

JULIUS CHARLES HARE : COLERIDGE, DeQUINCEY, AND GERMAN LITERATURE ¹

By G. F. McFARLAND, M.A., Ph.D.

PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH AT ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK

DURING his undergraduate days at Trinity College, Cambridge, the early love that Julius Hare developed for the poems of Wordsworth and Coleridge and the natural enthusiasm for contemporary German literature instilled in him during a boyhood residence at Weimar coalesced in an ardent and energetic commitment to awaken at least some of his countrymen from the deepening doldrums of Regency worldliness. When he went down from Cambridge as Master of Arts and Fellow of Trinity, Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria* (1817), *The Friend* (1818), and the poet's lectures on English and German literature of 1818-19 seemed to point the way to a practical beginning. Hare decided that he would start by translating recent German writing that might help reinforce and perhaps even extend the philosophical, critical, and moral influence of Wordsworth and Coleridge. He hoped thereby to further the reconciliation of reason and imagination, experience and faith, which in his opinion they had started, so that true vitality and integrity might be restored to thought, taste and belief in his homeland. But, before leaving Cambridge for London, Hare had awakened similar interests in several of his friends : Hugh James Rose, William Whewell, and Connop Thirlwall. The group gathered in Hare's room to learn German ; the text they used was Niebuhr's *Romanische Geschichte*. Later, all three of his pupils would assist, each in his own fashion, in introducing German literature to the educated English public. Thirlwall would soon become Julius Hare's working partner in the special project he had chosen for himself.

In the early summer of 1820 Charles and James Ollier published Hare's version of la Motte-Fouqué's *Sintram and his Companions*. At the end of that same year three pieces by Julius Hare

¹ This is the second of two articles on the subject of Julius Charles Hare, the first of which appeared in the preceding volume of this BULLETIN.

appeared in *Ollier's Literary Miscellany*. The opening article, "A. W. Schlegel on Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, with Remarks upon the Character of German Criticism",¹ is remarkable on two counts: first, Hare pointed out in Schlegel² the concept of the organic unity of an imaginative work that in English literary history is most often associated with the name of Coleridge; and, second, Hare chided Coleridge for the lack of intellectual discipline which alone prevented him, in the young man's point of view, from being the most eminent commentator on Shakespeare in any language. Thus, at the very beginning of his literary career, Julius Hare suggested an awareness of the coincidence of German and Coleridgian critical theory and demonstrated an honest appreciation of Coleridge's powers and weaknesses.

Two events occurring almost simultaneously seriously delayed Hare's immediate plans for publishing more in the cause of the romantic rebellion. In the summer of 1822 Hare accepted Christopher Wordsworth's invitation to return to Trinity College as an assistant tutor and lecturer in the classics. Also, he was asked by his eldest brother, Francis George Hare, long a resident in Italy, to act as agent for Walter Savage Landor who was having trouble finding an English publisher for his *Imaginary Conversations*. Without knowing Landor personally and with no hope of benefit to himself, Julius Hare laboured and connived throughout the next ten years to insure the publication of five volumes of Landor's dialogues.³ He had to deal with three reluctant publishers, correcting, editing and copying manuscripts, approving printed sheets, and above all arguing for Landor's right to the free expression of his own personality. Although he often disagreed with Landor intellectually, Hare admired his work for its erudition, its classical spirit, and its individuality. And Hare disagreed with Landor personally. He scolded Landor for his readiness in suspicion and anger just as he scolded John Taylor,

¹ pp. 1-39. On the fly-leaf of his own copy, now at Trinity College Library, Hare indicated the authorship of each item in the *Miscellany*. ² p. 9.

³ The best account of Hare's service to Landor is to be found in R. H. Super's *Walter Savage Landor, a Biography* (New York University Press, 1954). See also "The Early Literary Career of Julius Charles Hare" by the present writer in *B.J.R.L.*, xlvii (1963-64), 42 ff.

who published the first two volumes, for his carelessness in business matters and his moral and religious touchiness. When Hazlitt first reviewed the *Imaginary Conversations* in the *Edinburgh Review*,¹ although his final judgement of the dialogues was not unfavourable he railed at Landor (with whom he differed politically) for loving neither truth nor mankind, only himself. To forestall other writers with similar inclinations, Hare wrote a review for Taylor's *London Magazine*² in the form of an imaginary conversation, pointing out the beauties and the faults of Landor's essays and heavily satirizing contemporary reviewers who made wit and bias the principal weapons of their trade.

Hare's relations with Landor illustrate, as does his connection with Coleridge from beginning to end, a notable talent for dealing with extraordinary literary personalities. Although he faced squarely their limitations as men and artists, he continued to cherish their individuality and their genius and remained a faithful friend. It will be the particular purpose of this article to enlarge that theme by clarifying the often confusing details of Julius Hare's life from 1825 to 1834, his most productive literary years, and to give special emphasis to the part he played in the careers of Coleridge and DeQuincey, another eminent man of letters in whom Hare would find much to revere and much to deplore.

Through his association with John Taylor, Julius Hare came to know the brilliant circle of authors who contributed regularly to the *London Magazine* during its best days: Lamb, Hazlitt, DeQuincey, Allan Cunningham, and John Clare. DeQuincey especially interested Hare. They met only once or twice. Yet the Cambridge don had read with admiration the *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater* when it appeared in 1822 and thereafter followed DeQuincey's publications with close attention. His economic writings convinced Hare that the Opium-Eater could also be one of the great logicians of the age. Nevertheless, he found DeQuincey mistaken in questions of fact and interpretation more than once. In the spring of 1823 Hare would have quarrelled with DeQuincey over his "Letters to a Young Man whose Education has been Neglected",³ in which Coleridge's old friend had

¹ xl (March 1824), 67-92.

² ix (May 1824), 523-41.

³ *London Magazine*, vii (January 1823), 84-90.

seemed wilfully to misconstrue the advice offered in chapter xi of the *Biographia Literaria*—"Never pursue literature as a trade". When Hare later read DeQuincey's review¹ of Carlyle's translation of *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship* he was deeply disturbed by the Opium-Eater's lopsided judgement of Goethe's fiction and immediately asked John Taylor for space in the *London Magazine* for an opposing series of articles on the achievement of the great German genius. Taylor consented, but before DeQuincey had written all that he intended on the subject and before Hare could complete his rebuttal the editorship of the *London Magazine* passed into other hands.

Another opportunity to answer DeQuincey on Goethe presented itself almost at once. Some of the younger men at Trinity College—Macaulay, W. M. Praed, Derwent Coleridge, W. S. Walker, and John Moultrie—together with DeQuincey had been the principal contributors to *Knight's Quarterly Magazine*. A falling out between the publisher and his Cambridge authors had caused Charles Knight to discontinue the periodical and then, when their disagreements seemed to be resolved, start a second series in August 1825. To that number, the only one ever to appear, Julius Hare contributed a translation of Ludwig Tieck's "The Love-Charms".² The Goethe article was to have come out in the next issue of the new series of the *Quarterly Magazine*. So far as I have been able to determine, it was never published anywhere. Hare was disappointed, but he had little time to indulge his sense of frustration.

Perhaps as early as the autumn of 1825 Julius Hare began to make arrangements with John Taylor for the publication of an anthology of notes, aphorisms, and essays inspired by his reading and his lecturing at Trinity College. His brother, Augustus William Hare, then a Fellow and tutor of New College, Oxford, joined him in the undertaking. Taylor had printed Coleridge's

¹ *London Magazine*, x (August and September 1824), 189-97 and 291-307.

² In his edition of *The Uncollected Writings of Thomas DeQuincey* (London and New York, 1892) James Hogg attributed the translation to DeQuincey. His ascription remained unchallenged until Hans K. Galinsky suggested Hare's authorship in "Is Thomas DeQuincey the Author of The Love-Charms?", *Modern Language Notes*, lii (June 1937), 389-94. See also "The Early Literary Career of Julius Charles Hare" mentioned above.

Aids to Reflection in the late spring.¹ The brothers knew of the work and may have encountered the poet at Taylor's establishment. It may also have happened that the publisher found their idea attractive on account of its Coleridgean tone. In time Taylor decided to print, and when the proofs were still being corrected Augustus suggested that Taylor send several of the sheets to "old Coleridge" at Highgate :

Their fragmentary character would not displease him ; if they were sent to him interleaved with blank pages, he might be tempted occasionally to add a note, a limitation, a deduction or a guess which would double the value of the book to thinkers, and amply repay my brother and myself for any pains it may have cost us.²

There is no evidence that the scheme succeeded. Busy with Landor's *Imaginary Conversations* and the translation that he and Thirlwall were making of Niebuhr's *Romanische Geschichte*, Julius Hare had little time for his own work ; nevertheless, the anthology came out in two volumes in May 1827 and was called *Guesses at Truth by Two Brothers*.³ Its success surprised the authors and the publisher.

In a brief preface, Julius Hare warned the reader that the book required a different approach :

... My own [contributions] are little more than glimmerings, I had almost said dreams, of thought : not a word in them is to be taken on trust.

If then I am addressing one of that numerous class, who read to be told what to think, let me advise you to meddle with the book no further. You wish to buy a house already furnisht : do not come to look for it in a stonequarry. But if you are building up your opinions for yourself, and only want to be provided with materials, you may meet with many things in these pages to suit you.⁴

The subject matter of the *Guesses* ranges widely. There are essays by Julius Hare on Homer, Virgil, and Milton ; Sophocles and Horace ; Plato, Cicero, Bacon, and Luther ; Shakespeare, Pascal, Bentham, and Shelley ; Boccaccio, Sir Thomas More,

¹ E. K. Chambers, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge, A Biographical Study* (Oxford, 1938), p. 311.

² Rylands English MS. 1238. Undated fragment of a letter from Augustus Hare to John Taylor, which I would place in the winter of 1826-7.

³ London : Taylor and Walton. Augustus Hare died in February 1834. Julius revised and expanded the *Guesses at Truth* in 1838 and again in 1847-8. The work went through a number of printings and editions after his own death in 1855 and was well known in England and America even in the first decade of this century.

⁴ *Guesses at Truth* (1871), "To the Reader", p. xiii.

Montaigne, Defoe, Burke, and DeQuincey. Of the German authors, Kant, Goethe, Niebuhr, and Tieck are most frequently mentioned, but Hare writes also of Fichte, Schelling, Lessing, Novalis, Ranke, Hegel, Herder, and Richter. He refers continually to Wordsworth and Coleridge. Generally, he proposes to interpret or correct and to apply what has interested him to the experience of the ordinary educated Englishman. He tries to stimulate fresh ways of looking at old and new subjects. His tone varies from the pedantic to the poetic, from the witty to the moralizing, from the genial to the enthusiastic and the sharply critical. Although helpful, he seldom talks down to his reader, and rarely does he scold without praising. Perhaps the most dominant themes are the perfectability of mankind, or the possibilities of progress towards perfection, and the desirability of awareness and tolerance. With respect to literature he stresses the validity of the imagination as a means of knowing and the transcendence of poetry over science. In judging the work of philosophers and poets Hare uses the criteria of accuracy, originality, suggestiveness, fidelity to the wholeness of human experience, and aesthetic or intellectual unity and integrity. What he has to say is, therefore, not so novel as intermediary.

The allusions to Coleridge in the first edition of *Guesses at Truth* are numerous, and two passages in particular reveal both the qualified admiration that Hare had for the poet-philosopher and the deep and persuasive influence that Coleridge cast over his disciple's attitudes and opinions :

Some minds cannot boil, without boiling over. Let Coleridge devise any vessel for his thoughts, however eccentric its shape, however manifold its convolutions, still it will not hold them. He seldom says enough on any subject, because he always says more than enough. His works are like a forest : you are for ever losing the main road, from . . . the number of pleasant by-paths which lure you along them, the number of wild dingles which you cannot choose but explore.¹

A friend who was looking over my proof sheets, has just reminded me that Mr. Coleridge in his *Biographia Literaria* (ii. 208), when defining the gentlemanly character, has made almost the same remarks as the preceding ; only what he says is much more subtle, more accurate, and more complete. To him then whatever is good in them belongs : for I read his observations some ten years ago, and the

¹ Augustus William and Julius Charles Hare, *Guesses at Truth* (London, 1827), ii. 94. See also Charles Richard Sanders, *Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement* (Durham, North Carolina : Duke University Press, 1942), p. 127.

thought has dwelt within me, although I remembered not whence it came. Perhaps this will have been the case often; so frequently have I strengthened my mind with the invigorating waters which stream forth redundantly in Mr. Coleridge's works, that, if I mistake not, many of my thoughts will appear to have been impregnated by his spirit. If they do, may they not shame their parentage.¹

The latter statement is especially noteworthy as it both echoes Coleridge's own acknowledgement of his general indebtedness to Schelling and forms the basis of Hare's later explanation of Coleridge's plagiarisms.²

Ordinarily Hare's references to Coleridge in later editions of the *Guesses at Truth* are brief. Sometimes he uses the older man's works to support special views of his own. Sometimes he praises or criticizes a line of verse or a word or phrase from Coleridge's prose. More significantly Julius Hare expresses his gratitude to Coleridge for what had become one of the first principles of his own critical method: "Until you understand an author's ignorance, presume yourself ignorant of his understanding" (p. 114).³

In a longer essay suggesting that few Englishmen can both admire and understand Shakespeare because they lack the discipline in analytical and historical methods natural to German critics such as Francis Horn, Hare singles out Coleridge as the great exception. Here he says more than he had in *Ollier's Miscellany* in 1820.⁴ Often hindered from comprehending the thoughts of others by the multiplicity of his own ideas and impressions, Coleridge nevertheless "had a livelier perception, than any other Englishman, of the two cardinal ideas of all criticism,—that every work of genius is at once an organic whole in itself, and

¹ *Guesses at Truth* (1827), ii. 278. Also Sanders, p. 128.

² See below, p. 192.

³ *Guesses at Truth* (1871). I return to this edition for this and future citations in the text because of its general availability. Since Julius Hare dated new materials in editions after the first, it is safe to assume that undated entries that remain correspond to those of 1827, except perhaps for the insertion of a quotation to support a point. This holds true for what is called the First Series in later editions. The Second Series, however, is more difficult to deal with chronologically, and therefore I do not make any citations from it in this essay. Furthermore, three-fourths of the Second Series, according to Hare's own statement in a head-note, was new (dated, that is, 1838 or afterward) and consequently of little importance in a consideration of his early career.

⁴ See above, p. 166.

the part and member of a living, organic universe, of that poetical world in which the spirit of man manifests itself by successive avatars" (pp. 190-1). Hare points to the origin of these principles in Winckelmann and Lessing, but claims that in Coleridge they are combined "with that moral, political, and practical discernment, which are the highest endowments of the English mind . . ." (p. 191). He goes on to assert that Coleridge's own poetical imagination assisted him in following others, yet though nothing was too profound for his "psychological analysis" Coleridge sometimes found depth where there was none. Finally, he says that Coleridge was assisted in his criticism by his personal attributes of faith and love :

—a boundless faith in Shakespeare's truth, and a love for him, akin to that with which philosophers study the works of Nature, shrinking from no labour for the sake of getting a satisfactory solution . . . (p. 191).

In the same essay on criticism Hare claims that the general superiority of contemporary German commentators on literature stems only from their superior training in the "principles and methods of knowledge" (p. 193). He praises in particular the German emphasis on historical criticism instead of the aesthetical and deplores English writers who seem not to suspect "that there is anything essential in the form of a poem, or that there are any principles and laws to determine it, or that a poet has anything to do, except to get an interesting story, and to describe interesting characters, and to deck out his pages with as many fine thoughts and pretty images as he can muster" (p. 195).

Of Niebuhr Hare writes in some detail. He admires the historian for having believed so implicitly in the need to pursue the truth with the utmost diligence so that the evidence and the assistance that God has provided will be discovered (pp. 61-62). He shares Niebuhr's affection for the Romans for having treated as heirlooms the measures enacted by their eminent statesmen of earlier times (p. 140). Hare also reveals the reason for his own tenacious interest in Niebuhr's *Romanische Geschichte*; for him the book seemed to testify that its author had raised himself by his learning to an eminence from which he could survey and comprehend the whole of human knowledge (p. 149). Perhaps it was such an all-inclusive purview of talent or understanding that

attracted Julius Hare to Coleridge, Landor, and Goethe, as well as Niebuhr.

Hare's special interest in Goethe, at least as expressed in *Guesses at Truth*, seems to have been as an artist and a critic who demonstrated the superior truth of the imagination. He recalls Goethe's comment that Leonardo might have searched the market place of Milan for sixteen years without finding a human model for the faces of Judas and Christ (p. 274). Hare feels that in his memoirs Goethe illuminated the origins of his art (p. 58) and he recommends the novels and some of the dramas as embodiments of the spirit of the history of his time, especially the restlessness of those men who had lost "every ancestral feeling" and all confidence in positive institutions (p. 278). He praises Goethe's autobiography for its author's "clearsighted Socratic irony, and power of representing every object with the hues and spirit of life" (p. 266);

Goethe calls the Memoirs of his life *Dichtung und Wahrheit, Imagination and Truth*; not meaning thereby that any of the events narrated are fictitious, but they are related imaginatively, as seen by a poet's eye, and felt by a poet's heart. Indeed so far are they from being fictions, that through this very process they come forward in their highest, completest reality: so that Jacobi, in a letter to Dohm, when speaking of this very book, says: 'I was a party to many of the events related, and can bear witness that the accounts of them are truer than the truth itself' (pp. 283-4).

And thus, Hare points out, Coleridge also could say of Chantrey's bust of Wordsworth "that it is more like Wordsworth than Wordsworth himself is" (p. 284).

None of the longer essays in *Guesses at Truth*, either the first or later editions, is critical of either Niebuhr or Goethe, yet it is always obvious that Julius Hare was not interested in either man's work solely for itself. He hoped that his references to them would correct English attitudes and stimulate English learning and literature. He used Coleridge in the same way, but early and late he qualified his praise by pointing to Coleridge's limitations. And always Hare remained conscious of the German origins of many of Coleridge's ideas.

In 1838 Julius Hare dedicated the new edition of *Guesses at Truth* to Wordsworth, the man "by whom my eyes were opened to see and enjoy the world of poetry in nature and in books" more

than twenty years before. Hare said that he and his brother had then felt a like obligation to Coleridge :

You and he came forward together in a shallow, hard, worldly age,—an age alien and almost averse from the higher and more strenuous exercises of the imagination and thought,—as the purifiers and regenerators of poetry and philosophy.¹

Consequently, *Guesses at Truth* must take its place with Hare's German translations as part of the project that its principal author and his college friend, Thirlwall, had undertaken in response to the works of Wordsworth and Coleridge.

The essays that Julius Hare wrote for the anthology are seldom profound ; they do, however, contain many striking insights. They can be difficult because they are heavily and not always helpfully larded with references to ancient and modern events and authors and with quotations in Greek, Latin, French, German, and Italian. It may well have been that the more common reader between 1827 and the end of the century bought *Guesses at Truth* as a prop for his pretensions to cultivation as a Christian gentleman, and it undoubtedly happened that more often than not he found most pleasure and use in its aphorisms, which are seldom effective and seldom the work of Julius Hare. Its popular fate notwithstanding, *Guesses at Truth* is a significant repository of romantic and Victorian literary ideas and attitudes and as such an important link in the history of ideas in the nineteenth century.

Despairing of the law and London, Connop Thirlwall had returned to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1827 to renew his expiring fellowship by taking orders. He and Hare had joined forces almost immediately and set about translating Niebuhr's *History*, the book they had read together some eight or nine years earlier. As lecturers in the classics they had some opportunity at last to raise the status of literary studies at the University, and they seem to have felt that a shift in a new direction, away from traditional textual studies, might accomplish their purpose.²

Niebuhr's *History of Rome* was indeed disturbingly different, if not revolutionary. While a professor at Bonn and Berlin, before

¹ *Guesses at Truth* (1871), pp. ix-x.

² J. C. Hare, *A Vindication of Niebuhr's History of Rome from the charges of the Quarterly Review* (Cambridge : John Taylor, 1829), p. 38.

being sent to the Vatican as Prussian envoy in 1816, Niebuhr had put together two volumes of a projected three-volume study of the problems of reconstruction in Roman historical writing. The death of his first wife and seven years of diplomatic duties delayed his return to the work until the middle of the eighteen-twenties. Acknowledged a man of remarkable erudition, Niebuhr did not attempt merely to narrate again in fuller detail the events in the history of Rome as reported in traditional sources; rather he questioned extensively the authority of all records, rejecting many of the hallowed ones and accepting the testimony of some that had been ignored. In dealing with accepted traditions he tried to distinguish the myth from the report, and when the myth existed alone he separated what he considered sheer fiction from hypothetical fact by referring to general patterns of development in the history of Rome and other nations. His interest, therefore, was primarily in historiography, and he used materials from all aspects of the culture: the anthropological and the archaeological, the mythological, the social and political and economic, the military, the religious, the biographical, and the literary. Basically, of course, his method was inductive but he relied heavily on intuition, and his conclusions threatened many a precious tradition.

When his first two volumes appeared, the reviewers were often sceptical. In a letter to an old friend Niebuhr explained his unconcern:

I am as certain of the correctness of my views as I am of my own existence, and that I have discovered the solution of the enigma. It is not the love of conjecture that has impelled me, but the necessity of understanding, and the faculty of guessing and divining. . . . Further, it is not to be expected that every one, or even that many, should have that faculty of immediate intuition which would enable them to partake in my immoveable [sic] conviction. . . .¹

Niebuhr's English translators were among those capable of appreciating his conviction although they did not agree with all of his conclusions. Hare and Thirlwall found inspiration in their German author's scholarship, especially the wholeness of it, in

¹ *The Life and Letters of Barthold George Niebuhr, with Essays on his Character and Influence by Chevalier Bunsen, and Professors Brandis and Loebell*, [ed. and trans. Susanna Winkworth], (London, 1852), ii. 69, letter to Mme Hensler, 20 November 1816.

his use of the imagination and in his boldness, and they hoped that others in England would at least be awakened sufficiently by their translation to corroborate or deny Niebuhr's theories and perhaps even build on them. They made their version of his *History* entirely faithful to the original and as objective as possible; their meagre notes directed readers to Niebuhr's unmentioned sources. The first volume of the translation was published by John Taylor in the spring of 1828.¹

Just before the volume was ready to go to the booksellers Julius Hare heard from Niebuhr that the promised revision of his first two volumes could not be completed for several months. Having assumed that the changes which the historian had announced some time earlier would be slight, Taylor and the translators had gone ahead with the publication of the first volume. At the same time Hare could report that Niebuhr was pleased with the sheets that he had seen :

No event (he says among other things) to which [sic] my literary life has given me, has afforded me greater delight. It is astonishing and wonderful how you have expressed all and everything, the whole and every particular thought, with the exact shade of feeling with which I wrote. Just such a translation I had conceived to be possible, but had not hoped that I was destined to meet with it : just such a one did I wish for, or none. No thanks can express what I owe you : through you my history belongs to your nation and your literature as much as to Germany.²

Characteristically Hare forbade Taylor to use Niebuhr's words of praise as a "puff" for their publication. By the autumn the translation was out of print,³ but the translators were in trouble.

When the revised German editions of the first two volumes reached Cambridge, they were found to be almost entirely rewritten. Hare and Thirlwall had to start all over again. John Taylor reported that Julius Hare entered upon the task "with all the enthusiasm of a Man of Genius and a Lover of Genius—Qualities not always united ; but it is to the Combination in the

¹ Barthold George Niebuhr. *The History of Rome*, trans. Julius Charles Hare and Connop Thirlwall (Cambridge, 1828), vol. i.

² Ryl. Eng. MS. 1238. Undated letter to Taylor. See also *The Life and Letters of Niebuhr*, ii. 358, letter to Mme Hensler, 4 November 1827, in which Niebuhr says essentially the same thing.

³ *The Life and Letters of Niebuhr*, ii. 369, letter to Savigny, 28 November 1828.

Characters of Hare and Thirlwall that we owe this new Translation—not to their Modesty ”.¹ The second English edition of the first volume appeared in 1829 ; the second volume was not published until 1832.

The task, though believed in and accepted willingly, was not made easier, however, by a writer in *The Quarterly Review*, who cast suspicion on both Niebuhr and his translators.² In a review of A. B. Granville's *St. Petersburg, A Journal of Travels to and from that Capital*, it was noted that Granville had reported that recent student uprisings at German universities were attributed in part to the influence of Niebuhr and his *History*, although in his second edition the historian had rejected the political opinions responsible for the riots.³ *The Quarterly* added its comment in a note :

We wish we could say the same as to his absurd and shallow doctrines of another class—but these remain ; and, by the by, we think his last translators, two clergymen of the Church of England, since they have exercised the right of adding notes to Niebuhr's text wherever they fancied they had anything worth hearing to offer, might have as well *remarked*, for the benefit of their young academical readers, on some of the most offensive paragraphs which have appeared since the days of the Philosophical Dictionary. But Niebuhr is, what Mr. Wordsworth should not have called Voltaire, ' a pert, dull scoffer.' We regret this omission the more, because one of these translators appears to us to be a man of great talents. He has written two prefaces, one to his version of Schleyermacher [*sic*] on St. Luke, and an other to some novels from the German, which are sufficient to place him in an eminent rank. Pity that such talents should be wasted on the drudgery of translation—and pity still more that the works rendered by such a hand should in any instance be pregnant with crude and dangerous speculations.⁴

Julius Hare reacted immediately with a sixty-page pamphlet published by John Taylor from Cambridge.⁵ First, he pointed out that *The Quarterly Review* had, in fact, changed its stand ; the June 1825 number that had introduced Niebuhr's first edition to the English public had found no cause for alarm in the

¹ Edmund Blunden, *Keats's Publisher : A Memoir of John Taylor* (London : Jonathan Cape, 1936), pp. 185-6.

² xxxix (January 1829), 1-41. The author of the review was not John Gibson Lockhart. See Hildyard M. Clive, *Lockhart's Literary Criticism* (Oxford, 1931), p. 160.

³ *The Quarterly Review* (January 1829), p. 8.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 8-9.

⁵ J. C. Hare, *A Vindication of Niebuhr's History of Rome from the charges of the Quarterly Review* (1829).

historian's politics or religion.¹ Nor had German scholars who knew Niebuhr's work—A. W. Schlegel, Welcker, Hüllmann, Walther, and others—found him inspired by anything but a deep love of learning. The present writers in *The Quarterly Review* had not bothered to check Niebuhr's work, dedicated in 1813 and 1827 to the King of Prussia, nor investigate Granville's "news"; the riots at Heidelberg had actually been over a matter of student discipline. Hare would admit that some fanatic, through misconstruction, might have been wrongly inspired by the book, but he knew of no work except perhaps Wolf's *Prolegomena* that had had greater influence over the truly learned in Germany during the past fifteen years. Hare's judgement of the real influence of Niebuhr's *History* remains just even today: "it has flung an entirely new light over the whole region of ancient history."²

The defender of Niebuhr then argued that there had in reality been no change in Niebuhr's political opinions. Throughout his adult life the historian had always been a foe of the tyranny of both oligarchies and democracies. Yet the emphasis of any man's principles must shift unless he is a slave to party. Niebuhr's hatred of the recent oppression of the Greeks indicated nothing more than such a shift. Nevertheless, Niebuhr opposed Jacobinism:

. . . because it has no reverence for the majesty of nature, but would level the distinctions of character . . . and because it has no reverence for the majesty of history, but would rend asunder the golden threads by which the present and the future are connected with the past.³

An even more significant passage in Hare's *Vindication* explains not only Niebuhr's shifts of emphasis but also the conservative-liberal conflicts in much of Wordsworth and Coleridge and what Hare's own contemporaries saw as baffling inconsistencies in his opinions:

The very principles, which yesterday were trodden underfoot, and therefore needed to be lifted up and supported, perhaps today, when they have risen and become predominant, may in their turn require to be kept in check by antagonistic principles. And this is the great problem for political wisdom, the rock it is the most difficult for political integrity not to split on: to know when to stop; to

¹ Thomas Arnold wrote the 1825 review for *The Quarterly* during the brief editorship of J. T. Coleridge.

² *A Vindication of Niebuhr's History*, p. 15.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 30-31.

withstand the precipitous seductions of success ; to draw back from the friends by whose side one has been fighting, at the moment they have gained and are beginning to abuse their victory ; to join those whom one has hitherto regarded with inevitable and perhaps well-deserved animosity ; to save those who have been too strong from becoming too weak ; and to rescue the abusers of power from being crushed by its abuse. This is no apology for a political turncoat. . . .¹

As one might expect, Hare pointed to Edmund Burke as the great English example of such consistency.

Briefly, Hare redirected the critic's attention to the "whimsical" notes he and Thirlwall had inserted in the *History*. Only one was not a source of reference and that illustrated rather than discussed Niebuhr's text. The truth of Hare's protest would strike even a casual reader of the book at first glance. Fidelity to the original he maintained, as he had in his preface to *Sintram* (1820), is the first responsibility of a translator.

Finally, Julius Hare treated the question of Niebuhr's religion and, in doing so, provided another example of his own enlightened tolerance. No writer well acquainted with *The History of Rome* and engaged in reviewing elsewhere than in *The Quarterly*, had charged Niebuhr with deism, impiety, or scepticism. Since the review that he was answering had made no specific references to passages, Hare avoided pointing out what might have been questioned. Instead, he asserted Niebuhr's belief in the operation of the Holy Spirit in determining historical events as, for instance, in Napoleon's bad winter in Russia,² and reminded readers that John Milton had had the same sort of faith. In conclusion, Julius Hare suggested that *The Quarterly Review* had demonstrated its own inconsistency by accepting Schleiermacher as a Christian scholar and at the same time raising doubts about Niebuhr :

What [Niebuhr's] religious faith may be, I know not : that is to say, so far as regards the peculiar doctrines and mysteries of Christianity ; for that his faith in God's superintending providence and retributive justice is vivid and vivifying, I have shewn. Thus much however I do know ; that it is very possible in Germany under the present aspect of religious feeling and knowledge, to unite a fervent

¹ *A Vindication of Niebuhr's History*, p. 20.

² Hare cites the *Prussian Correspondent* (April 1813) in illustration of his argument. The quotations contain phrases that Hare used as titles for two of his most famous sermons, "The Children of Light" (1828) and "The Mission of the Comforter" (1840). *A Vindication of Niebuhr's History*, pp. 52 and 54.

faith in Christianity, and a hearty love of it, with considerable doubts and scruples about the historical value of certain passages in Scripture.¹

In a postscript Connop Thirlwall endorsed Hare's argument, adding in his crisp, clean prose that he had found *The Quarterly Review's* charges ridiculous on three other counts : basing an accusation of religious inconsistency on disagreement over the first ten chapters of *Genesis* ; holding translators responsible for an author's opinions ; and calling the translation of such a book " drudgery " when real drudgery consisted of writing for religious, political, and literary proscription.²

With the publication of Niebuhr's *History of Rome* in English, Hare and Thirlwall began to see some evidence that their hope of stimulating classical scholarship and thought in general might be successful in no small way. The disciples of Coleridge and Niebuhr began to acquire disciples of their own. Among the undergraduates at Trinity College a *Conversazione* Society had been formed by two young men, F. D. Maurice and John Sterling, who had found Hare's lectures particularly impressive. Later, in the time of Tennyson³ and Arthur Hallam, the group became known as the Apostles' Club.⁴ Charles Merivale (1808-93), an Apostle who became an historian of Rome,⁵ wrote of those days in his *Autobiography* :

We began to think that we had a mission to enlighten the world upon things intellectual and spiritual. We held established principles, especially in poetry and metaphysics, and set up certain idols for our worship. Coleridge and Wordsworth were our principal divinities, and Hare and Thirlwall were regarded as their prophets ; or rather in this celestial hierarchy I should have put Shakespeare

¹ *A Vindication of Niebuhr's History*, p. 59.

² *Ibid.* pp. 61-63.

³ In December 1829 Julius Hare preached a sermon in the Chapel of Trinity College entitled " The Law of Self-Sacrifice ". John Churton Collins, " A New Study of Tennyson ", *Cornhill Magazine*, xli (January 1880), pt. i, 44, suggested a coincidence between two lines in " The Passing of Arthur "—

For so the whole round world is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God

and a sentence from Hare's sermon—

This is the golden chain of love whereby the whole creation
is bound to the throne of the Creator.

⁴ See Frances M. Brookfield, *The Cambridge "Apostles"* (New York : Scribner's 1906), an often unreliable but useful book.

⁵ *History of the Romans under the Empire* (1850-64) and *Conversion of the Roman Empire* (1864).

at the top of all, and I should have found a lofty pedestal for Kant and Goethe. It was with a vague idea that it should be our function to interpret the oracles of transcendental wisdom to the world of Philistines, or Stumpfs, as we designated them, and from time to time call forth from this world the few souls who might be found capable of sympathizing with them, that we piqued ourselves on the name of the 'Apostles' . . .¹

Winthrop Mackworth Praed (1802-39), though he had taken his degree in 1825, was one of the most shining Cambridge personalities of the same period. Handsome, refined, eloquent and talented, the young poet attracted friends and admirers from among the undergraduates, the dons, and the townsmen. He seemed to promise more personal brilliance than any other student since Byron had left Trinity College about sixteen years before, although he belonged to a generation of men at the same College who are now better known than he: Macaulay, Bulwer-Lytton, Maurice, and Sterling. In 1823 and 1824 he had contributed a large proportion of the material that had gone into *Knight's Quarterly Magazine*. In 1827 Praed was elected Fellow of Trinity College and then stayed on to take his M.A. the following spring. The sheer labour of his studies during those last years and the imminence of beginning law in London in the autumn seemed to warrant a special holiday during the summer of 1828. Praed and Julius Hare decided to tour the Rhineland together.² The adventure provided the best evidence we have of Hare's having known Coleridge personally.

The two Fellows of Trinity College left London for Ostend in July. Across the Channel, they admired the ladies at Bruges and the Rubens paintings at Antwerp. From the latter city Praed reported the special news:

I am to dine today with the poets, Wordsworth and Coleridge, and the daughter of the first mentioned. Hare knows both intimately. They are returning from a tour in Switzerland.³

No account of the dinner followed, but Praed had said enough to indicate that Hare knew Coleridge well, perhaps "intimately", at least six years before the death of the poet-philosopher.

¹ *Autobiography and Letters of Charles Merivale, Dean of Ely*, ed. Judith Anne Merivale (Oxford, 1898), pp. 98-99.

² Derek Hudson, *A Poet in Parliament, The Life of Winthrop Mackworth Praed, 1802-1839* (London: John Murray, 1939), pp. 137-9.

³ Hudson, p. 138. No date is given for the letter from Praed to his sister that mentioned the scheduled meeting.

Perhaps the choice of direction for their journey and also of his travelling companion had been influenced by Praed's having begun to learn German at Trinity ; in June, before they had set out, the young poet wrote some verses " From Goethe ".¹ From Antwerp they travelled south through the Rhine valley to Godesberg near Bonn. It is likely that Hare made a stop there for the purpose of visiting Niebuhr while Praed explored the countryside. They then walked on to Frankfurt where Praed bought a German collection of nineteenth-century English poets, including selections from Wordsworth and Coleridge, and one of his own pieces among the anonymous.² The trip ended at Paris whence they returned to England, to the study of law and to translating Niebuhr and a number of extracts from other German writers.

In 1825 Frederick Denison Maurice (1805-72), who according to Arthur Hallam had established the spirit of the Apostles' Club,³ had begun a brief but significant career in the world of periodical literature ; he became joint editor of the *Metropolitan Quarterly Magazine*. Shortly afterwards he was one of the proprietors of the *London Literary Chronicle*, and when the latter merged with the seven-month-old *Athenaeum* at the end of July 1828 Maurice took over the editorial work on the new *Athenaeum and Literary Chronicle*.⁴ In August the magazine reviewed *Guesses at Truth* and in December Hare's sermon, *Children of Light*, giving each more praise perhaps than it deserved.⁵ On 4 February 1829 Hare began to contribute to the *Athenaeum* as a translator of German literature.⁶ The form of this series recalls the abortive project DeQuincey had announced in the *London Magazine* in 1821.⁷

¹ *The Poems of Winthrop Mackworth Praed*, with a Memoir by Derwent Coleridge (London, 1864), i. 315.

² Hudson, p. 139.

³ John Frederick Maurice, *The Life of F. D. Maurice, Chiefly Told in his own Letters* (London, 1884), i. 110.

⁴ Leslie Alexis Marchand, *The Athenaeum, A Mirror of Victorian Culture* (Chapel Hill : University of North Carolina Press, 1941), pp. 5-6, and p. 14, n. 36.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 105.

⁶ Although hinted at in E. H. Plumptre's "Memoir" in *Guesses at Truth* (1871), p. xxiv, the following group of items has not, so far as I know, been hitherto attributed to Julius Hare.

⁷ See *B.J.R.L.*, xlvi. 69.

Although the first item, Richter's "Vision of a Godless World",¹ is signed "I. C. H.", Hare's authorship is hinted at also by the headnote's recommendation of an excellent English version of another such piece from J. P. Richter in volume ix, of the *London Magazine* "by his great admirer amongst us—an admirer, too, who is almost his rival in portraying the fantastic progeny of sleep".² Hare referred, of course, to DeQuincey. In the "Vision" Richter describes the transforming effect of belief in a Godless world. The number for 18 March 1829 contained Hare's second contribution under a general title, "Museum of Thoughts, I",³ which suggests that the translator anticipated that the short pieces would become a regular feature of the *Athenaeum*. The new heading is explained by an academically witty paragraph in which Hare insists that the Muses too should have a Museum. By way of introducing the present selections, Hare comments on the universality of Goethe's interests and the inexhaustible richness of great poetry: like the sea, "you may take all you can out of it, and it will not be missed; nay, the more you have already learnt from [the poet], the more you will still be able to learn from him". He then presents eighteen short remarks made by Goethe on the fine arts. The fourteenth sounds a note similar to one heard frequently in the *Biographia Literaria*: Every work should be an organized union of parts that transcends basic symmetry by presenting a mystery that we can almost see through and reaches perfection when we lose awareness of its symmetry and feel primarily the effects of the accidental and the spontaneous.⁴

On 20 March 1829, Maurice wrote Hare thanking him for the "valuable communications" that he had just sent to the *Athenaeum* and for his promise of others.⁵ "Museum of Thoughts, II" offers a brief essay by A. W. Schlegel on Homer and again the need for unity of details in great literary art is stressed.⁶ The next instalment continues with Schlegel on Homer, and the translator emphasizes in his headnote the organic nature of literary creations.⁷ A number of brief thoughts from Novalis make up

¹ *Athenaeum*, no. 64 (4 February 1829), pp. 65-66.

² *Ibid.*, p. 65.

³ No. 73 (18 March 1829), pp. 169-70.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 170.

⁵ *Life of F. D. Maurice*, i. 96.

⁶ *Athenaeum*, no. 74 (25 March 1829), pp. 187-90.

⁷ No. 75 (1 April 1829), pp. 201-3.

the fourth part of the "Museum", ideas such as the use of the past in progress, the combined operation of logic and imagination, the reconciliation of opposites in the creative process, and the ideal as reality.¹ The last German writer represented in the series, on 22 April 1829, is Fichte and the extract defines ideas themselves as "self-existent living thought, with a power of giving life to matter", and suggests their original and ultimate oneness.²

Julius Hare's contributions to the *Athenaeum* did not end with the discontinuation of the "Museum of Thoughts", which event might have occurred when Maurice relinquished the editorship in May 1829 to John Sterling, a friend of his and Hare's.³ On 6 May and a week later the *Athenaeum* presented Hare's hexameter translations of Goethe's first and second "Poetical Epistles".⁴ Both had originally been addressed to Schiller and are generally concerned with the influence of bad books, though neither is really serious in tone. Hare's lines retain the urbanity of Goethe's. The last certain contribution by Julius Hare to the *Athenaeum* at this time appeared almost six months later on 28 October 1829. Goethe's "Alexis and Dora", an idyll at once passionate and pathetic, dramatizes the manifestation of jealousy in unmerited love.⁵

As their work continued on Niebuhr's *History of Rome*, Hare and Thirlwall decided that much more could be done to encourage new classical studies. With that general purpose and heartened by the enthusiasm for modern philology discovered

¹ No. 76 (8 April 1829), pp. 217-18.

² No. 78 (22 April 1829), pp. 241-3, and specifically p. 242.

³ Marchand, pp. 6-7.

⁴ *Athenaeum*, no. 80 (6 May 1829), p. 280, and no. 81 (13 May 1829), pp. 297-8.

⁵ No. 105 (28 October 1829), pp. 677-8. This poem and the "Poetical Epistles" were reprinted in *English Hexameter Translations from Schiller, Göthe, Homer, Callinus and Meleager* (London, 1847), pp. 217-28. In that volume the translators—J. F. W. Herschel, W. Whewell, J. C. Hare, and E. C. Hawtrey—were identified only by initials. Hare also contributed to it twenty-six epigrams from Schiller. His three Goethe translations were attributed to him in *Goethe's Lyric Poems in English Translation prior to 1860* by Lucretia van tuyl Simmons in University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, no. 6 (Madison, 1919). Contrary to that source, however, "Die Metamorphose der Pflanzen" was translated by Whewell. See also Frederic Ewen, *The Prestige of Schiller in England, 1788-1859* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), pp. 235-6.

when an Etymological Society had recently been formed at Cambridge, they decided in 1831 to start a journal on their own, *The Philological Museum*. Julius Hare edited the first volume made up of the numbers for November 1831 and February and May 1832.¹ In his preface to the first he deplores the absence of such a publication in England and also the dearth of scholarly activity itself :

Grammars and dictionaries [translated from German] effect very little, if they produce nothing more than grammars and dictionaries : and if Niebuhr and Muller and Boeckh do not excite some of their readers to think and look about them, they might as well have been allowed to remain in the obscurity of their native language.²

Hare hoped, therefore, that whatever new work was being done could be noticed or published in *The Philological Museum*. The only requirements for articles would be "temperance in the style, and soundness in the matter". The subject matter might cover not only language and literature but also philosophy, history, mythology, and religion. Hare's characteristic breadth of outlook extended the limitations further ; although Greek and Roman studies would be favoured, modern philology would be admitted too, and so would Biblical criticism and oriental scholarship if not "as such things mostly are, either too light or too heavy".³

Altogether Julius Hare contributed nine articles of varying length to *The Philological Museum*, four on modern English philology, two classical translations from Niebuhr and one from Savigny, and one collection of observations on Thucydides, Savigny, Hermann, and Dobree. During the period of his influence in the ill-starred periodical, Hare published in its pages two of Landor's *Imaginary Conversations*, "P. Scipio Emilianus, Polybius, Panetus" and "Solon and Pisistratus",⁴ and also part of William Wordsworth's translations from the *Aeneid*, lines 901-1043 of Book I.⁵

¹ The two bound volumes are, therefore, dated 1832 and 1833. The journal was published by Deighton's, Cambridge ; Rivington's, London ; and Parker, Oxford.

² *The Philological Museum*, i. p. ii.

³ *Ibid.* p. iii.

⁴ i (May 1832), 427-38, "Solon and Pisistratus", and ii (November 1832), 1-37, "P. Scipio Emilianus, etc." Landor's "Poemata Latina" appeared in i (November 1831), 144-9.

⁵ i (February 1832), 382-6.

Julius Hare resigned his lectureship at Trinity College in the Spring of 1832 in order to prepare to take over the family living of Hurstmonceux Church in Sussex. He had resisted spiritual and practical arguments for such a move for more than a decade, but his closest brother, Augustus, had married and taken a living in Wiltshire. Joyfully and earnestly he urged Julius to fill the vacancy at Hurstmonceux. Perhaps Julius had thoughts of marrying, too. It is said that he had become engaged to his cousin, a young widow, Mrs. Anna Maria Dashwood in 1828.¹ After spending the winter of 1832-3 in Italy, Julius Hare settled into a quiet and uncongenial and lonely life at the Rectory in Sussex.

Connop Thirlwall managed the publication of most of the second volume of *The Philological Museum*. The last two numbers were hard to fill because promised contributions were not forthcoming and those already printed were not selling.² The failure of the venture was mortifying to the editors, but gradually, in small ways, they began to see in later years that significant beginnings had been made toward the accomplishment of their larger purpose, both through the journal and through their translation of Niebuhr.

At Cambridge in the Spring of 1834 the question of the admission of dissenters to University privileges became a stormy issue when sixty-three members of the Senate petitioned the House of Lords in favour of the change. Many of Hare's old friends signed the petition. If he had remained at Trinity College he might have joined them. As it happened, the matter is relevant to this essay because it shows Hare and Coleridge opposed in their reactions to the events that followed the presentation of the petition.

After debate in both Houses, the Commons passed the bill based on the petition, but the Lords voted it down by a large majority. At Cambridge the Professor of Divinity, Dr. Thomas Turton, wrote against the petition, arguing that no good could come of mixing young men from different religious backgrounds

¹ Augustus J. C. Hare, *Memorials of a Quiet Life* (New York, 1872), i. 205.

² *The Letters of Bishop Thirlwall*, ed. John James Perowne and Louis Stokes (London, 1881), pp. 108-9. Letter to Bunsen, 10 October 1833.

in the colleges of the University. On 21 May Connop Thirlwall answered in a *Letter to the Rev. Thomas Turton, on the Admission of Dissenters to Academical Degrees*. He argued that since in reality little theology was taught and little religion practiced at the University, the presence of dissenters would cause no trouble. He singled out compulsory daily chapel as an example of the failure and the futility of trying to make men religious by rule. On 26 May Christopher Wordsworth, the Master of Trinity, suggested that the assistant tutor resign his post, and Thirlwall complied immediately.¹

Coleridge was shocked and grieved. He saw the younger men at Cambridge joining the enemy of the Church, the democratic press, "banded together like obscene dogs and cats and serpents".² On 1 June, Julius Hare wrote to William Whewell whose assistant tutor he had been. As a former student of the law, he could see the logic of the Master's position :

. . . the officers of any executive body are bound not to proclaim the defects of the system they are appointed to execute, unless in concert with brother officers, and with a reasonable hope of correcting the defect they complain of.³

Although in that one respect he regretted Thirlwall's speaking out against chapel services, he argued also that the practice of daily worship or prayers was regarded in general society as an intrusion, and hence compulsory chapel was a mere form, "like passing muster", and therefore injurious. Hare thought Wordsworth's action, however, to be outrageous, an instance of "insolent folly". "The high church party seem all gone stark mad. . . ."⁴

Both Coleridge and Hare would have approved Thirlwall's protest under somewhat different circumstances, but Coleridge saw the weight of culpability in the threat to established order while his disciple fixed the principal blame on the Master's unrealistic and impersonal rage for the authority of tradition. In

¹ John Connop Thirlwall, *Connop Thirlwall, Historian and Theologian* (London: S.P.C.K., 1936), pp. 70-75.

² *Specimens of the Table Talk of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. Henry Nelson Coleridge (London, 1851), pp. 316-17.

³ Trinity College MSS. O.18.H2⁹. I wish to thank the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge and the College Librarian, Dr. Dodwell, for permission to cite this letter and for the privilege of using the Hare Collection in the Library of Trinity College during the winter of 1961-62.

⁴ *Ibid.*

his later works, as he had in the first edition of *Guesses at Truth* (1827), Hare would almost shamelessly declare his debt to Coleridge.¹ Nevertheless, his discipleship did not imply identity of thought or point of view nor did it preclude disagreement, especially when in keeping with the best in Coleridge's doctrine.

While the battle over the admission of dissenters was being fought in the government and in the University, Mrs. Dashwood, Julius Hare's beloved cousin, made it known to Coleridge that she hoped he would accept from her a small annuity. Later, during his last illness, she wrote to Mrs. Gillman expressing her "fervent admiration and love" of the poet-philosopher.² Coleridge died on 25 July 1834.

Not long afterward Hare wrote to William Whewell suggesting that an annual prize be offered by the College or the University in memory of Coleridge for essays in "the philosophy of Christianity". Whewell reported in October that he did not think it feasible. Few people could see in Coleridge's work even an outline of that philosophy. It "will frighten our dignitaries from their propriety", he said, and they "will see in it nothing but a trumpet-call to heresy and extravagance".³ Subsequently Hare modified his proposal, but the Heads rejected it in February 1835. Their objection was "to the name of Coleridge".

With our governors [wrote Whewell], it seems, the vagaries of his earlier years are better known than the Christian philosophy, which he has impressed on so many in his riper years.⁴

It would seem that Thirlwall's point about the limited religious spirit at the University had been well taken.

Meanwhile, the loneliness of the Hurstmonceaux Rectory was relieved by the arrival of John Sterling as Hare's curate and by the return of Mrs. Maria Hare from Italy. Augustus had died at Rome in April. There was much to grieve over, but at least now there was someone to grieve with. The household brightened in

¹ Sanders, pp. 123-46.

² Earl Leslie Griggs, "The death of Coleridge", *Coleridge, Studies by Several Hands . . .*, ed. Edmund Blunden and E. L. Griggs (London: Constable and Co., Ltd., 1934), p. 228.

³ Isaac Todhunter, *William Whewell An Account of his Writings . . .* (London, 1876), ii. 195. Letter to Hare, 19 October 1834.

⁴ *Ibid.* ii. 202. Letter to Hare, 13 February 1835.

August, however, with a visit from Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, then nineteen and about to enter Oxford, who came to see his family's old friends, "Aunt Maria" and "Uncle Julius". During the day Hare tutored the young man in Sophocles and Aristotle. It was like the "good old days" at Trinity. In the evenings Julius read to his company: Milton's essays and Shakespeare's sonnets, Wordsworth, Lamb, Coleridge, "and (Oh! tell it not in the streets of Gath!) Alfred Tennyson".¹ Hare also introduced his young visitor to both Thirlwall's preface to Schleiermacher and the *Mores Catholici* by his Roman Catholic friend, Kenelm Digby (1800-80). At his host's suggestion, Arthur Stanley read DeQuincey's *Confessions* and his articles in the *London Magazine*.²

During that summer of 1834 Julius Hare received from Joseph Henry Green, Coleridge's literary executor, a parcel containing the unpublished theological writings. It was intended that Hare and Sterling should prepare them for publication.³ The "Letters on Inspiration"⁴ became a favourite topic of conversation at the Rectory. Hare even made a copy to send to Thomas Arnold, his brother's university friend, so that he could have another opinion on their publication. When Arnold saw them, he offered to help with the editing.⁵ The family of the philosopher intervened, however, Sara and Henry Nelson Coleridge maintaining that an effort should be made "to widen Coleridge's public first" with less controversial work.⁶ Henry published one of the "Letters" in 1840 as *Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit*. Julius Hare found himself frustrated once more; he edited none of Coleridge's work. Still, he did what he could in other ways to explain his mentor and to preserve his name.

Almost coincident with Arthur Stanley's departure from Hurstmonceaux there began to appear in *Tait's Magazine* a series

¹ Rowland E. Prothero, *The Life and Correspondence of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, late Dean of Westminster* (New York, 1894), pp.110-13. The quotation is from page 113.

² *Ibid.* p. 117.

³ Earl Leslie Griggs, *Coleridge Fille, A Biography of Sara Coleridge* (London: O.U.P., 1940), p. 182.

⁴ For a description of the "Letters" see *Unpublished Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge . . .*, ed. Earl Leslie Griggs (London: Constable and Company, Ltd., 1932), ii. 342. Letter from Coleridge to James Hesse, dated c. 1825.

⁵ Prothero, pp. 109 and 120.

⁶ *Coleridge Fille*, p. 182.

of reminiscences of Coleridge by DeQuincey.¹ The poet had been dead not much longer than six weeks. In the September instalment, the first, DeQuincey addressed himself to the subject of Coleridge's life as a friend and an admirer, yet in that same number of *Tait's Magazine* he pointed out that Coleridge had "palpably", though needlessly, plagiarized Schelling²; that he had procrastinated in his personal relations as well as in his intellectual projects³; that Coleridge's marriage had been bad from the beginning for at least three reasons, Mrs. Coleridge's intellectual limitations, a more accomplished young woman in the neighbourhood, and Coleridge's lack of income⁴; and he offered the opinion that Coleridge had never broken his addiction to opium.⁵ DeQuincey even aired the long dead issue of Coleridge's Unitarianism, and he hinted at ingratitude in relation to financial help he himself had given Coleridge.⁶ All these matters would have to be dealt with by a biographer eventually, but why should a friend rehearse them when the family was still in mourning?

It has been argued that DeQuincey's approach was that of the realistic twentieth-century journalist: to tell all presented a difficult task, and an inescapable duty to future generations.⁷ DeQuincey later explained that at least on the topic of plagiarism he had hoped to make a defensive attack in order to frustrate others aware of Coleridge's fault,⁸ perhaps as Hare himself had done in his review of Landor's *Imaginary Conversations* but without the irony. Whatever had motivated DeQuincey, Hare

¹ Vols. i (September, October, and November 1834) and ii (January 1835), reprinted in *The Collected Writings of Thomas DeQuincey*, ed. David Masson (Edinburgh, 1889-1900), ii. 138-228. I follow DeQuincey's *Recollections of the Lakes and the Lake Poets*, vol. ii of *DeQuincey's Works*, Author's Edition (Edinburgh, 1863), ii 38-122.

² *Recollections of the Lakes*, pp. 46-49.

³ pp. 49-51.

⁴ pp. 60-65.

⁵ p. 67.

⁶ pp. 56-60, and p. 68.

⁷ John Calvin Metcalf, *DeQuincey: A Portrait* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940), pp. 113-14 and 127-8.

⁸ *Reminiscences of the Lakes*, p. 243, note to p. 43. "I therefore, greatly understated the case against Coleridge, instead of giving it undue emphasis, I did so (as at the time I explained) in pure kindness." For DeQuincey's first explanation, see p. 43: "... to forestall, that is to say, other discoverers who would make a more unfriendly use of the discovery, and also as matters of literary curiosity, I shall here point out a few others of Coleridge's unacknowledged obligations. . . ."

waited throughout October and November to see what else Coleridge might be charged with. Niebuhr had died in 1831, Goethe in the following year, and then in 1834 Schleiermacher, Augustus Hare, and Coleridge. The times must have seemed dark indeed. When no instalment appeared in December in *Tait's Magazine*, Julius Hare prepared his answer, "Samuel Taylor Coleridge and the English Opium-Eater".¹ While he was writing the last of it, news came of the death of Elia.

Hare began and ended his article with appreciative comments on DeQuincey's own genius; the rest was plainly critical. He berated DeQuincey for ingratitude to one from whom he had learned much, and he felt that DeQuincey's assurances of his admiration for Coleridge had had the same effect as an eagle's "bearing a tortoise up aloft, that it may be the surer of dashing it to pieces".² Rather than mention the sad loss occasioned by his admired friend's death, DeQuincey had gossiped not only about Coleridge but also about living persons related to the poet. Hare strongly disapproved of DeQuincey's having published private information that had been communicated to him only as a friend.

So far as Hare could see, the purpose of the reminiscences, beyond the publication of gossip, had been to prove Coleridge a plagiarist. With that in mind, DeQuincey had failed to do what he might have done :

. . . to delineate Coleridge's intellect, or his character, or to mark out the place he fills in the map of the human mind, or to determine the value of his labours in untwisting the gordian knot of thought, or to lead us to those spots in the dark forest of nature on which he has shed the sunshine of truth, or even to ascertain the influence which his writings, full of seeds as they are, have exercised, and are likely to exercise, on his countrymen. . . .³

Again, Hare wondered if a flaw in one's character should be treated as its foremost element.

Instead of denying DeQuincey's charges of plagiarism, Hare chose to "sift" them. He had studied both the *Biographia Literaria* and Schelling's works, and he found DeQuincey careless in his use of facts, as he had remarked to Taylor ten years earlier in connection with Goethe.⁴ He did not find Coleridge innocent.

¹ *The British Magazine, and Monthly Register* . . ., vii (1 January 1835), 15-27. Hugh James Rose was then editor.

² *Ibid.* p. 16.

³ *British Magazine* (1 January 1835), p. 18.

⁴ See *B.J.R.L.*, xlvi. 70-71.

The long passage on the relations of the *esse* and the *cogitare* (*Biog. Lit.*, 1907, ii. 175-90) was a literal translation from Schelling's *Transcendental Idealism*, although contrary to DeQuincey's statement Coleridge had made slight changes and additions.¹ The acknowledgement of a debt to Schelling that DeQuincey had said prefaced the passage actually occurred almost a hundred pages earlier (*Biog. Lit.*, 1907, i. 102-5).² Obviously, Hare meant to indicate that DeQuincey's carelessness in attacking Coleridge's practices was akin to the poet's blundering, though less understandable.³

Nevertheless, since Coleridge had pointed to his indebtedness in part, naming Schelling and at least two of his works,⁴ Hare felt that the plagiarisms were therefore unintentional. Still, he realized that the transferring of a half dozen pages from Schelling to one's own work without direct reference to the source must be regarded as strange behaviour :

The only way I see of accounting for it is from his practice of keeping note-books, or journals of his thoughts, filled with observations and brief dissertations on such matters as happened to strike him, with a sprinkling now and then of extracts and abstracts from the books he was reading. If the name of the author from whom he took an extract was left out, he might easily, years after, forget whose property it was, especially when he had made it in some measure his own by trans-fusing it into his own English.⁵

Hare added that Coleridge's memory was, of course, "notoriously irretentive" of details.

To support his view of Coleridge's borrowings as the result of careless note-taking, Hare pointed to three passages, not mentioned by DeQuincey, in the *Biographia Literaria* (1907, i. 95, 169 and 171) where Coleridge had made other transfers from Schelling and loosely referred to the German author or his work.⁶ On this kind of evidence Hare exonerated Coleridge of the conscious intention of stealing from Schelling.⁷

¹ *British Magazine* (January 1835), p. 19. Naturally, Hare used the 1817 edition of the *Biographia Literaria*. I refer to the John Shawcross edition (London: Oxford University Press, 1907).

² *British Magazine*, p. 19.

³ *Ibid.* p. 21.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 19-20.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 20-21. Shawcross, in his note to i. 171, on p. 268, said that he found most of Coleridge's borrowings from Schelling already noted in Sara Coleridge's 1847 edition and he recited the notebook theory to explain them.

⁶ *British Magazine* (1 January 1835), p. 21.

⁷ *Ibid.*

Without mentioning the poet's opium-eating, Hare suggested that Coleridge's powers had not decayed as DeQuincey had suggested.¹ He had continued to write short poems, but his life's work became "the forwarding the great atonement of philosophy with religion".² Hare concluded his exposure of DeQuincey's wrongheadedness by quoting Sir Alexander Ball on the proper aim of true biography: "to fix the attention and to interest the feelings of men on those qualities and actions which have made a particular life worthy of being recorded".³ As he had suggested to both John Taylor and Walter Savage Landor when they fell out over the profits from the *Imaginary Conversations* and to *The Quarterly Review* when it suggested that there remained indications of scepticism in Niebuhr's *History of Rome*, Hare observed explicitly in this case "how mean a thing a mere fact is, except as seen in the light of some comprehensive truth".⁴

Thus, Julius Hare's response to DeQuincey was much less a defence of Coleridge than a criticism of DeQuincey for bad faith as a friend, for bad manners in gossiping about the recent dead, for carelessness in impugning a man's honour, and for misunderstanding the role of the biographer. Six months after Coleridge's death he could hardly have been expected to say more, as a friend of the deceased and his family, on the subject of Coleridge's debt to German authors without doing what he was accusing DeQuincey of having done. That he was competent to have said more is substantiated by his fifteen years' experience as a careful translator and by the proportions of his library of German literature. During his lifetime his entire private collection of books, at least half of which was in German, amounted to some fourteen thousand volumes.⁵ Today, the Hare Collection in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, retains approximately one third that number and enough of Schelling's works for a full examination of Coleridge's major appropriations.⁶

¹ *Reminiscences of the Lakes*, p. 68.

² *British Magazine*, p. 24.

³ *Ibid.* p. 26.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ E. H. Plumptre's "Memoir" in *Guesses at Truth* (1871), p. xlv.

⁶ *Ueber die Möglichkeit einer Form der Philosophie überhaupt*, 1795; *Einleitung zu seinem Entwurf eines Systems der Naturphilosophie*, 1799; *Erster Entwurf eines Systems der Naturphilosophie*, 1799; *System des Transcendentalen Idealismus*, 1800; *Zeitschrift für spekulative Physik*, 1800; *Neue Zeitschrift für spekulative Physik*,

Julius Hare did not attempt to make an apology for Coleridge's drug addiction, his procrastination, his idiosyncrasies of manner, or his marital relations. On those subjects he was no doubt incompetent as well as discreet. His "defence" of Coleridge from the charge of plagiarism amounted to no more than a denial of malicious intent and an explanation of the misuse of Schelling's writings based on a theory about Coleridge's natural incompetence as a systematic scholar and his careless note-taking habits.¹ In the light of subsequent scholarship relative to Coleridge's literary indebtedness, it seems that little else was possible.² Hare might have indicated how Coleridge had integrated his borrowings into his own work, but that might only have increased speculation that would have further embarrassed the poet's family. His notice of all that DeQuincey had left undone, while most competent perhaps to do, suggests Hare's awareness of the proportions of the task of evaluating Coleridge's achievement.

The most detailed antagonistic contemporary examination of Coleridge's plagiarisms appeared in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* five years later.³ Its author, James F. Ferrier (1808-64), intended that no new edition of the *Biographia Literaria* would come out "without embodying some accurate notice and admission of the very large and unacknowledged appropriations. . ."⁴ He had been unsatisfied by DeQuincey's prosecution and Hare's defence :

Neither party appears to have possessed a competent knowledge of the facts ; and the question was not fairly and fully argued on the grounds either of its condemning or justifying circumstances.⁵

Ferrier said that he did not wish to injure Coleridge's reputation,

1802 ; *Ideen zu einer Philosophie der Natur, Als Einleitung in das Studium dieser Wissenschaft*, 1803 ; *Darlegung des wahren Verhältnisses der Naturphilosophie zu der verbesserten Fichte'schen Lehre*, 1806 ; *Philosophische Schriften*, 1809 ; *Vorlesungen über die Methode des academischen Studium*, 1813.

¹ Griggs, *Coleridge Fille*, p. 109, calls Hare's article an "almost unassailable defence", and points out that Sara and H. N. Coleridge used it in their edition of *Specimens of the Table-Talk of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (1835).

² Thomas M. Raysor and René Wellek, "Coleridge", *The English Romantic Poets, A Review of Research* (New York : The Modern Language Association of America, 1950), p. 96.

³ "The Plagiarisms of S. T. Coleridge", xlvii (March 1840), 287-99.

⁴ Ferrier, *Blackwood's* (March 1840), p. 287.

⁵ *Ibid.*

but that he did want to see justice done to Schelling and to prevent the palming off of German literature as native British.¹ Coleridge's general acknowledgements he considered specious and dishonest, indicating that the poet was a liar as well as a plagiarist.² And he would deny Coleridge's assertion that he and Schelling had independently worked out the same conclusions.³ In sentences, paragraphs, and pages he found that Coleridge had raided Schelling's work for twenty pages of the text of the *Biographia Literaria*.⁴ Although Ferrier could not believe that Coleridge had committed his plagiarisms intentionally and for selfish reasons, he maintained that genius could not be regarded as an excuse for wrong practices.⁵

Though Ferrier had not known Coleridge personally, his point of view softened years later. In about 1860 he wrote a short life of Schelling for the *Imperial Dictionary of Universal Biography* in which he suggested that Coleridge's use of "large extracts from the writings of Schelling, without any sufficient acknowledgement . . . should be attributed rather to forgetfulness or carelessness, than to wilful plagiarism on the part of the English poet".⁶

After her husband's death in 1843, Sara Coleridge decided to prepare a new edition of the *Biographia Literaria*. She consulted Julius Hare at the outset, and he told her that she would have to take notice of both DeQuincey's and Ferrier's assertions.⁷ He gave her permission to use his own essay, and apparently during the next four years while she studied Schelling thoroughly Sara sought assistance from him in other ways. When her edition appeared in 1847, she mentioned her obligation to Hare in numerous instances.⁸ Sara Coleridge herself, however, had performed

¹ Ferrier, *Blackwood's* (March 1840), p. 288.

² pp. 289-90.

³ p. 290.

⁴ p. 296.

⁵ p. 299.

⁶ "Schelling", *Imperial Dictionary of Universal Biography* (1881), iii. 914. Ferrier's essay is to be found also in *Lectures on Greek Philosophy and other Philosophical Matters of James Frederick Ferrier*, ed. Sir Alexander Grant and E. L. Lushington (Edinburgh and London, 1866), pp. 546-7.

⁷ Griggs, *Coleridge Fille*, pp. 147-8.

⁸ Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria, or Biographical Sketches of my Literary Life*, second edition prepared by H. N. Coleridge and Sara Coleridge (London, 1847), 2 vols. See vol. i, pp. viii, xii-xiii, xxxviii-ix, xl (n. 22), xlv, xlix, lxxii-iii (n. 13), and vol. ii, pp. 164 (n. 28), 212, and 299. See also Griggs, *Coleridge Fille* (1940), pp. 111 and 146, n. 3.

the painstaking work of discovering and explaining parallel passages. Shawcross's reliance on her findings in his 1907 edition is a tribute to her scholarship and insight.¹ In gratitude for Julius Hare's service to her father's memory, Sara Coleridge dedicated to him her edition of the *Essays of his own Times* (1850).

After the publication of Sara Coleridge's 1847 edition of the controversial *Biographia Literaria*, DeQuincey returned to the subject of the plagiarisms and his own conduct in first exposing them. In a note to a reprinting of his *Reminiscences*, he declared that Sara's edition had "placed this whole subject in a new light". He praised her "filial piety" and her "candour". "Wherever the plagiarism was undeniable, she has allowed it; whilst palliating its faultiness by showing the circumstances under which it arose."² In his essay, "Conversation and S. T. Coleridge", DeQuincey agreed that the most flagrant similarities between the poet's work and that of others might have arisen from "imperfect recollection" or "carelessness", and he accepted Sara's claim that the absence of deception proved the innocence of her father's motives.³

DeQuincey could not, however, accept the implications of Julius Hare's essay. In both later publications he denied that he had ever really been a friend of Coleridge's.⁴ In "Conversation and S. T. Coleridge", without referring to Hare's *British Magazine* article, DeQuincey said that such a composition was one-sided and only possible for a person whose knowledge of Coleridge had been derived solely from books—no more false really than "an advocate's speech". As one who had known both the man and his works, "the whole realities of the subject", he could not have written about Coleridge by "garbling or disguising" the truth.⁵ DeQuincey seems to have been unconscious of the fact that Julius Hare had admitted the plagiarisms and had explained them in the same way Sara Coleridge had. Perhaps, also, he had no knowledge of Hare's personal acquaintance with the poet.

¹ *Biographia Literaria* (1907), i. 268, note to p. 171.

² *Reminiscences of the Lakes* (1863), p. 244.

³ *The Posthumous Works of Thomas DeQuincey*, ed. Alexander H. Japp (London, 1891), ii. 34.

⁴ *Ibid.* ii. 16, and *Reminiscences*, p. 243.

⁵ *Posthumous Works*, ii. 15.

In conclusion, it seems appropriate to stress the implications of this short but involved history of Julius Hare's career from 1825 to 1834. I have attempted to show that Hare had participated more fully in the introduction of German literature into England before 1830 than has generally been recognized. I have hoped also to indicate that Hare's career as a translator enabled him to play a significant role in awakening liberal thought and modern scholarship in the third decade of the nineteenth century, particularly at Cambridge, and that it prepared him to judge Coleridge with accuracy as well as loyalty in 1835. At the same time I have suggested that his devotion to Coleridge, though deep, did not render him uncritical of the older poet-philosopher nor dishonest when criticizing him. Finally, I believe it to be apparent that Julius Hare proved himself an extraordinarily discerning and consistent friend of three of the most complex figures of his time, Landor, Niebuhr, and Coleridge.