

## THE LANGUAGE OF J. M. PRAT'S CATALAN NEW TESTAMENT\*

The Catalan version of the New Testament printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society went through four editions between 1832 and 1888.<sup>1</sup> It was the first attempt in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, and for many years the only one, at a large-scale prose work in Catalan. As such it is an important linguistic document. There are obvious limitations to the use of a translation as evidence of the state of a language at a given period. However, this version of the New Testament is well-worth studying as one indication of the state of the Catalan language at the beginning of the *Renaixença*.<sup>2</sup>

It is not necessary here to go into detail about the commissioning and execution of the translation, since I have done so elsewhere.<sup>3</sup>

The translator was Josep Melcior Prat, a native of Prats del Rei, a pharmacist by profession and a political exile in England between 1823 and 1833. The translation was made at Knaresborough in Yorkshire and Prat was assisted by a fellow Catalan exile Ramon Busanya, a native of Moià.

\* [A proposta d'una ponència formada pels senyors Jordi Rubió i Ferran Soldevila, membres de la Secció Històrico-Arqueològica, i R. Aramon i Serra, membre de la Secció Filològica, designats per l'INSTITUT, Jordi Carbonell, designat per la Societat Catalana d'Estudis Històrics, i Ferran Cuito, designat pel Patronat de la Fundació Palma Guillén de Nicolau, l'INSTITUT D'ESTUDIS CATALANS, en sessió plenària tinguda el dia 19 d'abril de 1968, acordà per unanimitat de concedir el III Premi Nicolau d'Olwer a la senyora Tine Barrass, pel seu treball *The British and Foreign Bible Society and the Catalan New Testament: 1820-1888* (*An account of the commission, translation, distribution and revision of the four editions, together with a study of some of the linguistic aspects of the texts*).

En la mateixa sessió plenària, l'INSTITUT prengué l'acord de publicar la tercera part del dit treball — dedicada a l'estudi de la llengua de la traducció de J. M. Prat i als diversos canvis que hi foren fets en les edicions tercera i quarta — dins els *ER*. — R. A. i S.]

1. London 1832; London 1835; Barcelona 1836; Madrid 1888.

2. The first attempt, known to me, to study any aspect of the state of the Catalan language at the beginning of the Catalan *Renaixença* is to be found in Chapter XIV of J. M. CASACUBERTA, *Lo Verdader Català* (Barcelona 1956).

3. In my Ph. D. thesis *The Catalan New Testament and the British and Foreign Bible Society, 1820-1888*, Girton College, Cambridge, 1968. The historical part of this thesis is shortly to be published.

In 1828 Prat submitted to the Bible Society a translation of Matthew, based on the Vulgate, as a proof of his ability. We know from existing correspondence that Busanya had helped him, but we do not know to what extent. The Society sought the advice of Antoni Puigblanch asking him expressly to pay attention to the quality of the language rather than to the accuracy of the version. Puigblanch's opinion was favourable and Prat was given the commission. Prat also translated the *Pentateuch* and *Psalms*, but these were never printed.<sup>4</sup>

Since Prat lived in Knaresborough it was not convenient for him to come to London to correct the proofs of the New Testament. For this reason another Catalan, Vicenç Torras, a printer by profession and friend of Puigblanch, was given the task of correcting the proofs and rendering the spelling uniform. This introduces the complicating factor that the orthography of the printed version is not that of Prat. This is clear from the survival of fragments of Prat's MS with the corrections of Torras.

There are no differences between the first and second editions, but revisions were made to the third and the fourth editions. The revision and printing of the third edition was in the hands of Lt. J. N. Graydon, the Bible Society's agent in Mediterranean Spain, working with the Barcelona printer Bergnes. The fourth edition was revised and printed in Madrid under the direction of the Rev. E. Reeves Palmer, the Society's agent in Madrid, who had reported that since Catalan as a literary language had undergone a revival since the 1840s the orthography of the existing version was no longer acceptable. And so it was decided that the fourth edition should be issued with an up to date spelling.

## I

### THE POSITION OF CATALAN IN THE EARLY 19<sup>th</sup> CENTURY

Catalan had been little used for literary purposes since the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> Century. As a result the language had in great part stagnated during a period of great importance in the evolution of the other European languages. This posed a series of problems for those who wished to use Catalan as a literary language in the first decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. The number of conflicting opinions on the language published in the century between the appearance of Ballot's *Gramàtica y apologia de la Llengua catalana*<sup>5</sup> and

4. The *Psalms* appear as an appendix in my thesis.

5. Barcelona 1815.

Fabra's *Gramática de la lengua catalana*<sup>6</sup> illustrate clearly the difficulties. Throughout those years the most difficult problem of all, and the one which claimed the most attention was that of orthography. Badia goes so far as to say that,

«la literatura *renaixentista* catalana carece de sólidas bases gramaticales, como se echa de ver en seguida que se examinan sus obras con un criterio lingüístico no muy exigente [...]. La mayor preocupación de nuestras gramáticas decimononas es la ortografía, a la cual, aun reconociendo todo el valor de integración que posee, preciso es considerar fuera de la verdadera entidad gramatical.»<sup>7</sup>

The interrupted development of Catalan, in the preceding centuries, had produced a state of affairs in which,

«se fosilice una conservación unilateral de grafías medievales en catalán decadente, el cual al propio tiempo adquiere grafías infundadas, sólo por imitación servil de la correspondiente solución castellana. Al iniciarse la *Renaixença*, la lengua ofrecía, pues, una ortografía anacrónica y forastera que había que reformar de raíz. Pero los primeros intentos de reforma provocaron un estado de verdadera anarquía ortográfica: casi no hubo problema que no recibiese dos o tres soluciones, tal vez no se encontrarían dos escritores que estuviesen absolutamente de acuerdo en todas las cuestiones planteadas.»<sup>8</sup>

Badia relates this concern about orthography with the literature produced in Catalan from the later 1830s on, and with the grammars of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, particularly those beginning with Pers i Ramona's *Gramática castellana-catalana*,<sup>9</sup> which followed the pioneer work of Ballot. However, there was confusion over the writing of Catalan even before the literary and grammatical works of the *Renaixença* began to appear. As Ballot wrote, in his section on orthography,

«de algun temps á esta part se han suscitat alguns dubtes y dificultats sobre las lletres ab que se deuen escriurer algunas veus Cathalanas.»<sup>10</sup>

This was revealed on at least two occasions in the 1790s: in the paper *De la ortografía catalana* read to the Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona on July 11<sup>th</sup>, 1792 by Dr. Antoni Alegret, and in a series of letters in the «Diario de Barcelona» in the second half of 1796.

6. Barcelona 1912.

7. A. M. BADIA I MARGARIT, *Gramática Catalana* (Madrid 1962), I, 24.

8. *Id.*, 33.

9. Barcelona 1847.

10. BALLOT, *Gramática*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, p. 138.

Both concern and confusion were shown in the controversy in the «Diario de Barcelona» to which Díaz Plaja has drawn attention.<sup>11</sup> It is impossible, without much research, to say who the participants were, since all used pseudonyms.<sup>12</sup> The identity of the writers is, however, not really important.

The issue was raised in a letter of July 17, 1796, whose author Lluç Capcigrañ asked for guidance on the spelling of such words as *fuiç*, *puix*, *dítça*, *mitja*, *mítç*, *agud*, since, as he wrote,

«no hallo Ortografía Catalana que me instruya sobre el particular».

This lack of works of reference was contested and four works in all were mentioned, although only one, the *Prontuario orthologigráfico trilingüe* of Padre Pedro Martyr Anglès<sup>13</sup> was actually suggested to Capcigrañ as a guide.<sup>14</sup> None of the participants was able to offer fixed rules, but an interesting division between an etymological and a phonemic approach is clear. Mossèn Enric Porrug, remembering what he had been taught by his Maestro de Gramática, holds that *pronunciación*, *uso constante*, and *origen* are the fundamental principles by which orthography should be guided.<sup>15</sup> One should write as one speaks. He, therefore, advocates omitting the *i* in *puix*, *goig*, etc. and write either *putj*, *gotj*, or *putx*, *gotx*.<sup>16</sup> As for the final *d*, in adjectives and past participles he suggests a *-t* when the feminine has *-ta*: *perfet*, *perfeteta*, but a *-d* when the feminine has *-da*: *tingud*, *tinguda*.<sup>17</sup>

As opposed to this phonetic orthography, Taboll puts forward an «etymological» approach. According to him it is impossible to determine the orthography without having first established the etymology.<sup>18</sup> He prefers to write *goig*, *boig*, because the *g* is native to the language whereas *j* and *x* are «imported», and should only be used before *a*, *o* and *u* when the sound requires it: *joya*, *boja*, *xeringa*, *jugament*.<sup>19</sup>

In the end nothing concrete came out of this polemic, which petered out in a series of personal attacks. A much more serious attitude is shown in Antoni Alegret's *De la ortografia catalana* which had been commissioned

11. G. DÍAZ PLAJA, *Una polèmica sobre el Català a les darreries del segle XVIII*, *EUC*, XVIII (1933), 182-208. For a full discussion of this controversy, see J. M. MIQUEL I VERGÈS, *La filologia catalana de la Decadència*, *RdC*, n° 92 (November 1938), 444-452.

12. Two of these — Taboll and Mossèn Botall — suggest that Ballot may have been the author of the letters published in the numbers of the 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> of September and 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> of September — DÍAZ PLAJA, *op. cit.*, 192-93, 197-99.

13. Barcelona 1742.

14. DÍAZ PLAJA, *op. cit.*, 185.

15. *Id.*, 187.

16. *Id.*, 188.

17. *Id.*, 189.

18. *Id.*, 192.

19. *Id.*, 193.

by the Acadèmia de Bones Lletres. Alegret began by remarking on the differences between medieval and modern Catalan. For him Catalan originates from the *llemosí*, a generally accepted belief at the time. He points out that the orthography of medieval Catalan was guided by the pronunciation. When speaking of the synaloepha he favoured its introduction. He finds similarity in the formation of syllables in Catalan, Castilian, Latin, but differences in the use of the letters *h*, *j*, *ll*, *ñ* and *x*. Catalan, he says, has no *h* preceded by a consonant, except in foreign words and names. For the Castilian *ch* the Catalans have *x*. The initial *i* of Latin words is replaced by the *j* but initial *hi* by a *g*: *Hieronimus - Geroni*. A Latin *g* remains *g* when not lost: *colegir*, but *teula*. The *j* can occur at the beginning of a word: *Joan*; and in the middle: *vejám*, but not at the end; then it has to be preceded by a *t*: *vatj*, *velj*, though *vaig* and *veig* have also been adopted. The *ll* occurs at the beginning, middle and end of a word: *llum*, *phalla*, *mirall*. In a rather absurd way he tries to point out that Castilian initial *ll* does not always correspond with the Catalan: *llorar - plorar*, but the very phonetics are enough to avoid confusion, one should think. Alegret is opposed to the use of *ny* for *ñ*. He prefers the latter for reasons of economy. The *x* can occur at the beginning, in the middle or at the end of a word; *xerrar*, *aixi*, *baix*. He points out that the pronunciation is not always the same and that in that case one should find the origin of the word, but there he leaves us, without giving any norm or orientation.

At the end of the paper Alegret urgently requested the Academy that steps should be taken which would lead to the publication of a Catalan dictionary, but although the project was revived on several later occasions nothing ever came of it.

The appearance of the *Diccionario Catalán - Castellano - Latino* by J. Esteve, J. Belvitges and A. Juglà y Font<sup>20</sup> and of Ballot's *Gramàtica y apologia de la Llengua Cathalana*<sup>21</sup> did not resolve the existing doubts about Catalan orthography.

In 1820 the Editors of a new edition of the *Poesías Jocosas y Serias* of Vicenç Garcia drew attention to the problem when they wrote in their prologue:

«empenem esta nova edició corregintla y portantla a una ortografia moderna cual reclama lo nostre idioma per nivellarse ab la de los espanyol, franses e italià».<sup>22</sup>

Their comment on the difficulty of the task is interesting:

20. Barcelona 1803.

21. Barcelona 1815.

22. P. IV.

«Ab la deguda sinceritat confesam al lector que en esta edició notará alguna falta ortografa, resultancia inevitable de la falta de dictionaris complerts, de la mala impressió del original que nos ha servit, y de la incertitud de las reglas del nostre idioma tan olvidat en el dia. Asi es que lo *tan* comparatiu y lo *tant* cantitat los trobam confusos varias vegadas, com igualment lo *cuant* cantitat ab lo *cuand* adverbí; lo *te* pronom ab lo *té* verb adoleixen en los escrits catalans de igual confusió, y a nosaltres nos ha passat, essent verb, sens lo accent, que en nostre entendre deu diferenciari del pronom. Estas y altres semblants faltas reclaman la indulgencia del lector, axí com dels sabis los estudis per fixar reglas certas en lo nostre idioma: reglas que no podem nosaltres establir en una sola edició.»<sup>23</sup>

It is probably an indication of how little progress had been made towards resolving these problems that both of these laments were reproduced, with minimal changes in the enlarged edition of Vicenç Garcia's work published in 1840.<sup>24</sup>

It is against this background of uncertainty about the written use of the language that one has to consider Prat's translation. He had used the dictionary of Belvitges<sup>25</sup> and the grammar of Ballot as guides in translating *Matthew* as a test-piece in 1828 and he continued to use them, though more selectively, after gaining the commission. They were the only published works with any direct relevance to contemporary Catalan usage available to him.

The motive which lead Esteve, Belvitges and Juglà to writing their Dictionary was not the compilation of a Catalan Dictionary. Their aim was to help Catalans to express themselves without embarrassment in Castilian:

«Por ser el idioma Castellano el de la Corte de España, y de casi todo el reyno; y por ser en Cataluña mismo indispensable en los tribunales, en las aulas y academias, y comun en los púlpitos, y en los asuntos de comercio, de literatura, y en casi todos los de alguna gravedad: se ven los catalanes con tanta frecuencia en la precision de producirse en Castellano, ya de palabra, ya por escrito, no solo en sus viages y en sus relaciones con la Corte y demas Provincias, sino tambien sin salir de sus casas, y en el trato con sus propias gentes; que no es de admirar que sean tan generales los deseos de un Diccionario, en que por orden alfabético de las voces y frases del idioma provincial se encuentren las castellanas, que les corresponden. Aun los catalanes que han puesto cuydado en aprender el Castellano, y han adquirido alguna facilidad en hablarle ó escribirle, se hallan muchas veces en el apuro de no ocurrirles voz ó frase castellana, para lo que quieren expresar; y por lo mismo que son tantas las comunes á ámbos idiomas, se hallan tambien á cada paso perplexos é inciertos de si la palabra que se les ofrece es ó no castellana, ó si lo es en el sentido en que la quieren usar;

23. *Nota dels Editors*, 197.

24. P. III-V, 211.

25. Belvitges will be used from now on as a convenient reference. The co-authors were, as already mentioned Esteve and Juglà.

y por esto suspiran por un Diccionario catalan y castellano, con que saldrían al instante de tan molestos embarazos, que siempre incomodan, y tal vez llegan á debilitar la energía del discurso.»<sup>26</sup>

Moreover, it does not contain the full range of vocabulary which Prat needed for his translation. In a number of instances Prat must have drawn on his own resources and those of his companion Busanya. In this context it is perhaps worth noting that Fèlix Torres i Amat, who had himself begun working on a Catalan-Castilian dictionary in the last years of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century, and whose work was utilised in the dictionary of Belvitges, thought that compilation deficient in comparison with the work of Albert Vidal, whose unpublished dictionary, composed at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century is preserved in the archives of the Acadèmia de Bones Lletres:

«contiene [Vidal] un gran caudal de términos y frases antiguas con las que se mejoraría mucho el Diccionario catalán publicado por los señores Belvitges, Juglá, etc.»<sup>27</sup>

It is clear that the Dictionary was only of value to those who knew Catalan. There are many instances where the Catalan word differs entirely from its Castilian equivalent:

<i>banya</i>	<i>cuerno</i>	(R, XIII, title)
<i>fals</i>	<i>hoz</i>	(R, XIV, 14)
<i>ordi</i>	<i>cebada</i>	(R, VI, 6)
<i>verema</i>	<i>vendimia</i>	(R, XIV, 19)
<i>cup</i>	<i>lagar</i>	(R, XIV, 19)
<i>granota</i>	<i>rana</i>	(R, XVI, 13)

The number of such instances must have severely limited the usefulness of Belvitges's dictionary to any one who thought and wrote principally in Castilian.

As for Ballot's work some of its deficiencies are dealt with later in this study. Its value lies almost entirely in the fact of its having been published at a time when there was no other guide readily available. There is no reason to dissent from the judgement of Miquel i Vergés who, while recognising that Ballot had certain insights, writes,

«La Gramàtica de Josep Pau Ballot no té un gran valor filològic. En la sola lectura hom constata que adés sentí una marcada predilecció per

26. Prologue to the *Diccionario Catalán - Castellano - Latino* (Barcelona 1803).

27. F. TORRES AMAT, *Memorias para ayudar á formar un Diccionario crítico de los escritores catalanes ...* (Barcelona 1836), 650.

les formes arcaiques, adés pel vulgarisme, gairebé sempre ferit per la influència castellana.»<sup>28</sup>

Having once gained the commission, Prat did not invariably follow Belvitges and Ballot. His letter to Puigblanch of November 24<sup>th</sup> 1828 suggests that he had followed their rules in translating Matthew for convenience rather than out of conviction. The letter shows that Prat was conscious that variations of orthography were liable to be questioned, and he asked Puigblanch to remember,

«que la ortografía que se ha adoptado para huir questiones es la de la gramática de Ballot y del Diccionario de Belvitges.»<sup>29</sup>

Puigblanch was specifically asked to report on the language of Prat's translation, rather than on the accuracy of the version. We do not have the text of Puigblanch's report on Prat's language, but he did give some account of it in the *Opúsculos*,<sup>30</sup> where he says that he had laid down rules for the use of the subjunctive and for the use of the synaloepha, which he later explained to Prat in person. The only record of Prat's having gone to London to confer with Puigblanch relates to the summer of 1830, after he had revised Matthew and translated Luke. This seeming anomaly suggests that perhaps Puigblanch had put his observations on paper for Prat's use in 1829. If this were true and if one can accept Dr. Molas's assertion<sup>31</sup> that Puigblanch's *Observaciones sobre la lengua catalana* date from Puigblanch's second exile, then it is tempting to speculate whether he did not write these for Prat's benefit. It is not possible to be definite about the matter.<sup>32</sup> But it does seem reasonable to suppose that the ideas expressed in it correspond quite closely with those which Puigblanch expounded to Prat. There are a number of points which Puigblanch specifically criticises in Ballot where Prat seems to follow Puigblanch. One example is the use of the ending *-ia* for the present subjunctive. Puigblanch reproaches Ballot for recognising *jo ame* as the only form for the present subjunctive, thus rejecting «la propia antigua hermosa y variada» form in *-ia*. He says that Ballot, by doing so, not only neglects the richness of the language, but that he also adds to the confusion between

28. J. M. MIQUEL I VERGÉS, *La filologia catalana de la Decadència*, *RdC*, nº 93 (Dec. 1938), 655.

29. Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, MS 8853.

30. *Opúsculos Gramático-Satíricos* (London 1828-29), p. cx.

31. *ER*, VII (1959-60), 189-90.

32. Perhaps it is worth noting Miquel i Vergés's observation that the MS of Puigblanch gives the impression of having been written rapidly and a little carelessly, and the informal tone in which it is written — e. g. «Para persuadirte de esta verdad no tienes más sino seguir uno por uno sus tratados y los hallarás diminutos todos», etc. *RdC* nº 93 (Dec. 1938).



the present subjunctive and the present indicative, since because of the unstressed *a*, *tu amas* and *tu ames* sound the same.<sup>33</sup> Another example is the abundant use of synaloepha, especially with articles and pronouns, which Puigblanch rejects as part of «lo monstruoso del sistema ortográfico» proposed by Ballot.<sup>34</sup> Incidentally, it is worth noting that Puigblanch's criticisms of Ballot are not always entirely fair. Referring to the possessive pronouns, he says: «también tenemos llur», as if Ballot had left it out, whereas in fact he does mention it.<sup>35</sup> When discussing the preterite, Puigblanch points out that there is also the «voz corriente» *vas amar*. Ballot however, does mention it, albeit in a footnote.<sup>36</sup>

## II

## THE DESCRIPTION OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE CATALAN NEW TESTAMENT

In the following account I have concentrated largely on orthography and vocabulary, since these are the aspects of language where Prat was free to choose; there are only very few points of morphology in which Prat diverges from Ballot; and as for syntax, we are dealing here with a translation which left the translator little freedom of construction, and it would be unwise to draw any conclusion of a syntactic nature based on the translation.

The description of the language of the Catalan New Testament which follows is based on the following texts: *Matthew*, *Acts*, the *Epistles of John and Jude* and *Revelations*. They have been chosen because *Matthew* is the longest of the Gospels; *Acts* since it is different in style and contents from the Gospels; the *Epistles of John and Jude* and *Revelations* because a substantial fragment of the MS is still extant. This fragment is of value because it has the «corrections» made by Vicenç Torras, who was given the task of rendering the spelling of the version uniform. The printed version therefore represents a conflation of Prat's views on orthography and those of Torras.

The surviving section of the MS of *Revelations* is not sufficient in itself to enable Prat's views to be reconstructed in their entirety. There is however still one way of discovering how Prat tackled this very controversial point. The MS of his translation of the Old Testament still exists in its original, uncorrected form. I have used the first half of *Psalms* — up to Psalm 71 — to illustrate Prat's spelling whenever this has proved possible.

33. *Op. cit.*, p. 667.

34. For Prat's practice cf. below.

35. 1<sup>st</sup> edition, p. 31.

36. 1<sup>st</sup> edition, p. 57.

A) *Orthography.*

1. SYNALOEPHA AND SYNERESIS; THE USE OF THE APOSTROPHE.<sup>37</sup> — Though undoubtedly an important aspect of Catalan orthography, Prat does not seem to have been unduly preoccupied by the use of the apostrophe. In a letter to Puigblanch dated 2/8/1829 he asked:

«¿Cree V. que es mas castiza la ortografia catalana usando contracciones?»;

but he added that the question was not very urgent.<sup>38</sup> Yet, when he finally got the commission and the translation was underway the question must have occupied his mind constantly. It is not surprising that he did not always follow consistently whichever rules he had at his disposal. But then his guide Ballot did not even succeed in following the ones he himself had laid down.<sup>39</sup> It is clear that Ballot does not favour the use of the apostrophe which he considers «ridicul i molest». He likes to use contraction:

«quis menja la carn, que roseguels ossos».<sup>40</sup>

However, when there is a choice between contraction and apheresis he recommends the latter:

37. These are the terms used by Ballot. He defines them as follows (p. 165, 1<sup>st</sup> edition):

«La *Sinalefa*, quant se calla la vocal ab que acaba una dicció, y la ques segueix comensa ab ella, com: l'home, l'or, l'orgull.

La *Sinéresis*, per la qual se uneixen y juntan dos síllabas una ab altra, com: *jals veig* en lloch de *ja los veig*».

This is not fine enough a distinction, for they do not cover the phenomena he is trying to discuss, which are in fact the following:

1) elision; when the first of two vowels in contact is dropped: *la abundancia, l'abundancia*.

2) apheresis; when the second of two vowels in contact is dropped: *y em, y'm, ym*.

3) contraction; when the first vowel fuses with the second vowel: *de el, del*.

4) syneresis; when the first and second vowel form a diphthong: *no ho, nou*; e. g. *nou sabem* (*M.* XXI, 27).

5) syncope; when a vowel is lost in the middle of a word: *de los, dels*.

6) apocope; when a vowel is lost at the end of a word; *de lo, del*.

In the above terminology I have used the definitions as given by J. MAROUZEAU in his *Lexique de la Terminologie Linguistique* (Paris 1961).

38. B. N., MS 8853.

39. There is no way of knowing whether Prat used the first or the second edition of Ballot. Miquel i Vergés gives an account of the principal modifications contained in the second edition (*La filologia catalana...*, *RdC*, n° 93, Dec. 1938, pp. 651-55). No modifications were made in the section on synaloepha and syneresis. My references are to the first edition.

40. P. 171.

«jot conech com la mare que t'ha parit» (p. 172).

After the introduction to what Ballot calls syneresis and synaloepha follow the rules and their application. The exposition is far from concise and not conveniently arranged. Only a small part corresponds with the classification based on phonetic criteria which I have adopted for they allow a finer definition.

a) The definite article. — Today the definite article *el* and *la* are reduced to *l'* before a noun which begins with a vowel or *h*. Ballot, who, like Prat, still uses the definite article *lo*, admits this only when the vowel of the article is the same as the initial one of the noun: *l'orgull*, *l'abundancia* (p. 181). Ballot himself is not always consistent in applying this: on p. 174 we find *la abundancia*. Prat extends the rule to the present day one and uses elision whether the vowels are the same or not, though it is surprising to find *la alabansa* (P, 25,7), *la ajuda* (P, 51,7), both *l'equitat* (P, 13,7) and *la equitat* (P, 16,3). Equally after having written *l'iniquitat* (P, 26,18 *et passim*) *la iniquitat* (P, 36,39; P, 37,14). The latter is the accepted spelling today, since the word starts with an unstressed *i*.

Ballot is quite firm in explaining that *a lo* becomes *al*, *de lo* becomes *del*; *a los* becomes *als*, and *de los* becomes *dels* (p. 178), as they do today. Prat agrees, on the whole, though one may find «... de los perseguidors» (P, 7, title). Even when the noun following the definite article begins with a vowel, he has an apocope: *del angel* (R, xxxi, 17), and not elision, as we have today. Ballot does not say what to do when the preposition *de* is followed by the definite article and a feminine noun which begins with a vowel or *h*. In the extant fragment of the New Testament Prat writes *del'aygua* (R, xxi,6) and *del'Iglesia* (3<sup>rd</sup> epistle John). The MS of the *Psalms* shows that he later must have halted between two opinions, for there he writes *de l'enveja* (P, 36,8), decomposing the contraction as we do today, but: *del'adversitat* (P, 36,20). The preposition *desde* is for Ballot not a compound one as it is today and Prat treats it as *de*: *desdel santuari* (P, 19,2) and *desde l'eternitat* (P, 24,6). Equally the preposition *pera* is not a compound for Ballot. Prat does not contract; he either writes *pera'l pobre* (P, 67,11), or *pera lo pobre* (P, 71,3). *Per lo* and *per los* become *pel* and *pels*, according to Ballot, but Prat does not favour this apocope: *per lo pecat* (P, 39,10).

Contrary to modern use one may write either *entrels peus* or *entre els peus*, according to Ballot. Prat uses syncope: *entrels pobles* (P, 56,12); *entrels justos* (P, 68,32).

Today's rules make no allowances for apocope and syncope with the prepositions *contra* and *sobre*, and Ballot does not discuss them. However,

because of the frequency with which they turn up in the text, it is worth while considering them here. In the singular Prat uses an apostrophe: *contra'l Senyor* (P, 2,2); but not for the plural: *contra los insults* (P, 3, title). When the noun begins with a vowel he prefers elision: *contra l'ignocent* (P, 14,5). As for the preposition *sobre*, Prat uses mostly syncope and apocope: *sobrels cantichs* (P, 60, title), but occasionally admits an apostrophe: *sobre'ls núvols* (P, 67,36); *sobre'l pobre* (P, 9,9). The neuter article remains unaltered: *sobre lo mes alt* (P, 67,35).

That the preposition *de* is reduced to *d'* before a word which begins with a vowel or *h* is not pointed out by Ballot. Although Prat in general applies this rule, there are numerous occasions where he does not, e. g.: *de ell* (P, 15,2); *de ells* (P, 18,3 *et passim*); *de alabansa* (P, 40,5); *de home* (P, 42,1); *de alegria* (P, 44,9); *de Israel* (P, 21,3).

In addition to Ballot's rules for the definite article as far as they correspond to those of today, we must now have a look at the ones which do not apply anymore.

He prescribes apocope or syncope for the definite articles *lo* and *los*:

1) With nouns which end in a vowel. The example given is: *Maneja la cúbl ca, no per tu, sino pel pa* (p. 175). Prat does not follow him here: ... *ab qui cometeren fornicació los reys* ... (R, XVII, 2).

2) With pronouns which end in a vowel (p. 177). The example given is: *lo quels ulls no veuhen, lo cor no dol*. Prat follows Ballot here: *aquesta es la generació del quel cercan* [lo rostro del Deu Jacob] (P, 23,6).

3) With verbs (p. 177). The example given is: *Cruxial vent, Neptú bramava*. Prat does not follow Ballot here: *Convertireu lo meu plor en goitg* (P, 29,14).

4) With conjunctions (p. 180). Prat does use apocope for *que* and the definite article: *quel*. Whereas Ballot prescribes this for the conjunction *y* as well, Prat prefers an apostrophe: *y'l*, *y'ls*. He does this even when the following noun begins with a vowel: *y'l escut* (P, 34,2). There is one exception: *Yl rey* (P, 44,13), but this is presumably a lapsus.

5) Ballot does not discuss the adverb followed by the definite article. Prat appears to be inconsistent: *nil gegant* (P, 32,16); *ni'ls injustos* (P, 5,5).

b) The weak personal pronoun. — The reduced and elided forms of the personal pronoun are

	1 <sup>st</sup> pers.	2 <sup>nd</sup> pers.	3 <sup>rd</sup> pers.
after the verb (reduced)	'm 'ns	't us	's 'l 'ls
before the verb (elided)	m'	t'	s' l' l' (fem.)

Prat agrees with Ballot on using contraction when the weak personal pronoun comes after the verb when this ends in a vowel other than *u* for the first and second persons. When the verbform ends in a *u* followed by *us* there is also a contraction: *Apidaus de mi* (P, 4,1). For the third person he prefers an apheresis: *deslliura'l* (P, 21,8).

Ballot prescribes elision when the weak personal pronoun is followed by a verbform which starts with a vowel or *h*. Although Prat follows him here in general, there are a few exceptions: *te alabarán* (P, 44,20); *me ha amparat* (P, 62,9) and: *se havian exaltat* (P, 46,9).

*Groups of weak personal pronouns.* Ballot prescribes elision when the weak personal pronoun is followed by the neuter pronoun *ho* and the adverbial pronoun *hi*, as we do today. Prat follows him here: *no t'ho diria* (P, 49,13).

Ballot prescribes apheresis for the adverbial *en* with a weak personal pronoun. Prat follows this rule. It occurs chiefly with the verbs *anar-se*, *portar-se* and *pujar-se*.

These are Ballot's rules as far as they have some correspondence with the present-day ones. He does however prescribe syncope or apocope for a large number of other cases. Since Prat does not always follow them and so falls on quite a few occasions in line with present-day usage, they are worth noting.

In addition Ballot prescribes contraction for the weak personal pronoun with nouns, pronouns, adverbs and conjunctions.

1) With nouns (pp. 182, 191, 195): e. g. *la scienciat serveix poch*. Prat does not follow him here.

2) With pronouns (pp. 183, 192, 196). Prat follows him here: *jom alsaré* (P, 56,11); *jous amaré* (P, 17,1); *jols donaré* (P, 40,11). Prat also agrees on this for the relative pronoun *qui*: *no hi ha quis puja* (P, 18,6), but not for the relative pronoun *que* with the reflexive pronoun *se*. *Ques* could be *que* plus the reduced pronoun 's, but also *que* plus the third person singular of the verb *ésser*. The extant fragment of the New Testament shows that Prat did not always distinguish: *los mercaders que's enriquiren* (R, xviii,15); ... *la serpent antigua, que's lo diable* (R, xx,2); *lo que's bo* (P, 37,21). There is one exception: ... *la tribulació que es para probarvos* (first epistle Peter, iv,12).

3) With adverbs (pp. 186, 193, 196). Prat follows Ballot when the word following the pronoun begins with a consonant: *nom llameu* (P, 50,12); *not deixias* (P, 36,8); *nol deixarà ... nil condemnará* (P, 36,35); *nous olvideu* (P, 9,12). There is one exception: *ni'm castigueu* (P, 6,1). When the word following the pronoun begins with a vowel or *h* he either has contraction: *nol entreguia en poder* (P, 40,2) or elision: *no t'ho diria* (P, 49,13). However, he does not follow Ballot in using contraction for the reflexive pronoun *se*: *ni's deté* (P, 1,1). Possibly in order to avoid confusion with the personal pronoun *nos*, he uses

the reduced form 's when the following word begins with a consonant: *no's troba* (P, 10,1) and the elided form *s'* when the following word begins with a vowel: *no s'olvida* (P, 9,12). However, the full form is not uncommon: *no se troba* (P, 5,9); *no se lastimarà* (P, 36,25); *no se apoderaren* (P, 43,4). This even occurs occasionally when the following word begins with a vowel: *se alsarà* (P, 63,7): cf. *s'alsaren los Reys* (P, 2,2).

4) With conjunctions (pp. 188, 193, 197). Prat does not contract with the conjunction *y*, but he is not consistent in using either the reduced or the elided form when the verb which follows begins with a vowel: *y'm instruirà* (P, 17,37); *y'l adoravan sempre, y l'estavan benhint* (P, 71,15); *y s'oculta* (P, 17,12). On one occasion he follows Ballot: *yus he esperat* (P, 24,5).

Prat agrees with Ballot on contraction for the conjunction *que* but not for *peraque*: *peraque's perdia* (P, 33,16). On one occasion he splits *peraque* up and consequently uses contraction: *pera quel defensia* (P, 7, title).

Ballot prescribes contraction for the neuter *ho* with pronouns, verbs, adverbs and conjunctions in which cases it is reduced to *u* (syneresis) (p. 199). Prat follows him only for the adverb *no*: *jo nou sabia* (P, 34,18).

Ballot also prescribes contraction for the adverbial pronoun *hi* with pronouns, adverbs and conjunctions. Prat does not accept this rule: *no m'hi enfanguia* (P, 68,17); *no hi ha qui sia semblant a vos* (P, 39,7). No examples of *hi* with a conjunction could be found in Prat's MS.

*The differences between the MS of Prat and the printed version.* For practical reasons the task of rendering the spelling of the New Testament uniform was given to Vicenç Torras. The alterations made by Torras concern mainly the use of the apostrophe:

1) When the preposition *de* is followed by a definite article and a noun Prat contracts the preposition and the definite article: *del ira* (R, xviii, 3); *del aygua* (R, XXI,6) and *del Iglesia* (1<sup>st</sup> ep. John, v,10). Torras changes these into *de l'ira*, *de l'aygua* and *de l'Iglesia*. As already pointed out,<sup>41</sup> Prat later halted between two opinions, for he writes: *de l'enveja* (P, 36,8) and *del'adversitat* (P, 36,20).

2) When the conjunction *y* is followed by a definite article and noun Prat uses an apostrophe: *y'l fi* (R, I, 8); *y'l Senyor* (R, xviii,5). He even does this when the noun begins with a vowel; *y'l imperi* (R, I,6); *y'l Omega* (R,18). Torras writes it as one word: *yl Senyor*, *yl fi*. When the noun begins with a vowel he is inconsistent: *yl impero*, but: *y l'Omega*; and then again: *yl Anyell* (R, xvii,14).

3) The same applies for the conjunction *y* plus the reduced personal

41. See above p. 11.

pronouns. Prat writes *y'ns rentá de nostras pecats* (R. 1,5); *y's feriran los pits* (R, 1,7); *y'm digue* (R, xvii,15). Torras alters these to: *ys, yns, ym*.

4) The relative pronoun *que* followed by the third person reflexive pronoun in its reduced form 's or by the third person singular of *ésser* seems to have been as much of a problem for Torras as it was for Prat.<sup>42</sup> In the extant fragment of the MS of the New Testament he is consistent in altering Prat's *que's* into *ques*: *los mercaders ques enriquiren* (R, xviii,15); ... *la serpent antigua, ques lo diable* (R, xx,2). In general he follows Ballot in using the contraction. But the printed version shows that he was not always consistent, though it is difficult to say whether this is due to an oversight or not: ... *de manera que's meravellavan* (M, xiii,54); ... *veus aqui quel qu'es en aquest lloch* (M, xii,41, 42); and: ... *pensan que's lo criat fiel?* (M, xxiv,45).

The extant fragment of the New Testament MS shows that Torras in addition to the alterations, mentioned above, made some which are not without interest:

1) Whereas words like *rey*, *angel* and *iglesia* have capitals in Prat's MS, Torras gives them small letters. He may have been influenced by Ballot who, in his section *de las letras majúsculas* (p. 134) says amongst other things that words which indicate institutions, dignities or positions should be written with a small letter; *collegi, universitat, cardenal, rey*.

2) Prat writes constantly *així*. This is altered by Torras into *axí*, as spelled by Ballot.

Whereas both Ballot and Prat spell *eixir* with an *i*, Torras writes it without: *exirá* (R, xvii,8).

3) Prat, probably under Castilian influence, writes *e* instead of *y*, the conjunction, before a word which starts with a vowel: *e isqué* (R, xix,5); *e irreprehensibles* (2<sup>nd</sup> ep. Peter, iii,14). Torras writes *y*.

4) Prat gives the first person singular present indicative of *fer* as *faig*, as does Ballot. Torras feels the need for an additional *t* and writes *faitg*.

5) Prat spells *Asia* with double s: *Assia*. This seems to reflect on his pronunciation of the word: **s**. Torras spells it with one s: *Asia*. He must have pronounced a voiced **z**.

Equally, in the 2<sup>nd</sup> epistle of Peter, Prat writes: ... *los cels cremant serán dissolts*. Again Torras alters this and writes *dissolts*.

In discussing the following points I have used in addition to Ballot, Belvitges, Prat's MSS and the 1832 edition of the New Testament, for comparative purposes, the *Diccionario Quintilingüe*<sup>43</sup> by L. Bordas, J. Cortada

42. See p. 13 above.

43. Barcelona, 1839.

and M. A. Martí (cited as Quint.); the *Diccionari de la Llengua catalana ab la correspondència castellana y llatina*<sup>44</sup> by P. Labèrnia (cited as Labèrnia) and the *Atlas lingüístic de Catalunya* edited by A. Griera<sup>45</sup> when this was helpful in deciding whether a word might be a regional preference.

**2. VOWELS.** — A — Latin *a* in the plural of feminine nouns is preserved.

The *a* is also written in the conjugation of the verb, thus coinciding with Castilian, as in Ballot: *tenian, estavan, deyan*.

*Famella* (M, XIX,4) is spelled by Belvitges *femella*, as do Quint. and Labèrnia. Prat must have been influenced by the pronunciation of the unstressed *a*.

o — The pronunciation of the unstressed *o* leads sometimes to inconsistency: *fonaments* (P, 17,8); *funaments* (P, 17,16). Belvitges has *fonament*, so have Quint. and Labèrnia.

**3. CONSONANTS.** — B,V — Prat agrees with Ballot that the imperfect of verbs in *-ar* should have a *v* (p. 139). Yet the MS of the Psalms shows that it was a point he had to bear in mind constantly. Very often we find a *v* written through a *b* and even then he sometimes forgot to correct himself: *estaba* (P, 31,3) and a whole run: ... *pesaba ... revolcaba ... portaba* (P, 31,4).

When in doubt whether to write *b* or *v* Ballot advises to refer to the Latin. He makes an exception for *haver*, as does Prat.

The word for 'cloud' occurs as *núbol* (*Ep. Jude*, 12; P, 17,12), but also as *núvol* (P, 35,5). Belvitges, Quint. and Labèrnia spell *núvol*.

G IG/TG — In discussing the *g* at the end of a word, Ballot (p. 143) prescribes *-ig* when one perceives a soft *t* and a faint *i*: *vaig, maig, veig*. Prat follows him here: *vaig* (P, 3,4 and 5); *faig* (R, XXI,5; P, 16,2); *veig* (P, 8,3).

As against these «soft sounds», Ballot prescribes *-tg* for *mitg* and *desitg*. Prat follows him here in general for *mitg* (P, 47,8; 54,10) but has the occasional *mig* (P, 45,2). Belvitges has *mitj*, presumably because the feminine form is *mitja*, which does not occur in Prat's MSS; Quint. gives *mig*; Labèrnia: *mitj*. Prat follows Ballot in writing *desitg* (P, 13,2). Belvitges gives *desitj*. Quint. gives *desitj* and so does Labèrnia.

Ballot does not indicate how the word for 'joy' should be spelled. Prat has constantly *goitg* (P, 20,6). Belvitges gives *gotg*; Quint. has *gotj* and Labèrnia *goig*.

G IX/IG — Ballot warns us that we should distinguish between *puix*-conjunction and *puig*-hill. Prat spells the latter as *puitg* (P, 64,12; 71,3).

44. Barcelona 1839.

45. Barcelona 1923 s.s.



Belvitges refers us under *puix*, which is the old spelling, to *putx*. So does Labèrnia. As for the conjunction, Prat writes *puix* (P, 21,25 *et passim*), but is not always quite sure, for on a number of occasions we find *puig* (P, 21,8; 34,8; 37,17).

H — Ballot advises (p. 148) to put an *h* between vowels when they do not form a diphthong. Prat follows him here in general: *obeir* (P, 2, title); *prohisme* (P, 14,3); *plaher* (P, 26,8); *trahició* (P, 40,10); *diuhen* (P, 3,2); *ohir* (P, 25,7). It is worth noting here that Ballot himself writes *oir*. In the spelling of the 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural imperative of this last verb Prat is inconsistent: *ohiu* (P, 4; 2,1) and *oiume* (P, 26,12).

The dictionaries sometime differ in their opinions, sometimes not:

BELVITGES	QUINT.	LABERNIA
<i>obeir</i>	<i>obeir</i>	<i>obeir</i>
<i>prohisme</i>	<i>proisme</i>	<i>proisme</i>
<i>oir</i>	<i>oir</i>	<i>ohir</i>
<i>traició</i>	<i>trahició</i>	<i>trahició</i>
<i>plaher</i>	<i>plaher</i>	<i>plaher</i>

Ballot (p. 146) favours the final *-ch* because one perceives a faint aspiration, as opposed e. g. the *k* sound in *rectitut*. Thus he writes *amich*, *antich*, *sanch*, *poch*, etc. He does not agree with Belvitges who writes *amig*, *antig*, etc., because the feminine is *amiga*, *antiga*. He also points out that Belvitges is inconsistent in writing *estomach* and *laich* whereas in general he has either *-g* or *-c*.

Prat agrees with Ballot and always writes *-ch*. The Quint. follows Belvitges in the examples offered by Prat's MS of the *Psalms*. Labèrnia agrees with Prat:

PRAT		BELVITGES	QUINT.	LABERNIA
<i>profétich</i>	(P, 2,t)	<i>profétic</i>	<i>profétic</i>	<i>profétich</i>
<i>cántich</i>	(P, 6,t)	<i>cántic</i>	<i>cántic</i>	<i>cántich</i>
<i>arch</i>	(P, 7,10)	<i>arc</i>	<i>arc</i>	<i>arch</i>
<i>poch</i>	(P, 8,5)	<i>poc</i>	<i>poc</i>	<i>poch</i>
<i>únic</i>	(P, 10,3)	<i>únic</i>	<i>únic</i>	<i>únich</i>
<i>cuch</i>	(P, 21,6)	<i>cuc</i>	<i>cuc</i>	<i>cuch</i>
—	—	—	—	—
<i>enemich</i>	(P, 3,7)	<i>enemig</i>	<i>enemig</i>	<i>enemich</i>
<i>foch</i>	(P, 10,6)	<i>fog</i>	<i>fog</i>	<i>foch</i>
<i>gemèch</i>	(P, 14,5)	<i>gemèg</i>	<i>gemèg</i>	<i>gemèch</i>
<i>llarch</i>	(P, 20,4)	<i>llarg</i>	<i>llarg</i>	<i>llarch</i>
<i>sanch</i>	(P, 29,11)	<i>sang</i>	<i>sang</i>	<i>sanch</i>
<i>cárrech</i>	(P, 9,15)	<i>cárreg</i>	<i>cárreg</i>	<i>cárrech</i>

In one instance Quint. differs from Belvitges: *lloch* (P, 10,8) is written *lloc* by Belvitges and *llog* by Quint.. Labèrnia agrees again with Prat. The conjunction *donchs* (P, 2,10) is given as *doncs* or *doncues* by Belvitges. Quint. just gives *doncs*. Labèrnia agrees with Prat.

Finally, Ballot says that «sempre se ha usat en aquest principat la *th* en las veus *Cathalunya* y *cathalá*» (p. 148) and that the *th* is also used in words of Greek origin: *thema*, *cathedra*. Prat agrees: the title page of the MS of the *Psalms* says: «... trasladat de la Vulgata a la llengua catalana». And he writes: *atesorar* (P, 38,10); *cathedra* (P, 1,1). Only once we find *citara* (P, 56,11), but normally *cithara* (P, 42,5; 70,23). He always preserves the *th* in proper names: *Apithalami* (P, 44, title); *Bethsabé*, *Nathan* (P, 50, title); *Geth* (P, 55, title); *Idithun* (P, 61, title). The dictionaries all give *catalá*, *atesorar*, *cátedra*.

m — Ballot prescribes *m* before *b*, *m* and *p* (p. 154). Prat agrees: *embriagar* (P, 22,7); *immaculat* (P, 18,13); *impio* (P, 1,1); *complagut* (P, 29,1). But he is inconsistent in writing: *y'l Senyor commauré lo desert* (P., 28,7) and writing the past participle of the verb *commaure* as *commogut* (P, 14,5; 15,8). Belvitges and Quint. have *commaure*, *commogut*. Labèrnia has *commaurer*.

qu — Although Ballot spells *qual* with a *q* (p. 154), Prat is very often inconsistent and writes *cual* (P. 5, title; 7, title *et passim*). This is also the case with *cuan* (P. 7,3). Belvitges has *cu-* and Labèrnia *qu-*.

r — Ballot says that one should always write *quant*, whether this comes from *quantus* or *quando* (p. 157). Prat, apart from the example mentioned under *q*, follows him here: *tot quant* (P, 1,3); ... *fins a quant?* (P, 6,3). The dictionaries agree on final *-t* for 'quantus', but offer every variation for 'quando'.

Belvitges: *quand* (quando); *quant* (quantus).

Quint.: *cuan* (quando); *cuant* (quantus).

Labèrnia: *quant* (quando); *quant* (quantus).

ix — Although Ballot specifically mentions (p. 157) that *axí* and *axó* should be written without an *-i*, Prat puts it in. So does Labèrnia. Belvitges and Quint. have *axí* and *axó* like Ballot. Ballot and Prat spell the verb *eixir* with an *i*. Labèrnia agrees. Belvitges and Quint. have *exir*.

## B) Morphology

Although Prat follows Ballot fairly closely as far as the morphology is concerned, he differs from him in one important aspect: the ending of the verb in the present subjunctive. Prat lets it end in *-ia*, whereas Ballot has *-e*

for the verbs in *-ar* and *-a* for the verbs in *-er* and *-ir*. It is worth remembering here that Puigblanch strongly disapproved of Ballot on this point and favoured «la propia antigua hermosa y variada desinencia» in *-ia*.<sup>46</sup>

*fals* (R, XIV,14). — Prat follows modern usage in attributing feminine gender to this word. Belvitges gives it as masculine.

### C) Vocabulary

Although a full-size study of the vocabulary used in the Catalan New Testament lies outside the scope of this work, a certain number of words call one's attention for one reason or another. They can be grouped under the following headings:

- a) Prat's castilianisms.
- b) choice between two alternatives.
- c) words which do not occur in Belvitges.

These lists are not intended to be exhaustive; they are intuitive but based on a careful reading of the texts:

a) *alhajar* (M, XII,43). — Although it occurs in Belvitges it is spelled *alajar*, so does Quint. Labèrnia spells it *alhajar*.

*barco* (A, XXVII,38). — This does not occur in Belvitges, but he does have *vaxell*. Both Quint and Labèrnia have *barco* and *vaxell* (Labèrnia: *vaixell*). Quint. defines *vaxell*: «embarcació de guerra».

*buscar* (A, X,21: XIX,19; XV,17). — Belvitges has: *buscar* v. *cercar*. Yet Prat knew *cercar*, spelled *sercar* (M, II, 13), possibly a misprint, for in A, XIII,11 it appears as *cercar*. Quint. defines *buscar*: «inquirir, fer diligències per trobar alguna cosa». Labèrnia gives: «cercar ab diligència». The *Atlas* gives *buscar* for the whole region and *cercar* for only a few isolated places in the Vall d'Aran.

*cena* (M, XXVI, title); (R, XIX, 17). — Belvitges gives *cena* as a «voz antigua» for *sopar*, but Prat never uses it. Quint. and Labèrnia agree with Belvitges. The *Atlas* has the verb *sopar* for the whole region, except for a few places in Huesca where *cenar* is used.

*fortalexer* (A, XIX,20). — This does not occur in any of the dictionaries, nor in the *Atlas*. Prat may have coined it on the analogy of *fortalecer*.

*ola* (M, XIV, title). — Belvitges does give *ola* and its definition but then refers the reader to *ona*. Quint. and Labèrnia also give *ola* but define it as «onada» and «ona» respectively. *Ola* does appear in the *Atlas*.

46. MIQUEL I VERGÉS: *La filologia catalana ...*, *RdC*, n° 93 (Dec. 1938, 667).

*rato* (*A*, xxviii,6). — Belvitges gives as meaning of *rato*: «estona». Quint. gives *rato*: «estona, espay curt de temps». Labèrnia distinguishes: *rato*: «espay de temps»; *estona*: «espay curt de temps». Cf. in this context *A*, v,34: *per un espay curt de temps*. It does not appear in the *Atlas*.

*rostre* (*A*, vi, 15). — Normally spelled *rostro* (e. g. *M*. xi, 10). All three dictionaries accept *rostro*.

*ruído* (*A*, II,2). — Belvitges refers under *ruído* to «soroll». Quint. gives as definition of *ruído*: «soroll». Labèrnia: *ruído*: «soroll, so fort». It does not appear in the *Atlas*.

*tullit* (*A*, iv, title). — Belvitges has *tulit*; Quint. has: *tulid*; Labèrnia has: *tulit*. Present day spelling is *tolit*. Prat seems to have been influenced by the Castilian *tullido*.

*b) arena* (*M*, viii, title). — Prat only uses *arena*, Belvitges gives both *arena* and *sorra*, as do Quint. and Labèrnia, the latter being described as «arena grossa». The *Atlas* shows that *arena* is used in the region of Prats del Rei, and that Moià, the birthplace of Prat's friend Busanya, lies on the border of *arena* and *sorra*.

*avesar* (*M*, xxi,5). — Belvitges refers to *acostumar*, which is the definition given by Quint. and Labèrnia of *avesar*. Prat only uses *avesar*.

*ca* (*M*, vii, title). — Belvitges refers the reader under *ca* to *gos*. This is the description of *ca* given by Quint. and Labèrnia. Prat only uses *ca*.

*esposallas* (*M*, xxii,2,3). — Belvitges refers the reader under *esposallas* to *bodas*. Quint. simply gives *esposallas*: «bòda». Labèrnia has both *esposallas* and *esposalls* = *esposals*: «mutua promesa de matrimoni». In *M*, xxii,2 it means the wedding preparations. In verse 3 the banquet.

*estany* (*M*, viii,12). — Belvitges gives: «llac». Quint. gives: «concavitat en la terra», without using the word *llac*. Labèrnia gives: «llach».

*fer fretura* (*R*, xxii,5). — Belvitges considers *fretura* «poco usado» and recommends *falta*. So do Quint. and Labèrnia.

*la messa* (*R*, xiv,15). — Belvitges only gives the plural: *messes*. Quint. considers *messes* a «voz antigua» for *sembrats* and recommends *messa*.

*mollesa* (*M*, xi,8). — Belvitges considers this a «voz antigua» for *blanura*. So does Quint. Labèrnia just gives the equivalent: «blanura».

*c) bossins*. — This is spelled as *bussins* in *M*, xvi,9 and xv,37, where the orthography is presumably affected by the pronunciation of the unstressed *o*. It only occurs in the sense of *bossi de pa*, cf. *P*, 52,5. It seems to be the Latin *buccinum* listed in Meyer Lübke (*REW*<sup>3</sup>, n° 1362) with outcomes in Provençal, Catalan and Basque; Gascon (Bearnese) has *bouci*: 'morceau,

petit bout; bouchée' (Simin Palay: *Dictionnaire du béarnais et du gascon modernes*).<sup>47</sup>

*cove* (*M*, XIV,20). — Quint. gives as *cove*: «cistell»; so does Labèrnia. It appears in the *Atlas* for the entire region.

*esberser* (*A*, VII,30). — Both Quint. and Labèrnia spell this as *esbarser* and give the Castilian equivalent *zarza*.

*escursó* (*A*, XXVIII,3). — Quint. gives it only as *escorsó*, Labèrnia both *escursó* and *escorsó*.

*gavella* (*M*, XIII,30). — This does not appear in Quint. either. It does in Labèrnia.

*gavia* (*R*, XVIII,2). — This does not appear in any of the dictionaries. It comes from the Latin *cavea*: 'prison, cage' (*REW*, n° 1789).

### III

#### THE REVISIONS MADE FOR THE THIRD AND FOURTH EDITIONS

##### A) *The alterations in the edition of 1836*

Graydon reported that the 1836 edition of the Catalan New Testament was «a faithful reprint [of the 1832 edition printed by Samuel Bagster], with certain orthographical and typographical corrections».<sup>48</sup> These «corrections» had been made by the printer, Antoni Bergnes de las Casas. Bergnes was an educated man. In addition to his substantial publishing activities he had a long career as a teacher. In 1830 he won the chair of French at the Escola d'Idiomes of the Barcelona Junta de Comerç, which he held until 1840; in 1836 he was appointed to the chair of Greek in the new Estudis Generals, which in 1837 became the University of Barcelona. This chair he held, with some variations in the conditions of tenure, for the rest of his life. He became a member of the Reial Acadèmia de Bones Lletres de Barcelona in 1836 and a corresponding member of the Real Academia Española in 1872. He also published two Greek grammars and two Greek anthologies.<sup>49</sup>

Bergnes' qualifications as corrector of the Catalan of the New Testament are not very clear. According to Olives i Canals he had received a thorough linguistic education. Among the many languages he studied (Latin, Greek,

47. 2 vols., Pau 1932.

48. Archives of the B. F. B. S., London. Quoted in *Minutes Committee*, vol. 26, M. 71, p. 51, from a letter by Graydon, Barcelona 21/1/1836, which is now missing.

49. S. OLIVES I CANALS, *Bergnes de las Casas, Helenista y Editor* (Barcelona 1947), Chaps III, IV, VIII and IX.

Castilian, French, German and English) there is no mention of Catalan. This did not, however, mean that he was indifferent to the language. From the account left by Joaquim M. Sanromà, who was one of his pupils a few years after the printing of the Barcelona Catalan New Testament, Catalan was his natural means of expression. Sanromà wrote,

«Mi profesor de Griego, D. Antonio Bergnes de las Casas pasaba, y con razón, por poseer como nadie el don de lenguas. Camus decía de él que sabía todos los idiomas menos el español, en lo cual, y sin hacerle agravio, se equivocaba de medio á medio el docto é ingeniosísimo catedrático de la Central. Bergnes conocía el español *literario* tan a fondo como el mejor hablista; lo que no conocía bien era el *familiar*, y no era extraño viviendo, como vivía, en un centro donde se habla el catalan á todo pasto.»<sup>50</sup>

Nevertheless Bergnes' experience in printing Catalan was extremely limited. At his initiative and in his printing business the first number of «El Vapor» had appeared on 22/3/1833 and it was in this paper on 24/8/1833 that Aribau's famous *Trobes*, later known as the *Oda a la Pàtria*, were published. Bergnes was to publish only one other Catalan work after the New Testament and that did not appear till 1875.<sup>51</sup>

The alterations Bergnes made can be grouped as follows:<sup>52</sup>

In *A*, xxv,5 the 1832 edition reads: *y si hi ha algun delict e en aquest home quel acusan*. Bergnes improves the reading by putting a comma after *home*, as the Vulgate and Scio do: ... *si quod est in viro crimen, accusent eum*; ... *algún delito en este hombre, acúsenle*.

In one instance Bergnes alters the division of the words: *del' Iglesia* becomes *de l'Iglesia* (*A*, xii,1).

*The use of the diaeresis*. — Bergnes uses consistently a diaeresis in *següent* (*dia següent, passim*), whereas the 1832 edition agrees with Belvitges who does not put it in.

In the case of *qüestió* Belvitges does have a diaeresis, but not so the 1832 edition. This is corrected by Bergnes who consistently puts it in (*A*, xv,2; xviii,15; xxv,20).

Both Belvitges and the 1832 edition are also corrected by Bergnes when he puts a diaeresis in the following: *eloqüent* (*A*, xviii,24), *frequentment* (*A*, xxvi,11) and *ungüents* (*R*, xviii,13).

Bergnes follows the 1832 edition in the use of the apostrophe everywhere,

50. JOAQUÍN M. SANROMÀ, *Mis Memorias* (Madrid 1887, 1894), I, 99.

51. N<sup>o</sup> 264 of the Catalogue as composed by OLIVES I CANALS, *op. cit.*, 256: *Poestas Catalanas* de Frederic Soler.

52. This comparison is based on an examination of the books used in the description of the 1832 edition, i. e. *Matthew*, *Acts*, 2<sup>nd</sup> *Epistle John*, 3<sup>rd</sup> *Epistle John*, *Epistle Jude* and *Revelation*.

except in the following case: in *A*, XI,19 *causa d'Esteve* becomes *causa de Esteve*.

The unstressed *a* is consistently spelled as *a* in the 1832 edition. In the following case it does not agree with Belvitges, perhaps a confusion caused by the frequency with which the unstressed *a* occurs: *al rodador* (*R*, IV,3,4,6; *R*, V,11; *R*, VII,11). Belvitges gives *rodedor* and Bergnes consistently corrects to *rodador*.

In *A*, XVII,16 Bergnes changes *mentres* into *mentras*, possibly under the influence of the Castilian *mientras*.

In a few cases the pronunciation of the unstressed *o* has its influence on the orthography:

The edition of 1832:		The edition of 1836:
<i>R</i> , XVIII,19:	<i>prorromperen</i>	<i>prorrumperen</i>
<i>Ep. Jude</i> , 23:	<i>aborrint</i>	<i>aburrint</i>
<i>A</i> , XXIII,14:	<i>bossi</i>	<i>bussi</i>
<i>M</i> , XV,20:	<i>bossins</i>	<i>bussins</i>

The 1832 edition has once *bussins* (*M*, XVI,9) and Bergnes copies this. Bergnes follows the 1832 edition in the use of the *y* except in two instances:

<i>R</i> , VII,17:	<i>aygua</i>	<i>aigua</i>
--------------------	--------------	--------------

Normally Bergnes writes *aygua* (e.g. *R*, XII,15)

<i>A</i> , XVI,16:	<i>Python</i>	<i>Pithon</i>
--------------------	---------------	---------------

*The spelling of b and v.* — The MS of the *Psalms* shows that Prat, probably because of Castilian influence, was inclined to write a *b* in the imperfect of a verb ending in *-ar*. There is a large number of instances where a *b* has been changed into a *v*. Since the changes are in Prat's own handwriting it seems reasonable to assume that this was a point he consciously watched for. Consequently it is not surprising that a few mistakes remained unnoticed. Even Bergnes became confused, as can be shown from the following:

<i>M</i> , XII,46:	<i>estaba</i>	<i>estava</i>
<i>idem</i> :	<i>estaban</i>	<i>estaban</i>
1 <sup>st</sup> <i>Ep. Peter</i> :	<i>administraban</i>	<i>administravan</i>
<i>R</i> , XX,10:	<i>enganyava</i>	<i>enganyaba</i>

Other instances of confusion between *b* and *v* are:

<i>M</i> , XXIII,15:	<i>haber</i>	<i>haver</i>
<i>A</i> , XIX,40:	<i>habenthi</i>	<i>haventhi</i>

On quite a few occasions we find *núbol* spelled with a *b* in the edition of 1832 (e. g. *A*, 1,9; *R*, x, title; *R*, x,1; xiv, 15,16; xi,12); yet in *R*, 1,7 it has *núvols*. Bergnes writes consistently *núvols*.

<i>R</i> , v, title:	<i>abans</i>	<i>avans</i>
<i>R</i> , xii,5:	<i>governar</i>	<i>gobernar</i>
<i>R</i> , xix,14:	<i>caballs</i>	<i>cavalls</i>

Yet in *R*, xix,18,21 the 1832 edition has *cavalls*.

1 <sup>st</sup> <i>Ep. Peter</i> :	<i>llabis</i>	<i>llavis</i>
------------------------------------	---------------	---------------

A case of confusion between initial *b* and *v* is to be found in *R*, xvi,6 where the 1832 edition has *veurer* and Bergnes writes *beurer*. Yet the 1832 edition has *beurer* in *R*, xviii,6.

*Final* -ch. —

<i>M</i> , viii, 30,32:	<i>porchs</i>	<i>porcs</i>
-------------------------	---------------	--------------

Yet Bergnes admits *anarch* (*R*, x,10):

<i>M</i> , viii,32:	<i>barranch</i>	<i>barranc</i>
---------------------	-----------------	----------------

Yet Bergnes admits *sanch* (*M*, xxiii,30 *et passim*). Both agree on *banch* (*M*, ix,9); *foch* (*passim*); *dich* (*passim*); *enemich* (*passim*); *amich* (*passim*); *lloch* (*passim*); *doméstich* (*M*, x,25); *foch* (*passim*); etc.

In *A*, xvi,23 the 1832 edition has *escarceller* where Bergnes writes *escarseller*. Yet four verses further down (*A*, xvi,27) he follows the 1832 edition: *escarceller*.

The reverse occurs in *R*, xv, title: the 1832 edition has *venseren* and Bergnes *venceren*. But both agree in *R*, xxi,7: *lo qui vensia*.

Belvitges spells the verb *regonéixer* with a *g*. The edition of 1832 agrees with him on this: *regonech* (*A*, x,34); *regoneix* (*A*, xxvi, title); *regoneixen* (*A*, xxiv,3). Bergnes prefers *reconech*, *reconeix* and *reconeixen*.

*Intervocalic h*. — The verb *ohir* is usually spelled with an *h* in the edition of 1832. Bergnes follows this, except on one occasion: *oir* (*M*, xiii,5). Yet he must have got so used to spelling it with an *h* that in one instance he puts it in when the 1832 edition leaves it out: *oidas* (*A*, xi,18) in the 1832 edition; Bergnes puts *ohidas*. But then four verses further down (*A*, xi, 22) both leave the *h* out: *oidos*.

The confusion as to whether *exhortar* should have an *h* is even greater. It is worth while remembering once more that Prat himself did not read the proofs, but that Vicenç Torras saw the work through its final stages and was given the task of rendering the orthography uniform. The part of



*Revelation* which is left in Prat's handwriting shows that Prat spelled *exortar* and that Torras put an *h* in. Yet on three occasions in *Acts* the edition of 1832 has no *h* whereas Bergnes puts it in:

<i>A</i> , XVIII,27:	<i>exortant</i>	<i>exhortant</i>
<i>A</i> , XI,23:	<i>exortava</i>	<i>exhortava</i>
<i>A</i> , XIII,15:	<i>exortació</i>	<i>exhortació</i>

But then in the *Second Epistle of Peter* the 1832 edition has the *h* put in: *exhorta*. This time Bergnes leaves it out: *exorta*.

Although in general Bergnes agrees with the 1832 edition on leaving in the *h* originating from the Greek in proper names, he decides to take it out on two occasions, though the first is probably a misprint:

<i>A</i> , XVII, 8:	<i>Filosopho</i>	<i>Filosopo</i>
<i>A</i> , XXVIII,13:	<i>Rhegio</i>	<i>Regio</i>

Yet in one instance the 1832 edition leaves it out and Bergnes puts it in:

<i>A</i> , XXI,29:	<i>Trofim</i>	<i>Trophim</i>
--------------------	---------------	----------------

Wherever the word *immediatament* occurs it is spelled with double *m* in the 1832 edition. Bergnes writes *nm* (e.g. *A*, XII,7; XVI,33).

*Initial qu- versus cu-* — Although Bergnes follows the edition of 1832 fairly consistently in writing *qual* with *qu*, he does make a number of changes:

<i>M</i> , I,16:	<i>de la qual</i>	<i>de la cual</i>
<i>M</i> , III,7 and <i>A</i> , VII,52:	<i>del qual</i>	<i>del cual</i>
<i>M</i> , XVI, 7:	<i>cada qual</i>	<i>cada cual</i>
<i>M</i> , XXIII,27 and 35:	<i>los quals</i>	<i>los cuales</i>
<i>M</i> , XXV, title and <i>R</i> , IX,3:	<i>las quals</i>	<i>las cuales</i>

In *A*, X,31 Bergnes changes the 1832 edition's *pregaria* into the Castilian *plegaria*.

In *R*, XVIII,23 Bergnes changes *antorxa* in the 1832 edition into *antorcha*, but in *R*, XXII,5 he follows the 1832 edition: *antorxa*.

These are the changes Bergnes made in the orthography. However, he took the work very seriously and went further than that. He catalanised *Aristarco* into *Aristarch* (*A*, XXVII,2), and in a few instances he altered the text. They are the following:

In *A*, VI,11 the 1832 edition reads: *li havian dit paraulas blasfemas*. The 1835 edition has already the correction: *li havian ohit dir paraulas blas-*

*femas*. Bergnes spotted that there was something wrong but puts: *li havian ohit paraulas blasfemas*. Presumably *dir* was left out by mistake.

In *A*, IX,20 the 1832 edition, presumably following the rule of concordance of time has: ... *predicava ... á Jesús, que est era lo Fill de Deu*. Bergnes changes this into: ... *que est es lo Fill de Deu*. He may have checked Scio, the Vulgate and even the Greek who have respectively: ... *que éste es el Hijo de Dios*; ... *quoniam hic est Filius Dei*, and *ὅτι οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς θεοῦ*. The same happens two verses later, in *A*, IX,22 where the 1832 edition has *era lo Christo*, whereas Scio, the Vulgate and the Greek have the present tense.

In *A*, XV,19 the 1832 edition has: *que no se incomodian als Gentils*. This is grammatically corrected by Bergnes into: *que no se incomodia als Gentils*. Cf. Scio: *que no se inquiete ...*

In *A*, XIX,4 the 1832 edition, though it may be a misprint, has *bateja*, in the present. Bergnes corrects *batejà*, the preterite, which is in the original version: *ἐβαπτισεν*. Cf. the Vulgate: *baptizavit* and Scio: *bautizó*.

#### B) *The alterations in the edition of 1888*

The edition of 1888 was to have only orthographic changes and by and large Palmer obeyed this instruction. The most important difference which one notices immediately when comparing the 1832 edition with that of 1888 is the much wider use of the apostrophe in the latter. But it should be remembered once more that the printed version of 1832 gives no indication of Prat's idea of the use of the apostrophe. However, few people, if any, were aware of this and it was Palmer's task to bring the spelling of the 1832 edition up to date.

**1. ORTHOGRAPHY.** — The orthographical changes can be grouped as follows:

a) **Syllable division.** — Although *ohir* usually has an *h* in the 1832 edition, there are quite a few instances in which it is left out. In all these cases it is put in in the 1888 edition (e.g. *M*, II,18; XI,15; *A*, VII,54; XXVIII,28).

Itches are also put in in the following cases: the edition of 1832 has in *M*, VIII,9 *constituit* which becomes *constituhit* in the 1888 edition. Equally *instruint* (*M*, XIII,52) becomes *instruhint*.

b) **Word division.** — 1) The accusative/dative form of the second personal pronoun plural *us*, preceded by the first personal pronoun singular

*jo* is joined to it in the 1832 edition but separated in the 1888 edition, e.g. *jous dich* (*passim*); *jous batejo* (*M*, III,9).

2) The same happens when *no* precedes *us*: *Y tot aquel que nous rebia...* (*M*, X,14). The 1888 edition separates them: *no us rebia*.

3) And again after the relative pronoun *que*: ... *feu be als queus aborreixen...* (*M*, V,44). The 1888 edition has: *que us aborreixen*.

4) It also occurs after the impersonal pronoun *se*: *seus donará* (*M*, X,14), for: *se us donará*, in the 1888 edition.

5) Finally, it happens after the relative pronoun *qui* followed by *us*: *qui us ha ensenyat* (*M*, III,7), which becomes: *qui us ha ensenyat*, in the 1888 edition.

The weak pronoun *ho*, when in enclitic position, is attached to the previous word. If this ends in a vowel, *ho*, is phonetically represented by an *u* in the 1832 edition:

*Qui sia capás d'aixó queu sia* (*M*, XIX,12). In the 1888 edition this becomes ... *que ho sia*.

*Nou sabem* (*M*, XXI,27) becomes: *no ho sabem*, in the 1888 edition.

*Si nou fos* (*M*, X,13) becomes: *si no ho fos*, in the 1888 edition.

c) **Elision**. — Personal pronouns and reflexive pronouns in the 1832 edition are joined to the preceding word; in most cases this is either another personal pronoun, a verb or the relative pronoun *que*.

In the case of a personal pronoun followed by another personal pronoun they are separated by an apostrophe when the following word starts with a consonant:

*jo't trauré* becomes *jo't trauré* (*M*, VII,4).

If the following word starts with an *h* or a vowel, the apostrophe is inserted between the second pronoun and the following word:

*jo ho diga* becomes *jo t'ho diga* (*M*, II,13).

Reflexive verbs have the conjugated form of the verb and the reflexive pronoun joined in the 1832 edition. They are separated in the 1888 edition by an apostrophe:

*alsat* becomes *alsa't* (*M*, II,13).

*estát* becomes *está't* (*M*, II,13).

Only on one occasion does the 1888 edition not separate the reflexive pronoun from the verb and that is in the Lord's prayer: ... *fassas la vostra voluntat* (*M*, VI,10).

The 1832 edition does not distinguish between the relative pronoun *que* followed by the third person reflexive pronoun *es* and the third person singular of the verb *ésser*. In both cases it is written *ques*. The edition of 1888 does make the distinction, e.g.:

...*ohit ques digué a vostres antepassats* (*M*, v,21) becomes *ohit que's digué a vostres antepassats*.

In: *¿ques lo que isqueren á veure?* (*M*, xi,8) the 1888 edition avoids the elision: *qu'es lo que...* and puts: *¿que es lo que isqueren á veure?*

The conjunction *que* and the relative pronoun *que* followed by the definite article *el* are written as one word in the 1832 edition. The 1888 edition separates them by an apostrophe:

*Tot alló que voleu quels homes fassan ...* (*M*, vii,12) becomes ... *que'ls homes fassan*.

Equally: ... *¿pochs son los quel troban [lo camí]* (*M*, vii,14) becomes: ...*que'l troban*.

*No* and *ni* followed by a reflexive verb have the pronoun attached to them in the 1832 edition. In the 1888 edition it is detached by an apostrophe when the verb starts with a consonant, and separated completely and then linked up with the verb by means of an apostrophe if the verb starts with an *h* or a vowel:

*nos pot ocultar* becomes *no's pot ocultar* (*M*, v,14).

*nis encen* becomes *ni s'encen* (*M*, v,15).

This is an improvement particularly in the third person of the reflexive verb since *nos* could be taken for the personal pronoun first person plural. The following example may illustrate this:

*¿Per ventura nos venen dos aucells per un diner...?* (*M*, x,29). The 1888 edition puts more clearly ... *no's venen*.

In the following cases the 1832 edition admits elision in the third person singular of the verb *ésser*:

... *nos digne de mi* (*M*, x,37). The 1888 edition puts much more clearly: ... *no es digne de mi*.

The same occurs in *M*, xiii, 55:

*¿Per ventura nos aquest lo Fill del fuster?* Again the 1888 edition gives: ... *no es aquest...*

Yet, in *M*, xii,2 we have a similar case:

*nos licit fer*; and this time the 1888 edition has: *no's licit fer*.

The conjunction *y* followed by the definite article appears as one word, *yl*, in the printed version of 1832. We know from the extant MS fragment and from the MS of the *Psalms* that Prat does, in fact, use an apostrophe here. The 1888 edition has constantly *y'l*.

d) **Phoneme representation.** — 1) *Vowels.* — In spite of the fact that Belvitges spells *mentres* with an *e*, the edition of 1832 has *mentras* (*A*, ii,35). The edition of 1888 has *mentres*.

Only in a few instances are there differences in transcribing the unstres-

sed *o*. In two cases the 1832 edition is wrong and the 1888 edition follows suit. In *M*, xv,37 and xvi,9 we find *bussins*. Yet both have *bossins* in *M*, xiv,20.

In *M*, xxiii,4, where the 1832 edition has *insuportable*, the 1888 edition has *insoportable*.

Whether to spell *fruyt* with an *i* or a *y* seems to have been a problem. The 1832 edition seems at first to have favoured *fruyt*. In *A*, xviii, title the 1832 edition gives then *fruyt*, as does the 1888 edition. But in *A*, 'xxi,19 both have *fruit*. The MS of the *Psalms* shows that Prat must have been confused on this point, even though Belvitges only gives *fruyt*. In *P*, 20,10 we find *fruits*. In *P*, 57,11 *fruyt*.

The *i*-*y* problem also occurs in the spelling of names. In *M*, xi,21 the 1832 edition has *Bethsaida*, the 1888 edition has *Bethsayda*.

In *M*, xi,21 the 1832 edition has *Tiro y Sidon*, whereas the edition of 1888 has *Tyro y Sydon*. But in the next verse the 1832 edition has *Tyro y Sidon*. The 1888 edition puts consistently *Tyro y Sydon*. In *A*, xii, one finds it the other way around in the 1832 edition: *Tiro y Sydon*. The 1888 edition remains consistent: *Tyro y Sydon*.

In *A*, xxi, title the 1832 edition has *Lisias*, whereas the edition of 1888 has *Lysias*. In *A*, xxiii, title the 1832 edition has this time *Lysias*; so does the 1888 edition.

2) *Consonants*. — Use of *b* and *v*; only in a few instances inconsistencies are to be found. In *M*, xii,46 the 1832 edition has *estaba*, the 1888 edition *estava*. Yet both editions have *estaban* in *M*, xx,3 and 6.

In *M*, xvi,12 the 1832 edition has *habia*, whereas the 1888 edition has *havia*. But then both editions have *haber* in *M*, xxiii,15.

*A*, xix,40 of the 1832 edition has in the same verse *habent* and *havent*. The 1888 edition has consistently *havent*.

The name of the prophet *Agabus* is spelled *Agavo* in the edition of 1832. The 1888 edition has *Agabo*.

Although the 1832 edition usually writes a *ch* for a final **k** sound, an exception is made for *Isaac* (*M*, 1,2; viii,11; *A*, vii, 32). The 1888 edition gives *Isaach* in these cases.

Once we find the reverse for the initial **k** sound: in *A*, xiii, 19, the 1832 edition has *Chanda*, the 1888 edition has *Canaan*.

Wherever the word *goitg* appears in the 1832 edition, (e.g.: *M*, xiii, 20; *A*, ii,28 and xi,23) it has a *t*. The 1888 edition takes it out and puts *goig*.

In *M*, vii, title, of the 1832 edition we find *exorta*. An *h* is put in in the 1888 edition. It must have escaped Torras's attention, for in the extant fragment of the MS of the *Letters of the Apostles* the *h* is consistently put in (e.g. *First Epistle St. John*, ii, title).

The 1832 edition has *immediatament*, as in Belvitges. The 1888 edition has *inmediatament* (e.g. *M*, VIII,3).

In *A*, XIII,50 there is an *x* in *expelliren*. The 1888 edition follows the pronunciation and has *espelliren*.

On the whole there is little confusion between initial *cu-* and *qu-*. Only in two instances there is an alteration: *A*, X,12 has *lo qual* in the 1832 edition and *lo cual* in that of 1888. In *M*, XVII,26 the edition of 1832 has *cuatre*, which in the 1888 edition is corrected: *quatre*.

*Axi* in the 1832 edition is constantly turned into *aixi* in the 1888 edition. However, the extant MS fragment of *Revelation* shows that Prat himself also wrote *aixi* (I,7). Belvitges has *axi*. Both versions agree on *aixó*. Belvitges has *axó*.

Equally, we find that the 1832 edition has *exir* for *eixir* in the 1888 edition (e.g. *M*, VIII, 28 and 32). But again the MS of *Revelation* shows that Prat in fact wrote *eixir*. Belvitges has *exir*.

In *M*, XIII,8 and 23 the 1832 edition has the numeral 60 spelled *sexanta*, as Ballot does. In the edition of 1888 there is a double change and it appears as *xixanta*.

The island Cyprus is spelled *Xipre* in the 1832 edition (e.g.: *A*, XI,;20 XIII,4). The 1888 edition changes it into *Chipre*.

An interesting case, though it may be a misprint, is the following: in *A*, XXI in the title the 1832 edition has *treballs*. This is spelled in the 1888 edition as *treballts*. If it is not a misprint, it could point to the swallowing of the *ll* in popular speech. The Linguistic *Atlas* gives no help on this point.

**2. MORPHOLOGY.** — Although Palmer, the editor of the 1888 edition, was not to touch the 1832 edition on any other point but spelling, there was one point of grammar in Prat's version which by 1888 must have become totally unacceptable. This was the ending of the verb in the present subjunctive. Prat, who, as already pointed out, does not follow Ballot in this respect, lets it end in *-ia*, whereas the 1888 edition gives constantly *-i*. Only on one occasion the 1888 edition, probably due to an oversight, copies Prat: *beguia* (*M*, XXIV, 29).

The 1832 edition has in *M*, X,26: *perqué res hi ha encubert, que no s'hajia de descobrir*; Ballot prescribes *haja*, which is the form printed in the 1888 edition.

One more alteration is to be found in *M*, VIII,9. Here the 1832 edition gives as the imperative singular of *fer*, *fes*, which is in agreement with Ballot. The edition of 1888 gives *feix*.

3. VOCABULARY. — In *A*, III,21 we find a third person singular subjunctive of *rebre*, *rebia*. This is altered in the 1888 edition into *recibi*, clearly a castilianism with a Catalan ending.

The edition of 1832 has *polls* (*M*, XXIII,37), which is perfectly acceptable as a translation of *pullus*... It occurs as such in Belvitges. However, the edition of 1888 gives the diminutive *pollets*, which also occurs in Belvitges. The Linguistic *Atlas* has *poll* and *pollet* on the same map. Both in the same place in most locations in central Catalonia.

4. CHANGES IN THE TEXT. — In one instance only was the text altered, and that was in the title of *M*, XVII, where the edition of 1832 reads: *Jesus paga lo tribut al César*. This is changed into: *Jesus paga lo tribut del temple*.

TINE BARRASS

Cambridge.