

Errors and omissions in the present English translations of
the Arcana Coelestia.

(The following list of errors and omissions is not from a systematic comparison of the English with the Latin of the Arcana Coelestia. There may be many more mistakes which I have not noticed.

By the present English translations I mean the Potts translation in the Standard and Library editions published by the Swedenborg Foundation, and the revision of that translation published by the Swedenborg Society. References are made to the Clowes translation, but this is no longer widely used.

A list of places where the translations are questionable will be added to this list.)

27 Omission. The words "non recedent statuta haec a coram Me", "these statutes shall not recede from before Me", at the end of the quotation from Jeremiah 31:35-36, have been omitted.

The Clowes translation does not omit these words.

99 At the end of this number the words "unicuique enim inest vita Domini, quae dat ut perceptionem habeat" are translated: "for there is in every man the life of the Lord which causes him to have perception. This sounds as if every man had the celestial perception described in this number. This should read: "for there is in each thing the life of the Lord, which gives that he has perception." Each thing there refers to each thought, idea, word and action which has been opened even to the Lord.

252 line 5. The words "uniatur Domino per proprium, adeo ut sit in proprio" are translated: "is united to the Lord by the proprium, insomuch that these are in their proprium." This should read: "is united to the Lord through the proprium, so much that it (the union) is in the proprium."

lines 7-8. The words "tunc apparet usque ut proprium", are translated "it still retains its identity." should read: "then it still appears as proprium."

line 11 The words "nondum dici potest" are translated "cannot be told." This should read "cannot yet be told."

The Clowes translation is correct in all these three places.

253 The words following the quotation from Isaiah 54:5,6, are: "ubi Maritus Factor in plurali quodam, quia proprium simul." These are translated: "where the Maker is called also the husband, because united to the proprium." Literally this should be translated "where Husband Maker is in a certain plural, because proprium at the same time." Such a sentence does not appear to be understandable at this time, at least not to me; but it is better to allow it to stand literally translated than to force a meaning in a vain endeavor to make everything immediately understandable.

The words in Hebrew for Husband and Maker in this verse of Isaiah are both in a plural form, which is very unusual for those words. This is no doubt what is referred to by the words "in a certain plural."

The Clowes translation omits this sentence.

In the next sentence "woman afflicted" should read "woman forsaken"

266 The words "non ita ex ratione" are translated "rather than from reason". I think Clowes is more correct in translating this "not so much from reason." I see no reason for the word "ita" if the meaning is that the wife does not act out of reason to any degree at all.

294 The word "internal" in second line should be "interior."

The words "subsequent comparison of passages" are not in the Latin.

357 lines 5 and 8. "self love" should read "proprial love."

371 4 lines from the bottom. The words "conscientia formatur ex revelatis et cognitionibus e Verbo" have been rendered "conscience is formed from things revealed, and from cognitions, and from the Word." The reading should be: "conscience is formed from things revealed and from cognitions out of the Word."

403 After line 7. The words "Historica series hoc secum habet" "The historic series has this it", have been omitted.

431 In 427 "livor" is translated as "hurt," and in 431 as "bruise." The translations should be consistent so that one knows it is the same word that is being treated of.

473 The word "effigies" is translated "real resemblance." Clowes translates it effigy. There are strong reasons why effigy should be used; or, if it is not used, that some word be consistently used in place of it. Several different words are used for effigy. An important idea is involved in the word effigy, namely, an external which is wholly out of and in correspondence with its internal.

475 The words "quod ecclesia" are translated "that they were the Church." This ought to read: "that it is the Church." It is not the male and female that are the Church, but the marriage between love and faith.

711 line 6. "instructed" instead of "furnished"

854 Lumen and lux are both translated as light, without distinction.

855 Again lumen is translated light.

Line 3-4. "charitatis" is translated "derived from charity," "of charity" would be better.

881 Line 5. "natural sense" should read "internal sense."

908 Section 3, line 2. The words "pro immani fera" have been omitted.

986 Four lines from the end. "ipsum malum vitae ei est falsum" have been rendered "what is false to him being the very evil of life." This should read "the very evil of life to him is the false." As I see it the meaning is that he regards the evil of life as evil because it is against the true of faith, and in that sense as false. The present translation gives the idea that this man regards every false thing as an evil of life, and did not pay attention to the evil of life.

987 3rd, 4th and 5th lines from end. "quare homo illa non solum sciet sed etiam agnoscet et credet" are translated "They are therefore not only known by man, but also acknowledged and believed." This should read: "wherefore man must not only know them, but also must acknowledge and believe them."

1013 Section 4, line 15. "ad similitudines" is translated "according to likenesses." It should be "toward likenesses," or as before in number 473, "preparatory to likenesses."

1193 and 1194 From the Hebrew it is evident that the Caphtorim were sons of Mizraim, and are not here to be coupled with the Philistines. Thence in 1194 Caphtorim should be included, as in the Latin. The "mistake" in 1194 is not that Caphtorim are included, in the Latin, but that Pathrusim and Casluhim are omitted.

It is not clear from either the Hebrew or the Latin from whom the Philistines went forth, whether from the Casluhim alone, or from Pathrusim and Casluhim, or from all the preceding sons.

1240 line 10; 1243, line 2 "novum ecclesiae" should be "what is new of the Church," not "a new Church."

1258 There should be no italics at beginning of this number. The sentence should read, "That from these were spread abroad the nations in the earth signifies..."

1258 line 18-19. "quisque ab eo, quod apud eum tunc regnet" is rendered "everyone from that which is dominant in himself at the time." As I see it this should read: Each one from that which then rules with it. "With himself" would be "apud se" as in the next sentence.

1288 Section 2 at the beginning. "Quod Verbum" is translated "That a word.." As I see it, it should be "That the Word.." "A word", meaning any word, does not signify all doctrine about charity and the faith thence. This number should be studied to see where "word" should be capitalized and where not. In the original edition it is capitalized in all the quotes from the Old and New Testaments.

1330 At the end. "Internal worship of this Church." "This" has been left out in the translations.

1373 In Hebrew the place translated as Haran begins with a cheth, and ought to be called "Charan." Haran, the man, in Hebrew begins with a hay. As things stand in the translations, it looks as if they were the same word.

1383 Line 4, and 1385 line 3. "Quid a semet" is translated "what from the persons themselves." It should be "what from themselves." The perception here spoken of is subjective, within themselves.

1414 Lines 7 and 8, 1428 line 8 "a virgine muliere" is translated "virgin mother." "Virgin woman" would be literally correct.

1419 In the quote from Matt. 20:26-28, "to give His life." The word translated "life" in both the Greek and the Latin means "soul."

1462 Line 8. "scientiae prae caeteris ibi vigeant." This is translated "knowledges flourished there more than anything else." "caeteris" refers to other places where the Ancient Church was. "more than elsewhere" or "more than in other places" would be better.

1469 "ut non solum illis insinuarentur coelestia, sed ut fierent quoque coelestia ita Divina." This is translated "not only that celestial things might be insinuated into them, but also that the celestial things might in this way be made Divine."

To me it appears evident that the subject of fierent is the "illis", and that the sentence should read: "not only that celestial things might be insinuated to them, but that they might become also celestial, thus Divine."

In 1616 section 3 at the end, it is said: "but to His knowledges (cognitiones) were constantly being insinuated celestial things, so that the knowledges continually became the recipient vessels of celestial things, and themselves also became celestial." This shows that the vessels, the cognitions, became celestial.

In 1469 it is said that the celestial and the true adjoined to it were in the Lord's internal man, which was Divine. So also in 1593 and 1602 it is said that the Lord's internal man was Divine. The celestial things with the Lord were the Divine things. In 1707 it is said, in section 5, that even the Lord's interior man as to celestial things or goods was Divine, and that His internal man, together with this interior man, was Jehovah Himself, His Father.

There appears to be some resistance against the idea that the "vessels" were made Divine. Since in general it is taught that the Lord made Divine His Body, which was a vessel, and in no. 5078 it is said that He glorified the sensual things, together with their recipients, as I see it there can be no argument about the fact that the Arcana Coelestia teaches that the recipient vessels with the Lord were made Divine. The question is as to how that was done, and therefore what is meant by it.

1673 Section 4, line 5. "Satis esse certus potest" is rendered "he may be pretty sure." This is both too weak and too undignified for "he can be sufficiently certain."

1752 Twice at the end the Latin "ipsi angeli" is rendered "real angels." This sounds as if the angelic spirits and good spirits were not real. Clowes translates this "the angels themselves", which I think is correct. The meaning of angelic spirits and of good spirits in this part of the Arcana Coelestia refers to those in the second and first heaven. Later the meaning changes, for reasons that ought to be studied. In this number it has already been said that those in the third heaven are "angels properly so called." There is no need for the word "real."

1788 In the quote from Psalm 91:2,4, scutum and parma are rendered "shield and buckler," whereas in section 1, near the end, they are rendered "buckler" and "target."

1795 Line 9. Templum is here rendered "place of worship."

1799 Last line of section 3. "quomodo homo erit" is rendered "how a man must live." It ought to be "how a man must be."

1944 Last line of section 1. "ex ejus usus seu functionis vita cognoscitur num fit" is rendered "whether the rational is coming into existence is known from his life in his use or function." This should be "is known from its life in its use or function." The whole subject of this number is the offices of the rational, not those of the man.

2009 Section 5, last line; section 6 line 7. Here, twice, the words "quale Jehovah seu Domini ex quo adorari vult" or "ex quo clendus" are rendered: "the quality of Jehovah or the Lord by reason of which He wills to be adored," and "by reason of which He is to be worshipped."

The number has already explained that "name" signifies all things of love and faith which are of the Lord and from Him. Nor can it be said that "worship" is the quality of the Lord by reason of which He is to be worshipped, for this sentence would read "where by name is not signified name, but the worship, which is the quality of Jehovah or of the Lord by reason of which He wills to be adored."

In 2724 section 1, it is said that the name of God is all in one complex through which God was worshipped, thus everything of love and faith, and that when internal worship perished, they worshipped the name only, not caring out of what love or out of what faith they worshipped.

As I see it, the meaning of the number is destroyed in the present translation. The Name means the quality of the Lord in the love and faith out of which the Lord wills to be adored.

2024 line 6 and 2025 line 3 The words "or powers" are not in the Latin and if felt necessary to explain "forces" should be put in brackets.

2032 "in the historic Word" should be "in the historical sense of the Word."

2251 Line 5 2252 lines 2,3. "vera possint esse plena bonis" is rendered "possibly the truths may be full of goods." This sounds as if there were already then some with whom truths were full of goods. But the truths with men could only be filled with goods through the Human made Divine, received by men.

As I see it, these words must be translated: "Truths can be filled with goods." If they are so filled, then man can be saved out of Mercy.

2356:3 Here it is rendered that the "janua" was at the front of the house. This sounds as if the janua was the front door. Clowes translates the words in question, "ante domum" as "before the house." The ostium was the front door, and the janua was some place in front of the ostium.

2380 Next to last line of section 1. "utcunque infestarentur quoad corpus" is rendered: "however severely they may be suffering bodily trouble." This is corrected in the London version to "however they are infested as to the body." I think the London version is right, except that "howsoever" might be better than "however."

2383 Section 2. "horse denotes the understanding." The London version corrects this to "horse denotes the intellectual."

2405 Section 7. "pro judico tam de bonis quam super malis" is rendered "denotes the Judgment as it concerns both the good and the evil." "The London version corrects this to read "denotes judgment both concerning the good and upon the evil."

2523: at end of section 1. "the human race of that time could not otherwise have been saved." There is no word for "otherwise" in the Latin, and its inclusion changes the meaning of the sentence. The meaning is that if the Lord had had to come immediately after the fall, the human race then existing could not have been saved. To insert "otherwise" makes the sentence mean that the human race existing then could not have been saved without the prophecy of the Advent. This is true enough, but it is not what is here meant.

The London version corrects this mistake.

2559 The number 1907, listed at the end, should be 1097. London version corrects this mistake.

2576 Section 5 at the end. "opened the way to His Divine Itself". This ought to read "to the Divine Itself," as in the London version.

2588 Near beginning of section 10. "Those who wish to enter into doctrinal and Divine things." The words "of faith" have been omitted after "doctrinal". London version corrects this omission.

2592 At the end. "Hic fuerat gentilis." This should be translated "This man had been a gentile," not "was a gentile."

Chapter 21, verse 7. This verse is translated: "Who would have said to Abraham, Sarah shall suckle sons?" As I see it this verse should be translated: "Who would have said, Sarah shall suckle sons to Abraham." Jehovah had said this to Abraham, and there is no point in anyone else saying it, to him.

In 2643, line 15, "and when it is said of this (the Divine True represented by Sarah here) that it suckles sons to Abraham." From this it is clear that the meaning is that "Sarah shall suckle sons to Abraham," no matter what the Hebrew punctuation may be.

If this is correct, then the phrase has to be corrected in 2638, twice, and in 2643, twice.

2655 four lines from the end, and 2657 line 2. "exterminarentur" is translated "banished", and in the London version "expelled," which is better. Why not "exterminated"?

2694 End of section 2. "ex relativis actualiter formatis" is rendered "from the realizing of contrasts." London has "from contrasts actually formed." I think that "from relative things actually formed" would be still better.

2701 In the quote from Matt. 6:22,23 in section 2, the Latin has, "the lamp of the body," not "light of the body", which agrees with the Greek. The London version has "lamp."

Omission The New York edition omits a whole line in section 3. "The sight of the understanding is from the light of heaven inflowing into the light of the world." The London version does not omit this.

2708 In this number the Latin word "desert" is translated sometimes "desert" and sometimes "wilderness" so that one can't tell which Latin word is being translated as what. The London version translates

the word consistently as "wilderness," but then translates some other word as "desert." As I see it, the Latin word "desertum" should be translated as "desert" consistently, and in a long treatment of that word, such as in this number, no other word should be translated desert. Otherwise one can't tell what the meaning of the word is.

2714 Section 4, lines 6 and 7. "Human Divinum" is here translated "Divine Human". Because the subject here is the Lord sustaining temptations, this ought to read "Human Divine" in view of the distinction made in number 2814. As I see it, this word order should always be observed, even in those places where it may appear obvious that Humanum Divinum means Divine Human, and even when it appears that the Arcana Coelestia is not being consistent in its usage. But in this place it appears certain that Human Divine should be said.

2719 Line 17 "Et non in tantum discrepant" is translated "is not to be in discrepancy to such a degree." Using "is" here makes the subject "doctrine", whereas the subject is plural, the appearances. Both Clowes and the London version are here correct.

2724 In the quote from Matthew 24:9,10, the Latin ends with the words, "and all these things for My Name's sake." New York edition omits these words. London edition includes them.

2730 Third line. "Quia fuerunt caelestes a bono in vero" is rendered: "Because they were celestial, were in truth from good." London edition and Clowes have: "because they were celestial by virtue of good in truth." "because they were celestial from the good in the true," would be still better, but the London version has the right meaning.

2744 Line 10. "ex amore conjugiale qui est ipse caelestis" is rendered "from conjugal love, and is heavenly freedom itself." London version, having "from conjugal love, which is heavenly love itself," is correct.

2793 and following numbers of this chapter. Where the Latin has Rationale Divinum, and Humanum Divinum, the word order should be observed, in view of the distinction made between them and Divinum Rationale and Divinum Humanum in 2814. The same distinction should be observed with regard to Truth Divine and Good Divine.

2822 Line 8. "the Divine Good of the rational of the Lord's Human" should read, "The Divine Good of the rational, or of the Lord's Human." The London version is correct.

2826 End of section 13. "Et quia non timor pro inferno et damnatione, ut dictum, est illis qui in bono fidei, minus qui in bono amoris," is translated: "and as it is not a fear of hell and damnation, as before said, those have it who are in the good of faith, but those have less of it who are in the good of love." This ought to read: "and because they who are in the good of faith have not fear for hell and damnation still less they who are in the good of love." The London edition is much better than the New York edition in translating this.

2831 Section 3, line 5. "Et annon cum verissimum ei manifestatur, usque non agnoscat," is rendered: "and if when a thing most true is made manifest to him he still does not fail to acknowledge it." The meaning might have been preserved if the latter part had read: "does he not still fail to acknowledge it." But as it stands it gives the opposite meaning. It ought to read: "and if when a thing most true is manifested to him, he does not acknowledge it."

3286 End of section 2. "rationale quoad verum sterile" is rendered "the rational is barren as to truth." As I see it this ought to read "the rational as to truth is barren." It was the truth which as yet

was barren. The present rendering ^{GIVES} ~~vies~~ the idea that the rational had not yet given birth to the truth.

3563 Middle of section 2. "influxus etiam facit ut tale sit ibi verum quale est," is rendered: "influx causes the truth there to be such as that into which it inflows. In the London version this is corrected to "influx also causes the truth therein to be of such quality as it is."

4823 Section 3, line 4. Omission. "Also conjugal love has its origin out of that conjunction; conjugal love with the celestial out of the conjunction of good with truth, and conjugal love with the spiritual out of the conjunction of truth with good."

The underlined words have been omitted in the New York edition. The London revision includes them.

6296 Beginning 6 lines from the end. "Inde nunc est quod pauci sint apud quos aliquid adhuc integrum est in parte voluntaria" is rendered: "Hence then it is that there are few with whom there is anything sound left in the will part." The number has just said that the voluntary of man is such that there is nothing integer remaining there. The present translation gives the idea that there are a few with whom there is something sound or integer left in the will part, and that this is what makes it possible for them to become celestial. Thus the present translation contradicts what has just been said in this number, namely, that there is nothing integer remaining in the voluntary.

The words in question are "adhuc integrum est." This could be translated in the way it has been translated. But it could also be translated: "There are few with whom there is as yet anything integer in the will part."

Moreover the whole subject of this part of the Arcana Coelestia concerns Manasseh and Ephraim, born from Joseph, thus of things to be ~~born in the voluntary~~ and intellectual of man. Manasseh does not signify something ~~infer~~ ⁱⁿ in the will part left over from the Most Ancient Church.

6873e "quod colendum perpetuo" is translated "that He must be worshipped perpetually." It ought to read "that It (the Divine Human) must be worshipped perpetually." London version corrects this.

6907:3 Line 2. "nam est lux per quam videntur objecta intellectualia" is rendered "for this is the light, etc." London version has "for it is the light". Both make the light of the world the light in which intellectual objects are seen. It ought to read "It is light .."

6948 At the end. "truths which are of light Divine cannot be together with fallacies and the falsities thence derived; but extinguish them, and thereby induce thick darkness." This sounds as if truths extinguished fallacies and thereby produced thick darkness. The Latin words after the semicolon, "sed exstinguunt illa" mean that the fallacies and falsities extinguish the truths, and by this produce thick darkness.

7004 at the end. "That the Lord leads heaven by immediate influx, and at the same time by means of it.." This ought to read: "That the Lord leads heaven at the same time through immediate influx, and through it.." The London version corrects this mistake.

7851 Line 1. "along with" should read "with" as in London version.

7663 Line 10. The word "sons" has been omitted. London version correct.

7778 Section 2, 3 lines from end. "the truths and goods give assent to the falsities and evils" should read "they give assent.." as in

7778 Section 3, line 9. "for when good has been falsified" should read "for when the truth has been falsified," as in the London version.

7997 Line 13. "venditarent" is translated "made a boast of them." London version has "trafficked" which is much better.

8103 3 lines from end. "instituta" is translated "purposes." London version has "customs." As I see it, the word should be translated "institutes", meaning rules or precepts formally established.

8414 and following numbers Here the word "populus" is a collective noun in the singular, but is often translated as plural. Thus in 8419 the Latin is, "propterea ut tentem illum," which is translated "in order that I might tempt them."

8426 Section 2, 3 lines from end. "Quail." The Latin "selav" in number 8452 is several times said to be a bird of the sea, as is also taught in Numbers 11:31. Perhaps "quail" was once used for some kind of sea bird, but at this day it is not so used. Some other word ought to be used, and research made as to what the Hebrew word actually means.

8714 The last sentence ought to read, as in the London edition : "Thus they are between those which are in a prior degree, and those which are in a posterior degree, for the sake of conjunction."

8910 Line 14. "is call concupiscence" should be "is called" as in London edition.

9163 Line 8. "imposed" should read "induced."

9209 In the quote from Psalm 72:2-4, in the 5th section, the word "add" should be "He", as in London edition.

9264 Line 22. "exstinguitur id, bonum et verum" is translated "this same truth and good are exstinguished .." Why not translate it literally "this is exstinguished, the truth and the good.."

9297 Jehovah is used throughout this number. It should be "Jehovah" as in the London edition.

9349 p.255 six lines from bottom. "senses" should be "sense" as in the London version.

Some way should be found to make clear what the verses mentioned in section 4 of this number are in the English Bible. The New York edition changes the verses under chapter 22 to those of the English Bible, but they are not changed when chapter 22 of Arcana Coelestia is treated.

9430 p.351 line 4. "internal sense is from man" ought to read "internal sense is for man" as in the London edition.

9518, last line, 9519, first line. "auditio et receptio omnium quae cultus ex bono amoris a Domino" is rendered "the hearing and reception of all things of worship from the good of love from the Lord.." As I see it, "a Domino" must be translated "by the Lord." Otherwise there is no one to do the hearing and receiving. London edition does not correct this.

9548 In quote from Apocalypse 21:23,24, "light thereof" should be "lamp thereof" as in the London version.

9825 p.615 line 2 "his interior and interior things" should be "his interior and exterior things." London corrects this.

9863 Line 13. "bonum illud est bonum amoris in Domino" is rendered "This good is the good of love to the Lord." The meaning of the sentence shows that it should be "in the Lord." London does not correct.

9915 p.676 lines 3-4. "The imagination receives the spiritual," should read "the intellectual receives the spiritual," as in the London version.

9937 Section 6, p.705, line 6. "and love was the being..." ought to read "which love was the Esse of His life.

9950 Line 10. "the Divine from it" should read "the Divine Truth from it" as in the London edition.

9971 Line 2. "colerent Deum visibilem et invisibilem" is translated "they worship a visible and an invisible God." This should be translated : "they worship God visible and invisible." As it stands it always sounds as if they worshipped two gods, one visible and the other invisible. As I see it, this should be the translation of these words in many other places.

9995 lines 12-13. "This Divine good is called celestial Good.." should read: "This Divine Truth is called celestial good.." London edition corrects this.

10049 Line 11. "sunt enim illa in mundo" is translated "for these evils and falsities are in the world." Illa does not refer to the evils and falsities but to the lowest and natural things spoken of. It ought to read "for those things are in the world." London edition says "for the formerthings are in the world" which is correct.

10076 p.107 first line. "The end is for the sake of something" should read, as in the London version: " This 'for the sake of something' is the end."

10229 Lines 2-3. "truths purifying by virtue of good" should read "truths out of good purifying." London edition has "truths from good, that purify." This is probably so said to show that the truths purify, not the good, but the expression "truths from good" should be sufficiently well known as a unity to avoid any ambiguity.

10367 End of section 6. "tunc quies est homini, et quies est Domino, nam homo non pugnat contra mala et falsa, sed Dominus apud illum," is translated : "Then man has rest, and the Lord has rest; for the man no longer fights against evils and falsities, but the Lord in the man." The London edition corrects this to read: "then a man has rest, and the Lord has rest, for a man does not fight against evils and falsities, but the Lord in him." This is correct, but I think "apud" should not be translated "in." "with him" would be better. See Arcana Coelestia 1010.

10528 Line 16 "how" should be "who." London edition corrects.

10531 Line 7. "apud quem enim est ecclesia, ibi est Divinum," is translated "for the Divine is where the Church is." London edition has "for where the Church is, there is the Divine." Literally the words mean "with whom is the Church, there is the Divine."

10549 "and stood at the door of the tent." There is no "his" before tent.

10568 Last line "on" should be "no" as in London edition.

10709 Three times in this number "apud se" is translated "at home." It should be "with himself," or "by himself."