

cutting the mouths of the areas. The *roable* is for pulling salt onto the walkways as well as the *surucon*, with which one pulls only the best (or surface) of the salt, which is called white salt. The *essageoires* are for taking the salt on the walkway and loading it in the carrying basket, with which it is carried up to the embankment.

From an *anonymous source*. The salt that is prepared at la Rochelle by crystalization does not have the same problems. It is made in salt-marshes below sea level lined with clayey soil, so they can retain the salty water that is brought in. Towards May, they drain out the water that was put in to preserve the marshes during the winter; after that they let as much salt water through as they wish. This they bring in by various channels in which it is purified and warmed up. Then it is brought into the evaporating areas, which are flat places, smooth and clean for the salt-creaming process. The heat of the sun evaporates part of the water, and a gentle wind which comes after the heat of the day in places around the sea, condenses and crystalizes by its coolness the salt floating in the water. Nothing but rain can then redissolve it: only two hours of rain has been known to undo the work of 15 days, and then they had to clean out the marshes, let the water out, and bring in new water; if it rained once every 15 days, salt could never be produced.

WHICH DIPHTHONG?

John Elliott

A brief explanation must be offered to recipients of the new translation of *Arcana Coelestia* as to why the title contains the diphthong *-ae-* rather than *-oe-*, as in previous editions.

In the Swedenborg manuscripts, whenever the noun meaning "heaven" or the adjective meaning "heavenly" occurs, the diphthong is written in such a way that one pair of eyes may see it as *-oe-*, another pair as *-ae-*. This perhaps explains why "the Arcana" and the other works printed in London by John Hart have *coelum* and *coelestia*, whereas those published in Amsterdam contain *caelum* and *caelestia*. (Thus in *Apocalypse Revealed* 424 and *True Christian Religion* 461—both printed in Amsterdam—we find the spelling *Arcana Coelestia* when reference is made to the earlier work that first appeared in London as *Arcana Coelestia*.)

But although the two spellings exist in the first editions of the Writings, only one seems to occur in the Swedenborg manuscripts that have come down to us. When we turn to the various indices that Swedenborg himself compiled we see that he regularly had the *-oe-* diphthong in mind. This applies to his indices of works published in Amsterdam as well as London. In his index to "the Arcana" *coeleste* (the singular of *coelestia*) and *coelum* stand after *clypeus*, *coecus* and before *coena*, *cogere*, as we would expect. But in an index to *Apocalypse Revealed* (Amsterdam 1766) and in another to *Conjugal Love* (Amsterdam 1768) we still find *coelum* between *coecus* and *coena*, not *caelum* between *byssinum* and *calamus*.

So why the change from *-oe-* to *-ae-* in the title of the new English translation? The reason lies in the third Latin edition (1949-73) on which the new translation is based. In that edition—wisely or unwisely—it was decided at the outset to alter Swedenborg's eighteenth century spellings "to conform to modern usage" (a list of such alterations appears on pages 29-33 of *An Appendix to Arcana Coelestia*, published in 1973). It was as a consequence of this decision that *coelestia* in the title was changed to *caelestia*.

Yet what is really meant by "modern usage"? Roughly a return, as with other "modern" books written in Latin, from the spellings of Medieval Latin and of Neo-Latin (Latin since c 1300) to the norms of classical times. In the eighteenth century the spellings *coelum* and *coelestia* were probably preferred because the former was thought to have been formed from the Greek word *koilos*, which means "a hollow"; but later examination of ancient texts has shown that the Romans used the *-ae-* diphthong. A hundred years ago it was thought that *caelum* was derived from the Latin *cavillum* (pronounced something like kah-weel-lum), but that explanation is now regarded by classical scholars to be unlikely. The tone etymology, they say, is "uncertain."

What would Swedenborg himself think of our change from *coelestia* to *caelestia*? I do not believe that he would be in the least concerned, for two simple reasons. First, as mentioned already, the spelling *caelestia* occurs in those works printed in Amsterdam; he would surely have ensured that *-oe-* was used if it had been at all important. Second, though in classical times *-ae-* and *-oe-* were pronounced differently, that difference had by the eighteenth century disappeared long since. As a north European Swedenborg would have pronounced both *coelestia* and *caelestia* as tsay-lestia, while one adopting Italian pronunciation would have said chay-lestia (*ch* as in "chain").