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Introduction and Orientation

RICHARD GRAVIL

1. THOMAS McFARLAND AND THE COLERIDGE CONNECTION

In his Life of John Sterling Thomas Carlyle delivers this remorseless and brilliant picture of Coleridge’s conversation at Highgate. It is a passage which Thomas McFarland reads with memorable relish and gusto.

Coleridge sat on the brow of Highgate Hill, in those years, looking down on London and its smoke-tumult, like a sage escaped from the inanity of life’s battle; . . . He was thought to hold, he alone in England, the key of German and other Transcendentalisms; knew the sublime secret of believing by ‘the reason’, what ‘the understanding had been obliged to fling out as incredible. ... I have heard Coleridge talk, with eager musical energy, two stricken hours, his face radiant and moist, and communicate no meaning whatsoever to any individual or his hearers…. He began anywhere: you put some question to him, made some suggestive observation: instead of answering this, or decidedly setting out towards answer of it, he would accumulate formidable apparatus, logical swim-bladders, transcendental life-preservers and other precautionary and vehiculatory gear, for setting out…. He had knowledge about many things and topics, much curious reading; but generally all topics led him, after a pass or two, into the high seas of theosophic philosophy, the hazy infinitude of Kantian transcendentalism. … Glorious islets, too, I have seen rise out of the haze; but they were few, and soon swallowed in the general element again. Balmy, sunny islets, islets of the blest and the intelligible. …

Thomas McFarland’s intellectual career has latterly revolved around the central project of clearing the mists from these ‘islets’ and demonstrating their geological connectedness or reticulation.

McFarland’s contribution to the study of Romanticism is elegant in its design, monumental in its scholarship and its effects. His monographs include the mas-
sively learned *Coleridge and the Pantheist Tradition* (1969), two influential essays in Romantic aesthetics, *Romanticism and the Forms of Ruin* (1981) and the more theoretical *Originality and Imagination* (1985), and most recently *Romantic Cruxes: the English Essayists and the Spirit of the Age* (1987), which includes a heroic reading of the life and work of Charles Lamb, and *William Wordsworth: Intensity and Achievement* (1992). But in his edition of Coleridge’s *Opus Maximum* for the Collected Coleridge, McFarland undertook to lock into place what will be—in Coleridge’s oeuvre as well as his own—the keystone of the arch, all that exists, formally, of Coleridge’s projected magnum opus, the great labour which overshadowed all his other productions and to which they were intended to be tributary.

Chapter Six of *Romanticism and the Forms of Ruin* offered McFarland’s first appraisal of ‘the psychic economy and cultural meaning’ of Coleridge’s magnum opus. Plans for this work take many forms over many years, but the heart of it is always consonant with a plan set down in September 1815. The work, according to Coleridge’s description, would comprise six treatises. First ‘a philosophical History of Philosophy and its revolutions’ from Plato through to the post-empiricist revival of dynamic philosophy. Second, ‘a system of Logic’. Third, a treatise of ‘the Dynamic or Constructive Philosophy’, preparatory to the fourth treatise ‘a detailed Commentary on the Gospel of St John’. The fifth treatise would deal with ‘the Pantheists and Mystics; with the lives of Giordano Bruno, Jacob Behmen, George Fox and Benedict Spinoza’ (those whose work, though negating true Christianity, contributed in Coleridge’s own experience to keeping alive the heart in the head). The last would make biographical amends for Coleridge’s own heretical phase, dealing with ‘the Causes & Consequences of modern Unitarianism’ (*CL*, iv, 589-90).

The new edition of the *Opus Maximum* opens up all of Coleridge’s published oeuvre, as well as the astonishing notebooks, for enriched re-reading. The task of relating Coleridge’s notes and fragments to the central core of his existential and intellectual design, required an editor who had read all that Coleridge read, and re-thought step by step what Coleridge thought. The present volume of essays (completed in 1990) was dedicated to Thomas McFarland as one of the very few, among the successive generations of Coleridge scholars, to whom such a momentous task could properly have been committed, and it was offered as a libation to cheer this great labour upon its way. As this electronic ‘reprint’ of the festschrift appears, the first collection of essays on the *Opus Maximum* has recently been published (edited by Jeffrey Barbeau), just in time to be included in the revised bibliography.
The Coleridge Connection explores what McFarland calls the symbiotic nature of Coleridge’s friendship and collaborations. Coleridge’s biography is to a large degree a history of his friendships, his talent for inspiring others, and his dependencies. Throughout his life he chose friends of great distinction in their own spheres: Lamb, Poole, Southey, Thelwall, Davy, Gillman, Green and Sterling, and in each case there is a symbiotic element. The mythology of his career begins (apart from the notorious interlude as Silas Tomkyn Comberbache, trooper of dragoons) with his share in the Pantisocracy project, and for many contributors to this book Pantisocracy is a fitting symbol for the Coleridge Connection: a lifelong Coleridge-selected Pantisocracy of minds, amorphous, anarchistic in the Godwinian sense, and remarkably devoid—Sara Coleridge suggested (in her edition of her father’s Biographia Literaria)—of property boundaries in matters of thought. The ideal intellectual community in which Coleridge was enrolled, does of course extend through time. This book, however, is largely concerned not with ‘influences’, but with contemporary connections: with what Coleridge gave and found in his many creative friendships, and with his role as interpreter and critic of some of his German contemporaries.

2. THE SOMETIME JACOBIN? COLERIDGE IN THE NINETIES

I therefore go, and join head, heart, and hand,
Active and firm, to fight the bloodless fight

In the early 1790s it was generally agreed in respectable dissenting circles that the end of the world—or, more accurately, the beginning of Christ’s thousand-year reign on earth—was nigh. What form it might take, and whether the millennium would be inward or public, cataclysmic or gradualist, was a matter of opinion. To the men of science considered in Ian Wylie’s essay, and to the Unitarians appraised by H. W. Piper later in the book, the age of universal equality was just around the corner: The Lamb of God hath opened the fifth seal’, Coleridge opined in Religious Musings. Thirty years later in the late 1820s, as John Beer reminds us at the end of this book, rumblings of Apocalypse could again be heard in a largely Caledonian outbreak of ‘speaking in tongues’.

Ian Wylie opens the collection with an illuminating account of Coleridge’s relations to the self-styled ‘Lunaticks’ and their sons, offering a glimpse of the intimate association between Coleridge and science, or natural philosophy, a connection which
is further explored by Molly Lefebure and Tim Fulford later in the book. His essay calls our attention to the significant presence of Joseph Priestley, Erasmus Darwin and Benjamin Franklin as presiding genii of Coleridge’s *Religious Musings*, and the extent to which major Lunar Society figures were enmeshed with Coleridge’s Bristol circle. He also sheds fascinating new light on the plausibility—one might even say Necessity—of the famous Pantisocracy project, which project recurs in several subsequent essays as a symbol of the ideal community to which Coleridge’s thought in all its phases seems to aspire.

The second and third essays in the collection, Nicola Trott’s on Coleridge’s so-called ‘Answer to Godwin’ and Nicholas Roe’s treatment of the Thelwall connection, offer methodologically contrasting approaches to the matter of Coleridge’s apostasy. The weakness of the presiding guru of the age, in the eyes of dissenting radicals who had not lost their faith, was his atheism, and Nicola Trott’s essay demonstrates how Coleridge’s contestation with Godwin and his adherents entwines Hartleyan and Unitarian traditions of thought in the search for an antidote to *Political Justice*. The essential platform for a riposte to Godwin’s chilling disinterestedness had to be an alternative theory of benevolence, in which Coleridge unites Priestley, Frend and Dyer. ‘General Benevolence’, argues *Conciones ad Populum*, ‘is begotten and rendered permanent by social and domestic affections…. The intensity of private attachments encourages, not prevents, universal Benevolence.’ And in developing his response, Coleridge is also laying the foundations for the part of the *Recluse* project that Wordsworth did find it possible to realize. The Wordsworthian poetry of the affections, it is suggested, is founded in Coleridge’s ‘millennium of love—the fraternizing revolution of *Religious Musings*’.

Nicholas Roe recovers what he calls ‘the banished history’ of one of Coleridge’s early friendships. John Thelwall, orator, agitator, poet, elocutionist is one of the most attractive figures of the time. He was sufficient of an adept at poetry—in a variety of fashionable modes, not all of them derivative—to treat with the authors of *Lyrical Ballads* as a fellow poet, as well as a fellow democrat. The allusion to Thelwall’s Welsh address (‘Liswyn farm’) in Wordsworth’s *Anecdote for Fathers* is a poignant reminder of this. He was *au fait* with much in contemporary intellectual culture and, as Molly Lefebure’s essay shows, he fed Coleridge’s interest in science at an early date. There can be little doubt also that his remarkable prose poem *The Peripatetic* (1793) contributes both to the themes of *Lyrical Ballads* and to the scope and compass, if not of Coleridge’s Platonic scheme for ‘The Recluse’, then at least of Wordsworth’s earliest published instalment of that project, *The Excursion*. Coleridge’s denial of him
is, by corollary, one of the least attractive features of his biography. Nicholas Roe’s essay on ‘the road to Nether Stowey’ attempts to set the record straight.

This matter of Coleridge’s alleged apostasy, and indeed the matter of his relations to Godwin, presiding guru of secular radicalism, may require some introductory comment. Macaulay’s judgement on Wordsworth’s *Prelude*, when published in 1850, that it revealed its author as having been ‘to the last degree Jacobinical, indeed socialist’ is not the kind of remark anyone felt tempted to make of *Biographia Literaria*, when published in 1817. Rather, that work seems to have been designed to create the impression that Coleridge had always been remote from faction and dissent. John Thelwall and Robert Southey, of course, knew better. Their responses to Coleridge’s apostatic recreation of the 1790s—Southey declaring that if Coleridge was not a Jacobin ‘I wonder who the devil was’, and Thelwall recollecting Coleridge as ‘a man of blood’—are detailed in Nicholas Roe’s essay.

Despite his immense output of lectures and essays (the *Lectures on Politics and Religion* (1795), the ten numbers of *The Watchman* (1796), the contributions in *The Morning Post* and *The Courier* from 1797 onwards) and the evidence of the *Notebooks* and the *Collected Letters*, recovery of Coleridge’s politics in the 1790s is by no means as easy as it might seem. Two readings seem to be possible. The first is that Coleridge was in fact deeply committed to political opposition, at least until 1798 when—as he tells his brother—he has ‘snapped my squeaking baby-trumpet of Sedition’, and that what he was committed to was, in the common sense of the term at that time, a broadly ‘Jacobin’ or Democratic view. The other is that even in his earliest recorded public utterances, the magnificent *Conciones ad Populum* (1795), Coleridge is clearly engaged in staking out a conservative political philosophy, not greatly different from that of *Church and State* (1829), even while his rhetoric takes on the lurid colouring of the day. That rhetoric, especially when contemplating the hypocrisies of the Church, betrayed as he once put it to Sir George and Lady Beaumont ‘a disposition to catch fire, from the very rapidity of my own motion’, and may well have coloured Thelwall’s recollection of its substance.

Coleridge’s work throughout 1795 and 1796 in the Bristol lectures and *The Watchman* is unified by a sustained critique of the ‘atheism’ of many leading radicals. Thomas Paine rarely receives a favourable mention. Still more surprisingly, the unworldey Godwin is privately presented in the role of chief regent of the grovelling sensualists, a ‘pandar to sensuality and vice’. Coleridge’s most sustained work of 1795, the *Lectures on Revealed Religion*, is impelled by the same impulse that led him in 1796 to contemplate a book on Godwin, comparing ‘the two systems—his &
Jesus’s’ (CL, i, 293). While this remark recognises the importance of Godwin, it also casts him as the Antichrist. Coleridge of course shared Godwin’s critique of the evils of property, and his conviction of the need for social progress to arise through gradual illumination, until the values of a ‘deeply principled minority’ become that of the whole community. In some respects Coleridge’s critique of impetuous political action, and his despairing remark in France: An Ode that nothing good can come from forms of government, may sound Godwinian, but much of what seems most Godwinian might, as Lewis Patton and Peter Mann have argued (in their extensive introduction to the 1795 lectures), derive more directly from Priestley and the Unitarians.

Coleridge, at this date, saw Christianity as essentially egalitarian. He therefore respected in Godwin what was compatible with the mores of the early Christians, and shared Godwin’s suspicions of political action (as Nicola Trott points out, Coleridge’s position in 1795 is that “whatever is just in Godwin is more forcibly recommended in the Gospel, and whatever is new is absurd”). He suspected from the first, however, that Godwin’s system must be ineffectual since it lacked any grasp of the importance of private attachments and their necessary connection to the social feelings. Nevertheless, Godwin and Coleridge became close enough in 1800 and later for Godwin to be the recipient of some of Coleridge’s most revealing letters, for instance about the extinction of his poetic self. In 1800 we find Coleridge demanding that Godwin should not ‘cease to appear as a bold moral thinker’, and exhorting him to ‘write a book on the power of words … in short … to philosophise Home Tooke’s System’. Evidently Coleridge thought highly enough of Godwin at this time to suppose him capable of solving ‘the great Questions’ relating to language and thought (Coleridge was always capable of imagining that his friends were capable of philosophical originality). One can see the influence of Godwin’s anarchism in Coleridge’s disappointed retreat from political optimism, his thoughts upon education and his animadversions against political associations—above all in Coleridge’s progress from millenarian oratory towards sober-sided clerisy. And indubitably, in return, though it is a matter of some irony that it should be so, Coleridge infused into Godwin a species of Pantheism.

3. THE RECLUSE PARADIGM

That Coleridge’s friendship with the Wordsworths is exceptional, in so far as it involved one of the most celebrated partnerships in literary history, need not blind one to the possibility that the nature of his friendship is also in some measure paradigmatic. With Dorothy Wordsworth the friendship is relatively untroubled: on the
whole Coleridge did not regard women as competitors, even when he admired them. He raids her journals with as much impunity as did her brother, and is not averse, when stuck for an image or the *mot juste*, to asking Dorothy ‘for a word’. Dorothy undoubtedly praised more unstintingly and was more easily influenced. As *anima* she is the necessary completion of the trinity.

With her brother, the friendship was more problematical. There is a marked curve, from initial dependency and self abasing adulation of ‘the Giant Wordsworth’, to resentment of the complacency of the adulated friend, and this curve Coleridge had travelled before. A letter to Southey in 1795, as the Pantisocracy project collapses in recriminations, prefigures in two of its motifs the Wordsworth relationship. At the end of the letter Coleridge alludes to what has been: ‘I did not only venerate you for your own Virtues, I prized you as the Sheet Anchor of mine’. Near the beginning of the letter, however, he peremptorily informs Southey (who has latterly demonstrated an obdurate concern with property and rank, incompatible with the communal ideals of Pantisocracy) that ‘You are lost to me, because you are lost to virtue’. Less than presciently, in view of Southey’s later role as provider for Coleridge’s wife and children, he adds that ‘this will probably be the last time I shall have occasion to address you’. He diagnoses in Southey what he will later find in Wordsworth: ‘you relapsed: your manners became cold and gloomy’, he complains, and Southey is detected in a tendency to make ‘Self an undiverging Center’.

There is by now a considerable literature dealing with the Wordsworth/Coleridge relationship and its many fascinations. The second section of this book is designed to complement rather than to add to that literature, though Elinor Shaffer’s essay in Part Three appraises the matter in relation to *Biographia Literaria*. A brief comment here, may serve to focus, in a resumptive way, the central creative friendship of Coleridge’s life. Critical endeavour in recent years has identified a number of primary issues. One is the nature of the *Lyrical Ballads* collaboration: was the volume intended to contain two kinds of poems (as proclaimed in *Biographia*), or one as suggested elsewhere? On this question depends the further question as to whether, in the compositional history of that work, we see a case of Wordsworth’s naturalism wilfully marginalising the Coleridgean poetry of the supernatural. Associated with this problem is the question of the theoretical differences between the two poets. A ‘radical difference’ is recognised by Coleridge as early as 1803, but it is most clearly expressed in Coleridge’s misrepresentation, in *Biographia*, of Wordsworth’s views on ‘poetic diction’, and his surprisingly conservative critique of Wordsworth’s practice and precepts from Aristotelian and Johnsonian premises. Recent work—particularly
Lucy Newlyn’s *Echo and Allusion* (1986)—has illuminated the fascinating question of Coleridge’s presence in *The Prelude* as addressee, invoked again and again, yet as one who arrives too late in Wordsworth’s biography to have any significant influence upon his character or his opinions.

This last leads us to the primary question, which has to do with the great work, which, as all agree, Coleridge foisted upon Wordsworth, the writing of *The Recluse*. It is not however in the inception of the work that Coleridge’s influence is most interesting but in its development. The debate about the relative merits of the ‘1805’ and ‘1850’ texts of *The Prelude* is—curiously—conducted almost without reference to the primary determinant of their evolution. For although Coleridge in 1804, in his letter to Sharp, was confident that Wordsworth would in effect be writing ‘the first and finest philosophical poem’ if he could simply achieve ‘a faithful transcript of... his own most habitual feelings and modes of seeing and hearing’ (and although the poetic accolade in ‘To William Wordsworth’ appears to concur with this supposition), there is clearly a conflict between this model and those recollected in 1815 and 1832, which suppose that writing a philosophical poem would involve refuting ‘the sandy Sophisms of Locke’ while demonstrating ‘a manifest Scheme of Redemption’. Writing to Wordsworth in May 1815 he makes it abundantly clear that *The Prelude* was not in Coleridge’s mature view a philosophical poem: ‘This I considered as The EXCURSION’, he says of *The Prelude*, whereas in *The Recluse* ‘I had ... anticipated ... that ... you were to begin a Philosophical Poem’.

This is not the place to demonstrate in detail the degrees to which the revisions of *The Prelude* are compelled by Wordsworth’s need to transform the written poem into an effective substitute for the unwritable *Recluse* and the disappointing *Excursion*. What needs to be examined (and one may hope that Norman Fruman will one day flesh out the many brilliant hints he has hitherto given in this direction) is the extent to which Wordsworth’s thirty year revisionary exercise is driven by the desire to make ‘the poem to Coleridge’ more acceptable in the sight of one who was, if not necessarily *il miglior fabbro*, then certainly ‘the onlie begetter’. In modifying the work from ‘the poem on my own mind’, to a work on the human spirit, Wordsworth also makes *The Prelude* seem less the work of a mind on the move and rather more the testament of one ‘whose mind is made up’: the meditation *ab intra* modulates into a discourse *ab extra*. The style—while often sharper and more powerful—too frequently abandons the homely phrase for greater elegance. One single revision, in which 1805 has the mind ‘breathed upon by a sensation’ where 1850 decides that it was ‘smitten by a sublime idea’, seems characteristic of a shift from an authentic expression of an
animist variant upon Empiricism toward a ventriloquized, and less honest, case for Idealism. The net effect—as well as creating a work of subtler articulation and more epic argument—is to make the poem conform more fully to the Coleridgean prospectus for *The Recluse*.

### 4. FRIEND AND VENTRiloquist

Wordsworth, however, was not the only one who found that his attempts at creative self-definition would be bound up with the fulfilment of Coleridge’s labours. The three essays in Part Two of this book consider the various ways in which Coleridge impinged upon the creative lives of five other friends, and they upon him, in a complex pattern of ventriloquism and cross-insemination. These friends belong to distinct periods in his life. Charles Lamb was of course a friend of Coleridge’s from schooldays. The friendships with Sir Humphry Davy, William Hazlitt and Thomas De Quincey belong to the years of Coleridge’s greatest poetic productivity. The fifth, J. H. Green, first met Coleridge in Highgate in 1817, and became—like James Gillman and John Sterling—one of the conduits through whom Coleridge’s mind coursed into Victorian culture.

The extent to which Lamb, Hazlitt and De Quincey learn from, and contribute to, Coleridge’s labours, and see themselves—with varying degrees of compensatory criticism—working under cover of ‘the greater Ajax’, is considered by Grevel Lindop. His essay will augment the admiration many already feel for Lamb (Coleridge’s oldest and closest friend) as one of the most incisive and sympathetic of critics, by demonstrating the rhetorical skill with which he steered Coleridge’s development towards the style of the ‘conversation poems’. In Hazlitt’s case, the extent of their later estrangement (Coleridge’s epistolary remarks upon Hazlitt are as virulent as Hazlitt’s attacks upon him are vehement) tends to obscure from us how profound was Coleridge’s impact upon Hazlitt’s early development. Lindop enables one to see Hazlitt’s later criticism of Coleridge as correspondent to his early idealisation, and as expressive of Hazlitt’s frustration at finding himself in the position—as he saw it—of pursuing the task of communicating truths which the greater figure had abandoned. Hazlitt comes to identify in Coleridge a desire ‘not to be understood’. His complaint about with wilful obscurity of *Christabel* may, in the light of Coleridge’s later anxieties about finishing his synthetic *magnum opus* lest it lead his readers to question the self-sufficiency of revelation, strike one as having a certain authority and prescience.

Where Hazlitt and Lamb can be seen respectively as one-time protégé and long-
term partner, Lindop suggests, De Quincey’s relation to Coleridge was rather wary and competitive, intellectual rather than personal. The philosophical interests of the two—as students of ‘the Kantian system’—were closer than was the case with either Lamb or Hazlitt. There is, on De Quincey’s part at least, a direct literary rivalry, in which the younger man tries both to outshine and to distance himself from Coleridge’s parallel experiences as opium-addict, using Coleridge’s celebrity as a shield, while advancing against his rival the charge that Coleridge lacked the courage of his addictions. Lindop’s reading of the relationship suggests, too, how De Quincey’s promotion of Coleridge as plagiarist is best seen as part of his dealings with one who, in this dimension also, was ‘a troublesome twin’.

Molly Lefebure and Tim Fulford turn to Coleridge’s closest friends among men of science, Humphry Davy, chemist, and Joseph Henry Green, anatomist. Davy, who first met Coleridge in Bristol, was close to him in the years of Coleridge’s greatest poetic productivity. Lefebure demonstrates how in the friendship with Humphry Davy one can observe a man of science fulfilling in a substantial degree, in works as diverse as Moses and Consolations in Travel, aspects of a Coleridgean Recluse project. Her essay presents a fascinating insight into the way in which the literary and intellectual pursuits of this myriad-minded man run parallel to those of Coleridge. Of all Coleridge’s friends this most poetic and visionary of scientists, ‘Father and Founder of philosophic Alchemy’ as Coleridge would remember him, exercised the most immediate influence on the direction of Coleridge’s own enquiries. It was an earlier and equally illuminating essay by Molly Lefebure on the relations between Coleridge and Davy that led to the conception and design of this collection of essays.

Joseph Henry Green, Professor of Anatomy at the Royal College of Surgeons, is popularly familiar to literary students mainly because he features in the anatomical education of John Keats (Green was Demonstrator of Anatomy at Guy’s Hospital where Keats learned anatomy and physiology) and is mentioned in Keats’s famous reminiscence of an encounter with Coleridge on Hampstead Heath. Green was just twenty-six when he first met Coleridge, in 1817, and at the start of his highly distinguished medical career (a distinction which owed something to the philosophical nuances which Coleridge’s influence imparted to his anatomical lectures). In later years, after his retirement from medicine, Green applied himself to a programme of study almost as ambitious as the youthful Humphry Davy’s in order to prepare himself for the task of piecing together Coleridge’s thought. His Spiritual Philosophy: Founded upon the Teaching of the Late S. T. Coleridge was published posthumously in 1865. Tim Fulford’s study of the interaction of Coleridge and J. H. Green demon-
strates how Green’s distinction as a professor and a lecturer gave Coleridge a vicarious extension to his own lecturing career. Both had studied in Germany, and together they were able to refine ideas which they had independently derived from those earlier studies, especially from Kant, Schelling and Solger. Examining this collaborative revision of shared sources the essay demonstrates the extent of their mutual indebtedness, and the value of Green’s aesthetics to Coleridge’s epistemology.

Fulford’s essay also puts into a fresh context the problem of Coleridge’s notorious ‘definitions’ of primary and secondary imagination in the truncated thirteenth chapter of *Biographia*. There are many problems to do with Coleridge’s definitions. Nothing said in them seems directly to correspond to Wordsworth’s view of imagination as ‘Reason in her most exalted mood’, or to Shelley’s view of it as ‘the instrument of moral good’. Although primary imagination is defined as the ‘agent of all human perception’, the inclusion of the word ‘all’ seems to recognise that some perception is more perceptive than others. Beauty, as Fulford points out, ‘is first an act of perception’. So, of course, are wholeness, meaning, and relation. The perennial argument about whether primary imagination gives us merely the world of ‘motor-buses, beef-steaks and acquaintances’ (in I. A. Richards’s phrase), or also the fresh creation at the opening of Wordsworth’s *The Leech-Gatherer*, or whether—as some believe—it enables us to ‘see into the life of things’, is barely soluble in the terms Coleridge gives us. The definitions of secondary imagination and fancy seem curiously preoccupied with the aesthetic, yet when applied to poetry they seem too brief and too tendentious to be of use as a critical tool. When we are told in *Biographia Chapter 22* that Wordsworth possessed ‘imagination in the highest sense of the word’, we are left to guess just what that highest sense might be. Clearly Coleridge has left us all in the air. Tim Fulford’s contribution to this debate is to argue that Green’s work offered ‘the only public completion’ of Coleridge’s theory of Imagination in aesthetic terms, and that Green also places this in the context of ‘the imagination’s production of a moral transcendence.’ What enabled him to do so, of course, is the shared German connection.

5. THE GERMAN CONNECTION

Coleridge’s German connection began with the visit to the ageing poet Klopstock in September 1798, in which conversation was held in the main through the medium of Wordsworth’s French. After a period of language study Coleridge settled in Göttingen. This choice was not accidental. English Unitarians were at this time receptive to the
new German sciences, and especially to the new developments in critical exegesis of the Bible. Thomas Beddoes, who enjoyed a personal reputation in Germany, had friends in Göttingen. Among them was J. G. Eichhorn, Orientalist and pioneer of modern biblical criticism, with whose work Coleridge was already familiar—through Beddoes—before he left Bristol. In Göttingen he also attended the physiology lectures of the famous anthropologist J. F. Blumenbach, and became acquainted with T. C. Tychsen, the philologist. During this period Coleridge conceived the notion of writing a Life of Lessing (then notorious for the corrosiveness of his own Biblical researches) from which project Davy later discouraged him. In 1805/6, during his circuitous return from Malta, he met Wilhelm von Humboldt, and also Ludwig Tieck with whom a long and productive friendship developed.

In 1828, when he visited Germany again in the company of Wordsworth and Dora, Coleridge was welcomed as a celebrity in his own right, and among those who called was August Wilhelm Schlegel. In the interim he had of course become notable as a communicant of German intellectual culture, and in his transmission of the ideas of Kant, Schelling, Fichte, Tetens, and the Schlegels, had posed for posterity immense problems regarding the independence and the cogency of his thought in metaphysics and aesthetics, as well as the degree to which some of his central preoccupations are determined, or merely enriched, by his acquaintance with German thought. The first of Coleridge’s editors to confront these problems was the most brilliant of his own progeny, Sara Coleridge.

Despite his poetic preoccupations with Nature and Imagination, Coleridge is indubitably concerned in the first place and the last place with religion. In this preoccupation lies the explanation of why it is that ‘the most imaginative of poets’ refuses to follow German thought uncritically in its most characteristic excesses as regards Naturphilosophie and the liberty of Imagination. Attracted as he was to the work of the Naturphilosophen—their search for a holistic explanation of creation, and their dynamic model of nature, based upon the dialectical principle of polarity, could not fail to appeal to the Coleridge of the Notebooks—he baulked at the anti-Biblical implications, in Schelling especially, of the self-subsistence of nature, and at the erosion in their work of any real sense of the separateness of the creator from creation, or indeed of body and soul.

When, for example, Coleridge confuses everyone by writing of primary imagination in scriptural terms—’The primary IMAGINATION I hold to be the living Power and prime AGENT of all human perception, and as a repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I AM’—he does so because he wishes to
redeem imagination, as a spiritual faculty, from the implications of infidel theories of mind. The philosophical context of the *Biographia* definition is Coleridge’s first attempt to synthesise the German ‘dynamic system’ (which he has been gaily plagiarizing) with the Christian, while continuing his refutation of British empiricism. His language is designed to establish that imagination is not, as Naturphilosophie might imply, a simple outgrowth of nature, an eruption in man of nature’s creative principle, but instead is that characteristic in man which transcends nature, and links him with God. At the same time, since in Coleridge’s view, ‘any system based upon the passivity of mind must be false’, he makes it abundantly clear that even in such basic perceptual activity the mind is exercising a creative and self-affirming power (‘I perceive therefore I exist’). In effect he offers a definition of perceptual activity which—while not precisely Fichtean—does most impressively call attention to the activity of mind in constituting its world. That it is not precisely Fichtean is adequately shown by the insistence that what the mind creates, as it marshalls its disparate data into meaningful wholes and relationships, is indeed a ‘repetition’ rather than a perverse variation upon creation. Nature is, in Coleridge, a given: neither the Absolute, nor the product of solipsistic ego-activity. Furthermore, God continues to uphold his creation, so what we reflect is ‘the eternal act of creation in the infinite I AM’.

The question of the degree of coincidence between what Coleridge found in German work, and what he himself brought to the redefinition of these materials, is illuminatingly explored by James Engell in his comprehensive essay on Coleridge’s transmission and revision of German idealism. The essay suggests that not only Coleridge’s ideas about religion, and imagination, but also his contributions to thought about mimesis and hermeneutics, the subjects of the two subsequent essays, all owed much to the same foundation, namely his grounding in the principles or first postulates of German metaphysics. While it is this fresh perspective that will interest the specialist, Engell’s essay will prove enlightening to readers with little previous exposure to transcendental idealism. In particular, Engell reminds us that both Schelling and Coleridge were concerned to overturn a materialist philosophy ‘according to which there can be neither poetry, religion nor love’.

Frederick Burwick contributes an exacting study of the precise use to which Coleridge put the work of Schelling in his discrimination between ‘copy’ and ‘imitation’; that is, between the unreality, inertia and redundance which we would experience if art were concerned with ‘copy’ and the mythopoeic activity engaged in ‘imitation’. This aspect of his aesthetic theory is quite as central, Burwick argues, as the more celebrated distinction between fancy and imagination. Mimetic art has as
its purpose, according to Schelling, the accomplishment of a task which the philoso-
pher can only contemplate; the revelation of the essential coincidence of mind and
nature. All art, on this definition, is mythological, and an expression of the quest for
reunion. What Coleridge makes of Schelling’s formative contribution to this ques-
tion of aesthetics is, similarly, the essay suggests, a creative mimesis rather than a
passive imitation: Coleridge enriches his extensive appropriations from Schelling,
and derives from Schelling’s premises a very different set of implications, partly as
regards the relation between the infinite ‘I AM’ and the conscious self-affirming will
of the individual artist.

For Coleridge the act of reading was above all a matter of entering a relationship
with another mind. Like Kierkegaard he was a natural hermeneut. In the final essay
on The German Connection E. S. Shaffer contributes a study of Coleridge in relation
to the theologian, Friedrich Schleiermacher, a kindred spirit in many ways but par-
ticularly in his extension of hermeneutic methods, hitherto confined to the study of
the Bible and classical texts, to the reading of modern literary—and particularly of
course Romantic—texts. Her essay relates the issue of evolving a general hermeneutic
to the strategy and assumptions of Biographia, which work she sees as ‘a search for
a method’, and as belonging to a genre originated by Giambattista Vico, the nine-
teenth-century Neapolitan professor of Rhetoric, whose works are founding texts in
the developing study of the humanities. What others have seen as Coleridge’s foren-
sic dismemberment of Wordsworth’s theory and practice in the course of Biographia,
Shaffer sees as an effort to set Wordsworth within the ‘colloquy of past and present
minds’, a transhistorical community. In Coleridge’s allusiveness, and the curiously
‘intertextual’ form of his most characteristic productions—poetic texts either built
upon dialogue or embedded in their own commentaries—Shaffer finds manifesta-
tions of what Bakhtin calls ‘internal heterology’, or a dialogue of styles, avoiding
pure and unmediated authorial discourse. Biographia, ingeniously, is presented as the
aesthetic realisation of the ideal community of Pantisocracy.

6. THE AMERICAN CONNECTION: FROM PANTISOCRACY TO
TRANSCENDENTALISM

Coleridge’s American connection began, of course, with the Pantisocracy project in
1794, and stemmed (as lan Wylie points out) from his admiration for the Unitarian
sages who emigrated to the new world as political and religious exiles. It was deep-
ened in practical terms during his circuitous return from Malta, in 1805-6, when in
Rome he became a friend of Washington Allston (who painted his portrait). In later years, in the Highgate sanctuary provided by Dr and Mrs Gillman, Coleridge was visited by a procession of American visitors, including, most famously, the writers James Fenimore Cooper and Washington Irving, Dr William Ennery Channing, the leader of the American Unitarians, and Ralph Waldo Emerson.

In Part Four of this book Anthony Harding revisits territory on which he has written with such perspicuity in his study of *Coleridge and the Inspired Word* (1985), and examines more directly than in his book the matter of Coleridge’s relation to American transcendentalism, and his transatlantic status as an embattled prophet of romantic individualism, or—to more conservative opinion—a lonely defender of religious truths. While Fuller, Hedge, Alcott and Thoreau are considered, the heart of the essay is an examination of Emerson’s role as Coleridge’s ‘most original avatar’. It is something of a historical irony that Emerson should meet Coleridge at the moment when the visitor was relinquishing his remaining interest in dogma, and his host was wrestling with the doctrine of the Trinity. As Harding reads the encounter, precisely this dissonance permits and encourages the younger man’s graduation from acolyte to equal: an equality which will paradoxically permit him to glean more from Coleridge after the disappointing visit—and to do so more directly—than he had done before it. A particular concern of the essay is to discriminate Emersonian ‘Reason’ from its Coleridgean and Kantian counterparts. Another is to distil the peculiar nature of Emerson’s communicative art. Indirectly, it seems to me, the essay may also suggest, through a number of its allusions to Wordsworth, as well as some unremarked echoes of Wordsworthian manuscripts, the intriguing possibility that without Coleridge *The Excursion* might have evolved into a more Emersonian work than it already is.

A second figure whose declaration of literary independence is in some degree qualified by a marked transfusion from Coleridge is Edgar Allan Poe. Jonathan Bate’s chapter reconsiders the question of Poe’s indebtedness to Coleridge, taking as his base text the notorious essay on “The Philosophy of Composition’, which he sees as a conscious inversion of Coleridge’s equally notorious stance (in the note to *Kubla Khan*) as the mere amanuensis of inspiration. Poe’s curriculum vitae—as supernatural story teller, critic and theorist, philosophical speculator, author of marginalia, plagiarist and laudanum taker—is, as Bate points out, oddly parallel to that of Coleridge. Each of these Poes is in some degree indebted to his precursor (as a plagiarist, Bate amusingly demonstrates, Poe seems to borrow the very manner of his plagiarism from the elder writer), and these debts have long been catalogued. Their meaning, however, is due for reappraisal in the light of recent rethinking of the nature of literary influence, and
literary colloquy. Approaching this task through an extended reading of Poe’s early tale, *MS Found in a Bottle*, Bate presents the story as not merely a powerful reworking of *The Ancient Mariner*, but as one which, rightly read, may save the poem from its more positivist critics.

7. **SAGE AND EVANGELIST**

The final section of this collection is concerned primarily with the religious dimension of Coleridge’s life and work. There can be little doubt that for many readers the freedom of Coleridge’s early work derives from his rebellion against the Established Church. It certainly gains colour from his conviction that the Church of England is as corrupt as that of Rome: ‘the mark of Antichrist is on both of them’. For some the emerging centre of his Highgate preoccupations, the establishment of a philosophical underpinning of Trinitarian theology, and the exposition of the constitutions and relative positions of Church and State according to the *Idea* of each, is a matter so peripheral to progressive concerns, so essentially defensive, that Coleridge’s self-immersion in such matters, whatever their success, can only be a matter of regret. For others, the insights which Coleridge gave his acolytes in the Church’s nineteenth-century rearguard action—and in particular his role in freeing believers from their indefensible belief in the literal inspiration of the Bible—are an integral manifestation of his Romantic vision. Certainly it is this that gives his life its meaning and its unity. E. S. Shaffer put the matter succinctly in ‘*Kubla Khan*’ and ‘*The Pall of Jerusalem*’ (1975): ‘Unitarianism, then, led Coleridge directly to the German higher criticism’ and in turn ‘the mythological school of German higher criticism enabled him to move away from the immediate reformist concerns of the radicals and towards a new apologetics that ultimately he would use to transform Anglicanism and make it viable for another century’.

H. W. Piper, author of *The Active Universe*, examines the rise and fall of Coleridge as a Unitarian. *Religious Musings*, as a synthesis of Unitarian belief, made Coleridge *persona grata* throughout the Unitarian community, which at that time embraced the most progressive figures in philosophy, science, and manufacturing technology. Such circles subscribed largely to *The Watchman*. The leading dramatis personae in Coleridge’s Unitarian progress are of course William Frend, a Fellow of Jesus, George Dyer and Thomas Beddoes, and John Prior Estlin, Unitarian minister and headmaster: it was another Unitarian, Thomas Wedgwood, whose offer of an annuity would relieve Coleridge from the need to enter formally the Unitarian ministry. Piper
argues that Unitarian beliefs underlie the symbology of the major poems throughout the 1790s, and that his philosophical enquiries in the period between 1800 and 1805 lead him into a phase of ‘negative unitarianism’, rather than to a rejection of it. Not until the Malta journey did Coleridge embrace the Trinitarian faith which he had hitherto found idolatrous.

Robert Barth, however, sees the Unitarian connection as an aberrant interlude in Coleridge’s central relationship with the Anglican church. By reverting to the Anglican communion—‘this Catholic and Apostolic Church in England’—Coleridge enrolled himself again not merely in a theological tradition but in a congenial tradition of thought and language, a sensus communis which extends from those great divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Richard Hooker and Jeremy Taylor, through Coleridge himself, to those who would, with him, undertake both to restore the Church’s declining spirituality and remind it of its social obligations. If Pusey and Newman are more associated with the former aspect of Coleridge’s witness, Dr Arnold and F. D. Maurice (and, one might add, Coleridge’s most concrete legacy to church and clerisy, his son Derwent) are more concerned with the Church as leavening agent.

Since this book was first published in 1990 the impact of Robert Weisbuch’s formative work Atlantic Double-Cross has led to an explosion of transatlantic studies, and to a deepened appreciation of the role of Coleridge in inspiring the thought and the creative literature of American Transcendentalism. The essays by Harding and Bate, above, have helped to fuel that reassessment, and transatlantic studies provide one of the major areas of expansion in the bibliography. Further American connections, and in particular some long-forgotten accounts of Coleridge by American visitors to Highgate in the 1820s, experiencing one of Coleridge’s legendary monologic performances, are the primary concern of John Beer’s essay. One of these records, published here for the first time, includes a remarkable verbatim note of Coleridge’s ideas on the Trinity, as expounded on 1 August 1829 to John Wheeler, later to become President of the University of Vermont. Another is an unsympathetic vignette by John McVickar, who would later make amends in his own edition of Aids to Reflection. In a fascinating sub-plot, illuminated by McVickar’s account, Beer explores the story of Coleridge’s interest in the Scottish orator, Edward Irving, whose involvement in an outbreak of ‘speaking with tongues’—sufficiently prevalent at this time to give rise to fresh speculation about the approach of Apocalypse—led to his dismissal from his ministry and a trial for heresy.
8. THE CARLYLE CONNECTION

In its brief evocation, via John Sterling and A. H. Hallam, of the Cambridge Apostles, Beer’s essay alludes also to those contemporaries who experienced what Basil Willey so poignantly termed, in his essay on Tennyson, ‘that poised uncertainty of the devoutly inclined agnostic mind’. Sterling himself was an acolyte both of Coleridge and of Carlyle, and represents a sort of synthesis of the two. Looking first to Coleridge for resuscitation of the Church, he ultimately lost patience with his mentor’s caution. Instead he turned towards a more Emersonian position, stressing divine immanence where Coleridge increasingly stressed transcendence. Unlike Carlyle, however, he was neither impatient of ideas, nor sceptical of the theological enterprise itself. A more introspective Carlyle, a more latitudinarian Coleridge, Sterling deserves greater credit than he has received as a harbinger of contemporary theology.

Sterling’s example also reminds us of the extent to which Carlyle is, after all, a secular version of Coleridge. There is much to be said for Emerson’s feeling—when reading *Sartor Resartus*—that he ‘had got all that earlier, from Coleridge’: it is hard to imagine a reader who would not feel that from time to time. Among the most thought provoking aspects of the Coleridge connection is the extent to which *Sartor* can be read as an attempt to present the Coleridgean ‘islets’ without the mist—or rather with the mist retranslated, as it were, into *Teufelsprach*, and consciously and rhetorically deployed, in engaging parody, as backdrop to the islets. Within its broader critique of Anglo-German Romanticism, *Sartor Resartus* presents a labour-saving digest of the essential Coleridge designed for rapid infusion into the Victorian drawing room—or indeed the Victorian novel. Its form entwines the mode of *Biographia* with that of Goethe’s *Werther*: in substance it is a transcendentalised *Recluse*, or a realised *Brook*. Idiosyncratic though its style may be, its major preoccupations are Coleridgean. Carlyle’s is the existential Coleridge: one hears him in Teufelsdröck’s urgent question ‘What am I, the thing that can say I’ (even if it is presented as a translation of ‘das Wesen das sich ich nennt’); in the theme of the subjectivity of truth (‘feel it in thy heart ... all else is opinion’); in the work’s haunting anxiety concerning the absenceship of God; and above all in its stress upon the duty of unfolding the self, where Coleridge is of course explicitly cited. Both writers are dedicated to the Blake-like task of reanimating the spiritual form of their country. Carlyle seeks to do so without subjecting it once more to the sartorial shortcomings of the established church.

Coleridge’s genius was equal to any in the nineteenth century: his tragedy, as Carlyle saw so clearly, if unsympathetically, was religion. From that Cain-like moment
in his childhood, when he almost succeeded in killing his brother (it is described in one of the autobiographical letters to Tom Poole, October 1797), the sense of sin came between Coleridge and the public realisation of what he seems to have been born to do—aiding the evolution of a post-Christian sense of the spiritual life. Instead, from an agnostic standpoint, he seems to have devoted much of his life to combating the evolution of such a sense. He left Carlyle and Emerson to suggest what a human-centered mythos might mean, just as he left Hazlitt to represent a continuing sense of political possibilities. Certainly he stood athwart his age in many respects. Yet many ideas which Coleridge refused to foster have already waned, while many which he instigated have yet to be properly valued. His work, especially in the infinitely rewarding notebooks, yields more with every passing year. Our sense of the place of Coleridge in the mind of the nineteenth century—and not least his seminal presence in the more ordered oeuvres of his friends and critics (oeuvres which often achieved the status of scholarly editions decades before the Collected Coleridge emerged to demonstrate Coleridge’s true stature) continues to grow.
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