According to Dr. Marsha Keith Schuchard, during Swedenborg’s “long career, he gained fame as a military engineer, natural scientist, intelligence agent, and kabbalistic visionary.”¹ The purpose of the following article is to show that there is little, if any, evidence for Dr. Schuchard’s last two classifications of Swedenborg. I do not feel that she has made a case for his being, in fact, “a secret agent on earth and in heaven.”²

More specifically, then, Dr. Schuchard has two basic hypotheses in her work on Swedenborg: One is that Swedenborg studied Jewish mysticism, or Kabbalah (also spelt Cabala), with Rabbi Johan Kemper, a lecturer at Swedenborg’s university, although Schuchard neglects to mention that Kemper had converted to Christianity before then,³ and later with Rabbi Dr. Falk in London. Her hypothesis is that Swedenborg mastered a vision-inducement technique taught him by those men, which involved converting his sexual energies into psychic energies. Her second hypothesis is that Swedenborg was a Jacobite spy on behalf of the Swedish government and used secret Masonic networks to pass intelligence back to Sweden or to carry out secret missions.

A recurrent pattern in Schuchard’s approach to these issues is that she appears willing to go to extreme lengths, including misquoting and misinterpreting Swedenborg or Blake and other authors, to prove her case. In my opinion, she for the most part does not build her case from facts, but,

---

¹ This article is an updated and expanded version of my article, “Schuchard’s Swedenborg,” which appeared in The New-Church Magazine No. 34 (March 2001) pp. 48-64 and No. 35 (April 2001) pp. 65-96. I would like to thank Dr. Kurt Simons for his helpful suggestions during re-editing of the manuscript, and Rev. Stephen Cole of Bryn Athyn for supplying copies of several of Dr. Schuchard’s articles.

² References to Swedenborg’s works in the footnotes are given by abbreviations only. See list of abbreviated titles at the back of this issue.

³ Biographical note: Rev. Talbot is a non-stipendiary member of the clergy of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain. He is married with two teenage sons and works as a high school mathematics teacher. He obtained a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) and Diploma in Education from the University of Sydney, Australia. Address:: bm@talbot1302.freeserve.co.uk
rather, typically indulges in circular reasoning and frequently resorts to what might be termed a “guilt by association” approach. Thus, for instance, if Blake lived across from a Masonic Hall during his apprenticeship, then Schuchard uses that fact as a basis for assuming he was a Freemason. If Swedenborg had Masonic friends, then he must have been a Freemason. If he just happened to be in London or Holland—not merely in a city like Amsterdam, but anywhere in the whole country—when Dr. Falk was in that country, then Swedenborg must have taken lessons from him.

In other words, Schuchard’s case appears for the most part to be based on circumstantial evidence or on seemingly unrelated events and people, which are forced together to support her two theses. Note the phrase “myriad of small details, coincidences, and probabilities” in the following quotation from her doctoral dissertation. This seems to me to sum up her style of scholarship:

Cagliostro stayed in London for over a year, and his activities there involved him with many associates of William Blake, thus raising intriguing questions about the possible relationships between Blake and Dr. Falk, Lord George Gordon, Grabianka, and the Duke of Orleans, and many occultist, radical, and artistic characters who have been little examined in the Masonic context of Anglo-French events of the 1780s and 1790s. Since the situation in London was extremely complex, and since the case for possible Masonic relationships between the principals still rests on a myriad of small details, coincidences, and probabilities, the next chapter will focus on Blake’s life and examine the activities and contacts of personalities known to be his associates, as well as those who might have been by virtue of common meeting-places and interests. 4

In this article I deal with Schuchard’s theories regarding Swedenborg under the following headings:

- My Limitations
- The Conjugial Love Controversy
- Swedenborg the Spy
- Swedenborg the Freemason
MY LIMITATIONS

I have never read Blake. I have not read Kabbalistic literature, and so, for instance, do not know whether a good Kabbalist and his wife have to reverentially have sacramental intercourse to rejoin or reintegrate the male and female within God.5 I do not know whether Zinzendorf adopted Kabbalistic theories of “earthly and heavenly copulation” from “Kabbalistic Christians and heterodox Jews,”6 I do not know whether Rabbi Zinzendorf had “sexual-Masonic rituals.”7 Apart from what I do not know I also do not have access to many of the resources which Schuchard refers to, nor have I had access to an academic library.

So what do I know? I have spent nearly thirty years studying Swedenborg’s theological works. Unlike Dr. Schuchard’s heavy (and selective) reliance on secondary sources about Swedenborg, like Toksvig’s8 and White’s biographies,9 I have built my analysis on the primary sources of what Swedenborg himself wrote.

THE CONJUGIAL LOVE CONTROVERSY

One of the major difficulties that Swedenborgian readers of Schuchard’s work will come up against is that illustrated, to begin with, by a 1993 article in which Schuchard claimed that Conjugial Love is “highly erotic” and that conjugal love is to be equated with “sexual magic!”10 In an article written in 2000 she equated conjugal love with free love or merely sexual acts or sexual acts to achieve visionary experiences.11 A 2006 article referred to “Swedenborg’s controversial sexual theories”12 and claimed that Swedenborg learned his doctrine of conjugal love from Moravians and was later influenced by Kabbalistic and Sabbatian material.13 In her 2006...
book, Schuchard claims that two early Swedenborgians, Philippe Jacques de Loutherbourg and Richard Cosway began exploring “the esoteric and erotic potential of conjugal love. They both collected works of occult sexology, while indulging in non-marital affairs, carrying out Swedenborg-style pellicacy.” 14 But eight pages earlier Schuchard had admitted that they had perverted Swedenborg’s premarital pellicacy into “happy promiscuity.” 15 She shows some understanding of such chapters from *Conjugial Love* when she writes: “Swedenborg lamented the conditions that prevented early marriage, but he allowed the bachelor to use a prostitute or keep a mistress, so long as the ultimate goal was conjugal love.” 16 But then she, in contradictory fashion, refers to Dr. James Graham’s “terrestrial version of Swedenborg’s celestial sex” twenty pages later! 17

Schuchard then talks about the Nordenskjölds: “As the son of Finnish Moravian parents and nephew of a Rosicrucian alchemist, Charles Frederick and his brother Augustus Nordenskjöld fully accepted the most esoteric and erotic of Swedenborg’s visionary teachings.” 18 But then later she writes that “Like the Nordenskjöld brothers, Wadström came from a Moravian background, so Swedenborg’s spiritual eroticism did not disturb them. As clearly stated in *Conjugial Love* and the *Spiritual Diary* manuscript, which Wadström brought to London, the maintenance of prolonged ‘virile potency’ was crucial to the visionary process that achieved the ecstatic ‘marriage within the mind.’ For those men whose wives did not stimulate such erectile energies, Swedenborg’s ‘permission’ for the husband to take a concubine should be honoured. However, the man must not continue sexual relations with his wife after he established concubinism.” 19

The central issue here is the lack of supporting documentation for these conclusions in Swedenborg’s books. Again, “In *Conjugial Love*, Swedenborg argued that sexual compatibility is so crucial to spiritual vision that a diminishment of mutual attraction is a cause for serious concern.” 20 But where is the documentation? What basis is there for *De Conjugio* being classed as one of Swedenborg’s “more explicit manuscripts?” 21 How do sections of *Apocalypse Explained*, another of “Swedenborg’s more explicit manuscripts,” according to Schuchard, contain “a daring advocacy of nudity,” when they’re actually talking about angels in the highest heavens? 22 Schuchard claims that the art historians
Baron D’Hancarville and Richard Payne Knight’s “valorisation of female genitalia recalled Moravian and Swedenborgian teaching.” Their pornography, or, at best, art history, is compared by Schuchard to Swedenborg’s “affirmation that the womb has communication with heaven.” The reverse is actually the case. The angels of the “womb” province of the inmost heaven look after unborn babies in the womb. The overall pattern here appears to be that Schuchard seems to cast as many aspersions as possible in the hope that some will be proven to be correct.

A second major problem is that Schuchard’s arguments are typically so disjointed and spread over so many pages that great discernment is required of the reader to see the whole picture being presented. The difficulty of putting all the pieces together may influence the reader toward simply accepting the piecemeal pieces individually, despite their being part of a train of illogic or self-contradictory reasoning.

Anyone who has read Swedenborg’s book *Conjugial Love*, in whatever translation, is well aware that Schuchard’s description of it as being “highly erotic,” or sexual magic, is a notable misrepresentation of what is basically a dispassionate review of its subject matter. For Schuchard to support her theories, however, she has to subscribe to this premise. Secondly, she does not make a clear distinction between kabbalistic or Masonic or occultist libertines who read and/or (mis-)use Swedenborg’s books and those who subscribe to those books as a revelation from God and the basis of a Christian religion. Here again, however, she has no choice in avoiding this differentiation, since accepting it would undermine many of the linkings she makes between Swedenborg and his works and antinomian or immoral readers of them who use those works for their own purposes. To be fair, however, it should be noted that she does at least provide the reader a few hints of this differentiation in her presentation, such as noting that Grabianka went “beyond Swedenborg’s sexual theosophy,” and, towards the end of her book, distinguishing between “radical Kabbalists and Swedenborgians,” “liberal and heterodox Swedenborgians,” and “illuminated Swedenborgians.”

The minutes of the Great Eastcheap Society meetings between 4th May 1789 and 11th April 1790 were destroyed because there arose a difference of opinion amongst early denominational Swedenborgians concerning passages in *Conjugial Love*. According to the Rev. Manoah Sibly in
1839, and Isaac Hawkins and Henry Bateman in 1853, the difference of opinion concerned the issue of concubinage. Only one of the members who resigned—Robert Hindmarsh, Henry Servante, Charles Berns Wadström, Augustus Nordenskjöld, George Robinson and Alexander Wilderspin—ever had a “concubine.” Hindmarsh does not seem to have been “guilty of the excessive enthusiasm of Wadström and Nordenskjöld.” Leslie Chambers points out, however, that “Augustus Nordenskjöld was reported to have carried out the lifestyle which he believed could be found in the theology. His justification for his action is his reference to Swedenborg taking a mistress when in Italy.” It should be noted, however, that the claim of there being such a mistress has never been documented and is not credited by Swedenborgians. It is interesting that, in her 2006 book, the number of Swedenborg’s sexual experiences, according to Schuchard, increased mischievously: Instead of just one mistress, she there states that “Swedenborg reportedly kept mistresses in Sweden and Italy, and his many descriptions of sirens and whores suggest his familiarity with brothels.” Presumably when Schuchard talks about “various bizarre theories . . . of ‘conjugal love’ in the . . . Swedenborgian movements of the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries,” she is thinking of this controversy within the early, sectarian Swedenborgian community in England and within the early Academy movement in the United States.

The “Conjugal love controversy” in the early New Church did have an effect on Blake. There is “an unattributed story” of Blake proposing to his wife that he take a concubine, which caused Mrs. Blake to cry. Chambers does note that Blake, at least in theory, did approve of free love in his poetry, which is “far more liberal than any Swedenborgian attitude. Certainly there is no evidence that Blake planned to take a concubine, or indulged in free love, or was ever unfaithful to his wife.”

In 1975, Schuchard wrote: “But it was in Swedenborg’s last work, The Delights of Wisdom Pertaining to Conjugal Love, ‘After Which Follow the Pleasures of Insanity Pertaining to Scortatory Love,’ that he carried the Cabalist Shekinah or Wisdom to new extremes. In it he dealt with sexual and marital experience in the after-life, and defined a view of ‘conjugal love’ which would trouble his followers for the next one hundred and fifty years.” This overstatement is, to begin with, historically in error because the only chapters in Conjugal Love which have ever troubled
Swedenborgians over the last 200 years are those on concubinage and polygamy. Even with different interpretations amongst Swedenborgians, only Augustus Nordenskjöld ever practised any alleged immorality. Any person who has read *Conjugial Love* will know that the book is primarily about heterosexual marriages between the spiritually-aware, in this world and as angels, who look to the one God as sustaining and increasingly blessing their relationship on every level of their being, from emotional, mental, psychological, physical to sexual. For example, Swedenborg talks to an angel couple who have been happily married and have been lovers for millennia, since the dawn of humanity.36 This is what Swedenborg presents as the ideal situation, and then compares it with every other possible type of human relationship, and how these do or don’t match up to the ideal.

Schuchard places a great deal of emphasis on Blake’s alleged description to Crabb Robinson of the “‘dangerous sexual religion’ of the Swedish spirit-seer.”37 A description of Wadström and Nordenskjöld as “radical Freemasons” who were publishing “Latin editions and English translations of Swedenborg’s most erotic and occultist writings”38 could only be written by someone who has never carefully read Swedenborg’s books. Similarly “The radical Swedenborgians among the magnetizers struggled to publish Swedenborg’s more explicit writings on the methodology of the Cabalistic erotic trance, but their efforts were frustrated by a wave of counter-revolutionary prudery which developed at the turn of the century . . .,” and “Cabalistic texts and Swedenborg’s writings are full of warnings about the dangers of mental derangement that threaten the intense meditator upon magical arcane.”39

I would argue that Schuchard has read into “the erotic and magical scenes” described in the *Spiritual Diary* because she seems to believe that they encourage Swedenborgians to practise antinomianism. She then goes on to assume that Augustus Nordenskjöld’s “bold advocacy of Swedenborg’s sexual and alchemical theories exacerbated an emerging liberal-conservative split in the [London Theosophical] society.”40 From my reading of New Church history, the split was partly between various groups, some of whom wanted to read Swedenborg’s works exclusively rather than eclectically with other mystical writers, some who wanted to form a Christian denomination, and some who indulged in Freemasonry,
magic, astrology, spiritualism, or other occult practices. Later it was between a handful of men who adopted one interpretation of what Swedenborg wrote about concubinage and the far greater majority who adopted another. There was no “compromise manifesto” issued “to patch over their quarrel” that I know of. To argue that Nordenskjöld, even with his beliefs in the legitimacy of concubinage under certain restricted circumstances, equated concubinage with “open and ardent sexuality,”41 is, I think it fair to say, a forced and manipulative interpretation. Similarly, it seems presumptuous to maintain that “Blake had friends and associates—especially the Swedenborgian Masons—who were adept at Kabbalistic-Yogic interpretations and psycho-sexual techniques”42 when you haven’t documented such a position being held in the first place.

How badly Schuchard misrepresents Swedenborg’s teaching that true marriage would last to eternity, was shown in 1975 when she wrote:

In the 1758 *Heaven and Hell*, Swedenborg had spoken of marriage in heaven as purely of minds, but in 1759 he began work on *Conjugial Love* (published 1768), which concluded that heavenly marriage included the same physical sensations as a successful marriage on earth.43

If the pertinent passages in *Heaven and Hell* are studied carefully, Swedenborg modestly and discreetly implies that cohabitation and sexual relations exist in heaven.44 In *Heaven and Hell* 402 he uses the phrase “conjugial delight” when referring to marriages on earth, but those who are better acquainted with Swedenborg could easily and accurately apply it to marriages in heaven:

The conjugial delight, which is a purer and more exquisite delight of touch, transcends all the rest because of its use, which is the procreation of the human race and thereby of angels of heaven.

It is true that in *Conjugial Love* Swedenborg links it with the sense of touch,45 but only in the role of an external expression of what is most fundamentally a union of hearts and minds.46

As another example of how Schuchard misrepresents the fundamental ideas of *Conjugial Love*, we turn to her comment about a remark made
by an early London Swedenborgian, Dr. William Spence, in his book Essays. Schuchard wrote:

He [Spence] thought the resumption “of conjugal love” would cure the King faster than “blisters”—“for I verily believe no bad spirits could bear the presence of so much virtue” when the Queen would be “allowed to resumemaking with him.”

Spence’s interest in “conjugal love” as a Panacea points to another aspect of Grabianka’s London visit, for there were rumors of “frivolous erotic practices” among his “Illuminated” London associates...47

The obvious interpretation here is that the King has been promiscuous, and Spence is saying that he would enjoy far better health if he were to remain faithful to his Queen. His return to marital faithfulness would relieve him of the stress and strain brought about by his infidelity. It would eliminate his risk of exposure to sexually transmitted diseases. Spiritually, it would attract mostly unconscious angelic influences, rather than self-serving demonic influences, into his thinking. As to linking it to Count Grabianka and any alleged orgiastic activities, and reading that back into Swedenborg’s Conjugial Love, that would be laughable if it weren’t so hurtful and exasperating to those who have actually read Swedenborg’s book carefully.

One more illustration of the kind of statements Schuchard appears prone to: “Because virile potency is crucial to spiritual vision, Swedenborg argued that there were cases where an unmarried man could take a mistress and a husband could take a concubine.”48 I will deal with the first part of this quotation later on in this review. I would only note here that is hardly surprising that Schuchard cannot back up either statement in this quotation from any of Swedenborg’s works, because that is not what Swedenborg said.

SCHUCHARD’S CLAIM THAT SWEDENBORG WAS A SPY

Schuchard admits that she has a “rather unconventional approach to his [Swedenborg’s] biography.”49 Schuchard claims that Swedenborg was
a Jacobite spy for the Swedish government and that it was the Swedish Ambassador Count Gyllenborg who was able to get him out of the trouble with the English authorities from not going through the proper quarantine procedures. One wonders why the usual, and simple and straightforward, Swedenborgian explanation of Swedenborg being well-connected with the Swedish court does not suffice. 50

I will consider the Jacobite allegation first, and then deal with Swedenborg’s political affiliations.

Schuchard appears eager to present Swedenborg as involved in a Swedish-Masonic-Jacobite plot. She likens him to “the sixteenth-century ‘intelligencer’ John Dee, who worked for Queen Elizabeth I.” She argues that both Swedenborg and Dee “aroused suspicion that they manipulated their visions and encoded their writings in order to outwit other spies, who served rival courts and causes.”51 Like so many of Schuchard’s allegations, this one is also unsubstantiated, as will be shown shortly. Considering Swedenborg wrote over thirty volumes, finding three or four passages in his earlier works does not prove this contention, especially when, as we shall see, Schuchard reads her theories into the passages. Schuchard claims that to break Swedenborg’s “multilevel codes”—and we have to accept that he used kabbalistic visionary techniques—he was an Écossais Freemason, an associate of Moravians, and a spy.52 Slightly circular reasoning again!

I would, next, seriously question the validity of her proposal that Swedenborg used Biblical passages as a code for communicating with his supposed fellow conspirators. For example, she takes Biblical quotations from The Messiah about to Come to prove her case: first of all, quoting Isaiah 49:5 and then Isaiah 43:1.53 It needs to be pointed out that The Messiah about to Come is essentially a collection of Biblical passages grouped under specific themes. The first quotation is from such a section, entitled “The Messiah Again about to come that He may lead back the Jews,” while Isaiah 43:1 occurs in section VII, entitled “The Kingdom of God.” If Swedenborg is referring to Jacobite conspirators, as Schuchard alleges, what does Swedenborg mean when he quotes Isaiah 58:1 “shew to the Jacobean house their sin,” or Isaiah 59:20 “The Deliverer shall come to Zion, and to those of the Jacobites that have drawn away from sin,” or Isaiah 2:5 “O Jacobean house, let us walk in the light of Jehovah,” or Isaiah
9:20–22, “The remnant of the Jacobites shall return unto God”?54 Who is the Jacobite the Lord delivered from prison, using the quotation from Isaiah 43:1?55 The only references to “Jacobeans” in Swedenborg’s biblical commentaries, listed on the CD NewSearch 98 (Release 2) under “Jacobeans,” usually refer to the descendants of the Hebrew patriarch Jacob.56 How does she understand other quotations from the Bible which mention “Jacobites,”57 or “Jacobeans in The Messiah about to Come”58

The difficulties with Schuchard’s proposal can be seen by considering the occurrences of the words “Jacobite” and “Jacobean” in The Word Explained, which was written shortly after The Messiah about to Come, and seems to be alluded to in the note written by Swedenborg on 17th November 1745, at the end of The Messiah about to Come. In Acton’s index to The Word Explained (henceforth “WE”) on page 65, we have a section entitled “Israelites and Jacobites.” In this section there is a reference to “The crime of the Jacobites, ill., 1598.” If WE 1598 is examined, we find that Swedenborg refers to “Jacob’s descendants lay with the daughters of Moab and with the Midianitish women, for which deed twenty-four thousand of the Jacobeans were put to death by command of Moses (see Num. chap. 25, etc.),” So on the basis of WE 1598, “Jacobites” is equivalent to “Jacobeans,” and Swedenborg is referring to the descendants of Jacob. In WE 1430 Swedenborg mentions “the offerings of the Jacobean church, or of that church which consists of those who are like Jacob.”59 The Word Explained 4256 reads: “One of the reasons why these laws [Exodus 19:1–25] were now promulgated in such great glory was because the Jacobites were now worse than any other nation in the entire globe, being ignorant of all natural statutes because in a perverted order of life.”60

It needs to be pointed out that in each of these passages in the original Hebrew of the Old Testament, “Jacob” is used eponymously to mean his descendants, the Israelites, as can be seen by the eponymous use of Israel in the poetic parallelism, which usually follows. “Jacobite” is the same as “Jacobeans.” If there is a code involved, Schuchard would not only have to explain all the passages in the Messiah about to Come and The Word Explained, but also how the code works. She would then need to explain why this work was left as a manuscript, and not published and circulated to the alleged fellow Jacobite conspirators. Schuchard would then have to find in Swedenborg’s later works, possibly using tools like the General Index to
Swedenborg’s Scripture Quotations, or NewSearch 98 (Release 2), further use of “Jacobites” to mean people sympathetic to the Stuart King James II. I doubt such evidence can be found.

Schuchard’s treatment of the two quotations mentioning “Jacobites” is highly selective at best, contrived at worst. However, since she has ignored other texts in this book, there is no constraint on her choosing to read into the quotations whatever she likes. A further problem I have with her use of The Messiah about to Come is that she does not list what she sees as wrong with traditional Swedenborgian interpretations of this book. She would need to point out the flaws in such treatments, as well as in the “Jacobite” passages which she ignores, to make her case more plausible.

Schuchard’s use of Swedenborg’s paraphrastic summary of Ezekiel 40:1–49 in The Messiah about to Come is similarly open to interpretation.

I find Schuchard’s use of a paragraph from the Spiritual Diary regarding Maul dubious. Firstly, she needs to provide more detailed evidence that the Maul mentioned is the “James Maule, a Scottish captain employed by the Swedish East India Company.” Secondly, she needs to show convincingly that it was on Masonic grounds that Swedenborg knew him, not just because Swedenborg had travelled on his ship. What Schuchard fails to mention is that leading officials in the Swedish East India Company, such as Sven Wenngren, an adviser to it and secretary of it, Nicolas Sahlgren, a director of it, and G. F. Beyer, one of its cargo officers, as well as local merchants in Gothenburg, including its mayor, and local sea captains, such as Peter Hammarberg, had formed a reading group to study Swedenborg’s Writings in 1768. Swedenborg corresponded with and visited members of this group during his lifetime.

We next turn to the question of which political party Swedenborg belonged to, if any. Schuchard accuses Swedenborg’s biographers of placing him in the wrong political party. She alleges that there was a “lifelong commitment of his family and relatives to the pro-French, pro-Jacobite political party known as the ‘Hats’ (who competed with the pro-English, pro-Hanoverian ‘Caps’). The excessive secrecy of the Hats, caused by Cap persecution, was a determining influence on Swedenborg’s behavior and writing. Swedenborg’s Hat colleagues also supposedly maintained a secret Masonic system that provided an ‘interior organization’ and interna-
tional communication network which served their political agenda. That this was also a kabbalistic and Rosicrucian agenda added another layer of secrecy to policies that operated on earth as well as in heaven."\(^{67}\) She further alleges that “Benzelius burned many of his papers because of their ‘dangerous political contents’ shortly before his death in September 1743.”\(^{68}\)

As to Schuchard’s allegation that Swedenborgians have regarded Swedenborg as a member of the wrong political party, the only evidence I have found in Swedenborgian sources is that Swedenborgians have always regarded him as an independent! Rev. Dr. Rudolph Tafel in his *Documents Concerning the Life and Character of Emanuel Swedenborg* (1875) quotes the opinion of the author of *The New Church and its Influence on the Study of Theology in Sweden*:

As a member of the House of Nobles, Swedenborg belonged neither to the party of the “hats,” nor to that of the “caps” in those times, but was an independent member, supporting whatever he saw to be worthy of his own position, and to be right and generally useful, without allowing himself to be influenced neither by the right or the left side. He, like every true friend of liberty, was opposed alike to despotism and to anarchy.\(^{69}\)

In Tafel’s *Documents* there is a reference to a comment by Dean Peter Wieselgren, the editor of the *Dela
gardiska Arkivet*, volume XI, that Swedenborg was a member of the “Caps” party. However, this is on the basis of Wieselgren mistakenly having attributed a tirade against Bidenius Renhorn to Swedenborg.\(^{70}\) It would not be surprising for Schuchard to wrongly attribute this quotation to Tafel, and thus Swedenborgians in general. In my review of “Why Mrs. Blake Cried,” I pointed out several occasions when Schuchard attributed quotations to the wrong person.\(^{71}\) Looking through Cyriel Sigstedt’s biography of Swedenborg, I can’t find any reference to Swedenborg being described as a member of the “Caps.” It was the “Hats” who had involved Sweden “in extensive foreign loans” and “large imports,” and it would thus be unlikely in the extreme that Swedenborg would be involved in supporting any such measures.

I have a number of difficulties with Schuchard’s interpretation of paragraph 4827 of *Spiritual Diary*. Swedenborg wrote in this passage that a
cap symbolizes a person’s “perceptions and credulities,” and yet Schuchard would have us believe that “Swedenborg always used the words cap and hat with full recognition of their political meanings in Sweden,” without justifying this unsubstantiated allegation. The fact is that Count Carl Gyllenborg, the Swedish Ambassador in London, who Schuchard alleges is Swedenborg’s Hat and Masonic spy-master,72 was seen by Swedenborg in the spiritual world wearing a cap!73 Similarly, Swedenborg wears a cap, which also contradicts Schuchard’s proposal that he was a Hat.74

If other passages in the Spiritual Diary are examined, it can be easily established that the cap symbolizes a person’s delusions or machinations or self-intelligence.75 Schuchard interprets Swedenborg’s statement that Maul “is not allowed to touch others with a hand, or the fingers; for in this way he almost destroyed them—which . . . corresponded to his life in this world,” as meaning that “he deceived his colleagues, and betrayed a secret Masonic handgrip and finger signs.”76 However, this statement basically demonstrates Schuchard’s lack of familiarity with Swedenborg’s theological works since what they teach here, which Swedenborg is actually alluding to, is the reality in the spiritual world, where one way people communicate their thoughts and feelings and delusions, and control of others, is by means of use of their hands or fingers. Spirits of a weaker disposition or more naive frame of mind run the risk of being controlled or manipulated by someone who is more persuasive or dogmatic, or certain of his or her beliefs, should weaker spirits allow themselves to be touched.77

Turning to another aspect: If Swedenborg is so pro-Stuart, as Schuchard is proposing, why in his “Memorial to the Houses of the Diet, in Favour of Re-instating Senators Baron Von Höpken, Baron Palmstjerna, and Baron Scheffer” does he imply that “the Babylonian whore (which is the Catholic religion) has fascinated and bewitched” “the king of England [James II], shortly before the house of Hanover was chosen to the throne, and how it is still dallying with the pretender?”78

In summary, I find it exceedingly difficult to understand how Swedenborg “provided a powerful and valuable intelligence tool to his embattled country . . . as a secret agent on earth as well as in heaven.”79
SCHUCHARD’S SWEDENBORG

SCHUCHARD’S CLAIM THAT SWEDENBORG
WAS A FREEMASON

Was Swedenborg a Freemason? I should say at the outset that this issue does not concern me since I do not believe that it would affect his theological Writings even if he was a Freemason. I should also note that I am not a Freemason. However, as in the other subject areas discussed above, I do object when Schuchard reads things into passages of Swedenborg’s theological and non-theological works in order to try to construct evidence that he was a Freemason.

To begin with, Schuchard admits that “Though there is a strong oral tradition in Sweden that Swedenborg was a Freemason, there is apparently no surviving documentary proof of his initiation.” She then reviews the sketchy evidence she feels supports the idea that he was initiated either in Lund, Sweden, or London, England. Part of her difficulty in proving Swedenborg was a Freemason is that she did not have access to Masonic archives since the British and Swedish Masonic archives are not available to historical researchers, although French Masonic records are. There are also the forty volumes of unpublished papers of General Charles Rainsford in the British Museum, which give some idea of international Freemasonry in the late eighteenth century. Schuchard also admits that Masonic records from about 1719, to do with Jacobite plots against the Hanoverian English monarch, were destroyed. Rev. Dr. Rudolph Tafel, a noted scholar on Swedenborg, argues that Swedenborg wasn’t a Freemason, and points out historical errors in Samuel Beswick’s arguments.

Just because Swedenborg knew many members of the Royal Society in London who were Freemasons does not prove his “guilt by association.” Indeed, with regard to his Royal Society associates, the question can be raised, why, if Swedenborg was a Freemason and was well-known by its leading members, was he never admitted into Society membership? He certainly donated some of his books to The Royal Society’s library. Surely if being a Freemason was as important as Schuchard maintains, his Masonic brothers would have elected him a member!

I would argue that Schuchard has misinterpreted Swedenborg’s Memorial to the King of June 10 1717, in which he asks “for the freeing of
workmen from the domination of the trade guilds.”86 Schuchard interprets this as applying to Masonic reforms, an argument I find hard to follow87 and, interestingly, ten years later Schuchard herself seems to have significantly modified her position: “Advocating a reform of the guilds, he may have introduced elements of Masonry that he learned about in England, for his report emphasized the kinds of reforms that elevated operative Masonry into a wide-ranging and prestigious profession.”88 Similarly, she misreads Swedenborg’s comment to his brother-in-law in a letter of 4th March 1716, about establishing a mathematical society, which “would be as necessary and useful as a philosophisk society, and would heal our land more than ever the latter would, both in the establishment of manufacturier and in connection with mines, navigation, etc.” This statement makes much more sense literally than applied to mathematical magic, like that of English Rosicrucians.89

Another apparent misreading is Schuchard’s conclusion that, “In 1733 Swedenborg undertook an intelligence mission to the Polish theatre of war and diplomacy, and he gave a cautionary report on his findings to the Swedish foreign affairs committee when he returned.”90 If we consult Swedenborg’s travel diary for 1733,91 he does not seem to have travelled to Poland.92 We also note that there is a difference of opinion amongst Swedenborgian scholars as to whether Swedenborg ever submitted this memorial to the Secret Committee of the Diet in 1734.93 Even allowing for a trip by Swedenborg to Vienna in 1733,94 we do not have any details of what was accomplished on the trip, and so Schuchard (and we) do not have enough information to determine what, in fact, Swedenborg did on that trip. Even if the Swedish New Church scholar F.G. Lindh is correct in his research—that Louis XV had given Swedenborg a lifelong secret pension for his help during the Polish crisis95—to what degree, if any, does this support Schuchard’s hypothesis? Schuchard assumes that Louis XV paid for the publication of Arcana Coelestia, provided that Swedenborg published it anonymously.96 But Swedenborg published all his theological works anonymously until 1769, when his identity as their author became public knowledge!

Another example of Schuchard “reading into” Swedenborg’s words or incidents in his life: She interprets “his visionary experiences in ‘angelic societies’ in the 1740’s”97 as meaning that he was involved in Kabbalistic
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instruction in Masonic groups in Amsterdam and London. However, Swedenborg’s works clearly define “angelic societies” as being in heaven. For instance, Rev. Norman Ryder’s work on Swedenborg and the Royal Society concludes with a quotation from a reply Swedenborg wrote to Rev. Thomas Hartley, about which literary societies he (i.e. Swedenborg) belonged to:

I am an Associate and Member of the Royal Academy of Sciences of Stockholm, by invitation . . . I have never asked to be received into any other learned society elsewhere, because I am in an angelic society, and there, only such things are dealt with as pertain to heaven and the soul, while in societies of the learned, it is things that pertain to the world and the body.

It is also interesting that Dr. Karl-Erik Sjödén remains unconvinced of any definitive linking between Swedenborgians and Freemasons:

the masonic “Swedenborgianism” of the seventeen-sixties is just a myth, consciously or unconsciously held by some authors in order to support the teachings of freemasonry by means of New Church doctrines.

From my study of early New Church history, most early Swedenborgians, before the founding of a New Church denomination, were syncretists. Some were into alchemy or mesmerism or spiritualism; some were into Freemasonry; some were into reading the writings of various mystics; some were into astrology or magic; and some were into whatever combination or permutation of them was possible. However, there were also purists or exclusivists who only read and studied Swedenborg’s theological Writings, and who regarded the activities of syncretists with concern or reservation, or even suspicion.

SWEDENBORG AND THE KABBALAH OR CABALA

Schuchard proposes that Swedenborg studied Jewish mysticism beginning in his student days at university, that he studied Kabbalah under various Rabbis, and that he practised Kabbalistic vision-inducement tech-
niques throughout his life. Before looking at Schuchard’s arguments, we will examine what other non-Swedenborgian scholars have said about the alleged influence of the Kabbalah on Swedenborg.

There is evidence that Swedenborg had some exposure to Jewish Mysticism, or Kabbalah. For instance, he does seem to quote Kabbalistic ideas in his book The Philosopher’s Notebook. However, there is disagreement about just how much Swedenborg knew about the Kabbalah. In 1915 Lamm argued that Swedenborg was aware of Kabbalistic ideas through his secondhand knowledge of the Cambridge theologians Cudworth and More. Lamm also argues that Swedenborg was exposed to Kabbalistic philosophy through reading Paracelsus and van Helmont, and occasionally uses occult terminology, which these two writers also used, such as Alkahesi, which was the “universal elixir that would reduce every natural body” into “its initial components.” However, in 1971 Inge Jonsson argued that “Swedenborg was not attracted by the Kabbalah, and we find none of Boehme’s linguistic mysticism in his writings.” Later, in his biography of Swedenborg, Jonsson states, “How familiar Swedenborg was with the rabbinic tradition and the Cabala is uncertain, but one can find numerous examples of an extremely negative attitude on his part” to any philosophy apart from his own in The Spiritual Diary, such as the following quotation:

By philosophy or human intelligence are also meant fairy tales and silly stories such as have formerly been and still are typical of the Rabbinical writers, and are beyond number; likewise also the magical acts of the Egyptians. 1748, 20 March.

Jonsson comments on this passage: “Statements of this nature should make us extremely cautious about attributing any influence on Swedenborg by the Cabala, . . . which has not seldom been done.”

In 1998 Schuchard wrote “From 1728 to 1732 a disillusioned and depressed Swedenborg became interested in the Hermetic theosophy of Johan Conrad Dippel and the Christian Cabalism of the Moravian Brethren.” In 1915 Martin Lamm pointed out that it was difficult to pinpoint when Swedenborg was influenced by Dippel. Lamm is not sure that Swedenborg ever met Dippel, and admits that he cannot find a time in
Swedenborg’s life or a place in his books in which this influence is obvious. There is evidence in the *Spiritual Diary* (or *Spiritual Experiences*) that Swedenborg had read Dippel.

There is a passage in *Last Judgement* (*posthumous*), in which Swedenborg talks about symbolism, as of gold of being “the goodness of love,” which suggests that, even if Swedenborg was aware of the symbolic interpretations amongst the Kabbalists, he didn’t take them literally. Among his dreams of 21–22 July 1744 Swedenborg had a dream about the air being full of gold, which he interprets symbolically as referring to the all-embracing Providence of the Lord looking after his spiritual and material needs. In Lamm’s opinion, Swedenborg’s system of thought is much clearer, more integrated and more logical than those of Boehme, Fludd, and others. Lamm then goes on to point out that: “His system, the theory of correspondences, doubtless constitutes an element of occultism; but, in the methodical form he gives it, it loses every trace of magic.”

This opinion is diametrically opposed to Schuchard’s theory that Swedenborg was involved in Kabbalistic magical practices. For example, Schuchard misinterprets Toksvig by writing that Swedenborg “believed that sensation was a power of the soul rather than of the body, a power the soul continued to possess after ‘death,’ to such an extent that it could hallucinate itself a spiritual body with more exquisite sensations than it had before” (Toksvig, pp. 121, 319). Schuchard does not seem to be aware that Toksvig’s approach to Swedenborg was as a kind of psychic researcher interested in his visions of the afterlife. The spiritual body which Toksvig refers to not merely a magical construct; it was a true reflection of one’s deepest desires and thoughts. In other words, even Toksvig, a non-Swedenborgian looking for psychic phenomena in Swedenborg’s experience, finds Swedenborg’s theory of correspondences non-magical.

Another of Schuchard’s allegations: she argues that Swedenborg “sought out Jewish Kabbalists in the east End, and he soon came under the spell of Dr. Samuel Jacob Falk, known as the ‘Baal Shem’ of London (Master of the magical names of God). Falk was a crypto-Sabbatian.” Shortly afterwards, she says that “Swedenborg became suspicious of the sincerity of Dr. Falk, whose apparent Christian sympathies clothed his private Sabbatian beliefs.” Such statements seem to suggest a close
relationship between Swedenborg and Falk, which Schuchard attempts to reinforce as an historical fact by the illustration on the front cover of her article in *Esoterica*. However she does not provide any definitive evidence to support this hypothesis. She is confined to simply stating a hope that Masonic records, to which, as noted above, she did not and does not have access, would help prove this hypothesis:

Though the possibility of Swedenborg’s contact with the London Baal-Shem has never been pointed out, and requires more documentation from Masonic archives to be more than a hypothesis, it is worth investigation, as the figure of Samuel Jacob Chayim Falk played an intriguing but still inadequately analyzed role in the development of occultism and radicalism within English Freemasonry, Swedenborgianism, and politics.¹¹⁹

In other words, Schuchard provides no definitive proof that Swedenborg knew Dr. Falk. In 1975 she instead listed vague, circumstantial possibilities of this acquaintanceship, which I will now deal with. Most fundamentally, the strongest evidence she produces is that they might have met in either Holland or London sometime between 1740 and 1742! Even accepting that Swedenborg and Falk might have both lived in Wellclose Square at one stage, for Schuchard to conclude from Bergström’s testimony that Swedenborg “usually walked out after breakfast,”¹²⁰ and that “Eric Bergstrom, the tavern keeper, said Swedenborg went out each morning on some unknown business,”¹²¹ is no proof that Swedenborg went to visit Falk.¹²¹ She also proposes that two early members of the London Swedenborgian Theosophical Society, who were also Freemasons, were influenced by Falk: One was the Marquis de Thomé, who supposedly learned Cabala from Falk in the 1770s. The other was General Rainsford, who was asked by the Paris Convention of International Freemasons in 1784 to find out information about several subjects and people, including Dr. Falk and Swedenborg.¹²² Again, there is no clear evidence here that Schuchard’s surmise is correct.

Schuchard even reads into Toksvig’s angel spokesman of a heavenly society in *Spiritual Diary* § 1145¹/₂, by interpreting the society to be Falk’s kabbalist-masonic group,¹²³ which is, to say the least, not exactly definitive proof! It is also of interest that she left her circumstantial “proofs” that
Swedenborg knew Falk out of her e-article “Why Mrs Blake Cried.” By that 1999 work, she merely claims that Swedenborg’s contact with Falk is “probable.”¹²⁴ In her 2006 book Schuchard changes her position again and claims that the connection between Swedenborg and Falk was through a Dr. Smith, whom she identifies as Dr. William Smith, a Freemason and someone who “participated in Moravian affairs.”¹²⁵ She provides only circumstantial evidence that this was the Dr. Smith of Brockmer’s story.¹²⁶ Schuchard then concludes, yet again without proof, that the “good Israelites” who had visited Swedenborg, while he had an ecstatic trance, were Dr. Falk and his “factotum Hirsch Kalisch.”¹²⁷ However, she neglects to mention that, according to Chastanier after Springer, the two Jews who had visited had stolen Swedenborg’s gold watch!¹²⁸ This would further blacken the antinomian reputation of Falk amongst orthodox Jews and Christians.¹²⁹

A still further example of Schuchard’s use of innuendo and misinterpretation is found in her interpretation of a passage in *Conjugial Love* which describes Swedenborg’s journey to one of the ancient heavens, where the people used art to symbolize different aspects of the love that monogamous, married couples have for each other. Schuchard links this with orgies in her paragraph before the passage’s mention, or “sexual experimentation” and “erotic art,” in the paragraph following its mention.¹³⁰ However, the fact of the matter is that this vision of Swedenborg’s contains no phallic or vaginal symbols, but “pieces of wood and stone carved to resemble human beings and various animals, birds and fishes. ‘What are they?’ I asked the angel. ‘Are they not idols?’ ‘Far from it,’ he answered. ‘They are shapes designed to depict various moral virtues and spiritual truths. The peoples of that age knew about correspondences; and since every person, animal, bird and fish corresponds to some quality, each carving depicts some aspect of a virtue or truth, and a number of them taken together depict the whole virtue or truth in its general full form.’”¹³¹ Then in her 2006 book, appealing to this passage in *Conjugial Love* and another, *Conjugial Love* § 56, Schuchard changes her interpretation again, and claims that Swedenborg “would later refer to a secret society in which ‘spirits from Asia’ teach initiates how to meditate on emblems of conjugal love, carved in stone or cast in silver.”¹³² Yet again
Schuchard seems unable to accept the standard and straightforward interpretation of Swedenborg’s visions, namely that they occurred in the next world.

On many occasions Schuchard presents her thesis as proven, before actually proving it, by coloring her evidence. So, for example, she misinterprets Toksvig’s attempt to prove that Swedenborg obtained quite a bit of his early writing from spirits through automatic writing. On one occasion Toksvig argues that a Gentile Christian or Judaeo-Christian from the second century is speaking through Swedenborg. However Schuchard misinterprets this proposal to mean that a contemporary Kabbalistic Jew, such as Dr. Falk, is talking to him, and that the reason he is not allowed to disclose more arcana is because he does not want to betray the secrets of his Jewish teachers!

Schuchard presumes that Swedenborg had to have Kabbalistic training to write the *Arcana Coelestia*:

> Whatever the nature of Swedenborg’s Jewish mentors, by 1749 he felt confident enough in his own Cabalistic powers to spend the next years on the voluminous *Arcana Coelestia*.135

Here is another demonstration of where, I believe, Schuchard is not academically rigorous enough. She points out some pattern of what she sees as similarities and then treats those similarities as proof of total dependence and identification. To appreciate her use of this practice, it is useful to compare her assessment of Swedenborg and the Kabbalah with that of another non-Swedenborgian academic, who is far more meticulous and precise. I will quote a passage from Professor Antón Pacheco’s book *Visionary Consciousness: Emanuel Swedenborg and the Immanence of Spiritual Reality*—Dr. Pacheco is the Professor of Philosophy at Seville University in Spain:

> We believe that Swedenborg’s whole philosophical and theological system largely hinges on spiritual hermeneutics, just as all of kabbalistic speculation, for example, hinges on its spiritual exegesis. This amounts to saying that Swedenborg’s philosophical and theological system hinges on the inner experience of apprehending meaning and assimilating it
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(hence the existential dimension of all spiritual hermeneutics). Actually it is possible to assert that Swedenborg’s exegetical work is an imposing **midrash** (just like the Kabbalah). By this we do not mean to suggest any historical dependence on Swedenborg’s part with respect to the Kabbalah or Hebrew midrashic literature. When we apply the term “midrashim” to the interpretations employed by Swedenborg, we are making reference to an identical phenomenology in the interpretation of the spiritual sense: a phenomenology based on themes, foundations, and experiences common to both midrashic literature of the Kabbalah and to the Scandinavian thinker. The comparative study of kabbalistic and Swedenborgian exegesis makes it possible to term both as midrashic (the same could be said about Shi’ite and Isma’ili exegesis).¹³⁶

The phenomenology of interpreting the Bible or the Quran according to visionary experiences might be common to Swedenborg, Kabbalists, and Muslim mystics, but, as Pacheco points out, it does not necessarily imply direct borrowing between any of them.¹³⁷

One more example of Schuchard’s circular reasoning is that she claims that Swedenborg “maintained a love-hate relationship with the Jews who continued to instruct him in Kabbalistic techniques of meditation and Bible interpretation.” Yet she hasn’t proven Dr. Falk was even an acquaintance! She then suggests that because “of the prevailing anti-Semitism” of Sweden, Swedenborg distanced “his published writings from their Jewish sources” despite having failed to prove that Swedenborg employed “Jewish sources” for his books to begin with. Nor does she stop there, but even goes on to claim that Swedenborg “gradually displaced his Kabbalistic theories from Israel to Asia, which was considered a more acceptable source of mysticism in contemporary Sweden.”¹³⁸

SWEDENBORG AND SEXUAL TECHNIQUES
FOR INDUCING VISIONS

In her “Emanuel Swedenborg: Deciphering the Codes of Celestial and Terrestrial Intelligencer” (1999) article, Schuchard once again presumes that she has established that Swedenborg is a kabbalistic visionary before she has in fact proven it.¹³⁹ She fails to explain why Swedenborg “practiced
Kabbalah in order to achieve communication with spirits.” She states that “Swedenborg’s path often crossed those of famous kabbalistic adventurers—such as King Theodore of Corsica, Dr. Samuel Jacob Falk, Comte de Saint-Germain, Giacomo Casanova, and Count Cagliostro,” and then alleges this proves “the surprising prevalence and strange ‘normality’ of governmental projects in extra-sensory perception in the eighteenth century” without, yet again, justifying this allegation. Then, only four pages later, she states that Swedenborg’s contact with Dr. Samuel Jacob Falk is “probable”! However, seven years earlier she had asserted that, “Secretly associated with the radical Sabbatians of Poland and with French agents of the Stuart cause, Falk instructed Swedenborg in Cabalistic trance techniques and sexual magic, which they believed would usher in a spiritual and political millennium.”

Similarly, Schuchard alleges that “Swedenborg gained access to the visionary techniques of Rabbi Moses Luzzatto, the great Hebrew poet and Kabbalist, during this visits to Amsterdam in 1740 and 1743” but a page later suggests that “It is certainly plausible that Swedenborg met or heard about Luzzatto, through his own Moravian and Masonic associations. In fact, Luzzatto’s theories and writings provide a strikingly effective key to many of Swedenborg’s most cryptic passages.” Again, Schuchard claims that “Though Luzzatto’s friendships with Christians in Amsterdam were considered remarkable, little is known about who they were” without citation of evidence to support this conclusion. Schuchard fails to demonstrate conclusively that Swedenborg ever met Luzzatto, or, as noted previously, Falk. Later on in her article, Schuchard claims that, between May 1744 and June 1745, “Swedenborg carefully maintained his incognito while he pursued his kabbalistic studies with unnamed Jews in London.” Yet again an assertion innocent of any credible evidence.

This brings us back to the central issue here—Schuchard’s suggestion that “virile potency is crucial to spiritual visions,” and her related allegation that Swedenborg’s teachings about concubinage and mistresses were a consequence of this. According to Schuchard, . . . while associating with Moravian and Jewish mystics in London, the fifty-six year-old Swedenborg learned how to perform the mystical
Kabbalistic marriage within his mind, through the sublimation of his sexual energy into visionary energy. By meditating on the male and female potencies concealed in the vessels of Hebrew letters, by visualizing these letters in the forms of human bodies, by regulating the inhalation and exhalation of breath, and by achieving an erection without progress to ejaculation, the reverent Kabbalist could achieve an orgasmic trance state that elevated him to the world of spirits and angels. Thus, Swedenborg became experienced in heavenly sexuality, which he—like the Kabbalists—believed to be the essence of the reintegrated God.

As a trained scientist and student of anatomy, Swedenborg recorded with rare objectivity the physiological processes of the erotic and visionary trance. Describing his own sensations in brain corticals, lung rhythms, abdominal muscles, and seminal duct, he provided a unique “scientific” record of paranormal states.147

This is an amazing theory—not least because Schuchard here again fails to prove her basic assertion that Swedenborg ever associated with Moravian and Jewish mystics in the first place. It is also unfortunate that she attempts to gives Swedenborg’s anatomical works such a sexual connotation. She does not appear to appreciate that he was one of Europe’s leading scientific anatomists of his day, which would hardly seem in keeping with such a lurid interpretation of his interests. As far as Swedenborg meditating on Hebrew letters, the nearest she could get to documentation was a note that he had a dream of three Latin words, *sacrarium et sanctuarium*, or “shrine and sanctuary.”148 Schuchard interprets this as “a veiled description of his Kabbalistic-style ecstatic experience, which he achieved through meditation on the Hebrew letters.”149 It is interesting that she even proposes that sexual contact is not necessary for the ecstatic Kabbalist to gain visionary experiences!150

Yet another example of Schuchard’s “guilt by association” approach is seen when she argues that, because Swedenborg wrote books on anatomy, he could control his cremaster and thereby induce visions in a Kabbalistic way! She then goes on to misinterpret a passage from the *Spiritual Diary* to support her theory. She takes the phrase “genital respiration” to refer to Abulafia’s and later Kabbalists’ method of inducing visions through controlling their sexual energies.151 Swedenborg never uses the phrase “geni-
tal respiration.” He uses “a respiration which belonged only to [the re-
gion] of the loins, as far as the soles of the foot;” “abdominal [respirations] 
[pertaining] to the region of the genital members [and] loins” and “respi-
ration about the province of the genital members.”

On the surface this may appear to provide some support for her thesis,
but in each of these passages Swedenborg talks about other types of 
respiration, such as “[a respiration] belonging only to the foot and sole,”
and “a respiration of the left side, and not at the same time of the right 
side.” Schuchard never mentions these other forms of respiration. What 
Swedenborg in fact seems to be referring to in these passages is a situation 
which occurred more obviously amongst our earliest ancestors, but still 
occurs among deceased people in the next world: If people are very 
worldly, their degree of inspiration is reflected by the fact that their 
respiration appears to come from their feet. People who are the most 
devoted to their spouses and who are the most family-oriented, breathe 
seemingly from their loins. However, their diametrically opposite de-
praved relatives breathe similarly, but it is a counterfeit or a perversion of 
the former. Whatever our true nature, our body and surroundings in the 
next world reflect it or mirror it, including the atmosphere we create or 
feel most comfortable in.

The technique of controlling the cremaster to encourage mystical 
experiences apparently involves control of the flow of semen. Schuchard 
claims to find support for Swedenborg’s mastery of this in Conjugial 
Love. However, here again Schuchard is attempting to interpret a spiri-
tual experience as a sexual one and so misattributes her citation. 
Swedenborg is here quoting a group of English people who have passed 
into the next world—not, as Schuchard claims, Swedenborg’s own opin-
ion and therefore evidence that he could control his cremaster muscles. 
She takes a sentence from Conjugial Love paragraph 374. The context is 
that of jealous husbands who, due to imagining that their wives are having 
affairs, become either temporarily or permanently impotent. (She is 
apparently unaware that, according to Swedenborg, married angels are 
always potent.) She then goes on to misconstrue Conjugial Love par-
agraph 55:4, which does not in fact talk about how a male can “maintain a 
prolonged erection,” but are the words of men who cannot control their
“roving eye,” and who allow themselves to be sexually excited by any good-looking woman who passes by. In a still further example of lifting a quotation out of context, Schuchard misuses Swedenborg’s letter to Beyer of 30th April 1770, in which Swedenborg talks about the worship of the Lord Jesus Christ being the basis of the revealed teachings he wrote down in his book *True Christian Religion*:

Next June I go to Amsterdam where I intend to publish the Universal Theology of the New Church. Worship of the Lord is the foundation, and if the true house or temple be not built thereon, others will build thereon lupinaria or brothels.160

Swedenborg uses the same phrase in a letter to “Bishop Mennander, the Pro Chancellor of the University of Äbo, Finland” on 20th July 1770:

In a few days I am leaving for Amsterdam where I will give to the press the whole theology of the New Church, the foundation whereof will be the worship of the Lord our Savior, whereon, if no temple be now built, brothels will likely be established later.

Schuchard also cites this passage as support of her conclusions that Swedenborg is guilty of Masonic and Kabbalistic excursions into masturbation and orgies:

However, emerging scandals among the Sabbatians—who were accused of practising cults of masturbation and group sex—and rival claimants to Swedenborg’s role as a Masonic and Kabbalistic guru made him worry that his Temple of Love was being turned into a brothel (*lupinaria*).161

Yet again, in other words, Schuchard reads into Swedenborg support for her theory, in this case turning the “Temple of Wisdom,” a place for angel instruction in spirituality which Swedenborg saw in heaven, into an earthly, materialistic, man-made brothel.162

A still further example: When Schuchard talks about a “religio-sexual experience” Swedenborg had in Leipzig in 1733, she adds the sexual interpretation because her source, Toksvig, only describes it as a mystical
experience. It seems very Freudian (in a reductionistic way) to argue that every visionary experience must be sexual!

The issue of Swedenborg having mistresses is summarily dealt with without examining the historical accuracy of such allegations. Once again, it seems that Schuchard cites evidence to support her hypothesis without consideration of the evidence’s credibility.

Having proposed that Swedenborg used Kabbalistic vision-induce ment techniques, Schuchard then goes on to suggest in her 2000 article that Swedenborg had learned about Tibetan and Chinese Yogic techniques through Swedish soldier-scholars used by the Russians to explore the interiors of Siberia and Tartary. The problem with this proposal is that, as in examples already noted, her supposed source of information, an article by the Swedish scholar, Dr. Anders Hallengren, does not say anything about yoga or sexual visionary techniques. He writes about the myth of Shambhala and the possibility of an ancient written revelation still existing amongst people living near Mongolia. Similarly, Swedenborg’s “Greater Tartary” is not Tibet, as Schuchard claims Hallengren argues, but among the Turkic-Mongolian people of Mongolia, between Tibet and Siberia. Interestingly, by 2006 Schuchard seems to have jettisoned this speculative argument, because she then tries to connect Swedenborg to Yogic meditation techniques through Moravian missionaries to India. Swedenborg does not in fact propose that “the Yogis of Great Tartary discovered the secrets of Kabbalism long before the Jews.”

Schuchard then goes on to say in her 2000 article: “From his Yogic-Kabbalistic sources, Swedenborg learned the meditative practices shared by husband and wife, which raise the act of conjugal love to cosmic significance.” In her 2006 book Schuchard asserts that Swedenborg claimed that “traditions of the ‘Generative Potency’ were preserved ‘in Tartary.’” Once again she offers no convincing proof. I would, however, agree that there is some evidence of a similarity between Swedenborg controlling his breathing and Yogic breathing techniques to induce visions. However, Schuchard cites work by Stephen Larsen for support of this theory, but Larsen does not mention anything about Tantric material—nor does he mention any need for Swedenborg to indulge in sexual techniques to induce visions!
To summarize here, I am proposing that Schuchard misused both Hallengren’s and Larsen’s work by reading a sexual element into them or presuming that the only way to obtain visions is through sexual practices. Again, to allege that Swedenborg “received reinforcement for his Kabbalistic-Yogic interests” from two members of the Royal Society in London, Dr. James Parsons and Martin Folkes, is speculation based on circumstantial evidence. As noted earlier, if these acquaintances of Swedenborg were so close, why didn’t they nominate him to become a member of the Royal Society?

Schuchard’s basic position is that “virile potency is crucial to spiritual vision.”173 There were times during 1743 and 1744, when Swedenborg noticed a reduction in his sexual urges,174 which, if Schuchard’s theory is correct, should have reduced his “spiritual vision.” However, Swedenborg makes no mention of any such reduction. Schuchard attempts to sidestep this problem, writing that, “Nevertheless, given his still-powerful sex-drive, his struggle for sublimation was difficult, as reflected in the sexually disturbed scenes recorded in his diary.”175 It does not appear to her that there might be a much simpler explanation, i.e., that the sexual dreams of the Journal of Dreams may be just those typical of a bachelor having “wet dreams.”

What did Swedenborg himself say about how his visionary experiences came about? I did a quick survey of what he wrote in his books Conjugial Love and True Christian Religion. Far from having any sexual basis, at times he psychically heard something176 or saw something in the next world177 and was allowed by the Lord to transfer his consciousness into the that world and explore. Sometimes he was meditating on a phenomenon in the world of nature, and then his consciousness was switched into the next world.178 At other times he was just wandering around the spiritual world exploring,179 and he might see things in the distance.180 Or, during a conversation with angels, they would then show him various scenes in the spiritual world.181 On some occasions a vision would result from his waking up182 or being awakened in the middle of the night.183 Again, there was no sexual component to any of these.

Yet another example of Schuchard’s selective use of sources is that she fails to mention any of the reports about how acquaintances of
Swedenborg’s described his trances and how he looked while conversing with deceased people. There are at least two accounts of Swedenborg coming out of a trance, when General Christian Tuxen and Christopher Springer had disturbed him while he was having a vision.184 These accounts have no sexual connotations and no mention of sexual visionary techniques.

Another of Schuchard’s proposals is that Swedenborg had similar ideas to those of Tantric yogis, that they could achieve visionary ecstasy through sexual intercourse.185 To support this proposal she misinterprets a passage in *Spiritual Diary* 186 which talks about a couple who are truly married as being united at every level of their being. She interprets that union as implying that it “refers to conjugal union through mental telepathy.” She fails to mention the obvious explanation—that, as a Christian, Swedenborg was simply expanding on the idea of married partners being “one flesh” on the basis of his discussions with angels about how they interpret this concept and experience it.187 Schuchard, however, then goes on to expand her “sexual intercourse through mental telepathy” theory by making the remarkable—and, again, undocumented—proposal that, “Because the bachelor Swedenborg hoped to marry the wife of Count Frederick Gyllenborg in the spirit world, he perhaps attempted to achieve mental copulation with her by long-distance thought-transfer in the natural world.”188 She fails to mention that the claim that Swedenborg hoped to marry Countess Gyllenborg in the next world Tafel regarded only as a “statement,” Sigstedt in her biography of Swedenborg as a “legend,” and Jonsson as a “rumour.”189 Martin Lamm regarded this “anecdote” as “a testimony that has been transmitted by a tradition among Swedenborgians,” which “bears all the signs of authenticity”190 but Lamm was sceptical of the authenticity of Swedenborg’s spiritual experiences to begin with.191 Similarly, White’s mischievous comment that “We may presume any spiritual intimacy with Swedenborg would date from her widowhood (1759)”192 needs to be taken with a grain of salt in view of his grievances against the Swedenborg Society.193
SCHUCHARD’S USE OF SWEDENBORG’S VISIONS

Here are two quotations from Schuchard (2000), p. 55:

In his diaries, Swedenborg recorded many of the lurid sexual ceremonies of the Moravians, which initially attracted but later repelled him.

In his journals, Swedenborg described the sexual rituals and magical practices of Jews in London, which both inspired and frightened him. According to oral tradition, Swedenborg kept a mistress in Sweden and, by his own admission, another one in Italy, moreover, his many descriptions of prostitutes and sirens and his advocacy of legal brothels made clear that he was widely experienced in earthly sexuality—despite his lifelong bachelorhood [34].194

I find such quotations astonishingly inaccurate. First of all, Swedenborg’s travel journals of 1710, 1721, 1733, 1734, 1736, 1737, 1738, and 1739 talk about the various tourist attractions he visited, such as churches, libraries, landmarks, or the mines or scientists he visited, or the books he was reading.195 Swedenborg’s interaction with people in Journal of Dreams (1743–1744), The Word Explained (1745–1747) and his Spiritual Diary (1746–1765) primarily or almost completely occurs in the next world, or afterlife.196 If he talks about Moravians or Jews, almost without exception those references are to what he observed about some individuals who happened to be Moravians197 or Jews198 in their life on earth. Some of the ex-London Jews he met lived underground in the spiritual world.199 Some Jews were antinomians,200 and yet others were bound for heaven.201 I am aware of no references to any of the sexual rituals and magical practices of Jews in London.” This is easy to confirm from any of the on-line and off-line search engines of Swedenborg’s work.202

In her 2006 book Schuchard suggests that, even though the Moravian archives in London mention no “‘irregular’ activities at the Fetter Lane Chapel by Christel,” the son of Count Zinzendorf, “several passages in Swedenborg’s diaries suggest that the unreformed son and his Schätzeln, his male and female ‘Sweethearts,’ secretly carried on their erotic ceremo-
Once again no passage in Swedenborg’s works is adduced to support this proposal. Later in her book, Schuchard refers to a footnote in the Swedenborg Foundation edition of *Spiritual Diary* attached to paragraph 3451, in which either George Bush or John Smithson, not Alfred Acton (sic!), records that, according to Swedenborg, there is no bearing of children in the next world, so that the characters Swedenborg is quoting must be talking about what they did in this world. However, they become associated with spirits who themselves believe in such endeavors. Concerning this footnote Schuchard writes “Though Swedenborg may have exaggerated and distorted the real-world behaviour when he transferred it to the spirit world, other critics of the Moravians described similar scenes.” I do not have any reason to doubt that there are similarities between contemporaneous descriptions of what Moravians did in London or Europe or wherever and what Swedenborg described of spirits who had been Moravian in our world doing in the next world or saying about what they did in our world. In the spiritual world, like attracts like, so promiscuous people will be attracted to their own type.

**SWEDENBORG, ZINZENDORF, AND THE MORAVIANS**

There is certainly no question that Swedenborg attended the Moravian Chapel in Fetter Lane while living in London in 1744. However, Schuchard seems to have a great deal of difficulty in distinguishing between when Swedenborg was talking about Moravians in this world versus in the next world. For example, she mentions Moravian missionaries recruiting “East Indians from Malabar” to help them convert Jews. She then spuriously once again links an event in this world with a vision of Swedenborg’s in the next world. Consequently, Schuchard mis-contextualizes and then goes on to misinterpret *Spiritual Diary* paragraph 6061 as referring to Indians whom Zinzendorf has converted to Christianity, when the passage is actually about Zinzendorf’s view of God as a cloud, whereas the non-Christians view God as a Person.

With regard to Moravians, Swedenborg certainly met Moravians in the next world who were antinomian while some were enthusiasts. It is true that some Moravians whom Swedenborg met were promiscuous
libertines or murderers or thieves because they believed that it didn’t matter how they lived but what they believed. In the following passage from the *Spiritual Diary*, Swedenborg says he was talking with “one who was lately come into the other life, and who said that he had been acquainted with me in the world”:

Moreover, all the good of charity which others do, whether they give to the poor, or utter prayers, or attend churches out of piety, and, so, the piety of all others, who are outside their assembly, they depreciate, yea, ridicule, believing that they place merit in those things, and that such persons can less easily be saved than robbers, adulterers and miscreants; consequently, they utterly reject a life of good.

Moreover, they believe that when they love the Lord as a man, they can do whatever they please, even deceive others outside their congregation, commit whoredom although they are married, and similar things; for they believe that this does not damn, because they are in the Lord.

I spoke with one of the Moravians, who, being asked what he felt about evil works and adulteries, and also heinous sins, stated, that if they were indeed perpetrated, they admonish the offender to desist from them, but that, nevertheless, they are overlooked, because he holds their faith; and that if he did not desist, the evils would still be pardoned, but not to the same extent.

Zinzendorf “afterwards said, that it is no harm for a man to live in sins, even the graver ones, inasmuch as God has then an opportunity for mercy; and that all things are of mercy.”208

But even looking at these quotations under a microscope, they do not support Schuchard’s contention that “In his diaries, Swedenborg recorded many of the lurid sexual ceremonies of the Moravians, which initially attracted but later repelled him.” The only support I can find for Schuchard’s allegation is to think very literally. In 1975 Schuchard wrote that “White points out that in Swedenborg’s diary of 1744, ‘the entries in England are even more mysterious than those in Holland’” (*Swedenborg*, p. 126).209 Schuchard refers to White’s 1868 biography of Swedenborg, which was a revision of his 1867 biography. (Note to begin with that, although Schuchard
does not mention it, the revised version was written after White’s dismissal by the Swedenborg Society. Cf. footnote 194). On page 126, White writes:

> The entries in England are even more mysterious than those in Holland, and it is often difficult to distinguish between transactions in bed and out of doors.

> The combination of the celestial and sensual in the succeeding paragraphs might be thought incredible under any voucher but his own . . . 210

If Schuchard interprets Swedenborg’s dreams of this period as having a basis in the practices of the London Moravian Community, I can begin to understand her statements. However, for me that means that after death these Moravians continued such practices, which Swedenborg observed in the next world.

Swedenborg was certainly attracted to the Moravians, “but as yet I am not permitted to join brotherhood with them.” 211 Even this quotation should remove any possible speculation about Swedenborg being connected with “the elite interior order (the ‘Pilgrim Church’)” within the London Moravians, who were engaging in illicit sexual practices. 212 Schuchard has to admit that both John Wesley and Swedenborg were not in the Moravian inner circle. In fact, according to Schuchard, Wesley and Swedenborg never made it through the vetting procedures. 213 However, she says that, at the Fetter Lane chapel, Swedenborg was given “rare access to not only Kabbalistic but Rosicrucian techniques of meditation—techniques that transformed him from a scientific explorer of the natural world into a visionary traveller in the supernatural world.” 214 In other words, Schuchard appears to contradict herself. Swedenborg apparently went every Sunday to the Moravian Chapel on Fetter Lane, according to Brockmer, with whom he lodged during May 1744, although there are great problems with Brockmer’s accounts that Swedenborg had some sort of epileptic or other fit. 215 Schuchard accepts Brockmer’s story uncritically, and so believes that Swedenborg had a nervous breakdown, a “manic illness and messianic mission to the Jews of Fetter Lane.” 216
One dream, which Schuchard might take as evidence of Moravian religio-sexual practices is in *Journal of Dreams* paragraph 206:

After this one night I was found in the church, but naked, with nothing but my shirt on, so that I did not venture forth. This dream perhaps may mean that I am not yet all clad and prepared as I ought to be.

Assuming that the church referred to is the Moravian chapel—which is by no means certain because Swedenborg did seem to keep up his attendance at the Swedish Lutheran Church in London—Swedenborg regards this experience as a dream and interprets it symbolically. Dr. Wilson van Dusen, a retired clinical psychologist, has written a commentary on the symbolism of Swedenborg’s *Journal of Dreams*, and Schuchard’s case would have been more plausible in my opinion if she had considered van Dusen’s interpretations of such dreams and then documented why her interpretation is more valid. Even the women in his dreams at this time could be interpreted as “the birth of feeling in him,” which “is the real essence of the change he is undergoing.” Even in *Journal of Dreams* paragraph 213, Swedenborg interprets the women in his dreams as symbolic: “all the objects of the sciences presented themselves to me in the form of women,” although van Dusen would, I think, regard this as Swedenborg intellectualizing his feelings and not really feeling them. Schuchard, in her typically circular style of reasoning, takes the dream in *Journal of Dreams* paragraph 206 as referring to an actual physical event, and argues that it is evidence of the “psychic strain” Swedenborg put himself through “to maintain kawwanah” or “pure intention” of a Kabbalist converting sexual energy into mystical energy. She also assumes that Brockmer’s story of Swedenborg throwing his clothes off and rolling in the mud is evidence of “the psychic strain” without even investigating whether Brockmer’s story was factual.

Even if we take Swedenborg’s sexual dreams as having some basis in Moravian practice, there is still the question of how his nonsexual dreams in London of 1744 relate to the Moravians. Again Schuchard’s work is only partly done.
It is not only Swedenborg’s *Journal of Dreams* which Schuchard regards as describing what Swedenborg experienced amongst Moravians and mystical Jews in London:

Moreover, in his *Spiritual Diary*, Swedenborg later recorded his London experiences in an antinomian and promiscuous society that included Jewish magicians and Moravian mystics.222

It is true that *some* deceased people, who happened to be Quakers during their life on earth, apparently indulged in communal sexual rituals which Swedenborg was told about but didn’t view.223 However, it is important to note that Swedenborg also met ex-Quakers who were horrified and disgusted with such behavior and led altogether godlier lives.224 But to return to the Moravians, Schuchard is apparently aware of an article by a British New Church Minister, Rev. James Hyde, who mentions Henry Rimius’ exposé of the immoral behavior of certain Moravians in London.225 Here again, however, other Moravians whom Swedenborg met didn’t hold such ideas and were capable of being saved.226

One passage, which Schuchard refers to as “the secret sex rituals of a Moravian and/or Jewish group in London,” occurs in *Spiritual Diary* paragraph 3453. In its context there is no identification of the person or people concerned as being either Moravian or Jewish during their earthly lives. There is also no mention of them ever having lived in London, so yet again Schuchard supplies the information which she wants to read into a passage: “When Swedenborg wrote this passage in October 1748, he was torn between his attraction to the Moravian and Jewish arcana of visionary sex and his guilt at its libertine ramifications.”227 Not surprisingly, Schuchard fails to supply documentation in support of this statement. In 1999, in an interpretation of *Spiritual Diary* 3453, Schuchard alleged that Swedenborg tried to mimic some promiscuous spirits, despite the fact that the paragraph begins “It was shown to me.” In other words, Swedenborg didn’t in fact attempt “one of the most difficult kabbalistic-tantric techniques;” he merely observed some depraved people, and how their promiscuous practices affected them “physically” in their spiritual bodies.228 It is absolutely astonishing to me that Schuchard could equate the practices of these depraved people with those of spiritually-aware religious people! For
example, *Spiritual Diary* 3453 has phrases such as: “in those grossest of natural things” and “their fetid loves. . . . To such an extent do they hate and abominate their partners, and conjugal love, indeed the whole female sex.” (I think the Latin scholar Shaw-Smith’s comment about the repetition of *confirmant* “hints at a process of sexual healing or rejuvenation,” doesn’t fit in with the context.) I find it amazing that Schuchard concludes: “Despite the weirdness of his description, Swedenborg clearly revealed his access to the arcana of tantric Kabbalah or Judaized yoga.”

Yet again, Schuchard’s interpretation that in *Spiritual Diary* 3453 Swedenborg was describing “the sexual energy progressing from the undersole to the toe of the left foot” is patently wrong, as readers can easily see from the text. The unidentified people do not believe in having a Christian faith but only in living as they want to. They are contrasted with antinomian Lutherans. They have false and defiled consciences, and are immodest and unashamed, of their “foul adulteries” and “shameful nakednesses.” The preacher among this unidentified group appears to have been a priest, which would presumably rule out the possibility of him being a Jew, and from the context might even have been a Roman Catholic. They are in league with adulterers who share wives, and indulge in “abominable promiscuous marriages.” Schuchard’s assumption that “calculations” refers to psychosexual gematria is again reading into the quotation, because *ratiocinatio* is usually used by Swedenborg to mean “reasoning.” As the very first occurrence of this phrase in the translation quoted by Schuchard, it means “justification” or “justifying” of their adulterous beliefs and practices, which result in pain being experienced by themselves and those who approach their company. Yet again Schuchard is justifying her argument with any passage which remotely mentions things in which she is interested, in however vague a way.

Schuchard then goes on to torture *Spiritual Diary* paragraph 3550 by interpreting it to mean that Swedenborg is talking to simple people who cannot master the techniques of visionary sex or “who cannot achieve such mental and visionary feats.” In fact, this passage is about very simple, uneducated peasants, who were almost like beasts, whom the angels and good spirits worked on and encouraged so that their spirituality and potential angelhood could come to the surface of their characters. Their coldness has no sexual connotation whatsoever, but was the effect
that their personalities have on their own spiritual bodies and on those of people who were near to them.

I discovered a reference in Sigstedt’s biography\textsuperscript{242} which suggested that even in 1736, Swedenborg, visiting Copenhagen, was very suspicious of fanatical pietism and enthusiasm:

\begin{quote}
The town is also infected with pietism or quakerism; and they are crazed enough to believe that it is well pleasing to God to do away with oneself and others; of which many instances are on record.\textsuperscript{243}
\end{quote}

In 1915 the non-Swedenborgian Martin Lamm commented about this reference: “The least one can conclude from this declaration is that it indicates no sympathy for the sects referred to.”\textsuperscript{244} Yet again, Schuchard’s allegations that Swedenborg was part of an inner, elite Moravian group within the London community indulging in orgies is suspect. But just to have an alternative geographical source, just in case her London theory is found to have even more holes in it, Schuchard writes: “Some of the scenes in the diary (late 1748) may have taken place in Moravian gatherings in Holland, where Christel’s innovations also influenced the more radical Brethren.”\textsuperscript{245}

It seems appropriate at this stage to briefly mention Swedenborg’s disapproval of “antinomianism,” or the intentional breaking of laws or God’s commandments, especially those involving illicit sexual relationships. I do not know of any place where Swedenborg uses this term, but he does criticize the proponents of this belief, under the term “faith alone.”\textsuperscript{246} To quote just one of many pertinent passages:

\begin{quote}
Those who confirm themselves in doctrine and in life, that faith alone without good works justifies and saves, close heaven against themselves by making excuse for evil works. And they do this by saying and believing that evils are not seen by God; or that they are remitted in the case of those who have faith, or (according to some) with those who have the confidence of faith; and (according to others) with those who are justified by faith. Many of them, therefore, think insanely in this way, “Of what importance is it to do goods when goods do not save me; and what does it matter if I do evils, when evils do not condemn me? I am in grace because
\end{quote}
I have faith.” And so they live to themselves and the world, neither abstaining from evil because it is evil, nor doing good because it is good. And if they do abstain from evil, it is from fear of the civil law, and of the loss of reputation, and not from any fear of the Divine Law, and of the loss of life eternal. And if they do good it is from the love of reward, and not from the love of God; and yet as is the quality of the life such is the man. For the Lord says:

Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? (Matt. vii. 16).

Such a man does not know what a good life is or an evil life. If he lives as a citizen of the world, he believes that he lives a good life; although if he does not live such life as a citizen of heaven, it is an evil life. Neither does he distinguish the one from the other, because they both appear alike in externals. The reason why he cannot distinguish them is, that good works, which make the life, are regarded as of no account. It now follows, therefore, that those who confirm themselves, in doctrine and life, that faith alone without good works justifies and saves, shut heaven entirely against themselves.247

So, in summary, here again many questions need to be asked of Schuchard. How can Swedenborg have been so influenced by Moravians? Where is the evidence to suggest that he was part of the secret, inner circle of London Moravians indulging in illicit sexual activities or Kabbalistic sexual techniques for inducing visions? Why was he so against “holy sinning” in his theological books as in the above quotation if he in fact supported these kinds of activities?

**DID SWEDENBORG ADVOCATE “LEGALISED BROTHELS”?’**

In keeping with what is now a recurrent pattern, Schuchard supplies no references to her claim that Swedenborg advocated “legalised brothels.”248 Swedenborg certainly claimed to have observed brothels in the various communities of hell, which he visited as an observer249 and in one case to have observed some promiscuous women “rush openly into” brothels.250 Deflowerers of women during their earthly life, after death, go
in search of brothels, but are disappointed when they cannot find virgins there.\textsuperscript{251} Swedenborg wrote: “Moreover, living with a prostitute or turning one’s house into a brothel is a disgrace,”\textsuperscript{252} which hardly sounds like the opinion of a person in favour of brothels! In \textit{Conjugial Love} Swedenborg does comment on how brothels are “tolerated” in some European cities of his day:

Consequently in large cities brothels are tolerated.

This point is made to confirm what was said in the last section. It is well known that brothels are tolerated by kings, magistrates, and so by judges, inquisitors and people generally in London, Amsterdam, Paris, Vienna, Venice, Naples and also Rome, and in many other places too. Some of the reasons for this are those listed above.\textsuperscript{253}

So did Swedenborg advocate legal brothels? No. However he did see them as a tolerated necessary evil and as a possible way of preventing promiscuous men from turning to rape or incest, which he taught were far greater sins. While ideally I, as a Swedenborgian, would be opposed to legalizing prostitution, from watching documentaries on the subject I understand that prostitutes are protected from exploitation and violence from procurers or clients or drug-dealers and have regular health-checks if they work in legalised brothels, such as in Amsterdam. Consequently, there are advantages to legalizing prostitution, although I struggle with the wider issues of it.

\textbf{CONCLUSION}

Schuchard has said that her biography of Swedenborg is “unconventional.”\textsuperscript{254} What I find limiting about her work are the following:

- Her biography of Swedenborg is based on selections from Toksvig’s and White’s biographies (sometimes misinterpreted), each of which have their own prejudices and biases, and she rarely discusses the firsthand sources behind their interpretations.
Her over-arching thesis that occultist or even illuminist Masonic lodges had an influence on Western society and literary figures like Blake and Yeats seems fair enough in general principle, and I can think of no reason why such illuminists might not have contributed something to the ideas of the time. But that does not prove that Swedenborg was involved.

Her over-arching belief that Swedenborg used Kabbalistic vision-inducement techniques is so pervasive that it colors virtually every piece of information, however disjointed or however isolated, or however irrelevant without misinterpretation. She moulds it all into her argument. Schuchard even resorts to circular arguments and reasoning, but never proves her theses.

This over-arching principle is so strong that she hardly if ever considers different interpretations of the source texts of Swedenborg’s that she is dealing with, or even of a secondary source written by one of his commentators. Her credibility would have been far greater if she had included interpretations other than her own, and explained the weaknesses of them, and why hers are superior.

She employs circumstantial evidence on many occasions, especially “guilt by association.” By this I mean, for instance, concluding that Swedenborg and Blake were Freemasons because many of their friends were.

At times she is very presumptuous and her arguments beg many questions. For example, in her 1975 thesis, in her 2000 article, and in her 2006 book, she is already saying that Swedenborg and Blake are using Kabbalistic or Yogic techniques to induce their visions, before this is what I would consider satisfactorily proven.

So, in summary, I do not believe that Schuchard has proved conclusively that Swedenborg was a Freemason, using Masonic networks to pass along intelligence for the Swedish government. As I said at the outset, it would not bother me even if Swedenborg were a Freemason. But I do not feel she has made any adequate case that he was. Secondly, Dr. Schuchard can only “prove” that Swedenborg used Kabbalistic or Tantric sexual techniques for inducing visionary experiences if she misinterprets every quotation of Swedenborg’s she adduces as “proof” as well as reading her
theory into and misquoting other scholars such as Toksvig, Hallengren, and Larsen.

I said in my editorial in the March 2001 issue of The New-Church Magazine, that the editor of Esoterica, Dr. Arthur Versluis, regarded Schuchard’s article “Why Mrs Blake Cried” as “groundbreaking,” I respectfully disagree with this opinion. I find her dissertation, articles, and book misleading and disappointing. Her style of scholarship is, in my judgment, more imagination than reality, more speculation than argument, more allegation than proof, more probability than certainty, more hypothesis than authenticity, more manipulation than corroboration, more self-contradiction than continuity, more innuendo than discretion, and more fiction than fact.

On a positive note, Schuchard does seem to have documented contemporary accounts of antinomian sexual practices on the part of some Moravians and Jews, which could illustrate accounts in the Spiritual Diary or Spiritual Experiences. However, unlike Schuchard, I think that the vast majority of these, and probably all of them, occurred or were presented to Swedenborg in his travels in the next world, not this one.

In closing, let me express the hope that, by this analysis, I have made it easier for other readers of Schuchard to evaluate her work.
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