

NOVA DOMINI ECCLESIA QUAE EST NOVA HIEROSOLYMA
THE LORD'S NEW CHURCH WHICH IS NOVA HIEROSOLYMA

BRYN ATHYN, PENNSYLVANIA

November 17, 1944

Mr. Thorsten Sigstedt,
Bryn Athyn, Penna.

Dear Thorsten,

As your letter is in agreement with the paper "The Priesthood and Ministry in the New Church" by Clarence Hotson, a copy of which he sent me, I will answer the two together.

The idea that the teachings of the Latin Word concerning government did not apply to the natural government of the Church and State was first propounded by the Rev. T.E. Harris [editor of HL], along with the proposition that what is said of marriage does not apply to the marriage of man and woman. An idea which we all opposed and which Loyal [Loyal D. Odhner, editor of HL] characterised as spiritual sodomy.

When we separated from the General Church the teaching of the Word was emphasized that "In the New Church there will not be an external separated from its internal." Anything in the natural life of the Church which is separated from its internal and therefore not genuine is merely adjoined to the Church and is not conjoined, and does not pertain to the Lord's New Church.

In our talks with the leaders of the General church it was pointed out that our concept of the Church organization was totally different from theirs; that they believed in an internal Church, the New Jerusalem, which is the Bride of the Lamb and an external Church which is a human institution; while we believed that the organization of the Church is truly organic and related to the internal of the Church as body and soul, and that otherwise the Lord would not be the God of Heaven and earth, and His Kingdom would not be over both.

You indicated you believe there are sincere men in the priesthood who perform a use. But their uses according to your position would be a separated external even more so than in the idea of the General Church, in which they admit the priesthood is representative, at least in a Jewish sense, for they do not admit of the necessity of the oneness of the external and the internal which characterizes the genuine New Church.

A complaint is made that the Church has followed the practices of the Catholic and Protestant Church, practices which go back to the primitive Christian Church, in having an ordained and set-apart priesthood. Instead you propose that we follow the practices of certain heretical sects, notably the Quakers, to the teaching of which the Word evidently refers in the statement: *There were some who have rejected the priestly office saying that the priesthood is universal, thus with all. Some of these have read the Word quite diligently, but as they have lived evilly, they have seized upon abominable dogmas thence. Of these there are many. These have been cast out of heaven, but at the back because they have preached clandestinely.* SE 4904

Doctrine is to be drawn from the Word and confirmed by it. Doctrine not drawn from the Word can still be confirmed by it. Wherefore the Word is called the book of heresies.

The question is, has the idea that there is not to be an instituted priesthood been drawn from the Word or is it merely confirmed by certain passages in a disorderly way.

It can be seen that one who wishes to deny the application of the teaching concerning marriage to the marriage of husband and wife and confine it to the marriage of good and truth does so, not from the Word, but from an aversion to marriage relation of husband and wife; having come to such an idea, he can then confirm it by certain passages in the Word, and also by much apparent experience as for example: that there are few if any in the Church who are in conjugal love such as it is described in the Word. If the teaching concerning marriage is confined to its spiritual sense and denied in application to the relation of husband and wife, the relation of husband and wife

becomes merely a concubinage, and the same applies to the priesthood which then becomes a vile institution such as you describe it.

Both you and Dr. Hotson maintain that representatives were abolished with the Coming of the Lord, and you quote a passage which speaks of the Jewish representatives being abolished and that in their place the Holy Supper and Baptism was instituted. It is obvious that what was abolished was merely representative worship and not representatives which are also correspondences. It is stated in the Latin Word that nations at this day are equally representative as were those spoken of in the Old Testament. To wish to do away with representatives which are genuine correspondences is to be in a similar state to those in faith alone who would do away with the Ten Commandments on the grounds that the Lord said: *For the Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.* John 1:17.

That the priesthood is a genuine correspondence and not a mere representative such as animal sacrifice, is evident from the fact that it speaks of priests in Heaven, and indeed of a high priest of a Society, indicating degrees of the priesthood. CL 266

It is clear from your letter and from the paper of Dr. Hotson, that the origin of your position in regard to the priesthood in the New Church did not have its origin in the Word but had its origin in the thinking from person, that is the persons who have been ministers in the New Church and the so-called New Church, and that, having come to a conclusion, there is made an attempt to confirm it by the Word.

This thinking from person is manifest in such passages as: "Have the leading champions of the New Church been so much better than the Lord's first disciples and their ecclesiastical successors to make quite needless this terrible warning? Is it not rather directly addressed to them?" (Dr. Hotson's paper, page 2, bottom of page).

The Christian Church never came to that stage which is characteristic of the genuine New Church, namely that "There will be no external separated from its internal." It is evident from this quotation that Dr. Hotson does not believe that there is or ever will be the Lord's New Church which is Nova Hierosolyma such as it is described in the Word.

The warning he refers to is indeed to the New Church but the end is that by and after repentance the Lord's genuine New Church may be instaurated.

Dr. Hotson on the top of page four states "The very existence in the New Church of a professional clergy, ministry or priesthood tends to discourage or prevent this distinctly 'New Church development' namely 4an eager group of those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, reading and studying for themselves, without professional help or hindrance, the Bible and the Writings, and making Doctrine for themselves and instructing each other'."

Here again it is manifest that Dr. Hotson does not believe it possible that a genuine organic New Church can be instaurated by the Lord, but his mind is filled with the thought of merely human institutions.

The words he uses to describe the "distinctively 'New Church'" are almost the same words that various heretical sects in the Christian world use to describe their meetings.

Dr. Hotson says: "Why should a layman read and study for himself when there is a paid priest or clergyman to do his doctrinal thinking for him, and answer all his questions for him." This sentence indicates that Dr. Hotson has not read or at least thought about what has been brought forth on the use of the priesthood, and that he can only think of the priesthood in the grossest old church manner, in fact the whole paper indicates he can not think of the priesthood and its use except in the grossest manner.

Dr. Hotson, in attempting to prove his point, makes much of mistranslations in various editions. While the importance of accurate translations is great he does not demonstrate that his translation although in some cases more accurate proves his point, and in some cases his translation is less accurate than the ones he criticizes, as for example: his translation "ought to be" or "must be" to "will be." The future tense here according to Latin usage is a strong imperative. It is the same tense as used in the Commandment "Thou shalt not kill," etc.

To translate this "you will not kill" would be a mistranslation and weaken the sense of the letter, although in the regenerate man it does again become a simple future, the regenerate man does not kill because he does not will to kill.

When it is said therefore that "there are two kinds of things that must be in order," in the interior sense the meaning is will be, but in the sense of the letter it is must be, which is therefore the correct translation; for a translation gives the literal sense.

We read: *By Levi was represented the good of charity, and therefore this tribe was made the priesthood; and the priesthood is the first of the Church.* E 229:4

You take this passage to mean that all who are in the good of charity are priests, but this is from viewing the sentence apart from the series in which it occurs. The subject is the twelve tribes of Israel, such as Jude - love to the Lord, Zebulon - the conjunction of good and truth, Rueben - faith, Gad -good works. All of these are in charity, in a specific sense. The reason charity pertains to the priesthood in this specific sense is that the natural function of the priesthood is the work of saving souls, which is the work of charity; and those are genuine priests who are in this love as their particular function, or use.

In the so-called New Church there are those who deny and are opposed to the internal sense of the Latin Word; and also those who are opposed to the literal sense. These latter are represented by the children who called Elijah bald, and were therefore attacked by bears. The denial of either the internal sense or the literal sense leads to faith alone. It is only where the internal sense and the genuine sense of the letter are truly conjoined that the Church truly exists.

You complained that I did not enter into the internal sense of the passages on the priesthood. The answer is that if the genuine sense of the letter is not understood it is dangerous to attempt to enter into the internal sense; for such a sense would then be like a tower in the air, having no foundation. The literal sense must indeed be received from within, so that the genuine natural which is the true foundation can be seen. The literal sense seen from without is the letter that killeth. But to do away with the genuine natural sense of the Word leads to mere fantasy.

Sincerely,

Theodore Pitcairn