

DE HEMELSCHE LEER

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

DEVOTED TO THE DOCTRINE OF GENUINE TRUTH

OUT OF THE LATIN WORD REVEALED FROM THE LORD

ORGAN OF THE GENERAL CHURCH

OF THE NEW JERUSALEM IN HOLLAND

EXTRACTS FORM THE ISSUES JUNE TO DECEMBER 1932

(ENGLISH TRANSLATION)

fourth facicle

LEADING THESES PROPOUNDED IN

"DE HEMELSCHE LEER."

1. The Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg are the Third Testament of the Word of the Lord. The DOCTRINE OF THE NEW JERUSALEM CONCERNING THE SACRED SCRIPTURE must be applied to the three Testaments alike.
2. The Latin Word without Doctrine is as a candlestick without light, and those who read the Latin Word without Doctrine, or who do not acquire for themselves a Doctrine from the Latin Word. are in darkness as to all truth (of. S. S. 50-61).
3. The genuine Doctrine of the Church is spiritual out of celestial origin, but not out of rational origin. The Lord is that Doctrine itself (cf. A. C. 2496, 2497, 2510, 2516, 2533, 2859; A. E. 19).

DE HEMELSCHE LEER

EXTRACT FROM THE ISSUE FOR. JUNE 193-2

FROM THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE SWEDENBORG GEZELSCHAP

Extract from the minutes of the meeting of Saturday, April 11th 1931.

The memorandum, calling this meeting together, reads as follows: Review of Mr. Groeneveld's Address The Nineteenth of June 1930 (see Third Fascicle, pp. 3—8).

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER gave the following elucidation of Mr. Groeneveld's address: The occasion for this address by Mr. Groeneveld was the celebration of the Nineteenth of June. The subject therefore is the coming into existence of the Church, that is. the coming into existence of those real things which, before the Lord, are the Church. If the essence of the Church is seen in spiritual light, it does not appear as an external organization in the world, but as a Man; and it is said of it and of the things which make it, that they are conceived and born, and that subsequently they pass through the ages of a man from the innocence of the ignorance of childhood to the innocence of the wisdom of old age.

In this way it is seen in the spiritual sense that the Doctrine of the Church is conceived in the Church from the Lord and is born out of the Church. The New Church of the Lord which will be in the lands, and which is the New Jerusalem, is represented by a Woman travailing in birth; the Doctrine of that Church by the male Son whom she bore; the travailing in birth signifies the difficult reception of that Doctrine, on account of the opposition of the proprium of man (cf. A.R. XII). It is indeed said in the literal sense of the APOCALYPSE REVEALED: "The Doctrine here meant is THE DOCTRINE OF THE NEW JERUSALEM, published in London, 17,')8; as also THE

4 FROM THE TRANSACTIONS

DOCTRINES CONCERNING THE LORD. CONCERNING THE SACKED SCRIPTURE, AND CONCERNING LIFE ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENTS OF THE DECALOGUE. Amsterdam" (n. 543). In the literal sense thus of the APOCALYPSE REVEALED the difficult birth of the Latin Testament itself in Swedenborg's time is here spoken of, but that this passage in the spiritual sense applies to the birth of the Doctrine in the Church, is evident to any one who understands the difference between the Word and the Doctrine of the Church. We read in the ARCANA CELESTIA: "He who does not know the arcana of Heaven. . . . supposes that the Word in the letter or the literal sense of the Word, is the Doctrine itself. . . . But the Doctrine must be collected out. of the Word, and while it is being collected, the man must be in enlightenment from the Lord" (n. 9424). The

great significance of the difference between the Word of the New Church, that is, the Latin Word, and the Doctrine of the New Church out of that Word, here clearly appears. If man is not open to the acknowledgement of this difference, the arcana of Heaven will not be accessible to him. The Word is given to the Church as the infinite and inexhaustible source of all truth, but its Doctrine, the Church as of itself must bring forth from the Word by the orderly means. The Doctrine is entirely such as the Church is; the purer the Church, the more interior its Doctrine, and also the reverse, the more interior the Doctrine the purer the Church. We read in the APOCALYPSE REVEALED: "Who does not know that the Church is not Church without Doctrine" (n. 97). That by the Doctrine here not the Latin Word is meant, but the Doctrine which the New Church as from itself makes for itself, is evident. So too in the following passages of the same work: "There are three things that make the Church, the truth of Doctrine, the good of Love, and Worship out of these" (n. 486). "The all of Religion consists in good, and the all of the Church in Doctrine, which must teach truths, and through truths good" (n. 675). "The Church is called Church out of Doctrine" (n. 923). And likewise in the ARCANA CELESTIA: "The Church is Church out of the Doctrine of truth and the Life of good" (n. 3305). In all these places by the Doctrine not the Word of the Church but the Doctrine of the Church is meant, and hence it is evident of what great

5 OF THE SWEDENBORG GEZELSCHAP

significance it is that one understands the difference between the Word and the Doctrine of the Church. It then becomes clear that in the spiritual sense by the travelling in birth of the Woman the difficult birth of the Doctrine in the Church is represented. It is by the spiritual sense that the truth of the literal sense of the Word, to which the former corresponds, may be seen in its essence, and it is thereby in no way destroyed. In what way the Dragonists out of the reformed Christian world from all sides, tried to prevent the coming into existence of the new Word (A.R. 543), has been described in many places in that Word. But as long as the thought of the New Church confines itself to this historical signification, it remains essentially a natural thought, in spite of the spiritual subject; for it then confines itself to the form in which the spiritual is, but not to the essence or the spiritual itself. A spiritual thought concerning these things becomes possible only when the essence of the dragon is grasped as an abstract concept, and when afterwards one discerns it as being present in the New Church itself and in every member of that Church.

The things from the Lord which make the Church are first formed as a seed, as the rational. This seed is conceived in the affection for truth, and there for itself forms a body, which is borne in the body of the Church, The essence of those things is then felt as a general principle of truth. By the continuous influx of the Lord they are there developed invisibly. When the time of birth has come, these things clearly appear in their relation and application to all particulars of the good and truth of the Church, and then their great significance is fully seen. In this way the conception and the birth of the Doctrine of the Church in our Society are here spoken of. This may be elucidated and confirmed by what we read in n. 3671 of the ARCANA CELESTIA: "In the rational are the seeds, and the natural is of service as a soil". This is the orderly way of the coming into existence of all genuine things of the Church. The things that make the Church thus are of purely Divine origin and purely Divine essence. Those are the "Divine things of the Church" that are spoken of in the Word (see for instance D.F. 215). It here clearly appears that it is not possible to speak of the Divine things of the Church before in this way they have been conceived and born in the

Church. Without such a generation, which is Divine, there can be no question of the Divine things of the Church. The goods and truths of the Word as they are in themselves, are not the Divine things of the Church: for it is not the Word that makes the Church, but the understanding of the Word. But man's understanding of the Word cannot make the Church, unless it is from the Lord: the understanding out of the proprium cannot make the Church. "It is the Divine of the Lord that makes the Church with man: for nothing can be considered as the Church but that which is the proprium of the Lord" (A.C. 2&66). That the Divine things of the Church are born out of the marriage between the Lord and the Church, is described in many places of the Word. So we read in n. 307 of THE TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION: "By mother in the celestial sense is understood the Church. . . . By the New Jerusalem is understood the New Church which at this day is being established from the Lord. ... This Church, and not the preceding, is the Wife and Mother in this sense. The spiritual offspring which are born out of this marriage, are the goods of charity and the truths of faith; and those who are in these from the Lord, are called sons of the wedding, sons of God, and born from Him".

The things of the Church, conceived and born in such a way, are given to it as something that is of Divine essence and imperishable. In this way the truth has been conceived and born that the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg are the Word of the Lord. Any one who has part in this conception and birth knows that this is an imperishable Divine truth. In this way the concept of the Divinity of the Doctrine of the Church has been conceived and born; and all those who have part in this conception and birth feel that this also is a Divine truth. A truth of the Church not thus conceived and born, does not exist. For this reason the truths of the Church in the Old Testament are represented by the sons of Israel. But this is also the reason why for those outside the Church, who have no part in the conception and birth of its truths, it is difficult to see these truths.

The faith in the possibility and reality of this Divine conception and birth of the things that make the Church, opens the possibility and brings the reality of regeneration, and a vision of the Doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit.

7 OF THE SWEDENBORG GEZELSCHAP

The sphere of the Holy Spirit is the sphere of the Divine things of the Church. It is not the Word that makes the Church, but the understanding of the Word; it is the Holy Spirit that makes the Church. By the Word alone without Doctrine out of the Word, no one comes into the essential things of the Word, which are the essential and really living things of the Church and the things of the Holy Spirit. The genuine Doctrine is from the Holy Spirit, and the Doctrine alone leads the Church into the sphere of the Holy Spirit. "By the Word of the Lord were the Heavens made, and all the Host of them by the Spirit of His Mouth" (Ps. 33 : 6). The Heavens were before the Angels were. So we read that it was once given to Swedenborg to see the extent of the uninhabited Heaven (H.H. 419). The Heavens have been made by the Word, but the Angels, and therefore the goods and truths of the Church, have been made by the Spirit of the Mouth of the Lord; that is, by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of the Mouth of the Lord is the Doctrine. The internal up building of the Church is only possible through the Doctrine.

The comparison of the transition from the state of the Church where the literal sense of the Word itself is considered as the Doctrine, to the state where the Doctrine of the Church is seen as spiritual out of celestial origin, with the transition from the geocentric to the heliocentric system of the universe, is based on an actual correspondence. It is self-evident that such an important general revolution in the thought of the human race must have a spiritual sense; for the entire natural world and the entire history are a theatre representative of the Lord's Kingdom (cf. A.C. 300U, 3483, 3518. and many other places). This revolution corresponds to the state of the Church and of each member of the Church when they can pass over from the spiritual natural state to the essentially spiritual state itself. In the natural state, of which the proper essence is obedience, the thinking must entirely follow the letter. It is only the general truths that can be seen in this state. This may be confirmed hereby that. the great importance of a strictly literal translation of each separate word in the Third Testament, was not felt in the beginning of the Church. In the spiritual state, of which the proper essence is genuine charity or the love of truth for the sake of truth, it for

8 FROM THE TRANSACTIONS

the first time becomes clear to man that the letter of the Word indeed is the basis for the truth, but that genuine truth is always given in the internal man, who then can see the truth in the letter of the word . The essence of the thinking in the natural state is the natural rational; this rational is always bound to obedience to the letter, and this thinking must always follow the letter. The essence of the thinking in the spiritual state is the spiritual-rational; this rational for the first time sees the spiritual causes or the essence of truth, and henceforward all thinking no longer follows the letter, hut the letter follows the thinking (e.f. A.C. 1)124). But the power and the significance of the letter is in no way thereby destroyed or weakened: on the contrary, the letter thereby for the first time comes into its proper rights. For the letter as it is in itself contains indeed all genuine truths; hut the natural thinking sees nothing in it but the coarsest generalities, (and with regard to the particulars that lie hidden in the internal, it is in ignorance and even in fallacies. The Divine operation in the bringing forth of truth out of the Word is always dependent on. the development of the internal man. That, however, the letter in. the spiritual state -- where thus the thinking no longer follows the letter, but the letter follows the thinking - is in no way put aside or even destroyed, appears clearly from this -that not until this state is the great importance seen of a. strictly literal translation of each separate word in the Third Testament.

It is according to order that the Church first must pass through a series of preparatory natural states, before -the spiritual state can commence, in which for the first time the Doctrine of the Church in its relation to the Word of the Church comes to the fore. hi all of those preparatory states it cannot be but •that the Church regards the Word itself of the Church as the Doctrine. Every Church from its beginning must as it were pass through all the states of the ages of a man, entirely as has been shown on a previous occasion (see Third Fascicle, pp. 90---108) with regard to the history of the human race as a whole. Accordingly also in the history of the New Church a series of successive, states may be discerned, which entirely corresponds to the series of the great periods of the entire history of the human race. In the history- of the New Church too

there is as it were an Adamic state, which is the age of its infancy; a Noachic state, which is the age of its boyhood; a Hebrew and an Israelitish state, which is the age of its adolescence; a state of the Coming and Sensual Presence of the Lord, which is the age of its early manhood: a Christian state, which is the age of its manhood: and a state of the Second Coming of the Lord or a proper state of the, New Church itself, which is its old age. While, however, in the general series in all periods before the Coming of the Lord the basis for the thinking lay in the sensual things of creation, and in the period between the Coming and the Second Coming of the Lord it lay in the Divine Natural of the New Testament. in all the periods of the particular series the basis for the thinking lies in the Divine Rational of the Third Testament. From this it is evident that; the Third. Testament in the first periods of the New Church plays a .role corresponding to the role which the sensual things of creation fulfilled in file ages before the Incarnation of the Lord. and subsequently a role corresponding to the role which the Divine Natural of the Divine Human of the Lord fulfilled in the (Christian age; and that this the Third Testament really only in the last period of the New Church, which is the period of the Second Coming of the Lord in the New Church, when the Church for the first time comes into the fullness of its proper state, will be able to fulfill that. role which fully agrees with its proper essence, as a result of which the Church for the first time will see therein the proper rational, that is. celestial truth.

Every Church begins with a state of innocence of ignorance; this is the celestial state of its infancy. For all beginning of a man or of a Church must be in the celestial of innocence. It is out of this celestial that in the course of its boyhood and adolescence it. must go forth, descending through the spiritual and the natural even into ultimates, in order there, in ultimates, to find the basis for the independence which is necessary for adult age, in order afterwards thence, by a wrestling through the natural as from itself, again to climb up to the interior degrees, by which it arrives at the internal bases of truth and in its own spiritual and celestial state.

The characteristic of the successive ages of infancy,

10 FROM THE TRANSACTIONS

boyhood, and adolescence, or as it were of the Adamic, Noachic. Hebrew and Israelitish periods, in the New Church, was that for all their thinking they were always entirely dependent on the direct cognizance of the letter of the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, exactly like all Churches before the Coming of the Lord in their thinking were always dependent on the sensual things of creation. Since in these successive states — with all those who actually had part in them --- the celestial, the spiritual, and the genuine natural successively were interiorly present, so through the direct cognizance of the writings an actual conjunction with the Lord was possible, which corresponds to the conjunction through the Human Divine of the Churches before the Coming of the Lord (cf. Third Fnsc., pp. 95-100).

The characteristic of the Adamic state is the awe bordering on an overpowering of the man who for the first time sees himself placed before the fact of the Second Coming of the Lord. Man in this state is all admiration and adoration of the Lord, who has fulfilled His promised Second Coming. Intellectual problems for him in this state do not exist at all. He thinks it incomprehensible and wrong when he sees that the members of the Church give their attention to

such problems. The Word of the New Church is for him a paradise. By the overpowering nature of this event the proprium is forced back for a considerable time. The all of this state is determined by the celestial which for this reason, thanks to his remains, can be given to him as it were as an unmerited advance, from which by direct cognizance he can see in the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg the celestial truth of his spiritual infancy. As long as this state lasts he can be kept from the Lord in a state of innocence; but it is the innocence of infancy, and therefore the innocence of ignorance. Every man who as an adult comes to the Church and who is susceptible to the reality of the Second Coming of the Lord, first comes into such a state. The children of the New Church who are really kept in the living sphere of the (church, are also in such a state. That the New Church in general after its first foundation was in such an Adamic state, the historian who would bring forward the internal things in the history of the Church, could show in the whole and in the particular things.

11 OF THE SWEDENBORG GEZELSCHAP

It is only in the next state, which corresponds to the age of boyhood and the Noachic period, that a certain intellectual formation of the thinking takes place. Just as in the Golden Age creation itself was the Word, but in the subsequent period, when the celestial degree was closed, a written Word became necessary, so too in the Adamic state of the New Church the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, as it were as a paradise, are themselves the Word, in which man out of celestial good by direct cognizance sees truth; but in the next, the Noachic, state, when man has left the celestial degree, the Writings are closed for him, unless a spiritual understanding is formed with him from the Lord out of the spiritual good which now, thanks to the remains of the preceding state, is given to him as an unmerited advance, and unless this understanding is developed by him, by which in the Writings he can see the spiritual truth of his spiritual boyhood. The development of this understanding can only take place by his applying to his life the truths of the Writings which he interiorly sees, that is, by his shunning evil. The more he, in the light he has, lives in spiritual charity, that is, the more he reduces the external with himself to obedience and thus to order, the stronger this spiritual understanding becomes out of the spiritual good, through which more and more in the Writings by direct cognizance he can see the spiritual truth. The characteristic of this state is thus — failing the celestial good of the preceding state which, without anything further made it possible for man to take direct cognizance of the truth — the intellectual investigation into the essence of the contents of the new Revelation and into the essence of the new Religion, in the light of the understanding which the Lord has formed out of the spiritual good with man and which can serve him as it were for a Word, whereby he will be able to see in the Writings of Swedenborg the truths which have reference to spiritual charity, just as a written Word had to be given to the Noachic man, if in the creation and in the things of their social life he were to see the spiritual truth. But in this state the thinking remains limited to the most general concepts of the Divine things which make Religion and the Church, such as man requires them for this spiritual state of an as it were Noachic charity, and such as they may be

12 FROM THE TRANSACTIONS

acquired out of the advance of spiritual good, by direct cognizance of the letter of the Writings, in the light of that formed and developed understanding. The thinking in this state is never able, independently of the letter, to arrive at a concept of the truth in its particulars such as it refers to the particular essence of the Three Testaments, and to the particular states of the existing Church and of the mail of the Church. The all of this state is determined by the fact that then, thanks to the remains of the preceding state, the spiritual degree has been opened as it were by way of an unmerited advance, such as in the preceding state was the case even with the celestial degree; and that out of this spiritual good, thanks to the fact that man shuns evil. by the application of spiritual truths to the life of the external man, the understanding for spiritual truth is developed.

In the next state, which corresponds to the first age of adolescence and the Hebrew period, man has left also the spiritual degree. The all of this state is determined by the genuine natural good which is now given to man thanks to the remains of the preceding states as it were as an unmerited advance, and by the necessity that now from the Lord out of that natural good a certain understanding for natural truth be formed, which is developed by man, thanks to the fact that he continues to shun evil by the application of natural truths to the life of the external man. Out of the natural good, in the light of that understanding. man sees genuine natural cognitions in the letter of the Writings, which essentially refer to the natural life of the Church and of the man of the Church. The essence of the up building of the Church in this state is seen in the gathering of as many as possible of such cognitions as being necessary for the natural life, and in the multiplication and extension thereof by their application to the exposition of the Old and the New Testament. The interior essence of Religion and of the Church in this state is seen in the good of genuine natural charity. Also the great attention then given by the Church to external evangelization is characteristic of this state. It was that period in the New Church when a remarkably great extension of its members took place in England and in America. From this it may also lie evident that it seems to be a very one-sided view

if the slight results of missionary work in our times are attributed essentially to the deterioration of the world, therefore to a change of the state of the world, instead of to a change of the state of the Church.

The state of the age of adolescence, which first corresponds to the Hebrew period, later on passes over into a state corresponding to the Israelitish period. In this state is the lowest point of the descending or outward going line of the successive ages; and such a state is unavoidable. since it is only there that the sensual Coming of the Lord and thereby the inversion to the ages of ascent and of the return into the interiors can take place. In this state man has left also the interior natural which in the Hebrew state was given to him as an unmerited advance. The states of such an advance are now past. since all possibilities thereto have successively been exhausted. The characteristic. of this state is that man considers himself strictly bound to the letter of the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg. similarly as the Israelites were strictly bound to the letter of the Old Testament; and the all of the essence of that state in its favorable sense is a strict external obedience to that letter, while all the weight is put upon an external holiness, even to corporeal and sensual things. The end in view in that state is the transition to the age of early manhood, in which man arrives at the adult state and therefore for the first time comes as it were to stand on his own feet. For in all the preceding ages there was always an absolute dependence on a direct or sensual taking cognizance of the letter, without which man never was capable of any orderly

thinking in the things of the Word. The beginning of early manhood for the first time brings such an independence, which can only be made possible by the Coining of the Lord at the end of the Israelitish state.

But before the Coming of the Lord can take place, man in the Israelitish state first passes through serious trials and dangers. The essence of all the states before the Coming of the Lord is that man out of a state of good which is given to him as it were as an unmerited advance — namely successively the Adamic celestial good, the Noachic spiritual good, and the Hebrew natural good — by taking direct cognizance is made capable of an orderly but external vision of the truth in the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg;

14 FROM THE TRANSACTIONS

entirely as all the historic Churches before the Coming of the Lord out of the good of their respective degrees by direct cognizance were in truth, but not in the actual, internal truth, but only in representative, external truth (cf. Third Fascicle, pp.95-99). The essence, however, of all states after the Coming of the Lord is that man, after taking direct cognizance of the letter of the Latin Word, by the wrestling through his own natural should arrive at one of the interior degrees of truth — namely successively at the interior natural, the exterior rational, and the interior rational. For only by the wrestling through the natural can the external man be united with the internal man, and the Human of the letter in man be conjoined with the Divine, and only by this conjunction does the Third Testament in man become the Word and thus the Divine Human which in man makes the Church. For the Word in itself is indeed always the Word; but in man the Word is not the Word until it is seen from the living Lord Himself (cf. S.S. 76—79). With the man in whom the external man is not conjoined with the internal man by the wrestling through the natural, the human of the letter will be separated from the Divine in the letter.

The end in view of the wrestling with the proprium or the shunning of evil in the states before the Coming of the Lord is to be in the good which is given as an advance; for out of that good there is direct cognizance of truth. The end of the wrestling with the proprium or the shunning of evil in the states after the Coming of the Lord is to enter into one of the interior degrees of truth; for only through the interior degrees of truth does man come into the good of the Divine Human which in man makes the Church; for the interior truth is one with good, as the Son and the Father are one. In the states before the Coming the end in view of the endeavor lies in good, for truth afterwards follows of itself; in the states after the Coming of the Lord the end in view of the endeavor lies in the genuine internal truth, for the genuine good of the Divine Human lies just in that truth. The states before the Coming of the Lord are as it were states of the Human Divine, for they perfectly correspond to the states of the human race before the Incarnation of the Lord; the states after the Coming of the Lord for the first time in the full sense

15 OF THE SWEDENBORG GEZELSCHAP

are states of the Divine Human of the Lord, and they correspond to the states of the human race after the Incarnation of the Lord. Now the entire essence of the Israelitish state and the necessity of such a state arise, from the fact that only in such a state the transition from the states before the Coming to the states after the Coming, or the transition from the descending or outward going development of man to the ascending or inward going development, can take place. An advance of one of the interior degrees of good in this state is no longer given. The all of this state depends on whether man, according to the scientifics which he has out of the letter, continues to shun the evils of the proprium and thereby is enabled to continue to have faith in the Divinity of the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg.

If man in this Israelitish state perseveres in the combat against his proprium, then, when the time has come, the Coming of the Lord in him will take place. The Coming of the Lord in this state is made possible because in the long run it proves impossible for man to maintain himself in the external holiness which characterizes the Israelitish state. He gradually sees all those things to which he first attached so much importance, since in them he saw the essence of Religion, fall away from him. And this gradually more and more, until at last he stands deprived of all foothold and nothing else remains than the affection for truth. It is in this affection for truth, as it were as in a Virgin Mary, that the Coming of the Lord is effected. This Coming consists in this that man now recognizes that the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg as to their letter are the Word itself for the New Church. Then the Lord Himself in His Divine Human is present with the man of the New Church for the first time in a sensual way, just as the Lord was present before the senses of His disciples. Then on the basis of the Divine Human that is seen in the letter of the Third Testament, the wrestling through the natural and thereby the ascending to the interior degrees of truth can begin.

But if man in the Israelitish state does not shun evil, and consequently the proprium more and more gains the upper-hand, there never will be such a development with him as will make possible the Coming of the Lord, and

in such a case it cannot be but that he will gradually regard the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg as purely human, and will seek the entire weight of the Divine Revelation exclusively in the Old and the New Testament. For in this state there is no longer any question of a good out of advance, out of which good in the preceding states the Divinity of the Writings could interiorly be felt; while the acknowledgement of the Old and the New Testament does not require such a combat against the proprium, since this acknowledgement belongs to the generally ruling tradition of the Church and is easily compatible with the merely external piety in which such a man lives.

It is clear that the concept-like problem whether the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg as to their letter are or are not the Word, presents itself for the first time in the Israelitish state, namely through the Coming of the Lord. This was the time when, in the general bodies of the Church in America and in England, small minorities formed who saw themselves obliged to defend their faith in the Divinity of the Writings over against the ever extending unbelief of the majorities. In the New Church the denial, based on argumentation, of the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg as the Divine Human of the Lord, or as the Word, is in complete correspondence with the rejection of the Lord by the Jews during His Sensual Presence on earth. Just as the Jews then turned away

from the genuine Divine, which thenceforward could be found in the Lord alone, and sought the essence of religion in a merely external and therefore idolatrous worship of the Old Testament, so the majority in the New Church turned away from the Divine Human, which thenceforward could be found only in the Third Testament, and sought the essence of the Word, that is, the Divine Human, in an external worship of the Old and the New Testament. The Third Testament as the means of salvation then recedes entirely into the back-ground; the Old and the New Testament alone are acknowledged as the means of salvation. But the New Church can only come into existence and remain in existence in the measure in which the faith in the Divinity of the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg remains alive. For therein is the Divine Human of the Lord from which alone the Church can be built up. In the states of the New Church corresponding to the states

17 OF THE SWEDENBORG GEZELSCHAP

of the Churches before the Coming of the Lord, for all genuine members of the Church the interior faith in the Divinity of those Writings, out of the good out of advance in which they were, was self-evident, except in the Israelitish state where everything depends on a conscious choice between acceptance and rejection, and the rejection signifies nothing less than a rejection of the Lord who has now fulfilled His Sensual Coming, and thus of the Divine Human itself.

In the Adamic, the Noachic, and the Hebrew state, or what is the same, in the ages of infancy, boyhood, and the first years of adolescence, the essence of the relation of the Church to the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg lay in an interior realization of their Divinity. In the Israelitish state, on the contrary, or in the later years of adolescence, the weight no longer is in the interior realization of the Divinity of the Writings, but the problem now is the essence of their letter. Therefore also with those who in this state persevere in the combat with the proprium, the Coming of the Lord takes place in lasts. But out of the essence of this state the Church is placed before a difficulty, which for a long time adheres to it. Since in this state the essence of the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg cannot possibly be seen in their internal, but is seen only in the letter, the three Testaments then lie before man as it were next to each other on the same plane. That the discrete degrees of truth can never exist anywhere else than in the living spirit, thus in the living man alone, man in this state cannot see. And so it happens that he places the discrete degrees of truth into the letter of the series of the three Testaments lying next to each other before his eyes. Thence comes the idea that each of the Testaments as to its letter is destined for a certain province of the mind, namely the letter of the Old Testament for the sensual mind, the letter of the New Testament for the natural mind, and the letter of the Third Testament for the rational mind; that thus the Third Testament is destined only for the rational mind. That the letter of each of the three Testaments is destined for the sensual man, since in the New Church also, regeneration begins with the lowest degree, further that the rational degree itself can only be attained the very last, after the wrestling through the natural,

18 FROM THE TRANSACTIONS

and moreover that the rational in a certain way is present also in the Old and the New Testament, since without the rational there never is a human, man in this state does not realize. The position that the exegesis of the different successive Testaments must take into account the fact of their

being addressed to different provinces of the mind, and that consequently there can be no question of an application of the law of correspondence between the discrete degrees of truth to the Third Testament, and that thus the DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE SACRED SCRIPTURE cannot be applied to the Third Testament without difference or reserve, is based on an idea which finds its origin in this difficulty, arising in this state.

The essence of the next state of the New Church, which corresponds to the Coming and Sensual Presence of the Lord on earth, lies in this that the Church begins to see and to acknowledge that the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg are the Word itself for the New Church. It is the fundamental truth of the Gospel that in the Lord Jesus Christ, Jehovah God Himself came on earth, that thus the Lord is the Father and not a Son from the eternal. So it is the characteristic of this state that the Church acknowledges that in the Third Testament the Human and the Divine are one, that thus the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg are Divine even into the letter, and that there alone redemption and salvation are to be found, and the essential things for the up building of the Church and for the conjunction with the Lord. Nevertheless in this state the Church is not conscious in a concept-like way of these facts; it is the time when the Writings from principle are acknowledged as the Word, whereby the separation of the majorities of the preceding state, who deny the Divinity of the Writings, becomes complete.

This state is the state of the early manhood of the New Church. The end in view of this state is that man by the wrestling through the natural shall arrive at the interior natural, and thus at the first degree of internal truth. In the Word of the Third Testament, as it is in itself, the Human and the Divine are one. But if the Word is taken up by the natural man by direct cognizance, the Human of the Word, the letter, in man is not yet conjoined with the the Divine. As long as this conjunction has not yet taken

place, the Word with man therefore is not the Word. It is only after the wrestling through the natural, by which man's proprium is overcome and forced back, that in man the Human of the Word is conjoined with the Divine, so that the Word with him is really the Word. The genuine essence of the state of early manhood thus consists in this, that by the wrestling through the natural in the first degree, the natural truth of the letter of the Word is conjoined with the interior natural, and thence the human with the Divine; just as the disciples during the Sensual Presence of the Lord on earth by the wrestling with their proprium were able to follow the Lord, and acknowledged that He was the Christ, the Son of the living God. That the majority of the others could not see this had its cause in nothing but the fact that there was no wrestling with the proprium.

The end in view in this state is that man be prepared for the transition to the next state. The essence of the next state, which corresponds to the state of the Christian Church and is the period of manhood, is the development of the Doctrine independently of the sensual presence of the letter, just as the Lord had to leave the earth, if the pouring out of the Holy Spirit were to become possible (John 16 : 7, 13). But before this transition can take place again two dangers present themselves, which as great difficulties for a long time adhere to the Church. Man in the ascending state can arrive at the genuine truth of the Third Testament in no other way than by the wrestling through the natural, by which the Human of the letter in man is conjoined with the Divine. If man will not realize the necessity of such a wrestling, then, according to his tendency

towards the Protestant or the Roman-Catholic disposition (cf. A.R. 387), he will attribute to the letter of the Latin Word by itself either the proper Divine essence itself, or the genuine Human essence itself. In the first case the man says that the literal sense of the Third Testament is the proper spiritual sense itself; in the second case the man says that the literal sense of the Third Testament, such as it has been taken up by direct cognizance, is the proper rational itself. Both these ideas are the result of the fact that it is not realized that before regeneration the direct cognizance of the letter can never lead to the posses-

20 FROM THE TRANSACTIONS

sion of genuine truth, since thereby the proprium always plays a certain role; and that therefore after taking cognizance a wrestling through the natural must always first take place, by which the external man is conjoined with the internal man, so that the man for the first time sees the genuine truth in the Latin Word, in which the Human is one with the Divine.

The first idea, namely, that by direct cognizance of the letter of the Third Testament one has to do with the spiritual sense itself, places the Divine, that is the spiritual sense itself, in the letter such as it is with man. The Divine is indeed in the letter itself, but only such as this is in itself, that is, in the Lord, since the Lord by the wrestling with and the victory over the hells has conjoined the Human with the Divine. So too in the Third Testament, as it is in itself, the Human is conjoined with the Divine. But in man the Human of the letter is only conjoined with the Divine after the wrestling through the natural. Thus by saying that the letter without the wrestling through the natural in man is the spiritual sense itself, thus the Divine, there is, as it were, a belief in a Divine Son from the eternal, instead of in a human Son who has become Divine by Glorification. The essential defect of this idea is here clearly evident as being the aversion from the wrestling through the natural, and thereby the interior essence thereof betrays itself as being the same as the protestant error of faith alone. Just as the First Coming of the Lord by itself brought no redemption unless man as from himself fulfilled the conditions pertaining to redemption, so too the Second Coming of the Lord by itself brings no redemption unless man according to order cooperates as from himself.

The second idea, namely that the Third Testament is a Revelation of the rational, so that man upon direct cognizance of the letter has to do with the proper rational itself, places the proper Human in the letter by itself, while yet the genuine Human can never exist anywhere else than in its unity with the Divine. The conjunction with the Divine, however, exists in man only after the wrestling through the natural. The letter of the Third Testament, as it is in itself, that is in the Lord Himself, is indeed one with the Divine, and thus the proper Divine Rational itself, but

21 OF THE SWEDENBORG GEZELSCHAP

never as it is in man by direct cognizance. The Rational of the letter with man, upon direct cognizance, becomes the sensual- or exterior-natural; and just as to the Lord after His birth from

the Virgin Mary there adhered the human of Mary, which human He had to put off by the Glorification, so to the man in this state, although the Lord has now been born in him from his affection for the letter of the Third Testament — which affection corresponds to Mary — there adheres a human that is only capable of a natural-rational vision of the Third Testament. It is this human which man by wrestling through the natural must remove. Thus by saying that by the direct reading of the Third Testament, that is, by direct cognizance, a taking up of the proper rational itself is possible, the necessity is denied of the opening of the interior degrees of the mind, which can only take place through regeneration, and by which alone the Word can be seen from within. In this conception the characteristic of the Roman Catholic disposition clearly shows, namely the lust of dominion out of the external authority of a separated letter — a vicar of Christ as it were — while the genuine freedom of man, existing in an internal enlightenment from the Lord by the opening of the internal degrees of the mind, is laid in bonds.

Both these ideas have their origin in nothing but the instinctive aversion of the proprium of man from a wrestling through the natural, since the proprium there clearly feels its downfall. Both ideas seek salvation in the sole letter in itself: the former considers that letter as the proper Divine itself, namely as the spiritual sense itself; the latter considers the letter as the proper and genuine Human itself, namely as the proper and genuine rational itself. It is especially in the next state of the Church, which is the period of the development of the Doctrine of the Church, that these two ideas come to light as essential contrasts with the Doctrine. For the genuine Doctrine of the Church is nothing but the proper and genuine spirit of the Word itself, in which the Human and the Divine are one, as the Son and the Father are one. It is given according to order in the internal man, after the external man by the wrestling through the natural has been conjoined with the internal man.

22 FROM THE TRANSACTIONS

The next state of the New Church, which corresponds to the Christian period and to the age of manhood, brings the development of the Doctrine of the Church. This state is to be compared with the pouring out of the Holy Spirit, which indeed characterizes the Christian Church. Just as the Lord had to leave the 'earth, if this pouring out were to become possible, so the Church must leave the letter of the Third Testament in the realization that within the letter by way of correspondence all the infinite particulars of the proper, abstract, spiritual truth lie hidden. The leading principle determining the Church's attitude in this state is the thesis that the DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE SACRED SCRIPTURE must also be applied to the Third Testament, and it is then seen that the up building of the Church is possible only through the Doctrine of the Church. The letter by itself brings to man only the generals of truth. The letter in itself is of such a nature, purely Divine and infinite, that from it into eternity ever new particulars of truth may be drawn. This drawing of the particulars of genuine spiritual truth is the task of the New Church in this state. The proper essence thereof lies in the masculine which has entered upon the combat with the natural in a more interior, the second, degree, and which thereby is in the genuine spiritual rational, which sees the genuine spiritual sense of the Word. The New Church in this state is for the first time a genuine spiritual Church.

In all these successive states of the New Church, however, from the beginning, the proper and essential state of the New Church itself is present. The proper state itself of the New Church is its celestial state, the old age of the human race, in which the celestial seed of its truth, the celestial Doctrine, is conceived as an immediate revelation from the Lord. It is the end of the creation of

this earth that this become the essential state of the human race, with which too the Paradise itself will return to this earth, since in this state the influx from the Lord can take place from the inmost to the outermost, by which the general order of all things will be restored. But even from the first beginning of the New Church this state is present as the proper source of its entire being. All truths that are essentially new and belong essentially to the New Church, from the beginning were of such a celestial origin. The successive

23

OF THE SWEDENBORG GEZELSCHAP

states described above are not possible unless such interior rational or celestial seeds of truth precede, from which those successive states in the Church are developed, comparatively as the things coming forth from a seed.

25

DE HEMELSCHE LEER

EXTRACTS FROM THE TSRTTE FOR JULY 1932

THE NINETEENTH OF JUNE 1932

Address by the Reverend Ernst Pfeiffer.

There were 46 persons present on Sunday evening for the celebration of the Nineteenth of June.

The Rev. Pfeiffer welcomed those present and asked them on that evening to try and enter into the spirit of the things that essentially make the New Church, and to give their attention to a few of the most important of the new principles that in the past year from the Lord have been given to the Church, as leading truths for the up building of the Church.

It is gradually becoming clear to us that the Church is a Divine institution, and that to it from the Lord is given a certain Divine power and a certain Divine doctrinal authority, and that the salvation for man and for the human race can be found only in the Church. This is a truth which indeed as early as the beginning of the Christian church, which out of the loves of self sought the essence of religion merely in external things, became a profane falsity; but which in the New Church, in the measure in which by the victory over the proprium it will come from the Lord into the internal things, will become a living reality. This truth is openly taught in the Latin Word with the explicit words: "Every one with whom the Church is, will be saved, but every one with whom the Church is not, will be condemned" (A.C. 10766). The abuse of this truth out of the love of dominion in the Christian church has indeed led to spiritual slavery and thereby to the

destruction of all internal things, but on the other hand only the insight into the genuine essence of this truth and a life according thereto will be able to lead the human race to the victory over the proprium and thereby into genuine freedom.

We now begin to see the Church as an actual spiritual being, as a Man before the Lord, and we now begin to understand why the Church is called the Bride and the Wife of the Lamb.

In the Third Testament the Lord Himself is present in His Divine Human. When the Church begins with man, then this Word lies outside of him before his corporeal eyes, and in a very general way it is seen and accepted by him as a Divine Revelation. But it is only recently that we have begun to understand what heavy responsibility for man this event brings with itself. This Word that lies without, in the form of books before the man, cannot possibly become the Word within man, unless it be conceived and born in him from the internal; otherwise that Word, which in itself is indeed the Word, with man is not the Word. It is also evident that all that is said in the Apocalypse concerning the Divine things of the Holy City, the New Jerusalem, in the natural world can only become a reality in the measure in which the Lord Himself is born in the Church, that is, in the human minds, thus in the measure in which the men of the Church are regenerated from the Lord.

Just as the Christian church believed that the Lord with His Coming had brought an active redemption, so too in the New Church the danger exists that one should see the redemption and salvation merely in the external things of the new Word, while, however, the Divine things of the Church must be born from the internal. We have learned to understand that all the evils and falsities which have destroyed the former churches, and which are described in the Third Testament, are also present and active in the New Church. The natural sense of the Third Testament indeed treats of the former churches, but the spiritual sense treats of good and truth, and of evil and falsity, in themselves; and for this reason all those places in the Third Testament which in the letter treat of the former churches, in their particulars and later even in their singulars, must be seen in application to the New Church; in the spiritual sense in the particulars and in the celestial sense in the singulars.

Rev. Pfeiffer then requested attention for what a year ago, on the Nineteenth of June 1931, Mr. Groeneveld had

told us about the essence of the Church as a Man, namely that the Church, like a man, has a soul, a spirit, and a body. When things of this kind are for the first time expressed, they seem so subtle, and they are so hidden and so difficult to grasp that for a long time they pass by man's conception. Only after a considerable time they take on a certain form. It is at present one of the most important things for the development of the thought in our Society to arrive at clear concepts with regard to the Church as a Man, with a soul, a spirit and a body.

That which is actually the Church cannot be born with man unless out of the affection for truth, and indeed the affection for the definite truth present in this world, that is, the truth in the Word in lasts; in the New Church therefore the affection for the Third Testament. It is the love for the Third Testament, the entire devotion of all our thought to that Testament, out of the interior conviction that it is the Divine Human of the Lord or the Divine Truth itself, and thus the sole source of truth, and that from anywhere else absolutely nothing is to be expected. This affection for the Third Testament is as it were the Virgin Mary, from which the Lord is born in the Church. If therefore the church is really Church, this is only possible because the Lord Himself is' born in it out of the affection for the Third Testament, and the Lord alone makes the entire being of the Church, as a Man, from firsts to lasts, from the soul to the body. Only if a man has that affection will it be possible for the Lord to be born in him, and for him to become a living member of the Church. This affection for the Third Testament in the Church will always play one of the most important parts. It is as it were the Church as the mother of all the Divine things of the Church. Only in this affection are we within the borders of the Church; even so much so that one can say that in the measure in which man does not entirely draw his thought out of the Third Testament alone, he still stands without the Church. The proprium ever anew leads man away; and man deceives himself if he fancies that he is in the light of the Word, when he has the things of the world as the basis for his thought and then only allows the light which he believes he has from the Word, to fall thereon; for in this way the light of the

Word is falsified. Into the true light of the Word man can only enter in the measure in which he withdraws his heart entirely from the world and directs his eyes only to within, being in the affection for the Third Testament alone. Those especially who have strong natural faculties, a strong memory, a strong imagination, and a strong natural rational, more than others are in this danger, namely of seeking the basis for their thought without, not realizing that all truth lies within, in the hidden treasures of the Word, and that all that comes from outside of it can never be anything else but fallacy.

There are two essential loves which precede all coming into existence of the Divine things of the Church; the one love is in the internal man, the other love is in the external man. The love in the internal man is as it were the father of those things, and the love in the external man is as it were the mother of; those 'things. The love in the internal man is the soul out of which they are conceived, and the love in the external man is the body in which they are borne and out of which they are born. What that love is in the external man, we have already seen, namely, the love for the Third Testament as the only source of truth. It is a love in the external man, since it is directed to an object which is present in lasts before our senses. But what is the love in the internal man, from which as from a father and as out of a soul the Divine things of the Church are conceived? It is the genuine general love for truth, in which love the Lord Himself with man is present in the internal man. This is thus not the love for the truth of the Third Testament, present in lasts; for this love is a love of the external man. The love or the good in the internal man, which makes that soul — for good makes the soul (cf. CANONS, Concerning the Lord Saviour, 4 : 6),—is, so to say, the general goodness of the internal man, or, so to say, the general internal well-disposedness of the man. Even before any one comes into contact with the Third Testament, this well-disposedness is with the man; with some it is stronger, with others it is less strong. It is that love by which for the one the eyes are opened for the Third Testament,

while for the other, who has not this love, they remain closed. It is the love for truth for the sake of truth, for the sake of which love the man is ready to put aside the

29 REVEREND ERNST PFEIFFER

loves of the proprium, to take up the wrestling through the natural, and to shun evil and falsity as sin against the Lord (cf. DE HEMELSCHE LEER, Third Fascicle, p. 45). This genuine love for truth for the sake of truth in the Church takes the form of an entire devotion to the Divine things of the Church, that is, to the spiritual principles by which the Church can come into existence, or to those things that make possible the regeneration of man himself; for truth is the neighbor, and the neighbor in the spiritual sense is the Church.

Only where these two loves rule, the one as a soul in the internal man and the other as a body in the external man, can that celestial marriage come into existence in man, from which all Divine things of the Church are born. Both loves are from the Lord alone; the love in the internal man is as a burning fire, the source of all life in the man as a Church; the love in the external man is a complete devotion to the Word of the Third Testament as the sole source of all truth; but to this love, just as to the Virgin Mary, all the evil and falsity of the love of self and of the world adhere. For as soon as ever an object is given in the natural, which is accessible to the senses, and to which a love is directed, the proprium also is there at once, trying to find access to that object through those same senses. No love in the Church can come into existence which directs itself to an object that is accessible in lasts, but the danger is there of the proprium in a very hidden way interfering with it.

If the man who from love for the truth for the sake of truth is in the love for the Third Testament, in the light which he has, wrestles in the natural with the proprium, and puts aside everything which he recognizes to be impure, then in that love there forms, as it were as in a body, something that can conceive the seed of the Divine things of the Church. The soul in the internal man which is of the Lord alone, descends as a seed, as the love clothes itself in the rational with a tender body, from which the Holy Spirit proceeds in the Church. Thus the Divine things which make the Church are conceived in the Church itself from the marriage of the Lord with the Church. All Divine things of the Church which in such a way have been conceived and afterwards born, are in them-

30 THE NINETEENTH OF TUNE 193

selves again as it were a Church in small, with a soul, a spirit, and a body.

In the first time after the birth it is especially the soul which leads the Church, since the spirit is as yet only present in germ. The Church in this state is first as a tender child which is led by the intuition which flows in from the Lord, without conscious exertion of the intellectual faculties. The love in the internal man makes the soul, the loves in the external man make the body. To this body, or to these loves in the external man, likewise evil and falsity adhere, just as this was the case with the body from which they are born. In the beginning this inherited evil and falsity scarcely assert themselves. The characteristic of these first states is a spontaneous devotion to the things of the Word and of the Church; but it soon appears that this is only a childlike and

external state. The necessity will now appear for the development of the spirit of the Church, which for the first time is the essential ecclesiastical state.

The state of the spirit of the Church is essentially the state of the development of the Doctrine. It is manifest that the childlike natural state, when it is the soul which leads spontaneously, cannot in the long run maintain itself, since the proprium has not yet been overcome. The proprium will soon endeavor to rise up and to lay its hand on the things of the Third Testament and of the Church, which are present in the external man. For to Mary and to that which is born out of her, the proprium adheres.

When the proprium thus begins to show itself in that body, that is, in the loves of the external man, then at once the important task of the spirit of the Church appears, namely by the opening of the internal sense of the Third Testament to bring to light those truths which have reference to that proprium. The Church, in this state, begins to see that all the descriptions of the evil and falsity that have destroyed the former churches, in the particulars of the internal sense are of application to itself, since all that evil and falsity are also present in her. Just to take one example: With the description of the dragon one never again will think of the forms of "faith alone" which has ruined the protestant churches, but one will begin to see the evil in the New Church which in the internal sense

31 REVEREND ERNST PFEIFFER

is meant by the dragon. Concerning the dragon we read in the MEMORABILIA, n. 5961: "They all are dragons who confirm falsities by the Word. ... Its tail are they who only read the Word, and place salvation therein, and who are not in any Doctrine, saying that the Word in the letter is the Doctrine; but thus they can defend whatever they wish", etc. That here by the Word the Third Testament is meant, and by the Doctrine, the Doctrine which from the Lord is born in the Church, is evident.

The spirit of the Church is developed only when the Church has reached its adult state. This development depends entirely upon whether the Church in the external man overcomes the evils that have come to light and thus removes the proprium. By this cleansing of the body the spirit of the Church as it were is given space for further development. Everything then depends upon whether the Church applies itself to a further opening of the Word. The new interior light that is thus given in the spirit, in the body brings the opportunity for new evils to come forth which before were not active. A new purification thereby becomes possible, and thereby again more space is given for the development of the spirit of the Church.

So we have a manifest reciprocal action between the spirit of the Church and the body, in the measure in which the letter to the Third Testament is opened more, and a more interior light falls upon the body, and in the measure in which afterwards the body is cleansed by the wrestling with the proprium in this new light. It is this reciprocal action which alone can bring the true interior up building of the Church, a Church which is truly Church, with a soul, a spirit, and a body from the Lord alone.

Address by H. D. G. Groeneveld.

This day is the commemoration of the Second Coming of the Lord and of the foundation of the New Church. We are seized with great fear when we realize that the Lord is again on earth with the human race. The Lord is now present in His Divine Human. In THE TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, n. 30, we read: "God is, after the World was made, in space without space, and in time without time". The Lord therefore in the Third Testament is

32 THE NINETEENTH OF JUNE 1932

present in the literal sense but not in the natural appearance of that sense. The Third Testament therefore should be approached not with a natural thought but with a spiritual thought deriving nothing from space and time.

The Lord is Love itself and Wisdom itself. Since Love has power only through Wisdom, the Lord as to Wisdom has come again in the Third Testament, as the esse for the existence of the conjunction with the human race. It is this esse which spiritually into eternity has the substance for the New Church established from the Lord. It is in this substance alone that the conjunction of the Lord with the human race can take place, for which reason it is represented by a bride, as appears from the second Verse of chapter XXI of the Apocalypse; "And I John saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband".

It is the Church in time which always after having brought to existence the substance of the esse of the conjunction, given it, must prepare itself for the reception of a new substance for a more interior conjunction with the Lord. Then the Church comes into the essence of the Third Testament, and the Church in time is the bride with which the Lord conjoins Himself again. By the deeper wisdom given to it the Lord then has power to combat the more interior evils and falsities and to bring redemption. That the conjunction of the Church with the Lord takes place when it prepares itself as a bride and that »it then represents wisdom, appears from the work on CONJUGIAL LOVE, where in n. 21 the signification of a wedding in Heaven is described.

We read there as follows: "And one out of the men of the wedding, a wise one, said: Do you understand what the things which you have seen signify? They said it was little; and then they asked him why the bridegroom, now a husband, was in such a dress? He answered that the bridegroom, now a husband, represented the Lord, and the bride, now a wife, represented the Church, because a wedding in Heaven represents the marriage of the Lord with the Church. Hence it is that on his head there was a mitre and that he was dressed in a cloak, a tunic, and an ephod, like Aharon; and that on the head of the bride, now a wife, there was a crown, and that she was dressed with

33 H. D. G. GROENEVELD

a robe like a queen; but to-morrow they will be clothed differently, because this representation lasts only to-day. They asked again: Since he represented the Lord, and she the Church, why did she sit at his right hand? The wise one replied: Because there are two things which make the marriage of the Lord and the Church, love and wisdom; the Lord is love and the Church is wisdom; and wisdom is at the right hand of love. For the man of the Church is wise as from himself, and in proportion as he is wise he takes up love from the Lord. The right hand also signifies power; and love has power through wisdom. But as has been said, after the wedding the representation is changed; for then the husband represents wisdom, and -the wife the love of his wisdom. This love, however, is not the prior love, but it is a secondary love, which the wife has from the Lord through the wisdom of the husband. The love of the Lord, which is the prior love, is the love of being wise with the husband; wherefore after the wedding, both together, the husband and his wife, represent the Church".

The Church therefore is in the state of the bride when it takes up wisdom from the Lord. It is the state in -which the essence of the Doctrine of the Church as the spiritual out of celestial origin, is revealed to it. After the fullness of the state in which this spiritual out of celestial origin is given to it, the Church is no longer the bride or the wisdom of the Lord. Husband and wife, or wisdom and love, or understanding and will, together form the Church, and the conjunction of the Church with the Lord is now dependent on the marriage of those two. It is the husband or the love for the truth of the wisdom of the Third Testament, given to the Church, which is now the prior love and the wife or the love for the spiritual truth the secondary love. It is the state in which the wisdom given to the Church must be brought into the will.

The Lord operates from firsts through lasts. The conjunction with the Lord thus is only possible and therefore is entirely determined by the application of the new truths of the Third Testament in the outermost of our natural life or in our sensual life. All our thoughts and all our acts must have the new things of the Church as their essence. All lusts of the proprium in which we live must

be put aside and the things in the natural world by themselves, and the desires for them, must come to be regarded as not of essential use. All things in the outermost of our natural life from love to the Lord should be put into order by our will, in order that thus we form a foundation on which with the new truths the life in the Lord can be built up. It is in the affection for bringing the spiritual things into our will in the outermost of our natural life that the conjugal sphere flows in from the Lord. It is in this life alone that conjugal love is present and only there lie the peace, the blessedness, and the delight of a life in the things of the Lord. Ever greater will these gifts of the Lord become, the more, and the more interiorly the spiritual things are present in the outermost of our natural life.

Conjugal love is the love for one of the sex. It is the love for that spiritual truth only which alone fits our will as our own property, by which wisdom and love or understanding and will become one man and thus one flesh. Love for the sex, that is love for the truths in the natural, is a natural love. This love should not enter into the will or the body but only into the understanding. It is meant to be followed by conjugal love which is a spiritual love and which is the desire for conjunction into one in the will. The bringing of the truths in the natural into the

will, together with a delight in those truths, results not only in a strengthening of the proprium but also in a falsification of truth and a violation of good. The taking up of these truths without a desire for conjugal love, thus without a desire for that spiritual truth that fits our will, makes us see in fullness the evils and the falsities of the proprium in which we live. As strength is lacking, a combat against these evils and falsities appears to us as not possible, wherefore redemption is expected from the taking up of more truths in the natural. The germ of faith alone would then receive its existence.

The chaste love of the sex is only there where conjugal love is; for the spiritual love of truth loves the truths in the natural for the sake of the spiritual. Conjugal love is in the fulness of the true love of the sex when the spiritual truth in the will is conjoined into one as into one man or into one flesh.

All our love for the truths of the wisdom of the Third

35

H. D. G. GROENEVELD

Testament, given to the Church, must therefore contain in it the desire for conjugal love, in order that the man of the Church may become a husband and the woman of the Church may become a wife. For Heaven is one marriage and life there is only possible in conjugal love. Now it is given to those who are in the New Church to possess the true conjugal love, as appears from the work on CONJUGIAL LOVE, where in n. 43 the following is written: "After these things an Angel appeared to me out of that [the third] Heaven, holding in his hand a parchment, which he unrolled, saying: I saw that you were meditating about conjugal love. In this parchment there are arcana of wisdom concerning that love, which have never yet been uncovered in the world. They must now be uncovered, because it is of importance. Those arcana in our Heaven are more than in the rest, because we are in the marriage of love and wisdom; but I foretell that no others will appropriate that love to themselves but those who are received by the Lord into the New Church, which is the New Jerusalem"

36

BLANK

37

DE HEMELSGHE LEER

EXTRACT FROM THE ISSUE FOR OCT.—DEC. 1932

A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE ESSENCE OF THE LATIN WORD AND THE DIVINITY
OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

BETWEEN THE REVEREND ALBERT BJORCK, AND THE REVDS. THEO. PITCAIRN
AND ERNST PFEIFFER.

(Note by the Editor: The text of this correspondence has here been reduced to the matter strictly bearing on the subject.)

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

March 16th 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorck.

Please accept our thanks for your pamphlet on the Doctrine of the Church.* I have read the three articles with great interest.

Although from a first reading we are convinced that the truth of your central argument, — namely "that the natural degree of the mind regarded in itself is continuous, but that there comes into existence an appearance of discreteness in it by the influx of the spiritual and celestial degrees" (cf. D.L.W. 256) — has been fully realized in our position as propounded in DE HEMELSCHE LEER, we have the impression that your pamphlet is a very valuable contribution to the difficult issue with which the Church is confronted at the present time. It impresses us as of great importance that your specific point is pressed forward by you with so much stress, and that it has now been presented by you with such ability and plainness. We strongly feel that this will contribute much to the possibility of a mutual understanding.

* Three Studies on the Doctrine of the Church, by the REV. ALBERT BJORCK. Printed and Published for the Author by W. J. Parrett, Ltd., Margate, 1932.

38 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

In the 5th paragraph on page 28 of your pamphlet you say: "The highest rational sight of spiritual truth that man in the world can ever acquire is on a lower degree than that of the angels, but it corresponds to the doctrine the angels in heaven have, and that doctrine is the same as the spiritual sense of the Word". The point of difference between Angels and men which you here have in mind, is that the latter are still in the natural body. As long as man lives in the natural body he is sensuously conscious only in the external man, while after the death of the body he becomes sensuously conscious in the internal man. This is indeed an immense difference; and since the external man even of a celestial man is still discretely lower than the internal man of an Angel of the lowest Heaven, this accounts for what is said about the degrees of Verum Divinum in n. 8443 of the ARCANA, a very important passage which you have quoted on page 29 of your pamphlet. According to this passage man is in the sixth degree,' and he cannot comprehend the

higher degrees except some small measure of the fifth degree, such as is in the ultimate or first Heaven.

But this does not take away the fact that the degrees of the mind must be opened while man lives in the natural body. Angels and men alike must be differentiated as to the three discrete degrees of life and of truth, and this differentiation is based not upon a qualification of the two higher degrees, but through regeneration, by influx, upon a qualification of the natural degree. This fact is thus valid for both Angels and men alike. Your argument as developed on page 21, paragraph one: "Men on earth, who in the Word they have while living in the world, see truths that teach love to the neighbor, and whose lives are formed by those truths, are in the spiritual heavens after the death of the body", and "Likewise those who while men on earth, in the Word they have, see truths that teach love to the Lord and whose lives are formed by those truths, are in the celestial heavens after the death of the body", according to my understanding does not account for that differentiation of the three discrete degrees of truth, and it seems to me to be altogether insufficient to explain the difference between a natural Church, a spiritual Church, and a celestial Church. For

39

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

everything you say to characterize the spiritual and the celestial is also an indispensable requisite for an interior natural Church, which as to its internal is in conjunction with the ultimate Heaven. If a man does not see truths in the Word which teach love to the neighbor and love to the Lord, and if his life is not formed by those truths, he is not even within the most ultimate borders of the interior natural Church. Love to the neighbor and to the Lord make the Church and Heaven even in the last degree. There are three discrete degrees, even with man as long as he lives in this world, of seeing truths that teach love to the neighbor and of living accordingly, and there are three discrete degrees of seeing truths that teach love to the Lord and of living accordingly. In your letter of March 3rd you explicitly deny the existence of a discretely distinct natural Doctrine, spiritual Doctrine, and celestial Doctrine, although these are spoken of in the Third Testament itself (cf. for instance A.R. 350), and

moreover they can clearly be seen in the comparative description in the ARCANA of the Adamic and the Noachic and the Hebrew Churches.

From our study of the difference between the natural and the rational, — which indeed as to their basis both belong to the natural degree of the mind, — we are led to hold that there are with man three discrete degrees of Doctrine, and thus of doctrinals, cognitions, and scientifics. We readily admit that these degrees are not in themselves discrete, but that they in reality only appear to be discrete because they are discretely qualified by the influx of the spiritual and the celestial degrees. But nevertheless, this apparent discreteness is as real, as if it were really a substantial discreteness, and there is no relation between these apparently discrete degrees but that of correspondence. Each of these three apparently discrete degrees of the natural mind has its own discretely different doctrinals, cognitions, and scientifics.

According to our understanding it is the interior natural that makes the man of the natural Church; it is the exterior rational that makes the man of the spiritual Church; and it is the

interior rational that makes the man of the celestial Church. According to this view it is thus plain that it is a qualification of the natural degree of the mind

into apparently discrete degrees, by the influx of the spiritual and of the celestial, that makes the difference between the natural, spiritual, and celestial Churches. For all of those degrees, namely the interior natural, the exterior rational, and the interior rational, as to their basic essence, belong to the natural degree of the human mind. If this were not the case it would not be necessary for man to be born first in the natural world. Here you may see how the teaching that the natural degree of the human mind regarded in itself is continuous, but that there comes into existence the appearance of discreteness by the influx of the spiritual and celestial degrees, has fully been realized in our position. Regarded as to their basis the interior natural, the exterior rational, and the interior rational, form a continuous degree, because all of them belong to the natural degree of the human mind; but through correspondence with the two higher degrees, namely the spiritual and celestial, if these flow in, there is the full appearance of discreteness.

As long as an interior natural man lives in this world, he is sensuously conscious only in the external of the interior natural; when he leaves this world he becomes sensuously conscious in the internal of the interior natural. As long as a spiritual man lives in this world, he is sensuously conscious only in the external of the exterior rational; when he leaves this world he becomes sensuously conscious in the internal of the exterior rational. As long as a celestial man lives in this world he is sensuously conscious only in the external of the interior rational; when he leaves this world he becomes sensuously conscious in the internal of the interior rational. And whereas, as I pointed out before, the external of even the celestial man is discretely lower than the internal of the interior natural man, it is quite plain why in one specific sense it is said in the number quoted by you (A. 8443), that man compared with the Angels is in the lowest, namely the sixth, degree. But this regards rather the full sensuously conscious enjoyment of the different degrees of truths than the essential possession of the concepts of the different degrees of truths. Therefore it is said in this specific sense that man cannot grasp the higher degrees of truths. But on the other hand it would seem evident that the doctrinals, cognitions, and scientifics

of the Adamic man were discretely higher than those of the Noachic man — although this discreteness is not a discreteness in itself but draws its origin from the influx of the two higher degrees — and likewise, in a general way, that the doctrinals, cognitions, and scientifics of a celestial man are discretely higher than those of a spiritual man, and those of a spiritual man discretely higher than those of a natural man. The Doctrine, doctrinals, cognitions, and scientifics of the celestial man of the New Church will be discretely higher than those of the men of all previous Churches except the Adamic. Those men could never grasp these thoughts and concepts. Your statement, however, that "the highest rational sight of spiritual truth that man in the world can ever acquire is on a lower degree than that of the angels", would give to the Angels

of the lowest Heaven a higher rational insight of spiritual truth than to a spiritual or even to a celestial man, a conclusion which, it seems to me, can hardly be maintained, if one realizes that the spiritual man thinks out of the exterior rational, and the celestial man out of the interior rational or out of the rational proper (cf. A. C. 1914), while an Angel of the ultimate Heaven cannot think in the rational proper at all but can only think in the interior natural, receiving an unconscious influx of the rational.

In using the words "the highest rational insight that man in the world can ever acquire" you seem to indicate that you look for the cause of the difference between the state of man as long as he lives in the world and his state after death in the apparently discrete degrees of the natural degree of the mind — namely the different degrees of the rational which can be distinguished — while in reality the difference of these degrees is valid for both Angels and men alike. The real difference between the states of man before and after the death of the body, does not lie in the difference between a lower and a higher rational, but between the external and the internal of the different degrees of the rational. Both Angels and men alike are distinguished by the different degrees of the rational; but man is sensuously conscious only in the external of his respective degree, while the Angels are sensuously conscious in the internal of their respective degree.

To illustrate this still further: If a man has become a

celestial man this is by virtue of the fact that he has been introduced from the Lord into the interior rational, or the rational proper. This is the highest degree of rational insight for both men and Angels alike. Nevertheless as long as he lives in this world he is sensuously conscious only in the external of it, and the thoughts of the celestial Angels who are in the internal of it, exceed by far his own thoughts, so that they cannot be compared. But it would be a wrong conclusion to think that "his rational insight" is on a lower degree than that of the Angels of the second or of the ultimate Heaven. He has truly rational concepts which the lower Angels could never grasp, the Angels of the lowest Heaven not being in the rational at all, but in the natural, and receiving only an influx of the rational. And yet it is true that the light of truth of the Angels even of the lowest Heaven in a certain sense exceeds his light, because they are sensuously conscious in the internal of the interior natural which is discretely higher than the external of the interior rational in which he is sensuously conscious. Yet they are only in an interior natural light, while he is in a truly rational light. I would say that this is confirmed by the fact that the states of regeneration represented by the life of Isaac refer to things which must occur as long as man lives in this world, and not only after the death of the body. But nevertheless we have fully taken into account the great importance and significance of your central argument on the part which the natural degree plays in man's life, as long as he lives in this world.

For the sake of illustration I would like to ask you what you would think of the following formulation of the contents of the second paragraph on page 68 of your pamphlet. I would suggest to have it read like this: "The celestial sense of the Third Testament as it is with the Angels in the Third Heaven, cannot be seen by man on earth, but it can be seen in a corresponding form by man on earth, and that form is the form the Divine Truths take in the external of the interior rational of a celestial man. And likewise, the spiritual sense as it is with the Angels in the Second Heaven, cannot be seen by man on earth, but it can be seen in a corresponding form by man on earth, and that form is the form the Divine Truths take

in the external of the exterior rational of a spiritual man. And likewise, the spiritual-natural sense as it is with the Angels in the First Heaven, cannot be seen by man on earth, but it can be seen in a corresponding form by man on earth, and that form is the form the Divine Truths take in the external of the interior natural of a spiritual-natural man".

In the third paragraph of the same page you say: "The internal sense which men of the Church in the world can see is one with their rational understanding of the Word...", but exactly the same is true of the Angels likewise, as you pointed out yourself on page 48, line 2—10. This is thus not where the difference lies of man's state before and after the death of the body. The difference to us, as I pointed out before, would seem to lie in the fact that as long as he lives in the world, man is sensuously conscious only in the external of the different apparent degrees of the natural degree, while after the death of the body he becomes sensuously conscious in the internal of those degrees. This internal is the truly angelic spiritual or celestial itself, into which man can never come as long as he lives in this world. But with both Angels and men alike the discreteness of the different degrees of the mind is dependent on the same qualification not of the two higher degrees but of the natural degree into a very substantial though in itself only apparent discreteness.

I suppose you will have received the proofs of the article by Mr. Groeneveld on The Coming of the Lord for Conjunction with the Church, together with an elucidation which I gave of this article.* From this, our position with regard to the discrete degrees of internal truths which since the Incarnation of the Lord must become the basis for the thought of the Church, may become quite clear. It seems to us that unless there would be a qualification of the natural degree itself into a practically very real, though in itself only apparent, discreteness, the difference between a celestial, a spiritual, and a natural Church, would be non-essential. And therefore it seems to me that your central point, namely on the great significance of the

* DE HEMELSCHE LEER, Third Fasc. pp. 86-108.

44 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

natural degree of the mind in its relation to the two higher degrees, is the very stronghold of our position; for the foundation of the celestial and spiritual degrees does not lie in these degrees themselves, but in the natural degree, with both Angels and men alike.

I would also be grateful if you would let me know what you think of what has been developed in these proofs concerning the ages of the human race; namely that the Third Testament is essentially addressed to the old age or celestial state of the human race, when it is prepared to enter into the interior rational. I wonder how you think this compares with your thought that the Third Testament is the Lord speaking to the human race when it has arrived at the age of

rationality (see page 70, paragraph one). The age of rationality of which you speak, if I understand you correctly, is that of early manhood (juventus), when the influx of the rational is being received in the interior natural.

ERNST PFEIFFER

REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

March 28th 1932. Dear Mr. Bjorck.

Thank you for the pamphlet you sent me. I think it will perform an important use if read extensively; it appears to me that it would be very useful for the NEW CHURCH LIFE to publish it, and thus bring it to the attention of the Church at large.

One of your statements which does not appear in agreement with the Latin Word is to the effect that the Doctrine of the Church is not Divine. In the ARCANA CELESTIA 3712 we read: "Divine Doctrine is Divine Truth; and Divine Truth is all the Word of the Lord. Divine Doctrine itself is the Word in the supreme sense; ... from this Divine Doctrine is the Word in the internal sense; ... Divine Doctrine is also the Word in the literal sense; . . . and whereas the literal sense contains within it the internal sense, and this the supreme sense, and as the literal sense altogether corresponds thereto, ... therefore also the Doctrine therefrom is Divine. ... But Divine Truth is the Divine Good appearing in Heaven before the Angels and on earth

45 REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

before men, and although it is apparent, nevertheless it is Divine Truth." The APOCALYPSE REVEALED, n. 157, like many other passages, speaks of "Divine truths out of the Word" with men. In n. 193 in reference to the New Church it says that "Divine Truth will be written on their hearts". While n. 920, also referring to the New Church, says that "All who are in the good of life and believe in the Lord, will there live according to Divine truths, and will see them inwardly within themselves as an eye sees objects". The APOCALYPSE EXPLAINED, n. 395, says that "The white robes which were given them, signify the Divine Truth from the Lord with them". From these and other passages it is clear that the genuine truths from the Lord with the man of the Church are called Divine truths. Yet it is also clear that there is an infinite difference between the Divine truths with man and the Divine Truths that were with the Lord, or, to use the representation in the above passage, between the garments of Angels and men and the garments of the Lord. In the Latin Word the word "Divine" is most frequently used in relation to the Divine Itself, and the Divine Human itself, that is, to the Divine above the Heavens. Wherefore the word Divine as used in the Church is usually synonymous with the Infinite. Yet the Divine which makes Heaven and the Church, that is, the Divine goods and truths which have been received in the Church, are also called Divine, although being in a finite receptacle they are not infinite.

You speak in your STUDIES as if there would not be a discrete degree between the Doctrine of the natural, the spiritual, and the celestial Church in the New Church, for the reason that while man lives on earth he is in the natural, and the natural is of one degree. Yet is it not evident that there was a discrete degree of difference between the Adamic Church, the Noachic Church, and the Hebrew Church? That there will be similar degrees in the New Church is clearly taught

in the APOCALYPSE REVEALED, n. 350, and following numbers, where we read: "Of the tribe of Judah were sealed twelve thousand, signifies celestial love ... with all who will be in the Lord's New Heaven and New Church. In the supreme sense Judah signifies the Lord as to celestial love; in the spiritual sense the celestial kingdom of the Lord, and the Word; and in the natural

sense the Doctrine of the celestial Church out of the Word. But here Judah signifies celestial love, which is love to the Lord; and because he is mentioned first in the series, it signifies that love with all who will be in the Lord's New Heaven and New Church; for the tribe first named is the all in the rest". This is a proof that the essential New Church is a celestial Church. In n. 351: "Reuben signifies wisdom out of celestial love with those who will be in the Lord's New Heaven and New Church". In n. 360: "Joseph signifies the doctrine of good and truth with those who will be in the Lord's New Heaven and New Church. Joseph signifies the Lord as to the Divine Spiritual; in the spiritual sense the Lord's spiritual kingdom". In the APOCALYPSE EXPLAINED, n. 5557, we read: "As by Samaria, the metropolis of the Israelites, in the Word is signified the spiritual Church, and by Jerusalem, the metropolis of the Jews, the celestial Church, both as to Doctrine they are called women". In the ARCANA CELESTIA, n. 4279, we read: "The sense of the Word is according to the Heavens; the supreme sense ... is for the inmost or third Heaven; its internal sense . . . is for the middle or second Heaven; but the lower sense . . . is for the lowest or first Heaven; but the lowest or literal sense is for man while still living in the world, who nevertheless is such that the interior sense, and even the internal and supreme sense, can be communicated to him; for man has communication with the three Heavens". And in n. 2242: "While the Word as to the letter is for man, as to the internal sense it is for the Angels, as also for those men to whom, out of the Lord's Divine mercy, it is given, while living in the world, to be like the Angels".

From the above it is evident that in the New Church there will be a Doctrine of the natural Church, a Doctrine of the spiritual Church, and a Doctrine of the celestial Church, and that these Doctrines are communicated from Heaven out of the spiritual and the celestial sense of the Word. In your STUDIES you have brought out passages which teach that while man lives in the body, he thinks on the plane of the natural mind, and the natural mind is continuous. While the natural mind is continuous, its form is totally qualified by the internal degree that is opened, so that it is as it were discrete, as is illustrated by the fol-

lowing comparison. The body of an animal, a tree, and a stone, are all in the same degree, nevertheless due to the soul or atmosphere which acts upon them and forms them, there is as it were a discrete degree of difference between the body of an animal, a plant, and a stone. DE HEMELSCHE LEER teaches throughout that the literal sense of the Doctrine .of the Church is natural, nevertheless the literal sense of the Doctrine of the Church is totally qualified by the degree of the mind of the Church which has been opened. Thus the literal sense of the Doctrine

of the natural Church, of the spiritual Church, and of the celestial Church, would differ in a corresponding way as a stone, a tree, and an animal differ.

While a man in the natural world thinks in the natural, this does not mean that essentially a man who has had the celestial degree of his mind opened, is not wiser than an Angel of the natural Heaven; for a man in Heaven, comes into the essentials of the things he had on earth. It is evident that a man of the Most Ancient Church was essentially wiser while living on earth, than a man of the Hebrew Church is in Heaven.

While it appears to me that in the points referred to above you did not go far enough, I enjoyed reading your booklet very much, and I believe it will perform a use in the Church.

THEODORE PITCAIRN

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. THEO. PITCAIRN

April 14th 1932. Dear Mr. Pitcairn.

In your recent letter you say: "One of your statements which does not seem in agreement with the Latin Word is to the effect that the Doctrine of the Church is not Divine". It has not been my intention to make any statement to that effect. I certainly believe that the Doctrine of genuine truth in the Church is Divine. In the beginning of the third study I quoted from the Doctrine of the GENERAL CHURCH as stated in the Liturgy: "Since the Lord is the Word, He also is Doctrine from the Word in the Church", etc. (at bottom of p. 31). And on p. 77 I say: "The Doctrine of the

Church therefore in a very real sense is the Coming of the Lord to the Church and to the individual man of the Church, if the Doctrine is from a genuine understanding of the Divine Truth in the Word of His Second Coming".

The fact that you understand me to deny the Divinity of the Doctrine of genuine truth in the Church seems to me an indication that when we speak of the Divine Doctrine we have different concepts of what is meant by the term. Statements in DE HEMELSCHE LEER have also given me this impression. Sometimes the Doctrine of the Church is there defined as a vision of the Divine Truth in the Word. If the vision is true, and the thought or understanding is a true form of that vision, I think we all agree. But in some places the Doctrine of the Church is spoken of in a way that seems to imply that it is not thought of as the result of, or equivalent with, a true understanding of the Word, but as something abstract which gives light to our understanding, and yet is not the same as the Divine Doctrine of the Word. I have been at a loss to understand clearly just what is meant by the Doctrine of the Church as spoken of in DE HEMELSCHE LEER, seeing that it is claimed that no falsity from man's understanding can adhere to it.

The references you give in your letter do not clear up the difficulty. Divine Truth is certainly Divine Doctrine, but men may have a certain understanding of Divine Truth, be guided by it, and by the truth they see' and obey be conjoined to the Lord, while this understanding of the Divine Truth is still very imperfect and even mixed with falsities.

I agree that the difference between the Adamic, the Noahitic, and the First Christian Church is one of discrete degrees, but when you proceed from this to say that similar discrete degrees will arise in the New Church, I disagree. Nor can I see that the references you give offer support for that thought if compared with other teaching. What is said in the *ARCANA CELESTIA* about Jacob and his sons and Israel and the tribes has led me to a different understanding, the main features I will try to set forth as plainly as I can in a few words. All the tribes together make one Church, though Judah is the head. The other tribes signify different states of those within the New

Church who by means of the celestial doctrine from the Latin Word can be regenerated.

The Latin Word reveals the Lord's Divine Human as infinite Love and Wisdom, His Love one with Life itself and Substance itself going out to give of itself to others, and His Wisdom the form of His Love, Life, and Substance, one with and inseparable from them. The universal and particular faith of the New Church as stated in the *TRUE, CHRISTIAN RELIGION*, n. 2 and 3, is the faith taught by the Latin Word, and the truths of the Word proceed from the Lord's Love for saving men and are all together Divine Doctrine. The central teaching is that the Lord is the one God of heaven and earth and that He is Love and Wisdom itself. That is celestial doctrine even when understood in a natural way, as it generally is at first. An affirmative disposition to the doctrine from natural good is the first of regeneration and is signified by Dan. Under the influence and guidance of the Doctrine Dan may become Joseph; but if the affirmative disposition is not accompanied by the shunning of evil and doing of good, the state signified by Dan is not really within the boundary of the Church, even if a man's natural understanding is enlightened and becomes intelligent, and therefore may be said to be signified by Ephraim, who represents the understanding of the Word, both true and false, in the Church. In the *APOCALYPSE* the tribes of Dan and Ephraim are not among those called. But as long as we live in the world we cannot judge whether a man's voluntary is affected by his knowledge or understanding of Divine teaching or not, and therefore whether he is of the Church or not.

The Doctrine of the New Church is celestial because proceeding from the Lord's Love, and the New Church is therefore celestial in its essence from the beginning, however different the reception of its Doctrine is with the men of the Church. Judah, or love of the Lord, is the head, and from that head all the tribes are governed or guided, even they whose understanding of the Divine Truths is most natural.

The understanding I get from the *ARCANA CELESTIA* and the Latin Word in general is that the three heavens, the highest, based on the Adamic Church, the second,

based on the Noahitic Church, and the first, based now entirely on the New Church, make one whole, and each one is a discrete degree in that whole. You cannot divide each one of the three heavens in discrete degrees, although the angels which constitute them receive the Lord's life differently. This difference in their reception of life from the Lord merely decides whether they are in the east, south, west, or north of the heaven they are in. This understanding seems to be supported also by the fact that the three heavens correspond to the three atmospheres, aura, ether, and air, each of which is in a continuous degree.

The inmost and interior minds in the New Church would then seem to correspond to the aura and ether within the air, which has more of the effluvia and vapors of the earth in the lower regions than in the higher, decreasing in density continuously. The relation in the TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, n. 386, may be of aid to understand my meaning. The angel from the east I think of as in the state signified by Judah, while he from the south in the state signified by Reuben or Joseph.

In the spiritual world the interior state of the angels decides their location and eternal surroundings. Here we cannot judge concerning a man's interior, and the interior state of a man here is constantly changing according to regeneration. To think of the New Church in the future as divided in discrete degrees, forming a celestial Church, a spiritual Church, and a natural Church, each with its own separate Doctrine, seems to me erroneous. Nevertheless there will always be in the Church grades of celestial life, in that some will see the truths of Doctrine from love to the Lord, some from charity or wisdom from that love, and some from love of use without any deeper understanding of the love and wisdom.

I am aware that the view I have tried to put before you, may seem in opposition to other teaching found in the Latin Word. It needs elaboration and elucidation, but it would take considerable time to do that. I can only say that it is the result of a true desire to understand the Latin Word and of much reflection on what is said there.

ALBERT BJORCK

51 REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

April 15th 1932.

Dear Mr. Pfeiffer.

In your letter to me you say that the truth, that the natural degree of the mind regarded in itself is continuous, has been fully realized in your position as propounded in DE HEMELSCHE LEER.

To me that does not appear to be the case. If I understand you correctly (which I am not quite sure of) it appears that you make the apparent discreteness of the natural mind to be so real and substantial that the teaching in DIVINE LOVE AND WISDOM is practically put aside. You base, so it seems to me, your conceptions of three discrete degrees in each of the three heavens and in each Church on the reality of these discrete degrees, though admitting that it is only an appearance. Your conception, it seems to me, postulates not three degrees of the mind but nine, and also nine discretely different heavens. My study and reflection on what is said in the Latin Word, including A.R. 350, has led me to a quite different, view, which I will try to set forth

briefly. I have just done so in a letter to Rev. Theodore Pitcairn, but I know it lacked much as an expression of my view. It is not easy to bring ideas of spiritual things down in thoughts -and words to be found by the natural mind. What I am to say now may supplement what I said to him and help to make my idea clearer.

The highest or inmost heaven is mainly composed of angels who as men on earth were of the Adamic Church, who were in good of life from the Lord through interior perception of influx of life from Him. This perception gradually decreased until in the men signified by Noah it had entirely disappeared, but in whom there were remains of innocence, and a beginning of the rational understanding to which spiritual truths could be taught as separate from nature but corresponding.

The highest heaven, or the inmost, is living perception of influx of life from the Divine in varying grades of intensity from the center to the circumference. The whole makes one continuous degree regarded in itself and one of the discrete degrees, the inmost, of the heavens as one. All the angels of this heaven live in an atmosphere proceeding

from the Lord as a sun, which is the atmosphere of the third degree of truth. The life of the Lord tempered by that atmosphere is their light. The second or middle heaven is composed of angels who as men on earth were of the Churches of Noah and their descendants down to the Coming of the Lord. The revelation of life from the Lord came to them not through interior perception of influx of life from Him, but by teaching from without to the beginning of understanding, meeting with and received by the remains of good from the Lord in their interior degree. The remains of innocence in their interior degree could by the teaching be preserved, and with some that degree could be opened letting down the light of the heaven to their external or natural degree in ritualistic worship representing their interior reception of light.

The heaven based on these Churches is one, composed of angels who are living forms of truth from the good of the highest heaven, truths which correspond to the different grades of perception there, from inmost to circumference in one continuous degree. Those in the spiritual Church, if any, who through regeneration came to perceive the influx of life from the Lord as if it were their own, after death were taken to the heaven of perception.

Those who were in good in the Jewish Church before the Coming of the Lord joined the spiritual heaven after death. Those of the First Christian Church who were in good and died before the Second Advent of the Lord also were associated with the existing heavens from previous Churches, unless their good was joined with so many falsities in their understanding that they were bound in the false heavens until the Last Judgment.

We are taught that the Churches existing before the Lord's Coming were representative Churches, because interior Churches from remains from the Lord not yet ultimated in a natural will and understanding of their own.

The men of the Adamic Church had no rational as we understand it any more than an infant has. Their external was ruled directly from their internal perception. The men of the Churches of

Noah and descendants had the beginning of an external rational which made it possible for them to receive and be guided by teaching from without, which teaching could preserve the remains of innocence

and gradually develop an external understanding out of the faculty for rationality given to all men in creation.

Not until the age of adolescence is the rational in the natural developed enough to let us see spiritual truths, in the light from the interior to our own reason and in freedom as of ourselves, and even then the spiritual is seen in natural form. To this age the Lord comes as man on earth, and is hailed by some with youthful enthusiasm and with earnest desire to follow Him.

But the rational of this stage is not yet able to understand that the Divine Human of the Lord is not man born of woman. It is a temporary state preserving the remains in some and brings their life down into the natural as worship of a Divine Man. Not until the interior rational has been further developed through influx from the Lord through the heavens, and sheds its light on the natural, can the Lord come and be received in His Divine Human.

That opening of the natural to the light from the internal coincides with the "coming of age", or early manhood. From then on the rational in the natural degree can constantly receive more light from the Lord, as the interior desire for truth and good meets with and joins to itself the truths of the Divine Human.

In one sense, as I understand it, the New Heaven from those who have received the Lord in His Divine Human and have brought truths from His Love down into their natural life, so moulding it in conformity with those truths, is the only one that can be called natural, or a heaven in ultimates. The angels of that heaven make one whole, dwelling in an atmosphere of truth from the Divine Human, and that heaven constitutes one continuous degree, and looked upon in its relation to the former heavens it is the lowest of the discrete heavens which together form one whole man, because it is most ultimate, in constant and proximate conjunction with the only true and specific Church on earth.

The words of natural language are poor means for expressing ideas of spiritual things, but they are the only means we have, and we have to do the best we can with them. We are apt to think of the three distinct heavens as on three different horizontal planes, one above the other, with no other connection than transmitting and receiving

light and heat from the Lord. When we have that view in mind, it would be impossible to think of the New Heaven from the New Church as of one continuous degree. But the heavens are described from different points of view in the Latin Word, in relation to each other and according

to their performance of use in the Grand Man. Sometimes the New Church, and therefore the heaven from it, is said to be the heart and lungs, and again the most external of the Grand Man. I have no difficulty in combining the different aspects and to think of the New Heaven as one discrete degree of the whole, yet in itself continuous, the different societies embodying different yet continuous grades of reception of the Lord in His Divine Human; those in the center receiving His Life in a more interior way than the others, all ranged in the east, south, west, or north in the same heaven; the inmost in one aspect also the most ultimate, because the result of more intense struggle against evil in the life on earth and a fuller bringing down the interior life in ultimates.

The attempt I have made to express my ideas is a hurried one, and I am well aware of its imperfections and the need of a new effort. But your interesting letter has been left unanswered too long as it is. I will mention some things that have been in my mind next time I write you, which I hope will not be very long.

ALBERT BJORCK

REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

April 19th 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorck.

As you point out in your letter, the subject of the Doctrine of the Church has many phases, and thus may be viewed in different series. A comparison with Heaven brings this out. Heaven and the Church may be seen as the Body of the Lord, as the Wife of the Lord, as to the Divine of the Lord which makes Heaven, or as to the Angels which constitute it. The Heavens to eternity in a kind of infinity are present before the Lord, while only the actual Heavens are visible to Angels; and the same applies to Doctrine.

The different aspects of Doctrine are illustrated by the

55 REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. THEO. PITCAIRN

things which represent it. For example in many places it speaks as if the Doctrine and the understanding of the Word were one and the same thing, yet in the case of a horse and chariot, the horse represents the understanding of the Word and the-chariot the Doctrine. Again a candle or a lamp is said to represent Doctrine, the lamp being the vessel containing oil. On the other hand the Word without Doctrine is said to be like a candlestick without light; in this representation the literal sense is the candlestick and Doctrine the light. Some of the things representing Doctrine are, a field, a bow, a rainbow, a lip or tongue, a way, a prophet, a fountain, a ship; as it is too extensive a subject to enter into these various aspects of the subject, I will leave it for the present.

It appears from your letter that you are warning against the danger of making personal or artificial distinctions in the Church, as would be done if it were said that so and so is a spiritual man and so and so is a natural man. The Lord alone orders and disposes the Church, and man must not make any personal judgments.

That there are degrees of altitude as well as degrees of length and breadth in the New Church appears to be clearly taught in the APOCALYPSE REVEALED, n. 348—363; compare also the APOCALYPSE EXPLAINED, n. 429—452.

THEODORE PITCAIRN

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. THEO. PITCAIRN

April 28th 1932.

Dear Mr. Pitcairn.

I wish to thank you for your letter received some days ago. In DE HEMELSCHE LEER, Second Fasc. p. 125, occurs the following statement: "That the reception with the nonregenerate man is not Divine certainly does not in any way do away with the fact that the reception with the regenerated man is Divine". The sentence I have quoted implies, or rather says in so many words, that not only the truths and goods from the Lord in man are Divine, but also man's reception of them.

I have wondered if this is really the position of DE HEMELSCHE LEER, or if Mr. Pfeiffer in his desire to

56 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

defend the truth as he sees it was led to use an expression that does not really bring out the position.

If the position is truly described in the sentence quoted, namely that man's reception of good and truth from the Lord is Divine, I regard it as an error. Man must cooperate with the Lord, and his reception of truth and good is from that cooperation. The power to cooperate with the Lord is given man by the Lord from creation. It belongs to the man as a created being, and can never become Divine because it is from the Divine. One might as well say that the living forms on earth, or the earth itself, is the sun, because they are created from the sun.

The Lord's human reception of the truths of the Word was indeed Divine always, because the Divine was the inmost of His Human. Man's inmost, his soul, is a first finite receptacle of the Divine, and the finite can never become the infinite.

ALBERT BJORCK

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFEER

May 1st 1932.

Dear Mr. Pfeiffer.

After reading the proofs you recently sent me, * the meaning of some things you say in the First Fascicle has been clearer in my mind; but there are still things said that I can only account for by a failing on my part to understand your meaning, or as the result of an error on your part.

On p. 56 you say "That by the Doctrine of the Church not the Writings of Swedenborg are meant, but the vision of these Writings and the Word as a whole which the Church gradually acquires for itself; and second, that this Doctrine of the Church is of purely Divine origin and of a purely Divine essence".

This I fully agree with, and I think most thinking New Churchmen would. But the very fact that a true vision of the Word as a whole is only gradually acquired by the Church, seems to indicate that during this gradual process

* Pp. 111—144 of the Third Fascicle. ED.

57 REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

falsities may adhere to -the vision, though they may be removed one after another as the vision clears. This I think is also plainly taught in the Latin Word.

Though the Doctrine of the Church in itself is of Divine origin and of a purely Divine essence, the vision the Church as a whole, or any one regenerating man, may have at any given time, can at best be what corresponds to the Human Divine with the Lord.

I agree fully with what is said in the second paragraph p. 61, beginning, "By the influx from the Lord", and also with the thoughts expressed in the following paragraph. What I have said in my pamphlet will show that I also agree with what is said in the next paragraph on p. 62, that the rational must be inspired, that is, elevated and illumined, in order to see the Doctrine which is in itself Divine; yet, this elevation and illumination of the rational is also progressive. When you say, "it is never anything by itself, it is never anything but the recipient of the Divine Human of the Lord", I cannot agree. The human faculty of rationality is from the Lord, given to man in creation. It is not the Lord, but created by the Lord in man.

In the previous paragraph you say: "The rational is only a recipient or dwelling place for the Doctrine". A recipient vessel is something by itself, and that which fills it takes on the form of the vessel. Man cooperates with the Lord in regeneration by receiving good and truth from the Lord, opening his rationality to the Lord's teaching in the Word and shunning the evils there shown him to be residing in his will and thoughts. The devils in hell have the faculty of rationality, but with them it is not a receptive vessel of the Divine Human. Man's reception of the Divine can never be the Divine itself.

Some men's visions of the Lord as He reveals Himself in the Word may closely resemble each other, but they will never be exactly alike. As the Church grows numerically there will therefore be more diversity of vision, that is, of Doctrine. Some men's Doctrine will be more external, some others' more internal, according to the measure in which their rational has been inspired. So viewed one may speak of a natural, a spiritual, and a celestial Church, but they will

all be of the same Church on earth, led by the same essential Doctrine, or their reception of good and

58 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

truth from the Lord's Divine Human, though their understanding of the Doctrine may differ.

We cannot say that because a man's understanding or vision of the Lord's Divine Human, as he is able to express that vision, to us seems external, he therefore has not progressed far in regeneration. Every man whose regeneration has begun is in one sense in truth from good, for no one is in truth unless remains of good from the Lord in his will have taken truth from the Word and joined that truth to itself, thus giving that good form in the natural man. Therefore I cannot think of the Church in the future divided as Natural, Spiritual, and Celestial, each with its own Doctrine.

When you say that the Church hitherto has been in a natural state, I suppose you mean the Church at The Hague which you have been in intimate contact with, and as teacher and leader have had ample opportunity to observe the state of. But by the way you express yourself you give the impression that you consider the Society at The Hague to be in a state of more advanced regeneration than the rest of the Church, seeing truth from good, and therefore able to get a vision of the Word as a whole, or a Doctrine of the Church, which is purely Divine as to origin, and also of purely Divine essence even as to your reception of it. I cannot believe that you really mean that, but the way you express yourself in many places would bring that meaning to most of your readers. In the First Fascicle, p. 13, Mr. Groeneveld says; "Then will this new Magazine be the place where the Lord will speak openly to us". You have left that standing without any comment.

Such expressions seem to embody the idea, that you not only speak from the Lord, but that it is the Lord Himself who speaks through you. If so, then indeed your magazine would be a New Word of the Lord, giving the internal sense of the Latin Word. That would indeed be possible if, as you say on p. 58, "the internal man is the soul itself, which is Divine and above man's reach". But that is not the teaching of the Latin Word, as far as I can see. Man's soul is not Divine, but the first created receptacle for the Lord's life to flow into and be received by. The first receptacle of life, or man's soul, is from

59 REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

the finest created substances which enclose the Lord's dwelling place — the inmost. In this soul are implanted seeds of good from the Lord, but also tendencies to all kinds of evils by inheritance in all born from human father and mother. From these seeds the human proprium grows, an evil one if the Lord's truths are not received, giving growth and form to the seeds of good from Life itself; but a heavenly one, if the Lord's truth is received. The human proprium with its evil tendencies can never be cast out, only subjugated and moved to the circumference.

The Divine Human has no human father, but the Divine itself is its Father. Therefore the Divine seed grew in the Lord as He as a man put off the human from the mother, and He became gradually Human Divine and finally Divine Human, so superadding a Divine Natural Human to the Divine Human in the heavens. In this Divine Human the Word became flesh, and in it the infinite Life of Love dwells. The Lord our God is God Man and Man God.

In the genealogy of Luke, which represents the growth of the Divine Human seed to complete union with the Lord from eternity, Mary is not even mentioned. Mary represents the Church. She also represents the affection for Divine Truth laid down in the human soul from creation, because without that affection there could never be any Church. That affection is the beginning of the Church in man, but it is not Divine, but created by the Lord in the soul of man. It is necessary as a receptacle in and through which the Divine can come and make the external at one with the good from the Lord implanted in the soul. Therefore the genealogy in Matthew commences with Abraham, who represents the Divine Itself in the Lord's Human, and in man the Divine influx into the human affection for Divine Truth, descending through the patriarchs and kings; or the truths of the Word as given to the Church, until received by the Church in the state represented by Mary it becomes the Word made flesh, the Son of Man, or Divine Truth in an external natural form.

Thinking of the difference in our views of the correspondence of the different Churches with the ages of man, I would draw your attention to n. 10225, of the ARCANA

60 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

CELESTIA, which seems to give further support to my conception as to the state of the New Church as a whole at the present time. To me it seems impossible to think that the Church has grown beyond the earlier years of manhood. To me it seems that most of us are still in the Ishmaelitic rational, discussing truths and defending each his own understanding of it. And I think the Church necessarily has to go through such a period in its growth. At any rate we seem to be yet far from that innocence of wisdom that belongs to old age, when man is no longer concerned about understanding truths and goods, but about willing and living them.

ALBERT BJORCK

REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

May 2nd 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorck.

Your letter has just come to hand. You state: "The sentence I have quoted from DE HEMELSCHE LEER, Second Fasc. p. 125, implies, or rather says in so many words, that not only the truths and goods from the Lord in man are Divine, but also man's reception of them". Your statement of the case would not be correct, for man's reception of them could never be Divine. What DE HEMELSCHE LEER states is that "The reception with the regenerate man is Divine, for the reason that the Lord dwells in His Own with man". Thus it is not man's reception that is Divine, but the Lord's reception with man that is Divine. In this connection the following number from the ARCANA CELESTIA is of importance: "The case is like this: With no man is

there any understanding of truth and will of good, not even with those who were of the Most Ancient Church. But when they become celestial it appears as if there were a will of good and an understanding of truth with them, but it is of the only Lord, as they also know, acknowledge, and perceive. So it is with the Angels also; so much so that whoever does not know, acknowledge, and perceive that it is so, has nothing whatever of an understanding of truth or of a will of good. With every man and every Angel, even the most celestial, that which is his proprium is nothing but falsity and evil; for it is known that the Heavens are

61 REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

not pure before the Lord, and that all good and all truth are of the only Lord. But so far as a man or an Angel is capable of being perfected, so far, out of the Lord's Divine Mercy, he is perfected, and receives as it were an understanding of truth and a will of good; but his having these is only an appearance. Every man can be perfected, and consequently receive this gift of the Lord's Mercy, in accordance with the actual doings of his life, and in a manner suited to the hereditary evil implanted from his parents" (n. 633).

The above makes it clear that the understanding of truth and the will of good are the Lord's and are thus Divine, and that it is only an appearance that man has an understanding of truth or will of good; if man had an understanding of truth or a will of good, this would mean that man's proprium was not wholly evil. It is known that it is the Lord's proprium that makes the Church and not anything of man's proprium, and as it is the Lord's proprium with the Church which receives good and truth this reception is Divine.

This can be confirmed by innumerable passages; the following few must here suffice. We read in HEAVEN AND HELL: "Man is so far in innocence as he is removed from his proprium; and so far as anyone is removed from his proprium, he is in the Lord's proprium" (n. 341). In the APOCALYPSE REVEALED: "The Divine can be with man, but not in his proprium; for the proprium of man is nothing but evil; and therefore he who ascribes what is Divine to himself as his proprium ... profanes it. What is Divine from the Lord is exquisitely separated from the proprium of man, and is elevated above it, and never immersed in it" (n. 758). "Heaven is not Heaven from the things proper to the Angels" (n. 882). In the MEMORABILIA: "All good is the proprium of the Lord" (n. 1178). "The Holy with Angels and spirits is the proprium of the Lord; and that which is the proprium of an Angel and spirit is evil and unclean" (n. 1370). In the APOCALYPSE EXPLAINED: "The Lord is not conjoined with the proprium of man, but with His Own with him. The Lord removes the proprium of man, and gives out of His Own, and dwells in that" (n. 254). "As man as to his proprium is such, therefore out of the Lord's Divine Mercy means have been given by which

62 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

he can be removed from his proprium. These means are given in the Word; and, when a man operates by these means, that is, thinks and speaks, wills and acts out of the Divine Word, he is then kept out of the Lord in Divine things, and is thus withheld from the proprium; and when this

lasts, as it were a new proprium, both voluntary and intellectual, is formed with man from the Lord, which is completely separated from the proprium of man" (n. 585).

The means by which the proprium of the Lord is built into a Church is described in the formation of Eve out of the rib of Adam. We read: "By Adam himself is there meant the Lord as to the Divine Itself and at the same time the Divine Human; and by his wife the Church, which is called 'Chavah' from life, because it has life from the Lord, and of her Adam said, she was his bone and his flesh, and that they were one flesh, because the Church is from the Lord and out of Him and as one with Him" (CONCERNING THE SACRED SCRIPTURE FROM EXPERIENCE XIV).

From the above it is evident that it is the Proprium of the Lord with man that receives good and truth, and hence that the reception is Divine. The cooperation on the part of man is "as of himself" for the sake of appropriation. Nevertheless, as stated above, "Man receives as it were an understanding of truth and a will of good; but his having these is only an appearance", for the reason that the reception of good and truth is the Lord's and hence Divine, and is not at all man's.

I will look forward to seeing you before or after the Assembly.

THEODORE PITCAIRN

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. THEO. PITCAIRN

May 5th 1932.

Dear Mr. Pitcairn.

Thank you for replying so promptly to my last letter. The numbers in the different parts of the Latin Word that you refer to in support of the position that the reception in man of the Divine is itself Divine, are all important for a true understanding of the relation between the Divine and the human. But I cannot see that they are in opposi-

63 REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

tion to the teaching I referred to — or rather to my understanding of the teaching given 138 — when seen in connection with what is said in other places. I am not at present able to refer you to many special numbers, but I have just lately read THE TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION 470, where the general teaching is given very clearly. In a recent letter to Mr. Pfeiffer I have stated my understanding more fully than I did in my letter to you, and what you have said does not invalidate that view as far as I can see.

Man's soul is not life but the first receptacle of life. Man's will is not itself love but a receptacle of love, and man's understanding is the receptacle of truth. They are both formed — created from finite substances — by the Lord in the embryo. If man receives the good of love in his will and the truth of wisdom in his understanding, he becomes an image — a finite one — of the Divine. Man prepares himself for a receptacle of the Divine as he from natural power believes in God and loves the neighbor (cf. T. C. R. 74).

It will be a pleasure to be able to talk with you on this and other points before or after the Assembly.

ALBERT BJORCK

REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

May 12th 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorck.

Your last letter concerning man as a receptacle involves the whole Doctrine of regeneration, a subject which is most profound, and of which at present we are only acquainted with the most general things; and as we are only in generals it is difficult to see the question in clear light.

While man is a receptacle of life and a receptacle of good and truth, or rather may become such a receptacle, it is not a merely passive receptacle, but a reactive receptacle. If man were a passive receptacle he would be like a stalk. Man as to his proprium or as to what is his own is not a receptacle of good and truth, but of their opposites. The question is, what is the reactive essence in the receptacle, which is the basis of the reformation and regeneration of the receptacle so that it can receive good and truth

64

A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

from the Lord. Since the Coming of the Lord this essential reactive in the receptacle is the Proprium of the Divine Human of the Lord. Hence it is that the Lord is the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last, in the regenerated man, that is, the Lord works from what is His Own in man both in firsts and lasts, and the Church is built out of the Proprium of the Lord as lasts, as Eve was built out of the rib of Adam. Eve is said to be the celestial proprium, which is built out of the Lord's Proprium. As the Lord builds the celestial proprium of the Church out of His own Proprium in the Church the celestial proprium is the Lord's and not man's. Thus the Lord dwells in His Own in man, and not in anything which is man's, wherefore the essential of reception is the Lord's and not man's and is hence Divine. Nevertheless the Lord provides that man feels the new proprium from the Lord as if it were his own, and hence he may be in good and truth as if from himself, but he must acknowledge that this is only an appearance, and that all good and truth with man. are not the man's but are entirely the Lord's, and hence are Divine. How the Proprium of the Lord is built into the celestial proprium, (usually translated heavenly proprium), contains the deepest arcana which we cannot enter into now. In n. 633 of the *ARCANA CELESTIA*, quoted in my last letter, it says that "When men become celestial it appears as if there were a will of good and an understanding of truth with them, but it is of the only Lord. ... Man receives as it were a will of good and an understanding of truth". The will of good and the understanding of truth with the Church are the Lord's and are hence Divine, but man is held in these by the Lord, as if they were the man's, hence man as it were has a will of good and an understanding of truth; but man must acknowledge that he has no will of good or understanding of truth, and that all will of good and understanding of truth are wholly the Lord's and not at all man's; and that it is of the mercy of the Lord, he can as it were have a will of good and an understanding of truth, while he acknowledges that he does not have these, but that they are the Lord's, and that whatever man has that is not the Lord's is nothing but evil and falsity. If man had the least thing of the will of good or the understanding of truth, then, as is said in

THE TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, n. 470, life would be in man, and man would not be a receptacle but would be life, yea he would be God.

The men of the Most Ancient Church we are told had the Word written on their hearts, that is Divine good and truth were written or impressed on their will; but although it was written on their hearts and they were thus kept by the Lord in Divine good and truth, the Word was not theirs, but was wholly the Lord's. Because they were held in Divine good and Divine truth, and indeed had these written on their hearts, when they fell and thus perverted this Doctrine into its opposite, they claimed the Divine good and truth which had been written on their hearts as their own; thus they made themselves gods.

To deny that the will of good and the understanding of truth are Divine is to deny that it is wholly the Lord's and not at all man's, that is, to confirm the fallacy of the senses spoken of in T. C. R. 470. Note that the will of good and the understanding of truth is not the vessel but the active; it is the vessel which causes the appearance that they are as it were man's own, and which thus causes them to be attributed to man as if they were his. Men are in appearances, but appearances are not the will of good nor the understanding of truth, but if man acknowledges that the appearances with him are appearance and that the will of good and the understanding of truth are the Lord's and are not man's, then the will of good and the understanding of truth are in the appearances, and the Lord dwells in man and man in the Lord.

I am looking forward with great pleasure to seeing you before the British Assembly.

THEODORE PITCAIRN

P. S. Since writing the above I found the following number in the APOCALYPSE EXPLAINED bearing on the subject: "And I went unto the angel, saying, give me the little book, signifies the faculty to perceive from the Lord of what quality the Word is. . . . The Lord gives to every man to perceive this, but yet no one does perceive it unless he wishes as it were out of himself to perceive it. There must be this reciprocity from the side of man in order that he may receive the faculty to perceive the Word; unless

a man wishes and does this as out of himself no such faculty can be appropriated to him; since in order that appropriation may be affected, there must be an active and a reactive. The active is from the Lord, so is the reactive, but the latter appears to be from man; for the Lord Himself gives this reactive, and thence it is from the Lord and not from man; but as man does not know otherwise than that he lives out of himself, and consequently that he thinks and wills out of himself, so he must needs do this as out of the proprium of his own life".

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

May 14th 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorck.

Please accept my thanks for your several letters in reply to the proofs which I sent you and to my letter of March 16th. I hope to come back on the different points raised by you in detail, but I should like to-day to make only the following few remarks with regard to what seems to me an obvious misunderstanding of our position. There is the Divine in itself, which is infinite, and there is the Divine in the Heavens and in the Church, which, though it is truly Divine, nevertheless is not infinite. Practically the whole of your last letter seems to be based on the opinion that in our position we regard the Doctrine of the Church as infinite, which by no means is the case. For instance, you say that "the Doctrine of the Church . . . can at best be what corresponds to the Human Divine with the Lord". This is what we have always held. We have never said that the Doctrine of the Church is the Divine Human in itself, or that it is infinite. Does the Word not teach in many places that that which corresponds to the Divine is also Divine? It is just by virtue of this correspondence that finite things can be Divine. This is illustrated by the law that as long as the body corresponds to the soul, it is sane and lives, but as soon as the correspondence ceases, it dies. And of the soul it is plainly said both that it corresponds to the Divine Human of the Lord and that it is Divine; and yet it is not infinite; it is not life, but only a recipient of life. Evil and false things can never correspond to the Divine, except ex opposite; but the

67 REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

genuine Doctrine of the Church does truly correspond to the Divine Human of the Lord, and by no means ex opposite. Although the Church and the Doctrine of the Church are not infinite, nevertheless they are Divine. The living Church, as to its Doctrine, is the Holy City, and it is also the Bride of the Lamb. The Lord in it dwells in His Own. I find it difficult to believe that in your letters you have not entirely lost sight of the difference between the infinite Divine Human in itself and the Divine in the Heavens and in the Church, which of course involves also the recipients of the Divine. Also the recipients, though finite, must be purely Divine, because the Lord can dwell only in His Own. Only in the measure in which also the recipients are from the Lord, can there be conjunction with the Lord.

That you seem not to make this distinction I take from your letter of April 28th to the Rev. Theodore Pitcairn, in which you say: "One might as well say that the living forms on earth, or the earth itself, is the sun, because they are created from the sun". And yet in the ARCANA CELESTIA 5116 we read: "They who attribute all things to the Divine can see . . . that the Divine is in each thing in nature". In your last letter to Mr. Pitcairn, in answering to what he had written to you on the difference between the Divine in itself and the Divine in Heaven and the Church, you throw the whole problem again on the fact that man is not life but a recipient of life; but it is obvious that this has never been denied by us, and our position is in no way in opposition to this law. To bring this in here again would draw the attention entirely away from the real issue, namely, that the Lord with man can dwell only in what is His Own. The real issue is this that in Heaven and in the genuine Church the reception of the Divine influx is Divine, while in hell and with man as far as he is not regenerated, the reception is not Divine. It seems to me that you must admit that in this connection the truth that Angels and men are not life but only recipients of life, is altogether irrelevant; for both Angels and evil spirits alike are only recipients, and yet the reception with Angels is Divine, and with evil spirits it is not Divine. The

case becomes perfectly clear with regard to the soul — as I said before — of which it is plainly taught that it is

68 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

the Lord with man, and yet it is not life- but a recipient of life.

In confirmation of the above I would like to quote the following passages from the Latin Word. In the *ARCANA CELESTIA*: "The Divine must be in what is Divine; not in the proprium of anyone" (n. 9338). "All good is Divine with man, because it is from the Divine" (n. 10618). "Then they do not think out of themselves, neither are they affected by the Word out of themselves, but out of the Lord; therefore not anything evil or false does enter, for the Lord removes these" (n. 10638). In the *APOCALYPSE REVEALED*: "That which is from God . . . is called Divine" (n. 961). And in *THE TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION*: "Nothing can proceed from God but what is Himself, and is called the Divine" (n. 6).

It may be clear that this position is in no way in contradiction with the fact that there must be progress in the Doctrine of the Church, as you seem to think. It can be compared with the orderly growth of the human body, which from creation as to all its essentials is purely Divine, and nevertheless begins from a seed. So also from re-creation or regeneration, the body of the genuine Church is purely Divine. How otherwise could it ever be the Bride of the Lamb and the Wife of the Lord? The evils and falsities of which you speak, by no means belong to its organics, they are altogether extraneous to them. Falsities which may rule among the members of the Church do not belong to the genuine Doctrine of the Church. This latter is spiritual out of celestial origin (A. C. 2496); the Lord is that Doctrine itself (A. C. 2533, 2859; A. E. 19).

ERNST PFEIFFER

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

May 20th 1932. Dear Mr. Pfeiffer.

I thank you for your interesting and lucid letter. What you have said has made it easier for me to understand your position, but not easier to agree with it. The sense in which you use the term "The Doctrine of the Church" when saying that it is Divine, is, as I understand it,

69 REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

something like this: The Heavenly Doctrine is the Lord Himself because proceeding from Him, and thus Divine. It is the teaching of Divine Wisdom proceeding from Divine Love, or the Lord in His Divine Human coming to men as the Word. When men see and live according to the genuine truths of the Divine Doctrine in the Word, that Doctrine is as it were gradually transferred from the Word to men, and so it becomes the Doctrine of the Church. As it proceeds from the Divine, it is Divine in men. Growing in the Church as a plant grows from a seed, it becomes the finite image and likeness of the Divine Doctrine which is the Lord Himself as the Word.

So far, if this is a correct understanding of your position, I am in full agreement with you.

The good and truth in the Church is from the Lord alone, and is the Divine to which the Lord can come — that in man or the Church which is His own. And so far as the perception in the Church of what is good and true from the Lord corresponds to the Divine Doctrine in the Word, so far the Doctrine of the Church is Divine, and can grow and be perfected to eternity. It is the Divine finited in the heavens and the Church.

But, as I understand the teaching given us, neither man's reception, nor his conception or understanding of the Doctrine is Divine.

The human internal is the Lord's. In it His own infinite life dwells, and from there He creates and forms man's internal for a receptacle of life corresponding to His; and through the internal so formed He creates the interior in correspondence with it, and through both He creates the natural to correspond with them. So created man is a finite correspondence to the infinite Divine Man, or, if you please, the infinite finited. Therefore it is said that, if the Most Ancient Church had remained in its integrity, there would have been no need for the Lord to be born man. The angelic heavens and the Church together would gradually have grown into a Human Divine man.

But it is through man's consciousness on the natural degree of the mind that man's life becomes separate from the Divine and as it were independent of it.

This is of course only an appearance, as there can be no life independent of Life itself, but the separation of human

70 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

life from the Divine is real, and the Lord created man with such a mind purposely, in order that there should come into being individual forms perceiving the inflowing life from Him as their own, and free to use that life as if it were their own, yet, in the beginning with an inward perception of how to use it from love of good and truth. If man had not been created with freedom to follow the impressions of his outward senses instead of that inner perception, a freedom which, as far as man's own consciousness is concerned, separates his life from any other man's and the Creator's, he would have been an automaton, without any choice of his own shadowing forth the Divine life in natural forms; and if life were withdrawn from the natural form, there would be no individualized spirit left, but the spirit of man would return to his infinite Maker and disappear in Him.

It is the separation from Life itself which makes man a being with individual spiritual life for ever. It is the Creator's gift to man, but though given by the Divine Life and from it, it is human life, not Divine. And as it is through this separateness of human life from the Divine that man can receive or reject, understand and follow the truths the Lord makes known to his natural mind in the Word, or go his own way in disobedience to them, man's reception of these truths is human, not Divine.

Neither is man's understanding or perception of the Divine Doctrine in the Word Divine. It can indeed come to correspond more and more closely to the Divine Doctrine, but even with the most regenerate man it remains human.

This is so because man's understanding or perception of Divine Truth is subject to the cooperation of his natural will and understanding with the Spirit of the Lord in the Divine Doctrine.

In man's natural will there are tendencies by inheritance to all kinds of evil, and in his understanding a tendency to false reasoning from sense impressions. These tendencies must be overcome before man's understanding can come to correspond with the Divine Doctrine; and when it does correspond it is still a human understanding or perception, not a Divine one.

The Doctrine of the Church is therefore always one with the understanding the Church has of the Divine

71

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

Doctrine, and imperfections and falsities are bound to adhere temporarily to the understanding men who compose the Church have of the Divine Doctrine in the Word. These falsities or imperfections do not belong to the Divine Doctrine, and they can be dropped off from the human doctrine of the Church one by one as men's understanding is illumined by the Divine Doctrine.

It seems to me that you both in DE HEMELSCHE LEER and in your letters to me, lose sight of, or do not pay enough attention to, the difference between the human and the Divine. This is shown in your use of expressions like "essentially and purely Divine" applied to things created human by the Lord; and this, I think, is the main cause of the non understanding of your position that you find in others, who do not use the terms in the sense you do, but by "essentially and purely Divine" mean the things that belong to the Divine itself, the Lord and the Word. There is an instance in your last letter, where you say that the human body "from creation as to all its essentials is purely Divine". Another is in your illustration of how finite things by correspondence can be Divine, where you say that "as long as the body corresponds to the soul, it is sane and lives, but as soon as the correspondence ceases, it dies". However closely the body may correspond to the soul, it never becomes the soul; and however closely the created human may correspond to the Divine, it never becomes the Divine. It remains human even when reformed and regenerated into an image and likeness of the Divine Human.

The Lord's human was glorified and became Divine, but the Lord's Human was from the beginning the Divine Life itself, not created. Man is created human, and though his regeneration is an image of the Lord's glorification and corresponds to it, he does not by regeneration become Divine.

I most heartily wish that we may come to understand each other better, and I think we all will when we take pains in explaining the sense in which we use terms.

I shall look forward to receive further letters from you, and to meet and talk with you later in the summer.

ALBERT BJORCK

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

May 27th 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorck.

Many thanks for your kind letter of May 20th, which duly came to hand. You write in both your last letters that you fully agree that the Doctrine of the Church is Divine, but you deny that the reception of the Doctrine of- the Church is Divine. It seems evident from the particulars of your letters that in speaking of the Doctrine of the Church you admit that the Doctrine of the Church is not identical with the Divine Doctrine in itself or the Latin Word, though they are one by correspondence. The Doctrine of the Church can only come into existence by reception by the men of the Church. It is not possible to speak of the Doctrine of the Church before it has been received. Before reception it is the Divine Doctrine in itself. If therefore the reception would not be Divine, the Doctrine of the Church could not be Divine either.

In your last letter you again much enlarge on the truth that man is only a receptacle of life, and that he has received the gift of freedom and rationality, without which he would be only an automaton. Of this gift you say: "It is that which makes man man, it is the Creator's gift to man, and though from the Divine it is not Divine". From what has been said in the last paragraph of p. 92 and the first paragraph of p. 93 of the Third Fascicle, it may be clear that the truths concerning man as a receptacle of life and concerning the gift of freedom and rationality have fully been taken into account in our position; but it may also appear from the numbers of the work on DIVINE PROVIDENCE which have been quoted in those passages, that that gift, being from the Divine, being thus the Lord with man, is Divine. The teaching is that by that gift the Lord is conjoined with man, but that only after regeneration man becomes also conjoined with the Lord. Your words: "It is the Creator's gift to man, and though from the Divine it is not Divine", are altogether incomprehensible to me. The teaching is in many places that nothing can be from the Divine but what is Divine, or what is called the Divine. How can we speak of "the Creator's

gift", unless that gift is Divine? Can the Lord give anything which is not Divine?

It is true, of course, that as far as man is not regenerated his use of that gift is not Divine; it is rather an abuse than a use. But in the measure man becomes regenerated also the use of that gift with man becomes Divine. By regeneration man is conceived anew and born anew, from the Lord; the Lord then is his Father, and the Church his Mother. He is conceived from a new seed, which is Divine (see A. C. 1438).

Now it is the human with man, or his natural mind, which must be regenerated. By regeneration the human of man comes into correspondence with the soul. It is utterly irrelevant to say that the human always remains human and never becomes Divine, just as the body does not become the

soul, or the earth does not become the sun. Of course not, but .by regeneration it comes into correspondence and thereby becomes Divine from the Lord. The Divine Human itself of the Lord did not become identical with the Divine Itself of the Lord; but they became one by correspondence. It is the same with man, for the regeneration of man is an image of the glorification of the Lord.

You write: "Man's understanding can indeed come to correspond more and more closely to the Divine Doctrine, but even with the most regenerate man it remains human". Further on you say: "It seems to me that you lose sight of the difference between the human and the Divine". The human about which you speak here, is either an orderly human or a disorderly human. Before regeneration it is disorderly, after regeneration it is orderly. Before regeneration it is infernal, after regeneration it is Divine. It is by virtue of the fact that the Lord glorified His human that man can be regenerated, so that the human of men by regeneration can become Divine. The Coming of the Lord into the Flesh had no other purpose. This the Lord has expressed in John 6 : 54: "Whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood hath eternal life". Of course that human of man is not infinitely Divine as the Divine Human itself, nor is it Life itself as the Divine Human is, but nevertheless it is Divine. It is not life but it has life. Therefore we read that the Divine of the Lord makes Heaven and the Church, it makes the Angel and it makes

every regenerated man, and indeed as to the human of him, for anything •else than the human does not need to be regenerated.

It is not the Latin Word which makes the New Church, but the understanding of the Latin Word, or the purity of the Doctrine born in the Church from within. Apart from the Divine of the Latin Word itself there must be the Divine of the understanding or reception of that Word. Unless the understanding or reception be Divine the Divine of the Word remains outside of man, and then there is no regeneration and no Church. What is seen and acknowledged as the Church by the Lord, is that alone which is Divine by virtue of a Divine reception.

I repeat what I said in my last letter: the real issue is this that in Heaven and in the genuine Church the reception of the Divine influx is Divine, while in hell and with man as far as he is not regenerated, the reception is not Divine. You have not entered upon this crucial point. If the Divine essence of the reception is denied, there is no difference between Heaven and hell, between a living Church and a dead church, between an Angel-man and a devil-man; there is no regeneration and no Holy Spirit; for the Holy Spirit without a Divine reception is not given. It has no meaning to speak of "the truths and goods in man" and to say that they are Divine, if the Divine of the reception is denied, for before reception truths and goods are not in man but outside of man. Please, enter upon this crucial point.

Of course, the necessity of progress is not lost sight of in this view. Nor does it mean that man after the beginning of regeneration is now at once altogether Divine and free of falsities and evils; of course not. But the falsities and evils are extraneous to that which has been regenerated. With the very beginning of regeneration and rebirth, there is a complete new human being in man, though it is first only as a new born infant. It is altogether Divine. It is the child of the Lord. And it gradually grows up and becomes adult. Nothing evil can ever enter it. The evils and falsities of the man which are not yet removed by temptations are altogether extraneous to the

organics of that new born spiritual being in us. The entering of evils and falsities here would mean profanation and the spiritual death of man. Please, I pray you, will you enter upon this crucial point which alone makes the real issue.

75

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

The genuine Doctrine of the Church, being spiritual oat of celestial origin, is born. from that regenerated Divine human being in the living Church. The Word remains closed without that.

You say: "Man's understanding ... can indeed come to correspond more and more closely to the Divine Doctrine, but even with the most regenerate man it remains human. This is so because man's understanding of Divine Truth is subject to the cooperation of his natural will and understanding. . . . In man's natural will there are tendencies by inheritance to all kinds of evil", etc. It is the plain teaching, however, that as far as regeneration goes, all evils have been removed, and that no evils or falsities are then suffered to enter, "for the Lord removes them" (A.C. 10638).

It is therefore irrelevant to adduce the fact that no man is completely regenerated in one moment. This has nothing whatever to do with the real issue. Even with the Angels regeneration goes on to eternity; nevertheless it is the Divine of the Lord which makes an Angel. The Heavens are Divine from the Lord, they are pure; so is the living genuine Church, the Bride, the Holy City (AP. 21 : 27), a man as far as his regeneration goes; this Divine, this purity, is there by virtue of the reception; if it were not so, there would be no hells, and no unregenerate men; for as far as the Lord is concerned, He wants all men to be pure, but they can only become pure, as far as the reception of the Lord's Life is pure; and there is nothing which is pure, except the Divine. What else is the difference between Heaven and hell?

I have been preparing myself to write you a series of short notes on three or four other points of our latest correspondence; but before actually doing so, I hope that we can come to a mutual understanding of this elementary problem of the Divinity of Doctrine born in the Church, or, which is the same, of the truth that the Lord with man can dwell only in His Own; or, which again is the same, of the truth that the Bride of the Lamb, and the Holy City, must be purely Divine.

ERNST PFEIFFER

P.S. I am enclosing proofs of an address by Mr.

76

CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

Groeneveld *, which, throws more light on the relation. between the Word and the Doctrine of the Church.

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

June 4th 1932.

Dear Mr. Pfeiffer.

Thank you for your letter. I will not be able to give it the full consideration it requires until after the 12th.

The proofs of Mr. Groeneveld's article I have read with great interest, and find no difficulty in accepting it.

ALBERT BJORCK

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

June 4th 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorck.

Allow me to add the following to my last letter.

We read in the APOCALYPSE REVEALED, n.97: "Who does not know that the Church is not Church without Doctrine"? And in n. 486: "It is these three things which make the Church, the Truth of doctrine, the Good of love, and Worship out of these". And in n. 675: "The all of the Church is doctrine which shall teach truth and through truth good".

Do you agree that in these passages by the word "Doctrine" not the Word itself is meant, but the Doctrine born in the Church; in the New Church therefore not the Third Testament, but the Doctrine seen at a given time and guiding the Church at a given time? That this is so seems evident from the fact that a body of men may have the Third Testament while at the same time they have no genuine Doctrine out of it. Do you agree with this?

In THE TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, n. 245, we read: "That the Church is according to its Doctrine, and that the Doctrine should be out of the Word, is known. But nevertheless it is not the doctrine which establishes the Church, but the integrity and purity of Doctrine,

* This address on the Ease and the Existence of the Doctrine will be published in the Fifth Fascicle.

77

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

consequently the understanding of the Word". In this passage it openly speaks of the indispensableness of a doctrine which must be "integer" and pure, thus Divine, for nothing but the Divine is "integer" and pure.

The Divine of the Word in itself is therefore not sufficient to make the Church; it is the understanding of the Word which makes the Church. It is thus the understanding of the Third Testament which makes the New Church. Do you agree with this? If you accept the first point of this letter, you must necessarily also accept this point, for if you admit that the Third Testament

is the Word itself, and not Doctrine out of the Word, then this is openly taught in the n. 245 quoted from THE TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

Number 245 of THE TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION thus teaches that it is the understanding of the Third Testament which makes the New Church. Do you agree with this? Does it not then necessarily follow that that understanding must be Divine? How can anything else but the Divine establish and make the Church? And yet in your letters you repeatedly say that the understanding of truth with man is not Divine. If this were true, there could never be a Church. The Word would always remain outside of man. And yet in the n. 675 of the APOCALYPSE REVEALED, quoted above, it says: "It is true that the Word, Christ the Savior, and the Sacraments, are the Church, and that these make the Church; but they do not make it outside of man but within man".

ERNST PFEIFFER

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

June 6th 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorck.

Allow me to still add the following to my last two letters.

In your letter to Rev. Pitcairn of April 14th you say: "I certainly believe that the Doctrine of genuine truth in the Church is Divine". And in confirmation of this you quote from your recent pamphlet, p. 77, where you say, : "The Doctrine of the Church therefore in a very real sense is the Coming of the Lord to the Church and to the

78 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

individual man of the Church; if the Doctrine is from a genuine understanding of the Divine Truth in the Word of His Second Coming". Further on in the same letter you say: "Sometimes the Doctrine of the Church in DE HEMELSCHE LEER is defined as a vision of the Divine Truth in the Word. If the vision is true, and the thought or understanding is a true form of that vision, I think we all agree". In these places you thus speak of "a genuine understanding", of "a vision which is true", and of "an understanding which is a true form of a true vision". But there can be no question of "a genuine understanding", nor of "a vision or an understanding which is true" unless it be the Lord's with man and thus Divine. For man's proprium is altogether infernal and thus not in the least capable of "a genuine understanding" or of "a vision which is true". In so many places of your different letters you say that man's understanding of truth cannot be Divine, and yet you speak of "a genuine understanding of the Divine Truth", of "a vision which is true", and of "an understanding which is a true form of a true vision".

In your letter to Mr. Pitcairn of April 28th you say: "DE HEMELSCHE LEER (in a sentence occurring on p. 125 of the Second Fascicle) says in so many words, that not only the truths and goods from the Lord in man are Divine, but also man's reception of them. . . . If the position is truly described in that sentence, namely that man's reception of good and truth from the Lord is Divine, I regard it as an error. Man must cooperate with the Lord, and his reception of truth and good is from that cooperation". It does not seem possible to me to say "the truths and

goods from the Lord in man are Divine" if at the same time it is said that the reception thereof is not Divine. For it is only by virtue of the reception that truths and goods are within man; apart from reception they are outside of man. The presence of truths and goods in man is always due to influx. All influx is according to reception. If then the reception is not Divine it is not possible that the influx or the result of the influx is Divine. The truths and goods within man are the result of influx. To say that the truths and goods in man are Divine and to say at the same time that the reception is not Divine, is a plain contradictio in adjecto. If you speak of "a genuine understanding

of the Divine Truth-in the Word" or of "a vision which is true", it is clear that you speak of truth which is within man and not of truth outside of man. In other words: In admitting that the Third Testament and the Doctrine of the New Church are two distinct things, and that both are Divine, you seem to have the idea that the Divine Truth of the Third Testament can be poured into the Church, so as to become there the Divine Doctrine of the Church, without the understanding of it being Divine, thus almost like water from a bottle into a glass. This I take from the first page of your letter of May 20th to me, in which you describe your understanding of our position and where you say that "the Divine Doctrine in the Word is as it were gradually transferred from the Word to men, and so it becomes the Doctrine of the Church. As it proceeds from the Divine, it is Divine in men". But at the same time you say that man's understanding of the Doctrine is not Divine. Man's understanding is the vessel into which the Divine Truth must flow if the Divine Truth in the Word is to become the Divine Truth in the Doctrine of the Church. Before reception in the understanding it is not possible to speak of the Doctrine of the Church. To say that the Divine Truth in the Word can be poured into the Church so as to become there the Divine Doctrine of the Church, while at the same time it is held that the understanding is not Divine, can be compared to pouring a noble wine into a filthy glass, and say that it is still a noble wine. In other words: If one denies that the reception or the understanding of the Divine Truth is Divine, it is not possible to say that the Doctrine of the Church is Divine.

In your letter to Mr. Pitcairn of April 14th, after having spoken of "a genuine understanding of the Divine Truth" and of "a vision which is true", you say: "Men may have a certain understanding of Divine Truth, ... while this understanding of the Divine Truth is still very imperfect and even mixed with falsities". You thus seem to hold that "a genuine understanding of the Divine Truth" or "a vision which is true" can be mixed with falsities. But how can you then say that "the Doctrine of the Church, if it is from a genuine understanding of the Divine Truth, is Divine", if at the same time you say that "this genuine understanding" may be mixed with falsities? If the

"genuine understanding" is mixed with falsities, then the Doctrine of the Church is also mixed with falsities, for you plainly say that it is from that genuine understanding; but if the Doctrine of the Church is mixed with falsities, how then can it be Divine? You there also say: "It is still very imperfect". If in speaking of its imperfection you refer to the fact that regeneration goes on to eternity, and that even of the highest Angel after the lapse of ages of ages it cannot be said that

now he is perfect, of course then it is true that "a genuine understanding of the Divine Truth" with man is never perfect. But you will agree that a reference to this signification of the term "perfect" is here entirely beside the point in question. It would certainly be an error to ascribe to it that imperfection which is characteristic of all that is infernal; if the concept "perfect" or "imperfect" is used in this sense, it is evident that the Heavens and the Angels are perfect, while the hells and evil spirits are imperfect; man as far as he is regenerated, is perfect, but as far as he has not been regenerated, he is imperfect. And so also "a genuine understanding" cannot but be perfect; to say that it is mixed with falsities would be the same as to say that the thought of the Angels is mixed with falsities. "A genuine understanding of the Divine Truth in the Word", or, which is the same, the genuine Doctrine of the Church, can come forth only from that which is the Lord's with man, thus only from man as far as he is regenerated; it therefore is Divine and perfect, although it is true that it is capable of development ad infinitum. To say that the Doctrine of the Church, if it is from a genuine understanding, is Divine, but that nevertheless the understanding is imperfect and even mixed with falsities, is an obvious *contradictio in adjecto*; for all influx is according to reception, and if the reception is not Divine, the result of the influx cannot possibly be Divine. The Doctrine of the Church, being the Divine Truth received within the Church, is a result of influx.

But indeed I believe you will agree that the Divine Truth of the Third Testament cannot be poured into the Church, so as to become there the Divine Doctrine of the Church, like water from a bottle is poured into a glass. This also appears from the continuation of that passage

which I quoted from your letter to Mr. Pitcairn of April 28th. You there say: "If the position of DE HEMELSCHE LEER is truly described in the sentence that man's reception of good and truth from the Lord is Divine, I regard it as an error. Man must cooperate with the Lord, and his reception of truth and good is from that cooperation". Here you thus plainly say that man's reception of truth and good is from his cooperation. But your purpose in saying this is to prove that the reception cannot be Divine. And yet I presume that you would admit that man cannot cooperate with the Lord from his proprium; that only the Lord with man can cooperate with the Lord; from which it follows that there can be no essential cooperation unless it be Divine. But then you continue: "The power to cooperate with the Lord is given man by the Lord from creation. It belongs to man as a created being, and can never become Divine because it is from the Divine. One might as well say that the living forms on earth, or the earth itself, is the sun, because they are created from the sun. ... The finite can never become the infinite". From the question whether the cooperation and thus the reception and understanding can be genuine, thus perfect, pure, and orderly, you now suddenly skip to an entirely different proposition, which is foreign to the problem and has nothing to do with it. You now no longer discuss the question whether man's understanding is genuine or not genuine, orderly or disorderly, pure or impure, perfect or imperfect, the Lord's with man or of man's proprium, which alone is the point at issue, but you now bring in the difference between that which is uncreated and that which is created, the infinite and the finite, Life in itself and that which receives Life, the human and the Divine. In my letter of May 14th already I have quoted a number of passages from which it appears that that which is from the Divine is also called Divine. So in the ARCANA CELESTIA 9338 we read: "The Divine must be in what is Divine; not in the proprium of anyone"; in the APOCALYPSE REVEALED 961: "That which is from

God is not called God, but is called Divine"; and now I just have received a copy of Mr. Pitcairn's recent letter to you * in which he refers

* See below p. 87. ED.

82 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

you to ARCANA CELESTIA 3490, which expressly teaches that after regeneration, everything with man, including the whole human, thus both the rational and the natural, has become Divine. This number has already been quoted on p. 188 of the Second Fascicle, where the same subject is treated of and explained. I trust that Mr. Pitcairn's letter will now be sufficient to show you the irrelevancy of the difference between the human and the Divine being here introduced. So in your letter of May 20th to me you say: "It seems to me that you . . . lose sight of . . . the difference between the human and the Divine. This is shown in your use of expressions like 'essentially and purely Divine' applied to things created human by the Lord; and this, I think, is the main cause of the non understanding of your position that you find in others, who do not use the terms in the sense you do, but with 'essentially and purely Divine' mean the things that belong to the Divine itself, the Lord and the Word". To this I cannot but reply that they are not aware of the cognition out of the Third Testament that not only the Divine in itself is called Divine, but that also that which is from the Divine down to the very lasts of creation is called Divine. You then continue: "There is an instance of this in your last letter, where you say that the human body 'from creation as to its essentials is purely Divine'. Another is in your illustration of how finite things by correspondence can be Divine, where you say that 'as long as the body corresponds to the soul, It is sane and lives, but as soon as the correspondence ceases, it dies'. However closely the body may correspond to the soul, it never becomes the soul; and however closely the created human may correspond to the Divine, it never becomes the Divine. It remains human even when reformed and regenerated". Of course the body does not become the soul, and the created does not become the uncreated, and the human does not become the Divine. But it is plain from the Third Testament that there is the Divine in itself which is uncreated and infinite, and there is the Divine from the Divine. You have ignored this fundamental truth. You then continue: "The Lord's human was glorified and became Divine, but the Lord's Human was from the beginning the Divine Life itself, not created. Man is created human, and though his regeneration is an

83 REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

image of the Lord's glorification, and corresponds to it, he does not by regeneration become Divine". The n. 3490 of the ARCANA, quoted by Mr. Pitcairn, will no doubt be sufficient to convince you that this sentence is in contradiction with the teaching of the Word. The difference between the Lord's Human and man's human after regeneration is not that the one is Divine and the other not Divine, but that the one is the Divine itself and the other is Divine from the Divine; the one is Life itself, and the other has Life in itself from Life itself. That man after regeneration has Life from the Lord is taught especially in many places of the New Testament from the Lord's own mouth; please look it up also as described in THE TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, n. 249.

In your letter to Mr. Pitcairn of April 14th you say: "Sometimes the Doctrine of the Church in DE HEMELSCHE LEER is defined as a vision of the Divine Truth in the Word. If the vision is true, and the thought or understanding is a true form of that vision, I think we all agree. But in some places the Doctrine of the Church is spoken of in a way that seems to imply that it is not thought of as the result of, or equivalent with, a true understanding of the Word, but as something abstract which gives light to our understanding, and yet it is not the same as the Divine Doctrine of the Word. I have been at a loss to understand clearly just what is meant by the Doctrine as spoken of in DE HEMELSCHE LEER, seeing that it is claimed that no falsity from man's understanding can adhere to it". The Divine Truth of the Word cannot be transferred into the Church so as to become the Divine Doctrine of the Church, without all the human faculties being involved in the reception. But such a transfer is only possible if the human faculties have become Divine by regeneration. The progress of that regeneration is described in the 12th, 20th, and 26th chapters of GENESIS. From your remark it seems that the essential purport of what has been said on this subject on pp. 14-17 and 56-65 of the First Fascicle, has not yet had your consideration. The fundamental teaching of those chapters is that the genuine Doctrine born in the Church is spiritual out of celestial origin and thus purely Divine (see especially the numbers quoted in connection with the Leading Theses on p. 2 of the Third

84 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

Fascicle). From your remark: "I have been at a loss to understand clearly just what is meant by the Doctrine of the Church as spoken of in DE HEMELSCHE LEER, seeing that it is claimed that no falsity from man's understanding can adhere to it", it seems evident that you have not yet given any consideration to this explicit teaching of the Latin Word, namely, that the Doctrine born in the Church is spiritual out of celestial origin. But this is the very corner-stone of the position of DE HEMELSCHE LEER. You seem to have the idea that the Divine Truth of the Third Testament can be transferred into the Church, so as to become the Divine Doctrine of the Church, without man's cooperation or reception being Divine; we hold that that transfer is only apparently from a direct cognizance of the letter of the Third Testament; in reality the Doctrine flows in from within from the Holy Spirit, and it is spiritual out of celestial origin in its birth in the human mind; thus it is Divine. The Lord is that Doctrine itself (A.E. 19).

The following points should be seen as essential truths with regard to the relation between the Third Testament and the Doctrine of the New Church:

1. The Divine of the Third Testament by itself alone is not sufficient to redeem and save the human race and to build the New Church. Without the Divine in man by regeneration, whereby the Divine of the Third Testament is transferred into the Church, the Word of the Third Testament remains closed and not understood; there is no Church and no salvation; the Second Coming which the Lord has made in the Third Testament is still of no avail.
2. The Divine in man whereby the Divine of the Third Testament is transferred from outside man to within man, comes into existence by his regeneration.
3. By regeneration a new man is conceived and born in man. By this new birth the old man is not completely put aside at once; but nevertheless the evils and falsities which are still present in the old man are extraneous to the new man. The new man is altogether Divine. It is from the new man, and from the new man alone, that the genuine Doctrine of the Church is born. From this it

is evident that no falsities can adhere to the genuine Doctrine of the Church. It is true that relatively few truths in this

85 REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

Doctrine are as yet really opened truths, but the unopened truths in it are not falsities. Even with the highest Angel it remains always true that what he knows compared with what he does not know, is as a cup of water in relation to the ocean. If in the face of this truth it is still held that with man the will and the understanding remain always mixed with evils and falsities, then it would follow from this that the Divine of the Third Testament can never be transferred into the Church so as to become the Divine Doctrine of the Church. The Word then necessarily always would remain closed; there would be no possibility of salvation; for it is only by that in man which through regeneration has become purely Divine and free of all evils and falsities, that the Divine of the Third Testament which is outside of man can be transferred to become the Divine of the Doctrine of the Church within man. If not, the Divine will always remain outside of man.

In your letter of May 1st to me you say: "On p. 56 of the First Fascicle you say, 'that by the Doctrine of the Church not the Writings of Swedenborg are meant, but the vision of these Writings and the Word as a whole which the Church gradually acquires for itself; and second, that this Doctrine of the Church is of purely Divine origin and of a purely Divine essence'. This I fully agree with, and I think most thinking New Churchmen would. But the very fact that a true vision of the Word as a whole is only gradually acquired by the Church, seems to indicate that during this gradual process falsities may adhere to the vision, though they may be removed one after another as the vision clears. This I think is also plainly taught in the Latin Word". Allow me to make two remarks with regard to this. First, you say that you fully agree with that quotation from the First Fascicle, and that you think that most thinking New Churchmen would. But from all I have said thus far in this letter, it will now be plain to you that if it is said that "the Doctrine of the Church is of purely Divine origin and of a purely Divine essence", this can only be by virtue of the Divine of the reception or of the vision. If the Divine of the reception is denied, the expression "the Doctrine of the Church is Divine" loses all its meaning. Secondly, as soon as regeneration has begun, there is the Divine new man which is within, and there is

85 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

the proprial old man which is without. It is one of the foremost laws of Providence that they should be kept absolutely distinct, for a mixture or confusion of them would mean profanation and an unavoidable spiritual death. Evils and falsities are only in the old man; the new man is absolutely free of them. While it is indeed true that evils and falsities adhere to-man as long as he is not fully introduced into Heaven, it ought to be realized that those evils and falsities do not adhere to the new man but are altogether extraneous to him. From this the fallacy involved in the conclusion of the sentence "But the very fact that. a true vision of the Word as a whole is only gradually acquired by the Church, seems to indicate that during this gradual process falsities may adhere to the vision", may clearly become evident. The fact that evils and falsities adhere to the old man does not indicate that evils and falsities adhere to the new man. This would be a

monstrous thought, which involves a denial of all possibility of regeneration and a denial of the Holy Spirit; and so also the fact that falsities keep adhering to the thoughts of the members of the Church does not indicate that they adhere to the genuine vision of the new man regenerated from the Lord, which is the Divine Doctrine of the Church, spiritual out of celestial origin. This is the plain teaching of the Latin Word (A. C. 2496).

I repeat, if there were not a Divine reception and thus a purely Divine vision and understanding, the Divine Truth of the Word would always remain outside of man.

In conclusion I wish to take up the following passage from your letter to Mr. Pitcairn of April 28th: I refer to such statements as for example in DE HEMELSCHE LEER, Second Fascicle, p. 125, 'That the reception with the non regenerate man is not Divine certainly does not in any way do away with the fact that the reception with the regenerated man is Divine'. In its character of defense against Dr. Acton's criticism this sentence to most would involve an assertion of superior regeneration. And this meaning seems to be supported by what is said in other places". It can only be due to a misunderstanding of the problem involved if these words make such an impression. The problem is a theoretical and abstract one; it has nothing to do with persons; to introduce personalities is disorderly.

87

REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

I can. only assure you that in this or other passages not for a moment the thought has been of the regeneration of any particular person. I simply stated the abstract truth that with the regenerate man the reception is Divine, while with the non-regenerate man it is not Divine. I regret to see that the purely abstract statement of such an important and new truth should have given rise to the thought that it is born from a personal claim of superior regeneration.

I thank you in advance for all the trouble and time which the reading of this long letter and the two previous letters will require from you. I hope that it will bring us nearer to each other. I am most anxious to come to a clear agreement with regard to certain essential points, before I will have to meet and speak with our brethren in England in August.

ERNST PFEIFFER

REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

June 7th 1932. Dear Mr. Bjorck.

Thank you for your last letter. This morning I came across a passage bearing on the subject, which I believe will make the matter clear to you, namely, ARCANA CELESTIA, n. 3490: "Now in the internal sense the subject is the natural, how the Lord made it Divine in Himself. Esau is the good thereof and Jacob the truth. For when the Lord was in the world He made His whole Human Divine in Himself, both the interior which is the Rational, and the exterior which is the Natural, and also the very Corporeal; and this according to Divine Order, according. to which the Lord also makes new or regenerates man. And therefore in the representative sense the regeneration of man as to his natural is also here treated of, in which sense Esau is the good of the natural, and Jacob the truth thereof, and yet both Divine, because all the good and truth which one who is regenerate has, is from the Lord". The above makes it

clear that the good and truth which has been received in the will and understanding of the regenerate man is Divine, and hence that the reception is of the Lord and is therefore Divine; this applying to both the interior human or rational and the exterior human or natural.

In this connection read ARCANA CELESTIA 1661, in which it is taught that every man at first believes that goods and truths from which he combats are his own, and that he attributes them to himself. This evidently does not refer to the general acknowledgement that all good and truth are from the Lord, for this all New Churchmen acknowledge. The goods and truths spoken of are the goods and truths from which man combats, such truths being obviously goods and truths which have been received, as is clear from the whole number. Were this not the case how could it be said: "I will put My law in the midst of them, and write it on their hearts" (Jer. 31 : 32). Here the meaning of covenant is clearly explained, that it is the love and faith in the Lord which is with those who are to be regenerated (cf. A. C. 666). That this refers to the will and understanding see the same number.

I am looking forward to seeing you the end of next month.

THEODORE PITCAIRN

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

June 15th 1932.

Dear .Mr. Bjorck.

I just came across the following passage in the ARCANA CELESTIA 10675: "With the intellectual of man it is like this: either it will consist of truths which are out of good, or of falsities which are out of evil; it cannot consist of both at the same time, for they are opposite; and it is the intellectual which receives the truths and is formed by the truths". And further in n. 10703: "It is said, light in the external of the Word from its internal, but it is understood, light in the external of man from his internal, when he reads it; for the Word does not shine from itself except before man who is in light from the internal; without him the Word is only a letter". ERNST PFEIFFER

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

June 22nd 1932.

Dear Mr. Pfeiffer.

At last I have been able to re-read and consider your recent letters. From what I have said in my pamphlet it

ought to be clear that I agree with you in a great many essential things, though I cannot accept some of the conclusions you draw, because I do not see that they are in agreement with the teaching in the Final Testament.

We have both a fairly wide knowledge of the literal sense of the revelation, but each one of us bases his conception on apparently differing statements in the literal sense that we consider most important, and so we come to different conclusions. We are both agreed that our understanding of the Word must be based on the literal sense, and I dare hope that we are both equally desirous and earnest in our endeavor to understand the teaching there given, and that we do so for the sake of the truth and for the good it teaches us. A free and open exchange of our differences of understanding, and on what they are founded on, should therefore be of benefit to us both and also a means of opening the doctrine which is one with the understanding a man of the Church has, or arrives at, of the Word.

I do differ from your understanding of man's reception and understanding of genuine truth as being Divine, and the reason for this disagreement I think is to be found in the original disagreement between us regarding the natural degree of the human mind and the development of the rational and its functions.

I stated my understanding of this as clearly as I could in the last of the THREE STUDIES, with many references to the literal teaching of the Final Testament. You have said that you have taken that teaching in consideration in staling your position in DE HEMELSCHE LEER, which therefore remains unaltered. You still apparently think that there is a natural, a spiritual, and a celestial church, or will be in the New Church, each with its own doctrine, and these discretely different. Therefore there are also these three discrete degrees in each of the three heavens with no connection between them except by influx and correspondence.

I cannot see that this agrees with the teaching. I am aware that there are passages, or at least one passage that I now recollect having read without being able to refer to work or number, which apparently teaches that. But the specific teaching in DIVINE LOVE AND WISDOM 184—186

is so plain and definite that it cannot be left out of consideration, and it is in harmony with what is said of the natural degree of the mind and about the atmospheres in n. 184, in INTERCOURSE 16, and CORONIS 17.

Your reasoning with regard to man's reception of the Divine is very logical, but you draw conclusions that I do not see can be drawn, if the character and function of the natural mind are well considered and understood.

You agree with me that it is the natural degree of the mind that must be regenerated. It is in and through the natural mind that man can feel the life he receives from the Lord, who is Life itself, as if it were his own, and therefore regard the affections in his will and the thoughts of his understanding as proper to the life he feels as his own. Man's consciousness on the natural degree is in other worlds his proprium.

In the beginning when man was being created he was conscious on the celestial degree, and when, after what corresponds to birth, he was given consciousness on the natural degree of the mind, influx of good and truth from the Lord came directly through the open celestial degree into his natural and gave him to perceive the correspondence of natural things to the good and truth from the Lord that he was interiorly conscious of. Natural things became a revelation to his natural mind, and gave him to feel that his affections and thoughts were his own, or that they were part of his natural life.

As there can be no conjunction of God and man and of man with God unless man has a life that he feels as his own, and which therefore is his proprium, his own proper life, such a proprium was given him (A.C. 132, 134).

The proprium is necessary for a being destined to freedom of will and action according to his reason. As long as the celestial degree was open, the influx of good and truth from the Lord were adjoined to the proprium so that they and the proprium appeared to be one.

Man's freedom to live from himself or from the Lord presupposes an equilibrium between two forces. Influx from the Lord through the open celestial degree gave man interior perception of good and therefore of truth; revelation from without gave him knowledge of the good and the wisdom from truth on the natural degree, and he therefore

91 REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

felt this good and truth as his own. Man's proprium was vivified from the Lord's proprium (A.C. 149).

Conscious of life as it were his own, man desires to live from his own knowledge of good and from the wisdom he feels as his own, and thus the equilibrium necessary for freedom was created.

As men of the first church abused the freedom so given them by the Creator, their inner perception of good and truth from Him gradually disappeared. The celestial degree of their mind was gradually closed, man became consciously living only on the natural degree, and as the inner perception failed, their knowledge of correspondences was lost, and they misinterpreted or falsified the revelation through nature. The equilibrium was destroyed, and with that human freedom. Since the flood the celestial and spiritual degrees of the mind are closed to man's consciousness, and he lives on the natural degree, that is from his proprium in which there are inherited tendencies to all evil. But in the natural degree of his mind, which is his proprium, there are also implanted remains of good from the Lord. By instruction in truths from the Word to the external memory knowledge of spiritual things can be given to the natural man, reason from this knowledge can be developed, and thus equilibrium restored. Man can act from the reason developed in his natural mind by instruction in truths of the Word, or follow the tendencies to evil in the same mind. The remains of good from the Lord in his proprium can be kept alive and grow through this instruction, the influx from the Lord through the inner degrees can reach these remains in the natural, and cause an affection for good that man has consciousness of as his, that is, as belonging to his life here, and cause these affections to join with the truths from the Word that he has knowledge of and understands. Then the Lord vivifies

man's proprium, reforming it, as man as of himself shuns the evils in his nature that he has knowledge of from the Word.

And though this reformed and vivified proprium is from the Lord's proprium, it is still man's. He feels it as his own proper life, and it is called angelic or heavenly (A.C. 252). "It is not possible for the Lord to be in any angel or man. unless he in whom the Lord is with love and

92 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

wisdom, perceives and feels these as his own." (D.L.W. 113—118; A.C. 1937, 2883).

The Lord is the Word. The good and truth revealed in the Word are the Lord. Received by man they are the Lord in man, but man must receive them as of himself by the will in his reformed proprium. and make them his own by living and loving them.

The new man so born is truly human from the Lord, created in His image and likeness. Therefore he can love the Lord and what is good and true from the Lord in other men, and feel this love as his own proper love.

In DIVINE LOVE AND WISDOM, n. 49, it is said: "With respect to God: to love and to be loved in turn is not possible in relation to others in whom there is anything of infinity, or anything of the Divine".

Conversely, if man's reception, understanding and love of truth and good, revealed to him in the Word, were not human but Divine, would it be possible for man to love the Lord without that love being a species of self love?

I know that you will say now that I am confounding the Divine from the Divine with the Infinite Divine itself, or life from the only Life with that Life itself. On the other hand it seems to me that the way you use the word Divine for a regenerated man, and for everything created from the Divine, is more apt to confuse your readers and hearers and make them lose sense of the distinction between the Divine and the human.

In reply to my supposition that your use of expressions like "essentially and purely Divine", applied to things created human by the Lord, is the main cause of the non understanding of your position that you find in others, who do not use the terms in the sense you do, but with essentially and purely Divine mean the things that belong to the Divine itself, the Lord and the Word, you say that "they are not aware of the cognition out of the Third Testament that not only the Divine in itself is called Divine, but that also that which is from the Divine down to the very last of creation is called Divine".

I think I can claim to have a fairly wide knowledge of what is said in the Final Testament of the Lord to men, but from this knowledge I cannot subscribe to the above statement of yours.

93 REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

While all that proceeds from the Divine — Life, Good, Truth — is Divine and is called so, the created things that receive the proceeding Divine are not called Divine. On the contrary created things are always carefully distinguished from the Divine that creates them.

In this connection I would refer to DIVINE LOVE AND WISDOM 59, where it is said that "Although the Divine is in all things and each of the created universe, still there is nothing of the Divine itself in their esse; for the created universe is not God but from God; and because it is from God His image is in it, as man's image in a mirror, in which indeed the man appears, but still there is nothing of the man in it".

The same teaching is contained in DIVINE LOVE AND WISDOM 283. You say that a regenerated man is Divine, and is so called. I cannot recollect a single statement that says so, or gives any real basis for thinking so. I know you are familiar with n. 1906 of the ARCANA, where we are taught so much and so illuminatingly about remains in man's natural mind. If anything in created man could be called Divine, it would seem these remains would be worthy of the name; they undoubtedly are from the Lord, implanted in man, celestial and spiritual remains in the natural, by means of which a man can receive spiritual truth or faith. But there it is said that these remains are not Divine but human.

I have expressed myself so fully regarding my understanding of what we are taught about the natural mind and its reformation, because that will show you clearly the reason why I cannot see with you when you say that "The genuine Doctrine of the Church, being spiritual out of celestial origin, is born from that regenerated Divine human being in the living Church".

This it seems to me, implies that a regenerated man is rationally conscious on the spiritual degree of the mind itself, and like the spiritual angels has light from the celestial heaven, and that what he so sees is the genuine truth. A regenerate man would then have a genuine spiritual rational, and in its light he would see truths that are hidden in the letter of the Divine Doctrine itself, and in this way be able to draw out these hidden truths, thus giving birth to the Doctrine of genuine truth.

According to my reading of the Final Testament, man so long as he lives in the natural world is conscious only on the natural degree of the mind. By instruction in truths of the Word his desire for knowledge can be led to embrace spiritual things; his natural understanding can be enlightened by the spiritual truths from the Lord that he knows and has some understanding of.

If the remains of good in his natural mind are awakened to activity by the vision of spiritual life that the Word has given him, a new intellectual will is formed in his mind to live in accordance with these truths; thereby he is led into struggle against the inherited and acquired evils, which he must overcome as by his own efforts. It is the Lord's truth and good in his understanding and will that gives him victory, but in the beginning of regeneration man does not know this because he feels the truth and good that he has from the Lord in the Word as his own.

As regeneration proceeds the desire for good life will cause the man to read the Word with constantly increasing desire for understanding its truths that lead to good, and he will see the truths in a more interior way.

But as man's rational understanding is gradually developed by knowledge and observations of natural things as well as by instruction from the Lord in the Word, he at first understands the teaching of the Word naturally; and to his knowledge and understanding of the Word fallacies adhere, which cause that the truths are not truths.

Still, these appearances of truth in the man's understanding, if they are not confirmed, will serve for the growth of his rational, and as he continues to search for the truths of the Lord in the Word for the sake of the good. ~ of life, his understanding will be more and more enlightened by the spirit of the Lord; the fallacies will disappear, and his understanding of the Word become more and more genuine.

The Doctrine of the Church is thus conceived in man by the spirit of the Lord's Divine Human, when man in humility goes to the Word to be instructed.

It is born in him from the Lord, first as an understanding of truth in its most general aspects as it is accommodated to the simple. This first rational understanding born in man by the Lord is the beginning of the human from

95

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. THEO. PITCAIRN

the Lord's Divine Human, the Doctrine of the Church in man in that state; and as man subordinates his natural mind to the light from the spiritual truths of the Word, submitting to its teaching for the love of good, the inner degrees of the mind open more and more widely giving passage to the influx from the Lord through them into the natural, bringing it into a different state. The human rational thus grows, increases in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man. A new proprium from the Lord is born in man which can receive from the Lord a spiritual doctrine that has its origin in the Lord's love for man and carries His love within it.

The human understanding of the Divine Truth and the human reception of Divine Good, that is the new will and understanding so created by the Lord, is the new proprium of man, the receptacle of the Divine, but not Divine itself.

ALBERT BJORCK

P.S. After I had finished this letter your note referring to A. C. 10675 and 10703 came. I have looked them up in my edition of the ARCANA and found that I had marked both in former readings in connection with the subject before us, and had made annotations of them, and also of 10702, which contains the same teaching.

It seems to me that what is said there harmonizes with, and gives support to, the position I have tried to express in the THREE STUDIES and in the present letter.

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. THEO. PITCAIRN

June 22nd 1932.

Dear Mr. Pitcairn.

I must ask your forgiveness for not having acknowledged your two letters before this. I have had three letters from Mr. Pfeiffer on the same subject, and I have endeavored to consider the contents in all five and express my views in one letter to both of you.* In this letter, of which I now send a copy to each one of you, I have tried to put my position in such a way that the difference in

* See above DP. 88—95. ED.

96 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

our positions, and the cause of that difference should become quite clear.

Before writing it I have given careful thought to the several passages in the Final Testament that you and Mr. Pfeiffer have referred to, and I can only say that, as far as I am able to understand, they all harmonize better with my position than with yours.

I dare hope that the position I have come to is equally with yours the result of an earnest desire to understand the Divine Truth involved in the literal sense for the sake of the truth and the good it teaches.

Besides the references given in the letter I would also call your attention to ARCANA CELESTIA 10057, where the teaching concerning man's regeneration is so plainly given, and also n. 10028, which gives much light on the Doctrine of the Church.

ALBERT BJORCK

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

July 2nd 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorck.

Please accept my thanks for your kind reply to my several letters.

I note that you still object to calling Divine not only the Divine in itself but also that which is from the Divine. In your letter to Mr. Pitcairn of April 28th you say: "The power to cooperate with the Lord.... belongs to man as a created being, and can never become Divine because it is from the Divine". And in your present letter to me you say: "I cannot recollect a single statement that says, or gives any real basis for thinking, that a regenerated man is called Divine". In my last letters I have quoted repeatedly several such statements.

In ARCANA CELESTIA 9338 we read: "For Heaven is nothing else than Divine Truth proceeding from the Lord's Divine Good; the Angels there are recipients of truth in good, and in so far as they receive this, so far they make Heaven. And, which is an arcanum, the Lord does

not dwell with an Angel except in His Own with him. In like manner with man, for the Divine must be in what is Divine, not in the proprium of anyone. This is meant by the words

97 REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

of the Lord concerning the union of Himself with those who are in the good of love, in John: 'In that day ye shall know that I am in the Father, and ye in Me, and I in you. He that loveth Me keepeth My word, and We will come unto him, and make a dwelling with him' (14 : 20, 23); and in another place: 'The glory which Thou hast given Me I have given them; that they may be one, as We are one; that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them' (17 : 22, 26)". In this passage it is literally taught: "The Divine must be in what is Divine". That in man in which the Lord dwells is here plainly called Divine; thus plainly that in man which receives the Lord, for before reception the Lord does not dwell in man; thus not only the Divine which inflows, but also the human of man which receives. "Ye in Me and I in you". And indeed how could it be otherwise, in view of the law that all influx is according to reception. If the reception is not Divine, the influx also is not Divine. Moreover this passage says: "Heaven is nothing else than Divine Truth proceeding from the Lord's Divine Good". Thus Heaven is Divine; this is here plainly taught. But Heaven is not the Divine itself; it is a created thing which receives the Divine; it certainly is not Divine in that sense in which alone you will allow the use of this term. In your use of the terms "human" and "Divine" Heaven certainly is not "Divine" but "human". Whether you take an individual man and an individual Angel, or whether you take the Church and Heaven as a whole, it does not make the least difference; they remain finite and created and cannot be compared with the Divine Human of the Lord itself. So we read in ARCANA CELESTIA 6013: "The final end is that man should be a recipient of Divine good from the Lord in particular, such as Heaven is in general". Heaven is thus called a recipient, and Heaven is called Divine; and of man it is said that with him it is exactly the same, only in particular. And in n. 5115 we read: "Man is a Heaven in least form. . . . But it is especially the man who is being born anew, that is, who is being regenerated from the Lord, who is called a Heaven".

You say: "While all that proceeds from the Divine — Life, Good, Truth — is Divine and is called so, the created things that receive the proceeding Divine are not called

98 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

Divine. On the contrary created things are always carefully distinguished from the Divine that creates them". To this it must be answered that here the distinction is made between the Creator who is Life in itself, and created nature which in itself is deprived of life and which, apart from influx, therefore is dead in itself. This is the well known truth to which you here refer. But since the essence of the truly human of man is the problem, and the conjunction of man with the Lord, it seems to me it is beside the point to refer to that truth. For the human of man is not simply a part of created dead nature, apart from all influx; it is indeed a finite created being, but it is human only by virtue of the Divine influx; apart from that influx the human of it would utterly be destroyed and then indeed become simply a part of created dead nature. From the words of n. 9338 of the ARCANA CELESTIA: "The Lord does not dwell with an Angel except in His Own with him; in like manner with man; for the Divine must be in what is

Divine", it can be plain that this law of the difference between the Uncreated and the created, can here not have the application which you give to it. For the Lord can dwell with man only in man's human; if not, He would not dwell with him at all. The uncreated dwells in the created, the infinite in the finite; it has no sense to say that the uncreated dwells within the uncreated, or that the infinite dwells within the infinite. And whereas it is here said that the Lord can dwell only in His Own, and the Divine only in what is Divine, it therefore plainly follows that there is here an application of the term Divine to that which is finite and created. Moreover you agree that "all that proceeds from the Divine — Life, Good, Truth — is Divine and is called so"; but it ought also to be realized that it has no meaning to speak of "good and truth with man proceeding from the Lord" unless after reception; and that the influx and thus the quality of the good and truth proceeding is entirely according to reception. In n. 4380 of the ARCANA we read: "Good and truth cannot be predicated without a subject, which is man".

If you say: "The power to cooperate with the Lord belongs to man as a created being, and can never become Divine because it is from the Divine", it seems that you were induced to this conclusion by the thought of the

difference between the Uncreated which is Life in itself and the created which is dead in itself. But it seems that in making this conclusion you were lead into a contradiction with the truth that the Divine can dwell only in what is Divine. From the words of the Lord quoted above: "Ye in Me and I in you", and "That I may be in them", and "We will come unto him and make a dwelling with him", it is plain that that in which the Lord dwells is that which receives Him; .and it is that which receives Him which cooperates with Him. With the words "the Divine can dwell only in that which is Divine", it is thus plainly said that that which must receive the Lord, can receive Him only if it is Divine, and that that which must cooperate with the Lord, can cooperate with Him only if it is Divine. And indeed it is a self-evident truth that man from his proprium can never receive the Lord and can never cooperate with the Lord. He can indeed, after he has been born anew, cooperate from his celestial proprium, but this is of the Lord alone with man. Only that which is from the Lord with man can receive the Lord and cooperate with the Lord. The application of the truth concerning the difference between the Uncreated which is Life and the created which is dead to the problem of the power to cooperate with the Lord, in such a way as to conclude that the power to cooperate can never become Divine, would lead to the conclusion ' that that which is dead can cooperate with the Lord.

Another passage in which the human of man after regeneration is called Divine is the n. 3490 of the ARCANA, to which Mr. Pitcairn drew your attention: "In the representative sense the regeneration of man as to his natural is also here treated of, in which sense Esau is the good of the natural, and Jacob the truth thereof, and yet both Divine".

That there is such a difference in the use of the term Divine in the letter of the Word should not surprise or even disturb us. Nothing is more common than such apparent contradictions even in the Third Testament, from which it is evident that also the Latin Word without Doctrine is not understood. If then the full significance of the truth that "the Divine can dwell only in that which is Divine" is realized, it is not difficult to see that in n. 59

of DIVINE LOVE AND WISDOM, which you quote, the subject is an entirely different one. The teaching there is that there is nothing of the Divine in itself in the Esse of created things (*nihil Divini in se in illorum Esse*); which is a plain truth, because otherwise there would be more than one God. There is indeed nothing of the Divine in itself in the esse of the human of man, and yet it is plain that after regeneration, by virtue of the Divine influx, the human of man in which the Lord dwells is Divine and is called Divine, for the Divine can dwell only in that which is Divine.

Similarly it is not difficult to see that in *ARCANA CELESTIA*, n. 1906, quoted by you, where it is said that "the remains with man are not Divine but human", the difference is pointed out between the Remains of the Lord which were states of Life itself, and the Remains of man which are only conceivable together with a receiving vessel. This appears from the text itself: "But the Remains with the Lord were all Divine states, ... they are not to be compared with the Remains with man, for these are not Divine but human". From this it appears that the term Divine is here used in the specific sense of the Divine Life in itself. But that the human Remains are truly Divine and must necessarily be called so, if the term is used in the sense "from the Divine", appears from the following consideration: Of the remains with man we read that "they are of the Lord alone with man" (A.C. 8, 576, 1050). Now may I ask you whether you think that it can seriously be maintained that that which is of the Lord alone may not be called Divine? By what other word then could it ever be designated, if not by the word Divine? And in the *APOCALYPSE REVEALED* 961 we literally read: "That which is from God is called Divine". We further read that the remains with man are "all things of innocence, all things of charity, all things of mercy, and all things of the truth of faith, which man has from the Lord" (A.C. 661) and in n. 561: "Remains are... in one word all states of good and truth". I do not believe that there can be any contention about the truth that that "which is of the Lord alone" is Divine and must be called Divine; nor does it seem necessary to quote passages which teach that "all states of good and truth" are Divine; they could be

multiplied indefinitely; moreover you have yourself expressed agreement that "all that proceeds from the Divine — Life, Good, Truth — is Divine and is called so". From which it follows that the meaning of the term Divine in *ARCANA CELESTIA* 1906, "the remains with man are not Divine but human", is a quite specific one, which must first be understood, and that it is not possible to use it as a proof that genuine human states should not be called Divine.

In *DIVINE PROVIDENCE*, n. 52, we read: "But it must be known that the Divine in itself is in the Lord, but that the Divine from itself is the Divine of the Lord in created things". It is indeed true that created things in themselves are not Divine; this is your argument; but the point is that the regenerated human of man is not merely a created thing in itself; it is a created thing into which the Lord continually inflows and in which He dwells in His Own. For this reason the regenerated human is of the Lord alone and thus Divine. As soon as man would ascribe the least of it to himself, he would immediately cast himself out of Heaven. The fact that in the Word itself the distinction is pointed out between the "Divine in itself" and the "Divine from itself", makes it quite plain that in passages where simply the word "Divine" is used, it ought to be discerned in which of the two senses it must be understood. If only the actual existence of this

difference in the meaning of the term Divine is realized, there can be no doubt about the question in which one of the two senses it is used in the statement of the ARCANA, n. 1906, that "Remains with man are not Divine but human". The difference of the two meanings becomes quite evident from their respective opposites. The opposite of the primary meaning, which alone you admit, is indeed the human; but the opposite of the derivative meaning, in which the term has been used by us, is that which is of man's old proprium, thus disorderly and infernal.

If you say: "It seems to me that the way you use the word Divine for a regenerated man ... is apt to confuse your readers and make them lose sense of the distinction between the Divine and the human", I must reply what I have said in my previous letter, namely, that whereas the only issue is the difference between that which is the

Lord's with man and that which is of man's infernal proprium, or between that which from the Lord with man is holy, orderly, genuine, pure, and perfect and that which from man's proprium is infernal, disorderly, not genuine, impure, and imperfect, it is surprising to see the reader skip to an entirely different proposition, which is foreign to the problem, namely the difference between that which is Uncreated, Infinite, and Divine in itself, and that which is created, finite, and human. And I must repeat that the skipping to this other issue is only possible because the reader is ignorant of the cognition out of the Latin Testament that not only the Divine in itself is called Divine, but also that which is from the Divine, by which of course I did not mean a created thing apart from influx, but the Divine in created things (cf. D.P. 52). If it were not that from this ignorance the reader with the term "Divine" always connects the concept of the Uncreated and the Infinite, he could know from a simple reading of the articles published in DE HEMELSCHE LEER that in speaking of the understanding and reception of the Doctrine being Divine, we never have meant to say that it is uncreated and infinite. And similarly it seems that you consider it necessary to draw our attention to the teaching that "though the reformed and vivified proprium is from the Lord's proprium, it is still man's and he feels it as his own proper life, and so forth, A.C. 252; D.L.W. 113—118; A.C. 1937, 2883". The articles published in DE HEMELSCHE LEER contain no single word which is in opposition with this teaching; on the contrary, from a simple reading it can be evident that it is fundamental to all our thought, and self-evident, and self-understood. It is the leading idea of DE HEMELSCHE LEER that it is not the Latin Word in itself that makes the Church, but the understanding of that Word or the reception of it by the Church as from itself, if this reception by regeneration is Divine from the Lord (S.S. 76—79). It is our leading thought that it is impossible to speak of the Doctrine of the Church unless by virtue of the reception as of one's self; but you advocate the idea of a Divine Doctrine of the Church while at the same time you hold that the reception of it is marred by adhering falsities. In my previous letter I have already pointed out that in view of the law that all influx-is ac-

According to reception, the statement that "the Doctrine of the Church is Divine" loses all its meaning, if at the same time it is held that the reception of it is not Divine. I note, however, that while in your previous letters you spoke of falsities adhering to the reception and understanding of the Divine Doctrine of the Church, your last letter does not contain any such remarks; on the contrary you yourself now bring forward confirmatory passages to prove that very thing which is alone essential in our position, namely, that "the new man is truly human from the Lord", that his new proprium "is from the Lord's proprium, and that it is called angelic or heavenly". These remarks of yours now bring us for the first time to the real issue. The essence of the real issue can only be seen if it is seen in the difference between "the celestial and angelic proprium which is from the Lord and the infernal and diabolical proprium which is from one's self" (A.C. 252, the number quoted by you in this connection). There should now be no further difficulty for our mutual understanding, if only you will admit that no evils and falsities can ever adhere to this "celestial and angelic proprium" which is "truly human from the Lord" and "from the Lord's own proprium".

Even if, in spite of the preceding considerations, you would still insist on using the term "Divine" only to denote that which is uncreated and infinite — as the Divine Human of the Lord is uncreated and infinite — it makes no difference with regard to what is the real issue. Although according to my understanding it is contrary to the use which the Latin Word itself makes of these terms, and although it therefore necessarily takes away from the full integrity and clearness of the argument, in order to meet your difficulty I would suggest that in all those passages in our articles where the term Divine is used in such a way that you object, instead of "Divine" you simply read "of the Lord alone", or "celestial and angelic", or "truly human", or "orderly, genuine, perfect, pure, and holy". If with this interchangement of terms you can agree with our position, this is essentially all we want.

With this in mind, may I now return to those three points of my last letter, which I consider essential for the understanding of the relation between the Third Testament and the Doctrine of the New Church:

104 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

1. The Divine of the Third Testament in itself alone is not sufficient to redeem and save the human race and to build the New Church. Without that in man which is of the Lord alone, his truly human, orderly, genuine, perfect, pure, and holy, new-born proprium, whereby the Divine of the Third Testament is transferred from without man to within man, so as to become the Divine Doctrine of the Church — for you allow the use of the term Divine in connection with the Doctrine of the Church — the Word of the Third Testament remains closed and not understood; there is no Church and no Salvation; the Second Coming the Lord has made in the Third Testament is still of no avail.
2. That in man which is of the Lord alone, whereby the Divine of the Third Testament is transferred from outside man to within man, comes into existence by his regeneration.
3. By regeneration a new man is conceived and born in man. By this new birth the old man is not completely put aside at once; but nevertheless the evils and falsities which are still present in the old man are extraneous to the new man. The new man is altogether of the Lord alone, he is altogether truly human, orderly, genuine, perfect — although, of course, not perfect in the

infinite sense — pure, and holy. It is from the new man, and from the new man alone, that the genuine Doctrine of the Church is born. From this it is evident that no falsities can adhere to the genuine Doctrine of the Church, and so forth; please, look up the rest in my previous letter.

In all the places in these three points where originally the term "Divine" occurred in application to the man of the Church, I have now replaced it by the terms "of the Lord alone", "holy", and so forth. It is your position as developed in your letter to Mr. Pitcairn of April 14th, that the Doctrine of the New Church — of which you admit that it ought to be distinguished from the Latin Word — is Divine; you even say that "in a very real sense it is the Coming of the Lord to the Church" (p. 77 of your recent pamphlet); but at the same time you hold that the reception of it is "very imperfect" and the understanding of it "mixed with falsities". Keeping in mind the preceding considerations I now should like to make the following two remarks

105

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

with regard to this position. FIRST: To anyone who is familiar with the law that all influx is according to reception (A.C. 5118; H.H. 569. and many other places), it must be plain that the statement "the Doctrine of the Church is Divine" loses all its meaning if at the same time it is held that the reception and understanding of it are mixed with evils and falsities. For there is no sense in speaking of the Doctrine of the Church before it is received and understood; before reception it is not the Doctrine of the Church but the Word itself. SECONDLY: Whereas in your last letter you yourself pointed to the new, angelic and celestial, proprium, that it is "truly human", and "of the Lord alone with man", and whereas it seems evident that if we are to speak of the genuine Doctrine of the Church, this is possible only if its reception is in that new, truly human proprium, which is of the Lord alone, and by no means if the reception is in the old infernal proprium, or even if this latter would have the least part in the reception, does it then not follow plainly and inevitably that if the statement "the Doctrine of the Church is Divine" is to have any meaning, it involves that the reception and understanding of it must be of the Lord alone with man, truly human, orderly, genuine, pure, and holy. It cannot but be free of all imperfections — in the finite sense — it must be absolutely free of all falsities. We are convinced that it would be more in agreement with the language of the Latin Word to say that it must be Divine; but in order to meet your difficulty we are willing to use these other terms. May I ask you to kindly give me an answer to these two points?

In your letter to me of May 20th you say: "As the Doctrine of the Church proceeds from the Divine, it is Divine in men. Growing in the Church as a plant grows from a seed, it becomes the finite image and likeness of the Divine Doctrine which is the Lord Himself as the Word. Thus you say: "The Doctrine is Divine in men". How can it be "in men" unless it has passed through reception? You say "it grows as from a seed". How can it "grow" and how can it be "a seed", if it is not a created thing? The infinite and the uncreated does not grow. And yet you call it Divine. According to our position you are perfectly right in doing so, but how can you harmonize it

106

A CORRESPONDENCE. THE DOCTRINE

with your own position, according to which that which is from the Divine may never be called Divine? It is true that in a supereminent sense it may be said that the Divine Human of the Lord Himself, when He was on earth, "grew as from a seed". But now the Divine Human of the Lord is infinite, and though it is true that the genuine Doctrine and the seeds of it are from the Divine Human of the Lord, nevertheless these seeds in the Church are finite and by no means to be compared with the Infinite Seed from which the Divine Human grew, when the Lord was on earth. Thus this passage from your letter of May 20th in reality is an exact statement of the position propounded in the articles of DE HEMELSCHE LEER; but to us it appears in contradiction with everything else which you have argued in your letters.

But from your own endeavour, as shown in your last letter, to demonstrate that the new-born man is of the Lord alone with man, from the Lord's own proprium, truly human, "heavenly" — that is, celestial — and angelic, and from your statement that "the human understanding of the Divine Truth and the human reception of Divine Good, that is, the new will and understanding so created by the Lord, is the new proprium of man, the receptacle of the Divine, but not Divine itself", I now believe that the difference between our positions with regard to this point is not so fundamental as it first appeared. For the old position is that the Divine of the Latin Word in itself is sufficient to make that Word to be the real living Word not only in itself but also with the Church, while the new position is that also the Latin Word is really the Word with the Church only if it is received in a new will and a new understanding which is of the Lord alone with man, thus genuine, orderly, pure and holy. This position is held because it is believed that the teaching contained in the DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE SACRED SCRIPTURE, H. 77: "The Word is the Word according to the understanding of it with man, that is, as it is understood; if it is not understood, the Word is indeed called the Word, but with the man it is not the Word", must be applied to the three Testaments alike. That this is one of the essential differences in the two positions is plain from the fact that according to the one position it is held that such a reception and

107

REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

understanding which is of the Lord alone, perfectly orderly, pure, and holy, in the actual Church does never exist, but that it is always mixed with falsities; while according to the other it is held that as far as the reception and understanding is not free of falsities, thus not of the Lord alone, truly human, and holy, the Latin Word with man is not the Word. From certain remarks in your previous letters there was the appearance as if your thoughts were in the line of the old position; but from your last letter it seems to me that we agree as to this fundamental truth.

However, at the same time I realize that the real difficulties will not be removed before we have come to an agreement with regard to the difference between the rational and the natural.. I hope to write you on this subject within two or three days.

ERNST PFEIFFER

REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

July 6th 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorok.

As I have been very busy on my paper for the Assembly I have delayed answering your letter. In n. 2022 of the ARCANA CELESTIA we read: "To be to thee for a God. This signifies the Lord's Divine in Himself"; and in n. 2023: "And to thy seed after thee. This signifies the Divine thence derived with those who have faith in Him. . . . The Divine with those who have faith in Him is love and charity". It is well known that an Angel is nothing but a form of faith and charity from the Lord. In the above it is said their faith and charity which is with them from the Lord is Divine. It is well known that all that is from the proprium even with the Angels is nothing but evil and falsity; and the teaching is familiar that what is man's own cannot be commingled with what is the Lord's, for if they were, profanation would take place; hence the Lord miraculously separates what is of the Angels proprium from the faith and charity which make the Angelman, and which in the above are said to be Divine.

What you say in your last letter would seem to exalt the innocence of ignorance or infancy of the human race

above the innocence of wisdom of old age. That a celestial Church like the Most Ancient Church will again be raised up is taught in n. 10248 of the ARCANA: "I will set up the tent of David that is fallen and will build according to the days of the age (Amos 9 : II); by days of the age is meant the time when the Most Ancient Church was, which was celestial".

Doctrine out of the Word with the celestial Church is spoken of in the following numbers: A.C. 3880, 4606, 9144; A.R. 350; A.E. 119, 355. In n. 6304 of the ARCANA it is said: "And He shall bring you back unto the land of your fathers. This signifies to the state of both Ancient Churches".

The whole of the story of Ishmael, Isaac, and Joseph makes it clear that the exterior and interior rational represented by these are not degrees of the natural mind, namely that mind the opening of which makes the first Heaven; but that the Ishmael rational makes the spiritual and the Isaac rational the celestial, as is evident from the following passages in the ARCANA: "Consequently the celestial are signified, or those who are of the celestial Church; for the seed out of Isaac is treated of" (n. 2085). "The spiritual become rational out of truth, but the celestial out of good; ... the former are meant by Ishmael" (n. 2078, also n. 2087, 2088). "Now as by Isaac is represented the Lord's Divine Rational, by him are also signified the celestial who are called heirs, and as by Ishmael is represented the Lord's merely human rational, by him are signified also the spiritual who are called sons" (n. 2661; see the whole number). "The rational is in a degree above the natural" (n. 3209; see the whole number). The above is also taught throughout the story of Isaac and Joseph. "Joseph represents the external of the rational" (n. 4570; see the whole number). Joseph as the external of the rational is a discrete degree above Israel as the spiritual from the natural. As an intermediate between these two is Benjamin, the spiritual of the celestial which is intermediate between the spiritual from the internal natural, Israel, and the celestial of the spiritual which is the external of the rational, Joseph. From the above it is evident that if the New Church does not have the spiritual and celestial degrees actually opened, it will have neither the rational

that is represented by Ishmael, nor that represented by Isaac, nor that by Joseph.

I am very much looking forward to seeing you..

THEODORE PITCAIRN

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. THEO. PITCAIRN

July 12th 1932. Dear

Mr. Pitcairn.

Thank you for your letter. I am also busy on my paper for the Assembly, and I want to get it completed before I attempt to make any comments on your understanding of the teaching in the ARCANAE CELESTIA that you refer to. I will now only say that according to my understanding, the Most Ancient Churches after Adam, that is, Seth and those named in the Genealogy of the Lord as the Son of God down to Noah, were churches by virtue of, and according to, remains of perception of good and therefore of truth from the Lord in their natural life as men on earth. That perception was celestial remains in their natural mind. The churches of the Ancient Church down to Abraham that are named in the Genealogy were churches by virtue of remains of good through faith in the Word, through which they were instructed in truth as natural men. They are all representative churches by virtue of those remains, while the Israelitish Church only represented a church.

The Church must come down in man's will and understanding on the natural plane of the mind. The Church and the heaven formed by men's reception of the Divine Word of the Lord's Second Coming are therefore celestial natural or spiritual-natural, and therefore also, although below the heavens of infancy and youth, churches and heavens in a fuller sense than the preceding ones, because more fully the result of the cooperation of the natural mind of man with the Lord, from a conscious effort on his own part to understand the Divine Truth and live according to it. So doing the man of the Church returns into the former states of youth and infancy, and can therefore progress to eternity ever nearer the Lord in innocent dependence on Him for all things, and yet retain the experience gained in his struggle against evil during regeneration as a man on earth to eternity.

110 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

I have felt like saying this much now, as I evidently have expressed myself poorly in my former letter, as you think what I said there would seem to show that I exalt the innocence of ignorance of infancy above the innocence of wisdom of old age.

I shall be very glad indeed for the opportunity to have a good talk with you and Mr. Pfeiffer.

ALBERT BJORCK

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

July 9th 1932. Dear Mr. Bjorck.

The difference between the rational and the natural, according to the teaching of the Latin Word as we understand it, is indeed fundamental to the new position. It has first been pointed out by Mr. Groeneveld on the basis of NINE QUESTIONS II, on pp. 38—43 of the first Fascicle of DE HEMELSCHE LEER, and a short statement of the view is given on pp. 40—43 of the Third Fascicle. It is there called: "One of the most interior and therefore also most hidden arguments in connection with the Doctrine of the Church", and it is there said that: "If one is able to understand this difference between the rational and the natural and their mutual relation, one has understood the proper core of the Doctrine of the Church" (Third Fascicle, p. 40).

The essential difference between the rational and the natural and that they always are to be viewed as two distinct things, can be seen from the truth that the rational soul is from the father, while the natural is adjoined to it from the mother. Just as they are two things from a different origin, so they always remain distinct, the rational being within and the natural without. This truth is expressed for instance in the ARCANA CELESTIA, n. 3209, with the explicit words: "The rational is in a degree above the natural".

Man's conscious life begins in the natural. The rational itself before and during regeneration is above his conscious mind. In these preparatory states he receives only an influx from the rational. The end in view, however, is that, with

111 REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

the help of this influx, he should wrestle his way through the whole of the natural, more and more interiorly, so as to come above it, and enter at last the rational proper, in which he ought to find his conscious life, while the natural ought to be below him as his servant. This end in view is attained when man has become truly celestial, after having passed through all the previous degrees of regeneration, which consist in a wrestling through the natural.

This truth may be confirmed by the teaching that "the interior rational constitutes the degree in which the celestial Angels are, or in which the inmost or third Heaven is" (A.C. 5145); by the teaching that "the fathers of the Most Ancient Church, who had perception, thought out of the interior rational" (A.C. 1914); and by the teaching in n. 6240 of the ARCANA: "The intellectual of the internal man is called the rational, but the intellectual of the external man is called the natural; thus the rational is the internal and the natural the external; and they are amongst themselves most distinct. But a truly rational man is no one but he who is called the celestial man". From this explicit teaching it is plain that, if the concepts rational and natural are taken in their strictest sense, the intellectual of man before he has become celestial is not rational but natural. The rational is present with him only by influx, while the celestial man alone is in the rational itself; for for the first time he has been elevated above the natural, after having accomplished the whole wrestling through it.

In the Word this influx of the rational is simply called the rationality of man. And it is from this fact that it is common that in the beginning one speaks of the rational and may have an elaborate theory of the rational, without realizing in the least that it is only the influx of the rational into

the natural in the first states of regeneration one is dealing with, while the rational itself has not yet been thought of as a distinct concept. So it is quite common to say that "the truths of the Writings are rational truths", while in reality these truths in the letter of the Third Testament as taken up by direct reading are nothing else than natural-rational truths which correspond to genuine rational truths. For in the letter of the Third Testament the rational has been laid down in the natural.

Only with a celestial man they are truly rational truths. Everything which has been brought forward against the possibility of the exposition of an internal sense in the Latin Testament, is characterized by this mistaking of the influx of the rational into the natural for the rational proper which belongs only to the celestial man. This truth then and this fact account for the manner in which the position of DE HEMELSCHE LEER thus far has always been misunderstood and misrepresented; the opponents being in the idea that the truths which a well-disposed reader gathers from a direct reading of the Latin Word are in themselves properly rational truths; while according to the new position it is held that only a celestial man can have properly rational truths, which is the explicit teaching of the Latin Word (see A.C. 6240, the number quoted above); and that therefore, according to the opening with the orderly means of the literal sense of the Latin Word, there is a natural Doctrine of the Church which teaches the genuine literal sense of it, a spiritual Doctrine of the Church which teaches its spiritual sense, and a celestial Doctrine of the Church which teaches its celestial sense.

From the reading of your letters and your pamphlet it appears that all your thought regarding these problems is governed by the teaching that as long as man lives in this world he can be conscious only in the natural degree of his mind and by no means in the two interior degrees as is the case with the Angels. This is indeed an important truth; but it has nothing to do with the problem of the difference between the consciousness of the natural and the spiritual man in the natural alone, and the consciousness of the celestial man for the first time in the rational itself; and it has thus nothing to do with the fact that there are three discrete degrees of Doctrine in the Church. This is an entirely different series of things, and the insisting upon bringing it here into application, cannot but have the result that the attention of the mind is arrested so that it sees nothing but the problem of the difference between the state of man before and after the death of the body, while its foremost interest ought to be concentrated upon the problem of the difference between the state of man before and after regeneration. In my letter of March 16th, which I wrote you as a result of my reading your

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK 113

pamphlet, I have already pointed this out in some detail; but in your reply you have not entered upon my argument.

Your point which in all your thinking has been given such a predominant position, is this, that as long as man lives in this world he is conscious only on the natural degree of the mind. It is

only after the death of the body that he can become conscious on the superior degrees. This is what you evidently mean by your repeated remark in your letters and in your pamphlet that "this is consistently and uniformly taught in all the works, and summed up and made clear to our rational understanding in DIVINE LOVE AND WISDOM 256, 257" (see your letter to me of February 17th 1931).

The basis of this teaching is that there are three discrete degrees of the human mind, the celestial, the spiritual, and the natural (D.L.W. 232); that the natural degree viewed in itself is continuous (D.L.W. 256); and that man, as long as he lives in the world, is in the natural degree, which is the last, and he then thinks, wills, speaks, and acts out of that degree (D.L.W. 238); and that the human wisdom, which is natural as long as man lives in the natural world, can by no means be elevated into angelic wisdom, which is of the superior degrees (D.L.W. 257 § 4).

This teaching, if kept in its proper place, is indeed very important; and as to its meaning it is quite clear; it refers to the difference between the celestial, the spiritual, and the natural degrees of the mind, and it contains the outlook that the life and wisdom which awaits a regenerated man after death is so supereminent that no man can ever conceive of its glory. If the true meaning of what has been said in DE HEMELSCHE LEER on the difference between the natural Doctrine, the spiritual Doctrine, and the celestial Doctrine of the Church, has been seen, it will be evident that it is in no way in contradiction with this teaching. For it ought to be realized that though it is of the greatest importance that the natural and the rational should be seen as two entirely distinct things, according to what I have said in the first part of this letter, nevertheless, if the relation of the three discrete degrees of altitude — celestial, spiritual, and natural — is the subject under consideration, then, of course, both the natural and the rational belong to the natural degree. For, although the

114 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

teaching is that the rational proper, or the interior rational, constitutes the celestial degree of the human mind (A.C. 5145, see also n. 1914), nevertheless the rational is not the celestial degree in itself, but it is that inmost of the natural degree which by regeneration, through influx from the celestial degree and thus by correspondence with it, has become the dwelling-place in the natural degree for the celestial degree. This is according to the teaching: "That the natural degree of the human mind viewed in itself is continuous, but that through correspondence with the two higher degrees, if it is elevated, it appears as if discrete" (D.L.W. 256, chapter-heading). This is what I meant by the "very real apparent discreteness of the natural mind" in my letter to you of March 16th, the true purport of which, however, evidently seems to have escaped your attention. If a man becomes spiritual, in that the spiritual degree with him is opened (D.L.W. 252), he does indeed "not exchange the natural degree of his mind for a spiritual degree" as you say in your paper on The Rational, its Origin and Growth-, he remains in the natural degree; but nevertheless there is now formed in it the appearance of a discreteness, so much so that there is no relation between the different apparently discrete degrees in the natural than that of correspondence. The apparently discrete degrees of the natural which are formed through correspondence with the superior degrees by influx are called the interior natural, the exterior rational, and the interior rational. These degrees make the basis of the interior degrees not only with man but also with the Angels, as is plainly taught in n. 5145 of the ARCANA. Even the Angels must have a basis in the natural degree; otherwise they would be infinite; and it is for this reason that man must first be born in the natural world. For although it is true that a man when after death he becomes an

Angel of the spiritual Heaven, for the first time becomes conscious in the spiritual degree itself, and that a man when after death he becomes an Angel of the celestial Heaven, for the first time becomes conscious in the celestial degree itself — while both of them as long as they lived in the world were conscious only in the natural degree — nevertheless it is not the spiritual degree itself or the celestial degree itself, which makes a spiritual or a celestial Angel,

115 REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

but the qualification of the natural degree by influx from. and correspondence with the superior degrees. For it is the natural degree, and not the superior degrees, which must be regenerated. It is the exterior rational and the interior rational — which both belong to the natural degree — which make the spiritual and the celestial Heaven respectively (see A.C. 5145).

When man is regenerated in the first degree, so as to come as to his mind into the society of the Angels of the ultimate Heaven, he indeed remains conscious only in the natural degree, but through correspondence there is formed in his natural mind the interior natural, into which another man can never come and in the concepts of which another man can never have part, unless he has gone through the same degree of regeneration. When a man is regenerated in the second degree, so as to come as to his mind into the society of the Angels of the second Heaven, he indeed remains conscious only in the natural degree, but through correspondence there is formed in his natural mind the next higher apparently discrete degree, which is the exterior rational, into which another man can never come and in the concepts of which another man can never have part, unless he has gone through the same degrees of regeneration. And likewise, when a man is regenerated in the third degree, he indeed remains conscious only in the natural degree, but through correspondence there is formed in his natural mind the highest apparently discrete degree of it, which is the interior rational, for the first time a dwelling-place in the natural degree for the celestial degree, into which another man can never come and in the concepts of which another man can never have part, unless he has also gone through all the degrees of regeneration.

That there are not only the three degrees of the three Heavens, but accordingly also three degrees which make a discrete distinction between the men of the Church, is taught in n. 4154 of the ARCANA CELESTIA: "The goods and truths of the internal man are of threefold degrees, such as exist in the three Heavens; and the goods and truths of the external man are also of threefold degrees, and correspond to the internal ones. . . . These goods and truths of threefold degrees pertain to the external man, and they correspond to so many goods and truths of the

116 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

internal man. The goods and truths of all the degrees are entirely distinct from each other, and are not in the least confused; those which are interior are component and those which are exterior are composite". Here you have an exact description of the three discrete degrees of truths in the Church, thus even with man as long as he lives in this world. The discreteness is most aptly described in this that the truths of a higher degree are the components and those of the next lower

degree are their composites, of which qualification we can see at once that it is applicable not only to the degrees into which man comes after death, but just as much to the natural degree. Yea, it is only in the natural degree that such a discreteness can find its foundation, for the superior degrees regarded in themselves, apart from their foundation in the natural degree, are as it were infinite; which is the reason that regeneration is of the natural degree and must take place as long as man lives in this world. The fact that man after death may come into one of the three discrete Heavens is entirely dependent on the fact that while living in the world those basic discrete degrees in his natural mind have been formed. The difference between the natural, the spiritual, and the celestial Doctrine of the Church is therefore not that those who are in the natural Doctrine are conscious only in the natural degree, while those who are in the spiritual Doctrine have become conscious in the spiritual degree of the mind itself, and those who are in the celestial Doctrine have become conscious in the celestial degree of the mind itself. This would indeed be a great error, which would take away the truth that the wisdom of the Angels transcends the wisdom even of a celestial man. There is no doubt that this is the impression which you have received from reading DE HEMELSCHE LEER. But I trust that it will now be plain to you that this has never been the position of DE HEMELSCHE LEER. The difference between the three discrete degrees of the Doctrine of the Church lies altogether in the discreteness of the natural mind through correspondence with the interior degrees. From what is said in the ARCANA, n. 4154, of a higher discrete degree of the natural being the component of the lower discrete degree, and this the composite of the higher, it can be plain that there is such a great difference between the

discrete degrees of the Doctrine of the Church, that they are "most distinct and never are confused", and man can come into these degrees only by regeneration. "The truths of a higher degree remain hidden and inaccessible to a man who is regenerated only in a lower degree. Nevertheless, the truths of the Angels who are in the spiritual or the celestial itself, always exceed by several discrete degrees the truths of men even of the higher degrees, as long as they live in this world.

From the preceding considerations it may be seen that correspondences must also be applied in the exegesis of the Third Testament. The only application which you apparently allow as expressed on p. 68 of your pamphlet is that "the internal sense as it is with the angels cannot be seen by men, but it can be seen in a corresponding form by men". This indeed is true, but the teaching is that also the natural mind, by the opening of the superior minds, is at last divided into three "most distinct degrees, which are by no means to be confused" (A.C. 4154); and then also between these degrees there is no relation except that of correspondence. That there are such genuine correspondences not only between the natural degree in itself and the spiritual and celestial degrees in themselves, but also, through influx and by correspondence, in the natural degree itself, yea, even in the corporeal degree, is plain from the correspondence between muscles, which are composites, bundles of fibers of which they are composed, and single fibers, within these, which are the first components. It is the explicit teaching of the Latin Word that these are genuine discrete degrees, between which there is no relation except that of correspondence; and yet they are all within the corporeal plane. Another example is that of the three degrees of the blood.

It is exactly the same with the letter of the Latin Word. Those who judge about its internals simply from direct reading remain only in the outermost generals. The rational there is laid down in the natural. Those who have a genuine understanding of its natural sense are in rational-natural truths; but only after the death of the body do they come into the light of the ultimate Heaven itself. Those who with the orderly means have opened that letter in the second degree are in exterior rational truths;

but only after the death of the body do they come into the light of the second Heaven itself. Those who with the orderly means have opened the letter in the third degree are in interior rational truths; but only after the death of the body do they come into the light of the third Heaven itself. To those who have understood this discreteness also of the natural degree, it is quite plain that a knowledge of correspondences is indispensable also for the exegesis of the Third Testament.

From all these considerations it may now be clear to you that when you said on a certain occasion, by way of an objection against DE HEMELSCHE LEER: That "no matter how interior man may become, he will never see exactly that which the Angels see and perceive", * your understanding of the position of DE HEMELSCHE LEER was not according to the actual facts, for DE HEMELSCHE LEER has never held such a view. And I cannot but believe that the great stress which you laid on the truth that as long « as man lives in this world he cannot come into spiritual or celestial truth itself, which you did to prove that also the Third Testament has a letter, induced you to lose sight of the different degrees of truth in which man by regeneration must come while living in this world.

I also hope it has now become clear that the words in your last letter to me: "(your position) it seems to me, implies that a regenerated man is rationally conscious on the spiritual degree of the mind itself", are based on the same misunderstanding. It may now be plain to you that we do not hold this view. Nevertheless, if the teaching of the opening of the degrees of the mind is fully seen, it appears to be a genuine truth, that after a man has been regenerated in the second degree he then has "a genuine spiritual rational, and in its light he can see truths that are hidden in the letter of the Divine Doctrine itself, and in this way be able to draw out these hidden truths, thus giving birth to the Doctrine of genuine truth" (see the same place in your last letter). This truth is plainly taught in the Latin Word. Nothing is more common there than that the exterior rational is called "the spiritual rational", although it is always self-understood that this spiritual

* See NEW CHURCH LIFE 1931: 675.

rational is not the spiritual itself in which the spiritual Angels are, but only the external of it; nevertheless discretely distinct from the interior natural in which are those of the natural Church, who believe that the letter of the Word is the Doctrine of the Church itself. So in the ARCANA CELESTIA, n. 10584, we read: "Those are said to see the back-parts of Jehovah and not His

face, who believe and adore the Word, but only its external which is the sense of the letter, and do not penetrate more interiorly, as do those who have been enlightened, and who make for themselves Doctrine out of the Word, by which they may see its genuine sense, thus its interior sense". If it is here said that those who are enlightened make for themselves Doctrine out of the Word, what else can this mean, than that genuine Doctrine is born in them from the Lord; genuine Doctrine certainly cannot be born from their infernal proprium.

If you say: "I cannot see with you when you say that 'the genuine Doctrine of the Church, being spiritual out of celestial origin, is born ... in the living Church' ", it seems to me that you have not yet paid attention to this teaching in the 20th and 26th chapters of Genesis, where it is plainly given. These are not our words, but the very words of the Latin Word itself. How great your misunderstanding of our position is, appears from the following words in your letter to me of May 1st: "Such expressions seem to embody the idea that you not only speak from the Lord, but that it is the Lord Himself who speaks through you. If so, then indeed your magazine would be a New Word of the Lord, giving the internal sense of the Latin Word". The leading idea of DE HEMELSCHE LEER is that also the Latin Word without Doctrine is as a candlestick without light (S. S. 50-61); and that the genuine Doctrine of the Church is spiritual out of celestial origin, but not out of rational origin; and that the Lord is that Doctrine itself (cf. A.C. 2496, 2497, 2510, 2516, 2533, 2859; A.E. 19). If the meaning of these leading theses (see Third Fascicle, p. 2) is understood, it will be clear that there has never in the least been the idea that the Doctrine of the Church is "a New Word".

I feel that I should dwell in detail on another misunderstanding, namely that you believe that according to our

120

A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

position we come to the number of nine Heavens. But time forbids. I can only express the hope that you will not base further conclusions on this belief, because I can assure you .it is another misunderstanding. I hope to find the occasion at another time to show you this in detail, although I believe that if the foregoing remarks are seen in their application to the order of the Heavens, the misunderstanding may already have been removed.

ERNST PFEIFFER

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

July 13th 1932.

Dear Mr. Pfeiffer.

In trying to answer your letter I hardly know where to begin. It does not appear to me to be of much use to take up the details of your reasoning in the first part of your letter, by which you try to show that the human understanding and reception of good and truth from the Lord are Divine just as this good and truth is Divine, and that this is the teaching of the Latin Word. As I see it, it is your interpretation of the teaching, while I interpret it differently. I do not doubt that your interpretation to you seems so logically necessary that it is the teaching itself, though it does not seem so to me. As you say later on, that is not. the real issue. Interiorly we may have the same

idea, though in giving it form in thoughts and words we each have different phases of the Divine teaching in mind, and therefore express the idea differently.

You say: "There should be no further difficulty for our mutual understanding, if you only will admit that no evils or falsities can ever adhere to this 'celestial and angelic proprium', which is 'truly human from the Lord' and 'from the Lord's proprium' ".

I do admit this. The truth of it has never been questioned in my mind, though you may have thought so from what I have said with regard to the Doctrine of the Church, that it may include fallacies.

The difficulty for our mutual understanding remains notwithstanding this my admission, and in spite of the fact that we do agree in many essential points.

121 REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

Before I resigned from the CONVENTION and joined the GENERAL CHURCH, after I had come to see clearly that the Writings are the Word of the Lord, I understood that this Word like the former revelations of Divine Truth would be of no avail for the establishment of the Lord's New Church, unless the good and truth from the Lord there revealed were received by men in their affections, thoughts and lives; that they cannot be so received except in the measure that men understand the Word; and that therefore the Doctrine of the Church is according to its understanding of the Word; therefore that the Word is not the Doctrine of the Church, which is to be drawn from the Word. When the understanding in the Church of what is said in the Word is genuine, the Doctrine of the Church is Divine, because it is the good and truth of the Lord received by human affections and thoughts, living in them, and deciding or guiding men's thoughts, motives and affections in their natural life.

The Divine Good and Truth in the Word is the Lord Himself in His infinite Divine Human. Divine Good and Truth revealed in the Word, that is the Lord's Divine Human received by men, is the infinite finited in them, in their affections, thoughts, and lives. To this finited Divine Good and Truth in men, the Divine Human of the Lord can come and dwell. Therefore the Lord Himself is the inmost in the Church and in the heavens, though to men and angels He appears to be above them.

The Divine Truth in the Word is the seed; the proprium of man is the soil; received there it can grow, mature and bear fruit in different measures — first the stalk, then the ear, and at last the full corn in the ear.

The difficulty in the way for our mutual understanding arises from different conceptions of what constitutes the human proprium; and these different conceptions are caused, I believe, by our different views of the natural degree of the human mind and how it functions in the states of reformation and regeneration.

After the end of the Most Ancient Church, when men no longer had any interior perception from the Lord of what is good, and therefore what is true, men are born in ignorance, and all knowledge must be given them from without to the slowly growing natural faculty of

understanding. Influx from the Lord through heaven can give them no knowledge of good and truth. They must be instructed by means of the Word in an external form, and as they are conscious only on the natural degree of the mind, the revelation of good and truth is accommodated to the state of that degree.

This degree is man's proprium. In it are inherited tendencies to all kinds of evil. In it are remains from the Most Ancient and the Ancient Churches, or from the Lord through them. Men and animals alike are created with a natural disposition to love others and a natural desire to know things. Men differ from animals in this that the human natural disposition to love others can be directed to the good of eternal life and the human desire to know can be directed to the truths of eternal life. Good and evil alike are so created, and with good and evil alike this natural disposition has from the Lord the faculty of reacting to the influx from Him through the heavens, which in the beginning came directly and immediately to their conscious life, but after the flood can come only as they receive instruction from the Word about eternal life, given to their natural mind.

Influx from the celestial heaven preserves during infancy this faculty of reacting to good affections, and the angels present keep as far as possible the tendencies to love of self away, or in a state of innocence.

When the natural memory and the embryonic understanding have by life in the world been developed to a state that enables the infant to receive instruction from the Word in Divine Truth, spiritual angels are present with the child endeavoring to imbue the child with their love of truth, and by the truths the child is instructed in to give form and quality to the disposition to love others in the child's nature.

The knowledge and understanding of truth developed through instruction is natural, of the same quality as the child's knowledge and understanding of natural things, as long as it is only of the memory and thought from memory. If during growth the remains of good in the affections have caused the child or youth to pay particular attention to some truths, so that he thinks of them from affection, then his understanding is taking on a spiritual quality.

and this understanding is giving form and quality to the affections for good in the natural disposition.

But not until the natural faculty of understanding has been developed to a state which allows the growing youth to think of the truths in the Word he has been instructed in from himself, can he have any real faith in these truths, that is, a faith that is his own apart from the faith he has in the knowledge and wisdom of his teachers. Not before that can he be said to have any rationality that can be elevated and illumined by revealed Divine Truth, thereby receiving an interior or

spiritual quality. Then first can the state of regeneration as distinct from reformation really begin, as he then can begin to compel himself to think and act from the truths he knows, understands and has faith in.

By thus compelling himself, affections for good that he has become conscious of in his understanding can become of his will as a natural being, and be kept entirely apart from the inherited tendencies to evil.

It is true that the Lord does this, because He inflows in the affections for good in man's proprium and removes the affections for evil in the same proprium, so giving to man's proprium a spiritual and heavenly quality, and that man must acknowledge this and that of himself he can do nothing. But this acknowledgement is not possible until his understanding has been instructed from the Word that it is so, and his own reason sees it in the light from the Word, or, as he advances in regeneration, he perceives and feels that it is so.

This understanding of truths from the Word has by instruction been given to his natural faculty of understanding, and the will to live according to them is given to his natural faculty of willing, that is, to the faculties he is created with as a human being, and which all men are created with, those who receive instruction from the Word and compel themselves to live from it, and those who do not.

The will and the understanding constitute the natural mind of all men. In the regenerating man they receive an interior quality from the Lord that is truly human. This natural mind of man is after the death of the body the spirit that lives its own life, in heaven or in hell according to its quality. The regenerating man lives in one of the

heavens as an individual part of the Grand Man, performing a use and therefore in a place as part of an organ in the Grand Man that his reception of Good and Truth from the Lord has fitted him for.

His heavenly or truly human quality is from the Lord's good and truth received by the remains of good in his natural disposition, that is, the proprium he is created with which has received instruction from the Word and thereby has been given truly human quality and form. That proprium is from the proprium of the Lord's Divine Human because from the Word that is the Divine Human.

You may of course, if you like, call this proprium Divine without in your own mind confusing it with the Divine Human, the created with the uncreated, the finite with the infinite, but when you do so you will unavoidably be misunderstood by others who have not from the beginning been with you, participating in the development of your thought and thereby enabled to understand the meaning you put into it.

July 15th.

I had written the above when I received your second letter. I have read it with great interest as it seems to open a way for a better mutual understanding, though there are still some things that I cannot see with you. I will try to write you as soon as possible.

ALBERT BJORCK

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

July 19th 1932.

Dear Mr. Pfeiffer.

I have re-read Mr. Groeneveld's address *The Coming of the Lord in the Doctrine of the Church*, and also your comments on it in the *Third Fascicle*, p. 40.

What Mr. Groeneveld says I have always found interesting, and generally I have felt in agreement. But I may not have got his idea quite correctly. I notice in re-reading what you say in the *Third Fascicle* that I have put a question mark after the sentences on the bottom of p. 41: "The rational or the internal man with him, which is the Lord's, before and during regeneration makes itself felt

125 REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

only by an unconscious influx. For that rational in itself is the proper celestial with man, since the rational in itself or the interior rational makes the third. Heaven (cf. A.C. 5145). It is therefore clear that man, before he has become celestial, does not live in the rational but only receives an influx from the rational".

I have always understood the words in Swedenborg's letter to Rev. Hartley to mean that the rational existing by means of influx from the Lord into the celestial and spiritual heavens at the time when the Lord was born man on earth corresponds to the rational during infancy and boyhood in a man who is being reformed or in the first state of ~generation,, when the remains of good in his natural mind receive influx from the Lord through the heavens. These remains are kept alive and augmented by means of instruction in truths, and thus the natural mind is being reformed in preparation for regeneration. The rational during that state cannot be said to be the child's or youth's own rational, but is in him from others through his faith in parents and teachers and from that in the truth of what they teach him. Not until he commences to think for himself about and from these truths he has been instructed in, can he be said to have a rational understanding of his own; and not until he obeys the truths because he has faith in them from his own reason, can he be said to have a rational will of his own; and not until then can the state of regeneration begin. This I see implied in the statement that "the rational is predicated solely of the celestial and spiritual natural".

In other words, as the natural understanding is instructed in Divine Truth, and elevated and illumined by this truth can it become spiritual in quality; and not until the natural faculty of willing obeys the truth rationally understood can it take on a spiritual quality.

"Rationality itself is from spiritual light, and not at all from natural light" (D.P. 167). Even those in hell see from spiritual light, but according to the structure of their understanding.

"The faculty of receiving spiritual light is what is meant by rationality. From this faculty man has not only the power of thinking but also of speaking from thoughts" (D.L.W. 247).

In his natural understanding is inherent from creation the faculty of receiving spiritual light, but he can receive this light from heaven or from hell. From both and from nature influx comes to man's desire to know, but the influx from the Lord through heaven can reach the desire for knowledge in his natural mind only by the means of the Word in a natural or literal form, which his natural understanding can be instructed from in the same way as it can learn history, geography, physiology or any natural science. Unless there were such a Word, men in the world could have no knowledge of anything pertaining to eternal life; and without knowledge of that there could not come to man any desire to live differently from what his physical existence and needs would seem to him to demand. Such things as charity and love, mercy and justice, would not exist for any length of time if the Word were taken away from the world, and men would become worse than animals.

"The faculty of rationality man has from creation. This faculty consists in understanding things interiorly, and in drawing conclusions concerning what is good and true" (D.L.W. 413).

When man is born he has no perception or knowledge of good or truth or anything else. He has the embryo of a mind which is slowly developed through sense impressions from without. In this mind there are implanted certain faculties which slowly grow, memory, will and understanding. As they grow they take on form and quality according to inherited and acquired tendencies, instruction, discipline, and man's own exertions. The interior tendencies of the mind man inherits from his father, the exterior form and quality from the mother. The interior mind from the father tends to all evil. The rational is according to the interior of the natural understanding, and by inheritance all men's natural will and understanding are directed by the love of self.

The rational inherited from the father is the rational of self love. Therefore another rational must be born in man, that is, he must learn to think from another source. There is only one source from which truly rational thoughts can be born in man's natural understanding or faculty of thinking, and that source is Divine Truth revealed in a

form accommodated to that faculty in man's natural mind. Divine Truth so revealed is the Word with men on earth.

The Divine Truths in the Word are from the Lord and are the Lord, and the thoughts born in man's understanding from them are conceived by the Lord, our heavenly Father; they are sons of

God. But before such thoughts can be conceived and born from the Spirit of the Lord in man's natural mind, it must be given a quality and form that makes it willing to receive the Spirit of the Lord. That quality and form is given to man's understanding by the Church as the mother by means of instruction from the Word and in doctrine from the Word.

The rational thoughts born from the Word in man's natural faculty of thinking are of a nature discretely distinct from all thoughts born to the rational from the human father, but the faculty of understanding which is instructed from the Word, and in which these thoughts are born and grow, is the faculty of the mind that all men have from creation.

The affections for good, born in man's natural faculty of loving, when man shuns what instruction from the Word has shown his understanding is evil, are of a nature discretely distinct from the affections his inheritance from human parents inclines him to harbor. They are as distinct as heaven is distinct from hell, but they are affections born in the natural will's faculty of loving that all men are created with.

They are born from the Lord, first in man's intellectual part as understanding of what is evil by instruction from the Word, and as man obeys the affection for good in the understanding, the affections pertaining to love of self are one by one crowded to one side and affections for good and truth are made room for in man's natural will.

This, as I understand it, is the plain general teaching of the Final Testament, and all particulars in the teaching of man's regeneration seem to me in perfect harmony with this general, and aid us to see it more clearly.

When writing this I have had in mind particularly DIVINE LOVE AND WISDOM, n. 394—432, and ARCANA CELESTIA, n. 2715—2718, 10028, 10057.

In CONJUGIAL LOVE, n. 495, it says: "A man is reformed by his understanding, which is done through the knowledge

128 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

of good and truth, and a rational intuition thereby. If a man inspects rationally these truths and lives according to them, the love of the will is elevated at the same time". The same is said in THE TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, n. 571, 587, and many other numbers. In n. 589 it says: "He is reformed who is in affection for truth for the sake of truth; for this affection conjoins itself with the will; and if it progresses, it conjoins the will to the understanding and then begins regeneration".

To me all this teaching conveys the idea that in the natural mind man is created, with there are certain faculties which can respond to the mediate and immediate influx of life from the Lord through the Word and through heaven; and that these faculties in the natural degree are the beginnings of the spiritual and celestial degrees of the human mind. When they respond to the teaching of the Word and to the influx through heaven, they become the internal degrees of the natural, and as the external of the natural is ruled by this internal and brought into correspondence with it, man becomes spiritual natural or celestial-natural, of whom alone true rationality from the Divine Rational of the Lord's Divine Human can be predicated.

The understanding of truth leads in the first state; the will to do according to the truths in the understanding leads in the second state; and as progress is made love for the truth of the Lord comes down in man's will and gives perception that what the Word teaches is really true and good.

This perception is also in the elevated and illumined natural mind, for such as the quality of man's will and understanding is when he is living in the natural world, such is his spirit when it leaves the body. Man's will and understanding constitute his mind, and his mind is his spirit. It is the natural mind which in regeneration becomes spiritual or celestial as to quality.

The perception a celestial-natural man has is joined to his understanding of the Word; he sees there continually truths that he had not seen before, but he never perceives truths that his understanding of the letter of the Word does not give him to perceive.

As the understanding is a faculty of the natural mind,

129

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

it is contingent not only on the progress in regeneration but also on hereditary and acquired character. The knowledge of correspondences gives great aid for the understanding of the Word and a rational comprehension of its teaching, because it is the science of sciences, and the greater the knowledge of all science the mind has, the clearer and more rational should its ability to think be.

But the Lord in His Second Coming has given us a Word which in its very letter reveals Divine Truths in such a way that man's understanding can see them, be elevated and illumined by them, and so see more, and this to eternity.

I may misunderstand your position. Very likely I do, as your position in the light of some of the things you say in your last letter does not appear to differ very much from that I have tried to put forward in the above. Other things said, however, give me the impression that you postulate a celestial and a spiritual degree of the human mind from conception which are in perfect correspondence with the celestial and spiritual heavens, and that, as man's natural degree is becoming regenerated so that he loves the truths of the literal sense and the good they teach, his spiritual degree opens, and he from that degree sees spiritual truths hidden in the letter, and similarly with the celestial degree.

This letter will no doubt disappoint you, because I have not taken up the different points in your letter one by one in order. But to do that would have taken me much longer time than I at present have at my disposal. I have therefore chosen to try to express my position in such a way that you from that will understand the reasons why I cannot agree with you, when you call the human reception and understanding of the good and truth from the Lord, Divine. Also why I cannot agree with your thought of the application of correspondences in unfolding the spiritual sense of the Latin Word.

Finally I will say that when I in a letter to you said: "Such expressions seem to embody the idea that you not only speak from the Lord but that it is the Lord Himself who speaks through you. If so, then indeed your magazine would be a New Word of the Lord, giving the internal sense of

the Latin Word", I did not mean to say that I thought this was your position, but that men reading what

130

A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

is said in DE HEMELSCHE LEER might easily understand it to mean that, and that the form of expressions used would give them a certain justification for thinking so.

I cannot stop for more now except to point out that you and I both in some instances base our different understanding on the same statements in the Latin Word, showing that our understanding of what is implied in these statements differs. A man's understanding of the Word is his doctrine. We cannot both be right. Some false conception or fallacious conclusion must adhere to the doctrine one of us has drawn from the Word. If you make the understanding entirely dependent on regeneration, you cannot speak of the Doctrine you have drawn as the Divine Doctrine without implying that the other understanding is from a more imperfect state of regeneration.

ALBERT BJORCK

REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

July 20th 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorck.

I believe you will find the following numbers in the APOCALYPSE EXPLAINED, of especial interest at this time:

"Nothing of the understanding and perception of truth is from man's proprium, but all out of God" (n. 627).

"And I will give unto My two witnesses, signifies the good of love and charity, and the truth of doctrine and faith, both from the Lord. This is evident from the signification of witnesses, as being those who in heart and faith acknowledge the Lord, His Divine in His Human, and His Divine, proceeding [Note, the Divine, proceeding, is the Holy Spirit in Heaven and the Church]. ... These goods and truths are meant by the witnesses, because they, that is, all who are in them, acknowledge and confess the Lord; for it is the Divine, proceeding, which is called the Divine Good and the Divine Truth, whence is the good of love into God and the good of charity to the neighbor, and the truth of Doctrine and the truth of faith thence, which bear witness concerning Him; from which it follows that those who are in these likewise bear witness concerning the Lord, that is, acknowledge and confess Him. For it is the Divine that bears witness con-

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK 131

cerning the Divine and not man out of himself; consequently the Lord is in the good of love and in the truth of Doctrine therefrom, that are in man, and it is these that bear witness" (n. 635).

"By the temple in like manner was represented Heaven and the Church; by the adytum where the ark was, was represented the inmost or third Heaven, also the Church with those who are in inmosts, which is called the celestial Church; by the temple outside the adytum was represented the second or middle Heaven, also the Church with those who are in the middle, which Church is called the internal spiritual Church; by the inner court was represented the ultimate or first Heaven, also the Church with those who are in ultimates, which Church is called the internal natural Church; but by the outer court was represented the entrance into Heaven" (n. 6306).

THEODORE PITCAIRN

P.S. You might find it interesting to compare the above with the first paragraph of n. 630 which speaks of the Word, the Church and of Worship in relation to the parts of the temple..

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

July 24th 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorck.

Please accept my thanks for your last two letters which you sent me in answer to my letters of July 2nd and of July 9th. As you say yourself you did anticipate my disappointment that you did not enter upon the points which I developed, although in several places I made the explicit and urgent request for a direct reply. It is quite evident that I have failed in my efforts to make our position clear to you, and that all you have replied is the result of misunderstanding. I most certainly must insist on taking all the blame on my own account, and I now only hope that our personal meeting, which may become possible within a few days, will give the opportunity to actually enter together upon these things.

That you still must have misunderstood us is plain from

132

A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

the fact that instead of entering upon the points which I presented, you again fill several pages to prove a thing which we have never denied, namely that all reformation and regeneration must take place in the natural degree, that there would be no beginning and no progress in regeneration if there were not a Word given which appeals to that degree, and that that Word is the one and only source of truth for man.

There are two things I note in your last letter which seem to influence your argument in such a way as to make it impossible for you to see our position. First, you seem to believe that the rational soul which a man inherits from his father from outermosts to inmosts is infernal, while in reality the paternal seed does not only contain inmostly the very soul of man but also interiorly the first beginnings of his genuine mind; if this were not the case man would not be born as a smiling baby, but as a monstrous creature of hell; the smiling of the baby testifies to the presence of a rational mind. And secondly, you still seem to believe that the Word which is outside of man can be "born" in man, so as to be within man, simply like water from a bottle is poured into a glass, while in reality such a transfer is impossible as being contrary to order. It ought to be realized that such a transfer, by which the Divine things of the Word from being outside of man may become the Divine things of the Word within man, is not possible except through a spiritual influx from within, whereby all the human

intellectual faculties, thus not only the direct cognizance of the letter, are involved as receiving that influx in free cooperation as of themselves. And this spiritual influx is dependent on the conception of a new seed from within from the Lord (A.C. 1438), which can descend into the human mind by no other way than through the inmost and genuine interiors of the original seed derived from the father. The fundamental law that all influx is according to reception seems still to be left out of consideration in your reasoning.

In the last paragraph of your first letter you say: "You may of course if you like, call this proprium Divine . . . but you will unavoidably be misunderstood by others who have not from the beginning been with you, ... and are not enabled to understand the meaning you put in it". To this

133

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

I must reply that a man cannot willfully make the meaning of a term and then expect that others will follow him. The meaning of a term is not made by man but it is found by him in the Word. The point therefore is not that others have not been aware that we have given such a meaning to the term Divine; but the point is that they are ignorant of the fact that this is the meaning which the Latin Word always gives to the term Divine when the subject is not the Divine in itself but the Divine from itself (D. P. 52). There are several places where the Latin Word explicitly speaks of "the Divine things of the Church" (see one place D. P. 215). And whereas man when he is being regenerated is made a Church (A. C. 3654, 3939, 4427, 6113, 9325, 10310) it is also possible and orderly to speak of "the Divine things of man". It ought to be plain that thereby the Lord alone is exalted, and not man.

As long as man sees the Divine things of the Word as outside himself he is in a state of obedience to them and does not see truths in light, although as to his spirit he may be among the Angels of the lower parts of the Heavens (cf. D.L.W. 253); but when man sees the Divine things of the Word within himself, which can only be by virtue of the opening of the spiritual degree of the mind, he sees truths in light (cf. D.L.W. 252). That man can see the Divine things within himself, and that this seeing is out of Heaven, is described in n. 10675 of the ARCANA.

In the last paragraph of your second letter you bring in the question of personal regeneration. As soon as personal things enter, the subject is obscured; it can never be understood unless it be seen from the affection of truth as an entirely abstract proposition.

I am looking forward with much pleasure to seeing you and Mrs. Bjorck soon.

ERNST PFEIFFER

NOTE BY THE EDITOR

At this point the correspondence was interrupted by the British Assembly, London, July 30th to August 1st, which was attended by the three gentlemen concerned. On Thursday and Friday, July 28th and 29th, the two days preceding the Assembly, they had several long conversations in which the subject of this correspondence was discussed. Mr. H. D. G. Groeneveld was also present at these meetings.

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. THEO. PITCAIRN

August 27th 1932.

Dear Mr. Pitcairn.

Thank you very much for sending me Mr. Hugo Odhner's letter and your reply. I have read both twice and I found your letter very interesting. For myself I will say that after our conversations in London and after the papers read at the Club * and at the Assembly **, I understand your position better and am in much closer agreement with it than I 'have been. It certainly seems more rational than Mr. Odhner's which I cannot understand. There are however some details about which I am doubtful about your precise meaning. You say in your reply: "It is this new man that receives influx, for the Lord can dwell only in His Own with man". The question arises: what is it in man that receives the influx of good and truth from the Lord before the new man is formed? Is it not the ability to understand truth and to will good which all men, good and evil alike, are created with?. And which therefore is eminently human. The earth is created with the ability to respond to the action of the sun's rays and to produce vegetable and animal life. In the corresponding way the human mind is created to respond to the influx of good and truth from the spiritual sun. It seems to me yet, in spite of what has been said in explanation, that when you say that this reception is Divine, you do not distinguish sufficiently between the Divine and the created, while, as I understand it, the Third Testament constantly stresses the importance of such distinction. In this connection I would like to draw your attention to what is said in A.C. 3671, and also 9258. The teaching I get from these numbers is that the soil into which the seed from the Lord can fall and produce thoughts and affections from Him, is itself produced by the external instruction from the Word responded to by

* The Understanding of the Word, address by Rev. Ernst Pfeiffer, given before the New Church Club, on Friday evening, July 29th.

** Series and Degrees in the Latin Word as illustrated by the Law of the Firstborn, address by Rev. Theodore Pitcairn, given before the British Assembly, on Monday morning, August 1st.

135 REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

the human ability to understand truth and to will good. This response seems to my understanding of the teaching to be human and not Divine, if we keep in mind the distinction between the Creator and the created.

I have mentioned this to show you why I find it difficult to regard the reception of truth from the Lord on man's part as Divine, though I can see what you mean when you say the new man's reception is Divine.

I should be very glad if you would consider this and tell me your explanation when it is convenient for you to do so.

ALBERT BJORCK:

REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

September 2nd 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorck.

Thank you for your letter which I read with much interest. I do not quite understand your point in regard to the first reception before regeneration and the reception in the new man. The subject is the nature of the genuine Doctrine of the Church, which always pertains to the new man, being spiritual out of a celestial origin.

Freedom and rationality or the ability to understand truth and will good, as you say, are the Lord's with every man, both the evil and the good; thus these abilities are Divine. But the abilities and the use or misuse of the abilities are two different things. The genuine use of the abilities, that is, the genuine understanding of truth and the genuine will of good, is also the Lord's with man and is Divine.

In using the words human and Divine we must always observe closely the series we are treating of. The word human means manlike or manly, while the ' word Divine means Godlike or Godly. In one series it is evident that the Lord is the only Human, because He is the only Man; thus there is nothing essentially Human except the Divine Human. In another series the Divine and the human are used in the relation of God or of the Lord and of man; while in still another series the human is used as that quality which distinguishes a man from an animal. The Word Divine is used in relation to the Divine Itself in the Lord, the Divine Human of the Lord, and the Divine thence with man. Certainly in this last series, at least in

one aspect the Divine does not refer to the Uncreate or Infinite, and thus the distinction is not as 'you make it between "the Divine and the created". We read: "But the Divine Truth is the Divine Good appearing in Heaven before the Angels, and on earth before men, and although it is apparent, it is nevertheless Divine Truth" (A.C. 3712). What appears before men and Angels is never the Uncreated, but is the Divine appearing in created form, which nevertheless is called Divine Truth.

In regard to the ground which receives the seed, inmosty regarded the Lord is the Ground as He is the Rock. For the Lord is the First and the Last, and He operates from His Own in Firsts through His Own in lasts in man. Concerning ground we read: "And I shall bring thee back to the ground, signifies conjunction with Divine Doctrine. This appears from the signification of

bringing back, as denoting to conjoin again; and from the signification of ground, as denoting the Doctrine of good and truth in the natural man, here Divine Doctrine. . . . Divine Doctrine is Divine Truth, and Divine Truth is all the Word of the Lord; Divine Doctrine itself is the Word in the supreme sense ... ; hence Divine Doctrine is the Word in the internal sense ... ; Divine Doctrine is also the Word in the literal sense ... ; and since the literal sense contains in itself the internal sense, and this the supreme sense, and altogether corresponds through representatives and significatives, therefore also Doctrine thence is Divine" (A.C. 3712; see the rest of this number, part of which is quoted above).

Reception is never something merely passive, but is a reactive. The words reception, conception, and perception are closely related. Thus reception of good and truth is never like the pouring of water into a glass, which does not respond.

The nature of the response of the earth to the seeds is thus described: "That the earth is the common mother may be illustrated spiritually; and is so illustrated by the fact that in the Word the earth signifies the Church, and the Church is the common Mother, and is so called in the Word. But that the earth or the soil can enter into the inmost of a seed even to its prolific principle, calling this forth and giving it circulation, is because every least

particle of dust or powder exhales from its essence a kind of subtle penetrating effluvium, which is an effect of the active force of the heat out of the spiritual world" (T.C.R. 585).

Note that there are three essential influxes which cause the seed to grow. First, the influx into the germ which gives it life and is its soul; secondly, the influx of heat and light from the sun which is added from without; and thirdly, the influx out of the soil from the spiritual world, spoken of above. It is this active which is the essential of the soil as a receptive of the seed, and this in the corresponding thing in man is Divine. The soil as a dead created form could never be such a receptive. When the Word and the Doctrine remain in the external memory and its affections, there is such a barren and dead soil. In this connection note the number quoted in my letter to Mr. Hugo Odhner: "The Divine, proceeding, which is the Father in the Heavens, flows in equally with the evil and the good; but the reception of it must be from man; yet not from man as from man, but as it were from himself; for the faculty to receive is given to him continually, and it also inflows to the extent that man removes the opposing evils, also from the faculty that is continually given; and that faculty itself appears to be as it were the man's, although it is the Lord's" (A.E. 64423).

Three influxes are here spoken of. The influx of good and truth; the influx of the power of reception of good and truth; and the influx of the power and willingness to shun evils as sins, upon which the reception of good and truth depends. The last of the three powers appears to be man's, but it is the Lord's as much as the former two, and becomes the Lord's when the man acknowledges it as the Lord's.

While before regeneration man is in a perverted form, is it not clear that the very commencement of regeneration must have its origin in something Divine both as to influx and reception? The influx referred to in the quotation above is the same with the good and the evil; it is the reception that causes the origin of the new birth, or what is the same, it is the conception.

In connection with the above, what is said about the "first love" is important. Man is granted a first love by unmerited advance in new states, and this first love is the

138 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

Lord's with man, although it has not as yet been appropriated to the man as his own.

I am not sure whether I fully understand the questions in your mind; I will await with interest your reply.

THEODORE PITCAIRN

P. S. I had written to Mr. Pfeiffer, asking him for his opinion with regard to your letter; and after I had written my reply as above I received from him a letter which I enclose.

REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. THEO. PITCAIRN

September 2nd 1932.

Dear Mr. Pitcairn.

We greatly enjoyed Mr. Bjorck's letter to you. In saying that he can see what you mean when you say that the new man's reception is Divine, he practically seems to admit the whole position.

In answering him I would suggest to consider the following points: The very n. 3671, which Mr. Bjorck quotes, throws much light on the subject. "Interior good and truth is the seed" and "exterior good and truth is the soil"; this is the essential teaching of the number. Now if the question is asked: "What is it in man that receives the influx of good and truth from the Lord before the new man is formed?" the answer is indeed that such an influx is possible by virtue of the two faculties of rationality and liberty which are from the Lord with every man, as Mr. Bjorck himself suggests. The literal teaching of DIVINE PROVIDENCE, n. 88, is: "Every one who has any thought from interior understanding can see that the posse to will and the posse to understand are not from man but from Him who has the Posse itself, that is, who has the Posse in its essence. [I choose to keep the Latin word posse, for to translate it with 'power' is certainly not satisfactory; rather would I say 'ability'.] ... Therefore the posse in itself is Divine. ... From these things it is evident that those two faculties which are called rationality and liberty are from the Lord and not from man".

Now it is plain that if interior good and truth are the seed and exterior good and truth are the soil, the evil man -- thus the man before the new man has been formed --

139 REV. ERNST PFEIFFER TO REV. THEO. PITCAIRN

has neither good seed nor good soil, but only the posse which is even more interior than the seed. For every man — the evil also — has inmosty that posse or ability; it is the Lord with man. It is

curious that in this n. 88 the actual words are used that it is Divine. This in itself is a full answer from the Word itself to Mr. Bjorck.

If Mr. Bjorck therefore truly sees and admits what he says, namely, that he can see that the new man's reception is Divine, it must be said that the reception with the evil man, which is in the posse or ability to receive — as Mr. Bjorck himself suggests — is Divine even in a stronger sense. For it is plain that this reception is less "human" than the reception with the new man, where there is a reception for the first time even in a good soil.

It seems evident that if Mr. Bjorck says that you do not distinguish between the Divine and the created, the importance of which distinction is stressed in the Third Testament, he still thinks of that created thing in itself which in itself is dead; while the created thing together with the influx is not a dead thing, but is living from the Divine. In other words, Mr. Bjorck seems not yet to realize the significance of the teaching that not only the Divine in itself is called Divine, but also the Divine from the Divine, which is conceivable only after reception. And this in spite of the fact that he now says that he can see that the new man's reception is Divine. If this objection were just, it would apply still more to the reception after regeneration than before regeneration. Because only after regeneration the reception is in that which in the case of man is "human", namely not only the interior good and truth which is of the rational, but even the exterior good and truth which is of the natural, which latter for the first time is a good soil. That this natural after regeneration also with man is Divine, is explicitly taught in the often quoted n. 3490 of the ARCANA CELESTIA.

The difficulty of Mr. Bjorck, therefore, seems to lie in the fact that he still does not distinguish between the relation of the Divine and the created, in which relation the Divine is Life and the created in itself is dead in itself, and the relation of the Divine and the human, in which relation also the human after regeneration becomes Divine.

ERNST PFEIFFER

140 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. THEO. PITCAIRN

September 8th 1932.

Dear Mr. Pitcairn.

I am indebted to you for your answer to my last letter and also for letting me know Mr. Pfeiffer's opinion of it. The letter I wrote you was like several previous ones written not with the object in view to oppose your position, but for the purpose of getting at a distinct understanding of the meaning you yourselves are expressing. Your last letter has helped me a lot to understand, and I am prepared to say that as far as I now understand your meaning, I am virtually in agreement with you.

I think that a clear presentation in DE HEMELSCHE LEER of the different senses in which the word Divine is used in the Third Testament, with a reference to your use of it when you say that

man's understanding and reception of genuine truth is Divine, would go far in removing much misunderstanding and consequent opposition.

ALBERT BJORCK

REV. THEO. PITCAIRN TO REV. ALBERT BJORCK

September 16th 1932.

Dear Mr. Bjorck.

Thank you for your letter. In regard to the suggestion that something be published as to the different meanings of the word Divine, it appears to Mr. Pfeiffer and myself that if you are willing, this end might be accomplished by a publication in DE HEMELSCHE LEER of our correspondence on this subject and on the as it were discrete degrees.

THEODORE PITCAIRN

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. THEO. PITCAIRN

September 19th 1932.

Dear Mr. Pitcairn.

Your letter just arrived. I am quite willing that our correspondence on the subject of the apparent discrete degrees of the natural, and on the use of the term "Divine", should be published in DE HEMELSCHE LEER.

141 REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

I still think it would be useful to add a concise exposition of the use of the term "Divine" in the Third Testament.

ALBERT BJORCK

REV. ALBERT BJORCK TO REV. ERNST PFEIFFER

EL TERRENO, PALMA DE MALLORCA, SPAIN.

October 29th 1932.

Dear Mr. Pfeiffer.

I have read the proofs of the recent correspondence between you, Mr. Theodore Pitcairn, and myself with great interest. It gives me pleasure to know that it will be published and that thereby an opportunity will be given thinking members of the Church to get more information and a clearer understanding of what has become known as the Hague position.

At present very little is known about it and still less is understood, except by a few on this side of the water, who have had an opportunity to read DE HEMELSCHE LEER and to get their impressions from that reading cleared by listening to what you have said at the late London Assembly.

As far as I am concerned I am quite willing to confess that I have shared the common illusion that one's own individual understanding of the Third Testament is identical with what is there taught, and that the ideas of that understanding have been an obstacle for seeing the truth in your position as you have expressed it.

But I can also claim that I have made efforts to understand your position, and through my correspondence with you and Mr. Pitcairn and our conversations in London before and during the Assembly I now think I understand your position. With that understanding has also come the conviction that your position is in agreement with the teaching of the Third Testament. This is of course what matters.

I now perceive and see that the thoughts expressed by you are statements unfolding genuine truths of the Word, and that they, when understood in the Church, will lead

142 A CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DOCTRINE

the way for more interior truths to be seen, and be the means for an interior growth of the Lord's Church with men on earth that will never cease. I am an old man, and my work here must soon come to an end, but my hope and prayer is that the Lord may give you and Mr. Pitcairn, and all those who now are with you, light and strength for the continued opening of the Doctrine of the Church.

May the Man-Child of the Woman, conceived and born by the Lord Himself, embodying His Spirit of Love, Mercy, and Truth, grow, and become a power in the world for the salvation of men and the restoration of Paradise on earth, is the prayer of

Your friend and brother

ALBERT BJORCK

143

CONTENTS

Leading Theses propounded in DE HEMELSCHE LEER 2

From the Transactions of the Swedenborg Gezelschap. From the Minutes of the Meeting of April 11th 1931. Elucidation by the Rev. Ernst Pfeiffer of the Address by H. D. G. Groeneveld "The Nineteenth of June 1931"3

The Nineteenth of June 1932. Address by the Rev. Ernst Pfeiffer.....25

Address by the H. D. G-. Groeneveld.....31

A Correspondence on the Essence of -the Latin Word and the Divinity of the Doctrine of the Church, between the Rev. Albert Bjorck, and the Revds. Theodore Pitcairn and Ernst Pfeiffer 37

Advertisement. 144

144

In preparation:

DE HEMELSCHE LEER

FIFTH FASCICLE OF THE ENGLISH EDITION

To be obtained through: Academy Book Room, Bryn Athyn, Pa. U.S.A. Mr. Horace Howard, 30, Drury Road, Colchester, England. J. H. Ridgway, Esq., 2, Old Well Court, Durban, South Africa.

THE SWEDENBORG GENOOTSCHAP 229, LAAN VAN MEERDERVOORT THE HAGUE, HOLLAND

Approximately 150 pages.

Price including postage 2.25 florins. (\$1.00 or 3s. 9d.)

Through the generosity of the Reverend Theodore Pitcairn the English edition of DE HEMELSCHE LEER will henceforth be sent to the ministers of the GENERAL CHURCH free of charge. A copy of the Second and of the Third Fascicle will also be sent to them on application.