

Bodleian Shelley MSS. Re-examined: A Re-edited Text of Some of Shelley's Prose Works in the Bodleian MSS. (III)

TATSUO TOKOO

'On the Devil, and Devils' and 'On the Punishment of Death'

Mary Shelley intended to publish the essay 'On the Devil, and Devils' in her *Essays, Letters from Abroad, Translations and Fragments by Percy Bysshe Shelley* (1840). It was actually set up in type but excluded from the edition after all. The proof-sheets corrected by Mary are among the Shelley papers in the Bodleian. We also find among the Abinger papers deposited there a transcript of this essay in an unknown hand and corrected, apparently, by Lady Shelley.* The transcript seems to have been made from the proof-sheets corrected by Mary rather than from the original manuscripts. The essay was first published by H. B. Forman in his edition of Shelley's prose works (1880), with permission from Sir Percy and Lady Shelley. There are a few peculiarities common to Forman's text and the transcript, which makes one suspect that the former is based on the latter. The Julian editors re-edited the essay for their edition of Shelley's works (1926-30) from the original manuscript then in the possession of Sir John Shelley-Rolls. Their text seems to be less accurate than Forman's. The prose fragment 'On the Punishment of Death' was first published in *Essays, Letters from Abroad,...* The Julian editors faithfully follow this 1840 edition.

In the Textual Notes I have recorded important variants in *The Complete Works of P. B. Shelley*, ed. R. Ingpen and W. Peck, Julian edition, VII, 87-104 (J.) and *The Prose Works of P. B. Shelley*, ed. H. B. Forman, 1880, II, 383-406 (F.) for 'On the Devil, and Devils', and those in the Julian edition, VI, 185-190 (J.) and *Essays, Letters...*, I, 212-222 (MWS.) for 'On the Punishment of Death.'

* Dep. c. 663/6 (ult.).

TEXT

[Paragraph numbers, and words, phrases, or punctuation marks in square brackets are editorial additions or emendations; MSS. used are indicated in parentheses after each paragraph.]

‘On the Devil, and Devils’

[1] To determine the nature and functions of the Devil is no contemptible province of the European Mythology. Who or what he is, his origin, his habitation, his destiny, and his power are subjects, which puzzle the most acute Theologians, and on which no orthodox person can be induced to give a decisive opinion. He is the weak place of popular religion—the vulnerable belly of the crocodile. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, p. 35.*)⁵

[2] The Manichæan philosophy respecting the origin and government of the world, if not true, is at least an hypothesis conformable to the experience of actual facts. To suppose that the world was created, and is superintended by two spirits of a balanced power, and opposite dispositions is simply a personification of the struggle[,] which we experience within ourselves, and which we perceive in the operations of external¹⁰ things as they affect us[,] between good and evil. The supposition that the good spirit is, or hereafter will be superior, is a personification of the principle of hope, and that thirst for improvement without which present evil would be intolerable. The vulgar are all Manichæans,—all that remains of the popular superstition is mere Machinery and accompaniment. To abstract in contemplation, from our sensations of pleasure and¹⁵ pain, all circumstance and limit,—to add those active powers, of whose existence we are conscious within ourselves—to give to that which [is] most pleasing to us a perpetual or an ultimate superiority, with all epithets of honourable addition, and to brand that which is displeasing with epithets ludicrous or horrible, predicting its ultimate defeat, is to pursue the process by which the vulgar arrive at the familiar notions of God and²⁰ the Devil. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 35-37.*)

[3] The Devil was clearly a Chaldæan invention, for we first hear of him after the return of the Jews from their second Assyrian captivity. He is indeed mentioned in the Book of Job; but so far from that circumstance affording any [proof] of that book having been written at a very early period, it tends rather to shew that it was the²⁵ production of a later age. The magnificence and purity indeed of the poetry and the irresistible grandeur of its plan strongly suggest the idea that it was a birth of the

vigorous infancy of some community of men. Assuredly it was not written by a Jew before the period of the second Captivity, because it speaks of the Devil and there is no other mention of this personage in the voluminous literature of that epoch. And that³⁰ it was not written by a Jew at all may be presumed from a perpetual employment[,] and that with the most consummate beauty[,] of imagery belonging to a severer climate than Palestine. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 37-38.*)

[4] But to return to the Devil. Those among the Greek Philosophers whose poetical imagination suggested a personification of the cause of the Universe, seemed nevertheless³⁵ to have dispensed with the agency of the Devil. Democritus, Epicurus, Theodorus, perhaps even Aristotle, indeed, abstained from introducing a living and thinking Agent, analogous to the human mind, as the author or superintendent of the world. Plato following his master Socrates, who had been struck with the beauty and novelty of the theistical hypothesis, as first delivered by the tutor of Pericles, supposed the existence⁴⁰ of a God, and accommodated a moral system of the most universal character, including the past[,] the present and the future condition of man, to the popular supposition of the moral superintendence of this one intellectual cause. It is needless to pursue the modification of this doctrine as it extended among the succeeding Sects. A partial interpretation of it has evidently afforded the basis of the least refined portion of our⁴⁵ popular religion. But the Greek Philosophers abstained from introducing the Devil. They accounted for evil by supposing that what is called matter is eternal, and that God in making the world, made not the best that he, or even inferior intelligence[,] could conceive; but that he moulded the reluctant and stubborn materials ready to his hand, into the nearest arrangement possible to the perfect archetype existing in his contempla-⁵⁰ tion. In the same manner as a skilful watchmaker who if he had diamonds and steel and brass and gold, can construct a time-piece of the most accurate workmanship, could produce nothing beyond a coarse and imperfect clock if he were restricted to wood as his material.* The Christian theologians however have invariably rejected this hypothesis, on the ground that the eternity of matter is incompatible with the omnipotence of God. (*MS.*⁵⁵ *Shelley adds. e. 9. pp. 38-41.*)

[5] Like panic-stricken slaves in the presence of a jealous and suspicious despot, they

* [This] hypothesis, though rude enough is [in] no respect very absurd and contradictory. The refined speculations respecting the existence of external objects, by which the idea of matter is suggested; to which Plato has the merit of first having directed the attention of the thinking⁶⁰ part of mankind. [Shelley's note.] (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, p. 41.*)

have tortured themselves ever to devise some flattering sophism, by which they might appease him by the most contradictory praises—endeavouring to reconcile omnipotence, and benevolence, and equity in the Author of an Universe where evil and good are inextricably intangled and where the most admirable tendencies to happiness and preservation are⁶⁵ for ever baffled by misery and decay. The Christians therefore, invented or adopted the Devil to extricate them from this difficulty. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 41-42.*)

[6] The account they give us of the origin of the Devil is curious:—Heaven according to the popular creed is a certain airy region inhabited by the Supreme Being, and a multitude of inferior Spirits.* These spirits are supposed like those which reside in the⁷⁰ bodies of animals and men to have been created by God, with a foresight of the consequences which would result from the mechanism of their nature. He made them as good as possible, but the nature of the substance out of which they were formed, or the unconquerable laws according to which that substance when created was necessarily modified, prevented them from being so perfect as he could wish. Some say that he gave⁷⁵ them free will, that is, that he made them without any very distinct apprehension of the results of his workmanship, leaving them an active power which might determine themselves to this or that action independently of the motives afforded by the regular operation of those impressions, which were produced by the general agencies of the rest of his creation. This he is supposed to have done, that he might excuse himself to his⁸⁰ own conscience for tormenting and annoying these unfortunate spirits, when they provoked him, by turning out worse than he expected. This account of the origin of evil, to make the best of it, does not seem more complimentary to the Supreme Being, or less derogatory to his omnipotence and goodness, than the Platonic scheme. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 42-44.*)

[7] They then proceed to relate, gravely, that one fine Morning, a chief of these⁸⁵ spirits took it into his head to rebel against God, having gained over to his cause a third part of the eternal angels who attended upon the Creator and Preserver of Heaven and Earth. After a series of desperate conflicts between those who remained faithful to the antient dynasty, and the insurgents, the latter were beaten, and driven into a place called Hell, which was rather their empire than their prison, and where God re-⁹⁰ served them to be first the tempters, and then the jailors and tormentors of a new race

* With respect to the situation of it, theologians are not agreed, but it is generally supposed to be placed beyond the remotest constellation of the visible stars. [Shelley's note.] (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, p. 43.*)

of beings, whom he created under the same conditions of imperfection and with the same⁹⁵ foresight of an unfortunate result. The motive of this insurrection is not assigned by any of the early mythological writers. Milton supposes that on a particular day God chose to adopt as his son and *heir*, (the reversion of an estate with an immortal incumbent, would be worth little) a *being* unlike the other Spirits, who seems to have been supposed to be a detached portion of himself, and afterwards figured upon the earth in¹⁰⁰ the well-known character of Jesus Christ. The Devil is represented as conceiving high indignation at this preference; and as disputing the affair with arms—I cannot discover Milton's authority for this circumstance; but all agree in the fact of the insurrection, and the defeat, and the casting out into Hell. Nothing can exceed the grandeur and the energy of the character of the Devil as expressed in *Paradise Lost*. He is a Devil very¹⁰⁵ different from the popular personification of evil; and it is a mistake to suppose that he was intended for a personification of evil malignity, implacable hate, and cunning refinement of device to inflict the utmost anguish on an enemy, these which are venial in a slave are not to be forgiven in a tyrant; these, which are redeemed by much that ennobles [his misfortune] in one subdued, are marked by all that dishonours his conquest¹¹⁰ in the victor. Milton's Devil as a moral being is as far superior to his God, as one who perseveres in some purpose which he has conceived to be excellent in spite of adversity and torture; is to one who in the cold security of undoubted triumph inflicts the most horrible revenge upon his enemy,—not from any mistaken notion of bringing him to repent of a perseverance in enmity, but with the open design of exasperating him to¹¹⁵ deserve new torments. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 44-48.*)

[8] Milton [so] far violated all that part of the popular creed which is susceptible of being preached and defended in argument, as to allege no superiority in moral virtue to his God over his Devil. He mingled as it were the elements of human nature, as colours upon a single pallet, and arranged them into the composition of his great picture,¹²⁰ according to the laws of epic truth; that is, according to the laws of that principle by which a series of actions of intelligent and ethical beings, developed in rhythmical language[,] are calculated to excite the sympathy and antipathy of succeeding generations of mankind. The writer who would have attributed majesty and beauty to the [character] of victorious and vindictive omnipotence, must have been contented with the character of¹²⁵ a good Christian; he never could have been a great epic poet. [It] is difficult to determine, in a country where the most enormous sanctions of opinion and law are attached to a direct avowal of certain speculative notions whether Milton was a Christian or not,

at the period of the composition of *Paradise Lost*. Thus much is certain that Milton gives the Devil all imaginable advantage; and the arguments with which he exposes the¹³⁰ injustice and impotent weakness of his adversary are such as had they been printed, distinct from the shelter of any dramatic order, would have been answered by the most conclusive of syllogisms—persecution[.] (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 48-50.*)

[9] As it is, *Paradise Lost* has conferred on the modern mythology a systematic form;* when the immeasurable and unceasing mutability of time shall have added one¹³⁵ more superstition to those which have already arisen and decayed upon the earth,** commentators and critics will be learnedly employed in elucidating the religion of ancestral Europe, only not utterly forgotten, because it will have participated in the eternity of genius. [T]he Devil owes everything to Milton. Dante and Tasso present us with a very gross idea of him: Milton divested him of a sting, hoofs, and horns; clothed him¹⁴⁰ with the sublime grandeur of a graceful but tremendous spirit[.] (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9. pp. 50-52.*)

[10] I am afraid there is much laxity among the orthodox of the present day respecting a belief in the Devil. I recommend the Bishops to make a serious charge to their diocesans on this dangerous latitude. The Devil is the outwork of the Christian¹⁴⁵ faith—he is the weakest point—you may observe that infidels in their novitiate always begin by humorously doubting the existence of the Devil. Depend on it that when a person once begins to think that perhaps there is no Devil, he is in a dangerous way. There may be observed in polite society a great deal of coquetting about the Devil especially among divines, which is singularly ominous. They qualify him as the evil¹⁵⁰ Spirit—they consider him as synonymous with the flesh. They seem to wish to divest him of all personality; to reduce him from his abstract to his concrete; to reverse the process by which he was created in the mind[;] which they will by no means bear with respect to God. It is popular and well looked upon if you deny the Devil “a local habitation and a name.” Even the vulgar begin to scout him. Hell is popularly considered as¹⁵⁵ metaphorical [of] the torments of an evil conscience, and by no means capable of being topographically ascertained. No one likes to mention the torments of everlasting fire and the poisonous gnawing of the worm that liveth for ever and ever. It is all explained

* The whole mechanism of the affair,—the tempting of Eve,—the damnation of the innocent posterity of our first parents. [Shelley's note] (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, p. 51.*) 160

** Is it possible that Socrates seriously believed that Aesculapius would be propitiated by the offering of a cock? [Shelley's note.] (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, p. 51.*)

away into the regrets and the reproaches of an evil conscience, and in this respect I think the most presumptuous amongst us may safely say—"One touch of nature makes the whole world kin." (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 52-54.*) 165

[11] On the other hand Heaven is understood to have some settled locality, and the joys of the elect are to be something very positive. This way of talking about a personage whose office in the mythological scheme is so important, must lead to disbelief. It is in fact a proof of the approaching extinction of any religion, when its teachers and its adherents instead of proudly and dogmatically insisting upon the most ludicrous¹⁷⁰ or unintelligible articles of their creed, begin to palliate and explain away the doctrines in which their ancestors had shewn a reverential acquiescence, and an audacious exultation of confidence. It is less the opinion of the person himself than that of those by whom he is surrounded, which gives that air of confidence by which the most absurd tenets have been transmitted from generation to generation. A man may in truth never have con-¹⁷⁵sidered whether there is or is not a Devil; he may be totally indifferent. Yet it may occur to him to state his positive opinion on one side or the other;—the air of confidence with which he does this is manifestly determined by the disposition [with] which he expects his opinion to be received. An illustration of this view of the subject is afforded by a circumstance in the life of Dr. Johnson,—the last man of considerable talents who¹⁸⁰ shewed any serious attachment to the antient faith, and whose life and death as compared with that of his contemporary Hume, affords a just standard of the consolations of Christianity or the Infidel systems. A gentleman enquired of Johnson what he meant by *being damned*. "Sent to Hell and punished everlastingly," he replied. The kingdom of the faithful. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 54-57.*) 185

[12] The Devil is *Δι᾿αβολος*, an Accuser.* In this view he is at once the Informer, the Attorney General, and the jailor of the Celestial tribunal. It is not good policy, or at least cannot be considered as a constitutional practice to unite these characters. The Devil must have a great interest to exert himself to procure a sentence of guilty from the

* In this character he presented himself among the other Sons of God twice before His father's¹⁹⁰ throne to request to be allowed to tempt Job, by tormenting him, so that God might [damn him]. God it seems had some special reason for patronizing Job; and one does not well see why he spared him at last. The expostulations of Job with God are of most daring character[;] it is certain he would not bear them from a Christian. If God were a refined critic, which from his inspiration of Ezechiel could never have been suspect, one might imagine that the profuse and¹⁹⁵ sublime strain of poetry not to be surpassed by anything [in antient literature had found favour.] [Shelley's note.] (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 67-68.*)

judge; for I suppose there will be no jury at the resurrection—at least if there is it will be so overawed by the bench and the counsel for *the Crown*, as to ensure whatever verdict the court shall please to recommend. No doubt, that as an incentive to his exertions half goes to the informer.* (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 57-58.*)

[13] If the Devil takes but half the pleasure in tormenting a sinner which God does, who took the trouble to create him, and then to invent a system of casuistry by which he might excuse himself for devoting him to eternal torment, this reward must be considerable. Conceive how the enjoyment of half the advantages to be derived from their ruin, whether in person or property, must irritate the activity of a delator. Tiberius, or Bonaparte, or Lord Castlereagh, never affixed any reward to the disclosure or the creation of conspiracies, equal to that which God's Government has attached to the exertions of the Devil to tempt, betray, and accuse unfortunate man. These two considerable personages are supposed to have entered into a sort of partnership in which the weaker has consented to bear all the odium of their common actions, and to allow the stronger to talk of himself as a very honourable person, on condition of having a participation in what is the especial delight of both of them,—burning men to all eternity. The dirty work is done by the Devil, in the same manner as some starving wretch will hire himself out to a King or a Minister[,] with a stipulation that he shall have some portions of the public spoil, as an instrument to betray a certain number of other starving wretches into circumstances of capital punishment, when they may think it convenient to edify the rest, by hanging up a few of those whose murmurs are too loud. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 58-60.*)

[14] It is far from inexplicable that earthly tyrants should employ these kind of agents, or that God should have done so with regard to the Devil and his Angels; or that any depository of power should take these measures, with respect to those, by whom he fears lest that power should be wrested from him. But to tempt mankind to incur everlasting damnation, must, on the part of God, and even on the part of the Devil, arise from that very disinterested love of tormenting and annoying, which is seldom observed on earth except from very old <?> <?> The thing that comes nearest to it is a troop of idle dirty boys baiting a cat. Cooks skinning eels, and boiling lobsters alive,

* What an army of spies and informers all Hell must afford under the direction of that active magistrate, the Devil! How many plots and conspiracies[!] [Shelley's note.] (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, p. 58.*)

and bleeding calves, and whipping pigs to death, naturalists anatomizing dogs alive, (a dog has as good a right and a better excuse for anatomizing a naturalist,) are nothing compared to God and the Devil judging, damning, and then [tormenting] the soul of a miserable sinner. It is pretended that God dislikes it, but this is mere shamefacedness and coquetting, for he has everything his own way and he need not damn unless²³⁵ he likes. The Devil has a better excuse, for as he was entirely made by God, he can have no tendency or disposition the seeds of which were not originally planted by his creator, and as everything else made by God, those seeds can only have developed themselves in the precise degree and manner determined by the impulses arising from the agency of the rest of his creation. It would be as unfair to complain of the Devil for acting ill, as of²⁴⁰ a watch for going badly; the defects are to be imputed as much to God in the former case as to the watchmaker in the latter. There is also another view of the subject suggested by mythological writers which strongly recommends the Devil to our sympathy and compassion, though it [is] less consistent with the theory of God's omnipotence than that already stated. The Devil, it is said, before his fall as an Angel of the²⁴⁵ highest rank and the most splendid accomplishments placed his peculiar delight in doing good. But the inflexible grandeur of his spirit, mailed by the consciousness [of] the purest and loftiest designs[,] was so secure from the assault of any gross or common torments, that God was considerably puzzled to invent what he considered an adequate punishment for his rebellion; he exhausted all the varieties of smothering and burning²⁵⁰ and freezing and cruelly dilacerating his external frame, and the Devil laughed at the impotent revenge of his conqueror. At last the benevolent and amiable disposition which distinguished his adversary, furnished God with the true method of executing an enduring and a terrible vengeance. He turned his good into evil, and by virtue of his omnipotence inspired him with such impulses, as in spite of his better nature, irresistibly²⁵⁵ determined him to act what he most abhorred, and to be a minister of those Iniquitous schemes of which he was the chief and the original victim. He is for ever tortured with compassion and affection for those whom he betrays and ruins; he is racked by a vain abhorrence for the desolation of which he is the instrument; he is like a man compelled by a tyrant to set fire to his own possessions, and to appear as the witness against and²⁶⁰ the accuser of his dearest friends and most intimate connexions; and then to be their executioner [and] inflict the most subtle and protracted torments upon them and to grin with a delight in their agony. A man, were he deprived of all other refuge, might hold his breath and die—but God is represented as omnipotent and the Devil as eternal.

Milton () has expressed this view of the subject with the sublimest pathos. (*MS.*²⁶⁵
Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 60-66.)

[15] It is commonly said that the Devil has only precisely so much power as is allowed him by God's providence. Christians exhort each other to despise his attacks, and to trust in God. If this trust has ever been deceived, they seem in a poor way, especially when it is considered that God has arranged it so that the Devil should have no incon-²⁷⁰
siderable portion of the souls of men. My pious friend Miss — tells me that she thinks that about nineteen in twenty will be damned. Formerly it was supposed that all those who were not Christians, and even all who were not of a particular sect of Christians, would be damned. At present this doctrine seems abandoned or confined to a few. One does not well see who is to be damned, and who not according to the fashionable creed. ²⁷⁵
(*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 66, 68.*)

[16] The sphere of the operations of the Devil is difficult to determine. The late invention and improvement in Telescopes has considerably enlarged the notions of men respecting the limits of the Universe. It is discovered that the earth is a comparatively small globe, in a system consisting of a multitude of others, which [roll round] the²⁸⁰
Sun; and we have all analogy to suppose that all these are inhabited by organized and intelligent beings. The fixed stars are supposed to be suns, each of them the centre of a system like ours. Those little whitish specks of light that are seen in a clear night are discovered to consist of a prodigious multitude of suns each probably the centre of a sys-
tem of planets. The system of which our earth is a planet has been discovered to belong²⁸⁵
to one of those larger systems of suns which when seen at a distance look like a whitish speck of light; and that lustrous streak called the milky way is found to be one of the extremities of the immense group of suns in which our system is placed. The Heaven is covered with an incalculable number of these white specks, and the better the telescopes the more are discovered, and the more distinctly the confusion of white light is²⁹⁰
resolved into stars. All this was not known during the gradual invention of the Christian mythology, and was never even suspected by those barbarians, in the obscure extremities of the Roman Empire[,] by whom it was first adopted. If these incalculable millions of suns, planets, satellites, and comets are inhabited, is it to be supposed that God formed their inhabitants better or less liable to offend him than those primordial Spirits, those²⁹⁵
Angels near his throne, those first and the most admirable of his creatures, who rebelled and were damned? Or has he improved like a proficient in statuary or painting[,] proceeding with rude outlines and imperfect forms to more perfect idealisms or imitations[,]

so that his latter works are better than his first, or has some fortunate chance, like that which[,] when the painter despaired of being able to [paint] the foam of a horse,³⁰⁰ directed the sponge so as to represent it accurately, interfered to confer stability and exactness upon one, or how many, among the numerous systems of animated nature? There is little reason to suppose that any considerable multitude of the planets were tenanted by beings better capable of resisting the temptations of the Devil than ours. But is the Devil like God omnipresent? If so he interpenetrates God and they both exist coessentially,³⁰⁵ as metaphysicians have compared this omnipresence of God, coinciding with the infinity of space or being[,] to salt dissolved in water. If not he must send some inferior Angels, either to this or some other planet, first to tempt the inhabitants to disobey God, and secondly to induce them to reject all terms of salvation; for which latter purpose, it seems especially requisite that he should take up his residence on the spot; nor do I³¹⁰ see, how he or God, by whose Providence he is permitted, that is to say, compelled to act, could commit a business of such high moment to an inferior Angel. It seems very questionable whether the Devil himself, or only some inferior Devil, tempted and betrayed the people of the Earth; or whether Jupiter, a planet capable of containing a hundred times more inhabitants than the earth,—to mention only the planets of our own system,³¹⁵—or the Sun, which would contain a million times more, were not entitled to the preference. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 68-73.*)

[17] Any objection arising from the multitude of Devils[,] that I think futile. You may suppose a million times as many devils as there are stars. In fact you may suppose anything you like on such a subject. That there are a great number of Devils,³²⁰ and that they go about in legions of six or seven, or more at a time, all mythologists are agreed. Christians in general will not admit the substance and presence of Devils upon the Earth in modern times, or they suppose their agency to be obscure and surreptitious, in proportion as the histories of them approach to the present epoch, or indeed any epoch in which there has been a considerable progress in historical criticism and nat-³²⁵ ural science. There were a number of Devils in Judea in the time of Jesus Christ, and a great deal of reputation was gained both by him and others by what was called casting them out. A droll story is related amongst others of Jesus Christ having driven a legion of Devils into a herd of pigs, who were so discomfited with these new ?invaders that they all threw themselves over the precipice into the lake and were drowned. These³³⁰ were a set of hypochondriacal and high-minded swine, very unlike any others of which we have authentic record; they disdained to live, if they must live in so intimate a

society with devils as that which was imposed on them; and the pig-drivers were no doubt confounded at so heroic a resolution. What became of the Devils after the death of the pigs, whether they passed into the fish, and thence by digestion, through the³³⁵ stomach into the brain of the Gadarene Ichthyophagists; whether they returned to Hell, or remained in the water, the Historian has left as subjects for everlasting conjecture. I should be curious to know whether any half-starved Jew picked up these pigs, and sold them at the market of Gadara, and what effect the bacon of a demoniac pig, who had killed himself, produced upon the consumers. The Devils requested Jesus Christ to³⁴⁰ send them into the pigs, and the Son of God shewed himself more inclined to do what was agreeable to these Devils than what was profitable to the owners of the pigs. He had no doubt, say the Christians, some good reasons. Poor fellows, the pigmasters were probably ruined by the operation! The Gadarenes evidently disapproved of this method of ejecting devils—they thought probably that Jesus shewed an inequitable preference to the³⁴⁵ disagreeable beings—and they sent a deputation to him to request that he would depart out of their country. I doubt whether the yeoman of the present day would have treated him with so much lenity. After all, the Devils could have been no great gainers by the bargain—for the pigs drowned themselves immediately—but perhaps neither did Jesus Christ foresee this circumstance. I wonder what Ulysses would have said to³⁵⁰ Eumanus, if that divine pig herd had informed him on his return that all pigs had drowned themselves in despair because a wandering prophet had driven a legion of devils into them. If I were a pig herd I would make any excuse rather than that, to a master renowned for subtilty of penetration, and extent and variety of experience. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 73-77.*)

355

[18] Among the erroneous theories concerning the condition of Devils, some have resorted to the Pythagorean hypothesis, but in such a manner as to pervert that hypothesis from motives of humanity into an excuse for cruel tyranny. They suppose that the bodies of animals, and especially domestic animals, are animated by devils, and that the tyranny exercised over these unfortunate beings by men is an unconscious piece of retaliation over³⁶⁰ the beings who betrayed them into a state of reprobation. On this theory Lord Erskine's Act might have been entitled "An Act for the better protection of Devils." How devils inhabit the bodies of men is not explained. It cannot be that they animate them like what is called the soul or vital principle because that is supposed to be already preoccupied. Some have supposed that they exist in the human body in the shape of teniae and hy-³⁶⁵datids; but I know not whether those persons subject to vermicular and animalcular disease

are the most likely to be subject to the invasions of Devils from any reasoning *a priori*, although they may be safely said to be tormented of Devils. The pedicular disease, on this view of the subject may be the result of diabolical influence, the sensorium of every separate louse being the habitation of a distinct imp. Some have supposed that the³⁷⁰ Devils live in the Sun, and that glorious luminary is the actual Hell; perhaps that every fixed star is a distinct Hell appropriated to the use [in] its several systems of planets, so great a proportion of the inhabitants of which are probably devoted to everlasting damnation, if the belief of one particular creed is essential to their escape, and the testimony of its truth so very remote and obscure as in the planet which we inhabit. I³⁷⁵ do not envy the theologians, who first [invented] this theory. The Magian worship of the Sun as the creator and preserver of the world is considerably more to the credit of the inventors. It is in fact a poetical exposition of the matter of fact, before modern science had so greatly enlarged the boundaries of the sensible world [and] was, next to pure Deism or a personification of all the powers whose agency we know or can conjecture,³⁸⁰ the religion of the fewest evil consequences. (*MS. Shelley. adds. e. 9, pp. 77-81.*)

[19] If the sun is Hell, the Devil has a magnificent abode, being elevated as it were on the imperial throne of the visible world. If we assign to the Devil the greatest and most glorious habitation within the scope of our senses, where shall we conceive his mightier adversary to reside? Shall we suppose that the Devil occupies the centre and God³⁸⁵ the circumference of existence, and that one urges inwards with the centripetal, whilst the other is perpetually struggling outwards from the narrow focus with the centrifugal force, and that from their perpetual conflict results that mixture of good and evil, harmony and discord, beauty and deformity[,] production and decay which are the general laws of the moral and material world? Alas, the poor theologian never troubled³⁹⁰ his fancy with nonsense of so philosophical a form—he contented himself with supposing that God was somewhere or other—and that the Devil and all his angels, together with the perpetually increasing multitude of the damned were burning alive to all eternity in that prodigious orb of elemental light, which sustains and animates that multitude of inhabited globes in whose company this earth revolves. Others have supposed Hell to be³⁹⁵ distributed among the comets which constitute, according to this scheme[,] a number of floating prisons of intense and inextinguishable fire; a great modern poet adopts this idea when he calls a comet

“A wandering Hell in the eternal space.”

(*MS. Shelley. adds. e. 9, pp. 81-83.*)

400

[20] Misery and injustice contrive to produce a very poetical effect, because the excellence of poetry consists in its awakening the sympathy of men, which among persons influenced by an abject and gloomy superstition, is much more easily done by images of horror than of beauty. It requires a higher degree of skill in a poet to make beauty, virtue, and harmony poetical, that is, to give them an idealized and rhythmical analogy⁴⁰⁵ with the predominant emotions of his readers—than to make injustice, deformity, discord and horror poetical—there are fewer Raphaels than Michael Angelos. Better verses have been written on Hell than Paradise. No poet can develop the same power in that part of his composition where he feels himself insecure of the emotions of his readers, as in those where he knows that he can command their sympathy.* (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp.*⁴¹⁰ *83-84.*)

[21] As to the Devil, and the imps, and the damned living in the Sun—why there is no great probability of it. The Comets are better fitted for this purpose; except that some astronomers have suggested the possibility of their orbits gradually becoming less elliptical until at last they might arrange themselves in orbits concentric with the⁴¹⁵ planets, lose their heat and ?their substances, become subject to the same laws of animal and vegetable life as those according to which the substance of the surface of the others is arranged. The Devils and the Damned, without some miraculous interposition would then be the inhabitants of a very agreeable world; and as they probably would have become very good friends from a community of misfortune, and the experience which time⁴²⁰ gives those who live long enough of the folly of quarrelling—would probably administer the affairs of their Colony with great harmony and success. But there is an objection to this whole theory of solar and planetary Hells; which is, that there is no proof that the Sun or [the] Comets are themselves burning. It is the same with fire as with wit: a man may not be witty himself as Falstaff was, although like him he may be the cause⁴²⁵ of wit in others. So the Sun, though the cause of fire[,] may only develop a limited portion of that principle on its own surface. Herschel's discoveries incline to a presumption that this is actually the case. He has perceived that the universal cause of light and heat is not the burning body of the Sun itself, but a shell as it were of phosphoric vapours, suspended many thousand of miles in the atmosphere of that body. These⁴³⁰ vapours surround the sphere of the Sun at a distance which has not been accurately

* How few read the Purgatorio or the Paradiso of Dante, in the comparison of those who know the Inferno well. And yet the Purgatorio, with the exception of two famous passages, is a finer poem than the Inferno. [Shelley's note.] (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, p. 85.*)

computed, but which is assuredly very great, encircling and canoping it as with a vault⁴³⁵ of ethereal splendour; whose internal surface may perform the same office to the processes of vital and material action on the body of the sun, as its external one does on those of the planets. A certain degree of plausibility is conferred on this notion by the observation that the interior surface, as far as can be collected from a view of the sides of the chasm, is of an obscurer colour than the external one; what are called spots in the Sun,⁴⁴⁰ being no more than immense rents produced probably by streams of wind in this incumbent mass of vapours, which disclose the opaque body of the sun itself. All this diminishes the probability of the Sun being a Hell, by shewing that there is no reason for supposing it considerably hotter than the planets. Not to mention that the Devils may be like the animalculae in mutton broth, whom you may boil as much as you please, but⁴⁴⁵ they will always continue alive and vigorous.* (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 84-88, 89.*)

[22] The Devil and his angels are called the Powers of the Air, and the Devil himself Lucifer. I cannot discover why he is called Lucifer, except from a misinterpreted passage in Isaiah, where that poet exults over the fall of an Assyrian king, the oppressor of his country:—"How art thou fallen, Lucifer, king of the Morning!" The⁴⁵⁰ Devil after having gradually assumed the horns, hoofs, tail, and ears of the antient Gods of the Woods, gradually lost them again, although wings had been added. It is inexplicable why men assigned him these additions as circumstances of terror and deformity. The Sylvans and Fauns, with their leader the great Pan, were most poetical personages, and were connected in the imagination of the Pagans with all that could enliven and⁴⁵⁵ delight. They were supposed to be innocent beings in habits and not greatly different from the shepherds and herdsmen of which they were the patron saints. But the Christians contrived to turn the wrecks of the Greek mythology, as well as the little they understood of their philosophy to purposes of deformity and falsehood. I suppose the sting with which he was armed gave him a dragon-like and viperous appearance, very formidable.⁴⁶⁰ (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 88-90.*)

[23] I can sufficiently understand why the author of evil should have been typified under the image of a serpent; that animal producing merely by its sight, so strong an associated recollection of the malignity of many of its species. But this was eminently a

* The idea of the sun being Hell, is an attempt at an improvement on the old-established idea of⁴⁶⁵ its occupying the centre of the earth. The Devils and the damned would be exceedingly crowded in process of ages, if they were confined within so inconsiderable a space. [Shelley's note.] (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, p. 88.*)

practice confined to the Jews, whose earliest mythology suggested this animal as the cause of all evil. Among the Greeks the Serpent was considered as an auspicious and⁴⁷⁰ favourable being. He attended on Aesculapius and Apollo. In Egypt the Serpent was an hieroglyphic of eternity. The Jewish account is, that the Serpent, that is the animal, persuaded the original pair of human beings to eat of a fruit from which God had commanded them to abstain, and that in consequence God expelled them from the pleasant garden where he had before permitted them to reside. God on this occasion, it is said, assigned⁴⁷⁵ as a punishment to the Serpent that its motion should be as it now is along the ground upon its belly[.] We are given to suppose that before this misconduct it hopped along upon its tail; a mode of progression which if I were a Serpent I should think the severest punishment of the two. The Christians have turned this Serpent into their Devil, and accommodated the whole story to their new scheme of sin and propitiation[.]⁴⁸⁰ (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 9, pp. 90-92.*)

‘On the Punishment of Death’

[1] The first law which it becomes a Reformer to propose and support at the approach of a period of great political change, is the abolition of the punishment of death. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 8. p. 23.*)

[2] It is sufficiently clear, that revenge, retaliation[,], atonement, expiation, are rules and motives so far from deserving a place in any enlightened system of political⁵ life, that they are the chief sources of a prodigious class of miseries in the domestic circles of society. It is clear that[,], however the spirit of legislation may appear to frame institutions upon more philosophical maxims[,], it has hitherto done, in those cases which are termed criminal, little more than palliate the spirit by gratifying a portion of it, and [afford] a compromise between that which is best: the inflicting of no¹⁰ evil upon a sensitive being without a decisively beneficial result in which he should at least participate, and that which is worst, that he should be put to torture for the amusement of those whom he may have injured or may seem to have injured[.] (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 8, pp. 23-24.*)

[3] Omitting these remoter considerations, let us enquire what *Death* is, that which¹⁵ is applied as a measure of transgressions of indefinite shades of distinction, so soon as they shall have passed that degree and colour of enormity, with which it is supposed no inferior infliction is commensurate. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 8. p. 24.*)

[4] And first, whether death is a good or evil, a punishment or reward, or whether it be wholly indifferent[,] no man can take upon him to assert. That that²⁰ within us which thinks and feels continues to think and feel after the dissolution of the body, has been the almost universal opinion of mankind, and the accurate philosophy of what I may be permitted to term the modern Academy by shewing the prodigious depth and extent of our ignorance respecting the causes and nature of sensation, renders probable the affirmation of a proposition, the negation of which it is so difficult to conceive, and²⁵ the popular arguments against which[,] derived from what is called the atomic system, are proved to be applicable only to the relation which one object bears to another as apprehended by the mind, and not to the existence or essence of that which is the ?measure and the receptacle of objects. The popular system of religion suggests the idea that the mind, after death[,] will be painfully or pleurably affected according to its³⁰ determinations during life. However ridiculous and pernicious we must admit the vulgar accessories of this creed to be, there is a certain analogy not wholly absurd between the consequences resulting to an individual during life from the virtuous or vicious[,] prudent or imprudent conduct of his external actions, to those consequences which are conjectured to ensue from the discipline and order of his internal thoughts as affecting his³⁵ condition in a future state. They omit indeed to calculate upon the accidents of disease and temperament[,] organization and circumstance[,] together the multitude of independent agencies, which affect the opinions and the conduct and the happiness of individuals, and produce determination of the will, and modify the judgement, so as to produce effects the most opposite, in natures considerably similar. These are those operations in⁴⁰ the order of the whole of nature, tending, we are prone to believe, to some definite mighty end, to which the agencies of our peculiar nature are subordinate; nor is there any reason to suppose that in a future state they should become suddenly exempt from that subordination. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 8, pp. 24-27.*)

[5] The philosopher is unable to determine [whether] our existence in a ?previous⁴⁵ state has affected our present condition [and] abstains from deciding whether our present condition would affect us in that which may be future. That, if we continue to exist, the manner of our existence will be such as no inferences or conjectures afforded by a consideration of our earthly experience can elucidate, is sufficiently obvious. The ?conception that the vital principle within us in whatever mode it may continue to exist, must⁵⁰ lose that consciousness of definite and ?individual being which now characterises it, and become a unit in the vast sum of action and of thought which disposes and animates the

Universe, and is called God, seems to belong to that class of opinion which has been designated as indifferent. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 8, pp. 27-28.*)

[6] To compel a person to know all that can be known by the dead concerning that⁵⁵ which the living fear, hope or forget, to plunge him into the pleasure or the pain which there awaits him,—to punish or reward him in a manner and in a degree incalculable and incomprehensible by us—or to disrobe him at once from all that intertexture [of] good and evil [with] which Nature seems to have clothed every form of individual existence[,] is to inflict on him the doom of death. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 8, pp. 28-29.*)⁶⁰

[7] A certain degree of pain and of terror usually accompany the infliction of death. This degree is infinitely varied by the infinite variety in the temperament and opinions of the sufferers. As a measure of punishment[,] strictly so considered[,] and as an exhibition which by its known effects on the sensibility of the sufferers is intended to intimidate the spectators from incurring a similar liability, it is singularly inadequate.⁶⁵ [Firstly,] [p]ersons of energetic character, in whom, as in men who suffer for political crimes, there is a large mixture of enterprises[,] fortitude and disinterestedness, and[,] though disarranged[,] the elements by which the strength and happiness of a nation might have been cemented, die in such a manner, as to make death appear, not evil, but good. The death of what is called a traitor, that is[,] a person who from whatever⁷⁰ motive would abolish the government of the day[,] is [as] often a triumphant exhibition of suffering virtue as the warning of a culprit. The multitude instead of departing with a panic[-]stricken approbation of the laws which exhibited are inspired with pity, and sympathy, and the most generous among them feel an emulation to be the authors of such flattering emotions as they experience, stirring in their⁷⁵ bosoms. Impressed by what they see and feel, they make no distinction between the motives which incited the criminals to the actions for which they suffered or the heroic courage with which they turned into good that which their judges awarded to them as evil or the purpose itself of those actions, though that purpose may happen to be eminently pernicious[.] The laws in this case lose that sympathy which it ought to be their chief⁸⁰ object to secure, and in a participation of which consists their chief strength in maintaining those sanctions by which the parts of the social union are bound together, so as to produce, as nearly as possible, the ends for which it is as instituted. [Second,] [p]ersons of energetic character, in communities not modelled with philosophical skill to turn all energies which they contain to the purposes of common good, are prone also [to] fall into⁸⁵ the temptation of undertaking, and are peculiarly fitted for despising the perils attendant

upon consummating, the most enormous crimes. Murders, rapes, enormous schemes of plunder, are the actions of persons belonging to this class, and death is the penalty of conviction[.] But the coarseness of organization peculiar to men capable of committing acts wholly selfish, is usually found to be associated with a proportionate insensibility⁹⁰ to fear or pain. Their sufferings[,], when exhibited, communicate to those of the spectators who may be liable to the commission of similar crimes, a sense of [the lightness of that event] which when closely examined and at a distance, as uneducated persons are accustomed to do, probably they regarded with horror. But great majority of the spectators, are so bound up in the interests and the habits of social union, that no temptation⁹⁵ would be sufficiently strong to induce them to a commission of the enormities to which this penalty is assigned. The more powerful and the richer among them—and a numerous class of little tradesmen are richer and more powerful than those who are employed by them, and the employer in general bears this relation to the employed—regard their own wrongs as in some degree avenged, and their own rights secured by this punishment inflicted,¹⁰⁰ as the penalty of whatever crime. In cases of murder, or mutilation[,], this feeling is almost universal. In those therefore whom this exhibition does not awaken to the sympathy which extenuates the crime, and discredits the law which restrains it; it produces feelings more directly at war with the genuine purposes of political society. It excites those emotions which it is the chief object of civilisation to extinguish forever, and in the ex-¹⁰⁵ tinction of which alone there can be any hope of better institutions than those ?under which men now misgovern one another[.] Men feel that their revenge is gratified, and that their security is established by the extinction and the sufferings of beings in most respects resembling themselves and, their daily occupations of life constraining them to a precise form in all their thoughts, they come to connect inseparably the idea of their¹¹⁰ own advantage with that of the death and torture of others. It is manifest that the object of sane polity is directly the reverse; and that laws founded upon reason should accustom the gross vulgar to associate their ideas of security, and of interest, with the reformation[,], and the strict restraint for that purpose alone, of those who might invade it. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 8, pp. 29-35.*)

115

[8] The passion of revenge is originally nothing more than habitual perception of the sufferings of the person who inflicts an injury as connected, as they are in a savage state, or in such portions of society as are yet undisciplined to civilisation, with security that that injury will not be repeated in future. This feeling engrafted upon superstition and confirmed by habit, at last loses sight of the <?> object for which it may be sup-¹²⁰

posed to have been implanted, and becomes a passion and a duty to be pursued and fulfilled even to the destructions of those ends to which it originally tended. The other passions, both good and evil, Avarice, Remorse, Love, Patriotism, present a similar appearance; and to this principle of the mind overshooting the mark at which it aims we owe all that is eminently base or excellent in human nature; [and] in [the] providing for¹²⁵ the nutriment or the extinction of which, consists the true art of the legislator[.]*
(*MS. Shelley adds. e. 8, pp. 35-36.*)

[9] Nothing is more clear [than] that the infliction of punishment in general—in a degree which the reformation and the restraint of those who transgress the laws does not render indispensable, and none more than death, confirms all the inhuman and unsocial¹³⁰ impulses of men. It is almost a proverbial remark that those nations in which the penal code [has] been particularly mild have been distinguished from all others by the rarity of crime. But this example is to be admitted to be equivocal. A more decisive argument is afforded by a consideration of the universal connexion of ferocity of manners, and a contempt of social ties with the contempt of human life. Governments deriving their in-¹³⁵stitutions from existences of circumstances of barbarism and violence, which with some rare exceptions perhaps, are bloody in proportion as they are despotic[,] form the manners of their subjects to a sympathy with their own spirit. (*MS. Shelley adds. e. 8, pp. 38-39.*)

[10] The spectators who feel no abhorrence at a public execution, but rather a self[-]¹⁴⁰applauding superiority and a sense of gratified indignation are surely excited to the most inauspicious emotions. The first reflection of such an one, is the sense of his own internal and actual worth, as preferable to that of the victim whom circumstances have

* The savage and the illiterate are but faintly aware of the distinction between the future and the past[;] they make <?> belonging to periods so distinct the subjects of similar feelings; they live¹⁴⁵ only in the present or in the past as it is present. It is in this that the philosopher excels one of the many. It is this which distinguishes the doctrine of philosophical necessity, from fatalism, and that determination of the will by which it is the active source of future events, from that [liberty] or indifference to which the abstract liability of irremediable actions is attached according to the notions of the vulgar[.]150

This is the source of the erroneous excesses of Remorse and Revenge, the one extending itself over the future and the other over the past; provinces in which their suggestions can only be the sources of evil[.] The purpose of a resolution to act more wisely and virtuously in future, and the sense of a necessity of caution in repressing an enemy are the sources from which the enormous superstitions implied in the words cited have arisen[.] [Shelley's note.] (*MS. Shelley adds.*¹⁵⁵
e. 8, pp. 37, 39, 41.)

led to destruction. The meanest wretch is impressed with a sense of his own comparative merit. He is one of those on whom the tower of Siloam fell not, he is such a one as Jesus Christ found not in all Samaria, who in his own soul throws the first stone at the woman taken in adultery. The popular religion of the country takes its designation¹⁶⁰ from that illustrious person whose beautiful sentiment I have quoted. Any one who has stript from the doctrines of this person, the veil of familiarity, will perceive how adverse their spirit is to feelings of this nature. (*MS. Shelley adds, e. 8, pp. 40-41.*)

TEXTUAL NOTES

'On the Devil, and Devils'

- Line 15 *To abstract in contemplation: Nothing is [simpler than to take J.; To abstract in contemplation F.;* "Nothing is simpler than to take" is cancelled in the MS.* and substituted with "To abstract in contemplation".
- Line 17 *[is]: are MS.; is F.*
- Line 18 *addition,; addition; J., F.*
- Line 22 *The Devil was clearly...: J.* has before this "The wisest of the antient philosophers accounted for the existence of evil without introducing the Devil", but in the MS. this sentence is cancelled with diagonal strokes. The omission of the sentence is justified by the fact that in paragraph [4] we find the following sentences to the same effect: "Those among the Greek Philosophers...seemed nevertheless to have dispensed with the agency of the Devil....But the Greek Philosophers abstained from introducing the Devil". *The Devil was clearly a Chaldæan invention, for he first... F.*
- Line 23 *their: the J.; their F.*
- Line 24 *[proof] of that book having been: denial of that Book having been J.; proof that that Book was F.; [proof that] ?denial of that book having been MS.*
- Line 27 *its plan: the poem J.; its plan F.*
strongly: Omitted in F.
a birth: the birth J.; a birth F.
- Line 30 *And that: [That] J.; And that F.*

* MSS. are quoted by permission of the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

- Line 37 *perhaps: and perhaps* J., F.
- Lines 43-44 *It is needless to pursue...*: J. has before this “Of the Stoics...”, which is cancelled in the MS.
- Line 45 *?evidently: gradually* J., F.
refined: inspired J.; *unrefined* F., MS.
- Line 46 *But the Greek Philosophers...*: A new paragraph in J. and F.
- Lines 50-51 *contemplation. In the same: contemplation:—in the same* F.
- Line 51 *had: has* F.
- Line 52 *construct: compose* F.
- Line 54 *however*: Omitted in F.
- Paragraph [5]: Part of the preceding paragraph in F.
- Lines 58-61 [*This*] *hypothesis...thinking part of mankind.*: J. and F. incorporate this into the text after “It is needless to pursue...succeeding Sects” (ll. 43-44 above). In the MS. the passage occurs, separated by two horizontal lines, between line 56 and line 57 above.
- Line 58 [*This*] *hypothesis: These hypotheses* J.; *This hypothesis* F.; *These hypothesis* MS.
is [in] no respect: are in no respect J.; *is in no respect* F.; *is no respect* MS.
- Line 60 *suggested;: suggested,* J., F.
- Line 62 *some: any* J.
- Line 78 *themselves: them* J., F.
- Line 91 *to be first: first to be* F.
- Lines 92-93 *With respect to...the visible stars*: J. and F. incorporate this into the text after “Heaven according to...of inferior Spirits” (ll. 68-70 above). In the MS. these sentences occur at the bottom of page 43, separated by a horizontal line.
- Line 99 *being: being* J., F. Underlined in the MS.
- Line 100 *supposed: and approved* J.; *supposed* F.
- Line 105 *He: Here* J.; *He* F.
- Lines 106-108 *personification of evil...an enemy, these: personification of evil malignity and it is a mistake to suppose that he was intended for an idealism of implacable hate, cunning, and refinement of device to inflict the utmost anguish on an enemy, these,* J.; *personification of evil, and it is a mistake to suppose that he was intended for an idealism of Evil. Malignity, implacable hate, cunning, and refinement of device to inflict the utmost anguish on an enemy, these* F.
- Line 110 [*his misfortune*]: Omitted in J. and F. The MS. reads “[the misfortune]

his [defeat]”.

Line 111 *Milton's Devil...*: A new paragraph in J.

Line 112 *some*: a F.

Line 115 *open*: *open and alleged* J., F. In the MS. “open” is written over “alleged”, an alternative, I take, to “alleged”.

Line 117 [so]: so J., F.; *thus* cancelled MS.

Line 122 *intelligent and*: The MS. has an indecipherable word over “intelligent”.

Line 123 *language*: *tale* F.

Line 124 [character]: Cancelled by a pencil stroke in the MS.; *character* J., F.

Line 126 [It] *is*: MS. cancels “whether he was a Christian or not”, the original subject for “is”, but substitutes none; *It is* J., F.

Line 133 *persecution*[.]: MS. goes on: “a celebrated critic”; *persecution*. J., F.

Paragraph [9]: Part of the preceding paragraph in F.

Line 139 [T]he Devil owes: *As to the Devil he owes* J.; *The Devil owes* F. “As to” is cancelled in the MS., though “he” is left to stand.

Line 140 *clothed*: *clothes* J.; *and clothed* F.

Line 141 *tremendous spirit*[.]: J. has “tremendous spirit—and restored him to the society.” but “restored him to the society” is cancelled in the MS.

Line 147 *Depend on it...*: A new paragraph in J.

on: *upon* J., F.

Line 156 [of]: Omitted in the MS.; *of* J., F.

Lines 159-160 *The whole mechanism...our first parents*: J. takes this to be a note on the second sentence of paragraph [9]: “when the immeasurable...eternity of genius”.

Lines 161-162 *Is it possible...offering of a cock?*: J. and F. incorporate this into the text after “[It] is difficult...composition of Paradise Lost” (ll. 126-129 above). In the MS. the sentence occurs at the top of page 51; at the bottom we find one more sentence which I take to be meant for a note on the first sentence in paragraph [9]; the rest of page 51 is left blank.

Line 166 *understood*: *supposed* F.

Line 169 *extinction of*: *extinction in* J., F.

Line 170 *ludicrous*: The reading was first suggested by E. B. Murray in his note ‘Annotated Manuscript Corrections of Shelley's Prose Essays’ (*Keats-Shelley Journal*, XXVI [1977], 10-21). *invidious* J.; *knotty* F.

Line 172 *their ancestors*: *their more believing ancestors* J., F.; “believing” has no MS.

- authority. MS. has, between “their” and “ancestors”, “more” followed by a blank.
- Line 175 *never*: Omitted in J.
- Line 176 *indifferent. Yet: indifferent to the question; yet* F.; “to the question” has no MS. authority.
- Line 178 [*with*]: *with* J., F. Cancelled in the MS.
- Line 179 *An: One* F.
- Lines 184-185 *The kingdom of the faithful*: Omitted in F.
- Paragraph [12]: Part of the preceding paragraph in F.
- Lines 186ff. There is a notation “X” against this passage in the MS. On p. 67 of the MS. we find a paragraph beginning with another notation “X”: “In this character...”.
- Line 188 *a*: Omitted in J. and F.
- Lines 190-196 *In this character...[in antient literature had found favour]*: J. and F. incorporate this passage into the text after the first sentence in paragraph [12]: “The Devil is *Διᾶβολος*, an Accuser” (l. 186 above). [I am now inclined to agree with Forman and the Julian editors in incorporating this into the text.—Tatsuo Tokoo/ 13 Nov. 1985]
- Line 190 *twice*: Omitted in J. and F.
- Line 191 *so that God might [damn him]: so that God might damn him* J. Omitted in F.; “damn him” is cancelled in the MS. but no substitute provided.
- Line 195 *could: would* J., F.
suspect: suspected J., F.
- Line 196 *by anything [in...found favour]: by anything in antient literature, much less modern, had found favour with him* J.; *by anything ancient, much less modern, had found favour with him* F.; “in antient literature” and “had found favour” are cancelled in the MS.; “much less modern” and “with him” have no MS. authority.
- Line 199 *the Crown: the Crown* J.; *the crown* F. Underlined in the MS.
- Line 204 *eternal: external* MS., J.; *eternal* F.
- Line 205 *of half the: of one half of the* J., F.
- Line 209 *Devil: Devil*, J., F. The comma after “devil” is unnecessary because the “to” which follows should be construed with “exertions” in the same line.
- Line 210 *sort: kind* F.
- Line 215 *a Minister: Minister* J.; *minister* F.
with: to work with J.; *with* F.; “to work” has no MS. authority.
- Line 216 *portions: portion* J., F.

- Line 225 *very*: Omitted in F.
- Line 226 *except ?from ?very old <?> <?>*: *except fom very old...* J.; omitted in F.
- Line 227 *cat. Cooks*: *cat; cooking, J.; cat; cooks* F.
- Lines 228-229 *What an army...plots and conspiracies[/]*: In the MS. this passage is surrounded by angle brackets, which I take to indicate Shelley's intention of making this a note. J. ignores the notations. F. surrounds the passage in parentheses.
- Line 228 *informers: delators* F.
- Line 229 *How many plots and conspiracies[/]*: Omitted in F.
- Line 233 [*tormenting*]: Cancelled in the MS. but no substitute provided; *tormenting J., F.*
- Line 238 *else made: else was made* MS., J., F.
only have: have only J., F.
- Line 244 *it [is]*: "is" is omitted in the MS.; [*it*] *is* J.; *it is* F.
- Line 245 *as: was* F.
- Line 246 *placed: who placed* F.
- Line 247 *mailed: mailed and nourished* J., F.; in the MS. "mailed" is written over "nourished", an alternative, I should think, to "nourished".
[*of*]: Omitted in the MS., J. and F.
- Line 250 *varieties: variety* F.
- Line 251 *dilacerating: lacerating* J., F.
- Line 255 *impulses: an impulse* F.
- Line 256 *Iniquitous: designs and* J., F.
- Line 261 *their: the* F.
- Line 262 [*and*] *inflict*: "and" is omitted in the MS.; *and to inflict* J., F.
the most subtle and: Omitted in F.
- Lines 262-263 *them and to grin...agony. A man: them. As a man* J., F.
- Line 263 *might: he might* J., F.
- Line 265 *Milton () has: Milton has* J., F.
- Line 271 *My pious friend Miss —: A pious friend of mine* F.
- Line 273 *all who: all those who* J., F.
- Line 275 *who is to: who are to* J.
- Paragraph [16]: Part of the preceding paragraph in the MS.
- Line 278 *invention and improvement in Telescopes has: inventions and improvements in telescopes have* F.
- Line 279 *limits: bounds* F.

- Lines 279-280 *a comparatively small globe: comparatively a small globe* F.
- Line 280 [*roll round*]: Cancelled in the MS. but no substitute provided; *roll round* J., F.
- Line 281 *we have all analogy...that all these: there is no reason to suppose but that all these* J., F. Shelley first wrote as in J. but I adopt the alternative “we have all analogy” written over “there is no reason” and omit “but” before “that”.
- Line 292 *even*: Omitted in J.
 in: on J.
- Line 296 *the*: Omitted in J. and F.
- Line 298 *proceeding with: with* J.; *proceeding from* F.; “proceeding” is omitted in J.
 more perfect idealisms or imitations: a more perfect idealism or imitation J.;
 more perfect idealisms or imitations F.; *a more perfect idealisms and imitations* MS.
- Line 299 *first,:* *first?* J., F.
- Line 300 [*paint*]: Cancelled in the MS. and substituted by “represent” which again is cancelled and nothing is supplied in its place; *paint* J.; *depict* F.
- Line 305 *coessentially,:* *together;* J.; *co-essentially;* F.
- Line 306 *this: the* J., F.
 coinciding with: pervading J., F.
- Line 307 *or: and* J., F.
 dissolved in: mixed with J., F.
- Line 310 *especially: equally* J., F.
- Line 318 *that*: Omitted in F.
- Line 322 *in general: indeed* J., F.
 substance and: substansive J.; *actual substance and* F.; “actual” is cancelled in the MS.
- Line 323 *they suppose their...surreptitious:* F. places this sentence after “natural science” in l. 326.
- Line 324 *the histories: any histories* J., F.
- Line 325 *and: or* J., F.
- Line 327 *deal of:* Omitted in J. and F.
- Line 328 *related amongst: told us among* J., F.
- Line 329 ?*invaders:* Doubtful reading; *enemies* J.; *invaders* F.
- Line 330 *the precipice: a precipice* J., F.
- Line 334 *at: by* F.
 heroical: unusual J.; *heroical* F. In the MS. “heroical” is written over

"unusual", an alternative, I take, to "unusual".

Line 335 *thence: then J.; thence F.*

Line 337 *in the water: on the Earth F.*

subjects: subject J., F.

Line 338 *curious: anxious J.; curious F.*

Lines 342-344 *He had no doubt,... by the operation!: No doubt saying: "Poor fellows, the Christians had good reasons [and] were probably ruined by this operation. J.; He had, no doubt, say the Christians, some good reasons. Poor fellows! They were probably ruined by this operation. F.*

Line 345 *ejecting: casting out F.*

inequitable: unjust F.

the: these F.

Line 346 *to him to request that he would depart: to request him to depart F.*

Lines 348-354 *After all, the Devils...variety of experience: Omitted in F.*

Lines 348-350 *lenity. After all, the Devils...did Jesus Christ foresee: lenity but...neither, Jesus Christ did not foresee J.*

Lines 349-350 *perhaps neither did Jesus Christ foresee: perhaps neither [the Devils nor] Jesus Christ did not foresee MS.*

Line 351 *divine: driven J.* This reading was first introduced by E. B. Murray (*Keats-Shelley Journal*, XXVI [1977], 20).

Line 353 *excuse: Left blank in J.*

Line 356 *erroneous: numerous F.*

Line 357 *resotred: applied J.; resorted F.*

Lines 365-366 *hydatids; but I...animalcular disease: hydatids and animalcula; but I know not whether those persons subject to vermicular disease J.; hydatids, but I know not whether those persons subject to vermicular and animalcular diseases, F.*

Line 367 *invasions: incursions J., F.*

reasoning: reason J., F.

Line 368 *be safely: safely be F.*

Devils: the Devils J.; Devils F.

disease: diseases J., F.

Line 372 *to: for J.; to F.*

[in]: of J., F.; In MS.

Line 375 *very remote: very far remote F.*

- Line 376 [*invented*]: Cancelled and substituted with an indecipherable word; *invented* J., F.
- Line 379 [*and*]: Omitted in the MS.; *and* J., F.
- Line 381 *of*: *attended by* F. The MS. has two indecipherable words written over “of the”, probably an alternative to “of”.
- Line 387 *?narrow ?focus*: Doubtful reading; *narrow focus* J., F.
- Line 388 *that mixture*: *the mixture* F.
- Line 391 *form—he*: *form, and* J.; *form. He* F.
- Line 392 *other—and*: *others* J.; *other; that* F.
- Line 393 *alive*: *above* F.
- Line 397 *adopts*: *had adopted* F.
- Line 406 *predominant*: *predominating* J., F.
- Line 407 *and horror*: Omitted in F.
- Line 408 *No poet...*: A new paragraph in J.
can develop: *develops* J.; *can develop* F.
that part: *the heat* J.; *that part* F.
- Line 409 *where*: *when* J.; *where* F.
- Line 410 *where*: *when* J.; *where* F.
- Line 413 *purpose*: Omitted in F.
- Line 414 *astronomers*: *astronomer* F.
- Lines 414-415 *less elliptical*: *ecliptical* J., F.
- Line 416 *?their*: Doubtful reading; *their* J., F.
substances: *substance* J., F.
- Line 424 [*the*]: *that* MS., J.; *the* F.
- Line 427 *portion*: *proportion* J., F.
- Line 428 *perceived*: *discovered* F.
universal: Omitted in F.
- Line 430 *thousand of*: *thousand* J., F.
- Lines 432-434 *How few read...than the Inferno*: J. and F. incorporate this into the text after “Better verses have been written on Hell than Paradise” (ll. 407-408 above).
 In the MS. the passage occurs at the top of page 85.
- Line 433 *well. And*: *well—but* J.; *well. And* F.
- Line 435 *as*: Omitted in F.
- Line 436 *splendour*: *splendour* J., F.

- Line 438 *conferred on: inferred in J.; conferred on F.*
- Line 439 *collected: attested J.; collected F.*
- Line 440 *one;: one: J., F.*
- Line 441 *this: the F.*
- Line 451 *hoofs: hoof F.*
- Lines 456-457 *beings in habits...from the shepherds: beings not greatly different in habits
from the shepherds J.; beings in habits and not greatly different from the shepherds F.*
- Lines 465-467 *The idea of...inconsiderable a space: A separate paragraph in J. between
paragraphs [21] and [22].*
- Line 467 *space: sphere J., F.*
- Line 474 *and that: and then F.*
- Line 476 *as a punishment: a punishment J., F.*
- Line 478 *were: was F.*
- Line 479 *severest: severer J., F.*
- Line 480 *propitiation[.]: propitiation, &c. J.; propitiation. F.*

'On the Punishment of Death'

- Lines 8-9 *hitherto done,...termed criminal, little: hitherto, in those cases which are termed
criminal, done little J., MWS.*
- Line 10 *it, and [afford]: it; and afforded J., MWS.; "afford" is cancelled in the MS.
but no substitute supplied.
best:: best,— J.; best;— MWS.*
- Line 12 *participate,: participate;— J., MWS.
worst,: worst; J., MWS.*
- Line 25 *affirmation: affirmative J., MWS.
negation: negative J., MWS.*
- Lines 28-29 *not to the existence...and the receptacle: not to existence itself, or the
nature of that essence which is the medium and receptacle J., MWS.*
- Line 29 *The popular system...: A new paragraph in MWS.*
- Line 37 *together: together with J., MWS.*
- Line 38 *agencies,: agencies J., MWS.
opinions and: opinions, J., MWS.*
- Paragraph [5]: Part of the preceding paragraph in J. and MWS.

- Line 45 [*whether*]: Cancelled in the MS.; *whether* J., MWS.
?previous: Doubtful reading; *previous* J., MWS.
- Line 46 [*and*]: Cancelled in the MS.; *and* J., MWS.
- Line 49 *?conception*: Doubtful reading; *opinion* J., MWS.
- Line 51 *?individual*: Doubtful reading; *individual* J., MWS.
- Line 58 [*of*]: Omitted in the MS.; *of* J., MWS.
- Line 59 [*with*]: Omitted in the MS.; *with* J., MWS.
- Line 66 [*Firstly,*] [*p*]ersons of...: A new paragraph in J.
- Line 66 [*Firstly,*] [*p*]ersons: *Firstly,—Persons* J., MWS.; *1stly Persons* MS.
- Line 67 *enterprises*[,]: *enterprise, and* J., MWS.
- Lines 67-68 *and*[,], *though disarranged*[,], *the elements: and the elements, though misguided and disarranged*, J., MWS. In the MS. “all” before “the elements” is cancelled and substituted by “though misguided disarranged” written over it; “disarranged” seems to be the alternative to “misguided”.
- Line 71 [*as*]: Cancelled in the MS.; *as* J., MWS.
- Line 73 *exhibited* : Left thus blank in the MS.; *exhibited such a spectacle*, J., MWS.
- Line 74 *pity*,: *pity, admiration* J., MWS.; “admiration” is cancelled in the MS.
- Line 77 *suffered*: *suffer* J., MWS.
- Line 83 *as instituted*.: *instituted.* J., MWS.
 [*Second,*] [*p*]ersons of...: A new paragraph in J. and MWS.
 [*Second,*] [*p*]ersons: *Secondly,—Persons* J.; *Secondly—persons* MWS.; *2d Persons* MS.
- Line 85 [*to*]: Cancelled in the MS.; *to* J., MWS.
- Line 87 *Murders*: *Murder* J., MWS.
enormous schemes: *extensive schemes* J., MWS.
- Lines 92-93 [*the lightness of that event*]: Cancelled in the MS.; *the lightness of that event* J., MWS.
- Line 93 *which when closely examined and at a distance*,: *when closely examined, which, at a distance*, J., MWS.
- Line 94 *great*: *a great* J., MWS.
- Line 103 *the crime*: *crime* J., MWS.
- Line 106 *?under*: Doubtful reading; *under* J., MWS.
- Line 109 *of life*: Omitted in J. and MWS.

Bodleian Shelley MSS. Re-examined: A Re-edited Text of Some of
Shelley's Prose Works in the Bodleian MSS. (III)

- Line 116 *habitual perception of: an habitual perception of the ideas of J.*, MWS.
- Line 120 <?>: *only J.*, MWS.
- Line 125 [*and*] in [*the*]: in J.; "the" is cancelled in the MS.; "and" is supplied by
the present editor.
- Line 128 [*than*]: Omitted in the MS.; *than J.*, MWS.
- Line 132 [*has*]: Cancelled in the MS.; *has J.*, MWS.
- Line 133 *this: the J.*, MWS.
- Line 135 *deriving: which derive J.*, MWS.
- Line 136 *?existences: the existence J.*, MWS.
which: Omitted in J. and MWS.
- Line 137 *form: and form J.*, MWS.
- Line 145 < ? >: *actions J.*, MWS.; "actions" is cancelled in the MS. and substituted
by an indecipherable word.
- Line 147 *many. It: many; it J.*, MWS,
philosophical: philosophic J., MWS.
- Line 149 [*liberty*]: Cancelled in the MS.; *liberty J.*, MWS.
- Line 153 *?resolution*: Doubtful reading; *resolution J.*, MWS.

Received June 29, 1985