



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

σφῶν προστίθσιν Ζεύς, ἐγὼ δὲ σὺν Δί.
 Ἐρμῆ Ἄρε]ος εἰς κρήνην βαλῶ
 γυναῖκα θάψας της νουσα γῆς
 νασμοῖσι τέγγη πεδία Θηβαίας χθονός,
 Δίρκη πρὸς ἀν[δρ]ῶν ὑστέρων κεκλημένη
 λύω δε νείκη καὶ τὰ πρὶν πεπραγμένα.

u. 61. *ἔδειξας εἰς φῶς probabiliter suppleas.* Hipp. 714 *μηδὲν κακῶν σῶν εἰς φάος δείξειν ποτέ.* Similia sunt Sophoclis *εἰς τὸ φῶς φανεῖ κακά, λέγειν εἰς φῶς ὃ λέξει, ἀναπτύξαι πρέπει πρὸς φῶς.* u. 62, si recte papyrus legit Mahaffy, potest latere *εἰς φρήτορας* siue *εἰς φράτορας*, nam Amphionem et Zethum, Ioue procreatos et Antiopa. quae Nyctei nata erat, Lycus, Nyctei frater, patruus Antiopae, iure suo *φράτορας* uocaturus erat. Itaque haec dicit ‘ostendisti, Iuppiter, quam inconsiderate egerim in cognatos meos, cum Iouis esse eos non crederem.’ Sequens uersus bene se habet, quamuis dubitet Mahaffy de H quae I excipit: nec multum haereo in ΕΦΡΕ Quid enim potest esse nisi *εἶρε*, praesertim sequentibus

μηνυτῆς χρόνος
 ψευδεῖς μὲν ἡμᾶς, σφῶν δὲ μητέρ’ εὐτυχεῖν.

Respuunt certe εἶλε, litterae. Hipp. 1052 οὐδὲ μηνυτὴν χρόνον Δέξει καθ’ ἡμῶν. u. 65 ἵτ’ οὖν scripserim pro ἵτε νῦν.

Restant 68–70: qui sic scribi poterant:

Ἐρμῆ δ’ ὑπέικων Ἄρεος εἰς κρήνην βαλῶ
 γυναῖκα θάψας, τῆσδ’ ὄπως ἐνοῦσα γῆς
 νασμοῖσι τέγγη πεδία Θηβαίας χθονός.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

ON THE TEXT OF HOLBERG'S "JEPPE PAA BIERGET."

Although the students of Holberg are comparatively few in this country, the following brief observations on the text of one of his most interesting comedies may be of some value. They are based on a careful comparison of the following editions: the first three, published during Holberg's lifetime, dated 1723, 1724 and 1731 respectively, the Höpfner of 1764, the earliest separate edition of the play known to have been printed, Rahbek's of 1804, Boye's, C. Molbech's, containing the first five comedies, and

Liebenberg's, the last three of 1843. While Liebenberg's is at present generally recognized as the most reliable, Molbech's text is of special value to foreign students, to whom the earlier editions are inaccessible, as giving many variorum readings in foot-notes, which in the first edition of Liebenberg's text, in eight volumes, but not in the smaller later editions, are inconveniently placed at the back of the book. Liebenberg's, furthermore, makes no reference to editions published after the poet's death. Molbech's edition is of value, too, on account of its full introduction and copious notes, which, in lack of a better, may be used as a commentary on these first five plays. Molbech's readings, however, are not wholly free from errors, and it is the object of this paper to point out all such occurring in "Jeppe paa Bierget" as came under the writer's notice. For the sake of convenience, the first four editions will be referred to by their dates, the others by the initial letters of their editors.

In Jeppe's monologue, I 5, *ikke* is omitted by M. in: "Er *ikke* min Mave mere end min Rygg?" That this is merely a careless mistake is shown by the following, "jeg mener *jo*," the invariable affirmative after a negative question. M. notes under *Anslage*, I 8, "thus both 1731 and 1723 (more correctly *Anslag*)," the natural inference being that 1724 has the more correct form, which, however, is not the case. This is first given by R., who, it may be noted in passing, shows a too great tendency to correct Holberg. Later editors have been more willing to take him as he is. In the following paragraph it should be noted that 1723 gives *et Raqvæt*, but *Raqveten* in the next line. Instead of "*Ney* det er ikke jeg"; II 1, 1723 has "*Nu*," etc., an evident printer's mistake, corrected in all subsequent editions, but not noted by M. Under *Carnalie*, II 1, M. states: "All the old editions have here *Carnalie*, but above, pp. 185 and 189 (I 5 and 7), *Canalier*." As a matter of fact, this is true only of the first passage, as in I 7, 1723 has *Carnalier*. M. is wrong in stating that "all the old and the Höpfner editions have *giv* in "Men er det en Dröm, saa *giv*," II 1. In reality they have *gid*, which is retained by B., R. and L., M.'s being the only text that makes the correction. In the same scene the variation, *at gaae*, occurring in 1723 as *at gaa*, and followed by L., is not noticed by M. So too the variation "*det er, at*" in the same scene, occurring in 1723 and followed by L., is silently suppressed. A more important omission may be found in the following scene, where the phrase, "een af Baronens

Bönder," in Jeppe's fifth reply, is omitted by M., also without notice, although it is found in all the first four editions and is given also by B., R. and L. In the same scene, "og jeg aldrig har været," occurring in 1723 and L., is printed without the pronoun in all other editions. M.'s statement that the form *Doctorne*, II 2, occurs "in all three original editions, later Höpfner editions have *Doctorerne*," is incomprehensible, as the correct form is found in every text except his own and B.'s. "Han *havde ikke*," II 3, is arbitrarily changed by M. to "Han *ikke havde*."

The following variations, occurring in 1723 and followed by L., but not noticed by M., may for convenience sake be given together: the word or words omitted, inserted, or in any other way differing from the other editions are printed in italics, with the proper explanation following, which in every case refers to 1723:

"Jeppe. I veed jo selv hvad Viin jeg pleyer *at* drikke," III 1, omitted.

"Han drikker *igjen*, og Trompetterne blæser," III 1, inserted.

"Jeppe gaaer og spadserer *lidt* frem og tilbage," III 2, inserted.

"Jeppe befaler *at spille* en Polsk Dantz," III 3, inserted.

"at han har *drukken* sig fuld," IV 6, drukket in all other editions.

"Falder om, og blir *liggende*," IV 6. *afmægtig* in all other editions except B.'s.

"Nille . . . , kommer *ud* igjen," V 1, inserted.

"deres Overmænd, som *de* er visse paa vil expedere dem," V 6, inserted. R. has "som *de ere*."

In some few cases M. gives forms not warranted by any of the original editions, following sometimes the Höpfner editions, sometimes the dictates of his own critical judgment. Thus, for "Cammer-Tienneren. *Der* er Rhinsk-Viin," III 1, M. substitutes "*Det* er," etc., occurring in 1763. "Legger sig at slumre igjen," IV 1, M. inserts *til*, taken from 1763. This variation is, of course, not noticed by L.

"Saa dömmes han til at omkommes *af* Gift," IV 6, is given "*med* Gift."

Of variations not occurring in any of the first four editions, the following may be mentioned:

"Nu falder jeg i *de* forrige galne Tanker igjen," III 1. The *de* is here arbitrarily inserted by M.

"*thi* jeg er selv en Bonde," III 2. *thi* omitted by M.

"See nu kommer *dette* Koglerie igien," III 2. Instead of *dette* M. has "*det forbandede.*"

"Og omendskiönt han kand bevise sig at *have været* drukken," IV 6, occurs in M. as "at *være* drukken."

"At regne mod saadan *En* som jeg," V 4, inserted by M.

"Hvorfor blev du *ikke der* længer?" V 5. These two words are transposed by M.

From this brief study of the subject it may be gathered that Molbech was inclined to follow the Höpfner texts more closely than the majority of other Holberg editors, and combined with this frequent rejection of the original editions, especially that of 1723, a dangerous tendency to allow his own views on Danish grammar and orthography to interfere with the faithful rendering so necessary in a great classic. Liebenberg, on the other hand, almost entirely disregards the posthumous editions, and but seldom departs from what he regards as the best forms in the first three. As has been shown, he frequently selects a form occurring in 1723 that is rejected in all the later issues. Molbech's excuse for re-editing Holberg lies in the unsatisfactory state of the early texts, but in spite of this, the almost unanimous verdict of critics of the present day is in favor of the more conservative Liebenberg.

Unfortunately, the limits of a summer vacation and the press of other work did not permit the writer to study the other four of Holberg's comedies edited by Molbech, with regard to their variations. The present play was selected for several reasons. In the first place, it is altogether the most national of all Holberg's comedies, with the possible single exception of "Erasmus Montanus." In the second place, it has been more frequently and more variously criticised than any other single play in "Den danske Skueplads." In the third place—and in writing for an American public this reason ought perhaps to have been given in the first place—it contains the same plot as the induction to Shakespeare's "The Taming of the Shrew." This is not the place to consider the vexed question of how far Jeppe is to be regarded as a tragic figure, and of whether the author was acquainted with the great English poet. As its title indicates, this article is directed merely toward the rendering of the text by Molbech.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.