IN the autumn of 1820, Shelley's publisher, Charles Ollier, inaugurated a new periodical. The first number appeared in time for the Christmas trade, and John Gisborne sent Shelley a copy of the *Literary Miscellany, in Prose and Verse, by Several Hands* (1820) in a long-awaited box. Shelley referred to it indirectly in his letter to Thomas Love Peacock dated 20 November 1820.

The box containing my books, and consequently your Essay against the cultivation of poetry, has not arrived; my wonder, meanwhile, in what manner you support such a heresy in this matter-of-fact and money-loving age, holds me in suspense. The essay that Shelley was anxious to see was, of course, Peacock's "The Four Ages of Poetry", in which the poet's friend would argue satirically yet seriously too that poetry had in effect outlived its purpose and that the several good minds still engaged in its creation and cultivation could more profitably and more intelligently be applied to science, politics, or the useful arts.

When Shelley read Peacock's article, the amused irony of his letter turned to shock, confusion, and then determination to answer, but not in kind. He could delight in Peacock's wit; he could not let pass unchallenged such an effective disparagement of devotion to the imagination. Shelley wrote Charles Ollier on 20 January 1821, acknowledging receipt of the books, reviews, and periodicals that the publisher had included in the shipment.

I have also to thank you for the present of one or two of your publications. I am enchanted with your *Literary Miscellany*, although the last article it contains

---

1 I first saw the *Literary Miscellany*, a very rare item indeed, in the Hare Collection at Trinity College, Cambridge. In the preparation of this essay I also used the copy at Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania. I am grateful to the Librarians of both institutions for the privilege of working with their copies, especially since Bryn Mawr's had been the property of the late Chauncey Brewster Tinker and Trinity's the personal copy of J. C. Hare.

has excited my polemical faculties so violently, that the moment I get rid of my ophthalmia I mean to set about an answer to it, which I will send to you, if you please. It is very clever, but, I think, very false (Letters, ii. 258).

Why Peacock wrote “The Four Ages of Poetry”, the last article in Ollier’s Miscellany, remains unclear. Shelley certainly shared many of his specific reservations about contemporary poets and men of letters, but he had not anticipated Peacock’s fundamental rejection of poetry in their time. He might have been prepared for such sharpness or severity, it was difficult to read the tone of the article with any confidence, if he had been able to read the unfinished “Essay on Fashionable Literature” that Peacock had worked at in 1818. The villains of it, nevertheless, are not so much poets as lightweight readers and high-sounding, senseless critics; indeed, “Fashionable Literature” surprises one with an extended defence of Coleridge’s “Christabel” and even hints that a sympathetic treatment of Wordsworth might have become part of it. Peacock’s letter to Shelley of 4 December 1820, written while the poet awaited the arrival in Italy of the box containing his books and his friend’s “heretical” essay, restated in brief the argument of “The Four Ages of Poetry” and placed it in a context that might have made it easier for Shelley to understand or accept if the letter had reached him before the box.

Considering poetical reputation as a prize to be obtained by a certain species of exertion, and that the sort of thing which obtains this prize is the drivelling doggerel published under the name of “Barry Cornwall”, I think but one conclusion possible,—that to a rational ambition poetical reputation is not only not to be desired, but earnestly to be deprecated. The truth, I am convinced, is, that there is no longer a poetical audience among the higher class of minds; that moral, political, and physical science have entirely withdrawn from poetry the attention of all whose attention is worth having; and that the poetical reading public being composed of the mere dregs of the intellectual community, the most sufficing passport to their favour must rest on the mixture of a little easily-intelligible portion of mawkish sentiment, with an absolute negation of reason and knowledge. These I take it to be the prime and sole elements of Mr. Barry Cornwall’s “Madrigals”.  

The mixed reviews of *The Cenci* (1819) that Shelley had hoped would be popular, the indecision he felt concerning major literary undertakings following the publication of *Prometheus Unbound* (1820), the persistence of emotional distraction in the wake of deep family sorrow, his concern for the plight of Emilia Viviani, his interest in the Neapolitan cause, the trouble with his eyes, his uncertainty concerning Peacock's intention in the *Miscellany* essay, all contributed to the difficulty that Shelley had in composing an appropriate rebuttal, but he did respond to Peacock's letter. A month after announcing to Ollier that he would answer "The Four Ages of Poetry", Shelley put together, on 15 February 1821, a pleasant letter to Peacock agreeing with his particular objections to Barry Cornwall's ottava rimas and declining, at least for the time being, to attempt a vindication of poetry in general.

The world is pale with the sickness of such stuff. At the same time, your anathemas against poetry itself excited me to a sacred rage, or caloëthes scribendi of vindicating the insulted Muses. I had the greatest possible desire to break a lance with you, within the lists of a magazine, in honour of my mistress Urania; but God willed that I should be too lazy, and wrested the victory from your hope; since first having unhorsed poetry, and the universal sense of the wisest in all ages, an easy conquest would have remained to you in me, the knight of the shield of shadow and the lance of gossamere. Besides, I was at that moment reading Plato's "Ion", which I recommend you to reconsider (Letters, ii. 261).

A week later, nevertheless, Shelley was continuing arrangements with Charles Ollier to have his formal response to Peacock entered in the "lists" of the *Literary Miscellany*, perhaps at the publisher's suggestion following Shelley's offer of such a piece.

Peacock's essay is at Florence at present. I have sent for it, and will transmit to you my paper as soon as it is written, which will be in a very few days. Nevertheless, I should be sorry that you delayed your magazine through dependence on me. I will not accept anything for this paper, as I had determined to write it, and promised it to you, before I heard of your liberal arrangements; I shall be glad to contribute to your magazine on those terms (Letter from Pisa, 22 February 1821, Letters, ii. 268-9).

The several drafts¹ of Shelley's formal communication to the editor of the *Literary Miscellany* in response to "The Four Ages of Poetry" suggest how carefully the poet approached the task. His difficulty in finding the most suitable direction is clear, but

¹ *Letters*, ii. 272-4.
perhaps part of that difficulty stemmed from his having sensed that Peacock’s argument against poetry, staggering to himself yet most likely composed “’twixt earnest and joke”, was a public expression of recent unsettling transitions in Peacock’s private life. The letter of 4 December had suggested that Peacock might be trying to persuade himself as well as Shelley and others that a “poetical reputation is not only not to be desired, but earnestly to be deprecated.” There had been something irritable and unreasonable in Peacock’s recent fulminations: “If I should live to the age of Methusalem, and have uninterrupted literary leisure I should not find the time to read Keats’s Hyperion”.¹ Peacock’s appointment at the East India House in 1819, his marriage in 1820, and responsibilities following upon both those events no doubt shortened his patience with poets and their present taste for passion, fantasy, and mysticism unrestrained by reason and reality and, unhappily, diminished his own aspirations as a poet.

Shelley’s finished manuscript of “A Defence of Poetry” was posted to Charles Ollier on 20 March 1821, and, as Shelley told Peacock in a letter the next day, he had in the end “taken a more general view of what is Poetry”.² Shelley hoped that his friend might agree with some of his points without feeling his own challenged. Although he promised Ollier two other parts of the “Defence” for the Miscellany, Shelley did not want to engage Peacock in a feud of any kind. Near the end of the “Defence” itself he gave another reason for his essay’s being “devoid of the formality of a polemical reply”: “it belongs to a philosophical critic to distinguish rather than confound”.³ In demonstration of his distaste for criticism that confounds, Shelley expressed his deeply felt beliefs concerning the nature of poetry and the role of the poet in the finest language, dignified, graceful, and reasonable as well as imaginative. He did not,

² Letters, ii 275.
however, write the other parts of the "Defence" that he had promised Ollier, and the publisher did not publish the essay Shelley sent him.¹

For still undiscovered reasons the second number of Ollier's *Literary Miscellany*, in preparation and planned for March 1821, did not appear either, and the one and only number is rarely mentioned now except in connection with "The Four Ages of Poetry" and "A Defence of Poetry", probably because it is rarely seen.² Yet Shelley had been "enchanted" with the *Miscellany* and obviously not because it contained Peacock's essay. If "The Four Ages of Poetry" had shocked him, confused him, and moved him to make impassioned philosophical distinctions, what in that first and last *Miscellany* had Shelley found so charming, delightful, or simply attractive?

In that letter of 20 January 1821 to Charles Ollier, Shelley had mentioned finding "two beautiful stories" in the magazine, both apparently attributable to Ollier himself.³ The identification of the stories that impressed Shelley may be complicated by the fact that in addition to those that Ollier might have written, "The Convict" and "The Disinterment", the magazine contains two narrative poems, "The Siege of Ancona", written by la Motte-Fouqué and translated by Julius Charles Hare, and "David Ramsay" by Allan Cunningham. Shelley did, however, remark in some detail on one other piece.

Who is your commentator on the German Drama? He is a powerful thinker, though I differ from him *toto caelo* about the Devils of Dante and Milton. If you know him personally, pray ask him from me what he means by receiving the *spirit into me*, and (if really it is any good) how one is to get at it. I was immeasurably amused by the quotation from Schlegel about the way in which the popular faith is destroyed—first the Devil, then the Holy Ghost, then God the Father. I had written a Lucianic essay to prove the same thing (*Letters*, ii. 258).

¹ Mrs. Shelley first published "A Defence of Poetry" after the poet's death in *Essays; Letters from Abroad; Translations and Fragments* (1840).


³ There is no disagreement about the authorship of "The Disinterment". "The Convict" is signed "MLC" in the magazine, but apparently Ollier later considered it his since he included it in his *Inesilla, or the Tempter, A Romance; with Other Tales* (1824) (ibid. p. 128).
The author of "On the German Drama, No. 1: Oehlenschlaeger", obviously the beginning of a projected series, was Julius Charles Hare (1795-1855), a young Master of Arts who had gone down from Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1818, and who was then officially engaged in reading law at the Middle Temple. Hare had distinguished himself at the University in the Classics and as an enthusiastic admirer of Wordsworth and Coleridge. His real work in London from 1818 to 1822 became the translation of German literature in the hope that the attention of the reading public might be turned away from what he considered the shallow, frivolous, and scandal-mongering stuff that for the most part filled the magazines then and that the educated might be further enlightened by an infusion of new ideas. Hare's attitude toward fashionable literature differed very little from Peacock's. Coincidentally, Shelley and Mary had just finished reading Hare's translation of Baron de la Motte-Fouqué's Sintram and His Companions.1 Early in January 1821, Shelley had sent the romance on to Claire Clairmont without comment.2 We do not know if Ollier ever told Shelley who his anonymous commentator on the German drama was or that he knew Hare since he had published Sintram; we do know that some years later Lady Shelley identified the author as Julius Hare.3

Shelley seems to have been genuinely interested in learning more about the author of the essay on German drama for another, more personal, reason. He closed the letter of 20 January 1821 to Ollier with a second request for information.

Who wrote the review in your publication of my "Cenci"? It was written in a friendly spirit, and, if you know the author, I wish you would tell him how much obliged I am to him for this spirit, more gratifying to me than any literary laud (Letters, ii. 259).

1 Mary Shelley's Journal, ed. Frederick L. Jones (University of Oklahoma Press, 1947), p. 143 and n. 61. 2 Letters, ii. 254 and n. 2. 3 The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley, ed. Roger Ingpen (London and New York, 1909), ii. 846, n. 2. Lady Shelley probably learned of Hare's connection with the Literary Miscellany through Mary Shelley who became friendly with Mrs. Anne Paul Hare, Julius's sister-in-law, a few years after the poet's death (see Mary Shelley's Journal, p. 201). Hare's copy of the Miscellany in Trinity College Library presents in Hare's hand his assignment of the authorship of the contents.
Shelley's indefinite reference to the review suggests that there was a separate article of the usual kind and proportions in the *Literary Miscellany* on the subject of his tragedy. An ordinary search would lead one to conclude that Shelley had been mistaken when he mentioned "your publication", for no such review can be found in the *Miscellany*.\(^1\) Newman Ivey White decided, as one would, that the poet referred to a portion of another work appearing in *The Retrospective Review*,\(^2\) which Shelley had received along with the *Miscellany*. There the reviewer observed that despite "the odious subject" of Shelley's drama "mighty elements in his genius" are discernible in it.\(^3\) Notwithstanding, there did appear just as substantial a notice or review of *The Cenci* in Ollier's publication as Shelley indicated, and it appears in the article by Julius Hare on the German drama.

Hare devoted a large portion of his essay to a discussion of the literary fault of the dramatist or poet who makes a character analyse in an impersonal, almost mechanical, way his own feelings and actions and concluded with the general assertion that evil results from "the separation which the individual consciousness establishes between itself and the rest of creation".\(^4\) Hare went to Shelley for support of his second point.

In the words of a great modern poet, whose genius, when he has bowed down his neck and received into himself the purifying and sanctifying influence of the Spirit, if such be his earthly fate, must assuredly prove a cherisher of innocent thoughts and a kindler of noble thoughts unto many:

\[\text{It is their trick}
\text{To analyse their own and other minds.}
\text{Such self-anatomy doth teach the will}
\text{Dangerous secrets. For it tempts our powers,}\]

\(^1\) *Letters*, ii. 259, n. 9.
\(^2\) *The Retrospective Review* (1820-6, 1827-8) had just been launched by another Cantabrigian, Henry Southern (1799-1853), who took his B.A. at Trinity College in 1819, one year later than Hare, and like Hare was in London reading law at the Middle Temple but devoting his major efforts to literature.
\(^4\) Ollier's *Literary Miscellany*, p. 149.
Shelley’s direct response to this passage in his letter to Ollier of 20 January—"pray ask him from me what he means by receiving the spirit into me"—indicates that Hare’s notice, not that in The Retrospective Review, was the one that Shelley appreciated especially. Obviously Hare’s characterization of Shelley as an arrogant atheist in the solemn and dramatic language of an Evangelical sermonizer amused the poet, but he sensed also the friendliness behind the manner. Not many readers or reviewers had called him “a great modern poet”, and few beyond his closest friends had even felt, let alone announced, that the author of The Cenci possessed a genius that might make him “a cherisher of innocent thoughts and a kindler of noble thoughts”, which Shelley certainly considered himself to be. Hare’s slight reference said a lot to Shelley that he needed to hear in a dark time; it meant that a stranger had read his drama closely enough to be able to know the heart or the spirit of the man who wrote it. His repeated request that Ollier identify the author of “On the German Drama” implies that Shelley had been both personally and intellectually impressed by the writer’s tone and his ideas.

Julius Hare’s participation in Ollier’s Literary Miscellany was not limited to the essay on the German drama. He also contributed “A. W. Schlegel on Shakespeare’s Romeo and Juliet: with Remarks upon the Character of German Criticism” (pp. 1-39) in which he maintained that Schlegel’s Lectures on Dramatic Art offered “the truest, ablest, and fullest delineation” of Shakespeare’s genius then available, better than the work of other Germans—Lessing, Herder, Goethe, Wieland, and Eschenberg—and better also than that of Hazlitt, Lamb, and Coleridge, although Hare found something to give Englishmen hope in the lectures or the writings of each of their countrymen that he named. Shelley might, indeed, have found the Miscellany more attractive because he had known A. W. Schlegel’s Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature as translated by J. Black in 1815.1

1 Mary Shelley’s Journal, p. 93, the entry for 16[-21] March 1818, and Shelley and His Circle, vi. 527, n. 8. K. N. Cameron, The Young Shelley, Genesis of a
He had read aloud from it to Mary and Claire as they travelled south from Rheims to Lyons in the Spring of 1818. In addition, Ollier's *Literary Miscellany* published Hare's blank verse translation of la Motte-Fouqué's "Siege of Ancona" (pp. 54-61), a romantic narrative poem, mentioned above, which illustrates the transcendent power of love to assist both men and nations, a recurrent theme of course in Shelley's own work and perhaps sufficient reason for Shelley to find the story "beautiful".

There is no indication that Shelley suspected that the author of the piece on German drama was responsible as well for the essay on Schlegel and the poem by la Motte-Fouqué nor that Ollier identified his heaviest contributor as Julius Hare or Hare as in fact his assistant or editor in his new publishing venture, the *Literary Miscellany*. Letters from Hare to Ollier in the Boston Public Library demonstrate that the young Templar had been closely associated with the undertaking from beginning to end.¹

The Olliers published Hare's translation of *Sintram* in the early summer of 1820. Their relationship had commenced, however, about a year earlier, certainly after the publishers had purchased the copyright for *The Literary Pocket-Book* from Leigh Hunt in July. In October 1819, Hare wrote Charles Ollier apologizing for holding up his printer; the young man had gone off to his aunt's home at Worthing for a holiday without the list of German authors he had been preparing for the *Pocket-Book* and suggested alternative means of accommodating the publisher. He went on to offer a number of ideas for improving that pretty little *vade mecum*, and then turned his thoughts in a fresh and more promising direction.

May I be allowed to suggest to you that considering the number of ingenious young authors with whom you are acquainted, I think you could not fail of succeeding if you could engage some of them to contribute towards a Journal or Magazine, something in the style of, though of course considerably different

---

¹ Three manuscript letters: to Mr. Ollier, 18 October 1819; to [?], n.d.; and to Mr. C. Ollier, 26 December 1820. I use the letters and quote from them by courtesy of the Trustees of the Boston Public Library; they were first called to my attention by the late David Bonnell Green.
from Blackwood's. Notwithstanding the chaotic press of periodical publications that steam forth from the press, I think there is still room for another globe to steer through the intellectual world without jostling against anything except a stray comet or two, and they, alas, are not very abundant. You would however, should you think seriously of any such scheme, be on your guard lest your own journal should be rather too cometlike in nature; which, considering your probable correspondents, would not be very improbable. Notwithstanding... I would gladly contribute anything in my power, towards filling up your numbers, at least till you found letters pouring in in floods and had no difficulty except that of selection.

Apparently conceived therefore by Julius Hare, the Literary Miscellany did not have an easy birth although Hare surely did his utmost to fill up the pages. When correcting proofs for Ollier's publication of his translation of Sintram during the early summer of 1820, Hare wrote Charles Ollier offering to translate an "admirable article" from the Vienna Review concerning A. W. Schlegel's dramatic lectures, which he would gladly supply for the first number in addition to his own essay on Schlegel. Despite the obvious redundancy, he saw no real difficulty in that: the "subject is Shakespeare the prince of poets, and the drama the topmost region of poetry". The letter, postmarked 26 December 1820, casts Hare as assistant or editor of the ill-fated second number of Ollier's Miscellany. He told Ollier that he could not be satisfied with some sonnets submitted by Mr. Hinds, without consulting the author, but he promised them for the middle of the second number. Hare seemingly tried to pick up Ollier's flagging interest: "Let us be diligent and energetic, and try if we cannot lick Campbell and Colburn", the editor and proprietor respectively of The New Monthly Magazine and Literary Journal, who had just embarked in 1820 on a new series of that periodical. Though still hopeful, Hare himself had no intention of maintaining his involvement with Ollier's Miscellany. "If your second number succeeds, I shall hope to get you a very powerful assistant for the third".

The editorial assistant of Ollier's Literary Miscellany had not intended his essay "On the German Drama" to be a review, as such, of anyone, not even Oehlenschlaeger, the

1 Probably Samuel Hinds (1793-1872), author of Sonnets and Other Short Poems, Chiefly on Sacred Subjects (London, 1834) (D.N.B.).
Danish poet and dramatist who either wrote in German or translated into that language what he created in Danish. Hare wanted, first of all, to clarify what he considered a dangerous development in romantic literature, especially the drama—the unmotivated and unnatural analysis of a character by the character himself in dialogue or in soliloquy. Since he felt his countrymen should know more about literary events in Germany, he used a bad German play, Muellner’s *The Guilt*, and a good one, Oehlenschlaeger’s *Aladdin*, to demonstrate his thesis. Hare mocked the automatic mouthings of Muellner’s characters and deplored the “superabundance of art” everywhere in the play.

There is nowhere any under-current, any secret working of passion, every vein and nerve and muscle is dissected and exposed to view, and accompanied with an anatomical commentary upon all its purposes and beauties. None of his personages are contented with being what they are, and acting accordingly; they must be always telling you that they are such, and are so eaten up by morbid self-consciousness, that they can neither think nor talk about anything except their own prodigious selves (*Literary Miscellany*, p. 96).

In his last words on Shelley in the *Memoirs* of 1858 Peacock found a similar inclination to have been Shelley’s only fault.

What was, in my opinion, deficient in his poetry was, as I have already said, the want of reality in the characters with which he peopled his splendid scenes, and to which he addressed or imparted the utterance of his impassioned feelings. He was advancing, I think, to the attainment of this reality.¹

Hare had no such hope for Muellner. After praising Oehlenschlaeger for avoiding that pitfall he presented a twenty-five page (123-48) condensation of *Aladdin* with copious translated extracts in hexameter couplets. Although Hare seems to digress wherever possible in the body of his essay and in the footnotes, he argued consistently and persuasively for implicit, unanalysed, organic unity of detail. He made it clear also that he considered medieval literature worthy of imitation by more of his contemporaries and that, if a moral lesson were to be drawn from what he presented to his readers, it was that habitual self-analysis inevitably became morbid and productive of evil. Hare was pleased that Shelley, through his Orsino in Act II of *The Cenci*, had come to the same conclusion, and so the “review” to which Shelley responded.

¹ *Memoirs of Shelley and other Essays and Reviews*, p. 82.
Still, one can see, without straining, how Shelley might have been inclined to call a flattering reference a review upon closer examination of "On the German Drama". Hare supported his arguments about Oehlenschlaeger and literature in general with critical allusions to the undisputed great, Dante, Homer, Shakespeare, Milton, and Goethe, as might have been expected, but in his notes he discusses his English contemporaries also. Hare criticized Wordsworth for sometimes allowing his characters to "marvel! at the idea" their lines were supposed to express and for his simplicity that is "occasionally too well aware how simple it is". He thought Wordsworth guilty also of adverting too explicitly and too often to his distaste for the literature of the preceding age, a preoccupation that gave Wordsworth’s work "a windy side", such as a tree might develop that had been too long exposed to strong and steady winds from one point of the compass. Nevertheless, Hare believed that critics had overemphasized the difficulties caused by Wordsworth’s simplicity and that "many of his characters possess an entire poetical reality and truth" (Miscellany, pp. 102-4 n.).

Acknowledging that Byron could write "fine-sounding misanthropical lines", Hare characterized "the noble Lord" as "the prince of egotists"; in reading his verse tales, one must be repeatedly confounded by his use of He and I, "for no human being ever thought or spake of himself, as a third person would describe him" (Miscellany, pp. 105-6 n.). Hare considered Coleridge’s introduction of German principles into English thought praiseworthy, but he could not agree with the poet-philosopher’s disparagement of Dante’s representation of the Devil. If it were not for the well-known "want of harmony and unity in Mr. Coleridge’s mind", the philosopher would have had serious difficulty, Hare believed, in explaining "his preference of Milton’s apotheosis of the Spirit of Evil... to

1 For more of Hare’s criticism of Wordsworth, see my article, "Wordsworth and Julius Hare", Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester, Iv (1972-3).

2 Strong words from a man who would love and revere Coleridge and become known as one of his principal disciples. See my monograph, Julius Charles Hare: His Literary Career from 1818 to 1834 (Manchester, 1964).
Dante's diabolization of it" (Miscellany, p. 119 n.). Hare disagreed with Hazlitt's assertion in his Lectures on the English Poets that "Milton has got rid of the horns and tail, the vulgar and physical insignia of the devil, and clothed him with other greater and intellectual terrors, reconciling beauty and sublimity, and converting the grotesque and deformed into the ideal and classical" (Miscellany, pp. 119-20 n.). Hare argued that there must be harmony between the outward and visible and the inward and spiritual in literary characterizations although he decried steadfastly in his essay unsubtle representations that announce themselves in poetry as nothing does in nature.

Shelley was the only contemporary English author mentioned in the essay with whom Hare did not disagree on a matter of literary principle. As we have seen, Shelley's amusement at Hare's concern for his soul was mixed with sincere appreciation of the spirit of Hare's remarks about him. Such a favourable, albeit implicit, alignment of Shelley with the most prominent talent of his day could only have pleased the poet. For Shelley, at least, Hare's note on The Cenci and its author comprised a review.

Shelley's interest in "On the German Drama" went beyond identification of its author (his reviewer), transmission to him through Ollier of a return compliment—"He is a powerful thinker"—, and the amused query as to how one gets the Spirit. Shelley told Ollier in that letter of 20 January 1821 that he had written a "Lucianic essay" of his own before he had read Hare's remarks on Coleridge, Hazlitt, Milton, and the Devil in the Literary Miscellany.

"On the Devil, and Devils" seems to be all that Shelley wrote on the subject in essay form and may have been composed earlier, but it is clear that, if it were his Lucianic essay, revisions at least were made in response to Hare's article. Ingpen first noticed the connection. In his general notes to "On the Devil, and Devils", he observed that "it is possible Shelley

1 Complete Works of Shelley, ed. Ingpen and Peck, vii. 87-104. Hereafter I cite this edition for all references to "On the Devil, and Devils" and "A Defence of Poetry". Ingpen prepared the texts and the notes of both essays.
2 Ibid. p. 346.
meant that 'he would he had written', not that 'he had once written' a piece proving the same thing as Hare's quotation from Friedrich Schlegel:

Scepticism proceeds always along this scale; first the Devil is attacked, then the Holy Ghost, then our Lord Christ, and last of all God the Father (Miscellany, pp. 120-1 n.).

Just as Shelley's letter echoes Hare's quotation from F. Schlegel, so does his essay respond to Hare's arguments about evil and especially Milton's conception of Satan as expressed in "On the German Drama".

Hare maintained that Milton had erred in attempting to beautify the Devil, in making Satan a sympathetic figure in Paradise Lost, and he attributed the flaw to the influence of Descartes's concept of the separation of matter and spirit. He argued that on the basis of that dubious proposition "the belief in the unity of nature and the faith in the devil have been gradually dying away together" (Miscellany, p. 120 n.). In his Lucianic essay, Shelley's remarks on the topic, though decidedly less sober, make something like the same point with a pronounced but laughing echo of the Schlegel-Hare language.

I am afraid there is much laxity among the orthodox of the present day respecting a belief in the Devil. I recommend the Bishops to make a serious charge to their diocesans on this dangerous latitude. The Devil is the outwork of the Christian faith—he is the weakest point—you may observe that infidels in their novitiate always begin by humourously doubting the existence of the Devil.

Depend upon it that when a person once begins to think that perhaps there is no Devil, he is in a dangerous way (Works, vii. 92).

In expressing his disapproval of Milton's conception of Satan, Hare argued that in the highest order of poetry in all ages delineations of the Devil and his cohorts had remained essentially the same, "that is, as they existed in the popular faith, and as

1 Neither Mary Shelley's Journal, with its lists of Shelley's and Mary's reading, nor The Journals of Claire Clairmont, with its close documentation of Claire's reading and Shelley's direction of it, indicates that Shelley had read F. Schlegel outside of Hare's essay.

2 In Percy Bysshe Shelley, Selected Poetry and Prose (New York, 1951), p. 513, note to p. 222, the editor, K. N. Cameron, observes that Hare's essay "probably inspired" Shelley's "On the Devil, and Devils".
they are represented in Tasso and Dante, not as they are represented in Milton ".

For the former, as they are infinitely truer, are consequently more sublime; and the Satan of Paradise Lost—however mighty the individual genius expended in its conception and delineation; however noble a picture it may afford of the struggles of a haughty human spirit that disdains submission to the laws, the beauty whereof it still cannot but feel; and however grand its Titanic, Promethean hostility to the new sovereigns in heaven—appears to us, we hesitate not to declare it, an utterly false representation of the Spirit of Evil. It was the unavoidable consequence of his age, wherein, though mighty elements were fermenting, hatred rather than love or at least together with love was predominant, that Milton should compose all his good spirits of little but mere negations, . . . and should concentrate all that is positive into his devils, thus exactly and utterly reversing the truth (Miscellany, pp. 118-19).

This dissatisfaction with Milton’s Satan as contrasted with his Christ has been felt by many readers of Paradise Lost; they find the antagonist more interesting, more sympathetic, more attractive than the hero whom they are required nevertheless to admire.

Hare’s universal scheme was, of course, that of traditional Christianity, heaven, earth, and hell made manifest in the works of the Trinity, man, and the fallen angel, integrated and somewhat transformed, however, by the concept of the dynamic, inviolable, eternal whole associated with Coleridgean thought and Blakian myth.1 Just as Wordsworth and Shelley generally accepted the latter principle while rejecting various of its ramifications, most romantic poets admired Milton’s Paradise Lost yet found it an unsatisfactory projection of their own attitudes concerning the ultimate realities. Professor Abrams has made the point quite recently.

Prometheus Unbound, then, like Wordsworth’s Prelude and Home at Grasmere, Blake’s Milton, and Keats’s Hyperion, can be looked upon as a deliberate attempt by a Romantic Miltonist—in his Preface Shelley called his predecessor “the sacred Milton”—to revise Milton’s great but no longer adequate imaginative

1 See, for instance, in this particular regard, Coleridge’s “Religious Musings”, lines 399-401:

And lo! the Throne of the redeeming God
Forth flashing unimaginable day
Wraps in one blaze earth, heaven and deepest hell.
conception of the nature, justification, and mitigation of the evils and agonies of
the human experience.¹

Although Hare recognized the earthly truth of human
confusion concerning good and evil, their appropriate intimacy
or ambiguity in representations of men in literature, he believed
that the harmony of universal truth, as reflected in the popular
or vulgar faith, required that representations of God be essentially
good and those of the Devil be essentially evil. At the very
beginning of "On the Devil, and Devils", Shelley seems to
agree with Hare's premise, though from a different point of view.

To suppose that the world was created and is superintended by two spirits of
a balanced power and opposite dispositions, is simply a personification of the
struggle which we experience within ourselves, and which we perceive in the
operations of external things as they affect us, between good and evil. The
supposition that the good spirit is, or hereafter will be superior, is a personification
of the principle of hope, and that thirst for improvement without which, present
evil would be intolerable (Works, vii. 87).

While recognizing the natural simplicity of attributing honour to
the good spirit and the ludicrous, horrible, or defeated to the evil,
Shelley argued, however, that such a process indulged in over
the ages had produced a residue of "mere machinery", the
vulgar notions of God and the Devil. Quite clearly responding
to Hare's essay and disagreeing with him toto caelo, Shelley
praised Milton for boldly reversing the worn-out, unjust, and
illogical mechanism of the old mythology.

Thus much is certain that Milton gives the Devil all imaginable advantage;
and the arguments with which he exposes the injustice and impotent weakness of
his adversary are such as had they been printed, distinct from the shelter of any
dramatic order, would have been answered by the most conclusive of syllogisms—
persecution.

As it is, Paradise Lost has conferred on the modern mythology a systematic
form; when the immeasurable and unceasing mutability of time shall have added
one more superstition to those which have already arisen and decayed upon the
earth, commentators and critics will be learnedly employed in elucidating the
religion of ancestral Europe, only not utterly forgotten, because it will have
participated in the eternity of genius. As to the Devil he owes everything to
Milton. Dante and Tasso present us with a very gross idea of him: Milton
divested him of a sting, hoofs, and horns; clothed him with the sublime grandeur
of a graceful but transcendent spirit—and restored him to society (Works, vii. 92).

¹ Meyer H. Abrams, Natural Supernaturalism, Tradition and Revolution in
The "sting, hoofs, and horns" were incidental to Hare's viewpoint; he was contending for a timeless and recognizable representation of the Devil or Satan as evil whereas Shelley praised Milton's conception, not as a Devil, but as a social rebel against evil, "the injustice and impotent weakness of his adversary," and then, when he needed another such rebel, chose Prometheus, not Satan, as he explained in the preface to *Prometheus Unbound*.

The only imaginary being resembling in any degree Prometheus, is Satan; and Prometheus is, in my judgment, a more poetical character than Satan, because, in addition to courage, and majesty, and firm and patient opposition to omnipotent force, he is susceptible of being described as exempt from the taints of ambition, envy, revenge, and a desire for personal aggrandisement, which, in the Hero of Paradise Lost, interfere with the interest. The character of Satan engenders in the mind a pernicious casuistry which leads us to weigh his faults with his wrongs, and to excuse the former because the latter exceed all measure. In the minds of those who consider that magnificent fiction with a religious feeling it engenders something worse.¹

In other words, even Shelley believed Satan to be too evil to be at the same time a universal hero. And, obviously, Shelley picked up Hare's reference to Dante and Tasso as the proper standard and the "hoofs and horns" of Hare's quotation from Hazlitt. Shelley brought to a close² that section of his essay "On the Devil, and Devils" that seems to have been responsive to Hare when he cautioned the clergy in particular about their inconsistency concerning the Devil.

They qualify him as the evil Spirit—they consider him as synonymous with the flesh. They seem to wish to divest him of all personality; to reduce him from his abstract to his concrete, to reverse the process by which he was created in the mind, which they will by no means bear with respect to God (*Works*, vii. 92).

Despite the tone of his "review" of Shelley, Julius Hare was not then a clergyman although he might easily have sounded like one to the poet. With diffidence, reluctance, and some pain, Hare submitted to ordination in 1826, to please his family and to secure his fellowship at Trinity College.

² Roger Ingpen heard another echo of the Hare essay in "On the Devil, and Devils" when Shelley characterized Byron, the author of *Manfred*, as "a great modern poet." Hare had quoted from *Manfred*, and of course he had referred to Shelley as "a great modern poet" (*Works*, vii. 101 and 349).
Taken by themselves Shelley’s responses to Hare’s strictures on Milton’s treatment of Satan in “On the German Drama” appear to be insufficient grounds for Shelley’s description of Hare as a “powerful thinker” in the letter of 20 January 1821 to Charles Ollier. The poet reverses or contradicts virtually every point made by the writer in the Miscellany, though one may discern some indefinite agreement on general principles. Yet that was not the end of it. While Shelley was having some serious fun with the Devil and no doubt with the writer on German drama, it seems more than likely that during the ten weeks or so in January, February, and March of 1821 when he was also thinking about and composing his answer to Peacock’s irreverent “The Four Ages of Poetry” he turned to Hare’s essay again, this time for the support of shared opinions.¹

In the following comparison of certain points in “On the German Drama” and “A Defence of Poetry”, essays written for very different purposes, correlative statements of general Romantic precepts are ignored unless there seems to be some direct response in Shelley’s work. Only those other connections between the essays of Hare and Shelley that are discernible in wording and seem to have evolved from accidental conjunction of Shelley’s reading in the Literary Miscellany and his composition of a response to Peacock will be mentioned.

Hare opened his essay with the observation that dramatic poetry is “the highest product of the national poetical genius”.

Whenever a mighty poetical instinct awakens in and actuates a nation that has reached an advanced stage of culture, the dramatic department of poetry will ever be the one in which, above all others, it will infallibly strive to put forth its organizing powers (Miscellany, p. 90).

Shelley agreed.

And it is indisputable that the highest perfection of human society has ever corresponded with the highest dramatic excellence... (Works, vii. 122).

Hare praised Ludwig Tieck for employing the tragicomic in dramatic tales and rationalized the mixture or fusion of tones on the fundamentally Romantic basis of the natural wholeness of life,

¹ Shelley did, however, repeat his stand on Paradise Lost in “A Defence of Poetry” (Works, vii. 129-31). Ingpen did not note any connections, nevertheless, between Shelley’s famous essay and Hare’s article.
... rather by hovering between tragedy and comedy, than by combining the extremes of each. It is neither vehemently tragic nor profoundly comic, though of the two it ends much rather towards the extravagantly, Aristophanically laughable, than towards the horrible. ... For being mostly developed from stories, that have grown up amongst those by whom life is regarded as an undivided whole, and unto whom the scientific distinctions between the tragic and the comic are altogether unknown, [his tales] contain within themselves the germs of both, and are often at the very same instant both ludicrous and terrific, each feeling thus in a manner supporting and balancing and controulling [sic] the other (Miscellany, pp. 116-17).

With reference to King Lear, Shelley treated the same subject, the intermingling of the tragic and comic, more specifically in terms of the drama, accepting the practice as an extension of the possibilities of the genre.

The modern practice of blending comedy with tragedy, though liable to great abuse in point of practice, is undoubtedly an extension of the dramatic circle; but the comedy should be as in King Lear, universal, ideal, and sublime. It is perhaps the intervention of this principle which determines the balance in favour of King Lear against the Oedipus Tyrannus or the Agamemnon, or, if you will, the trilogies with which they are connected; unless the intense power of the choral poetry, especially that of the latter, should be considered as restoring the equilibrium (Works, vii. 120).

In each passage Shelley and Hare emphasized balance or equilibrium as the crucial element to be maintained or recovered.

Both writers asserted the powerful and far-reaching yet elusive ability of poetry to communicate thought and understanding, the fundamental mysteriousness of poetry, and the slowness of the poet's audience to understand or appreciate his genius. The last thought is, of course, a major one in Wordsworth's "Essay Supplementary to the Preface of 1815".

If we examine all the truly beautiful and living works of poetry, we shall find that, though their beauty may have been immediately evident to the simple and instructive feelings, ages and ages have passed before the reflex understanding has approximated to anything like a correct and profound appreciation or analysis of their merits. For they were really mysterious; they actually and in truth possessed a mysterious life (Hare, Miscellany, p. 102).

In the infancy of the world, neither poets themselves nor their auditors are fully aware of the excellence of poetry, for it acts in a divine and unapprehended manner, beyond and above consciousness; and it is reserved for future generations to contemplate and measure the mighty cause and effect in all the strength and splendour of their union. Even in modern times, no living poet ever arrived at the fulness of his fame; the jury which sits in judgement upon a
poet belonging as he does to all time, must be composed of his peers; it must be impanelled by Time from the selectest of the wise of many generations. A Poet is a nightingale, who sits in darkness and sings to cheer its own solitude with sweet sounds; his auditors are as men entranced by the melody of an unseen musician, who feel that they are moved and softened, yet know not whence or why (Shelley, \textit{Works}, vii. 116).

The problem of the mysterious operation of poetry on readers naturally involved Hare and Shelley in the equally difficult question of the real and the proper relationship of the visible and the invisible. Hare's discussion of that subject might contradict the stand he took against Milton, yet, as pointed out above, the general purpose of his essay on the German drama was to warn poets and dramatists about falling into the obvious and the explicit.

We willingly and cheerfully acknowledge the truth, that there are deep and unfathomable powers in the universe, and that all poetry, which pretends to any thing more than a mere momentary existence, or rather which pretends at all to life, must rest ultimately, as all life does, upon a mysterious basis, that is and ever must be incomprehensible to the reflective understanding, but in poetical works, in the same manner as in organical beings, we should see only the products of the invisible power, not the generative process; and an attempt to render that which is invisible visible is an absolute contradiction, which can only apparently succeed, through the substitution of some gross fiction in its room (\textit{Miscellany}, pp. 101-2).

If Hare here puts in jeopardy the "gross fiction" of the traditional Devil, Shelley's reference to the visible and invisible in "A Defence of Poetry", directly concerning the details used by an author in the embodiment of truth in the characterizations of his poems or plays, concedes more than a little to the general point upon which Hare had challenged Milton's Satan.

The beauty of the internal nature can not be so far concealed by its accidental vesture, but that the spirit of its form shall communicate itself to the very disguise, and indicate the shape it hides from the manner in which it is worn. A majestic form and graceful motions will express themselves through the most barbarous and tasteless costume. Few poets of the highest class have chosen to exhibit the beauty of their conceptions in its naked truth and splendour; and it is doubtful whether the alloy of costume, habits, etc., be not necessary to temper this planetary music for mortal ears (\textit{Works}, vii. 117).

Although the moral and imaginative influence of love is a basic dogma of Romantics, the principle dominated both Shelley's life and his work and can therefore be considered especially
characteristic of him. It had the same importance for Hare throughout his career as scholar, critic, and churchman; it is, in fact, either the theme or a commanding element in each of the three pieces by Hare in Ollier’s Miscellany. The importance that Hare gave to the operation of love, as opposed to the cultivation of self, in life and literature in “On the German Drama” may indeed supply the key to Shelley’s placing a higher value on the spirit of Hare’s remarks than on any literary laud that the notice of The Cenci might have conveyed. The men agreed in this matter, and their agreement might well have been a source of comfort and support to Shelley at a time when Peacock had challenged the value of poetry itself and when specific criticisms of his poems did not seem to justify his continuing to write. More particularly, Shelley was writing “Epipsychidion”, with its famous lines on love (160-89), during January and early February 1821; the first of the following statements by Hare must have struck Shelley as marvellously close to his own thinking, almost like mind-reading.

For the central principle of poetical life, no less than of all life, is love; and wheresoever the free development of love has been checked, wheresoever any thing like hatred mingles with and in any respect prevails over love, there will ever be found something symptomatic of disease (Miscellany, p. 103 n.).

It is still possible for a humble faith, animated by hope and acting in the spirit of love, to achieve works, that may stand side by side with the most glorious of the ages that are passed. The difficulties indeed may have increased and multiplied, but this is still possible. There are not a few gleams of promise in the appearances of our own recent literature . . . (Miscellany, pp. 106-7).

In “A Defence of Poetry” Shelley wrote more closely and more analytically about the interrelationship of love, morals, imagination, and poetry.

The great secret of morals is love; or a going out of our own nature, and an identification of ourselves with the beautiful which exists in thought, action, or person, not our own. A man, to be greatly good, must imagine intensely and comprehensively; he must put himself in the place of another and of many others; the pains and pleasures of his species must be his own. The great instrument of moral good is the imagination; and poetry administers to the effect by acting upon the cause. Poetry enlarges the circumference of the imagination by replenishing it with thoughts of ever new delight, which have the power of attracting and assimilating to their own nature all other thoughts, and which form new intervals and interstices whose void forever craves fresh food (Works, vii. 118).
Both young men maintained that the living poetry of any age derives originally from an attitude of love or act of loving.

Inherent in the thoughts and words of Shelley and Hare, which have already been compared, is a similarity of approach to manifestations of the universal in poetry. Hare adverted to the subject a number of times, but what he says of Shakespeare in this respect impresses one most.

For he knew that the highest poetry is that, the germs of which are gradually and in the course of ages developed throughout a whole people, which in one form or other is talked of before every hearth and sung over every cradle, and which owes not its origin to the wilfulness of any individual, but is the silent birth of the spirit of the universe . . . (Miscellany, p. 118).

On this subject Hare quoted a fragment from the writings of Friedrich von Hardenberg on the nature of the tale that perhaps tantalized "the knight of the shield of shadow and the lance of gossamere", as Shelley had called himself in his letter to Peacock of 15 February 1821.

The whole of nature must be wondrously mixed up with the whole world of spirits; thus arises the age of universal anarchy, lawlessness, and freedom, nature's state of nature, the time before the world. This time before the world presents as it were the scattered features of the time after the world, as the state of nature is a singular type of the kingdom of heaven. The world of a tale is the one diametrically opposed to the world of truth, and for this very reason as thoroughly similar to it, as chaos is similar to the perfect creation. In the future world everything is as in the former world, yet altogether otherwise; the future world is the rational chaos; the chaos that has penetrated itself, that is within itself and without itself. A genuine tale must be at the same time a prophetical representation, and ideal representation, an absolutely necessary representation. The genuine tale-writer is a seer of futurity. It is owning only to the weakness of our organs and to our contact with ourselves, that we do not behold ourselves in a fairy world. All tales are only dreams of that our native world, which is everywhere and nowhere. The higher powers within us, which will hereafter fulfil our desires as genii, are now muses that refresh us with sweet remembrances upon this our wearisome course (Miscellany, pp. 121-2 n.).

Shelley may not have followed precisely every paradoxical turn in von Hardenberg and certainly he would not have agreed with all of the above, but his reading of the passage might have assisted him in refining his own ideas about the poet's involvement in time, in prophecy, and in the universal, as expressed in "A Defence of Poetry".
Poets, according to the circumstances of the age and nation in which they appeared, were called, in the earlier epochs of the world, legislators or prophets; a poet essentially comprises and unites both these characters. For he not only beholds intensely the present as it is, and discovers those laws according to which present things out to be ordered, but he beholds the future in the present, and his thoughts are the germs of the flower and the fruit of the latest time. Not that I assert poets to be prophets in the gross sense of the word, or that they can foretell the form as surely as they foreknow the spirit of events; such is the pretence of superstition, which would make poetry an attribute of prophecy, rather than prophecy an attribute of poetry. A poet participates in the eternal, the infinite, and the one; as far as relates to his conceptions, time and place and number are not (Works, vii. 112).

The eloquent penultimate sentence of "A Defence of Poetry" might also have been informed by some of the mystical spirit of von Hardenberg’s ideas concerning time and vision.

Poets are the hierophants of an unapprehended inspiration; the mirrors of the gigantic shadows which futurity casts upon the present; the words which express what they understand not; the trumpets which sing to battle and feel not what they inspire; the influence which is moved not, but moves (Works, vii. 140).

Hare’s quotation from the paradoxical German lay close by while Shelley composed his "Defence". At certain points tones harmonize, themes touch, and the same ideas are heard with variations. Some communication seems possible.

It has not been my purpose, however, to argue that Julius Hare’s essay on German drama or any part of it might be called a definitive source of Shelley’s "A Defence of Poetry". When K. N. Cameron announced some years ago "a new source" for the "Defence",¹ Imlac’s discourse on poetry in Johnson’s Rasselas, he concluded that what he had tried to demonstrate was "a complex transmutation and not a simple copying", and I claim no more and no less in this instance. Indeed, since Hare had read Shelley with care and appreciation, it might be maintained that the Hare article had been inspired in part by his reading of Shelley’s earlier work, particularly Prometheus Unbound and its preface. I have intended to demonstrate here that Julius Hare “reviewed” Shelley in Ollier’s Literary Miscellany (1820), that Shelley probably read Hare’s work closely and appreciatively even though he disagreed with his

¹ "A New Source for Shelley’s ‘A Defence of Poetry’”, Studies in Philology, xxxviii (1941), 644.
views on Milton's Satan, and that because "On the German Drama" was physically close and fresh in his mind during the long weeks when he formulated his own views on poetry and wrote or re-wrote "On the Devil, and Devils", Shelley responded to Hare's article as well as to Peacock's "The Four Ages of Poetry", satirically in his Lucianic essay and sympathetically in "A Defence of Poetry".