

writer is exonerated of any taint of facetiousness in attempting to put words in the mouth of this great scholar. Rather, any change of word or expression was motivated by the sole purpose of clarifying, if possible, some of his great concepts by drawing on the vernacular of our day.

THE PURE INTELLECT *

BY HAROLD F. PITCAIRN

We are greatly impressed with the fact that much is said about the pure intellect in *Rational Psychology*, but the term is never used in the Writings. And yet, so far as we are aware, there is no notice of this in any collateral New Church literature. Therefore, the question arises as to whether there is any term in the Writings which designates the same thing. This question was asked of a number of the leading ministers in the Church.

The answer given by Bishop Acton was:

The Pure Intellect is the Faculty of Rationality and Liberty.

At first we could not agree with this answer, but after considerable study came to agree with it. However, after more study it does not seem to us that the pure intellect can be *identified* with the faculty of rationality and liberty. It is hoped that our process of reasoning, presented herewith, may be of interest.

At first we could not agree with this answer because so much is said which indicates that the pure intellect does not operate above the natural plane. If this were so, it could hardly be the faculty of rationality and liberty, for that faculty functions especially while a man is suffering temptation, and in treating of temptations of those of the spiritual church we read:

“. . . in temptations, the man is in combat against falsity and evil. These—falsity and evil—flow into the external man from the hells, while good and truth flow in through the internal man from the Lord; thus by virtue of the combat of the internal man with the external, which is called ‘temptation’” (*A.C.* nos. 8351 : 2).

* Unless otherwise indicated, the numbers quoted are from *Rational Psychology*, as translated by Dr. Alfred Acton and Rev. Norbert H. Rogers, published in 1950 by the Swedenborg Scientific Association.

The first of the following quotations from *Rational Psychology* indicates that the pure intellect does not operate above the natural plane. There are, however, no italics in the original.

First as to the INTELLECTORY since it is the organ of the pure intellect (no. 125) :

“From its own essence, the soul forms a pure intellectory, the mind whereof is natural. This mind is within the pure intellectory, being most individually present in each. *This common essence and life of the several parts is called the animus, and within it is only what is natural and corporeal but not what is spiritual, although it descends from the spiritual and is created by it*” (no. 305).

The common mind of the intellectory is called the animus, no. 463 (line 9).

Now what is said of the ANIMUS which is the mind of the intellectory :

“*Thus the animus is purely animal, being, as it were, an inferior or irrational mind. . . . Wherefore the cupidities of our animus are to be restrained by a superior or rational mind, and to be moderated in accordance with the determination of the mind’s judgment*” (no. 284).

“Therefore, the animus is the form of the ideas of the common or external sensory—for, according to the form of the sensory, such is the animus—and the active and living principle of all the mutations of its body” (no. 198).

“That the animus is not the soul, and is not the same as the rational mind, is clearer than light; for to the animus are ascribed all those affections and cupidities, such as anger, venereal love, envy, etc., *which are purely animal, being proper, not only to the human race, but also to brute animals. The animus can never be said to be rational like the mind*” (no. 284).

“Since it was said above [no. 296], that the rational mind is intermediate between the pure [superior] mind or that of the soul, *and the impure inferior mind or that of the body, that is, the animus*, it would seem to follow that the rational mind possesses no affection of its own or of itself. . .” (no. 299).

“To the animus are attributed affections and also cupidities. To the mind are attributed loves and also wills” (no. 379).

The animus is natural while the mind is spiritual, no. 295 (line 4).

“But when the animus rebels and wishes to make itself superior,

it is rejected by the spiritual mind, and a perpetual combat arises, hardly otherwise than as between God and the devil" (no. 474). On the other hand, in no. 475 it is told how the animus may be changed from evil to good. Also there are a number of places which speak of the first animus, as in the following: "For while it is the animus which is affected and feels desire, that animus is not the animus which thinks, but is below the animus, if I may so call it, which thinks and which is called rational" (no. 284). In no. 290 it speaks of "that mind which is the form of forms and is called the superior animus."

Now to return to the INTELLECTORY:

"This harmony in and between the ideas of thought, this love, rational enjoyment and end, instantaneously and naturally affects *the pure intellectory, whose ideas are pure natural truths, and whose harmonies are pure natural goodnesses*" (no. 165). It would seem that the faculty of rationality and liberty deals with spiritual rather than natural truths because it has to do with regeneration.

The mind of the intellectory is natural, no. 307 (l. 8), no. 343 (l. 2).

The intellectory is a pure natural mind, no. 473 (l. 1).

Now as to the PURE INTELLECT:

"In order, therefore, to express the quality of the pure intellect, recourse must be had to universal terms, as stated above [n.128], *inasmuch as this intellect is the verimost nature of its body, and the verimost science of the natural things existing below it*" (no. 131).

"On this intellectory depends the sensory, or on the pure intellect depends sensation, no sensation or perception of sensation being possible unless the nature of what is perceived is understood by an interior or superior power" (no. 126). The function of sensating would seem to be a discrete degree below the function of the faculty of rationality and liberty.

The ideas of the pure intellect are so many natural truths, no. 133 (l. 4).

"The pure intellect, whose property it is to have knowledge of the whole of nature, . . ." (no. 134).

* * * *

From the following number, it first seemed that the faculty of rationality and liberty resided in the rational mind and not in the

pure intellect, because it is the rational mind that chooses between spiritual good and evil:

“It is also clear that we are able to choose that which is best, and to reject evil; or that our rational mind is able freely to make decisions and to act in accordance with its decisions. If loves were not the property of the rational mind, but only flowed in from elsewhere and forced that mind to decide and act, then nothing of its own could be predicated of the mind, and therefore nothing free. But the very fact of free decision demonstrates that the rational mind is the middle between two inflowing loves, and is the arbiter in the choice of which is the best. Furthermore, it is clear that, unless there were some affections proper to the mind, of which it could will one rather than another, there would be no will, but instead of will, either cupidity or instinct, as in brute animals; for all that flows from the animus is cupidity, and all that flows from the superior mind is instinct” (no. 300).

Some confusion of thought may arise unless a distinction is made between the *faculty* of rationality and that thing which makes the choice.

That the pure intellect has knowledge above the plane of the natural is indicated in no. 134 (l. 13) where it is said that the intellect which is instructed and perfected is below the pure intellect.

While it would seem that the intellectory and the pure intellect have functions which are a discrete degree below the faculty of rationality and liberty, they also have functions above the natural. This is indicated in no. 129, and this number, quoted just below, at first seemed to support the conclusion that the faculty of rationality and liberty resides in the pure intellect.

“That such an intellectory or pure intellect does exist, cannot be doubted, inasmuch as it plainly manifests itself in the several parts of our thought and speech, being there proximately at hand and inmosty within. For we instantly reduce the ideas of our memory, which are not unlike visual ideas, into such order, form, and harmony that a rational analysis results therefrom, and this is recognized as to whether it is true or false by an intellect purer than our thought. Sensations supply no other objects than such as are parts of the imagination; but analytically to reduce these objects into forms, and then to conceive and bring forth new forms, which in turn are parts of a more sublime thought; and in these, from

their connection and order alone, to behold truths, verisimilitudes, and probabilities—*this is the function*, not of sensations, but of the *pure intellect*. It is not even the function of thought, for thought is that which is reduced into such form, and so is the product resulting from an intellect which is prior and which produces the intellectual and rational ideas of thought” (no. 129).

A careful reading of the above number in connection with other numbers, would seem to indicate that while the function of the pure intellect has to do with sublime thought, truths, and verisimilitudes, these are on the natural and not the spiritual plane.

One reason why the pure intellect should not be *identified* with the faculty of rationality and liberty is that it would seem that the former has functions which are not applicable to the latter.

* * * *

In concluding we would point out that both men and animals have an intellectory and a pure intellect, but that animals do not have the faculty of rationality and liberty.

That animals have a pure intellect is taught in the following:

“This is the reason why brute animals act from this same principle and this same end; for their soul is of the nature of our pure intellect, and so looks to and desires, not spiritual ends, but only natural, that is to say, not a heavenly society as does our soul [but only an earthly]” (no. 205).

But that animals do not have the faculty of rationality and liberty, we believe is accepted by New Churchmen and need not be demonstrated here.

With men the faculty of rationality and liberty flows into and, at least in part, acts through or by means of the pure intellect, but this demonstrates to us that the two cannot be the same thing.

* * * *

From the above quotations and considerations we conclude that there is no term in the Writings which designates the same thing as the terms “pure intellect” or “intellectory” as used in *Rational Psychology*.