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Without a concept of discrete degrees, one can know nothing of the difference between the three heavens, nor of the difference between the love and wisdom of the angels in them, nor of the difference between the warmth and light that they possess, nor of the difference between the atmospheres which surround and envelop them.

Furthermore, without a concept of these degrees, one can know nothing of the difference between the interior faculties in people which are those of the mind, thus nothing of their state in regard to reformation and regeneration; nor of the difference between the exterior faculties in both angels and people which are those of the body; and nothing at all of the difference between something spiritual and something natural.

(Emanuel Swedenborg, *Divine Love and Wisdom*, §185)
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For the better part of my career I have been writing about other people’s beliefs, examining how they find their path through life, and explaining it as best I can. To borrow a term from historian John Lukacs, my aim has been to write “‘honest” history rather than fool myself and others into thinking I am always writing objectively about the topic at hand. Because my attention in recent years has focused almost entirely on the influence of Swedenborg and his church and unchurched followers, I have felt the need on more than one occasion to explain that I am neither a Swedenborgian nor a Christian but a secular humanist with a fascination for and an empathy toward other people’s belief systems.¹

In searching for the most effective way to tell Frank Sewall’s story, the answer came quite serendipity. After reading remarks made at his memorial service in Washington, D.C. in 1916, I realized that his life of seventy-eight years divided almost evenly into three periods: the first twenty-six years covered from childhood to ordination; the second twenty-six, his time as pastor of the Glendale church, his presidency of Urbana University, and travel abroad; and the last twenty-six as pastor
of the Church of the New Jerusalem in the nation’s capital. Simple and detached from any densely reasoned assumptions or dialectically grounded thesis, it offers a very conventional and straightforward approach to understanding the man and his beliefs.

I am not the first to write Sewall’s biography. In a written statement by his oldest daughter Alice Archer Sewall James (known by family and friends as “Archie”), a noted artist, poet, and playwright, she recalled being informed by her father in 1915 shortly before his death that he had intended to write his autobiography but never found the time to get it done except for a draft outline which he shared with her. On the title page he had written the title: “Felix, or the Reminiscences of a Happy Life. The Autobiography of Frank Sewall.” In explaining the oddity of the word “Felix,” from the Roman cognomen meaning lucky or successful, he told his daughter that on his fiftieth birthday when he and his wife Thedia were in Scotland climbing a mountain in the face of an approaching thunderstorm, he had remarked casually to her, “My name should have been Felix. Frank is a good name but it does not so fully express my life as Felix would have—it has been so very happy.” After showing his daughter his tentative outline, he asked if she would write his biography using the title “Felix, or the Reminiscences of a Happy Life.” In her recollection of their conversation, Alice made the remark: “The Reminiscences will have to be mine of him, now,—not his of himself.”

Alice made several attempts to write her father’s biography, none of which adhered strictly to his outline. The first, begun in her mid-forties, amounted to little
more than a collection of materials. In 1920, at age fifty-one, she made a second effort at a biography, giving it the title “Felix, or the Life of a New-Church Man.” Three chapters (“The Boyhood of Frank Sewall,” “Frank Sewall at Bowdoin,” and “Frank Sewall’s Student Life in Italy”) were subsequently published in The New-Church Review. A fourth chapter intended to cover his studies in Germany and France was never published due to presumed differences with the magazine’s editor.3

Over the next two decades, Alice collected additional documents and toyed with two possible titles: “A Happy Life: The Biography of a Swedenborgian Minister” and “A Happy Life: The Biography of Frank Sewall.” Nothing more seems to have resulted from this effort.4 Then, in 1950, at age eighty, following the death of her husband, John Hough James (1869-1950), Alice turned one final time to write her father’s biography. A 191-page draft titled “Biographical Glimpses of Frank Sewall,” copies of which were shared with several family members, divided her father’s life into three lengthy chapters which she named “The Call,” referring to Sewall’s early life whose compass seemed always pointed to ordination; “The Defeat,” referring to Sewall’s resignation from the presidency of Urbana University because of conflicting expectations between himself and the trustees; and “The Victory” which celebrated his many achievements as pastor of the Swedenborgian church in Washington D. C. Alice’s biographer, Alice B. Skinner, has suggested that the three periods she identified for her father’s life might possibly have been a reflection of the way she interpreted her own life’s struggles as well.5
Two unpublished manuscripts, along with numerous drafts and discarded notes constitute a significant portion of the Frank Sewall Collection in the Swedenborg Memorial Library at Urbana University in Ohio. The manuscripts, of which there are two different versions, contain a mixture of first- and third-person accounts of Frank Sewall’s life. The final product was never published, a decision probably justified because at least half of the manuscript consisted of quoted comments and reminiscences made by friends and colleagues at Sewall’s memorial service in 1916. In other words, at age eighty, Alice was simply attempting to fulfill the promise she had made to her father.

This biography could not have been written without the prior work of Alice Archer Sewall James (“Archie”) and so is dedicated to her and her memories which constitute much of the Frank Sewall Collection. I consider this to be Alice’s biography to which I have added an historical context.

* * * *

My thanks go to the staff of the Swedenborg Memorial Library at Urbana University, with appreciation for the help generously provided by Melissa Runkle and Julie McDaniel. Their assistance proved invaluable in identifying materials in the library’s Special Collections. My appreciation extends as well to Pastor Betsy Coffman of the Urbana Swedenborgian Church; the Glendale New Church; and the Swedenborgian Church of the Holy City in Washington, D.C.
The beliefs of the scientist, philosopher and reve-
lator Emanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772) were
uniquely positioned in the first half of the nine-
teenth century to comfort Americans repulsed by the
Puritan doctrines of sin, reprobation, and hell. His
breakthrough ideas and metaphysical speculations had
come at age fifty-seven after he had made his reputation
in science with nebular hypothesis; articles on mechani-
cal, mathematical, physical, chemical and astronomi-
cal subjects; the doctrine of the three atmospheres; the
vibratory nature of heat, light, electricity, and magneto-
tism; and the causes of the rotation of the planets. Not
until after he had mastered geology, anatomy, physics,
neurology, paleontology, and astronomy did his insight
open into the spiritual world with an equally compre-
hensive commentary.

Swedenborg’s *Arcana Coelestia*, whose first volume
appeared anonymously in 1749 with later volumes pro-
duced at short intervals over a period of seven years, con-
tained an exposition of the internal and spiritual meaning
of the books of Genesis and Exodus. Following their
publication, he began a series of remarkable treatises
that included *Heaven and Hell* (1758), *The Last Judgment and the Destruction of Babylon* (1758), *The Earths in our Solar System* (1758), *The New Jerusalem and its Heavenly Doctrines* (1758), *Angelic Wisdom* (1763), *Angelic Wisdom Concerning the Divine Providence* (1764), *The Apocalypse Revealed* (1766), *Conjugial Love* (1768), *A Brief Exposition of the Doctrine of the New Church Signified by the New Jerusalem in the Revelation* (1769), *Intercourse between the Soul and the Body* (1769), and *The True Christian Religion* (1771). In this last work, Swedenborg presented a complete synopsis of his theology, beginning with a discussion of the Absolute Being, Sacred Scripture, Repentance, the Coming of the Lord, the New Heaven, and the New Church. This change in Swedenborg’s study from the science of nature to the spiritual world was not without parallel as both Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz and Sir Isaac Newton had devoted periods in their lives explaining the Scriptural prophecies. What Swedenborg discovered was that the substructure of earthly science and philosophy conformed to the interior principles revealed spiritually. Science acted as handmaid to the Word.

When Swedenborg turned to the study of scripture, he gave rise to a distinctly popular cult within Christianity known as Church of the New Jerusalem, or simply the New Church. Originating in England, where it spread among Anglican clergymen like Thomas Hartley of Winwick and John Clowes of St. John’s in Manchester, the New Church soon spread to people like printer Robert Hindmarsh, British sculptor and draughtsman John Flaxman, poets Samuel Coleridge and William
Blake, and homeopath James John Garth Wilkinson. At the same time, Swedenborg’s ideas carried to the Continent where Professors Gabriel Beyer and Johan Rosen at Gothenburg, brothers and Finnish Masons August and C. F. Nordenskjöld, and Carl Bernhard Wadström disseminated his teachings to appreciative Christians grateful for the Swede’s clarifications of dogma. Just as quickly, Swedenborgian ideas crossed the Atlantic where they appealed to Lord Thomas Fairfax in Virginia, Thomas and Samuel Worcester in Boston, as well as to theologian and philosopher Henry James, Sr. So measurably did the Swede’s ideas fit the time that Ralph Waldo Emerson identified the first half of the nineteenth century as “the age of Swedenborg” meaning the culture had embraced the Gnostic gospel that “the soul makes its own world.”

The question left unanswered was whether Swedenborgianism would continue to draw support in the second half of the century with the sciences having traded seats with religion in the halls of education. Was the nation now inclined to the separation of church and state, and opening its mind to biblical criticism, evolutionary theories, and the secularization of American life? Or were there other more pressing issues for the culture to consider? Perhaps it was best said by historian Henry Adams:

Of all the conditions of his youth which afterwards puzzled the grown-up man, this disappearance of religion puzzled him most. ... The religious instinct had vanished, and could not be revived .... That the most
powerful emotion of man, next to the sexual, should disappear, might be a personal defect of his own; but that the most intelligent society, led by the most intelligent clergy, in the most moral conditions he ever knew, should have solved all the problems of the universe so thoroughly as to have quite ceased making itself anxious about past or future seemed to him the most curious social phenomenon he had to account for in a long life.²

American theologian, philosopher, and Swedenborgian minister Franklin Sewall (1837-1915) led a remarkably illuminating life in the New Church. Born into a world of great ideas and a vastness of new and old knowledge meant to challenge the limits of human capacity, Sewall entertained volumes of thought—from poetry, music and hymns, to theology, philosophy, and science—all of which fit comfortably into his world-view consisting of the Swedenborgian doctrines of Forms, Series and Degrees, Influx, and Correspondence. The doctrine of correspondence, key to the intercourse between the body and soul, held that all natural objects corresponded or participated in transcendent archetypes.

One of a constellation of New-Church ministers whose leadership dominated the halcyon years of Swedenborg’s popularity, Sewall dedicated a lifetime to identifying those central or harmonizing truths existing within theology, philosophy, and science to prove that God abided in and controlled the entire sphere of existence with his Love, Wisdom, and Power. There was little that failed to interest him and, familiar with people
and places on both sides of the Atlantic, Sewall made the most of his network of New Church colleagues from his youth to old age. As described by the editor of the New-Church Messenger, he “had deep convictions and held to them tenaciously,” and with a spirit ever resolute, advocated his views vigorously. Though many judged his ideas as quixotic, those who knew him considered his work thoughtful and constructive, albeit very much *sui generis*. His faith never dimmed; his hopefulness never waned; his zeal never flagged.³

For much of his career, Sewall focused on the questions: What is it to know? And what is to be known? Can the soul know anything that is not of its own kind? Does not the fact that an object has become something of our consciousness, declare the nature of that object to be of the nature of the soul? And within the context of idealistic development, how is it that the absolute monism of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel differed from the trinal monism of Swedenborg?⁴

Sewall’s clean-shaven face and refined scholarly demeanor were notable characteristics of this gentle and loyal member of the General Convention. Neither a parliamentarian nor a pulpit orator, he nevertheless held a commanding presence within the leadership of the New Church with the power of his pen. Profoundly interested in philosophy, he was particularly attentive to demonstrating the importance of connecting modern theology to the study of Swedenborg’s scientific and philosophical contributions.

Sewall measured the progress of the New Church using the Doctrine of Discrete Degrees —end, cause,
and effect. Without knowledge of these discrete degrees, humanity could know nothing of the real nature of man, of nature, of the spirit, or of God. Without this knowledge, there could be no true science, nor any true theology. Working separately and together they constituted the mutual relation of mind and matter, the physical and spiritual worlds. First is the object as we seek it, namely the effect. Second is the reason for its particular form unlike any other, namely the cause. And finally, is that which first moved interiorly to form it, the end. Without a cause there could be no effect; and without an end, no cause. And without these critical pieces of information, there could be no new and rational system of Christian faith. God revealed Himself to man first in the intellect, then in the will—first as truth, then as the good. Discrete degrees represented parallel but distinct planes of existence: the highest being celestial; the middle being spiritual; and the lowest, the natural plane. Without these degrees, one could know nothing of the difference between the interior faculties in people which are those of the mind, thus nothing of their state in regard to reformation and regeneration; nor of the difference between the exterior faculties in both angels and people which are those of the body; and nothing at all of the difference between something spiritual and that which is natural.

Sewall viewed Swedenborg’s religion as eminently ethical and practical because it was all about uses. His religion constituted the essence of charity which was simply “the love of God to man exercised by means of, or through, voluntary human agents. . . . . When sinful self love is removed by man, all the works that he per-
forms become good works, and all earthly uses become the ultimate forms in which the ends of Divine love are realized in effect.”
Frank Sewall’s life was remarkable in two fields: one, chosen, labored at and prayed for, the other innate and unconscious. Both the richness of his achievement for the ministry (the first field) and for human living (the second field) were united in him by his inheritance from the ship-builder, who could make anything float. Whether he thought it out, or planed and smiled it out, he rode on the top of surging difficulties and got important results.

(Alice Archer Sewall James, “Biographical Glimpses of Frank Sewall,” 1850)

The Sewall name in England is of Saxon origin and spelled variously as Saswalo, Sewald, Sewalle, and Sewall. Whether it was Seswald who owned seventeen hides (an Anglo-Saxon word meaning “family”) of land and allowed to retain them by William the
Conqueror, or Archbishop Sewall de Bovill (d. 1257) of York who was excommunicated in 1238 for his opposition to the centralizing power of Rome, the name stood for “a solid civic base of character though quite loosely involved in the confining formulas of its period.”¹ From the time of Henry Sewall, a middle-class linen-draper and a man of “great estate” chosen to serve as mayor of Coventry in 1606, or his eldest son Henry who immigrated to Massachusetts in 1634 where he settled in Newbury and married Jane Drummer, the family name held up to the harshest scrutiny. With the addition of Drummer family genes, the contributions of the Sewall family grew proportionally with judges, statesmen, and clergymen adding further luster to the family name.²

Henry and Jane had eight children among whom was Judge Samuel Sewall and his brother John of Newbury from whom Frank Sewall was descended. One of those eight ancestors, Judge David Sewall (1735-1825), graduated in the same class (1755) as future President John Adams and Sir John Wentworth, Governor of New Hampshire. An original member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, he was commissioned judge in 1789 of the U.S. Court for the District of Maine, performing his duties over forty years. He was also a member of the first board of overseers of Bowdoin College.³

Another was Drummer Sewall of York, Maine, who served as a loyal soldier of King George in the French and Indian War after which he purchased land in Bath before serving as a Lieutenant Colonel in the American Revolution. Although a man of ordinary education, he served with distinction as treasurer and trustee of
Bowdoin College and as a delegate to the Massachusetts Convention to ratify the Federal Constitution. By the time of his death in 1832, he had acquired all the characteristics of a stolid citizen who passed on his virtues of thriftiness and hard work to his sons, one of whom was Joseph Sewall who entered the shipping business on Bath’s river front. When Joseph’s business failed, he moved to Farmington where, freed from ambition, he lived a respected civic life supported by his son William Dunning who at the age of twenty-four, married Rachel Allyn Trufant of Bath and discovered the New Church doctrines of Swedenborg, replacing his Puritan beliefs with the promise of the Grand Human. William purchased a section of forest adjoining his father’s farm whose trees were ideal for masts and, with his friend Freeman Clark, became the second generation of Sewall family members who acquired their wealth and status from the shipbuilding business.

On September 24, 1837, Franklin Sewall, one of seven children of William Dunning Sewall and Rachel Allen Trufant Sewall, was born in the farmhouse of Drummer Sewall. Nine months later, his sister Harriet carried him to the family’s new home near the wharves where the sound of scaffolding and hammers pounded out an endless cacophony of noise from his father’s shipyard. There Frank spent his childhood years and where, from the windows of the family home, he could spy a lighthouse and the Kennebec River dotted with schooners in various stages of construction—both setting the tone for youthful excursions to the ocean a distant twenty miles away. These were good years that left
indelible memories of his mother Rachel who planned family picnics, taught him games, caught his joy, and sang to him in the evening hours.⁶

Though assigned the care of the barn and cows as part of his boyhood chores, Frank acquired a taste for music, especially the piano, which became his ultra-ego. Before long he was composing and using the pages of his diary to memorialize his latest creations. Along with the piano he carried a sketchbook to capture the people and places he saw in everyday life. A favorite among the gentler sex, it was said by those who remembered him “that he was seldom seen with one damsel at a time but chose to dash the streets with at least one on each arm.”⁷

The New Church

With the establishment of the Boston Society of the New Jerusalem in 1818, Swedenborgian Societies formed in Waltham, Newtonville, Brookline, Roxbury, and Cambridge. Societies also organized in nine other Massachusetts towns: Abington, Bridgewater, Brockton, Elmwood, Fall River, Lancaster, Mansfield, Springfield, and Yarmouthport. These together with Societies in Rhode Island and New Hampshire united to form the Massachusetts Association of the New Church and eventually joined with other associations to become the General Convention of the New Jerusalem in the United States.

The New Church in Bath originated with the Rev. Abraham Cummings, a Baptist preacher who, in 1792, introduced the doctrines of the New Church to the town. This was followed two years later by the Rev. Wil-
liam Hill and the arrival of Captain Horatio Allen who moved from Hingham, Massachusetts, to Bath extolling the virtues of Swedenborg. About the same time, a Mr. Manning, a convert of Rev. Hill, sent information on Swedenborg to Deacon Caleb Marsh, one of the pillars of the Congregational Church in Bath. Because these early contacts were declared heretical, the seeds of the Seer’s new doctrines grew slowly among members of the Old South and Old North Congregational churches in Bath.

It is sometimes difficult to appreciate, much less understand, the hardships experienced by those who rebelled against the strongly entrenched Calvinism in the New England churches. Empowered by their status, Calvinists excommunicated any who challenged their doctrines of predestination, vicarious atonement, and salvation by faith alone. The beliefs of the Swedenborgians caused them to be regarded with suspicion and ridicule, and in many cases, forcibly cut off from relatives and former friends by the dictates of the church. Thomas Worcester recalled the early days of his pastoral work when hardly a respectable minister dared to be civil to him. The same applied to the children of parents who had joined the New Church Societies. Yet, for those ridiculed New Churchmen, Swedenborg represented the highest attainment that human reason ever reached. He stood between the man of science and the theologian, a human mind divinely called to lead thought to a higher plane of truth.⁸

In 1829, William and Rachael Sewall left the Old North Congregational Church and organized a New
Church Society whose sixteen communicants met regularly in the parlor of their home. Both were subsequently read out of the town meeting (membership which in those days depended on orthodox church membership) for being Swedenborgians, receiving in the process a public rebuke for their moral failure. Denounced and excommunicated by the Old North Church, William and Rachel responded with equal vigor:

As we, myself and wife, have lived ever since we joined our hands and hearts in marriage union with each other as I trust man and wife, the partners of each other’s joys and sorrows, should, worshipping as we believe the same Lord and enjoying as we trust the same religion and hoping to finally enjoy the same heaven, ever feeling that no difference of importance would or could exist with those whom the Lord joined together in the conjugal relation of husband and wife, hence we have viewed the recent doings of the North Church to be the attempts of man to put asunder those whom the Lord hath joined together.

The Bath Society grew over time and despite its small size, the members were able to support the Rev. Samuel F. Dike and build a church in the form of a Greek temple in the Doric style which they dedicated on January 11, 1844. Both the temple and its communicants formed a large part of Frank Sewall’s youth. His father, with unusual foresight of his son’s interests, introduced him to Zina Hyde, one of the early organizers of the New-Church Society in Bath, whose ancestor
was Edward Hyde, the Earl of Clarendon, historian and Lord Chancellor of England. Although affected with a spinal disease that confined him to bed, Hyde had been a major contributor to the series of publications known as the Scientific and Philosophical Writings dedicated to the translation of Swedenborg’s works into English. A man of wealth and a lover of art, he filled his home with many fine works from the Italian Renaissance. As early as age ten, Frank made a habit of Sunday afternoon visits to the Hyde home where he loitered in its spacious halls and gardens imbibing in the richness of the paintings that adorned the walls and enjoying the social and musical events that were a frequent occurrence.

The long-suffering Hyde shared with young Frank his love of the Renaissance, exchanging his knowledge for the boy’s artistic gifts in poetry and music. From Hyde and George J. Webb, a British New Churchman living in Boston who gave him piano lessons, Frank advanced in his artistic abilities enough to become the church organist and, working with his schoolmaster Mr. Wiggin and his pastor Dr. Dike, participated in hours of dutiful choir-practice. He also commenced duet playing with his sister Monica who later married the painter Joseph Ropes and moved to Italy. When scarcely in his teens, Sewall wrote in his diary: “I paint some in oils now, play on the piano and draw eyes and noses and mouths and ears. I can’t help thinking which I shall be. I can’t decide. A painter, a poet, or a pianist. I would like to be all three, but I cannot . . . I would have a little study with statuary and paintings on the walls and roses under my window . . . Now I think I would be a celebrated composer and
Alice described her father’s youth as that of a young man bursting with a love of hymns, many of which were yet unwritten but ruminating in his mind. In literature, he preferred Dickens to Plutarch and the Elizabethans, and at the bedside of Hyde recited his latest poems and played the piano. He became the town bard, composing odes, giving addresses before the Young Men’s Debating Club, and publishing his first poem in the church paper in 1853.\textsuperscript{13}

Many of young Frank’s circle of New Church friends were those of his father, including the Boston attorney Peleg Whitman Chandler, a graduate of Bowdoin College who served two terms in the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and the pharmacist, homeopath, and Swedenborgian publisher Otis Clapp. But above all else, it was the influence of pastor Dike and the galaxy of men and women who supported the New Church and the Swedenborg Association for the Dissemination of a True Philosophy who influenced him the most. To a person, they drew him away from the ghosts of Puritan predestination and hell-fire that had stalked his grandparents. After reading Arthur Otto Brickman’s \textit{Defence of Rev. A. O. Brickman, Before the Lutheran Conference, on the Charge of Having Embraced the Doctrines of Swedenborg} (1854), he gained new insight into the liberating doctrines of Swedenborg and the prejudices faced by the earliest New Churchmen.\textsuperscript{14}

Alice described her father as someone who even in his youth lived “in connection with spirits, heavenly,
surely, though not always rational, often almost infantile, but so unbrokenly as to conform in the midst of even profound study a leisurely use.” On another occasion she wrote: “He was always the same to every one without effort, a radiant mind expecting at least something charming and delightful out of every incident, and at the most, some evidence of his Master.” As she reflected on his boyhood years, she discovered a young man whose view of the world was one of continued celebration. “Oh, how beautiful is the morning,” he wrote in his diary, “when the sun is shining, and birds are singing, and busy sounds of the workmen mingle with the general tone of merry activity.” In another remark made on May 1, 1852, he described his walk through the woods. “It was a beautiful place. I made a little bower of evergreen. We found May-flowers, made wreaths, played ball . . . . I brought home a little spruce tree which I have set out in the upper part of the garden.”

Sewall rejoiced at the beauty of being, and whether conscious or not, was bent on capturing its exquisiteness in the totality of the moment. In many ways, his observations are reminiscent of Jonathan Edwards’ “The Mind” and his later “Nature of True Virtue.” Of course, there was a difference between the two thinkers. While Edwards marveled at the sovereignty of God manifested in Scripture and in nature (“[I wish] to lie low before God, as in the dust; that I might be nothing, and that God might be all, that I might become as a little child.”), Sewall marveled at God’s ruling love and man’s corresponding individual loves. Despite their differences, both enjoyed what could be called a mystic’s appreciation of nature.
In June 1854, Frank traveled to Portland with his father where he participated in his first General Convention of the New Church. Out of the twelve delegates from the Maine Societies, three were from Bath—Samuel Dike, J. B. Swanton, and Frank Sewall. There, he met Arthur Brickman from the Baltimore Society whose *Defence* he had recently read.\(^17\) At the end of the Convention, he wrote of Brickman in his diary:

> Oh, what a warming, cheering, loving influence he wrought upon us all. How his happy, beaming face lighted up the hall with the brilliancy of this rejoicing heat. May I never forget him—when he would fain clasp us all as dear friends of the Church in his arms, when his loud, clear voice rang through the hall and his solid figure and strong arm made the platform tremble with his eloquence—when he told of his longing for the truth—when he thanked God for the privilege of being united with us—then I felt the almost heavenly influence around me.\(^18\)

Sewall listened intently to the reports elicited from each of the Societies; heard Principal Milo G. Williams from Urbana, Ohio, report on the commencement exercise at the nation’s first New Church university; and the plaintive call for more ministers to serve the Church. It was there, too, he listened to appeals for a theological school and the importance of translating Swedenborg’s works and supplying them to libraries. All these matters filtered through the young man’s mind. The experience, which included being asked to play the “Great Volun-
tary” before the assembled delegates, caused him to harbor a real, though not yet declared, vocation in the Church. As Alice explained, he felt that “in the whole experience he stepped upon the height of dreams, half majestic, half childish.”

The enthusiasm he had for his first Convention was never lost. With few exceptions, he attended almost all of them and was always a congenial colleague able to offer an opinion, but equally able to engage in conversation, break into song, recite poetry, or prepare a sketch of the landscape. At these meetings he learned first-hand the importance of New Church education; the missionary role of New Church magazines; and the need for a common *Book of Worship*.

As evidence of his preparedness for a yet undeclared life in the Church, he wrote to his younger brothers those matters closest to his heart:

*First,* give no occasion for anything unpleasant to happen in the house. *Second,* be ready to render service to each person in the house, of course with difference as to position,—never intruding your services, which also might be injurious to yourselves and others;—when your Uncle or Aunt refuses anything, be sure to be obedient. *Third,* always live in peace with one another; and never forget your prayers. *Fourth,* keep everything in order; do everything at its proper time; and when you have something to do to which you are not accustomed, pay great attention; look well to your clothes, and remember that your parents are not rich. These are important points and I hope you will follow them out.
Bowdoin College

A year later, Frank traveled to Bowdoin College to take its entrance examinations, noting in his diary:

“Oh dreaded and yet longed for, sighed for day,
Come, come, I long to clasp thee to my heart.”

Then, when the exams were over, he again returned to his diary with a poem.

“After”
No tear shall stain thee, tho’ my heart is full.
No words shall weigh thee down, though utterance
Is vain, and though they burn within my soul.
Would every page were free from sorrow’s touch
And gladness and content beamed over all.
Oh, better far that we our destiny
Know not before in order ‘tis revealed.
Life’s sorrows then would counteract its joys
And spread forever shrouds of gloom o’er all.
And happy I and oh, how fortunate
That I may place my trust and hope in God
The Ruler of all Fates, the Helmsman o’er
The Dark tempestuous troubled sea of life.21

As the hours passed waiting with friends for the results of their exams and knowing that he had not done well with his Latin and Greek, Frank felt an “agony of suspense” wondering if he had failed. He soon learned that he and one other classmate had been graded unsatisfactory and refused a certificate of admission. Writing
in his diary, he expressed his gloom: “But oh, how dark and gloomy burst the reality like night upon me! What misery, what misery I felt!” Concerned with the young man’s state of mind, Professor Thomas Cogswell Upham took Frank aside and counseled him to wait a year before presenting himself for examination.22

Living through his first real disappointment, Frank returned home and, without tears, explained his situation to family members, including his father, who encouraged him to write to Mr. A. B. Wiggin, principal and teacher of languages at North Yarmouth Academy. Mr. Wiggin, who had known the young man for several years, assured him all was not lost and together they met with Professor Alpheus Spring Packard, Sr. at the College and obtained his approval for admittance on the condition of Wiggin’s promise to prepare him in the two subject areas. Frank spent the next several weeks at the Academy under Wiggin’s watchful eye before returning to Bowdoin where he retook his examination and passed.

Frank entered “under the high elms of the campus into [its] lofty mental spaces already hung with the embroidered consecrations of a distinguished half-century.” As Alice explained, Bowdoin offered a feast “where the devout spirit was served first and the arts and sciences last.” To the gentlemen of Bowdoin College, its Congregationalist petitioners to the General Court of Massachusetts to incorporate a college in the District of Maine insisted that Virtue was at the core of its education. Though Bowdoin was a church-going institution, it lacked the comfort Frank found when reading *Heaven and Hell* and other Swedenborg writings. Nevertheless,
its presidents, beginning with Joseph McKeen, and followed by Jesse Appleton, William Allen, and Leonard Woods Jr., inculcated in students a deep sense of religion or, as explained by McKeen: “God forbid that you should ever be ashamed to be governed by the principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.”

Frank’s classmates at Bowdoin included Thomas F. Moses who followed in Frank’s footsteps to become pastor of the Glendale Church outside of Cincinnati, and eventual president of Urbana University. Another classmate was Ellis Spear who commanded a brigade at the Battle of Peeble’s Farm (September 30-October 2, 1864) in Virginia and who remembered Sewall as serious and thoughtful, but not without a level of quiet humor. “He was a sound scholar from the beginning . . . [with] a singularly firm grasp upon abstract subjects and understood things from the foundation upwards. Habitually he was wrapped in thought, and his intercourse with his friends was his relaxation.” Similarly, the Rev. Benjamin W. Pond remembered Frank as a student who, while fun-loving, “took a high stand in his class for scholarship.” There, too, he became an accomplished pianist and equally versatile with the chapel organ.

It was this spirit that guided the mental fiber of Frank through his years of sparse living, chapel, summons to prayers, recitation, study, and physical exercise at Bowdoin. Born into a prominent New England Family, he followed his ancestors in attending the same institution as Longfellow and Hawthorne. Admitted to the Alpha Delta Phi and Phi Beta Kappa Societies, and then into the literary group known as the Athenaeum, he began
his education at a time when the names of Emerson, Holmes, Lowell, Longfellow, Hawthorne and Whittier were in the forefront of literature in the day.

The plain living in Mrs. Witney’s boarding house brought new challenges to Frank who had enjoyed the comforts of home. Now he faced water pumps in his lodgings with water freezing in the pail, the shared responsibility for cutting wood and mending fires, and building wigwams in their rooms to keep out the cold as they studied. There, too, he enjoyed the piano and shared its music with all who would listen. “My playing making another happy a whole half day! Do you wonder, dear Journal, that I sit down and play—regularly, happily and lovingly!” he wrote in his diary. Frank’s gift as a musician was not lost on his comrades as he was often asked to play at their social events. On his own initiative, he enjoyed mentoring younger students in the New Church doctrines.26

Frank Sewall’s love of music was evident early in his college days where he contributed two songs that made it into the Bowdoin songbook, one of which was:

“Fast, Brothers, Speeds the Night.”

Fast, brothers, speeds the night,
Soon comes the morning light,
When we must part;
But let us night dispel,
While jovial song doth tell
Greeting the last farewell
To every heart.
Labor and care are o’er,
Bell-signal now no more
Measures our day;
Silent the floors we’ve paced,
Problem and form erased,—
From head and heart effaced,
Ever away.

Still have we fostered here
Wisdom and friendly cheer,
Not thus to die;
Let us, then, loudly sing,
So that the pines shall ring,
And rolling echoes bring
Down from the sky.

Long live our ‘Mother dear,’
She whom we all revere,
Great, good and gay;
Long live her worthy mate,
Him whom we venerate,
_Prex, Sage and Celibate,_
Honored for aye.²⁷

Among Frank’s favorite teachers was Thomas Upham, professor of mental and moral philosophy from 1825 to 1868, whose _Elements of Mental Philosophy_ (1858) reflected a spiritual journey from strict Calvinism to Wesleyan holiness. Another, Alpheus Spring Packard Sr., professor of ancient languages and classical literature, had
a soft spot for young Sewall because of his perseverance in seeking admission. President Leonard Woods Jr., Bowdoin’s fourth president, consulted Frank on the King’s Chapel’s choir stalls and Biblical pictures, drawing him early in his manhood to the integrative aspects of ritual and architecture, lessons that would carry through his career. Woods appointed Frank as organist, playing at the dedication of the chapel and later playing for his own graduating class.28

But Frank’s heavy social commitments came at a cost when he fell ill in his sophomore year with chills and fever, causing his parents and professors to worry that he might have contracted the “wasting sickness” which had taken the life of his cousin Fanny. During bouts of illness that lasted over months, Sewall filled his time with concerts, hearing for the first time The Messiah, and embarking on an intensive study of German philosophy.

Frank went through moods, during which a deep despondency sometimes came over him. On these occasions, he learned to transfer his interior feelings into exterior expressions such as how the liturgy of the Church service could be improved. “I wish that on Sundays I could be better contented with things as they are . . . . I find after all that our liturgy was prepared with an idea of far more form and variety than is used at present.” Rather than see the New Church struggling to be a sect, he thought of it as a “Church universal, taking what is good from all that has gone before and thus becoming the crown of all churches.” While fulfilling his role as stu-
dent, he offset his dark moods by directing his energy to writing hymns as a way of bringing new meaning to the liturgy. Using a notebook to write down snatches of music that came to him during the day, he prepared the musical schedule for chapel services, conferred with others on the selection of music, and composed his own, adapting it to the chapters of the Gospel referenced in the service.  

Alice never seemed to tire in describing her father as he crystallized the prayers and introspections that filled his journals and elevated his life into one of celestial grace and harmony. In her biography, he is depicted as a man existing in two worlds, living physically in one and mentally and spiritually in the other. In his studies he strained to do well; but it was in his introspections that he found piece of mind. From Monday through Saturday he lived at Bowdoin, but when Sunday arrived, he returned home preparing to play for the Sunday service and teach Sunday school.

From the year he entered Bowdoin in 1854 until his graduation in 1858, Frank Sewall filled nine volumes of journals as he reckoned with scholastic life and the normal influences of the world on a young man. He graduated with a bachelor’s degree, earning first honors and first prize for his essay on “The Interior Memory,” a paean to Swedenborg. “My mind is active and accordingly contented and happy,” he wrote in his journal, a state of mind that he capped off with daily readings from Swedenborg’s *True Christian Religion*.  

Tübingen and Berlin

Frank’s father, having known for some time that his son’s vocation most likely involved something spiritually remote from the family’s shipping business, booked him passage on the *Arago*, sailing from New York to Havre in October 1858. Aware he needed to support the direction his son was taking, he wrote him saying: “I want, Frank, that you should be a learned man and a good man; if you are this I shall be satisfied and do all I can for you.” In his reply, Frank wrote in his journal, “May his brief wish ever be before my mind in all my doings.”

Before leaving, he procured a letter of introduction from Rev. Thomas Worcester in Boston addressed to the New Church scholar Dr. J. F. Immanuel Tafel at Tübingen University. Attending lectures at Tübingen enabled Sewall to examine the New Church from an “outside point of view” freed of the provincialism of his native community. Before his ordination in 1863, Frank would spend the next three years abroad studying at Tübingen, Berlin, and with the Swedenborgian scholar Jacques-François Le Boys des Guays at St. Armand before returning home.

Alice’s accounts of her father at this time centered on his visit to Italy where he stayed with his favorite sister Marcia Elizabeth and her artist husband Joseph Robes who were living in Rome. There he took lessons in Italian from his sister who laid out for him a series of classics; toured the city and countryside with his sketchbook; and listened to the Papal choir at St. Peters. He haunted St. Peter’s day and night listening to the music that seemed to enter his very bloodstream. And, as the
evening hours arrived, he spent them reading Henry Hallam’s *Middle Ages* (1835). There, too, he met some of the more distinguished literati of England and America, including the poet and playwright Robert Browning and the neoclassical sculptor Hiram Powers.\(^34\)

As he traveled across Italy visiting its many cathedrals, Sewall was frequently reminded of the bigotry, corruption and violence of Roman Catholic hegemony. Nevertheless, as soon as the church organs rolled out their endless variations of choral hymns, he trembled at their beauty. In Cologne, Paris, Tübingen and elsewhere in his travels, his feet guided him to the organ music, stained glass windows, and choir areas of every cathedral that crossed his path. “In Antwerp,” he observed, “the Cathedral is again built of music, not only from the great organ at work on the Mass, but from the harmony that reigns throughout the structure.” For Sewall, the music, combined with the service and architecture symbolized an organic whole.\(^35\)

Saying his farewells to Marcia and her husband, Sewall traveled to Baden-Würtemberg, home of Tübingen University founded in 1477. In his pocket was Worcester’s letter of introduction to Dr. Frederick Immanuel Tafel who held the post of Royal Librarian and Professor of Philosophy and under whose guidance he planned to study. It was a time when the university community was pregnant with anticipation of a Faculty of Science scheduled to be installed in 1863. Until then, the curriculum remained in the hands of the theologians. The Bible stood at the centermost core, albeit no longer a strictly literal document due to the spirit of German
research ("higher criticism") which had given it a rigorous cleansing using the tools of science. Among the early advocates of this higher criticism were professors Ernst Gottlieb Bengel and Ferdinand Christian Bauer in the School of Theology. Among Frank’s fellow students at Tübingen was Karl Josef von Hefele, a Roman Catholic theologian who would later oppose Papal Infallibility on moral and historical grounds; Jacob Friedrich Reiff who lectured on the history of philosophy; and John Tobias Beck who believed in orthodox Bible Christianity and opposed the work of Bauer and Bengel.\textsuperscript{36}

Once settled in Tübingen, Sewall fell into a comfortable routine of reading Swedenborg in Latin with Dr. Tafel and searching for a middle ground between the literal interpretation of Scripture and the questions and explanations coming from the higher critics. At times, Sewall must have compared his situation with that of Swedenborg who, at the University of Uppsala, found himself in the middle of a tug of war between the proponents of Aristotelianism and Cartesian dualism. In Tübingen, it was finding common ground between Beck and Bauer, both of whom he admired for their personal and intellectual integrity. As Sewall saw matters, Bauer had built a structure of "critical idealism" that eventually "began to omit heaven from the spiritual, the divine from the ideal, and stumbled into the dark." Beck, an orthodox Bible Christian, who taught Hebrew and Greek, would have none of it. While both helped him to understand the Greek and Latin church history with greater depth and clarity, neither accepted his views on Swedenborg.\textsuperscript{37}
Sewall’s memories of Tafel were strikingly positive. A man of great scholarship, he had been appointed professor at Tübingen in 1825 on condition he refrained from publishing or propagating the writings of Swedenborg. Appealing the school’s decision to the monarchy, the King of Württemberg released him from the prohibition and, in addition to his professorship, conferred on him the position of Librarian of the University. Tafel’s first publication was a translation of the *Doctrine of the Lord*, followed by Swedenborg’s *Four Leading Doctrines, The Last Judgment, The Apocalypse Revealed, Heaven and Hell, The True Christian Religion, The Divine Love and Wisdom, The Divine Providence*, five volumes of the *Arcana Coelestia, a Brief Exposition of the Internal Sense of the Prophets and Psalms*, and *Conjugial Love*. Small in stature with a face expressive of gentleness, Tafel lent Sewall hours of uninterrupted instruction as they translated Swedenborg from the Latin.38

As his studies were ending at Tübingen, Sewall received a letter from Jonathan Young Scammon, founder of the Chicago Society of the New Jerusalem and trustee of Urbana University, informing him of the possibility of a position opening at the University. While mulling over that possibility, he convinced himself that his next quest must be the study of Kant who he compared to Swedenborg as the “revealer of Divine Truth.” Before heading for Berlin, he stopped for a time in Cologne to examine its unfinished cathedral, climbing among the rafters to gain a practical working sense of the construction and its architectural and engineering breakthroughs.39
Sewall entered Berlin University with the highest hopes for its faculty but, to his dismay, found they were “not equal to the moment, and the half-year’s work he did there, was in the main a disappointment.” He was not only struck by the differences in the curriculum from what he found at Tübingen, but the smaller role given to religion. Despite its wealth, greater efficiency, and growing national stature, Berlin University struck Sewall as “a lower grade of genuine distinction.”

Besides attending the lectures of Orientalist Franz Bopp, the historian Leopold von Ranke, and the theologians Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg and Carl J. Nitzch, he threw himself into reading Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, Reuss’s *History of the New Testament*, Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason*, Carlyle’s *Life of Frederick the Great*, Macauley’s *History of England*, Schleiermacher’s *Presentation of Theological Studies*, and Hegel’s *Encyclopedia of Philosophical Knowledge*. When he was not studying German metaphysics or what he called “the miserable polluting German Scientifics,” he kept up with his piano and hymns.

During his entire time in Berlin, Sewall despaired of the “perverting tendencies” of German speculation and criticism. “It is really melancholy to see the manner in which a German scholar of the present day takes up the Word of God to dissect with the instruments of his scientifics,” complained Sewall when he was studying the Old Testament. “He may profess to abhor Rationalism, may cry out against Swedenborg for rejecting the ancient canon,—and yet he treats them one by one as though the results of mere chance.” It seems ironic that while Charles Eliot, Abraham Flexner, and thousands
of other Americans were completing their education by feasting on what the German universities offered by way of scientific studies, Frank Sewall viewed his experience with distrust.

Before leaving for France, Sewall critiqued each of his professors and found only a few to be an improvement over his home-reading. In the end, he concluded that little of his Berlin experience made him any wiser or how to become a good shepherd to his flock when called to his first church. “The German University and I are like two negatives which repel . . . O Germany and student life—Adieu, a jamais!” It struck him as a deadly camp whose atmosphere reeked of skepticism.43

By June, Sewall was settled in St. Amand, thirty miles south of Bourges in the home town of Le Boys des Guays, author of The True System of Religious Philosophy (1850) and editor and translator of several of Swedenborg’s writings. His time with des Guays contrasted dramatically from his months in Berlin. Their conversations, he explained joyfully, “resulted in a kind of heavenly revelation to me, I have been able to pray as I never have before—to feel more delightfully conscious of my real relations to God and the world about me.”44

* * * *

During his time abroad, Sewall kept a meticulous accounting of his activities. His diary allotted two and a half inches of space for each day’s events which he filled by crowding the words and even wrapping them around the margins. The first item was always the weather,
followed by activities attended, items read, lectures heard, persons met, and bits of conversation. At the end of any journey, he listed his expenses to the penny. Sewall also expressed a growing concern for the political events of his country, inching closer and closer to civil war. Despite his anxiety, he never strayed from what he saw as his path to the priesthood which remained his singular purpose on his return to New York November 16, 1861. During the half-year that followed, he prepared himself for ordination by studying under the direction of his boyhood pastor, the Rev. Dike, now the ordaining minister for the Maine Association. Recommended in 1863 by the Bath Society for ordination, he became a licentiate preacher during which time he traveled the Midwest honing his preacher skills until receiving a call from the New Church in Glendale, Ohio, where he would spend the next seven years.⁴⁵
God the eternal and infinite Being, or the substance of all things, exists by virtue of His own infinite trine of degrees, the Divine Love, the Divine Wisdom, and the Divine principle of Use. The Divine Ends are truly those of the Divine Love; they exist by means of the Divine Wisdom; they are attained and effected in the Uses of a created world.

(Frank Sewall, The New Metaphysics, 1888)

The village of Glendale (now a suburb), located along the Cincinnati, Hamilton and Dayton Railroad some twelve miles outside Cincinnati, began as a planned summer community for wealthy businessmen and their families who wanted to be close to work but distant enough to enjoy the sights and sounds of rural Ohio. Formed in 1851 by thirty families, the Glendale Association purchased six hundred acres of land belonging to farmers John
Riddle and Edmund R. Glenn which it then subdivided into lots and laid into streets and parks. The village, incorporated May 22, 1855, included the Glendale Female College (1854), and eventually the First Presbyterian Church of Glendale (1855), St. Gabriel’s Catholic Church (1859), and the Christ Protestant Episcopal Church (1865).

Among the families choosing to build in Glendale was Charles H. Allen (1820-1889), a Cincinnati chemist and drug supplier, who convinced a group of Swedenborgians, many of whom were connected by family or business, to build their summer residences there where it would serve as a spiritual haven (an inner goodness) of comfort outside the city. As Societies were springing up in communities across Ohio, the situation pleaded for New Church members in Glendale to show their “newness” to potential members. As patriarch of the group, Allen donated land for the church to become a reality. Designed by Architect Alfred B. Mullett, the church, considered a branch of its parent church in Cincinnati, laid its cornerstone on April 27, 1861 and, despite the threat of civil war, completed construction that summer. Its pastor, Rev. James P. Stuart officiated at the dedication on October 6, 1861, and Rev. Chauncey Giles preached.

Like most New Church communities, the Glendale Society thought ‘big.’ While it initially served only fifty-six members, its hall of worship held as many as three hundred. It was the fifth New Church temple in the state of Ohio. Church officials also planned a children’s magazine and a school to provide much needed religious instruction.
At the ripe age of twenty-six, Frank Sewall accepted a call to the Glendale parish when its pastor, Rev. James P. Stuart was appointed editor of the *New-Church Messenger*, the official magazine of the General Convention. Chosen as Stuart’s replacement, Sewall threw his energy into the job and especially into those areas he knew best and which he believed would make the most positive difference in New Church liturgy.

Believing that music and liturgy went hand to hand in the worship of the Divine, Sewall added chants that resonated with listeners, and initiated his first hymnological work in 1867 in *The Christian Hymnal* which set 208 hymns to music, of which he contributed twenty-two songs. The selections were intended to embody “the doctrine that He is the INCARNATE JEHOVAH, and that in Him resides the fullness of the blessed Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, constituting His trinal nature of Love, Wisdom and Divine Proceeding.” Having collected from a range of sacred poetry—both old and new—in English, German, and Latin, he translated them in their original meters, and arranged them in two distinct categories: those addressing the Incarnation, Redemption, Church and Kingdom; and those containing more general and occasional hymns arranged according to topics. Many of his translations had never been published in English. That same year he also prepared *A Prayer Book* for use in the New Church, and a year later, published *The Welcome*, a book of hymns, songs, and lessons for children. For Sewall, liturgical music was the lifeblood of the service. So important was
his contribution that he chaired the Book of General Convention’s Worship Committee until his death.⁵

J. B. Lippincott published a revised and enlarged second edition titled *The New Churchman’s Prayer-Book and Hymnal. A Complete Manual of Devotions* in 1884. In his preface to the second edition, Sewall expressed his gratification that the hymnal had been incorporated into the *Book of Worship* of the General Convention. “It is with devout gratitude and sincere rejoicing that the compiler witnesses such results of those labors of past years.” Its publication, he explained, was intended to “promote the growth of a more prayerful . . . and devout spirit in the worship of the New Church;” facilitate private prayer; furnish “convenient forms of occasional worship” not previously provided; and offer a greater order to regular services by embodying “historic and commemorative elements as will make them to reflect . . . the great theme of the Divine Word.” In meeting this objective, he provided a calendar with a list of lessons and psalms for each day of the year, including prayers, matins, vespers, and hymns for special occasions. With this newest edition, he hoped that its more generous addition of hymns would fill a void not covered by any other publication in the New Church.⁶

Overall, Sewall contributed an important chapter in the history of the New Church in America, rejecting the anti-ritualism that had dominated its New England Puritan heritage. As someone who had drunk heavily in the Renaissance, he wanted desperately to infuse the liturgy with the distinctive beauty of music.⁷
Omen

In 1868, the Urbana trustees invited Pastor Sewall to deliver the University’s June commencement address. Intrigued by the offer, and aware of its potential, he chose for his topic, “Religion and Learning in the New Church,” a topic that would become the centerpiece of his thinking for decades to come. In it, he explained that the destructive wars between rationalism and faith, between reason and revelation were over, and therefore education in the age of the New Dispensation was destined to affect people more universally and harmoniously than ever before. The historic hostility between reason and faith had ceased as neither side had cause to deface or subvert the purposes and methods of the other. Both had achieved “brilliant and honorable results” in their respective studies of man. No longer were articles of faith such as the nature of the Trinity, the nature of inspiration, the creation of the world, its end, and man’s future destiny topics which reason was forbidden to engage.⁸

Sewall blamed past attitudes on the Roman Church which he called “the suppressor of learning and the enemy of free thought.” For it to admit Galileo’s astronomy was to consent to the overthrow of revealed truth. The Protestant Church was similarly at fault, excommunicating “as readily and as uncompromisingly as ever did the Catholic Church and heretics of the Middle Ages.” The geologist who explained that the natural history of creation was not written in Genesis and the antiquarian who questioned the world being only 6,000 years old were just as despised by the Church of the Reformation as the heretics of the Catholic Church. The freedom to
investigate rationally the articles of faith in both Protestant and Catholic churches had never been tolerated. 9

To those preachers who announced: “Leave your learning at the door—God has no use for it,” Sewall responded that the New Church had a much different pronouncement, “Nunc licet,” meaning that it was now permitted “to enter into the sanctuary of Religion, of Revelation, of Faith, with all the rich trophies of science, and to lay them down in sincere, glad worship at the altar of the Almighty.” Christianity had mistakenly restricted the meaning of the Scriptures “to the letter only, which inevitably, when deprived of its spiritual interior or substance, dies—that is, refutes itself.” This forced geology and Genesis into unnecessary and “irreconcilable discord.” With the New Church, explained Sewall, a new era in the development of the human mind had begun.

Hitherto, to reason about the Bible—to question its literal statements—was to reject it as Divine, and thus to reject all Christian revelation. But must this always be so? Is there not hidden beneath the surface of the letter of the revealed Word a deeper meaning—a meaning which is spiritual and Divine, and the existence of which, beneath the literal sense, is precisely what constitutes the Divine Inspiration of the Bible; which makes it indeed the Word of God, in a sense more real and significant than has ever been apprehended by the faith of the most devout believer? 10

The present consideration of the Scriptures imparted two irreconcilable positions: the strictly literal sense
conveying moral and spiritual instruction such as the Ten Commandments; and the other, where Scripture is observed as a record of natural science and history. Into this divide Sewall introduced the Swedenborgian concept of spiritual reason, a plane of consciousness between revealed truth on the one hand and the natural sciences on the other. Illuminated by the Word, man could affirm “that God is, and that God is one; that His nature is trinal; that there is a trine of degrees in all things; that this trine constitutes the order of the universe; that man reflects the whole world in himself; that he is a microcosm, everything of his spiritual nature having its reflection in an outward symbol or corresponding form in nature: thus, that all things of nature correspond to things of the mind, and that, therefore, all nature, in its lowest material plane, reflects and images forth an inner spiritual world.” The law of correspondence made the inner, spiritual truth of the Scriptures intelligible. However, this could not occur until the Scriptures were recognized as “different from all other writings in having a spiritual meaning and containing a kind of truth removed by the discreet degrees from all natural or scientific truth.” Only then could science and revelation be brought into harmony.¹¹

Given his peculiar approach to Scripture (an approach he would later present to the World’s Parliament of Religions in 1893), Sewall stood opposed to the ‘higher critics’ who, as a branch of scientific inquiry, investigated Scripture in order to better understand the world behind the text. For Sewall, the true purpose of the higher critics should have been to transform nature into “a great and wondrous mirror of the inner and the
higher world wherein God and the human soul are the two great factors.” Failing in this objective, they were unable to reconcile the facts of science with the truths of revelation. With the law of correspondences, however, faith and reason were reconciled; no longer did they need to treat each other with mistrust. This new spiritual sense of the Word restored the proper mutual relation of religion and learning. Here in the New Church, revealed truth and natural science could be taught with “heaven-descended light” guiding the pursuit of intelligence and wisdom.\footnote{12}

With this address, Sewall set the tone for reconciliation between the competing forces of science and religion, the subject of which had been dividing teachers, trustees, faculty, students and alumnae at Urbana and at colleges and universities across the country. For Sewall, the matter did not devolve into an either/or situation fraught with constant battles, but rather a Swedenborgian compromise that, like his trine monism, sought a middle ground using a combination of the Doctrine of Discrete Degrees and the science of correspondences.

**Marriage**

During his annual attendance at the General Convention in Philadelphia, Sewall met Thedia Redelia Gilchrist, daughter of William Gilchrist. To all who knew them, it was a perfect match since both came from old families and because she played guitar, painted, drew and sang, and loved the outdoors. They were married on October 28, 1869, at the home of Thedia’s grandmother in Port
Richmond on Staten Island. A woman of exceptional artistic abilities, and sister of William W. Gilchrist, a well-known musician and composer, she devoted her life to her family and to the New Church. Together, she and Frank had five daughters (Alice Archer, b. 1870; Maud Gilchrist, b. 1871; Mary Redelia, b. 1873; Rachel Kenyon, b. 1875; and Elizabeth Truffant, b. 1878).\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Urbana University}

The first ecclesiastical body organized around Swedenborg’s theological works was the General Conference of the New Jerusalem Church founded in 1787 in London. Its American counterpart formed in 1817 in Philadelphia as the American Convention of the New Jerusalem Church (later called the General Convention of the New Jerusalem Church). In both countries, efforts were made to organize schools for the children of New Churchmen. In the United States, schools were started by individual Societies between 1836 and 1845, most of which were in the Midwest and New England, the latter due to the influence of Samuel Worcester, chairman of the General Convention’s Committee on Moral and Religious Instruction. Except for Urbana University chartered in 1850, most closed before mid-century due largely to the combination of financial problems and the expansion of Horace Mann’s public-supported, non-sectarian, ‘common’ schools.\textsuperscript{14}

Much like the rest of Protestantism, the New Church was loosely organized as it moved into the second half of the nineteenth century, a factor that weighed heav-
ily in the decades following the impact of the theory of evolution on Biblical creation and the general increase in the authority of science over matters once deemed solely within the hegemony of religion. This explains the mindfulness of those New Church leaders who sought to keep the young from rejecting their religion due to the growing secularization of society. During the second half of the nineteenth and into the early decades of the twentieth century, the numbers of private schools expanded exponentially as a means of protecting and preserving the doctrines of Christianity and the moral authority of religion.

Urbana University had its origins in the late 1840s when New Church leaders in Ohio raised concerns over the education of their children. Among those who voiced these concerns was Rev. James P. Stuart, a New Church missionary and later pastor of the Glendale Church, who traveled the Midwest selling books and distributing tracts. In the town of Urbana, Ohio, Stuart found a welcomed ear in Colonel John H. James, a prominent lawyer and landowner, who agreed to write the Ohio Association of the New Church with an offer to donate ten acres of land as site for a proposed university. In June 1849, the Association, with the approval of the General Convention, took responsibility for the university and selected land southwest of the town as the site for the school.¹⁵

The act of incorporation for Urbana University passed in the Ohio Legislature on March 7, 1850. Its charter, one of the most liberal granted by the legislature, gave its trustees what they interpreted as the power to establish whatever school, seminary, or college they deemed desirable
under the title of “Urbana University.” According to the charter, the university was to be governed by a board of twelve trustees whose replacements were appointed by its own members. The board was authorized to “encourage and promote the diffusion of knowledge, in all the branches of Academic, Scientific, and Exegetic instruction, and to combine therewith instruction in the productive arts and the practice of rural economy; which shall be under the management and direction of persons known and recognized as belonging to the New Church, or attached to the principles thereof.” Following incorporation, the trustees chose the scientist and educator Milo G. Williams principal and chair of the board, and Rev. James P. Stuart as secretary. Prior to his appointment, Williams had been a New Church schoolmaster, co-founder of the Cincinnati Day School in 1840, and an advocate of the Pestalozzian method of education popular in New Harmony.

At about the same time, the New Church Society of Urbana was incorporated by an act of the Ohio legislature on March 20, 1851. With a constitution and board of trustees approved a year later, the community gathered in various homes for their services until January 5, 1856, when the Rev. Stuart conducted the Society’s first service in its Church Hall on the corner of South Main and Reynolds Streets, followed by a lecture on the “History and Character of the Word” delivered by Mr. Willard G. Day, a student at Urbana University. Stuart remained pastor of the Society until 1858 when services were taken over by the professors at Urbana University.
The Society’s main interest was the health and welfare of the university which Colonel James had suggested be named “Emanuel College,” a symbol of what he hoped would be the prevailing religious focus of the institution. The trustees, however, were of a different mind. Acting on the liberal terms of the university’s charter and envisioning a world-class center of learning which included New Church theology but was otherwise open to all eligible students, they insisted on the name “Urbana University,” a coeducational institution providing education from the primary level through the collegiate.  

With the trustee’s intent on providing a liberal education, the university opened its doors in 1850 as a preparatory school with eighty-three students of both sexes who, it was expected, would eventually enroll in the College. A faculty of five was directed by Dr. J. F. Leonhard Tafel, head of the Department of Language, and Rev. James P. Stuart, head of the Department of Philosophy. Due to his extensive missionary work through the Midwest, Stuart was credited with recruiting the first cohort of students. Two years later, the school’s first building, Bailey Hall, opened its doors. Named in honor of Francis Bailey, the first American to publicly support the teachings of Swedenborg, it consisted of a central hall, classrooms, and library. College Hall, the next addition, became the student dormitory, and in 1875, the expansion of Bailey provided for a chemist’s laboratory and President’s Room.  

By the summer of 1852, the trustees settled on an approved course of study in three departments: science, language, and philosophy. This included teaching Swedenborg’s *True Christian Religion* and the law of cor-
respondences; mathematics and the natural sciences; and the ancient and modern languages. By the fall of 1853, the College opened with the faculty prepared to offer coursework in the first university ever established under the auspices of the New Church. On September 7, Principal Williams welcomed nearly one hundred students, a dozen of whom were beginning the collegiate level.\textsuperscript{21} The faculty included Milo Williams, professor of science and dean of the faculty; Charles W. H. Cathcart, professor of mathematics and librarian; J. F. Leonhard Tafel, professor of languages; Henry Thayer Niles, professor of Greek and Rhetoric; Rev. James P. Stuart, professor of philosophy, and Miss Caroline W. Collier from the Cincinnati public schools as principal of the Preparatory Department. Tuition amounted to $30/year or $10/per term, with room and board costing from $2 to $2.50/per week.\textsuperscript{22}

The catalog of 1855-56 listed 128 students of both sexes, divided into primary, 46; preparatory, 54; college regular, 14; and partial-course students, 15. Unfortunately, 59 chose not to return the following term. Of the 347 students who had matriculated between 1853 and 1860, only 198 came from New Church families, a troubling statistic indicative of the fact that the school had failed to convince sufficient numbers of New Church families of its educational mission.\textsuperscript{23} Despite the presence of the Ohio Association of the New Church (later renamed the General Society of the New Church in Ohio) which held its annual meetings on the campus, member families seemed unimpressed with the prospect of enrolling their children there instead of the
public schools. Therefore, the school faced a continuing challenge to realize the trustees’ vision of a world-class center, much less a New Church school of learning.24

Despite their optimism, issues remained unsettled between the faculty and the trustees. Believing that religion was not receiving its due deference among the disciplines, Rev. Stuart instigated a standoff with the trustees, leading to a public feud between the departments of philosophy and science. From the trustees’ point of view, Stuart’s fractious complaints were unfounded since, in addition to the required set of courses the students took in philosophy, the school opened daily with readings from Swedenborg and Scripture, and all students were required to attend Sunday school and church services. Hoping to settle the dispute, the trustees replaced Principal Williams with the Rev. Chauncey Giles, pastor of the First New Jerusalem Society in Cincinnati. Giles was aware of the campus unrest but, choosing to live in Cincinnati and make only occasional visits to Urbana, he proved unable to assert the “hands-on” approach necessary to quell the feud.25

Warning Signs

With the outbreak of Civil War, the scramble of its collegiate students to enlist in the armies on both sides of the conflict forced the College to suspend its program, leaving the institution to reopen in the fall of 1862 with only its Preparatory School welcoming students; it too, closed in 1864. Suffering from President Giles’s chronic absenteeism and his preferred management style of
delegating to others the handling of everyday affairs of the university, the trustees decided on a much-needed change in leadership.26

When the university reopened its doors in the fall of 1866, Alonzo Phelps became the new principal and, to his credit, succeeded in returning the enrollment to nearly its pre-war numbers. Unfortunately, with the New Church Society in Urbana declining in numbers and the continued reluctance of New Church families in the region to send their children, the trustees decided to reach out once again for new leadership, this time to Frank Sewall, pastor of the Glendale Church. Sewall was by no means an unknown quantity. As noted earlier, while pursuing his studies at Tübingen, he had received a letter from Jonathan Young Scammon suggesting that he consider the possibility of taking a chair at Urbana on his return to the States. Also, while serving as pastor of the Glendale Church, he delivered the June 1868 commencement address which had been enjoyed by all.27

Changing of the Guard

Buoyed by the prospect of having a true intellectual at the helm, Colonel James persuaded the trustees to offer the presidency to the thirty-two-year-old Sewall, a responsibility to which Sewall “threw himself with all the ardor and energy of his nature.” With his investiture, he set out to re-establish the College as well as increase the ecclesiastical influence over the school, a position intended to soothe the still simmering differences between Stuart’s supporters and the more secular leanings
of the trustees. With a priest as president, the trustees hoped to find a balance between the school’s Swedenborgian roots and their aspirations for a world-class university.  

Essentially, there were two issues that would fester during the sixteen-year tenure of Sewall’s presidency. The first concerned the modern scientific spirit which challenged the traditional classical education; and the second was the place of women in higher education. For the former, he developed a unique and convincing plan designed to combine Swedenborg’s scientific and philosophical writings with his theology, a marriage of science and religion. While judged problematical, hypothetic, and suppositional by outsiders, Sewall’s plan convinced most New Churchmen that he had found the right formula. Having witnessed the dissolution of religion in the German universities when skepticism and the higher critics took hold of the curriculum, Sewall made it a point to ensure that the Word remain the medium of Urbana’s academic life. Sewall’s effort to build Urbana into a Swedenborgian school of distinction was based on bringing the effects of the New Dispensation into the realm of science. This did not mean a separate existence for religion, but rather uniting the two through the theory of discrete degrees and the science of correspondences. As for co-education, the trustees gave Sewall permission to build a separate educational program for the Girl’s School, but privately they questioned his judgment.

Intent on modeling Urbana on the famous English schools of Eton and Harrow, Sewall organized a course of instruction that rose in “discrete degrees” from gram-
mar school to a preparatory school and college. Into it, he added a distinctly New-Church blend of Swedenborg’s scientific, philosophical, and religious writings. He also allowed the substitution of modern for ancient languages and provided additional studies in Mathematics, Trigonometry, Surveying, Astronomy, Geology, Mineralogy, Botany, Anatomy and Physiology. To counterbalance these changes he made religion a required course that included units on the science of correspondences, Bible history, Sampson Reed’s *Growth of the Mind*, and Swedenborg’s *True Christian Religion* and *Heaven and Hell*.29

Urbana, which had suffered financially through much of its early history, benefitted measurably from the sheer energy Sewall brought to the presidency. Not only did he succeed in fundraising, but more importantly, he laid the groundwork for the school’s future endowment with his cultivation of several students, one of whom was Julian Kennedy Smyth who entered Urbana in 1871 with his parent’s desire to send one of their sons to be ordained a New-Church minister. According to Lewis F. Hite, “Sewall’s poetic charm, his unflagging zeal and energy, his lofty ideals of New-Church education and New-Church life . . . inspired [Smyth] with unfailing loyalty and with ever growing appreciation of the School both as it was in its actual working and as the possibility of immense and indispensable service to the Church and to the whole community.” The families of Thomas Coleman DuPont, a graduate student in the Theology Department, and another classmate, James G. Wentz,
also gave generously to the university—all had been cultivated by Sewall.\textsuperscript{30}

In 1876, the university graduated its first cohort of baccalaureate students. In addition, it conferred master’s degrees on those who, after completing their studies, were promoted into their respective professions. This included Richard De Charms, Julian K. Smyth, Jacob E. Werren, and Jacob Kimm who pursued special theological courses taught by Sewall and were all subsequently ordained into the ministry.\textsuperscript{31} The catalog of 1878 listed students coming from Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, New York, Kentucky, Kansas and Maine; also, from Norway, Sweden, and Canada.\textsuperscript{32}

In 1879, the local Urbana Society turned over possession of its wood-framed house of worship to the university where it was raised by crane to become the second story of Lyceum Hall where it accommodated the School for Girls. In consideration of this transfer, the university agreed to assume responsibility for building the Society’s new house of worship. Designed by architect A. Holcomb and built by Thomas Allison, it was dedicated in 1882 and became the university’s church as well as a teaching facility for evening lectures.\textsuperscript{33}

For much of his tenure, the faculty consisted of Sewall, president and professor of intellectual and moral science; Thomas Freeman Moses, professor of natural science and Director of the School for Girls; Philip Baraud Cabell, professor of ancient languages and literature; Thomas French, professor of physics and mathematics, and Master of the Grammar School; William Pinckney Starke, professor of ancient languages; Jacob
E. Werren, professor of modern languages; Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen, tutor in Latin and Greek; and George A. Worcester, instructor in botany and Master of the College Hall.34

The faculty’s scholarly contributions in the 1870s and 1880s were significant. They included meteorological reports contributed to the Smithsonian Institution by Milo Williams; *The Unity of Natural Phenomena* (1873) translated and edited from the French by Thomas Moses; a translation from the Latin of Swedenborg’s *De Cerebro* (1880); M. Saigly’s “The Unity of Natural Phenomena;” Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen’s novel *Gunnar*; and a photolithographic copy of *Ontologia* (1880) by Philip B. Cabell. As for Sewall, he produced two volumes of religious discourses titled *The Pillow of Stones* (1876) and *The Hem of His Garment* (1876); a classroom text titled *Latin Speaker: Easy Dialogues and Other Selections for Memorizing and Declaiming in the Latin Language* (1877); and a translation of Swedenborg’s *The Soul, or Rational Psychology* (1886) from the Latin. From these significant accomplishments, Sewall drew hope that the future efforts of the College would realize not only the true educational ideals of the New Church but the expectations of the trustees for a world-class university.

* * * *

Though the college had yet to realize its full potential, Sewall rejoiced that the purposes which had brought forth its existence were now fully embedded in its organizational structure and culture. From the music of the
Choral Society, to the study of Plato, daily chapel service, spring exhibitions of student projects in City Hall, to graduation exercises under ancient oaks, the trustees, teachers and students saw the rewards of their labor realized.\textsuperscript{35} However, contrary to Sewall’s expectations, Urbana remained a creature of the trustees, a fact reinforced by Louis Hite’s commencement address in 1903 when he remarked that Urbana University was taking its place among the institutions of higher learning “not as a sectarian school but as a school for humanity. It imposes its theological and religious tenets on no one although it provides ample opportunity to learn and to appreciate its distinctive principles.”\textsuperscript{36}
Wherefore the uses of all things which are created ascend by degrees From the lowest things to man, and through man to God, their Creator, From whom they originate.

(Swedenborg, Divine Love and Wisdom, §170)

University communities in the mid-to-late nineteenth century went through a period of transformative change as they defined a path between empirical and verified knowledge (facts) and the spiritual, moral and cognitive dimension that constituted knowledge (values). This transition between facts and values was closely connected with changes in educational and scholarly practices that challenged such normative structures as the balance between science and classical education, the inclusion of more modern and practical subjects, the set curriculum versus specializa-
tion, debates over the idea and meaning of evolution, support for natural theology versus scientific study, and the importance of value neutrality. These were but a sprinkling of the issues facing universities as the notion of education moved inexorably toward a more secular and humanistic set of parameters, including a movement away from denominational governance and church sponsorship to a merit driven approach to scholarly excellence.¹

As colleges and universities lived through these transitions, so, too, did their presidents and trustees, many of whom took immediate sides in the perceived divide between science and religion, while others searched for common ground somewhere between religion’s deductive approach and science’s insistence on inductive inquiry. Educational leaders who trained abroad, especially those trained in German universities, typically came away from their experience with a new awareness that caused many to play key roles in the dismantling of education practices that had out-lived their usefulness.

Most of the literature on educational reform during this period focuses on leaders like Charles Eliot of Harvard, Daniel Coit Gilman of Johns Hopkins, and James B. Angell of the University of Michigan who were blessed with resources—public and private—to attain their goals. By contrast, Frank Sewall belonged to a different tier of university president’s intent on defending the missions of their respective institutions relying on a mix of authority, piety, discipline, utility, and service. They defended a world-view that associated truth with religion, and more importantly with revelation, setting the tone for this
combination by demonstrating the connection between character, guidance, clearness of purpose, and the subject areas of instruction. Religion transformed abstract knowledge into truths that directed daily activity and explained one’s personal destiny.

During his sixteen years as president, Sewall found himself wearing the hats of a priest, pastor, president, husband, father, advisor, employer, scholar, judge, and jury—any one of which could fill a day’s work. Sewall was a man in perpetual motion as he attended student events, responded to correspondence, prepared speeches, planned events, sought donors, attended conferences, counseled with trustees, inspired and engaged all who could further the mission of the institution, and then have quality time left over at the end of the day to spend with his family. Entrusted with many people’s lives, he stood guard over the human and material assets of the university.

**Correspondence**

Arguably on almost any day of the week the largest claim on Sewall’s time was answering correspondence that ranged from students to parents, colleagues, and a raft of miscellaneous others. In an age of letter writing, he was the personification of dedication to the task. There were requests for letters of recommendation for students as well as for potential teachers. In the latter, Sewall usually asked for information regarding their disciplinary powers, their sober-mindedness, their natural
fondness for teaching, their schooling, who they studied under, and their fluency in German and French.  

Another significant portion of his mail related to the prospect of finding work for students, so they could afford their education. Given the small size of the school’s enrollment, finding a job for a single student or two could mean a difference in the institution’s financial stability. Thus, many of the letters that crossed his desk came from those who qualified their attendance contingent on the expectation of employment. The bottom line financially also depended on coaxing those students who failed to return after one or two terms, an issue particularly common among local families. For these, Sewall made it a point of personally urging them and their families to rethink their decision. In one response to Sewall’s letter, William H. Kerus explained that he had mistakenly thought he had saved enough funds to graduate but learned that his expenses were far more than he had anticipated and could no longer consider a college education. Nevertheless, he thanked Sewall for his kindness and promised to continue reading Swedenborg. “I miss going to church very much. There is no New Church near enough.”

In a related manner, Sewall frequently received letters from people seeking employment at the University or in the town. One letter came from the wife of a physician and mother of eight desperate to find a new life in Urbana. “We have sold our all in Olivet [Kansas] for just enough to get away with and now we do not know where to go.” Most letters were less desperate but still bent on seeking employment—from teaching positions, to janitors and resident hall managers.
There were also letters written in response to parents asking him to be watchful should their son become homesick, a condition particularly common among those who had not been away from home before. By contrast there was correspondence from one worried parent who had not heard from his son in months and wondered how he was doing, where he spent his vacations and summers, and if he was in good health.\

As the dormitory or residence hall represented a very new experience for students, it played an important role in the co-curricular aspects of their education and often caught parents by surprise when they discovered changes in their son’s behavior. “As my son now has no bad habits that I am aware,” wrote J. S. Ingham of Academy Corners, Pennsylvania, “I therefore wish to keep him under a good influence.” For that reason, parents urged the University find a New Church family with whom their sons could board as a way of protecting them from negative influences.

Of equal concern were letters from parents fearful for their son’s spiritual health due to the negative influence of a roommate. “Another important reason for a change [in rooms],” wrote one parent, “is that Clifford will get on much better alone in a religious point of view, Scott being older than he with a more or less negative feeling or perhaps more justly to say a feeling of indifference or want of reverence for the Bible and the writings of the Church, may have a tendency to gradually undermine or lessen Clifford’s love of Holy things. I learned through a great friend of Clifford here that he has acknowledged
to him that he could not say his Prayers in the room but would make some excuse to go out to say them.”

The elective system which permitted students to choose their curriculum without a narrowly prescribed course of study was sixty years in the making before Charles Eliot Harvard implemented it at Harvard in 1884. Eliot based the change on both the Reformation and American political theory, arguing that the freedom to choose courses allowed students to exercise their God-given propensities to develop true growth of character. Though most colleges continued to use a highly structured curriculum, Sewall allowed some variance for those who he knew had enrolled for very narrow purposes. One example was a young man already teaching in a normal school who desired to spend a year or more at Urbana to improve his education and perhaps help him to decide for or against a career in the ministry. To this end, he requested permission to set his own curriculum that would include Chemistry, Philosophy, Engineering, and perhaps Mental Philosophy and Political Economy. He also wished to take lessons on the violin.

On account of Sewall’s appointment to the position of Superintendent of Missions for the General Convention, he answered an inordinate amount of mail on behalf of the Missionary Fund. Through a combination of personal letters, questionnaires that asked for an annual contribution, and letters containing religious tracts or the latest issue of The New-Church Messenger, Sewall solicited as well as answered a host of correspondence, including many who apologized for their meager
contributions owing to their lack of income or employment.\textsuperscript{12}

One of his correspondents, G. Nelson Smith, was especially active. Writing from Richmond, Indiana, March 5, 1871, he reported on his efforts to organize Societies in the surrounding region. His letters listed contacts in the various counties, addresses of households requesting tracts, and the prospect of receiving financial help from the University. Overall, converts to the New Church were too few to support a permanent minister’s salary, forcing Sewall to rely on a cadre of traveling missionaries to fill the void and sending money orders to make up the difference in their salary.\textsuperscript{13}

A dedicated letter-writer, Sewall kept in touch with missionaries at home and abroad, answering their concerns and providing financial support when needed. The Rev. S. H. Spencer, for example, traveled through Ohio holding meetings and communion in private homes. As a missionary, he depended on contributions and money orders from Sewall to support his work.\textsuperscript{14} Other letters spoke to the lack of an available minister to preach, essentially complaining that their dollars had not brought the New Church any closer to their communities than before.\textsuperscript{15} Some asked Sewall to provide a course of lectures that might attract memberships; others complained of the inability to find a public hall to have a New Church service owing to the rental expense.\textsuperscript{16} There were letters challenging Sewall: “Dear Sir,” wrote M. J. Pollock, editor of the \textit{Wheeling Daily Register} in 1878, “We send you today is an article upon science and religion written by one of our brightest cler-
gymen. If it is not presuming, we would ask you to write an article upon the same subject giving the New Church ideas which we will publish in the same paper, with your permission. Enclosed I send you 25 cents with which to pay your postage upon any manuscript you may favor us with.”

Sewall also handled subscriptions and donations, receiving letters containing coins, checks, and money orders to purchase subscriptions to *The New Church Messenger*, the *University Courant*, or simply to support the Church’s missionary efforts. Major areas of missionary focus included Cleveland, Lynchburg, Dayton, and Steubenville Ohio; Titusville, Pennsylvania; Peru and Indianapolis, Indiana; and Wheeling, West Virginia.

The most popular of the General Convention publications was *The New-Church Messenger*, a semi-monthly published since 1854. When its editor asked subscribers to publicly proclaim their faith to the doctrines of the New Church, some felt very uncomfortable with the recommendation and wrote Sewall. “I am satisfied that if I should do that the most of my supporters here would forsake me,” admitted J. B. Parmeller of Peru, Indiana. “If I had plenty of money, or a visible means of support before me, I cannot doubt but that I should stand out publicly for the despised Swede at once and declare his teachings openly.”

From time to time, Sewall received letters from New Church members asking for clarification of specific church doctrines. In a lengthy letter from A. D. Sproat in Chillicothe, Ohio, regarding Divine spiritual knowledge and the role of revelation compared to the “simple
sciences” and the “wild theories like Darwin’s that can never be substantiated . . . . Pure simple science ought to be kept within its own province. It is the foundation only and a false theology cannot properly rest on it. It rather hovers over it.”

Teacher/Scholar/Mentor

Another of Sewall’s many hats was that of teacher/scholar/mentor, meaning one who had command of the subject matter and took pride in the timeless task of educating young minds to the joy of learning, exchanging ideas, mastering new material, and keeping their knowledge up-to-date through contacts with the broader scholarly community. In annual addresses to the university community, evening lectures at the Urbana Church, sermons, conversations with students, faculty and alumni, and the publication of books and articles, Sewall had a choice of avenues to fulfill his teacher/scholar/mentor obligations.

Sewall’s writings appeared repeatedly in The New-Church Messenger, The New Church Review, Contemporary Review, World Quarterly Review, and the University Courant, Urbana’s official newsletter. In the New-Church Messenger alone, he authored over fifty articles addressing the music and psalmody of the church. With “a poet’s and preacher’s gift of utterance,” he explained his doctrinal beliefs and his dedication to the pure-mindedness of his Swedenborgianism. As a priest, his mission was to save his fellow human beings from drifting away. He
listened, he read, and he taught. An optimist at heart, he seldom, if ever, showed his discouragement. \(^{20}\)

Sewall wrote as he spoke, never lessening the importance of Revelation. His sermons as seen in his treatment of Ishmael and Hager in *The Pillow of Stones; Divine Allegories in their Spiritual Meaning*, and in its companion book, *The Hem of His Garment; Spiritual Lessons from the Life of Our Lord*, he knit together different allegories to demonstrate Divine power. They included “The Eternal Lamp; or, How Faith is to be Preserved;” “Hagar’s Return to Her Mistress; or, the Submission of the Rational;” “Noah’s Dove; or, the Soul Set Free;” and “The Temptation of Eve; or, the Beguilements of the Sensual Man.” \(^{21}\)

In 1878, Sewall published *The Latin Speaker; Easy Dialogues and Other Selections for Memorizing and Declaiming in the Latin Language* intended to infuse more enthusiasm into the study of Latin in the schools. With it, he wanted to make more of the thought behind this so-called dead language by using modern teaching methods to bring Latin alive with animation, impulse, emotion and purpose. “To make a language live it is only necessary to put ideas behind the words and thoughts behind the sentences, and then to give utterance to these works and thoughts in accent, tone, and inflection, as these are naturally prompted.” As a way of relieving the student of unnecessary rules such as pronunciation and sentence arrangement, he focused on making Latin words speak what they mean; inserted medieval hymns to be sung in iambic tetrameter; added passages from Scripture; and chose a selection of Horatian odes to be
read to a musical beat. Taught in this manner, he hoped that the language of Cicero and Horace would become a living language associated with “lively forms of natural expression.”

In another allegorical tale, *Angelo, the Circus Boy* (1879), Sewall told a boy’s story of ambition, love, innocence, and fidelity. It involved the adventures of a runaway who deserted his home for a life in the circus and of another who dreamed of having a home and all that it implied and how “some are taught by experience that which they cannot or will not learn from precept.” Of interest in the adventure was the way Sewall treated death in clear Swedenborgian terms as a passage from one plane to another where angels gather and “take care of us when we are asleep.” Similarly, he spoke of the doctrine of uses by explaining how there was dignity and even “a certain delightfulfulness” in the most common labors provided one worked from love. “The truth was he had a purpose and end which gave a soul to all his labors and brought ever fresh drafts of spiritual strength into his determined physical efforts. He was working from love to another, from pure, unselfish, and self-sacrificing love. Nothing seemed hard to him which helped to gain or make clearer his object.”

Intended as an addition to the curriculum, Sewall published *The New Ethics: An Essay on the Moral Law of Use* (1881) which began by explaining the importance of distinguishing between “the will as the affectional part of the human mind and the intellect as the instrument of thought.” After acknowledging this two-fold division in man’s nature, he reflected on the fact that in the past as
well as in modern times, periods of “brilliant intellectual activity” had been marked by notable periods of “moral stagnation and corruption.” In other words, the intellect was “a comparatively external part of man, near the surface, capable as well of disguising the real man within, and susceptible of training from without by means of entirely discordant . . . impulses of the will within.”

Sewall explained the will as that affectional agent in man which, as a sensation or experience, feels and does not think as it strives to achieve an end. “Behind the man that acts, that speaks, that reasons, that thinks, that desires even, is the man that feels, that loves. The life of man itself is his love.” Here was the proper domain of ethics and ethical education. This was the part of man which feels, and which affects the moral culture. Just as in physical education where the body is trained to be in harmony with the physical universe, so the will and thought should “find a perfect and ready and mighty instrument in the body for transmitting its emotion and desires in the forms of effectual act and profitable labor in the field of matter.” The mind of man should be developed in harmony with the “universal laws of truth so that the truth shall readily enter it and find a welcome in a quick perception” free from delusions and able to form conclusions secure from fallacies. The trained intellect was one that can “look through effects to causes, and through causes to ends, and thus see the laws of order upon which not only the universe is constructed and exists, but without which there could be no determination of the true or false.”
Having set the parameters, Sewall explained that the object of education was to adapt the moral plan of the mind to the moral laws of the universe so that the mind “shall respond harmoniously to the pulsations of the moral atmosphere without.” Whether one believed in an objective moral law and law-giver was of no serious consequence to the discussion of ethics as a matter of education. Ethics was a practical matter regardless of whether one believed in an objective moral law. So regardless whether the moral force was subjective or objective, coming from within or without, the law to which man must conform was the law of use which Sewall called the “divine end.” It was the law of “mutual service,” not simply the service of self. “The whole universe is a great work of uses, and not the smallest atom exists in its material depths, nor the purest angel in its celestial spheres, which is not actuated wholly by this one universal divine law of life, and order, and happiness, the mutual service of things.”

The law of use, or mutual service was the moral law of the universe and different from the doctrine of the Utilitarians who made self-interest and self-love the foundation of all moral and social stability. Compared to the ethics of Plato, the law of use had more to do with doing than knowing; and compared to the ascetic monk, it subordinated fasting and mortification to the serving of fellow man.

Then came Sewall’s English translation of Swedenborg’s The Soul, or Rational Psychology (1887). Taken from J. F. I. Tafel’s 1849 Latin translation, it represented the summary of Swedenborg’s great scientific and philosophic series titled the Animal Kingdom. In the book’s
preface Swell explained that the Swede’s purpose was to open man’s “spiritual” eyes using the doctrine of correspondences. The principal aim animating from the book was his search for the soul. To know the nature of the spirit and its relation to matter remained key objective of Swedenborg’s lifelong work in the world of science, philosophy, and theology. “If we regard the body in the sense of the larger body—the natural world—and the soul as meaning the larger soul—the spiritual world—the knowledge of the soul and its intercourse with the body becomes identical with that of the spiritual world and its relation to the natural world, and this is preeminently the subject of the descriptive portion of our author’s theological writings.” He sought this knowledge, explained Sewall, in the kingdom of uses “as exhibited in the beautiful order, harmony, and activities of the human anatomy and physiology.”

To Sewall’s disappointment, the translation received little support from the academic community which called the work a quixotic if not a futile effort to secure a place for theology in the emerging world of empirical science. Exemplary of the response were the following two reviews. “It is hard to see . . . what useful purpose the book can be made to serve,” wrote one reviewer. Though there was obvious interest in psychological studies, he doubted that, owing to the unscientific character of the work, there was much to be gotten from it. This was especially the case because Swedenborg was a mystic who assumed that man possessed a lower mind or animus whose role was to conceive, imagine, and to desire; a rational mind or mens to understand, think and
to will; and a soul or *anima* to represent the universe, to have intuition of ends, to be conscious, and to determine, recognizing the part played by the brain and the body in connection with mental phenomena. Unfortunately, “Swedenborg’s anatomy and physiology are quite as fantastic as his psychology,” concluded the reviewer. “Those who believe Swedenborg to have been a divinely inspired teacher may perhaps accept such doctrines . . . but to other persons his book will be chiefly interesting as an example of the aberrations of the human intellect.”

A second reviewer, writing in *The American Journal of Psychology* was equally harsh, calling it an outdated exposition from a transcendental point of view. Ignored by modern day scientists for “obvious reasons,” Swedenborg was “purely a speculator” whose hallucinations were incorporated as key elements in his system and, like August Comte, became the creed of a religious sect. Sewall intended his translation to explain Swedenborg’s investigations into the discovery of the soul, the last of his pre-hallucinatory literary career. In his remarks, the reviewer opined that if Swedenborg’s writings had ended there, he would have been compared favorably with other great philosophers. However, having followed this work with thirty years of hallucinations, it seemed more natural to think of him as a “seer” or “madman.”

**Family Life**

For family members, Sewall’s multiple hats were an ever-present reality. Urbana University was both a state
of mind and a presence in the form of students, faculty, books, buildings, and the shadowy influence of trustees. “Consciously we sense adventure from the Lord,” recalled Alice. From the Choral Society whose expressive voices Sewall directed, sang, and interpreted from his piano, to his evening lectures in the church, to welcoming families and students to the new term, to his “twenty questions” at mealtime, and end of the day playtime with his daughters, Sewall made a festival of it all. As Alice explained,

The festival might be of the commonest stuff—his humour, his playfulness could turn it to gold. And he was so sincere in the play that one felt the gold was worth the price. It was good to be in the game. And he would no more be late for the picnic than for morning Prayers: he was never late for anything unless it was Sunday dinner, when he must dally a little in the Church after the people had gone, to see if everything was left as beautiful and as significant as possible. His vacations were packed for uses which some might designate as hard work, and some as frivolity. In the latter class, it might be organizing a whole seaside hotel of nondescript pleasure seeking people,—housed in the dull rooms by the heavy fog and thundering breakers of the Atlantic,—into opposing camps for Twenty Questions pursued with mock seriousness.

To the extent that Sewall took responsibility for cultivating the spiritual, emotional, and intellectual growth of students in his multiple roles as president, pastor,
and superintendent of Sunday school, the responsibility extended as well to his five daughters. Alice Archer (Archie), named after Alice Worcester Sewall, Frank’s youngest sister, was the oldest of the five, born in 1870 at Glendale. The other four daughters were all born at Urbana: Maud Gilchrist (Maud), 1872; Mary Redelia (Maidy), 1873; Rachel Kenyon (Ray), 1875; and Elizabeth Trufant (Bess), 1878. Assisting Sewall’s educational plan for his daughters was a German governess who managed the girls’ lessons under his close supervision. According to Alice, “we learned from our German governess reading, writing, and arithmetic, in German, with lovely fairy tales and bits of poetry.”34 In addition each was given a sketchbook to use on family travels and short outings.35

Following a set format determined by Sewall, the family began each day with morning prayers, an indication of the degree to which they valued religion in their lives. During the day, the children expressed themselves with music, dancing, and play-acting. During the evening, Frank played the piano while Thedia preferred the guitar or cello. By all accounts, the household was filled with music, song, and dance, interspersed with games of cards such as “Dr. Busby” which they played frequently.

Around the parlor, with its bare, waxed and inlaid floor, my little sisters and I sat waiting the prelude to the dance to come to a pause, when my father, looking up from his flying hands on the keyboard, would announce, ‘Signorina Madelina’, or ‘Signorina Alicia,’ or whoever out of the four was to be the performer of the
DiFFERENT HATS

passeu. Then out the child would fly to the center, in front of the coal grate, with the Sistine Madonna above it blessing the evening play, and my mother with the baby on her lap, clapping for the encore. The dances were to be expressive of the music, and no one could tell what that might be, as the improvisation poured out every mood, changing its beat and character from Largo to Vivace with dramatic suddenness. Maud was famous in the family for her tiptoe whirls that seemed to come from the trills. The breathless joy ended all too soon in the goodnight kisses before going to bed.36

On the other hand, “there was never a sound of music or a flower in the house during Holy Week,” recalled Alice. But on Easter their father “filled the house with flowers, and the breakfast table was cheerful with hand-painted eggs (landscapes, flowers, etc.). There was a present at each place. Then there was music—loud and joyous.” Christmas was always a special time for the Sewall family. The challenge to create a gift box that contained gifts (except for Thedia) holding to a 25-cent limit for each. In writing about the 1906 Christmas, Sewall’s box contained a poem to his “darling precious family” whose words spoke to the very heart of his emotions.37

“Old Song”
Without the door let sorrow lie,
And if by cold it hap to die,
We’ll bury it in a Christmas pie,
And everyone be merry
The position of university president was never a singular job for Frank Sewall. Instead, it was an amalgamation of duties ranging from the very large to the very small. To be sure, he thrived in this multidisciplinary role, changing his hats with skill and resolution. Like many small church-related liberal arts presidents, he was prepared to assist young men and women make the transition from rural to urban society; promote men for the ministry; facilitate upward social mobility; and protect the classical curriculum and traditional faith from the snares of humanism and the scientific method. This was a time when college and university presidents spoke and wrote of the university as an idea and an ideal. Without any official consensus or set of national academic standards, they exercised historic levels of authority, support, and popularity. To each of these characteristics, President Sewall knew his hats and changed them as the need arose.
Use is the law that governs the growth and determines the final success of institutions. Institutions that are not needed are sure to fail in the end.

. . . But if we bend all our efforts toward the performing of our peculiar use, the establishing of a New Church college, that is, of a school wherein the distinctive principles of the New Church shall come down even into the teachings of science itself, . . . we shall make all other efforts subordinate to this ruling one.

(Frank Sewall, “Inaugural Address,” 1870)
to support its Primary Department and School for Girls. Having been charged by the trustees to restore the full collegiate program, he requested and received approval to temporarily suspend both the primary and the girl’s programs. The reason for this was Sewall’s belief that the female mind differed from the male; therefore, he could not accept co-education as the ideal model for the New Church or for education in general, even though it had long been the intent of the trustees to include girls in the University’s programs. For Sewall, the trustees’ preference for coeducation had not been based on discrete degrees and forms but on the peripheral winds of opinion that would ultimately disappoint and distract from education’s true purposes.

**Mind Games**

In 1879, after extensive discussions with the board and building his faculty, Sewall reopened several schools under the charter of the university: a Kindergarten for children from four to seven years old; a Primary School for boys and girls from eight to twelve; a Girl’s School for ages twelve to eighteen; a Grammar School for boys of the same age group, and a College restricted to men only. Sewall insisted on a rigorous but separate, curriculum for girls. In his report to the trustees, he made his point quite clear.

In the School for Girls, there are at present three classes in Latin, two in French and two in German, the advanced class reading Schiller’s *Maid of Orleans*. 
There is a class in Natural History and one in Physics, both of which have occasional illustrated lectures from the College professor in the College Museum or Laboratory. There are classes in Ancient and Modern History, in English Literature, in Mythology, in Botany and regular and careful drilling in English composition and reading.¹

Despite obtaining trustee approval, Sewall was “aware of the changes in the air, the national air, the educational air” that continued to challenge his views. This nagging realization caused him to reach out to Rev. Orson Lloyd Barler to head the Girl’s School. A graduate of Shurtleff College in Alton, Illinois, and a long-time Baptist minister, Barler had found comfort in the New Church teachings of future life after the death of his son. In 1876, he left the Baptist ministry to preach the doctrines of the New Church in Illinois and Wisconsin. In 1882, he toured the United States to raise funds for Urbana University.²

Barler’s theory on the differences between the sexes was based principally on their differing spiritual needs which required separate classes rather than co-education. Except for seminarians preparing for ordination, girls required more doctrine than men to fulfill their usefulness in the world. As Barler explained, “Man during his life in the world induces a form beyond the purest substances composing the inmost of his natural body degree, so that it may be said that man forms the quality of his own life, since according to that form the Lord’s life in him is received. Forms or degrees are for the uses
of life, and always the quality of life is according to the form that receives it.”³ Intending to preserve and inculcate those truths (forms) necessary for youths to fulfill their greatest usefulness in the world, Barler insisted that the expectations for women to be the protectors and preservers of the family’s spiritual capital required that they not be taught like men. The woman was the “guardian of heaven” whose spirituality demanded an entirely different channel reflective of her form.⁴

Sewall spent years thinking about the role of women and what he learned from Barler. Nothing seemed so important than cultivating and preserving the spiritual life of youth and particularly that of girls. This issue, which became a lightning rod during his presidency, caused him years later to publish *The Angel of the State; or, the Kindergarten in the Education of the Citizen: A Study of Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Swedenborg* (1898) which focused on their respective educational theories and, in particular, Swedenborg’s “Doctrine of Remains.”⁵ What he found important in kindergarten was not that the child be educated religiously, but that the intellect be awakened to the use of free will and reason.⁶

Sewall rejected both the theory of the mind as a *tabula rasa* and Plato’s theory of inborn ideas; neither was consistent with the true processes of education. “The mind,” he insisted, “is a growth, and not a mechanical structure; and while it is true that it grows by what it feeds on, still the thing itself that grows is a force to be taken into account as well as the food assimilated in the process of growing.”⁷ The life-substance inflowing from the Divine was finite, varied, and individualized according to the
form of the recipient. The divine life flowing down into the mental receptacles became the child’s individual life only with the awakening of the child’s consciousness and intellectual self-activity. This is what Swedenborg called the “appropriation of life.” The foundation of the self—the ego—lay in this inflowing of the divine life into the recipient forms of the conscious human mind.  

According to the forms into which life flowed and the way it was exercised or put forth into use, it became good or bad, heavenly or infernal. The maturing of the vessels began with heredity and, in the early years of infancy, was further developed for the reception of Divine influx. This was love from the Divine that flowed into the soul taking on the forms of truth, beauty, and use in self-activity.  

To the extent that God descended into the human mind and life, reasoned Sewall, so did man “ascend heavenward and Godward, rising from the mere sensuous reception of life to the intellectual, the rational, the moral, and the spiritual reception, until at length he becomes the angelic form itself, the immortal inmate of the house eternal in the heavens.” The degree to which these forces were used depended on the individual’s free will and the rational reflection to bring them forth. From the first impressions of infancy, the mind progressed with the acquisition of knowledge and the awakening of reasoning power to the full exercise of freedom and rationality. On this intellectual and rational plane came the exercise of uses and the development of character. “From this time on, life itself becomes the educator, and man in his daily conduct and the formation, by volun-
tary choice, of his ruling loves and principles becomes the maker of his own future and immortal destiny.” The process of divine descent and human ascent were simultaneous with God’s descending through will, faith, and action, and man’s journey to exercise his freedom according to reason.  

This entire process was nowhere more consequentially exercised than in the creative environment of kindergarten which did not require teaching of formal doctrines but the nourishing of those affections that lay at the base of human society. This religious function, explained Sewall, was found in the Swedenborg’s Doctrine of Remains:

- Man is not life but is a recipient of life; and all life is according to reception.
- Man’s life is not imparted once and for all at the single instant of conception or birth but is being constantly received by him from the One Infinite Source.
- The forms into which this life is received are mental as well as corporeal.
- The forms earliest receptive of the inflowing life control and modify all subsequent reception.
- The forms earliest receptive of life, while characterized by the least hereditary selfhood, afford the least opposition to the affections of the good and the true—flowing in from the Divine.
- The prolonged infancy and adolescence of the human child afford a period of elasticity, in the receptive forms, which may be availed of in de-
termining the fixed forms and so the fixed character of the adult.\textsuperscript{11}

Like the Buddhist idea of Karma, what may have passed out of consciousness was stored as an inheritance. In early states of youth, the innocent joys of childhood were not obliterated but treasured in the interiors as germs that could later emerge into the consciousness of the exterior man. The consciousness of that which past into the interior could be reserved by the Divine and be recalled when needed.

**Idea of the University**

President Sewall had been thinking about what education should look like long before he took office and for many years afterwards. His beliefs were not too unlike John Henry Newman’s *Idea of a University* (1852) except that Newman insisted on not only promoting wisdom and knowledge, but also in the freedom of thought. While theology was surely a legitimate branch of knowledge, Newman’s academic curriculum did not include the heavy hand of dogma. Man’s pursuits required God-centeredness but not at the expense of the other branches of knowledge. The university was dedicated to liberal education first and foremost, with disciplines that took no second seat to theology. This implied the freedom to indulge in research and publication without church interference, including censorship. Newman did not intend for the university to become
the mouthpiece of Catholic theology. If religious training was desired, there was always the seminary—an entirely separate entity. The university could not be a seat of learning if the intention was to have theology (i.e., dogma) dominate or otherwise restrict enquiry.

Both men tried to replicate the Oxford model but Newman, truer than Sewall, saw education as one that prepared the individual to appreciate knowledge for its own sake, not for a discipline or specialized field or endeavor. Newman’s educated gentlemen treated knowledge in the context of duty. With knowledge its own reward, philosophy became its informing spirit, providing the essential bearings to affect moral progress. The terms “knowledge,” “philosophy,” “reason,” and “philosophical morality” were set in the context of “Revelation,” “Catholicism,” and “the Church.” For Sewall the terms would have been the same except for substituting Swedenborg for Catholicism and New Church for the Church.¹²

Benefitting from the support of friends and acquaintances, Sewall embarked on an ambitious expansion of the curriculum that included the addition of a chemical laboratory, an historical cabinet and museum, new courses in mineralogy and assaying of metals, expansion of the botanical collection, and the acquisition of new instruments (i.e., telescope, oxy-hydrogen lantern), much of it donated. Ever watchful that the institution retains its spiritual core, Sewall tried to balance classical education (i.e., Hebrew, Latin and Greek, Sanskrit, Syriac, and even Anglo Saxon) with the steady rise and
inclusion of the sciences—practical and theoretical—in the curriculum.

Like many of his generation, Sewall felt that race rather than nationality was the deciding factor in how different groups embraced certain forms of mental traits or activity. He selected the Aryan or Indo-European race and its four subdivisions (i.e., Teutonic, Slavonic, Pelagic, and Celtic) as the “birthplace of philosophic thought” through reason, distinct from Oriental races whose religious knowledge came by intuition or immediate vision. The predilection to objectivity was a characteristic of the Aryan family although Sewall did not rule out differences due to the intermixture of races that followed the downfall of the Caesars and the birth of nationalities in Europe. This made it “hazardous to treat of the influence of the original race types on the subsequent mental activity of the composite peoples.” Thus, the Germans, English, and French had certain biases which differentiated from each other. The exception, argued Sewall, was the Anglo-Saxon influence on philosophic thought in America. “Freedom from the insular traditions of the mother country and the vast accessions of distinctly foreign elements, such as the mother nation has never known—the African, the Chinese, the Italian, and the various types of the Slavonic race—must ultimately produce some modifications in the mental type beyond a doubt.”

With the race and gender issue settled in his own mind, Sewall proceeded to design a curriculum for each of the different levels. The Grammar School offered a curriculum that included the following studies:
Rhetoric—George Payn Quackenbos’ Rhetoric and Composition
Handbook of Natural Philosophy—William James Rolfe and Joseph Anthony Gillet
Handbook of Chemistry—William James Rolfe and Joseph Anthony Gillet
Geology and Mineralogy—Edward Hitchcock
Botany—Asa Gray
Anatomy and Physiology
Divine Love and Wisdom—Swedenborg
Religious System—Le Boys des Guays
Science of Government—Joseph Alden
Book Keeping and Letter Writing.

A brief look at the books and their authors suggests that with minor exceptions, Sewall followed a path not too different from other denominational schools in the United States, namely choosing texts that made no mention of religion; those chosen to ignore evolution altogether; those that supported evolutionary concepts albeit with certain qualifications; and those that were overtly religious in nature. In the first category were the authors Quackenbos, Rolfe and Gillet, In the second category was the Rev. Edward Hitchcock (1793-1864) of Massachusetts, a noted geologist and president of Amherst College. An early student of glacial history, he had no difficulty reconciling geology with Scripture. A
strict creationist, he opposed evolution as destructive of Christianity’s essential concept of immortality. In geology, he found a clear statement of Divine intent. “Instead of bringing us into collision with Moses, it seems to me that Geology furnishes us with the some of the grandest conceptions of the Divine Attributes and Plans to be found in the whole circle of human knowledge.”

Sewall placed Asa Gray’s (1810-1888) *Botany* (1865) in the third category. A professor of natural history and director of the herbarium at Harvard University, he was Darwin’s main advocate in the months following the publication of *Origin of Species* (1859). Gray opposed Louis Agassiz’s belief in the fixity of species or forms. Evolution was the law of life, but he rejected any notion of dysteleology with respect to man. While evolution was the process for change, it was not accomplished by chance but by an intelligent first cause. Gray used his support of Darwin’s theory as a means of encouraging scientific inquiry and to ensure both materialists and religious leaders that natural selection was not incompatible with some form of theism. A lifelong member of the Presbyterian Church, he had no interest in pursuing a fundamentalist approach to creation; instead, he advocated a form of supernatural selection in place of natural selection. Natural selection might account for the plant and animal species, but there was a teleological or purposeful design when it came to man. Sewall found himself somewhere between Hitchcock and Gray, arguably closer to Gray than the former but insistent that science and religion remained compatible.
In addition, Sewall introduced courses in Drawing, German, and an additional course in Religion that included several of Swedenborg’s writings. Still, classical education remained the dominant model for Urbana. Before entry into the College, the high school graduate had to pass examinations in Latin grammar, Latin prose composition, Greek grammar, Algebra, English grammar, and Ancient and Modern Geography.

With entry into College, the student entered a four-year course of studies:

- Latin, Greek, Mathematics
- History (of Greece and Rome)
- French History
- Rhetoric, Shakespeare, Chemistry
- Natural History, Science, Philosophy
- Logic, Anglo Saxon
- Political Economy, Physics
- Swedenborg’s Science of Correspondences and Divine Providence
- Metallurgy and Mining
- Agricultural Chemistry
- Zoology
- History of the Arts and Commerce

Besides this set of courses, Sewall initiated a set of four public lectures on “The Second Coming of the Lord as Now Being Fulfilled” and a second set of six lectures on the “Internal Sense of the First Chapters of Genesis” to which the citizens of Urbana were invited to attend.
Outside the curriculum, Sewall created a Glee Club, an Urbana Choral Society Concert, a Silver Cornet Band, and Chamber Concerts, all intended to bring the town and gown closer together. By 1876, he had added a Principia Club, a Missionary Society, a Students’ New Church Aid Society, Minerva Literary Society, the Morse Natural History Society, and the Amphion Quartette Club. Four years later, the University’s Latin Society was performing plays in Latin. Supporting the curriculum was a University Library that claimed a collection of 5,000 volumes and a Cabinet of minerals and fossils provided through donations from William G. Cranch of Washington, D. C., and Dr. O. P. Baer of Richmond, Indiana.\textsuperscript{16}

Sewall’s educational plan reflected his training in Swedenborg’s concept of discrete degrees by which he started with kindergarten at the base and moved upwards. His reality was a composite of an ideal that had grown out of his experiences at Bowdoin, Tübingen, Berlin, and Paris. Ultimately, as he would discover, his idea of the University was more a state of mind than one of bricks and mortar.

**Theological School**

As much as the New Church desired to augment its numbers through the establishment of seminaries for the education of future generations of ministers, the path was never certain, and complicated by mistrust among competing groups of Swedenborgians. In 1838, Boston’s New Churchmen, whose influence dominated
the General Convention, pushed through a rule requiring all Societies to organize under its uniform rules of order. This unwanted change precipitated a revolt led by Richard De Charms, a former student of Sewall’s and now pastor of the New Church in Philadelphia, who checked Boston’s the overbearing rules by establishing a rival Central Convention. For many reasons, some real, and others imagined, a revolt had been simmering for some time among the Societies spawned in the Midwest who resented New England’s control over the General Convention. The Philadelphia Society of De Charms was simply the catalyst for the break and, as part of its rationale, insisted that the writings of Swedenborg were the only authority needed for New Churchmen to abide.

As the Central Convention picked up supporters, the General Convention moderated its position to the extent that, in 1852, the dissidents agreed to return to the General Convention provided it would accept an Academy, an independent educational component devoted to the study of and divine origin of Swedenborg’s works as well as the training of ministers. Once accepted, Rev. William Henry Benade (1816-1905), the son of a Moravian teacher and school administrator, became the guiding voice of the so-called Academy Movement.

In the meantime, it had been Rev. James P. Stuart’s intent when he joined the faculty at Urbana in 1853 as a professor of philosophy and secretary to the trustees, to establish Urbana as a center for the instruction of New Church ministers. When Stuart wrote for advice from the leader of the Academy Movement, Benade insisted that the university should be under the control of the
ministry, not the laity (i.e., an independent board) as was the case at Urbana. Stuart thus faced an uphill battle to make Urbana a distinctively New Church educational experience. After failing in an attempted coup to have Benade assume the presidency and change the name of the university to Emanuel College, and faced as well with the board’s insistence that the religious and ecclesiastical element could claim no superior role in the institution, Stuart resigned his chair in 1859 and joined forces with Benade to advocate for a distinctive New Church educational system. Those supportive of the idea included N. C. Burnham, Thomas Wilkes, J. R. Hibbard, R. L. Tafel, Frank Sewall, J. C. Ager, and Samuel H. Warren—all notable Swedenborgians.

Stuart’s feud had less impact than he intended since it was the firing of Confederate cannons at Fort Sumter in April 1861 that caused the most damaging effect on Urbana’s enrolment. Nevertheless, by war’s end there was still no theological school for the training of ministers at Urbana and prospects looked grim. To further complicate matters, there remained within the General Convention a basic disagreement between its New England and Pennsylvania branches as to where such a school should be established and disagreement as well regarding the nature and authority of Swedenborg’s writings.

When President Thomas Worcester announced in his address before the General Convention in 1865 the critical need for a theological school, Stuart recommended a compromise that would establish a theological school at Waltham, Massachusetts, on condition that
it represented the views of both groups. Soon after the agreement was reached, however, Benade and Stuart realized that Waltham remained under the tight control of Worcester and his coterie of New England professors. It was widely assumed that Worcester carried a prejudice against any ministers outside the New England school of thought. Despite its overpowering influence, Waltham did not begin instruction for the ministry until June 1876 and even then, several of its students announced their preference for private study instead of a more formalized curriculum.¹⁹

In the meantime, when Sewall was appointed president at Urbana, he laid his own plans for a School of Theology which involved the study of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, New Testament Greek, and Biblical Antiquities; exposure to Geology and Natural History, Biblical Exegesis, History of Philosophy, Church History, and independent readings directed by him. All was capped off with written treatises in each of the departments of study that would be evaluated by a committee of examiners appointed by the president.

As with so many demands on Sewall’s time, his School of Theology remained more a state of mind than a reality, a situation clearly evident when the Swedish born Herman Constantin Vetterling (later known as Philangi Dasa), who had begun reading for the ministry in 1873-75 on a scholarship, announced his intent to discontinue his studies at Urbana; nor did he wish to go to Waltham. Neither Waltham nor Urbana satisfied the training he had sought. To add to the confusion, Dr. J. R. Hibbard, a trustee for both Urbana and Waltham,
concurred in Vetterling’s criticism.\textsuperscript{20} Disgusted with both options, Vetterling expressed his intent to become a student of Benade, the effect of which was to cause Benade to acquire property in New Jersey for an independent theological school. Eventually Vetterling would embrace Buddhism, publish \textit{The Buddhist Ray}, the first Buddhist journal in the United States, and author \textit{Swedenborg the Buddhist, or the Higher Swedenborgianism: Its Secrets and Tibetan Origin} (1887).\textsuperscript{21}

Given the conundrum, Benade put together a plan. As an ordained minister and pastor of a society in Pittsburgh, he looked to the creation in 1877 of a free-standing Academy in New Jersey under the supervision of professors N. C. Burnham and James P. Stuart. Students were expected to travel once or twice a term to Philadelphia be examined by Prof. L. H. Tafel, a situation by no means ideal. To minimize the inconvenience, the Academy rented space on the lower floor of the Cherry Street Society in Philadelphia to accommodate its Divinity School with Benade as the school’s chancellor. Present at the opening ceremony was Frank Sewall, president of Urbana University.\textsuperscript{22}

The school’s curriculum offered a two-year course to be taken after a three-year academic course in languages, mathematics, science and the doctrines. The course in the Divinity School included:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{First Year:} Systematic theology; mental philosophy; terminology; categories; degrees and correspondences, exposition, history of doctrine, theses, extemporaneous speaking; and languages
\end{quote}
Second Year: Synonyms, mental philosophy, ontology, oriental antiquities; correspondences; hieroglyphics; church history; homiletics; sermons; lectures; the priesthood; church organization; and dissemination of the heavenly doctrine²³

By 1882, Benade, who was now bishop of the General Church of Philadelphia, an association of seven Societies, broke once again from the General Convention, justifying his action on their differing interpretation of what constituted the spiritual documents of Christianity. While the General Convention insisted that the Old and New Testament were central to Christianity to which were added Swedenborg’s commentaries on the internal meaning of the Scriptures, the General Church of Philadelphia claimed that the divinely inspired writings of Swedenborg constituted a third and superseding testament. Thus, there remained a divide between the General Convention and the General Church (and its Academy) as to which one more intelligently interpreted the teachings and doctrines of Swedenborg. The difference concerned the relative ‘weight’ of Swedenborg’s writings (i.e., infallibility) rather than their interpretation.

The Academy of the New Church, founded in 1876, was a conservative movement within the General Convention which sought to incorporate several neglected beliefs found in the writings of Swedenborg. The society’s objective was to instill the fullness of New Church doctrines in the younger generations that they might remain members and contribute to the Church’s dis-
distinctive role in modernity. Religious instruction was foremost among the subjects believed to be key to the sustenance and growth of the Church. The objective was clear, namely producing the right environment for lives lived in accord with around the doctrines of Swedenborg.

By 1897, all the Academy Schools had moved to Bryn Athyn, including the Divinity School which was placed under the charge of the Bishop of the General Church of the New Jerusalem. The line between the college and the divinity school was not strictly observed, with students crossing over from time to time.\textsuperscript{24}

Mixed into this assemblage of issues were the personalities of William Benade and William Frederic Pendleton of the General Church whose individual goals were often on a collision course as they sought common ground, a situation that led to lengthy struggles over structure, dissent, and leadership. All of this played out within a larger theatre of conflict when on November 1890, the General Church of Philadelphia formally withdrew from the General Convention and reorganized as the General Church of the Advent of the Lord.

In 1897, under the leadership of Bishop W. F. Pendleton, the General Church of Philadelphia renamed itself the General Church of the New Jerusalem. Gathered under a more authoritarian (episcopal) form of government headquartered at Bryn Athyn, they established an educational system that began with kindergarten and continued through grammar school, high school, college, and a theological seminary.
Enrollment Woes

At the completion of each year of his presidency, Sewall reported to the trustees on the health of the university, remarking first on any changes among the faculty, purchases for the library collection, and changes in the enrollment. As everyone knew all too well, enrollment was the life-blood of the institution and changes, however small, could precipitate a myriad of unanticipated consequences, including the release of faculty and staff, the forced closing of residency halls and services, threats to town/gown relations, and unwanted micromanagement by the trustees.

In his annual report to the trustees for the year 1882-83, Sewall announced a total of eighty students, an increase of sixteen over the previous year: forty-three in the College and Grammar School, and forty in the Primary, Kindergarten and School for Girls. Of those, only three students were enrolled in theological studies. On average there were eleven students in the college track from 1876 through 1879, including six “special students” admitted provisionally and allowed to take regular courses. From 1875 to 1881, Sewall reported graduating a total of fifteen students from the College compared with a total of twenty graduates in the entire twenty years preceding. Of great concern was the Girl’s School and Kindergarten where tuition remained too low to cover the salary of its teacher.

More telling was the continued lackluster attendance in the College and the issue of whether the “indiscriminate admission into the college classes at the time of application regardless of primary preparation or regular
promotion is conducive to the growth of the College and the elevation of its instruction or whether it does not on the contrary lend to the lowering of standards.” Sewall feared that the level of college instruction and been lowered to that of the common school. Of the eight “special students” in the college, five dropped out before the end of the year due to lack of scholarly progress. Here was telling evidence of the difference between Sewall’s idea of a university and its reality at Urbana.

To offset criticism, Sewall distributed a statement to the university community of information obtained from a Report of the U.S. Commissioner of Education, published in the October 1882 issue of the Atlantic Monthly, which compared different public and private colleges and universities in the country. “While there is certainly nothing that affords us occasion for boasting in the least,” he admitted, “at the same time it is important that we should not under-rate our own position or fail to note what there is in it to encourage us to further effort.” Noting that the students counted were those strictly in the College proper, thus not those in the Grammar or Preparatory School, he provided the following information.25

The Report gives the total number of colleges and Universities in the United States in 1882, as 336. Of these the number of schools:

- Having less Productive Funds than Urbana 110
- Having smaller property in Grounds, Buildings, etc. than Urbana 47
Having smaller library than Urbana 178
Having fewer Professors than Urbana 12
Having fewer Professors and Instructors than Urbana 27
Having fewer students than Urbana 15

Compared to the 35 other colleges and universities in Ohio, the number of schools:

Having smaller Library than Urbana 11
Having smaller property than Urbana 7
Having smaller productive funds than Urbana 8
Having smaller tuition income than Urbana 13

Sewall reminded the Board that while attendance in its Preparatory School and the College had declined, when compared with other New Church schools, its attendance was not discouraging. The actual enrollment numbered fifty-two students in all grades of whom fourteen were young boys and men attending the College and Grammar school and thirty-eight young ladies and children attending the School for Girls and Primary School. He noted that instruction in the School for Girls had continued to be furnished in part by the professors in the college.26

As the lackluster nature of the enrollment continued to undermine trustee confidence, several of its members began missing meetings and thus affecting the number required for a quorum. Complicating matters further, several vacancies had resulted from deaths and resignations, with the remaining board members unable to
arrive at any consensus on their replacements. There was also the nagging question whether the college should return to a required curriculum rather than allowing optional studies and the continuing matter of separation of the sexes.27

To offset the lingering issue of co-education, Sewall noted that when attendance had been confined to only boys and young men, the income from tuition was larger than when the college comprised both sexes. “It is doubtful,” he explained, “whether any New Church school or College in this country or elsewhere can show a larger income than $5,500 this year, and I do not know that any has a larger role of attendance than even our greatly reduced one.”28

In his report to the trustees in June 23 and 24, 1885, Sewall provided a full statement of income and expenses for the years 1882-83, 1883-84, and an estimate for 1884-85. In all, he had reduced expenses for the year from $6,246 to an estimated $4,339, thus paying off the institution’s debt.29

But disappointment continued to undermine trustee confidence. In anticipation of the May 23, 1885 meeting of the trustees, Sewall noted in his written statement that a proposal had been made, “by whom I do not know, of closing the college, at the end of the present year.” Sewall informed the trustees that he considered the proposal unsound in that the income was larger than “at any time during the first twenty-five years of the college’s career.” To the anonymous proposal he asked the following questions:
Example: 1882-83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,637</td>
<td>$5,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>Janitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbana Society</td>
<td>Fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>87.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining Fund</td>
<td>Repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>78.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents</td>
<td>Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastures</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sundries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,337</td>
<td>$6,246.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is not the Board’s first duty to use any means at its disposal for carrying the college, reducing the expenses to its actual ability to pay? If the present salaries are beyond its means, is offer lower ones? And only when it has found itself unable to pressure teachers to the salaries offered—then to admit the necessity of closing? Can the Board divert the character of the institution from a college [fitting students for graduation] to a secondary school, or can it divide the use of the College Endowment Fund—given for ‘supporting professorships in the college’ without being liable to legal prosecution? As a suspension of five years would involve the
transfer of the ‘Alvan Washburn Endowment’ to some other New Church school—would not the Board in suspending the College be compelled to resume or close it again before the lapse of that time period and is it clear that once closed for a considerable time it will be easy or practicable to reopen it? Meanwhile as the buildings cannot be ‘leased for gain’ or used in any ‘private’ way or otherwise, will not the property of the University be liable to serious damage and loss if left unoccupied for a considerable time? Finally, will not the closing of the college by action of the Board do more to injury and hinder the development and progress of the college than be recovered hereafter in many years, if at all?”

Sewall reminded the Board that the original act that set the scope and work of the University did not authorize a Preparatory School or a School for Girls. In effect, Sewall questioned the trustees’ liberal interpretation of their charter and whether its breadth of programs had exceeded its mandate. In one of his final reports to the trustees, Sewall provided a full report on the state of the university’s property and assets.

PROPERTY AND ASSETS OF URBANA UNIVERSITY 1885

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land—the College Campus</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layton Lot</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Hall</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclay Hall</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Hall</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lyceum Hall 3,000
Library and cases 5,000
Apparatus and Models 2,000
Cabinet and Coins 1,200
Furniture in all Buildings 450

34,800
Investments 43,500
Notes 6,800
Subscriptions to Endowment 4,700

55,000
Total real Estate, Chattels and Securities $89,800
Due to Endowment fund from College and Now being paid in annual installments
Out of yearly income 9,000

Total assets of University $98,800

Rather than continue what had become an annual standoff between the president and the trustees, once the endowment goal of $50,000 had been reached, Sewall announced his resignation. Satisfied with what he had achieved but disappointed that the trustees had chosen what he considered a popular trend over a true understanding of doctrine, degrees, and form, he turned his eyes across the Atlantic to memories of France and Italy where he, Thedia, and their daughters might find renewal of their spirits.

* * * *
Sewall’s sixteen-year tenure at Urbana University made an indelible impression on his family. In many respects, the campus had been an extension of their home. Through public lectures, choral groups, piano and organ recitals, sports, the library, and open spaces, the campus and home were joined together in time and place—an organic whole. Leaving Urbana amounted to a loss of identity—a quality of life that each member never found again, even in the nation’s capital. Washington was a different place requiring a different set of human relationships and accommodations. For Alice, Urbana had acquired an identity and character that grew with her memories of it. Those memories would eventually cause her to return.

Although Sewall left Urbana when he lost the confidence of the trustees, he remained a vital part of the university in later decades by becoming a member of its board of trustees and returning numerous times to give addresses at commencement exercises, assisting in its development needs, and maintaining contact with old friends. He had the uncanny ability “to feel no ill towards those who opposed him,” recalled an old friend, and enjoyed his return visits to meet with students, join in their hymns at the chapel, attend select classes, discuss Swedenborg’s relation to modern science, and celebrate at commencement exercises.33

In 1901, on the occasion of Urbana University reaching its half century anniversary, Sewall returned to give an address before the students, faculty, and friends of the school. In it he stressed the same theme that had propelled him to the presidency following his first address
in 1868, namely the divinely foretold reconciliation of science and religion and of reason and faith by Swedenborg. “The founders of this college,” Sewall he reminded the audience, “foresaw a place of learning where spiritual truth could be learned in a rational manner, where men could pursue sciences and philosophy to its utmost resources without danger of losing their faith in the Word of God, in the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and in the life of charity.” 34 His effort to build Urbana into a Swedenborgian school of distinction had relied on the prospect of bringing the light of the New Dispensation into the realm of nature and science. This did not mean for theology to be separate from science and philosophy, but rather to unite with them by way of the Doctrine of Discrete Degrees and the science of correspondences. 35
There is no information ever given to mankind of more vital importance to religion than the announcement that in the Word of God, contained in our Christian Bible, there is such an internal sense; that hence the word is a bond or bridge of union between men on earth and the heavens of angels; that hence the word is and must be the source and vehicle of the spiritual life of our race.

(Frank Sewall, “The Permanent and the Transient in Christianity,” 1912)

Following his resignation, Sewall booked the family’s passage to Europe where he planned to concentrate his energies on writing, travel, and directing the education his daughters. Presenting the opportunity as the beginning of a grand adventure, he buried his personal embarrassment by focusing the family’s en-
energies on the coming trip. If anything, Sewall showed artfulness in concealing his disappointments with diversions, digressions, and new purposes. He possessed a capacity for shrewdness in transposing defeats into victories. A master of the grand style, he attended to the family’s distress with humorous affection, purposeful activities, and a trust in what the future would bring. Rather than retreat into himself, he expressed a sense of assurance that rubbed off on his family as they prepared for their journey. In his darker moments, recalled one of his close friends, “he just reposed in certain assurance that issues do not rest with man, but are in the absolute and certain control of the All-mighty, All-present, All-wise, All-loving, All-knowing Father.”

Glasgow

Hearing of Sewall’s departure from Urbana through notices in *The New-Church Messenger*, the Queen’s Park Society of Glasgow, Scotland, invited him to be their pastor for as long as he wished to stay. The Society, known as Glasgow South, had recently split from the Cathedral Street Church, a separation that resulted in internecine strife among members in both churches who supported or opposed the change. Sewall accepted the offer knowing that it would restore much needed stability to the family and offer him a meaningful time period to better prepare for the travels he promised his wife and daughters. When he arrived at Glasgow, Sewall found the Society “torn and bleeding.” It took him two years to heal the wounds brought by the separation.
Once installed in December 1886, Sewall deployed the skills he had learned at Urbana, directing the members to a focused set of objectives aimed at bringing cohesion to the Society. In addressing the challenge, he introduced a series of innovative strategies, including a Ladies’ Aid Society, adult classes, and evening lectures—all techniques he learned from working with the Urbana community to improve town/gown relations. Intending above all else to bring accord to the Glasgow South members, he even met with the former minister (Alice called him “the grand old outcast”) to begin the process of healing.³

Equally important for the Glasgow South members was the building of a new church. For this, the Queen’s Park Society greatly appreciated Sewall’s expertise, particularly his knowledge of architecture and the multitude of steps required in the planning process. By the time the family Glasgow, recalled his daughter Alice, “a new Church building was above the ground, and a happy sphere neither group had known before, was working.”⁴ So fruitful were the dividends that Rev. Louis G. Hoeck, a recent graduate of the Cambridge Theological School who had preached several times to the Queen’s Park Society, praised Sewall’s efforts.

It so happened that an offshoot of the old Cathedral St. Society was busy making plans for the construction of a new building in the south side of Glasgow. I was connected with this movement. And it appeared to us then that Dr. Sewall’s proposal to visit us was most timely. And so it proved . . . . Various architects in the
city submitted plans for the new building. . . . Then we held meeting to consider their merits and decide on the best plan. In all this work Dr. Sewall took a most active part. Few things gave him more pleasure than those connected with the construction of a church, as also the construction of its forms of worship.⁵

One of Sewall’s more memorable presentations before the Glasgow community was his lecture titled “The Ethics of Service” which he read before the Ruskin Society of the Rose in January 1888. Sewall explained that ethics pertained to the will rather than the intellect, suggesting it compelled conformity to the natural law on pain of misery and death. Ethics was a form of moral aesthetics that harmonized with the environment and was best expressed in the law of use or of service, but not the “service of self.” All work and activity were relevant to salvation. Everything was created from use, in use, and for use. Of divine origin, use had not only a spiritual function but a concrete and practical function as well. No person was ever born for the sake of any other end than that he might perform a use for the society in which he belonged.⁶

**The New Metaphysics**

Before leaving Glasgow, Sewall published *The New Metaphysics; Or the Law of End, Cause, and Effect* (1888). In it, he made it clear that metaphysics was different from spiritual or revealed knowledge in that it was “strictly and impassively scientific in its scope and application.”
For too long, the study of metaphysics had been a fruitless endeavor due largely to the conflicting positions of *monism* and *dualism* and the inability after centuries of contentious argument to resolve two questions: What is matter? What is mind? The most popular position had always favored some form of dualism. Everything pertaining to mind, spirit, and soul constituted a world which, being incorruptible, was essentially an ideal or ‘other world.’ “There seems to be something profane,” Sewall observed, “in any commingling of the two [monism and dualism], viewing it as something unlawful because it broke down the barrier set up in the nature of things.”

In his response to this age-old dilemma, Sewall dismissed the position of the agnostic as lacking credibility. By proclaiming the “ever incomplete and misleading knowledge of things,” the agnostic forfeited his place in critical thought. Rather than despair over the monists’ claim that mind and matter were one and the same, and the dualists claiming they were distinct, Sewall offered a third option which he based on three observations: *First,* physicists had made the unity of nature and the correlation of all the forces of nature a fundamental principle in modern scientific research. Beyond that, thinkers like Henry Drummond and the Duke of Argyll in Great Britain, Pierre Janet in France, and Hermann Lotz in Germany had extended the natural law into the spiritual world and the discernible laws which governed both. *Second,* the very idea of law in the spiritual world implied there was not just “another world,” but a “substantial world in the truest sense” in which all sub-
stances and forces were subject. And third, that God was in the world as “its Life, its Order, its Law, and its End or controlling Purpose, rather than God over a world as its long-ago Creator and its far-away Ruler and Judge.” These three observations favored a reconstruction of the fundamental notions of matter and spirit.

To address the problem, Sewall deferred once again to the Doctrine of Discrete Diseases, or of End, Cause, and Effect. Referring to Swedenborg’s scientific and theological writings, most notably Animal Kingdom and Divine Love and Wisdom, he proposed that all matter and spirit was one, yet at the same time distinct; they were related to both cause and effect by the law of correspondence. “The natural or material world is the effect of which the spiritual world is the cause, and God is the end.” Here in the division of metaphysics, theology, and science, the currents of the Divine descended into creation and commenced the re-ascent of man back to his Divine origin. As Swedenborg explained, “the uses of all created things ascend by degrees to man, and by man to God the Creator, from whom they originate.” Thus, the new metaphysics asserted that matter was a Divine fact and served as the substratum on which all human consciousness was built. It derived from God and existed as the forms on which Divine Love and Wisdom rested.

The Doctrine of Discrete Degrees resulted in the classification of the science of Being into three distinct divisions: Theology (the study of being from ends), Metaphysics (the study of Being from Causes), and Physical Science (the study of being in the plane of facts and effects). Theology completed the trine of knowledge, of
which metaphysics and the Sciences of matter constituted the two lower degrees. Science was the study of effects; Philosophy, the study of means and laws; and Theology, the study of ends and of the Being in whom those ends resided. Thus, the universe was a complex of means to a universal end.\(^\text{13}\)

Within this context, Sewall took note of Herbert Spencer’s quest for a new basis of ethics and observed that his so-called new morality represented modes of thinking and feeling based on conditions of happiness already experienced. In other words, Spencer’s moral law lay in what was behind and not what was beyond and above. There was a higher use for science than the promotion of happiness, namely in cultivating the rational mind, and through it to the spiritual plane of the mind.\(^\text{14}\)

The educational use of science is like the use of all form to its substance, and all matter to spirit. Scientific facts are not truths, but the vessels of truth; they are the shell which may have good or bad meat within. The rational principle is what, under Divine influence, makes all scientific knowledge subservient to the spiritual or inner man, and puts sound meat in the shell, first by enabling man to think—that is, to analyze, reflect upon, and draw conclusions from mere isolated facts; second, to apply these thoughts or conclusions to useful living, or the benefit, first of his own body as his chief instrument of use; then to the perfecting of his mind as the agent of a higher use; then to the communication of good to others. The rational makes a man capable of thus using his mind, his body, and all knowledge de-
rived through the senses for these higher purposes; but whether a man does so or not depends upon the still interior motive of his will.\textsuperscript{15}

For too long, the Christian intellect had labored under the constraint of dogma. Not until the rebellious influences engendered by the French Revolution did reason break with the authoritative teachings of the Church and seek possibilities beyond the limitations set by religion. With ecclesiastical domination a thing of the past, a new period of spiritual and rational liberty had come of age. This did not mean the absence of God but a whole new meaning for contemporary metaphysics. Instead of fleeing from authoritative religion, minds now acknowledged God as “something more than a \textit{deus ex machine}, something better and higher than any idol of man’s making, even though it be the creation of the reason itself.”\textsuperscript{16}

In his examination of Christianity and its critics, Sewall happened upon the historian John Fiske whose understanding of religion came from the standpoint of an evolutionist. Fiske insisted that the most sensible of all truths (“All that we really know is mind”) acknowledged man as a moral being and God as “the great moral reality, as the Good.” Being a critic of anthropomorphism, Fiske had found the “living God” imminent in nature, a concept that Fiske utilized to reconcile science and religion. Though Sewall appreciated the concessions Fiske and others had taken, he insisted that Revelation remained essential to reveal God to man. Revelation was not merely the voice of man’s rational intuitions; it was the
Deity answering man’s call for a living God. “Revelation lifts the idea of God out of its powerless subjectivity and gives to man a God that speaks to him from without,” explained Sewall. “Without it the idea of God is incomplete and inconsistent with itself, and therefore fails to satisfy either the religious or the rational instinct.”

**Moving On**

Taking leave of Glasgow in 1888, Sewall and his family traveled through much of Europe where they began a planned period of study, first in France and Switzerland, before moving on to Italy, the Tyrol, Tübingen, Germany, and Holland. With sketchbooks in hand, they visited museums, castles, churches, and scenic vistas, filling pages with pencil sketches and watercolors. Sewall also had his daughters read about the places they visited to make their history of people and events come alive. Each daughter became versed in philosophy, history, literature, and the arts. Sewall also continued Alice and Maud’s education begun earlier in Glasgow with the reading of Cicero and Vergil in Latin, studying history, and reading the British philosophers, poets and novelists. Alice, who at sixteen, had been enrolled in the Glasgow School of Art, was now introduced to the galleries of Rome and Florence, and the literature of Dante and the Renaissance.

In their travels, the family visited the homes of Robert Browning and John Ruskin and met with several New Church societies and families scattered across Europe. There among friends in drawing rooms cluttered with
tea cups, wine, sandwiches, and candlelight, Sewall was often called upon to sit at a piano and joyfully improvise or linger with youthful decorum around guests that included his uncle May and son John from Syracuse, New York, and the American sculptor Hiram Powers.

His enjoyment of art, especially literature, was an aspect of his charity, or as Alice described it, “a festival of appreciation for its immediate use.” His sketchbook was as apt to capture the view of a roadside Normandy cottage as his journals were to report on a specific pastoral scene or event. Much of his best writing was meant to be abstract, believing that “the silent power of thought is a mighty factor in the world . . . for the conclusions of thinking minds about deep subjects steal into and colour not only the thinking, but the feeling and doing of the great masses.”

Like Emerson, who, in his address “The American Scholar” before the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Cambridge in 1837 called on Americans to seek their creative inspirations independent of Old-World authorities, Sewall called for a distinctive school of American art that did not mimic European mannerisms and techniques. Proud that Americans were taking prizes abroad for their art, he admitted that most brought home techniques perfected Old World masters. The exceptions were men like Whistler and Sargent whose genius brought to the American public the possibilities of a truly distinctive school of art. Another who he admired was Solon Hannibal Borglum whose prize sculptures at the Paris Exposition in 1900 (“The Scout,” “The Lame Horse,” and “The Buffalo”) conveyed a deep feeling of
sympathy with the life of the American far West with its
scenes and characters. Borglum spent much of his youth
on his father’s ranch in western Nebraska and did not
begin the study of art until age twenty-four, first in Santa
Ana, California, and then at the Art School in Cincin-
nati, before spending time in Paris. On his return, he
lived with the Sioux on the Crow Creek Reservation in
South Dakota where he studied the Native American
with great sympathy. Borglum’s works convinced Sewall
of the existence of artists “born of American skies and
[who] breathe the spirit of American life.”

As their European travels were ending, Sewall
received an invitation from the Washington Society in
the District of Columbia to become pastor of its Church,
a position that he would hold until his death.

**New Church in Washington**

The first American New Church house of worship
formed in Baltimore in 1800 with Rev. John Hargrove as
minister. Two years later, in a speech delivered before
the president and forty members of Congress, Hargrove
lectured on the leading doctrines of the New Church.
The first meetings of Swedenborgian worshipers in
Washington were held sometime prior to 1838 at the
home of Dr. Nathaniel C. Towle, the city’s first Record-
er of Deeds. Later meetings convened at the Unitarian
Church at the corner of Sixth and D Streets, and some-
times in the hall of the Medical Department of Columbia
College (now George Washington University) at the cor-
er of Tenth and E Streets. With the arrival of Rev. Rich-
ard DeCharms to the city in 1841 came the formation of the Washington Society of the New Jerusalem whose meetings moved from place to place until 1846 when it rented a frame building at the foot of Capitol Hill. In 1852, the Society built a permanent church on the east side of North Capitol Street, between B and C Streets, led by several pastors until 1863 when Rev. Jabez Fox, a clerk in the Treasury Department, was called to the position. He remained until 1886 when the General Board of Missions sent him out on missionary work. With his leaving, church members began a search for another strong leader and, in the interim, invited Rev. Eugene D. Daniels who remained a year, followed by William B. Hayden who was elected for a term of only six months.  

On the night of February 9, 1889, the North Capitol Street Church was destroyed by fire. Before his six-month term ended, Rev. Hayden arranged for the congregation to move into temporary quarters at the Spencerian Business College on D Street near 7th. In the meantime, Job Barnard, a United States federal judge and secretary for the Society, wrote to Sewall informing him that by unanimous vote the congregation had elected to call him to the pastorate for one year. Although the salary was unusually modest, Barnard advised him that the prospects were certainly in Sewall’s favor provided he brought to the position his rich pastoral and scholarly experience. Sewall accepted the call knowing that he already had done much of what would be required of their pastor. Besides, a church in the nation’s capital? What more could one want? Sewall accepted the call and the family gratefully booked passage back to the States.
Asked by the Society his thoughts on purchasing a new lot of land in a more central part of the city, Sewall agreed they should consider a new building instead of restoring the older edifice. Moreover, it was important to identify a location that would make the church “a joy forever.” As for the type of building, he begged time to become acquainted with the Washington landscape before offering an opinion. He thought it unnecessary to build a temporary church merely for the sake of accommodating the Society in the short term. Instead he recommended renting space until a suitable plan was adopted. In his acceptance letter to Judge Barnard, he made the following suggestion:

Rather than do anything hastily, I would advise the society constituting itself for the meantime a kind of missionary in the field, and selecting, accordingly, the most favorable place for holding temporary services with a view to missionary work in Washington. I would have a new building constantly in view, and begin at once procuring as large a building fund as possible to start with; but while this is going on, I think advantage may be taken of the interim, in our going out, as it were, into the ‘highways and byways,’ and calling in those who are ready to come with us, and thus building up a congregation, if we can, in anticipation of our building a permanent place to worship in. I think if a convenient, easily accessible, and pleasant room can be rented, and our services made genial, warm and attractive in their sphere, a work of peculiar value may be accomplished before a new building is entered.
In response to Sewall’s recommendation, the Society formed a committee to begin raising funds for a “National Church.” In the meantime, services continued at the Spencerian Business College, and then in the hall of the National University Law School on 1006 E Street where Sewall preached his first sermon. The General Convention which typically met at the Washington Society church, moved its meetings to St. Paul’s English Lutheran Church at Eleventh and H Streets, and then to the Church of Our Father (Universalist) at Thirteenth and L Streets.²⁴

Seward was no novice when it came to building houses of worship, having experience at both Urbana and Glasgow. In both instances, he started with a thorough study of church architecture before making any decisions. Sewell’s choice of architect was Henry Langford Warren, the first chairman of Harvard University’s architecture department. His assistant Paul J. Pelz, had been one of the architects of the Library of Congress.²⁵ Mrs. Nancy B. Scudder, widow of Judge Henry A. Scudder and former member of the Washington Society, bequeathed nearly $44,000 for the building. The New Church Young People’s League of America contributed $2,700 toward the purchase of a Hook and Hastings organ. But, as Alice explained, architect Warren “was not enough of a poet” to capture her father’s vision for the church, causing him to make sketch after sketch at his writing desk before capturing what his heart longed to see in the architect’s drawings.²⁶

In the meantime, Sewall was appointed General Pastor of the Maryland Association, a responsibility that
took him frequently to Baltimore and to outlying towns and villages along the Chesapeake’s Eastern Shore. He enjoyed these opportunities and was never without his sketchbook to capture the peaceful serenity of the region’s remote plantations.

On December 12, 1894, the cornerstone for the National Swedenborgian Church was laid at 1611 16th St. Northwest with the help of Rev. Hiram Vrooman who Sewall had ordained, and Rev. William L. Worcester, president of the New Church Theological School. Located near the residences of historian Henry Adams, General Nicholas L. Anderson, and statesman John M. Hay, the church was of English Gothic design, an early variation of Oxford’s Magdalene tower. The church’s memorial windows held enormous historical value to its members. The seven widows in the chancel representing the seven churches of Asia (Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea) were in memory of William B. Hayden, Richard de Charms, John Randolph Hibbard, Chauncey Giles, Abiel Silver, Jabez Fox, and John Worcester. Other windows were placed in honor of Prof. Henry C. Spencer, Maskell M. Carll, and Frank Sewall.

Washington Life

When Frank, Thedia, and their daughters (Archie was 19; Maud, 17; Maidy, 16; Ray, 14; and Bess, 11) arrived at their new home at 1618 Riggs Place in Northwest Washington in October 1889, they found a city of sprawling villages connected by aroundabouts and monuments of
men on horseback, diplomats strutting about in strange clothes, cable-cars moving along 14th Street, and the much used tow-path of the C and O Canal following the contours of the Potomac River. Washington was a city anxious to improve its image in the world. The National Theater and the Washington Choral Society were in their infancy as was the Kneisel Quartet (1885) in Boston, the Flonzaley Quartet (1902) in New York City—all matters of great import to Sewall who threw himself into making them self-sustaining.

For Sewall and his family, Washington was not just the nation’s capital but a city whose families envisaged parks conveniently situated; social, artistic, scientific, and philosophical clubs that would bring the talents of its citizens to light; and architecturally notable private and public structures that would become the envy of the world. Known as a “laissez-faire Democrat,” Sewall joined the Committee on the Future Development of Washington. Along with families like the Meems, Halsteds, Klakrings, Edsons, Bernards, Donaldsons, and Hitz, the former Swiss consul to the United States and now director of the Volta Bureau for the Deaf, he worked to transform Washington into one of the great capitals of the world.27

As a member of the National Committee of Four Hundred, Sewall took a prominent role testifying before the Committee on Education of the House of Representatives for the establishment of a national university. He also was a member of the Alpha Delta Phi Fraternity of the Cosmos Club, the Sophocles Club organized for the study of Greek dramatists, the Literary Society of Wash-
ingston, the American Federation of Arts, and the Theta Sigma Club composed of the city’s sixteen leading clergymen.28

Sewall eagerly joined in the social, literary, and artistic life of the Washington community.29 Remembering their discussions in the Theta Sigma Club and in the Literary Society of Washington, Merrill Gates remarked that he had “never had a colleague in any club whose contributions to such discussions [were] more invariably penetrating, germane, broadly Catholic in spirit, yet absolutely inflexible in devotion to central principles.”30 Whether it was Helen Keller who he brought to his home shortly before she joined the New Church, the Wagner singer Anton Schott, or string quartets that practiced and performed in his parlor, Sewall seemed to be ever present and filled with ideas for future events.31

Beginning in 1886, Miss Madeleine Beckwith, Mrs. John D. Patten, and Miss Fredericka Rodgers organized an informal women’s club for the study of music, instrumental and vocal. By 1890, the Friday Morning Music Club had thirty-one members whose activities included a Club Chorus; sponsorship of concerts; support for a music reference library; contributions toward musical endeavors in the city; and sponsorship of lectures. The Club, whose members included the violinist organist, composer, and choir director Maud Sewall, met regularly in the music room of the Washington Club located at 1710 I Street.32

Sometime during the family’s early years in Washington, Sewall acquired possession of the ancestral family house in Maine built by Judge David Sewall, brother to
Dummer Sewall of Bath. Georgian in style and adorned with hand carvings and precious paneling, with its east windows opening to the sea, it served as a much welcome retreat in his old age. There with Thedia, their daughters, and their families, he translated José-María de Heredia’s *Les Trophées* (1900), welcomed friends like William Dean Howells and the Hon. John Bigelow, former Minister to France, and read proof sheets of his latest article. Having a strong interest in New-Church history, he joined in the work of the American Evidence Society where he served as president for thirteen years. His principal interests during his tenure as president focused on the condition of the world as affected by the higher criticism, and the phase of New England thought known as transcendentalism.

**Poems of Giosuè Carducci**

In 1893, Sewall introduced the poet Giosuè Carducci to English readers for the purpose of examining the survival of ancient religious characteristics within the literature of a people who had passed through a succession of belief systems before turning to Christianity. Few nations possessed a literature that had undergone such fundamental changes. “It is only to the Latin nations of Europe,” he explained, “sprung from Hellenic stock and having a continuous literary history covering a period of from two to three thousand years that we may look for the example of a people undergoing these radical religious changes and preserving meanwhile a living record of them in a contemporaneous literature.”
In Carducci’s poetry, Sewall discovered an underlying character inherited from ancient Hellenic race instincts and appetites—both civil and religious—that persevered through pagan and Christian forms of worship, a Roman hierarchy that was never native to the Italian people, French and German invaders, papal supremacy, the expulsion of the Jesuits, and the secularization of the schools. Carducci’s poetry celebrated “the return of the ancient worship of nature, of beauty, and of sensuous love . . . in a universal jubilant hymn to Bacchus.” It gave utterance to those “deeply hidden and long-hushed ideas and emotions which belonged anciently to the people, and which no exotic influence had been able entirely to quench.”

Much like Harvard philosopher George Santayana, Sewall celebrated a sense of joyous veneration of the ancient poets, their worship of nature in all its intensity, and an abhorrence of the supernatural artifacts of religion. One also senses in Sewall’s translations a feeling that he had at last found his alter ego in Carducci, a man who cast off conventional rules to listen to the echoes from past generations. He found in this poet laureate of Italy someone who gave utterance to the Hellenic spirit in art and literature, its worship of immediate beauty and sensuous pleasures, and its hostility towards mortification and stern ascetic practices. Sewall enjoyed Carducci’s poetry because it allowed him to wander innocently like a dancing satyr into this ancient world to escape his own native woods.

Farewell, Semitic God: the mistress Death
May still continue in thy solemn rites,
O far-off king of spirits, whose dim shrines
Shut out the sun.
Crucified Martyr! Man thou crucifiest;
The very air thou darkenest with thy gloom.
Outside, the heavens shine, the fields are laughing,
And flash with love.
The eyes of Lidia — O Lidia, I would see thee
Among the chorus of white shining virgins
That dance around the altar of Apollo
In the rosy twilight,
Gleaming as Parian marble among the laurels,
Flinging the sweet anemones from thy hand,
Joy from thy eyes, and from thy lips the song
Of a Bacchante!
Odi Barbare.\textsuperscript{37}

Almost as an apology, Sewall admitted that the day was past when Hellenism could fill the place of Christianity. “The soul craves a substance for which mere beauty of form, whether in intellect, art, or nature, is a poor and hollow substitute,” he wrote. “To revive not the poetry alone, but the humanity of the nation, a force is needed greater and higher than that to be got by the restoration of either dead Pan or Apollo.”\textsuperscript{38}

Sewall considered Carducci an example of classic Hellenic realism. It was the poet’s pagan rather than Christian heritage that gave him his artistic expression. “Were Carducci himself a believer in the present existence of the Gods of Greece, he could hardly have infused a more intense life into his writing than he has
done by the continually suggested presence of the happy gods, sirens, and nymphs of the classic mythology.” In discussing Carducci, Sewall imbibed in the delights of a poet who had used his power of interpretation to consort with the souls of the past. “Whatever form he chooses,” observed Sewall, “is for the time filled with its own life and speaks from that and no other.”

Sewall praised Carducci for finding truth in beauty and used his classic realism as the standard for critiquing the school of realism in his own day. The nude was not real simply for being nude; the reality of an object depended on what was within it. By avoiding a moral purpose, Sewall complained, contemporary writers and artists had deluded themselves into believing they had attained the real. The emptiness of modern realism, which he described as “naked of soul within as of garments without,” proved to be “as powerless a factor in human character-building as is the multiplication table.” It was the equivalent of reducing ethics to a scientific equation.

Most realists, particularly the modern French school of realists, had gotten lost in their expressions of reality, setting them apart from the subject’s own true self. “This is the essentially immoral element in art—the licentious worship of form, or of external shape, regardless of an internal soul or motive.” It was only the apprehension of the universal element that constituted the gift of the artist in being true to nature, or humanity. Sewall referred to Whitman, who he considered the avowed prophet of realism, as little more than a “moral photographer” who
fell short of being an artist. Although he had a passion for expression, his words “heaped like sand-dunes.”

There is a sound of roaring waves, but the landscape is, too often, overall, shapeless and wearisome. One feels that there is meaning in the poet’s mind, but the expression is excessive, and so without form. The delight of ultimation has become a frenzy of word-piling or word-inventing. The disappointment is like that experienced on seeing a piece of sculpture which reveals a bold and vigorous design with magnificent anatomy and muscular strength, but which has a weak line in the face. It just falls short of being art.42

On the other hand, he praised William Dean Howells for remaining ethical, always concerned with the morality and fairness of what happened to his characters. Howells viewed his fellow human beings as living and working in an environment that often prevented them from being good even though they desired it in their heart. There was a subtlety in his realism that included a “deep moral purpose which, like a strong, irresistible current, underlies his . . . serious writing . . . . So perfect is the form and so true to nature that, with the author, we keep up, too, the little deception, that it is with the form itself that we are pleased, and that this constitutes the realism of which the author is so ardent an advocate. Meanwhile we learn, when the story is ended, that this realism was all informed with a soul of moral and divine purpose, and that this is all that is real in it as in anything else.” In making his point, Sewall spoke from his
Swedenborgian roots; so, too, did Howells who grew up in a Swedenborgian household. For both men, but particularly for Sewall, the soul was the form which made the body and its presence or absence distinguished true realism from its falsity.43

“Archie”

Alice Archer, named after Alice Worcester Sewall, Frank’s youngest sister, was the oldest of the five daughters and the one who Sewall would ultimately entrust with the task of writing his biography. Examining her life recalls Henry James’ novel The Golden Bowl (1904) which recounts a complex and intense examination of a father’s relationship with his daughter and the challenging marriage of the daughter to a man who eventually learned to live with that relationship. A gifted artist, poet, playwright, and musician, Alice was given special lessons, a private studio and exhibitions—all supported by her father. “Archie always had art or something important to do when dishes had to be washed,” remarked her biographer Alice Skinner. And she used these excuses to attend her father’s clubs, study with him, and even travel with him to meetings. She was clearly her father’s favorite, and the closeness of their relationship was evident in a family photograph where she stood solemnly beside her father while Thedia, his wife, sat among the other daughters.

This relationship deepened during their Washington years when Alice accompanied her father to meetings of the Society for Philosophical Enquiry, Sophocles Club,
and Literary Society where she listened and sometimes participated in the discussions. “His order of thinking, feeling and living was immoveable,” wrote Alice admiringly of her father, “In the midst of opinion he grew like a mountain out of many foothills, seen from various points of view to be of various shape, but always there where he could be looked for, above and in a wide expanse.”

Until 1889, Alice made her home in Washington where she worked with the painter Howard Helmick, benefiting from his criticism and judgment. Several her paintings were chosen for exhibition in the collections of the New York Architectural League, the Philadelphia Academy of Art, the Chicago World’s Fair, the Expositions of Atlanta and Nashville, and at the Salon in Paris. Her illustrative designs were also published in Century Magazine, Harper’s Monthly and Cosmopolitan. In addition to her paintings, she distinguished herself as a poet and playwright authoring several volumes of verse including An Ode to Girlhood, and Other Poems (1899) and The Ballad of the Prince (1900) and plays such as Masque of the Trenches (1917) and The Honor of Jaffrey (1918). Until his death, Frank Sewall acted as his daughter’s agent, arranging her exhibitions, submitting her manuscripts to publishers, and even managing her correspondence.

When Alice accompanied her father to the World’s Parliament of Religions, she expressed her gratitude in a poem titled “To Frank Sewall after the Fair at Chicago, 1893.” Rev. Louis Pyle Mercer, who published the proceedings of the New Church, was so taken by the poem he made it the frontispiece for his book.
“To Frank Sewall after the Fair at Chicago”

These things are yours and mine forever more:—
The broad, white vision on the western plain,
(How doth it like a midday moon remain)
Of twined fruit and wings; of things that soar;
Of lifted trumpets ‘mid the lions’ roar;
Of sinless colonnades without a stain
Of anarchy, or war, or tears, or pain,
Where Beauty lies in sunshine at the door;
Of those who walked therein and were our friends,
Turbaned in love and clad in suns and moons,
Symbols of things too mighty to reveal.
And we two on the curved bridge lean and feel
The warm, still charm of lantern-lit lagoons:—
These things are yours and mine until life ends.
—Alice Archer Sewall.

In all these matters, Sewall documented their relationship in his journals, taking delight in acknowledging the publication of her poems or the acceptance of a painting in an exhibition. Similarly, in frequent letters to her father, Alice reciprocated with effusive remarks, an example being his visit to her home in Urbana in 1904.

Oh dearest father, I do love you so! And although I have been very good about letting you go and have wept so . . . . I don’t believe you have any idea of all the encouragement and pleasure you left behind you . . . . and everyone was impressed and influenced by the ardor
of your presence. It seems harder than ever to let you go, with all that you have brought of home and childhood and safe domination of the parental roof, back to it again where life is always that way, and that security, beauty, and happiness continues as if childhood had never ended. I have followed you all in my thoughts and have felt so sorry for the tiresome day ahead . . . .”

At age twenty-nine, Alice married John H. James, a prominent attorney and Swedenborgian whose grandfather, Colonel James, had been the founding father of Urbana University. Alice and John had been classmates at Urbana. The only son among five strong-willed sisters, John’s submissiveness placed him in an awkward relationship with the commanding presence of his father-in-law and an equally uncomfortable position with his sisters whose house at 300 High Street he and Alice shared for many years. Self-effacing, he chose to live in the shadows of other people. “I believe she [Alice] found it very hard to live in the James Urbana home (a lovely, old, old rambling building with a long row of little servant rooms then filled with dust, spider webs and magazines) with Marjorie James acting as the mistress,” observed a longtime friend. A relatively unhealthy individual, John suffered from a multitude of illnesses.

Alice suffered from “nervous prostration” in 1905, causing her to discontinue painting until the 1920s. In 1909, she and her husband eventually moved out of the James’s house for several years before moving to Washington in 1913 where John took a position in the State Department. In 1914, a year before his death, Frank
Sewall arranged for the adoption of a son for Alice and John who was named David Sewall James. Two years later, following the death of her father, Alice, James and David returned to the family home in Urbana where John’s sisters refused to accept David as a true member of the family. David would eventually be handed off to two of Alice’s sisters.\textsuperscript{50}

Even after her father’s death, Alice lived in the shadow of his memory. Writing in 1921 in \textit{The New-Church Review}, she ascribed the decline in New Church membership to the negative effects of the Sunday school experience which had devolved into simply another form of secular education. Like her father, she believed that this hour in the child’s experience should be calculated to instruct and train the mind for life; unfortunately, it had become form of “chatty unpreparedness, talking down to the children, often trying to make them laugh in order to bring them again.” Having neglected children’s minds when impressions struck so deep, and being unable to differentiate between education and instruction, Swedenborgians had minimized the central role of the family, and with it, the warmth of the Church. Remembering her father’s love of music, she proposed that “if those who desire to be together can bring upon themselves to melt into each other’s spiritual arms,” the world would be a better place. Better to have a proces-sional hymn sung before the sermon during which the singing children could gather as the procession passes before they retire for class work during the sermon. Unless children are made to understand the Church and its goodness, the Church will die. “Let us not wait
until disaster overtakes us” and the Sunday school “dissolves itself and closes its doors because there are no children.”

Alice recounted another indelible mark left by her father in an unpublished pamphlet titled “Notes on the Making of a Home, by a Child of the Rev. and Mrs. Frank Sewall.” Prepared in 1927 from memories of her childhood, she identified twelve “elements” that constituted her home life, all of which involved a “sense of” the Lord in everything. The elements began with the unity of her parents and their separate functions, the sense of festival that revolved around daily life, the role of games and play, of confessionsals and privacies, and of their relationship to the outside world.

In their separate functions, the mother served the family as comforter, queen, nurse, food-giver, play-giver, and beauty-giver. She was “to be made comfortable . . . delighted with everything lovely . . . and kissed and embraced.” By contrast, the father was “owner (sic) of Mother, the protector, the guide, the adviser, the one who knows how, the best companion, the commander, the provider, and the reward.” Perhaps nothing better explained Alice’s relationship with her father than the remembrance of this division of roles and responsibilities.

These and the other elements produced a form (good) that entered into every activity and gave the family a “sense of” participation in the splendor of the world. The family, a microcosm of the outside world, exercised its function in the larger scheme of God’s plan around seven festivals that occurred each year: Christmas Eve and
Christmas day, Good Friday, Easter Eve and Easter Day, the first Sunday after Easter, and Ascension Day. This was the calendar around which the Sewall family, utilizing its collective imagination, performed its “uses.” Added to these seven religious observances were national holidays, birthdays, and weddings—all of which imparted a “sense of” romance, poetry, and “glory of soul.” It brought meaning into the routine of everyday obligations. Here was the essence of Swedenborg’s Doctrines of Forms, of Discrete Degrees, and Use performed in the safety and comfort of the home.\(^{52}\)

Given this special relationship, Alice B. Skinner, Archie’s biographer, often speculated on the relationship between Frank and Thedia. Writing from Concord, Massachusetts in 1982, she made the following comment:

Frank Sewall seems to have been a very energetic and strong person. Thedia Sewall seems also to have been a person of considerable strength, but many of the tales about the family life of the Sewall’s suggest that he made the major decisions. For example, in describing the Easter morning ceremonies, you said ‘their father always filled the house with flowers . . . etc.’ What do you think Thedia’s part in preparing for the occasion? Do you think she consented to her husband’s ideas? Or did she contribute ideas of her own? There are many details in which this question arises. For example, the girls had a German governess when they lived in Urbana. Was that Frank Sewall’s idea? Or did Thedia share in such plans? The question is important because it
bears on the relationship of Archie to her father, as well as to her mother.\textsuperscript{53}

Alice died at her home in Hotel Broad Lincoln, Columbus, Ohio, September 20, 1955—“Beloved daughter, sister and wife and poet and painter—and student and teacher of the New Church doctrine.”
If the Parliament of Religions has shown anything to the world it is this: It has proved to the world that holiness, purity and charity are not the exclusive possessions of any church in the world, and that every system has produced men and women of the most exalted character. In the face of this evidence, if anybody dreams of the exclusive survival of his own religion and the destruction of the others, I pity him from the bottom of my heart.

(Swami Vivekananda, *Life and Philosophy of Swami Vivekananda*, 1893)

As planning got under way for the World’s Fair of 1893 in Chicago (also known as the Columbian Exposition), to celebrate the quadricentennial anniversary of the discovery of the New World, its visionaries intended for it to become the most comprehensive
display of the world’s material progress to date. From artist studios in Paris and Munich, to weavers in Delhi and Damascus, to ivory cutters in Japan and China, representatives from forty-six nations began gathering the material splendors of their respective cultures to put on display for the anticipated influx of world visitors. Altogether some twenty-seven million people, the equivalent of nearly one quarter of the nation’s population at the time, visited the Fair on its six-hundred-acre site in Jackson Park designed by Frederick Law Olmstead on the shores of Lake Michigan.¹

The Gathering

In 1889 the World’s Congress Auxiliary authorized the creation of twenty-seven separate parliaments to convene during the season of the Exposition (May 1 to October 31, 1893). Their purpose was to highlight specific subject areas: women’s progress, public press, medicine and surgery, temperance, moral and social education, commerce and finance, social and economic science, music, literature, education, engineering, art, government, science, philosophy, labor, religion, Sunday rest, public health, and agriculture for more in-depth discussion. Exemplary was a lecture before the American Historical Association meeting by University of Wisconsin Professor Frederick Jackson Turner who presented his classic paper on “The Significance of the Frontier in American History.”²

Preparation for these individual Parliaments was the work of Charles Carroll Bonney (1831-1903), a powerful
Chicago attorney and president of the International Law and Order League. A Swedenborgian layman, he strongly recommended the creation of the Parliament of Religions. Writing in the *Statesman* magazine in October 1889: “The crowning glory of the World’s Fair of 1893 should not be the exhibit there to be made of the material triumphs, industrial achievements, and mechanical victories of man, however magnificent that display may be. Something higher and nobler is demanded of the progressive spirit of the present age.”

At first the idea seemed impractical to the sixteen-member planning committee, all of whom were of the Judean-Christian faith. On further examination, they learned that the Buddhist Emperor Asoka had presided over a similar gathering some twenty centuries earlier, and that parliaments of this type had been conceived by Moravian bishop John Comenius and by the Mogul emperor Akbar. More recent recommendations had come from the Free Religious Association of Boston in the 1870s and by Dr. W. F. Warren of Boston University who preached a sermon about an imaginary conference of religious leaders meeting in Tokyo. With positive response from the public to Bonney’s proposal, the World’s Congress Auxiliary signed a manifesto calling for a Parliament of Religions and appointed the Rev. John Henry Barrows, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Chicago, to plan the event. Under his leadership, the Parliament of Religions became the largest of all the parliaments held in conjunction with the Exposition.

With the approval of the World’s Congress Auxiliary, Barrow’s committee prepared a set of objectives: (1) to
bring together the leading representatives of the great historical religions of the world; (2) show what and how many truths the various religions teach in common; (3) promote a spirit of brotherhood through mutual understanding while not striving to create any formal unity; (4) set forth the distinctive truths taught by each religion, including the various branches of Christianity; (5) indicate the foundations and reasons for man’s faith in immortality in opposition to a materialistic philosophy of the universe; (6) secure from leading scholars full and accurate statements of the beliefs they hold; (7) to learn what each religion may contribute to other religions of the world; (8) prepare a permanent record of the parliament; (9) to discover what light religion has thrown on the great problems of the age; and (10) hopefully bring the nations of the world into a more friendly fellowship.5

In June of 1891, the committee sent out a circular to religious leaders world-wide announcing that the parliament would meet during the Exposition and include representatives from all the historic faiths and disclaiming any purpose other than one of brotherhood. Its choice of participating religions included Theism, Judaism, Mohammedanism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, Shintoism, Zoroastrianism, Catholicism, the Greek Church, and Protestantism.6 Accompanying the circular, the committee proposed an initial set of topics for discussion: revelation, immortality, the incarnation of God, the universal elements in religion, the ethical unity of different religious systems, and the relation of religion to morals, marriage, science, philosophy, evolution, music, labor, government, peace and war.7
As anticipated, the response produced sharp differences of opinion with an unusual number of critics insisting that a parliament of any type would compromise Christianity’s claim to be the only true faith. Others predicted a “picturesque spectacle . . . enough to dazzle visionaries, but of slight actual significance;” and still others thought it might signify a “manifestation of the modern scientific spirit and an efficacious means of disseminating enlightenment and inculcating religious tolerance.” Overall, religious leaders felt that a Parliament could demonstrate the significance of their religion, or alternatively, that it could better inform the world of their respective truths.⁸

Barrows’ greatest challenge was the Roman Catholic Church who many believed would oppose any involvement. Angered by the notorious corruption in the Vatican and convinced that the “lower elements” of the Catholic population in the United States were restrained from anarchy only by forcefulness of its priests, Barrow feared that Cardinal James Gibbons, leader of the Catholic church hierarchy in the United States, might refuse to join in the effort. When both Gibbons, who sought to harmonize the tenets of Catholic faith with American democracy, and Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul, Minnesota, promised cooperation, Barrows breathed a sigh of relief, convinced that the Catholic Church in America had taken a different turn from Old World Catholicism. At a meeting of the Catholic Archbishops of America in 1892, John J. Keane, Rector of the Catholic University of America, was appointed to arrange for the presentation of Catholic doctrine at the Parliament.⁹
Planers initially estimated that the parliament would require a week to fulfill its purpose. So great, however, did interest build for the parliament that its organizers extended the calendar of events over seventeen days, from September 11 through the 27th. Even then, several groups found it necessary to meet beyond these limits.

On the opening morning of the Parliament, President Bonney urged all to unite in the universal prayer of mankind which Cardinal Gibbons led with the “Our Father.” So great was the size of the audience (Hall of Columbus held 4,000), that visitors spilled over to the adjoining Washington Hall which held an additional 3,000, a situation that required speakers to repeat their addresses to a second audience. The parliament became the focus of international attention emphasizing liberty, fellowship and character in religion, and the desirability for greater unity. As it played out, however, the forces of unity were frequently offset by outspoken partisanship. Even in his introductory remarks to the assembled delegates and guests, Barrows revealed his own personal bias when he expressed his belief that the Parliament offered “a matchless opportunity” to set forth the distinctive truths of the Christian Gospel and predicted that its scholars would show Christianity “to be the true religion, fitted to all and demanding the submission of all.”

by the prophets. Mercer, a well-known orator whose force of argument, scholastic precision, and continuity of thinking made his sermons highly respected and often printed in their entirety in the *Chicago Times* and other newspapers, had been ordained at Urbana in 1872. He interpreted the discovery and colonization of the American continent, together with the Reformation, as having enabled the development of self-government and “a state of society in which the natural man has been so strong, so intelligent, so well poised, and so marvelously equipped for indefinite advancement.” The exhibitions of the world’s wonders displayed in the “White City” were the visible indications of the supremacy of mind over matter and the proper exercise of law in use.\textsuperscript{11}


Amidst the assembly of cardinals, archbishops, bishops, priests and scholars, Sewall viewed the Parliament
as the coming together of delegates from the world’s historical religions at a time when people were commemorating the discovery of a new world. He valued the Parliament as “a signal event in the religious history of the world” and of particular importance to the New Church in that it corroborated Swedenborg’s own statements concerning the religious condition of humankind and the transition from an old to new Christian Dispensation. Those who participated in the Parliament felt a spirit, “an indefinable presence and movement,” like a gust of wind that rushed through the assemblage of delegates bringing a totally new experience to the history of the world. That its proceedings were conducted in English marked another historical turning point, reminding Sewall that Swedenborg had predicted that the English-speaking nations were at the center of the spiritual world. “No other agency in the world,” he explained, “equals those of the British and American Foreign Bible Society in distributing Bibles throughout the world.” Around these two guardians of the Word of God were arranged “other peoples in spiritual order according to their religious illumination.”

Sitting through lectures and presentations by the delegates, Sewall did not ignore the outbursts of prolonged applause and waving of handkerchiefs when something was said that touched the hearts of the delegates, or the outcry of disapproval and scowls of dissent that resulted from partisan utterances such as the approval of polygamy. Often, however, when a dignitary went too far in asserting an unpopular dogma or opinion, the response
“would be a kindly smile of amusement rather than the scowl of dissent.”

As noted earlier, in planning the Parliament’s agenda, the committee included a call for delegates to speak to the concept of Revelation. According to Mercer, there were two universally accepted ideas, the most popular being that Revelation was the voice of God that came through human consciousness. Revelation was not precisely the word of God, but a record of the Word as revealed in holy men who were not without error. Even the most scrupulous writers made mistakes in grammar, rhetoric, logic, expression, and arrangement of material. The other view involved the involution of the divine in human speech by a divine act. Of the two approaches, the delegates who opted to speak on the subject chose the former, namely the voice of God unfolding in the consciousness of man. Representative of this approach were the observations of Protap Chunder Mozoomdar who presented Hindu point of view.

In the high realms of that undying wisdom the Hebrew, the Hindu, the Mongolian, the Christian are ever at one, for that wisdom is no part of themselves, but the self-revelation of God. The Hindu books have not plagiarized the Bible, Christianity has not plundered Buddhism, but universal wisdom is like unto itself everywhere. Similarly love, when it is unselfish and incarnal, has its counterpart in all lands and all times. The deepest poetry, whether in Dante, Shakespeare, or Kalidasa, is universal. The love of God repeats itself century after century in the pious of every race;
the love of man makes all mankind its kindred. True holiness is the universal idea, however much personal prejudices or passions stand in the way of the light. Hence Asia, seeking the universal God in her soul, has discovered God to all the world. This process of seeking and finding God within is an intense spiritual culture, known by various names in various countries; in India we call it Yoga. The self-concentrated devotee finds an immersion in the depths of the indwelling deity. God’s reason becomes man’s reason, God’s love becomes man’s love. God and man become one. Introspection finds the universal soul — the over-soul of your Emerson — beating in all humanity, and a human and divine are thus reconciled.  

Aware that none of the speakers had chosen the second of the two perspectives, Mercer, appealed to Sewall to present the Swedenborgian position. Sewall agreed, and in a highly structured paper titled “The Character and Degree of the Inspiration of the Christian Scriptures,” he explained that the Scriptures were divinely inspired because they contained “a direct communication from the divine Spirit to the mind and heart of man.” Written in two parts—the Old and the New Testament—with an interval of time between the two, the divine canon consisted of a beginning in which man was with God, and the second when God became incarnate in the person of Jesus. It constituted the source of revelation and inspiration for man, its prophecy, its fulfillment, and its power to illuminate. The books were evidence of God’s revelation and “of direct dictation by
means of a voice actually heard, as one hears another
talking, although by the internal organs of hearing.”
Besides the canon itself, there was the divine language
spoken in parables, namely, a series of veils or symbols
which became the divine language “wherein things of
the kingdom of heaven are clothed in the familiar figures
of earthly speech and action.” Thus, he argued, “We
may regard, therefore, as established that the source of
the divinity of the Bible, of its unity, and of its author-
ity as Divine revelation lies in having the Christ, as the
eternal Word within it, at once its substance, its inspi-
ration, its prophecy, its fulfillment, its power to illumine
the minds of men with a knowledge of Divine and
spiritual things.”

In view of these matters, Sewall questioned the ratio-
nale of those favoring the first theory of revelation.

Were the Bible a work of human art, embodying hu-
man genius and human wisdom, then the question of
the writer’s individuality and their personal inspira-
tion, and eve of the time and circumstances amid which
they wrote, would be of the first importance. Not so if
the divine inspiration and wisdom is treasured up in
the very words themselves as divinely chosen symbols
and parables of eternal truth . . . . The difference be-
tween inspired words of God and inspired men writing
their own words is like that between the eternal fact
of nature and the scientific theories which men have
formulated upon or about it. The fact remains forever a
source of new discovery and a means of ever new rev-
elation of the divine; the scientific theories may come and go with the changing minds of men.\textsuperscript{18}

Along with his repudiation of the majority opinion on Scriptural inspiration, Sewall attacked the higher critics for placing limitations on Biblical meanings. He saw a difference between inspired words and men writing their own words. The scientific theories formulated about it could never possess the heavenly and divine meanings.\textsuperscript{19} Later that same year in \textit{Dante and Swedenborg}, he expressed the same theme.

That the world is actually entering upon a new age seems to be universally acknowledged by witnesses from every grade and department of human life. New incentives are stirring men’s hearts, new ideals inspire their arts, new physical achievements beckon them on to one marvelous mastery after another of the mysterious forces of the universe, until it seems as if mankind were on the verge of demonstrating, even to their natural senses, the universality of spirit as the only substance and force and the comparative non-substantiality of matter. The reaction against the blind literalism of Christian dogma in its interpretation of the Scriptures, as well as against the essential injustice and savagery of the Calvinistic scheme of atonement, have driven thoughtful and refined natures to the extreme of rejecting altogether the idea of a written revelation and of a physical incarnation of Deity. These revolts are however more often against the perverted traditional interpretations of the Church of the past than against
the sublime mysteries themselves which have been so profanely handled; while, on the other hand, much of the pretended “higher criticism” of the Bible by those within the Churches is pursued with a far more destructive and agnostic spirit than inspires the humble and reverent seeker of God through the paths of nature’s revelations to science. But both agnosticism on the one hand, and a desiccated theology on the other, stand equally witnesses to the fact that an old order of thought and motive in spiritual things is passing away, if it has not already passed away, as a vital agency in human life, and that a new religious impulse and a new religious vision is coming over the world.20

In a smaller congress sponsored by the Church of the New Jerusalem which opened September 13th in Washington Hall, the program listed five different categories for discussion: “Origin and Nature of the New Church,” “Its Doctrines the True Basis of a Universal Faith and Charity,” “The Planting of the New Church,” “The Future of the New Church,” and “Woman and the New Church.” Each had a list of speakers followed by open discussion among the participants.

Sewall opened the Congress with his paper, “One Lord, One Church, with Its Successive Ages,” focusing on the central idea of history which was idea of God. Thick with metaphysical language, the paper was probably little understood by his audience. Ever a Platonist, he explained how the whole of creation was just a series of infinite forms of the Divine Love which constituted the First Form—the Creator of the world. Following
the creation of earths on which man could dwell, he explained how God descended into the consciousness of man first by “direct inflowing and immediate revelation,” followed by the written Word, and lastly by the Word incarnate in Christ.21

Sewall discussed the succession of the four great church eras or Dispensations in world history to which he gave the names Adam, Noah, Abraham, and the Apostles. Each symbolized a distinctive mode of receiving the Divine into human intelligence, with remnants of the past often commingling with the religious forms of more modern ages. Thus, the forms, traditions, and creeds of an earlier religious era often remained long after their purpose ceased to be regarded. Still, primitive religion was the mother of all religions and the variety of religions were expressions of the one original Form—“the Divine Love and Wisdom which formed the world.”22

In the aftermath of the Parliament, Sewall felt energized by the warmth of the delegates, the promise it offered for the future, and his belief that major accomplishments had been achieved in the calling together of so many faiths.23 There in its peaceful halls, Protap Chunder Mozoomdar, author of The Oriental Christ, the Oriental theosophist Ganandra Nath Chakravarti, and the Buddhists of Japan and India met without judgment to share and to understand each other’s beliefs. No other national or ecclesiastical authority had been so able to command such a meeting. In the ensuing years, scholars from Hindu, Buddhist, Confucian, Parsi (Zoroastrian), Muslim, Christian, and Jewish faiths came together to discuss their common interests in an atmosphere of
openness. Sewall was sure this openness of discourse could only have happened because of the contributions of the Swedenborgians. Except for the freedom that came with the new Christian Dispensation, the Parliament would have been a distant idea. Like “a rushing, mighty wind,” the Parliament had made it possible for an assemblage of delegates from the world’s religions to sit face to face and share their beliefs, many of which were held in common.\textsuperscript{24}

Sewall returned to Washington with a renewed sense of this signal event and its significance in the religious history of the world. He thought it doubly important to the New Church since it corroborated many of Swedenborg’s statements concerning the religious condition of humankind and the transition occurring as Christianity moved from the old to new Dispensation. Alice, on the other hand, came away with a different premonition. For her, the Parliament had “opened flood gates of the Celestial love which no purely philosophical intention could henceforth satisfy,” an enthusiasm that swept many New Churchmen out of the General Convention and into the arms of Theosophy.\textsuperscript{25}

**Theosophy**

Westerners had long been circumspect of Indian thought and its practices which included belief in planes of psychic intuition, occult racial theories, bursts of energy or chakras, and spiritual enlightenment. Although buoyed by a romantic portrayal of the Indian subcontinent by Emerson and the transcendentalists, it wasn’t until the
Russian occultist and spirit medium Helena Petrovna Blavatsky (1831-1891) articulated the esoteric religion of Theosophy in 1874 that a syncretic system of Eastern and Western thought took hold in America. Claiming knowledge of a cosmos which developed through seven stages of evolution and whose humanity moved through an ascending arc of reincarnation to arrive at pure consciousness, Theosophy connected Western esotericism with an ancient group of monks she described as the “Masters.” Blavatsky’s peculiar brand of occultism which she explained in her two-volume *Isis Unveiled* (1877) came at a time when Christianity was struggling with the transition between faith and rationality by embracing an immanent rather than a transcendent God. Purported to be the esoteric wisdom of the world’s most revered religious prophets (Moses, Krishna, Lao-tzu, Confucius, Buddha, and Christ) handed down through an ancient brotherhood of gifted adepts, mahatmas, or masters, it became a worldwide movement which, by the time of Blavatsky’s death in 1891, had drawn into its fold such luminaries as George Bernard Shaw, Lyman Frank Baum, James Henry Cousins, William Butler Yeats, Lewis Carroll, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, Jack London, James Joyce, D. H. Lawrence, T. S. Eliot, Thornton Wilder, Kurt Vonnegut, Lewis Carroll, Susan B. Anthony, Thomas Edison, and Alfred Russel Wallace.²⁶

One version, known as Christian Theosophy was heavily laced with Swedenborgian concepts. Behind the veil of the physical universe, lay a spiritual universe of infinite gradations, concepts like Swedenborg’s law of correspondences, the rejection of ecclesiasticism
and theological dogmatism, an emphasis on the inner and outer person, and a concept of matter as a form of spiritual substance made visible for divine purposes. John Hamlin Dewey’s version of Christian Theosophy insisted that occult knowledge and power were attainable by anyone and that the mission of Jesus was to show humankind how to come to the immediate and intuitive knowledge of the truth through inward illumination. This was not achieved by turning to Indian Theosophy, Buddhism, or Spiritualism, but by returning Christianity to its esoteric origins.²⁷

Theosophy became a magnet for many New Churchmen at the turn of the century, including the physician, philosopher, and publicist Hermann Vetterling (1849-1931) who had been a member of the Advisory Committee for the World’s Parliament of Religions. Once a student at Urbana University where he pursued ministerial studies before leaving in disappointment to finish his studies with Benade in Philadelphia, he eventually became a disillusioned believer in Protestantism and wrote a series of articles noting the similarities between Swedenborg’s philosophy and that of Buddhism and Theosophy. In 1887, using the pseudonym Philangi Dasa, he authored an occult novel titled Swedenborg the Buddhist; Or, the Higher Swedenborgianism: Its Secrets and Thibetan Origin.²⁸ The prophet Thomas Lake Harris (1823-1906) was another who began as an admirer of Swedenborg but who later in life adopted Theosophy as a more effective response to modernity.

Sewall was similarly influenced by Theosophy and, in a series of lectures on “Theosophy and Religion” deliv-
ered in Boston in 1895 and published by the Massachusetts New-Church Union, he observed that man’s desire in finding God came in three forms: Revelation and Doctrine; Philosophy, or the process of rational thinking; and Theosophy, meaning the acquisition of knowledge by immediate vision.

In laying out his argument, Sewall discounted the claims of theorists like Herbert Spencer who approached the history of religion using the tools of evolution and the scientific method. It made no sense to associate the earliest form of religion with charms, fetishes, sacrifices, and fear. Instead, Sewall accused the evolutionists of inventing a prehistoric animistic form of worship in order to match their theory of emerging stages of human development from barbarism to civilization. Far from aligning specific religious sentiments to stages in human evolution, he found that some of the strongest aspects of religious belief were evident in the earliest history of man. Indeed, “the earliest religion was of a pure and elevated type and that in its descent it assumed the forms of a symbolism more and more gross and external.”

In place of evolutionary theory, Sewall appealed to Swedenborg’s teachings of the Ancient Word. In his understanding, Swedenborg had divided the world’s religious tradition into two streams: A Western stream that developed from the Greek branch of the Aryan family; and an Eastern stream that originated from the ancient Vedic hymns of India. This latter was the religion of Buddha with adaptations that continued into the present-day Theosophy. In its theology and cosmogony, Theosophy was Brahmin, while its ethics were Buddhist.
The Gautama or Buddha obtained his wisdom from the Vedic hymns and teachers.\textsuperscript{30}

As with the Western tradition, Eastern unity had been interrupted by a formal priesthood and a literal tradition that produced stagnation and blindness to the spiritual doctrines of the inner life. Eventually, this caused the formation of a new inner wisdom attained directly by a state of ecstasy or by recovering the lost knowledge handed down in the secret traditions of the Brotherhood. Evidence of this effort, explained Sewall, was best represented by Madame Blavatsky and her followers in the British and American Theosophical Societies. Her \textit{Secret Doctrine} represented an effort to discover the essence of Hindu, Zoroastrian, Chaldean, Egyptian religion, Buddhism, Islam, Judaism, and Christianity.\textsuperscript{31}

Sewall found a striking resemblance between the writings of Swedenborg and the teachings of Theosophy. “When judged of by name only . . . we cannot wonder that theosophists themselves who have not studied Swedenborg, on merely hearing the titles of his treatises are ready to assign him a prominent place in their ranks.” Theosophists saw Christ as a witness to the truths of Buddha. Similarly, Theosophists and New-Churchmen saw a fundamental sameness in their use of the terms “inner and outer,” “spiritual and natural,” and “divine and human.” Yet, Sewall considered their differences to be much greater than any similarities. “The difference between the two is as wide as the vast stretch of the ages between them,” he insisted.\textsuperscript{32} Throughout history, Theosophy had taken many forms, including the nomenclature of Swedenborg’s theology, but their meanings
were totally different. Unlike Swedenborg’s True Christian Religion, Theosophy represented no true synthesis of the world’s religions; it contained only a few truths found in all religions. Some were useful and convenient as a reference, but they added nothing since its cycle of evolution was “from nothing back to nothing.”

* * * *

Sewall returned to the nation’s capital with three impressions of the Parliament: first, that it had brought knowledge of the New Church and of its teachings to many visitors who would have remained unaware of its existence. Besides listening to the addresses given by New Churchmen, thousands had received souvenir copies of Chauncey Giles’ book on the Nature of Spirit, and Mercer’s books, The African and the True Christian Religion and Swedenborg and the New Christian Church. The second impression he had of the Parliament was the mutual enlightenment and charity extended by all. Finally, the third impression had been the use of the Parliament on the material and natural plane. The motto of the World’s Congress Auxiliary being, “Not Things but Men,” it stressed those Divine ideals which led man from nature to the Grand Man which “is the organism not of one civilization, one Religion alone, but of all combined into a reflection of the Divine form of the Maker.”
The objects of the scientific knowing are the phenomena of this world, of which we become aware through our senses; those of the philosophical knowing are the ideas and processes of reason; those of the religious knowing are truths communicated by revelation from the divine and the supernatural, through chosen human instruments, to men.

(Frank Sewall, *Reason in Belief*, 1906)

America emerged from Reconstruction with a newly minted sophistry that ended slavery but metastasized into a new formulation of black servitude that did nothing to remove the stigma of race. Both sides in the conflict reached an ‘understanding’ which empowered the South to institute disfranchisement in exchange for the North’s freedom to control the nationality of future immigrants. With this Faustian
handshake, the nation stood poised to fulfill not the agrarian dream of Thomas Jefferson but the laissez-faire and self-sufficing economic and industrial world of Alexander Hamilton. Purged of its passion for war, Americans grew indifferent to the wastefulness, corruption, exploitation, and the amassing of private wealth. Walt Whitman, the highly regarded poet of democracy, showed his misgivings of the age. “Never was there, perhaps, more hollowness of heart than at present . . . . The great cities reek with respectable as much as non-respectable robbery and scoundrelism.”

Yet beneath the tawdriness of the nation’s “gilded” landscape, a mix of evolutionary theories opened the world to a new climate of opinion. A new paradigm emerged, and with it, a reformulation of religion, philosophy, architecture, painting, science, economics, history and sociology. Elements of evolutionary theory found their way into all aspects of life, leading to the abandonment of many older formulations that had once unified society. In place of eternal and changeless absolutes and intuitively derived truths, there emerged a world of unpredictability that applied to moral standards, judgments, laws, and objectivity. In place of a world defined by Kant and Emerson stood an organic and dynamic society whose social conscience was driven not by whether something was ‘right’ or ‘wrong,’ but by weighing its consequences. “The ultimate test for us of what a truth means,” explained William James, “is the conduct it dictates or inspires.”
Building Blocks

Among Washingtonians, there seemed to be a desire above all else to transform the capital into a radiant center of literature, art, statesmanship, law, and science. Much of the energy for this grand idea came from a mix of public figures (cabinet members, Supreme Court justices, and congressmen), scientists, entrepreneurs, and the city’s genteel families. Early examples of this transformation included the Literary Society of Washington (1875) whose most celebrated member, Madeleine Vinton Dahlgren, was allegedly the feminine powerhouse described in Henry Adams’s *Democracy* (1880). Another was the Philosophical Society of Washington (1871) which grew out of Joseph Henry and Alexander Dallas Bache’s pre-war Scientific Club. Filling in around the edges were the Anthropological (1879), Biological (1880), Chemical (1884) and Entomological Societies (1884); The National Geographic Society (1888); the Geological Society of Washington (1893); and the Washington Academy of Sciences (1898). Despite their differences in size, topic, membership, funding, and reputation, all intended to create “an environment in which scientists, scholars, educators, public administrators, and their guests could meet socially under pleasant surroundings.”

The Philosophical Society originated with the scientist and engineer Joseph Henry, who served from 1846 to 1878 as the first Smithsonian Secretary. An early researcher of magnetism and the discoverer of electromagnetic self-induction, he gathered a group of friends and colleagues at his home on March 13, 1871, to consider forming an association to discuss “all subjects
of interest to intelligent men.” In the early years of its existence, the meetings covered such topics as astronomy, geography, physics and biology. Later, when more specialized scientific societies organized, it turned its attention to the physical and mathematical sciences, geophysics, and biophysics.  

The origins of the Cosmos Club (1878), a gentleman’s club for the advancement of the sciences, literature, and art, is also attributed to a group of scientists at the Smithsonian Institution, among whom was the geologist Clarence E. Dutton who first suggested the idea to encourage social intercourse in science, literature, and art. On the evening of November 16, 1878, at the home of the explorer, geologist, anthropologist, philosopher and poet Major John Wesley Powell, a meeting took place followed three weeks later with articles of incorporation. The Club met initially in the Corcoran Building at the corner of Fifteenth and F Streets before moving to Lafayette Square in 1882, later to the Tayloe and Dolley Madison Houses, and then to the Townsend House on Embassy Row in 1952. Over the course of its illustrious history, it included among its members U.S. presidents, vice presidents, Supreme Court justices, and Nobel and Pulitzer Prize winners. Eventually the Club became home to the Philosophical Society of Washington, The National Geographic Society, and the Wilderness Society.

Society for Philosophical Inquiry
In January 1893, a group of academics, clergymen, and other interested parties met at Columbia University in
Washington, D.C., to organize a Society for Philosophical Inquiry. The group’s elected officers included Rev. J. MacBride Sterrett, professor of philosophy at Columbian University as president, Edward Farquhar, assistant librarian of the U.S. Patent Office and Professor of History at Columbian University as secretary; and Kepler Hoyt as corresponding secretary and treasurer.

Among the Society’s more active members were the Hegelian Dr. William T. Harris, geologist and anthropologist W. J. McGee; soldier, geologist and explorer John Wesley Powell; Edward Farquhar from the U. S. Patent Office; meteorologist and clergyman Frank Hagar Bigelow, political scientist Lee Davis Lodge, sociologist Lester F. Ward, and Frank Sewall. President Sterrett recalled meeting Sewall at the Cosmos Club, describing him as a faithful member and almost always ready to do battle on behalf of idealism. “We had some royal battles in those days,” and Sewall was always in the thick of things. “To him a thoughtless universe was unthinkable, and he had the zeal of the philosopher of idealism.”  

So sure was Sewall of his beliefs, added Prof. J S. Lemon, that he looked on persons, doctrines and problems philosophically with a point of view that was thoroughly Swedenborgian. “He had such faith in his philosophy that he lived largely free from uncertain, unsatisfactory, problematical, hypothetic, suppositional, theoretical states of mind.” To him, Heaven was “a social place, homelike, active, participative, industrious, free from any feeling of loneliness, offering angelic and uplifting society, practically a continuity of life for which life on earth is preparative.”
In reviewing the society’s regular and special meetings from 1893 through 1901, several observations are immediately evident. First, the principal topics discussed by the members concerned the writings of Kant, Hegel, Swedenborg, Comte, Monism, and Spencer; second, that Sewall attended virtually every meeting and either presented a paper or contributed to the group discussion; and third, some of the members of the society (i.e., Paul Carus and William Torey Harris) came from distant states, a clear sign of the society’s importance to its members. As Sewall observed: “We will discuss the permanent, the absolute and the eternal and nothing else; you might go into the solid, but it would be swinging away from philosophy.” Such was his commitment to pure speculative thought.\textsuperscript{11} Listed below are many of Sewall’s contributions to the society between 1893 and 1903:

- “The Philosophy of Swedenborg and of Emerson” (March 7, 1893)
- Discussion of paper by Major John Wesley Powell on the “Principles of Classification” (April 4, 1893)
- “Being and Existence” (January 2, 1894)
- Discussion of paper by H. Farquhar’s “Realism of the Inductive Sciences” (May 22, 1894)
- “Philosophy of Swedenborg in Its Relation with that of Aristotle” (January 8, 1895)
- Discussion of Catholic University Professor E. A. Pace’s “Exposition of the Philosophy of Thomas Aquinas” (March 12, 1895)
• “The Real, the Ideal, and the Actual” (February 4, 1896)
• “Basis for Induction” (February 25, 1896)
• “The Difference Between Spinoza and Swedenborg on the Doctrine of Divine Love” (March 17, 1896)
• “Philosophy as Affected by Nationality” (February 2, 1897)
• “Humanity an Object of Worship” (March 23, 1897)
• Sewall claimed priority of Swedenborg over Kant regarding the Nebular Theory (January 25, 1898)
• Debates Lester F. Ward on the “Theories of Cognition” (February 8, 1898)
• “The Physico-Theological Argument Treated in the Critique” (April 16, 1898)
• “On the Aesthetic and Teleological System of Kant” (December 20, 1898)
• “Jacobi” (February 21, 1899)
• “Swedenborg’s Philosophy and the Relation Between the Universe and the Soul” (January 2, 1900)
• Debates Lester F. Ward on the “Mind” (May 8, 1900)
• “Hegel’s Philosophy of Religion” (April 12, 1901)
• “Psychology or De Anima of Aristotle” (February 4, 1902)
• Discusses the unitary of justice idea or righteousness in Plato’s Republic (November 25, 1902)
• “Education in Plato’s Republic” (December 9, 1902)
In 1902, Sewall published *Swedenborg and Modern Idealism: A Retrospect of Philosophy from Kant to the Present Time*. Not surprisingly, four of his nine chapters (“Swedenborg and Modern Idealism,” “Swedenborg and Aristotle,” “Jacobi and the Reason of Belief,” and “Emerson and Swedenborg”) were read before the Society for Philosophical Inquiry where discussions concerning Swedenborg usually turned quite spirited. Admitting the obvious influence of Swedenborg on Kant in Germany, Carlyle and Coleridge in England, and Emerson in America, Sewall’s colleagues in the Society were less supportive of his efforts to interpret Swedenborg’s works as “a critical and corrective standard” for modern philosophy, including the pragmatic philosophy of William James. Having relegated Swedenborg to that of a quixotic and protected species in the life of the mind, they found it difficult to accept his system of Swedenborgian science and philosophy as a “seed slumbering in the darkness of the earth awaiting the conditions favorable to its bursting into light.”

For Sewall, Swedenborg’s principles regarding the reality of spirit and the economy of the spiritual universe which he first anticipated in his *Economy of the Animal Kingdom* (1740-41) and *Animal Kingdom* (1744-45) and later announced in his eight-volume *Arcana Coelestia* (1749-56) represented a rebirth of the spiritual-rational principle in the human mind. Idealism and the truths of Revelation were a vital part of Swedenborg’s vision—
past and future. As proof of Swedenborg’s relevancy, Sewall called attention to several doctrines in modern thought that he attributed to Swedenborg: the evolution of the universe as taught in the Principia; tremulations; light, sound and color as ethereal and aerial vibrations; the all-prevalent ether; the three discrete degrees of end, cause, and effect; the teleology of will; nature as the phenomenal reflection of the spiritual world; and terms such as atom, force, mass, space and time being symbols of reality rather than reality themselves. Each and all of these concepts were now accepted as part of modern science and thus were corroboration of Swedenborg’s continued relevance in the modern world.13 To the extent that Aristotle had put to practical application the idealism of Plato, so too, had Swedenborg in his search for the soul contributed to the ladder of knowledge using his doctrine of Discrete Degrees and of Correspondence which rested upon the other doctrines of Series, Orders, Degrees, and Modifications. Everything was in its series greater or less, general or particular.14

And because this series everywhere prevails, therefore between the lower and higher degrees, or the inner and outer planes of being, there is this perfect correspondence; so that the whole natural world corresponds to the whole spiritual world, just as the whole of man’s body corresponds perfectly to the whole of his spirit, and this for the reason that the spirit itself is the law and reason and instrumental cause of every natural thing or form that clothes it. The outward or phenomenal plane of being belonging to anything becomes thus
not the thing itself, but a perfect symbol of the thing—the veil to the senses conforming to the real form and substance within.\textsuperscript{15}

Noting that Idealism had been falsely misunderstood as “a system of idle fancies having no foundation in experience beyond that of dreams,” Sewall praised Swedenborg for having viewed spiritual principles not as abstractions but as everywhere associated with substance, and so having an actual existence. The idea of immanence was a “character-mark of modern Idealism.”\textsuperscript{16} The presence of the Divine in the spiritual, and the spiritual in the natural, was implicit in the very laws of being since “the Divine as the end and first cause must be in the spiritual, as the universal law or instrumental cause, and both must be in the effect which is the natural world itself.”\textsuperscript{17}

\section*{Swedenborg Scientific Association}

During the second half of the eighteenth century, patronage from all over Europe contributed to the publication of Swedenborg’s scientific works, his election to the Royal Society of London (1742), the Imperial Academy of Russia (1734), and the Academy of Science in Stockholm (1741). For good reason, the scientific world had shown interest in his theories concerning the ether, the magnetic vortex, the nature of light and of vision, the influx of life in the form of vibratory motion, and the discrete degrees of being. Indicative of this interest, the Swedenborg Scientific Association of London pub-
lished *The Principia, Animal Kingdom, and Economy of the Animal Kingdom* to highlight his scientific and philosophic prowess. Once published, however, the New Church leadership did little to encourage the study of his scientific writings. Despite the eloquent references to Swedenborg’s works by Emerson, the translations by James John Garth Wilkinson and Charles Edward Strutt of England (*Generative Organs, Posthumous Tracts, Outlines of the Infinite, Principles of Chemistry, and Miscellaneous Observations*), the translation by Augustus Clissold of the *Principia* and *Animal Kingdom*, and the work of Rev. Rudolph Tafel *On the Brain*, the New Church as a body gave little attention to their study. Except for Tafel’s translation *On the Brain*, few supported the printing of second editions. As for Swedenborg’s unpublished philosophic and scientific writings, some feared they might never be translated or published in their entirety but left to disintegrate in the archives in Sweden and London.

At the heart of this perceived neglect was Swedenborg’s transition from scientist to theologian, a decision that caused the scientific community to relegate his scientific and philosophical works to secondary status. Despite the New Church’s insistence that the Seer’s writings were incomplete without looking at the whole, most Churchmen focused their attention on his theological writings which they believed had more immediate consequence for mankind’s spiritual needs.  

In his essay on “The Church and Science,” Sewall noted the strides made in natural sciences over the course of the century and the degree to which its accomplishments had overshadowed the spiritual exercise
of human reason. “Is there, then, no higher use of science that of industrial use?” he asked. He answered his question saying that “it is its use to the human soul as an immortal creature, and as one above and distinct from matter, and as moved by forces entirely distinct from any physical or mechanical force.” It was its use to the rational mind and through the rational to the spiritual plane of the mind that counted most.  

In looking at the ascending order of degrees in the human mind, Sewall began with the sensuous or natural plane which represented man’s knowledge of matter and the world of time and place before turning to the spiritual plane which took cognizance of spiritual truths. Forming a bridge between the two was the rational faculty. “It is by means of this [rational faculty] that man can rise from the natural to the spiritual plane of thought,” Sewall wrote. Although science has been helpful, it stopped at the rational plane, denying anything higher. Equally so, religion in the form of dogma was something into which reason could not enter. While Oriental religions did not face this destructive standoff, it remained a challenge for Christendom. Complicating this dualism was the rise of the higher criticism which “seems to be drifting on the sea of opinion, speculation, and doubt, as if there never had been a fixed and orthodox and catholic faith in the world.” Essentially the dogmatic and miraculous faith of the past was gone. While in previous times, New Church ministers preached to audiences who believed the Bible to be a divine book, in recent years many had ceased to accept it.  

Such freedom in thinking about spiritual things proved to be an overriding challenge to
the functions of the New Church. The essence of religion was summed up in two words: revelation and salvation. “Take these away . . . and religion is henceforth no more a factor in life.” Here then was the mission of the New Church.\footnote{21}

Every Swedenborgian minister, Sewall explained, should become a philosopher in order to be a teacher of spiritual truth. The intellectual foundations of faith must be laid anew and doing so required ministers to meet the modern man on his own ground, using language acceptable to both in pursuit of the mystery of faith. The natural sciences served three different planes: the industrial art which addressed the bodily wants of man; the civil and moral sciences which addressed man’s relations to fellow man; and the spiritual sciences or those revealed truths that related to matters of heaven and the church.\footnote{22} In order to approach the modern man it was thus necessary to meet him on the plane of the fundamental scientific and philosophical problems, namely God, Human Freedom, and Immortality. It was therefore important to involve the concept of God and the course of creation in the doctrine of evolution. Equally important it was essential to explain that revelation was the way God showed himself to the world. Next involved the discussion of human freedom and the moral responsibilities which necessarily arose amid the uses of evil in the world. Essential to both the spiritual universe and the natural universe was the creation of love from God and the exercise of free will on the part of man. From this followed the doctrine of immortality and the necessary corollary to the concepts of God and of free will.\footnote{23}
Convinced something must be done to correct the mistaken assumption that the scientific and philosophical writings of Swedenborg were no longer integral to his theological thought, and believing it was essential to find common ground between science and religion, Sewall proposed bringing together a cadre of interested parties to discuss the issue. The meeting which was held on May 27, 1898, in the offices of the American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society on West Twenty-Ninth Street in New York City included representatives from Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C., and Russia. Chaired by Sewall and assisted by Rev. S. M. Warren, Dr. F. A. Boericke, and Rev. L. P. Mercer, the group adopted a resolution that the present body constitute the Swedenborg Scientific Association to reawaken interest in and out of the Church for the need to republish the scientific and philosophical writings of Swedenborg. This was followed by the adoption of a constitution and the appointment of Sewall as president.24

In Sewall’s opening address before the Association in 1898, he set forth three objectives: (1) the preservation, translation, and publication of Swedenborg’s scientific and philosophical works; (2) the founding of a periodical representative of the Association; and (3) the study, exposition and promulgation of the philosophy contained in Swedenborg’s works. To offset the fear that science had fallen into the hands of materialists, the Association responded with the argument that theology did not by itself possess the necessary knowledge “to see interior spiritual and divine causes.” It was therefore left
for Swedenborg’s philosophical and scientific writings to assist in making whole an interior view of the causes of natural forces and phenomena. For all practical purposes, New Churchmen insisted that Swedenborg’s science and philosophy were inseparable from his theology. His science was eminently philosophical and theological, and his philosophy and theology equally scientific with the result being wisdom. Thus, Swedenborg’s *Principia* was a book for modernity in view of the doctrines which it anticipated; it was also a book for the future offering solutions to questions not yet mastered including atomic theory, the undulatory theory of light, the nebular hypothesis, the connection between magnetism and electricity, and the ethereal motions.25

In looking at the tasks ahead, Sewall recommended republishing out-of-print works; translating and publishing Swedenborg’s unpublished works; and preserving Swedenborg’s original manuscripts by making photolithographic copies. For too long, the works on *Tremulation*, the *Corpuscular Philosophy*, the *Brain*, the *Summary of the Principia*, the *Minor Principia*, and the work on *Creation* were largely unknown and inaccessible, hidden away in illegible manuscripts at the Royal Library at Stockholm. These needed to be translated and added to the canon of Swedenborg’s writings. “The time has come for an aggressive and not a mere apologetic and defensive attitude in those possessed of these scientific and philosophical doctrines,” he explained. This required the study of Swedenborg’s works by specialists, the publication of analytical articles in current scientific
and philosophical journals, and the creation of an Academy of Science and Philosophy dedicated to his work.\textsuperscript{26}

In view of the movement to translate, publish, and call attention to Swedenborg’s scientific works, Association’s members stressed that the study of his theology without his science and philosophy was “like building a house in the air and not on the solid rock of earth.” The scientific works were not only important for the natural welfare of man but were essential to his spiritual welfare as well. Just as the knowledge of correspondences was the means by which the minds of men were “led from the clouds of the letter to the glory of the internal sense,” so the philosophic and scientific writings of Swedenborg were “the means by which the votaries of science who do not believe in the letter of the Word, may be led to the knowledge of the doctrines of the internal sense, and thereby to a belief in the Divinity of the letter.”\textsuperscript{27}

The work of producing and preserving Swedenborg’s scientific works got underway with support from the Convention, the Academy of the New Church, the Swedenborg Society of London, and the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences. Additional support came from the International Swedenborg Congress in 1910, the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, the patronage of the King of Sweden, and the contributions of scholars from across Europe and America.\textsuperscript{28} In the ensuing years, publications included a reprint of the \textit{Economy of the Animal Kingdom}; a second and revised edition of the \textit{Soul or Rational Psychology}; the work on \textit{Tremulation}, published in Boston; and \textit{Ontology}, \textit{Summary of the Principia}, and the \textit{History
of Creation translated into English from Latin and Swedish by Alfred H. Stroh.\textsuperscript{29}

Sewall intended for these efforts to draw out a new generation of “young intellects” who might otherwise have remained unchallenged despite their philosophical training. There was a genuine optimism that the Association would generate a renaissance in new studies. As evidence of this optimism, the Association seemed to be the one common interest among New Churchmen standing apart from the differences that so divided the Academy and the General Convention. For several years, its annual meetings moved around—from New York to Chicago, Washington, Philadelphia, and Bryn Athyn. Those in attendance at the 1912 meeting of the Association held in Philadelphia included Rev. J. K. Smyth, president of the General Convention and former Urbana student; Rev. L. F. Hite, professor of the Cambridge New Church Theological School; and Bishop W. F. Pendleton, chancellor of the Academy of the New Church.\textsuperscript{30}

In fulfilling their objective, M. W. Haseltine published \textit{A Great Thinker}, a reprint of articles on Swedenborg and his works. This was followed with the completion of thirty-two volumes of Swedenborg’s writings supported by a bequest from the estate of Lydia Rotch and produced under the auspices of the Riverside Press of Houghton Mifflin. All had been translated into English from their original Latin and embodied Swedenborg’s religious and ethical teachings, together with what he claimed to have seen in the world of spirits and the heaven of angels. Published as \textit{The Divine Revelation of the New Jerusalem}, they included \textit{Arcana Coelestia} (vols.
1-19); *Index Arcana*; *Heaven and Hell*; *Miscellaneous Works* (*Final Judgment, White Horse, Earths in the Universe, Summary Exposition*); *Four Doctrines* (*New Jerusalem and its Heavenly Doctrines*); *The Divine Love and Wisdom* (*Intercourse Between the Soul and the Body*); *Divine Providence*; *Apocalypse Revealed* (*vols. 26-28*); and *Marriage Love* (*vols. 30-32*).

With the materials now at hand, Sewall and his Association colleagues felt that teachers could bring forth an entirely new school of science and philosophy working hand in hand with New Church theology. Future anatomists, physicists, and theologians could correlate the macrocosm or greater universe with the microcosm, unlocking the larger by means of the special creations which were ever occurring. This meant having knowledgeable instructors who had mastered Swedenborg’s scientific system and were devoted to carrying it into the schools and universities. “It is not alone the church or the spiritual in man that requires regenerating; science itself must be regenerated; and as all real generations proceed from within outward, so it must be with the regenerating of science.” This meant that science could be born anew, with a new breed of scholars capable of looking at the world as an “animated mechanism” moving toward “an all-forming, all-directing END.” Unless and until a nexus was found between spiritual faith and the facts of science, the world would continue to lack unity of purpose. Not until the “magical key of correspondences” combined with Swedenborg’s study of the heavens and the human brain could there emerge a full understanding of the Divinely human form. “To know the Human Form
as the Divine Form of Forms, the constructing principle not only of worlds but of the knowledge of worlds must be the aspiration of both the church and science.”

John Whitehead, president of Urbana University, followed in Sewall’s footsteps by pointing out that theology and science dealt with two very different classes of human knowledge separated by discrete degrees which made them “intimately connected and interrelated.” Just as harmony reigned between God and the universe, so likewise harmony reigned between the different types of knowledge, all of which was in the Divine mind. Since the works of Swedenborg presented the only comprehensive view of the universe, it was necessary to bring the theology and science together in any reconstruction of human knowledge. Together, they constituted the foundation of all forms. God, Spirit, and matter were a trine of existences. Thus, Swedenborg’s three discrete kinds of substance unfolded a rational and consistent exposition of the vital elements of existence. “This system of truth sheds a clear light on cosmical theories and shows a rational mode of origin from God of matter and its forces.”

**The New Philosophy**

The General Convention directed the Association’s officers to publish a magazine that would explain and popularize the philosophic and scientific works of Swedenborg. The magazine, called *The New Philosophy*, became its official organ. Edited and published out of Urbana by John Whitehead beginning in March 1898, it served
as a medium for introducing the scientific and philosophical works of Swedenborg to the public. This included the nebular hypothesis and evolution, questions concerning the origin of life and spontaneous generation, and knowledge of the New Church and of Swedenborg’s principles. Patrons were asked to subscribe for multiple copies to facilitate their being sent to libraries, educators, and scientists around the country. Edited in later years by Dr. H. Farrington and then the Rev. Alfred Acton, the journal continued to provide research on Swedenborg’s philosophical system.  

In the magazine’s initial years, it emphasized four works focused on the nature of the human body and the functions and uses of its organs and viscera: *The Economy of the Animal Kingdom*, *The Animal Kingdom*, *The Generative Organs*, and *The Brain*. It later expanded into psychology, ontology, and the relation of the soul and body. To accomplish this, numerous scholars contributed their research. This included C. Riborg Mann on chemistry; Dr. John Swanton on the corpuscular philosophy; the papers of Miss Beekman on cosmology, the brain and the stars; Alfred Stroh’s essays on light and color, on the theory of fire, and the worship and love of God; W. F. Pendleton’s article on the relation of the scientific and theological works and on the credibility of Swedenborg’s science; Reginald Brown’s translation of Swedenborg’s notes relating to the larger principia; and Dr. E. A. Farrington’s essays on the relation of the chemical elements to Swedenborg’s doctrine of the atmospheres and salts.
Not long after a series of articles explaining the connection between Swedenborg’s science and his theology, membership in the Association dropped off, including subscriptions to *New Philosophy*. “The demand for the scientific works, whether here or in England, would seem to be almost nil,” Sewall complained in 1912. “So far as the information of the general public is concerned, they might almost as well have never been published.” After years of labor and many publications, few of the new editions were in the homes of New Churchmen or in New Church schools and libraries. “I do not know that there is at present the slightest mention of the scientific and philosophical works in the regular courses of study, either there or in the Theological School of the General Convention or of the New Church College in London.”

**Annual Addresses**

As president of the Association, Sewall delivered an address each year before the assembled members updating them on the progress made during the previous twelve months. As he accounted for the list of articles and books published, he admitted to finding it difficult at times to separate the Swede’s scientific world from his idealism; his Aristotelian doctrine of entelechy; his doctrine of degrees among things material, spiritual and Divine; and of the Divine indwelling in man. More than once, he had to admit it was difficult to detach Swedenborg’s science, including his discoveries on the brain, blood, and nervous system, from his theological beliefs.
In his remarks, Sewall praised past scholars who had recognized Swedenborg’s contributions to the nebular theory of the universe, the modern theories of stereo-chemistry; the molecular arrangement of bodies; and the grouping of crystalline forms. Turning to the present, he highlighted the works by Gustav Retzius of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences on Swedenborg as an anatomist and physiologist including the nature of the cerebro-spinal fluid and the localization of the motor centers of the cortical substance; C. S. Mack on Swedenborg’s studies of the brain, heart and lungs; and the articles of Max Neuburger, docent at the University of Vienna, on Swedenborg’s work on the respiratory motion of the brain, the centers of muscular activity in the cortex, and the physiological system laid out in Swedenborg’s *Economnia Regni Animalis* and *Regnum Animal*.

Each of these contributions fit into Swedenborg’s teleological process of discovery that found its vindication in science. “It is of no small significance that from the field of pure science there should come this witness to the productive force of a system that embraces both the natural and the supernatural realms of knowledge.”

In Sewall’s address to members in 1906, he discussed what he called the “remarkable meeting-ground” between Swedenborg’s thought and theory of Pragmatism, of which Professor William James was “the most prominent exponent.” The meeting ground to which he referred was the similarity existing between the pragmatic emphases on experience or utility as the test of truth and Swedenborg’s doctrine of use. While many New Churchmen hailed the relationship, Sewall was less
enthusiastic with the comparison and set out to examine pragmatism in more detail to explain its deficiencies. In his critique, Sewall focused on James’s essay “Will to Believe” which he attacked for mistaking facts for truths. “Facts are realities,” Sewall insisted, “but they are by no means truths, nor are any one of them a truth, because not a fact exists that may not be changed from reality to non-reality . . . by a change of its relations, real or conceivable.” Truth was always “in the relation of efficient or instrumental cause to the result, the effect, or fact.” Having made the point, he agreed there was much to be admired in what James had written, including his appeal for the acceptance of a belief in God on the grounds that such belief affected one’s conduct and happiness in life.

Overall, Sewall reduced James’s radical empiricism to a form of monism which made experience an absolute continuum where “feeling, thought, object sought, object realized, truth, reality, are all only the several stations along the flow of the stream of consciousness.” It meant the rejection of Swedenborg’s doctrine of discrete degrees and their correspondences, and the accompanying doctrine of influx from higher to lower, an intellectual position held by his father, Henry James Sr., a life-long Swedenborgian. Real knowledge could never be attained in any system that regarded the effect or the thinking from effect as the basis of knowing. The mind knew things only by virtue of an intelligent power and by the soul’s participation in that Divine life which saw all things in their relation to end. “It is the knowledge of the world viewed from its centre, which is the only true knowledge; and it is the capacity of the soul to
so view things and according to is capacity to do this that the mind of man can know reality,” concluded Sewall.43

In another related address before the Association, Sewall optimistically reported that the world was steadily advancing toward Swedenborg. “We may very reasonably anticipate in fifty years from now a vastly higher and more intelligent appreciation of Swedenborg’s scientific system, both in purely scientific and philosophical circles, and in the theological world as well.”44 The world was only beginning to awake to a consciousness of Swedenborg’s theology and cosmology, and of the discrete degrees that separated matter and spirit and the nexus between mind and body. In view of the slow process in the maturing of human knowledge, Sewall urged patience that Swedenborg’s complete works would someday bring full recognition of his scientific system. Science was beginning to leave behind the gross materialism of earlier years for a reasoning process that embraced two worlds—the mundus intelligibilis and the mundus sensibilis—a process drawn from William James’s Radical Empiricism which explained that the whole of experience embraced not just the immediate aspects of sensation but all the mental processes that form thought and conclusion.45

Despite what he saw as imperfections in James’s philosophy, Sewall admired his efforts to understand the world of pure experience. The more he studied this modern doctrine of reality, the more he saw a resemblance to Swedenborg’s introductory essay in Principia which argued that it was “impossible to receive knowledge immediately from the soul; man attains it
only through the medium of the organs and senses . . . the means therefore of all our wisdom are to be found in experience.”

**Reason and Belief**

Exemplary of Sewall’s support of science education, Sewall wrote *Reason in Belief; or, Faith for an Age of Science* (1906) to demonstrate that Christianity could best be understood using the combined resources of science, philosophy, and theology. Though Christianity had long relied on revelatory truths to explain its principles, Sewall’s book represented an effort “to consider the underlying principles of the Christian faith in their rational aspect and so bring to view of the scientific mind of our time a system of rational Christianity.” Contrary to many of his fellow clergy, Sewall argued that science’s reductionist/empiricist approach not only comforted humanity with explanations that had long remained unsolvable, but enlarged humanity’s knowledge in anticipation of the future. Through scientific analysis, Christianity’s essential doctrines (i.e., birth and resurrection of Christ, salvation, life hereafter, hell and heaven) were understandable not only on the basis of revealed supernatural truth but on the basis of rationality as well. This he called “faith for a scientific age.”

In making this point, Sewall followed the steps taken by Swedenborg who, as Marguerite Block explained, “felt no conflict between faith and reason, and therefore it seemed to him a simple, albeit tremendous, task to reunite science and religion in an indissoluble bond
for all of the entire world.”

God had forewarned His unfathomable mystery by working through the sciences to explain His purpose. Anyone willing to investigate nature could know the truth. The genius of Swedenborg was his ability to use Newtonian physics to explain how the Creator worked to incorporate the omniscient wisdom and power of God within the known fabric of the physical sciences. Rather than rend the fabric of the universe to accomplish His purposes, God worked through the recesses of the cortical glands, making the cortex the instrument of life and vice-regent of the soul. The mystery of the Godhead was suppressed in order to give humanity a firmer understanding of God’s purposes.

Similarly, Sewall dismissed arguments that the inductive sciences were opposed to faith in the supernatural, insisting that induction was a process that could be dynamic and prophetic. With a line of discussion that was first epistemological and then metaphysical, he proposed to examine the doctrines of Christianity to see what relation they stood to a single rational conception of the universe. His argument devolved on Kant’s discovery that in mind and not in matter lay the creative framework of the world. By interposing philosophy between science and theology, Sewall forced a fusion of the two epistemologies. “The certainty of all our knowledge,” he wrote, “is based on the conception of an infinite and universal mind [where] subject and object are seen and experienced as one, not one in identity, but one in harmonious correspondence.”

It began with Sewall’s definition of induction as the conjunction
of two planes of being—mind and matter—and the assumption that the Infinite Mind guaranteed that the external world of matter existed analogous to the world of consciousness. Philosophy yielded a higher form of knowledge, i.e., knowledge that the ultimate reality of the university is mind.

Although Sewall supported the theory of evolution, a stumbling block arose with Darwin’s method of explaining change through the chance mechanism of natural selection. The prospect that man was an accident of evolution rather than the “ultimate factor of creation” was an outcome he could not and would not accept. The world was the plane of man’s existence made intelligible by the immanence and fulfillment of Divine purpose.

Sewall’s book offered an interesting contrast to John Henry Newman’s *Grammar of Assent* (1870) whose argument for belief operated based on the laws of probability, not facts. Newman’s *illative* sense functioned between sentiment and formal logic, rejecting Christianity as either a religion of sentiment or of evidence, with reason as the sole judge. The illative sense was a form of inner logic whose inferences were not constrained by formal rules. It resembled a communal wisdom which relied on impressions derived from sources deeper than consciousness and formal reasoning. It was the product of intuition that included instinct, imagination, conscience, scripture, the church, antiquity, words of the wise, hereditary lessons, ethical truths, historical memories, legal and state maxims. When combined, they provided “the purgation of individual error”—the ultimate sanction of belief and action.

Newman some-
times described the illative sense as a form of genius obtained not from reasoning in the abstract but from a range of inferences and the converging of probabilities that determined what science could not determine. It was an exercise of the mind that proceeded to its conclusion by a method of reasoning analogous to mathematical calculus.\textsuperscript{54}

* * * *

Guided by his beliefs, Sewall used the Cosmos Club, the Society for Philosophical Inquiry, and the Swedenborg Scientific Association as platforms to launch his search for a more lucid explanation of Christian eschatology. A broad-minded pastor guided by moral intuition and erudite interrogation, he engaged his colleagues—both secular and religious—with pertinent questions and observations he hoped would nudge them in the directions his mind took. He had a singular awareness of God and eternity and, using the more recent insights of his age, challenged both science and the conventional house of Christian theology with the propositional theology of Swedenborg.

Preferring the written word to the sermon, Sewall produced an impressive array of poems, hymns, lectures, articles, and books expressive of his spiritual pilgrimage into the world of Swedenborg and the intellectual challenges faced by his followers. At the center of his endeavors was the ever-present desire to restore Swedenborg’s mystical world-view with its primacy of spirit over matter. Attuned to a higher reality, he paid
scrupulous attention to the interaction of the physical and metaphysical orders of reality, the doctrines of correspondence and discrete degrees, and the need for greater rapport between the scientist and theologian. He encouraged progressive thinkers to envision harmony between the empirically tested world of science and the metaphysical order of reality. Ultimately, he accepted the coming age of empirical science only on the condition that it aligned with providential laws and purposes, bringing physical events under the guidance of a higher law.

With failing health, Sewall was obliged to discontinue his normal pastoral duties in 1915. His last sermon was delivered on November 7th. For the next three weeks he grew weaker and on December 5th received the Holy Supper for the last time. He died on the morning of December 7th.\textsuperscript{55} His funeral service was filled with ritual that included the singing of Sewall’s own hymn “While My Redeemer’s Near” from the \textit{Magnificat}. His internment was in Bath, Maine, in a family plot for members of the Sewall family.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1837—</td>
<td>Born in Bath, Maine (Sept. 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858—</td>
<td>Graduated from Bowdoin College (A.M.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studied at the Universities of Tübingen and Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended lectures at Sorbonne, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863—</td>
<td>Ordained pastor in the New Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863-70</td>
<td>Pastor Glendale, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867—</td>
<td><em>The Christian Hymnal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869—</td>
<td>Married Thedia Redelia Gilchrist, Staten Island, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Moody Mike; Or, the Power of Love</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-86</td>
<td>President Urbana College, now Urbana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876—</td>
<td><em>The Hem of His Garment; Or, Spiritual Lessons from the Life of Our Lord</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*The Pillow of Stones: Divine Allegory in their Scriptural Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td><em>The Latin Speaker. Easy dialogues and Other Selections for Memorizing and Declaiming in the Latin Language</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td><em>Angelo: the Circus Boy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td><em>Emanuel Swedenborg as a Philosopher</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td><em>The New Ethics: An Essay on the Moral Law of Use</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td><em>The New-Church Review (editor)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1885   | *The New Churchman’s Prayer-Book and Hymnal: A Complete Manual of Devotion*
<p>| 1885   | <em>Young New Churchman’s Guide to the Holy City, a Manual of Doctrine with Prayers Preparatory to Confirmation and the Holy Communion</em> |
| 1886-87| Pastor of the New Church in Glasgow, Scotland                          |
| 1887-89| Lived in France, Switzerland and Italy                                |
| 1887   | <em>The Soul or Rational Psychology</em>                                    |
| 1888   | <em>The New Metaphysics; Or, the Law of End, Cause, and Effect, With Other Essays</em> |
| 1890   | Lived at 1618 Riggs Place, Washington                                |
| 1890   | Pastor of Swedenborgian National Church in Washington, DC             |
| 1893   | <em>Dante and Swedenborg</em>                                               |
|        | Poems of Giosue Carducci                                              |
|        | “Narrative and Critical Account of the Parliament of Religions”       |
|        | “Character and Degree of Inspiration of Christ”                       |
|        | “New Jerusalem in the World’s Religious Congress”                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1895—</td>
<td><strong>Swedenborg and Aristotle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896—</td>
<td><em>The Angel of the State: Or, the Kindergarten in the Education of the Citizen: a Study of Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Swedenborg</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898-1915—</td>
<td>President of the Swedenborg Scientific Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900—</td>
<td><strong>The Trophies: Sonnets by Jose Maria Heredia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kant’s ‘Dreams of a Spirit Seer’ translated by Emanuel F. Goerwitz</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902—</td>
<td><strong>Swedenborg and Modern Idealism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Miracle and Law; As Viewed Under the Doctrine of a Trinal Monism</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honored with degree of DD by Bowdoin College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902—</td>
<td><strong>Swedenborg and the Modern Doctrine of Reality: A Retrospect of Philosophy from Kant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>to the Present Time</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903—</td>
<td>“Professor James on Religious Experience”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904—</td>
<td>“Beginnings and Founders of the New Church in America—The Church in Bath, Maine”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Swedenborg’s Contribution to Science”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905—</td>
<td>“Animated Mechanism”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906—</td>
<td>&quot;The Pulpit and Modern Thought, Being Three Lectures Delivered before the Theological School of the New Thought in Cambridge, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906—</td>
<td><em>Reason in Belief; Or, Faith for an Age of Science</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908—</td>
<td>“Swedenborg and the University”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909—</td>
<td><em>Being and Existence</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910—</td>
<td><em>Swedenborg and the Sapientia Angelica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911—</td>
<td>“Life on Other Planets”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913—</td>
<td>“Is the Universe Self-Centered or God Centered?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915—</td>
<td>Died, Washington, DC (December 7); survived by wife Thedia Redelia and five daughters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOOKS BY FRANK SEWALL

Liturgical
- Book of Holy Offices, 1866
- Christian Hymnal, 1866
- Prayer Book and Hymnal, 1867
- The Church’s Lectionary. Or Plan of Uniform Lessons from the Word, 1900
- Book of Worship, 1912
- The Magnificat, 1893
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- The Pillow of Stones: Divine Allegories in Their Spiritual Meaning, 1875
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- Succession in the Ministry, 1892
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*The Trophies: Sonnets by Jose Maria Heredia Carducci and the Hellenic Reaction in Italy*, 1892
*Dante and Swedenborg. With Other Essays on the Renaissance*, 1893
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