"Jacke Jugeler," II. 256-259

Author(s): G. C. Moore Smith

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (Jul., 1915), p. 375

Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3712628>

Accessed: 28/06/2014 08:47

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Between this ultimate source of the salt story and its use in *Cleanness* I know no intervening link. The Hebrew legend does not seem to occur in the Latin Church Fathers, and it is not found in any Old French source accessible to me. It does not appear, it may be noted, in the Old French *Mistère du vieil testament*, though that is too late for influence on the English poet. Besides, I find no trace of it in other English works in which it might be expected, as the Old or the Middle English *Genesis*, the *Cursor Mundi*, the *Miracle Plays*, or the *Travels of Mandeville*, the writer of which does say that the pillar of salt was still standing in his time. It is perhaps not too much to believe that the Middle English poet was directly acquainted with the Hebrew commentaries on the Bible.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, U.S.A.

‘JACKE JUGELER,’ ll. 256–259.

When wee came yender, there dyd I see
My mayster kisse gentilwomen tow or three
And to come emongs others my thought bysye
He had a myruayllus great phantasye.

I quote from the recent edition of the play by Professor W. H. Williams, who has the following note on l. 258:

My thought, me thought. Cf. l. 191.

bysye, i.e. [he was] busy. Hazlitt unnecessarily changes to ‘I see.’

It seems to me that an emendation *is* required, and I have little doubt that the true reading is ‘my thought by ‘s ye,’ that is, ‘me-thought by his eye.’

The spelling ‘ye’ = ‘eye’ is found in the play at l. 576 ‘my yes, nose and lyppes,’ l. 821 ‘That he...hath sine [seen] w^t his ye,’ and l. 827 ‘I wold myne owne yes in no wyse belyue.’

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

TWO EXITS IN ‘OTHELLO.’

It has frequently been observed that in the early editions of Shakespeare stage directions are found placed somewhat differently from what modern usage would require. A special class of such cases is made