

"Revised and Collected Editions."

THE poet Campbell, though his longer poems have passed nearly into oblivion, is familiar to us from a number of shorter ones, such as "Ye Mariners of England," "The Battle of the Baltic," "Lochiel's Warning," "Lord Ullin's Daughter," and "The Soldier's Dream." He spent some years in Germany about the year 1800; this stay is marked by his poem "Hohenlinden," of which battle he is said to have been a witness. Returning from Hamburg to Scotland, on the outbreak of the war with Denmark, he discovered that a warrant was out for his arrest as a spy and associate of Jacobins. He promptly called on the sheriff, who was much troubled about the matter, and assured Campbell that nothing would happen if he kept quiet. This, however, was not good enough for him; he declared himself ready to answer any questions, and to have his papers examined. On this being done he had no difficulty in clearing himself; not only were his papers found quite harmless, but among them was the manuscript of "Ye Mariners of England," which the sheriff declared to be better than any certificate of loyalty.

This story comes substantially from Campbell himself. But to the most interesting point, the discovery of the manuscript of "Ye Mariners of England," there is *primâ facie* a serious critical objection. This poem contains the well known line "where Blake and mighty Nelson fell," which clearly can only have been written after the battle of Trafalgar, 1805; whereas the above story dates the poem not later than the battle of Copenhagen, some years before Nelson's death. This suggests that this part of the story is apocryphal. But further investigation shows that the line in question was substituted by Campbell in a later edition of the poem, for the original "where Grenville, boast of freedom, fell," referring of course to Sir Richard Grenville of the *Revenge*. Thus this critical objection to the story, though sound in itself, falls to the ground.

These facts caution us that historical difficulties may arise from the existence of more than one edition of a work. Statements found in a later edition may not have been in the original one; an apparent anachronism may be due to a later insertion.

This applies more particularly to editions published not by the author of the original work, but by a later editor. Nowadays such an editor would naturally be expected to distinguish clearly his own notes and additions from the text of his author; but this was not regarded as necessary till comparatively lately. Indeed, till the invention of printing it would not have been easy to carry out, and even if an attempt were made to distinguish, copyists would be likely to confuse (compare the case of Origen's Hexaplaric LXX.). The tendency to bring one's author up to date would often be very strong.

We all know how greatly hymns have been altered by subsequent editors whose aim has been edification rather than literary accuracy. In some professedly old ballads there occur phrases with a modern sound, causing suspicion that the ballads may really have been composed by their modern editors; but it is known that in some cases these phrases were injudiciously substituted by the editors for the original ones. But perhaps the most striking instance of comparatively recent date is found in Strype's edition of Stow. John Stow's *Survey of London*, our best authority for Medieval and Tudor London, was first published in 1598, and again in 1603. About a century later a new edition was brought out by John Strype, Vicar of Leyton, an antiquarian and historian of the first rank in his day, much of whose work has not yet been superseded. He carried Stow's work up to date, without clearly distinguishing his own additions; hence it is easy for the unwary to quote as a statement of Stow's one actually made only by Strype and applying only to a later period. Conversely it would be possible, if the facts were not so well known, to maintain that the name of "Stow" was fictitious, the whole work dating from a century later.

It is highly probable that some difficulties in dating ancient works, or in determining their authors, may be solved by supposing the original work to have been modified in a later edition. The publication of more than one edition of a work goes back beyond the times of printing. The Fathers sometimes complain of inaccurate copies of their works, lacking their final revision, getting circulated without their consent. One way of accounting for some striking variations in the text of the Acts of the Apostles is the supposition that there were two editions of the book, both pro-

ceeding from Luke himself. Discussion of this view, first put forward by Blass more than twenty years ago, led to the drawing up of a long list of ancient or medieval works which appeared in more than one edition. A notable instance in English literature is Langland's *Piers Plowman*, which is extant in three distinct texts or editions.

This supposition may explain some other Biblical writings. One theory to account for the difficulty of dating the Apocalypse is that this work, originally written under Nero, was revised under Vespasian or Domitian (or at least that while belonging to the later date, it has incorporated passages written under Nero.) It is possible that some Psalms bearing the name of David have reached us only in later revisions, which may have added things foreign to David's own circumstances. This may be the case with Psalm li., the two last verses being due to a later reviser. So Psalm cxliv. may be ascribed to David as the actual author of one or more of the fragments embodied in it, rather than of the Psalm as it stands. That Psalms did actually appear in various editions is shown by the connection of Psalm xiv. with Psalm liii. ; of Psalm xl. and Psalm lxx. ; of Psalms lvii. and lx. with Psalm cviii. ; and of Psalm xviii. with 2 Samuel xxii.

The same theory may account for some difficulties in the books of the Prophets. Probably in some cases the book is a collection of the prophet's utterances, published late in his life by himself or some disciple ; in other cases a collection made from various sources after his death. The book of Ezekiel would seem to have been collected and published by the prophet himself ; and we know from Jeremiah xxxvi. that in Jehoiakim's time Jeremiah published a roll containing his collected prophecies from the beginning of his ministry. It is probable that our first twenty chapters, or thereabouts, come ultimately from this roll. But while Ezekiel gives the original occasion of each prophecy, this part of Jeremiah usually does not. In such collections, since the prophets wrote with a practical object rather than a literary one, local or temporary matter might easily be dropped, or notes might be added applying to present conditions. And while the arrangement might be, as in Ezekiel, chronological, it also might be rather according to subject. In the former case we might get change of subject without any note to mark the transition ; in the latter case, what is

apparently a connected prophecy on one subject might really consist of several spoken at considerable intervals. Perhaps the occasion of the first part alone might be given ; then if another part seems not to suit this occasion, it might easily be inferred that the whole was wrongly dated.

Or a prophet's utterances might be collected after his death by a disciple, much as now a man's " literary remains " are sometimes collected and published. Such utterances might be very unequally preserved—some of them practically in full, others only in notes or summaries. Nowadays there would probably be headings or notes giving the occasion and possibly the source of each discourse or fragment ; but this is not the case with the prophets whose books are best explained in this way, e.g. Hosea or Micah (Much of Haggai reads like a summary ; but the occasion of each prophecy is given.) The fragments might, like the Suras of the Koran, have been preserved in various ways ; Zaid compiled the sacred book of Islam from passages preserved on " ribs of palm leaves and tablets of white stone, and in the breasts of men " ; and the Suras are by no means in chronological order ; it is the work of criticism so to arrange them. So if the utterances of any Hebrew prophet were similarly preserved and collected, we should not be entitled to assume chronological order. Passages coming from the same source or resting on the same authority would be likely to be joined together, or else passages dealing with the same subject. This last possibility would, however, not stand in the way of the book having been carefully arranged ; but it interferes with historical arguments drawn from the order. E.g. a difficulty in Micah may be thus lessened. According to Jeremiah xxvi. 18, Micah's prophecy, (Micah iii. 12), was the occasion of Hezekiah's reformation. But this verse is immediately followed by iv. 1-4, which is parallel to Isaiah ii. 2-4. The context points to Isaiah quoting from Micah, unless of course both draw from a common source ; and this part of Isaiah, if the book is at all chronologically arranged, is earlier than Hezekiah's time. But if Micah's book is arranged to some extent by connection of subject, this difficulty is lessened.

A later instance is perhaps furnished by the " Second Epistle to the Corinthians." It is obvious that the four last chapters differ greatly in tone from the earlier ones ; also that vi. 14-vii. 1, comes in rather abruptly, vii. 2, resuming the thought of vi. 13. Hence

many consider our epistle a composite one, comprising one epistle all but complete, a large part of a second, and perhaps a fragment of a third. x.-xiii. on this view belong to an earlier letter than i.-ix., viz., the painful letter mentioned ii. 4, vii. 8, which is distinct from I Corinthians; while vi. 14-vii. 1 may belong to an earlier letter still, viz. that mentioned I Corinthians v. 9. Their combination is accounted for by the theory that after our First Epistle had come into general circulation, the Corinthian Church searched for other writings of St. Paul in their possession, and finding these, perhaps already imperfect, combined them into one epistle for general circulation. There is certainly much earlier evidence of use of the First Epistle than of the Second; this may, however, be due to their contents.

HAROLD SMITH.

