

To those interested in the arguments put forward in "A Gentleman of Literary Eminence," by Roger Paulin, William St Clair, and Elinor Shaffer.

Please consider the following points:

1) the letter from Bohte (1 Aug 1820) stating that Coleridge is translating Faust cannot be dismissed as literary gossip of the German bookdealer in London. Bohte himself had planned a dual-language edition of Faust, but Soane, his translator, delivered only the first 577 lines.

2) the argument that Boosey claimed that Faust was being translated by a "Gentleman of literary eminence," and that Coleridge wasn't really a gentleman, is specious wordplay.

3) in my annotations to the text, I cite over 800 verbal echoes from Coleridge's other poetry, some of passages of several lines; some with characteristic phrasing often repeated in Coleridge's poetry. The reviewers do not acknowledge these.

4) all the evidence, circumstantial and textual, points to Coleridge; no evidence points elsewhere. And "gentlemen" like Soane and Mellish aren't viable candidates for the edition published by Boosey in 1821.

5) Mellish might well have been considered a rival of Coleridge when he translated Schiller's *Wallenstein* (1800), a play that Mellish wanted to translate, but then translated Schiller's *Maria Stuart* (1801) instead.

6) the reviewers overlook the fact that Bohte published another edition of *Faust* after Soane let him down and abandoned the project.

7) the reviewers fail to mention that, in addition to twice referring to Coleridge as translator of *Faust*, Goethe also translated from Coleridge, and appropriated to himself, the lines on 'an orphic tale' originally entitled "To a Gentleman" (later "To William Wordsworth"). According to the criteria of the reviewers, Wordsworth would not properly be considered a "gentleman" either.

8) the reviewers challenge the attribution of Boileau as author of the prose translation (Boosey 1820), but fail to notice that in his review of Hayward's translation, Boileau cited this work as his own.

This review provides a well researched commentary on the illustrations, and includes excellent reproductions of many plates, a luxury not available to me at Oxford University Press. Roger Paulin, an expert on German Romanticism and the work of Tieck, has been researching book illustrations for at least the past 15 years. At Trinity, Cambridge, he has worked extensively in the Julius Hare collection.

Rather than extending this list of oversights, misstatements, and misrepresentations in the review article, let me encourage readers to look at the work being reviewed: *Faustus: From the German of Goethe Translated by Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (Oxford, 2007)

Frederick Burwick
Professor Emeritus of English
29 February 2008