

SIDELIGHTS ON GEORGE BORROW'S GYPSY *LUKE*

**Mrs. Ann Ridler**, who lives in Oxford, is a linguist engaged in research on George Borrow (1803-1881) as a linguist.

The opening pages of Borrow's *Embéo e Majaró Lucas* seem to be self-explanatory, the title-page indicating in *caló* or Spanish Romani that the gospel was "First written in the Greek language, now cast into the Romani, or language of the Gypsies of Spain . . . 1837", with a note overleaf, also in *caló*, that "This book was cast into Calo-Romani by GEORGE BORROW, a servant of the Bible Society, in the city of Badajoz on the frontier of Portugal, in the winter of the Year of our Lord 1836." There follows, in Greek characters, the singularly apt quotation from Rom 15.24: *Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you: for I trust to see you in my journey.* From various sources, however, a less straightforward picture emerges. Although in the note cited above Borrow refers solely to Badajoz (where he spent only ten days from 6 to 16 January 1836)<sup>1</sup>, it is clear elsewhere that he completed the gospel at Madrid,<sup>2</sup> and though little besides *Luke* has survived he claims in one place to have translated the greater part of the New Testament<sup>3</sup> but elsewhere that he translated the whole of it.<sup>4</sup>

Borrow's interest in *caló* may be traced in his letters to the Bible Society<sup>5</sup>. Encountering Spanish Gypsies less than twenty-four hours after crossing the frontier, he gives a characteristic impression of linguistic virtuosity: "We began conversing in the Spanish dialect of this language, with which I was tolerably well acquainted." During his stay in Badajoz he "translated certain portions of Scripture into their dialect", which he frequently read to them, "especially the parables of Lazarus and the Prodigal Son."<sup>6</sup>

Writing from Madrid in mid-February, Borrow announced that he had so far mastered the Spanish Gypsy dialect as "to be able to translate into it with tolerable ease."<sup>7</sup> He wanted either to return to Badajoz or go to Granada to complete his translation "with the assistance of the Gypsies of those places", but was to remain in Madrid until just after the Revolution of La Granja in August 1836, when he travelled south to visit the Gypsies at Granada before sailing for England.

The Bible Society also received from Borrow in February Lk 15 translated into *caló*, with "Specimens of the Horrid Curses in use amongst the Spanish Gypsies".<sup>8</sup> The Sub-Committee evidently reserved the curses for its own

<sup>1</sup> William I. Knapp, *Life, writings and correspondence of George Borrow*. 2 vols. London: John Murray 1899, I, 240-1.

<sup>2</sup> George H. Borrow, *The Zincali: an account of the Gypsies of Spain*. London: John Murray 1901 (2nd impression; 1st ed. 1841), 275-280.

<sup>3</sup> George H. Borrow, *The Bible in Spain; or, The journeys, adventures, and imprisonments of an Englishman in an attempt to circulate the Scriptures in the Peninsula*. London: John Murray 1899 (1st ed. 1843), 519.

<sup>4</sup> *The Zincali*, 279

<sup>5</sup> *Letters of George Borrow to the British and Foreign Bible Society*, ed. T. H. Darlow. London: Hodder and Stoughton 1911.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 166-171.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 145.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 143.

delectation but on 1 March 1836 authorised Borrow “to print this specimen [i.e. Lk 15], and other single chapters in the same dialect . . . and that he inform the Committee of the results as they arise.” The Society was understandably cautious. Borrow had not previously engaged in Bible translation, his work in St Petersburg on the Manchu New Testament having been confined to transcription and editing. Moreover the people for whom the translation was intended were largely illiterate, and although Borrow had not concealed his deep interest in Gypsies, his main task was to achieve the circulation of the scriptures in Spanish. Hence Mr Brandram wrote, “You will be doing well in occupying leisure hours with this work; but we are not prepared for printing anything beyond portions at present.”<sup>9</sup>

Borrow noted in July 1836 that he had “corrected and improved” his translation of the Lord’s Prayer into *caló*<sup>10</sup>, but his report to the Bible Society in October 1836 made no mention of Gypsies, nor of his proposed translation, and when he next raised the matter it was in a second postscript to his letter of 27 February 1837, announcing that his translation of *Luke* was “nearly ready for the press”. He added, “It is my intention to subjoin a vocabulary of all the words used, with an explanation in the Spanish language.”<sup>11</sup> He must have known that this would be alien to the Bible Society’s principle of circulating the unadorned text, and there is more than a hint of wilfulness in the casual tail-piece. The Committee however resolved “to authorise Mr. Borrow to print 250 copies of the Gospel of St. Luke, without the Vocabulary, in the Rummanee dialect . . .”<sup>12</sup>

Publication was further delayed, since from January to April 1837 he was seeing the Spanish New Testament through the press at Madrid, and from May to November was away on a tour of northern Spain. On Christmas Day 1837, however, we catch a glimpse of him exercising “the most strict surveillance” over the compositors who were entirely ignorant of *caló*, and although 1837 appears on the title page, the gospel was not ready until late January or early February 1838, when a copy was dispatched to London.

Borrow had earlier formed the intention of enlisting the help of the Gypsies<sup>13</sup>, and seems to have hit on a translation method remarkably similar to that described in Euan Fry’s paper “An Oral Approach to Translation”, published in this journal in April 1979 (pp. 214-7), both in its team approach and the actual technique of achieving a group translation.

I commenced (he says) with Pepa and Chicharona. Determined that they should understand it, I proposed that they themselves should translate it. They could neither read nor write, which, however, did not disqualify them from being translators. I had myself previously translated the whole Testament into the Spanish Rommany but I was desirous to circulate amongst the Gitános, a version conceived in the exact language in which they express their ideas. The women made no objection . . . We commenced with Saint Luke: they rendering into Rommany the sentences which I delivered to them

<sup>9</sup> Knapp, I, 254.

<sup>10</sup> Darlow (ed.), 166.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 205.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 8 and 145.

in Spanish. They proceeded as far as the eighth chapter, in the middle of which they broke down. Was that to be wondered at? The only thing which astonished me was, that I had induced two such strange beings to advance so far in a task so unwonted, and so entirely at variance with their habits, as translation . . .

I completed the translation, supplying deficiencies from my own version, begun at Badajoz in 1836 . . .<sup>14</sup>

He adopted similar methods with the Gypsies at Cordoba in December 1836 to produce a translation of the Apostles' Creed, noting that it was "in this cautious manner that I first endeavoured to divert the attention of these singular people to matters of eternal importance."<sup>15</sup>—Yet if he had already translated part of *Luke* it is curious that he did not try out his version on the Cordovese Gypsies.

Possibly, then, Borrow did not translate at Badajoz much more than the thirty-two verses of Lk 15 containing the parables of the lost sheep and the prodigal son, and that of Dives and Lazarus from Lk 16—surely most sensitively chosen for his Gypsy audience. However "tolerably" he felt he could translate into *caló*, it is hard to believe that he could have tackled the whole gospel at all convincingly without help, let alone the entire Testament.<sup>16</sup> He could scarcely have "supplied deficiencies" in the Gypsies' version from his own, except in the limited sense of adding the remaining sixteen and a half chapters, and it is unlikely that he prepared his final text without further consulting the Gypsies. It is clear also from his account that the first seven and a half chapters at least were based not on the Greek but on the Spanish version, most probably that by Scio, which he saw through the press for the Bible Society. It seems that no appraisal of Borrow's translation was sought, and indeed the Society would have found it difficult to appoint a competent adviser in *caló* at that stage.

The distribution and reception of the Gypsy *Luke* are beyond the scope of this paper, but one may note that the edition was not of 250 copies as authorised and as quoted by Wise in his *Bibliography*<sup>17</sup>. Borrow himself reported in July 1839 that 286 copies remained unsold, and in *The Zincali* mentioned that 500 copies were printed.<sup>18</sup>

By September 1839 political circumstances were such that the door to further circulation of the scriptures in Spain was closed. The remaining copies were shipped to England, Borrow himself returning for good in the following April.

There the matter might be thought to have ended, and for just over thirty years nothing much was heard of the Gypsy *Luke*, until on 27 January 1870 the Rev. S. B. Bergne received at Bible House a letter from a Rev. Dr. Knapp in Madrid, in which he wrote:

<sup>14</sup> *The Zincali*, 279-280.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 201-202. Borrow's statement conflicts with his assertion in *The Bible in Spain*, 105-106, that it was at Badajoz that he first preached the gospel to the Gypsy people.

<sup>16</sup> Carlos Claveria, "Gitano-Andaluz *Devel, Undevel*?" in *Romance Philology* (University of California Press) 2 (1), August 1948, 45f., n.41.

<sup>17</sup> T. J. Wise, *A bibliography of the writings in prose and verse of George Henry Borrow*. London: Dawsons, rep. 1966, 65.

<sup>18</sup> Darlow (ed.), 281

I have since come upon a copy of Borrow's gipsy version of St. Luke, 1837, without name of printer or place where printed. I hope to do good service with it. I wish you would reprint it here. It would find a large sale in Andalusia among the 'aficionados' as well as Gipsies—classes who would only begin the reading of the Word when prompted by *curiosity* to read *Roman/els*. I think an effort should be made to translate the four Gospels into that Dialect, which can easily be done now here.<sup>19</sup>

This was undoubtedly the William Ireland Knapp, then living in Spain, who was to become Borrow's first biographer and champion.<sup>20</sup> The reply on 11 February came from the Editorial Superintendent, R. B. Girdlestone:

Your proposal to reprint St Luke in the Gipsy language has been discussed by our Editorial Subcommittee. This morning I have been looking through the Gospel. I find that instead of being as it (by implication) professes to be on the title page a translation from the Greek it is a translation either from the Vulgate or from Scio. Even in the division of the verses it follows the Vulgate . . . There is however one important exception; viz. the Lord's Prayer xi. 2 etc. in wh. he has followed the Greek except in the last clause.

Then as to matters of translation, *penitencia* for *repentance* throughout. Vi. 4 'Bread of proposition' for shewbread. Vii. 27 'angel' for 'messenger'.

There are other points in the Gospel to be observed, e.g. the absence of italics . . . Again what is the exact meaning of *muchobe* (to baptize)? *Debel* (God)? Note that un-Debel (a God) is used in iii.38, v.21. Words are inserted here and there; e.g. iii. 21 [a Debel]. Again *Peniche* is the Holy Ghost; but in iv.1 and 14 la suncai 'the spirit' with a small s; whereas in v.18 it has a large S. I also casually noted . for : at the end of iv.7.

I hardly think on the whole that the Committee could be recommended to reprint the book as it stands. Do you however know of anyone competent to go through it & to bring it into accordance with the Greek? & after all, when this is done, would it be really worthwhile to reprint it, merely to satisfy the curiosity of the few, when all who could read it could also read Spanish? . . .<sup>21</sup>

Dr Knapp's reply to this eminently sensible letter was received at Bible House on 7 March 1870:

About the Gitano Gospel. My object was simply to reprint it, just as it is, knowing well that an attempt at a revisal, would be attended with an expense wholly impracticable. We have here a perfect Gipsy scholar, who speaks English too, & who could make a new version under competent direction. He has already published a Grammar of the Gitano, and some Tales in that dialect to serve as a Chrestomathy.<sup>22</sup> Now to your questions. I answer them from my own knowledge of the Gipsy Dialects in general, of which I have studied three, English, Spanish & Turkish Gipsy some years ago in connec-

<sup>19</sup>Bible Society Archives: Agents Book no. 126 (Spain and Portugal), 233. Thanks are due to the Bible Society for permission to quote this and other passages from its archives.

<sup>20</sup>The clerk-copyist wrote 'W. J. Knapp', but there can be no doubt that this was the William Ireland Knapp (1835-1908) mentioned in the *Dictionary of American Biography* as a "very brilliant linguist", and referred to as Professor Knapp in the BFBS's Report of 1870.

<sup>21</sup>Bible Society Archives: Editorial Correspondence Outwards, vol. 3, 190.

<sup>22</sup>Possibly Francisco de Sales Mayo ("Quindalé"), whose *El Gitanismo* . . . was published at Madrid in 1867, 1869, and 1870.

tion with my former Department of Comparative Philol. in America. Muchobelar 'to baptize' means *to wash, to sprinkle*. Debel 'God' is the usual word, sometimes interchanged with *Undebel* which is a more *ancient* form, nor of the Span. art. un 'one', but is the well known Oriental Hom. On . . . denoting the 'ever existing'<sup>23</sup>. It is therefore properly 'On-Devel' (The On God). Devel is the Sanscrit Dēva the Gr and Lat theos. Deus. Peniche is the technical word 'Holy Spirit'. Suncai means 'mind' 'spirit' though may be used for Peniche but as you say should be written with init. cap.

I cannot ascertain how many gipsies there are in all Spain . . . I only thought they might be attracted first by curiosity to the Word by this means, & that subsequently, an interest in its import might spring up. A great number of Spaniards also would buy the Gipsy Gospel as a matter of curiosity, and I thought that we might thus lay hold of this arm of the natural heart, & perhaps save some . . .<sup>24</sup>

Having heard this letter, the Editorial Sub-Committee at its meeting on 30 March 1870

Resolved, to recommend that St Luke in the Gipsy Dialect of Spain be reprinted in Madrid, that 1000 copies be struck off, but that before any other step is taken, the Superintendent confer with Mr. George Borrow on the subject.<sup>25</sup>

Borrow had moved to London with his family in 1860, but since his wife's death in January 1869 had lived alone. At the age of sixty-six he was in many ways much changed since those "most happy years" he spent in Spain.

Initially progress with the revised edition was rapid. Mr Girdlestone visited Borrow and reported in April 1870 that he "had undertaken to go carefully through the Gipsy St Luke before it was reprinted."<sup>26</sup> Two months later, members were informed that he had completed the revision, which would shortly be ready for the printer, whereupon the Sub-Committee "Resolved to recommend that an edition of 500 be printed in London in a good clear type."<sup>27</sup>

Doubtless the nature of Borrow's revisions had caused the Bible Society to decide to print in London rather than Madrid. Any further correspondence between its Officers and Dr Knapp has not been preserved, but it seems that the man who was to do more than any other to establish Borrow's reputation was never put directly in touch with Borrow, though correspondence might easily have passed between them via the Bible Society.

Before the revised edition appeared there was a very lengthy delay. Wise's *Bibliography* (p. 65) refers to a second edition of 1871, and a third of 1872, bearing the same imprint and with the same collation, but the Bible Society's records do not bear out publication of two further editions.<sup>28</sup> It appears rather that proofs were set up bearing 1871 on the title-page, corrected subsequently

<sup>23</sup> Knapp either had not seen, or disagreed with, A. F. Pott's judgement in his *Die Zigeuner* (Halle 1844) that this was a false derivation (cf. Claveria, article cit., 36).

<sup>24</sup> Bible Society Archives: Editorial Correspondence Book no. 7, 191.

<sup>25</sup> Bible Society Archives: Editorial Sub-Committee Minutes, 30 March 1870, Min. 20.

<sup>26</sup> Bible Society Archives: Editorial Sub-Committee Minutes, 27 April 1870, Minute 3.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 29 June 1870, Min. 29.

<sup>28</sup> Clement K. Shorter in his *George Borrow and his circle* (London: Hodder and Stoughton 1913) says "Two later copies in my possession bear on their title pages 'Lundra, 1871' and 'Lundra, 1872'" (187 n.), and no doubt these were the source of Wise's statement.

to 1872 because of the book's delayed appearance. A year after Mr Girdlestone's first visit to Borrow he was to write apologetically:

My Dear Sir,—I have been hoping to see you or hear from you with regard to the Gypsy St. Luke. Do not let my mistake in inking up your pencil marks hinder the poor Gypsies from reading the Gospel of our Lord. I made what amends I could, and at some trouble, in the hope that I might shortly receive from you the copy in such a form as that the printer might take it in hand.<sup>29</sup>

The revisions Borrow made to the Gypsy *Luke* were very extensive, e.g. Lk 1.1:

1837 *Acána que sares han penchabado chibar de pacuaró a narracion es buchías que andré amángue han sinado quereladas.*

1872 *Pre bausale que butres han penchabado chibar de pacuaró a pista es buchías que enré amangue han sinado pachibeladas:*

His efforts were clearly directed towards achieving a "purer" *caló* less adulterated than his first version by Hispanicisms<sup>30</sup>, and much of the revision was done through a succession of proofs. The Romany Collection in Leeds University Library has a proof copy marked "20th revise, 20 June 1872"<sup>31</sup>, an indication of the amount of trouble Borrow gave both himself and the printer. Mr Girdlestone, who seems to have treated him with great patience and tact, must have discussed with him the fact that the original version was based on the Vulgate, yet the extant British Museum Reading Room slip bearing Borrow's signature, dated 12 April 1872, applying for the *Biblia Graeca et Latina*, 5 vols. Basel 1550<sup>32</sup> suggests that he was comparing the Greek and Latin versions against his own at a relatively late stage.

The Sixty-Ninth Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society, 1873, recorded that the Spanish Gypsy *Luke* had been "re-translated, and printed under the editorship of Mr. G. Borrow, the translator".<sup>33</sup> It appeared in December 1872, and on 16 January 1873 Mr Girdlestone wrote to convey to Borrow the Committee's special thanks:

I have explained to them what little I could concerning the exceeding difficulties of the work, and I also told them how frequently you had journeyed from the West End of London to the East, in order to communicate personally with the printer, so as to secure the accuracy of the edition.<sup>34</sup>

How Borrow had achieved so extensive a revision after an absence of thirty years from Spain, lacking any contact with Spanish Gypsies, and from what source he drew the enlarged vocabulary reflected in the revised translation, remains a mystery. He could by now have consulted in the British Museum

<sup>29</sup> Knapp, II, 232-233, letter of 7 March 1871.

<sup>30</sup> Claveria, article cit. 45 n. 41, refers to "Borrow's endeavour to 'gitanicize' at áll costs the Castilian words in the original printed text". Claveria bases his criticisms on the 1837 text, not that of 1872.

<sup>31</sup> *Catalogue of the Romany Collection, University of Leeds*. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons 1962, no. 885, 154.

<sup>32</sup> Shorter, 230

<sup>33</sup> BFBS, 69th Report 1873, 411.

<sup>34</sup> Darlow (ed.), 471.

Reading Room several Spanish Romani vocabularies later than his own<sup>35</sup>, though they were not all of much value for his purpose, and in several instances incorporated his own work without acknowledgement. No record of the works he used survives, nor is there any record of Knapp's reaction to the revised version when he received it in Madrid. If he felt disappointed that he had not been able to supervise the second edition himself, or that the "perfect Gipsy scholar" had not been consulted, he says nothing of this in his *Life* of Borrow. Of the first edition, he was to write: "Of this work we can say less than it deserves. Since it was the first specimen of a book ever attempted in any Gypsy dialect, we must consider that Borrow had no models to aid him; so that on the whole it is a creditable performance."<sup>36</sup> Knapp refers to the second edition as a "formidable undertaking, since it involved a complete reconstruction of his translation"<sup>37</sup>, but of his own role in initiating its publication he says nothing. The Bible Society's Sixty-Ninth Report did however record that "satisfactory tidings" had been received concerning its acceptance among the gypsies.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to offer a detailed linguistic comparison of the two editions, but some curious features of the 1872 edition merit brief comment. One such is that on eighteen occasions Borrow inserts an alternative rendering in brackets. Sometimes it is a proper noun, e.g. *Simprofie* (*Joseph*) (1.27); sometimes the Spanish equivalent, e.g. *La Lachi Nevipen* (*Evangelio*) "Gospel" (4.18—in the 1837 edition this was *lachias nuevas*); sometimes it is an alternative *caló* rendering, e.g. *daschmanuces* (*enormes*) "enemies" (1.71); and on occasion the Romani seems to be what John Sampson called "a curious Borrovian variety"<sup>38</sup>. Thus in 1.9 *inciense* "incense" becomes *usur-gudlo* (*inciense*) "sweet smoke", though *gudlo* is not a Spanish Romani form<sup>39</sup>, and *usur* appears nowhere except in Pott, who took it from Borrow without comment. *Berribuion* "Legion" (8.30) would also appear to be a Borrovian coinage, formed presumably from *beribu* "multitude", listed in Borrow's Gypsy Vocabulary in *The Zincali*.

Another curiosity is the rendering of *Pontius Pilate*, as in 3.1. In his *Romano Lavo-Lil* "Word-Book of the Romany" of 1874, devoted to English Romani, Borrow inserts in a chapter on "Gypsy Names" a lengthy digression on the Spanish Gypsy rendering of Spanish *Poncio Pilato*, which he gives as *Brono Aljenicato* (properly *Aljeñicato*). His account of the process of loan-translation whereby *Pontius Pilate* = *puente pila* "bridge-fountain" = *Brono Aljenicato* because "*Brono* is connected with the Sanscrit *pindala*, which

<sup>35</sup> The possibilities were: A. F. Pott, *Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien* 2 vols., Halle 1844; R. Campuzano, *Orioen, Usos y Costumbres de les Jitanos y Diccionario de su Dialecto*. Madrid 1848; D. A. de C., *Diccionario del dialecto gitano* Barcelona 1851; A. Jiménez, *Vocabulario del dialecto jitano*. Seville 1853; and the work of de Sales Mayo (see n. 22 above). Trujillo's *Vocabulario del dialecto gitano*, Madrid 1844, is not listed in the British Museum General Catalogue.

<sup>36</sup> Knapp, I, 272.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 232.

<sup>38</sup> George H. Borrow, *The Romany Rye*. London: Methuen 1903, xxix.

<sup>39</sup> De Sales Mayo gives *guló* as the Spanish Gypsy form. *Gudló*, according to A. G. Paspati (*Etudes sur les Tchinghianés ou Bohémiens de l'Empire ottoman*. Constantinople 1870) is the Roumelian Gypsy form, but it could equally be an Hispanicized rendering of English Romani *gódlo* (see B. C. Smart and H. T. Crofton, *The dialect of the English Gypsies*. London: Asher & Co. 1875).

signifies a bridge, and *Aljenicato* is a modification of the Gypsy *aljenique*, derived from the Arabic *al-ain*, which signifies a fountain” need not detain us, odd as it is. Curiously, however, neither the 1837 edition of the Gospel nor Borrow’s transcription of the Creed translated by the Gypsies of Cordoba<sup>40</sup> uses the term *Brono Aljeñicato*, although it occurs mistranscribed in the vocabulary in *The Zincali* as *Brono Alieñicato*<sup>41</sup>, and in another version of the Creed ascribed by Borrow to the *afición* of Seville<sup>42</sup>. The term appears in Gitano vocabularies from R. Campuzano’s *Diccionario* of 1848 on, in the form Brono Arjeñicato (substitution of *r* for *l* commonly occurs), but these may have taken it from Borrow. Certainly in the 1840s Borrow did not know the origin of the term, for he inserts a footnote in *The Zincali* to that effect.<sup>43</sup>

The Bible Society’s Correspondence Books include among letters received from agents in Spain, the following addressed from a Mr T. Gladstone to Mr R. Corfield (dated Madrid, 10 June 1873):

I do not hold myself to be a Romani scholar, although some 30 years ago I took the pains to copy out a whole dictionary of that language<sup>44</sup>. The mistake in the Gospel of Luke that I named to you the other day is in Luke 10.1, where the translation has evidently followed the Vulgate saying ‘efterdi ta dui’, that is 72 instead of ‘efterdi’ 70. The same occurs again in Luke 10.17. The Received Text gives 70 as the number of the disciples. This leads one to the next verse Luke 10.2. The note of admiration should be a simple colon. I turn to Luke 16.3, and observe that the lord of the unjust steward is written with a capital letter Erañó, the same in verse 5. This being the title of our Lord himself, who tells the parable, produces confusion.

Luke 16.22 The angels have also a capital letter. I have not looked further, but the impression produced, is, that in any future edition some careful revision might be well in carrying this book thro’ the press. [!]<sup>45</sup>

Mr Girdlestone would have taken care to check that the text now conformed with the Greek, but the Editorial Sub-committee had either not noticed or chosen not to press the matter, and the ghost of the Vulgate was not to be laid.

The use of the Vulgate as a basis for translation had been a hotly controversial subject for the Bible Society, from the late 1830s when the Trinitarian Society first raised an outcry about it, until at least the mid-1870s, as numerous pamphlets attest. The Bible Society had to some extent yielded but not totally capitulated, and Girdlestone would have been understandably sensitive to the risk of criticism if the Society were to countenance a new edition based on the Vulgate. As Knapp indicates, however, when Borrow was in Spain the situation was different—“The Roman Catholic version of the Spanish Scriptures by Scio de San Miguel had, then, very properly been fixed on by the Society as the authorized text of the country and the only one likely to prove acceptable to the people.”<sup>46</sup> The storm did not really break until more than a year after the

<sup>40</sup> *The Zincali*, 418-419.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid*, 372, whence Pott accepted it into his vocabulary in *Die Zigeuner*, vol. 2, 433.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid*, 416-417 and preamble 415.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid*, 417.

<sup>44</sup> That of Borrow or Pott?

<sup>45</sup> Bible Society Archives: Editorial Correspondence Book no. 9, 331-332.

<sup>46</sup> Knapp, I, 247.

first publication of the *Gypsy Luke*, and there is some echo of this in Borrow's letter of 28 June 1839 to Mr Brandram<sup>47</sup>: "Those who decry the Vulgate should please to remember that, though adopted by the Popish Church, its foundation was laid before Popery existed . . ." Even if Brandram realised that Borrow's translation was based on the Vulgate text, he would probably not have been unduly alarmed in 1838.

As for the motivation of Borrow himself, the nature of his religious principles is often hard to define, and the element of deception involved originally in presenting a Gospel version as if translated from the Greek when it was not, and as if produced wholly at Badajoz when this was untrue, verges uncomfortably on sacrilege.

Borrow elected to close his 1837 translation with the words

*SABOCA ENRECAR DEBEL ERERIO.  
Chachipé.*

The first sentence is a variant on the ancient prayer Borrow interprets for the one-eyed Gypsy<sup>48</sup>: *Saboca Enreacar María Eréria*—so may be interpreted as "Dwell within us, blessed God". Even here, he was transgressing the Bible Society's principle of not adding to the text. The final word, *Chachipé*, means "Truth", and there the matter may rest.

<sup>47</sup> Darlow (ed.), 421.

<sup>48</sup> *The Zincali*, 278-279.

## REVIEWS

- C. C. de Bruin (ed.): **Vetus Testamentum: Pars Secunda (1 Paralipomenon—Ecclesiasticus)**. (Corpus sacrae scripturae neerlandicae medii aevi: series maior, tomus I). Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1978. x + 404 pp. Price: 100 guilders.
- C. C. de Bruin (ed.): **Pars Tertia (Isaias—II Machabaeorum)**. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1978. x + 408 pp. Price: 100 guilders.
- C. C. de Bruin (ed.): **Novum Testamentum devotionis modernae**. (Corpus sacrae scripturae neerlandicae medii aevi: series maior, tomus II, Volumen II). Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1979. xii + 337 pp. Price: 96 guilders.

These three volumes are the fruit of an excellent initiative to publish a complete fourteenth century Dutch Bible translation from the Vulgate. The major part of the translation presented in the first volume dates from 1360 and was prepared by an anonymous Carthusian monk in Brabant. If the text of Psalms does not come from the same translator, it stems at least from a circle closely connected with him. Only the rendering of 1-2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah has been taken from the so-called Delft Bible of 1477 since no complete manuscript of these books was available. A similar picture prevails in the second volume: the minor prophets and Baruch and Ezekiel are taken from the Delft Bible whereas all other books represent the translation of 1360. The translation of the New Testament, presented in the third volume, is most probably from the hand of the devotionalist Johan Scutken and it was prepared in the last decade of the fourteenth century.

One is almost tempted to characterize this translation as "Good News for