

118: 131, which has *spiritum* instead of *ipsum*. But the reading with *ipsum* makes nonsense of the Latin. This misreading by earlier editors stems from taking the short vertical stroke in the manuscript immediately before *pm* as a minim complete in itself; that is, as an *i*, whereas it is clearly the bottom portion of a long *s*, that is, an abbreviation for *spiritum*.

Buchholz, Zupitza, and Holthausen provide the verb *opnedest* as the translation of *aperui*. But this is palaeographically impossible: there are no descenders visible in the damaged line, nor are the rounded bottoms for *o* and *e* present in the right places. *Untundest* suggests itself as the verb here since Old English psalters commonly render *aperui* here as *on-*, *un-*, *an-* or *atynde*.

J.-G. JOHANSEN

Camrose Lutheran College,
Alberta, Canada

A HITHERTO UNNOTICED MIDDLE ENGLISH POEM IN UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA MS ENGLISH 6¹

THE *Catalogue of the T. Edward Ross Collection of Bibles Presented to the University of Pennsylvania Library*² describes on pp. 27-8 a small (180 × 115 mm) vellum manuscript of the Wycliffite New Testament, now University of Pennsylvania MS English 6. On folio 4r of this manuscript is preserved a unique text of a Middle English poem which the *Ross Catalogue* mistakenly describes as 'written in prose'.³ The poem was not noted by subsequent cataloguers of the Pennsylvania manuscripts,⁴ and some line endings have faded or been cropped, so it is not surprising that the poem has escaped the notice of later indexers and students of Middle English verse.⁵ Although the poem deals with

moral commonplaces, its versifier was not without technical skill; this, along with several interesting problems of textual emendation raised by the poem, make it appropriate for consideration in these pages.

The main text in the manuscript is the Wycliffite New Testament in the later version, complete with standard prologues (although the usual prologue to the Epistle of James has been transferred to the Epistles of Peter). It was not known to Forshall and Madden.⁶ That main text is written in one neat but undistinguished Anglicana hand of the late fourteenth century. The other contents of the manuscript, in differing Anglicana hands of the same period, include selections from a *Floretum*, extracts from the Fathers of the Church on Christian behaviour, several snatches of Latin, a calendar after the use of Salisbury, and a hitherto unnoticed fragment of the Middle English prose treatise *Memoriale Credencium*.⁷

The provenance of the manuscript is uncertain. The name 'Gilbert Bath & Wells' appears on folio 1r; this would appear to be either Bishop Gilbert Bourne (1554-60) or Bishop Gilbert Berkeley (1560-81), but the name does not appear to be that of either man. The manuscript does not appear to be listed in either man's will, the inventories of the Bath and Wells libraries for the time, or in Dugdale's lists. The name 'John Mey of Reppel' appears in an Elizabethan hand on the rear leaf; his identity is uncertain. The gold-tooled calf binding (with modern rebacking) has been identified by Mr Paul Needham of the Pierpont Morgan Library as the work of 'an unidentified Elizabethan bindery, almost certainly in London',⁸ but it provides no further clues to provenance. Modern mention of the manuscript begins in 1935 when T. Edward Ross lent it for an exhibition at the University of Pennsylvania Library, where it became part of the permanent collection in 1947.

In the text presented below, the poem is reproduced entire except for the omissions of alterations in a later hand and ink which will be

¹ I would like to thank the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania Library for granting me permission to publish from their manuscript, and to thank Professor George Kane for his helpful comments.

² University of Pennsylvania Library, *A Catalogue of the T. Edward Ross Collection of Bibles Presented to the University of Pennsylvania Library* (Philadelphia, 1947), 27-8.

³ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁴ N. Zacour and R. Hirsch, eds, *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Libraries of the University of Pennsylvania to 1800* (Philadelphia, 1965), 50.

⁵ C. Brown and R. H. Robbins, *The Index of Middle English Verse* (New York, 1943), and supplements.

⁶ J. Forshall and F. Madden, eds, *The Holy Bible . . . by John Wycliffe and his followers* (Oxford, 1850).

⁷ Most recently edited by J. H. L. Kengen, *Memoriale Credencium: A Late Middle English Manual of Theology for Lay People* (Nijmegen, 1979).

⁸ Letter to the author, 5 September 1980.

discussed in the notes. Expansions of scribal abbreviations are in italics; punctuation, capitalization, and stanza and word division are as in modern English. Emendations (in all but one case required by loss of text as a result of cropping) are in square brackets; the 25 long lines of text have been subdivided. The readings of lines 2, 8, and 10 have been confirmed under ultraviolet light.

Whanne þou art stered to don amys,
bihold þisilf *and* þenk on þis.
Bihold wherof þou art wrouzt
and se þi lenyng what it is.
Seize *and* sorwe weel þou mouzt
and morne for þi dedis mys.
Naked heder were þou brouzt;
so schalt þou hennes wende ywis.

Whanne þou art mys mewed in þi þouzt,
bihold þisilf *and* þenk on þis.
Bihold what god hæþ don for þe
and see his goodnesse what it is.
To die wiþ deei uppon a tre
for to bryng þee to his blis –
It was gret loue, so þinkeþ me,
so sore to suffre for serwant his.

Whan þou art mismoued wherof it be,
bihold þisilf *and* þenk ofn þis.]
Bihold hou freic þou art to falle;
to folewe fondyng is al þi blis,
And to þe seende þou makest þee þralle,
and lesest þe ioye þat þe ordeyned [is.]
god spareþ þee zit þat deme þee schal
to spille þee for þi dedis mys[is.]

3if þou wilt leue þi synnes alle,
bihold þisilf *and* þenk on þis.
Bihold how litil tyme þee is lent
þi lyf to lede in worldly blys.
þou nost how sone þou schalt be asent,
þou wrecche, wiþ wormes to wo[ne] ywys.]
þou schalt nauzt haue whan þou art went
but þi goode dedis *and* þi mys[is.]

In folye to falle whan þou ast ment
bihold þisilf *and* þenk on þis[is.]
Bihold in man is litil trust:
now hool, now sik, now deed he is.
To leue whanne hym likeþ best,
sodeynly he wendeþ, ywis.
His bodi to rote in erþe schal reste;
his soule schal wende to pey[n] ywis.]

3if þou wilt do weel whyle þi lyf last,
bihold þisilf *and* þenk on þis.]
Bihold ze alle *and* takeþ hede
þe ende of man what it is.
Whizle he walkeþ in riche wede,
wonder workus he worcheþ ywys[is.]
But whanne his body schal wormes fede,

who wole helpe hym wiþ [mys,]
But feynt frendes *and* fals at nede?
Bihold þisilf *and* þenk on þis.]

50

Notes to the text

3 The emendation of *wrouzt* to *ywrouzt* would improve the metre.

4 *lenyng* could as easily be transcribed *leuyng*; both meanings make sense in context. The present reading was chosen because it better agrees with *stered* in line 1. Comparison with *leue* in lines 25 and 37 provides no evidence to prefer the second reading.

18 *on þis* The line ending is lost by cropping; the reading is restored by comparison with lines 2, 10, and 26, where the same refrain appears intact. The same restoration is made in lines 34, 42, and 50.

22 *þat þe* The word *to* appears inserted above these words in the manuscript in a later hand and ink with a caret placed between them to show the place of insertion. Either elision of *þe ordeyned* or contraction of *lesest* to a monosyllable yields a metrically acceptable line without the added preposition. *is* The line ending is lost by cropping; restoration is made by the criteria of sense and rhyme.

24 *mys* The line ending is lost by cropping; the restoration is made by the criteria of sense and rhyme.

29 *be asent* The word *astir* appears inserted above these words in a later hand and ink in the manuscript, with a caret placed between them to show the place of insertion. The *a* of *asent* has been partially erased. The punctus elevatus after *asent* has been altered to a tironian *et* in the same ink as the later corrections. The corrector either did not know that *asenden* could mean 'to summon' (*MED* v. 3) or else was attempting to clarify the meaning. With the additions removed, the line is metrically acceptable if elision is possible.

30 *wone ywys* The line ending is lost by cropping; the emendation seems probable on the grounds of sense, rhyme, and metre.

33 Word-order in this line is disturbing, since the first three stanzas begin *Whanne þou* and the fourth and sixth stanzas *3if þou*. The presence of the words *whan þou* in this line suggest that originally this stanza may have begun as the first three do, reading perhaps *Whan þou in folye to falle ast ment*. Accidental

disordering of the stanzas is unlikely because of the interlocking rhyme scheme of the poem, but to suggest that the line is a deliberate variation by the versifier may be to attribute to him a degree of poetic skill which he does not possess.

40 *peyn ywis* The line-ending is lost by cropping. On the grounds of sense, rhyme, metre, and commonplace moral teaching, the emendation seems probable. However, the repetition of the rhyme tag *ywis* twice in three lines happens nowhere else in the poem; it is also possible that a phrase such as *peyn or blis* or *peyn and mys* was the original reading. A single penstroke seems to rise out of the bowl of the *y* in *peyn*, but cropping has rendered it impossible to determine what letter or letters (if any) this may once have represented.

46 *ywys* The line ending is lost by cropping; the restoration is made by comparison to lines 8 and 38, where the rhyme tag appears intact.

48 *mys* The line ending is lost by cropping. The emendation seems probable on the grounds of sense, rhyme, and metre; if *wip* is translated 'against', the line would then read 'Who will help him against misfortune?' (*MED* s.v. *mis* n. 2)

JOSEPHINE KOSTER TARVERS

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**A VERBAL ECHO FROM *PE*
DESPUTISOUN BITWEN PE BODI AND
PE SOULE IN *THE GOOD KNIGHT AND*
*HIS JEALOUS WIFE***

THE Middle English poem *The Good Knight and His Jealous Wife* is a legend about a miracle performed by the Virgin Mary. It is preserved (end missing) in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Ashmole 61 [S.C. 6922*], of the late fifteenth century;¹ the original version is thought to have

¹ Editions: Carl Horstmann, *Altenglische Legenden, Neue Folge* (Heilbronn, 1881; repr. Hildesheim, 1969), 329-33 [No. II. 12] 'Marienlegende: Vom guten Ritter und seinem eifersüchtigen Weibe'; Beverly Boyd, *The Middle English Miracles of the Virgin* (San Marino, California, 1964), 92-104 (notes p. 137). See also: John E. Wells, *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400* (New Haven, 1916), 170 [No. II. 8]; C. Brown, R. H. Robbins, *The Index of Middle English Verse* (New York, 1943), No. 1987; Gisela Guddat-Figge, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Middle English Romances*, *TUEPh*, 4 (Munich, 1976), 249-52.

been composed much earlier, 'probably in the fourteenth century'.² The source of this poem is not known. Lines 289-300, however, which describe a group of devils coming out of hell in order to torment a soul, seem to contain a clear verbal echo of a passage from 'the best-known' Middle English poem on the Body and Soul theme, namely *pe Desputisoun bitwen pe Bodi and pe Soule*, which is extant in seven manuscripts and which was probably originally composed in the second half of the thirteenth century.³ In the passage concerned (lines 473-84), devils also appear to fetch a damned soul.

The closest similarity is provided by the version in the Auchinleck manuscript. The two passages are given for comparison, with the points of correspondence printed in italics:

A. *pe Desputisoun bitwen pe Bodi and pe Soule*, ed. Linow, p. 56, lines 473-84 (Auchinleck version):

Hadde he no raþer þis word yseyd,
It wist neuer whider to go,
475 It was yhent in a brayd
Wip a þousand fendes and zete mo.
And when þai hadde on him ylayd
Her scharpe hokes al þo,
It was in a sori playd,
480 Ytoiled boþe to and fro.
Sum were raggid and rowe-tayled.
Wip brode boches on her bak,
Scharpe-clawed and long-nalled;
Nas no lim wipouten lak.

B. *The Good Knight and His Jealous Wife*, ed. Horstmann, p. 332, lines 289-300:

Herkyns how þe fendys felle,
290 How þat they wente oute of hell,
So lothe þei were to tyne:
A thousand wente on a raw
Fore þei wend in a throw
The sawle haue to pyne.
295 *Some were ragyd and longe-tayled*
Scharpe-clawde and longe-nayled,
The fendys euery-Ichon,
Some had hornes grel and longe,
Oute of þer mouth þe fyre spronge -
300 *Withoutene lake wer none.*

² Boyd, *Miracles*, 137; cf. Horstmann, *Legenden*, 329.

³ Edition: Wilhelm Linow, *pe Desputisoun bitwen pe Bodi and pe Soule*, *Erlanger Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie*, 1 (Erlangen, 1889); see also Brown-Robbins, *Index*, No. 351; Francis Lee Utley, 'Dialogues, Debates, and Catechisms', in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1500*, ed. A. E. Hartung (New Haven, 1972), vol. 3, vii, 693 and 848 f. [No. 18c]; Guddat-Figge, *Catalogue*, 121-6. Quotation from Utley, 693.