



CRITICISM

VOLUME

184

Poetry Criticism

*Criticism of the Works
of the Most Significant and Widely
Studied Poets of World Literature*

Volume 184

Lawrence J. Trudeau
Editor

Produced in association with
Layman Poupard Publishing



GALE
CENGAGE Learning®

Farmington Hills, Mich • San Francisco • New York • Waterville, Maine
Meriden, Conn • Mason, Ohio • Chicago



Poetry Criticism, Vol. 184

Layman Poupard Publishing, LLC

Editorial Directors: Richard Layman,
Dennis Poupard

Editorial Production Manager: Janet Hill

Permissions Manager: Kourtney King

Quality Assurance Manager:
Katherine Macedon

Production Technology Manager:
Natalie Fulkerson

Editors:

Eric Barger, Hollis Beach, Christina Petrides

Bibliographer:
Kevin Kyzer

Content Conversion, Data Coding,
Composition: Apex CoVantage, LLC

Advisors to LPP:

Ward W. Briggs
Robert C. Evans
James Hardin
Joel Myerson
Andrew S. Rabin

Volume Advisors:

Noel Jackson, Massachusetts Institute of
Technology (for "Samuel Taylor Coleridge")
Jeremy Venema, Mesa Community College
(for "Alexander Pope")
Albert D. Pionke, The University of Alabama
(for "Augusta Webster")

© 2017 Gale, Cengage Learning

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. No part of this work covered by the copyright herein may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, except as permitted by U.S. copyright law, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

This publication is a creative work fully protected by all applicable copyright laws, as well as by misappropriation, trade secret, unfair competition, and other applicable laws. The authors and editors of this work have added value to the underlying factual material herein through one or more of the following: unique and original selection, coordination, expression, arrangement, and classification of the information.

For product information and technology assistance, contact us at
Gale Customer Support, 1-800-877-4253.

For permission to use material from this text or product,
submit all requests online at www.cengage.com/permissions.

Further permissions questions can be emailed to
permissionrequest@cengage.com

While every effort has been made to ensure the reliability of the information presented in this publication, Gale, a part of Cengage Learning, does not guarantee the accuracy of the data contained herein. Gale accepts no payment for listing; and inclusion in the publication of any organization, agency, institution, publication, service, or individual does not imply endorsement of the editors or publisher. Errors brought to the attention of the publisher and verified to the satisfaction of the publisher will be corrected in future editions.

Gale
27500 Drake Rd.
Farmington Hills, MI, 48331-3535

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER 81-640179

ISBN-13: 978-1-4103-2968-4

ISSN: 1052-4851

Poetry Criticism

Guide to Gale Literary Criticism Series

| For criticism on | Consult these Gale series |
|--|--|
| Authors now living or who died after December 31, 1999 | <i>CONTEMPORARY LITERARY CRITICISM (CLC)</i> |
| Authors who died between 1900 and 1999 | <i>TWENTIETH-CENTURY LITERARY CRITICISM (TCLC)</i> |
| Authors who died between 1800 and 1899 | <i>NINETEENTH-CENTURY LITERATURE CRITICISM (NCLC)</i> |
| Authors who died between 1400 and 1799 | <i>LITERATURE CRITICISM FROM 1400 TO 1800 (LC)</i> <i>SHAKESPEAREAN CRITICISM (SC)</i> |
| Authors who died before 1400 | <i>CLASSICAL AND MEDIEVAL LITERATURE CRITICISM (CMLC)</i> |
| Authors of books for children and young adults | <i>CHILDREN'S LITERATURE REVIEW (CLR)</i> |
| Dramatists | <i>DRAMA CRITICISM (DC)</i> |
| Poets | <i>POETRY CRITICISM (PC)</i> |
| Short story writers | <i>SHORT STORY CRITICISM (SSC)</i> |
| Literary topics and movements | <i>HARLEM RENAISSANCE: A GALE CRITICAL COMPANION (HR)</i> <i>THE BEAT GENERATION: A GALE CRITICAL COMPANION (BG)</i> <i>FEMINISM IN LITERATURE: A GALE CRITICAL COMPANION (FL)</i> <i>GOTHIC LITERATURE: A GALE CRITICAL COMPANION (GL)</i> |
| Asian American writers of the last two hundred years | <i>ASIAN AMERICAN LITERATURE (AAL)</i> |
| Black writers of the past two hundred years | <i>BLACK LITERATURE CRITICISM (BLC)</i> <i>BLACK LITERATURE CRITICISM SUPPLEMENT (BLCS)</i> <i>BLACK LITERATURE CRITICISM: CLASSIC AND EMERGING AUTHORS SINCE 1950 (BLC-2)</i> |
| Hispanic writers of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries | <i>HISPANIC LITERATURE CRITICISM (HLC)</i> <i>HISPANIC LITERATURE CRITICISM SUPPLEMENT (HLCS)</i> |
| Native North American writers and orators of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries | <i>NATIVE NORTH AMERICAN LITERATURE (NNAL)</i> |
| Major authors from the Renaissance to the present | <i>WORLD LITERATURE CRITICISM, 1500 TO THE PRESENT (WLC)</i> <i>WORLD LITERATURE CRITICISM SUPPLEMENT (WLCS)</i> |

Preface

Poetry Criticism (PC) presents significant criticism of the world's greatest poets and provides supplementary biographical and bibliographical material to guide the interested reader to a greater understanding of the genre and its creators. This series was developed in response to suggestions from librarians serving high school, college, and public library patrons, who had noted a considerable number of requests for critical material on poems and poets. Although major poets and literary movements are covered in such Gale Literary Criticism series as *Contemporary Literary Criticism* (CLC), *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism* (TCLC), *Nineteenth-Century Literature Criticism* (NCLC), *Literature Criticism from 1400 to 1800* (LC), and *Classical and Medieval Literature Criticism* (CMLC), librarians perceived the need for a series devoted solely to poets and poetry.

Scope of the Series

PC is designed to serve as an introduction to major poets of all eras and nationalities. Since these authors have inspired a great deal of relevant critical material, PC is necessarily selective, and the editors have chosen the most important published criticism to aid readers and students in their research.

Approximately three to six authors, works, or topics are included in each volume. An author's first entry in the series generally presents a historical survey of the critical response to the author's work; subsequent entries will focus upon contemporary criticism about the author or criticism of an important poem, group of poems, or book. The length of an entry is intended to reflect the amount of critical attention the author has received from critics writing in English and from critics who do not write in English whose criticism has been translated. Every attempt has been made to identify and include the most significant essays on each author's work. In order to provide these important critical pieces, the editors sometimes reprint essays that have appeared elsewhere in Gale's Literary Criticism Series. Such duplication, however, never exceeds twenty percent of a PC volume.

Organization of the Book

Each PC entry consists of the following elements:

- The **Author Heading** cites the name under which the author most commonly wrote, followed by birth and death dates. If the author wrote consistently under a pseudonym, the pseudonym will be listed in the author heading and the author's actual name given in parentheses on the first line of the biographical and critical introduction. Also located here are any name variations under which an author wrote, including transliterated forms for authors whose native languages use nonroman alphabets. Uncertain birth or death dates are indicated by question marks. Single-work entries are preceded by a heading that consists of the most common form of the title in English translation (if applicable) and the author's name (if applicable).
- The **Introduction** contains background information that introduces the reader to the author and the critical debates surrounding his or her work.
- The list of **Principal Works** is ordered chronologically by date of first publication and lists the most important works by the author. The first section comprises poetry collections, book-length poems, and theoretical works by the author about poetry. The second section gives information on other major works by the author. In the case of authors who do not write in English, an English translation of the title is provided as an aid to the reader; the translation is either a published translated title or a free translation provided by the compiler of the entry. In the case of such authors whose works have been translated into English, the **Principal English Translations** focuses primarily on twentieth-century translations, selecting those works most commonly considered the best by critics.
- Reprinted **Criticism** is arranged chronologically in each entry to provide a useful perspective on changes in critical evaluation over time. All individual titles of poems, poetry collections, and theoretical works about poetry by the

author featured in the entry are printed in boldface type. The critic's name and the date of composition or publication of the critical work are given at the beginning of each piece of criticism. Unsigned criticism is preceded by the title of the source in which it appeared. Footnotes are reprinted at the end of each essay or excerpt. In the case of excerpted criticism, only those footnotes that pertain to the excerpted texts are included.

- A complete **Bibliographical Citation** of the original essay or book precedes each piece of criticism. Citations conform to recommendations set forth in the Modern Language Association of America's *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*, 7th ed. (2009).
- Critical essays are prefaced by brief **Annotations** describing each piece.
- An annotated bibliography of **Further Reading** appears at the end of each entry and suggests resources for additional study. In some cases, significant essays for which the editors could not obtain reprint rights are included here. Boxed material following the further reading list provides references to other biographical and critical sources on the author in series published by Gale.

Cumulative Indexes

A **Cumulative Author Index** lists all of the authors that appear in a wide variety of reference sources published by Gale, including *PC*. A complete list of these sources is found facing the first page of the Author Index. The index also includes birth and death dates and cross references between pseudonyms and actual names.

A **Cumulative Topic Index** lists the literary themes and topics treated in *PC* as well as in *Classical and Medieval Literature Criticism*, *Literature Criticism from 1400 to 1800*, *Nineteenth-Century Literature Criticism*, *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism*, *Contemporary Literary Criticism*, *Drama Criticism*, *Short Story Criticism*, and *Children's Literature Review*.

A **Cumulative Nationality Index** lists all authors featured in *PC* by nationality, followed by the number of the *PC* volume in which their entry appears.

An alphabetical **Title Index** lists all individual poems, book-length poems, collection titles, and theoretical works about poetry contained in each volume of *PC*. Titles of poetry collections and separately published poems are printed in italics, while titles of individual poems are printed in roman type with quotation marks. Each title is followed by the author's last name and corresponding volume and page numbers where commentary on the work is located. English translations of titles published in other languages and variations of titles are cross-referenced to the title under which a work was originally published so that all references to discussion of a work are combined in one listing. All titles reviewed in *PC* and in the other Literary Criticism Series can be found online in the *Gale Literary Index*.

Citing Poetry Criticism

When citing criticism reprinted in the Literary Criticism Series, students should provide complete bibliographic information so that the cited essay can be located in the original print or electronic source. Students who quote directly from reprinted criticism may use any accepted bibliographic format, such as Modern Language Association (MLA) style or University of Chicago Press style. Both the MLA and the University of Chicago formats are acceptable and recognized as being the current standards for citations. It is important, however, to choose one format for all citations; do not mix the two formats within a list of citations.

The examples below follow recommendations for preparing a works cited list set forth in the Modern Language Association of America's *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*, 7th ed. (New York: MLA, 2009); the first example pertains to material drawn from periodicals, the second to material reprinted from books:

Linkin, Harriet Kramer. "The Language of Speakers in *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*." *Romanticism Past and Present* 10.2 (1986): 5-24. Rpt. in *Poetry Criticism*. Ed. Michelle Lee. Vol. 63. Detroit: Gale, 2005. 79-88. Print.

Glen, Heather. "Blake's Criticism of Moral Thinking in *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*." *Interpreting Blake*. Ed. Michael Phillips. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1978. 32-69. Rpt. in *Poetry Criticism*. Ed. Michelle Lee. Vol. 63. Detroit: Gale, 2005. 34-51. Print.

The examples below follow recommendations for preparing a bibliography set forth in *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 16th ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010); the first example pertains to material drawn from periodicals, the second to material reprinted from books:

Linkin, Harriet Kramer. "The Language of Speakers in *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*." *Romanticism Past and Present* 10, no. 2 (summer 1986): 5-24. Rpt. in *Poetry Criticism*. Edited by Michelle Lee. Vol. 63. Detroit: Gale, 2005. 79-88. Print.

Glen, Heather. "Blake's Criticism of Moral Thinking in *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*." In *Interpreting Blake*, edited by Michael Phillips. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978. 32-69. Rpt. in *Poetry Criticism*. Edited by Michelle Lee. Vol. 63. Detroit: Gale, 2005. 34-51. Print.

Suggestions Are Welcome

Readers who wish to suggest new features, topics, or authors to appear in future volumes, or who have other suggestions or comments, are cordially invited to call, write, or fax the Product Manager:

Product Manager, Literary Criticism Series
Gale
Cengage Learning
27500 Drake Road
Farmington Hills, MI 48331-3535
1-800-347-4253 (GALE)
Fax: 248-699-8884

Acknowledgments

The editors wish to thank the copyright holders of the criticism included in this volume and the permissions managers of many book and magazine publishing companies for assisting us in securing reproduction rights. Following is a list of copyright holders who have granted us permission to reproduce material in this volume of *PC*. Every effort has been made to trace copyright, but if omissions have been made, please let us know.

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL IN *PC*, VOLUME 184, WAS REPRODUCED FROM THE FOLLOWING PERIODICALS:

Australasian Victorian Studies Journal, v. 10, 2004 for “‘Present in the Drama’: The Literary Drama of Augusta Webster” by Patricia Rigg. Copyright © 2004 Patricia Rigg. Reproduced by permission of the author.—*CLA Journal*, v. 6.1, 1962. Public domain.—*College English*, v. 11.3, 1949; v. 20.4, 1959. Both public domain.—*Connotations*, v. 17.2-3, 2007-08. Copyright © 2007-08 Connotations Society for Critical Debate and Waxmann Verlag Münster/New York. Reproduced by permission of *Connotations*.—*Critical Survey*, v. 5.3, 1971. Copyright © 1971 Berghahn Books. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—*Durham University Journal*, ns v. 40, 1978. Copyright © 1978 *Durham University Journal*. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—*ELH*, v. 17.1, 1950; v. 21.1, 1954. Both public domain.—*Kenyon Review*, v. 15.1, 1953. Copyright © 1953 *Kenyon Review*. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—*MLN: Modern Language Notes*, v. 21.7, 1906; v. 72.4, 1957; v. 76.6, 1961. All public domain.—*MLQ: Modern Language Quarterly*, v. 8.3, 1947; v. 24.1, 1963. Both public domain.—*MLR: Modern Language Review*, v. 7.1, 1912. Public domain.—*Nineteenth-Century Gender Studies*, v. 6.1, 2010; v. 6.3, 2010. Copyright © 2010 *Nineteenth-Century Gender Studies*. Both reproduced by permission of the publisher.—*Philological Quarterly*, v. 41.4, 1962. Public domain; v. 86.3, 2007. Copyright © 2007 Department of English, University of Iowa. Reproduced by permission of *Philological Quarterly*.—*PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, v. 65.6, 1950; v. 69.4, 1954. Both public domain; v. 86.5, 1971; v. 90.5, 1975; v. 120.1, 2005. Copyright © 1971, 1975, 2005 Modern Language Association of America. All reproduced by permission of the publisher.—*SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, v. 16.3, 1976. Copyright © 1976 Rice University. Reproduced by permission of *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*.—*Studies in English*, v. 15, 1935; v. 24, 1945. Both public domain.—*Studies in Philology*, v. 48.1, 1951. Public domain.—*Studies in the Literary Imagination*, v. 44.1, 2011 for “‘Anxious Cares’: From Pope’s Spleen to Coleridge’s Dejection” by Michael O’Neill. Copyright © 2011 Michael O’Neill. Reproduced by permission of the author.—*Tennessee Studies in Literature*, v. 25, 1980 for “‘Well Our Pow’r to Use’: The Meaning of Clarissa’s Speech in *The Rape of the Lock*” by Charles Scruggs. Copyright © 1980 Charles Scruggs; v. 37, 1995 for “Mocking the Heroic? A Context for *The Rape of the Lock*” by Nigel Wood. Copyright © 1995 Nigel Wood. Both reproduced by permission of the authors.—*Victorian Poetry*, v. 51.4, 2013. Copyright © 2013 *Victorian Poetry*/West Virginia University Press. Reproduced by permission of *Victorian Poetry*.—*Victorian Review*, v. 17.1, 1991; v. 26.2, 2000. Copyright © 1991, 2000 Victorian Studies Association of Western Canada. Both reproduced by permission of *Victorian Review*.—*Wordsworth Circle*, v. 4.4, 1973. Copyright © 1973 *Wordsworth Circle*. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL IN *PC*, VOLUME 184, WAS REPRODUCED FROM THE FOLLOWING BOOKS:

Magnuson, Paul. From *Coleridge and Wordsworth: A Lyrical Dialogue*. Princeton University Press, 1988. Copyright © 1988 Princeton University Press. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—O’Brien, Lee Christine. From *The Romance of the Lyric in Nineteenth-Century Women’s Poetry: Experiments in Form*. University of Delaware Press, 2013. Copyright © 2013 Lee Christine O’Brien. Reproduced by permission of Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.—Paulson, Ronald. From *Acts of Narrative*. Ed. Carol Jacobs and Henry Sussman. Stanford University Press, 2003. Copyright © 2003 Board of Trustees of Leland Stanford Junior University. Reproduced by permission of Stanford University Press.—Potter, Tiffany. From *Women, Popular Culture, and the Eighteenth Century*. Ed. Potter. University of Toronto Press, 2012. Copyright © 2012 University of Toronto Press. Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—Slinn, E. Warwick. From *Victorian Poetry as Cultural Critique: The Politics of Performative Language*. University of Virginia Press, 2003. Copyright © 2003 Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia. Reproduced by permission of University of Virginia Press.—Sutphin, Christine. From *Augusta Webster: Portraits and Other Poems*. By Augusta Webster. Ed. Sutphin. Broadview, 2000. Copyright © 2000 Christine Sutphin. Reproduced by permission of Broadview Press.

Contents

Preface vii

Acknowledgments xi

| | |
|---|-----|
| Samuel Taylor Coleridge 1772-1834 | 1 |
| <i>Entry devoted to the poem "Dejection: An Ode" (1802)</i> | |
| Alexander Pope 1688-1744 | 85 |
| <i>Entry devoted to the poem "The Rape of the Lock" (1712)</i> | |
| Augusta Webster 1837-1894 | 223 |
| <i>English poet, playwright, essayist, translator, and novelist</i> | |

Literary Criticism Series Cumulative Author Index 327

Literary Criticism Series Cumulative Topic Index 449

PC Cumulative Nationality Index 473

PC-184 Title Index 477

“Dejection: An Ode”

Samuel Taylor Coleridge

English poet, critic, essayist, dramatist, and journalist.

The following entry provides criticism of Coleridge’s poem “Dejection: An Ode” (1802; rev. 1817). For additional information about Coleridge, see *PC*, Volume 11; for additional information about the poem “Kubla Khan,” see *PC*, Volume 39; for additional information about the collection *Lyrical Ballads*, by Coleridge and William Wordsworth, see *PC*, Volume 67; for additional information about the poem “The Rime of the Ancient Mariner,” see *PC*, Volume 100.

INTRODUCTION

An important lyric poem of the early Romantic period, “Dejection: An Ode,” by Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772–1834), concerns the speaker’s dejection and loss of poetic inspiration, which becomes the occasion for a meditation on the imagination—particularly, its role as the engine of poetry and wellspring of joy. The poem was first drafted as a love letter in verse to Sara Hutchinson, future sister-in-law of Coleridge’s friend the poet William Wordsworth, in early April 1802. Over the next several months, Coleridge significantly cut and reorganized the verses, removing personal references to his own childhood and to Hutchinson and Wordsworth—both are addressees of the poem in separate drafts—and shifting the focus from unrequited love to questions of inspiration, creativity, and joy. The poem was first published in the London *Morning Post* on 4 October 1802 and underwent several revisions before the final version appeared in the volume *Sibylline Leaves* (1817).

Scholars consider “Dejection” particularly important in the context of Coleridge and Wordsworth’s long-standing poetic collaboration. They were friends who engaged in philosophical discussion about the source of poetic inspiration and human imagination, as well as the role of the natural world in each. The poem is frequently read alongside the first few stanzas of Wordsworth’s “Ode: Intimations of Immortality” (1807), a draft of which Coleridge read in March 1802, and “Resolution and Independence” (1807), which Wordsworth began in early May 1802 after reading the first draft of “Dejection.”

FORM AND SUBJECT

Written in the first person, “Dejection” is a meditative example of the English ode, a long poetic form in irregular stanzas that follows a structure laid down by Pindar, the ancient Greek poet credited with inventing the ode. Whereas the traditional English ode, which was in vogue in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, tends to celebrate a public occasion such as the birth or wedding of exalted personages, the Romantic ode uses the elevated language of the traditional form to speak intimately about the self. In Coleridge’s poem, the speaker, a stand-in for the poet himself, complains in verse about his loss of poetic inspiration.

The 1817 version of “Dejection,” which is generally considered authoritative, comprises eight long stanzas, or strophes, prefaced by a quotation from the medieval ballad “Sir Patrick Spens” (1765). This epigraph describes the image of the new moon rising “with the old Moon in her arms,” a phenomenon portending the coming of “a deadly storm.” In the first stanza of the poem proper, the speaker observes the similarity of this poetic representation with the night sky, in which “the New-moon winter bright! / And overspread with phantom light” holds “the old Moon in her lap, foretelling / The coming on of rain and squally blast.” Claiming that he can already feel the storm approaching, the speaker hopes the storm will “startle this dull pain, and make it move and live,” alleviating the numbness and depression he feels. In stanzas 2 and 3, he invokes the unnamed “Lady,” and describes his dejection as “a grief without a pang . . . which finds no natural outlet, no relief.” He cannot palliate this dejection by crying or writing, and it prevents him from feeling the beauty of nature. When he looks at the stars and the moon, he can only “see, not feel, how beautiful they are” because those images are only “outward forms”; what he is missing is “the passion and the life, whose fountains are within.” Stanzas 4 and 5 lay out Coleridge’s theory of poetic inspiration, describing the mechanism of joy in effusive stanzas. “O Lady!” he exclaims, “we receive but what we give, / And in our life alone does Nature live.”

According to the poet, we are not made alive by nature; rather, the self illuminates and vivifies the world, and from the self “must issue forth / A light, a glory, a fair luminous cloud / Enveloping the Earth” and a “sweet and potent voice, of its own birth / Of all sweet sounds the life and

element!" In stanza 6, he elaborates on this "strong music in the soul," which he calls Joy, explaining that it originates in the human perceiver and is the source of art. From it "flows all that charms or ear or sight, / All melodies the echoes of that voice, / All colours a suffusion from that light." In stanza 6, Coleridge expands on the relationship between Joy, hope, and the imagination, observing that when he was younger he had both hope and joy but that, of late, "afflictions bow me down to earth." Although he claims not to mind the loss of "mirth," he cannot bear the corresponding loss of his creative capacities. After each episode of depression, he loses a little more of "what nature gave me at my birth, / My shaping spirit of Imagination." In stanza 7, the speaker attempts to elude "viper thoughts, that coil around my mind" by turning to "the wind, / Which long has raved unnoticed." Hailing the wind as a "Mad Lutanist" and a "mighty Poet, e'en to frenzy bold," he describes it as singing a great battle song as well as a quieter lyric about a lost child. Many critics identify this tale "of a little child / Upon a lonesome wild" as Wordsworth's poem "Lucy Gray." In the final stanza, the poet, who accepts that he will not rest, asks "Sleep" instead to visit his Lady and bestow upon her the peaceful night, the Joy, and the inspiration that he dare not hope for himself.

MAJOR THEMES

The last of Coleridge's major poetic works, "Dejection" is a mature articulation of the poet's aesthetic philosophy that focuses particularly on the relationship between the natural world, human senses, and the mind. While the poem describes Coleridge's dejection in terms that prefigure the modern understanding of depression, "Dejection" is more about the loss of inspiration and imaginative capacity than it is about sadness or depressive mood. Indeed, the revisions to the original verse letter to Hutchinson illustrate its transformation from a reflection on Coleridge's state of mind in a particular moment—one that takes in the effects of interpersonal relations, his poor health, and his low creative output—into an attempt to anatomize a state of dejection and imaginative crisis that is not primarily the result of misfortune but springs from the innermost self. Where the verse letter conflates the poet's unhappiness in his marriage and his unresolved feelings for Hutchinson with his fear that he is losing his poetic ability, the poem omits the biographical details of Coleridge's love life, leaving a meditation on what he sees as his essential melancholy, a dejection rooted in his awareness that he has lost the "shaping spirit of Imagination."

In partial contrast to Wordsworth, who never fails to find inspiration in natural beauty, Coleridge locates the sources

of imagination, joy, and beauty in the individual mind. The storm could not fill him with joy, for only he could fill himself with joy. Where Wordsworth frequently turns to the natural world to relieve his melancholy, Coleridge's melancholy is stunting precisely because it prevents a full and restorative aesthetic experience. When in a natural setting, he feels worse because he can see the natural forms and know that they are beautiful, but he is not capable of feeling their beauty. Coleridge's difference from his colleague is underscored by Coleridge's meditation in stanza 4 on how dejection has beset him. In the first lines of Wordsworth's "Ode: Intimations of Immortality," the poet declares, "There was a time when meadow, grove, and stream, / The earth, and every common sight, / To me did seem / Apparell'd in celestial light," but now he cannot see that light for "there hath pass'd away a glory from the earth." Coleridge echoes Wordsworth's opening line, and yet the source of his dejection is located more decisively in the poet's own mind: once, "Fancy made me dreams of happiness" from his misfortunes, for "hope grew round me," but "now afflictions bow me down to earth."

CRITICAL RECEPTION

The critical writing on "Dejection" is considerable, dating back to the poem's publication and addressing a wide range of issues including its importance to the genre of the Romantic ode and to Coleridge's conception of the Romantic imagination, the link between dejection or melancholy and the Romantic ethos, and the poem's relationship to the literary friendship between Wordsworth and Coleridge. Critics have also considered the poem in relation to the ideas of Coleridge, other Romantic poets, and later poets about the making of poetry, the role of the poet, and the relationship between the outward world and the inner self. Robert Daniel (1953) identified "Dejection" and John Keats's "Ode to a Nightingale" (1819) as prototypes of a subset of the Romantic ode that he called the "Romantic Lament." In such a poem, according to Daniel, the speaker meditates on his own melancholy in a setting that partially represents the speaker's mood while also providing an "ironic contrast to it," and there is a profound sense of the poet's alienation from the world, an alienation frequently identified by readers and critics with the Romantic sensibility. Charles S. Bouslog (1963) compared the published form of "Dejection" to the draft verse letter that Coleridge composed in April 1802, arguing that his concern in editing and revising was "concealment" rather than "aesthetics." Bouslog suggested that the poem is less effective than previous critics have generally held, that it would be equally or more effective if it ended with the last line of stanza 5,

and that Coleridge adhered too much to logical argumentation at the expense of aesthetics. Panthea Reid Broughton (1973) analyzed the poem in the context of Coleridge's view that "the perceiver is a participant in and shaper of experience," arguing that the central theme of "Dejection" is the Romantic "truism" that "reality as perceived is a joint product of the other and of the self." According to Broughton, Coleridge wrote "Dejection" in the present tense to demonstrate the shaping power of language and to capture the interplay between language and the creative process. A. Harris Fairbanks (1975) situated the poem within a history of the lyric, identifying it as the first example of the Romantic ode, a subset of what M. H. Abrams called the "greater Romantic lyric" that yokes together the "personal style and immediacy" of the Romantic conversation poem and the grandeur and magnitude of the "English greater ode." Paul Magnuson (1988) analyzed the poem in the context of the collaboration between Coleridge and Wordsworth, focusing on how "Dejection" responds to Wordsworth's "Ode: Intimations of Immortality," the transformation of the verse letter to Hutchinson into the published poem, and Wordsworth's writing of "Resolution and Independence" as a reply to "Dejection." Hisaaki Yamanouchi (1972; see Further Reading) provided a close reading of Coleridge's poem, detailing the central concepts and tropes and arguing that the work is ultimately optimistic, with "a potential for joy," since the poet still remembers that emotion and wishes for his lady to possess it.

Jenny Ludwig

Academic Advisor: Noel Jackson,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

PRINCIPAL WORKS

Poetry

Poems on Various Subjects. With Charles Lamb and Robert Southey. London: Robinsons and Robinsons, 1796. Rev. ed. *Poems.* Bristol: Biggs, 1797. Rev. ed. London: Biggs, 1803. Print.

Fears in Solitude, Written in 1798, during the Alarm of an Invasion. To Which Are Added, France, an Ode; and Frost at Midnight. London: Johnson, 1798. Print.

Lyrical Ballads, with a Few Other Poems. With William Wordsworth. Bristol: Biggs and Cottle, 1798. Rev. ed. 2 vols. London: Longman and Rees, 1800. Rev. ed. London: Longman and Rees, 1802. Print.

Christabel; Kubla Khan, a Vision; The Pains of Sleep. London: Bulmer, 1816. Print.

**Sibylline Leaves: A Collection of Poems.* London: Fenner, 1817. Print.

The Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge Including the Dramas of Wallenstein, Remorse, and Zapolya. 3 vols. London: Pickering, 1828. Print. (Plays and poetry)

The Devil's Walk; a Poem. By Professor Porson. With Southey. London: Marsh and Miller, 1830. Print.

The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Ed. Ernest Hartley Coleridge. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1912. Print.

Other Major Works

The Fall of Robespierre. An Historic Drama. With Southey. Cambridge: Flower, 1794. Print. (Play)

Conciones ad Populum. Or, Addresses to the People. Bristol: n.p., 1795. Print. (Nonfiction)

A Moral and Political Lecture, Delivered at Bristol. Bristol: Routh, 1795. Print. (Lecture)

The Plot Discovered; or, An Address to the People, against Ministerial Treason. Bristol: n.p., 1795. Print. (Nonfiction)

The Watchman. 10 issues. 1 Mar.-13 May 1796. Print. (Journal)

The Friend; a Literary, Moral, and Political Weekly Paper, Excluding Personal and Party Politics, and the Events of the Day. 27 parts and one supernumerary. 1 June 1809-15 Mar. 1810. Pub. as *The Friend; a Series of Essays.* London: Gale and Curtis, 1812. Print. (Journal)

Omniana, or Horæ Otiosiores. With Southey. 2 vols. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1812. Print. (Prose)

Remorse. A Tragedy, in Five Acts. London: Pople, 1813. Print. (Play)

The Statesman's Manual; or, The Bible the Best Guide to Political Skill and Foresight: A Lay Sermon, Addressed to the Higher Classes of Society, with an Appendix, Containing Comments and Essays Connected with the Study of the Inspired Writings. London: Gale and Fenner, 1816. Print. (Nonfiction)

Biographia Literaria; or, Biographical Sketches of My Literary Life and Opinions. 2 vols. London: Fenner, 1817. Print. (Autobiography and criticism)

A Lay Sermon, Addressed to the Higher and Middle Classes, on the Existing Distresses and Discontents. London: Gale and Fenner, 1817. Print. (Nonfiction)

Zapolya: A Christmas Tale, in Two Parts. London: Fenner, 1817. Print. (Play)

The Grounds of Sir Robert Peel's Bill Vindicated. London: Clowes, 1818. Print. (Nonfiction)

Remarks on the Objections Which Have Been Urged against the Principle of Sir Robert Peel's Bill. London: Clowes, 1818. Print. (Nonfiction)

Aids to Reflection in the Formation of a Manly Character on the Several Grounds of Prudence, Morality, and Religion: Illustrated by Select Passages from Our Elder Divines, Especially from Archbishop Leighton. London: Taylor and Hessey, 1825. Print. (Nonfiction)

On the Constitution of the Church and State, according to the Idea of Each: With Aids toward a Right Judgment on the Late Catholic Bill. London: Hurst, Chance, 1830. Print. (Nonfiction)

Specimens of the Table Talk of the Late Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge. 2 vols. London: Murray, 1835. Print. (Nonfiction)

The Literary Remains of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge. 4 vols. London: Pickering, 1836-39. Print. (Criticism)

Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit. Ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge. London: Pickering, 1840. Print. (Nonfiction)

Hints towards the Formation of a More Comprehensive Theory of Life. Ed. Seth B. Watson. London: Churchill, 1848. Print. (Essays)

Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare and Some of the Old Poets and Dramatists with Other Literary Remains. Ed. Sara Coleridge. London: Pickering, 1849. Print. (Criticism and lectures)

Essays on His Own Times; Forming a Second Series of "The Friend." Ed. Sara Coleridge. 3 vols. London: Pickering, 1850. Print. (Essays)

The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Ed. William Greenough Thayer Shedd. 7 vols. New York: Harper, 1853. Print. (Autobiography, essays, fragments, journals, lectures, nonfiction, poetry, and prose)

Seven Lectures upon Shakespeare and Milton. Ed. John Payne Collier. London: Chapman and Hall, 1856. Print. (Criticism)

The Philosophical Lectures of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Ed. Kathleen Coburn. London: Pilot, 1949. Print. (Lectures)

Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Ed. Earl L. Griggs. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1956-71. Print. (Letters)

The Notebooks of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Ed. Coburn. 5 vols. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957-2002. Print. (Notebooks)

The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Ed. Coburn et al. 16 vols. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1969-2001. Print. (Autobiography, essays, fragments, journals, lectures, nonfiction, poetry, and prose)

Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Ed. H. J. Jackson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985. Print. (Autobiography, poetry, and prose)

Selected Letters. Ed. Jackson. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1987. Print. (Letters)

*Includes "Dejection: An Ode," an early version of which was published in the *London Morning Post* on 4 October 1802.

CRITICISM

Richard Harter Fogle (essay date 1950)

SOURCE: Fogle, Richard Harter. "The Dejection of Coleridge's Ode." *ELH* 17.1 (1950): 71-7. Print.

[In the following essay, Fogle argues that examination of "Dejection" "reveals a more highly organized, a more rounded, and comprehensive experience than investigation of either its biographical or its philosophical elements can uncover."]

Coleridge's *Dejection: An Ode* is not quite so gloomy as the title would suggest, and as students of the poem have generally maintained. This conclusion is in one sense revolutionary: in another, as I hope to show, it is natural and inevitable to the verge of the obvious.

It is usually assumed that the dejection of the *Ode* ["Dejection"] is both deep and unrelieved—melancholy at its most atrabilious. Fred Manning Smith, in an article examining its relation to Wordsworth's *Intimations Ode*, remarks that "In Wordsworth's *Ode* grief finds relief and ends in joy; in Coleridge's, grief finds no relief and ends in dejection."¹ More recently Elisabeth Schneider in her excellent treatment of *Kubla Khan* has likewise employed it as a touchstone for gloom: "The dejection (of *Kubla Khan*) is not deep and hopeless as in the ode."²

Both of these statements are, of course, true in their contexts, but they are both inadequate, just as they are both

typical. They are epitomes of the accepted view of the Ode. This view has arisen and remained unchallenged probably because *Dejection* has hardly been studied as a poem at all; its enormous biographical and philosophical importance has obscured its poetic structure. It has been treated as a reflection of irretrievable personal disaster, as a lament for Coleridge's impending loss of poetic imagination, and as the expression of a despairing subjectivism; but seldom as a poetic object and unity.

Thus Professor de Selincourt has correlated the *Ode* with Coleridge's life. By establishing and publishing its earliest version he is able to draw valuable biographical conclusions—that the *Ode* was originally addressed to Sarah Hutchinson, rather than to Wordsworth; that it arises directly from the circumstances of Coleridge's hopeless marriage and his equally hopeless love of Sarah; and that it signalizes his approaching loss of poetic power, as a direct result of these insuperable domestic and amatory difficulties.³

The philosophical or metaphysical interpretation of *Dejection*, which develops naturally from the biographical view, utilizes a single passage (ll. 45-58) to point out the *Ode*'s unhappy subjectivism. This passage, "O lady! we receive but what we give," is for the philosophical approach the core of the poem, expressing as it does a crisis in Coleridge's thinking about the relationship of nature and the mind—a disturbance of the subject-object balance which he sought to maintain in both philosophy and poetry.⁴

Each of these approaches is entirely valid in its own sphere, and is indeed indispensable as a preliminary to a full and accurate reading of the poem. But let us not confuse our purposes. If we attempt to substitute biography, or philosophy, for the poem itself, we shall be using methods inappropriate to the end to be attained, and are likely to find ourselves possessed of unsatisfactory conclusions: unsatisfactory not because untrue, but because they are half-true, incomplete, and misleading. Taken as a literary structure the *Ode* in its wholeness is more interesting and more valuable than an abstract proposition drawn from a part of it only: as Coleridge himself warns, "that which suits a part infects the whole." Taken as an "imitation" of the mind which made it, as Coleridge would take it,⁵ it expresses a richer, more varied, completer experience than the sense of flat defeat to which the biographical approach must bring us, or the static rigor of the philosophical conclusion.

In attempting to describe the Ode's evolving meaning, I shall assume the authority of the established text of 1817 as its most perfect version, and shall assume also

that Coleridge as a metaphysical realist⁶ and a Romantic poet of nature is expressing his experience through the interaction of his thoughts and emotions with natural symbolism and imagery. Whether or not this relationship is harmonious, the objectification of the mind by means of external nature is the only method available to him in this poem. Consequently considerable stress will be placed on what may be termed "the natural situation," as it develops over a period of hours; with the interaction of the wind and the Aeolian harp (a crystallizing symbol of mind and nature), the significance of the moon, and the objectification of the various shifts and developments of mood by means of the rising and changing wind. This relationship, however, is "symbolic" rather than "allegorical." These equivalences of mind and nature are suggested, not explicit; they are dynamic and variable, not fixed and exact. They may be characterized by Coleridge's own conception of symbol as "that which means what it says and something more besides";⁷ thus the natural setting of the *Ode* is objectively present, not the mere servant of allegory—but it is also the medium of Coleridge's meaning.

In Strophe 1 the "natural situation" is a tranquil night, amid which light winds "mould yon cloud in lazy flakes," and cause a

... dull sobbing draft, that moans and rakes
Upon the strings of this Aeolian lute,
Which better far were mute.

The phenomenon of the new moon with the old moon in her lap, however, forewarns of storm to come. The tone and the particulars of the moon-image, one may suggest, are in no way ominous, but rounded and agreeable, with the hint of that same effluence of light which later on in the poem is used to symbolize joy (ll. 9-12).⁸ Strophe 2 describes Coleridge's mood at its nadir of dejection—

A grief without a pang, void, dark, and drear,
A stifled, drowsy, unimpassioned grief,
Which finds no natural outlet, no relief
In word, or sigh, or tear . . .

(ll. 20-24)

This state of mind is the counterpart of the natural setting of Strophe I, which objectifies it in the light wind, the lazy cloud, and the sobbing draft, inharmonious yet dull and passive. The Aeolian harp "had better far be mute" because at present it expresses only discord. The moon-phenomenon is a harbinger not of disaster but of hope, for only a storm will clear the air, and only some violence of release will rescue Coleridge from the prison-house of his dejection. The relationship between nature and mind is explicitly stated in ll. 15-20, in which Coleridge prays for

the wind and the rain that "Might startle this dull pain, and make it move and live." The way is prepared, then, for a natural cycle which shall move from calm to storm to calm again, the last as it were a reconciliation; and Coleridge's own statement in Strophe 1 warrants us in interpreting the development of his mood according to the same design.

Strophe 2, after setting forth his dejection, states his peculiar dilemma,—of the beautiful forms of nature he must say only

I see them all so excellently fair,
I see, not feel, how beautiful they are!

(ll. 37-38)

Only through Joy, he continues, can we have more

Than that inanimate cold world allowed
To the poor loveless ever-anxious crowd,—

(ll. 51-52)

Our world is created by ourselves, and only the power of Joy can endow it with life and meaning. This power of Joy,⁹ essential to the poet, Coleridge has now lost, robbed of it by repeated afflictions, and with it (I should be inclined to say in this poem identical with it) his "shaping spirit of imagination." Joy and Imagination, it should be noticed, are active agencies, by which the mind creates, shapes, and unifies its vision of reality; dejection is passive and inert, uncreative and lifeless.

The poet's griefs rise to their climax in Strophe 6. In combatting them his "sole resource" has been "to be still and patient all I can"—to deaden his nature (see ll. 89-90) by "abstruse research." This ill-advised attempt more even than the afflictions which caused it to be made has nullified the creative Imagination, for he has sought to suppress the very activity which make it possible. Understanding, the abstracting and calculative power, he has cultivated; but Understanding alone leaves the world essentially dead, inert, and inorganic.¹⁰ Coleridge has committed the very sin which he most fears against himself; he has mutilated the living organism of mind, destroyed its complex harmonies, upset its ordered hierarchy by seeking to substitute a part for the whole.¹¹

Now, to return to the natural setting, as does Coleridge in the following Strophe VII, this unhappy self-mutilation has been brought about by a deliberate passivity, for the "abstruse research" which has so disproportionately exercised the Understanding was undertaken to deaden, not to arouse, the spirit; and sluggishly rules its scattered kingdom in default of the banished creative power. This passivity, this "stillness" and "patience," is equivalent to the oppressive

calm of Nature in Strophe 1. The logic of the relationship, in company with the storm-warning of the new moon (ll. 9-14), demands that this stagnant spell be broken, and declares that any change which involves activity must be a change for the better. And accordingly at the beginning of Strophe VII Coleridge rouses from his melancholy introspection to find that the wind has risen, and the storm is at its full.

The Aeolian lute, earlier touched only by a "dull sobbing draft" (ll. 6-7), now screams as if in agony (ll. 97-98). The wind, a "Mad Lutanist," raves among the leaves and blossoms, becomes a tragic actor; and then a mighty epic poet who sings of a host in rout, of groans and of trappings (ll. 104-113). Action disorganized and painful, but action nonetheless, and as such clearly preferable to the earlier deathlike lull. The feelings are awake, the Imagination, though imperfectly, is at work. Storm follows calm, strife has supplanted uneasy peace, as in a plot at the height of its complication, and after a moment of rest comes the reconciliation or denouement.

... all that noise, as of a rushing crowd,
With groans, and tremulous shudderings—all is over—
It tells another tale, with sounds less deep and loud!
A tale of less affright
And tempered with delight (italics mine),
As Otway's self had framed the tender lay ...

(ll. 115-120)

These lines express a further development of the Imagination, a more complex organization in which the shaping power moulds into unity the diverse elements of grief, fear, and their opposite delight (see l. 124). Strife, in effect, has given way to reconciliation, and for Coleridge only the Imagination can reconcile. The mind, recalled to activity, has regained its wholeness. Ceasing to flee, it has faced its difficulties and in part at least has overcome them.

In the final strophe, in which the poem is symbolically brought by midnight to a term, Coleridge returns to the "Dear Lady" to whom the poem is addressed. He wishes her a gentle Sleep, and prays that

... this storm be but a mountain-birth,
May all the stars hang bright above her dwelling,
Silent as though they watched the sleeping Earth!

(ll. 129-131)

Here, I believe, two points are to be noticed. First is the significance of Coleridge's turning here to another: that he is able to wish her well, to forget himself in imagination of the peace and joy which he invokes in her behalf and of the creative vision of reality (ll. 135-136), the ability "to see

into the life of things," which only Joy can give. This argues for the rebirth of his imagination, which in Coleridge as in Wordsworth, Shelley, and Keats is the faculty which enables us to escape the prison of self and participate in other lives and modes of being.¹² The second point, interesting though less material, is that Coleridge wishes for his friend peace and clear skies untouched by disturbance. Having in the poem imaginatively portrayed a hard-won balance attained only by struggle, for another he asks a simpler, more static equilibrium. The implications give food for thought.

Examination of *Dejection: An Ode*, then, reveals a more highly organized, a more rounded, and comprehensive experience than investigation of either its biographical or its philosophical elements can uncover. Having stated a truth, however, let us not do a disservice by exaggerating it, or by confusing our purposes. The reconciliation achieved in the Ode is relative, not absolute, just as common sense will tell us that Coleridge's dejection could not be absolute, nor his difficulties wholly crushing. There is no disposition here to deny that these difficulties were great, nor that his poetic powers were, as he says, permanently impaired. What is affirmed basically is that the poem itself will yield us more valuable, subtler, and truer insights than any nonliterary abstraction from it can attain.

Notes

1. "The Relation of Coleridge's *Ode on Dejection* to Wordsworth's *Ode on Intimations of Immortality*," *PMLA*, L (1935), 224.
2. "The 'Dream' of 'Kubla Khan,'" *PMLA*, LX (1945), 799.
3. E. de Selincourt, "Coleridge's *Dejection: An Ode*," *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, XXII (1937), 7-25. Also in E. de Selincourt, *Wordsworthian and Other Studies*, Oxford, 1947. See also T. M. Raysor, "Coleridge and 'Asra,'" *SP*, XXVI (July, 1929), 305-324, for the influence of Sarah Hutchinson upon Coleridge's poetry and life. The *Ode* plays an important though subsidiary role in Professor Raysor's argument.
4. See, e.g., S. F. Gingerich, *Essays in the Romantic Poets* (New York, 1929), pp. 45-49; J. W. Beach, *The Concept of Nature in Nineteenth-Century English Poetry* (New York, 1936), p. 123. Both Gingerich and Beach, however, are inclined to consider the subjectivism of the *Ode* a permanent trait of Coleridge's thought, interpreted by Gingerich as "transcendentalism" and by Beach as "antinaturalism." See E. Bernbaum, *Anthology of Romanticism*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1948), pp. 1103-1104, for a brief digest of the view

implied in my text; at greater length N. K. Stallknecht, *Strange Seas of Thought* (Durham, N.C., 1945), pp. 159-171; also J. Shawcross, *Introduct., Biographia Literaria* (Oxford, 1907), p. xliii.

5. The poem expresses and objectifies the mind and the creative process from which it takes its origin. Thus the famous definition of poetic imagination, although it is concerned with the *poet* and *poetry* rather than the *poem*, implies that the critic will commence with the poem and work backward to the complex activity of mind which is its cause. His analysis and evaluation of the poem will be controlled by his conception of the developing structure and unity of the mind behind it. See *Biographia Literaria*, II, pp. 12-13.
6. Used here to signify belief in the reality of mind and nature both, in agreement with the views of Shawcross, Stallknecht, and Bernbaum.
7. The symbolical ... is always itself a part of that, of the whole of which it is the representative ... the latter (the allegory) cannot be otherwise than spoken consciously;—whereas in the former (the symbol) it is very possible that the general truth may be working unconsciously in the writer's mind. ... (Coleridge, *Miscellaneous Criticism*, ed. T. M. Raysor (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), p. 99.)
8. Cf. ll. 53-55, 62, 66, 73-75.
9. Gingerich acutely remarks, "Had he (Coleridge) had a profound conviction, such as Poe's, that sorrow and melancholy are the best themes for poetry, he undoubtedly could have written many marvellous poems in a doleful spirit. But like Wordsworth he held that truly creative art must be inspired by joy, that poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings." (*Essays in the Romantic Poets*, p. 48.)
10. "It (Imagination) is essentially *vital*, even as all objects (*as* objects) are essentially fixed and dead." (*Biographia Literaria*, I, p. 202.) If the term "Understanding" be objectionable, we may shift our terms and define Coleridge's state of mind as the result of an attempt to disjoin Intellect and Feeling.
11. See ll. 92-93. In Coleridge's dialectic the antithesis of Whole and Part is roughly equivalent to the antitheses of Reason and Understanding, Imagination and Fancy, Imitation and Copy, Organic and Mechanical, Genius and Talent.
12. See, e.g., Coleridge's statement specifically in terms of the poetic genius, *Biographia Literaria*, II, pp. 14-15.