

FUGITIVE TEXT

Robert Southey and S. T. Coleridge's *Ballad of the Devil*

Robert William Rix



I

A RUNAWAY SUCCESS OF 1799 WAS THE SATIRICAL BALLAD 'The Devil's Thoughts', published anonymously in the *Morning Post and Gazetteer* (no. 9569) on 6 September. The poem (written in fourteen four-line ballad stanzas) is narrated from the perspective of the Devil, who has ascended to the surface of the earth one morning. This is to see 'how his stock went on', that is to say, he gleefully observes the rampant inequities in the city expecting a good yield in Hell.¹ The poem aims its barbs at lucrative professions, such as lawyers, apothecaries, and booksellers, but government policies of prisons and support for the war with France are also criticised. The issue of the *Morning Post* in which the poem appeared was given a second print run to keep up with demand.² However, only few readers at the time would have known that the ballad was jointly written by S. T. Coleridge and Robert Southey. Over a period of almost four decades, the ballad was transcribed, reprinted and imitated (the number of imitative poems practically constitutes a minor genre). But despite the fact that it became one of the most popular texts either of the two Romantic poets wrote, modern criticism has given it only cursory attention.

This article makes up for this lacuna by examining the circulation, editing, and revisions of the text. In the idiom of the day, Southey and Coleridge's devil-ballad can be called 'fugitive', a nineteenth-century descriptor for a text that dealt with ephemeral matters of only passing interest (*OED* 5). However, the term was broadened to mean a poem reprinted several times, often with no certainty about its authorship. Both meanings hold true in the case of 'The Devil's Thoughts', which was written as a topical squib to fill the pages of a newspaper on a given day, and yet the anonymous ballad was still being reprinted decades later without the authors' consent. In contrast to readings that tie the great Romantic ode or the meditative lyric to the individual genius of its author, we have yet to fully account for the complexities of disposable poems whose lease of life extends beyond what the authors intended or even desired—that is, fugitive texts. Focusing on the textual variants of 'The Devil's Thoughts' and its copies, I will discuss how the print market came to treat an anonymous ballad as public property and how each new version of the text introduced features that altered readers' interpretive perspectives.

The essay will proceed in four stages. First, I will examine how the ballad's allegories were instrumental in securing the text a prolonged life (the poem's

transsexuality, as Gérard Genette would have it).³ Second, I will explore the trajectory of the text through its reproductions and probe the nexus of reasons for Southey's and Coleridge's apparent reticence about acknowledging authorship of the ballad. This will be followed, in the third section, by an analysis of the revised versions Southey and Coleridge eventually decided to publish independently of each other. In the fourth and final part, I will look at the entrepreneurs who cashed in on the popularity of the ballad by churning out a number of imitative compositions in hasty succession. This 'afterlife' of the ballad is interesting not only because it has never been studied, but also because it provides a unique insight into how original literary ideas of the romantic-period could be copied and exploited in the market for popular print.

Allegory as a Means for Textual Transmissions

The argument I want to present in this first section is that the ballad consists of a series of allegories that invite to a certain structure of reading that helped to secure its longevity because new readers could reinterpret its allusions to fit new signifiers. Allegory and fable were modes of writing often used in satire of the 1790s as a safeguard against government prosecution, as the Pitt regime, in fear of insurrection, was wont to take legal action against radical publications.⁴ Thus, satire would lodge its message in representations that would trigger associative bands, but effectively sever representations from any direct or singular signification. That is to say, readers were invited to collude with texts that excelled in oblique hints, feeling themselves on the 'inside' of an interpretive community that could decode the message. This was a strategy that meant the author and bookseller could avoid charges. Perhaps the way in which Southey and Coleridge stake the claim that government supporters would end up in Hell for their crimes was appreciated by readers. At least, Coleridge could write to Southey a few months after publication: 'Our "Devil's Thoughts" have [*sic*] been admired far & wide—most *enthusiastically* admired!'⁵

Throughout, the ballad relies heavily on the Bible for its allegories. The first stanzas are general indictments of ignoble professions. For example, the Devil observes a lawyer killing a viper, the two being so alike that the scene is inevitably compared to Cain's fratricide on Abel. The Devil also sees an apothecary (a profession notorious for dishing out suspicious medicines) on a white horse like one of the horsemen of the Apocalypse (as a note tells us), who will bring death and destruction. In the final stanza, the Devil sees an agitated General's 'burning face' and mistakes this for the 'General Conflagration' to come at the end of time. This image is a pun on the belief that the whole world will eventually be burned up, at which time all men will be judged. The Devil's misreading of the situation makes him hurry back to Hell to prepare himself for the people he expects to receive there. The fact that the ballad is concluded with the Devil's glaringly erroneous interpretation forces readers to question the sanity of all the Devil's observations so that it becomes difficult for potential conservative

detractors to determine whether anything in the poem is to be interpreted at face value.

This textual strategy is especially important in relation to the attacks on the government and Prime Minister William Pitt. The most political part of the ballad is stanza 10, in which the Devil observes a pig swimming down the river, who at every stroke was ‘cutting his own throat’. This appears to allude to the Prime Minister keeping his own head above water while he is damaging the country he represents. This interpretation is underscored by its correlation with another Coleridge’s essay ‘Pitt and Buonoparte’ (published in the *Morning Post* on 19 March 1800), in which he targets Pitt for claiming ‘prosperity’ as one of his ‘general phrases’, but incapable of documenting the country’s success by ‘one single fact of real national amelioration.’⁶ The use of animal imagery in political satire was not unknown: a 1797 cartoon by James Gillray, for example, shows William Pitt as ‘the learned pig’, and a print by Richard Newton from 1795 depicts both Charles James Fox and Pitt as pigs.⁷

The animal fable, from which the ballad borrows, is a genre that was given meaning and shape at a historical moment in a socially specific environment. ‘The artistic act’, as Mikhail Bakhtin has it, ‘lives and moves not in a vacuum but in an intense axiological atmosphere of responsible interdetermination.’⁸ The idea of representing politics through the vehicle of animal fable (with its studious indeterminacy as to the exact tenor of the represented) was a response to a particular legislative and constitutional situation. James Epstein and David Karr have argued that the policing of publications and the willingness to prosecute seditious statements were restrictive measures that dictated ‘strategies of indirection, the adaptation of language and behaviour “on the margins of legal sanction”’. In this way, government attempts to contain free expression were, ironically, productive of textual inventiveness and creative interpretation.⁹ Most incendiary was the fable ‘King Chanticleer; Or the Fate of Tyranny’ (1793) by Coleridge’s one-time associate John Thelwall. In this allegorical tale, a domineering gamecock drives ‘his subjects’ into ‘foreign wars’ to ‘snatch every little treasure’ but is eventually decapitated for his despotism. The government understood the gamecock to be a representation of George III and therefore prosecuted the printer, Daniel Isaac Eaton, for sedition. Eaton was eventually acquitted, however, as the prosecution failed to prove that the allegory pointed unequivocally to the King.¹⁰

With this example of government paranoia in mind, it is worth noting that the pig in ‘The Devil’s Thoughts’ is ‘cutting his *own* throat’ (emphasis added), indicating that violent action is not necessary, as the Prime Minister will sink of his own accord—together with the country he misgoverns. At no point does the ‘The Devil’s Thoughts’ push its allegories into the rubric of sedition. Although the ballad is critical of government—tax levies, the war with France and the management of prisons—it expresses no Jacobin or revolutionary sentiments. In this way, the ballad averts the threat that Coleridge had levelled at Pitt in an earlier allegorical poem from the *Morning Post*, ‘Fire, Famine, and Slaughter.

A War Eclogue' (8 January 1798), in which the Prime Minister's death is violently imagined: 'the multitude [...] shall seize him and his brood [...] They shall tear him limb from limb!'¹¹

The usefulness of allegories as reusable vehicles unto which new meanings could be grafted is highlighted in stanza 11 of 'The Devil's Thoughts', in which the Devil recalls his two children 'Taxation' (alluding to the taxes Pitt introduced in response to the national debt in 1798) and 'Victory' (the hoped-for outcome of the war with France). The humour here relies on the parallel with John Milton's allegory of Satan's two children in *Paradise Lost*: Sin and Death. This is not as highbrow an allusion as it first seems: Milton's allegory was well-known and had been used for the purpose of political satire by Gillray in his popular cartoon 'Sin, Death, and the Devil' (1792), a critique of Pitt's dismissal of his Chancellor after disagreement over tax policies. In relation to *Paradise Lost*, it is pertinent here to note Kenneth Borris' argument that it was the 'allegorical modulation' of the poem that extended its 'longevity' by 'enhancing its adaptability' for posterity. Yet the abstract quality of allegory is also what laid the poem 'open to usage for betokening meanings that may even question or subvert the authority of the host itself'.¹² I will contend that the allegories used in 'The Devil's Thoughts' gave it a prolonged life as a republished text, as later nineteenth-century readers were able to reinscribe it with new indictments of contemporary government abuses. In a recent book, Cassie LeGette has examined how several Romantic poems of the 1790s were repurposed to new political ends, long after their original publication. For example, poems by Wordsworth, Southey and Coleridge appeared in excerpt in Thomas Wooler's *Black Dwarf*, alongside Chartist prints, and other radical publications between the 1820s and 1840s, although the poets themselves had turned to conservatism at this time. Coleridge's allegorical 'Fire, Famine, and Slaughter' was reprinted. So were his 'Religious Musing' and 'Fears in Solitude', but excerpting them in such a way that only the censure of the British government is preserved, while the criticism of French aggression is left out.¹³ What we will discover in the following section is that the interpretive possibilities of the devil-ballad were also expanded as it was copied into variant versions beyond the control of its authors.

Textual Transmission

The ballad's circulatory life from 1799 to the late 1830s is revealing because it shows how anonymously published texts could be usurped by others in the book market. I contend that in order to reuse the ballad as a commercial commodity, it was necessary to elevate it to a more respectable and bookish piece. This happened primarily through framing the piece with and within various *paratexts*.¹⁴ The appropriation of the ballad in new settings was helped by Southey and Coleridge effectively disowning their text for many years. The reason for this cannot be pinned down to a single motive, but—I will argue—must be understood as a nexus of reasons closely tied in with the socio-historical conditions

for satirical texts in the arena of early nineteenth-century textual production and reproduction.

As the original issue of the *Morning Post* became unavailable, the ballad continued to circulate in transcript (see further below). This testifies to the fact that Romantic-period readers did not entirely surrender to print economy; the avalanche of print did not supplant manuscript culture as a means of literary dissemination, and Coleridge was especially active in this practice.¹⁵ Despite the fact that the ballad seems to have continued to receive attention, Coleridge did not reprint it or acknowledge authorship until 1817. The admission was made in the collection *Sibylline Leaves* in connection with the reprinting of the more incendiary 'Fire, Famine, and Slaughter'. Coleridge's disclosure of his authorship of that poem was very much a forced confession. It was prompted by Leigh Hunt's unauthorised printing of the poem in *The Examiner* for 24 November 1816 with the clear intention to embarrass the conservative Coleridge, who by this time was distancing himself from his political satires of the 1790s. In an aptly titled 'Apologetic Preface', Coleridge assures his readers that no malignity was intended when he wrote 'Fire, Famine, and Slaughter', avowing that 'there was never a moment in my existence in which I should have been more ready, had Mr. Pitt's person been in hazard, to interpose my own body, and defend his life at the risk of my own.'¹⁶ In the same preface, Coleridge divulges that he was also one of the authors of 'The Devil's Thoughts'. The confession to this was surely made because he was expecting that his authorship of this other poem from the *Morning Post* would be found out, and he therefore wanted to preempt his detractors. Coleridge explicitly apologises for the potential hurt he had caused to the 'religious feelings of certain readers'. This statement comes after Coleridge had become high Tory, supportive of a position on Church and state that saw the two as an organic unity, a point he wrote vigorously about. In stanzas 12 and 13 of 'The Devil's Thoughts', the allegorical figure of Religion (written as '—', rhyming with 'pigeon') was depicted as a harlot or prostitute. The context was the Church's willingness to consecrate military battle standards for victory in the war with France.¹⁷ In the 'Apologetic Preface', Coleridge admits his parenthood of the ballad while presenting it as an errant piece. He says that what he once 'dared beget', it would only be 'manly' and 'honourable' to now accept as a 'father'.¹⁸ The underlying parable invoked here is that of the biblical tale of the Prodigal Son, who is mercifully accepted back by his father despite his riotous life as a wanderer. The analogy was apposite, of course, when referring to a poem that had circulated in manuscript for years. But important here is the rhetorical sleight of hand by which Coleridge posits the ballad as an entity that had strayed from the author's control, as if it had a life and will of its own.

Coleridge's reluctance to actually reprint the ballad in *Sibylline Leaves* (1817) and to wait for another decade afterwards made it possible for the satirical piece to continue to drift nomadically. But as handwritten manuscripts are expected to have a closer relation to the hand that wields the pen than printed pages that are perceived to introduce distance between text and author, the anonymous

devil-ballad soon became associated with the name of an author, a misattribution that came to determine the reception of the ballad. In *Humorous Tales in Verse* (1818), which claims to be the first printed version of the ballad, the verse lines are accompanied by an anecdote. We are told that the poem was written by the classical scholar Richard Porson at a dinner party where he supposedly hammered out the poem *extempore*. The printing is said to be an authoritative version corrected by Porson himself in contrast to 'other MS copies with material variations.'¹⁹ The spurious origin tale was repeated in later reproductions of the ballad.²⁰ It is possible that Porson had transcribed the poem in a manuscript that others perhaps copied.²¹ At least, the printed versions that credit Porson as the author contain verbal differences from the *Morning Post* version and the misplacement of a stanza. Manuscript culture was just as happy to nurture authorial discretion as the print market, and unsigned manuscripts may have circulated, accompanied by rumours of who the author may be. But Porson had died in 1808 and could therefore not weigh in on the matter.

Connecting Porson with the poem made sense insofar as he was known for his oppositional political views and had published an unknown number of unsigned articles in the *Morning Chronicle*. The prefatory note added to the ballad in *Humorous Tales in Verse* can be classified as what Genette terms a *peritext* (a textual element surrounding the body of a text) that establishes a new framework for interpreting the ballad. The story of Porson and the dinner party presents the verse lines as written by a highly respected Cambridge professor, who purportedly had churned out the verses in the spirit of lighthearted fun. In this way, the ballad (by nature a 'low' form associated with the politics of the streets and taverns) is disconnected from contact with the radical satires of the 1790s—the type of composition Michael Scrivener refers to as 'seditious allegories', of which it otherwise bears the hallmarks.²² This may have been important in 1818 when William Hone (whose political and religious satires were the descendants of the allegories published in the 1790s) was on trial for *The Late John Wilkes's Catechism of a Ministerial Member* (1817), *The Political Litany* (1817) and the *Sinecurist's Creed* (1817), which were considered harmful to public morality, and the *habeas corpus* was still suspended amidst fear of insurrection.

A significant development in the devil-ballad's history is the publication of a series of highly popular illustrated versions during 1830–31. The poem was now retitled *The Devil's Walk*, edited by H. W. Montagu and published by London booksellers Marsh and Miller in collaboration with Edinburgh-based Archibald Constable (Walter Scott's publisher). In the early editions (see the appended Chronological List in Part II of this essay), the ballad is attributed to Porson, and a four-page memoir of the classical scholar (including the anecdote of the dinner party) is inserted as a preface. The edition is a collated text with variant readings for several of the stanzas, which was necessary because the ballad had 'appeared in several publications and it had circulated in MS with various alterations and interpolations'.²³ It was customary at the time to sell older works by hiring well-known editors, and Montagu had recently achieved

some literary success. Hence, it is as 'Author of *Montmorency, a Tragic Drama* [1828]' that his editorship is advertised on the title page. Montagu's own ambitions as literary author interfere with the presentation of the editorial material, so that annotations to verse lines often run over several pages, and on more than one occasion are used to introduce new satire on contemporary victims. In this way, the annotations veer between what Genette distinguishes as the 'allographic' note (scholarly comments by an editor) and the 'fictional' note (creative or pseudo-comments).²⁴ For instance, there is a general mockery of both contemporary politicians and celebrities, whose identities are only vaguely obscured by blanking out letters in their names. This is a textual act akin to what Genette calls 'proximation': the relocation of a text to bring it into closer proximity with the temporal context of expected readers.²⁵ Only in this case the transposition is not changing the original text but adding *paratext*. This method of intrusive editing effectively makes Montagu co-author of a satirical palimpsest. The reason for bringing a 30-year-old text back into circulation was likely the increased alertness to social privilege and political mismanagement in the years leading up to the Reform Act of 1832.

The illustrated *The Devil's Walk* features six black-and-white wood engravings designed by (Isaac) Robert Cruickshank, showing the Devil engaged in various city activities. The co-presence and interaction of pictures with the text create a hybrid form—variously called 'iconotext', 'word-bound text', 'imagetext' and other denominations.²⁶ The engravings elevate the original newspaper skit to a more respectable format. The hermeneutic shift was also signalled through repackaging the text in a standalone edition, furnished with a frontispiece, preface, annotations and appended adverts for the 'elegantly bound, full gilt' books that were also published by Marsh & Miller. The illustrations were probably commissioned to appeal to the same group of readers who had enjoyed Pierce Egan's well-received publication *Life in London* (a series running from 1821 to 1828), furnished with illustrations by both George and Robert Cruickshank.²⁷

The fact that Montagu wrongly attributed the devil-ballad to Richard Porson meant that Southey and Coleridge were robbed of recognition for what was not only a long-standing satirical classic, but now a commercial success as well. When their authorship was finally acknowledged in a later edition, Montagu states in the preface (signed October 1830) that a staggering 15,000 copies of the poem has been sold.²⁸ The change was urged by Coleridge himself, who had arranged for a letter about the matter to be sent to Montagu.²⁹ The overwhelming popularity of the poem and the fact that Montagu's handsome edition (though not expensive) was a sufficiently gentrified version of the ballad seem to have swayed Coleridge to claim the poem. Furthermore, Coleridge had already authorised a reprinting of the devil-ballad in the second volume of his *Poetical Works*, published in 1828. However, Montagu's recognition of Southey and Coleridge on the title page of the bestselling edition was only an empty gesture, as no monetary compensation would have been paid to them: they did not hold any copyright over an anonymous, 30-year-old poem.

The question why neither Southey nor Coleridge was eager to claim the ballad at an earlier stage is a moot point. But over the following pages I will discuss a number of possible explanations, as they will help to illuminate some important dynamics of the Romantic-era book market. One reason why the poem was not embraced is its origin as a joint work. Today, we are comfortable with texts that do not fit in with myths of the isolated and solitary genius in the Romantic period. Several critical studies have established how a large proportion of Romantic works were composed as a part of a sociable activity or in response to communal interaction.³⁰ But, as Alison Hickey has noted, co-authored texts were hard to square with the 'ideas of genius' prevalent at the time of Romanticism.³¹ The devil-ballad was a collaborative effort with input from both Southey and Coleridge, and it is possible that this was a reason why neither Southey nor Coleridge was able to claim full ownership over it, especially after they had drifted apart. In this respect, the collaborative poem sat uneasily with Coleridge's later unswerving insistence on the singular author's inalienable right to literary property and Southey's strident advocacy of the author's perpetual rights.³² In fact, a manuscript Coleridge owned of 'The Devil's Thoughts' shows that he kept a meticulous record of the respective stanzas he and Southey had individually contributed.³³

But more so than an unsettled question of authorship among former friends, it is relevant to consider whether the literary and aesthetic codes associated with popular satire were contributing factors in the authors' long-held silence on their authorship. Already when Coleridge accepted the position of what he called 'a hired paragraph-scribbler' for the *Morning Post* in 1798, he aired his misgivings about both the quality and political positioning it entailed:

[I]f any important Truth, any striking beauty occur to my mind, I feel a repugnance at sending it garbled to a newspaper: and if any idea of ludicrous personality, or apt anti-ministerial joke, crosses me, I feel a repugnance at rejecting it, because something must be written, and nothing else suitable occurs.³⁴

Arguably, the venue and circumstance for publication affected how Coleridge viewed his own production. In 1802, he writes in a letter that the 'greater number' of occasional verses to be sent to the *Morning Post* 'will be such as were never meant for anything else but peritura charta'.³⁵ The Latin phrase plays on the two possible meanings 'perishable paper' and 'ephemeral writing', correlating the quality of the writing with the quality of the paper on which it was printed. This corroborates the literary historian John Guillory's analysis of Romantic writers' urge to distinguish firmly between literary and subliterate genres, a distinction based on both aesthetic evaluation and a sense of what constituted cultural capital in the bourgeois literary market.³⁶ Southey and Coleridge both wanted to distance themselves from the 'low' literature of the popular market, which dovetailed their pursuit of careers as writers of meditative poetry. Satire was anathema to the work of the serious poet, as one critic at the time expressed

it by pouring praise on the Lake School's 'contemplative turn' as a bulwark against popular satires.³⁷

Before H. W. Montagu corrected the misattribution of *The Devil's Walk* to Porson, he actively denied the rumour that Southey and Coleridge could be the authors of the ballad: the rumbustious satire had 'nothing in common with the works of the very talented persons [Southey and Coleridge] to whom it is ascribed', he writes in the preface.³⁸ Montagu's (erroneous) deduction leads us to consider Michel Foucault's essay 'What is an Author' (1969), in which he argues that the name of an author does not point to a physical person, but has the function of evoking the works written under that person's name. Thus, the function of the author's name on the cover is to create a sense of homogeneity among his or her texts.³⁹ Foucault's observation is particularly pertinent to the nineteenth century, as an author was often identified not by name but through reference to a former successful work from him or her (in the style of 'by the author of . . .'). Coleridge and Southey may both have been reluctant to insert the devil-ballad in the chain of works that would defile their professional identities as authors of meditative verse. Coleridge certainly wanted to distance himself from the market of 'low' and 'popular' publications. The issue came up in connection with the publication of Mary Robinson's posthumous four-volume *Memoirs* (1801), in which Coleridge's poem 'A Stranger Minstrel' (written in November 1800) was printed. In a letter of 1802, he laments the decision to associate his name with the gothic productions that the poem's sombre tone brings to mind: 'I understood that an excessively silly copy of Verses, which I had absolutely forgotten the very writing of, disgraced me & the volumes'.⁴⁰ That Coleridge should have forgotten a poem he wrote less than two years earlier seems insincere, but he is really reflecting on the fact that as soon as one's name was attached to a publication, it would freeze that name in time and at some point leave it out of sync with the opinions of the living and developing author. From 1802, Coleridge often used the signature 'ΕΣΤΗΣΕ', ostensibly Punic Greek, which—he explained in a letter—meant '*He hath stood*'. This was a signature in which he invested great significance: 'in these times of apostacy from the principles of Freedom [...] it is in truth no more than S.T.C. written in Greek. *Es tee see*'.⁴¹ However, Coleridge could not let these signs 'stand' in the 1810s, as he slipped away from his earlier Jacobin/oppositional stance to a Tory position, becoming the very apostate he had condemned.

That Southey and Coleridge seemingly wanted to dissociate themselves from the devil-ballad cannot be separated from their turn towards a more conservative and authoritarian position. In *The Friend* for 19 October 1809, a reactionary Coleridge would criticise 'vapid satires' and condemn satirical 'scribblers' who wrote libels from 'envy and malevolence'.⁴² Southey published the essay 'On the Rise and Progress of Popular Disaffection' (1817), in which he turned his ire towards the satirist 'Junius', whom he saw as 'the most influential and most pernicious English writer of his age', and whose libel against the authorities had caused ruinous political unrest.⁴³

Southey's and Coleridge's Revised Versions

Important moments in the plurality of intertexts that 'The Devil's Thoughts' engendered are Southey's and Coleridge's own revisions of the ballad. In the following, I will argue is that they both attempted to mitigate the low status of the ballad and take the edge of its oppositional politics.

Coleridge reprinted the devil-ballad in the second volume of his *Poetical Works* (1828). At this point in time, Coleridge and Southey had been called out as the authors of the ballad in an 1826 printing of the ballad in the influential *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, so in compiling a three-volume collection of his poetry, omission of the devil-poem would seem disingenuous.⁴⁴ But, significantly, Coleridge produced a redacted version, reducing the ballad to just ten stanzas, which meant leaving out (as Coleridge explains in a note) verses that were 'grounded on subjects that have lost their interest—and for better reasons'.⁴⁵ The omitted stanzas were primarily those that had lost their topicality, such as those alluding to the slave trade (less relevant after the passing of the Slave Trade Act of 1807) and the war with France (concluded in 1815). Coleridge also adds textual notes to the poem that, if anything, help to obfuscate the prosaic politics of the original ballad and place it more securely in the domain of the literary. This is done by referring the reader to *Paradise Lost* and including quotations in Latin and Greek letters. The last time that Coleridge exerted any control over his collected poems was in the 1835 Pickering edition of his works, edited just before his death.⁴⁶ Here, the ballad is expanded to 17 stanzas, restoring what was left out in 1828. The fact that this reprinting appeared after Montagu's full version of the poem had become a smash, selling by the thousands, made the withholding of any material seem futile—and it would also disappoint those who had read and admired the longer version.

In a discussion of a text that became plural it is relevant to take into account Jack Stillinger's proposal that one needs to 'grant the legitimacy and interest [...] of *all* the versions' of a Romantic textual object to fully understand it as *text*.⁴⁷ Plurality is particularly pertinent to a consideration of the political charge of the last stanza, which Coleridge had penned. The Devil observes a 'General ——'s burning face', which he mistakes for the 'General Conflagration' to come at the end of time. As a consequence, the dark lord hurries back to Hell in expectation of the many people he will be receiving there. The excision of a proper name by replacing it with dashes was a strategy that had migrated from political to satirical writing, exploiting a loophole in libel laws that allowed innuendos to escape prosecution.⁴⁸ In the notes to his 1828 reprinting, Coleridge added the assurance that the empty spaces were never meant to be filled by any particular name; he had simply wanted to refer to 'a red-faced person' he had seen in a dream.⁴⁹ This explanation tries to conceal the ballad's origin in political satire where empty spaces were routinely used to target public persons. The disclaimer was surely a response to the pirated versions of the ballad in which different names had been inserted by editors, and Coleridge is now vying to regain control of a text that had roamed freely. When the ballad was printed in *The Tickler* (January 1819),

the dashes were replaced by the name 'General Gascoigne'—referring to one Isaac Gascoyne (1763–1841), a British Army commander who was also a Tory politician in opposition to the abolition of the slave trade.⁵⁰ Yet this can hardly be the name originally intended in 1799, since Gascoyne did not attain the rank of Major-General until 1802. In a manuscript version transcribed in the *British Critic*, we find the name 'General Gage', invoking Thomas Gage (1718–87), on whose orders Charlestown was burnt in the American War, a fact that would explain Coleridge's pun on destructive fire.⁵¹ Likewise, in one of Coleridge's own manuscript copies of the ballad, the name 'General Tarleton' is given—Banastre Tarleton (1754–1833), who was known for his military service in the American War, not least for the burning of villages.⁵² In another manuscript copy, the name is written out as 'General Burrard', for Harry Burrard (1755–1813), who was involved in the signing of the Convention of Sintra (1808), an agreement Coleridge commented upon with much vehemence.⁵³ It goes without saying that this insertion of Burrard's name was a post-1799 revision, which speaks to the fact that Coleridge's disavowal of the last stanza as a pointed political satire does not hold up.⁵⁴

Like Coleridge, Southey was also outed as the author of the devil-ballad. In private, Southey decided to revise the ballad and sent an expanded version to his friend Grosvenor C. Bedford in a letter dated 24 February 1827. This was perhaps in reaction to being explicitly named as the author in the 1826 printing of the ballad in *Blackwood's Magazine*.⁵⁵ Southey's own version was retitled 'The Devil's Walk' and contains 57 stanzas, incorporating the original ballad, but adding a welter of new ideas. The length of Southey's revised version and his abandonment of the simple ballad stanzas made the new version resemble the format of neoclassical verse satire, which was still held in high regard. Even so, Southey still felt the need to disown any artistic investment in the composition. In the letter to Bedford, he does his utmost to present the poem as a hack job that was dashed off in a hurry:

I am almost doubtful whether you can decipher the detestable character in which it is scrawled and scratched rather than written. It has been lying on my table some three weeks before I could make up my stomach to send it.⁵⁶

The new and substantially longer version was not printed until it was included in the third volume of Southey's *Poetical Works, Collected by Himself* (1838).⁵⁷ Southey adds a preface that explains how he and Coleridge had composed the poem that went on to become a publication success. This is repeated within the poem itself (stanzas 37–40) as a jocular metafictional account of how the two poets had met at Nether Stowey, in Somerset, and thrashed out the original poem while shaving and having breakfast. This representation of the ballad's compositional history is the poet laureate's opportunity to claim that the ballad was spontaneously composed rather than written as a calculated and well-organised attack on authorities. The longer version is also an attempt to dilute the oppositional content of the original ballad: in addition to challeng-

ing government and taxes, the new lines also shore up the powers of authority. For instance, the original attack on 'Religion' is now more univocally aimed at religious dissent that 'lets down' the Anglican Church and its moral principles and religious doctrines.⁵⁸ In this way, Southey's revised version becomes a palimpsest that restrains the original text by subsuming it.

The Devil's Imitators

H. W. Montagu, the editor of the illustrated *The Devil's Walk*, claimed that the ballad was 'one of the most strikingly original poems that ever appeared'.⁵⁹ This is a paean to the Romantic ideology of originality. A collateral of originality is copying, and an important dimension of the ballad's *transfextuality* is its many imitations and sequels. Despite the fact that the exploitation of creative originality by imitators and book-market impresarios is integral to an understanding of the Romantic period, this is often a neglected area of discussion. The remainder of this article will examine how a number of *hypertexts* (texts that allude, derive from, or relate to an earlier work) appropriated Southey and Coleridge's ballad.

The first imitation was written by Percy Bysshe Shelley, who may have seen 'The Devil's Thoughts' when he visited Southey at Keswick in 1811. A year later, he arranged for 'The Devil's Walk: A Ballad' to be printed in Dublin as an anonymous broadside. Shelley's third stanza on the lawyer killing a viper is almost identical with stanza 3 of the original version, and he incorporates the pig and an allusion to the general conflagration destroying the world. By flagging up the generic marker 'ballad' in the title, Shelley signalled that the text had communal ownership, as textual variations (wording and narrative) among broadside ballads from different printers, and even between printings by the same printer, were commonplace.⁶⁰

Shelley's version moves in a dangerously radical direction. Most critically, the Devil observes 'a brainless King', and his overweight son, who ruled Britain with a 'maudlin brain'. These allusions to the mentally ill George III and the later George IV may partly be a provocation guided by Shelley's dissatisfaction with Southey's turn to conservatism.⁶¹ In any case, Shelley knew he was going too far, and the broadside does not display the required details of the publisher (who would be the one who could be charged with sedition for disseminating the print). Shelley tried to distribute the ballad both by hand and mail together with the incendiary *Declaration of Rights*, at the time he resided in the village of Lynmouth, West Devonshire, in 1812.⁶² This came to an end on the evening of 19 August, when his Irish servant Daniel Healey was arrested for distributing and posting the two documents in Barnstaple, because they did not have the imprint of the printer's name and therefore were illegal. Healey was tried and convicted to serve six months, because he was unable to pay the fine. We know that Shelley and his group also launched bottles into the sea and by air in hot air balloons which appear to have contained 'The Devil's Walk' (these launchings are celebrated in the sonnets 'On Launching Some Bottles Filled with Knowledge into the Bristol Channel' and 'To a Balloon Laden with Knowl-

edge'). This method of distribution may seem less curious when one considers the penalty to be incurred if caught circulating them in person. Apprehensive about the authorities' interest in their activities, Shelley and his companions finally decided to destroy most of the existing copies. In fact, only one copy survives in the Public Record Office where it was found in 1871.

One of the most imitated authors of the age was George Lord Byron, whose texts were used for imitations such as *Childe Harold in the Shades* (1818), *Harold in the New World* (1831) and not least Lamartine's *The Last Canto of Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (1825, English translation 1827). But Byron himself also found inspiration in popular works: he drafted the poem 'The Devil's Drive' on 8 December 1813 and made a fair copy of it the following day. Byron, who by this time had already established himself as a successful satirist of authorities, writes a version in which the Devil has returned to Hell after his morning walk and then decides to ride out in a coach the same evening. This way of referencing the previous poem may invite us to classify it as a *continuation*, which, according to Genette, is different from a sequel (*suite*) in that it works from the presupposition that the original poem is not finished but can be continued and its narrative possibilities thereby fulfilled.⁶³ Byron lashes out at a number of named contemporaries, both politicians and royals. However, the poem remained in copy and was not published during Byron's lifetime. In fact, it did not appear in its entirety (27 stanzas) until a manuscript, held by the Earl of Ilchester, was transcribed in a 1904 edition of Byron's poems. Given that Byron would viciously satirise Southey in *The Vision of Judgment* (1822), it is ironic that Byron—probably without realising it—had in fact used a satire by Southey for inspiration.

David A. Brewer has theorised that a 'fictional archive' of reusable literary characters developed in the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century print market.⁶⁴ The Devil could be seen as one such fictional character, who could be easily sent out on new itineraries as a roaming observer of social and political mores. This could take place in new settings, as we see in 'The Devil's Walk in Philadelphia' (1826), which directs the satire towards local matters in what was the American financial and cultural centre at the time.⁶⁵ But most imitations in Britain appeared in the wake of Montagu's successful illustrated version. These appropriations may usefully be discussed under the category of 'viral literature', a capacious notion that includes paraphrases, reworkings, parodies, quotations and other manifestations of a text's life.⁶⁶ More concretely, the imitations are akin to what Kyle Grimes has dubbed 'hacker satire': compositions written primarily to exploit a successful idea by responding 'quickly and massively to momentary and fleeting opportunities in the public sphere'.⁶⁷ We may begin with an imitation that carries the Bunyanesque title *The Devil's Progress*, published in 1830 with illustrations by Robert Seymour (who would later achieve fame for his designs to Charles Dickens' *The Pickwick Papers*). The preface points specifically to Southey and Coleridge's composition as an inspiration, and the first verse of their original ballad is quoted.⁶⁸ This poem uses the Devil's travels to criticise the clergy and lawyers, as was also the case in the original, but it also jibes at

high-society ladies and celebrities, the identities of whom are thinly disguised through substituting asterisks for some of the letters in their names.

Another imitation entitled *The Real Devil's Walk* was issued by the radical publisher Effingham Wilson in 1830. This publication continued along the tracks laid down by the original ballad, targeting the Church, Parliament, the courts and high society. The unnamed author takes his starting point in the public debate over who wrote the original devil ballad and now offers a 'real' account of the Devil's walkabout. It is declared in the first stanza:

Of the Devil's Walk there's been much talk
And folks seem mighty curious
Now this is the real Devil's Walk
And all the rest are spurious'.⁶⁹

This is what today would classify as a 'reboot' of the Devil's adventures, effected through a tongue-in-cheek rejection of the original ballad as fake. This disingenuity is a send-up of the period's talismanic notions of 'originality' by a canny book-market entrepreneur. *The Real Devil's Walk* was also furnished with illustrations by Robert Cruikshank, presumably to appeal to the same buyers who had bought Montagu's illustrated version a few months earlier. Effingham Wilson also published *Walks about Town* (again with drawings by Cruikshank) in an attempt to revive fictionalised narratives featuring an outsider who observes and comments on experiences in London, a trend that was popular in the late eighteenth century. He includes a reference to *The Real Devil's Walk*, which obviously was an inspiration, and three stanzas from an unpublished poem entitled 'The Devil in London' are also cited.⁷⁰

A new edition of *The Real Devil's Walk* was published by William Kidd, a London bookseller known for his inventive, but also controversial, publishing ventures.⁷¹ Kidd's edition introduces a self-mockery of the poem's derivativeness by including a 'CAUTION TO THE PUBLIC' (a standard phrase used by publishers to warn against counterfeit prints), admonishing the reader that another 'Bookseller' is 'guilty of *purloining* the first stanza from the *Real Devil's Walk* and affixing it to the Wrapper of a *spurious* publication of his own called the Devil's Walk' [Montagu's edition had been issued in drab paper wrappers].⁷² In this way, the confusion over the original poem's authorship was utilised to provide the plagiariser with a gag on what was in fact his own piggybacking on a successful publication.

Kidd further capitalised on the public's appetite for illustrated Devil poems by reissuing Robert Burns' *Address to the Deil* (1830), a humorous portrayal of the Devil addressed through the pulpit oratory of the Presbyterian Church. This poem was originally published in 1786, but was now furnished with illustrations by Thomas Landseer. Landseer also provided ten etchings for another print seller and book publisher, F. G. Harding, who published an 1831 version of Southey and Coleridge's original ballad.⁷³ In a telling remark, a reviewer of this edition commented on the excessive attention given to the ballad in recent years that 'we have had the Devil walking upon earth till we fancy he must be nearly tired'.⁷⁴

In 1831, Kidd also published *The Devil's Visit*, a poem originally printed in *The Intelligence* the year before. Evidently, market opportunities now made it a saleable commodity as a standalone publication. This poem claims to be a sequel to Southey and Coleridge's original poem by referring to the Devil's 'first Visit' in the first line and then declaring that the Devil is now 'resolved to return to earth | To resume his perambulation'.⁷⁵ The anonymous author fires rounds at famous actors, the Attorney General and Parliament (which the Devil proclaims as his dominion). Again, Robert Cruikshank was hired to illustrate the poem. Later in 1831, Kidd collected and bound the remainder copies of the devil-themed poems as part of a two-volume duodecimo edition that he sold under the title of *Facetiae; being a General Collection of the Jeux d'esprits which Have Been Illustrated by Robert Cruikshank* (1831). Volume 2 includes an edition of *The Devil's Walk* (Kidd probably bought unsold copies, which he bound with his own publications). This collection offered the book buyer a cheap way of acquiring several works that would have been more expensive to buy individually.

Most of the imitations focus as much on mocking socialites and celebrities, their fashion and public scandals (which is a tendency observable in much of the satirical work published in the 1830s), as they concern themselves with political and social issues. In 1833, however, another imitation was printed in *Cobbett's Magazine*, entitled 'The Devil's Visit', which reinvigorated the political verve. The first lines are directly taken from Southey and Coleridge's poem, followed by an updated criticism of the government: 'Then a view of the Court, afforded much sport | And he [the Devil] thought of a suffering nation; [...] | All savour'd of grinding taxation | Realizes he is inferior to man'.⁷⁶

To conclude, we may briefly consider how Southey and Coleridge's verses stimulated developments in the market for periodicals. During 1832, a weekly magazine in thirty-seven issues was published under varying titles: *The Devil in London; Asmodeus, or the Devil in London; and Asmodeus in London*, seemingly capitalising on both the devil-ballad and Alain-René Lesage's popular 'devil-on-two-sticks' satire. The periodical functioned as a running commentary on issues such as parliamentary reform and national manners. The first six numbers contained twenty-four woodcuts designed by Kenny Meadows and Robert Cruikshank. At this time, publishers realised that the combination of satirical verse with comical illustrations of the Devil in various London settings was a recipe for success. A commentator even dubbed Cruikshank: 'Robert the Devil', and wrote that it is to his pictorial designs that the dark Lord owes his 'warm reception' on earth.⁷⁷ Finally, with direct reference to Southey and Coleridge's ballad, three numbers of a journal entitled *The Devil's Walk* were published by the radical London bookseller Benjamin Steill during 1832. This was a miscellany, illustrated by George Cruikshank, containing political poetry, articles on reform, and reviews of new publications. However, after the passing of the Reform Act, the interest in the Devil's perambulations appears to have died down—perhaps more from exhaustion of the satirical model than from an actual lack of objects to satirise.

* * *

What emerges from examining the various versions and imitations of the fugitive ballad, published over almost four decades, is that the original anonymity of the poem and the seeming flexibility of the allegorical representations encouraged reprinting, while the possibility of an ever-expandable ballad structure invited continuations. For the authors themselves, their satirical invective remained an outlier in their oeuvre, even if they both eventually came to accept paternity of the orphaned poem. I have not attempted to systematically document all the minute differences. But one thing is clear, in terms of the ballad's impact the majority of readers would have come to the poem through a reprinted version with alterations or a revised version. In fact, Southey's expanded revision was frequently anthologised in the latter half of the nineteenth century (after the expiry of his copyright), such as *A Budget of Humorous Poetry* (1866), *British Poets* (1866), *The Humorous [sic] Poetry of the English Language* (1870), *The Cyclopaedia of Wit and Humor* (1875), *The Family Library of Poetry and Song* (1880), and other collections for the popular market. It is ironic, of course, that although Southey and Coleridge both would pursue a career in meditative poetry, one of their most popular poems was their early squib, which remained more a burden than an object of pride to them.

II

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF VERSIONS OF *THE DEVIL'S BALLAD**A. Published Versions*

1. Anon., 'The Devil's Thoughts', *The Morning Post and Gazetteer* (no. 9569), 6 September 1799.
2. Richard Porson, 'The Devil's Walk', in *Comic and Humorous Tales in Verse, Selected from the Most Approved Authors* (London: R. Wilks, 1818), pp. 309–10.
3. Richard Porson, 'The Devil's Walk', *The Tickler, or, Monthly Compendium of Good Things, in Prose and Verse*, 1.2 (January 1819), 31–32.
4. Richard Porson, 'Extemporaneous Lines Ascribed to the Late Professor Porson', in *The Cambridge Tart: Epigrammatic and Satiric-Poetical Effusions by Cantabs* (London: J. Smith, 1823), pp. 22–25.
5. S. T. Coleridge, 'The Devil's Thoughts', *The British Critic*, n.s., 19 (June 1823), 576–77.
[Review of item 4.]

6. S. T. Coleridge and Robert Southey, 'The Devil's Walk', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 19.109 (February 1826), 135–36.
7. S. T. Coleridge, 'The Devil's Thoughts', in *The Poetical Works of Coleridge*, 2 vols (London: William Pickering, 1828), II, 89–91.
8. S. T. Coleridge, 'The Devil's Thoughts', in *The Poetical Works of Coleridge, Shelley, and Keats. Complete in One Volume* (Paris: A. and W. Galignani, 1829), pp. 214–15.
9. Robert Southey, 'The Devil's Walk', in *The Poetical Works of Robert Southey. Complete in One Volume* (Paris: A. and W. Galignani, 1829), p. 723.
10. Richard Porson, *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by Professor Porson*, ed. with biographical memoir and notes by H. W. Montagu [1st edn, 1st issue] (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co., 1830). [1st edn, 1st issue. Error in pagination on pp. 21–22.]⁷⁸
11. Richard Porson, *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by Professor Porson*, ed. with biographical memoir and notes by H. W. Montagu [1st edn, 2nd issue] (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co., 1830). [1st edn, 2nd issue. Error in pagination on pp. 21–22 corrected.]
12. Richard Porson, *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by Professor Porson*, ed. with biographical memoir and notes by H. W. Montagu, 2nd edn (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co., 1830). [Error in pagination on pp. 21–22 is repeated, though this had been corrected in the 2nd issue of the 1st edn.]
13. S. T. Coleridge and Robert Southey, *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by S. T. Coleridge, Esq. and Robert Southey, Esq. LL.D. &c.*, ed. with biographical memoir and notes by H. W. Montagu, 3rd edn (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co., 1830).
14. S. T. Coleridge and Robert Southey, *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by S. T. Coleridge, Esq. and Robert Southey, Esq. LL.D. &c.*, ed. with biographical memoir and notes by H. W. Montagu, 4th edn. London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co. [the words 'Second Edition' appear above the imprint].
15. *Ten Etchings Illustrative of The Devil's Walk by Thomas Landseer* (London: F. G. Harding, 1831).


16. *The Devil's Walk*, in *Facetiae; being a General Collection of the Jeux d'esprits which Have Been Illustrated by Robert Cruikshank* (London: William Kidd, 1831).
[Remainder copies of the 4th edn of Montagu's version were bound with other devil-poems published by Kidd.]
17. S. T. Coleridge, 'The Devil's Thoughts', in *The Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge*, 3 vols (London: William Pickering; Boston: Hilliard, Grey, 1835), II, 83–87.
18. Robert Southey, 'The Devil's Walk', in *The Poetical Works, Collected by Himself*, 10 vols (London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, & Longmans, 1838), III, 83–100.

B. Manuscripts of 'The Devil's Thoughts' Mentioned in this Essay

1. S. T. Coleridge's MS given to Sara Hutchinson. The text contained in this MS is transcribed in George Whalley, *Coleridge and Sara Hutchinson and the Asra Poems* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1955), pp. 20–23 (see also n. 33).
2. MS copy taken at Highgate by Derwent Coleridge, in June 1820. The text is transcribed under the title 'The Devil's Thoughts. [MS. copy by Derwent Coleridge.]', in *The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Including Poems and Versions of Poems now Published for the First Time*, ed. by Ernest Hartley Coleridge, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), I, 319–23.

C. Imitations

1. Percy Bysshe Shelley, *The Devil's Walk* ([n. pl.]: [n. pub.], 1812).
[A single copy survives in the Public Record Office.]
2. George Gordon, Lord Byron, 'The Devil's Drive', in Journal entry for 8 December 1813.
3. Anon., 'The Devil's Walk in Philadelphia', in *Philadelphia; or, Glances at Lawyers, Physicians, First-Circle, Wistar-Parties, &c &c.* (Philadelphia: R. H. Small, 1826), pp. 112–15.

4. Thomas Kibble, *The Devil's Progress. A Poem* (London: Lupton Relfe, 1830).
5. Anon., *The Real Devil's Walk* (London: Effingham Wilson, 1830).
6. 'The Antiquated Trio', *Walks about Town: A Poem in Two Cantos, with Notes and a Memoir of the Authors* (London: Effingham Wilson, 1830). [Authorial attribution in foreword.]
7. Anon., *The Real Devil's Walk not by Professor Porson* (London: Effingham Wilson, 1831).
8. Anon., *The Real Devil's Walk not by Professor Porson*, 2nd edn with additions (London: William Kidd, 1831).
9. Anon., *The Devil's Visit: A Poem* (London: William Kidd, 1831).
10. *Facetiae; being a General Collection of the Jeux d'esprits which Have Been Illustrated by Robert Cruikshank* (London: William Kidd, 1831). [Collects all of Kidd's publications.]
11. Anon., 'The Devil's Visit', *Cobbett's Magazine: A Monthly Review of Politics, History, Science, Literature, and Rural and Domestic Pursuits*, (Dec 1834), 378–42. 

NOTES

1. Unless otherwise noted, references will be to the poem as it was published in the *Morning Post*, available electronically in an edition by Donald H. Reiman and Neil Fraiſtat on the *Romantic Circles* website <<https://www.rc.umd.edu/editions/shelley/devil/devil.stc1799.html>>.
2. Wilfrid Hope Hindle, *The Morning Post, 1772–1937: Portrait of a Newspaper* (1937; Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1974), p. 89.
3. Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 1.
4. See Jon Mee, *Print, Publicity, and Popular Radicalism in the 1790s: The Laurel of Liberty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), pp. 1–60.
5. Coleridge to Southey, 10 Nov 1799, in *Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. by Ernest Hartley Coleridge, 2 vols (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1895), I, 318.
6. Citation rptd in *Political Essays: With Sketches of Public Characters*, ed. by William Hazlitt (London: Simpkin and Marshall, 1822), pp. 398–400.
7. See Jan Bondeson, *The Feejee Mermaid and Other Essays in Natural and Unnatural History* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1999), p. 28.

8. Mikhail Bakhtin, 'Art and Answerability', in *Art and Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*, trans. by Vadim Liapunov (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011), p. 275.
9. James Epstein and David Karr, "'Playing at Revolution": British Jacobin Performance', *Journal of Modern History*, 79 (September 2007), 495–530 <<https://doi.org/10.1086/517980>> (p. 530).
10. Michael Scrivener, *Seditious Allegories: John Thelwall and Jacobin Writing* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), pp. 11–20.
11. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Sibylline Leaves: A Collection of Poems* (London: Rest Fenner, 1817), pp. 115–16.
12. Kenneth Borris, *Allegory and Epic in English Renaissance Literature: Heroic Form in Sidney, Spenser, and Milton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 74.
13. On the reprinting of Coleridge's texts, see Casie LeGette, *Remaking Romanticism: The Radical Politics of the Excerpt* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 84–93 <<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46929-4>>.
14. Genette, *Palimpsests*, pp. 3–4.
15. See Lynda Pratt, 'Non-Publication', in *The Oxford Handbook of British Romanticism*, ed. by David Duff (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 495–512 (esp. pp. 498–99).
16. Coleridge, 'Apologetic Preface', in *Sibylline Leaves*, p. 97.
17. See Morton Paley, *Apocalypse and Millennium in English Romantic Poetry* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), p. 148.
18. Coleridge, 'Apologetic Preface', p. 98.
19. 'The Devil's Walk', in *Comic and Humorous Tales in Verse, Selected from the Most Approved Authors* (London: Wilks, 1818), pp. 309–10.
20. See 'Extemporaneous Lines Ascribed to the Late Professor Porson', in *The Cambridge Tart: Epigrammatic and Satiric-Poetical Effusions by Cantabs* (London: Smith, 1823), pp. 22–25.
21. A correspondent to *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 19.109 (February 1826), 135–36, accused Porson of having repeated the poem 'in such a way as to lead people to believe it was his own'.
22. Michael Scrivener, *Seditious Allegories: John Thelwall and Jacobin Writing* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001).
23. *The Devil's Walk: A Poem. By Professor Porson* (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable and Co., 1830), p. viii.
24. Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. by J. E. Lewin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 337–39 and 340–43 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511549373>>.
25. Genette, *Palimpsests*, pp. 303–04.
26. For a survey of terms and the critical discussion, see Christina Ionescu, 'Introduction: Towards a Reconfiguration of the Visual Periphery in the Eighteenth-Century Illustrated Text', in *Book Illustration in the Long Eighteenth Century: Reconfiguring the Visual Periphery of the Text*, ed. by Christina Ionescu (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, 2011), pp. 1–50.
27. Proofs on India Paper of Cruickshank's devil illustrations were also issued separately at 2s 6d; see Thomas J. Wise, *A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (1913; London: Dawsons, 1970), 137.

28. 'Advertisement', *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by S. T. Coleridge Esq. and Robert Southey Esq. L.L.D and &c.*, ed. by H. W. Montagu, 2nd edn (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co.; Dublin: Milliken, 1830), p. v.
29. The letter from April 1830 can be seen on the Texas Christian University Digital Repository website <<https://repository.tcu.edu/handle/116099117/6117>>.
30. See e.g. Tim Fulford, *Romantic Poetry and Literary Coteries: The Dialect of the Tribe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015) <<https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137518897>>; Jon Mee, *Conversable Worlds: Literature, Contention and Community, 1762–1830* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); David Fairer, *Organising Poetry: The Coleridge Circle, 1790–1798* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199296163.001.0001>>; and Felicity James, *Charles Lamb, Coleridge and Wordsworth: Reading Friendship in the 1790s* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
31. Alison Hickey, 'Coleridge, Southey, and Co.: Collaboration and Authority', *Studies in Romanticism*, 37.3 (1998), 305–49 <<https://doi.org/10.2307/25601342>> (p. 306).
32. For Coleridge's ideas of literary property, see Lior Zemer, *The Idea of Authorship in Copyright* (2007; London: Routledge, 2017), pp. 12–22 <<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315239095>>. For Robert Southey, see his article 'An Inquiry into the Copyright Act', *Quarterly Review*, 21 (1819), 196–213.
33. The MS version of the ballad owned by Sara Hutchinson has the four stanzas Coleridge says were composed by Southey marked in the margin with the Greek sign sigma; see George Whalley, *Coleridge and Sara Hutchinson and the Asra Poems* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955), pp. 20–22.
34. Coleridge in letter to Josiah Wedgwood, January 1798, in *Collected Letters*, ed. by E. L. Griggs, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956–71), I, 365.
35. Coleridge to T. Sotheby, 26 August 1802, in *ibid.*, II, 867.
36. John Guillory, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), pp. 132–33 <<https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226310015.001.0001>>; see also Tilar J. Mazzeo's considerations in *Plagiarism and Literary Property in the Romantic Period* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), pp. 49–85 <<https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812202731>>.
37. Anon., 'A Literary Essay on Wordsworth and the Lake School of Poetry', in *The Living Poets of England: Specimens of the Living British Poets, with Biographical and Critical Notices and an English Poetry*, 2 vols (Paris: Baudry, 1827), I, 280.
38. *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by Professor Porson*, ed. by H. W. Montagu (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co., [1830]), p. viii.
39. Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, trans. by D. F. Bouchard and S. Simon (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), pp. 121 and 123.
40. Coleridge to Miss Robinson, 27 December 1802, in *Gothic Readings: The First Wave, 1764–1840*, ed. by Rictor Norton (London and New York: Continuum, 2000), p. 254.
41. Coleridge to William Sotheby, 10 September 1802, in *Collected Letters*, II, 867, Griggs notes that the Greek signifies 'He hath placed', not 'He hath stood'.
42. Coleridge's criticism of satire is reprinted in a note to *Biographia Literaria: Or, Biographical Sketches of my Literary Life and Opinions* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1817), p. 20.

43. Robert Southey, 'On the Rise and Progress of Popular Disaffection', *Quarterly Review*, 16 (January 1817), 511–52 (p. 530).
44. *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 19.109 (February 1826), 135–36. Even more provocative was the French pirate publishers J. A. and W. Galignani's later decision to print a short eight-stanza variant of the poem under the heading 'Suppressed Poems' in their edition *Poetical Works of Robert Southey. Complete in One Volume* (Paris, 1829), p. 723.
45. *The Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge*, 3 vols (London: Pickering, 1828–29), I, 91.
46. *The Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge*, 7th edn, 3 vols (London: Pickering; Boston: Hilliard, Grey, 1835), II, 83–87.
47. Jack Stillinger, *Romantic Complexity: Keats, Coleridge, and Wordsworth* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2006), p. 150.
48. Anne Toner, *Ellipsis in English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 59 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139680974>>.
49. Coleridge, *Poetical Works* (1828–29), I, 91.
50. *The Tickler*, 1.2 (January 1819), 32.
51. Review of *The Cambridge Tart*, *British Critic*, n.s., 19 (June 1823), 577.
52. An MS copy made by Coleridge's son Derwent at Highgate in June 1820; see S. T. Coleridge, *Poetry & Prose*, ed. by H. W. Garrod (Oxford: Clarendon Press; London: H. Milford, 1925), p. 181.
53. Whalley, p. 22. On the Convention of Sintra, see Coleridge to Thomas Poole, in *Collected Letters*, III, 132.
54. For a discussion of Coleridge as an inveterate reviser of his texts, see Mark Ve-Yin (ed.), Tee, *Coleridge, Revision and Romanticism* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009).
55. See n. 44, above.
56. Quoted in an anonymous entry: 'The Devil's Walk', *Notes and Queries*, 216 (March 1866), 197–98.
57. Robert Southey, *The Poetical Works, Collected by Himself*, 10 vols (London: Longman, 1838), III, 83–100.
58. *Ibid.*, III, 93.
59. *Devil's Walk*, p. viii
60. David Atkinson, *The English Traditional Ballad: Theory, Method, and Practice* (New York: Routledge, 2016), pp. 21–24 <<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315086675>>.
61. For this argument, see Peter A. Schock, *Romantic Satanism: Myth and the Historical Moment in Blake, Shelley and Byron* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 80–84.
62. The following information is taken from *The Poems of Shelley: Volume One: 1804–1817*, ed. Geoffrey Matthews and Kelvin Everest (London and New York: Routledge, 1989), pp. 230–37.
63. Genette, *Palimpsests*, pp. 161–65.
64. David A. Brewer, *The Afterlife of Character, 1726–1825* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), pp. 25–52 <<https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812201437>>.
65. The poem (which takes lines from the original poem as its epigraph) is included as the 'Finale' in Robert H. Small and James Maxwell, *Philadelphia; or, Glances at Lawyers, Physicians, First-Circle, Wistar-Parties, &c &c*. (Philadelphia: Small, 1826), pp. 112–15.
66. Ryan Cordell, 'Viral Textualities in Nineteenth-Century US Newspaper Exchanges', in *Virtual Victorians: Networks, Connections, Technologies*, ed. by Veronica

- Alfano and Andrew Stauffer (Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), pp. 29–56 <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137393296_3>.
67. Kyle Grimes, 'Verbal Jiu-jitsu: William Hone and the Tactics of Satirical Conflict', in *The Satiric Eye: Forms of Satire in the Romantic Period*, ed. by Steven E. Jones (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 174–75.
 68. [Thomas Kibble Hervey], *The Devil's Progress. A Poem*, 2nd edn (London: Relfe, 1830), p. 7.
 69. *The Real Devil's Walk* (London: Effingham Wilson, 1830).
 70. 'Antiquated Trio', *Walks about Town: A Poem in Two Cantos, with Notes and a Memoir of the Authors* (London: Wilson, 1830), p. 21 [cf. p. 29n, pp. 32–33].
 71. See Robert L. Patten, *George Cruikshank's Life, Times, and Art*, 2 vols (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992–96), I, 369–72.
 72. *The Real Devil's Walk not by Professor Porson*, 2nd edn with additions (London: Kidd, 1831), p. 8.
 73. *Ten Etchings Illustrative of The Devil's Walk by Thomas Landseer* ([London]: Harding, 1831). A stanza from the poem is at the foot of each illustration.
 74. *National Omnibus and General Advertiser*, 6 (June 1831), cited by E. H. Barker in 'Mr S. T. Coleridge and Dr R. Southey and Mr Professor Porson', *Monthly Magazine*, 28 (May 1838), 485.
 75. *The Devil's Visit* (London: Kidd, 1830), p. 5.
 76. 'The Devil's Visit', *Cobbett's Magazine* (December 1833), 378–42.
 77. 'A Hypochondriac', 'Preface', *The Blue Devils, or, New Police* (London: Henderson, 1830), p. 5.
 78. For discussion of the editions by H. W. Montagu, see Thomas J. Wise, *A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (London: Dawsons, 1970), pp. 135–40.

REFERRING TO THIS ARTICLE

R. W. RIX. 'Fugitive Text: Robert Southey and S. T. Coleridge's *Ballad of the Devil*', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 24 (Winter 2021) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.64>>.

COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

This article is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 16 September 2019.

