THE EARLY LITERARY CAREER OF JULIUS CHARLES HARE

By G. F. McFARLAND, M.A.
PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH AT ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK

EXCEPT in several special connections the name of Julius Charles Hare (1795-1855) means little today. C. R. Sanders devoted a chapter to Archdeacon Hare in his pioneeer study, *Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement* (1942), and R. H. Super in his life of Walter Savage Landor (1954) worked out in detail Julius Hare's relation to the publication of the *Imaginary Conversations*. Earnest readers of Carlyle have encountered his name in a number of generally unflattering references in *The Life of John Sterling*, and fans of Victorian memoirs may remember Hare as the beastly Uncle Julius who carriage-whipped a boy and acquiesced in the murder of a pet cat in Augustus J. C. Hare's story-telling autobiography.[1]

Nevertheless, I am certain that many scholars working the areas of nineteenth-century English literature and church history have been unable to avoid Hare's frequently indefinite involvement with a remarkable number of eminent personalities: Wordsworth, Niebuhr, Tieck, Winthrop Praed, De Quincey, Thomas Arnold, Frederick Maurice, Connop Thirlwall, Daniel Macmillan, Arthur Stanley, Charles Kingsley, and Alfred Tennyson. Despite such pointed or suggestive notice, Julius Hare remains a shadowy figure, rather odd, frequently baffling, much too German, and not very interesting.

When one does encounter him, Julius Hare is playing a supporting role in someone else's drama, yet more often than not he is billed as either an enthusiastic and influential disciple of Coleridge, or a leading figure in the Broad Church Movement, or an erudite but uncritical and volatile lover of German literature. Only Sanders and Super have gone further and attempted to define his real significance. That others have left Hare buried in old generalizations is not surprising; detailed exploration,

[1] *The Story of My Life* (London, 1896-1900), 6 vols.

though often tempting perhaps, would have been frustrated by the lack of real evidence concerning his personal relations with literary men of his own time and by the uncertainty surrounding the canon of his own writings. To be sure his nephew's autobiography and the same author's account of Maria Leycester Hare, Julius's sister-in-law,[1] contain a great deal of family information, but little of that has proved directly useful in determining the exact extent of Hare's literary pursuits. This essay, therefore, pretends to be no more than a report of my findings in a search for fuller and more accurate information concerning Julius Hare's early literary career as translator, critic, scholar, and friend of genius.

Julius Hare's parents were Francis Hare-Naylor, a grandson of the famous pluralist Bishop Hare of the early eighteenth century, and Georgiana Shipley, a daughter of Bishop Jonathan Shipley, the friend of both Dr. Johnson and Benjamin Franklin.[2] Their marriage had been blessed by neither family, and consequently the lovers left England in the hope of managing to live well on their small means on the Continent, particularly in Italy. In sunny self-banishment they cultivated their interests : Georgiana read widely in the classical and modern languages and improved the drawing and painting that she had learned from Sir Joshua Reynolds [3] ; Hare-Naylor followed closely the political developments at home and in France (where his sympathies lay) and gathered materials for a history of the Swiss Republic. And they had four sons—Francis George, Augustus William, Julius Charles, and Marcus Theodore. When Hare-Naylor came into his estate, in the worst days of the French Revolution, the family returned to England, settling at Hurstmonceux, Sussex, where they tried to make the curtailed inheritance as profitable as it had once been. They enjoyed the fashionable Whig society of the turn of the century and added

[1] A. J. C. Hare, *Memorials of a Quiet Life* (London, 1872), 2 vols.

[2] See James Madison Stifler, *My Dear Girl, The Correspondence of Benjamin Franklin with Polly Stevenson, Georgiana and Catherine Shipley* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1927) for an account of Franklin's relations with the Shipleys.

[3] Reynolds's portrait of her first-born, entitled " Master Hare," hangs in the Louvre.

another child to their household, a daughter, Anna Maria Clementina, but they were not very successful farmers. Soon Georgiana's health failed and she began to lose her sight. In August 1804, at the age of nine, Julius left the Tunbridge School to accompany his parents to Germany. They made their home in Weimar where one could enjoy acquaintance with Goethe and his circle. Schiller died that winter, and Mrs. Hare-Naylor's health worsened. In that exhilarating though sad situation, Julius Hare learned to read and speak German. His mother died at Lausanne in April 1806.

Returned to England, Julius was entered at the Charterhouse and there, a year or two later, made his first acquaintance with Connop Thirlwall (1797-1875), a precocious young scholar, who would become his intellectual partner and life-long friend. Under masters such as Drs. Raine and Russell, both boys achieved some reputation as promising classicists. Hare went on to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1812 and Thirlwall followed two years later. Again, they distinguished themselves in Greek and Latin, but protested at the emphasis placed on mathematics and the importance given to Locke and Paley.

Although Thirlwall was personally cool and precise, his sound learning, his restless curiosity, and especially the vigour and clarity of his thoughts and speech won him the respect and friendship of the younger and more vigorous scientists at Trinity —George Peacock, Adam Sedgwick, and William Whewell especially. When the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Wood, strode into a meeting of the two-year-old Union Debating Society and forbade it to continue or to convene again, Whewell and Thirlwall as president and secretary convinced him that the present meeting should at least be allowed to end without interruption.[1] Hare had the same friends, but as his interests were more literary he impressed them differently. His bookshelves and his mind were crowded with the expected classics and strangely, too, with an amazing array of the works of contemporary English and German writers. Rarely did his Cambridge friends escape from an encounter without an impassioned discourse on the

[1] John Connop Thirlwall, *Connop Thirlwall, Historian and Theologian* (London: S.P.C.K., 1936), p. 16.

beauty and truth of his special favourites, Wordsworth and Coleridge.

Although Hare refused to prepare seriously for the tripos and instead developed his interest in modern literature, he became a Fellow of Trinity College two years after taking his B.A. in 1816. Dutifully though reluctantly Thirlwall collected a number of prizes and was graduated twenty-second Senior Optime in 1818.

It seems likely that Julius Hare remained at Cambridge until 1818 too, altering the routine of his undergraduate days, however, with more frequent trips to London in order to visit his aunt and guardian in his nonage, Lady Anna Maria Jones,[1] and, when he was at home, his eldest brother Francis[2] who had the means to supply more books and to introduce him to the diverse resources of Regency London. Whether the Hare brothers saw Ludwig Tieck during his sojourn in England from 29 May to 21 July 1817, it can be safely assumed on the basis of their keen interest that they knew of his presence and had heard perhaps of his meeting with Coleridge.[3] In view of the appearance of the *Biographia Literaria* in the same year and the reprinting of *The Friend* in book form in 1818, one so predisposed to admire Coleridge as Julius Hare then was would certainly have wanted to hear the poet-philosopher's lectures on Shakespeare and philosophy. He may have missed them, nevertheless.

On 29 July 1817, Francis Hare left England again and

[1] Anna Maria Shipley, his mother's older sister and widow of Sir William Jones (1746-94), the orientalist and jurist.

[2] F. G. Hare had tried Christ Church, Oxford, briefly in 1806 ; however, his immense but undisciplined learning unfitted him for University residence. Both before and after the death of their father at Tours in 1815, Francis assisted Augustus and Julius in their formal studies and kept them constantly aware of literary and intellectual developments on the Continent where he had lived most of his life. The best sources of information on this striking and elusive personality are his alienated son's memoirs—*The Story of My Life* (1896-1900) and *Memorials of a Quiet Life* (New York, 1872), 2 vols., both written by Augustus J. C. Hare—and Robert H. Super, *Walter Savage Landor, A Biography* (New York University Press, 1954).

[3] Edwin H. Zeydel, *Ludwig Tieck and England, A Study in the Literary Relations of Germany and England during the Early Nineteenth Century* (Princeton University Press, 1931), pp. 68-70, and *Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson*, ed. Thomas Sadler (London, 1869), ii, 53-63.

travelled once more to Italy, on this occasion with his brother Augustus, who had gone down from New College, Oxford, in 1814. By January 1818, Augustus had returned to his college where he was a Fellow, and after Julius was elected Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge in the following October, he set out for Naples for a visit of unknown duration with his eldest brother.[1] Since the purpose of his trip was undoubtedly to consult Francis on the course he should set in life and since Francis urged him to read law at the Middle Temple, it seems more than likely that Julius also hurried back to England, unhappily, for the start of the winter term.[2] There is the possibility, therefore, that Julius Hare's first real glimpse of the man Coleridge was caught at the Crown and Anchor tavern in the Strand, on a Monday or a Thursday evening between 14 December 1818, and 29 March 1819.[3] As templar or as Fellow of Trinity College, he might well have heard Lecture XIII on Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Locke, Kant, and Schelling, and also the lecture on *Romeo and Juliet* on 18 February 1819.[4]

Those possibilities are considerably strengthened by the appearance of a Mr. Hare in the correspondence of Coleridge in 1816 and again late in February 1819. On 16 July 1816, Coleridge had written John Hookham Frere, trying to explain away rumours that he was an unreliable borrower of books, an ill-deserved reputation that had prevented him from borrowing works that were crucial in his writing.

From the same cause I doubt not, Mr. Hare refused to let me have the Reading of such Works of Giordano Bruno, as I had not had an opportunity of seeing (a unique collection of which he purchased for a trifle at the Roxburgh Sale), tho' I

[1] *Memorials of a Quiet Life*, i. 177, 185, 192.

[2] Mrs. Stair Douglas, *The Life and Selections from the Correspondence of William Whewell* (London, 1881), pp. 209-13. Letter from Hare to Whewell, 17 December, 1840. In discussing the changes in course his life had taken, Hare told Whewell that he had spent two almost fruitless years at the Temple. If he meant precisely two years, no more no less, then he began to read law in October, 1820, for he was to return to Trinity College exactly two years later to become a lecturer in the classics and Whewell's assistant tutor.

[3] *The Philosophical Lectures of Samuel Taylor Coleridge Hitherto Unpublished*, ed. Kathleen Coburn (London, The Pilot Press Ltd., 1949), p. 13.

[4] The *Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. Earl Leslie Griggs (Oxford University Press, 1956-9), iv. 924, n. 1.

had in the *Friend* announced my intention of writing the Life of G. Bruno with a critique on his System and that of the Pantheists of the same age (*Behmen etc.*).[1]

Since only Francis and Julius Hare were notable in their family and in contemporary society for the purchase or possession of German books and since the books seem to have been refused Coleridge in the early autumn of 1815,[2] the Mr. Hare of Coleridge's letter must have been Francis, who had returned to England from France in order to bury his father in late April of that year.[3] Julius was then still an undergraduate at Cambridge. Almost three and a half years after having been refused the books, Coleridge wrote, on 27 February 1819, to J. H. Bohte, the bookseller, encouraging him to attend the lectures and to bring his friends along. At the same time he requested any works of Meiners on the age of Luther or preceding ones, or any creditable works whatsoever on alchemists and mystics, or Nicolai's History of the Knights Templar if he had it.[4] On 1 March Coleridge wrote Bohte again giving him a *laissez-passer* note for future lectures. Tentatively he accepted an offer made by the bookseller.

If I find that I cannot procure t[he] work otherwise, I will *then* avail myself of your [offer], tho' Mr. Hare, if it be the same Mr. Hare, once refused to lend me a few works of Giordano Bruno. . . .[5]

Since Francis Hare remained in Italy in 1819 after Julius's return to start reading law, Julius may well have been the second Mr. Hare who offered rather than refused Coleridge the use of his books. Among the considerable remains of Hare's once enormous private collection now in the Wren Library at Trinity College are four works by C. Meiners.[6] There is, however,

[1] The *Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, iv. 656. [2] iv. 590.

[3] Francis Hare-Naylor died 16 April 1815.

[4] *Collected Letters of Coleridge*, iv. 922-3. [5] Ibid. iv. 926.

[6] Griggs in the *Collected Letters of Coleridge*, iv. 922-3, indicates that Coleridge might have been asking for Meiners's *Historische Vergleichung der Sitten und Verfassungen, etc.*, 1793-4, and *Lebensbeschreibungen berühmter Männer aus den Zeiten der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften*, 1795-7.

The Hare Collection at Trinity College contains Meiners's *Historia doctrinae de vero Deo omnium rerum Auctore atque Rectore*, 1780; *Grundriss der Geschichte aller Religionen*, 1787; *Geschichte des Verfalls der Sitten, der Wissenschaften, und Sprache der Römer in den ersten Jahrhunderten nach Christi Geburt*, 1791; and *Untersuchungen über die Verschiedenheiten der Menschennaturen, etc.*, 1811.

no direct evidence that Julius Hare loaned Coleridge the books or that a meeting of the two men occurred at that time. Nevertheless, a year or two later a reflection of the 1818-19 lectures is discernible in Hare's own work.

Convinced of the desirability of the introduction of German literature to the English public on a larger scale and by way of relief from his daytime labours in the law, Julius Hare set about translating *Sintram und seine Gefährten* (1814) by Friedrich H. K., Baron de la Motte-Fouqué. *Undine* (1811) by the same author had appeared in an English version by George Soane (1790-1860). Hare considered such a loose translation an inadequate rendering of la Motte-Fouqué's most beautiful and most permanent work and said so in the preface to his own *Sintram*,[1] which Charles and James Ollier published in the early summer of 1820.[2] He planned to bring out other German romances and dramas, not solely to present them to English readers in accurate translation but also to reinforce the example of Walter Scott in offering works of the imagination that might properly be read by women.[3] Perhaps Hare was seriously concerned about the type of popular romance in prose or verse that Byron had done so much to inspire from 1812 to 1816. More probably he hoped to console Lady Jones who emphatically disapproved of her nephew's literary associations and especially his love of the dangerous new German writers. At the beginning of the year she had ordered him *in loco parentis* to burn all his German books. His answer might seem liberal, enlightened, and courageous although it served to stiffen all the more the opposition of his good eighteenth-century relative.

> As for my German books, I hope from my heart that the day will never arrive when I shall be induced to burn them, for I am convinced that I never shall do so, unless I have first become a base slave of Mammon, and a mere vile lump of selfishness. I shall never be able to repay a hundredth part of the obligation I am under to them, even though I were to shed every drop of my blood in defence of their liberties. For to them I owe the best of all my knowledge, and if they have not purified my heart, the fault is my own. Above all, to them I owe my ability

[1] *Sintram and his Companions : a Romance*, from the German of Frederic, Baron de la Motte-Fouqué (London : C. and J. Ollier, and Edinburgh : William Blackwood, 1820).

[2] Reviewed in the *London Magazine*, ii (July, 1820), 65-71.

[3] *Sintram* (1820), pp. ii-iii.

to believe in Christianity with a much more implicit and intelligent faith than I otherwise should have been able to have done ; for without them I should only have saved myself from dreary suspicions, by a refusal to allow my heart to follow my head, and by a self-willed determination to believe whether my reason approved of my belief or not. The question has so often been a subject of discussion, that I have determined, once for all, to state my reasons for remaining firm in my opinion.[1]

As a younger son left in the care of a wealthy aunt whom he had learned to love and respect, Julius Hare may have had some hopes. If so, they proved false, for after the death of Lady Jones on 6 July 1829, he learned that his foster parent had wittingly or unwittingly disinherited him and his brother Augustus.

Purity and integrity are the themes of his preface to *Sintram.* Hare intended his translation to be absolutely literal, faithful not only to the words but also to the spirit of the Germanic origin of the English language. La Motte-Fouqué's romance recommended itself also because it was free of the egotism of the age that " has made poetry, instead of being a reflection of the universe in the individual, become the mere reflection of the individual in the universe . . ." and free too of " the separation between the heart and the head and the inability to reunite them and perceive the coincidence between the laws of reason and of nature. . . ." [2] Hare saw *Sintram* as a rejection of utilitarianism that seemed to assert self-love and self-interest to be the central principles of human behaviour and as an affirmation of the romantic idea of unity.

Like the medieval romance, *Sintram* is extravagant in tone and appeal, violent in action and in characterization, and almost turgid with shadowy visitors and mysterious coincidences. It tells the story of the near-disaster that old Sir Biorn's angry jealousy of his wife's charity brings to his home and to his son. When the young Sintram becomes a cadet knight, the father's reversion to paganism bears evil fruit in his son's ignoble love for the wife of the perfect knight, Folko, who had spared Sintram's life in battle. The Little Master, the devil, and his companions, sin and death, then become relentless in their torment of the confused young knight. They make his apprenticeship a winter of temptation and very nearly, with the aid of their old friend, Sir

[1] *Memorials of a Quiet Life,* i. 195. [2] *Sintram,* p. ix.

Biorn, lay waste his natural virtues. Sintram succeeds in an all-night contest of wills with his father, but as he faces the light of the future he is a very much wiser and a sadder man.

The reviewer for the *London Magazine* (July 1820) [1] confessed that he could not see the fine qualities that the translator—" evidently a man of talent "—had led him to expect. He found the romance stiffly fantastical and disappointingly German because Sintram did not win Folko's wife. Despite the inclemency of the story's atmosphere, the reviewer encouraged the translator to go ahead with his intention to offer more romances and dramas, " under a new system ", however.

In later life Hare cherished the memory of his first publication, particularly its delineation of the forces of evil in the Little Master. Shelley sent the translation to Claire Claremont after he and Mary had read it.[2] Blake told Crabb Robinson in 1826 that la Motte-Fouqué's tale " is better than my things ". [3] It is said that when Newman read the book he was so overcome that he had to go into the garden to compose himself.[4] In 1865 Connop Thirlwall remarked that la Motte-Fouqué's stories, which had once given him pleasure, " belong to a period of unnatural excitement, and are not, I think, a good sample of German literature ". [5] Yet Edmund Gosse decided, in the introduction to his own translation of *Undine*, that *Sintram* stood as one of the few tales by its author that had survived the revolution in taste and might well be immortal.[6] Julius Hare had made a small, but significant beginning.

Throughout the rest of 1820, Hare managed to stay on good terms with Shelley's publishers, the Olliers. When the brothers decided to inaugurate yet another magazine, just in time to catch the Christmas trade, they called on the translator of *Sintram* for

[1] pp. 65-71.

[2] *Mary Shelley's Journal*, ed. Frederick, L. Jones (University of Oklahoma Press, 1947), p. 143 and n., and *The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. Roger Ingpen (London, 1909), ii. 840-2. [3] *Diary*, i. 371.

[4] *Sintram and his Companions and Undine*, introd. by Charlotte M. Yonge (London, 1896), p. xviii.

[5] Connop Thirlwall, *Letters to a Friend*, ed. Arthur P. Stanley (Boston, 1883), p. 47.

[6] (London : Lawrence and Bullen, 1896), pp. 3-4.

several pieces.[1] Only one number of the *Literary Miscellany* appeared, however, and today copies are very scarce indeed.[2] Nevertheless, in its pages the Olliers published Thomas Love Peacock's essay, " The Four Ages of Poetry ", and of course that in turn precipitated the writing of a classic of English literary criticism, Shelley's " Defence of Poetry ". Julius Hare's contributions were not without an interesting consequence.

" A. W. Schlegel on Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet : with Remarks upon the Character of German Criticism " [3] opened the *Miscellany* and may have been a repercussion of Coleridge's lecture on the same play. Perhaps, the lecture had led Hare to Schlegel. The article begins with two long paragraphs translated from an essay in the *Characteristiken und Kritiken* (1801), a revision of a statement that Schiller had published in the *Horen* six or seven years earlier. There follow thirteen pages of commentary by Hare, and the piece concludes with the remainder of Schlegel's remarks on *Romeo and Juliet.* Near the beginning of his own comments Hare points to the particular respect in which Schlegel's criticism has remained consistent.

And it is most instructive, at a time when the prevalent notion of a poem is that of a multitude, the greater the better, of pretty expressions, and pretty images, and pretty speeches, and pretty descriptions, and pretty characters, that come together, how and wherefore neither the poet nor the critic know, . . to behold unfolded to us, in the manner in which it is here done, how the multiform springs out of the uniform ; how the seminal principle of every true poem is One, out of which the characters and incidents and images and expressions grow, in the same manner in

[1] A. W. and J. C. Hare, *Guesses at Truth* (London and New York, 1871), " Memoir " by Edward Hayes Plumptre, pp. xiii-xiv. Plumptre (1821-91) stated that Julius Hare had contributed articles on German literature to the *Miscellany.* Both Hare and Plumptre married sisters of Frederick Denison Maurice ; through that connection and as Hare's sometime curate Plumptre became aware of details of Hare's life that have otherwise escaped notice. See also, Richard Garnett, " Charles Ollier (1788-1859)", *DNB.*

[2] In the preparation of this essay I used Julius Hare's own copy in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, with the kind permission of Dr. Dodwell, the Librarian. I am deeply indebted to the Master of Trinity College, to Dr. Dodwell and his assistants for their generous hospitality and for numerous special favours accorded me during the winter of 1961-2 while I made a survey of the Hare Collection.

The fly-leaf of the Trinity College copy of *Ollier's Literary Miscellany* (1820) presents in Hare's handwriting his assignment of the authorship of the contents.

[3] pp. 1-39.

which the branches and leaves and flowers of a tree grow from its seed. But so little is this fitness, yea this necessity, of each part of a poem recognized at present, that the sole object is to crowd effect upon effect, burst passion upon burst of passion, the compatibility of which with each other is never even for a moment thought of ; . . .[1]

Because of this conception of poetry, which we today would usually associate with Coleridge in English literature, Hare argues that Schlegel's " Lectures on Dramatic Art " offer " the truest, ablest, and fullest delineation " of Shakespeare's genius in print at that time. He disqualifies Lessing, Herder, Goethe, Wieland and Eschenberg. He acknowledges that Hazlitt's " Characters of Shakespeare's Plays " (1817-18) " like all his critical works, amidst heaps of extravagance, contained no little that is good ". In Lamb's essays Hare found scattered observations that might disprove the charge that Shakespeare is not understood in England. And, of course, if Coleridge could discipline himself enough to publish his lectures, Hare concludes that the situation would be different. The young disciple had heard at least some of the 1818-19 lectures, and he did not hesitate to try to goad Coleridge into literary action with a bit of scolding praise.

Hare's second contribution to *Ollier's Miscellany* rendered la Motte-Fouqué's " Siege of Ancona " in undistinguished, if not bad English blank verse. A highly romantic narrative, the poem illustrates the transcendent power of love, at once sexual and pure, to sustain good men and rescue nations from calamity.

Julius Hare's last contribution is entitled " On the German Drama, No. 1 : Oehlenschlaeger ".[2] In the first decade of the century, the Danish poet had attracted considerable attention in Northern Europe ; his poems and plays gave full-voiced expression to a lyrical and passionately romantic spirit. Hare judged him important also because of the moral seriousness of his early work, its use of the Scandinavian sagas, and certain resemblances to Elizabethan historical and love tragedies. The essay's special relevancy to this account of Hare's early literary career derives obliquely from a brief passage that it contains on Shelley. Following its publication by the Olliers in the spring, Hare had read " The Cenci ", and now in support of an argument

[1] p. 9. [2] pp. 90-153. Adam Gottlob Oehlenschlaeger (1779-1850).

concerning the machinations of the devil in literature, he cited lines 8-13, Act II, Sc. ii.[1] In doing so, Hare pointed to the author of the play that scandalized so many—those who had only heard about it—as a " great modern poet, whose genius . . . must assuredly prove a cherisher of innocent thoughts and a kindler of noble thoughts unto many ". Hare qualified his praise by adding " . . . when [Shelley] has bowed down his neck and received into himself the purifying and sanctifying influence of the Spirit. . . ." [2] Nevertheless, Shelley was gratified to see an appreciative review and amused by its author's concern for his soul. On 20 January 1821, he wrote to Charles and James Ollier from Pisa that he had been " enchanted " with the *Miscellany.*

Who is your commentator on the German Drama? He is a powerful thinker, though I differ from him *toto caelo* about the Devils in 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.[3]

From his first publications, several conclusions may be drawn about Julius Hare, the emerging translator and critic. With respect to his use of the German language he was unusually careful, inclining even to stress philological precision. Though obviously already a devoted admirer, he could hear and read Coleridge and follow where he seemed to lead because he too had a wide acquaintance with German literature. Yet Hare did not follow without expressing some dissatisfaction with the man and showing some independence in his own choice of literary tasks. The theme of love besieged by elementary evil most stimulated his imagination. Hare respected genius, but he was not intimidated by it. Nor was he put off in his interests of his judgements by familiar prejudices or social sanctions. Even the young Julius Hare demonstrated that he could be vigorous and generous

[1] Hare used the same lines from " The Cenci " in a different context in his *Guesses at Truth* (1871), p. 418.

[2] *Ollier's Miscellany*, p. 149. Later, Lady Shelley identified the anonymous author of the Oehlenschlaeger article as J. C. Hare. *The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. Roger Ingpen (London : Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons Ltd., and New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909), ii. 846, n. 2.

[3] *Letters of Shelley*, ii. 845-6.

as a man, independent and discreet as a critic, and perceptive as well as learned as a scholar.

Before Hare had left Cambridge, he persuaded several of his contemporaries to learn German: Hugh James Rose, William Whewell, and his good friend Connop Thirlwall.[1] All regretted the closing of the Union as another indication of the apathetic conservatism and provincialism of the University. Things were happening in Germany that might help break the deathlike spell that intellectual life in England seemed to be under. Whether exactly then or later, Hare led his friends also to an awareness and ultimately to an appreciation of the poetry of Wordsworth and Coleridge.[2] Thirlwall was especially interested in learning German, however, for he hoped to have at least some of that language as well as French and Italian at his command when he visited the Continent after taking his degree. The book that the little group attacked first must have been Barthold Georg Neibuhr's *Romanische Geschichte* (vol. i, 1811). On 11 June 1818, Connop Thirlwall wrote a friend of his conviction "that no modern language will so amply repay me for my time and labour ",[3] and of Hare's pupils he in particular must have been most diligent in his new studies. Shortly after Julius Hare made his October 1818 trip to Naples to visit Francis, Thirlwall realized his dream of crossing the Channel to France, Switzerland, and Italy. By 10 March 1819, Thirlwall had met Christian Charles Bunsen, secretary to Niebuhr who had been made Prussian envoy to the Papal Court in 1817. During his stay in Rome, the young Cambridge graduate impressed Bunsen and his English wife, the former Frances Waddington and a cousin to J. H. Monk, Fellow of Trinity College and Regius Professor of Greek at the University. Although his German was not then really fluent, he had read Niebuhr's *History of Rome* and he wanted to read more widely in his new language.[4]

In February 1820, several months after his return to England, Connop Thirlwall reluctantly entered Lincoln's Inn and joined

[1] *Connop Thirlwall*, p. 16. [2] *Ibid.* p. 9.

[3] *The Letters of Bishop Thirlwall*, ed. John James Perowne and Louis Stokes (London, 1881), p. 48. Letter to John Candler.

[4] A. J. C. Hare, *The Life of Baroness Bunsen* (New York, 1879), i. 138-41, and Frances, Baroness Bunsen, *A Memoir of Baron Bunsen* (London, 1868), i. 149.

his college friend in half-hearted pursuit of qualification for the Bar. About to publish *Sintram*, Hare had obviously found the time and the means for furthering his literary career, and Thirlwall set a similar course for himself.

Meanwhile, Hare had sent a copy of la Motte-Fouqué's romance to William Whewell who received it gratefully and recognized Hare's purpose in translating it, " to diffuse valuable ideas and feelings ", but Whewell hoped, and only half in jest, that his enthusiastic friend would not devote himself merely to making versions of German novels " for the conversion of the heathen ". Whewell's response also reported that there was promising news from Cambridge. Rumour had it that William Lort Mansel would soon retire as Master of Trinity College and that Christopher Wordsworth would become his successor.

> If this turns out so, he shall invite his brother here and you shall come and meet him, and we shall be the most poetical and psychological college in the universe, though some of us are bad materials for such an edifice.[1]

Within a few years, after Hare and Thirlwall had returned as lecturers and Winthrop Praed, Edward Fitzgerald, Arthur Hallam, and Alfred Tennyson had entered as students, Trinity did in fact become a most poetical college.

Thirlwall, however, could understand Hare's enthusiasm. When he wrote to Bunsen in November 1821 he told his friend in Rome that since his return to England in the autumn of 1819 he had received great pleasure and profit from expanding his knowledge of German authors, especially the works of Ludwig Tieck.[2]

As he and Hare read on during the eighteen months or more that they both lived in London studying law, their avocational interest became more serious. Perhaps those remarkable Thursday evening receptions at the Highgate home of Dr. and Mrs. Gillman that were instituted at the same time had some influence in strengthening their commitment to German literature. Whether the two young men were among the first to sit and listen

[1] Isaac Todhunter, *William Whewell, An Account of his Writings*... (London, 1876), ii. 37-38. Letter to Hare dated 1 July 1820.

[2] *Letters of Thirlwall*, p. 61.

to Coleridge, we do not know, yet they did go then or later,[1] and it is interesting to note how many of the circle Julius Hare himself got to know within the next few years : Edward Irving, Charles Lamb, Leigh Hunt, Robert Southey, Joseph Henry Green, Thomas Carlyle, Henry Francis Cary, Harriet Martineau, Henry Crabb Robinson, and Sara and Henry Nelson Coleridge. Some he met elsewhere for the first time ; some he never saw at Highgate. But in 1828 Hare was familiar enough with the event to introduce two other young men from Cambridge, John Sterling[2] and F. D. Maurice, to the moral and imaginative stimulation of those gatherings.

Whewell had cautioned Hare in 1819 of the largeness and the elusiveness of the point of view that he was then developing.

> It is true that besides mere Reason there is much in the spiritual nature of man, that his reasoning powers are but a small portion of his existence, but all the rest of him is so mysterious and unaccountable, so capricious in its operations, appearing in general to acknowledge the authority of reason and yet eluding her grasp when she attempts to bring it before her judgment seat, that I can make nothing of it and could almost find in my heart to forswear speculating about it, and to be content to feel and love the beautiful, or what seems so to me, without knowing why or caring wherefore.[3]

Nevertheless, by the end of 1822 the purpose that inspired Hare and Thirlwall had become a large and lofty one. They hoped not only to acquaint English readers with a foreign literature and thereby possibly to stimulate intellectual and imaginative activity; they hoped also to do something to break down the narrow and static rationalistic and scientific precepts and methods that had determined most of what they had had to learn at Cambridge. In the absence of one whom they could consider an " original and independent English thinker ",[4] Hare and Thirlwall determined to make an attempt, through their translations, to further a reconciliation of reason and imagination and experience and

[1] For Hare's membership in the Highgate circle, see Lucy E. Watson, *Coleridge at Highgate* (London : Longmans, Green and Company, 1925), pp. 83-84, and *Coleridge the Talker, A Series of Contemporary Descriptions and Comments*, with a critical introduction by Richard W. Armour and Raymond F. Howes (Cornell University Press, 1940), pp. 236-7.

[2] *Coleridge the Talker*, p. 339.

[3] *William Whewell*, ii. 32. Letter to Hare, 25 February 1819.

[4] *Letters of Thirlwall*, p. 66. Letter to Bunsen, 20 January 1823.

faith so that true vitality and integrity might be restored to thought, to taste, and to belief. It was the resolve of conscientious and ambitious young men, and in the long run they were not entirely unsuccessful. At the time, however, apparently neither thought that Coleridge had done or could do all that was necessary.

Perhaps in the autumn of 1822 Hare called Thirlwall's attention to a work of great promise, Friedrich Schleiermacher's *Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke* (1821), a landmark in German higher criticism.[1] Exactly how soon Thirlwall undertook the translation of that intentionally abstruse book is uncertain. By May 1824, however, the text seems to have been completed. He was then labouring over an introductory essay, trying to clarify Schleiermacher's obscurities and reconcile superficial inconsistencies. For relief from the dryness of the scholarship, Thirlwall simultaneously translated Tieck's *novellen*, *Die Gemälde* and *Die Verlobung*. Since by that time Hare was himself involved with John Taylor, the publisher, Thirlwall offered both projects to him for publication. Taylor accepted, much to his credit, the Schleiermacher, but refused the Tieck, much to Thirlwall's amusement, because it might do " injury to the cause of godliness ".[2] Before the final printing, Hare advised his friend to " [soften] the doubt expressed by Schleiermacher as to the authenticity of Matthew's Gospel ". Thirlwall would not do so, either by suppression or vindication, for that would require his taking an unwarranted liberty. Furthermore, he shared Schleiermacher's doubts and was satisfied that the Biblical scholar had not merely " thrown out a random paradox ".[3] No doubt Julius Hare had thought that casting doubt on one Gospel at a time was enough. More of a diplomat though no less honest, Hare was always aware that to achieve one's ultimate purpose one might have to compromise on secondary issues.

[1] " Of ' Schleiermacher ' nobody certainly has so good a right to dispose as yourself, to whom I am indebted both for the knowledge of the book itself and for almost all the materials of my Introduction." Letter from Thirlwall to Hare, 31 October 1824. *Letters of Thirlwall*, pp. 74-75.

[2] Ibid. p. 79. Letter to Hare, 12 November 1824. For the development of the Schleiermacher publication, see pp. 70-83.

[3] *Letters of Thirlwall*, pp. 79-83. Letters to Hare, 26, 29 and 30 November 1824.

Despite that minor difference over stress, Hare supported Thirlwall whenever John Taylor raised objections, particularly in the last stages of the printing. Apparently he read both the introduction and the text while still in proof and made some suggestions for slight alterations. Although he acknowledged to Taylor the German tone of the language, Hare told the publisher that " like all good translators, and all men of powerful mind, [Thirlwall] is desirous to be faithful to the very core ".

. . . . it is scarcely possible that a work like Schleiermacher's, where the particular sentences are not brought [together], in which there is not a good thing, but where the whole is good, and the author's mind is fixed upon his reasoning and the connection of his propositions with his inferences, should not appear somewhat bald and inelegant in style.[1]

Hare tried to convince Taylor that a slightly awkward yet faithful translation was much to be preferred to the so-called free translations that are " of all kinds of composition the most imbecile, though often the most conceited ".[2] When Hare saw the final proofs, he declared that " as pieces of critical analysis, I know not anything better, and very little so good unless in the same book ".[3]

When it appeared in 1825, Thirlwall's edition of Schleiermacher's *Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke* elicited little of the hoped-for response in England. At Cambridge, Hugh James Rose, who had studied German with Thirlwall in Hare's rooms, preached against it in the strongest terms, and for years thereafter many an Englishman considered the author of the introduction a heretic.[4]

At the beginning of 1823, Connop Thirlwall reported to Bunsen that, without diminishing his admiration of Goethe, he

[1] Rylands English MS. 1238. Letter from Hare to Taylor, [9 March 1852]. This and a number of letters cited below are part of a manuscript collection relating to the publication of Landor's *Imaginary Conversations* acquired by the Rylands Library in June 1959. Parts of some of the letters have been published elsewhere, most obviously in John Forster's *Walter Savage Landor* (London, 1869) and in subsequent writings that have made use of it. Interpolations and bracketed dates are, of course, mine.

I am deeply indebted to the Director of the John Rylands Library and the Keeper of Manuscripts there, Dr. F. Taylor, for the privilege of using the letters and for this opportunity to incorporate them in my own work.

[2] Ryl. Eng. MS. 1238. Letter from Hare to Taylor, [9 March 1825].

[3] Ibid. Undated fragment of a letter from Hare to Taylor.

[4] *Connop Thirlwall*, pp. 32-33.

would argue that Tieck had both pointed to and explored more fully than any other writer of his time "the richest vein of German and European poetry in general—the heroic ages of Christianity".[1] In justifying his own interest in Tieck, Thirlwall suggests the reason why both he and Hare chose to translate imaginative literature that today seems too extravagant to be very significant. Not all of Tieck's fiction, to be sure, is fantastical, but Hare and Thirlwall as inheritors of the romantic spirit were attracted by his revival of the medieval combination of the vividly and strangely suggestive with the Christian. Tieck was especially admirable to them because at the same time he opposed fanaticism.

On hearing from Thirlwall that John Taylor would not accept *Die Verlobung*, Julius Hare showed his temper in his next letter to the publisher.

> For my own part I see nothing to which it can do harm but the cause of religious hypocrisy, and it will not do that half so much harm as the New Testament does. You will excuse this; but I was forced to assure you I did not mean to recommend you the publication of any book that can do harm to the cause of true godliness, and that, I am confident, cannot be the tendency of a poem in which there are such characters as Brandenstein and Dorothea. At least on me the effect was the very reverse. It was one of the finest evenings in last July that I lay on the grass and read it, and I arose in delight at seeing religion for once brought into union with the best poetry, that of real life and true nature.[2]

John Taylor was not persuaded, however, and *The Pictures and The Betrothing* with an introductory essay by the translator was published by Whittaker in 1825. Connop Thirlwall's thirty-six page preface suggests that the *novellen* will be instructive because their author avoided the present tendency to be either zealously

[1] Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. 0.15.44[3]. Letter dated 20 January 1823. Although *Letters of Thirlwall* contains most of the letter, this paragraph on Tieck is omitted.

[2] Ryl. Eng. MS. 1238. Letter of 26 November [1824]. The echo of Wordsworth's *Preface to the Lyrical Ballads* (1800) may have been a consequence of Julius Hare's having met the poet in the Master's Lodge at Trinity College in May 1824. See *The Letters of William Wordsworth and Dorothy Wordsworth, The Later Years*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939), i. 166, letter from Wordsworth to Landor, 11 December 1824. Wordsworth and Hare enjoyed each other's company intermittently until the poet's death. Augustus and Julius Hare dedicated their principal work, *Guesses at Truth*, to Wordsworth in 1827.

religious or excessively aesthetical. They demonstrate that true art can be implicitly moral without moralizing. To give readers a context into which they might fit his translations, Thirlwall surveyed the general history of German imaginative literature in the previous century. A modern scholar especially concerned with the writings of Tieck praises Thirlwall's acuteness in perceiving Tieck's " pioneer work " as early as 1825 and says of the text that " it is close enough to be called an interlinear translation, yet its spirit is also true to the original and its English idiomatic, flexible and smooth throughout ".[1]

In the autumn of 1821 Julius Hare had become ill and to recuperate had gone again to Italy where Francis was established as a figure in the international society of diplomats and dilettantes. Julius returned to the Inns of Court for another winter term of his double life of law and literature. The summer of 1822 brought him a difficult choice.

Whewell hinted that Christopher Wordsworth, the new Master of Trinity College, would soon offer him a lectureship in classics. The proposal materialized and placed Hare in a dilemma.[2] If he took the position, he would have little time for his cherished projects, and in four years he would be required to take orders if he wished to stay on at the College as a don. Ordination would imply a primary and overriding commitment to the Church, which as an institution in the reign of George IV seemed antagonistic to much of what he hoped for. As onerous and stultifying as the law might be, it offered a future that could include the realization of his literary and intellectual goals. And a career in the courts would not require him to compromise his fundamental religious convictions that were too Platonic, too romantic and too much enlightened by German Biblical criticism to be acceptable to the orthodox. In the end, nevertheless, Hare decided in favour of the University. Thirlwall's reaction summed up his long debate : " I could, perhaps, have wished you a somewhat wider channel for your activity, but it is certainly good. . . ." [3]

[1] Zeydel, pp. 147-8.
[2] *William Whewell*, ii. 44-47. Letters to Hare, 12 May and 17 July 1822.
[3] *Letters of Thirlwall*, p. 62. Letter to Hare, 8 November 1822.

Hare was hardly established on the banks of the Cam before he received a call that eventually carried him much deeper into the literary history of his time. About the middle of June 1822, Walter Savage Landor wrote him at the suggestion of Francis Hare, asking that he retrieve from Longmans the manuscripts of fifteen dialogues that he hoped to have published.[1] Landor authorized Julius to arrange terms with a publisher and to make whatever changes in the text that would hasten the process. Thus began an extraordinary, if not unique, service to English letters. For almost ten years Julius Hare acted as agent for Landor (whom he had not met) in the frustrating struggle to have printed five volumes of the *Imaginary Conversations* by three publishers. Far younger than Landor and obligated to him in no material way, Hare showed unusual tact, courage, and resourcefulness in dealing with the " volcanic " (as Hare once described him) author.[2] Landor's biographers have, nevertheless, been generally unaware of the sheer labour that Hare performed as amanuensis. The manuscript was often so unreadable and so subject to change from Italy, where Landor was living, that Hare transmitted it to the publisher a dialogue or two at a time after copying off the worst passages in some conversations and all of others in his neat, square hand. For instance, of the Richelieu dialogue, which he feared would extend to 150 pages, he told the publisher, " You shall have part of it soon, but it will take some trouble to get it in order." [3] On another occasion, Hare mentioned that although he had first thought of transcribing all of the manuscript he " could not easily find time to copy out any but the more illegible conversations ".[4] The most exasperating aspect of Hare's new work, however, was persuading John Taylor, who eventually published the first two volumes in March

[1] Robert H. Super, *Walter Savage Landor, A Biography* (New York University Press, 1954), p. 159. With minor exceptions, I have used this work throughout because it offers more detailed information concerning Hare's role in the publication of the *Imaginary Conversations* than either Forster's *Walter Savage Landor* (1869) and *The Works and Life of Walter Savage Landor* (1876) or Malcolm Elwin's *Savage Landor* (1941). [2] Super, p. 160.

[3] Ryl. Eng. MS. 1238. Letter to Taylor, dated simply " Trinity, Sunday ", but probably belonging to the spring of 1823.

[4] Ibid. Letter to Taylor, 17 April 1823.

1824, that the essays were publishable as Landor wrote them, that they were neither irreligious, unpatriotic, nor indecent.

Julius Hare had been turned away by three publishers [1] before he rather charmingly approached John Taylor as " one to whom our literature has been so much indebted, as to the publisher of Endymion, of Keats's last volume, of Cary's Dante, of the Opium-Eater, and above all of dear inimitable Elia ".[2] Taylor agreed to add Landor's conversations to his list, and almost immediately afterward began to hesitate, first over certain passages, then whole dialogues, and finally the entire venture. To the publisher's objections to indelicate language, Hare answered that " it is difficult to determine how far one is bound to abstain from saying what is innocent in itself, lest an impure, tinderous age should catch fire at the sparks which one is amusing oneself by striking ", and of such language from the lips of Queen Elizabeth Hare thought that for verisimilitude she " ought to have a little of her favourite seasoning ".[3] He agreed to expunge a potentially libellous attack on Lord Bentinck, but refused to modify what amounted to nothing more than ridicule of other English diplomats.

John Taylor's refusal to accept the Middleton conversation on the grounds that in it Landor discouraged prayer and attacked the Bible became an issue that he and Hare argued for at least a year. Hare agreed neither with Landor's admiration for Middleton nor with his apparent rejection of prayer ; nevertheless, he saw no real offence in the dialogue and he finally lost patience with Taylor's sensitivity.

> The single argument against prayer is the old one that God is immutable; and I cannot see that any effect will be produced by saying so for the million and first time. It must have occurred to everybody who has ever thought about prayer, and it is brought forward in one way or another in every discussion on the subject ; and even this is not enforced in the passage we are to insert. You must really have a most astonishing notion of Landor's powers, if you think he will dissuade men from prayer by these few words. With all my admiration for him, I think him no reasoner, and could prove him so, if it were worth the while. Whatever he might write on the subject I am sure would be utterly unavailing ; but

[1] Super, p. 161.
[2] Ryl. Eng. MS. 1238. Letter to John Taylor, 3 March [1823].
[3] Ibid. Letter to Taylor dated 27 April and clearly postmarked 1823.

the words [you wish to omit] would not even shake a pin, and again and again I say, I cannot think it anything but the merest trifle.[1]

On a similar occasion Hare made a special plea for freedom of speech and tolerance of difference of opinion.

But my principle always is, as I would claim a right to speak out my own opinion freely and without any restraint, so long as nothing morally wrong is contained in it, in like manner to throw no impediment in the way of a similar freedom of speech in others, however at variance their opinion may be to my own. Many of Landor's, as I have already said, I all but abhor. The dialogue between James and Casaubon for instance I cannot read without disgust at its gross misrepresentations : but still I would not prevent its publication ; but where there is so much good in the volume wish to facilitate it ; and trust that the evil the book might produce and the errors it might generate will be purged away. The good must endure and must be great ; and we must content ourselves in this world in taking good mixed up with evil.[2]

At the end of April 1823, Taylor had returned the manuscript to Hare, suggesting that he find another publisher.[3] Complete rupture was avoided, however, by all parties agreeing that disputed passages and essays would be submitted to Southey and his judgement would be accepted as final. On that basis, Taylor took up the work again, printing began, and " Southey and Porson " appeared separately in the July number of the *London Magazine*, of which Taylor was then both publisher and editor. Still, Taylor's continuing uneasiness, Landor's second thoughts, and the arrival of more and more dialogues delayed the appearance of the book itself. Landor became impatient, but he appreciated the services performed for him by Julius Hare. " I have wearied my excellent friend Mr. Hare to death with perpetual corrections and insertions. He never even saw me. He does not complain of his trouble, occupied as he is in other literary labours." [4] When the *Imaginary Conversations* went to the booksellers in March 1824, there were two volumes containing thirty-six dialogues.[5]

Julius Hare had indeed been busy with his own work. In the long vacation of the previous summer he had started translating

[1] Ryl. Eng. MS. 1238. Letter to Taylor of uncertain date. The postmark reads 9 March, and on the basis of other contents I suggest 1824 as the year.

[2] Ibid. Letter to Taylor indistinctly postmarked 30 June 1823.

[3] Super, p. 162.

[4] Ibid. p. 165. Letter from Landor to Southey, originally printed by Forster in *Walter Savage Landor* (1869), ii. 18. [5] Super, pp. 164-7.

Niebuhr's *Romanische Geschichte.*[1] Perhaps John Taylor's consideration of Thirlwall's Schleiermacher had suggested to him that such a major undertaking might be worth the trouble. The work, however, proved too great for one man ; Hare put it aside until Thirlwall returned to Cambridge in 1827.

William Hazlitt wrote the critique of the *Imaginary Conversations* in the *Edinburgh Review* in the same month that the work was published.[2] Although Jeffrey had altered some of his kinder comments,[3] Hazlitt's judgement may in the last analysis be considered just and not unfavourable. But, he concentrated the extravagance of his style on the faults of the *Conversations.*

> Mr. Landor's book is a perfect 'institute and digest' of inconsistency: it is made up of mere antipathies in nature and in reasoning. It is a *chef-d'oeuvre* of self-opinion and self-will, strangling whatever is sound and excellent in principle, defacing whatever is beautiful in style and matter.[4]

With no real justice, he accused Landor of loving neither truth nor mankind, only himself.[5] The sharpness of his railing derived more often than not from his political differences with Landor. Nevertheless, the temper of Hazlitt's remarks was not unusual; boldness, wit, and bias were the essence of contemporary reviewing.

To muffle the expected thunder from the *Quarterly Review,* Hare quickly put together an ironical review of Landor's work in the form of an imaginary conversation, and Taylor printed it in the May number of his *London Magazine.*[6] Crabb Robinson thought it a "capital" job: "the scandalous abuse of all criticism by vehement declamations and fixing on words and syllables and perverting their import is admirably exposed."[7]

In his essay, Hare imagines that he meets Frank Hargrave, the personification of bad criticism, after both have read the

[1] *Letters of Thirlwall,* p. 70. Letter to Hare, 28 October 1823.

[2] xl (March 1824), 67-92. [3] Super, p. 168. [4] *Edinburgh Review,* p. 68.

[5] Ibid. pp. 70-71. Hazlitt modified his strictures in "Mr Landor's 'Imaginary Conversations'" in the *London Weekly Review* (14 June 1828), reprinted in *New Writings by William Hazlitt* collected by P. P. Howe (London: Martin Secker, 1925), pp. 68-79.

[6] "On Walter Savage Landor's Imaginary Conversations", pp. 523-41.

[7] *Henry Crabb Robinson on Books and their Writers,* ed. Edith J. Morley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), i. 305.

Imaginary Conversations. Once a promising young man, Hargrave "is now content to become a fixture at his desk, and to be confined like soda water in its stone bottles, provided he may occasionally explode in a sarcastic or scurrilous article for the Quarterly Review".[1] Hare allows Hargrave to expatiate on Landor's faults, and then answers the charges and tries to make his antagonist see what might justly be criticized. After Hargrave has had his say, Hare enumerates the beauties of the *Conversations.* Two selections will suggest the fundamental tolerance of men and ideas that controlled Hare's judgement of not only Landor but also DeQuincey and Coleridge, and also his general approach to literature.

Every thing that is not with us is against us, cry both the radical and the loyalist, both the political economist and the churchman; and the same words are graven upon Hargrave's soul. All who object to any thing in the discipline or administration of our church are rank atheists with Hargrave; all who think that our constitution is susceptible of the slighest improvement, that our laws are not perfect, that our expenditure may be diminished, are radicals and traitors; and any measures may fairly and honorably be resorted to for their speedy and effectual extirpation.[2]

The evening before last was one of intense enjoyment. It was spent in listening unto those mighty spirits, whom Landor has been awakening and calling forth from their graves. And in truth it was a goodly, a most noble company. There was the lion heart of Richard, the mild grace of Sidney, Cromwell's iron mask, the good-humoured gossip of Burnet, the serene and cloudless magnanimity of Kosciusko; there was Milton's severe imagination, and Bacon's piercing fancy, and the humble wisdom of Hooker's heart, and Lady Jane Grey's majestic purity, and Anne Boleyn's playful innocence and simplicity. . . . I resigned myself altogether to the impressions which thronged in upon me from everything that I heard; for not a word was idle, nor a syllable but had its due place and meaning; if at any moment the pleasure was not unmingled, at least it was very greatly predominant throughout; if there was a good deal questionable and some things offensive in the matter, the manner was always admirable; and whenever a stone against which I might have stumbled lay in my path, I stepped over it or aside from it, and would not allow myself to feel disgust, or to be irritated and stung into resistance. My own peculiar opinions and prejudices, my sympathies and antipathies were put to sleep for a while. . . . It is good and wholesome thus occasionally to disencumber and disencrust the mind from the stiff and heavy coating of its own individuality, and lay it bare to all the influences of nature. So much in our likings and dislikings, in our belief and unbelief, is merely arbitrary and conventional, we are so apt to confound the accidental with the necessary, the modes and customs of society with the principles and laws of nature, that it is beneficial for us now and then to hear our most cherished notions assailed, whereby we may

[1] *London Magazine* (May 1824), p. 524. [2] Ibid. p. 525.

be led to examine the strength of their foundations ; . . . There may be much wisdom and much good in activity; but there is much also in "wise passiveness".[1]

Julius Hare's debts to Wordsworth and Coleridge are obvious enough—wise passiveness, organic unity, and the suspension of disbelief—but the emphasis on open-minded conservatism (in the best sense) is as much his own as anyone's.

Of special relevance also is Hare's treatment, in his review of Landor, of Byron's slight imitation of Goethe's " Kennst du das Land " at the beginning of " The Bride of Abydos ". Landor had suggested in his satire of Byron in " Bishop Burnet and Humphrey Hardcastle " that the English poet had plagiarized the lines. Hare indicates that Byron could not have done so because he did not then read German. Simply for good measure, Hare inserts his own verse translation of Goethe's " Song of Mignon " —" Know'st thou the land in which the citron blows ? "[2]

Hare's article seemingly fulfilled its purpose. Young Henry Taylor who noticed the *Imaginary Conversations* for *The Quarterly Review* succeeded in persuading Gifford to reduce the tone of the charges that he had dutifully composed against the book.[3]

By the end of 1824, the first edition of the *Conversations* was sold out, but John Taylor either inadvertently or fearing that the projected third volume and second edition would not fare so well did not turn over to Landor his full share of the profits.[4] When Landor requested that the money be sent him immediately, Taylor replied that he was sorry about the delay, and foolishly tried to explain it by mentioning the possibility of future losses. Taylor's weak and clumsy apology drew a strong and intemperate response from Florence. The part Hare took in the ensuing ruckus clearly anticipated the attitude he would later express in his answer to DeQuincey's remarks on Coleridge's plagiariams.

Landor ordered John Taylor to stop all publication of his writings ; he explained to Hare that Hazlitt and Leigh Hunt, then both in Italy, supported his feelings that the publisher had behaved like a scoundrel ; and he requested his cousin, Walter

[1] *London Magazine* (May 1824), p. 523.

[2] Ibid. pp. 526-9.

[3] Super, p. 168.

[4] For accounts of the break in relations between Landor and Taylor, see Super, pp. 181-4, and Edmund Blunden, *Keats's Publisher : A Memoir of John Taylor* (London : Jonathan Cape, 1936), pp. 156-65.

Landor of Rugeley, to start legal action against Taylor. Julius Hare answered Landor immediately. He took the blame for the omissions in the first two volumes and the authorization of the second edition, unapproved decisions that Landor had ascribed to Taylor. Also, he attributed the publisher's failure to pay Landor to unwise though innocent delay.

On the calmest review of the whole matter, it seems to me that I have been three or four times to blame for delaying to write to you, and that Taylor has been so once or twice ; but surely there is no villainy in this, or I must be a fourfold villain.[1]

Hare wrote to John Taylor, too. Although they had quarrelled over many items in the *Imaginary Conversations*, Hare knew the publisher to be a gentleman as well as a businessman. At his home, the Cambridge don had met Lamb, Hazlitt, DeQuincey, John Clare and other members of the bright circle of contributors to the *London Magazine* during the final months of its glory.[2] Julius Hare knew John Taylor to be amiable, intelligent, and much more honest and discriminating than most London publishers of the day.

20 April [1825]

My dear Sir

I am extremely grieved that you should have been exposed to such unmerited and unwarrantable insults as are contained in Landor's letters to you, for which in great measure I must needs think myself personally answerable, as from the beginning I have almost forced you, though for many reasons much against your will, to engage in the publications of his Dialogues. I trust however that you will exonerate me from much blame on this account, as I have always felt, and have not been slow in expressing, my esteem for your behaviour throughout the whole of the transactions between us. And as Landor has written in such language on the subject, allow me to assure you that from beginning to end I have felt convinced that your conduct has been that of a thoroughly upright, liberal, and conscientious man. As one cannot tell what steps Landor in the violence of his passion may have recourse to, it may be as well that you should have this assurance

[1] Super, p. 183.

[2] The occasion of Hare's meeting Lamb and DeQuincey was first described in a letter from Daniel Macmillan to Rev. S. Watt printed in Thomas Hughes, *Memoir of Daniel Macmillan* (London, 1882), and reprinted in Edward V. Lucas, *The Life of Charles Lamb* (London, 1905), ii. 69. See also *Sketches in the Life of John Clare*, written by himself and edited by Edmund Blunden (London : Cobden Sanderson, 1931), Appendix, " Clare on the Londoners ", p. 117. Clare reported that Taylor is " very fond of arguing about the Latin and Greek poets with the Reverends and the Cambridge [wits] that drop into his Waterloo house ".

from the only person acquainted with all the details of the matter, which, if it were necessary, I would readily confirm upon oath. What can have perverted Landor's judgment, so, except the unfortunate vehemence of his temper, it is difficult to make out. The only subject on which I have ever had to find fault with you, has been that you did not reply to his letters last Christmas on drawing upon you for the produce of the first edition so soon as you might have done; and however satisfactory your reasons for not paying the profits to him before you had yourself been paid by the booksellers I still must regret that you did not write to Landor on the subject soon after receiving his letter; for there is nothing more likely to give offence even to the less irritable persons, than the neglect of such an application. This however is only a point of delicacy, and, at the worst, furnishes no justification for any part of the language he has used. On certain other points Landor seems to be under a mistake, to clear up which I will write him tomorrow: —I would have done so today, if I could have found time:—and [feel] that scoundrel Hazlitt may have a finger in the pie and may have been irritating him against you, as he evidently has been against other people.[1]

As to the publication of the Second Edition and of the third volume, I know not what to do. I cannot ask you to continue it, even if Landor should be brought to perceive his error: but I suppose, if another publisher is found, the sheets already printed may be made over to him. For the present I would only finish the sheets already set, and leave the remainder till some new arrangement is entered into. Hoping that you will excuse the part I have borne in this unfortunate business. Believe me.

Yours very faithfully
J. C. Hare[2]

Hare had good reasons for supporting Taylor as well as for trying to placate Landor. The publisher had not behaved so badly as to deserve the abuse of Landor's violence. Several of the dubious acts attributed to Taylor had in fact been his own, and thus he shared the censure. Also, he had worked hard for at least two years persuading Taylor to print the *Conversations*; he could not have looked forward to starting all over again with another man. Hare's support of him surprised Taylor who answered immediately expressing his gratitude. In his next letter to Taylor, Hare encouraged the publisher, as he had Landor, to think better of human beings and save himself from the disappointments that are most often " attributable to ignorance or misunderstanding, or want of thought ".[3]

Julius Hare remained on good terms with both parties during

[1] Julius Hare's conception of Hazlitt's activities was no doubt formed from the news his brother Francis, an intimate friend of Landor's, had sent him from Italy.

[2] Ryl. Eng. MS. 1238.

[3] Ibid. Letter of 25 April 1825.

and after the quarrel. He need not have done anything when it blew up, but he had involved himself, pointed to each man's particular fault—Landor's ready anger and Taylor's carelessness, and then cleared away the wreckage afterward. In the next several years he arranged with three different publishers for the printing of the second edition of volumes i and ii and of the first edition of volumes iii. iv and v, a project that ended only when he himself published two dialogues planned for volume vi in the *Philological Museum* that Thirlwall and he edited at Cambridge in 1831 and 1832. In the dedication of his complete *Works* in 1846, Landor did not exaggerate the service that Julius Hare had done him: " . . . without [his] patience and assiduity in superintending the press while I was in Italy, the 'Imaginary Conversations' never would have appeared in my life-time."[1] John Taylor, in a new publishing partnership, published *Guesses at Truth* by Augustus and Julius Hare in 1827 and the Hare-Thirlwall translation of Niebuhr's *History of Rome* from 1828 to 1832.[2]

In a letter dated 27 November 1821, to the Editor of the *London Magazine*, DeQuincey had promised to supply " Translations in Prose and Verse from the most eminent of the Fine Writers of Modern Germany, with a Character of the Genius of each Author, forming an Anthology of their finest Passages ".[3] The first and only instalment appeared in the same number [4] and consisted of two passages from Jean Paul Richter prefaced by a " Letter to F—— " in which DeQuincey expressed himself in his lively personal style, at once playful and serious. He made it clear that his favourite German writers other than " Jack " [5] Richter were Schiller and Kant. If Julius Hare saw the item, he very likely smiled away his disagreement: DeQuincey had slighted Goethe, who had seemed to Hare since his childhood residence at Weimar perhaps the first man of the age. Having been engaged in translating for the Olliers a few months earlier and having projected a series on German drama, it is doubtful if Julius Hare failed to notice the scheme that DeQuincey had in mind. He would use the idea some years later.

[1] Super, p. 184. [2] Vol. i, 1st edn., 1828. Vols. i and ii, 2nd edn., 1829-32.
[3] Vol. iv (December 1821), p. 583. [4] pp. 606-20. [5] p. 607.

As his first letter to John Taylor had suggested,[1] Hare had read and admired the *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater* (1822). Thereafter, he seems to have followed DeQuincey's publications quite closely. The articles on Malthus (1823)[2] impressed him so much that despite crucial differences with DeQuincey over Goethe and Coleridge in the years that followed, Hare retained his opinion, formed in the reading of those articles, of the Opium-Eater as " the great logician of our times ".[3]

Hare's disagreement with DeQuincey relating to Coleridge, which probably remained silent between them until 1834, started at least in Hare's mind with DeQuincey's " Letters to a Young Man whose Education has been Neglected " in the *London Magazine* for January 1823.[4] When DeQuincey told his correspondent that " literature must decay unless we have a class wholly dedicated to that service, not pursuing it as an amusement only with wearied and pre-occupied minds ",[5] he was arguing against Coleridge's advice to young men in the *Biographia Literaria*, chapter xi—" Never pursue literature as a trade". Otherwise, Hare would have agreed with DeQuincey's intention in that essay : to engage Coleridge in activity so that he might produce another " Ancient Mariner ". But, De Quincey was calling Coleridge out on a point that would prove no more than an equivocation. The poet had meant *trade* to signify the literary life as it was, irregular in every sense and therefore neither dignified nor satisfying. " DeQuincey writes with great power, it cannot be questioned ", Hare told Taylor. " But I wish he were a little more cautious. In many points touched upon in his last letters I fear he is very much mistaken. . . ." [6] Though he did not specify the exact reference of his statement, Hare declared again a month later that DeQuincey had on another occasion

[1] See above, p. 62.

[2] " Malthus ", *London Magazine*, viii (1823), pp. 349-53, and " Malthus on the Measure of Value ", loc. cit. pp. 586-8.

[3] A. W. and J. C. Hare, *Guesses at Truth* (London and New York, 1871), p. 311. Originally published in 1827 in two volumes by Taylor and Walton, this work went through several enlargements during Julius Hare's lifetime and a number of editions thereafter. Since I have already cited this edition for E. H. Plumptre's " Memoir " and since it is more generally accessible, I make use of it again. [4] vii. 84-90. [5] p. 90.

[6] Ryl. Eng. MS 1238. Letter of 5 March 1823.

made a "grievous misstatement".[1] However, Hare had no quarrel with "On the Knocking at the Gate in Macbeth".[2]

Very soon another writer interested in German literature joined the contributors to the *London Magazine.* Thomas Carlyle's essay on "Schiller's Life and Writings" appeared in several parts at the end of 1823 and during 1824.[3] John Taylor told Hare of the publication of Carlyle's translation of Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship* at Edinburgh in 1824, and anxious to see the new work Hare complained that he could not get a copy in Cambridge.

I should feel disposed to try whether I could make it more intelligible than A. Cunningham and Proctor seemed to have found it. Perhaps if you can allow room for, what Lamb talked of so much, a *long* article, I may still set about it.[4]

If Hare were considering either a review of *Wilhelm Meister* or an essay on Goethe, DeQuincey got into print before he had made much progress. "Goethe as reflected in his novel of *Wilhelm Meister*" came out in the *London Magazine* in August and September 1824.[5] Even if one disregards its severe treatment of Carlyle, DeQuincey's article might well be criticized for its summary dismissal of *Faust* and for its petulant judgements of Goethe's fiction. Julius Hare read what the Opium-Eater had to say and resolved that now he had to answer that admirable but erratic writer as well as clarify *Wilhelm Meister.* He told John Taylor of his plan to reshape what he had already written into an opposing series on Goethe, and the publisher promised him space.[6]

[1] Ryl. Eng. MS 1238. Letter of 17 April 1823.

[2] *London Magazine*, viii (1823). [3] *London Magazine*, viii-x.

[4] Ryl. Eng. MS 1238. Letter to Taylor, 21 July [1824].

[5] x, 189-97 and pp. 291-307.

[6] Hare may have started the project in the summer just before the first article by DeQuincey appeared. In an undated letter to Taylor, Ryl. Eng. MS. 1238, after discussing Landor's initial inquiry about profits from his *Conversations*, Hare reported on his letters on Goethe. (The letter, therefore, should be dated about February 1825.) "Two, some four sheets, are ready for the press. The third is in my head and will be put on paper as soon as I have any leisure : and I have a tolerably complete scheme of the remainder." Since the letter mentions DeQuincey in the same connection, John Taylor may have planned to publish two points of view on Goethe's achievement. Hare's slowness in presenting his own judgement seems to have been caused by the unexpectedly one-sided aspect of DeQuincey's and later by the imminence of Taylor's relinquishing altogether the *London Magazine.*

In the autumn of 1824, however, the decline of the *London Magazine* had begun, and the partnership of John Taylor and James Hessey would be dissolved at the end of the year. Though few of his regular contributors remained from former days, Taylor decided to start a new and enlarged series of the magazine in January with someone other than himself as editor.[1] The plan encouraged Julius Hare even though University duties kept him from his literary work.

I have been very anxious not to be too much behind in my defence of Goethe. Does DeQuincey mean to insert his promised attack on Mignon? I would rather he had said his say against the great poet, to have still more points in which to repel his attack.[2]

Late in December 1824, he delivered to Taylor the manuscript of his first letter on Goethe, and shortly after the holidays promised the second for the first week of February.[3] Not until March, however, did Hare begin to suspect that his defence of Goethe was doomed. Henry Southern, the new editor of the *London Magazine*, apparently raised objections or simply was not interested. Anxiously, Hare wrote Taylor asking for proofs of the instalment he had submitted two months earlier.

If the Editor of the *London* likes to insert it in the 1st of April number, I will return it immediately. But so much time is passing since DeQuincey's attack, that if he does not think he can find room for it in the next number, I must get it printed in some other way.[4]

Soon afterward Hare received direct word that his answer on Goethe would not appear in the *London Magazine*. His response to Taylor showed his dissatisfaction with the New Series and the keenness of his disappointment.

[1] Writers on the *London Magazine* have disagreed on the roles of Taylor and his new editor, Henry Southern (1799-1853), between January and July 1825. I follow John and Anne Tibble, *John Clare : his life and Poetry* (London : Wm. Heinemann Ltd., 1956), p. 116.

[2] Ryl. Eng. MS. 1238. Undated letter to Taylor. The best date for this seems to me to be sometime in November, 1824. Nothing new from DeQuincey on Goethe had come out in the October number of the *London*, yet the new series was already projected.

[3] Ryl. Eng. MS. 1238. Letter to Taylor, 6 January [1825] (clearly postmarked 8 January 1825). In a postscript, Hare indicated that his preparation for ordination further complicated the writing of his articles.

[4] Ibid. Undated letter to Taylor. The context points quite obviously to March 1825.

I am on the whole rather glad that the Editor of the *London* Magazine has refused my article; for I was beginning to dread appearing in such blackguardly company, having seen no articles but C. Lamb's since the change in the editorship, with the writer of which I should not feel ashamed of being connected. . . .[1]

Julius Hare's association with John Taylor and the *London* had promised much more than the publication of Landor's dialogues and the wonderful company that gathered in Waterloo Place for good food and good talk, and not a little wine. Taylor had been remarkably perceptive of genius, and although obstinate at times he was a man who could be reasoned with. Not only had he published Keats, Lamb, DeQuincey, and Landor and was at that time bringing out Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*; he had also undertaken Thirlwall's translation of Schleiermacher. The decline of John Taylor's influence, mirrored in the *London Magazine*'s rejection of his Goethe article, must have impressed Hare as a threat to his long-nurtured, larger objectives.

By that otherwise frustrating spring of 1825, Julius Hare had become a substantial figure, at least in his restricted circles. He had some personal acquaintance with Wordsworth and Coleridge; he corresponded fairly regularly with Landor and Southey. At Cambridge, a man qualified to judge, Henry Crabb Robinson, spent two evenings with him and found him personally and intellectually remarkable.

Hare is a passionate lover of German literature and philosophy. He has the air of a man of talent, and talks well. I was struck with his great liberality. [18 March]

I had great pleasure in looking over his library of German books—the best collection of modern German authors I have ever seen in England. He spoke of Niebuhr's 'Roman History' as a masterpiece; praised Neander's 'St. Bernard', 'Emperor Julian', 'St. Chrysostom', and 'Denkwürdigkeiten'; was enthusiastic about Schleiermacher. Hare represents Count deMaistre as the superior of deLamennais. I am to read his 'Soirées de St. Petersbourg.' [15 April][2]

[1] *Keats's Publisher*, p. 161. Susanna Howe in *Wilhelm Meister and his English Kinsmen, Apprentices to Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930), p. 99, maintains that the reply to DeQuincey's article appeared in the October 1824, number of the *London*, that Julius Hare wrote it, and that "it was feeble enough". If any note by Hare did appear, I have been unable to identify it as his, and from the above it could not have been all that Hare intended. I am indebted to D. A. Rees, Librarian of Jesus College, Oxford, for the information that T. Rowland Hughes's unpublished dissertation *The London Magazine* (1931) in the Bodleian Library contains no indication that Hare contributed any articles to the *London* other than the Landor piece in vol. ix (May, 1824). [2] *Diary*, ii. 292-3.

Although he did not succeed, Hare was generally considered to be the leading candidate[1] for the Regius Professorship of Greek at Cambridge in September 1825, following the unexpected death of Professor Peter Paul Dobree. At Trinity College, however, he won the respect of the most promising undergraduates of that period, T. B. Macaulay and Winthrop Praed.

It was through his relations with the younger men of the College that a second opportunity developed for the publication of the essay on Goethe. As a consequence of the brilliant success of the *Etonian* before Macaulay, Praed, Derwent Coleridge, Sidney Walker and John Moultrie had migrated from Eton to Cambridge, they had persuaded Charles Knight to start another journal with something of the same spirit. The venture got under way in the summer of 1823 as *Knight's Quarterly Magazine* and ran through only six numbers until the end of 1824 when the Cambridge contributors became dissatisfied with Knight's editorial practices and he in turn accused them of not fulfilling their promises of material.[2] In the first months of 1825 Winthrop Praed and Henry Malden, both Trinity men, tried to convince Charles Knight to begin a new series with more professional editorial arrangements and more serious content. DeQuincey, who had appeared in the first series with "The Incognito ; or, Count Fitz-Hum ",[3] also encouraged Knight to resume, but on the old basis.[4] With the possibility of more material from DeQuincey, of whom Knight saw a good deal in the first half of 1825, and assurances of plentiful contributions

[1] *The Poetical Remains of William Sidney Walker*, edited with a Memoir of the Author by Rev. J. Moultrie (London, 1852), p. lxxxii. Walker (1795-1846) was probably the best Greek scholar under consideration, but crippling personality problems disqualified him. Alice A. Clowes, *Charles Knight, A Sketch* (London, 1892), p. 159, citing Henry Malden (1800-76), Fellow of Trinity College and later Professor of Greek, University of London. *William Whewell*, ii. 62. A crucial source of first-hand information on this controversial election of a Professor of Greek may be found in the Archives of the Cambridge University Registrary, MSS. 39.4, letter from John Croft, one of the electors, to Joseph Romilly, Registrary, 2 May 1853.

[2] The quarrel was aired in the magazine itself, mostly under pseudonyms. See also Clowes, *Charles Knight* (1892) and Charles Knight, *Passages of a Working Life during Half a Century* (London, 1864-5), 3 vols.

[3] iii (1824), 153-6, a free translation from Friedrich Laun (F. A. Schulz).

[4] *Passages of a Working Life*, i. 339.

from Cambridge, Charles Knight relented. The one and only number of the Second Series, known simply as *The Quarterly Magazine*, came out in August 1825. Knight's business associate in the experiment was George B. Whittaker, the publisher of Thirlwall's translations from Tieck, *The Pictures and The Betrothing*, which were appearing about the same time. As a relative of Thirlwall's, Whittaker might have helped persuade Knight of the reliability of the Cambridge group.[1] To the single number Julius Hare contributed his translation of a tale by Ludwig Tieck, " The Love-Charm ",[2] inspired perhaps in this unannounced work by having found so much pleasure in reading " Die Verlobung " and Thirlwall's impressive version of it.

Henry Malden apparently acted as Cambridge agent for the editor. On 15 September 1825 he wrote Knight telling him of about seven articles planned for the second number, including two from himself. He would try to get one from Macaulay, and he hoped that Knight could persuade DeQuincey to write another: " his last was well liked ".[3] With his letter he sent a long serious article by Julius Hare, probably a modified version of the rejected series on Goethe. Despite its diffuseness, Malden recommended that Knight print all of it.

> The article is a masterly piece of elaborate criticism, better than any literary criticism which has appeared in any English Review for the last half-dozen years... It is of a kind to stamp at once a marked character, and a very high character, on a new publication..., a full and powerful assertion of our literary faith.... I wish to show that men may be good political economists, and liberal thinkers in politics, without being raving democrats, without reviling *everything* old, without renouncing the imagination and all its works, without being selfish and hard-hearted, and without being despisers of God and of all religion. I wish, too, that our magazine may be thoroughly and heartily religious without cant or affectation. Such a character Hare's article will go far to give us.[4]

[1] *Letters of Thirlwall*, p. 74. Letter to Hare, 16 October 1824.

[2] *The Quarterly Magazine*, new series, no. 1, pp. 146-73. The only copies that I know of are in the Bodleian Library and the British Museum.

[3] Clowes, p. 157. The letter there is dated 15 September 1823. The content makes it clear, however, that the letter should be placed in 1825. Malden may have referred to "The Incognito" or to "The Somnambulist", vi (November 1824) or even to " The Love-Charm " (see below). William E. A. Axon, *The Canon of DeQuincey's Writings*... (London : Adlard and Son, 1912) [reprinted from the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, xxxii, pt. i], pp. 34-37], argues for the ascription of " The Somnambulist " to DeQuincey since it also came from the German of Laun.

[4] Clowes, pp. 155-7.

Malden further instructed the publisher to divide Hare's essay, if necessary, only at the phrase, "the majestic characters of Brandenstein and Dorothea", which suggests Tieck as well as Goethe, and rather pointedly told Knight that Hare insisted that his name be signed to the article. Despite his praise, Malden showed some anxiety in a subsequent letter that Knight might be "a little astonished" or terrified by Hare's extravagance and his cleverness.[1] Of course, the second number failed to materialize, and Julius Hare's defence of Goethe, attack on De Quincey, critical essay on German literature, or whatever that long article was, did not get published. Appearing in the first issue, the translation from Tieck did, however, raise a perplexing question many years later. Julius Hare included it, altered only by his special orthographic principles (for example, *wisht* instead of *wished*), in a volume with two other translations from Tieck by himself, *The Old Man of the Mountain; The Love-Charm; and Pietro of Abano*, published by Edward Moxon in 1831.[2] John W. Parker, who later printed most of Hare's ecclesiastical works, reprinted the three tales in 1860 with an Advertisement that read:

> This little volume was printed several years ago by permission of the Translator, who intended a Preface to it. The publication was accordingly delayed until long after his lamented decease, and the book is now laid before the public without any addition to the sheets printed off during his lifetime.[3]

The 1860 text corresponds with that of the 1831 edition, but neither printing adds the "Note on Tieck" that followed the tale in *The Quarterly Magazine* in 1825.

In the headnote to another version (1826) of the same tale, Thomas Roscoe expressed his diffidence in offering "Love-Magic, Some Centuries Ago", as he called it, in the light of "several versions from the pens of our best German scholars" of Tieck's

[1] Clowes, pp. 158-9. Letter from Malden to Knight, 25 September [1825].

[2] Though there was no question of DeQuincey's participation in the volume then, Sarah Austin, in *Fragments from German Prose Writers* (London, 1841), p. 349, identified the anonymous translator of the 1831 Moxon publication as Julius Hare.

[3] The 1860 reprint had the same title, and the Advertisement may be found on a leaf before the text.

tales, and he mentioned Thirlwall's specifically.[1] Either DeQuincey or Hare would have qualified as one of the other scholars Roscoe had in mind. In 1845, James Anthony Froude wrote a preface for a volume entitled *Tales from the " Phantasus " . . . of Ludwig Tieck*.[2] Froude made no claim, however, that the translation of " The Love-Charm " that the volume contained was his. Since this version and Hare's of 1831 " seem at the start to bear certain resemblances but later drift apart ", E. H. Zeydel has attributed the 1845 translations from the *Phantasus* to both Hare and Froude.[3] It seems strange to me, nevertheless, that Hare would have modified his original translation in 1845 and then go back to it shortly before his death in 1855, or that he would admit another, not-quite-independent version of a work that he himself had once done in a volume to which he was also contributing. Conjectures aside, there is no real evidence that Hare did assist in any way in the 1845 volume for which Froude wrote the preface.

In 1852, DeQuincey suggested to James Hogg who was assisting him in the collection of items for the *Selections Grave and Gay* edition of his work that he should see Charles Knight for a correct list of his contributions to the *Quarterly Magazine*. Apparently after his visit to the old archives in Fleet Street, Hogg found that DeQuincey's memory went blank at times and that the old essayist jokingly decided against himself on a number of questionable pieces. DeQuincey rejected " The Love-Charm " as his own work, although " there is no doubt ", said Hogg, that it " would have been reprinted had the Author lived to carry the *Selections* farther ".[4] James Hogg's authority for eventually publishing Tieck's tale as a translation by DeQuincey was Charles Knight who later remembered in his autobiography

[1] *The German Novelists : Tales Selected from Ancient and Modern Authors* (London : Henry Colburn, 1826), 4 vols. That Hare and Henry Colburn were having difficulties over the publication of the third volume of the *Imaginary Conversations* is a distinct possibility and may account for the lack of specific notice being taken of the *Quarterly Magazine* version of the translation from Tieck. See Super, pp. 196-5.

[2] London, James Burns.

[3] Edwin H. Zeydel, *Ludwig Tieck and England* (1931), pp.172 and 193-5.

[4] *The Uncollected Writings of Thomas DeQuincey*, ed. James Hogg (London and New York, 1892), pp. xiv-xv.

(1864-5) the friendliness of his relations with DeQuincey in the spring of 1825. " He wrote a translation of ' The Love Charm ' of Tieck, with a notice of the author. This is not reprinted in his collected works, though perhaps it is the most interesting of his translations from the German."[1] And thus Hogg ascribed the piece to DeQuincey in his edition of the *Uncollected Writings of Thomas DeQuincey* in 1890-2 despite the author's earlier disclaimer and the existence of an identical version by another writer.

James Hogg's decision remained unquestioned until 1937 when Professor Hans K. Galinsky discreetly asked, " Is Thomas DeQuincey the Author of *The Love-Charm ?* " and argued persuasively for the possibility that Julius Hare had in reality been the translator.[2] I believe that this present account of Hare's early literary career should remove the sole obstacle that Professor Galinsky could find in the way of attributing the work to Hare, that is, that DeQuincey had published in *Knight's Quarterly Magazine* whereas Hare had had no connection with the publication in 1825. The evidence of Henry Malden's correspondence with Charles Knight in this regard was corroborated in the " Memoir " Edward Hayes Plumptre, Mrs. Julius Hare's brother-in-law, wrote for the 1871 edition of *Guesses at Truth.* After commenting on Hare's version of *Sintram,* Plumptre added the following :

> It was intended to be the first of ' a series of versions of some of the best German romances and dramas'. Contributions of like character appeared in two short-lived periodicals, *Ollier's Magazine,* in 1820, and Knight's *Quarterly Review,* in 1825. . . .[3]

[1] *Passages of a Working Life,* i. 339.

[2] *Modern Language Notes,* lii (June 1937), 389-94. Professor Galinsky argued against the possibility of Hare's plagiarism of ' The Love-Charm ' translation by pointing to Hare's reputation as a translator in 1820 (Fouqué) and in 1828 (Niebuhr), his knowlege of German from childhood, his ordination in 1826 and subsequent reputation as an independent churchman, the absence of protests from Knight or DeQuincey in 1831, the correspondence of ideas and phrasing in the " Note " with passages in *Guesses at Truth,* DeQuincey's silence elsewhere on Tieck, and, the closeness of favourable comments on Novalis, Schleiermacher and Goethe in the " Note " to Hare's views rather than DeQuincey's. Although obviously indebted to Professor Galinsky's article for suggesting the main direction of my own argument on this matter, I have tried to avoid covering the same ground more than was necessary.

[3] pp. xxiii-iv.

Regardless of Plumptre's confusion over exact titles of magazines, it is clear that the family of Julius Hare knew about his 1825 publication.

One detail not unfavourable to Hare may, however, be disturbing on second thought. The 1831 printing of " The Love-Charm " reflects his idiosyncrasies of spelling while the 1825 version, the one in question, does not in any systematic way. The explanation, I believe, is simple; in 1825 Hare had not seriously adopted the mannerism, as a glance above at samples of his writing will indicate. His interest in revising English orthography took shape toward the end of the decade after longer acquaintance with Landor, who supported the project, and when Hare and Thirlwall were planning the *Philological Museum* at Cambridge about 1830.

The accuracy of the 1825-31 translation argues for Julius Hare's authorship also. Zeydel, who had not seen the 1825 publication, speaks of the three tales published by Moxon in 1831 as " precise and faithful " and " conscientiously accurate " translations.[1] DeQuincey's versions of German literature are for the most part and particularly at that time of doubtful fidelity,[2] more like " free adaptations ".[3]

Comparison of the 1825 and 1831 versions leaves no doubt that they are one translation of " The Love-Charm " and suggests that their slight differences are no more than simple revisions. For instance, the opening four stanzas of the first lyric coincide exactly. The fifth was altered in the following way.

1825

As from their braids her locks she flings,
Then twines them in a flowery band,
While at each motion of her hand
The white robe to her fair form clings.[4]

[1] *Ludwig Tieck and England*, pp. 193-6.

[2] Alexander Hay Japp, *Thomas DeQuincey : His Life and Writings* (London, 1890), p. 189 The comment originated with Charles Knight.

[3] Horace Ainsworth Eaton, *Thomas DeQuincey, a Biography* (London : Oxford University Press, 1936), pp. 348-9, and Edward Sackville West, *A Flame in Sunlight : The Life and Works of Thomas deQuincey* (London : Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1936), p. 207. West noticed the particular accuracy of " The Love-Charm ".

[4] *The Quarterly Magazine* (August 1825), p. 148.

1831

As from their braids she flings her tresses,
Then twines them in a flowery band,
While at each motion of her hand
The light robe to her fair form presses.[1]

The last paragraph of the tale illustrates similar revisions.

1825

Roderick took his dying friend in his arms. He had found him in his wife's room, playing with the dagger. She was almost drest when he entered. At the sight of the hated red bodice his memory had rekindled; the horrible vision of that night had risen upon his mind ; and gnashing his teeth he had sprung after his trembling, flying bride, to avenge that murder and all those devilish doings. The old woman, ere she expired, confessed the crime that had been wrought ; and the gladness and mirth of the whole house were suddenly changed into sorrow and lamentation and dismay.[2]

1831

Roderick took his dying friend in his arms. He had found him in his wife's room, playing with the dagger. She was almost drest when he entered. At the sight of the detested red bodice his memory had rekindled ; the horrid vision of that night had risen up before his eyes ; and gnashing his teeth he had darted after his trembling, flying bride, to avenge that murder and all those devilish doings. The old woman ere she died, confest the crime that had been perpetrated ; and the gladness and mirth of the whole house were suddenly changed into sorrow and lamentation and dismay.[3]

The changes represent the small improvements, the correction of awkwardness mainly, that an author, not a borrower, might want to make. Except for changes in printing practices, the 1892 version in James Hogg's edition of DeQuincey's *Uncollected Writings* quite naturally follows the 1825 *Quarterly Magazine.*

" The Love-Charm " is a tale of the imagination, not unlike *Sintram* in tone, less cluttered and more graceful, combining the fantastic and the realistic, the mysterious and the horrible of the Gothic tradition, and the poetic vitality and moral significance of

[1] *The Old Man of the Mountain; The Love-Charm; and Pietro of Abano* (London, 1831), p. 171. The verse form is that of Tennyson's *In Memoriam*, written 1833-50. During his days at Trinity, Arthur Henry Hallam, the poet's friend, lived in New Court less than a hundred yards from Hare's rooms. In September 1829, during the long vacation at Malvern, Hallam translated the same song from Tieck into the same kind of verse. *The Writings of Arthur Hallam*, ed. T. H. Vail-Motter (New York: Modern Language Association of America, and London: Oxford University Press, 1943), pp. 308-12.

[2] *The Quarterly Magazine*, p. 170.

[3] *The Old Man, etc.*, p. 219.

the old romance. Young love frustrated by its ideal purity capitulates, renounces thought, accepts evil and illusion as the natural order of life, and then destroys itself when confronted with the terrifying reality. Implicitly Tieck argues for an easy and happy acceptance of experience as an unavoidable admixture of goodness and evil. He suggests that idealism does not require a rejection of what is human, although the latter may be unlovely or unjust. Nor does realism imply wholehearted involvement in evil. Tieck seems to deplore the extreme positions that would make of life either a sweet dream or a nightmare because both preclude real love and real goodness, and ultimately deny life itself. One is apt to adopt such absolute points of view, he warns, if he isolates himself from everyday human events, even in pursuit of learning or of virtue.

In the " Note on Tieck " Julius Hare refused to extract the beauties of the tale as he had also done in his preface to *Sintram*. He praised Thirlwall's recent translations of *The Pictures and The Betrothing* and ranked Tieck as the second among contemporary German poets, whose genius was surpassed only by that of Goethe.[1] Briefly, he traced Tieck's career and then anticipated with great praise his forthcoming work on Shakespeare. In his comments on " The Love-Charm " itself, Hare stressed " the poetical harmony and perfect keeping of the whole ",[2] and the acute suggestiveness of Tieck's choice of details of characterization and action. As Thirlwall had in his introduction, he selected " calm and masterly irony " [3] as the special quality of Tieck's genius, an unshakable yet compassionate and creative reconciliation of the disparities in life and in art.

Exactly when Hare had translated " The Old Man of the Mountain " and " Pietro of Abano ", which Moxon published with " The Love-Charm " in 1831 is not known. He seems to have been attracted to all three tales by Tieck's continued opposition to fanaticism, in love as we have seen, in wealth in " The Old Man ", and in learning in " Pietro of Abano ". In each instance, fanaticism causes the avoidance of reality and the

[1] *The Uncollected Writings of Thomas DeQuincey* (1892), ii. 154-5. I cite this edition because of its accessibility.

[2] p. 157. [3] p. 158.

development of cynicism. The old man retreats to a mountain community because of the insidious evil he has discovered in the world. As a benignant cynic he makes himself the lord of the region, a Faust of rural industry, and in the process loses his power to discriminate good and evil in those around him. Perhaps in the spirit of Shakespearean tragi-comedy, the serious and comic characters are brought together in the end, goodness is revealed and rewarded and evil punished. " Pietro of Abano ", packed full of the bizarre and the magical, is the most fantastical of the three and, though probably least acceptable to twentieth-century readers, its theme embraces those of the other tales. The destruction of its diabolical protagonist, a priest-wizard, warns against all learning and theorizing that purport to explain the essential mysteries of life. The violation of the inviolable by science or religion can only be evil and destructive, no matter what else it might seem to be. Again, the right-minded shun the perverse and accept as inherently good the natural vicissitudes of experience.[1]

Reluctantly but dutifully Julius Hare took orders in 1826. There are indications that the awful seriousness of the step caused in him the not uncommon spiritual and physical crisis. During the Long Vacation he stayed close to Trinity College, keeping busy with moving into rooms in recently completed New Court and with re-arranging the books in the College library. The year marked the end of his youthful obscurity.

In this article, I have tried to present with as little comment as possible the best evidence concerning the seldom noticed events of Julius Hare's early literary career. Now, in conclusion, it seems fair to say that the facts, though few, indicate clearly enough Hare's development as an unusually competent and independent translator of German literature and as a man distinguished by enthusiastic devotion to truth and genius despite differences of opinion and personality or antagonistic conventions. His return to Cambridge to lecture in the classics and to

[1] For estimates of the tales as original works in German and as translations, see Edwin H. Zeydel, *Ludwig Tieck, The German Romanticist, A Critical Study* (Princeton University Press, 1935), pp. 200-1, 289-90, and 297, and *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country*, iv (November 1831), 446-60.

prepare for ordination had not seriously interrupted nor impeded his general project of extending in England the revitalization of thought and feeling engendered by the romantic rebellion, particularly as expressed in the writings of Wordsworth and Coleridge. Under the influence of the latter, Hare and Thirlwall had dedicated themselves to carrying on the task of anglicizing German writers and their methods. Nevertheless, Julius Hare's influence up to 1826 was limited to his friends and acquaintances in London and at Cambridge. His major literary work was yet to be done—*Guesses at Truth* (1827), Niebuhr's *History of Rome* (1828-32), " Samuel Taylor Coleridge and the English Opium-Eater " (1835), and the " Memoir of John Sterling " (1848).