

of the Lord in the ongoing, living story of the Hero and the Eternal Return of the Springtime. As we work with the living, dynamic recycling of these themes we will, I believe, begin to get a glimpse of the true science of *Correspondences* rather than just the science of *symbolism*.

Man is the highest form of the Lord's creation; certainly we will get a clearer rational picture of the Lord by watching *man* go through his regenerative cycles than merely to be content with watching the sun or the moon going through their phases. If we work with this we will have graduated from our Anatomy to our Physiology class, we will have moved from the dissection table where we separated, examined and labeled the parts to the gymnastic arena where we see the muscles, tendons, nerves tuned up and directed and used to some purposes.

## COMMUNICATION

To the Editor of THE NEW PHILOSOPHY :

I feel no need to defend myself against Mr. Prescott Roger's comments (NEW PHILOSOPHY vol LXXVIII no. 3 p. 288-290) since they were fair enough. Research in the field of ancient history is not a New Church minister's job. However, as Mr. Rogers seem to agree, any approach to investigating the pre-Hebrew Churches must begin from what the Doctrines say.

Now the evidence of secular science has a very subtle way of undermining what the Doctrines reveal. Especially would this be the case, were the "externals" of the pre-Hebrew Churches to be compared with secular scholarship on ancient man. There is a real need for caution, and I would thoroughly endorse the method Mr. Rogers proposes—namely of examining the two fields in juxtaposition, "in the hope of seeing how they naturally fit, *i.e.* without problems." (p. 290)

That was also my own endeavour. My two gauges, which would have matched the two fields of investigation, were the flood and the invention of writing (including inscriptions of all kinds). Only these two, in my view, could have left a sufficient historical imprint for modern scholars to discover. That led me to my conclusion of the 35000 to 8000 BC for the duration of the flood.

If any such juxtaposing of information be undertaken, however, I would warn against using the "externals" of the pre-Hebrew Churches in the same manner as the facts of secular scholarship. The externals of the former are to be regarded as the *externals of their own proper internals*. Unless

they are regarded from their own internals, therefore, they cannot be properly compared with secular facts—which have no internals (save perhaps atheism).

For example, the question of eating meat in the Most Ancient Church has to be seen from the internal change of state from holy to profane. Only then can it be compared with secular knowledge of the food of ancient man.

In answer to Mr. Rogers' implied queries of my hypotheses—if they are so to be called—yes, Noah is said not to be “numbered among the churches before the flood.” (AC 535) But Mr. Rogers is mistaken in his wording of that quote. Also that quote ends: “Concerning Noah and his sons, of the Lord's Divine mercy hereafter.”

This leads us on to AC 788: “Every man of the church called Noah was of the posterity of the Most Ancient Church, and with respect to hereditary evil was therefore in a state nearly like that of the rest of the posterity which perished. . . . They [Noah] were of the race and seed of the most ancient men.”

This effectively countermands the previous statement. But Mr. Rogers is correct in saying that Noah was as a parent to the Ancient Church, though not properly belonging to it. (Cf. AC 788)

But as to his difficulty in seeing Noah and the flood lasting from ca 35000 to 8000 BC, I would mention only that each “new church” is formed from a remnant of the former church. The heavens attend to this remnant with especial care, instilling remains of good and truth with them, and so leading them, from the Lord, into a new state in which they can serve as propagators of that new church. The continuous internal sense of Genesis 7 and 8 manifests how this angelic attention brought the remnant of Noah through several distinct stages in their preparation. They *were* the “life-securing medium” (p. 290) which Mr. Rogers worries about (as is evident from reading AC 468, also quoted by Mr. Rogers). And my point was that such states of preparation could well account for the whole of the Cro-Magnon era. In my view, the internal states of Noah, as taken from the Doctrines, “fit” the externals of Cro-Magnon as taken from secular knowledge. However, I am open to other suggestions.

I still feel that my hypotheses stand—admittedly precariously. The most noble sources would perhaps force an uninitiated mind like mine to admit error after error. But this cannot be done by derogating those sources I did make use of. Be that as it may. Ministers and New Church scholars have no need to glare at each other across the gap separating Doctrine from science. There is instead need for putting heads together, in more areas than just ancient history. It is an exciting prospect for the future of the New Church, and I wish Mr. Rogers and others well in it.

London, England  
Nov. 19, 1975

Sincerely,  
ERIK E. SANDSTRÖM