

THE MANUSCRIPT OF *THE VISION OF JUDGEMENT*

The manuscript of *The Vision of Judgment* is at 50, Albemarle Street, London, in the John Murray Archive. A note written inside the front cover says:

Lord Byron Autograph MS of the Vision of Judgment folio to A H Hallam Murray Jan 1892 left by A H H M to A M M & bought back by J M from the executors April 1948

The manuscript, now bound, consists of eight double folio sheets, folded once each, making thirty-two sides in all, of which thirty-one are written on. The watermark is hard to see. Byron has marked the first side of each sheet *1st*, *2nd*, and so on: someone else has neatly numbered the top outer corner of each side in red. At the top of side one are these words:

**The “Vision of Judgement” by R^a May 7th 1821
Quevedo redivivus - suggested by the composition so entitled by the
<Southey> Author of “Wat Tyler”.**

**“A Daniel come to Judgement yea a Daniel ..
“I thank thee, - Jew, - for teaching me that word.” - -**

Here is the way the poem is laid out in the eight double-folio sheets of which the manuscript consists:

- Sheet 1 Side 1: Title to stanza 4 line 6
- Sheet 1 Side 2: stanza 4 line 7 to stanza 7 line 8
- Sheet 1 Side 3: stanza 8 numerical heading to stanza 11 line 6
- Sheet 1 Side 4: stanza 11 line 7 to stanza 14 line 8
- Sheet 2 Side 1: stanza 15 numerical heading to stanza 18 line 2
- Sheet 2 Side 2: stanza 18 line 3 to stanza 21 line 2
- Sheet 2 Side 3: stanza 21 line 3 to stanza 24 line 4
- Sheet 2 Side 4: stanza 24 line 5 to stanza 27 line 8 (with change of ink colour from black to light brown after numerical heading to stanza 27 just before the entrance of Michael)
- Sheet 3 Side 1: stanza 28 numerical heading to stanza 31 line 6
- Sheet 3 Side 2: stanza 31 line 7 to stanza 35 line 3
- Sheet 3 Side 3: stanza 35 line 4 to stanza 38 line 8
- Sheet 3 Side 4: stanza 39 numerical heading to stanza 42 line 6 (with change of ink colour from light brown to black at start just before Sathan’s prosecution speech)
- Sheet 4 Side 1: stanza 42 line 7 to stanza 46 line 2
- Sheet 4 Side 2: stanza 46 line 3 to stanza 49 line 6
- Sheet 4 Side 3: stanza 49 line 7 to stanza 53 line 2
- Sheet 4 Side 4: stanza 53 line 3 to stanza 56 line 8 (with change of ink colour from black to light brown after numerical heading to stanza 55 which starts *When the grand Signal ran from Heaven to Hell*)
- Sheet 5 Side 1: stanza 57 numerical heading to stanza 60 line 6

Sheet 5 Side 2: stanza 60 line 7 to stanza 64 line 6
 Sheet 5 Side 3: stanza 64 line 7 to stanza 68 line 2
 Sheet 5 Side 4: stanza 68 line 3 to stanza 71 line 4
 Sheet 6 Side 1: stanza 71 line 5 to stanza 74 line 8
 Sheet 6 Side 2: stanza 75 numerical heading to stanza 78 line 2
 Sheet 6 Side 3: stanza 78 line 3 to stanza 81 line 4
 Sheet 6 Side 4: stanza 81 line 5 to stanza 84 line 8
 Sheet 7 Side 1: stanza 85 numerical heading to stanza 88 line 4
 Sheet 7 Side 2: stanza 88 line 5 to 91 line 8
 Sheet 7 Side 3: stanza 92 numerical heading to stanza 95 line 2
 Sheet 7 Side 4: stanza 95 line 3 to stanza 98 line 4
 Sheet 8 Side 1: stanza 98 line 5 to stanza 101 line 6
 Sheet 8 Side 2: stanza 101 line 7 to stanza 104 line 8
 Sheet 8 Side 3: stanza 105 numerical heading to end of poem
 Sheet 8 Side 4 is blank.

The manuscript concludes with the following note, inked round with a broken line:

R^a <Sept^r beneath> Oct^r <inked over> 4th 1821

Mem. -

on 7th 1821

This poem was begun <xx> May but left off the same day: -- resumed about

<in>

the 20th of Sept^r of the same year - & concluded as dated. - - - -

/
/NB/
/

Byron wrote four stanzas of *The Vision of Judgement* without revision, erasure or second thoughts of any kind. They are: 15, 32, 39, and perhaps 62 (there is the suspicion of an erased "s" after *make* in Stanza 62, at line 491).

Eight stanzas have one erasure or inked-in revision only. They are 2, 42, 43, 47, 70, 79, 88 and 94. Fourteen further stanzas (1, 9, 22, 28, 29, 34, 35, 37, 49, 51, 53, 66, 72, and 99) have two erasures only, and a handful of others only slightly more. Thus nearly a third of the poem was written straight on to the page and hardly altered - assuming Byron made no other sketches.

There are numerous crossings-out elsewhere, including a small number which are illegible. Virtually all the legible ones - Byron normally scores through once - are indicated on the left-hand page of the foregoing text. Most of Byron's deleted first thoughts are rejected on the clear grounds of clumsy or lame phrasing and scansion, because he decided on a capital, or simply because an even better wording occurred to him: but there are some which give more food for thought, and on these I comment below.

35-6:

daily

So many Conqueror's Cars were <proudly> driven

<cut>

<So many heads off - without the new>
 Being a whit better>
So many kingdoms fitted up anew -

At first Byron's temptation was to illustrate the damnability of his own times by describing the French Revolution and the Terror; but he was anxious to refer in the opening stanzas to the post-Waterloo scene rather than to the pre-Napoleonic crisis, as having more immediate applicability to his readers: he probably did not want to depict the French Revolution as a crisis as huge as the post-1815 peace; so the settlement of the Congress of Vienna substitutes.

40: **The page was so <splashed oer> with blood and dust. -
 besmeared**

You cannot splash dust, and yet *dust* is clearly dictated by the need for a rhyme for *disgust*: Byron was writing so rapidly that the very obvious "splashed" emerged from his pen before he could rein it in, and substitute the much more brutal and deliberate-sounding *besmeared*, which also alliterates with *blood*, and takes *blood* plus *dust* more naturally as its objects.

48: **both Generals
 'Tis that he has <that Conqueror> in reversion**

Evidently the need to damn Wellington as well as Napoleon did not occur to Byron at once; and it would not be clear which Conqueror was meant.

53: **<We will erase them by and bye>
 <They will be crushed yet>; - meantime they increase
 'Twill one day finish -**

A progressively less optimistic and more fatalistic attitude.

54-6: **and
 "With seven heads and ten horns" - all in front
 Saint John's foretold beast
 Like <the great beast in the Apocalypse>
 <to the Saint's foreseen beast> but ours are born
 formidable in
 <With> Less <proportion in> the head than horn.
 <With less proportion in the head>**

In right-hand margin: <not so gigantic in the head as horn>

Byron had three tries at a phrase to describe the monstrous Beast in *Revelations* 13. They were, firstly *the great beast in the Apocalypse*; then, *the Saint's foreseen beast*; and lastly, written above the first idea, the one which he finally chose: the name of the Saint is stated, as if to make the Biblical reference absolutely explicit, and *foretold* gives more confidence in the prophesy's fulfilment than *foreseen*. A joke about its heads and horns emerged with less difficulty; *With less proportion in the*

head than horn was tried twice; *not so gigantic in the head as horn* was tried vertically in the margin; finally Byron decided on *Less formidable in the head than horn*, which seems to flatter Georgian virility at the expense of its brains, and is also a reference to the loss of America, for the horns of the Beast are often taken to mean the provinces of the Roman Empire.

Stanza 8:

In the first year of Freedom's second dawn
Died George the third, although no tyrant, one
 <fought>
 <Who did for tyranny until withdrawn>
 <tyranny till>
Who<m> <tyrants> shielded tyrants, till each Sense withdrawn
Left him nor mental nor external Sun,
farmer
A better <Country Squire> neer brushed <the> dew from lawn,
A worse king never left a realm undone -
 <Because With middling parts and mighty power he made>
but subjects
He died - <and> left his <kingdom> still behind -
One half as tother no less
 <Not much less> mad - <and certainly as> blind.

Byron revised the first stanza describing George very heavily. My argument (see above, page 9) is that he needed to stress George's slow fading into impotence in a *decrecendo* running throughout the stanza: thus to start with George fighting for tyrants - defying the new dawn - would be too aggressive, so Byron substitutes - after a lot of false starts - the weaker idea of him shielding them. The phrase *shielded tyrants* gives a better scansion to the start of line 3, (though a crossed-out *m* after *Who* indicates that tyrants were once to become the subjects of a verb of which George was to be the object) and its rhythm perhaps helps dictate *till each Sense withdrawn*, which gives Byron a stronger idea of where the stanza is going.

The superb line *Left him nor mental nor external Sun* follows without correction. A *better Country Squire* follows with slightly less forethought: George was known for his amateur interest in farming techniques, so *Country Squire* is too formal, however, and *farmer*, both less elevated socially and more aptly mundane, substitutes. Yet George was not a farmer, he was a king, and a farmer only in his mind, or on paper; so Byron needs next to stress the impracticality - the fantasy element - even in his farmer's role. Next *dawn ... withdrawn* leads to *lawn*, which at once suggests the lines from Gray's *Elegy*:

Oft have we seen him at the peep of dawn
 Brushing with hasty steps the dews away
 To meet the sun upon the upland lawn.

whereupon line five completes itself. *Brushing the dew from the lawn* is entirely pastoral in tone, has nothing to do with getting up at 4.30 to milk the cows, and George is a harmless daydreamer in his ideals. The second part of the antithesis now

crushes the dream, and brings us brutally into the world where people who dream may also be damned: *A worse king never left a realm undone*. Byron subsequently “mitigated” this; see my argument on pages 8-10, that the erratum printed in the *Liberal’s* second number, substituting *weaker* for *worse* in line 6, is a genuine, and not a politic, further revision of the stanza. A line follows which looks like *Because with middling parts and mighty power* – evidently a cul-de-sac; it could actually be *middling parts and mighty horn*, which would not fit in with the rhyme-scheme, as the couplet is now called for, and *-awn* has been used three times already: also, it would introduce a sexual concept, and Byron is determined to have none.

Byron planned to make the concluding couplet about George’s “kingdom”:

**<He died - and left his kingdom still behind -
Not much less mad - and certainly as blind.>**

but the replacement of *kingdom* by *subjects* improves the insult, together with an anticlimactic “but”:

**He died - but left his subjects still behind -
One half as bad - and t’other no less blind.**

75-6: ... the funeral
Made the attraction, and the black the woe -
<Old Windsor’s towers were all which we can call>
There throbbed not there a thought which pierced the pall;

What it was which *Old Windsor’s towers* had which all else lacked is left unstated - dignity, or perhaps sincere gloom: Byron substitutes a finely-alliterative line, which impugns the sincerity of the funeral celebrations much more cuttingly.

94: **<virtues> qualities**
In whom his <vices all are> reigning still

“Qualities” suavely encapsulates both vices and virtues.

101: **I hardly know too if not quite alone am I**
<I know not if ...>

I know not if not quite alone am I would have been adequate scansion but poor style, with its repeated “not”s. The facetiously tripping rhythm which Byron’s alternative version possesses is perhaps explained by the fact that *hárldy-know* and *nót-quite-a-* are dactyls – monotonously prominent in the hexameters of Southey’s *A Vision of Judgement*. Byron, in shyly admitting his unorthodox distaste for damnation, parodies the enemy who parades his liking for damnation so vulgarly. (This interpretation relies heavily on tone of voice.)

127-8: **<snort/>start** **wink**
But he with first a <start> and then a <Nod> -
Said **another**
<Snored> - “There’s <some new> **I think**

<must be some> **Star gone out <by G-d>!**"

“Snored” is excellent, but perhaps line 8 is too lengthy to be snored by St. Peter, and in any case, Uranus, the new star named after George, survived him as confidently as it predated him. Note the omission of the casual blasphemy; the joke is too crude, and Byron wants to avoid obvious impiety.

156: **the Parvenù!**
“That fellow Paul - <the damndest Saint!”>

As with St. Peter’s “by God!” in Stanza 16, the idea of his rivalry with St. Paul leading to the wish, even in a thoughtless curse, to see him damned, is too much for Byron, though the idea of a damned saint had formed a momentary temptation; and the more complex and subtle *Parvenù* is substituted, which conveys Peter’s distaste with greater discretion.

<but>
 190: **Fierce <and> unfathomable thoughts**
and

Byron’s comic inability to decide on the conjunction perhaps shows his doubt about how obvious he intended Sathan to be. *Fierce but unfathomable* is cheap, and implies fierceness to be normally comprehensible: *fierce and unfathomable* gives the Fiend a more inscrutable dignity.

The colour of the ink changes just as stanza 27 begins, just after the joke about angels being all Tories, and before the entry of St Michael. Could this be where Byron temporarily abandoned the poem on the day he started it – May 7th? It is a good “natural break”; but as the ink colour changes twice again later on, only once at a “natural break”, the evidence does not seem conclusive.

246-7: **No thought save for his Maker’s service durst**
 <Intrude, he was the loveliest Machine>
 <In> <However fair and high>
Intrude, however glorified and high -
He knew him but the Vice=roy of the Sky.

An important re-emphasis in Byron’s exploratory angelology. The question is, do angels possess free will or not? Is Michael merely an expression of the will of God, and thus a glorious automaton? Is he a *Thing of Light*, as most editions have him, or is he merely a *thing of light*, as the manuscript insists? Even if he is a *Thing*, has he equality with Sathan, who was unquestionably prompted to his unsuccessful rebellion by free will? Byron tries an unequivocal statement: Michael has no free will; he is *the loveliest Machine*. Then he decides this is to be rejected, perhaps because *durst* has already hinted at the subtler alternative - angels are prevented from disobedience by fear. They may possess free will, but the omnipotence of the Maker – even more obvious since the Fall – makes certain that they will only use it in His service. Despite the fact that he is *glorified and high* – an improvement on *fair and high*, which Byron tries out and rejects also – Michael is wise enough to be content with subordination,

434 and 441: <thousand> million ... <just> half a minute

Byron increases the distance from Heaven to Hell, and then shortens the amount of time it takes Sathan's signal to pass over it.

455-6: The erasures here indicate that Byron first thought he would start the parenthesis with a bracket at the beginning of line 456, and end it with the stanza; but he then decided to start it at *I am doubtful* and to run it over with *But take your choice* at the start of Stanza 58. The absence of punctuation at the end of 656 indicate that he wanted Stanzas 82 and 83 to run-over too: these are the only two examples of run-over in the poem.

535: **Behold a Candidate with unturned-coat!**
<It shall be me they'll find the trustyest patriot>

The first thought gives too many stresses, and almost makes the line into an alexandrine: the substitution prepares our thoughts for Southey.

580: **Belial upon**
Where <Beelzebub on> on duty for the day

Byron knew his Milton, and knew that Belial, the suave bestial hypocrite and rhetorician, had less dignity than Beëlzebub; so Sathan's right-hand man is relieved of the job of roasting Pitt and Fox. This idea is as important as the improved scansion which results.

611: **Nabob**
<A Doctor> - a Man Midwife

Byron was of the school which thought Sir Philip Francis had been Junius, and the "Nabob" substitution hints at the suspicion voiced unambiguously in Stanza 79: Francis made a fortune in India.

639: **'Tis that**
<It is that he> wh</om>at Junius we are wont to call

"It is that he was nobody at all" would terminate the stanza at its seventh line; so Byron has to provide some discreet padding, with perhaps a covert hint (*really - truly*) at what we may suspect, namely that Junius is his alter ego. The substitution of *what* for *whom* renders Junius less human.

657-8: **<are on> upon record will outlast**
"My charges <is> <upon record and will live>
"The Brass <both> of <epitaphs> both his epitaph and tomb,
<Longer than all his laureat odes ...>

See Shakespeare, Sonnet 65: *Since brass, nor stone, nor earth, nor boundless sea, / But sad mortality o'ersways their power ...* In the new line, Junius derives his

confidence in the immortality of his words in part from Shakespeare, whose sonnet ends ... *In black ink my love may still shine bright*. For “love” read “hate” and you have the same reflection. However, it could also be that Byron remembered Southey’s pompous words in his *Letter to William Smith* (page 28):

I brand him on the forehead with the name of SLANDERER. Salve the mark as you will, Sir, it is ineffaceable! You must bear it with you to your Grave, and the remembrance will outlast your Epitaph.

(Brass also implies brazenness – see *Don Juan*, I 1733 or *I Corinthians* 13, 1.) Thus Junius, whose multiple personae include Byron, George III, George IV, Sin, and Death, is made momentarily to echo Southey himself, plus St. Paul, to make up the muster of shadows. The omission of the line about odes, at the same time, makes the subject of Junius’ speech, less ambivalently, George. His *laureate odes* could imply that Southey was being spoken of.

said to Michael

669: **Then Sathan** <rose again and> **don’t forget**

another example of Byron avoiding vulgar impiety.

741: <they hear him> **now**
 the slaves hear

Byron removes a neutral phrase and adds a more dramatic one, underlining it either for emphasis or to indicate that he is quoting. One clue as to the precise reference may be found in a letter to Moore of October 28th 1815, describing an Irish play which he is having to read for Drury Lane:

Turgesius is chained by the leg (vide stage direction) to a pillar on the stage; and King Malachi makes him a speech, not unlike Lord Castlereagh’s about the balance of power and the lawfulness of legitimacy, which puts Turgesius into a frenzy - as Castlereagh’s would, if his audience was chained by the leg. He draws a dagger and rushes at the orator; but, finding himself at the end of his tether, he sticks it into his own carcass, and dies, saying, he has fulfilled a prophecy (BLJ IV 323).

The idea of Castlereagh’s audience having no option but to listen may have its germination in the ridiculous playscript – which Byron still remembered in 1821, for he refers to it in *Detached Thoughts* (no. 67 – IX 36). However, a still more immediate source is *The Irish Avatar*, written immediately before *The Vision*, in August and September 1821, immediately upon the heels of the events which inspired it. Stanzas 22 and 23 read:

But let not his name be thy Idol alone -
On his right hand behold a SEJANUS appears!
Thine own CASTLEREAGH! Let him still be thine own!
A wretch, never named but with curses and jeers,-

Till now, when the Isle that should blush for his birth,
 Deep, deep as the gore which he shed on her soil,
 Seems proud of the Reptile which crawled from her earth,
 And for murder repays him with shouts and a smile!

(CPW VI 10-11)

Castelreagh's reception by the servile Dubliners must still have been on Byron's mind; and his astonishment at the way the Irish had welcomed the *Eutropius of its many masters* still very probably rankled. Hence the allusion.

767: **To name his works; he would but cite a few -**
 <He therefore was content to name a few>

The breathless punctuation conveys Southey's eager self-publicity more vividly. And cite has a more aptly ecclesiastical pomposity.

802: **with**
 <of>
 Judge my Judgement - ! -

A climactic hesitation. Would Southey offer his *Vision* for criticism, or not? Byron finally decides that he will not ask them either to *judge his Judgement*, or to *judge of his Judgement*, but, far more confidently and blasphemously, to *judge with his Judgement!* The phrase makes better use of the pun: the heavenly and hellish hosts are being invited (conscious meaning) to doom George according to Southey's blueprint, but also (unconscious meaning) to make asses of themselves in the way he is going to.

823: <Saint Mich Peter>
 Michael took refuge in his trump - but lo!

Which of the Saints to call upon at this point in the narrative flummoxed Byron slightly before he sorted out Saint Michael's humiliation to come before Saint Peter's triumph.

842-3: **the telescope is gone**
 <the light is now withdrawn>
 optics
 Which kept my <opinion> free from all delusion -

To admit to his own *light* being *withdrawn* would put Byron in the same case as George's in Stanza 8: so the implication of fellowship with the king must go. The words *telescope* and *optics* also give a more modern, precise and scientific feeling to the stanza, in keeping with Byron's anti-rhetorical and anti-obscurantist drift.

846: **slipped**
 King George <squeezed> into heaven for one

A participle at once less uncomfortable, and more devious.

THE PRINCIPAL EDITIONS OF THE VISION OF JUDGEMENT

The text in *The Liberal* of October 1822 introduces variations from the manuscript, other than simple punctuation ones, which have been with the poem ever since. At 301, *if in his earthly span* becomes *if in this earthly span* (this was corrected in 1991). At 590, *heads and knees* becomes *hands and knees* (this wasn't). Michael is deprived of an authentic exclamation-mark and tonal lapse in *For Godsake! Stop, my friend!* at 727; and a very funny moment at 735-6 is altered from the confident *What? What? / Pye come again!* to the querulous *What! What! / Pye come again?* – it seems to me that to credit George with a brief flash of certainty in the face of Southey's *spavined Dactyls* is closer to Byron's sympathetic intention.

Exclamation-marks are lost from *let him have way!* (304) *Michael!* (381) *Eternity!* (502) *"Iron Mask"!* (624) and *the latter yours, good Michael!* (690).

On the other hand, several new exclamation-marks have been introduced – *undone!* (62) *died!* (65) *Speak!* (300) *you, Saint Peter!* (381) *True!* (385) *of that be sure!* (396) *"No!"* (407) *The Shadow came!* (593) *Vision!* (801) *fall!* (804) and *Alfonso!* (807). Some are expressive and comical: but those given to the narrative voice at 62, 65 and 593 seem cheaply sensational.

Some inauthentically conservative capitalisations occur: *King* (throughout) *President* (472) *Lords and Commons* (558) and most damagingly *Thing of Light* (218). Much of Byron's own eccentric capitalisation vanishes, as it habitually did at this stage; and the comedy is smothered in semi-colons and colons.

Byron's archaic preference *burthen* is modernised at 677 as *burden*. His correct but unpunctuated *eer* becomes *ere* at 780, and his correct scansion at 800, *Has more of brass in't and is as well blown*, gets a foot added in *Has more of brass in it, and is as well blown* (*in't* makes the line harder to say). Finally, at 803, Southey loses a proud and thus fatuous underlining / italicisation: *Now you shall judge – all people! – yes – you shall / Judge with my Judgement!*

The January 1823 *Liberal* introduces the three errata which Byron sent from abroad, but does not incorporate them into the text. This could have been done, at least for the two most radical, *A weaker king ne'er left a realm undone* (62) and *Of constancy to an unhandsome woman* (96) which occur in the new twenty-page first signature which was used to replace the original sixteen-page signature (the enlargement being necessary to accommodate the Preface):¹ but presumably it was thought that to include them as errata would draw public attention to them in a way which straight correction would not.

After *The Liberal* appeared, and the poem gained notoreity, a number of pirates were printed. They include duodecimos of 1822 printed by and for W. Bumpus of Fleet Street, and W. Dugdale, 23, Russell Court, Drury Lane. Dugdale put his pirate out late in 1822, then issued a second one in 1823, by when he had moved to Seven Dials. These editions reproduced the *Liberal* text, with errata in the case of Dugdale's second version, and also gave Southey's poem – in the case of the second (1823) Dugdale version, fronted by Byron's preface, which no 1822 pirate would have known

1: See F.L.Randolph, *Studies for a Byron Bibliography* (1979) p.76.

about. In 1824, now back at 23 Russell Court, Drury Lane – an address billed on the title-page as *The Original Byron's Head* – Dugdale issued the poems yet again, in an improved version, with the title-page epigraph *My bane and antidote are both before me* (from Addison's *Cato*). Southey's poem was printed first, this time, followed by Byron's poem with its preface.

A French pirate edition of Byron's poem only was issued late in 1822, by A. Belin of Rue de Mathurins S.J., N° 14 – who was normally Gaglignani's printer. It had also had of necessity no preface, but at fifty-six pages duodecimo, with only two stanzas to a page, found an excellent pocket format.

In 1824 Bumpus issued another pirate of both *Visions*, with page 57 misnumbered 56: it too was duodecimo, with four Byron stanzas to a page (Southey's hexameters suffer badly in duodecimo). And lastly Richard Carlile, the most famous of the radical publishers, crowned the enterprise with a handsome octavo in the same year, giving six stanzas to a page. The British Library catalogue used to list a duodecimo pirate of 1835 printed by B.D.Cousins, but this seems no longer to exist.

Only the second Dugdale version gives the 1823 errata.

Other pirates doubtless existed, and the trade shows how popular the poem was with the less well-off.

The Hunts published a version of *The Vision* in the seventh volume of a doubtfully complete Byron which they put out in 1825. It included the poem on pages 125-90, but cut the following: stanza 8, stanza 9 lines 1 and 2, stanza 43 lines 1 to 6, stanza 44, stanza 45 lines 1 to 6, and stanza 47 lines 4 to 8. However, they *included* the prohibited parts in an account of John Hunt's trial, which they placed as an appendix.

In 1826 a publisher in Frankfurt called H.L. Broenner issued a single-volume complete edition of Byron's works. This seems to have been an international edition, for it advertised itself as being obtainable at named "bookselling houses" in Amsterdam, Brussels, Frankfurt, Leyden, Paris, Milan, St Petersburg, Moscow and Venice. Murray seems to have been part of the cartel, for it was published under his name too, though it is not clear how many copies were sold. The edition contained *The Vision*, with an unique piece of censorship, perhaps to please the German, French and Russian establishments: line 145 had its last word cut and a dash substituted, so that it was not clear which decapitated king was being referred to (in the context remaining it could just be Charles I). Murray took the cut over, and the version thus mutilated represented the first time that the firm had acknowledged the poem's existence publicly. The *Liberal* errata were ignored (as was the *Don Juan* dedication).

An edition of Byron published in 1829 at Philadelphia by the Washington Press advertised itself on the title-page as *The / Poetic Works / of / Lord Byron, / including his / Don Juan - all his Minor Poems, / and the suppressed pieces of / Cain, and The Vision of Judgment / all complete / in two volumes*. It did not quite live up to its ambition, for in *Don Juan*, Canto I 129 7-8, 130 7-8, and all of 131, were still missing - fortunately, perhaps, for their content would not have amused many Americans. In *The Vision*, which is in volume two on pages 569-90, the editors included the errata, not in a list, but in the text. Queen Charlotte thus became for the first time *an unhandsome woman*; George was less abused than he had been in 1822, although the scansion was, for the editors, like their distinguished compatriot in 1986 (see below, pages 199-200) ignored the full change and made line 62 *a weaker king never left a realm undone!* Parry had (at least) two *crews*, Peter was accompanied by no fellow saints, and the Devil was *Satan* at 47 and *Sathan* everywhere else. As would be

expected, *our President* was capitalised at 472, but surprisingly *the new world* at 369 was not, as it would be by Wright. The edition had no notes apart from Byron's own.

In 1831 two volumes were added by Murray to an authentic edition of 1830, making a complete Byron of six volumes. *The Vision* is on pages 397-440 of the fifth volume. The errata are again ignored, and the poem is unannotated.

In Murray's big seventeen-volume edition of 1832 the text of the poetry was edited by John Wright.² *The Vision* is in Volume XII, and takes up pages 231 to 296. The Introduction gives long extracts from Southey's Preface, from Byron's *Two Foscari* Appendix, from Southey's *Courier* letter of January 5th 1822, and from Byron's letters to Moore of October 1st 1821 and to Kinnaird of February 6th 1822; Moore (or Wright) refers patronisingly to Byron's challenge to Southey as a "warlike missive".

In its notes to Byron's Preface, the edition quotes from Lord Eldon's judgement on *Wat Tyler*, gives a note on *William Smith*, Southey's poem on *Marten the Regicide* – with its *Anti-Jacobin* parody – and a note on Landor. In its notes to the poem it includes many lines from Southey's *Vision*, and has also notes on: George III's death; the "German will"; Louis XVI; Parry; Southcote, "the aged lunatic"; Johnson; George III and the Catholics; the "gilt key"; Walpole; the Reverend Robert Hall on Southey's blasphemy; Simond on Wilkes; Wilkes' profligacy; the different candidates for Junius; Byron on Junius as a good hater; the "iron mask"; Mackintosh on Francis as Junius; *Nominis Umbra*; Skiddaw; Horace and Boileau; George's speech-habits; Pye; *Blackwoods* on Byron's own scribbling; Aubrey; *Blackwoods* on Southey's *Vision*; Byron's letter of October 9th 1822 about *The Liberal*; a long note about Leigh Hunt, in refutation of his assertions about Byron in *Lord Byron and his Contemporaries*; and finally a poem by Moore satirising Hunt as one who *judges of lions by puppy-dog habits ... He lifts up his leg at the noble beast's carcass / And – does all a dog, so diminutive, can*. The animus displayed towards Hunt is part of the interest of this edition, for it is the only major one done while Byron's friends – except Kinnaird, who died in 1830 – and the controversy which surrounded him as a contemporary, were still living. The preparation of Moore's *Life* had been expedited because of anger over Hunt's memoir (see Smiles, *A Publisher and his Friends*, II p.306).

The edition includes as appendices William Smith's 1817 speech on Southey, and Southey's *Letter to William Smith*. Perhaps the most striking omissions are any reference to Quevedo, and any reference to *The Liberal*'s errata. Line 62 goes in as *A worse king never left a realm undone!* and at line 96 Queen Charlotte is *a bad, ugly woman*. Parry loses a *crew* at 216 and Peter is joined by other *saints* at 236 – two errors which were to recur over and over again until 1986, when Jerome McGann eliminated them (*saints*, but not *crew*, actually originates in the 1831 edition). At 76 *woe* becomes *wo* and at 197 *potter'd* becomes *patter'd*. The text otherwise loses most of *The Liberal*'s capitalisation, and several exclamation marks. Sathan loses his "h" –

2: CPW I xxxii. Wright worked for Murray as a freelance and, among other things, edited the regular index to the *Quarterly Review*, as well as the letters of Chatham and various other prestigious ventures such as a Boswell, a Crabbe, and a Goldsmith; publisher and editor parted in 1839 in an acrimonious quarrel over payment (information from John Murray Archive.) I do not know whether or not he was the same John Wright who published the *Anti-Jacobin*, went bankrupt in 1802 and spent the following years as general factotum to William Cobbett, parting from him in 1812. This John Wright was born in 1770, so his dates are consistent with the idea that he switched allegiances and became factotum to Murray: clearly he would have known Gifford. See Draper Hill, *Mr Gillray the Caricaturist*, Chapters 6 to 9.

he doesn't recover it until 1991 – and the punctuation is altered haphazardly in ways which suggest neither respect for *The Liberal* nor familiarity with the manuscript, which was probably at this stage lost.

In 1837 Murray condensed the 1832 edition into a single volume, which became standard throughout the nineteenth century. *The Vision* is on pages 512-26, and contrives to include all the notes from the 1832 edition.

E.H.Coleridge's 1901 edition for Murray has *The Vision* in Volume IV, pages 473-525. By this time the manuscript has been recovered, although it is not in Murray's possession, and Coleridge is able to quote several deleted readings from it, as well as the usual chunks from Southey's *Vision*. In his introduction Coleridge quotes not only from Byron's letters but from Southey's, and the question of the "League of Incest" is referred to. Southey's *Vision* is characterised as an "undivine comedy", "impossible and intolerable". Its Preface is quoted, as are Byron's *Foscari* appendix, Southey's 1822 *Courier* letter, Byron's October 1st letter to Moore, and Medwin's account of Byron's "prismatic" fit. It is admitted that Byron was annoyed at Murray over the Preface and the proof (no-one reading the 1832 edition would gather this); and adverse reviews from *The Courier* and *A Critique on The Liberal* are quoted. The 1823 *Liberal* errata are described as *precautions, not ... afterthoughts*, and there is reference to the trial of John Hunt. (Prothero's companion edition of the letters had already given much information on the Byron-Southey quarrel.) The poem is illustrated with portraits of George, Southey, and Landor.

Coleridge quotes Crabb Robinson on Goethe, and adds notes on the following: Scrub; Eldon; William Smith; Marten; Roger L'Estrange and Quevedo; Pope; Landor; Napoleon's and George's deaths; Byron on George's death; *The European Magazine* on George's funeral; the "German will"; Lady Byron on Byron's theology; Louis XVI; St. Bartholomew; *pottered / patterned*, which he corrects; Parry; Quevedo; Southcote; Job; eastern gates; Dr Johnson; Bute; Catholic Emancipation; the "gilt key"; Walpole; the telegraph; *The Ancient Mariner* and *Paradise Lost*; spades; Wilkes (four separate notes); Eve's petticoat; Bute and Grafton; the Treason and Sedition Bills; Junius; the Iron Mask; Malaprop; the Niger's mouth; *Stat Nominis Umbra*; Horne Tooke and Franklin; Asmodeus; William Smith and the "renegado" accusation; the weight of Southey's books; tea; asses; the "spell" at 817; Minos in Fielding; Horace; George's speech patterns; Pye; Southey's looks; Southey's first reaction to the poem; *Wat Tyler*, *Blenheim* and *Waterloo*; Wesley; Byron on pantisocracy; Southey's scribbling; Alfonso; and Wellborn, who is denied his double "I" in the text, as he was in 1832.

Coleridge restores much capitalisation from the manuscript, but decides against the errata. Very strangely he attributes Parry's crews to the *Liberal* text only, and does not restore it from the manuscript; and keeps Peter accompanied by other non-existent but at least capitalised *Saints* at 236.

In 1926 the Cambridge University Press issued a single-volume edition of the *Vision* as part of their *Plain Texts* series. It was unannotated, ignored the errata problem, and had an introduction by Mary Le H. Redman which claimed that one of Byron's ancestors was called Foul-mouthed Jack;³ that line 328 *reads Heaven could not make him better, nor I worse*, and that "him" refers to George III.⁴ Redman's attitude may be gauged from her summing-up: *The poem is shocking yet exhilarating*,

3: *Byron's Vision of Judgment*, int. M.Le.H. Redman, C.U.P. 1926, p.v.

4: *Ibid* p.x.

and prudence and morality must be set on one side in criticising it.⁵ C.U.P. did not reprint this edition.

E.H.Coleridge's is a full and informative edition: but an Oxford University Press version of 1929, edited by E.M.Earl, has the distinction of being the only good edition so far to contain *The Vision* as its sole main text (perhaps conceived as a more useful rival to the Cambridge edition, it places Southey's *Vision* as an appendix, but also ignores the 1823 errata completely). Earl's historical and literary notes are copious, and include a controversial one to line 584, which says that the line (***I'll have him gagged – 'twas one of his own bills***) refers not to any gagging legislation of 1795 or later, but to the Order in Parliament in November 1763 that No. 45 of the North Briton should be burned publicly by the common hangman.⁶ The reading would assume that him and his refer exclusively to Wilkes: but see my own note, suggesting otherwise. Earl's is a most useful edition: but it has never been reprinted either.

In 1932 the Raven Press, seemingly a small private venture, brought out both *Visions* in one extremely handsome volume, in a limited edition of 220 copies. It ignored the errata – as all editions do between 1904 and 1986 – but printed both Southey's dedication and preface as well as Byron's preface and poem, in dramatically contrasting typefaces, with woodcuts by the printers before each of the two sections. Technically it is a very fine piece of work. The illustrations, however, appear equally pompous,⁷ and the book has an introduction by R. Ellis Roberts, which among other things spells "damning" with two "m"s,⁸ asserts that Southey had no idea what Shelley was like⁹ and refers throughout to Southey's *The Vision of Judgement*.

In the *Keats-Shelley Journal* for January 1953 Payson Gates published the letter from Leigh Hunt to his nephew Henry in which Byron says in a marginal comment that it should be ***midst the roar*** not ***midst the war*** that the voice of Jonathan should be heard at line 470. Editors were slow to react, and it was not until sixteen years later that J.D.Jump, revising Frederick Page's cramped Oxford Standard Authors Byron, corrected the line.

In 1986 Jerome McGann edited a one-volume Byron for the less cramped though less complete *Oxford Authors* series. For his *Vision* (pages 939-68) he went back to *The Liberal* for nearly all his punctuation and capitalisation, though very strangely he substituted a colon for the *Liberal's* question mark after that thou canst claim him at line 300. Elsewhere he restored a crew to Parry and deprived Peter of his saints. He

5: Ibid p.viii.

6: *Byron's Vision of Judgment*, ed. E.M.Earl, O.U.P. 1929, p.74.

7: Speaking parenthetically of illustrations, I have never seen mention made of the coincidental links between *The Vision(s) of Judgement* and the stained glass south window of Trinity College Library, Cambridge. Here the enthroned George III, with Britannia at his shoulder, gazes soulfully into the cloudy middle-distance, oblivious to a female muse-figure who is trying to present Newton to him (some have mistaken Newton for Byron, on the grounds of his fleshy jaw) and Bacon with quill in hand stares blankly at the spectator; cherubs and trumpeting seraphim circle above. The eighteenth-century window (*A.B.Cipriani delinquit* is signed in the bottom left-hand corner) is very reminiscent of Southey's *Vision* in mood. It invites facetious comment, and Byron must have known it. Cipriani was a lecturer at the Royal Academy when James Gillray was a student there.

8: *A Vision of Judgement by Robert Southey and The Vision of Judgement by Lord Byron*, here printed in one volume with an introduction by R. Ellis Roberts and wood-engravings by the printers, The Raven Press Harrow Weald 1932, introduction p.v.

9: Ibid, introduction p.x.

provided some standard notes, including a misleading one¹⁰ which asserts that *Wat Tyler* was published in 1794.

He also incorporated the errata, though incompletely, so that 62 again reads *A weaker king never left a realm undone!* This apparently was a typographical error, and we now (February 1991) await his full edition of the work, which will explain why he chose the Liberal text rather than the manuscript, and why having opted for *The Liberal* in aggregate he opted against *Sathan*, which is unquestionably a *Liberal* detail as well as a manuscript one. It will be interesting to see whether he has enough room for the ancillary prose documents by both Byron and Southey which make the surrounding drama so fascinating.

Having been expected since 1988, and announced for March 1991, CPW VI came out finally in September 1991. It is hard to be completely objective about it, for it includes, on page 672, an unexpected puff for the present edition:

The Miltonic background of the work goes without saying. Peter Cochran, who is doing a separate edition of the 'Vision', sees an important general source text in the Book of Revelation. He also argues that the figure of Southey recalls Pope's treatment of Theobald and Cibber in *The Dunciad*, Sheridan's portraits of Sir Fretful Plagiary and Mr Puff in *The Critic*, and various of Southey's own characters in *The Curse of Kehama* (e.g. Kehama, Arvalan, etc.). In the last case, St Peter would correspond to Southey's Indra.

The source of all this is a letter from P.C. to Professor McGann of April 27th 1989, which contains, in addition to a series of "cast-lists" showing equivalences between works, the texts and context of the letters to John Murray III from John Breese, printed on pages 170-1 above. Professor McGann had not seen these letters at that date, and a paraphrase of their contents, with a short quotation, and speculation as to what proof it was that Breese lost, appears on page 668 of CPW VI. The generous mention – which, it must be said, also enables Professor McGann to make an economic résumé of many strands in the poem's tradition, some perhaps original, some embarrassingly obvious – may be interpreted as a gesture of thanks for the shared information (he misses out Lucian's *Kataplous* from the works listed as antecedents in the 1989 letter). The dating of the editorial introduction at 1988 may suggest that part of the edition's lateness was because it had to be relaid to incorporate the Breese material.

CPW claims that *The Liberal* is not the sole basis for its text of *The Vision*. In the introduction, a dramatic change of editorial principle is announced:

... whereas the customary editorial policy in this edition [sic] has heretofore been to favour late over earlier readings (when it can be shown that Byron remained an active participant in the production process), in the present case the policy has been reversed. Here Byron's M.S. readings are given presumptive authority over printed readings in substantive matters. A substantive reading in the original

10: *Byron* ed. McGann p.1073.

M.S. will be rejected only when a later reading (printed or otherwise) makes a stronger case for itself. (CPW VI p.xiv)

The copy text entry at the foot of the first page of text for *The Vision* consequently reads:

379. Copy text: for Preface, 2nd edn. of *Liberal*; for verse text, 1st edn., first issue of *Liberal*, collated with 2nd issue and 2nd edn.; both Preface and verse text collated with *Knight and Lacey* and later edns.; verse text collated with Murray MS. and proof. Unless otherwise stated, all variations are from the Murray MS. (CPW VI 309)

However, the editors still adhere to the printed versions when matters other than the “substantive” are in question:

It may fairly be asked why, in such cases, we do not use the MSS. themselves as copy texts. The answer is that they are clearly working MSS., and have not been properly prepared for the printer. The MSS. are still being produced by Byron with the clear expectation that they will not *determine* the system of printed accidentals, and that the publisher will take a hand in ordering the accidental material for ultimate publication. (CPW VI p.xv).

All this is a great pity. For comments on the quasi-medieval distinction between “substantive” and “accidental”, see above, page 21: in appearing to reverse one half of its principle while retaining the other, and in avoiding the highly relevant, but upsettingly radical question, whether the style in which Byron’s publishers ordered his “accidental material” was an apt one, CPW VI loses a major opportunity. Actually the edition isn’t altering its principles at all: it’s retaining them, while conceding that the social circumstances of its texts’ production have changed: their copy-texts will still be the ones Byron is presumed to have “overlooked” last.

Anyone looking for exciting new textual changes as a result of the “new” policy will be disappointed, for apart from the errata, discussed above, and two other monosyllables, the only changes from the *Liberal* text are the substitution of Arabic for Roman numerals, the substitution of single for double inverted commas, the loss of all inverted commas within speeches, the loss of the diphthong in *Ægean* at 452, and the substitution of *M.S.* for *MS.* at 809. (In the copy used here, a comma has become a full stop at the end of 438, and another full stop has crept in where it’s not wanted at the end of 539 – but the editors are not necessarily responsible.)

Two “substantive” errors occurred in the poem’s transmission, from Ravenna to Old Bond Street via Albemarle Street, and thus to the world: one is the loss of *his* in favour of *this* at line 301, which CPW VI amends; the other the loss of *heads* in favour of *hands* at 590, and this, despite the seeming inconsistency, CPW VI records in its apparatus but does not include in its text.

To take one detail ignored: the manuscript of *The Vision* (or the ‘Vision’, as CPW calls it) has at 780, *Become as base a critic as eer crawled*: that is, as base a critic as ever crawled. CPW would apparently see the spelling of eer as an “accidental” problem, for (without recording any change from the M.S.) it retains the *Liberal* reading, *Become as base a critic as ere crawled*: that is, I suppose, become as base a critic as had crawled beforehand – the usage is extremely strained (see above, page

51). Later, on page 716, in a note for *The Deformed Transformed*, II i 6, another manuscript *eer* is conversely given preference over an incorrect printed *ere*, which is blamed on Mary Shelley's faulty transcription; see also the note to *Sardanapalus* IV i 343 on page 623). In thus relegating some homophonic spelling questions (but not others) to the periphery of their concern, CPW's editors rob themselves of the chance to right quite a few wrongs.

They rob themselves, and anyone else to whom the manuscript in the Murray Archive is inaccessible: for, true to their half-reversed principles, they list, in their apparatus at the page-bottoms, no "accidental" variants from the manuscript at all. No student will know from CPW VI what Byron really wrote at either line 780, just discussed, or at lines 62, 65, 218, 300, 304, 381, 385, 396, 407, 472, 502, 558, 593, 624, 677, 690, 727, 735-6, 800, 801, 803, 804, or 807 (for all these, see the opening of this section) or at lines 224, 247, 326, 503 or 613 (see notes to manuscript above).

The editorial matter relating to *Manuscript and Proofs* (pages 667-8) is well done, though necessarily without full documentation. I would query one detail: Murray did, contrary to what is said at the bottom of page 668, have a proof set up of the preface to the poem, as well as the poem itself. The section *Composition and Publishing History* is accurate as far as it goes: but the full drama of the botched publication cannot be conveyed without quoting letters from Murray and Kinnaird as well as from Byron, and of such there is no mention.

In the section *Literary and Historical Background* (pages 671-2: also notes to Stanzas 36-7 and lines 389-92) CPW gives much space and credit to Stuart Peterfreund's 1979 MLQ article *The Politics of "Neutral Space" in Byron's Vision of Judgment*. Although useful attention is drawn to Emrys Jones' 1981 MLR article *Byron's Visions of Judgment*, less space dedicated to Peterfreund might have given some in which to credit William Walling's *Tradition and Revolution: Byron's Vision of Judgment*, in TWC for autumn 1972.

The January 1823 *Liberal* errata are well discussed (especially that for 470 – the *roar / war* one) but the problems of the rushed transmission of those errata are ignored - especially the obvious question, what, from the newly-respected M.S., might we deduce that Byron would have added to them, in the way of punctuation, had he had the time, patience and inclination?

The precision of CPW's attention to the detail of the manuscript seems frustratingly haphazard: despite being indebted to it for several new readings, I would further record seventy-seven points where its account of the erasures seems to me inaccurate, in details either minor or major (see the list at the end of this section). Whether, at 769, Byron wrote, and then erased, *Blenheim*, as CPW would have it, or merely *Blenhei*, as the text above would have it, is hardly a great matter: but whether at 658 he wrote, and then erased, *longer than his lamentation*, as CPW, echoing E.H.Coleridge (C., IV 515) would have it, or *longer than his laureate odes*, as the text above would have it, does seem one.

Haste may be suspected: it certainly is to blame when, at page 325, m.s. note for line 330, *worm* is recorded as having been erased, when in fact it is *Soul* which has been erased and *worm* which has been substituted, as CPW's own text shows (the same occurs with *still* and *yet* at 754). Haste may also be responsible for the number of words and fragments which are claimed to be illegible beneath the erasures: *Great* or *Green* (16) *never* or *neer* (23) *made* (159) *monster's* (160) *know* (227) *superfluous* (323) *vary* (483) or *Britannic* (510); for those not recorded at all: the marginal *Not so gigantic in the head as horn* (56) *as it went for him* (92) *sea* (685)

or *Mich* (823); for one recorded as erased which isn't: *Oppression* (368) or for those simply misread: *corse* (for *carcase* – 75) or *bawling* (for *brainless* – 160).

CPW sometimes records words as erased which are actually part of the text. Thus at 284 it records <*The heart is placed in such men*> as a complete erasure: it should read *The heart <is placed> in <such> men*. At 657 it offers as erasures <*My charges are on*> when in fact only the last two words are erased. At 512 it records a phrase (*of kings*) which is not on the manuscript at all.

The disadvantage of the whole approach is shown more alarmingly on page 516, in CPW's edition of the allied but previously unpublished fragment, *On Southey. Detached Thought*. Here, with only one possible copy text, and no printed version to derive accidentals from at all, two capitals are lower-cased, and the poem's terminal exclamation-mark dropped, without acknowledgement. In the bottom-of-page apparatus, six monosyllables (*they, thy* twice, *So let, tombs*) and an ampersand in the poem's couplet, all erased by Byron, are ignored. This contrasts with the text, at CPW IV 35-40, of the *Epistle to Augusta*, another poem which is judged authentic in no printed version, and where not only do capitals seem preserved (except that one can't tell, because the apparatus beneath gives no "accidental" details!) but even the manuscript dashes serve for punctuation – as they do here at CPW VI pages 698-712, the first draft of *Werner*, Act I.

The Devil's postlapsarian name is still *Satan* at 47, and *Sathan* everywhere else; CPW seems insufficiently embarrassed by the inconsistency to mention it (better perhaps to have *Satan* throughout, as in the *Oxford Byron*). Although the edition is conscious enough of the spelling *judgement* to use it itself at page 676, top paragraph, no-one would know that Byron also used it, exclusively.

Several of the notes give the impression either of unchecked haste, or of prejudgement. The resemblance of the uncomfortable House of Lords meeting of Byron and Chancellor Eldon, as reported by R.C.Dallas (quoted by Stuart Peterfreund in his *MLQ* article) to that between Michael and Sathan at Stanzas 36-7, can only be argued by leaving out all reference to Stanza 35. No *mutual glance of great politeness* passed in the Lords – as Peterfreund actually admits, on page 282 of his article. It is slightly unscrupulous to list Byron's *A rushing sound of wind, and stream, and flame* (123) among the borrowings from Southey's *Vision*, and not to go from both poems to Acts, 2, 1-2. Whoever looked through Parry's 1821 North-West Passage Journal for the Aurora Borealis reference at 215-16n, and stopped at pages 34-5, must have taken a very long coffee-break – there is no reference to the Aurora in them at all: it is on pages 134-6. The editors should have included line 450, as well as 454-5, in their *Ancient Mariner* note: and any readers who allow themselves to be directed by CPW to *The Antiquary*, Chapter 21, for the Aubrey reference at 816n, will be frustrated: it is in fact in Chapter 9.

The one text to which I have found my attention usefully drawn by this edition is "Peter Pindar"'s *Ode upon Odes* of 1787: it has furnished material for the note to line 341.

CPW VI does contain (pages 222-5) a well-researched text of the *Two Foscari* note about Southey, which is such an important document in the Southey-Byron confrontation. A paragraph omitted in 1821 is placed as a note; and a later note (page 643) gives the reader the most important part of Southey's preface to *A Vision of Judgement*, which inspired the *Foscari* appendix.

But to sum up: *The Vision of Judgement* has still not appeared in public print in a version faithful to Byron's demonstrable intentions in manuscript. The Clarendon

Press have had the opportunity, but, because of partially-thought-through editorial principles, and an inadequate eye for detail, have not been able to take advantage of it.

PRESENT READINGS ALTERNATIVE TO THOSE OF CPW

(In CPW, the places where Byron erases a word, only to change his mind and write it again at once, are not recorded: neither are “accidentals” in the erasures. Apart from 535 and 837, I have only recorded disagreements defined within these terms.)

Line:	CPW reading:	present reading:
16	< ? >	<Grea/Gree> (B intends Greenland) ✓
23	< ? >	<neer/never>✓
29	<service>	<caxxere>✓
44	<weapon - was>	<weapon was so>✓
47	<here his>	<here his si> (B intends single)✓
56	[omission]	<Not so gigantic in the head as horn>✓
59	Who <tyrants>	Who<m> tyrants✓
71	[omission]	the <man> torches (B intends manners)✓
75	<corse>	<carcase>✓
77	<towers are>	<towers were>✓
87	<sons sent << ? >>	<soon/sons? sent might/right/night?>✓
88	Yet	<And/>Yet✓
89	earth <has down>	earth <has done>✓
92	[omission]	<as it went for him>✓
94	<whose living>	<whose loving> ✓ [? room for doubt]
94	<vices all were>	<vices all are>✓
104	[omission]	of <Sat> Hell's (B intends Sathan's)✓
104	<large>	<huge>✓
125	<exceeding>	<exceedin>✓
152	<land>	<hand>✓
159	<scarcely << ? >>	<scarcely made>✓
160	<poor << ? >> bawling>	<poor monster's brainless>✓
164	<sits>	<acted>✓
165	<And (You>	<And (You have>✓
180	<billows>	<billow>✓
188	<Africa>	<African>✓
202	<Falcons>	<Falcon>✓
205	<knew not>	<not>✓
214	<fire>	<fine>✓
227	<one to << ? >>	one to <know>✓
235	<he past>	<he past - he stood>✓
271	<deriding>	<derision>✓
275	<we see>	<causes all are>✓
284	<The heart is placed in such men>	The heart <is placed> in <such> men✓
323	<'twere << ? >>	<'twere superfluous>✓
330	poor <worm>	poor <Soul>✓
360	His <not>	His <net> (B intends neutral)✓
368	<his Oppression>	<his> Oppression✓
429	<As> I	<Or> I✓
438	[omission]	<Sky/xx>✓

443	<signals>	<signal>√
459	<overflowed>	<oerfowed>√
477	Ready	<For> Ready√
483	He < ? >	<H/The vary> (B intends He varied)√
510	<The ? Majesty's>	<Britannic Majesty's>√
512	<The count of kings>	<The court> (“of kings” is not present as such)√
516	<domains and>	<domains> <& then> <dispense>√
517	<should>	<should> over <shall>√
519	<then>	there <are> many√
525	<after>	<other>√
533	<our Election>	<an Election>√
535	<trustiest>	<trustyest>√
538	<were>	<now>√
539	<Must do in>	<Mortals is> [?room for doubt]
541	<Are summoned>	<Are surrounded> [?room for doubt]
592	<as the>	<in the>√
608	<uncle>	<uncl>√
613	<though>	<thei>√
654	<faith or>	<further>√
657	<My charges are on>	My charges <are on>√
658	<lamentation>	<laureat odes>√
671	<there were>	<there arose>√
678	<this>	<This> tis</is>√
685	<half the>	<half the sea>√
730	<classics>	<classic>√
735	[omission]	<Except the>√
744	<some>	<his> <some>√
754	<yet>	<still>√
755	<In earth>	<Except for earth>√
768	<Blenheim>	<Blenhei>√
811	<reviewers>	<menace>√
823	<Saint Peter>	<Saint Mich Peter>√
829	<Into his own>	Into <his own>√
837	<Guelph>	<Guelf>√
838	<all>	<aught>√
847	[omission]	when <as>√ [RE-CHECKED 26/10/06 – P.C.]

IMPORTANT READINGS IN SIX VERSIONS

MS	GALLEY PROOF	THE LIBERAL	WRIGHT
47: Satan's	Satan's	Satan's	Satan's
62: worse king never	worse king never	worse king never	worse king never
65: He died -	He died!	He died!	He died!
96: bad ugly	bad, ugly	bad, ugly	bad, ugly
138: Apostle	apostle	Apostle	apostle
140: Angel	angel	Angel	angel
169: Angel answered	angel answer'd	Angel answer'd	angel answer'd

216: crews	crews	crews	crew
218: thing of light	thing of light	Thing of Light	Thing of Light
224: Southcote or Bob	Southcote, or Bob	Southcote, or Bob	Southcote, or Bob
236: Saint	saint	saint	saints
258: Sathan	Sathan	Sathan	Satan
301: if in his	if in his	if in this	if in this
344: France! -	France!	France!	France.
347: consumed!	consumed!	consumed!	consumed.
407: —No; —	—”No!”—	—”No!”—	—”No.”—
472: president	president	President	president
590: heads and knees	hands and knees	hands and knees	hands and knees
593: The Shadow came -	The shadow came!	The Shadow came!	The shadow came -
651: Shadow of a Shade -	shadow of a shade	Shadow of a Shade:	shadow of a shade:
663: Phantom dim	phantom dim	Phantom dim	phantom dim
677: burthen	burden	burden	burden
735: “What? what?	“What! what!	“What! what!	“What! what!
736: “ <u>Pye</u> come again!	“ <i>Pye</i> come again?	<i>Pye</i> come again?	<i>Pye</i> come again?
740: “Off - Off-”	737 - 848	“off, off,”	“Off, off!”
800: brass in`t	missing	brass in it	brass in it

COLERIDGE OXFORD**CPW VI**

47: Satan’s	Satan’s	Satan’s
62: worse king never	weaker king never	weaker king ne’er
65: He died!	He died!	He died!
96: bad, ugly	unhandsome	unhandsome
138: apostle	Apostle	Apostle
140: angel	Angel	Angel
169: Angel answered	Angel answer’d	Angel answer’d
216: crew	crews	crews
218: Thing of Light	Thing of Light	Thing of Light

224: Southcote, or Bob	Southcote, or Bob	Southcote, or Bob
236: Saints	saint	saint
258: Satan	Satan	Sathan
301: if in this	if in this	if in his
344: France.	France!	France!
347: consumed.	consumed!	consumed!
407: —"No."—	—'No!'—	—'No!'—
472: President	President	President
590: hands and knees	hands and knees	hands and knees
593: The shadow came	-The Shadow came!	The Shadow came!
651: shadow of a shade:	Shadow of a Shade:	Shadow of a Shade:
663: phantom dim	Phantom dim,	Phantom dim,
677: burden	burden	burden
735: "What! what!	"What! what!	"What! what!
736: <i>Pye</i> come again?	<i>Pye</i> come again?	<i>Pye</i> come again?
740: "Off, off!"	'off, off,'	'off, off,'
800: brass in it	brass in it	brass in it