

themselves could not visit. In some cases this was probably no more than an accurate account of some particular incident or teaching which had been wrongly reported by others. But whatever was thus written by those who had first-hand knowledge of the Lord's life was carefully preserved, and in time these scattered accounts were brought together and combined to form a connected whole." [p. 34-35]

**377** *Connected Wholeness In the Three Senses of the Word.* Connected wholeness refers to three senses that make the whole of The Word,

1. The natural sense, that is the literal sense, to which the Old and New Testaments are directed.
2. The spiritual sense, to which the Heavenly Doctrines are directed.
3. The celestial sense, which is the innermost sense of the whole.

"The key" referred to above brings together the Old and New Testaments and the Heavenly Doctrine in order that there may be some understanding of the harmony when the key opens the door to man's understanding. For the sake of man's understanding harmony produces a connected whole. But there is another connected whole that encompasses all particulars about revelation of which harmony is only one. That connected whole concerns the inmost sense of all. Bishop de Charms writes,

...we are told that in both Testaments there is an inmost sense which treats of the Lord alone. [p. 1] ■

---

## Translator's Corner

---

J. Durban Odhner, Editor

### **DEVIANT INFINITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN SWEDENBORG FIRST-DRAFT MANUSCRIPTS**

---

In editing Swedenborg's first-draft manuscripts it is sometimes very difficult to know where to draw the lines between grammaticality, idiosyncrasy, and non-grammaticality (error). This is evidenced in J. F. I. Tafel's own editing, which shows frequent

inconsistencies in handling identical situations. (One could say, however, that he did make allowances for idiosyncrasies when he recognized them as such.)

As Latin was not the natural language of those who wrote in it at that time, idiosyncrasies of style and usage varied with nationalities and individuals, as the authors sought to express the nuances of their own vernaculars. The features that seem to be determining for these distinctions in Swedenborg's Latin are:

- Ungrammatical:* Clearly erroneous  
 Contrary to intended meaning  
 Unintelligible without editorial intervention  
 Inconsistent with author's usages
- Idiosyncrasy:* Deviation from prescriptive rules occurring  
 with a degree of frequency  
 Apparently intentional  
 Not unintelligible  
 Typical of idiom-derived distortions  
 resulting from language transfer

(In the following all numbers refer to Tafel's (T) edition of the *Spiritual Diary*.) Examples of the first category are:

- |  |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| nisi resipiscant, et fidem in Dominum<br><i>resipiscant</i> (2578)         | recipiant             |
| quod quod magis quis putat., quod eo<br>magis se elonget a caelo (2652)    | quo                   |
| nisi vasa sanguinea cum eorum membranis<br>non prorsus concordarent (1968) | si<br>(or delete non) |
| vocales ibi nullae.; dum vocales<br>sunt <i>adjuncti</i> (2631)            | adjunctae             |

Belonging to the second category are such common constructions as *quis(que)* or *quid* with a plural verb:

- |   |                |
|---|----------------|
| nec quicquam curent, [quam] quid sibi<br><i>contingant</i> (2667) | (T: contingat) |
|---|----------------|

which habit with indefinite pronouns extends to such a case as:

- |  |               |
|--|---------------|
| nam unaquaevis idea infinita <i>continent</i> (2655) | (T: continet) |
|--|---------------|

much like what is often heard in English: "each contain." One frequently encounters two singular nouns joined by *cum* governing a plural verb (see last example below). Or the use of an infinitive instead of gerundive—clearly a Swedishism:

eam cupiditatem amiserint, venire in (T: veniendi)  
caelum (2040) "att komma"

dein quoque facultate donatur aliquid (T: efficiendi)  
boni efficere (662) "att utföra"

The influence of Swedish "att" is sometimes found in the superfluous use of *ut* or *quod*:

quare ut omni sua vi et potentia uli  
contra me ei permissum erat (282) "att använda"

Perhaps in this class, but probably more grammatical than not, are the frequent uses of *quod* (argumentative) with indicative, or of *anima* or *tellus* as masculine nouns.

The correct criterion for this second category of deviation is the intention of the writer, or habitual use. Of course, some types of errors seem habitual; and some of these questionable constructions are sometimes corrected by the author—so that again, the line is sometimes very difficult to draw. Editorially, however, if the construction is understandable, there is no great problem because a footnote to the effect *sic ms.* will suffice in lieu of a change in the text.

In linguistic field study of dialects or vernaculars this principle is recognized in the "event," i.e. the occurrence of speech as observed in a specific area, milieu, or individual. The event must have a certain frequency of occurrence to qualify as such, and by studying the occurrences we can form a picture of acceptability, limited acceptability, or non-acceptability of given habits; but the criterion is not what the observer, but what the speaker, accepts.

Data thus far in the *Spiritual Diary* on dubious grammaticality in the use of infinitives has turned up some interesting patterns. One of them seems to have the characteristic of an idiosyncrasy, that is a device to express a specific nuance that corresponds, namely, with a structure existing in Swedish, German, Dutch, French, (English??), but not in Latin: an impersonal active lying between personal active and passive, in which the impersonal pronoun can refer to or imply any of the grammatical persons, and has the use of toning-down or retiring that person, or of objectivizing the statement:

cum(que) dicere (1677½) (normal: dicerem, diceretur)

då man sade  
als man sagte  
toen men zei(de)  
quand on disoit  
when one said

(not typical with past tense)

No doubt, such occurrences in the ms. would have been edited away by a printer (as they were by Tafel) or even by Swedenborg himself in final draft. Tafel treated them as slips or cases where Swedenborg inadvertently failed to put the personal ending on the form in question, such as *-m*, *-t*, *-nt*:

<i>ita ut inde scire posse, quod perpetua esset gloriatio (604½)</i>	så att man kunde veta
<i>nam putabant quod eorum machinationes non intelligere, sed dabatur ea[s] quod audire et percipere (316)</i>	att man inte förstod att man hörde och förnam
<i>adfuerunt etiam, cum haec scribere (550)</i>	då man skrev
<i>sed ii spiritus se occultant prae aliis, suntque magis invisibiles, ita ut credidisse fere, quod inveniri non potuerunt (264)</i>	så att man trodde
<i>postmodum quum in inferno esse, et quidem corpore, quali hodie sum (228)</i>	då man var
<i>nihilominus tamen corde talia recon- dunt [et] ferunt, ac ut percipere posse, id trahunt haereditario (732)</i>	som man kunde för- nimma
<i>nisi quis credat ea quae vera sunt, et sic esse in via veritatis, nequa- quam .. (860)</i>	om .. inte och man (inte) är
<i>modo veritas seu veritatis terror unum invasit, qui talis fuerat, ut pu- tare se nusquam potuisse terrificari (996)</i>	att man tänkte
<i>quare gloriatus est quidam, quod ita cogitare posset, ut non percipere... (1308)</i>	så att man inte förnam
<i>cumque dicere, quomodo erecti ambulare possint absque pedibus (1672½)</i>	och då man sade
<i>nec sustinebant audire, quod cogitare eos esse sine facie (1672½)</i>	att man betraktade

dicentes *quod nunc sciant quod non ab aeterno, sed quod nati sicut alii, sed in opinione ista fuisse, quod spiritus eorum ab aeterno fuisse* (1073) att (men att) man i denna mening var

spiritus saepe me increparunt, *quod nullam habere vitam, quia sicut est, quod homines, spiritus, angeli, non vivant ex se, sed ex Domino* (1708) att man inget liv hade

de hoc sermo cum spiritibus, qui putabant usque *quod potuisse* aliter, sed ostensum etiam est iis, quod non aliter potuissent loqui, et quod facile esset aliter dicere, sed dicere dabatur *quod non potuerit* (2464) att man hade kunnat (annat) att man inte kunde

If these cases are simply uncompleted forms, which seems unlikely, they could be translated into the appropriate personal verb; but there is a literal and linguistic argument against this. I do not know at this point how many more of these cases will be encountered in the rest of the *Diary* ms.; but depending upon the degree of their scarcity or frequency the linguistic argument will be weakened or strengthened.

Another pattern that occurs quite frequently is a mixture of the "quod + subjunctive," and the "accusative-infinitive" constructions for indirect statements. This may explain two of the last examples given above:

dicentes *quod nunc sciant quod non ab aeterno, sed quod nati sicut alii, sed in opinione ista fuisse, quod ..* se nunc scire

spiritus saepe me increparunt, *quod nullam habere vitam ..* (me)

But its occurrence is too frequent to easily ignore; as when *quod* appears to be superfluous:

dicunt quoque, *quod plura intervenisse, sicut in somno, iis, de Salvatore mundi* (513)

similiter agnoscunt id, *quod ens universale, nusquam esse universali nisi a singularissimis* (349)

et num sciat, *quod ea ei auferri, quia non sunt, nisi phantasiae* (729)

nesciunt enim, *quod* interiora dari, minus *quod* intimiora (1139)

usque tamen percepi *quod* peccatum esse in singulis (1559)

sed in opinione ista fuisse, *quod* spiritus eorum ab aeterno fuisse (1673)

et vix autumem, *quod* captu seu intellectu humano communiter comprehendi posse (1894)

However, it is questionable whether these cases simply involve the insertion of a superfluous *quod*: for there is reason to believe that the substantive following *quod* (or implied) in the above passages is, in the intention of the author, in the *nominative*, not accusative case as they appear to be. Take this example:

at quum perciperem *quod talis nidor* ex quodam vitio spirituum spargi .. (1150)

In one case, the two constructions are mixed in the reverse manner:

*quod* sciant, vim agentem cum vi instrumentali unam causam *agant* (649) (editorial correction: *agant* — *agere*)

Looking to publication of first-draft Swedenborg text, the editorial objective should be to present in its true form—that of an informal, personal and individual expose—what he said (or intended to say) in his own style. It is somewhat like the editing of a tape recording, in which only those elements are altered that are unintelligible, but in which unimportant deviations from exact, completely proper, rehearsed language, are left as recorded for the sake of preserving individuality and its traits, the total sphere, the spontaneous flux of the discourse, as it was inspired. ■

J. D. O.

## NOTE ON A READING IN TCR 478: 1

---

**John Chadwick**

Among the natural analogies to illustrate the equilibrium of free will, one example is that of a man held by two strong men pulling in opposite directions; even a small movement by the man in the middle will be enough to overcome the force applied in the opposite direction. This is equally true if the two men are replaced by three

men of equal strength on either side, or even by camels or horses. The words of the Latin text are: "Similiter si aliquis etiam imbellis ligatus foret inter tres viros a dextro, et totidem a sinistro ejusdem potentiae." This is the reading of the First Edition, repeated by Worcester.

Translators, however, have not correctly rendered *imbellis*, which means "unwarlike," but have substituted "feeble," which accords well with the sense required. There does not seem to be any other example of Swedenborg's use of *imbellis*, and it is therefore almost certain to be a printer's error for *imbecillis*, which does mean "weak" or "feeble." This word is used in CL 218: 1 in the comparative *imbecillior*, so that we cannot be sure whether the positive is *imbecillis* or *imbecillus*. Both forms are found in classical Latin; nor does the derivative *imbecillitas*, found in AC 8002: 1 and Life 111, settle the point. But it seems reasonable to assume that Swedenborg used the form in-*is*, and that this should be substituted in the text for *imbellis*; for although "unwarlike" is just possible in the context, the correction is simple. There is a further misprint four lines below, where the First Edition has *trubina* for *trutina*. ■

## CORRECTION

In our previous issue (April-June, 1980) there is an erroneous statement which the author is anxious to have corrected. In the note at the bottom of page 70 on lines 7 and 8 it is stated that "...the right side using the left halves of both retinae." It should read: "...the right side using the right halves of both retinae." [Ed.]

## OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

At a meeting with the Board of Directors following the annual meeting on May 5, 1980, the following officers were elected:

<i>Vice President:</i>	Mr. Prescott A. Rogers
<i>Secretary:</i>	Miss Hilary Pitcairn
<i>Treasurer:</i>	Mr. E. Boyd Asplundh
<i>Editor:</i>	Mr. Lennart O. Alfelt
	Hilary Pitcairn, <i>Secretary</i>