Notes

Where a work has been published in two or more editions, unless specifically stated to the contrary the *most recent* of the editions has been cited.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE: COLERIDGE: A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

1. The major biographies are the following: (a) James Dykes Campbell, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Narrative of the Events of his Life* (London and New York, 1894; repr. Highgate, 1970); (b) E. K. Chambers, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Biographical Study* (Oxford, 1938; repr. 1967); (c) Lawrence Hanson, *The Life of S. T. Coleridge: The Early Years* (London and Oxford, 1938; repr. New York, 1962); and (d) Walter Jackson Bate, *Coleridge* (Masters of World Literature Series) (New York, 1968; London, 1969; repr. 1973).
2. See *CL*, I 310, 354. Coleridge's relations with his mother are both baffling and complex: see, for example, Thomas McFarland, 'Coleridge's Anxiety', in *Coleridge's Variety: Bicentenary Studies*, ed. John Beer (London, 1974; Pittsburgh, 1975) pp. 134–65.
3. See, for example, the Introduction to my *Imagination in Coleridge* (London, 1978) pp. 1–26.
4. Charles Lamb, 'Christ's Hospital Five and Thirty Years Ago', in *Prose of the Romantic Period*, ed. Carl R. Woodring (Boston, Mass., 1961) pp. 193–204; the quotation is from p. 203. For Coleridge's recollections of Christ's Hospital, see (especially) his letter of 19 February 1798 to Thomas Poole (*CL*, I 387–9) and his tribute to James Boyer in *Biographia Literaria*, ch. 1 (*BL*, I 4–6).
5. See George Whalley, 'Coleridge and Southey in Bristol, 1795', *RES*, n.s. I (1950) 324–40.
6. Coleridge has left a vivid description of his Midlands tour in *Biographia Literaria*, ch. 10: see *BL*, I 114–19.
7. Charles Lloyd, an emotionally unstable young man who wished to be a poet and philosopher, had fallen under Coleridge's spell in January 1796. In August, Lloyd asked Coleridge to take him in as a pupil, and Coleridge, at the request of Lloyd's father, went to Birmingham to discuss the proposal. Consent was obtained, the terms were fixed at £80 a year, and Lloyd returned with Coleridge to Bristol.
8. Lloyd, in fact, spent only three or four weeks in all with the Coleridges in

Nether Stowey. After an unexpected series of epileptic fits in the autumn of 1796, Lloyd returned to his parents in Birmingham and did not finally join the Coleridges until 22 February 1797. By 23 March at the latest Lloyd had left Stowey and was shortly afterwards placed under the care of Dr Erasmus Darwin in a sanatorium at Lichfield.

9. The biographical background and compositional history of 'Kubla Khan', 'The Ancient Mariner' and the Conversation Poems of 1797–8 are discussed in detail in the chapters which follow.
10. William Hazlitt, 'My First Acquaintance with Poets' (1823), in *Prose of the Romantic Period*, pp. 279–94.
11. Both Wordsworth and Coleridge were thought by many of their neighbours to be dangerous Jacobins, and a government agent was sent down from London to spy on their activities: see Coleridge's amusing account in *Biographia Literaria*, ch. 10 (*BL*, I 126–8).
12. For an account of John Chester, a Stowey neighbour who idolised Coleridge, see Hazlitt, in *Prose of the Romantic Period*, pp. 291, 293.
13. See George Whalley, *Coleridge and Sara Hutchinson and the Asra Poems* (Toronto, 1955).
14. For a vivid account of Coleridge's nightmares, see 'The Pains of Sleep' (*CPW*, I 389–91), which Coleridge told Southey was 'a true portrait of my nights' (*CL*, II 984).
15. See Ch. 5 below.
16. See Donald Sultana, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge in Malta and Italy* (Oxford and New York, 1969); and Alethea Hayter, *A Voyage in Vain: Coleridge's Journey to Malta in 1804* (London, 1973).
17. See 'To William Wordsworth', in *CPW*, I 403–8.
18. See Ch. 6 below.
19. Thomas Carlyle, 'The Life of John Sterling' (1851), in *Thomas Carlyle's Works*, 18 vols (London, 1905) II 45.
20. Quoted in Chambers, *Coleridge: A Biographical Study*, p. 330.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO: THE CONVERSATION POEMS

1. G. M. Harper, 'Coleridge's Conversation Poems', *Quarterly Review*, CCXLIV (1925) 284–98.
2. Harper (ibid.) includes both 'Dejection' and 'To William Wordsworth' in his list of Conversation Poems. Among recent critics only George Watson still argues for 'Dejection': see *Coleridge the Poet* (London, 1966) p. 74. 'To William Wordsworth' has attracted a number of supporters: see R. H. Fogle, 'Coleridge's Conversation Poems', *TSE*, V (1955) 103; Watson, *Coleridge the Poet*, pp. 80–2; and Max F. Schulz, *The Poetic Voices of Coleridge* (Detroit, 1963; rev. edn 1964) p. 73. The case for 'Lines Written at Shurton Bars' is argued vigorously by Geoffrey Little, '*Lines Written at Shurton Bars* . . .: Coleridge's First Conversation Poem?', *Southern Review* (Adelaide), II (1966) 137–49.
3. On the general characteristics of the Conversation Poems, see (in addition to the works cited in note 2 above) the following: R. A. Durr, '"This Lime-Tree Bower my Prison" and a Recurrent Action in Coleridge', *ELH*, XXVI (1959)

514–30; M. F. Schulz, 'Oneness and Multeity in Coleridge's Poems', *TSE*, IX (1959) 53–60; A. S. Gérard, 'The Systolic Rhythm: the Structure of Coleridge's Conversation Poems', *EIC*, X (1960) 307–19, enlarged and repr. as ch. 2 in Gérard's *English Romantic Poetry: Ethos, Structure, and Symbol in Coleridge, Wordsworth, Shelley, and Keats* (Berkeley, Calif., and London, 1968) pp. 20–39; J. D. Boulger, 'Imagination and Speculation in Coleridge's Conversation Poems', *JEGP*, LXIV (1965) 691–711; F. Garber, 'The Hedging Consciousness in Coleridge's Conversation Poems', *TWC*, IV (1973) 124–38.

4. More complex structural patterns are proposed by Gérard and by Schulz: see above, n. 3. Gérard argues that a heart-beat rhythm of systole and diastole is the fundamental pattern in all the Conversation Poems. Schulz, in a rather similar way, sees a centripetal–centrifugal action developed in two calm–exaltation–calm parabolas as the poems' basic structural pattern.
5. The original version of 'Frost at Midnight' (1798) ended with a six-line coda which Coleridge dropped in all later printings because, he said, the lines destroyed 'the rondo, and return upon itself of the Poem' and because 'Poems of this kind of length ought to be coiled with its' tail round its' head': quoted in B. Ifor Evans, 'Coleridge's Copy of "Fears in Solitude"', *TLS*, 18 Apr 1935, p. 255.

   For the history of the *ouroboros* emblem (i.e. a coiled serpent with its tail in its mouth), see H. B. de Groot, 'The Ouroboros and the Romantic Poets: a Renaissance Emblem in Blake, Coleridge and Shelley', *English Studies* (Amsterdam), L (1969) 553–64.
6. Humphry House, *Coleridge: The Clark Lectures 1951–52* (London, 1953; repr. 1969) p. 79.
7. Before Coleridge's close relationship with the Wordsworths, which began in the late spring of 1797 (by which time 'The Eolian Harp' and 'Reflections on Having Left a Place of Retirement' had already been composed), perhaps the most important influence on Coleridge was Charles Lamb: see George Whalley, 'Coleridge's Debt to Charles Lamb', *E&S*, XI (1958) 68–85.

   In 1796–7 there was a flourishing correspondence between Lamb and Coleridge. Lamb's letters are mostly about poetry, and their general thrust is well summarised in the letter of 8 November 1796: 'Cultivate simplicity, Coleridge, or rather, I should say, banish elaborateness; for simplicity springs spontaneous from the heart, and carries into daylight its own modest buds and genuine, sweet, and clear flowers of expression. I allow no hot-beds in the gardens of Parnassus' (*LL*, I 60–1). For Coleridge, whose poetry in these years was tainted either by elaborate Miltonising or the insipid sentimentalising of Bowles, Lamb's advice was salutary and his stress on the virtues of compression and simplicity was an influence entirely in favour of the conversational mode with its easy intimacy, its directness, and its flowing rhythms. 'I have seen your last very beautiful poem in the Monthly Magazine', Lamb wrote of 'Reflections' in December 1796, '– write thus . . . and I shall never quarrel with you about simplicity' (*LL*, I 65).
8. Samuel Johnson, 'Life of Denham', in *Lives of the English Poets*, 2 vols (London, 1906; repr. 1964) I 58.
9. M. H. Abrams, 'Structure and Style in the Greater Romantic Lyric', in *Romanticism and Consciousness*, ed. Harold Bloom (New York, 1970) pp. 201–29. On the tradition of Augustan loco-descriptive poetry, see

Robert A. Aubin's compendious survey, *Topographical Poetry in XVIII-Century England* (New York, 1936).

10. Abrams, in *Romanticism and Consciousness*, p. 224.
11. For the 1803 text of 'The Eolian Harp', see *Coleridge's Verse: A Selection*, ed. William Empsom and David Pirie (New York, 1973) pp. 103–4.
12. Coleridge's image of 'Music slumbering on its instrument' is perhaps an echo of Keats's description of Poetry as 'might half slumbering on its own right arm' in 'Sleep and Poetry', line 237: see John Barnard, 'An Echo of Keats in "The Eolian Harp"', *RES*, XXVIII (1977) 311–13.
13. In 1828, line 33 reads, 'Is Music slumbering on *her* instrument' (emphasis added).
14. For detailed analysis, see: H. J. W. Milley, 'Some Notes on Coleridge's "Eolian Harp"', *MP*, XXXVI (1938–9) 359–75; M. H. Abrams, 'Coleridge's "A Light in Sound": Science, Metascience, and Poetic Imagination', *PAPS*, CXVI (1972) 458–76; and W. H. Scheuerle, 'A Reexamination of Coleridge's "The Eolian Harp"', *SEL*, XV (1975) 591–9.
15. Abrams, in *PAPS*, CXVI 474.
16. H. Nidecker, 'Notes marginales de S. T. Coleridge en marge de Kant et de Schelling, transcrites et annotées', *Revue de littérature comparée*, VII (1927) 529.
17. John Beer, *Coleridge the Visionary* (London, 1959; repr. 1970) p. 92. See also Beer's *Coleridge's Poetic Intelligence* (London, 1977) p. 67.
18. Abrams, in *PAPS*, CXVI 459–60.
19. Coleridge's *joy* is not simply a reading of our own feelings into nature. 'It is rather', as Dorothy Emmet says, 'the possibility of entering into a deep *rapport* with something in the world beyond us, seeing it with such loving sympathy that we make, as Coleridge says, the "external internal, the internal external" and out of this comes the possibility of the creation of imaginative symbolism. But the first condition of such creation is that we should be able not only to look, but to love as we look' – 'Coleridge on the Growth of the Mind', in *Coleridge: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Kathleen Coburn (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1967) p. 173.
20. House, *Coleridge*, p. 77; Watson, *Coleridge the Poet*, p. 66.
21. See Geoffrey Yarlott, *Coleridge and the Abyssinian Maid* (London, 1967) pp. 95–6; and Ronald C. Wendling, 'Coleridge and the Consistency of "The Eolian Harp"', *SIR*, VIII (1968–9) 26–42.
22. Harold Bloom, *The Visionary Company: A Reading of English Romantic Poetry* (New York, 1961; rev. edn Ithaca, NY, and London, 1971) p. 200.
23. Beer, *Coleridge's Poetic Intelligence*, pp. 66–7.
24. House, *Coleridge*, p. 76.
25. Horace, *Satires* I iv 41–2: *neque, si qui scribat uti nos / sermoni propiora putes hunc esse poetam* ('nor would you consider anyone a poet who writes, as I do, lines nearer to prose'). Although Horace uses the proper form *propiora*, Coleridge always used the 'fractured' form *propriora*, perhaps to facilitate a punning translation (apparently originating with Charles Lamb): 'Charles Lamb translated my motto *Sermoni propriora* by – *properer for a sermon*!' (*TT*, p. 191). In a letter of 1802 Coleridge claimed this witty translation as his own (*CL*, II 864). The phrase is discussed by Richard T. Martin, who in 'Coleridge's Use of "*sermoni propriora*"', *TWC*, III (1972) 71–5,

argues that Coleridge's use of the term was influenced by its appearance in John Foster's *Essay on . . . Accent and Quantity* (1762).

26. The querulous egotism of the poem is discussed by Jill Rubenstein in 'Sound and Silence in Coleridge's Conversation Poems', *English*, XXI (1972) 54–60, esp. pp. 56–7.
27. See Wordsworth's later pantheistic treatments of the theme in the Simplon Pass and Mount Snowdon episodes of *The Prelude* (1805) VI 549–72 and XIII 29–119.
28. Richard Haven, *Patterns of Consciousness: An Essay on Coleridge* (Amherst, Mass., 1969) p. 56.
29. Another copy of the poem was sent in a letter of July 1797 to Charles Lloyd; this letter was known to Ernest Hartley Coleridge (*CPW*, I 178n.), who quotes from it, but it has since been lost. In October 1797 Coleridge quoted lines 38–43 of 'This Lime-Tree Bower' in a letter to John Thelwall: *CL*, I 350.
30. For an analysis of the significance of the changes between 1797 and 1800, see Haven, *Patterns of Consciousness*, pp. 64–8.
31. Michael Schmidt, 'Coleridge: "This Lime-Tree Bower my Prison"', *Critical Survey*, VI (1973) 47.
32. Donald Davie, *Articulate Energy: An Inquiry into the Syntax of English Poetry* (London, 1955; repr. 1976) pp. 72–3.
33. *Biographia Literaria*, ch. 22 (*BL*, II 103). In the Fenwick note to 'Lines Written in Early Spring' Wordsworth describes what (in all probability) was the precise location of Coleridge's dell: 'The brook fell down a sloping rock so as to make a waterfall considerable for that country, and across the pool below had fallen a tree, an ash, if I rightly remember, from which rose perpendicularly boughs in search of the light intercepted by the deep shade above. The boughs bore leaves of green that for want of sunshine had faded into almost lily-white; and from the underside of this natural sylvan bridge depended long and beautiful tresses of ivy which waved gently in the breeze that might poetically speaking be called the breath of the waterfall' (*WPW*, IV 411–12).
34. See Coleridge's note of September 1803 on *Gentiana major* – 'It's *blue* Flower, the Colour of Hope' – in line 57 of 'Hymn Before Sunrise': *CL*, II 966.
35. Durr, in *ELH*, XXVI 526–7.
36. In September 1796 Mary Lamb, in a fit of insanity, had killed her mother and wounded her father with a kitchen-knife. Charles Lamb sent Coleridge word of the tragedy and asked him to write 'as religious a letter as possible' (*LL*, I 44); Coleridge did so on 28 September, imploring his friend, 'if by any means it be possible, [to] come to me' (*CL*, I 239).
37. Durr, in *ELH*, XXVI 525–6.
38. Cf. Coleridge's Notebook entry of August 1803: 'As I write this, I turn my head, & close by me I see a Birch, so placed as among a number of Trees it alone is in full sunshine, & the Shadows of its Leaves playing on its silver Bark, an image that delighted my Boyhood, when I had no waterfalls to see' (*CN*, I no. 1449, f.4^{v}). While much of the natural description in 'This Lime-Tree Bower' derives ultimately from actual scenery known to Coleridge (see also above, n. 33), it should be pointed out that this topography is also

indebted to Coleridge's reading. There are, for example, a number of Miltonic echoes (especially in lines 22–37); and, as Mario L. D'Avanzo has suggested, the lime-tree bower itself (although certainly a description of Poole's arbour at Stowey) is also an adaptation of Prospero's 'lime grove' in Act v of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*: see 'Coleridge's "This Lime-tree Bower my Prison" and *The Tempest*', *TWC*, I (1970) 66–8.

39. Durr, in *ELH*, XXVI 530.
40. Quoted by B. Ifor Evans, in *TLS*, 18 Apr 1935, p. 255.
41. House, *Coleridge*, p. 82.
42. E. H. Coleridge quotes these variants in full: see *CPW*, I 240–1.
43. I have discussed Coleridge's view of perception and its relation to imagination (and fancy) in the Introduction to my *Imagination in Coleridge* (London, 1978) esp. pp. 1–3 and 21–3.
44. House, *Coleridge*, p. 79.
45. In a footnote to line 15 Coleridge explains that 'In all parts of the kingdom these films are called *strangers* and supposed to portend the arrival of some absent friend'. See also Cowper's *The Task*, IV 291–5: quoted above, p. 40.
46. Garber, in *TWC*, IV 130–1.
47. On Coleridge's affection for his sister and his grief at her death, see the two sonnets concerning her composed in 1791: *CPW*, I 20–1.
48. There is an early version of this image in a Notebook entry belonging (probably) to the winter of 1797–8:

> The reed-roof'd Village, still bepatch'd with snow
> Smok'd in the sun-thaw.
>
> (*CN*, I no. 329)

49. Schulz, *The Poetic Voices of Coleridge*, p. 94.
50. *Biographia Literaria*, ch. 4 (*BL*, I 59).
51. Reeve Parker, *Coleridge's Meditative Art* (London and Ithaca, NY, 1975) p. 127.
52. Robert Langbaum, *The Poetry of Experience: The Dramatic Monologue in Modern Literary Tradition* (London and New York, 1957; repr. 1972) p. 46.
53. Walter de la Mare, 'Night', from *Memory and Other Poems* (1938): *The Complete Poems of Walter de la Mare* (London, 1969) p. 378.
54. Carl R. Woodring, *Politics in the Poetry of Coleridge* (Madison, Wis., 1961) p. 192.
55. E. P. Thompson, 'Disenchantment or Default? A Lay Sermon', in *Power and Consciousness*, ed. C. C. O'Brien and W. D. Vanech (London and New York, 1969) p. 167.
56. Quoted ibid.
57. Ibid., p. 168.
58. Ibid., pp. 168–9.
59. *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, ed. J. R. de J. Jackson (London, 1970) pp. 47–8.
60. Schulz, *The Poetic Voices of Coleridge*, p. 98; Watson, *Coleridge the Poet*, p. 71; Reginald Watters, *Coleridge* (London, 1971) p. 26.
61. Coleridge makes a similar statement in a marginal note (probably of 1807) to lines 159–75 of 'Fears': these lines 'are neither poetry, nor anything – as eloquence for instance which approximates to it. They are *Prose* that in a

frolic has put on a masquerade Dress of metre & like most Masquerades, blundered in the assumed character': quoted by B. Ifor Evans, in *TLS*, 18 Apr 1935, p. 255.

On *sermoni propriora* see above, n. 25.

62. Woodring, *Politics in the Poetry of Coleridge*, p. 189.
63. Under the pseudonym Nicias Erythraeus, Coleridge had published 'Lewti' in the *Morning Post*, 13 Apr 1798. In fact, 'Lewti' was actually set up in type and some copies of *Lyrical Ballads* containing the cancelled sheets of 'Lewti' were mistakenly issued before 'The Nightingale' was substituted for it. For the printing history (which is quite complex) of the volume, see D. F. Foxon, 'The Printing of *Lyrical Ballads*, 1798', *The Library*, 5th ser. IX (1954) 221–41. Not all readers would accept that the substitution of 'The Nightingale' for 'Lewti' was made in order to preserve the anonymity of *Lyrical Ballads*: see John E. Jordan, *Why the Lyrical Ballads?* (London and Berkeley, Calif., 1976) pp. 42–5.
64. *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, p. 58.
65. Watson, *Coleridge the Poet*, p. 71.
66. These three lines and the four lines that follow them are found in a Notebook entry probably belonging to early 1798: see *CN*, I no. 231. For a discussion of this Notebook entry in its context, see George Whalley, 'Coleridge's Poetic Sensibility', in *Coleridge's Variety: Bicentenary Studies*, ed. John Beer (London, 1974; Pittsburgh, 1975) pp. 4–7.
67. '– Hartley fell down & hurt himself – I caught him up crying & screaming – and ran out of doors with him. – The Moon caught his eye – he ceased crying immediately – & his eyes & tears in them, how they glittered in the Moonlight!' (*CN*, I no. 219).
68. Schulz, *The Poetic Voices of Coleridge*, p. 89.
69. Watson, *Coleridge the Poet*, pp. 72–3.
70. Many modern readers have confidently identified the castle of the poem as Enmore Castle (the seat of Lord Egmont in north Somerset) and the 'gentle Maid' as Ellen Cruikshank, whose father was Lord Egmont's agent. There is no good reason, however, for so dogmatic an identification. Indeed, the description of the maiden would seem to fit Dorothy Wordsworth more closely than anything we know about Ellen Cruikshank. Dorothy's Alfoxden Journal describes many night-time walks, some of them with Coleridge, in the spring of 1798. Her entry for 27 April, for example, reads, 'Coleridge breakfasted and drank tea . . . went with him in the evening through the wood, afterwards walked on the hills: the moon, a many-coloured sea and sky'; and even more interesting (cf. 'The Nightingale', lines 64–9) is the entry for 6 May: 'Went with [Coleridge] to Stowey; heard the nightingale; saw a glow-worm' (*JDW*, p. 14). However, since Dorothy is presented in 'The Nightingale' as 'our Sister' (line 40), it seems unlikely that she should reappear transformed in the guise of a 'gentle Maid' only a few lines later. The maiden of the poem is probably no *particular* individual but rather a conflation of Ellen (and/or Mary?) Cruikshank, Dorothy Wordsworth, and (as well) the lady Christabel; the castle, if one *must* identify it, is probably Enmore Castle.
71. Robert Mayo, 'The Contemporaneity of the *Lyrical Ballads*', *PMLA*, LXIX (1954) 494. In a footnote (ibid., n. 12) Mayo gives a brief list of nightingale poems in the magazine verse of the 1790s.

72. R. H. Hopkins, 'Coleridge's Parody of Melancholy Poetry in "The Nightingale: a Conversation Poem, April 1798"', *English Studies* (Amsterdam), XLIX (1968) 436–41; the quotation is from p. 438.
73. *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, p. 57.
74. Alun Jones, 'Coleridge and Poetry: the Conversational and other Poems', in *S. T. Coleridge* (Writers and their Background series), ed. R. L. Brett (London, 1971) pp. 104–5.
75. Watson, *Coleridge the Poet*, p. 72.
76. Derek Roper argues that Coleridge probably found the form 'blosmy' (line 84) – so spelled in all editions of the poem until 1828 – in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* (II 821) or 'Parlement of Foules' (line 183): *Lyrical Ballads 1805*, ed. D. Roper (London, 1968) p. 325. George Watson thinks that Coleridge probably found the word 'joyance' (line 43) in Spenser's *Faerie Queene* (III xii 18) and reintroduced it into English poetry: *Coleridge the Poet*, p. 72.
77. I am grateful to my colleague Dr C. J. Wortham for bringing this parallel to my attention. T. S. Eliot uses the phrase in Part II of *The Waste Land* (line 103).
78. Watson, *Coleridge the Poet*, p. 72.
79. In March 1797 Dorothy Wordsworth wrote to Mrs Marshall, 'You ask to be informed of our system respecting Basil. . . . We teach him nothing at present but what he learns from the evidence of his senses. He has an insatiable curiosity which we are always careful to satisfy to the best of our ability. It is directed to everything he sees, the sky, the fields, trees, shrubs, corn, the making of tools, carts, &c &c &c. He knows his letters, but we have not attempted any further step in the path of *book learning*. Our grand study has been to make him *happy* in which we have not been altogether disappointed . . .' (*LW: EY*, p. 180).

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE: 'KUBLA KHAN'

1. John Livingston Lowes, *The Road to Xanadu: A Study in the Ways of the Imagination* (Boston, Mass., 1927; rev. edn, 1930; repr. 1964); Elisabeth Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'* (Chicago, 1953; London, 1954; repr. New York, 1970); John Beer, *Coleridge the Visionary* (London, 1959; repr. 1970); Marshall Suther, *Visions of Xanadu* (New York and London, 1965); E. S. Shaffer, *'Kubla Khan' and the Fall of Jerusalem: The Mythological School in Biblical Criticism and Secular Literature 1770–1880* (London, 1975).
2. George Watson, 'The Meaning of "Kubla Khan"', *REL*, II (1961) 21–9. In fairness, I hasten to add that, in the revised version of this paper which appears as chapter 8 in Mr Watson's *Coleridge the Poet* (London, 1966), he begins by saying that 'this chapter is bound to be speculative' and by confessing that 'some aspects of "Kubla Khan" remain inexplicable' (p. 117).
3. Quoted in Morchard Bishop, 'The Farmhouse of *Kubla Khan*', *TLS*, 10 May 1957, p. 293.
4. Although these references will be discussed individually later in the present chapter, it may be useful to have them listed briefly here: (a) a cryptic

reference in Dorothy Wordsworth's Hamburgh Journal (October 1798); (b) allusions to 'Kubla Khan' in a poem by 'Perdita' Robinson (Oct 1800); (c) an account (*c.* 1811–12) of Coleridge reciting his poem, reported by John Payne Collier in his diary; (d) Leigh Hunt's record in his *Autobiography* of Coleridge reciting 'Kubla Khan' to Lord Byron in 1816; (e) Charles Lamb's comments on the poem in a letter to Wordsworth (26 Apr 1816); and (f) Mrs Coleridge's terse remark about the poem's forthcoming publication, in one of her letters to Thomas Poole (24 May 1816): 'He has been so unwise as to publish his fragments of "Christabel" & "Koula-Khan" . . . we were all sadly vexed when we read the advertisement of these things.'

5. Quoted and discussed in Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, pp. 321–4.
6. *Journals of Dorothy Wordsworth*, ed. E. de Selincourt, 2 vols (London, 1941; repr. 1959) I 34.
7. H. M. Margoliouth, *Wordsworth and Coleridge, 1795–1834* (London, 1953; repr. New York, 1966) p. 49. Margoliouth's conjecture is supported by Mary Moorman (*WW*, I 412–13) and, with reservations, by Elisabeth Schneider (*Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, esp. p. 305). At one time it was assumed that Dorothy was referring to a manuscript copy of 'Kubla Khan', but that interpretation no longer has any currency. Jean Robertson, in *RES*, n.s. XVIII (1967) 438–9, offers a third interpretation: she proposes that Dorothy, whose German was weak, may have intended to write *Kübel* ('a vat, tub, milking-pail or bucket') or a diminutive form *Küblein* – but this solution seems far-fetched and more ingenious than the original problem.
8. Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, pp. 216–18, 298–305.
9. J. D. Campbell, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Narrative of the Events of his Life* (London and New York, 1894; repr. Highgate, 1970) p. 89.
10. Malcolm Elwin, *The First Romantics* (London, 1947) pp. 226–32.
11. Lawrence Hanson, *The Life of S. T. Coleridge: The Early Years* (London and New York, 1938; repr. New York, 1962) pp. 259–60, 282 and 487 n. 115.
12. E. K. Chambers, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Biographical Study* (Oxford, 1938; repr. 1967) p. 101; Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, pp. 158–61.
13. Ibid., p. 165.
14. Hanson, *Coleridge: The Early Years*, p. 260.
15. Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, p. 236.
16. Ibid., p. 200.
17. Ibid., p. 186.
18. Ibid., p. 214.
19. To my knowledge only two other serious attempts have been made to defend a 1799–1800 date: Warren Ober, 'Southey, Coleridge, and "Kubla Khan"', *JEGP*, LVIII (1959) 414–22; and Jean Robertson, in *RES*, n.s. XVIII 438–9.
20. Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, p. 236.
21. Alice Snyder, 'The Manuscript of "Kubla Khan"', *TLS*, 2 Aug 1934, p. 541.
22. Chambers, *Coleridge: A Biographical Study*, pp. 100–3.
23. Wylie Sypher, 'Coleridge's Somerset: a Byway to Xanadu', *PQ*, XVIII (1939) 353–66; E. L. Griggs, *CL*, I 348–9; Mary Moorman, *WW*, I 346 ('late September or October 1797'); Molly Lefebure, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Bondage of Opium* (London, 1974; repr. 1977) pp. 251–2.

24. '[From Porlock] we kept close to the shore about four miles. Our road lay through wood, rising almost perpendicularly from the sea, with views of the opposite mountains of Wales: thence we came by twilight to Lynmouth, in Devonshire. The next morning we were guided to a valley at the top of one of those immense hills which open at each end to the sea, and is from its rocky appearance called the Valley of Stones. We mounted a cliff at the end of the valley, and looked from it immediately on to the sea' (*LW: EY*, p. 194).
25. Mark Reed, *Wordsworth: The Chronology of the Early Years, 1770–1799* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1967) pp. 208–9 n. 33.
26. John Beer, 'Coleridge and Poetry: I. Poems of the Supernatural', in *S. T. Coleridge* (Writers and their Background series), ed. R. L. Brett (London, 1971) pp. 53–4 n. 1.
27. Sypher, in *PQ*, XVIII 364–5.
28. Bishop, in *TLS*, 10 May 1957, p. 293.
29. D. H. Karrfalt, 'Another Note on "Kubla Khan" and Coleridge's Retirement to Ash Farm', *N&Q* n.s. XIII (1966) 171–2. See also Beer, in *S. T. Coleridge*, p. 60; and Walter Jackson Bate, *Coleridge* (Masters of World Literature series) (New York, 1968; London, 1969; repr. 1973) p. 76 n. 7.
30. See *Coleridge's Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare*, ed. T. Ashe (London, 1897) p. 17; and *The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt*, ed. Roger Ingpen, 2 vols (London, 1903) II 58.
31. Skeat's note: 'This has sometimes been read as "Mr Southey" but "Mrs" is a much more probable reading.'
32. T. C. Skeat, 'Kubla Khan', *British Museum Quarterly*, XXVI (1963) 78.
33. Snyder, in *TLS*, 2 Aug 1934; E. H. W. Meyerstein, 'A Manuscript of "Kubla Khan"', *TLS*, 12 Jan 1951, p. 21; John Shelton, 'The Autograph Manuscript of "Kubla Khan" and an Interpretation', *REL*, VII (1966) 30–42. Shelton provides both a photocopy of the Crewe Manuscript and a transcription of it.
34. Alethea Hayter, *Opium and the Romantic Imagination* (London, 1968; repr. 1971) pp. 29–30.
35. E. L. Griggs, 'Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Opium', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, XVII (1954) 357–78. See also *CL*, II 731.
36. Molly Lefebure, for example, vigorously maintains on entirely circumstantial evidence (which few scholars have accepted) that Coleridge was a confirmed addict as early as 1796–7: 'Everything about S. T. C. at this period of time conforms to the classical portraiture of the narcotics addict' (*Coleridge: A Bondage of Opium*, p. 252). Elisabeth Schneider, whose voice on this topic is always one to be reckoned with, is purposely vague: 'The habit, at any rate, was permanently fixed by 1801, and perhaps much earlier. He had used the drug more than once as early as 1791; by 1803 (probably by the preceding year) he knew only too well that it was an evil, at least for himself' (*Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, p. 62).
37. As Alethea Hayter points out, 'We have the testimony of both Coleridge and DeQuincey that the closest visual equivalent they had ever seen to their opium visions was one of the *Carceri d'Invenzione* engravings by Piranesi' (*Opium and the Romantic Imagination*, p. 93). Miss Hayter discusses the relationship in some detail on pp. 93–8.
38. For a similar image, not explicitly connected with opium but closer in time to the fall 1797 composition-date of 'Kubla Khan', see *CN*, I no. 220: 'Some

wilderness-plot, green & fountainous & unviolated by Man.' Kathleen Coburn dates this Notebook entry in June–September 1797.

39. J. M. Robertson, *New Essays towards a Critical Method* (London and New York, 1897) p. 138; M. H. Abrams, *The Milk of Paradise: The Effect of Opium Visions on the Works of DeQuincey, Crabbe, Francis Thompson, and Coleridge* (Cambridge, Mass., 1934) p. 4. See also R. C. Bald, 'Coleridge and *The Ancient Mariner*: Addenda to *The Road to Xanadu*', in *Nineteenth-Century Studies*, ed. H. Davis, W. C. De Vane, and R. C. Bald (Ithaca, NY, 1940) pp. 1–45.
40. Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, pp. 35, 40–1. Miss Schneider goes on to argue (pp. 71–2) that Coleridge (unlike DeQuincey, from whom most of the myths about opium and imagination have sprung) 'seems never to have suggested that opium stamped a peculiar or unique character of its own upon his creative imagination; his own statements, if read without the exaggeration encouraged by the subsequent tradition, are not as far as has been supposed from conformity to scientific modern knowledge'.
41. Hayter, *Opium and the Romantic Imagination*, pp. 331, 334–5.
42. Hanson, *Coleridge: The Early Years*, p. 260.
43. Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, pp. 367, 331.
44. F. W. Bateson, *The Scholar-Critic: An Introduction to Literary Research* (London, 1972) p. 56.
45. Thomas Love Peacock, 'An Essay on Fashionable Literature', in *The Works of Thomas Love Peacock*, ed. H. F. B. Brett-Smith and C. E. Jones, 10 vols (London, 1924–34; repr. New York, 1967) VIII 290.
46. Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, pp. 88–9. 'Coleridge', Miss Schneider goes on to say (p. 90), 'may have been in a sort of "reverie" as the note says. . . . No doubt he had been taking opium; perhaps, too, the euphoric effect of opium rendered his process of composition more nearly effortless than usual. But he was wide enough awake, we may suppose, to write down his poem more or less as he composed it, and there is no reason to think that it was printed without revision and polishing. There is reason to suspect that the whole was not composed at one sitting. Finally, we cannot suppose that opium created the particular character of the poem.'
47. Watson, in *REL*, II 21.
48. Norman Fruman, *Coleridge: The Damaged Archangel* (New York, 1971; London, 1972) p. 343.
49. As Alethea Hayter remarks, the 'vision' recorded in 'Kubla Khan', while unlike Coleridge's recorded *dreams*, is very like his *daydreams*: 'We know from his Notebooks and from many references all through his works that a wilderness-plot, green and fountainous, far away beyond a desert, was an image that . . . would at any time have been a likely starting-point for a reverie of his': Hayter, *Opium and the Romantic Imagination*, pp. 216–17. On 'Kubla Khan' as a 'daydream poem', see also Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, pp. 90–1; Max F. Schulz, *The Poetic Voices of Coleridge* (Detroit, 1963; rev. edn 1964) pp. 114–24; and Fruman, *Coleridge: The Damaged Archangel*, pp. 348–9.
50. Lefebure, *Coleridge: A Bondage of Opium*, p. 255.
51. Beer, *Coleridge the Visionary*, pp. 201–6.

52. Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, pp. 26–7. See also ibid., pp. 87–8.
53. Ober, in *JEGP*, VIII 414. For a similar view, see R. Smith, 'Spontaneous Overflow', *LiNQ: Literature in North Queensland*, II (1973) 25–8.
54. Fruman, *Coleridge: The Damaged Archangel*, p. 335.
55. Bate, *Coleridge*, p. 84.
56. Edward Bostetter, *The Romantic Ventriloquists: Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, Shelley, Byron* (Seattle and London, 1963; rev. edn 1965) p. 85.
57. Alicia Martinez, 'Coleridge, "Kubla Khan", and the Contingent', *Concerning Poetry*, X (1977) 59.
58. Bernard Breyer, 'Towards an Interpretation of *Kubla Khan*', in *English Studies in Honor of James Southall Wilson*, ed. Fredson Bowers (Charlottesville, Va, 1951) pp. 286–7.
59. Paul Magnuson, for example, argues that 'the Preface need not be accepted or rejected on the grounds of its literal truth; it can be taken seriously as Coleridge's attempt to explain one process of poetic creation and the inadequacies of that process which led to an inevitable loss. Both the Preface and the poem have creativity as their subjects; both trace, not only the creative process, but also the loss of creativity': *Coleridge's Nightmare Poetry* (Charlottesville, Va, 1974) p. 40.
60. Irene Chayes, '"Kubla Khan" and the Creative Process', *SIR*, VI (1966) 1–21. The sentence quoted is on p. 4.
61. Elisabeth Schneider, 'The "Dream" of *Kubla Khan*', *PMLA*, LX (1945) 784–801. The findings of this paper were later incorporated into Schneider's important book, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*.
62. Beer, *Coleridge the Visionary*, p. 200.
63. Shaffer, *'Kubla Khan' and the Fall of Jerusalem*, pp. 89–90. Shaffer goes so far, indeed, as to say (p. 90) that 'In the new secular theory of inspiration, then – and this was its triumph – there was no difference between the brief note on the Crewe MS of "Kubla Khan" and the later, more elaborate prefatory "Vision in a Dream".'
64. James Hoyle, '"Kubla Khan" as an Elated Experience', *Literature and Psychology*, XVI (1966) 27–39.
65. *Minnow among Tritons: Mrs S. T. C.'s Letters to Thomas Poole*, ed. Stephen Potter (London, 1934) p. 13.
66. E. H. W. Meyerstein, 'Completeness of *Kubla Khan*', *TLS*, 30 Oct 1937, p. 803. Also Humphry House, *Coleridge: The Clark Lectures 1951–52* (London, 1953; repr. 1969) p. 114: 'If Coleridge had never published his Preface, who would have thought of "Kubla Khan" as a fragment?'
67. Bate, *Coleridge*, p. 76.
68. Other critics who argue for 'Kubla Khan' as a complete and completed poem include: George Watson, in *REL*, II, esp. p. 23; S. K. Heninger, Jr, 'A Jungian Reading of "Kubla Khan"', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, XVIII (1959–60) 358–67, esp. p. 367; Harold Bloom, *The Visionary Company: A Reading of English Romantic Poetry* (New York, 1961; rev. edn Ithaca, NY, and London, 1971) pp. 217–20; Kenneth Burke, '"Kubla Khan", Proto-Surrealist Poem', in his *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, Calif., and London, 1966) pp. 202–22, esp. pp. 217–18; Norman Mackenzie, '"Kubla

Khan": a Poem of Creative Agony and Loss', *English Miscellany*, xx (1969) 229–40.

69. See, for example, Breyer, in *English Studies in Honor of Wilson*, pp. 285–6.
70. R. H. Fogle, 'The Romantic Unity of "Kubla Khan"', *College English*, xiii (1951) 13–19; repr. ibid., xxii (1960–1) 112–16. The prototype of Fogle's view may be found in N. B. Allen, 'A Note on Coleridge's "Kubla Khan"', *MLN*, lvii (1942) 108–13.
71. Alan Purves, 'Formal Structure in "Kubla Khan"', *SIR* i (1962) 187–91; the quotation is on p. 191.
72. See also Carl Woodring, 'Coleridge and the Khan', *EIC*, ix (1959) 361–8. Woodring argues (p. 361) that the 'Germanic idea of organic unity' (which Coleridge himself propagated in the *Biographia Literaria* and elsewhere) 'discourages a complacent acceptance of anything imperfected'. For Woodring, 'Kubla Khan' is 'imperfect' in the sense that it *is* a fragment, as Coleridge claimed; but that fact does not necessarily imply that the poem lacks a total meaning. Ironically, 'Kubla Khan' has become the victim of the success of Coleridge's own doctrine of organic unity.
73. T. S. Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism: Studies in the Relation of Criticism to Poetry in England* (London, 1933; repr. 1975) p. 146.
74. See, for example, Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, pp. 312–88 *passim*; Bostetter, *Romantic Ventriloquists*, p. 84; Lefebure, *Coleridge: A Bondage of Opium*, p. 258; Fruman, *Coleridge: The Damaged Archangel*, esp. pp. 331, 346; Shaffer, *'Kubla Khan' and the Fall of Jerusalem*, pp. 89–95; and L. D. Berkoben, *Coleridge's Decline as a Poet* (Paris and The Hague, 1975) pp. 108–20.
75. Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, pp. 252, 246–8. John Beer comes to a similar conclusion: 'Coleridge's own assertion that the poem was unfinished was probably sincere, for his notebooks contain various notes on Kubla Khan and the Tartars which were no doubt collected with a continuation in mind. One can continue a poem in the middle, however, as well as at the end: and it is likely that this was his plan. Certainly it is difficult to see how the poem could be carried on after the last stanza: the argument is there brought to an end with overwhelming finality' (*Coleridge the Visionary*, p. 275).
76. Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, p. 375.
77. The case for biblical influences on 'Kubla Khan' from the books of Ezekiel and Revelation is well argued by H. W. Piper, 'The Two Paradises in *Kubla Khan*', *RES*, n.s. xxvii (1976) 148–58. On the possible influence of the apocryphal book of Tobit, see T. Copeland, 'A Woman Wailing for her Demon Lover', *RES*, xvii (1941) 87–90.
78. R. H. Milner, 'Coleridge's "Sacred River"', *TLS*, 18 May 1951, p. 309; Robert F. Fleissner, *'Hwæt! Wē Gardēna*: "Kubla Khan" and those Anglo-Saxon Words', *TWC*, v (1974) 50.
79. Robert F. Fleissner, '"Kubla Khan" and "Tom Jones": an Unnoticed Parallel', *N&Q*, n.s. vii (1960) 103–5.
80. Susan M. Passler, 'Coleridge, Fielding and Arthur Murphy', *TWC*, v (1974) 55–8; the quotation is on p. 57.
81. See, for example, Sypher in *PQ*, xviii 353–66; Geoffrey Grigson, 'Kubla Khan in Wales: Hafod and the Devil's Bridge', *Cornhill Magazine*, no. 970 (Spring 1947) 275–83; George Whalley, 'Romantic Chasms', *TLS*, 21 June 1947,

p. 309; Eugene L. Stelzig, 'The Landscape of "Kubla Khan" and the Valley of Rocks', *TWC*, VI (1975) 316–18.

82. Collinson's *Somerset* (1791), as quoted by Sypher, in *PQ*, XVIII 364.
83. Lane Cooper, 'The Abyssinian Paradise in Coleridge and Milton', *MP*, III (1906) 327–32; Howard Parsons, 'The Sources of Coleridge's "Kubla Khan"', *N&Q*, CXCVI (1951) 233–5; Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, pp. 264–77; Beer, *Coleridge the Visionary*, pp. 233–7; and Piper in *RES*, n.s. XXVII 148–58. Perhaps it is not surprising that Lowes, who was in quest of rarer game than Milton, should have virtually ignored the influence of *Paradise Lost* on 'Kubla Khan'.
84. See above, pp. 72–3.
85. Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, pp. 345–6.
86. Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, p. 245.
87. Lamb, letter to Wordsworth (26 Apr 1816): *LL*, III 215.
88. *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, ed. J. R. de J. Jackson (London, 1970) pp. 246, 235.
89. Lamb to Wordsworth, *LL*, III 215; Leigh Hunt, 'Sketches of the Living Poets', *Examiner*, 21 Oct 1821, as repr. in *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, p. 475.
90. Hazlitt's review of the *Christabel* volume in the *Critical Review*, May 1816, as repr. in *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, p. 208.
91. Algernon Swinburne, *Essays and Studies*, 5th edn (London, 1901) p. 263. For a survey of other Victorian assessments, see R. Hoffpauir, '"Kubla Khan" and the Critics: Romantic Madness as Poetic Theme and Critical Response', *English Studies in Canada*, II (1976) 402–22, esp. pp. 405–9.
92. Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, pp. 367, 374, 377.
93. William Walsh, *Coleridge: The Work and the Relevance* (London, 1967) p. 111; Hanson, *Coleridge: the Early Years*, p. 260.
94. Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, p. 285.
95. Peacock, in *Works*, VIII 291.
96. Watson, *Coleridge the Poet*, p. 122.
97. For example, Bloom, *The Visionary Company*, pp. 217–20; H. H. Meier, 'Ancient Lights on Kubla's Lines', *English Studies* (Amsterdam), XLVI (1965) 15–29, esp. pp. 26–7.
98. For example, Beer, *Coleridge the Visionary*, esp. pp. 222–9; Watson, *Coleridge the Poet*, pp. 117–30.
99. House, *Coleridge*, p. 116; Chayes, in *SIR*, VI 17; Bostetter, *Romantic Ventriloquists*, p. 84. Bostetter's view has enjoyed wide popularity in the criticism of the last two decades: see, for example, Mackenzie, in *English Miscellany*, XX 229–40; Magnuson, *Coleridge's Nightmare Poetry*, p. 40; and Berkoben, *Coleridge's Decline*, pp. 108–20.
100. On *pleasure*, see *Biographia Literaria*, ch. 14 (*BL*, II 9–10), and the following critics: Breyer, in *English Studies in Honor of Wilson*, pp. 278–9; and Fogle in *College English*, XIII 115–16. On *genius*, see *Biographia Literaria*, ch. 2 (*BL*, I 20–1), and the following critics: Breyer, in *English Studies in Honor of Wilson*, pp. 289–90; and Beer, *Coleridge the Visionary*, pp. 226–9. On the *reconciliation of opposites*, see *Biographia Literaria*, ch. 14 (*BL*, II 12), and the following critics: Fogle in *College English*, XIII 112–16; Chayes, in *SIR*, VI 11–14; Charles Moorman, 'The

Imagery of "Kubla Khan"', *N&Q*, n.s. VI (1959) 321–4; and D. B. Schneider, 'The Structure of *Kubla Khan*', *American Notes and Queries*, I (1963) 68–70. On *fancy–imagination*, see *Biographia Literaria*, ch. 13 (*BL*, I 202), and the critics listed below in nn. 102–4.

101. Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, p. 286.
102. Watson, *Coleridge the Poet*, pp. 124–6.
103. Purves, in *SIR*, I 189–90.
104. Chayes, in *SIR*, VI 8–11, 15–17.
105. Robert Graves, *The Meaning of Dreams* (London, 1924) pp. 156–9.
106. I. A. Richards, *Principles of Literary Criticism* (London, 1925; repr. New York, 1968) p. 30.
107. Douglas Angus, 'The Theme of Love and Guilt in Coleridge's Three Major Poems', *JEGP*, LIX (1960) 655–68; Eugene Sloane, 'Coleridge's *Kubla Khan*: the Living Catacombs of the Mind', *American Imago*, XXIX (1972) 97–122; and Gerald Enscoe, 'Ambivalence in "Kubla Khan": the Cavern and the Dome', *Bucknell Review*, XII (1964) 29–36.
108. James Bramwell, '*Kubla Khan* – Coleridge's Fall?', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, LIII (1952) 449–66; and Eli Marcovitz, 'Bemoaning the Lost Dream: Coleridge's "Kubla Khan" and Addiction', *International Journal of Psycho-analysis*, XLV (1964) 411–25 (the passage quoted is on p. 422).
109. Most of these interpretations (including the outrageous hypothesis about miscegenation) are either proposed or discussed in Fruman, *Coleridge: The Damaged Archangel*, pp. 395–401. See also the critics cited in nn. 107–8 and 110–11.
110. H. S. and D. T. Bliss, 'Coleridge's "Kubla Khan"', *American Imago*, VI (1949) 261–73; the quotation is on p. 267.
111. James F. Hoyle, '"Kubla Khan" as an Elated Experience', *Literature and Psychology*, XVI (1966) 27–39; the passages quoted are on p. 37.
112. Kathleen Raine, 'Traditional Symbolism in *Kubla Khan*', *Sewanee Review*, LXXII (1964) 626–42; the quotation is on p. 638.
113. Maud Bodkin, *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry: Psychological Studies of Imagination* (Oxford, 1934) pp. 90–115; the quotations are from pp. 96 and 114.
114. See, for example, Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action*, esp. pp. 220–2; and N. L. Goldstein, 'Coleridge's "Kubla Khan": Mythic Unity and an Analogue in Folklore and Legend', *Queen's Quarterly*, LXXV (1968) 642–50.
115. See Raine, in *Sewanee Review*, LXXII 640: 'Coleridge's Abyssinian maid comes from the heights, and her song is of "Mount Abora"; yet the poet knows that the song he hears arises from the depths and heights of his own being. He has only to recollect her music. . . . He has but to *remember* in order to re-create in his poetry an image of the sphere and harmony of heaven. That is what the poem is about – that forever unfinished poem.' For Plato's doctrine of recollection, see *Phaedo*, 72e–76, and *Phaedrus*, 247c–252c.
116. See Heninger, in *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, XVIII 358–67; and H. M. Brown, 'Archetypal Patterns in "Kubla Khan"', *Proceedings of the Conference of College Teachers of English of Texas*, XXXIII (1968) 13–17. Jungian *individuation* is 'the process by which the self becomes

consciously larger through assimilating to the conscious more of the aspects of the unconscious part of the self' (ibid., p. 15) – thus, the Abyssinian maid, for example, is a symbol of the Jungian *anima* (the feminine personification of the unconscious) who sings to the poet about the depths of his own soul.

117. Robert F. Fleissner, '"Kubla Khan" as an Integrationist Poem', *Negro American Literature Forum*, VIII (1974) 254–6. In essence, the argument is this: 'Since the [Abyssinian maid] is Black, the final love and inspiration suggests the harmony of integration. . . . The basic disharmony in the poem is that the speaker cannot reach the "Vision" of the dulcimer damsel and thereby become her spirit-lover. Though he is cut off from her, the inherent unconscious urge, a communal and anti-racist longing, persists' (pp. 255–6).
118. Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and 'Kubla Khan'*, pp. 277–82.
119. Schulz, *Poetic Voices of Coleridge*, pp. 114–24.
120. Woodring, in *EIC*, IX (1959) 361–8; and Norman Rudich, 'Coleridge's "Kubla Khan": his Anti-political Vision', in *Weapons of Criticism: Marxism in America and the Literary Tradition*, ed. N. Rudich (Palo Alto, Calif., 1976) pp. 215–41.
121. Beer, *Coleridge the Visionary*, pp. 207–76, with summaries on pp. 222, 266–67; and Piper, in *RES*, n.s. XXVII 148–58.
122. Keats, letter of 21 Dec 1817: see *Letters of John Keats*, ed. R. Gittings (London, 1970) p. 43.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR: 'THE ANCIENT MARINER'

1. The history of the origin of 'The Ancient Mariner' is well documented. The evidence, moreover, is remarkably consistent, so that minor errors (e.g. Wordsworth's dating of the poem in the spring of 1798 instead of the autumn of 1797, in the Fenwick note to 'We Are Seven') are usually self-correcting in the light of substantial documentary evidence from other sources. The first five paragraphs of this chapter draw freely on seven separate accounts, which I shall list in chronological order: (1) a fragment of Dorothy Wordsworth's letter, probably to Mary Hutchinson, dated 'Alfoxden. Nov 20 1797' (*LW: EY*, p. 194); (2) Coleridge's note in *Sibylline Leaves* (1817) to lines 226–7 of 'The Ancient Mariner' (*CPW*, I 196); (3) Henry Crabb Robinson's report (13 Jan 1836) of a conversation with Wordsworth (*HCR*, II 481); (4) Wordsworth's Fenwick note (1843) to 'We Are Seven' (*WPW*, I 360–2); (5) Mrs Davy's account of a dinner conversation between a Mr Price and Wordsworth in July 1844 (*PWW*[G] III 442); (6) Christopher Wordsworth's record of his uncle's words in *Memoirs of William Wordsworth*, published in 1851 (*PWW*, III 374); and (7) the Revd Alexander Dyce's report of a statement by Wordsworth, first published in the 1852 edition of Coleridge's *Poems* and quoted in John Livingston Lowes, *The Road to Xanadu: a Study in the Ways of the Imagination* (Boston, Mass., 1927; rev. edn 1930; repr. 1964) pp. 203–4. One other contemporary account, by a witness (however) whose testimony is not always reliable, appeared in DeQuincey's first essay in *Tait's Magazine*, Sept 1834): see Thomas DeQuincey, *Recollections of the Lakes*

and the Lake Poets, ed. David Wright (Harmondsworth, 1970) pp. 38–9. For detailed modern commentary, see (for example) Mary Moorman, *WW*, I 346–8; Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, pp. 202–8; and E. K. Chambers, 'Some Dates in Coleridge's *Annus Mirabilis*', *E&S*, XIX (1934) 85–111.

2. 'The Ancient Mariner' was not their first attempt at collaboration in 1797. 'The Three Graves' (also a ballad) was begun by Wordsworth in 1796 and taken over by Coleridge in June 1797; and, more significantly still, it was probably on a walking-tour to the Valley of the Rocks in early November 1797 (that is, only a fortnight or so before the planning of 'The Ancient Mariner' that Wordsworth and Coleridge proposed to join forces on a prose tale in the manner of Gessner's *Der Tod Abels* – an attempt at collaboration which, according to Coleridge in 1828, 'broke up in a laugh: and the Ancient Mariner was written instead' (*CPW*, I 287). Coleridge's light-hearted account of 1828, however, as Mary Moorman has pointed out (*WW*, I 346–7), is a conflation of two separate tours of November 1797 and the two quite separate attempts at collaboration associated with them.
3. 'It is an enormous blunder', asserted Coleridge later in life, 'to represent the An. M. as an old man on board ship. He was in my mind the everlasting wandering Jew – had told this story ten thousand times since the voyage, which was in his early youth and 50 years before' (*CN*, I, no. 45n).
4. The relevant passage from Shelvocke's *Voyage* is quoted in Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, p. 206: 'we had not had the sight of one fish of any kind, . . . nor one sea-bird, except a disconsolate black *Albitross*, who accompanied us for several days, hovering about us as if he had lost himself, till *Hatley*, (my second Captain) . . . imagin'd, from his colour, that it might be some ill omen. That which, I suppose, induced him the more to encourage his superstition, was the continued series of contrary tempestuous winds, which had oppress'd us ever since we had got into this sea. But be that as it would, he, after some fruitless attempts, at length, shot the *Albitross*, not doubting (perhaps) that we should have a fair wind after it.'
5. Wordsworth's words, as recorded by Miss Fenwick: see n. 1 above.
6. *PWW*[G], III 442: see n. 1 above.
7. Wordsworth's words, as recorded by Miss Fenwick: see n. 1 above.
8. On the origin and development of the *Lyrical Ballads*, see Moorman, *WW*, I 369–74; and Mark Reed, 'Wordsworth, Coleridge, and the "Plan" of the *Lyrical Ballads*', *UTQ*, XXXIV (1965) 238–53.
9. It is perhaps significant that, until many years later, neither Coleridge nor the Wordsworths ever gave a title to the poem intended for the *Monthly Magazine*; they referred to it in every recorded instance between November 1797 and March 1798 simply as the 'ballad'. The earliest (apparent) reference to it as 'The Ancient Mariner' occurs in Coleridge's letter to Cottle of 28 May 1798 (*CL*, I 412). If the ballad composed for the *Monthly Magazine* remained untitled, and if the title 'The Ancient Mariner' should properly be applied only to the revised and much expanded version of that early ballad, then Coleridge's later statement that he had composed 'The Ancient Mariner' in partial fulfilment of his obligation with respect to *Lyrical Ballads* is perfectly accurate and perfectly comprehensible: 'it was agreed, that my endeavours should be directed to persons and characters supernatural. . . . With this view I wrote "The Ancient Mariner"' (*BL*, II 6).

10. See *CL*, I 399–400, 402–3, 411–12; Joseph Cottle, *Reminiscences of Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Robert Southey* (London, 1847; repr. Highgate, 1970) pp. 174–80. A useful guide through the labyrinth of negotiations leading to the *Lyrical Ballads* is provided in Mark Reed's *Wordsworth: The Chronology of the Early Years, 1770–1799* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1967) pp. 238, 318–20.
11. Cottle, *Reminiscences*, p. 178.
12. These lines were cancelled in all subsequent editions of the poem. The full text of the 1798 version of 'The Ancyent Marinere' is readily available in *Lyrical Ballads*, ed. R. L. Brett and A. R. Jones (London, 1963; rev. 1965) pp. 9–35; and (on facing pages with the 1834 *textus receptus*) in *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner: A Handbook*, ed. R. A. Gettmann (San Francisco, 1961) pp. 2–41; and also in *CPW*, I 528–46.
13. As quoted in *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, ed. J. R. de J. Jackson (London, 1970) p. 52.
14. Southey in the *Critical Review*, Oct 1798, and Burney in the *Monthly Review*, June 1799: as quoted in *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, pp. 53, 56.
15. Robert Mayo, 'The Contemporaneity of the *Lyrical Ballads*', *PMLA*, LXIX (1954) 486–522; the quotations are from pp. 490, 492.
16. The deletions and alterations in the 1798 text are listed (and quoted) in E. H. Coleridge's notes to 'The Ancient Mariner': see *CPW*, I 186–209. For a fine and detailed study of Coleridge's changes to the poem, see B. R. McElderry, Jr, 'Coleridge's Revision of "The Ancient Mariner"', *SIP*, XXIX (1932) 68–94; the discussion of the revisions of 1800 is on pp. 70–9.
17. As quoted in *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, pp. 57–8.
18. Although Mary Moorman believes that 'Coleridge . . . must have seen the note and given his full consent to its inclusion' (*WW*, I 491), Max F. Schulz has argued convincingly that the note on 'The Ancient Mariner' was an afterthought, written and posted to the printer without Coleridge's knowledge: 'Coleridge, Wordsworth, and the 1800 Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*', *SEL*, V (1965) 619–39; see esp. pp. 630–1.
19. Reproduced from *Lyrical Ballads*, ed. Brett and Jones, pp. 276–7. For a discussion, see below, pp. 133–4.
20. The subtitle 'A Poet's Reverie' is most frequently discussed by critics who wish to argue for the influence of opium on 'The Ancient Mariner'. The case, however, is not a strong one. Since there is no solid evidence, the argument for opium influence is inferential and conjectural. The most vigorous exponents of the case *for* opium influence are M. H. Abrams, *The Milk of Paradise* (Cambridge, Mass., 1934) pp. 36–9, and R. C. Bald, 'Coleridge and *The Ancient Mariner*: Addenda to *The Road to Xanadu*', in *Nineteenth-Century Studies*, ed. H. Davis, W. C. De Vane, and R. C. Bald (Ithaca, NY, 1940) pp. 24–45. The most vigorous opponents of such a view are Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, pp. 381–8; E. H. Coleridge, 'The Genesis of *The Ancient Mariner*', *Poetry Review*, IX (1918) 271–7, esp. pp. 276–7; and Molly Lefebure, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Bondage of Opium* (New York, 1974; repr. London and New York, 1977) pp. 60–4.
21. After 1800, the 'Argument' was omitted altogether in all subsequent versions of 'The Ancient Mariner'. The subtitle 'A Poet's Reverie' was retained when

the poem was published in the third and fourth editions (1802, 1805) of *Lyrical Ballads*, but was omitted in all versions after 1805.

22. See Coburn's notes in *CN*; I have cited the relevant Notebook entries in this and the following paragraph. Patricia Adair offers a convincing and detailed study of the influence of the Malta voyage on the 1817 revisions: see her *The Waking Dream: A Study of Coleridge's Poetry* (London, 1967) pp. 75–94.
23. Adair, ibid., p. 79. The most striking illustration in the notebooks of Coleridge's self-identification with the Ancient Mariner occurs in the entry for 13 May 1804, which records the unmotivated thoughtlessness of sailors shooting at a hawk, and does so in terms that inevitably recall the strange impulse which slew the albatross: 'Hawk with ruffled Feathers resting on the Bowsprit – Now shot at & yet did not move – how fatigued – a third time it made a gyre, a short circuit, & returned again / 5 times it was thus shot at / left the Vessel / flew to another / & I heard firing, now here, now there / & nobody shot it / but probably it perished from fatigue, & the attempt to rest upon the wave! – Poor Hawk! O Strange Lust of Murder in Man! – It is not cruelty / it is mere non-feeling from non-thinking' (*CN*, II no. 2090).
24. For a detailed analysis of these revisions, see McElderry, in *SIP*, XXIX 79–87.
25. Some hints about the probable content of this proposed essay may also be gleaned from Coleridge's review of M. G. Lewis's *The Monk* in the *Critical Review* for February 1797 (*IS*, p. 192), from some comments on 'Asiatic supernatural beings' in a lecture of March 1818 (*MC*, 191–4), and from a late Notebook entry on the supernatural in poetry (*IS*, p. 191).
26. J. R. Barth, *The Symbolic Imagination: Coleridge and the Romantic Tradition* (Princeton, NJ, 1977) p. 90.
27. In both the Notebook entry and the motto to 'The Ancient Mariner', Coleridge abridges Burnet while adding two short phrases of his own: see *CN*, I no. 1000H(n). For helpful critical discussions of the motto, see S. C. Wilcox, 'The Arguments and Motto of *The Ancient Mariner*', *MLQ*, XXII (1961) 264–8, and J. Twitchell, 'The World above the Ancient Mariner', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, XVII (1975) 103–17.
28. R. C. Bald, 'The Ancient Mariner', *TLS*, 26 July 1934, p. 528.
29. McElderry, in *SIP*, XXIX 87–92; the quotation is from p. 91. McElderry also makes the interesting point (p. 91) that, since 'The Ancient Mariner' is Coleridge's 'one completed masterpiece', the composition of the prose gloss to accompany it would have given the poet a nostalgic opportunity 'to relive the creative joy of his youth; and by reliving "The Ancient Mariner" who could tell but that one day he might achieve something worthy to stand beside it?'
30. See Empson's Introduction in *Coleridge's Verse: A Selection*, ed. W. Empson and David Pirie (London, 1972) esp. pp. 42–54; and also L. J. Forstner, 'Coleridge's "The Ancient Mariner" and the Case for Justifiable "Mythocide": an Argument on Psychological, Epistemological and Formal Grounds', *Criticism*, XVIII (1976) 211–29. In essence, Empson and Forstner object to the gloss and to most of the other 1817 revisions because they emphasise the 'greasy injustice' of a specifically moral and Christian theme. Empson discards the gloss, arguing (perversely) that it provides an entirely mistaken frame of reference for the poem, since it was composed by a poet who had

rejected his earlier political and theological ideals and had grown more conventional and orthodox in his old age.

31. Huntington Brown, 'The Gloss to *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*', *MLQ*, VI (1945) 319–24; the quotation is from p. 320. Brown's thesis, which is now widely accepted, has been developed further by a number of more recent critics: see, for example, George Watson, *Coleridge the Poet* (London, 1966; repr. 1970) pp. 89–94; Sarah Dyck, 'Perspective in "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner"', *SEL*, XIII (1973) 591–604; and Raimonda Modiano, 'Words and "Languageless" Meanings: Limits of Expression in *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*', *MLQ*, XXXVIII (1977) 40–61, esp. pp. 44–6.
32. Thomas McFarland, 'The Symbiosis of Coleridge and Wordsworth', *SIR*, XI (1972) 263–303; the quotation is from p. 263. See also H. M. Margoliouth, *Wordsworth and Coleridge 1795–1834* (London, 1953); A. M. Buchan, 'The Influence of Wordsworth on Coleridge (1795–1800)', *UTQ*, XXXII (1962–3) 346–66; and Stephen Prickett, *Coleridge and Wordsworth: The Poetry of Growth* (Cambridge, 1970).
33. See, for example, the anti-Wordsworthian argument of Malcolm Elwin, *The First Romantics* (London, 1947) pp. 194–6, and the pro-Wordsworthian arguments of L. S. Boas, 'Coleridge's "The Ancient Mariner", Part IV', *Explicator*, II (1944) item 52; and L. H. Harris, 'Coleridge's "The Ancient Mariner"', *Explicator*, VI (1948) item 32.
34. Sheridan's suggestion that Coleridge should compose 'a tragedy on some popular subject' for Drury Lane was transmitted to Coleridge in early February 1797 (*CL*, I 304), and in compliance with this request Coleridge began to plan *Osorio*. On 16 March, although his plot was 'chaotic' and not yet fully worked out, he described it as 'romantic & wild & somewhat terrible' (*CL*, I 318). At the end of March Wordsworth paid a brief visit to Coleridge at Nether Stowey – their first meeting since 1795 – but Coleridge was in ill health and not even Wordsworth's conversation could rouse him much (*CL*, I 319–20), so that it is unlikely that there was discussion of their respective tragedies. On 10 May Coleridge announced to Cottle that he had completed '*1500* lines of *my Tragedy*' (*CL*, I 324); and a month later, when he visited Wordsworth at Racedown, he sounded surprised to discover that Wordsworth, too, had written a tragedy (*CL*, I 325). *Osorio*, then, seems to have been well under way well before Coleridge had any knowledge or, at least, any substantial knowledge of Wordsworth's *Borderers*.
35. For the full text of 'The Three Graves', see *CPW*, I 269–84. Until comparatively recently it was thought that Coleridge composed all four parts of the projected six-part ballad that were written, but it is now clear that the working draft (all that survives) of Parts I and II are by Wordsworth, while Coleridge contributed Parts III and IV. The projected conclusion of the work (Parts V and VI) was never written. In 1809 Coleridge published Parts III and IV (his parts of the ballad) in *The Friend* (*CC*, IV ii 89–96); Parts I and II, by Wordsworth, were not published until 1893, when they were wrongly attributed to Coleridge. See *WW*, I 388.
36. Charles Smith, 'Wordsworth and Coleridge: the Growth of a Theme', *SIP*, LIV (1957) 53–64; the quotation is from pp. 53–4.
37. Barron Field, *Memoirs of Wordsworth*, ed. Geoffrey Little (Sydney, 1975) pp. 100–1.

38. Wordsworth's own later account in the Fenwick note to 'We Are Seven' is rather different, for it omits any reference to the supernatural: 'we began to talk of a Volume, which was to consist, as Mr Coleridge has told the world, of Poems chiefly on natural subjects taken from common life, but looked at, as much as might be, through an imaginative medium' (*WPW*, I 361). This statement constitutes an important piece of evidence to support the contention that Wordsworth either misunderstood or rejected Coleridge's theory of the supernatural.
39. In his 1800 note to 'The Thorn' Wordsworth likens the poem's garrulous narrator to 'a Captain of a small trading vessel', who is 'prone to superstition' and who, 'having little to do' since his retirement from seafaring, has 'become credulous and talkative from indolence'. Wordsworth's merchant captain, selected 'to exhibit some of the general laws by which superstition acts upon the mind', looks suspiciously like a domesticated version of Coleridge's Ancient Mariner, whose glittering eye and compelling tale mesmerise his auditors.
40. For an interesting analysis of the place of 'The Thorn' in the developing aesthetic rift between the two poets see Stephen Parrish, 'The Wordsworth-Coleridge Controversy', *PMLA*, LXXIII (1958) 367–74.
41. See, for example, in addition to *WW*, I 392–4, the following: Smith in *SIP*, LIV 60–3; Kathleen Coburn, 'Coleridge and Wordsworth and "the Supernatural"', *UTQ*, XXV (1956) 121–30, esp. pp. 122–6; and Anya Taylor, *Magic and English Romanticism* (Athens, Ga, 1979) pp. 138–43.
42. Coburn, in *UTQ*, XXV 124.
43. For example, Wordsworth's various notes to 'The Thorn' (*WPW*, II 512–13), his 1819 Dedication in 'Peter Bell' (*WPW*, II 331; quoted in part on p. 131 above), and his statement about the 'plan' of *Lyrical Ballads* made to Miss Fenwick in 1843 (see above, n. 38).
44. Coburn, in *UTQ*, XXV 125.
45. Keats's friend John Hamilton Reynolds published his 'Peter Bell: A Lyrical Ballad' in 1819 in advance of Wordsworth's poem. Shelley's 'Peter Bell the Third', written in October 1819, was not published until the second edition of his *Poetical Works* in 1839.
46. Line references are to the Reading Text of the two-part *Prelude*: see *The Prelude, 1798–1799*, ed. Stephen Parrish (Ithaca, NY, 1977) pp. 43–67.
47. Adair, *The Walking Dream*, p. 63.
48. On 'The Ancient Mariner' as 'epic', see the following: A. A. Mendilow, 'Symbolism in Coleridge and the Dantesque Element in "The Ancient Mariner"', *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, II (1955) 25–81, esp. pp. 48–50; K. Kroeber, '"The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" as Stylized Epic', *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, XLVI (1957) 179–87; and Warren Stevenson, '*The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* as Epic Symbol', *Dalhousie Review*, LVI (1976) 542–7. For readings of it as a dramatic monologue, see Lionel Stevenson, '"The Ancient Mariner" as a Dramatic Monologue', *The Personalist*, XXX (1949) 34–44; and E. E. Gibbons, 'Point of View and Moral in "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner"', *University Review* (Kansas City), XXXV (1968) 257–61. Anca Vlasopolos, inspired by M. H. Abrams's paper 'Structure and Style in the Greater Romantic Lyric', in *Romanticism and Consciousness*, ed. Harold Bloom (New York, 1970)

pp. 201–29, proposes an entirely new generic category in '*The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* as Romantic Quest', *TWC*, x (1979) 365–9.

49. W. P. Ker, *Form and Style in Poetry* (London, 1928; repr. New York, 1966) p. 98.
50. Anne H. Ehrenpreis, *The Literary Ballad* (London, 1966) p. 11.
51. Joseph Addison, in *Spectator*, no. 70 (21 May 1711).
52. The translation is by William Taylor, from the *Monthly Magazine*, Apr 1796; repr. in Ehrenpreis, *The Literary Ballad*, pp. 68–76.
53. The ballad 'Alonzo the Brave' first appeared in Lewis's notorious (but extremely popular) Gothic novel, *The Monk* (1796); it is reprinted in Ehrenpreis, *The Literary Ballad*, pp. 64–7.
54. On the thematic complexity of 'The Ancient Mariner', see the section on critical approaches below. Various aspects of Coleridge's technical success and virtuosity are analysed in detail in the following: C. W. Stork, 'The Influence of the Popular Ballad on Wordsworth and Coleridge', *PMLA*, XXIX (1914) 299–326; Tristram P. Coffin, 'Coleridge's Use of the Ballad Stanza in "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner"', *MLQ*, XII (1951) 437–45; R. H. Fogle, 'The Genre of *The Ancient Mariner*', *TSE*, VII (1957) 111–24; Alice Chandler, 'Structure and Symbol in "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner"', *MLQ*, XXVI (1965) 401–13; and Richard Payne, '"The Style and Spirit of the Elder Poets": the *Ancient Mariner* and English Literary Tradition', *MP*, LXXV (1978) 368–84.
55. Ehrenpreis, *The Literary Ballad*, p. 10.
56. For a discussion of Coleridge's use of extended stanzas, see Coffin, in *MLQ*, XII 437–45, who also provides a useful chart of the 'distorted stanzas' in 'The Ancient Mariner'. It should be pointed out that some of the old ballads – namely 'Chevy Chase' and 'Sir Cauline' – with which Coleridge was familiar from Percy's *Reliques* contain stanzas of five or (more often) six lines, but these extended stanzas in the old ballads lack the technical sophistication and architectural power that Coleridge achieves.
57. All of these passages are quoted and discussed in Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, pp. 129–30, 134–5. Whatever objections one may raise to Lowes's method and assumptions (see above pp. 87–8), he has demonstrated the influence of the explorers' narratives on 'The Ancient Mariner' beyond doubt, and his case is both stronger and broader than that which he makes in his later chapters for 'Kubla Khan'. A number of other critics since Lowes have argued (not often with great success) for the influnce on 'The Ancient Mariner' of specific travel-books: see, for example, B. Martin, *The Ancient Mariner and the Authentic Voyage* (London, 1949; repr. 1970); Bernard Smith, 'Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner* and Cook's Second Voyage', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XIX (1956) 117–54; and Warren Ober, '"The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" and Pinckard's "Notes on the West Indies"', *N&Q*, CCII (1957) 380–2.
58. Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, p. 198.
59. Discussed by Lowes, ibid., pp. 195–7. Lowes devotes an entire chapter (pp. 178–200) to detailing the influence of Coleridge's friendships and personal experiences on the poem. For additional suggestions, see E. H. Coleridge, in *Poetry Review*, IX 271–7; and Elwin, *The First Romantics*, pp. 197–8.

60. See Lane Cooper, 'The Power of the Eye in Coleridge', in *Studies in Language and Literature in Celebration of the Seventieth Birthday of James Morgan Hart* (New York, 1910) pp. 78–121. The essay is also reprinted in Cooper's *Late Harvest* (Ithaca, NY, 1952) pp. 65–95.
61. See Bernard Smith's useful essay 'Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner* and Cook's Second Voyage', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XIX (1956) 117–54.

    It has also been suggested that Fletcher Christian and the thrilling story of the mutiny aboard HMS *Bounty* in 1789 may have influenced 'The Ancient Mariner'. In 1795–6 Coleridge included in a list of projected works one on the 'Adventures of CHRISTIAN, the mutineer –' (*CN*, I no. 174); and, as Lowes has pointed out (*Road to Xanadu*, pp. 26–7), this hint may imply that the famous mutineer provided in some way a source for the adventures and guilt-haunted soul of Coleridge's Ancient Mariner. Lowes's suggestion, which is reasonable and possible, is made guardedly and presented as, in fact, no more than an interesting possibility. But in the hands of some more recent source-hunters, the suggestion has lost its aura of tantalising conjecture and been precipitated into the arena of historical certainty: C. S. Wilkinson, for example, insists that Coleridge's Mariner is modelled on Fletcher Christian, and speculates that Christian instead of dying on Pitcairn Island returned as a fugitive to England where he was in contact with Wordsworth ('schoolmate, relative, and family friend of Fletcher Christian'), who subsequently related Christian's adventures to Coleridge, who, of course, wrote 'The Ancient Mariner': see *The Wake of the Bounty* (London, 1953) esp. pp. 123–4. Wilkinson's imaginative conjectures have been enthusiastically endorsed by N. B. Houston, 'Fletcher Christian and "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner"', *Dalhousie Review*, XLV (1966) 431–46, and have been just as enthusiastically disputed by R. C. Leitz III, 'Fletcher Christian and *The Ancient Mariner*: a 'Refutation', *Dalhousie Review*, L (1970) 62–70. On Wordsworth's connections with Fletcher Christian and his family, see J. R. MacGillivray, 'An Early Poem and Letter by Wordsworth', *RES*, n.s. V (1954) 62–6.
62. The most comprehensive collection of such parallels is to be found in Lowes's *Road to Xanadu*, *passim*; but other interesting connections have been made, *inter alia*, by the following later critics: E. G. Ainsworth, Jr, 'Another Source of the "Lonesome Road" Stanza in *The Ancient Mariner*', *MLN*, XLIX (1934) 111–12 (on Blair's 'The Grave'); C. O. Parsons, 'The Mariner and the Albatross', *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XXVI (1950) 102–23 (on Peter Longueville's *The Hermit: or . . . Adventures of Mr Philip Quarll*); E. Schanzer, 'Shakespeare, Lowes, and "The Ancient Mariner"', *N&Q*, n.s. II (1955) 260–1; R. Huang, 'William Cowper and "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner"', *University of Windsor Review*, III (1968) 54–6; and M. Jacobus, 'William Huntington's "Spiritual Sea-Voyage": Another Source for "The Ancient Mariner"', *N&Q*, n.s. XVI (1969) 409–12.
63. See, for example, *Coleridge's Poetical Works*, ed. J. D. Campbell (London, 1893) p. 598; or (most recently) W. Nelson, 'A Coleridge "Borrowing"', *TLS*, 11 June 1954, p. 377.
64. G. Wilson Knight, *The Starlit Dome: Studies in the Poetry of Vision* (Oxford, 1941; repr. London, 1964) p. 90. Knight's general thesis is that

'Christabel', 'The Ancient Mariner' and 'Kubla Khan' 'may be grouped as a little *Divina Commedia* exploring in turn Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise' (p. 83). The influence of Dante on 'The Ancient Mariner' has been discussed by a number of readers: see, for example, Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, esp. pp. 263–4, 480–3; Mendilow, in *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, II 25–81; Adair, *The Waking Dream*, esp. pp. 93–4; and E. Moses, 'A Reading of "The Ancient Mariner"', *Costerus*, VIII (1973) 101–7.

65. H. W. Piper, *The Active Universe: Pantheism and the Concept of Imagination in the English Romantic Poets* (London, 1962) p. 85.
66. Maren-Sofie Røstvig, '"The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" and the Cosmic System of Robert Fludd', *Tennessee Studies in Literature*, XII (1967) 69–81.
67. Daniel Stempel, 'Coleridge's Magical Realism: a Reading of *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*', *Mosaic*, XII (1978) 143–56; the quotation is from p. 145.
68. Ibid., p. 151.
69. Epigraphs: (a) from Robert Southey's review of *Lyrical Ballads* in the *Critical Review*, Oct 1798: see *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, p. 53; (b) *AP*, p. 5.
70. *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, p. 403.
71. Ibid., p. 53. Southey's public opinion was also his private opinion: 'The ballad I think nonsense', he declared to C. W. W. Wynn in a letter of December 1798 – *New Letters of Robert Southey*, ed. Kenneth Curry, 2 vols (New York and London, 1965) I 177. Coleridge, for his part, was stung by Southey's comments and long remembered them, citing phrases in 1809 and 1811 to illustrate his harsh treatment at the hands of the reviewers: see *CL*, III 203, 316.
72. In fairness to Wordsworth it should be said that his letter (which has not survived) appears largely to have been concerned not with what Lamb had said about 'The Ancient Mariner' but what he had said about Wordsworth's poems in the 1800 edition of *Lyrical Ballads* – although (Lamb declares) 'Devil a hint did I give that it [i.e. the 1800 *Lyrical Ballads*] had *not pleased me*' (*LL*, I 272).
73. An anonymous review in the *Edinburgh Magazine*, Oct 1817, for example, begins with these words: 'Every reader of modern poetry is acquainted of course with "The Ancient Mariner" . . . which, when once read, can never afterwards be entirely forgotten' – *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, p. 392.
74. J. G. Lockhart in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, Oct 1819: *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, p. 436. See also Richard Haven's useful essay, 'The Ancient Mariner in the Nineteenth Century', *SIR*, XI (1972) 360–74.
75. G. H. Clarke, 'Certain Symbols in *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*', *Queen's Quarterly*, XL (1933) 27–45; the quotation is from pp. 29–30.
76. See, for example, Gertrude Garrigues, 'Coleridge's "Ancient Mariner"', *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, XIV (1880) 327–38; A. W. Crawford, 'On Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*', *MLN*, XXXIV (1919) 311–13; and Newton P. Stallknecht, 'The Moral of the *Ancient Mariner*', *PMLA*, XLVII (1932) 559–69.
77. Robert Penn Warren, 'A Poem of Pure Imagination: an Experiment in Reading', *Kenyon Review*, VIII (1946) 391–427; rev. and expanded in *Selected Essays of Robert Penn Warren* (New York, 1958) pp. 198–305. (All my references are to this latter version.)

78. Among the best of the symbolic religious interpretations are the following: Clarke, in *Queen's Quarterly*, XL 27–45; Warren, *Selected Essays*, pp. 198–305; C. M. Bowra, *The Romantic Imagination* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949; repr. New York, 1961) pp. 51–75; R. L. Brett, *Reason and Imagination: A Study of Form and Meaning in Four Poems* (Oxford, 1960; repr. 1968) pp. 78–107; and J. W. R. Purser, 'Interpretation of *The Ancient Mariner*', *RES*, VIII (1957) 249–56.
79. Warren, *Selected Essays*, pp. 227–33; the quotation is from pp. 232–3. The view that 'the great constitutive idea' of *The Ancient Mariner* is 'the concept of the fall and of man's damaged nature' has been argued by a number of critics: e.g. William Walsh, *Coleridge: The Work and the Relevance* (London, 1967; New York, 1973) pp. 118–21. See also W. H. Auden, *The Enchafèd Flood, or the Romantic Iconography of the Sea* (Charlottesville, Va, 1950; repr. New York, 1967) pp. 72–3: 'But for the Fall (the shooting of the Albatross), Adam (The Ancient Mariner) would never have consciously learned through suffering the meaning of Agapé, i.e., to love one's neighbour as oneself without comparisons or greed (the blessing of the snakes), so that the Ancient Mariner might well say in the end, *O felix culpa*.'
80. Adam's transgression, however, while perhaps unmotivated, is by no means a sin committed (like the Mariner's) in ignorance. Adam was specifically interdicted the eating of the apple; the hapless Mariner received no such warning about shooting birds.
81. J. A. Stuart, 'The Augustinian "Cause of Action" in Coleridge's *Rime of the Ancient Mariner*', *Harvard Theological Review*, LX (1967) 177–211. See also George Bellis, 'The Fixed Crime of *The Ancient Mariner*', *EIC*, XXIV (1974) 243–60.
82. Edward Bostetter, 'The Nightmare World of *The Ancient Mariner*', *SIR*, I (1962) 241–54; rev. in Bostetter's *The Romantic Ventriloquists: Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, Shelley, Byron* (Seattle and London, 1963; rev. edn, 1965) pp. 108–18; the quotation is from p. 115.
83. James D. Boulger, 'Christian Skepticism in *The Rime of The Ancient Mariner*', in *From Sensibility to Romanticism: Essays Presented to Frederick A. Pottle*, ed. F. W. Hilles and Harold Bloom (New York, 1965) pp. 439–52; the quotations are from pp. 451 and 444.
84. Warren, *Selected Essays*, pp. 257–60. Although many critics would agree that the Mariner symbolises the figure of a poet, not everyone accepts Warren's case for his being a *poète maudit*: Boulger, for example, argues that 'he is a parable of the creative poet, of course, working in the modern rationalistic world, but he is not *maudit*, but rather a necessarily suffering being' (in *From Sensibility to Romanticism*, p. 450).
85. Warren, *Selected Essays*, pp. 233–50.
86. See, for example, John Beer's analysis of Coleridge's sun and moon imagery in *Coleridge the Visionary* (London, 1959; repr. 1970) pp. 158–74 *passim*.
87. Humphry House, *Coleridge: The Clark Lectures 1951–52* (London, 1953; repr. 1969) pp. 110–13.
88. S. F. Gingerich, 'From Necessity to Transcendentalism in Coleridge', *PMLA*, XXXV (1920) 1–59; the quotation is from p. 14.
89. Dorothy Waples, 'David Hartley in *The Ancient Mariner*', *JEGP*, XXXV

(1936) 337–51. See also G. O. Carey, 'Ethics in "The Mariner"', *English Record*, XVII (1966) 18–20.

90. See Beer, *Coleridge the Visionary*, pp. 133–74, and his chapter on 'The Ancient Mariner' ('An Exploring Fiction') in *Coleridge's Poetic Intelligence* (London, 1977) pp. 147–84. Also helpful is Adair *The Waking Dream*, esp. pp. 44–55. Other examinations of the relationship between empiricism and transcendentalism in the poem include the following: Irene Chayes, 'A Coleridgean Reading of "The Ancient Mariner"', *SIR*, IV (1965) 81–103; Ralph Freedman, 'Eyesight and Vision: Forms of the Imagination in Coleridge and Novalis', in *The Rarer Action: Essays in Honor of Francis Fergusson*, ed. A. Cheuse and R. Koffler (New Brunswick, NJ, 1970), pp. 202–17; and George Bellis, 'The Fixed Crime of *The Ancient Mariner*', *EIC*, XXIV (1974) 243–60.
91. Hugh l'Anson Fausset, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (London, 1926; repr. 1972) p. 166.
92. D. W. Harding, 'The Theme of "The Ancient Mariner"', *Scrutiny*, IX (1941) 334–42; Douglas Angus, 'The Theme of Love and Guilt in Coleridge's Three Major Poems', *JEGP*, LIX (1960) 655–68; Lynn M. Grow, '*The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*: Multiple Veils of Illusion', *Notre Dame English Journal*, IX (1973) 23–30; Lefebure, *Coleridge: A Bondage of Opium*, pp. 259–66; L. D. Berkoben, *Coleridge's Decline as a Poet* (Paris and The Hague, 1975) pp. 73–92.
93. George Whalley, 'The Mariner and the Albatross', *UTQ*, XVI (1947) 381–98. Reprinted in *Coleridge: The Ancient Mariner and Other Poems*, ed. A. R. Jones and W. Tydeman (London, 1973) pp. 160–83; the quotation is from pp. 161–2.
94. Ibid., p. 177. For other important discussions of the Mariner's and Coleridge's shared experience of alienation and depression, see the following: A. M. Buchan, 'The Sad Wisdom of the Mariner', *SIP*, LXI (1964) 669–88; Adair, *The Waking Dream*, pp. 39–94; and Richard Haven, *Patterns of Consciousness: An Essay on Coleridge* (Amherst, Mass., 1969) pp. 18–42.
95. H. Parsons, 'Coleridge as "The Wedding Guest" in the "Rime of the Ancient Mariner"', *N&Q*, CXCV (1950) 251–2; Hoxie N. Fairchild, *Religious Trends in English Poetry*, 6 vols (New York, 1949; repr. 1956) III 294; Mendilow, in *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, II 48–62.
96. Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action* (Baton Rouge, La, 1941; 2nd edn, 1967) pp. 71–3, 287–8.
97. For a broad sample of Freudian readings, see the following: Beverly Fields, *Reality's Dark Dream: Dejection in Coleridge* (Kent, Ohio, 1968) pp. 84–91; H. S. Visweswariah, 'Motive-finding in *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*', *Literary Criterion* (Mysore), VIII (1969) 27–38; M. J. Lupton, '"The Rime of the Ancient Mariner": the Agony of Thirst', *American Imago*, XXVII (1970) 140–59; Leon Waldoff, 'The Quest for Father and Identity in "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner"', *Psychoanalytic Review*, LVIII (1971) 439–53; and Norman Fruman, *Coleridge: The Damaged Archangel* (New York, 1971; London, 1972) pp. 403–12.
98. David Beres, 'A Dream, a Vision, and a Poem: a Psycho-Analytic Study of the Origins of *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*', *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, XXXII (1951) 97–116; the quotation is from p. 109.

99. Maud Bodkin, *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry: Psychological Studies of Imagination* (Oxford, 1934; repr. New York, 1958) pp. 25–58; and Mark Littmann, '*The Ancient Mariner* and Initiation Rites', *Papers on Language and Literature*, IV (1968) 370–89.
100. The most attractive argument for a political undercurrent in the poem is John Beer's suggestion that the Mariner's anguish and subsequent restoration through blessing the water snakes reflects the process of political disillusionment through which young idealists such as Coleridge and Wordsworth passed when the French Revolution soured into the Reign of Terror and necessitated their effort to rediscover an idealistic vision in the reinterpretation of Nature rather than in the world of political events: see *Coleridge's Poetic Intelligence* (London, 1977) pp. 149–51, 161–4, 175.

    Other critics have seen reflected in the poem Coleridge's strong opposition to the slave-trade and his objections to exploitative colonial expansion: see Malcolm Ware, 'Coleridge's "Spectre-bark": a Slave Ship?', *PQ*, XL (1961) 589–93; William Empson, 'The Ancient Mariner', *Critical Quarterly*, VI (1964) 298–319 – a highly idiosyncratic and question-begging essay; and J. R. Ebbatson, 'Coleridge's Mariner and the Rights of Man', *SIR*, XI (1972) 171–206.
101. See, for example, House, *Coleridge*, p. 96; Ward Pafford, 'Coleridge's Wedding-Guest', *SIP*, LX (1963) 618–26; Boulger, in *From Sensibility to Romanticism* esp. pp. 446–50; M. L. D'Avanzo, 'Coleridge's Wedding-Guest and Marriage-Feast: the Biblical Context', *University of Windsor Review*, VIII (1972) 62–6; and Modiano, in *MLQ*, XXXVIII 40–61.
102. See, for example, E. E. Stoll, 'Symbolism in Coleridge', *PMLA*, LXIII (1948) 214–33; Lionel Stevenson, in *The Personalist*, XXX, esp. pp. 34–40; I. A. Richards, Introduction to *The Portable Coleridge* (New York, 1950; repr. Harmondsworth, 1977) p. 34; and Watson, *Coleridge the Poet*, esp. pp. 94–100.
103. Beer, *Coleridge's Poetic Intelligence*, p. 180.
104. Barth, *The Symbolic Imagination*, p. 99.
105. Henry Nelson Coleridge, the editor of his uncle's *Table Talk* (1835), first reported this anecdote a year earlier in the *Quarterly Review*, LII (Aug 1834) 28: 'Mrs. Barbauld, meaning to be complimentary, told our poet, that she thought the "Ancient Mariner" very beautiful, but that it had the fault of containing no moral. "Nay, madam," replied the poet, "if I may be permitted to say so, the only fault in the poem is that there is *too much*! In a work of such pure imagination I ought not to have stopped to give reasons for things, or inculcate humanity to beasts. 'The Arabian Nights' might have taught me better." They might – the tale of the merchant's son who puts out the eyes of a genii by flinging his date-shells down a well, and is therefore ordered to prepare for death – might have taught this law of imagination . . .' – quoted in T. M. Raysor, 'Coleridge's Comment on the Moral of "The Ancient Mariner"', *PQ*, XXXI (1952) 88.
106. Both the prose passage (from Mrs Barbauld's *Lessons for Children of Three Years Old*, pt I) and 'Epitaph on a Goldfinch' are quoted from Frances Ferguson, 'Coleridge and the Deluded Reader: "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner"', *Georgia Review*, XXXI (1977) 626.
107. Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, p. 277.

108. Lionel Stevenson, *The Personalist*, xxx 42.
109. Watson, *Coleridge the Poet*, p. 99.
110. See Irving Babbitt, 'Coleridge and the Moderns', *The Bookman*, LXX (1929) 120; E. M. Bewley, 'The Poetry of Coleridge', *Scrutiny*, VIII (1940) 406–11; Bostetter, *Romantic Ventriloquists*, pp. 116–17; and Chayes, in *SIR*, IV (1965) 81–103, esp. pp. 101–3.
111. House, *Coleridge*, p. 92.
112. Beer, *Coleridge's Poetic Intelligence*, p. 182.
113. Gayle Smith, 'A Reappraisal of the Moral Stanzas in *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*', *SIR*, III (1963) 42–52; the quotation is from p. 50.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE: 'DEJECTION: AN ODE'

1. Coleridge spent a good deal of time at Dove Cottage; Mrs Coleridge, however, seldom visited the Wordsworths. It may be added that, while the Wordsworths frequently came to Keswick, their visits were usually short and somewhat strained: 'we are never comfortable there', Dorothy remarked, 'after the first 2 or 3 days' (*WL: EY*, p. 330).
2. While it is sometimes assumed that Coleridge composed the whole of this verse-letter between sunset and midnight of 4 April, there are two pieces of information that militate against the supposition that it was finished on the same day on which it was begun. First, although the Wordsworths were still at Keswick on 4 April and although he accompanied them as far as Threlkeld (about four miles) on their walk to Eusemere the following day, Coleridge did not read or (as far as we know) even mention the poem to them until two and a half weeks later, when he recited 'the verses he wrote to Sara' to them at Dove Cottage on Wednesday, 21 April (*JDW*, p. 113). Second, the wind which figures so prominently in the poem's imagery does not seem to have sprung up for almost a week; Dorothy's Journal says nothing about the weather on 4 April, but her entries for 9–12 April have a good deal to say about the change in the weather and the sharp windy nights (*JDW*, p. 108). A more probable conjecture, then, is that Coleridge began to compose the verse-letter on Sunday, 4 April, that he worked on it over the next week or so, and that he sent it to Sara Hutchinson sometime before Tuesday, 20 April, when he arrived at Grasmere and recited it to the Wordsworths on the following day.
3. E. de Selincourt, 'Coleridge's *Dejection: An Ode*', *Essays and Studies*, XXII (1936) 14.
4. David Pirie, '*A Letter to* [*Asra*]', in *Bicentenary Wordsworth Studies in Memory of John Alban Finch*, ed. J. Wordsworth (Ithaca, NY, and London, 1970) p. 329.
5. See *JDW*, p. 141 (22 June 1802): 'I wrote to Mary H. and put up a parcel for Coleridge. The LB arrived.' Doubtless the parcel for Coleridge included a copy of *Lyrical Ballads*.
6. ΕΣΤΗΣΕ (ESTESE) is, as Coleridge said in 'A Character' (1834), 'Punic Greek for "he hath stood"' (*CPW*, I 453). Literally, ἔστησε means 'he has placed', not 'he has stood', as Coleridge well knew; but he was interested in the pun on his own initials STC. (See *CL*, II 867.)

7. For more detailed accounts of the stages through which the poem passed from April to October 1802, see Pirie, in *Bicentenary Wordsworth Studies*, pp. 325–35, and also C. S. Bouslog's statistical analysis of deletions from the April verse-letter in 'Structure and Theme in Coleridge's "Dejection: An Ode"', *MLQ*, XXIV (1963) 48.
8. De Selincourt, in *Essays and Studies*, XXII 8.
9. The stanzas, while there are only seven of them (as compared with eight in the *textus receptus* of 1817), are numbered 1–5, then follow three rows of asterisks with the note 'The Sixth and Seventh Stanzas omitted', and finally the last two stanzas (numbered 8 and 9). 'It is', as Pirie remarks, 'hard to know what Coleridge meant by this claim [of two deleted stanzas]. No form of the poem contains two other stanzas at this point. . . . The most likely explanation is that Coleridge was aware of creating a clumsy transition, and decided that a little deceit would make it more acceptable' (*Bicentenary Wordsworth Studies*, p. 333). Pirie's explanation is, perhaps, as plausible as any that is possible; but one still wonders whether Coleridge *did* propose to add something at this point but never got around to doing it.
10. See the letter to Thomas Wedgwood of 20 October 1802 (*CL*, II 875), and the letters to George Coleridge of 2 October 1803 and 30 November 1806 (*CL*, II 1008, 1201).
11. In line 5 'clouds' (1817) is altered to 'cloud' in the texts of 1828 and following.
12. The verse-letter to Sara Hutchinson is readily available in a number of places. It is printed in full in *CL*, II 790–8; by de Selincourt, in *Essays and Studies*, XXII 16–25; by George Whalley in *Coleridge and Sara Hutchinson and the Asra Poems* (London, 1955) pp. 155–64; by Humphry House in *Coleridge: The Clark Lectures 1951–52* (London, 1953; repr. 1969) pp. 157–65; by William Empson and David Pirie in *Coleridge's Verse: A Selection* (London and New York, 1972) pp. 187–97; and by George Dekker (who also reprints the *Morning Post* version) in *Coleridge and the Literature of Sensibility* (London, 1978) pp. 250–8.
13. Whalley, *Coleridge and Sara Hutchinson*, pp. 1–2.
14. Pirie, in *Bicentenary Wordsworth Studies*, p. 305.
15. Coleridge's poem 'A Day-Dream', which was probably written before the verse-letter (see Whalley, *Coleridge and Sara Hutchinson*, p. 125), describes this same incident: *CPW*, I 385–6.
16. Pirie, in *Bicentenary Wordsworth Studies*, p. 325.
17. Walsh, *Coleridge: The Work and the Relevance* (London, 1967) pp. 131–2.
18. Pirie, in *Bicentenary Wordsworth Studies*, p. 294. Dekker argues – although there is no evidence to support his view – that 'the essential components of *Dejection: An Ode* existed as actual stanzas of poetry *before* the verse letter to Sara Hutchinson was drafted' (*Coleridge and the Literature of Sensibility*, p. 47).
19. Pirie, in *Bicentenary Wordsworth Studies*, p. 325.
20. Beverly Fields, 'The First Draft of *Dejection*: an Explication', ch. 7 (pp. 119–64) of her *Reality's Dark Dream: Dejection in Coleridge* (Kent, Ohio, 1968) pp. 150–1.
21. Mary Jane Lupton, 'The Dark Dream of "Dejection"', *Literature and Psychology*, XVIII (1968) 44–5.
22. Max F. Schulz, 'Coleridge', in *The English Romantic Poets: A Review of*

Research and Criticism, ed. Frank Jordan, 3rd (rev.) edn (New York, 1972) p. 203.

23. 'The Mad Monk' was published in the *Morning Post*, 13 Oct 1800, over the pseudonym 'Cassiani, jun.' and was later reprinted under Coleridge's name in *The Wild Wreath* (1804), a collection edited by 'Perdita' Robinson's daughter Maria. There is some dispute as to whether 'The Mad Monk' was composed by Coleridge or by Wordsworth – or, perhaps, as a joint production by them both: see S. M. Parrish and D. V. Erdman, 'Who Wrote *The Mad Monk*?: a Debate', *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, LXIV (1960) 209–37.
24. Stephen Prickett, *Coleridge and Wordsworth: The Poetry of Growth* (Cambridge, 1970) p. 152.
25. The verbal parallels are detailed in F. M. Smith, 'The Relation of Coleridge's *Ode on Dejection* to Wordsworth's *Ode on Intimations of Immortality*', *PMLA*, L (1935) 224–34.
26. Prickett, *Coleridge and Wordsworth*, pp. 161–2.
27. George Meyer, '*Resolution and Independence*: Wordsworth's Answer to Coleridge's *Dejection: An Ode*', *TSE*, II (1950) 69.
28. For two early views of Coleridge's 'Platonic' influence on Wordsworth's 'Ode', see J. D. Rea, 'Coleridge's Intimations of Immortality from Proclus', *MP*, XXVI (1928) 201–13; and N. P. Stallknecht, 'The Doctrine of Coleridge's *Dejection* and its Relation to Wordsworth's Philosophy', *PMLA*, XLIX (1934) 196–207.
29. Harold Bloom, *The Visionary Company: A Reading of English Romantic Poetry* (New York, 1961; rev. edn, Ithaca, NY, and London, 1971) p. 222.
30. Prickett, *Coleridge and Wordsworth*, p. 155.
31. L. G. Salingar, 'Coleridge: Poet and Philosopher', in *From Blake to Byron* (vol. V of the Pelican Guide to English Literature), ed. Boris Ford (Harmondsworth, 1957; rev. edn, 1962) p. 195.
32. Milton Teichman, 'Wordsworth's Two Replies to Coleridge's "Dejection: An Ode"', *PMLA*, LXXXVI (1971) 982–9.
33. Bloom, *The Visionary Company*, pp. 228–9.
34. Gilbert Highet, *The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature* (Oxford, 1949) pp. 226–7.
35. On the development of the English ode, see George N. Shuster, *The English Ode from Milton to Keats* (New York, 1940; repr. Gloucester, Mass., 1964). Carol Maddison's *Apollo and the Nine: A History of the Ode* (London, 1960) is a thorough and scholarly examination of the development of the ode on the Continent and in England, but her discussion ends with Cowley. Two useful introductory studies (both of which discuss Coleridge's 'Dejection: An Ode') are John Heath-Stubbs's *The Ode* (London, 1969), and John D. Jump's *The Ode* (London, 1974) in the Critical Idiom series.
36. Jump, *The Ode*, p. 43.
37. See Ch. 2, n. 2.
38. See Ch. 2, n. 9.
39. From the date of its first publication in the *Morning Post* Coleridge called the poem an ode: see, for example, his reference to 'the ode to dejection' in a letter of 20 October 1802 to Thomas Wedgwood (*CL*, II 875) and his title for the poem – 'Dejection, an Ode. – (Imperfect) *April 4th, 1802*' – in the letter of 13 August 1803 to the Beaumonts (*CL*, II 970).

40. A. H. Fairbanks, 'The Form of Coleridge's Dejection Ode', *PMLA*, XC (1975) 874–5. For a similar view, see Irene Chayes, 'Rhetoric as Drama: an Approach to the Romantic Ode', *PMLA*, LXXIX (1964) 67–79, esp. p. 69.
41. Walsh, *Coleridge: The Work and the Relevance*, p. 133.
42. 'The paradox that he is capable of rendering his impressions so precisely is more apparent than real. As R. D. Laing has shown in his book *The Divided Self*, in moments of "dissociation" (when a person is thinking "this seems unreal", "nothing seems to be touching me") the self is often excessively alert and may be observing and recording with exceptional lucidity. It is such an experience that the *Dejection Ode* seems to offer': Reginald Watters, *Coleridge* (London, 1971) p. 91.
43. The phrase 'my genial spirits fail' has been much discussed. In Milton's *Samson Agonistes*, lines 594–6, the blind hero refers at the nadir of his despair to a similar loss, believing that God has forsaken him:

> So much I feel my genial spirits droop,
> My hopes all flat, nature within me seems
> In all her functions weary of herself.

Since Coleridge had had *Samson Agonistes* much in mind in the spring of 1802 (see *CN*, I no. 1155) when he composed these lines, the echo is of considerable interest. It may also be the case that Coleridge had one eye on Wordsworth's 'genial spirits' in line 113 of 'Tintern Abbey'. For a recent discussion, see M. L. D'Avanzo, 'Wordsworth's and Coleridge's "Genial Spirits"', *TWC*, II (1971) 17–20.

44. On *joy* see Ch. 2, n. 19. See also Pirie, in *Bicentenary Wordsworth Studies*, pp. 303–4; and Dekker, *Coleridge and the Literature of Sensibility*, pp. 142–76.
45. See my *Imagination in Coleridge* (London, 1978) pp. 168–9.
46. Prickett, *Coleridge and Wordsworth*, pp. 110–11.
47. The germ of this image is to be found in a Notebook entry of October 1800: 'Oct. 21 – Morning – 2 °clock – Wind amid its [?brausen] makes every now & then such a deep moan of pain, that I think it my wife asleep in pain – A trembling Oo! Oo! like a wounded man on a field of battle whose wounds smarted with the cold' (*CN*, I no. 832).
48. It is often confidently asserted that the reference in these lines on the lost child is to Wordsworth's 'Lucy Gray', and this view is supported by the fact that the April verse-letter specifies Wordsworth rather than Otway as the framer of the 'tender lay' (see *CL*, II 795, line 210). While Wordsworth's Lucy probably lies behind the image, I do not think that the matter is simply one of allusion, for the lost child is (in part) Coleridge himself and, as we know from a letter of February 1801, he had adapted the image to describe the wind as well: 'O my dear dear Friend! that you were with me by the fireside of my Study here, that I might talk it over with you to the Tune of this Night Wind that pipes it's thin doleful climbing sinking Notes like a child that has lost it's way and is crying aloud, half in grief and half in hope to be heard by it's Mother' (*CL*, II 669). The image may also have recalled to Coleridge a traumatic experience from his youth, on which occasion he nearly died from exposure having stayed out all night during a dreadful storm: see *CL*, I 353–4.

49. Walter Jackson Bate, *Coleridge* (New York, 1968; London, 1969; repr. 1973) p. 109.
50. Of this 'crowning metaphor' of the eddy, M. H. Abrams has said: 'The figure implies a ceaseless and circular interchange of life between soul and nature in which it is impossible to distinguish what is given from what received': *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (New York, 1953; repr. 1958) p. 68.
51. Bate, *Coleridge*, p. 110.
52. House, *Coleridge*, p. 134.
53. For various other similar views, see Bouslog, in MLQ, XXIV 49–52; Max F. Schulz, *The Poetic Voices of Coleridge* (Detroit, 1963; rev. edn 1964) p. 206; A. R. Jones, 'Coleridge and Poetry: the Conversational and other Poems', in *S. T. Coleridge* (Writers and their Background series), ed. R. L. Brett (London, 1971) pp. 116–22; and Pirie, who concludes that 'The *Ode* is not merely an acceptable reworking of *A Letter*; it is a wholly different poem, and a good one in its own right . . . I should, however, like to suggest that the *Ode* is essentially the slighter achievement. . . . The *Ode* is impressive, *A Letter* had been moving as well' (*Bicentenery Wordsworth Studies*, pp. 338–9).
54. Walsh, *Coleridge: The Work and the Relevance*, pp. 131–2. See also Fairbanks, in *PMLA*, XC 879.
55. Bate, *Coleridge*, p. 108; Schulz, *Poetic Voices of Coleridge* p. 203. To these views may be added that of Michael J. Kelly, who believes that Coleridge's dejection of April 1802 was resolved, not in the later redactions of the verse-letter, but in another poem entirely (namely, 'The Picture, or the Lover's Resolution', which appeared in the *Morning Post*, 6 Sep 1802): See 'Coleridge's "Picture, or the Lover's Resolution": its Relationship to "Dejection" and its Sources in the *Notebooks*', *Costerus*, V (1972) 75–96.
56. Smith, in *PMLA*, L 224.
57. R. H. Fogle, 'The Dejection of Coleridge's Ode', *ELH*, XVII (1950) 71–7; J. L. Simmons, 'Coleridge's "Dejection: an Ode": a Poet's Regeneration', *University Review* (Kansas City), XXXIII (1967) 212–18; and P. R. Broughton, 'The Modifying Metaphor in "Dejection: An Ode"', *TWC*, IV (1973) 241–9 (the quotations are from pp. 242 and 245).
58. M. H. Abrams, 'The Correspondent Breeze: a Romantic Metaphor', in *English Romantic Poets: Modern Essays in Criticism*, ed. M. H. Abrams (New York, 1960; rev. edn 1975) pp. 38–9.

NOTES TO CHAPTER SIX: BIOGRAPHIA LITERARIA

1. Barron Field, *Memoirs of Wordsworth*, ed. Geoffrey Little (Sydney, 1975) p. 62, n. 101. It is impossible to know exactly when Coleridge first suggested the idea of the Preface to Wordsworth, but the most probable time would be either April 1800 (when Coleridge spent several weeks at Grasmere) or early July 1800 (when the Coleridges were at Dove Cottage for more than three weeks before their move into Greta Hall at the end of the month).
2. In her note to this entry Miss Coburn says, 'Possibly this was a memorandum for the Preface to the *Lyrical Ballads* (1800) when it was still the intention

that Coleridge should write it. Or for the "Essay on Poetry" still in his mind, 9 Oct [*CL*, I 632].' While either of these suggestions is possible, I incline toward the first of them. In the first place, there is the similarity of theoretical ideas and even of phrasing (examined by Miss Coburn) between Coleridge's note and the Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*. In the second place, it should be noticed that, although Wordsworth mentions the Preface as early as 29 July (*LW: EY*, p. 290), he does not say *who* was writing it – and in mid August (writing *from Keswick*) he apologises to the printers: 'The preface is not yet ready: I shall send it in a few days' (*LW: EY*, p. 292). Procrastination and non-delivery are not Wordsworthian traits. I suspect that in July–August 1800 Coleridge was the intended author of the Preface and that Wordsworth took it over, probably sometime in the first two weeks of September, when it became clear that Coleridge was not getting on with the job. The first clear evidence we possess that Wordsworth was himself writing the Preface dates from mid September (*JDW*, p. 40).

3. George Whalley, 'The Integrity of *Biographia Literaria*', *E&S*, n.s. VI (1953) 87–101; the quotation is from p. 92.
4. Whalley, followed by D. M. Fogel in 'A Compositional History of the *Biographia Literaria*', *SIB*, XXX (1977) 224, dates this Notebook entry 'August 1803'; Miss Coburn, however, dates it (provisionally) 'September–October 1803' in her edition of the Notebooks. The entry is discussed by Watson, *BL*[W], pp. xi–xii. It may be added that, while the Notebook entry focuses on metaphysics, Coleridge was still very much concerned with Wordsworth's theory and its adverse effect on his poetry in the autumn of 1803: 'I have seen enough,' he told Poole on 14 October, 'positively to give me feelings of hostility towards the plan of several of the Poems in the L. Ballads: & I really consider it as a misfortune, that Wordsworth ever deserted his former mountain Track to wander in Lanes & allies . . .' (*CL*, II 1013).
5. Fogel, in *SIB*, XXX 224.
6. In unravelling the complex compositional history of the *Biographia Literaria* in this and the following paragraphs, I have relied heavily on two important discussions: first, E. L. Griggs's summary (and notes) in his edition of Coleridge's letters (*CL*, III xlvii–lii), and, second, D. M. Fogel's paper in *SIB*, XXX. Fogel provides a useful tabular synopsis (pp. 221–2) of the probable evolution of *Biographia Literaria*.
7. The placement of this comma is crucial. Its omission in the transcript of the letter published in the *Westminster Review* in 1870 led early scholars such as John Shawcross (*BL*, I xc–xci) to suppose that Coleridge's literary autobiography 'came to demand a preface' and that this hypothetical preface (i.e. the critique of Wordsworth in chs 14–22) mushroomed to such a size that it could no longer serve as a 'preface' and had to be appended to the 'Autobiographia literaria' (i.e. chs 1–12). This theory, which George Watson erroneously persists in maintaining (*BL*[W], pp. xiii–xiv), is untenable. Since the publication in 1959 of the correct text of the letter (*including* the comma after 'preface') in E. L. Griggs's edition of the *Letters*, it is clear that 'At no time did Coleridge propose a preface to his autobiography' (*CL*, IV 578 n. 2). The problem is discussed in detail by Fogel, in *SIB*, XXX 226–8.
8. As we know from Crabb Robinson's diary, Wordsworth *was* displeased with

Biographia Literaria: 'Coleridge's book has given him no pleasure, and he finds just fault with Coleridge for professing to write about himself and writing merely about Southey and Wordsworth. With the criticism on the poetry too he is not satisfied. The praise is extravagant and the censure inconsiderate. I recollected hearing Hazlitt say that Wordsworth would not forgive a single censure mingled with however great a mass of eulogy' (4 Dec 1817; *HCR*, I 213). See also *CL*, IV 591, 598, and 620.

9. Two months later (30 May 1815) Coleridge elaborated this criticism in a letter to Wordsworth himself: *CL*, IV 572–6.
10. Chapter 22 presents problems. Since Coleridge was required to expand *Biographia Literaria* in 1816–17 to make it a work of two volumes (see above, pp. 219–21), and since the printing of the planned one-volume edition was stopped midway through chapter 22, the question naturally arises as to whether or not the expansion involved any rewriting and extension of the so far unprinted material forming the last half of chapter 22. Scholars are divided on this issue. Griggs (*CL*, IV 657) assumes that chapter 22 was complete in 1815 and underwent no revision or extension; Fogel (in *SIB*, xxx, p. 233) argues that, since chapter 22 was originally intended to conclude the *Biographia*, Coleridge would 'have had to revise at least the last page' of it before carrying on with the interpolation of 'Satyrane's Letters' and the other new material incorporated in chapters 23 and 24; and George Watson (*BL*[W], p. xvi), who notes the liberal use of long quotations in the last half of chapter 22, conjectures that this section was rewritten and heavily padded in the revisions of 1816–17.
11. Fogel, in *SIB*, xxx 230.
12. Several later statements (Sep–Oct 1815) express Coleridge's conviction that *Biographia* was 'a Work per se' and his sense of the book's essentially miscellaneous character – 'sketches of my own *literary* Life; and of my opinions on Religion, Philosophy, Politics, and Poetry': see *CL*, IV 588, 591 and 598.
13. Fogel, in *SIB*, xxx 232.
14. Coleridge's borrowings from Schelling were first noticed by Thomas DeQuincey in 1834. For the extent and nature of these borrowings see, for example, J. W. Beach, 'Coleridge's Borrowings from the German', *ELH*, IX (1942) 36–58; G. N. G. Orsini, *Coleridge and German Idealism* (London and Carbondale, Ill., 1969) esp. pp. 192–221; and Norman Fruman, *Coleridge: The Damaged Archangel* (New York, 1971; London, 1972) esp. pp. 69–107.
15. He also had before him some notes (probably made for his projected 'Logosophia' rather than for the *Biographia*) based on Schelling's *System*: see *CN*, III no. 4265 (and notes).
16. The *reasons* for Coleridge's resorting to 'plagiarism' are complex, fugitive, and deeply rooted in his psychological make-up. DeQuincey, with justification, was quite simply baffled by what he found. More recent commentators have been more dogmatic and less charitable: the case for the prosecution may be gathered from n. 14 above. The case for the defence, begun by Sara Coleridge in her edition (1847) of *Biographia Literaria*, has been ably continued by Thomas McFarland, who demonstrates that Coleridge's 'borrowings, though skirting and sometimes crossing the boundary of propriety, were not the thefts of a poverty-stricken mind, but the mosaic materials of a neurotic technique of composition' – *Coleridge and the*

Pantheist Tradition (Oxford, 1969) p. 32. See also E. S. Shaffer, 'The "Postulates in Philosophy" in the *Biographia Literaria*', *Comparative Literature Studies*, VII (1970) 297–313.

17. For a detailed account of the printing history of *Sibylline Leaves*, see Grigg's headnote in *CL*, IV 618. Coleridge returned the final proof-sheet of this volume to Bristol on 14 June 1816.
18. I have abbreviated the complex story of the protracted and acrimonious disputes concerning *Biographia Literaria* between July 1816 and May 1817. For a fuller account, see Griggs's comments in *CL*, III xlix–lii and IV 657–60.
19. Although the *Biographia* version is slightly revised, the letters – said to have been written by a 'friend' (actually Coleridge himself) whose pseudonym was 'SATYRANE, the Idoloclast, or breaker of Idols' – first appeared in nos 14, 16 and 18 of *The Friend* (1809): see *CC*, IV ii 187–96, 209–21, 236–47. 'Satyrane's Letters' were based on seven letters written to Tom Poole and Mrs Coleridge during Coleridge's stay in Germany in 1798–9: see *CL*, I nos 256, 258–9, 261–2, 269–70.
20. In August–September 1816 a series of five unsigned letters criticising Maturin's *Bertram* (a play accepted by Drury Lane Theatre in preference to Coleridge's *Zapolya*) were published in *The Courier*. The letters were written by Coleridge, who dictated them to John Morgan: *CL*, IV 664 n. 2 and 670. Part of the first and all of the last four of these letters were reprinted as *Biographia* ch. 23: see *CC*, III ii 435 n. 1.
21. In 1816–17 Coleridge was savaged by reviewers, especially by William Hazlitt in the *Examiner* and (later) in the *Edinburgh Review*. In vicious attacks on the *Christabel* volume (June 1816) and on *The Statesman's Manual* – both *before* and after it was published in December 1816 – Hazlitt aimed (in Griggs's phrase) 'a veritable campaign of hate' at Coleridge both as man and author. Hazlitt's attacks, while the most virulent, were not isolated. For a résumé, see Griggs's headnote in *CL*, IV 668. The reviews of Hazlitt (and others) are reprinted in *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage*, ed. J. R. de J. Jackson (London, 1970).
22. Thomas DeQuincey, *Recollections of the Lakes and the Lake Poets*, ed. David Wright (Harmondsworth, 1970) p. 46. DeQuincey's essay on Coleridge first appeared (in four instalments) in *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine*, Sep 1834–Jan 1835.
23. T. S. Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (London, 1933; repr. 1975) p. 67; and Maurice Carpenter, *The Indifferent Horseman: The Divine Comedy of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (London, 1954) p. 304.
24. Whalley, in *E&S*, n.s. VI 92.
25. Ibid., p. 95.
26. Ibid., p. 100.
27. Jerome C. Christensen, for example, argues in a recent paper that no reading of *Biographia Literaria* could ever produce a unified reading of the text: 'It would likely produce a parody of such a reading. The *Biographia* is itself a parody, but not one which could accurately be called intentional or unintentional – just because the *Biographia* is the parody not of a particular book but a parody of the idea of [a] book, a parody of the kind of book it would like to be.' See 'The Genius in the *Biographia Literaria*', *SIR*, XVII (1978) 215–31; the quotation is from p. 231.

28. See, for example, Lynn M. Grow's chapter 'The Consistency of the *Biographia Literaria*' (pp. 128–47) in her book *The Prose Style of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (Salzburg, 1976).
29. J. E. Barcus, 'The Homogeneity of Structure and Idea in Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria*, *Philosophical Lectures*, and *Aids to Reflection*', unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of Pennsylvania, 1968): see *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXIX (1969) 2205A–6A.
30. Watson argues that Coleridge 'set out to write a work of metaphysics to which he hoped the events of his life would give a continuity: he ended by producing a work of aesthetics to which such narrative as there is has failed to give continuity. But there is another unity, and it is peculiarly Coleridgean . . .' (*BL*[W], p. xix). Coleridge did *not*, however, set out to write a work of metaphysics: see above, n. 7; indeed, *Biographia Literaria* began as an aesthetic work (a preface to Coleridge's poems) and the metaphysical section was the last part of the book composed in 1815.
31. J. A. Appleyard, *Coleridge's Philosophy of Literature* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965) p. 169. Appleyard also stresses (*contra* Whalley) that *Biographia Literaria* was 'the result of little planning and foresight' (ibid.).
32. Grow, *The Prose Style of Coleridge*, p. 136.
33. See also *CL*, IV 591, 598.
34. It is impossible to overstate the importance for Coleridge of the establishment of right principles: 'It is my object', he declared in the first number of *The Friend* (June 1809), 'to refer men to PRINCIPLES in all things; in Literature, in the Fine Arts, in Morals, in Legislation, in Religion' (*CC*, IV ii 13). This was his lifelong conviction and his lifelong endeavour, which found its most mature expression in his 'Essays on the Principles of Method' in the much revised 1818 version of *The Friend*: see *CC*, IV i 448–524. With respect to literary critical principles, it should be pointed out that there is a direct and unbroken belief, stretching from 1802 to 1815 and beyond in Coleridge's thought, in the existence of such underlying criteria. The 'object' of the *Ur-Biographia* described to Southey in July 1802 had been 'not to examine what is good in [an individual poet], but what has ipso facto pleased, & to what faculties or passions or habits of the mind they may be supposed to have given pleasure' (*CL*, II 829–30); then, in chapter 18 of the *Biographia* itself, we meet the following restatement of the same conviction: 'The ultimate end of criticism is much more to establish the principles of writing, than to furnish *rules* how to pass judgement on what has been written by others; if indeed it were possible that the two could be separated' (*BL*, II 63).
35. M. G. Cooke, '*Quisque Sui Faber*: Coleridge in the *Biographia Literaria*', *PQ*, L (1971) 208–29; the quotation is from p. 225.
36. Appleyard, *Coleridge's Philosophy of Literature*, p. 187.
37. See above, p. 218 and nn. 14 and 16.
38. Thomas Carlyle, 'The Life of John Sterling', in *Thomas Carlyle's Works*, 18 vols (London, 1905) II 46–7.
39. Three points must be made about this sentence. First, it must be insisted upon that Coleridge is concerned with epistemology *not* with ontology, with 'knowing' *not* with 'being'. (*Being* – that is, the reality and existence of the subjective and the objective, of self and non-self, is ASSUMED.) That is why he

declares that 'We are not investigating an absolute principium essendi [principle of being] . . . but an absolute principium cognoscendi [principle of knowing]' (*BL*, I 186). Second, Coleridge argues that any true theory of knowledge and knowing must begin from the subjective pole and *then* take into account the objective pole in order to arrive at the fullness of the human intelligence. Third, following Fichte (see *BL*, I 101), Coleridge asserts that knowledge involves an *act*, that knowing is an active not a passive activity: 'in all acts of positive knowledge there is required a reciprocal concurrence' of both conscious intelligence (or subject) and unconscious nature (or object), and the 'problem is to explain this concurrence' (*BL*, I 174).

40. Appleyard, *Coleridge's Philosophy of Literature*, p. 197. It may be added that the probability of confusion on Coleridge's part is supported by his own statement of mid 1834, only a month before his death: 'The metaphysical disquisition at the end of the first volume of the *Biographia Literaria* is unformed and immature; it contains the fragments of the truth, but it is not fully thought out. It is wonderful to myself to think how infinitely more profound my views now are . . .' (*TT*, p. 311).
41. Coleridge had defined the neologism 'esemplastic' in the opening sentences of *Biographia*, ch. 10: '"*Esemplastic. The word is not in Johnson, nor have I met with it elsewhere.*" Neither have I. I constructed it myself from the Greek words, εἰς ἓν πλάττειν, to shape into one; because, having to convey a new sense, I thought that a new term would both aid the recollection of my meaning, and prevent its being confounded with the usual import of the word, imagination' (*BL*, I 107).
42. Appleyard would not accept this point; he believes that there is 'a fatal difficulty implicit in [Coleridge's] approach, a confusion of knowing and making' (*Coleridge's Philosophy of Literature*, p. 207). Appleyard's analysis of the 'weaknesses' of Coleridge's mingling of philosophy and aesthetics is well worth reading, esp. pp. 203–8.
43. Percy Bysshe Shelley, *A Defence of Poetry*, ed. J. E. Jordan (New York, 1965) pp. 74–5.
44. It was this point that Wordsworth had misunderstood in the Preface to his *Poems* (1815), where he had asserted that 'To aggregate and to associate, to evoke and to combine, belong as well to the imagination as to the fancy': see Coleridge's retort at the end of *Biographia*, ch. 12 (*BL*, I 194).
45. Coleridge defines *symbol* in *The Statesman's Manual* (1816). A symbol, he says there, is characterised 'Above all by the translucence of the Eternal through and in the Temporal. It always partakes of the Reality which it renders intelligible; and while it enunciates the whole, abides itself as a living part in that Unity, of which it is the representative' (*CC*, VI 30).
46. The complementary relationship existing between the two distinct powers of fancy and imagination is stated clearly in a Coleridgean aphorism of 1833: 'Genius must have talent as its complement and implement, just as in like manner imagination must have fancy. In short, the higher intellectual powers can only act through a corresponding energy of the lower' (*TT*, p. 269).
47. R. H. Fogle, *The Idea of Coleridge's Criticism* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, Calif., 1962) p. 71.
48. Coleridge confronts these issues directly in chapter 18. First, 'The ultimate

end of criticism is much more to establish the principles of writing, than to furnish *rules* how to pass judgement on what has been written by others; if indeed it were possible that the two could be separated' (*BL*, II 63). Second, in answer to the notion that poetry (Wordsworth's or anybody else's) could be produced by the formulaic application of external rules, he responds: 'Could a rule be given from *without*, poetry would cease to be poetry, and sink into a mechanical art. It would be μόρφωσις [a shaping power], not ποίησις [a making power]' *BL*, II 65.

49. There are numerous early drafts (dating as early as 1809) of this definition: see *CN*, III nos 3615, 3827, 4111, 4112; *SC*, I 148 and II 41, 50–1, 68.
50. This is a favourite Coleridgean distinction: see, for example, *CL*, II 810; *CN*, II no. 2086 and III nos 3247–8; *TT*, pp. 92–4 (12 May 1830) and 309–10 (23 June 1834).
51. U. C. Knoepflmacher, 'A Nineteenth-Century Touchstone: Chapter XV of *Biographia Literaria*', in *Nineteenth-Century Literary Perspectives*, ed. C. de L. Ryals (Durham, NC, 1974) pp. 3–16; the quotation is from p. 4. See also Fogle, *The Idea of Coleridge's Criticism*, pp. 97–104.
52. Nathaniel Teich, 'Coleridge's *Biographia* and the Contemporary Controversy about Style', *TWC*, III (1972) 61–70; the quotation is from p. 65.
53. D. H. Bialostosky, 'Coleridge's Interpretation of Wordsworth's Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*', *PMLA*, XCIII (1978) 912–24. Bialostosky argues that Coleridge frequently distorts or misinterprets Wordsworth's meaning: 'Not only has he variously and inconsistently identified the passages to which he objects, but he has misleadingly distinguished between what the Preface can legitimately be taken to mean and what it probably does mean' (p. 912).
54. Fogle, *The Idea of Coleridge's Criticism*, p. 79.

Index

An asterisk indicates that the author or work is quoted. Numbers in bold print indicate extended discussion or detailed references. Except in the case of the *first* reference to a work (where full bibliographical information is given), names in the Notes section are not included when they merely refer to an author already cited in the text; however, authors cited only in the notes or those cited in notes which do not connect them directly with the text are included in the index.