines are now being zealously received in the Mauritius. Quite a number of persons are now interested in them, and from present appearances the good cause is likely to make much progress there. They were about to start a periodical at the beginning of the present year. They are very desirous to have among them a person from Europe who can preach the doctrines both in the French and English languages ; but a preacher suitable in every way to go out and perform this use, is not easily found.

The second part of Rich's Index to the Arcana is now published, and before this you must have received some copies in America. It is calculated to be very useful to all persons in the New Church.

Our friend, M. Le Boys des Guays is bringing out a general Index to the passages of the Word in Swedenborg's works. It will make a volume of some 400 pages, and will refer to every text of Scripture in all Swedenborg's theolo-

gical works, including the *Adversaria*. The plan pursued is similar to that in the Indexes which he has now for several years given to his translations of the works, the nature of the references being indicated by small initial letters. It will be in the French language, but will very likely be soon translated and published also in English.

Thus our French friend has recently published in his own language his second and third volumes of the *Apocalypse Revealed*; volumes four, five and six of the *Apocalypse Explained*; and the *Four Leading Doctrines* in one volume. All these with analytical tables; also the Index to the *Arcana Cælestia*. It is his intention to continue the preparation of analytical tables until each of the works shall have its own.

I happened to say in a former letter that our doctrines had been received and avowed by Mrs. Howitt the Quakeress. This she has denied, or some one has done it for her, in the papers; but the denial is qualified by saying she has not joined "the sect of Swedenborgians." I have since learned from a friend of hers that she is simply opposed to the "sect," while she receives fully the doctrines, and is much interested in their progress.

I also said in a former letter that the Rev. T. L. Harris of New York was in this country, and was about to lecture for three months in Manchester. He lectured accordingly, and is now lecturing for the same length of time in London. He was not so successful as he had expected to be in Manchester, and of this he more than once complained in his discourses; but towards the last his audiences became rather numerous. It is said that in London he is more successful.

Yours truly,

March 1st, 1860.

FRATER.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE A. N. C. ASSOCIATION, AND THE A. S. P. AND P. SOCIETY.—The Anniversary of these sister Institutions will be celebrated on the evening of May 10th, (present month,) at the New Church house of worship in

35th St., New York—commencing at 8 o'clock, P. M. In addition to the other exercises on the occasion, an appropriate Address by Rev. W. B. Hayden is expected.

MR. RICH'S INDEX TO THE ARCANA.—We learn through our English correspondent that the second Volume of this admirable Index, which has been waited for with so much anxiety for the last three years, is at last completed. The two volumes together embrace about 1500 royal 8vo. pages, being by far the fullest and most complete Index to the Arcana ever published. It is the intention of the Board of Managers of the American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society to adopt this as the Index to their beautiful edition of the Arcana.

DEDICATION OF THE NEW CHURCH TEMPLE IN PHILADELPHIA.—On Sabbath, March 25th, the recently finished Temple of the First New Jerusalem Society in Philadelphia was solemnly dedicated to the worship of the Lord in his Divine Humanity. The occasion was one of deep interest to the Society, and drew together a large audience, crowding the aisles and all the available space in the building. Many of those in attendance were strangers, who, however, seemed much interested and impressed with the exercises. The services were very simple, and all the more impressive on that account. They consisted mainly in the singing of an appropriate Hymn and Anthem by the choir, the reading of selections from the Word by Rev. E. A. Beaman, and a short dedicatory Address by Rev. B. F. Barrett, who also preached a sermon appropriate to the occasion from the words (Rev. xxi. 5,) "And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write ; for these words are true and faithful." Religious services were also held at the Temple in the afternoon and evening of the same day, with preaching by Mr. Beaman and Mr. Barrett to large and attentive audiences.

The walls of this Temple were erected and the basement story (in which the society has since worshiped) finished some four or five years ago. The building is situated in a pleasant part of the city, at the southeast corner of Broad and Brandywine streets, above Spring Garden. It is built of gray stone, having a front doorway of Connecticut brown stone in the Roman style of architecture, with a massive circular head. It is fifty feet front on Broad street, by seventy-five feet deep on Brandywine. The Broad street front has three openings in each story, a neat window on each side of the doorway, and three large windows on the second story. On Brandywine street it has five large windows, with circular "corbelled" heads upon each story, the whole surmounted with an ornamented bracketed cornice. The interior of the building comprises a large basement, which is divided into a lecture-room, pastor's room, and library room. The second story, or audience room for the congregation, is fitted up in very neat style, with a tastefully panelled pulpit, an elevated platform for the organ and choir, and pews sufficient to seat 500 persons. The whole cost of the building, including the organ and lot of ground, was \$20,000 ; all of which, except \$1000, has been raised by the voluntary contributions of the society and congregation.

The Society worshiping in this Temple has a simple organization, and has long occupied the ground of complete ecclesiastical independence. That is, it has no connection with the General Convention nor with any other ecclesiastical body ; therefore it is perfectly free to make its own laws and govern itself in its own way. This it has been doing now for many years. And the fact that it is by far the most flourishing New Church society in Philadelphia, having much the largest and most costly house of worship, and a congregation two or three times as large as any other—numbering, it is thought, nearly as many as all the four societies in that city belonging to the General Convention, put together—this fact, we say, is significant, and one

which should encourage New Church societies everywhere to maintain a similar independent attitude. There can be no doubt that the present healthy and flourishing condition of this society is attributable mainly to this circumstance—its ecclesiastical independence; and there is not much danger that it will ever abandon its present position in this respect.

Rev. E. A. Beaman, who has been officiating for the society for more than a year past, still continues to preach acceptably. We presume there are few New Church societies in our country that are in a more healthy condition than this, or whose prospects for the future are more encouraging.

NEW LUNAR DISCOVERIES.—It is extremely interesting to New Churchmen to note how almost every new discovery in science goes to confirm some principle or doctrine of our Church, or some statement made by Swedenborg more than a hundred years ago.

In his treatise on the "Earths in the Universe," our author, among other things thought to be strange, gives an account of *the inhabitants of the Moon*. This, our scientific men have said, is unworthy of belief, because Science assures us that the Moon has no atmosphere and no water, and therefore cannot support either animal or vegetable life. But Science, it seems, is about to reverse her own decision on this subject—as she has already reversed it on a hundred others within the last century—and to confirm the lunar revelations of the great Seer, as the following paragraph, just clipped from the *Morning Times* will show.

"Certain recent astronomical observations seem to prove a new chapter of Life in the Moon. Hitherto our satellite has been looked upon as merely a dry earthy mass, without water, without atmosphere, and consequently without vegetation and inhabitants. The popular imagination, indeed, has always persisted in peopling it with lunar denizens; but how were they to subsist without air? EULER thought the moon really had an atmosphere; but his observations did not convince astron-

omers. Later, DE LA RIVE and others added new authority to the opinion of EULER ; according to them she has an atmosphere, but it is extremely low.

HERR SCHWABE, a distinguished German astronomer, goes still further. In a late number of the *Astronomical Annals* (*Astronomische Nachrichten*) he announces having seen a species of vegetation in the moon ! Here is the fact on which he bases his conclusion ; the surface of the moon presents numerous striped lines like so many furrows. These had been explained in a variety of ways—some considering them as dried-up river-beds, others as tracks left by torrents of lava, &c. SCHWABE advances a quite other solution. According to him, the ridges that run down the loftier lunar mountain sides present at certain seasons a green color, which they lose at the end of a few months. Thence he concludes that there exists a vegetation in the moon, coming at a season corresponding to our earthly Spring, and going at a season corresponding to our Autumn. Should this interesting fact receive final authenticity, it will certainly overthrow the commonly received opinion that there is no water on the surface of the moon. For, since the vegetation seen by SCHWABE is green, would not analogy suggest that it is the result of chemical combinations similar to those which produce the phenomena of our earthly vegetation.

LITERARY NOTICES.

Delights of Wisdom concerning Conjugal Love ; after which follow, Pleasures of insanity concerning Scortatory Love. By EMANUEL SWEDENBORG, a Swede, [originally published in Latin, in Amsterdam MDCCLXVIII.] New-York ; Published by the General Convention of the New Jerusalem Church in the United States at the office of its Board of Publications, 346 Broadway. John L. Jewett, agent, 1860. — In size, style of binding and lettering, and general external appearance, this book closely resembles the edition of the same work published by the American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society—a similarity which may be presumed to be purely the result of accident. In some other respects, however, it is widely different, being nothing more than a reprint, without the slightest alteration or emendation, from a set of stereotype plates cast in Boston nearly thirty

years ago, and which, having become greatly depreciated in value by the publication of the newer and better edition of the Publishing Society, were bought at a low price by some gentlemen connected with the General Convention, and are now nominally owned by that body. It is much to be regretted that these plates were not destroyed at once when first superseded, instead of being again brought into use. They embody so many glaring faults of style, and errors of translation, that we can hardly conceive how, even in the infancy of the Church, when its scholars and educated men were few in number, they should have attained the dignity of being stereotyped; and still less, how at this late day, with a much more elegant and correct edition already in market, an attempt should be made to force an edition, printed from them, upon an unsuspecting and confiding public. The pages of the copy before us read like a schoolboy's exercises; they fairly bristle with barbarisms; whole sections of the text are a mere muddle of confused sense; and frequently it seems as if the translator, in despair of seizing and conveying the author's real meaning, had just given the words of the original with English terminations, one after another, and left the reader to make the best he could of the assortment. For instance, take the following paragraphs:

“Whoever wishes from any of the senses to acquire to himself an idea respecting good, cannot find it without some *adject* which fixes and manifests it; good without this is an *entity* of no name; and that by which it is fixed and manifested relates to truth; say only good, and not at the same time this, or that with which it is, or define it abstractly or without any *adject cohering*, and you will see that it is not anything, but that it is something with its *adject*; and if you examine the subject rationally, you will perceive, that, of good without some *adject*, nothing can be predicated, and thence it is of no relation, of no affection and of no state, in a word, of no quality. So it is also with truth, if the word be heard without its *injunct*; that its *injunct* has relation to good, may be seen by an *acute* reason.”—(n. 87.)

“That the woman was taken from the man was shown just now above from the book of creation; that hence there is to each sex a faculty and inclination for conjoining themselves into one, thence follows: for that which is taken from anything derives and retains from

the proprium of that thing that which makes its own, which because it is *homogeneous, breathes after re-union* and when it is re-united it is as *in itself when in that*, and the reverse. That there is a faculty of conjunction of the one sex with the other, or that they can be united, *this no scruple moves; nor but that there is an inclination to conjoin themselves, for every ones' own experience teaches each.*"—(n. 157.)

"For every end viewed in itself is love, and lasciviousness in its spiritual origin is insaneness; by insaneness is understood the *deliration* of the mind from the falses. and *eminent deliration* is the *deliration* of the mind from falsified truths, until they are believed to be wisdom; that these persons are opposed to conjugal love, manifest *confirmation or eviction is given* in the spiritual world; there at the first *smell of conjugal love* they flee away into caverns, and shut up the doors; and if these are opened they are insane, like persons out of their senses in this world."—(n. 212.)

These passages are culled at random, and are by no means all that might be adduced of a similar description. It is versions of Swedenborg like these, which have helped as much as anything else to bring his works into disrepute; for almost any one reading such nonsense as we have just quoted, might very reasonably conclude that Swedenborg was insane, and his writings unworthy the attention of sensible men. So, again, the translator has in many cases entirely mistaken and misrepresented Swedenborg's meaning; as for instance,

"I crawled away to the brink and threw myself down from it, and being taken up by those who were standing beneath, and being carried into an *inn*, there *sanity* returned to me."—(n. 10.)

The word here translated "inn" is "diversorium," which means a lodging-house of any kind, and not an "inn" as we understand the word, and especially should not be so rendered in relation to the spiritual world. "Sanity," also above mentioned, has reference to "health" in general, and not that of the brains only, and should be so rendered. Again :

"It is incumbent on the men to be complaisant to the women, by civilly, kindly, and humbly courting and soliciting concerning that sweet accession to their life from them; the elegance of face, of body, and of the manners of that sex in comparison with the male, also adds itself as the *debt of a vow.*"—(n. 297.)

The Latin phrase, here translated "debt of a vow" is "debitum voti," and very clearly means "due object of desire." The translator in this case confesses his inability to understand Swedenborg's meaning, by adding the Latin words in brackets, as if to throw the task of interpreting them upon each individual reader. A like want of capacity to comprehend his author is manifested in the following passage :

"That therefore it is vain to believe that man lives after death any more than a beast, except that he may, perchance, for some days after his decease, from the exhalation of the life of the body, appears as a cloud under the appearance of a spectre before he is dissipated into nature ; scarcely otherwise than as a shrub *kindled anew from its own ashes*, appears in the likeness of its own form."—(no. 151*.)

There is nothing whatever in the original answering to "kindled." The word is simply "exsuscitatum," and means "raised or gathered up." As above translated, Swedenborg's illustration is meaningless ; but by a proper rendering, it is clear enough.

If we had space and leisure at our command, we might cite a dozen more such instances of blundering ; but we trust the above will suffice to show their general character.

Throughout the book, the pretext of "literalness" is put forth to conceal poverty of scholarly attainments, and want of acquaintance both with Latin idioms and the resources of our mother tongue. The phrase "certum reddere" the translator renders "make sure" instead of "inform." (n. 2) ; "datum est" he makes "given" instead of "permitted," (n. 5, 12 and other places) ; the dative of possession is continually rendered by "to" instead of the nominative ; "laetificari" is "made joyful" instead of "rejoiced" (n. 8) ; "hic" and "ille" are rendered "this" and "that," where the idiom of our language requires "the one" and "the other." Then, too, instead of giving the fair Saxon equivalent for many words, he shows his want of skill by merely Anglicising their terminations ; and so the whole book is

liberally bestrewn with such barbarisms as "habitaclcs," "sedulity," "injunct," "sanctitude," "adscititious," "traduction," "inconspicuous," "arcane," "intranquillity," "congruences," "evulgation," "pensile," "succedaneous," and many more, the full ugliness of which can only be seen in their connection with their context. Above all, this edition persistently retains the word "scortatory" for "adulterous," the use of which has long since been abandoned by our English brethren, is unwarranted by the authority of any good writer, and is entirely unnecessary. So, too, Swedenborg is made to call his own treatise a "lucubration."—(n. 295.)

Now this wretched translation, so disgraceful to the reputation of the Church, and so unworthy the merits of the original, certain parties are trying to bring into favor, not merely by such commendations of it as every tradesman is at liberty to bestow on his wares, but by a most unfair and reckless depreciation of the version they vainly imagine their own will rival. Abusing the control placed in their hands over periodicals supported by their brethren, they have published in them a number of articles directly attacking the edition of the Publishing Society, and making the most groundless charges against its officers. Among other things it is asserted :

That the Publishing Society's edition is a loose and unfaithful translation.

That its title-page is an outrage upon Swedenborg's rights as an author.

That the apologetic preface prefixed to it, is unnecessary, highly objectionable, and a violation of the Society's constitution.

The first of the charges comes with a bad grace from men who can not only perpetrate, but glory in, the blunders we have pointed out in their own work. The version they thus impudently assail, is the one issued by the London Sweden-

borg Society, the officers and members of which are the best educated men in the English New Church. It has been revised again and again there, and was still again carefully corrected here before its publication. It may not be perfect, we admit, but it is smooth, elegant, and intelligible; and in comparison with its would-be rival, it is a paragon of excellence. The reader must, however, decide this question for himself, and we fearlessly challenge inquiry into it.

As to the title, it is true that the Publishing Society's edition substitutes for the long and involved one given at the head of this article, simply the words "Conjugal Love and its Chaste Delights; also Adulterous Love and its Sinful Pleasures"; *at the same time giving in the same page Swedenborg's original Latin title in full.* This the Convention's edition fails to do; and we submit, that in this respect the other does more perfect justice to the author. We have also the opinion of good judges, that the shorter English title is really the more accurate translation; and it has the support of both the London and New-York Publishing Societies, against the opposition of the Convention; so that the authorities are two to one in its favor.

But the greatest outcry is raised against the preface, which a writer in the *Messenger* devotes a whole column to abusing. He claims that a preface is unnecessary; that the book needs no apology; and that it is worse than folly to offer one. It is sufficient to say in reply, that the conviction of the necessity of explaining and defending some of its most important doctrines is so general, that it may be considered universal among New Churchmen. Every libeler of the church fastens upon it at once; and every apologist that has written on our side—Hartley, Clowes, Hindmarsh, Noble, Parsons, Bush, Cabell, Barrett, and others, has felt obliged to defend it. When, therefore, the Managers of the Publishing Society were about to issue an edition for *popular use*, they saw the eminent propriety of prefixing to it such a statement as should answer in advance these often-

repeated slanders ; and a few pages prepared by a committee of their number, and afterwards read and fully considered by the whole Board, were published accordingly. It is *untrue* that, in doing this, they violated the Constitution of the Society. Nothing is said in the Constitution about it. *It is untrue*, that "numerous remonstrances have been sent them" against their action. *Not a single word has been breathed against it except by the writers in the Convention's own Periodicals.* As to the abstract propriety of thus defending Swedenborg from misconception, it is too late now to moot that question. Practice has long since settled it in the affirmative. The Publishing Society's *Heaven and Hell* has had such a preface seven years. The Boston edition of the *True Christian Religion* had one ; so had the *Arcana*, the *N. J. D.*, and many others. But this point, again, we are willing to submit to the decision of the public. So far as the sales of the work can settle it, their approval of the Publishing Society is general. The sales of the book, "objectionable preface" and all, is 120 copies for the past eleven months, against 92 for the previous year, and 81 the year before that. With the advertisements gratuitously given it in these attacks, its circulation is likely to increase still more.

In conclusion, we can only express the hope that the members of the General Convention will interfere to prevent another such waste of their funds as has been committed in printing this new edition of "Conjugal Love." It is perhaps too late to suppress it now ; but the plates had better at once be sold for type metal, and the book be put among the things of the past. H.

The Century (published weekly in the city of New-York, 37 Park Row, at \$2.50 a year) is one of the most interesting and valuable of our exchanges. The "New Series" just commenced, is very inviting both in matter and appearance. The previous newspaper form has been exchanged for one far more pleasant to the eye, as well as preferable for preservation.