

8267

MODERN
LANGUAGE NOTES.

A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT,
MANAGING EDITOR.

JAMES. W. BRIGHT, HANS C. G. VON JAGEMANN,
HENRY ALFRED TODD,
ASSOCIATE EDITORS.

VOLUME IX.

1894.

BALTIMORE: THE EDITORS.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, April, 1894.

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.

Luke 6. 42. 'Repressor,' p. 3.

Pecock—"Ypocrite, take first the beam out of thine owne ige and thanne thou schalt se forto take the mote out of thin neigboris ige."

*Wiclif.—"Ipocrite, first take out the beem of thin ige, and thanne thou schalt se to take the moot of thi brotheris ige."

Jas. 1. 21. 'Repressor,' p. 68.

Pecock.—"Take ge or receyue ge this graffid word which may saue goure soulis."

Wiclif.—"Resseyue ge the word that is plauntid that may saue goure soulis."

John 8. 31. 'Repressor,' p. 103.

Pecock.—"Jesus seid to hem¹ of the Iewis, whiche bileeueden to² him: 'If ge schulens dwelle in my word ge schulen be my very disciplis and ge schulen knowe trouthe⁴ and trouthe schal delyueres gou.'"

¹ A MS. of the earlier version of Wiclif's Bible has *hem, the*.—² Earlier version, *in to*.—³ Earlier version, *schulens dwelle*.—⁴ A MS. of the later version omits *the*.—⁵ Earlier version, *delyuere*.

* I quote in every case from the later Wiclif version.

Wiclif.—“Jhesus seide to the^r Jewis, that bi-leueden in^a hym, ‘If *ge* dwellen³ in my word, verili *ge* schulen be my disciplis; and *ge* schulen knowe the^r treuthe, and the treuthe schal makes *gou* fre.’”

John 3. 19, 20. ‘Repressor,’ p. 97.

Pecock.—“This is the judgement, for *ligt* came in to the world, and men loued more derknis than *ligt*, sotheli^r her werkis weren yuel. Forsothe^r ech that doith yuel hatith *ligt*, and he comith not to *ligt*, that hise werkis ben not vndernome.³ He that doith treuthe cometh to *ligt*, that hise werkis be mad open, for^r that thei ben doon in God.”

Wiclif.—“And this is the dom, for *ligt* cam in to the world, and men loueden more derknissis than *ligt*; for^r her werkes were yuell. For^a ech man that doith yuele, hatith the *ligt*; and he cometh not to the *ligt*, that hise werkes be not repreued.³ But he that doith treuthe, cometh to the *ligt*, that hise werkes be schewid, that^r thei ben don in God,”

EXAMPLES OF MINIMUM DIVERGENCE.

II Tim. 4. 2. ‘Repressor,’ p. 1.

Pecock.—“Vndirnnyme thou, biseche thou, and blame thou in al pacience and doctrine.”

Wiclif.—“Repreue 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* *geeris* of plente; and the *vij* *kijn* thynne and leene, whiche stieden up after tho, and the *vij* thinne eeris of corn and smytun with brennyng wijnd ben *vij* *geeris* of hungir to comyng.”

Wiclif.—“Seuene faire *kiyn*, and seuene ful eeris of corn, ben seuene *geeris* of plentee . . . ; and seuene *kiyn* thinne and leene, that stieden aftir tho and seuene thinne eeris of corn and smytun with brennyng wynd, ben seuene *geer* of hungir to comyng. . . .”

Col. 2. 5, 7. ‘Repressor,’ p. 232.

Pecock.—“Thoug *y* be absent in bodi, *git* bi spirit *y* am with *gou*, ioiying and seyng *goure*

¹ Earlier version, *forsoth*.—² Earlier version, *sothe*.
^{li}.—³ Earlier version, *repreued or undirnomun*.—⁴ Earlier version, *for*.

ordre and the sadnes of *goure* bileeue which is in Crist.”

Wiclif.—“For thoug *Y* be absent in bodi, bi spirit *y* am with *gou*, ioiying and seyng *goure* ordre and the sadnesse of *goure* bileue that is in Crist.”

I Cor. 14. 38. ‘Repressor,’ p. 53.

Pecock.—“Sotheli,^r if eny man unknowith, he schal be unknowun.”

Wiclif.—“And^r if ony man unknowith he schal be unknouen.”

EXAMPLES OF MAXIMUM DIVERGENCE.

II Cor. 4. 3, 4. ‘Repressor,’ p. 54.

Pecock.—“That and ifoure Euangelie is couered, it is couered to hem whiche spullen; in which ^rGod of this world hath blindid the myndis or wittis of unfeithful men, that the *ligting* or cleering of the Euangelie of the glorie of Crist, which is the ymage of God, schine not.”

Wiclif.—“For if also ouere gospel is kyuerid, in these that perischen it is kyuerid; in which ^rGod hath blent the soulis of vnfeithful men of this world, that the *ligtning* of the gospel of the glorie of Crist, which is the ymage of God, schyne not.”

Rom. 10. 12. ‘Repressor,’ p. 2.

Pecock.—“^rzeel of good wille but not aftir kunnyng.”

Wiclif.—“^rloue of God, but not aftir kunnyng.”

Isa. 66. 2. ‘Repressor,’ p. 6.

Pecock.—“To whom schal *y* beholde ^rbut to a ^rlitle pore man, broken in herte, and ^rtrembling at my wordis?”

Wiclif.—“To whom schal *y* beholde ^rno but to a ^rpore man and contrit in spirit and ^rgreetli dredyng my wordis?”

Prov. 25. 16, 27. ‘Repressor,’ p. 68.

¹ Earlier version, *Forsothe*.

¹ Vulgate—*Deus hujus saeculi*.

¹ No MS. of Wiclif has “zeel of good wille.” Vulgate, *aemulationem Dei*.

¹ Earlier version, *but*.—² Earlier version, *my porelet*.—³ Earlier version, *trembling my wordis*. Vulgate, *pauperculum, et contritum spiritu, et tremementem sermones meos*.

Pecock.—“Thou hast founde hony, ete therof what is ynoug and no more; lest thou ouer fillid caste it up out agen and thanne is it to thee vilonie: Forto ete miche of hony is not good to the eter.”

Wiclif.—“Thou hast founde hony, ete thou that that suffisith to thee: lest perauenture thou be fillid, and brake it out. As it is not good to hym that etith 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 Wiclif 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 Wiclif; 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 Wiclif 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.

ll. 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 Schritt sich heiter zu entschliessen
Und, wär es mit Gefahr, ins Nichts dahin zu fliesen.”

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 (C¹) 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 C¹, 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 Loeper in his two Hempel editions does not attempt to reproduce the original punctuation, and Düntzer 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 Schröder'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