or amplify several of the arguments presented in *Remarks* and *Grounds*. The accepted view has been that these fragments belong to the manuscript for a third printed pamphlet, following *Remarks* and *Grounds*.[10] However, close examination of the wording of letters written by Coleridge at this time indicates that the fragments must have come from the manuscript for a later pamphlet.

On 30 April, six days after completing *Grounds*, Coleridge was for the first time in two years sleeping away from his Highgate haven with the Gillmans and 'writing as hard as I can put pen to Paper, at the Spring Garden Coffee House, in defence of [Peel's] Bill'[11] – which had that day been sent up from the Commons to the Lords. In this letter he warns J. H. Green, surgeon and collaborator, that he 'cannot hope to finish it in time to return to Highgate before night. . . . For it must be done now or not at all.'[12] The object of this furious industry must have been the manuscript for another pamphlet.

Three days later, in the 3 May letter to Crabb Robinson requesting legal information, Coleridge mentions only two pamphlets – identified as *Remarks* and *Grounds* by T. J. Wise, the controversial bibliophile:[13] 'I send herewith two of the circulars, that I have written – as the most to the point in respect of what I now solicit from you.'[14] However, on 7 May, in a letter to H. J. Rose, friend and theologian, Coleridge refers to three printed pamphlets: 'Three of the circular papers – which I have written (that is of the *printed* papers) I will have the pleasure of sending you.'[15] *Remarks* and *Grounds* would have accounted for two of the three; given the urgency with which Coleridge was working, the third 'circular paper' may well have been the printed version of the Spring Gardens manuscript of the previous week. The wording suggests that more than three pamphlets had been printed and that there were other 'circular papers' which had been distributed in handwritten form. The manuscript fragments dated '15th May, 1818' must therefore belong, not to a 'third' pamphlet, but to a later circular.

Tim May

London

[10] The editors of *Shorter Works*, H. J. Jackson and J. R. de J. Jackson, refer to E. H. Coleridge's transcription 'of what appears to be the third pamphlet' (I, 715). D. V. Erdman, the editor of *Essays*, also refers to 'evidence of a third pamphlet of 15 May' (II, 483).

[11] The coffee house was listed in the 1819 *British Imperial Calendar* as the 'Spring Garden Coffee House & Tavern'. The present-day Spring Gardens is on the south side of Trafalgar Square, running off Cockspur Street and The Mall.

[12] *Collected Letters*, IV, 853.

[13] Wise received both pamphlets from Lucy (Mrs H. G.) Watson, who had found them among the papers of her grandfather, James Gillman, the doctor who housed and cared for Coleridge during his Highgate years. Below the title of the *Remarks* pamphlet Coleridge had written the following note: 'I ought to have made a collection of Papers of this kind, written by me on various Subjects brought before Parliament. This is not one of the best; & yet I do not think it below par – S. T. Coleridge' (*Shorter Works*, I, 716). In another note penned over the title of *Grounds*, Gillman certifies that it is 'By Mr Coleridge himself'. Wise had the pamphlets reprinted in a 1913 limited edition as *Two Addresses on Sir Robert Peel's Bill (April 1818)*, edited and introduced by Edmund Gosse. Lucy Watson also included them in her account of Coleridge's later life: *Coleridge at Highgate* (London, 1925). See also *Inquiring Spirit: a new presentation of Coleridge from his published and unpublished prose writings*, ed. Kathleen Coburn (London, 1951), 351–65.

[14] *Collected Letters*, IV, 855.

[15] *Collected Letters*, IV, 857.

COLERIDGE'S GREEK ODE ON THE SLAVE TRADE

COLERIDGE won the Browne Medal at Cambridge in 1792 for a Greek Ode on the slave trade. He published a revised version, with translation, of the first four stanzas in 1796[1] and reprinted these on several occasions.[2] The complete text was first published by James Dykes Campbell in 1893,[3] from Coleridge's handwritten copy, which is now in the University Archives.[4] The text has been re-edited, and translated in its entirety for the first time, by Anthea Morrison, 'Samuel Taylor Coleridge's Greek Prize Ode on the Slave Trade', in J. R. Watson (ed.), *An Infinite Complexity: Essays in Romanticism* (Edinburgh,

[1] In a note appended to his contribution to Southey's *Joan of Arc* (Bristol, 1796), Book 2, line 428.

[2] In the same note, now appended to the passage as incorporated in *The Destiny of Nations* (in *Sibylline Leaves* 1817, *Poetical Works* 1828, 1829, 1834 = *The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. E. H. Coleridge (Oxford, 1912), 146–7).

[3] *The Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (London, 1893), 476–7 (with notes, 653–4).

[4] UA Char. I.4.

1983), 145–60; the translation is reprinted as Appendix I in William Keach (ed.), *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: The Complete Poems* (Penguin, 1997), 419–21. Morrison's work is of high quality.[5] I offer some amendments and additions to it.

(*a*) *Text*

Sine Morrison has corrected other wrong accents, ζεύχθεν at 2 should have been corrected to ζεῦχθεν. Similarly, at 41 and 59 ἄδυ and ἄδυν should be ἅδυ and ἅδυν. At 34 πρίν should be πρὶν.

55 'τοὺς Campbell: τοῦς'. The alleged circumflex is an acute messily corrected to grave.

62 'ἐλαίας scripsi: ἐλάιας'. A superfluous note. Coleridge (like medieval scribes) regularly placed the accent on the first vowel of a diphthong (e.g. 15 βροτὸι, 38 Δέιματ', all regularized by Morrison without comment).

85 'γενοῦνται vix sanum: γεύονται Campbell'. It is wrong to term this reading 'hardly sound', a term which, properly used, indicates doubt that an author wrote what the manuscripts impute to him. Coleridge *did* write this, and he meant to. Campbell's correction gives nonsense (as Morrison's rendering of it, 'your children taste of [?] Justice', brings out) and is unmetrical. What Coleridge meant is plain: 'your Children are the offspring of Justice'. He will first have thought of writing γίνονται. Realizing that he needed a short initial syllable, he substituted a non-existent γενοῦνται by analogy with Latin *genuntur*, the archaic form of *gignuntur*.

90 'scribere voluit, ut vid., ὄχον'. Coleridge did not 'mean to write' the masculine accusative. The following neuter participle βράδυνθεν shows that he mistook the gender of ὄχος for neuter.

(*b*) *Translation*

22 'tearful' is better taken with 'mist' than with 'eyes', just as in the passage of Aeschylus which this echoes (*Prometheus Vinctus* 144–6, cited by Morrison) it is mist which is 'full of tears'.

23–4 Not 'and how often at the same time the heart has groaned!' but 'how often my heart has groaned!' If κ'ἅμα means 'and . . . at the same time', then 'and' is both misplaced (second word in its clause) and superfluous ('how often' is anaphoric, after 'how often' two lines earlier, and therefore no further connecting word is wanted), and 'at the same time' is feeble. ἅμα, taken as pronominal adjective, has more point in itself, and allows κ(αί) to lend emphasis rather than connection ('*my* heart'). That Coleridge intended ἅμα to mean 'my' is confirmed by his earlier version (Morrison, 153), where he follows it with the genitive participle εννοευντος (*sic*), which agrees with 'me', according to the familiar idiom whereby 'my' suggests 'of me'.

25–8 Not 'I grieve deeply with the race of slaves suffering dire ills, just as they groan with unspeakable grief, so they circle round . . .' but 'how they groan . . ., how they circle . . .'.

49 Add 'this' after 'behold'.

57–8 Not 'But what sweet-voiced echo, what throbbings of the Dorian lyre, hovers towards me?' but 'like the throbbings . . .'.

(*c*) *Allusions*

Add to those detected by Morrison: 1 'leaving the gates of darkness': Euripides, *Hecuba*, 1; 2 'yoked to misery': Sophocles, *Ajax*, 123; 19–20 'a bloody blow': Aeschylus, *Choephori*, 468; 41 'if they seek after any sweet delusion': Pindar, *Pythian*, 2.37; 47–8 'snatching your brother's blood': Aeschylus, *Seven against Thebes*, 718; 49 'does not an inescapable Eye behold?': Aeschylus, *Prometheus Vinctus*, 903; 51 'Do you hear? Or do you not hear?': *Seven against Thebes*, 100; 75–6 'wild cries . . . when life is setting': *Seven against Thebes*, 280, *Agamemnon*, 1123; 79 'has already been stretched': *Ajax*, 1402.

[5] Particularly interesting is her discovery that Coleridge has borrowed from a recently published poem by W. L. Bowles, *The African* (later called *The Dying Slave*). This borrowing may throw some light on an oddly expressed remark by G. B. Greenough, based on a conversation with Coleridge in Germany in 1799, that 'When Coleridge wrote his Greek ode, he first conceived the idea and afterwards hunted thro' the several poets for words in which to cloth[e] those ideas' (E. J. Morley in E. L. Griggs (ed.), *Coleridge and Wordsworth: Studies in honor of George McLean Harper* (Princeton, 1939), 231). N. Fruman, *Coleridge, The Damaged Archangel* (New York, 1971), 526 n. 15, assumes (without argument) that Coleridge was speaking about the ode on astronomy, which he submitted unsuccessfully for the Browne medal in 1793. This is possible, but not more probable. Coleridge's youthful enthusiasm for Bowles is attested in *Collected Letters* (hereafter *CL*) I, 29, 32, and *Biographia Literaria*, ch. 1; his debt to Bowles is discussed by Fruman, ch. 17.

(*d*) *Critical Judgements*

Coleridge wrote in 1796 that 'the Ideas are better than the Language or Metre, in which they are conveyed'.[6] Morrison observes that, when Coleridge reprinted his note in 1817, he dropped the reference to metre. 'The metre, on the whole', she says, 'is sound'. But she finds fault with his handling of the Aeolic dialect: 'it is obvious that he understood at least some of the main characteristics of the dialect . . . It is not to be wondered at, however, that he . . . should have been inconsistent in his attempt at Aeolic'.

Morrison appears to equate 'language' with 'dialect'. But when Coleridge acknowledges deficiencies in language, he is not referring exclusively or even primarily to dialect. The deficiencies are rather weaknesses in vocabulary, syntax, and style. He will have had little perception of how sound or unsound was his dialect. *We* can write faultless Aeolic, because we know what faultless Aeolic looks like. We can read Sappho in the edition by Lobel and Page[7] and quickly find a thumbnail sketch of the rules.[8] Coleridge was not so lucky. By the end of the eighteenth century (when there was available only a small part of the Aeolic poetry which, thanks to the discovery of papyri, is available now) the principles of the Aeolic dialect were dimly apprehended. Consult the texts of Sappho then in use, and see by what standards Coleridge's handling of the dialect should be judged.[9] Or consult the other odes which won this medal in the years before and after Coleridge. He does not emerge badly from the comparison. In one respect he emerges with credit. A fundamental feature of the Aeolic dialect is *psilosis*, or lack of aspiration (i.e. smooth breathing where the Attic dialect has rough breathing). Between 1775 (when the medal was first awarded) and 1829 (when I stopped looking), there were fifty-six medallists.[10] *Psilosis* was observed by only three of them, the medallists of 1776 and 1777, and Coleridge. Even Porson, appointed to the Regius Chair of Greek this very year, fails to observe it.[11]

Coleridge later acknowledged a metrical fault in line 2.[12] There are several further false quantities (at 34, 45, 54, 60, 72). And there is a recurrent metrical flaw of a different kind. He admits two features which belong to Homeric epic, not Aeolic lyric: correption (shortening of a final long vowel or diphthong before a word beginning with a vowel) and hiatus. These features are found at 9, 10, 13, 28, 41, 47, 51, 53, 54, 70, 90. He also admits hiatus, where it is not allowed, between the third and the fourth line of the stanza (19–20, 39–40, 91–2). We must not fault him too harshly for this. Many of the other fifty-five medallists are equally guilty of these faults, including one who was later to edit Sappho and, in the same year that he won the medal (1806), was described by Porson as 'a very pretty scholar', C. J. Blomfield.[13]

[6] See n. 1 above.

[7] Edgar Lobel and Denys Page, *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* (Oxford, 1955).

[8] Denys Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford, 1955), 327–9 ('Note on the Dialect').

[9] Coleridge will have been familiar with the two odes of Sappho in the Sapphic metre which are preserved by ancient writers (1 and 31 Lobel–Page), but with little or nothing else by her or by Alcaeus. T. Faber, *Anacreontis et Sapphus carmina* (Saumur, 1660, 1680), the anonymous Foulis Press edition (Glasgow, 1770, 1777), and R. F. P. Brunck, *Analecta Veterum Poetarum Graecorum*, I (Strasburg, 1772), have only these two odes (when he refers to 'Brunck's Analects' in *CL* I, 121, dated 24 October 1794, he probably refers to the copy which Jesus College Library acquired that same year: correct, therefore, K. Coburn, *The Notebooks of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, III, 3276n., who also mistakes this work for an 'edition of poems from the *Greek Anthology*', and R. J. Coffmann, *Coleridge's Library* (Boston, 1987) 34); and there is little more in the editions by 'Mr. Adison' (London, 1735) and F. G. Born (Leipzig, 1789). It is unlikely that he had access to J. C. Wolf, *Sapphus . . . fragmenta* (Hamburg, 1733), which assembled everything then extant (there was no copy of this edition in Jesus College Library). Three times between December 1791 and November 1792 he borrowed from the College Library T. Morell, *Thesaurus Graecae Poeseōs; sive, Lexicon Graeco-Prosodiacum* (Eton, 1762), an aid to verse composition, which will not have helped him much. See J. C. C. Mays, 'Coleridge's Borrowings from Jesus College Library, 1791–94', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, viii (1985), 557–81 (566–7 for Morell). I am indebted to Dr F. H. Willmoth, Assistant to the Keeper of the Old Library, Jesus College, for her help in checking the Library records.

[10] Their poems may be read in UA Char. I.3–5.

[11] In his note on Euripides, *Medea*, 494 (London, 1801); also *Adversaria* (Cambridge, 1812), 49. Nor is it observed in any of the editions listed in n. 9 above.

[12] In a handwritten marginal note (Campbell, 585, E. H. Coleridge, 147), which Campbell dates 1814. Coleridge was commenting on the revised version of line 2; the original version had a comparable fault.

[13] M. L. Clarke, *Greek Studies in England 1700–1830* (Cambridge, 1945), 87. The edition of Sappho was published anonymously in *Museum Criticum*, i (1814), 1–31.

The reputation of Coleridge's ode has never recovered from the blow that was dealt it by an anonymous reviewer of *Biographia Literaria* in 1817.[14] I quote him more fully than he is usually quoted, so that his animus, and unscrupulous mode of argument, may be clearly seen.

> His classical knowledge was found at the University to be equally superficial. He gained a prize there for a Greek Ode, which for ever blasted his character as a scholar; all the rules of that language being therein perpetually violated. We were once present in a literary company, where Porson offered to shew in it, to a gentleman who was praising this Ode, 134 examples of bad Greek.

The story of Porson was picked up maladroitly by De Quincey: 'Porson was accustomed, meanly enough, to ridicule the *lexis* of this ode, which was to break a butterfly upon the wheel'.[15] It is often reported as if it were authenticated fact,[16] and sometimes misreported.[17] 'Porson' (writes Morrison) 'quite probably could have shown "134 examples of bad Greek" in it.'

I doubt it; and I doubt if he offered to. The reviewer begins with two sentences of humbug, which he justifies in the third by invoking the authority of Porson. Since Porson was dead, and the rest of the 'literary company' remains unnamed, the reviewer could cite Porson without fear of contradiction. '134 examples': why, and when, did Porson make such a precise count? As an examiner? An examiner who finds so many (more than one per line) could not award the medal. Perhaps he was not an examiner: but, if not, motive and occasion are even harder to divine. At all events, only a few months later (January 1793) we find Porson examining Coleridge for the Craven Scholarship and judging him worthy to be on the short list of four out of seventeen candidates. Coleridge himself, who at this time idolized Porson, believed that he had Porson's vote.[18] And he believed that he would have won the medal again in the following year, if only Porson had been an examiner.[19] The idolatry continued, even after the review was published.[20]

How many examples are there of bad Greek in the Ode? Examples of wrong or even dubious Greek are relatively few (5, 19, 34, 44, 46, 50, 62, 69, 73, 82–3, 85, 90). There are several uncouth expressions (21, 29, 89–91, 94–6) and a few false quantities (mentioned above). Even if we add that other metrical licence (hiatus and correption), and the more obvious mistakes in dialect, as well as mistakes in accentuation, and we label all these (improperly enough) as bad Greek, we shall be a long

[14] *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, ii (1817), 12, reprinted in J. R. de J. Jackson (ed.), *Coleridge: The Critical Heritage* (London, 1970), 340, where the reviewer is identified as John Wilson.

[15] *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* (1834–5), reprinted in R. Pite (ed.), *Lives of the Great Romantics*, II, *Coleridge* (London, 1997), 99.

[16] E. K. Chambers, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Biographical Study* (Oxford, 1938), 18; C. R. Woodring, *Politics in the Poetry of Coleridge* (Madison, 1961), 59; Woodring (ed.), *Collected Works* (hereafter *CW*), 14: *Table Talk*, I (London and Princeton, 1990), 302 n. 1; O. Doughty, *Perturbed Spirit: The Life and Personality of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (Rutherford, etc., 1981), 51; Richard Holmes, *Coleridge: Early Visions* (London, 1989), 43 (where 'Brown' should be 'Browne', and the statement that 'he had chosen a subject that was politically popular' is misleading – the University chose the subject). A rare expression of caution: L. Patton (ed.), *CW*, 2: *The Watchman* (1970), 116 n. 2 ('If we may believe this statement, I suspect it was made after Porson had learned of C's change in politics, for Porson was a staunch whig').

[17] Doughty (n. 16), 289 has Porson offering 'to show his colleagues' the 134 examples. P. J. Keane, *Coleridge's Submerged Politics: The Ancient Mariner and Robinson Crusoe* (Columbia and London, 1994), 67, has Porson attack Coleridge 'in *Blackwood's*'.

[18] *CL*, I, 46 ('the most elegant Scholar among the examiners' must be Porson); see also *CL*, I, 138–9. Accounts of the Scholarship examination are full of inaccuracies. Coleridge was not 'selected by Professor Porson as one of the seventeen' (Holmes (n. 16), 46); anyone could enter; only the finalist were 'selected'. The scholarship was not awarded to Bethell (Holmes) but to Butler. Bethell was not the future Bishop of Bangor, as stated by C. Le Grice, *Gentleman's Magazine*, December 1834 (reprinted in Pite (n. 15), 85), followed by later writers (J. D. Campbell, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Narrative of the Events of his Life* (London, 1894), 23, S. Butler, *The Life and Letters of Dr. Samuel Butler* (London, 1896), I, 13, Griggs, *CL*, I, 45, Holmes), although he was explicitly corrected by J. Gillman, *The Life of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (London, 1838), 50 ('The candidate was Mr. Bethell, one of the members for Yorkshire . . . Bishop Bethel [sic] himself, not long ago, told me this'). That is, not Christopher Bethell (*DNB*, IV, 426) but his brother Richard, MP for the East Riding (J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, II.i (Cambridge, 1940), 250). Finally, the Greek ode on astronomy was not written for this examination (Campbell); see n. 5 above.

[19] J. Cottle, *Early Recollections* (London, 1837), I, 253 n.

[20] *CW*, 11: *Shorter Works and Fragments*, II (ed. H. J. Jackson and J. R. de J. Jackson, 1995), 859 (dated 1820). Contrast *Notebooks*, I, 2894 (dated 1806).

way short of 134. One of the two, the reviewer or Porson, is answerable to the charge of exaggeration – or malice.

JAMES DIGGLE
Queens' College, Cambridge

COLERIDGE'S 'NIGHTINGALE': A NOTE ON THE SUBLIME

THE first thirteen lines of Samuel Taylor Coleridge's *The Nightingale, A Conservation Poem* (1798) contain virtually every aspect of the Burkean sublime.

> No cloud, no relique of the sunken day
> Distinguishes the West, no long thin slip
> of sullen light, no obscure trembling hues.
> Come, we will rest on this old mossy bridge!
> You see the glimmer of the stream beneath,
> But hear no murmuring: it flows silently,
> O'er its soft bed of verdure. All is still,
> A balmy night! and though the stars be dim,
> Yet let us think upon the vernal showers
> That gladden the green earth, and we shall find
> A pleasure in the dimness of the stars.
> And hark! the Nightingale begins its song,
> 'Most musical, most melancholy' bird![1]

The debt that this poem owes to the aesthetic theory advanced in Edmund Burke's 1757 *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* is obvious. However, it has not heretofore been noted that Coleridge's design is particularly remarkable in so far as Burke's characterizations of the sublime enter the poem in exactly the same order as Burke lists them in Part II of his *Enquiry*.

Burke lists, under 'privations' causing the sublime in Part II.6 of his treatise, the aspects of *vacuity*, *darkness*, *solitude*, and *silence*.[2] These appear, respectively, in the first six lines of Coleridge's *Nightingale*. 'Vacuity' is implicit in the anaphora of absences that begin the poem; the others are more straightforward. As Coleridge's setting widens into a night vista (lines 7–8), there enter sublime qualities of *vastness* ('All is still . . .') and *infinity of perspective* (the heavens) delineated in sections II.7–8 of the *Enquiry*. The next few divisions of Burke's treatise (II.9–12) are subsidiary discussions on artificial infinity plus a paragraph on 'Difficulty' of construction as a 'source of greatness'. The next substantial designation of an aspect of the sublime, 'Magnificence' (I.13), is mirrored in Coleridge's poem by the night scene in lines 8–11. 'The starry heaven', Burke reflects at the start of this section, 'though it occurs so frequently to our view, never fails to excite an idea of grandeur.'

From Coleridge's tenth line, the 'green earth' itself starts to come to life in its connection with the verb 'gladden', and the next verse 'A pleasure in the dimness of the stars' not only could pithily define the Burkean sublime, but also stresses the dim *light* and *colouring* that he promotes as its sources in the *Enquiry* II.14–16. Burke's ensuing four section titles (II.17–20) almost could have served as a textbook for Coleridge: 'Sound and Loudness', 'Suddenness' (of sound), 'Intermitting' (sounds), and 'The cries of Animals'. All these qualities are demonstrated in the nightingale's entrance at line 12. Particularly in what had been such a silent setting, the sudden intrusion of the animal's cry ('And hark!') has a momentary startling effect, thus evoking the sense of terror necessary for Burkean sublimity.

Aspects of 'Smell and Taste', downplayed in *Enquiry* II.21 as 'small', 'weak', and 'confined' sources of the sublime, are skipped. However, by a Miltonic allusion in line 13 of the *Nightingale* – '"Most musical, most melancholy" bird!'[3] – Coleridge tags the final aspect listed in the Part II of the *Enquiry*. Burke's concluding section (II.2), entitled 'Feeling, Pain', argues that the

[1] Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Critical Edition of the Major Works* (Oxford University Press, 1985), 99.

[2] Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry* (Oxford University Press, 1998), 65. Subsequent citations will refer to section number and title internally. It should also be noted that Sections 1–5 of Part II are more general discussions of the sublime aspects of 'Terror', 'Obscurity', and 'Power'. I begin my discussion at Section II.6 because, the preceding portion of Burke's discourse being less general in its descriptions, it becomes apparent only at this point in which way Coleridge's poem is paralleling Burke's treatise.

[3] Coleridge's footnote to the *Nightingale* emphasizes he never alludes to Milton with levity, 'a charge than which none could be more painful to [Coleridge], except perhaps that of having ridiculed his Bible'. The allusion is to *Il Penseroso*, the companion poem to Milton's *L'Allegro*. These double poems celebrate melancholy and mirth, respectively, and are meant to together portray the tug-of-war between those two emotions in the human psyche. Penseroso is a melancholy man who takes a moonlit walk and sees a nightingale which he fancies melancholy too.