

De Quincey, Coleridge, and the Literary Model of Habit

Daniel R. Mangiavellano

If opium-eating be a sensual pleasure, and if I am bound to confess that I have indulged in it to an excess, not yet *recorded* of any other man, it is no less true, that I have struggled against this fascinating enthrallment with a religious zeal, and have, at length, accomplished what I never yet heard attributed to any other man – have untwisted, almost to its final links, the accursed chain which fettered me. Such a self-conquest may reasonably be set off in counterbalance to any kind of degree of self-indulgence. Not to insist, that in my case, the self-conquest was unquestionable, the self-indulgence open to doubts of casuistry, according as that name shall be extended to acts aiming at the bare relief of pain, or shall be restricted to such as aim at the excitement of positive pleasure. (Thomas De Quincey, *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater* [1822: 4-5] [original emphasis])¹

De Quincey's "confession" in the above quotation is remarkable in that he confesses to astoundingly little. Allowing that the origins of his "self-conquest" and "self-indulgent" opium consumption may appear suspicious, De Quincey nevertheless presents his opium-eating as perfectly in balance with itself: the "sensuality," "fascinating enthrallment," and "positive pleasure" of opium are offset by the "religious zeal" and the heroism of "untwist[ing], almost to its final links, the accursed chain" of habituation. De Quincey fashions himself as an opium-eater

capable of managing habit, and the absence of rival opium-eaters with substantive “records” of their own certainly makes his the loudest voice about opium consumption in the opening decades of the nineteenth century.² Victorian and *fin de siècle* temperance movements will look back and blame De Quincey for championing opium use for the general public, but it is worth remembering that he actually frames his sundry opium experiences in terms of a functional, balanced, and manageable habit he “confesses” to in name only.³

In a footnote elaborating upon his use of the above phrase “not yet recorded,” De Quincey makes dubious reference to another, more famous opium-eater. He chides, “‘Not yet recorded,’ I say: for there is one celebrated man of the present day, who, if all be true which is reported of him, has greatly exceeded me in quantity” (4n) [original emphasis].⁴ Major textual editors of De Quincey’s 1822 *Confessions* easily identify this “celebrated man of the present day” as a thinly-veiled reference to Samuel Taylor Coleridge – whose life experiences Charles Lloyd borrowed heavily from in his 1798 epistolary novel, *Edmund Oliver*, and whose lounging melancholic indolence Wordsworth made famous when he described the “noticeable Man with large grey eyes,/ And a pale face that seemed undoubtedly/ As if a blooming face it ought to be” in “Stanzas Written in my Pocket-Copy of Thomson’s ‘Castle of Indolence’” (39-41).⁵ The rumors and so-called “reports” of Coleridge’s opium-eating from the footnote are far more significant than appear at first blush: they are deliberate, artful, *literary* reproductions of Coleridge dramatizing his binge opium consumption and subsequent habituation.⁶ It is easy to mistake De Quincey’s footnote as little more than a casual swipe at Coleridge (his sometime friend and sometime rival dating back to 1807), but when we take into account how the footnote evokes multiple imagined, fictional renderings of Coleridge, we glimpse how even passing literary representation of opium consumption underwrites lasting perceptions of dangerous habituation in the nineteenth century.

In this article, I argue that De Quincey spins these individual literary “reports” of Coleridgean opium consumption into a posthumous “record”

of illicit habit-formation. In biographical essays from the 1830s and '40s, and in the enlarged 1856 *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater*, De Quincey manufactures the "record" of Coleridge's destructive opium habituation through suggestive allusion to literary figures who themselves struggle with or represent cultural anxieties about habituation. In De Quincey's hands, Coleridge (and his habits) become alternate versions of Marley's Ghost from *A Christmas Carol*, of Caliban "fretting his very heart-strings against the rivets of his chain," and of a squabbling "Transcendental Philosopher" engaged in farcical debate with hired servants at a druggist's shop (1856: 20). Invoking texts from Shakespeare to Dickens enables De Quincey to concoct situations and scenarios suggestive of Coleridge's dangerous mismanagement of his opium habits – ones that stand in direct contrast to the more balanced and respectable habituation De Quincey works so hard to convince readers of in the opening quotation of this article. In short, the more fictional Coleridgean habituation appears, the more authentic De Quincey and his own manageable habit become by comparison.

The literary allusions and exaggerated fictional encounters underwriting images of Coleridgean habit in De Quincey's work constitute what I term a literary model for theorizing habituation; one that superimposes the supernatural, the exotic, and the comically absurd in popular literary texts from Shakespeare to Dickens to reinvigorate cultural anxieties about unmanageable habituation. *A Christmas Carol*, *The Tempest*, and even De Quincey's own acerbic caricatures of Coleridge present a constellation of invented images and associations that imagine the dangerous long-term effects of unmanaged habituation: including habit's haunting presence in the afterlife, the lingering metaphysical suffering and regret associated with habit, habit-formation as a product of free will, the racial coding and subservience of habituation, and the debilitating effects of illicit appetite upon the reasoning intellect. Critics invoke "addiction" as a catch-all term for understanding opium experiences in the nineteenth century, but as Virginia Berridge reminds us, "the type of terminology now taken for granted in discussing opiate use and abuse

was not at all applicable to the situation when opium was openly available” (49). Berridge’s point is especially relevant for a figure like De Quincey, whose life, literary output, and opium-eating habits span the period when opium was “openly available” in the Romantic period, to when it was the subject of growing social, economic, political, and medical concern in the Victorian period.⁷ Opium-eaters like De Quincey and Coleridge accounted for their own opium consumption by layering physical images of bondage and abject slavery on top of habituation. I argue here that De Quincey takes this one step further by re-inscribing standard images of bondage and slavery with literary allusion and fictional representation that not only contribute to cultural anxieties about habit and individual agency, but actually implicate Coleridgean habit within the same model.

The literary model of habit marks a philological pre-history for understanding addiction, one that informs Louise Foxcroft’s recent “Making” of addiction and Susan Zieger’s “Invention” of the addict during the nineteenth century. Zieger calls habit “an attractive concept for thinking about the relationship between acts and identities, [but] it is the very background of disappointed agency from which addiction emerges” (8). My purpose in this article is not to slight “addiction” as a vaguely anachronistic concept for De Quincey or Coleridge, rather to spotlight the correlation between habit and literary allusion that forms the contours of the “emergence” of addiction as a diagnostic concept, and the addict as a recognizable type. The embedded literary allusions, invented dialogues, and choreographed fictional situations that constitute a literary model of habit provide a nuanced reminder of how habituates theorized (and explained) correlations between desire and appetite. In the opening quotation, De Quincey insinuates that he has relatively little to confess for himself, though this will not stop him from assuming the responsibility of confessing on Coleridge’s behalf throughout the 1830s, ’40s, and ’50s, ultimately producing a literary “record” of Coleridge’s mismanaged habituation.

I

De Quincey's preoccupation with Coleridgean "habits and hankerings" begins in earnest with the publication of a four-part biographical series in *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* in 1834 (September: 511-12).⁸ His purpose in the "Samuel Taylor Coleridge" articles was "merely to supply a few hints and suggestions [about Coleridge] drawn from a very hasty retrospect" (January: 6). The insinuations built into De Quincey's "hints and suggestions" about Coleridge's life run the gamut from the personal (merely *hinting* that Coleridge was actually in love with Dorothy Wordsworth and not his wife, Sara) to the professional (simply *suggesting* that Coleridge's failed London lecture series on Poetry and the Fine Arts in the winter of 1808 was a result of overindulgence in opium) (September: 516-17, October: 594-95). Despite widespread popularity among the general reading public, criticism of the articles was intense: Crabb Robinson called them "shameful articles," and another critic lambasted De Quincey's villainous "coarse caricature" of Coleridge (2:464) (JCH: 22). Robert Southey famously advised Hartley Coleridge to "take a strong cudgel, proceed straight to Edinburgh, and give De Quincey, publicly in the streets there, a sound beating" (Carlyle 324).⁹ The anecdotal nature and gossipy tone of the *Tait's* articles reduces the collection to tattling sensationalism, a prevailing characteristic of much of De Quincey's biographical journalism.¹⁰ The provocative follow-up to the "Samuel Taylor Coleridge" essays, "Coleridge and Opium-Eating," matches the tone of the *Tait's* articles while, somewhat improbably, extending the consequences of Coleridge's habituation to the landscape of the afterlife.

"Coleridge and Opium-Eating" was published anonymously in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* in 1845, and it swiftly rejects claims about Coleridge's opium consumption made in Dr. James Gillman's *Life of Coleridge* in 1838.¹¹ Gillman's biography includes excerpts from Coleridge's private letters decrying his "unsuspecting delusion" and his innocent victimization in the wake of the "Maelstrom, the fatal whirlpool" of habituation (247). Enraged at such contrived complacency, De Quincey opens his article by rejecting the vitality of the biography and its biographical subject:

What is the deadeast of things earthly? It is, says the world, ever forward and rash – ‘a door-nail!’ But the world is wrong. There is a thing deader than a door-nail, viz., Gillman’s Coleridge, Vol. I. Dead, more dead, most dead, is Gillman’s Coleridge, Vol. I.; and this upon more arguments than one. The book has clearly not completed its elementary act of respiration ... Gillman’s Coleridge, Vol. I., deals rashly, unjustly, and almost maliciously, with some of our own particular friends ... and therefore, though the world was so far right, that people *do* say, “Dead as a door-nail,” yet, henceforwards [*sic*], the weakest of these people will see the propriety of saying – ‘Dead as Gillman’s Coleridge.’ (117, original emphasis)

These opening lines double as a brutal book review and a rejection of Coleridge’s self-assessed opium habituation. By collapsing the biography and the biographical subject into the same identity (“Gillman’s Coleridge”), De Quincey reserves his harshest criticism for the reincarnated specter of Coleridge born out of Gillman’s work. Despite his claim that the biography never “completes its elementary act of respiration,” De Quincey works hard in this opening paragraph to pronounce “Gillman’s Coleridge” “dead, more dead, most dead” on arrival. The only productive moment of the biography, it would appear, is the revision of “dead as a door-nail” to “Dead as Gillman’s Coleridge,” an attack set up from the first casual mention of the cliché in the opening sentence. Lingering throughout this blustering critique is the cultural and literary resonance of “dead as a door-nail,” a phrase Charles Dickens incorporates into the opening paragraphs of *A Christmas Carol* in 1843, two years before De Quincey’s article on Coleridge and opium habituation.

Like De Quincey’s pronouncement on Coleridge’s vitality, the opening paragraph of *A Christmas Carol* insists upon Jacob Marley’s death:

Marley was dead: to begin with. There is no doubt whatever about that. The register of his burial was

signed by the clergyman, the clerk, the undertaker, and the chief mourner. Scrooge signed it: and Scrooge's name was good upon 'Change, for anything he chose to put his hand to. Old Marley was as dead as a door-nail.

Mind! I don't mean to say that I know, of my own knowledge, what there is particularly dead about a door-nail. I might have been inclined, myself, to regard a coffin-nail as the deadest piece of ironmongery in the trade. But the wisdom of our ancestors is in the simile; and my unhallowed hands shall not disturb it, or the Country's done for. You will therefore permit me to repeat, emphatically, that Marley was as dead as a door-nail. (1)¹²

The startling similarity between De Quincey and Dickens's joint use of "dead as a door-nail" in their respective opening paragraphs certainly may have struck attentive mid-century readers.¹³ Nevertheless, the dynamic between De Quincey and Coleridge through their shared opium habituation matches up neatly with the shared miserly habits cultivated by business partners Scrooge and Marley. Within this parallel structuring, the Coleridge emerging out of De Quincey's article resembles an alternate version of Marley's Ghost, a character desperately entangled by chains representative of the metaphysical perils of mismanaged habit.¹⁴ In the novella, habit's influence on the behaviors of the afterlife, the culpability of habit-formation as a product of free-will, and the metaphysical penance and punishment of habit dominates the confrontation between Marley's Ghost and Scrooge. Taken together, De Quincey and Dickens's joint vision of habituation in the afterlife contribute to a potentially threatening (and undeniably fictionalized) mid-nineteenth-century literary rendering of the inability to exert control over habituation.¹⁵

Before Marley's Ghost materializes in Scrooge's room on Christmas Eve, Scrooge hears chains dragging in the wine cellar, a sound he immediately associates with spiritual haunting, but one that could also be readily associated with the figurative enslavement of ab-

ject habituation. By failing to associate dragging chains with the consequences of habituation, Scrooge reaffirms the purpose of his visitation by multiple ghosts throughout the story: his ignorance illustrates an inability to recognize the signs of habituation endangering him. When Scrooge sees Marley's Ghost for the first time, he notices the chains entwined around the ghost's transparent body: "The chain he drew was clasped about his middle. It was long, and wound about him like a tail; and it was made (for Scrooge observed it closely) of cash-boxes, keys, padlocks, ledgers, deeds, and heavy purses wrought in steel" (13). The items binding Marley's Ghost's body represent the greedy habits he cultivated in life, and Scrooge's "close observation" of these individual links betrays his curiosity about their function in the afterlife. The moral lesson of Scrooge's journey in *A Christmas Carol* begins precisely the moment Marley's Ghost uses his own chain of habituation as a prop to illustrate the dangerous path Scrooge follows in life. Analyzing this chain of habituation in the context of an essay on opium consumption and habituation, one wonders about the equivalent of "cashboxes, keys, padlocks, ledgers, deeds, and heavy purses" for the opium habituate's chain – the same chain De Quincey claims to have so masterfully unraveled in the opening quotation of this article. Nevertheless, the metaphysical bondage of habituation in the afterlife is on display in *A Christmas Carol*. In the imagined, literary world of the De Quincian and Dickensian afterlife, Coleridge's Ghost and Marley's Ghost share a similar fate because of the habits they were unable to keep in check while alive.

The description of the chain as "[winding] about [Marley's Ghost] like a tail" suggests something vaguely demonic about both the visitation *and* the habits that forge the chain. Such perilous bondage in the afterlife is the dominant image throughout the conversation between Scrooge and Marley's Ghost, with the latter repeatedly shrieking and rattling these chains to focus Scrooge's attention on the consequences of cultivating the wrong habits in life. When Scrooge finally musters the courage to ask Marley's Ghost about his chain, he replies, "I wear the chain I forged in

life ... I made it link by link, and yard by yard; I girded it of my own free will, and of my own free will I wore it. Is its pattern strange to *you*?" (16, original emphasis). Of course, the chain is famously *not* strange to Ebenezer Scrooge, as he (at least in the first Stave) "forges," "makes," and "girds" his own invisible chains by rejecting the needs of the poor, shrugging off the affection of his nephew, and ignoring the comfort of his only employee.¹⁶ Marley's Ghost accepts the blame for his habituation because, he maintains, it is a product of his own greedy desires and misguided free will. For Dickens, habit is a choice the individual makes, one capable of self-regulation regardless of the push and pull of individual desire. In Coleridge's articulation of habit as a "Maelstrom" from Gillman's biography, habit is an externalized, chaotic force of nature that subsumes and batters the helpless individual. Regardless of how habits form, their hypothetical influence on the imagined punishments of the afterlife reflects back on the desires habituates were unable to control while alive.

A Christmas Carol imagines the effects of habit in the afterlife, and as the reunion between Marley's Ghost and Scrooge concludes, Scrooge witnesses the listless wandering in store for those who, like Marley, were unable to manage their habits in life. When Marley's Ghost exits through a window, he joins other floating spirits roaming the cityscape:

He [Scrooge] became sensible of confused noises in the air; incoherent sounds of lamentation and regret; wailing inexpressibly sorrowful and self-accusatory. The spectre [Marley's Ghost], after listening for a moment, joined in the mournful dirge; and floated out upon the bleak, dark night.... The air filled with phantoms, wandering hither and thither in restless haste, and moaning as they went. Every one of them wore chains like Marley's Ghost; some few ... were linked together; none were free. The misery with them all was, clearly, that they sought to interfere, for good, in human matters, and had lost the power for ever. (19)

The chain binding Marley's Ghost presents to Scrooge the consequence of habit on the individual, though as the spirits "wander hither and thither in restless haste ... linked together," they forge a collective chain of habit. In Dickens's vision of habit in the afterlife, habit not only entangles the individual, but one actually *becomes* the very symbol of this enslavement in a system of punishment and penance reminiscent of Dante's *Inferno*.¹⁷ Well before the Ghost of Christmas Present introduces allegorized versions of Ignorance and Want to Scrooge, Marley's Ghost and the wandering spirits provide the allegorical structure for unmanaged habit in the afterlife.¹⁸

Reverberations of this comparison between Coleridge and Marley's Ghost echo throughout much of "Coleridge and Opium-Eating," particularly in relation to how readers may come to perceive De Quincey's own relationship to Coleridge. Beyond the opening paragraph, De Quincey objects to Coleridge's claims about the ease with which he attained unfettered sobriety from opium:

He speaks of opium excess – his own excess we mean – the excess of twenty-five years – as a thing to be laid aside easily and forever within seven days; and yet, on the other hand, he describes it pathetically, sometimes with a frantic pathos, as the scourge, the curse, the one almighty blight which has desolated his life. (129-30)

With characteristic vigor, De Quincey dives into the many ways opium corrupted Coleridge's body and mind: it "killed Coleridge as a poet," drove his procrastination, and was generally the cause of *all* of his personal and professional problems (130-31). By rejecting Coleridge's assertion that he could so quickly and so successfully shrug off the opium habit in one week's time, De Quincey disqualifies Coleridge from the same kind of re-habitation and automatic character change suggestive of Scrooge's experience in *A Christmas Carol*. If we bear in mind De Quincey's claim about his own managed habit from the opening quotation of this article, it stands to reason that he envisions

himself as the Ebenezer Scrooge emerging at the end of the story with Coleridge's Ghost forever wandering the night with other listless habituates.

Kathleen Poorman Dougherty uses an Aristotelian model of habituation from the *Nicomachean Ethics* to support the legitimacy of Scrooge's rapid character change in *A Christmas Carol*, and she maintains that such abrupt character change (what Elliot L. Gilbert and Edmund Wilson call "the Scrooge problem") is dependent upon a shift in how he views his surroundings: "Change, for Scrooge, is not a matter of 'rehabituating' himself to a different character, it is a matter of changing the way he perceives the world, and one suspects that given what he now sees, the prospect of going back seems virtually unthinkable" (308).¹⁹ Scrooge's perception of the world is, by the end of the story, one of a man who can better manage his financial and moral economy. Like De Quincey's idealized version of himself, Scrooge can keep his habits in check in order to maintain healthy relationships with others and with himself: donating money to charity, joining his nephew's family for Christmas dinner, giving Bob Cratchet a higher wage, and becoming a "second father" to Tiny Tim (85). De Quincey's "perception of the world" (in Poorman's construction) includes a particular vision of Coleridgean habituation – one that artfully suggests that the more Coleridge resembles the lamentable and irresponsible Marley's Ghost, the more De Quincey resembles Scrooge and his praiseworthy, successful management of habit by the end of the story.²⁰

Athena Vrettos argues that Dickens's most eccentric characters (most notably Pip from *Great Expectations* and Dombey from *Dombey and Son*) "confront the tension between individuality and mechanization that came to be at the center of [the debate about the social and psychological effects of habit]" (401). The Coleridge emerging out of "Coleridge and Opium-Eating" is an off-shoot of such Dickensian eccentricity. Instead of embodying "the tension between individuality and mechanization," Coleridge is a foil for conceptualizing the dangers of mismanaged habituation and their consequences in the afterlife.

II

Embedding an allusion to *A Christmas Carol* into “Coleridge and Opium-Eating” suggests that the partnership between Scrooge and Marley resembles (at least in passing) the friendship and rivalry between De Quincey and Coleridge. Such a close relationship, it would seem, grants De Quincey license to critique and question Coleridge’s opium habit, and just as he brags about standing as “the foremost of [Coleridge’s] admirers” in the biographical essays of the 1830s and ’40s, De Quincey also insists that he remains the “sole authority” on opium habituation in the enlarged 1856 *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater* (September: 510) (1856: 15).²¹ Ian Jack dismisses the renewed attention to Coleridge in the 1856 *Confessions* as gratuitous “skirmishing” and “dog-fighting,” though Jack’s critique undervalues the variety of fictional representations De Quincey employs to textualize Coleridge’s experiences (131, 133).²²

At the center of the renewed attention to Coleridge in the 1856 *Confessions* are multiple dramatizations of opium habituation as a form of metaphorical slavery. De Quincey asks the reader, “What then was it, after all, that made Coleridge a slave to opium, and a slave that could not break his chain? He fancies in his headlong carelessness, that he has accounted for this habit and this slavery” (19). The parallel construction mapping “*this* habit” onto “*this* slavery” underwrites the multiple caricatures in the text that ultimately set the stage for re-conceptualizing the subservience between Coleridge and opium to that of Caliban and Prospero in *The Tempest* – an apropos comparison given Coleridge’s conceptualization of habit as a “Maelstrom.” As with *A Christmas Carol* in “Coleridge and Opium-Eating,” literary characterization engineers cultural perceptions about mismanaged habit by textualizing Coleridge’s experiences in relation to uncontrollable appetite, bankrupt individual agency, and the disappointed intellectual potential of one of the century’s most celebrated poet-philosophers.

Unlike the subtle influence of *A Christmas Carol* on “Coleridge and Opium-Eating,” the 1856 *Confessions* is far more direct in fabricating

dialogue, inventing fictional encounters, and orchestrating scenarios that reaffirm De Quincey's managed (and, therefore, seemingly more legitimate and authentic) opium habituation at Coleridge's expense. In one such example, De Quincey casually impersonates Coleridge, calling attention to how mismanaged habituation overwrites an individual's sense of subjectivity. Appropriating Coleridge's voice, De Quincey announces, "'Know all men by these presents, that I, S.T.C., *a noticeable man with large grey eyes*, am a licensed opium-eater, whereas this other man [De Quincey referring to himself] is a buccaneer, a pirate, a flibustier [*sic*], and can have none but a forged licence [*sic*] in his disreputable pocket. In the name of Virtue, arrest him!" (17-18, original emphasis).²³ This impersonation digresses into an account of Coleridge's "inaccuracy as to facts and citations from books," a statement leading Frederick Burwick to conclude that De Quincey links "as cause and effect, Coleridge's opium addiction and his plagiarism" (1856: 18) (Burwick 44-45). But leaning (as it does) on an important *literary* reference to opium-eating from Wordsworth's "Stanzas Written in my Pocket-Copy of Thomson's 'Castle of Indolence,'" the impersonation hinges just as much on authentic opium experience as it does spurious literary originality.²⁴ By self-identifying through a truncation of his actual identity (Samuel Taylor Coleridge becomes the abbreviated "S.T.C.") only to be substantiated by a more complete description of his "presents" as "*a noticeable man with large grey eyes*" De Quincey makes it seem as if Coleridge actually endorses the validity of the indolence of his representation in Wordsworth's poem.²⁵ De Quincey choreographs the statement so that literary representation is an intractable quality of Coleridge's sense of subjectivity, and the impersonation actually has Coleridge textualize *himself*.²⁶ As a result, the exaggerated sensitivity to the legitimacy of his "licensed" opium-eating credentials in contrast to De Quincey's "forged licence" comically overcompensates for Coleridge's own troubled habits. The reader never forgets who pulls Coleridge's strings, and determining who is the imposter (or, the "buccaneer, pirate and flibustier" holding a "forged licence"), and who maintains a more authentic experience goes without saying.

De Quincey builds upon this impersonation by staging a theatrical re-enactment between Coleridge (cast as a “Transcendental Philosopher”) and a servant paid to forbid him access to a druggist’s shop. The situation is adapted from actual experience, and I quote it at length to showcase the extent to which De Quincey reinvents a situation that shapes correlations between Coleridgean desire, appetite, and the reasoning intellect:

It is notorious that in Bristol (to *that* I can speak myself, but probably in many other places) he went so far as to hire men – porters, hackney-coachmen, and others – to oppose by force his entrance into any druggist’s shop. But, as the authority for stopping him was derived simply from himself, naturally these poor men found themselves in a metaphysical fix ... And in this excruciating dilemma would occur such scenes as the following: –

‘Oh, sir,’ would plead the suppliant porter – suppliant, yet semi-imperative (for equally if he *did*, and if he did *not*, show fight, the poor man’s daily 5s. seemed endangered) – ‘really you must not; consider, sir, your wife and – ’

Transcendental Philosopher. – ‘Wife! what wife? I have no wife.’

Porter. – ‘But, really now, you must not, sir. Didn’t you say no longer ago than yesterday – ’

Transcend. Philos. – ‘Pooh, pooh! yesterday is a long time ago. Are you aware, my man, that people are known to have dropped down dead for timely want of opium?’

Porter. – ‘Ay, but you tell’t me not to hearken – ’

Transcend. Philos. – ‘Oh, nonsense. An emergency, a shocking emergency, has arisen – quite unlooked for. No matter what I told you in times long past. That which I *now* tell you, is – that, if you don’t remove that arm of

yours from the doorway of this most respectable drug-
gist, I shall have a good ground of action against you for
assault and battery. (20-21, original emphases)

De Quincey's adaptation dramatizes the troubling logic produced by Coleridge's uncontrollable appetite for opium. In the span of a single conversation, Coleridge contradicts his own explicit orders to a servant to bar him access to a druggist's shop, he rejects the consideration (and even the very existence) of his own wife, and his own suspicious conception of what constitutes a "shocking emergency" satirizes the bloated desires that co-opt his reasoning intellect. This encounter provides a troubling snapshot of the transcendentalism of this "Transcendental Philosopher," one that showcases how mismanaged habit corrupts one's sense of time, subjectivity, social hierarchy, and even legal recourse. The Coleridge presented here is one who does not necessarily fail at transcendental experience, but when he performs his habituation, one gets a clearer sense of how uncontrollable appetite manipulates the innate mental principles that drive his transcendental perspective. The Coleridge determined to keep himself out of a druggist's shop one day, only to lash out like a tyrant the next day threatening (however ridiculously) to bring a lawsuit against his servant for "assault and battery" anticipates the frenetic psychological desires and fractured identities Robert Louis Stevenson will present in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* in 1868.²⁷ And just as Jekyll and Hyde are fictional characters, so too is this reincarnation of Samuel Taylor Coleridge a product of De Quincey's imagination in the 1856 *Confessions*.

These two examples of literary representation of the opium habituate illustrate how De Quincey's own reimagined portrayals of Coleridge critique a particular kind of opium-eating habit in the 1856 *Confessions*. Alongside De Quincey's invented caricatures is a literary allusion that dramatizes the relationship between Coleridge and opium as comparable to that of Caliban and Prospero in *The Tempest*. De Quincey explains, "A slave he was to this potent drug not less abject than Prospero and Caliban – his detested and yet despotic master. Like Caliban, he frets

his very heart-strings against the rivets of his chain. Still, at intervals through the gloomy vigils of his prison, you hear muttered growls of impotent mutineering swelling upon the breeze..." (20). Like the "Transcendental Philosopher" re-enactment, Coleridge performs his habituation – though in this instance in "gloomy vigils," plucking the "rivets of his chain" while "muttering growls of impotent mutineering." It is no far stretch for De Quincey's reader to consider the "muttering growls of impotent mutineering" as the lamentable cry of the "buccaneer, pirate, and filibustier" from De Quincey's earlier caricature.

Just as Caliban is cowed by Prospero's "despotism," Coleridge similarly shrinks under opium's powerful influence, which suggests a correlation between Prospero's magic and the effects of opium. Coincidental or not, the sedative, mollifying effects of opium upon the individual simulate the effects of Prospero's magic. In the play, when Prospero casts a spell on Miranda to induce sleep, he could just as easily be talking about opium when he gently declares that "'Tis a good dullness,/ And give it way. Know thou canst not choose" (1.2.185-86). Likewise, Caliban could just as easily be talking about the physiological effects of opium when he worries over Prospero's anger: "From toe to crown he'll fill our skins with pinches,/ Make us strange stuff" (4.1.232-33). The seemingly magical effects of the drug that so captivate and metaphorically enslave Coleridge are easily (if unscientifically) interpreted through recourse to England's most influential playwright.

But such an explanation is not without its complications, especially since the end of the play has Prospero willing to abandon his own power and influence over others. In Act 5, Prospero meditates upon his great magical power, and he resolves to cast it aside, return everybody to their former states of consciousness, and forego all mystical practice:

...I have bedimmed
The noontide sun, called forth the mutinous winds,
And twixt the green sea and the azured vault
Set roaring war; to the dread rattling thunder
Have I given fire, and rifted Jove's stout oak

With his own bolt; the strong-based promontory
Have I made shake, and by the spurs plucked up
The pine and cedar; graves at my command
Have waked their sleepers, oped, and let 'em forth
By my so potent art. But this rough magic
I here abjure, and when I have required
Some heavenly music – which even now I do –
To work mine end upon their senses that
This airy charm is for, I'll break my staff,
Bury it certain fathoms in the earth,
And deeper than did ever plummet sound
I'll drown my book. (5.1.41-57)

Whether or not De Quincey has this soliloquy and the "potent art" and "rough magic" culled from the "*mutinous* winds" in mind when characterizing Caliban/Coleridge's "impotent *mutineering* swelling upon the breeze" is speculative.²⁸ If we substitute Prospero's determination to abandon his magic, for the dependency of opium, it suggests that opium (like Prospero) has the capability and willingness to divest *itself* of its own power over those it controls. By breaking his staff, burying it deep in the earth, and submerging his book of magic in the sea, Prospero resolves to change his life (perhaps reminding us in this context of Scrooge's resolve to give up greedy habits in *A Christmas Carol*). This is, of course, an entirely theoretical claim since we never actually see Prospero act upon this promise. In fact, the play ends with Prospero promising Alonso "calm seas, auspicious gales" and he can, supposedly, fulfill such promises because of his magic (5.1.378). Such a characterization raises questions about opium's agency in habituation, though above all, De Quincey wants readers to understand that opium itself is not the problem – the problem is in the person who cannot control his own relationship to habit.

Literary allusion and fictional representation of slavery shape Coleridge's legacy as an opium-eater throughout De Quincey's 1856 *Confessions*, though positioning him as a replication of Caliban also facilitates a

more nuanced understanding of the underlying sophistication of one of Shakespeare's most misunderstood characters. In a lengthy footnote to his posthumously published biography of William Shakespeare, De Quincey complains of the fragmented and misguided interpretations of Caliban that fail to take into account his intellectual potential and his inherent dignity:

Caliban has not yet been thoroughly fathomed. For all Shakespeare's great creations are like works of nature, subjects of unexhaustible [*sic*] study ... Caliban is evidently not meant for scorn, but for abomination mixed with fear and partial respect. He is purposely brought into contrast with the drunken Trinculo and Stephano, with an advantageous result. He is much more intellectual than either, uses a more elevated language, not disfigured by vulgarisms, and is not liable to the low passion for plunder as they are.... He trembles indeed before Prospero; but that is, as we are to understand, through the moral superiority of Prospero in Christian wisdom; for when he finds himself in the presence of dissolute and unprincipled men, he rises at once into the dignity of intellectual power. (80n)²⁹

De Quincey hardly follows his own recommendation to suspend judgment when he uses Caliban and his "muttered growls" to frame Coleridge's experiences. Just as Caliban is a foil for a new textualized Coleridgean 'habit as slavery,' it stands to reason that Coleridge can just as easily inform new perceptions about Caliban. The "intellectual power" and "partial respect" owed to Caliban can be contextualized through Coleridge. Caliban is a subject "of unexhaustible study," and De Quincey's thirty-five years of theorizing Coleridgean habit from the footnote of the first edition of the *Confessions* to the final edition in 1856 exemplifies how study of Coleridge is similarly limitless.

III

In the first flush of De Quincey's death in 1859, Henry M. Alden eulogized De Quincey's life and influence by placing him alongside the most influential writers of the century: his life "inclosed [*sic*], as an island, a whole period of English literature, one, too, which in activity and originality is unsurpassed by any other, including the names of Scott and Dickens, of Wordsworth, Coleridge, Lamb, and Southey, of Moore, Byron, Shelley, and Keats" (346). Alden makes an extraordinary claim that De Quincey was somehow more "active and original" than any other writer of his generation, and he later insists that Coleridge "as an opium-eater, is the only individual worthy of notice in the same connection [as De Quincey]" (360).³⁰ How the Victorians remember De Quincey and Coleridge alongside each other becomes a register for how perceptions of dangerous mismanaged habituation influence questions of which opium-eater was the more authentic than the other. In a move that is all too familiar for De Quincey's attention to Coleridge, Victorian critics rely on literary allusion to shape De Quincey's legacy as an opium-eater, essayist, and provocateur. David Masson (an early editor of De Quincey's collected works and one of his most sympathetic biographers) quotes Shadworth Hodgson's description of De Quincey in relation to Thomson's "The Castle of Indolence," a poem that has become all too familiar when theorizing an opium-eater's identity in the nineteenth century:

Mr. Shadworth Hodgson, who knew him [De Quincey] personally, vouches that no description of him could surpass for exactness that provided beforehand by the poet Thomson in the stanza of his *Castle of Indolence* in which he introduces the bard Philomelus: –

He came, the bard, a little Druid wight
Of withered aspect; but his eye was keen,
With sweetness mixed. In russet brown bedight,
As is his sister in the copses green,
He crept along, unpromising of mien.
Gross he who judges so! His soul was fair,

Bright as the children of yon azure sheen.
True comeliness, which nothing can impair,
Dwells in the mind: all else is vanity and glare.
(qtd. in Masson 150, original emphasis)

The remarkable coincidence that both De Quincey and Coleridge's identities would (by separate people) be tied to Thomson's poem is a microcosm for a particular interpretive dilemma that Victorians faced when conceptualizing the nineteenth century's two most famous opium-eaters. With De Quincey figuring as an extension of the *original* poem, it suggests that he is somehow more authentic than Coleridge's second-hand representation as the "noticeable Man with large grey eyes" within Wordsworth's poetic *copy* of Thomson's "The Castle of Indolence." However, a cross-section of Victorian comparisons of the two opium-eaters maintain that quite the opposite of this assumption is true: that is, they treat De Quincey as the copy of Coleridge, showcasing the futility of De Quincey's literary model of habit in making lasting distinctions between the two opium-eaters and differentiating the integrity of their habits.³¹

Arthur Symons grumbles that "Not even Coleridge is so uneven as De Quincey" (47), and George Saintsbury scoffs at how De Quincey's "pure rigmarole" meanders throughout his text "till the reader feels as Coleridge's auditors must have felt..." (317-18). Symons and Saintsbury isolate literary elements in their comparisons, and at least for Saintsbury, readers get implicated in the comparison: De Quincey's reader is beset by the same frustrations as Coleridge's "auditor." De Quincey not only resembles Coleridge for Symons and Saintsbury, but his readership begins to resemble Coleridge's audience to the detriment of both. George Gillfiles sees this "rigmarole" as a valuable attribute, one among many the two writers share:

It is told of Coleridge, that no shorthand-writer could do justice to his lectures; because, although he spoke deliberately, yet it was impossible, from the first part of his sentences, to have the slightest notion of how they were

to end – each clause was a new surprise, and the close often unexpected as a thunderbolt. In this, as in many other respects, De Quincey resembles the ‘noticeable man with large grey eyes.’ Each of his periods, begin where it may, accomplishes a cometary sweep ere it closes. (299-300)

While this remembrance is complimentary to both writers, it does foreground how De Quincey “resembles” Coleridge, the now infamous “noticeable man with large grey eyes.” By inserting Coleridge’s famous sobriquet into this point, one easily assumes that Gillfiles includes De Quincey’s resemblance as an opium-eater.

It comes as no surprise that given De Quincey’s consistent attention to Coleridge in print from the 1820s through the 1850s, Victorian readers and critics quickly associate the two and interpret their situations and habits alongside each other – though Coleridge emerges as not only the more prominent of the two, but the more authentic opium-eater. Harriet Martineau comments, “De Quincey must have strongly resembled Coleridge. Both were fine Grecians, charming discourses, eminent opium-takers, magnificent dreamers and seers, large in their promises, and helpless in their failure of performance” (95). The similarities Martineau detects give the impression that theirs is a one-way resemblance. De Quincey “strongly resembles” Coleridge, but this is not to say they actually resemble *each other*. She glosses over individual differences: their equally “charming” conversation, “eminent” opium consumption, and “magnificent” imaginative capacities blend into each other as much as does their disappointing “failure of performance.” For Martineau, the strength of De Quincey’s resemblance to Coleridge renders them practically indistinguishable from one another.

Leslie Stephen puts a finer point to Martineau’s comparison, and states “he [De Quincey] not only had not [*sic*] strength to stand alone, but he belonged to a peculiar side-current of English thought. He was the adjective of which Coleridge was the substantive; and if Coleridge himself was an unsatisfactory and imperfect thinker, his imperfections are

greatly increased in his friend and disciple” (260). Stephen recognizes the dire effects of the De Quincey/Coleridge affiliation: Coleridge’s “unsatisfactory and imperfect think[ing]” rubs off on De Quincey, and such intellectual imperfections become “greatly increased” and exasperated in “his disciple.” Martineau and Stephen each treat Coleridge as a baseline by which to understand De Quincey. As a result, De Quincey is remembered either as a carbon copy of Coleridge for the one, or more woefully Coleridgean than Coleridge for the other.³² In what amounts to a devastating blow to any distinction De Quincey attempted to establish between his own authentic, managed opium habit and that of Coleridge’s illegitimate, mismanaged habit, Stephen reduces both De Quincey and Coleridge to a pair of oversimplified and overstated literary terms.

Tulane University

Notes

¹ The *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater* was first published anonymously in serial form in September and October 1821 in *The London Magazine*. Grevel Lindop maintains that “the authorship of the *Confessions* was no mystery to those who knew De Quincey” and Lindop uses Crabb Robinson’s diary entry for 10 September 1821 to carry this point (251). Crabb Robinson notes on 10 September: “I lounged at the Tontine Coffee Room, an institution to which strangers have access. Here I read a strange article, *Confessions of an Opium Taker* [sic] in *London Magazine*, which must be by De Quincey. It is a melancholy composition, a fragment of autobiography in emulation of Coleridge’s diseased egotism...” (1:267). Crabb Robinson’s language suggests more surreptitious discovery of De Quincey’s authorship than Lindop gives him credit for – the “must be by De Quincey” appears accidental. Nevertheless, a book version of the *Confessions* (published by Taylor and Hessey, the publishers of *The London Magazine*) appeared in 1822 and included only minor revisions from the 1821 serial version. A significantly enlarged edition of the *Confessions* appeared in 1856 as part of De Quincey’s collected works, *Selections Grave and Gay*. Unless otherwise

noted in the text, all quotations from the *Confessions* are from Barry Miligan's edition of the 1822 text.

² The *OED* credits De Quincey with coining the terms "opium-eating," "opium taking," and "opium-shattered" in both the 1821 *Confessions* and in the autobiographical essay, "The English Mail Coach." He even stumbles into the *OED* through a separate reference to "opium taking" by twentieth-century humorist and travel writer, Bill Bryson: "Thomas de Quincey [*sic*], in between bouts of opium taking, found time to attack the expression *what on earth*" (2C1b) (Bryson 142, original emphasis).

³ Alethea Hayter notes that "De Quincey is often blamed, and rightly, for the terrible fascination of his masterpiece in drawing in others to follow his example" (*Opium* 35). See Robert Morrison, Wolfgang Schivelbusch (Chapter 8) and Virginia Berridge (Chapter 5) for how De Quincey's self-reported opium experiences influence not only his legacy as a writer, but how nineteenth- and twentieth-century audiences conceptualized drug use. Berridge, in particular, draws a direct line between De Quincey's account of his opium habit and how England understood the heroin "epidemic" in the mid-twentieth century: "a paraphrase of De Quincey's life was quite a regular component of medical journals at the height of the drug 'epidemic' of the 1960s" (50).

⁴ The variety and purpose of De Quincian footnotes are too diverse to explore here, though it is worth noting that he regularly incorporates footnotes clarifying the precise meaning of terms and phrases he uses. Moreover, he includes new footnotes to the American edition of his collected works (published by Ticknor and Fields) not originally included in the British editions. Coincidental to my attention to habit in this article, De Quincey invokes habit, repetition, and originality to define the slang term "Birmingham" in the third installment of the "Samuel Taylor Coleridge" articles in the American edition of his collected works: "Why the word *Birmingham* has come for the last sixty or seventy years to indicate in every class of articles the spurious in opposition to the genuine, I suppose to have arisen from the Birmingham habit

of reproducing all sorts of London or Paris trinkets, *bijouterie*, &c., in cheaper materials and with inferior workmanship" (Ticknor and Fields: 238) [original emphases].

⁵ See Hayter (Penguin, 1971), Lindop (Oxford, 1998), and Milligan (Penguin, 2003) for the most recent critical editions of the *Confessions* based on the 1822 text. The details Lloyd adapts from Coleridge's personal experience include his abandonment of a university education, his failed enlistment in the army, his running away from friends and family, and his opium consumption. In the "Advertisement," Lloyd makes oblique reference to Robert Southey as the source of information about Coleridge's stint in the army: "The incidents relative to the Army were given me by an intimate friend, who was himself eyewitness to one of them, and can produce testimony to the truth of the other two" (xii). See also "Letter LXXXV" in E. Hartley Coleridge, ed., *Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, for extended footnotes on Coleridge's offense at his portrayal in *Edmund Oliver*. Wordsworth's "Stanzas Written in my Pocket-Copy of Thomson's 'Castle of Indolence'" was published in 1815, and inaugurates Coleridge's lasting reputation as "the noticeable Man with large grey eyes." In 1886, T. Hall Caine argues that the "noticeable Man with large grey eyes" is *not* Coleridge, though he provides no other candidate to whom this reference would refer to in Wordsworth's poem (417).

⁶ Coleridge contributes to his own public image as an opium habituate. In the short preface to "Kubla Khan; or, A Vision in a Dream," he dramatizes opium consumption (or, what he calls "prescribed anodynes") and identifies it with his own process of literary creation (511).

⁷ Berridge's *Opium and the People* is the standard text for discussions of how the medicalization and politicization of opium in the Victorian period marks a turning point in attitudes about mid-nineteenth and twentieth-century attitudes about opium consumption.

⁸ Any impropriety leveled at De Quincey for publishing biographical articles so soon after Coleridge's death has more to do with the an-

ecdotal content of his reportage and less with his timing. After all, Heraud's "Reminiscences of Coleridge, Biographical, Philosophical, Poetical, and Critical" appeared in *Frasier's Magazine* in October 1834 – only one month after De Quincey's first installment in *Tait's*.

⁹ Carlyle's assessment of the *Tait's* articles is more forgiving than Southey's: "I believe I had myself read the paper on Coleridge,... In this paper there were probably within some domestic details or allusions, to which, as familiar to rumour, I had paid little heed; but certain, of general reverence for Coleridge and his gifts and deeds, I had traced, not deficiency in this paper, but glaring exaggeration, coupled with De Quincean drawbacks, which latter had alone struck Southey with such poignancy; or perhaps there had been other more criminal papers, which Southey knew of, and not I?" (324-25). Lindop sees beyond what critics historically perceive as the adversarial posturing and "exaggeration" of the *Tait's* articles, and suggests they have the "tone of one who is too close to his subject" (*Life* 317).

¹⁰ In his biography of William Shakespeare, De Quincey insinuates that Shakespeare's daughter, Susanna, was born out of wedlock. He goes to embarrassing lengths to calculate the date of Susanna's conception: "Next suppose the birth of Miss Susanna to have occurred, like her father's, two days before her baptism, viz., on the 24th of May. From December the 1st to May the 24th, both days inclusively, are 175 days; which, divided by seven, gives precisely twenty-five weeks, that is to say, six months short by one week. Oh, fie, Miss Susanna! you came rather before you were wanted" (44).

¹¹ See Neil Vickers for Coleridge's early nineteenth-century interaction with the medical establishment.

¹² It should be noted that Dickens *does* alter this cliché in *Little Dorrit*. Blandois tells Little Dorrit that Gowan's dog has been murdered, and instead of saying the dog was "dead as a door-nail," he puns between "dog" and "Doges" (the chief magistrate of the Venetian Republic). Blandois sneers, "somebody has poisoned that noble dog. He is as dead as the Doges!" (527).

¹³ “Coleridge and Opium-Eating” appeared on the heels of the 1844 publication of Dickens’s second Christmas story, *The Chimes* – the highly anticipated follow-up to *A Christmas Carol*. “Dead as a doornail” was a common phrase in the mid-nineteenth century – it appears as early as 1350 in Langland’s *Piers Plowman* and became Standard English by 1600 (Beale 294). See also Funk (195-96) and Hendrickson (199).

¹⁴ Lindop lists Dickens among a variety of authors influenced by De Quincey: “His [De Quincey’s] literary influence has been inconspicuous but remarkably pervasive, a vein of fantasy, introspection and unease tingeing the work of Poe, Stevenson, Dickens, Baudelaire, Proust, Dostoevsky, Borges and many others” (392). As De Quincey’s appropriation of the opening of *A Christmas Carol* suggests, Dickens also influences De Quincey to an equally “inconspicuous” degree.

¹⁵ See Paul Saint-Amour for a parallel reading of *A Christmas Carol* with Joyce’s “The Dead.” Saint-Amour reads both stories in relation to hospitality, and argues that “the *Carol* invites us to act before the inevitable happens; ‘The Dead’ asked us to be vigilant in case the unforeseeable should arrive” (112).

¹⁶ In addition to theorizing habit as a metaphysical concept, Dickens makes passing reference to some of Scrooge’s idiosyncratic habits when he meets Marley’s Ghost. He states, “Scrooge was not in the *habit* of cracking jokes” and it “was a *habit* with Scrooge to put his hands in his breeches pockets” (14, 16; emphasis added).

¹⁷ Though Stephen Bertman makes no mention of this scene in his analysis of *A Christmas Carol* and Dante’s *The Divine Comedy*, he does assign Scrooge (and by extension, Marley) a home in one of Dante’s Circles of Hell: “Dante would have consigned Scrooge to the Fourth Circle of his multi-level Hell, a place where misers like Scrooge were perpetually punished by pushing heavy weights that symbolized the burden of materialism” (168).

¹⁸ Habit’s impact on the afterlife was a fear of Coleridge’s, and a notebook entry in 1803 articulates this fear about what awaits the habitu-

ate in the afterlife. He wonders, "Is not *Habit* the Desire of a Desire? – As Desire to Fruition, may not the faint, to the consciousness *erased*, Pencil-mark-*memorials* or relicts of Desire be to Desire itself in its full prominence... Must not the Soul then work eternally inwards, Godward, or Hell-ward – will it not all be Habit?" (*Notebooks* 1:1421, original emphases). Coleridge acts out a paralytic psychosomatic response to opium habituation, and his fear about the soul's resiliency to move "Godward, or Hell-ward" reflects dominant cultural anxieties about habit's impact upon the afterlife.

¹⁹ See Elliot L. Gilbert for a history of the "the Scrooge problem" first addressed by Wilson. See M.F. Burnyeat (Chapter 5), Nancy Sherman (Chapter 10), and C.D.C. Reeve (59-61) for explanations and particular dilemmas of Aristotelian habit in the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

²⁰ William James acknowledges the possibility of abrupt character change in *Talks to Teachers on Psychology*, and it would seem as if he has Scrooge in mind when drawing a correlation between habit and punishment: "Sudden conversions, however infrequent they may be, unquestionably do occur. But there is no incompatibility between the general laws I have laid down and the most startling sudden alterations in the way of character ... the general laws of habit are no wise altered thereby ... the hell to be endured hereafter, of which theology tells, is no worse than the hell we make for ourselves in this world by habitually fashioning our characters in the wrong way" (53).

²¹ In response to this claim to being "the foremost of his admirers," the critic mentioned above who blasts De Quincey's "course caricature" sneers, "Heaven preserve all honest men from such forward admirers!" (JCH:20).

²² The textual differences between the 1822 and the 1856 revision of the *Confessions* have been meticulously addressed by Kenneth Forward and Ian Jack. Forward traces how a "painful recollection" (244) of libelous attack in reviews from the 1820s and 1830s motivates revision decisions in the 1856 revision of the *Confessions*, and Jack goes into extraordinary detail about the organizational, stylistic, and elaborated content

shift from the first to the final edition.

²³ Subsequent allusions to Wordsworth's description of Coleridge as a "noticeable Man with large grey eyes" do not consistently reproduce the line verbatim. Oftentimes, "Man" is transcribed as "man" (in lower-case). Unless otherwise noted, I have retained the spelling and capitalization as it appears in the original context of a given quote throughout this article.

²⁴ See Tilar Mazzeo (Chapter 2) for a discussion of De Quincey's accusations of Coleridgean plagiarism in relation to the psychology of habit.

²⁵ See Paley for a history of Coleridge's portraiture and how his opium-eating influenced his representation in prose sketches and formal portraiture. In particular, see the discussion of the Northcoate portrait (35-36) and speculation about how his "glistening" forehead in the portrait may be suggestive of opium withdrawal.

²⁶ It is worth remembering that Coleridge, himself, already claimed affinity with Shakespeare's Hamlet. He states, "Hamlet's character is the prevalence of the abstracting and generalizing habit over the practical ... I have a smack of Hamlet myself, if I may say so" (qtd. in Bate 160-61).

²⁷ See Daniel L. Wright for connections between psychology, addiction, and *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*.

²⁸ "Mutineere" appears once in *The Tempest*, though in relation to a sympathetic stance toward Caliban. After Trinculo insults Caliban, Stephano warns his shipmate to "keep a good tongue in your head. If you/ prove a mutineer – the next tree! The poor monster's my subject, and he shall not suffer indignity" (3.2.33-34). See Howard-Hill (135) for an authoritative concordance to the First Folio of *The Tempest*.

²⁹ The biography of Shakespeare initially appeared in 1838, but was also included in Masson's collected edition of De Quincey's work in 1862. In the "Preface" to Volume 15, Masson quotes a letter from De Quincey complaining of the labor it took to complete the article: "No paper ever cost me so much labour: parts of it have been recomposed three times over... The final part has cost me a vast deal

of labour in condensing; and I believe, if you examine it, you will not complain of want of novelty, which luckily was in this case quite reconcilable with truth, – so deep is the mass of error which has gathered about Shakspeare [sic]" (qtd. in *Collected Works* vi-vii). De Quincey's "Shakspeare" was also published as a single volume by Masson in 1864, with a prefatory note mentioning, "in justice to the author, that it was written in the year 1838, and had not the benefit of any revision before his lamented death, which occurred in the year 1859" (Masson n.p.).

³⁰ Determining whether the "activity and originality" Alden addresses is in reference to De Quincey or to the collective effort of all the writers he names is frustratingly indistinct. Ticknor and Fields (the editors of *The New Atlantic*) probably embraced such a vague construction given that they released installments of a 22-volume American collection titled *De Quincey's Writings* in 1851.

³¹ Arthur Conan Doyle incorporates a brief mention of De Quincey in the fictional world of Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson. In "The Man with the Twisted Lip" Watson recalls that "Isa Whitney ... was much addicted to opium. The habit grew upon him, as I understand, from some foolish freak when he was at college, for having read De Quincey's description of his dreams and sensations..." (113). The "foolish freak" of reading De Quincey suggests Watson's (and, by extension, Doyle's) dismissive opinion of De Quincey's work and influence.

³² Stephen's suggestion that De Quincey is more Coleridgean than Coleridge is similar to how Coleridge identifies himself as more Hartlean than David Hartley in a 1794 letter to Robert Southey. Coleridge says, "I am a compleat [sic] Necessitarian – and understand the subject as well almost as Hartley himself – but I go farther than Hartley and believe the corporeality of *thought* – namely, that it is motion" (*Letters* 137, original emphasis).

Works Cited

- Alden, Henry M. "Thomas De Quincey." *The Atlantic Monthly* 22 (1863): 345-68.
- Berridge, Virginia. *Opium and the People*. London and New York: Free Association Books, 1999.
- Bertman, Stephen. "Dante's Role in the Genesis of Dickens's *A Christmas Carol*." *Dickens Quarterly* 24.3 (2007): 167-75.
- Bryson, Bill. *The Mother Tongue*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1991.
- Burnyeat, M.F. "Aristotle on Learning to Be Good." *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics*. Ed. Amélie Rorty. U of California P, 1981. 69-92.
- Burwick, Frederick. "De Quincey on Coleridge." *Coleridge's Afterlives*. Ed. James Vigus and Jane Wright. New York: Palgrave, 2008. 36-53.
- Cain, T. Hall. "Correspondence: A Noticeable Man with Large Grey Eyes." *The Academy* 763 (December 1886): 412.
- Carlyle, Thomas. "Appendix." *Reminiscences*. Ed. James Anthony Froude. Vol. 2. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1881. 321-37.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. "To Charles Lloyd." *Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. Ed. Ernest Hartley Coleridge. Vol. 1. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1895. 249-53.
- . *The Notebooks of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. Ed. Kathleen Coburn. Vol. 1. Princeton UP, 1957. 1421.
- . "Kubla Khan: or, A Vision in a Dream." 1816. *The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. Ed. J.C.C. Mays. Vol. 16. Princeton UP, 2001. 509-14.
- . "To Robert Southey." *Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1785-1800)*. Ed. Earl Leslie Griggs. Vol 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. 133-43.
- . from *Table Talk*. 1836. *The Romantics on Shakespeare*. Ed. Jonathan Bate. New York: Penguin, 1992. 160-63.
- Crabb Robinson, Henry. *Henry Crabb Robinson on Books and Their Writers*. Ed. Edith J. Morley. Vol. 2. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1938.

Daniel R. Mangiavellano, "De Quincey, Coleridge, and the Literary Model of Habit"

"Dead as a door-nail." *Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional Usage*. 2nd ed. 1984.

De Quincey, Thomas. "Coleridge and Opium-Eating." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 58.357 (January 1845): 117-32.

———. *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater*. 1856. Ed. David Masson. New York: A.L. Burt Company, 1904.

———. *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater*. 1822. Ed. Barry Milligan. New York: Penguin Books, 2003.

———. "Samuel Taylor Coleridge." *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* 1.8 (September 1834): 509-20.

———. "Samuel Taylor Coleridge." *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* 1.9 (October 1834): 588-96.

———. "Samuel Taylor Coleridge." *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* 2.13 (January 1835): 3-10.

———. "Samuel Taylor Coleridge." *Literary Reminiscences*. Vol. 3. Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1865. 221-38.

———. *Shakspeare*. 1838. *Biographies of Shakspeare, Pope, Goethe, and Schiller*. Ed. David Masson. Vol. 15. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1862. 1-84.

Dickens, Charles. *A Christmas Carol*. 1843. New York: Bantam Books, 2002.

———. *Little Dorrit*. 1857. Ed. Stephen Wall and Helen Small. New York: Penguin Books, 2003.

Dougherty, Kathleen Poorman. "Habituation and Character Change." *Philosophy and Literature* 31.2 (2007): 294-310.

Doyle, Arthur Conan. "The Man with the Twisted Lip." 1891. *The Adventures and the Memoirs of Sherlock Holmes*. Ed. Ed Glinert. New York: Penguin Books, 2001. 113-36.

Forward, Kenneth. "'Libellous Attack' on De Quincey." *PMLA* 52 (1937): 244-60.

Foxcroft, Louise. *The Making of Addiction*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.

Funk, Charles Earle. *A Hog on Ice*. New York: Quill, 1948.

- Gilbert, Elliot L. "The Ceremony of Innocence: Charles Dickens' *A Christmas Carol*." *PMLA* 90 (1975): 22-31.
- Gillfillan, George. "Thomas De Quincey, Second Sitting." *A Second Gallery of Literary Portraits*. Edinburgh: James Hogg, 1852. 294-304.
- Gillman, James. *The Life of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. London: William Pickering, 1838.
- Hayter, Alethea, ed. *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater*. By Thomas De Quincey. 1822. New York: Penguin, 1971.
- . *Opium and the Romantic Imagination*. U of California P, 1968.
- Hendrickson, Robert. *The Facts on File Encyclopedia of Word and Phrase Origins*. New York: Facts on File, 2004.
- Heraud, John Abraham. "Reminiscences of Coleridge, Biographical, Philosophical, Poetical and Critical." *Frasier's Magazine* 10.58 (October 1834): 379-403.
- Howard-Hill, T.H. *Oxford Shakespeare Concordances: The Tempest*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Jack, Ian. "De Quincey Revises His *Confessions*." *PMLA* 72 (1957): 122-46.
- James, William. "The Laws of Habit." *Talks to Teachers on Psychology and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals*. 1898. Ed. Frederick H. Burkhardt. Harvard UP, 1983. 47-54.
- J.C.H. "Samuel Taylor Coleridge and the English Opium-Eater." *British Magazine* 7 (January 1835): 15-27.
- Lindop, Grevel, ed. *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater*. By Thomas De Quincey. 1822. Oxford UP, 1998.
- . *The Opium-Eater: A Life of Thomas De Quincey*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1981.
- Lloyd, Charles. *Edmund Oliver*. 1798. Ed. Jonathan Wordsworth. New York and London: Woodstock Books, 1990.
- Martineau, Harriet. "Thomas De Quincey." *Biographical Sketches*. New York: Leypoldt & Holt, 1868. 93-101.
- Masson, David. *De Quincey*. London: MacMillian & Co., Ltd., 1911.
- , ed. *Shakspeare: A Biography*. By Thomas De Quincey. 1838. Ed-

Daniel R. Mangiavellano, "De Quincey, Coleridge, and the Literary Model of Habit"

inburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1864.

Mazzeo, Tilar J. *Plagiarism and Literary Property in the Romantic Period*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2007.

Morrison, Robert. "‘I hereby present you, courteous reader’: The Literary Presence of Thomas De Quincey." *Charles Lamb Bulletin* 90 (1995): 68-72.

"Opium-eating" Def. 2C1b. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989.

"Opium taking" Def. 2C1b. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989.

"Opium-shattered" Def. 2C1c. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989.

Paley, Morton. *Portraits of Coleridge*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Reeve, C.D.C. *Practices of Reason*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Saint-Amour, Paul K. "'Christmas Yet To Come': Hospitality, Futurity, the Carol, and 'The Dead.'" *Representations* 98 (2007): 193-217.

Saintsbury, George. "De Quincey." *Essays in English Literature 1780-1860*. London: Percival and Co., 1890. 304-38.

Schivelbusch, Wolfgang. *Tastes of Paradise*. Tr. David Jacobson. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. c. 1610-11. Ed. Gerald Graff and James Phelan. Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin, 2000.

Sherman, Nancy. "The Habituation of Character." *Aristotle's Ethics: Critical Essays*. Ed. Nancy Sherman. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999. 231-60.

Standiford, Les. *The Man Who Invented Christmas*. New York: Crown, 2008.

Stephen, Leslie. "De Quincey." *Hours in a Library*. 1874. Vol. 1. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1899. 237-68.

Symons, Arthur. "A Word on De Quincey." *Studies in Prose and Verse*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1922. 47-51.

Vickers, Neil. *Coleridge and the Doctors, 1795-1806*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.

Vrettos, Athena. "Defining Habits: Dickens and the Psychology of Repetition." *Victorian Studies* 42.3 (1999): 399-426.

- Wilson, Edmund. *The Wound and the Bow*. Oxford UP, 1965.
- Wordsworth, William. "Stanzas Written in my Pocket-Copy of Thomson's 'Castle of Indolence.'" 1815. *Wordsworth's Poetical Works*. Ed. Thomas Hutchinson and Ernest de Selincourt. Oxford UP, 1975. 85.
- Wright, Daniel L. "'The Prisonhouse of My Disposition': A Case Study of the Psychology of Addiction in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*." *Studies in the Novel* 26.3 (1994): 254-67.
- Zieger, Susan. *Inventing the Addict*. U of Massachusetts P, 2007.

