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PECOCK’S ‘REPRESSOR’ AND THE WICLIF BIBLE.

In the introduction to his edition of Pecock’s ‘Repressor’ for the Rolls Series, Churchill Babington makes the following assertion:

“In the majority of Scripture citations, Pecock employs the version ascribed to Wiclif, in that form of it, however, which is the later of the two. . . .” (Introduction, p. xxviii.)

He adds in a note:

“See ‘Repressor,’ part v, ch. 1, more especially. The exceptions to this remark are mostly confined to short texts quoted apparently memoriter, such as occur in the first sixty pages.”

A somewhat careful comparison of the Scripture citations in the ‘Repressor’ with the Wiclif Bible reveals the fact that of about one hundred and fifty passages, but thirty-two are quoted exactly. Of course the phrase, “employs the version ascribed to Wiclif,” may admit very wide divergence from that version, and might be extended to mere paraphrase. In that sense, Pecock may be said to employ the Wiclif version, but it is doubtful if in any other sense. Yet the editor’s use of the word “quoted” in his note implies a much more limited meaning in his phrase than I have suggested.

His statement, however, that the remark is especially true of the fifth part, first chapter, must be confirmed without qualification. From this point to the close, the citations are nearly exact. But it must be remembered that this is less than one-sixth of the work. Nor is it to be inferred that all the exact or nearly exact citations are to be found in this fifth part, as they are distributed pretty evenly through the two volumes?

The second statement of Mr. Babington’s note is more doubtful. It can hardly be proved that the exceptions to his introductory remark “are mostly confined to short texts quoted apparently memoriter, such as occur in the first sixty pages.” All but one of the examples of maximum divergence given below have been chosen from the first sixty pages, and cannot, I think, fail to raise the question whether they can be satisfactorily accounted for by the theory of memoriter quotations. If they may, it is only by a greater extension of the term “quotation” than is ordinarily made. Nor are such divergences confined to the first sixty pages, for at page 389 (Wisdom, 5. 16) and at page 440 (Matt. 16, 16–19) are divergences as great as any that I have instanced. It must, however, be admitted that the longer citations are more accurate than the shorter ones, and that, as the work proceeds, a greater exactness in quotation is evident.

The following collated passages are designed, therefore, to raise the question whether, under any ordinary conception of the term “quotation,” Pecock may be said to have quoted from the Wiclif Bible; that is, whether such wide divergence was voluntary or involuntary, and, if the former, on what theory it can be explained.

EXAMPLES OF AVERAGE DIVERGENCE.


Pecock—“Ypocrity, take first the beam out of thine owen iȝe and thanne thou schalt se forto take the mote out of thin neighboris iȝe.”

*Wiclif.—“Ipocrity, first take ou out the beam of thin iȝe, and thanne thou schalt se to take the moot of thi brotheris iȝe.”

Jas. 1. 21. ‘Repressor,’ p. 68.

Pecock.—“Take ge or receyue ge this graffid word which may saue goure soules.”

Wiclif.—“Resseyue ge the word that is plentid that may saue goure souls.”

John 8. 31. ‘Repressor,’ p. 103.

Pecock.—“Jesus seid to hem of the Iewis, whiche bileueden tos him: ‘If ge schulen dwelle in my word ge schulen be my very discipilis and ge schulen knowe trouthe and trouthe schal deleyueres gou.’”

1 A MS. of the earlier version of Wiclif’s Bible has hem. the.—2 Earlier version, in to.—3 Earlier version, schulen dwelle.—4 A MS. of the later version omits the.—5 Earlier version, deleyueres.

* I quote in every case from the later Wiclif version.
Wyclif.—"Jhesus seide to the Jewis, that bi-leueden in hym, 'If xe dwellens in my word, verilli xe schulen be my disciplis; and xe schulen knowe thre treuthre, and the treuthre schal makes xe fre.' "


Pecock.—'This is the judgement, for ligt came in to the world, and men loued more dorknis than ligt, sothel; her weriks weren yuel. Forsothe ech that doith yuel hath ligt, and he comith not to ligt, that his weriks ben not vndernome.' He that doith treuthre cometh to ligt, that his weriks be mad open, for that thei ben doon in God.'

Wyclif.—"And this is the dom, for ligt cam in to the world, and men loued more dorkness than ligt; for her werkes were yuell. For ech man that doith yuelle, hath the ligt; and he cometh not to the ligt, that his werkes be not repreued.' But he that doith treuthre, cometh to the ligt, that his werkes be schewid, that thei ben done in God.'"

EXAMPLES OF MINIMUM DIVERGENCE.

II Tim. 4. 2. 'Repressor,' p. 1.

Pecock.—'Vndirynyme thou, biseche thou, and blame thou in al pacience and doctrine.'

Wyclif.—'Reprefe thou, biseche thou, blame thou in al pacience and doctryn.'

Gen. 41. 26. 27. 'Repressor,' p. 258.

Pecock.—'The vij faire kijn and the vij ful eeris of corn ben vij xeeis of plente; and the vij kijn thynne and leene, whiche stieden up after tho, and the vij thinne eeris of corn and smyten with brenynying wijd ben vij xeeis of hungir to comynge.'

Wyclif.—"Seuene faire kijn, and seuene ful eeris of corn, ben seuene xeeis of plente . . . ; and seuene kijn thynne and leene, that stieden affer tho and seuene thinne eeris of corn and smytun with brenynying wynd, ben seuene xeeir of hungur to conynge . . . ."'

Col. 2. 5. 7. 'Repressor,' p. 232.

Pecock.—'Thoug y be absent in bodi, gi bi spirit y am with you, ioyying and seynge xoure

Pecock.—"Thou hast founde hony, ete thereof what is ynowg and no more; lest thou ouer filid caste it up out a gen and thanne is it to thee vilonie: . . . . For te ete miche of hony is not good to the eter."

Wyclif.—"Thou hast founde hony, ete thou that that suffisith to thee: lest peraunent thou be filid, and brake it out. . . . . As it is not good to hym that ethh myche hony."

A gleam of light may be thrown on the problem by the fact that, in four of the twelve instances given above, Pecock's variations agree exactly, or very nearly, with the reading of one or more manuscripts of the earlier version of the Wyclif Bible.

It is with some hesitation that I advance the following theory: that, in the case of maximum divergence, we have in Pecock practically a new translation, based probably upon Wyclif; in the case of minimum divergence, we have citations made memoriter, in some instances, at least, with the Vulgate in mind; in the case of average divergence, we must hesitate between these two extremes.

It is interesting to note Pecock's evident preference for which as a relative, over that. In no less than twenty instances he uses the former where Wyclif employs the latter. Examples may be found among the citations given above (cf. Jas. 1. 21; John 8. 31; Gen. 41. 26, 27; Col. 2. 5, 7; II Cor. 4. 3, 4).

Charles H. A. Wager.

Yale University.

The Text of Faust.

II. 718 f.

Professor Cutting in a 'Note to Goethe's Faust' in the February number of the Mod. Lang. Notes calls in question the punctuation of lines 718 and 719 as given in the standard Weimar edition:

"Zu diesem Schritte sich beßer zu entschliessen.
Und, wir es mit Gehr, ins Nichts dahin zu fließen."

The basis of this edition is Goethe's final revision in the 'Ausgabe letzter Hand,' and the editors sought simply to reproduce the text as Goethe wished to leave it, and to which he dedicated the most painstaking attention. They permitted themselves only minor changes in punctuation, where manifest errors or inconsistencies occurred. Peculiarities of fashion in the typography of the time were not needlessly set aside. The texts of Faust which are to be considered in determining any reading, are the editions of the collected works of 1808 (A) Bd. viii. of 1817 (B) Bd. ix. of 1828 (C) Bd. xii. of 1829 (C) Bd. xii., and the two single editions of 1808 (E1) and of 1816 (E2). The text of the latter had Goethe's special revision, and was followed in B and C, while C was subjected to a second careful revision. Other editions can be disregarded, at least so far as determining the text of the First Part is concerned.

I have not the single edition of 1816, but as it was followed in the text of 1817, I assume that the two correspond. All these editions present the reading given above. The first complete edition of Faust of 1833 and the collected edition of the poet's works of 1836-7, published under the editorship of Eckermann and Riemer, agree with the above. We must regard the reading, therefore, as authoritative. Von Loever in his two Hempel editions does not attempt to reproduce the original punctuation, and Dintzler is endlessly arbitrary in his treatment of Goethe's text, changing not only the punctuation, but often the forms of words, basing his course upon some subjective canon. The punctuation is not uniform in Schröer's two editions. We cannot speak of "the change from the Hempel edition," for the Weimar edition, followed by Professor Thomas, preserves properly the original reading. The interpretation of the passage by the author of the note is unquestionably correct, but the text as preserved is undoubtedly that of Goethe.

The punctuation employed is common throughout the literature. A pirated edition of 1810 presents first the reading proposed. The question may, perhaps, be raised, whether in many cases of the similar use of und, its purpose may not have been originally to repeat with emphasis the preceding line, equal in the above passage to, "And [to do this], even at the peril of annihilation."

The question what principles should determine the text of a modern classical writer, is one upon which scholars may hold different