

**Maike Oergel, University of Nottingham**

**Politics, Radicalism and Anglo-German Relations: The Reception of Ernst Moritz Arndt in early 19th-century Britain**

This essay presents the early reception of Ernst Moritz Arndt in Britain. Retrieving this largely forgotten engagement with Arndt, and engagement *of* Arndt as it turns out, provides two insights. On a more general level it illustrates the influence of political constellations and political expediency on the introduction and reception of authors and texts. On a more specific level, it gives an insight into the engagement of young English liberals with the (radical) political thinking of the German Wars of Liberation, especially with its liberal and spiritual aspects, and its efforts to exert influence in a growing and increasingly powerful public sphere.<sup>1</sup>

In its first part the essay focuses on the swift introduction of Arndt's *Geist der Zeit* 1 (1806) into Britain between 1806 and 1808 through reviews and a partial translation. This introduction occurred in the context of anti-Napoleonic propaganda and was pursued with the clear political aim of promoting the possibility of a common cause between Britain and Germany against Napoleonic hegemony. Promoting such an idea was hampered by a prevalent anti-German bias, which at worst tended to associate German thought with Jacobinism and atheism and at best found German metaphysics, verbosity and sentimentality ridiculous.<sup>2</sup>

In its second section the essay looks at the place of Arndt in the reading and writing of Julius Hare (1795-1855), mediator of Anglo-German thought and liberal Anglican archdeacon, who would be a key influence on the Victorian elite-factory of the Cambridge Apostles. Through unpublished manuscripts by (the young) Hare and the marginalia in his books by Arndt, it is possible to trace Hare's early political radicalism, which is in line with Arndt's own, if not inspired by him. Such 'radical' thinking, nor the 'maturing' of this radicalism into a liberal-progressive political vision, is not part of the established Hare-picture. While this is clearly interesting for Hare-research, it is equally interesting for understanding the political contexts of reception histories. In the late 1810s and early 1820s, still a predominantly anti-German

---

<sup>1</sup> I use the term 'liberal' in its political sense of striving for a society in which most are politically enfranchised.

<sup>2</sup> For a summary of anti-German and anti-continental sentiment cf. Peter Mortensen, *British Romanticism and Continental Influences. Writing in the Age of Europhobia*. (Houndsmill: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 1-18.

phase, the young Hare did not make *public* his political agreement with the Arndt of the *Befreiungskriege*, who was being removed from his professorial post at the new University of Bonn amid suspicion of demagoguery and sedition. But Hare's dedication to introduce German critical, political and spiritual thought into Britain through his journalistic writing and translations from 1820 onwards helped to prepare the ground for the first Reform Bill and make German thought a key ingredient of the Victorian intellectual landscape.<sup>3</sup> By the late 1830s, when the political and intellectual landscape had changed and public opinion no longer considered German literature and thought dangerous, Hare is happy to refer to Arndt in very favourable terms.

If it was controversial to introduce Arndt into Britain in 1806-08, his reception history has remained polarised throughout the centuries. This polarisation hinged on the status of two ideas: nationalism and progressive politics, both of which are cornerstones of Arndt's thinking. While up to the 1830s he was considered a left-wing radical arguing for a constitutional nation state and enfranchised citizenship (who up to 1815 would nevertheless be useful to Prussian authorities in the battle against Napoleon), from the later 1830s he became an elder statesman of constitutional reform and nation statehood, who was elected to the Frankfurt Parliament in 1848. In the later 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century he was celebrated as an essentialist nationalist who focused on ethnicity and promoted Francophobia. In post-1945 in West-Germany this then necessarily made him a dangerous Teutomanic nationalist who had helped pave the way for the disastrous turns of German history between 1914 and 1945, while in the GDR he was celebrated as a defender of the dispossessed and disenfranchised, and a precursor of socialism who paved the way to "our socialist state of German nation".<sup>4</sup> The debate about the value and nature of his legacy continues to this day as the battle over the name of the University in Greifswald, Arndt's alma mater which (used to) bear his name, illustrates.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> It is beyond the scope of this essay to treat Hare's publicist activities in the 1820s in this respect. For a more detailed discussion of this cf. Maïke Oergel, *Zeitgeist. How Ideas Travel. Culture, Politics and the Public in the Age of Revolution*, forthcoming 2018, chapter 5.

<sup>4</sup> Manfred Herling and H.-D. Schroeder (Ed.s), *Ernst Moritz Arndt 1769-1969. Katalog der Ausstellung der Ernst Moritz Arndt-Universität Greifswald zum 200. Geburtstag E.M. Arndts*. (Leipzig: Ernst Moritz Arndt Universität, 1969), 4.

<sup>5</sup> For a summary of the most recent debates that culminated in a resolution to change the institution's name agreed by the University's senate in 2017, which was not confirmed by the Bundesland Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, and the eventual compromise, cf. the University's website <https://www.uni-greifswald.de/universitaet/geschichte/ernst-moritz-arndt/>, accessed 20 July 2018.

Arndt (1769-1860) was the son of a liberated (and highly educated) serf from the Pomeranian island of Rügen, which at the time was under Swedish rule. He worked his way up to a professorship at the University of Greifswald (1806), was an avid follower of the momentous political events in France, made his publishing debut with a tract against serfdom and established himself as an academic, poet, publicist, and political activist in the first decade of the nineteenth century. His initial fame rests on the first part of his *Geist der Zeit* (spring 1806), which saw its second edition within a year, and a third in 1815. *Geist der Zeit's* subsequent parts followed in 1809, 1813 (together with a second edition of part 2) and 1818.

The four volumes provide a commentary on the events and issues of the time, starting with (and occasioned by) the dark period around the Austrian and Prussian defeats by Napoleon and their consequences (parts 1 and 2). Part 3 covers the run-up to the *Befreiungskriege* to just before *Völkerschlacht*, and, finally, part 4 castigates the post-Congress of Vienna Restoration. Up to and including part 3 *Geist der Zeit* is broadly a political call to action against Napoleonic domination in the name of national, social and political reform. Arndt's message is: unite, get rid of French domination and set up a new, (fairly) democratic German nation state. In part 4, after the fall of Napoleon this political message turns (exclusively) against the German princes. The volumes are mixed-genre, containing loosely connected essays, speeches and poems or songs, much of which up to part 3 comes across as a kind of anti-Napoleonic *agit prop*, but at the same time, and especially in part 1, Arndt tries to work out how something like 'a spirit of the age' comes about, socially and intellectually.

To this end *Geist der Zeit I* opens with a theoretical section about how a spirit of the age arises, and how the current one has arisen, before reviewing a large number of modern (and a smaller number of ancient) European nations as well as different social classes and polities. A whole chapter is dedicated to Napoleon. The analysis draws on historical observations, an analysis of current conditions, and the relationship between intellectual elites and their publics. Although his analysis makes claims to general applicability, its key aim is to explain how the current political and cultural climate, which was allowing Napoleon to conquer Europe, had come about. The political players largely to blame are the German princes, selfish or cowardly 'Franzosenknechte',<sup>6</sup> who oppress and exploit their lands and fail in their duties to their people, not least because they foster a culture of selfishness among the upper

---

<sup>6</sup> Ernst Moritz Arndt, *Geist der Zeit I* (no place: no publisher, 1806), 437-438.

and middle classes. This culture is self-serving, because it primes the latter for seeking preferment in these princely autocracies rather than challenge the abuses of princely power.

In the autumn of 1806, six months after publishing *Geist der Zeit I*, Arndt had to leave his new professorial post and flee into Swedish exile to escape the advance of Napoleonic troops into North-Eastern Central Europe. Between 1806 and 1813 he would travel Europe, writing and drumming up support for German liberation.

### **1. The Introduction of Arndt's *Geist der Zeit I* into Britain between 1806 and 1808**

In early December 1806, barely eight months after its publication, a favourable review of *Geist der Zeit* appeared in the 'Foreign Appendix' of the *Monthly Review*.<sup>7</sup> The review was published in the general post-revolution context of the on-going Napoleonic Wars and the general (European) debate about the problems and currents of the present age. More specifically in the British context, the British ruling elite, and many conservative and moderate Britons, saw the continuing war, first against the revolutionary French republic and then against Napoleonic France, as a fight for their political and social way of life. However, while initial approval of the aims of the Revolution in Britain among moderate liberal had ebbed away in the wake of the terror, it had left behind a debate about the need for political and social reforms. This trajectory from enchantment with the Revolution among liberals to disillusionment, or at least great caution, was similar in both Britain and Germany.<sup>8</sup> As the war intensified, especially with Napoleon's successes, paranoia and xenophobia spread and the violent excesses of the Revolution became conflated with military aggression and conquest, or with the violent implementation of a radical political re-ordering. This paranoia and xenophobia fed directly into anti-German (and anti-continental) bias as conservative forces gained the upper hand as the war continued: both the French and the Germans were Jacobins and atheists, the Germans largely due to their abstract new philosophy and their radical new literature, which included *Sturm und Drang* literature, such as Goethe's *Werther* and Schiller's *Räuber*, 'gothic' literature, and anything displaying intense sentimentality. August von Kotzebue's work, hugely popular in Britain, was seen in this context. Irrespective of conservative fears, German gothic, German sentimentality and German Storm and Stress

---

<sup>7</sup> [Christian Schwabe], "Geist der Zeit, &c. The Spirit of the Times by Ernest Moritz Arndt", in *The Monthly Review or Literary Journal, Enlarged. From September to December inclusive 1806 with an Appendix* (1806): 524-527.

<sup>8</sup> The attitudes of Coleridge, Wordsworth and Southey or Schiller, Fichte, and Hegel are well documented.

had a large reception. William Hazlitt, who, as an indefatigable defender of the Revolution, took a positive view of such literary endeavours, summarised in hindsight in 1819:

Is it wonderful that the poets and philosophers of Germany, the discontented men of talent, who thought and mourned for themselves and their fellows, the Goethes, the Lessings, the Schillers, and the Kotzebues, felt a sudden and irresistible impulse by a convulsive effort to tear aside this factitious drapery of society, and to throw off that load of bloated prejudice, of maddening pride and superannuated folly, that pressed down every energy of their nature and stifled the breath of liberty, of truth and genius in their bosoms? These Titans of our days tried to throw off the dead weight that encumbered them, and in so doing, warred not against heaven, but against earth. [...]The same [German] writers (as far as I have seen) have made the only incorrigible Jacobins, and their school of poetry is the only real school of Radical Reform .<sup>9</sup>

The ‘introduction’ of Arndt’s work has a thoroughly political aim: to initiate a change in British public opinion towards seeing Germany, or perhaps just Prussia, not as a mad, radical and dangerous lot, but as an ally in the fight against Napoleon. In order to facilitate this, author and text were presented in line with what British readers expected of contemporary German texts and with British perceptions of current affairs, i.e. author and text were carefully calibrated for their audience.

In early December 1806 a British audience would read a review of *Geist der Zeit* against a specific set of political and military circumstances. The British public were digesting, with some alarm, the collapse of Prussia (October), which had followed on the heels of the dissolution of the *Reich* (August). This dissolution had been preceded by the defeat of Austria and Russia in December 1805, leading to the creation of the Confederation of the Rhine (*Rheinbund*), which operated as a part-replacement of the soon to be defunct Empire and which was under the ‘protection’ of Napoleonic France. While Britain had averted the threat of invasion at the battle of Trafalgar in October 1805, Western and central continental Europe were controlled by Napoleon, directly or through client states.

The reviewer takes into account of British readers’ preconceptions of German texts and German thinking by pointing out that Arndt is worth reading because he is *not* affected by

---

<sup>9</sup> William Hazlitt, *Lectures chiefly on the Dramatic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth*, in *The Collected Works of William Hazlitt* vol. 6, ed. P.P. Howe, (London and Toronto: Dent, 1931) 169-363, here: 362.

German mysticism, which is frequently used as shorthand for Kantian and post-Kantian philosophy. The review foregrounds Arndt's *criticism* of the negative effect of too much speculative metaphysics: 'he [Arndt] censures with great propriety the rage for proposing new systems, the separation of literary men from active life, their desire to know everything' (525). The reviewer on the other hand *censures Arndt* for his inappropriate and needless exaggerations, his dispersiveness and obscurities in argument and language, i.e. the reviewer acknowledges and confirms British prejudices of German writing. He also skirts over the novel aspects in Arndt's book - the investigation of how ideas are spread by intellectual elites and how and why they find approval - and instead praises the book's more traditional part, the panorama of nations and their characteristics as the 'most interesting' section (526). Such overviews had been a stock feature of historical texts since the 17<sup>th</sup> century, were generally common, and hence safe to praise because entirely uncontroversial.<sup>10</sup>

Before going into detail regarding the content, the reviewer takes care to present Arndt as a positive figure. He establishes Arndt's moral superiority by reporting that Arndt 'objects to the literary, political and moral qualities of his contemporaries' (525), i.e. a wrong-headed spirit of the age, before suggesting he is 'the voice of truth' (527). Arndt's 'frank confessions of his sentiments' (525) evince him as honest. He is brave: fearless to speak out on political matters in a context of political persecution, 'he by no means avoids the subjects on which it is now scarcely safe in Germany to speak or write the truth' (525). This makes him the trustworthy voice of the considerable sections of the German public who share key British views regarding the political landscape, and especially Napoleon. This commonality of views with trustworthy Germans is presented by the reviewer as a pleasant surprise, something that is unlikely to be obvious to his British audience. He asserts that the British have been misinformed, not to say misled: 'We have often been told that opinions abroad respecting the ruler of France differed widely from those which are prevalent among us; but we may conclude, from the pages of this writer, that many think, but few dare to speak or write, as we do.' (527)

Regarding content, the reviewer focuses on Napoleon, the British, and the Spanish, i.e. on areas of direct British interest. He translates three long quotes, each tailored to engage British readers: two relating to the British themselves and one about the Spanish. The first quote relating to the British presents Arndt's view that it is in Germany's interest to support Britain,

---

<sup>10</sup> This part of the book was praised by most reviewers, see below, note 16.

because Britain falling to France would produce an (even more) intolerable French hegemony. To the British reader it must then seem that many Germans would naturally support the British war effort. The second quote establishes Arndt as an admirer of English liberty and nationhood (a common stance among several generations of political liberals). The reviewer does however not shrink from quoting Arndt's assessment of the *recent* British political and social decline, possibly because these views were also current in Britain. Although risky, this strategy may be intended to give himself, and Arndt, extra trustworthiness, *he* is honest about the book and *Arndt* is telling it like it is. The quote finishes with Arndt's impassioned exhortation to the 'Britons' to recover their sense of themselves and defend liberty in Europe.

'Britons: you were one a noble people. Your constitution gave spirit and power; you had poets and orators, astronomers and discoverers; you were free, high minded [sic] and just. On the banks of the Ganges and the Senegal, and in Jamaica, the morals, the virtues and the admirable constitution of Englishmen were lost! Oppressors became oppressed, and despots became slaves! [...] Victories by land and sea militate nothing against this assertion; such proofs or glory and virtue many nations can produce, when everything else is lost that rendered them worthy of being a people. Should you be overwhelmed, and France become the despot of the seas, the last spark of European liberty is extinguished. You will perish by no power but your own. You are yet more a nation than most of us [...] You have been so great that your fall would shake the world.' (527)

Spain was of particular interest to the British for a number of reasons. It is geographically close and dominant next to Britain's ally Portugal. Portugal was crucial for British naval operations against the French and important as a transatlantic trading partner through their colonial possessions in Brazil, and Spain was an unreliable player in the ongoing wars, having sided with and against France, revolutionary and Napoleonic, since the early 1790s. Only a year ago, in October 1805, the battle of Trafalgar had been fought against a Franco-Spanish fleet. Portugal remained vulnerable, and the Franco-Spanish occupation of Portugal, which was to precipitate the Peninsular War, would take place five months after the review appeared, in early May 1807. Spain, however, rather like the *Rheinbund*, was really under Napoleon's control. The reviewer introduces Arndt's assessment of the Spanish in a way that must be palatable to British ears: the Spanish are stronger than one might think. 'Of the Spaniards he [Arndt] entertains great hopes, and he anticipates from the nature of their country and the character of the inhabitants the approach of better times' (526). In fact Spain

has, according to Arndt, the fibre to throw off French domination. The reviewer translates: ‘Had the courage of the antient Cantabrians and Celtiberians now existed, a French army might indeed have crossed the Pyrenees, but none would have returned. Yet the time of deliverance approaches [...] All America will be free; priests will lose the lustre of holiness and kings will lose their thrones, unless the former mean to work and the latter to govern. Then the Spaniards will be again what they once were, one of the most flourishing and powerful nations of Europe.’ (526) Again, there is an element of risk in the reviewer’s strategy, he is happy to underline Arndt’s liberal stance: the Spanish will only re-achieve their former greatness if they become liberal modern citizens, abandoning what remains of exploitative colonial rule, sponging Catholicism and parasitical absolutism, and make kings and priests facilitators of their communities who hold their offices on the understanding that they *serve*. According to Arndt, victory over Napoleon will only come to a reformed, public-spirited, liberal polity. While Spanish strength against Napoleon would be welcome to Britons of almost all political persuasions, it seems the reviewer hopes to engage liberal-minded ones in particular. As a prediction of the Spanish uprising in May 1808, still seventeen months in the future at the time, Arndt’s assessment of the Spanish will in hindsight appear as impressive political prescience.

Not many Britons would have been able to read Arndt’s book in German. One of the key purposes of the review was to draw attention to the existence and content of Arndt’s book. The reviewer has been identified as Dr Christian A. E. Schwabe (17??-1843),<sup>11</sup> a German national who was the incumbent pastor of the German Lutheran Church, St. George’s, in Whitechapel. The *Monthly Review* operated a strict policy of reviewer anonymity, so its readers would not have been aware of the reviewer’s nationality and Dr Schwabe certainly posed as a Briton. Schwabe had begun reviewing for the *Monthly* only in the summer, and would be a regular contributor to the ‘Foreign Appendix’ until 1813.

The *Georgenkirche* in Alie Street, which still exists, was the spiritual centre of the German *Zuckerbäcker* in London’s East End. Founded in 1763<sup>12</sup> by the wealthy German sugar refiner Dietrich Beckmann, it had by the 1840s become the largest German congregation in London.<sup>13</sup> Schwabe was *Rektor* for nearly half a century, from 1799 to his death in 1843.

---

<sup>11</sup> Benjamin Christie Nangle, *Monthly Review Second Series 1790-1815. Indexes of Contributors and Articles*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 51. I have not yet been able to establish Schwabe’s date of birth.

<sup>12</sup> 1762 according to St. George-in-the-East website [stgitehistory.org.uk](http://stgitehistory.org.uk), accessed 3 July 2018.

<sup>13</sup> John Southerden Burn, *The History of the French, Wallon, Dutch and other Foreign Protestant Refugees settled in England*. (London: Longman, Brown and Green, 1846), 240.



There is evidence that he was well connected, in 1819 he was appointed chaplain to the Duchess of Kent, Princess Victorian's German mother, and in 1820 made 'minister of the Prussian Embassy'.<sup>14</sup> The Duchess of Kent was also patron of the German and English school attached to St. George's, which had existed since the early days of the church in the 1760s, but was given a new building in 1805, under Schwabe's incumbency as pastor.

The *Georgenkirche*, like most Protestant German churches in London, had connections with the German Pietist centre of Halle, and the Frankische Stiftungen. Graham Jefcoate has recently illuminated how closely these connections affected the London book market.<sup>15</sup> Against this background it is possible that Schwabe took his cue for his review from the *Hallische Allgemeine Literatur Zeitung*, which also had reviewed *Geist der Zeit* in October. His review shares a number of points with the Halle piece. Like Schwabe, the *Hallische ALZ* had reviewed Arndt's book also in conjunction with Fichte's *Grundzüge des gegenwärtigen Zeitalters*, and Schwabe echoes closely specific criticisms the *Hallesche ALZ*'s makes of *Geist der Zeit*, such as Arndt's over-dramatic view of the current situation and his equally over-dramatic language.<sup>16</sup>

In 1808, less than two years later, a partial translation of *Geist der Zeit I* appeared in London, entitled *Arndt's Spirit of the Times*.<sup>17</sup> It seems that simply drawing attention to Arndt's book was not enough, part of it was to be made available to Anglophone readers. The translation shares a number of features with Schwabe's review: it, too, is carefully calibrates Arndt's text

---

<sup>14</sup> *The Reminiscences of Doktor John Sebastian Helmcken*, edited by Dorothy Blakey Smith, Victoria: British Columbia University Press, 1975, p. 9. Helmcken was a second-generation German immigrant, born in Whitechapel to German parents in 1824 who attended St. George's school.

<sup>15</sup> Graham Jefcoate, *Deutsche Drucker und Buchhändler in London 1680-1811*. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 43-44.

<sup>16</sup> Schwabe noted that 'We do not, however, find M. Arndt's sentiments, and his way of stating them, so praiseworthy as we believe his intentions to be. [...] By the former [his lively imagination and ardent feelings] he has been led in the work before us to many exaggerations and gloomy views of things, and sometimes to great aberrations from his main subject; while the latter [affection of strength and originality] seduces him into much less plain and dignified language, than he who assumes the office of the monitor of the age, and addresses in particular the enlightened part of the community, ought to adopt. [...] thus by blaming everything, he renders his correction unimpressive; and by laying the dark colours too strongly on his picture, he makes the features indistinct.' (525) The Halle reviewer had found very similar faults: 'Aber diese [Stärke des Charakters] zu erwecken, ist ein solcher Vortrag, wie des des Hn. A. nicht geschickt. [...] Hr. A. Vortrag ist nicht ein politisches Raisonement [...] der heftige Unmut über die Lage der öffentlichen Angelegenheiten macht sich Luft, und ergießt sich in einem wilden Strome höchst unreiner Beredsamkeit. [...] mit zu vielen unverständlichen Bildern, übertriebenen Wendungen, ungestümen Ausbrüchen der Empfindungen in über zusammengesetzten Phrasen vermischt, als daß sie beibende Wirkung thun könnten.' ('Ohne Angabe des Druckorts und Verlags: Geist der Zeit, von Ernst Moritz Arndt u.s.w.'" in *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung (Halle)* 246, 14 October 1806, 89-93, here: 92) Schwabe also agrees with the Halle reviewer that the best part of Arndt's book is his panorama of peoples (but he may equally have gleaned this from other reviews) and he reproduces the Halle reviewer's criticism of Arndt ignoring recent progress in the arts and sciences.

<sup>17</sup> *Arndt's Spirit of the Times translated from the German by Rev. P.W.* (London: Thiselton, 1808).

for its target audience at this particular time, it has the same aim of pointing out shared anti-Napoleonic interests between Britain and ‘Germany’, and the translator, who is working into English, is German. The translator, who identifies himself on the cover only as ‘Rev. P. W.’, is, like Schwabe, a Protestant clergyman. Unlike Schwabe, he outs himself as German in his preface, but he too wants to influence British public opinion, not least by promoting Arndt’s genius as a political analyst.

The slim volume renders less than half the source text, focusing on the sections that the reviewer(s) valued so highly. It presents most, though not all, of the review of nations, and the chapter on Napoleon, i.e. it offers Arndt’s assessment of contemporary politics, but, like the review, it leaves out the review of elites and his observations on how *zeitgeist* arises. The nations reviewed include Spain/Portugal, Sweden, the Germans, the Russians, the Turks, and the French. The translation leaves out the ancient nations, the Italians, the Prussians, and the Hungarians, as well as the chapters on ‘Republics’, ‘Edelleute und Fürsten’, and the final chapter ‘Wahrheit und Versöhnung’. The content is carefully chosen to engage, and not alienate, the target audience, fairly openly calibrating the presentation of his source text. The title page and the translator’s preface make clear how the text is to be read. Both are an exercise in ‘domesticating’ the horizon of expectation.

[image of title page]

It looks as if the volume was published in haste, the somewhat dyslexic misspelling of Arndt’s name on the cover as ‘Ardnt’ was not picked up on this front page that is so carefully designed to attract immediate attention. Tapping into anti-Napoleonic feeling, the cover refers to Napoleon as ‘the Destroyer’, a strategy continued in the preface, where he is described as ‘French Attila’ (iv) and ‘modern Attila’ (vi). The cover also suggests that Arndt’s book is the publication that led to the infamous execution of the bookseller Johann Philip Palm by the French in August 1806 in Braunau am Inn. Palm was executed for disseminating anti-Napoleonic material, in lieu of the author of the text, who could not be found, nor identified. Arndt’s book, however, was not the ‘Corpus Delicti’ (iii), as the translator promptly admits in his preface, explaining his casual approach to facts with the points that it had become difficult and dangerous to try to procure the publication that had really led to Palm’s death (the anonymous *Deutschland in seiner größten Erniedrigung*), that Arndt’s book too had ‘kindled’ Napoleon’s bloodthirsty rage, and implying that Arndt would have faced a similar fate, had he not fled into exile (iii-iv). Using the Palm-story was

probably a tactical decision: while Arndt was evidently fairly unknown in Britain, the translator could rely on Palm's execution being public knowledge. In the preface he refers to a public outcry in Britain over the execution: 'the heroic Palm, the unfortunate bookseller of Erlangen, (whose fate, to the eternal honour of the British character, made so deep an impression on the minds of Englishmen, that a very considerable sum was generously collected here by subscription for his disconsolate widow and fatherless children)' (iii). In the translator's description Napoleon appears as a despotic, vengeful tyrant, i.e. the opposite of a liberator or wise legislator, he is in fact a man who 'tramples under foot all laws, both human and divine' (iii). Finally, the translator Arndt's prescience regarding the Spanish uprising in May 1808 as a selling point, presenting Arndt as an exceptionally far-sighted political analyst, from whose wisdom every politically minded reader will profit. 'His [Arndt's] remarks on the Belligerent Powers [...] bespeak him a man of considerable knowledge of the world and the human heart, and of profound political penetration and judgement' (v), so much so that 'other predictions of the author, that of the late glorious revolution in Spain, written in November 1805, was literally fulfilling' (iv). Given such prescience, Arndt's views must 'be highly interesting to every loyal Briton at the present crisis' and 'to the public in general' (v). As Arndt's text provides (other) 'political sketches with prognostics', the correct prediction of the Spanish uprising adds weight to what he says.

The translator's intentions are very similar to Schwabe's, but his approach to his audience is more determined. Unlike Schwabe, he takes no risks. For example, he decides to leave out the chapter on Britain, sidestepping its condemnation alongside its praise, avoiding offending his public. To an even greater degree than Schwabe, he manages his target audience's preconceptions. His preface is an exemplary para-text, very deliberately setting out how to read Arndt. He frames his audience's reading experience as a reprise of what he describes as his own: after initial 'aversion' to the 'metaphysical criticism of [...] the present state of philosophy, history and divinity &c. couched in the unintelligible jargon of the critical philosophy' (v) he was engaged by Arndt's comments on Spain. These have, after the preceding May, taken on a particular significance, and 'amply repaid me for the difficulty I had wading through the mud of his sybillic [sic] style' (vi). He censors Arndt for engaging in 'metaphysical criticism' in the first half of the book (the theory of *zeitgeist*), which he has not translated, because it is written in the 'unintelligible language' of German metaphysics, which is 'not appearing to me to possess interest enough for an *English* reader' (v, italics in the original), and it 'for a long while deterred [him]' as well as 'several learned friends of

[his]' (v). Finally, there is a bit of pandering: the translator presents himself as a grateful refugee who has escaped from an intolerable regime, 'I do not indeed desire ever to quit this hospitable country, where all the intended victims of the modern Attila are sure of meeting with a safe asylum.' (vi).<sup>18</sup> This is clearly designed to flatter the British self-perception of providing a haven of 'liberty' for those persecuted by tyrannical regimes. Biographical details show, however, that the Rev. P. W., whom library catalogues identify as Peter Will, was already in London long before Napoleon became the conqueror of Europe. Will's contemporary Johann Gottlieb Burkhardt, in his *Kirchen-Geschichte der deutschen Gemeinden in London* of 1798, reports that Will succeed Carl G. Woide at the German Reformed Church in the Savoy. Woide died in May 1790.<sup>19</sup> seems to have held the position of pastor at the German Reformed Church (St. Paul's) in the Savoy in or before 1800.<sup>20</sup>

The Rev. Peter Will (1764-1839) was, like Christian Schwabe, a Protestant German clergyman serving the sizeable German community in Georgian London. Will was also a prolific translator of German (Gothic) novels into English during the 1790s and early 1800s, he also translated some Lavater and Knigge,<sup>21</sup> and was generally active in the area of disseminating contemporary German literature in Britain.<sup>22</sup> There is considerable irony in the fact that the unabating popularity of German 'Gothic' literature, which was so suspect to arbiters of good British taste (and sense) and part of the reason for the anti-German bias that Will so carefully addresses in his calibration, also contributed significantly to his income. Will exclusively translated from German to English, which is testimony to his excellent language skills. Considering Will's and Schwabe's respective posts, it is certain that they did not only know each other, but would have been in close contact, as the German Lutheran

---

While he does not reveal his name for fear that his parents, who still live in Germany, will be the target of reprisals, he is happy to give his London address (8 Howland St, Fitzroy Square), in case anyone wants to peruse the whole book in the original.

<sup>19</sup> Johann Gottlieb Burkhardt, *Kirchen-Geschichte der deutschen Gemeinden*. (Tübingen: Fues, 1798), 101-102.

<sup>20</sup> That Will was at the Reformed Church is corroborated by the reference to this post in the American imprint of his translation of Kotzebue's *Familie Ortenberg* (see note 21).

<sup>21</sup> He translated Lavater's *Geheimes Tagebuch eines Beobachters seiner selbst* into English as *Secret Journal of a Self-Observer* (1795) and produced another Lavater translation, *On the nature, excellency and necessity of Faith*, in 1805. Karl Grosse's *Der Genius* appeared as *Horrid Mysteries: A Story* in 1795, and Cajetan Tschink's *Geschichte eines Geistersehers* as *The victim of magical delusion; or, The mystery of the revolution of P-l. A magico-political Tale* in the same year. In 1799 Adolf Freiherr von Knigge's *Über den Umgang mit Menschen* appeared as *Practical philosophy of social life: or The art of conversing with men, after the German of Baron Knigge*, and probably in 1800 *Romulus: a tale of ancient times translated from the German of Augustus Lafontaine*. Will's most widely disseminated translation seems to be Kotzebue's *Die Leiden der Ortenbergischen Familie*, which appeared as *The sufferings of the family of Ortenberg: A novel. Translated from the German of Augustus von Kotzebue* in 1799 in London and was the following year also published in Philadelphia, New York and Dublin.

<sup>22</sup> Together with Anton Willich he edited the (short-lived) *German Museum*, which in its first issue (1800) defined its aim as providing 'an historical account of the rise and progress of German literature and the North of Europe, together with a critical account of their works'. It is specifically addressed to 'a liberal and judicious public'. Quoted in Jefcoate, *Drucker und Buchhändler*, 360-364.

churches in London maintained close links, and perhaps because they had similar political objectives.

Unsurprisingly in this context Will's translation of Arndt was reviewed by Schwabe in the *Monthly Review* in early 1809, this time with Arndt's name spelt correctly.<sup>23</sup> Schwabe, again under the cover of the *Monthly's* anonymity rule, makes sure that outwardly at least there is no suggestion of any connection or common cause between them.<sup>24</sup> Again he poses as a Briton, 'It is worth *our* attention to hear what a man of experience and knowledge [Arndt] whose sentiments concerning *our* enemy coincide so fully with our own, thinks of *our* situation and our actions' (109, italics mine). Arndt is described as a 'sincere foreigner' (108).

Schwabe is rather critical of Will's methods of attracting his readers' attention. First he ticks Will off for using a cheap sensationalist trick to get the book noticed (the Palm execution), and for good measure also points out that this is factually wrong (although Will himself clarifies this in the preface). He censures Will for the (similarly) sensationalist choice of epithets given to Napoleon ('Destroyer', 'Attila'), complains that Will has not included the section on Britain, and urges care in regard to Arndt's incitement of a violent struggle. Although he agrees that Napoleon must be fought, it would not do to fight him with his own 'weapons' of oppression and brutal dictatorship, even though this idea is, Schwabe says, 'not uncommon in this country' (109). Such a course, based on injustice and dishonesty, will bring bloodshed, misery and recriminations, especially if one fails to vanquish one's adversary. Much of Schwabe's review is dedicated to pointing out the dangers of attacking a more powerful enemy. Apart from the fact that fighting like with like would be a 'contest between the worst principles of human action', 'the feeble [...] will fall unpitied, detested, and be made accountable for all the miseries which both they and their more powerful adversaries have occasioned, when they attempt to enter the lists in conjunction with injustice and cruelty' (109).

The review provides further publicity for Arndt, his views and the idea that Britain and 'Germany' should 'naturally' work together against Napoleon, but it is also clearly designed

---

<sup>23</sup> [Christian Schwabe], "Arndt's Spirit of the Times" in *The Monthly Review* 60 (1809) 108-109. He is identified as the reviewer again by Nangle, *Monthly Review*, 262.

<sup>24</sup> However, the careful reader of the translation would spot a suggestive link between the two: to underline his point regarding Arndt's prescience, Will quotes from Schwabe's review the latter's summary of Arndt's *hopes* of a Spanish insurgence between his Preface and the beginning of his translation, (verso page, no pagination). In this particular place the quote appears almost as a motto.

to stimulate discussion and reflection of the situation. It is tempting to suspect that Schwabe and Will were co-ordinating their interventions. Whether their efforts were instigated or sanctioned by higher authorities with political motives is a question that requires more research. I have already mentioned that Schwabe was appointed minister to the Prussian embassy in London in 1820, over a decade later, but this does not mean he had no contact with these circles earlier.

To sum up, Arndt's *Geist der Zeit* is introduced into Britain promptly after its publication in Germany, the introduction is engineered by German nationals, to some extent under the cover of anonymity, with entirely political motives. It still needs further research to establish whether their interventions can be considered successful, i.e. whether they did prepare the change of public opinion they were working towards. Similarly it would need to be established to what extent any change of public opinion on such political (and military) issues contributed towards the gradual change in the way German thought was considered before the more established mediators such as Mme de Staël, whose *De l'Allemagne* was published in London in 1813, Julius Hare and Thomas Carlyle paved the way for the Germanophilia of the Victorian period.

By 1815 the political landscape had changed dramatically, Napoleon was defeated and exiled, and the Congress of Vienna was re-ordering Europe, in many respects by turning back the political clock. Liberal opposition to conservative politics became difficult, but it did not go away. One of the centres of youthful political liberalism in England was Trinity College Cambridge. And one of the young men at Trinity was Julius Hare, who was, it seems, a keen admirer of Arndt's.

## **2. J.C. Hare: Liberal Student Politics and Hidden Reception of Ernst Moritz Arndt**

Julius Charles Hare (1795-1855) is recognised as one of the key 'Germanisers' of his generation. The size of his German library, to which he kept adding from his teenage years until the end of his life, was legendary.<sup>25</sup> A Fellow of Trinity College, translator of Romantic German literature, co-translator of G.B. Niebuhr's *Römische Geschichte*, and liberal publicist, Hare became, as Arch-Deacon of Lewes, a high-ranking functionary of the Anglican Church, and a prominent member of the Broad Church Movement. Hare is a typical

---

<sup>25</sup> Roger Paulin, "Julius Hare's German Books in Trinity College Library" in *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 9.2 (1988) 174-193, 177-178.

representative of what Duncan Forbes a long time ago called Liberal Anglicanism.<sup>26</sup> Hare's appreciation of German thought combined a desire for political and social change with spiritual renewal, an approach that eventually fitted in well with the liberal part of the Victorian elite.

While Hare's general Germanophilia is well established, much less is known about Hare the youthful radical. That he was an admirer of Arndt, and of much that Arndt stood for in terms of social and political reform utilising national traditions, Protestant religiosity, and an abiding hatred of Napoleon, has so far escaped critical notice, not least because Hare himself kept it quiet.<sup>27</sup> However, physical evidence of his keen interest in Arndt is to be found in his library, which is preserved almost in its entirety at Trinity College Cambridge, and the intellectual evidence can be pieced together from Hare's own preoccupations and his political development.

Hare's library contains most of Arndt's significant works, and virtually all his publications linked to the Wars of Liberation. Most of these are first editions, something that cannot be said for the works of the Schlegels, Fichte, or Hegel that Hare owned. His life-long interest is borne out by the fact that he added to this Arndt stock over several decades, well into 1840s. The Hare Collection at Trinity comprises thirty-three Arndt publications in total, if *Geist der Zeit* is counted as one. It is likely that Hare met Arndt during his trip to Germany in the summer of 1828, when he stopped in Bonn where Arndt was living during his professional exile from academic life.<sup>28</sup> In 1828 Arndt was not yet halfway through his suspension from his professorial post at the University.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Duncan Forbes, *The Liberal Anglican Idea of History*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952).

<sup>27</sup> Although it is well known that Hare was an important mediator of German thought from the late 1810s, there is little research on Hare or his mediating activities. One exception are the two essays by G.F. MacFarland: 'The Early Literary Career of Julius Charles Hare' and 'Julius Charles Hare: Coleridge, DeQuincey and German Literature' both in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 46 (1963/64) and 47 (1964/65) 42-83 and 165-97 respectively.

<sup>28</sup> In his "Memoir" prefixed to most of the posthumous editions of *Guesses at Truth* (from 1861 onwards) E. H. Plumptre reports that when stopping in Bonn on his continental travels in the summer of 1828 Hare looked up Arndt, as well as August Wilhelm Schlegel, Niebuhr and Friedrich Schleiermacher (*Guesses at Truth by Two Brothers*, London: Macmillan, 1867, p. xxvii). Hare's more recent biographer N. Merrill Distad does not mention Arndt in this context (*Guessing at Truth. The Life of Julius Hare*, Shepherdstown: Patmos Press, 1979, pp. 55-56), but it is likely that Plumptre, who as a member of Hare's extended family had known Hare personally in his later years and was writing from personal memory, would not have included this detail if he had not heard it from Hare himself. Both Schlegel and Schleiermacher were well represented in Hare's Library, but not as numerous as Arndt. Visiting Niebuhr would have been natural not just because Hare was co-translating Niebuhr's *Römische Geschichte*, but because the two were corresponding at the time.

<sup>29</sup> While the right to lecture, the main source of income for a university professor, had not been returned to him, although he had been acquitted by a special tribunal of the charges of sedition and demagoguery in early 1821

It would appear that Arndt appealed to Hare on several counts: politically, spiritually, and as a leader of public opinion. Like Arndt, the young Hare was convinced that social and political reforms were required and that these should be based on (nearly lost liberal) national traditions. He shared with Arndt a fervent Protestant religiosity and a hatred of Napoleon, and he is likely to have admired Arndt's political activism, his public role, fighting his battles in the public sphere, engaged in changing public opinion and the condition of his nation. This is a role Hare whole-heartedly adopted from himself during the 1820s and 1830s: his reforming efforts – both politically and spiritually – focused on changing attitudes via engaging the (educated) public.

Unlike most of his British contemporaries, Hare had easy access to Arndt's work because he had very good German, relatively rare at the time, due to an extended stay in Weimar in 1804-05 as a nine-year-old boy. Hare grew up in a Europe-trotting, impecunious upper middle-class family with intellectual and artistic penchants, who were well connected: their relatives and friends included the (William) Joneses – William's wife was Hare's aunt - the Wilberforces, Charles James Fox, and Georgiana Duchess of Devonshire. Both his parents were staunch republicans, they idolized Switzerland as a model of a historical democracy and independent nationhood and welcomed the French Revolution.<sup>30</sup> The latter was not that rare in their generation, but *their* political liberalism outlived the terror and transferred to Napoleon, at least in the late 1790s.<sup>31</sup> Although they avidly politicized their children,<sup>32</sup> Hare did not take over any of his parents' enthusiasm for Napoleon. While at Cambridge he refers to Napoleon as a blood-thirsty Aaron,<sup>33</sup> which is reminiscent of Peter Will's epithets, and a view shared by Arndt. It is of course also a view shared by large numbers of others in Britain and elsewhere from the early 1800s onwards.

Hare went to Trinity College Cambridge in 1812, and remained connected to the college throughout the 1820s. Hare's German library, which contained mainly recent publications, caused great concern to his conservative aunt Jones, who feared her nephew was becoming radicalised in Jacobin and atheistic directions. A heated argument between the two is

---

occasioned by *Geist der Zeit* 4, Arndt was suspended on full pay, and residing in style in a handsome house in the town.

<sup>30</sup> Distad, *Guessing*, 10-12.

<sup>31</sup> Distad, *Guessing*, 10.

<sup>32</sup> According to Distad, Francis jr.'s letters to his parents, when the latter made a trip back to England in 1797 while three of their children stayed behind in Italy, were regularly confiscated on their journey into Britain due to the republican slogans which adorned them. Distad, *Guessing*, 12.

<sup>33</sup> Distad, *Guessing*, 29.



preserved in their letters when Aunt Jones suggests Julius should burn his German books. Hare counters that German thought helped him to tackle the rupture between knowledge and faith, and to withstand the immoral onslaught of materialistic capitalism, which relies on, and produces, selfishness.

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 shall never 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 of the obligation I am under to them [...] 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 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 have only 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.<sup>34</sup>

Both the disconnect between knowledge and faith and prevalent selfishness are issues that preoccupied Hare in his student days at Cambridge.<sup>35</sup>

That Hare was interested in political and social reform is borne out by his activities in a new politically minded debating club at Cambridge, the Cambridge Union, which was founded in February 1815 and in which two of his closest friends, William Whewell and Connop Thirlwell, became closely involved, taking over as president and secretary respectively in 1817. The outline of a speech for a Union debate on 'The Question of the Propriety of the

---

<sup>34</sup> A.J.C. Hare, *Memorials of a Quiet Life*, American edition repr. from the 9<sup>th</sup> English edition. (New York: Routledge and Randolph, 1872), 195. Hare is reported to have told his aunt, when she objected to him translating German gothic horror (Motte de la Fouqué's *Sintram*) that his 'patriotism and his faith were in danger from the materialism which in England was claiming every domain of thought and even of religion itself'. Quoted in Distad, *Guessing*, 17.

<sup>35</sup> His effort to harmonize knowledge and faith is evident in his Commonplace Book, a notebook preserved in Trinity College Library, where he rejects, as in the letter to Lady Jones, the retreat into irrational faith and embraces the search for integrating advancing knowledge with religious belief. 'Often I have deplored the loss of that childish confidence, and yearned with a painful desire to cast away all the uncertainties of half-knowledge against which my soul is at present struggling [...]. But it cannot be: - it must not be. Even if it were possible to forget our knowledge, it would be our duty to increase it.' Quoted in Distad, *Guessing*, 27. While this is reminiscent of Schiller's impassioned appeal for the modern human being not to regress but to achieve happiness from completing the striving through the totality of knowledge in the 1795 *Naïve und Sentimentalische Dichtung*, it is equally the topic of Josef Görres' *Glauben und Wissen* (1805), which Hare owned. In his Commonplace Book Hare also inveighed against selfish competitiveness, which he felt was encouraged by the socialisation of boys in British boarding schools. Such institutions, in his view, bred 'selfishness' as they instilled a 'duty to surpass', regarding 'merit not as a positive, but a comparative' and bred 'a pernicious spirit of emulation, rivalry, and of contention.' Quoted in Distad, *Guessing*, 21.

War against France' dated February 1816 (i.e. only a few months after the conclusion of the Congress of Vienna) is preserved in Hare's 'Commonplace Book'. It castigates the current British policy of restoration, which had been set in stone at Vienna and which Hare presents as reactionary and oppressive. In his view, this could have been averted if England were still true to its genius of liberty and justice. (This is in line with Arndt's views put forward in *Geist der Zeit I* and the section Schwabe translated in his review.)

The Sovereigns of Europe might have otherwise been subjected to a scrutiny which would have been neither easy nor pleasant to have undergone. [...] It might have urged [...] 'We have overthrown oppression abroad, and we will not be oppressed at home.' [...] In the days of moral deluge [...] England alone preserved his [sic] virtues, as in an ark. For during all this age of universal calamity England has always been free, and safe, and pious and happy. She has stood forth, amid the perils of the world with almost the immunity of a blessed spirit. [...] Are we then, sir, to leap headlong from this sublime elevation [...]? Are we to degrade this Justice by injury, and to desecrate this High-mindedness in oppression? Are we to tyrannize, because France is weak [...]? [...] the tutelary genius of regenerated Europe, [...] this god Castlereagh. [...] I will let him pursue his career of triumph amid the applauses of princes and contractors, while his chariot wheels trample over multitudes, and are dogged by the curses of Africa and Ireland.<sup>36</sup>

Castlereagh was (regarded as) one of the architects of the restorative outcomes of the Congress of Vienna. In Hare's view, the Vienna settlement ignored the rights of the peoples over whom it decrees ('trampling over multitudes'). Furthermore it sanctioned colonial exploitation in Africa and colonial oppression in Ireland. The forces of the conservative reaction would of course quite literally trample over continuing English calls for social and political reform three year later, in the shape of the armed and mounted militia at Petersfield in Manchester, which gives Hare's notes a touch of prescience. The sentiments Hare expresses here are at the radical end of liberal reform. For Hare, this decline of liberty and rise of despotic oppression are due to the self-serving disabling of public 'scrutiny' by those in power. These views are very close to Arndt's description of the British in *Geist der Zeit I*. For Arndt the British were '...ein Volk, das einst durch Gerechtigkeit und Treue berühmt gewesen war, gebrauchte gegen Fremde allmählig [sic] dasselbe System von Plünderung und

---

<sup>36</sup> Quoted in Distad, *Guessing*, 28-29. The manuscript of Hare's Commonplace Book is held in the Wren Library, Trinity College Cambridge.

Unterdrückung, was es an den Neufranken verdammt' (329). A few page on: 'Die Zeit eures [des britischen] Adels und eurer Bürgerkraft scheint für immer vergangen. Gemeine Verachtung des Edelsten, Schätzung aller Dinge nach dem Golde, Würdigung der Nationen nach den Reichtümern, Niedertretung der Armut und Uebermuth [sic] eurer Nabobs sprechen euer Todesurtheil.' (333).

But such opinions are not rare, in Germany, or in Britain. William Hazlitt, admittedly a staunch political radical, wrote in a pamphlet entitled *Free Thoughts on Public Affairs. Advice to a Patriot; in a Letter Addressed to a Member of the Old Opposition* in 1806:

A commercial spirit is a very weak as well as dangerous substitute for the spirit of freedom: a sense of self-interest, of mere mercenary advantage, can ill supply the place of principle. [...] Men who are actuated by this sole principle will [...] defend their wealth, [...] they will think nothing else worth retaining [...]. The common birthright which they receive from nature, in which every Englishman has an equal interest as such, appears of little value in their eyes. [...] They will defend England as connected with her colonies, [...] but will they defend her [...] as their country? [...] They would defend their country not as her children, but as her masters, as a property, not as a state.<sup>37</sup>

In Britain there is a general sense of decline following the loss of the North American colonies, the scandals around the British East India Company, and the tailspin of fear occasioned by Napoleon's control of the continent and the threat of a French invasion. (By 1816 the latter, however, had been averted).

For Hare, Arndt's specific appeal was most likely the mixture of being anti-Napoleon without being against the principles of more democratic government, i.e. a progressive anti-Napoleonic stance, not a conservative one which tended to link closely *any* ideas of the French Revolution and Napoleon. This progressive anti-Napoleonic stance is the signature politics of the German liberation movement after 1806 up to the clampdown of 1819. Given his interest in Arndt, his activities in the Cambridge Union and the political direction of his thinking evident in his *Commonplace Book*, it is unlikely that Hare was unaware of the new German student movement, the *Burschenschaften*, which emerged in 1815 and which derived

---

<sup>37</sup> William Hazlitt, *Free Thoughts on Public Affairs. Advice to a Patriot; in a Letter Addressed to a Member of the Old Opposition*, in vol 1 of *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt in Twenty-One Volumes*, edited by P. Howe. (London and Toronto: Dent, 1930), 93-118, here: 114.

from the activities that were a crucial part of the German resistance movement against Napoleon in the run-up to the Wars of Liberation, to which Arndt himself contributed with such dedication and so many publications. As I noted before, Arndt's *Befreiungskrieg* oeuvre is prominent in Hare's library.<sup>38</sup> The *Burschenschaftler* saw themselves as keeping the liberal spirit that had sustained the Wars of Liberation alive after the Congress of Vienna. They soon became targets of conservative suspicion, and eventually suppression.

In March 1817 Hare experienced, either first- or second-hand, a very similar suspicion that lead to an act of suppression of liberal and reform-minded student activities. The Cambridge Union was closed down in a dramatic mid-session intervention by the university authorities on 24 March on suspicion of sedition.<sup>39</sup> If Hare gave his speech in 1816, and if such views were not uncommon among Cambridge students, it cannot altogether surprise that amid the general paranoia about sedition, which had led to a number of repressive measures, among them the suspension of Habeas Corpus in February 1817 and the passing of the latest, more stringent Seditious Meetings Act in March, the University authorities felt justified in their drastic action. It is not clear whether Hare was present at the meeting, but his close friends William Whewell and Connop Thirlwall, in their respective capacities as president and secretary of the Union, were, Whewell challenging – unsuccessfully – the VC's orders of immediate dispersal. If Hare did not witness the event, he would have got a detailed account of it from Whewell and Thirlwall. Such acts would confirm any views Hare might have held about illiberal currents in England.

In addition to Arndt's publications, Hare's library contained a fair number of books that would be considered 'seditious' in this climate, such as *Deutschlands künftige Verfassung* 1814, Josef Görres' *Teutschland und die Revolution* (1819) and its follow-up *Europa und die Revolution* (1821), as well as works by Heinrich Luden, Lorenz Oken, and Jakob Friedrich

---

<sup>38</sup> Hare owned many of Arndt's publications that prepare and sustain the *Befreiungskriege*: *Die Glocke der Stunde in drei Zügen*, [S.l.]: [s.n.], 1813; *Grundlinien einer deutschen Kriegsordnung* / von E.M. Arndt. [S.l.]: [s.n.], 1813; *Lieder für Teutsche* / von E.M. Arndt. [S.l.]: [s.n.], 1813; *Der Rhein, Deutschlands Strom, aber nicht Deutschlands Gränze* / von E.M. Arndt. Leipzig: Reim, 1813; *Ueber Volkshass und über den Gebrauch einer fremden Sprache* / von E.M. Arndt. [S.l.]: [s.n.], 1813; *Zwei Worte über die Entstehung und Bestimmung der Deutschen Legion*. [S.l.]: [s.n.], 1813; *Das preussische Volk und Heer im Jahr 1813* / von E.M. Arndt. Leipzig: Fleischer, [1814?]; *Ueber das Verhältniss Englands und Frankreichs zu Europa* / von E.M. Arndt. Leipzig: In Johann Benj. Georg Fleischer's Buchhandlung, [1814?]; *Was bedeutet Landsturm und Landwehr?* / von E.M. Arndt. *Nebst einer Aufforderung an deutsche Jünglinge und Männer zum Kampfe für Deutschlands Freiheit*; von Justus Gruner. [S.l.]: [s.n.], [1814?]; *Beherzigungen vor dem Wiener Kongress* / von X.Y.Z. [S.l.]: [s.n.], 1814; *Ansichten und Aussichten der deutschen Geschichte* / von E.M. Arndt. T.I. Leipzig: Wilhelm Rein, 1814. The references are given as found in the catalogue of Trinity College Cambridge Library.

<sup>39</sup> For an account cf. Distad, *Guessing*, 29.

Fries – i.e. the leading lights of the new young ‘political professoriate’ who supported the *Burschenschaften*.<sup>40</sup>

In this context it is likely that Hare watched with interest, six months later, the *Burschenschaft* congress on the Wartburg, which took place in October 1817. The *Wartburgfest* commemorated the fourth anniversary of the Battle of Leipzig, the ‘all-German’ victory over Napoleon, which symbolised the success of the Wars of Liberation, and the 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Reformation. It served as a platform to formulate a programme to drive forward constitutional reform and signal to the conservative authorities that the *Burschenschaften* and their supporters saw themselves as a political force. It was attended by a number of liberal-minded Jena professors, among them Jakob Friedrich Fries and Lorenz Oken; Heinrich Luden, while not attending the *Fest*, was involved in supporting it. The *Wartburgfest* was watched with alarm by the German authorities and all three professors experienced some form of pressure from conservative authorities in the wake of their participation or support.

The suspended Cambridge Union had meanwhile reinvented itself as a reading group. Hare’s biographer Distad expressed some surprise at their turning towards ‘studying the German language’ and reading *German* texts during the Union’s four year hiatus (1817-21), although he is duly sceptical as to this being an interest in German language alone.<sup>41</sup> It is clearly less surprising against the above background. Politically radical, ‘patriotic’ reading societies also existed in German (*Burschenschaft*) student circles, the most famous is perhaps Karl and August Follen’s ‘Teutsche Lesegesellschaft zur Erreichung vaterländischer Zwecke’ at Gießen University, which went through a number of permutations between November 1814 and 1818 and was the basis for the Follen-led ‘Black’ *Burschenschaft* at Gießen, the “Gießener Schwarzen”. The reading matter discussed at Follen’s ‘Lesegesellschaft’ ranged from literature to political pamphlets and newspapers, and unsurprisingly included works by

---

<sup>40</sup> This, however, is not to suggest that Hare copied from them: many of the above publications appeared between 1815 and 1821, after he had already formed the ideas he expresses in his Union speech draft. On the other hand, if he was still buying books of such content *after* he had formulated his views in the Commonplace Book, it would suggest that his ‘radical’ views were neither transitory nor just for argument’s sake.

<sup>41</sup> Distad, *Guessing*, 30.

Arndt.<sup>42</sup> Both Follen brothers were youthful veterans of the Wars of Liberation and at the heart of the radical German constitutionalist movement between 1814 and 1819.<sup>43</sup>

While we do not know whether Hare knew of the Follens,<sup>44</sup> we can be sure that he read Arndt's *Geist der Zeit I*. His copy bears the evidence of avid reading, the binding shows the effects of frequent use and its margins are littered with those pencil markings that Roger Paulin has identified as typical of Hare.<sup>45</sup> The most extensive markings, sometimes whole or half pages, are in the first part of the volume, where Arndt discusses the social impact of intellectual elites, such as writers (poets, journalists, reviewers) and scholars (philosophers, theologians, historians), and the way a particular age (*Zeitalter*) shapes and is shaped by its contemporaries (*Zeitgenossen*). These are the parts of the volume that the reviewers, including Schwabe and Will, purported not to value. Hare, however, clearly grasped the function and importance of these intellectual elites within the public sphere when it came to exerting public influence and directing public opinion in an increasingly literate and politicised age. This understanding more than likely informed Hare's own activities as a writer, translator and journalist from the 1820s onwards.

In the second half of the book, which contains the more traditional review of peoples and was much preferred by the reviewers, the chapters on the English, the Germans and the French are particularly marked, as is the final chapter 'Wahrheit und Versöhnung'.<sup>46</sup> Hare was interested in the relationship between religion, truth, and good government, and in language and speech, i.e. the medium of (public) communication. Within these topics, he seems to investigate particularly 'revolutionary' aspects, how to restore truth, justice and liberty in a corrupt and selfish world. Such aims are revolutionary because they necessarily entail the overthrow of the current system. This 'revolutionary' tendency is also borne out in Hare's markings in another publication by Arndt, his short-lived journal *Der Wächter*

---

<sup>42</sup> Frank Mehring, *Karl Follen. Deutsch-Amerikanischer Freiheitskämpfer*. (Gießen: Ferber'sche Universitätsbuchhandlung, 2004), 38-39.

<sup>43</sup> Maïke Oergel, 'Constitutionalism and Cultural Identity as Revolutionary Concepts in German Political Radicalism 1806–1819: the Case of Karl Follen' in *Comparative Critical Studies* 15.2 (2018): 183-205.

<sup>44</sup> Follen's publications are not present in Hare's library. It needs more research to ascertain whether they were available in Britain, bearing in mind they were considered seditious and subject to confiscation by the new federal surveillance authority in Germany.

<sup>45</sup> Roger Paulin, "Julius Hare's German Books in Trinity College Library" in *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 9.2 (1988): 174-193, 179. There, however, are no markings in parts 2-4, and Hare's double volume of parts 3 and 4 is so stiff as to suggest it was hardly ever opened.

<sup>46</sup> Some sections, however, bear no markings, such as 'Die alten Völker' - perhaps curious for a classicist, but evidently not his concern when reading this book - or 'Die Philosophen' and 'Die Rezensenten', the latter perhaps as curious for someone so actively engaged in periodical publishing and reviewing.

(1815),<sup>47</sup> in which Hare has marked especially sections relating to forms of government and the pernicious aspects of the rule of aristocratic oligarchies, as well as Arndt's reiteration of Britain's uneven potential, on the one hand as the model of historical liberty, but on the other as currently morally corrupt,<sup>48</sup> which was also a feature of *Geist der Zeit I*.

That Arndt's commanding presence in Hare's library, and his thought, has gone unnoticed is probably largely due to the fact that until the late 1830s Hare avoided mentioning Arndt's name in his publications. A case in point is his first book, co-authored with his brother Augustus, *Guesses at Truth by two Brothers*, the first edition of which appeared in 1827. *Guesses* is a collection of short essays and aphorisms, intended to make especially young men think, as the authors explain in the preface. While there is no mention of Arndt in this edition of *Guesses*, Hare describes the impact of the age on its contemporaries and their actions in a way that is very similar to Arndt's in *Geist der Zeit I*.

He [the historian] must also, since human actions are his chief theme, exhibit them at once as growing and as grown up, [...] so that human character as modifying and modified by circumstances, man controuling and controuled by events, will be the historian's ultimate object.<sup>49</sup>

Arndt wrote in the chapter entitled 'Der Zeitgeist und die Zeitgenossen':

[den] Geist und allgemeinen Schwung ihres Lebens stellt er [the theoretically-minded contemporary observer] ausser ihnen hin, gleichsam als eine Kraft, die sich um sie bewegt und wechselnd auf sie eindringt oder von ihnen abläßt, je nachdem sie dieselbe auf sich wirken lassen oder zurücktreiben. Ich [...] nehme das Zeitalter und die Zeitgenossen als zwei Dinge außer einander, die einander bearbeiten und auf einander wirken, denn so erscheinen sie wirklich.<sup>50</sup>

Arndt speaks of an age and its contemporaries, Hare of the historian's task to describe human actions, their origins and effects; both focus on the reciprocal activities - shaping and being shaped – between individuals and the age.

Both *Geist der Zeit* and *Guesses at Truth* are intended as public interventions to correct the course of public affairs, and the authors of both are keenly aware that they are writing and

---

<sup>47</sup> Ernst Moritz Arndt, *Der Wächter. Eine Zeitschrift in zwanglosen Heften*, Cologne: Rommerskirchen, 1815.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. 'Die Aristokratie' in *Der Wächter* vol. 1.

<sup>49</sup> *Guesses at Truth by Two Brothers*. Vol. 1 (London: John Taylor, 1827), 228.

<sup>50</sup> Arndt, *Geist der Zeit I*, 82.

thinking in a fluid situation. While Arndt kept on writing new parts of *Geist der Zeit* over twelve years, Hare re-wrote and re-edited *Guesses* three times between 1827 and 1848. In 1838 he introduced the new edition with the following words: ‘Ten years cannot pass over one’s head, least of all in these eventful times, without modifying sundry opinions. A change of position too brings a new horizon and new points of view.’ (p. xiii, 1838)<sup>51</sup> Similarly Arndt called *Geist der Zeit* a ‘wanderndes Bild der Zeit’ in the opening lines of part 2 (although the book’s ‘Gesinnungen’ should be eternally steadfast), in the preface to the re-issue of part 2 in 1813 he conceded that ‘einiges darin mag auch jetzt noch zu deutschen Herzen sprechen; anderes sieht der Verfasser selbst als Irrthum oder Traum an’.<sup>52</sup>

In the 1838 edition of *Guesses* Hare finally mentions Arndt, as that ‘honest and hearty German patriot, Arndt, which [sic] did such good service in kindling and feeding the enthusiasm during the war with France’, introducing Arndt as the writer of German national political agitation, which supported the British-led war against Napoleonic France.<sup>53</sup> Arndt is able to ‘kindle’ and ‘feed enthusiasm’, i.e. have public impact, because he communicates directly and without over-complicating matters. This is why he is able to get at ‘truth’.<sup>54</sup> The communication of truth is also a principal theme in *Geist der Zeit I*, introduced in its first chapter about ‘Der Schreiber’ and summed up in the final one ‘Wahrheit und Versöhnung’, both liberally pencil-marked in Hare’s copy.

It would appear that in the 1820s Hare felt uneasy referring in print to a political radical who had been removed from his university post and faced a special tribunal to defend himself against charges of sedition in this homeland. (Any such qualms, however, did not stop Hare, it seems, from visiting Arndt in the year after *Guesses* came out.) When by the late 1830s Arndt was on the way to being exonerated, Hare was happy to refer to him directly. In 1840

---

The new editions are Hare’s own work, Augustus died in 1834, before Julius embarked on the first reworking. The differences between the 1827 and 1838 editions of volume 1 and the differences between volume 2 of 1827 and 1848 are especially significant. The texts are adjusted in numerous ways, from changing individual words or phrases, to omitting sections, adding large sections and changing the positions or individual guesses, sometimes dramatically. A thorough study of all changes and their relations to Hare’s views and the changing political and intellectual contexts is still outstanding.

<sup>52</sup> Arndt, *Geist der Zeit* 2. (London: Boosey, 1813), pp. v and iii respectively.

<sup>53</sup> *Guesses at Truth by Two Brothers*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. (London: Tayler and Walton, 1838), 269.

<sup>54</sup> This (very brief) discussion of Arndt occurs in a section on language use, which touches on the difficulties of translating, the pitfalls of over-complicating language, i.e. making it highly technical and specialised, or using foreign words. In this context Hare compares Arndt to Cobbett, both are able to use straightforward language to effectively express truth, rather like Martin Luther, an association that must convey the highest merit on both writers. Hare’s main concern is the immediacy of simple direct language, which has not gone through numerous editing processes, of which he cites Cobbett’s and Arndt’s as good examples. Such language Hare recommends for intellectual discourse as well.



Arndt was reinstated in his professorial post at Bonn on the orders of the new Prussian king, Frederic William IV. And, in an extremely speedy rehabilitation, he was, by 1841, *Rektor* of his university. In Germany, too, Arndt had (again) become a venerable ‘patriot’.

There is no precise information regarding *when* Hare bought, or pencil-marked, his Arndt books. It is, theoretically, possible that the reason why he does not mention him in 1827 is that he had not read Arndt by the time he and Augustus were putting together *Guesses* in the mid-1820s. Against the political background and in the context of Hare’s own activities presented here I find this unlikely. How much Arndt Hare had read by the time he prepared his speech for the Cambridge Union debate in early 1816 is however uncertain. That he would have read *Geist der Zeit I* or its review in the *Monthly Review* is unlikely – in 1806 he was an eleven-year-old pupil at Charterhouse. But his copy of *Geist der Zeit I* is the second edition of 1807, not the 1815-one; it is bound with the 1813 edition of part 2. Part 3 (1813) and part 4 (1818), both first editions, are bound together. This could suggest that he did not acquire the books until 1818, but the fact that part 1 is so evidently carefully perused, whereas the others are not, could suggest he had this earlier, perhaps in a separate binding. His well-thumbed copy of *Der Wächter* (1815) may suggest perusal in the mid-1810s, when Hare was an undergraduate.

The reception of Arndt’s *Geist der Zeit* in Britain is clearly driven by political dynamics. In its first part between 1806 and 1808 it was more of an introduction than a reception. The book was pointed out and made available to British readers as part of a political agenda pursued by German nationals who wanted to influence public opinion. Whether British readers were swayed by this agenda is another matter,<sup>55</sup> but Arndt’s ideas were presented to them, which they otherwise might not have been. In Arndt’s more ‘genuine’ reception by Julius Hare – which may well be quite separate from the ‘introduction’ by Schwabe and Will – political motives were still key, although they were part of a more generally social agenda for spiritual renewal and political reform. It is very likely that Arndt’s thought strongly influenced the young Hare’s own political thinking and his public activities; and it looks as if political conditions influenced Hare’s public acknowledgement of Arndt, initially a non-acknowledgement, which changed as conditions did. (Arndt went on to have a strong public reception in Britain - which is beyond the scope of this essay.) Arndt’s reception history in

---

<sup>55</sup> Britain and Prussia did collaborate to defeat Napoleon in 1814-15, and Blücher received a hero’s welcome in London in the summer of 1814. Cf. Miranda Seymour, *Noble Endeavours*. (London and New York: Simon and Schuster, 2013), 22.

Britain up to the 1830s illustrates two things: texts tend not to travel randomly and any successful reception requires favourable conditions (even if these are covert). These two points are well acknowledged regarding cultural conditions. What is less often stressed, and so clear in this example, is the importance of political constellations.

There are few barriers to receiving foreign texts (and authors) that are in line with existing prevalent political views and structures. To what extent such texts are received depends largely on the target context's appetite for foreign culture. Foreign texts that sell, and have little *overt* political content, may be frowned upon by the arbiters of taste or by supporters of the prevailing political structures (if the texts could be seen as undermining 'proper' attitudes), but tend to be unstoppable, unless censorship is enforced. In this context the influence of German gothic and sentimental literature is an example of such unstoppable influx, with Kotzebue perhaps the most emblematic name. But texts that are problematic because they are in some respect counter-cultural in a political sense, like Arndt's *Geist der Zeit I*, tend to have hidden reception histories (at least *while* they are counter-cultural) because they enter unfavourable territory. Their receptions are covert, harder to trace and hence easy to overlook. The introduction of such texts requires considerable management if they are to appeal to an audience broader than the small counter-cultural group that may have picked them up. Seeking such a broader appeal makes sense if a political (or possibly cultural) impact is the aim. And only a distinct agenda justifies the efforts of 'management' that are required to give such texts the chance to be received broadly and favourably. Arndt's early reception in Britain is a clear example of such an introduction.