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The Problem

To investigate and evaluate the factors producing the spiritual and intellectual crises noted in their autobiographies and to contrast the two men in the light of their autobiographies, early correspondence, and early works.
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INTRODUCTION
The outstanding characteristic of the great autobiographies of English literary men of the Victorian Age is a feature which we may call storm and stress. In the autobiographical writings of Wordsworth, Newman, Carlyle, John Stuart Mill, Tennyson, and Ruskin we find a common denominator of personal mental crisis. We see that these individuals were confronted by new and startling ideas and movements far different from the life and thought and early environment of each individual’s youth. In each case the new ideas had such cogency that the men were abruptly halted in their earlier trends of thought by the apparent truth of these new and essentially different ideas. Then came a period of crisis for each man, a period of what Goethe calls the Sturm und Drang, or storm and stress, when each mind became an arena where old beliefs and new ideas wrestled in a death-like embrace. Eventually the crisis passes and the reborn mind emerged believing the new and casting aside the old.

Of the strictly prose autobiographies of the period we have selected those of Carlyle and Newman for our study, because Sartor Resartus and the Apologia Pro Vita Sua are the most religious of these works and because in the records of men’s religious crises we find the stress of belief, doubt, and eventual conversion most intense, most complete, and most vivid. In the last analysis no one can deny that religious experience, involving as it does both the emotions and the intellect of the thinking man, offers a potentially greater theatre of struggle than purely intellectual, non-religious speculation.
To understand the significance of these conversion-experiences of Carlyle and Newman we must understand the background of the age in which they lived and in which they underwent their spiritual crises. We must know the social, philosophical, and religious thought that constituted their environment; we must likewise know the actual social conditions of the day, because every man is, in some way or other, the product of the age in which he lived and died, either in the way he accepts or in the way he rejects contemporary values. Consequently we must look to the age itself as the first approach to our study of the man.

In our survey of the backgrounds of the age of Carlyle and Newman let us first consider the industrial revolution, for it produced on the one hand the materialism of wealthy employers which Carlyle so violently excoriated and on the other hand the poverty of the masses which aroused his pity and which contributed materially to the rapid rise of Evangelicism.

The life of the common people in England was very different in Carlyle's youth (1795 - 1825) from what it had been twenty five years before his birth. The industrial revolution had already started. England was rapidly changing from an agricultural country to a mercantile nation. The invention of machinery, the opening up of foreign markets, and the huge increase in population produced drastic changes in social and economic life.

The old English apprentice-system and hand-made goods gave way
to the modern factory where production and distribution were more economical than under the old system. The factories drew the rural population into urban centers where employees worked for considerably less than a living wage under the most laborious and most unsanitary conditions and where they lived in ramshackle hovels hardly worthy of the title "homes."

There was no alternative for the poor, because the old agrarian system of small holdings had broken down. The development of large estates had swallowed the holdings of the small farmer and reduced the rural poor to the rank of poorly paid laborers.

But if the manufacturing industries drew the common people into urban factories, the necessity of coal in this new age of steam likewise drew them into mines where their lot was no better than in the sweatshops of Glasgow, Birmingham, and Liverpool. The picture which the historians of the early nineteenth century give us is not a pleasant one; it is hard to believe that women and very young children worked in these mines as beasts of burden, drawing or pushing carts of coal through low passages where they could not stand but must crawl on hands and knees, with long chains extending from the carts between their legs, fastened to heavy leather belts about their naked waists.

We need hardly wonder that there was a continual clamor and occasional riot on the part of the poor for reform of conditions. They could do no more than that in those days before the advent of universal suffrage:

The laboring poor in the eighteenth century had enjoyed
many privileges, but they had lacked political power. This weakness proved their undoing alike in town and country, when the world of old custom, which had so long afforded them a partial shelter, was destroyed by the Industrial Revolution. When the common, the cow, the garden, the strip of cornland, the cottage industries, and the good wages of the early period disappeared together, the poor had no means of demanding analogous benefits under any new system. They had neither the influence nor the knowledge to plead so as to be heard, either before Parliament, or before their more immediate lords, the Justices of the Peace. (1)

There were attempts on the part of the men imbued with the humanitarian principles of the Romantic Movement or with an instinct for fair play to better the condition of the poor. Such extremely different men as William Cobbett, the fiery journalist and precursor of modern radicalism, and Robert Owen, a philanthropic owner of a humane and model factory in Glasgow, pointed out the crying need for social reform.

Owen proposed a Factory Act in 1815, the terms of which were met with raised eyebrows by Parliament. The proposed Act was considered far too kind at the time, though we should hardly think of it today as a betterment, as a real reform. The original Act provided:

first, to prevent children from being employed in cotton or other mills of machinery until they are twelve years old; secondly, that the hours of work in mills of machinery - including an hour and a half for meals and recreation - shall not exceed twelve per day; third, that, after a period to be fixed, no child should be received in a mill of machinery until he shall have been taught to read, to write a legible hand, and to understand the first rules of arithmetic; and the girls, in addition, to be taught to sew their common articles of clothing. (2)


(2) Beard, Charles, *The Industrial Revolution*, p. 74
Yet this bill was considered radical and required four years before it was passed in a form more considerate of the employer.

The struggle for reform was to be long and weary and the masses were to continue in misery for many years. It is hard for a modern age to understand that these conditions once prevailed:

Working class life, a hundred years ago, divided between the gloom of these dreary living quarters and the harsh discipline of the workshop, was uncheered by the many interests that now relieve the lot of the town dweller. Few of the workmen or their wives could read; the children had the factory and the slum, but not the school or the playground; holiday excursions and popular entertainments were rare, except some sporting events of a low type, such as setting on men, women, or animals to fight. In the vacant misery of such a life, two rival sources of consolation, drink and religion, strove for the souls of men. The annals of drink are much the same in all ages, though worse in ages of degradation. But the particular form that religion took (Evangelicism) among the workmen, influenced the course of political and social history. (3)

The intellectual life of the upper classes in the early years of the nineteenth century was still dominated by the works of the great writers of the preceding century and a half, the Age of Enlightenment. If one were asked to characterize briefly the general tone of contemporary culture he might safely say that materialistic scepticism was dominant. Locke, Hume, Gibbon, Voltaire, Bentham, and Adam Smith were still the outstanding writers of serious prose in the mind of the contemporary beau monde.

Locke's Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690) was the cornerstone of British empiricism and his Reasonableness of Christianity.

(3) Trevelyan, opus cit., p. 160
good Protestant though he professed himself to be, made human experience and pure reason the only basis of religion, cutting it off entirely from the miraculous and theological.

The pan-phenomenalism of David Hume (1711 - 1776) made him the outstanding sceptic in the history of British speculative thought. His *History of England* was not only pro-Tory but likewise pro-deist, thus making him a true prophet in the upper class eighteenth century enlightenment.

The agnostic Edward Gibbon (1737 - 1794) in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* made the rise of Christianity the cause of the fall of Rome and delighted to contrast Christianity unfavorably with the pagan civilization of the ancients.

Jeremy Bentham (1748 - 1832) was the leader of the new philosophy of utilitarianism which became widely known through his *Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1789). In this, as in other books he wrote, he constantly stressed the selfish fundamental principle of utilitarianism, namely, that the criterion of morality of an act consisted in the happiness of good or utility which it procured for the doer.

Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776) was the gospel of political economy during the course of the industrial revolution. Industry must be free of governmental control; free trade and monopolies must be tolerated. His *laissez - faire* became the cry of great merchants and industrialists in those days before the coming of modern planned economy.
Voltaire (1694 - 1778), clever, witty, cynical, a sceptic and a deist, became not only in his native France, but also throughout Europe, the greatest and most bitter enemy of ecclesiastical Christianity, whether Protestant or Catholic. Voltaire's destructive criticism owed it popularity partly to the witty but bitter attack of his genius upon l'infame and partly to the general vogue of deism which he had fervently embraced during his years in England.

Deism, the religious side of the Age of Enlightenment, had as its fundamental tenants the abolition of theological dogma and the acceptance of a purely natural religion. Though it was the product of a sceptical and classical age that the period of Enlightenment was, it owed much to Romanticism in general and to the primitivism of Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712 - 1778) in particular, as well as to the rise of the natural sciences.

In the seventeenth century, and to a great extent in the eighteenth, European intellectuals were signally impressed by reports from travellers, missionaries, and scholars of the naked savages in America who lived in simple piety, virtue, and happiness without priests, bibles, or creeds - without any knowledge of Christianity - and of the highly cultured natives of India and China whose religions were represented as being both more beneficial and more rational than Christianity. It may have been optimistic and a bit uncritical thus to attribute supreme virtue to the "noble savage" and the "Chinese sage", but these more or less hypothetical beings were invoked with telling effect as censorious critics of European faith and morals. Finally, there can be no doubt that the contemporary development of natural science and especially the rise of the new natural philosophy promoted rational scepticism. If the universe was a huge machine operating in accordance with natural law, what place was left in it for supernatural religion? Was not religion itself, like physics, simply natural? Could not true religion, like the law of gravitation, be discovered by the human reason, without recourse to "revelation" or "authority"? (4)

The city of Edinburgh and its University constituted a leading center of this worship of the Reason, and in such sceptical intellectual surroundings, both in the lecture room and in contemporary thought, young Carlyle was placed in 1809, when only fourteen years of age. In addition to the favored English and Scotch masterpieces of the Age of Enlightenment the books Carlyle borrowed from the University library included the works of the French Encyclopaedists. No eager young student could remain unaffected by the culture of the eighteenth century and a voracious reader like young Carlyle felt the force of his reading of French as well as British sceptics:

The great writers of the seventeenth century appear to have left him indifferent, but the Encyclopaedists and their Scottish and English followers affected his mind to a degree. The French writers of the eighteenth century reinforced Hume and Gibbon in their tendency to strip Carlyle of a belief in dogmatic Christianity. (5)

Consequently it is not strange that Carlyle had lost his religious faith by the time he was twenty one (1816), as he told William Allingham sixty-two years later when he described his first contact with death in his all-night vigil at the death-bed of his uncle and namesake, Thomas Carlyle, on June 9, 1816:

'It was then that I began to make reflections upon death.'
'Had you any kind of orthodox belief in your mind at that time?'
'No, I had given it all up some time before, but I said nothing about it one way or the other.' (6)

(5) Casamian, Louis, Carlyle, p. 29-30
(6) Allingham, William, Diary of William Allingham, p. 268
Evangelicism had arisen in the preceding century largely under the leadership of such men as the Wesley brothers. During the first quarter of the nineteenth century such Evangelical preachers and scholars as Robert Hall (1764 - 1831), Thomas Scott (1747 - 1821), and Charles Simeon (1759 - 1836) in England and Thomas Chalmers (1780 - 1847) and Edward Irving (1792 - 1834), Carlyle's friend, in Scotland maintained the pace set by the earlier leaders in gathering converts. Though England and Scotland were being evangelicized through the great efforts of its leaders, nevertheless it cannot be denied that Evangelicism, like all the forms of pietism then rampant throughout Catholic and Protestant Europe, supplied a need and fulfilled a function demanded of religion by the times. The culture of the Age of Enlightenment could offer only a cold and rationalistic scepticism and consequently men needed something for the natural fervor of their religious spirits. Moreover, Evangelicism arose and grew strong because of the everlasting disputations of rival religious sects. In its emphasis on the emotions it afforded a welcome relief from the aridities of theological argument as well as from the coldness of contemporary scepticism. Like other forms of pietism, Evangelicism had not originally arisen as a sect separate from the established ecclesiastical order, but only became such through the passing of the years.

The rapid growth of Evangelicism can be more easily understood when we consider the condition of the Established Church. Herbert and Crashaw were dead and the large part of the Anglican Church in these early years of the nineteenth century and in the preceding half century had apparently lost its vitality, its religious zeal. The Anglican ministers
we encounter in Jane Austen's novels are refined, gentle, sedate gentleman, but by no stretch of the imagination can we call them clergymen of fiery zeal. George Crabbe treated them satirically in his writings because of that very lack of fervor and zeal for souls. Neither were they well-trained in their professions, which was in itself excusable when we consider the state of lethargy into which Oxford and Cambridge had lapsed at the turn of the century. Some inkling of the manifest inadequacy of the large body of Anglican clergymen to cope with contemporary problems can be obtained from the following quotation:

England was probably the sole country in Christendom where no proof of theological knowledge was exacted from candidates for Ordination. These were all drawn from the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge; and neither of these Universities possessed a special organization for the teaching of Christian doctrines. At Oxford theology was reduced to one single question asked of all candidates for examination. At Cambridge no theology whatsoever entered into any of the examinations for a degree. The entrance examination once passed, and it was elementary in the extreme, not to say childish, students, who were not the eldest sons of gentle families, and did not possess sufficient industry or capacity to face more difficult examinations, could proceed without further delay to the clerical status. It is true that to hold any benefice, episcopal ordination was indispensable, and that ordination involved a preliminary examination by the bishop or his chaplain, whose object was, or was supposed to be, to discover the candidate's intellectual and moral endowments. But, as all the world knew, this examination was a mere formality. (9)

Naturally enough the common people turned from such clergy to the Evangelical ministers for consolation and spiritual uplift, leaving embarrassingly large voids in the Anglican churches on all occasions of religious observation:

(9) Halevy, Elie, History of the English People in 1815, pp. 342-343
The churches actually in existence were empty and a clergy devoid of conscientiousness or zeal had an interest in their remaining empty. Their work was the easier. But even had they all been filled, they would certainly have been insufficient to hold even a small minority of the population of England. Since 1768 neither bishops nor parsons had given a thought to the need of adapting the system to the increase of population and its altered distribution. (10)

If the pietism of the lower classes in the late eighteenth and and early nineteenth century had emptied the Anglican churches, the scepticism of the Age of Enlightenment also had its effect on Anglicanism in the rise of Noeticism or the Broad Church movement. Hugh Walker gives us the following amusing definition of Noeticism:

Though between the greatest of the Evangelicals and the Noetics there is a manifest kinship (absence of dogma), yet the latter breathed a different atmosphere. They were the "intelligent" of the Church, the men who laid emphasis on the "intelligible", the men to whom credo quia impossibile would itself have been impossible. In short, Noetic is "rationalistic" softened through the mist of the Greek language, so that to clerical ears it did not suggest all the dire associations of the latter word. It is difficult to read without a smile the explanations of friends of the Noetics that their rationalism is not the bad sort of rationalism. They seem to find the same sort of comfort in this that the child, fascinated and yet terrified by the story of a bear, finds in the assurance that this particular animal is a good bear. (11)

These were the men whom the Tractarians, particularly Newman, called the "liberals", men who were contented with a tolerance that bordered on indifference, men who would neither go over to Evangelicism nor to Rome or Romish Tractarianism, yet offered no alternative to the laity in their

(10) Halevy, Elie, opus cit., p. 349.
(11) Walker, Hugh, opus cit., p. 93.
antipathy to sectarianism. Curiously enough, Oriel College at Oxford was the home of the Noetic school just as it was later the center of Tractarianism. Richard Whately and Thomas Arnold and Hampden, three of the most prominent Noetics, had been fellows there and Copleston, another prominent Noetic, was its Provost from 1814 to 1828. Richard Whately is the Whately with whom Newman was for some time closely associated and of whom he speaks in the Apologia. (12)

"Germanism" or the school of the Coleridgeans took mystical elements from the German Romanticists and Idealists, particularly Kant and Hegel. It was really a transition from Noeticism to the later Broad Church, offering no distinctive dogmas of its own. (13) Among its leaders other than Coleridge was John Sterling (1806 - 1844), a close friend of Carlyle, Julius Hare (1795 - 1855), Sterling's friend, biographer, and superior during Sterling's short career as a minister, Frederick Denison Maurice (1805 - 1872), professor of moral theology at Cambridge, and Benjamin Jowett (1817 - 1893), distinguished exegesis and German scholar. The predilection of those men for German metaphysics constituted an intermediary by which the rationalism of the Noetics of the Enlightenment was toned down to the liberalism of the Broad Church of Newman's day.

Carlyle, the outstanding lover of German literature in England, was somewhat sceptical of the Germanistic or Coleridgean school as we can

(13) Walker, Hugh, opus cit, p. 99
readily see in his description of Coleridge and his disciples at Highgate, the motherhouse of Germanism. (14) The sage of Ecclefechan was not afraid to condemn the seer of Highgate:

His life had been an abstract, thinking, dreaming, idealistic, passed amid the ghosts of defunct bodies and of unborn ones. The meaning singing of that theosophico-metaphysical monotony left on you, at last, a very dreary feeling. (15)

He likewise ridiculed Coleridge's method of revivifying the Church through German transcendentalism in these sarcastic words:

By attending to the "reason" of man, said Coleridge, and duly chaining up the "understanding" of man: the Vernunft (Reason) and Verstand (Understanding) of the Germans, it all turned upon these, if you could well understand them - which you couldn't. (16)

Carlyle was, perhaps, a little severe in his castigation of Coleridge and the intricacies of Coleridgean speculation. Newman was more tolerant as we can readily see in his analysis of the good accomplished for Catholicism by the writings of Walter Scott and Coleridge:

While History in prose and verse was thus made the instrument of Church feelings and opinions, a philosophical basis for the same was laid in England by a very original thinker (Coleridge), who while he indulged a liberty of speculation, which no Christian can tolerate, and advocated conclusions which were often heathen rather than Christian, yet after instilled a higher philosophy into inquiring minds, than they had hitherto been accustomed to accept. In this way he made trial of his age and succeeded in interesting its genius in the cause of Catholic Truth. (17)

Finally in the religious movements of the day comes Tractarianism.

(14) Carlyle, Thomas, Life of John Sterling, p. 52 - 60.
(15) Carlyle, Thomas, Life of John Sterling, p. 56.
(16) Carlyle, Thomas, Life of John Sterling, p. 58.
a leaning toward Roman dogma and liturgy, an ultra-conservative reaction in a liberal age, looking toward primitive rather than modern Christianity for a sound basis. Tractarianism will be more fully treated in the chapter devoted to Newman; for the present it is sufficient to note that the High Church or Anglo-Catholic school of thought had persisted in the Established Church since the Reformation, having at times such outstanding leaders as Launcelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester (1555 - 1626) and William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury (1573 - 1645). (18)

Such were the social, intellectual, and religious backgrounds of the age in which Newman and Carlyle were born and spent the first thirty years of their lives. We need hardly wonder that the pessimistic Carlyle so frequently denounced the times and gave us such a black picture of the day as the following:

All science had become mechanical, the science not of men but of a kind of human beavers. Churches themselves had died away into a godless mechanical condition: and stood there as mere Cases of Articles, mere Forms of Churches; like the dried carcasses of once-swift camels, which you find withering in the thirst of the universal desert . . . . Men's souls were blinded, hebetated, and sunk under the influence of Atheism and Materialism and Hume and Voltaire: the world for the present was an extinct world, deserted of God, and incapable of well-being till it changed its heart and spirit. (19)

(19) Carlyle, Thomas, Life of John Sterling, p. 57
CARLYLE

"Love not pleasure; love God. This is the Everlasting Yes, wherein all contradiction is solved: wherein whoso walks and works, it is well with him."
Teufelsdrockh tells us what the condition of the irreligious man
or the Everlasting No is like:

Doubt had darkened into Unbelief; shade after shade goes grimly
over your soul, till you have the fixed Tartarean black. (23)

The unhappy victim of mechanistic science cries out wildly to the deist,
in impotent misery:

Is there no God, then; but at best an absentee God, sitting idle,
ever since the first Sabbath, at the outside of his Universe,
and seeing it go! . . . . . . . Thus has the bewildered Wanderer
to stand, as so many have done, shouting question after question
into the Sibyl-cave of Destiny, and receive no Answer but an
Echo. It is all a grim desert, this once fair world of his,
wherein is heard only the howling of wild beasts, or the shrieks
of despairing, hate-filled men; and no Pillar of Cloud by day,
and no Pillar of Fire by night, any longer guides the Pilgrim.
To such length has the spirit of Inquiry carried him. (24)

Why must this solitary individual cry out in this fashion? Has
not modern rationalism done the same to his fellows:

It is but the common lot in this era. Not having come to
spiritual majority prior to the Sicle de Louis Quinze, and not
being born purely a Loghead, thou hadst no other outlook. The
whole world is, like thee, sold to Unbelief; their old Temples
of the Godhead, which for long have not been rainproof, crumble
down; and men ask now. Where is the Godhead; our eyes never
saw him? (25)

Nevertheless, all the scepticism and rationalism and utilitarian-
ism and mechanism of the age could not entirely destroy conscience and love
for Truth and for God:

(23) Carlyle, Thomas, Sartor Resartus, p. 123.
Thus, in spite of all Motive-grinders and Mechanical Profit-and-Loss Philosophies, with the sick ophthalmia and hallucination they had brought on, was the Infinite nature of Duty still present to me: living without God in the world, of God's light I was not utterly bereft; if my as yet sealed eyes, with their un-speakable longing could nowhere see Him, nevertheless in my heart He was present, and His heaven-written Law still stood legible and sacred there. (26)

Yet he knew that he was weak and had accomplished nothing, his misery being thus intensified:

A certain inarticulate Self-consciousness dwells dimly in us; which only our Works can render articulate and decisively discernible. Our Works are the mirror wherein the spirit first sees its natural lineaments. Hence, too, the folly of that impossible Precept, Know thyself; till it be translated into this partially possible one, Know what thou canst work at.

But for me, so strangely unprosperous had I been, the net result of my Workings amounted as yet simply to - Nothing. How then could I believe in my Strength, when there was as yet no mirror to see it in? Ever did this agitating, yet, as I now perceive, quite frivolous question, remain to me insoluble; Hast thou a certain Faculty, a certain Worth, such even as the most have not; or art thou the completest Dullard of these modern times? Alas the fearful Unbelief is unbelief in yourself; and how could I believe? Had not my first, last faith in myself, when even time the Heavens seemed laid open, and I dared to love, been all too cruelly belied? The speculative Mystery of Life grew more mysterious to me: neither in the practical Mystery had I made the slightest progress, but been everywhere buffered, foiled, and contemptuously cast out. A feeble unit in the middle of a threatening Infinitude, I seemed to have nothing given me but eyes, whereby to discern my own wretchedness. (27)

In the passage just cited we can readily see the effects on his own bitter poverty as a student at Edinburgh and afterwards, the effects of

(26) Carlyle, Thomas, Sartor Resartus, p. 125.
his dissatisfaction with teaching, of his loss of faith in the ecclesiastical order and consequent aversion to the ministry, and the effect of his unsuccessful first love. All these things were enough to keep him in that terrible state of unhappiness which became more and more miserable till we get this very dramatic picture of it:

Some comfort it would have been could I, like a Faust, have fancied myself tempted and tormented of the Devil; for a Hell, as I imagine, without Life, though only diabolic Life, were more frightful: but in our age of Down-pulling and Disbelief, the very Devil has been pulled down, you cannot so much as believe in a Devil. To me the Universe was all void of Life, of Purpose, of Volition, even of Hostility: it was one huge, dead, immeasurable Steam-engine, rolling on, in its dead indifference, to grind me limb from limb. Oh, the vast, gloomy, solitary Golgotha, and Mill of Death! Why was the Living banished thither companionless, conscious, Why, if there is no Devil; may, unless the Devil is your God? (28)

This state of mind was too bitter and too pessimistic to be permanent in any human being and eventually the hold of gloom is broken one happy day in the Rue Saint - Thomas de l' Enfer:

Thus had the Everlasting No pealed authoritatively through all the recesses of my Being, of my Me; and then was it that my whole Me stood up, in Native God - created majesty, and with emphasis recorded its Protest. Such a Protest, the most important transaction in Life, may that same Indignation and Defiance, in apsychological point of view, be fitly called. The Everlasting No had said: Behold, thou art fatherless, outcast, and the Universe is mine (the Devil's); to which my whole Me now made answer: I am not thine, but Free, and forever hate thee! (29)

Teufelsdroch, Carlyle's alter ego, then described the Centre of

(28) Carlyle, Thomas, Sartor Resartus, p. 126.
(29) Carlyle, Thomas, Sartor Resartus, p. 128.
Indifference or transitional state between the Everlasting No and the Everlast- 
ning Yea "through which whose travels from the Negative to the Positive 
must necessarily pass" (30) and the manner in which the Everlasting Yea 
asumes control:

The hot Harmattan wind had raged itself out; its howl went 
silent within me; and the long-deafened soul could now hear. I 
paused in my wild wanderings; and sat me down to wait, and con-
sider; for it was as if the hour of change drew nigh. I seemed 
to surrender, to renounce utterly, and say: Fly, then, false 
shadows of Hope; I will chase you no more, I will believe you no 
more. And ye too, haggard spectres of Fear, I care not for you; 
ye too are all shadows and a lie. Let me rest here: for I am 
way-weary and life-weary; I will rest here, were it but to die: 
to die or to live is alike to me; alike insignificant. - And 
again: Here, then, as I lay in that Centre of Indifference: 
est, doubtless by benignant upper Influence, into a healing 
sleep, the heavy dreams rolled gradually away, and I awoke to 
a New Heaven and a New Earth. The first preliminary moral Act, 
Annihilation of Self, had been happily accomplished; and my 
mind's eyes were now unsealed and its hands ungved. (31)

This "Annihilation of Self" is the positive element of the Ever-
lasting Yea, the first principle in the practice of the new Gospel. His 
dawning perception of it is poetically expressed:

There is in man a Higher than Love of Happiness: he can do 
without Happiness and instead thereof find Blessedness! Was it 
not to preach forth this same Higher that sages and martyrs, the 
Poet and the Priest, in all times, have spoken and suffered; bear-
ing testimony, through life and through death, of the Godlike 
that is in Man, and how in the Godlike only has he Strength and 
Freedom? . . . Love not Pleasure; love God. This is the 
Everlasting Yea, wherein all contradiction is solved: wherein 
whose walks and works, it is well with him. (32)

(30) Carlyle, Thomas, Sartor Resartus, p. 139.

(31) Carlyle, Thomas, Sartor Resartus, p. 141.

The necessity of a positive rule of like is further emphasized in his admission of the futility of Christianity and in his rejection of the man who points out that futility but who has no working rule of life to offer in its place:

"Cease, my much respected Herr von Voltaire . . . . shut thy sweet voice; for the task appointed thee seems finished. Sufficiently hast thou demonstrated this proposition, considerable or otherwise: That the Mythus of the Christian Religion looks not in the eighteenth century as it did in the eighth. . . . But what next? Wilt thou help us to embody the divine Spirit of that Religion in a new Mythus, in a new vehicle and venture, that our souls, otherwise too like perishing, may live? What! thou hast no faculty in that kind? Only a torch for burning, no hammer for building? Take our thanks, then, and thyself away. (33)

In place of the outworn Christianity and following as a necessary consequence upon the "Annihilation of Self" is the famous Gospel of Work:

"But indeed Conviction, were it never so excellent, is worthless till it convert itself into Conduct. Nay properly Conviction is not possible till then; inasmuch as all Speculation is by nature endless, formless, a vortex amid vortices, only a felt indubitable certainty of Experience does it find any centre to revolve round, and so fashion itself into a system. Most true is it, as a wise man teaches us, that "Doubt of any sort cannot be removed except by Action". (34)

He then goes on in highly poetic and even mystical language to develop the theme of Work and ends with a crescendo of exhortation:

"I too could now say to myself: Be no longer a Chaos, but a World, or even Worldkin. Produce! Produce! Were it but the pitifullest infinitesimal fraction of a Product, produce it, in

---

(33) Carlyle, Thomas, Sartor Resartus, pp. 146 - 147.

(34) Carlyle, Thomas, Sartor Resartus, p. 148.
Thus ends the chapter entitled The Everlasting Yea. The whole story of conflict fits in perfectly with the Sturm und Drang or intense personal ordeal of the nineteenth century man. All the elements are there: the wandering but persistent quest for faith, the long period of unhappiness and dissatisfaction with one's outlook on life, the dawn of new hope and the acquisition of new faith and of new principles of guidance arising out of that moment when the soul rebels in revulsion from its ordeal of unhappiness and despair. The language in which that period of great mental stress is recorded is vivid, picturesque, and almost mystic; but to translate it into the language of the twentieth century, to denude it of the author's theatrical terminology, to examine those influences and factors which created the problem and those which solved it is necessary for a clear conception of Carlyle's struggle.

Carlyle was one of eight children of a lower middle class family living in the little village of Ecclefeshan about twenty miles from the English border. Though the Carlyles seemed to have a somewhat more secure economic standing than the majority of their neighbors, their living was very frugal:

The Scotch standard of living was low; the quarters of the family of ten were crowded, especially for sleeping, and the food was

(35) Carlyle, Thomas, Sartor Resartus, p. 149.
potatoes, milk, and the national oatmeal, seldom varied by meat or other luxuries. (36)

If physical conditions were simple, the atmosphere of the family circle was equally Spartan and was in some ways a practical application of the Gospel of Work which the most famous member of the family was to preach in years to come:

Frugality and assiduity, a certain grave composure, an earnestness (not without its constraint, then felt as oppressive a little, yet which now yields its fruit) were the order of our household. We were all particularly taught that work (temporal or spiritual) was the only thing we had to, and incited always to do it well. An inflexible element of authority surrounded us all. We felt from the first (a useful thing), that our own wish had often nothing to say in the matter. (37)

The religion of the Carlyles was a severe Calvinism quite in keeping with the rigorous simplicity of their lives. Carlyle gave us an amusing and yet pathetic picture of the strict religious atmosphere that dominated the home of his parents when he related to his friend, William Allingham, many years afterwards, how, as an imaginative boy of fifteen, he questioned his mother about the life of Christ:

'Did God almighty come down to make wheelbarrows in a shop?' She lay awake at night for hours praying and weeping bitterly. (38)

This strict code did not deprive the family of love and kindness. Carlyle's letters to his parents are always very affectionate and

the warmth and tenderness of his description of their domestic life in
the Reminiscences makes it a classic of filial devotion.

Parental kindness was responsible for sending him to the Univer-
sity of Edinburgh in 1809 when he was only fourteen years old. Here he
was enrolled for the next four years in preparation for the ministry, spend-
ing his summers at home helping his father. His university career was not
unusually successful and he found himself just a poor student in this old
city. His poverty and his provincialism excluded him from the social life
of Edinburgh and we find him seeking solace in his studies, particularly
mathematics and science, and in wide and varied reading. He had as his
teachers in mathematics and science John Leslie and John Playfair, two of
the most prominent figures in this period of the rise of natural science.
The Common Sense school of philosophy was having its golden day in Edin-
burgh with its leaders Dugald Stewart and Thomas Brown occupying pro-
fessorial chairs. During these years in the course of his voracious
reading he read such eighteenth century classics as Locke's Essay on the

With the degree of Master of Arts he left Edinburgh in 1814 to
take a position as teacher in the academy at Annan, preferring to give up
four years of resident work in theology at Edinburgh for six years study
in absentia at the conclusion of which he was to return for ordination.

His four years of what was supposed to be training for the mi-
nistry had left him with doubt of Christianity implanted in his mind; the
atmosphere of Edinburgh was deistic rather than Christian:
In his first year at the University the keen-witted boy had detected from the tone of their lectures the amusement of some of his professors at the simplicity which accepted the Scriptures literally. Close cultural contact with eighteenth century France had permeated the upper classes with the sceptical spirit of Voltaire and the Encyclopaedists, among whom David Hume had been a favorite visitor. Edinburgh had made him its idol and had named the street in which he lived St. David's in affectionate humor. Clergymen had fallen out of the highest society because they were not considered sufficiently enlightened, and deism, even atheism, was a mark of cultivation. (39)

In an age of such sceptical cast men could hardly be excluded from the clergy because of liberalism as regards dogma and no doubt many entered the ministry without any great store of piety. Carlyle had not fully given up the idea of the Church as a profession as yet, as we can see from the following account of a rather frivolous and worldly attitude for one who was preparing for the ministry:

About Christmas time (1815) I had gone with great pleasure to see Edinburgh again and read in Divinity Hall a Latin discourse - 'exegesis' they call it there - on the question. 'Num detur religio naturalis?' It was the second, and proved to be the last, of my performances on that treatise. My first, an English sermon on the words, 'Before I was afflicted I went astray, but now' etc. etc., a very weak, flowery, and sentimental piece had been achieved in 1814, a few months after my leaving for Annan. Piece second, too, I suppose, was weak enough, but I still remember the kind of innocent satisfaction I had in turning it into Latin in my solitude, and my slight and momentary (by no means deep or sincere) sense of pleasure in the bits of compliments and flimsy approbation from comrades and professors on both these occasions. Before Christmas day, I had got rid of my exegesis and had still a week of holiday ahead for old acquaintances and Edinburgh things, which was the real charm of my official errand thither. (40)

(39) Neff, Emery, Carlyle, p. 29 - 30.

(40) Carlyle, Thomas, Reminiscences, I, p. 92 - 93.
Num destur religio naturalis! The lukewarm postulant showed himself endowed with a great deal of Scotch shrewdness when he chose such a subject for a discourse at the University with its eighteenth century deism and its liberal theology.

In 1816 Carlyle accepted a position as teacher in the town of Kirkaldy where the pay was greater and where Edinburgh was less distant. There he met Edward Irving, a rival schoolmaster only three years older than Carlyle, a candidate for the ministry, a graduate of Edinburgh, a man of sound intelligence and much reading. Unlike Carlyle, he was devout and looked forward to the ministry; years later he was to become a well known Evangelist. They became close friends and spent most of their leisure time together, reading and discussing what they had read.

At the request of Irving, Carlyle and he visited the Church of Dr. Thomas Chalmers, the leader of the Evangelical party of the National Church of Scotland, but the eloquence of this famous preacher was not enough to have any spiritual effect on Carlyle.

Carlyle did not make the required third trial discourse for the ministry in 1817. He had apparently given up the Church as a profession.

Stronger than Irving's efforts to convert him were the books in Irving's well-stocked library. Gibbon, in particular, undid whatever good Irving might have accomplished or have hoped to accomplish:

Irving's library was of great use to me; Gibbon, Hume, etc. I think I must have read it almost through, . . . . Gibbon, in particular, I recollect to have read at the rate of a volume a day (twelve volumes in all); . . . . it was of all the books,
perhaps the most impressive on me in my then stage of investigation and state of mind. I by no means completely admired Gibbon, perhaps not more than I now do; but his winged sarcasms, so quiet and yet so conclusively transpiercing and killing dead, were often admirable, potent, and illuminative to me. (41)

The development in unbelief, completed by Gibbon, is traced from his University days on in a few words spoken to Allingham nearly sixty years later:

The Mathematical Professor had no single work of encouragement or advice to give me. I studied the Evidence of Christianity for several years, with the greatest desire to be convinced, in vain. I read Gibbon, and then first clearly saw that Christianity was not true. Then came the most trying time of my life. I should either have gone mad or made an end of myself had I not fallen in with some very superior minds. (42)

In this state of mind he could not go on to the ministry. Teaching bored him and paid poorly. A new career must be found. He had become more conscious of his poverty and poor prospects when he met the beautiful Margaret Gordon; a man in his economic status could not expect a successful romance. Consequently he resigned his position in the Kircaldy school in the autumn of 1819.

He went to Edinburgh to study law on his scanty savings and on what he could earn as a private tutor. He saw about him the misery of the poor, for both Edinburgh and Glasgow were undergoing a severe depression and in Glasgow, the more industrial city of the two, riots and strikes were

(41) Carlyle, Thomas, Reminiscences, I, p. 102.

(42) Allingham, William, opus cit., p. 232.
the order of the day. His sense of justice and his social intelligence excited by the social crises of the day distracted his attention from the study of law and he gave it up in the spring of 1820. The conditions of the poor were much worse in Glasgow than in Edinburgh and after a short stay of a month in these uncongenial and miserable surroundings he returned to Edinburgh.

Financial worries, stomach trouble, his own failure in making a place for himself, loss of faith, failure in love were making his life very unhappy and he was reaching the depths of the Everlasting No:

Enforced idleness . . . . made him brood upon the physical and emotional ills and upon the wrongs of the industrious poor. The only theory of the world that satisfied his intellect was the materialism in which Edinburgh was steeped, and into which he had been plunged since he had sought in mathematics the certainty he was losing in theology. The simple, self-contained, abstract system of Newtonian physics was the ideal sought for in every department of thought; in the philosophy of Locke and Brown, the ethics of Paley, the politics of Rousseau, Paine, and the Jacobins, the philosophic history of Voltaire and Gibbon, and the political economy of the school of Adam Smith. It was reflected in the aridity of the metaphysical discussion in which Edinburgh delighted; in the old formality of Edinburgh society. It formed a convenient creed for the rising middle class, resting on the axioms of private property and economic individualism, unqualified by obligations toward less fortunate fellowmen, which had created industrial Glasgow. All was clear, demonstrable; but selfish, cold, and comfortless. (43)

This was the Everlasting No, the "grim desert", "the whole world sold to Unbelief", "living without God", the consciousness of being "a feeble unit in the middle of a threatening infinitude", "the vast, gloomy,

(43) Neff, Emery, Carlyle, p. 52 - 53.
solitary, Golgotha and Mill of Death". This is the "most trying time of
my life". (44)

What brought him out of this state of unhappiness? What produced
the Everlasting Yea, shorn of its picturesque and dramatic literary fea-
tures? What were the influences and factors which caused him to say the
following, fifty years later after the wild conversion experience had
settled down through the passage of time into a less stormy state of con-
viction:

I should either have gone mad or made an end of myself had
I not fallen in with some very superior minds. (45)

Who were the superior minds and how did they help him? Carlyle's
situation and the steps he took to remedy it have been thus summarized:

Turned from divinity by "his grave prohibitive doubts", and
barred from the law because convinced that it and all connected
with it "were mere denizens of the kingdom of dullness", Carlyle
was by a sort of compulsion driven towards literature. That alone
promised what was indispensable to him - freedom and an opening
to the ideal. But the literature which would serve Thomas Car-
lyle must be a literature of thought and of spiritual truth, not
of mere form. He had already absorbed what the literature of
England in the eighteenth century could give him. He had found
it to be essentially destructive, and the influence of Gibbon
had merely deepened the doubts which beset him. Neither could
he find help from France. Her negative attitude of mind, the
scepticism of the Encyclopaedists, the perisflage of Voltaire,
were objects of life-long dislike to him. There was much in
the recent literature of England which might have served him
better; but while, as the essays on Voltaire and on Diderot prove,
Carlyle could be wonderfully just to characters most diverse
from his own, a necessary condition was that they must be suffi-
ciently removed from him in time or space or both. The calm

(44) Allingham, William, opus cit., p. 232.
(45) Allingham, William, opus cit., p. 232.
The wisdom of Wordsworth and the manly sense of Scott were to him of no avail, because these men stood too near him.

Carlyle was adrift. Some one told him that German literature would give him what he wanted, and he turned to it. This was in 1819, a time of deep despondency, two years before that "Spiritual New-Birth, or Baphometic Fire-baptism", which took place in the Rue Saint Thomas de l'Enfer, known on earth as Leith Walk. (46)

In the philosophy of the Germans Carlyle found the answer for which he had been looking, the answer to the spiritual bankruptcy of Hume's sensism. In the State of German Literature (1827) he shows us how the Germans have answered Hume:

They deny his first principle, that Sense is the only inlet of knowledge, that experience is the primary ground of belief. Their Primitive Truth, however, they seek, not historically and by experiment, in the universal persuasion of men, but by intuition, in the deepest and purest nature of Man. Instead of attempting, which they consider vain, to prove the existence of God, Virtue, an immaterial soul, by inferences drawn as the conclusion of all Philosophy, from the world of Sense, they find these things written at the beginning of all Philosophy, in obscured but ineffaceable characters, within our immost being; and themselves first affording any certainty and clear meaning to that very world of Sense, by which we endeavor to demonstrate them. God is, nay alone is, for with like emphasis we cannot say that anything else is. This is the Absolute, the Primitively True, which the philosopher seeks. Endeavoring by logical argument, to prove the Existence of God, a Kantist might say, would be like taking out a candle to look for the sun; nay, gaze steadily into your candle-light, and the sun himself may be invisible. (47)

It should be noticed that he uses the word "Kantist" rather than "Kant". Most of his knowledge of German philosophy came to him through

(47) Carlyle, Thomas, Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, I, p. 78.
the disciples rather than the master, for he found the writing of the professor of Koenigsburg obscure, albeit true.

To an exoteric reader the philosophy of Kant almost always appears to invert the common maxim: its end and aim seems not to be "to make abstruse things simple, but to make simple things abstruse." Often a proposition of inscrutable and dread aspect, when resolutely grappled with, and torn from its shady den, and its bristling entrenchments of uncouth terminology, and dragged forth into the open light of day, to be seen by the natural eye, and tried by merely human understanding, proves to be a very harmless truth, familiar to us from of old, sometimes so familiar as to be a truism . . . . We have been compelled to offer these remarks on Kant's philosophy; but it is right to add that they are the result of only very limited acquaintance with the subject . . . . To call Kant's system a laborious dream, and its adherents crazy mystics, is a brief method, brief but false. (48)

He had ridiculed Coleridge's juggling of the Reason and the Understanding (49), but in the State of German Literature Carlyle showed how German philosophy had profited by the distinction made between the two, avoiding thus the pitfalls into which English philosophy had fallen:

Reason discerns Truth itself, the absolutely and primitively True, while Understanding discerns only relations and cannot decide without if. The proper province of Understanding is all, strictly speaking, real, practical and material knowledge, Mathematics, Physics, Political Economy, the adaptation of means to ends in the whole business of life. In this province it is the strength and Universal implement of the mind; an indispensable servant, without which, indeed, existence itself would be impossible. Let it not step beyond this province, however; not usurp the province of Reason, which it is appointed to obey, and cannot rule over without ruin to the whole spiritual man. Should Understanding attempt to prove the existence of God, it ends, if thorough going and consistent with itself, in Atheism, or a faint possible Theism, which scarcely differs from this; should it speculate on Virtue, it ends in Utility, making Prudence and a sufficiently cunning love of Self the

(48) Carlyle, Thomas, Life of Friedrich Schiller, p. 110 - 111.
(49) Carlyle, Thomas, Life of John Sterling, p. 58.
highest good. Consult Understanding about the Beauty of Poetry, and it asks, Where is this Beauty, or discovers it at length in rhythms and fitnesses, and male and female rhymes. Witness also its everlasting paradoxes on Necessity and the Freedom of the Will; its ominous silence on the end and meaning of man; on the enigma which under such inspection the whole purport of existence becomes. (50)

Jean Paul Richter, the great German Romanticist, has often been the object of both praise and blame for the influence he had in forming the bizarre, choppy, and picturesque style that is known in English literature as Carlylese; but the influence of Richter on Thomas Carlyle did not end with style, for his life was paralleled to Carlyle's own. In fact Carlyle's description of Jean Paul is almost self-portrayal:

Richter's philosophy is not mechanical or sceptical; it springs not from the forum or the laboratory, but from the depths of the human spirit; and yields as its fairest product a noble system of Morality, and the firmest conviction of Religion. To a careless reader he might seem the wildest of infidels; for nothing can exceed the freedom with which he bandies to and from the dogma of religion, nay, sometimes, the highest objects of Christian reverence . . . . . Yet, independently of all dogmas, nay perhaphs in spite of many, Richter is, in the highest sense of the word, religious. A reverence, not a self-interested fear, but a noble reverence for the spirit of all goodness, forms the crown and glory of his culture . . . . . An intense and continual faith in man's immortality and native grandeur accompanies him; from amid the vortices of life he looks up to a heavenly loadstar; the solution of what is visible and transient, he finds in what is invisible and eternal. He had doubted, he denies, yet he believes. (51)

Richter's life was similar to that of two other great contemporary Romanticists in Germany, Schiller and Goethe; Carlyle found further solace

(50) Carlyle, Thomas, Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, I, p. 79 - 80.
in these men because of the similarity of their ordeals to his own:

Like Schiller and Goethe, Jean Paul had been confronted with the problem of creating out of his own unhappiness a philosophy of experience. Like Schiller, he had fought with poverty, obscurity, ill health, and religious doubt. It was thus Jean Paul's character, as well as his creative works, which gave him a high place in Carlyle's mind. Intellectually, Richter seemed as striking an analogue to Carlyle's experience as he was morally. He fought the rationalist philosophy of his times. (52)

Undoubtedly the most influential of the Germans upon Carlyle was Goethe, if we are to believe the words of Carlyle himself.

In the Sartor Resartus when preaching the annihilation of Self and when commanding men to "love not Pleasure, love God" he makes this his battle cry: Close thy Byron; open thy Goethe. (53)

In a letter to Goethe on August 20, 1827, Carlyle pays homage:

Your works have been a mirror to me; unmasked and unhoped for, your wisdom has counselled me; and so peace and health of My Soul have visited me from afar. For I was once an Unbeliever, not in Religion only, but in all the Mercy and Beauty of which it is the true symbol; storm-tossed in my own imagination; a man divided from men; exasperated, wretched, driven almost to despair . . . . . But now, thank Heaven, all this is altered. (54)

In a letter written on the fifteen day of the preceding April he had said to Goethe:

(52) Harrold, Charles Frederick, Carlyle and German Thought, 1819 - 1834, p. 17.
(53) Carlyle, Thomas, Sartor Resartus, p. 145.
(54) Norton, Charles, Eliot, Correspondence between Carlyle and Goethe, p. 34.
If I have been delivered from darkness into light, any measure of light, if I know aught of myself and my duties and destination, it is to the study of your writings more than to any other circumstance that I owe this; it is you more than any other man that I should always thank and reverence with the feeling of a Disciple to his Master, nay, of a Son to his spiritual Father. This is no idle compliment, but a heartfelt truth; and humble as it is I feel that the knowledge of such truths must be more pleasing to you than all other glory. (55)

Four years later he was still conscious of that debt to the old man in Weimar as we can see in this letter of June 10, 1831:

Daily must I send affectionate wishes thither; daily must I think, and oftentimes speak also, of the Man to whom, more than to any other living, I stand indebted and united. For it can never be forgotten that to him I owe the all-previous knowledge and experience that Reverence is still possible, nay Reverence for our fellow man, even in these perturbed chaotic times. (56)

No one can doubt the sincerity of those letters to Goethe, particularly when they are reinforced by the testimony of Carlyle's Reminiscences, written many years after Goethe's death. Speaking of his spiritual condition when translating Goethe's Wanderjahre in 1826, Carlyle gives us these words of his matured mind:

This year I found that I had conquered all my scepticisms, agonising doubtings, fearful wrestlings with the foul and vile and self-murdering Mud-gods of my Epoch . . . . and was emerging free of spirit, into the eternal blue of the ether . . . . I, poor, obscure, without outlook, almost without worldly hope, had become independent of the world . . . . I understood well what the old Christian people meant by their 'Conversion', by God's Infinite Mercy to them . . . . I then felt, and still feel, endlessly indebted to Goethe in the business, he, in his

(55) Norton, Charles Eliot, Correspondence between Carlyle and Goethe, p. 7.
(56) Norton, Charles Eliot, Correspondence between Carlyle and Goethe, p. 279 - 280.
fashion, I perceived, had traveled the steep, rocky road before me, — the first of the moderns. (57)

In his essay Goethe written in 1826 two years after he had translated the *Wanderjahre* he extols the great German's ability as the teacher of the Age:

But Goethe besides appears to us as a person of that deep endowment, and gifted vision, of that experience also and sympathy in the ways of all men, which qualify him to stand forth, not only as the literary ornament, but in many respects too as the Teacher and exemplar of his age. For, to say nothing of his natural gifts, he has cultivated himself and his art, he has studies how to live and to write, with a fidelity, an unwearyed earnestness, of which there is no other living instance; of which, among British poets especially, Wordsworth alone offers any resemblance. And this in our view is the result: To our minds, in these soft melodious imaginations of his, there is embodied the Wisdom which is proper to this time; the beautiful, the religious Wisdom, which may still, with something of its old impressiveness speak to the whole soul; still in these hard, unbelieving utilitarian days, reveal to us glimpses of the Unseen, but not Unreal World, that so the Actual and the Ideal may again meet together and clear Knowledge be again wedded to Religion, in the life and business of men. (58)

Despite the fact that Carlyle traced his spiritual rebirth to the Germans and particularly to Goethe, the observant reader of Carlyle cannot fail to note that Carlyle has never systematically outlined the case against English Empiricism. He preferred the intuitive knowledge of the Germans and he presented the idealistic starting point of the German


school in clear terms, but he never showed why that idealistic starting point of intuitive knowledge should be accepted rather than the sense-
realism of the empiricist. Granting the Kantian distinction of the Reason
and the Understanding, faith was safe in the protection of the Reason from
the less spiritual and almost materialistic Understanding. English Empi-
ricism provided no such loophole for faith in God, and various forms of
skepticism were the logical conclusion; this was, in fact, the theme of
his exposition of the German philosopher's starting point in the State of
German Literature. (59)

Carlyle's lack of systematic philosophical thought was one of
the factors which impelled one modern student of Carlyle to make this very
accurate statement:

The great influence which came to Carlyle through all these
works was primarily psychological. That is why Goethe remained
for him the chief influence to the end of his life. What Goethe
fundamentally taught him was faith in himself. (60)

A statement made by Carlyle to Allingham concerning his skeptic-
ism and his debt to Goethe would seem to confirm Harrold's opinion:

This went on for about ten years. Goethe drove me out of
it, taught me that the true things in Christianity survived and
were eternally true; pointed out to me the real nature of life
and things - not that he did this directly; but incidentally,
and let me see it rather than told me. This gave me peace and
great satisfaction. (61)

(59) Carlyle, Thomas, Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, I, p. 78.
(60) Harrold, Charles Frederick, Carlyle and German Thought, 1819 -
1834, p. 11.
(61) Allingham, William, opus cit, p. 253.
The clearest statement of Carlyle's final view of religion was never written by himself; it was stated in a conversation with Allingham and faithfully recorded by this good friend the same day, November 14, 1878:

Carlyle spoke of the folly of Tyndall and others who went on about the origin of things; 'I long ago perceived that no man could know anything about that; but that the Universe could come together by chance was, and is, altogether incredible. The evidence to me of God - and the only evidence is the feeling I have down in the very bottom of my heart of right and truth and justice. I believed that all things are governed by Eternal Goodness and Wisdom, and not otherwise; but we cannot see and never shall see how it is all managed. (62)

NEWMAN

"Ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem."
In at least one respect Newman's *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* stands far above the other autobiographical works of the age, because it is the most religious of all these stories of personal crisis and consequently it gives us the best version of the storm and stress theme. In the first place, unlike the *Sartor Resartus*, the *Apologia* was written not merely as a piece of literature but as the attempt of a highly religious man to clear himself of charges of deception which had been publicly attributed to him by Charles Kingsley, a prominent historian. Thus Newman wrote the *Apologia* in a very short space of time as a vindication of himself and of his religious development; his purpose and his distress can be seen from the words of the preface to the first edition of the book:

I am not expounding Catholic doctrine, I am doing no more than explaining myself, and my opinions and my actions. I wish, as far as I am able, simply to state facts, whether they are ultimately determined to be for or against me . . . . . this is a case above all others, in which I am bound to follow my own lights and to speak out my own heart. It is not at all pleasant for me to be egotistical; nor to be criticized for being so. It is not pleasant to reveal to high and low, young and old, what has gone on within me from my early years. It is not pleasant to be giving to every shallow or flippant disputant the advantage over me of knowing my most private thoughts; I might even say the intercourse between myself and my Maker. But I do not like to be called to my face a liar and a knave; nor should I be doing my duty to my faith or my name, if I were to suffer it. I know I have done nothing to deserve such an insult; and if I prove this, as I hope to do, I must not care for such incidental annoyances as are involved in the process. (63)

Not only was Newman's autobiography written in a state of mental stress, but it was recording a problem of definite dogmatic belief unlike

the unsystematic religious longings of Carlyle.

Carlyle's family lived in a poor village of Scotland, while Newman was born in London, the son of a prosperous middle class family. Life in the Newman home was religious:

I was brought up from a child to take great delight in reading the Bible; but I had no formed religious convictions till I was fifteen. Of course I had a perfect knowledge of my Catechism. (64)

Newman, like Carlyle, came into contact with the scepticism of the preceding century and a half at an early age, but remained comparatively unaffected:

When I was fourteen, I read Paine's Tracts Against the Old Testament, and found pleasure in thinking of the objections which were contained in them. Also, I read some of Hume's Essays; and perhaps that on Miracles. So at least I gave my father to understand; but perhaps it was a brag. Also, I recollect copying out some French verses, perhaps Voltaire's, in denial of the immortality of the soul, and saying to myself something like "How dreadful, but how plausible!". (65)

The scepticism of the enlightenment did not get a good opportunity to infect Newman's mind, because in the following year an event occurred which marked the beginning of a lifelong interest in theological reading:

When I was fifteen (in the autumn of 1816) a great change of thought took place in me. I fell under the influence of a definite creed, and received into my intellect impressions of dogma, which, through God's mercy, have never been affaced or

(64) Newman, John Henry, Apologia, p. 20.
obscured. Above and beyond the conversations and sermons of the excellent man, long dead, the Reverend Walter Mayers, of Pembroke College, Oxford, who was the human means of this beginning of divine faith in me, the effect of the books which he put into my hands, chiefly of the school of Calvin. (66)

In December, 1816 Newman matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, where he enjoyed throughout his undergraduate years the opportunities of reading the works of the leading divines of the Anglican Church and of hearing the outstanding preachers. He read Joseph Milner's Church History and confesses that he "was nothing short of enamored of the long extracts from St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and the other Fathers which I found there." (67)

From Thomas Newton's Dissertation on the Prophecies he received the idea that the Pope was Antichrist, an outlook which was inconsistent with that obtained from Milner, as Newman himself admitted:

My imagination was stained by the effects of this doctrine up to the year 1843; it had been obliterated from my reason and judgement at an earlier date; but the thought remained upon me as a sort of false conscience. Hence came that conflict of mind, which so many have felt besides myself; - leading some men to make a compromise between two ideas, so inconsistent with each other, - driving others to beat out the one idea or the other from their minds, - and ending in my own case, after many years of intellectual unrest, in the gradual decay and extinction of one of them. (68)

In 1821 Newman was made a Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, the

stronghold of the Liberal or Noetic party in the Anglican Church. The
Noetics or Liberals had risen to prominence a few years before through
the ability of their leaders who discussed the religious questions of
the day in the Common Room of Oriel:

Under the leadership of Whately, questions were asked
about what was supposed to be beyond dispute with both Church-
men and Evangelicals. Current phrases, the keynotes of many a
sermon, were fearlessly taken to pieces. Men were challenged
to examine the meaning of their words. They were cautioned or
ridiculed as the case might be on the score of "confusion of
thought" and "inaccuracy of mind;" they were convicted of
great logical sins, ignorantia elenchi, or undistributed middle
terms; and bold theories began to make their appearance about
religious principles and teaching, which did not easily accomo-
date themselves to popular conceptions. In very different ways
and degrees, Davison, Copleston, Whately, Hawkins, Milman, and
not least, a brilliant naturalized Spaniard, Blanco White, had
broken through a number of accepted opinions, and had presented
some startling ideas to men who had thought that all religious
questions lay between the orthodoxy of Lambeth and the orthodoxy
of Clapham and Islington. (69)

Dean Church has thus pictured the outstanding men of this great
Liberal school in their characteristic speculations. It was into such an
atmosphere that Newman was projected when he was made Fellow of Oriel.
Twelve years later as a Tractarian or an advocate of tradition and anti-
quity he was to oppose the Liberals and their outlook on religious matters
with the publication of the Tracts for the Times. Forty three years after
the day that he first entered Oriel Common Room as a Fellow he was to give
this definition of Liberalism:

Liberalism is the mistake of subjecting to human judgement
those revealed doctrines which are in their nature beyond and
independent of it, and of claiming to determine on intrinsic

grounds the truth and value of propositions which rest for their reception simply on the external authority of the Divine Word. (70)

All of these leaders were not present in Oriel when Newman entered there. The ability of the various members of the Liberal group had brought advancement and honors for the different members and even in Newman's time they were gaining promotions in the Church:

They represented a new idea, which was but gradually learning to recognize itself, to ascertain its characteristics and external relations, and to exert an influence upon the University. The party grew, all the time that I was in Oxford, even in numbers, certainly in breadth and definiteness of doctrine, and in power. (71)

Newman was only twenty years old when he entered Oriel and he fell under the influence of Liberal doctrine. Dr. Hawkins, Vicar of St. Mary's Church of Oxford, who recommended that he read Summer's Treatise on Apostolical Preaching, induced Newman to reject "my remaining Calvinism and to receive the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration." (72)

Thus before and after his ordination in 1824 close contact with Whately, Hawkins, and Blanco White and their Liberal School of thought had been dissipating his earlier Calvinistic belief and had been giving him an "unnecessarily scientific" critical outlook on religion:

(72) Newman, John Henry, Apologia, p. 27.
The truth is, I was beginning to prefer intellectual excellence to moral; I was drifting in the direction of the liberalism of the day. I was rudely awakened from my dream at the end of 1827 by two great blows - illness and bereavement. (73)

In 1826 Newman had become a Tutor of Oriel and had then formed a close friendship with Harrel Froude, one of the College's Fellows, who was to bring him into close touch about two years later with John Keble, former Fellow of Oriel, winner of double first class honors at Oxford, a poet, a professor of poetry, and vicar of the church at Hursley.

Some inkling of Froude's great personal influence upon Newman's spiritual development can be gained from Newman's own words concerning him:

I am introducing others into my narrative, not for their own sake, or because I love and have loved them, so much as because, and so far as, they have influenced my theological views. In this respect, then, I speak of Harrel Froude, - in his intellectual aspect . . . . . . He felt scorn of the maxim, "The Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants;" and he gloried in accepting Tradition as a main instrument of religious teaching. He had a high severe idea of the intrinsic excellence of Virginity; and he considered the Blessed Virgin its great Pattern. He delighted in thinking of the Saints; he had a vivid appreciation of the idea of sanctity, its possibility and its heights; and he was more than inclined to believe a large amount of miraculous interferences occurring in the early and middle ages. He embraced the principles of penance and mortification. He had a deep devotion to the Real Presence, in which he had a firm faith. (74)

(73) Newman, John Henry, Apologia, p. 32.
And again Newman comes back to the strong personal influence of Froude:

It is difficult to enumerate the precise additions to my theological creed which I derived from a friend to whom I owe so much. He taught me to look with admiration toward the Church of Rome, and in the same degree to dislike the Reformation. He fixed deep in me the idea of devotion to the Blessed Virgin and he led me gradually to believe in the Real Presence. (75)

John Keble was one of the lovers of the old orthodoxy of Oxford and the English Church. As Newman admits, "he was shy of me for years in consequence of the marks which I bore upon me of evangelical and liberal schools." (76) Keble had struck the keynote of Tractarianism in 1827 with the publication of his strongly Anglo-Catholic Christian Year. The book influenced Newman to this extent:

It is not necessary, and scarcely becoming, to praise a book which has already become one of the classics of the language. When the general tone of religious literature was so nerveless and impotent, as it was at that time, Keble struck an original note and woke up in the hearts of thousands a new music, the music of a school, long unknown in England. Nor can I pretend to analyze, in my own instance, the effect of religious teaching so deep, so pure, so beautiful. (77)

In the swinging of Newman's mind away from the contemporary Liberalism towards the orthodox Anglo-Catholic outlook and ultimately to Catholicism, the influence of antiquity must be strongly emphasized:

There is one remaining source of my opinions to be mentioned, and that far from the least important. In proportion

(75) Newman, John Henry, Apologia, p. 43.
(76) Newman, John Henry, Apologia, p. 36.
(77) Newman, John Henry, Apologia, p. 36.
as I moved out of the shadow of that Liberalism which had hung over my course, my early devotion towards the Fathers returned; and in the Long Vacation of 1828 I set about to read them chronologically, beginning with St. Ignatius and St. Justin. About 1830 a proposal was made to me by Mr. Hugh Rose, who with Mr. Lyall (afterwards Dean of Canterbury) was providing writers for a Theological Library, to furnish them with a History of the Principal Councils. I accepted it and at once set to work on the Council of Nicea. It was to launch myself on an ocean with currents innumerable; and I was drifted back first to the ante-Nicene history, and then to the Church of Alexandria. The work at last appeared under the title of "The Arians of the Fourth Century", and of its 422 pages, the first 117 consisted of introductory matter, and the Council of Nicea did not appear until the 254th, and then occupied at most twenty pages.

I do not know when I first learned to consider that Antiquity was the true exponent of the doctrines of Christianity and the basis of the Church of England; but I take it for granted that the works of Bishop Bull, which I at this time read, were my chief introduction to this principle. The course of reading which I pursued in the composition of my volume was directly adapted to develop it in my mind. (78)

His health having been weakened by the work of writing this book, Newman sailed to the Mediterranean in 1832 with his friend Hurrell Froude. He visited Rome, but was not favorably impressed with Catholicism and longed to return to England:

I was still more driven back into myself, and felt my isolation. England was in my thoughts solely, and the news from England came rarely and imperfectly. The Bill for the Suppression of the Irish Sees was in progress, and filled my mind. I had fierce thoughts against the Liberals.

It was success of the Liberal causes which fretted me inwardly, I became fierce against its instruments and its manifestations. (79)

He returned in 1833 and soon began the writing of Tracts, thus initiating the development of the Via Media or the extreme Anglo-Catholic

(78) Newman, John Henry, Apologia, p. 43 - 44.
School.

The Established Church of England had often been held up to ridicule, even by some of its own divines, for the utterly discordant elements it contained. To the atrophied "High and Dry" orthodoxy of Anglicanism, to the members with an Evangelical trend, and to the rationalistic Liberal party was added a new element, Tractarianism or Anglo-Catholicism, thus giving the entire Church more of a patchwork appearance than at any time since its inception in the sixteenth century. Even if the different elements were combined according to their doctrinal constitutions into a pro-Catholic group and a pro-Protestant group there would still be a lack of harmony which could never be overcome. This utter lack of fundamental unity has been facetiously expressed in this manner:

The Church of England may be likened to a ship freighted on one side with a Catholic, on the other with a Protestant cargo. So long as the rope of Parliamentary control succeeds in forcibly holding these warring elements together the vessel continues on an even keel. When it relaxes, she takes on an ominous list, or rather proceeds with alarming lurches, "rolling now to starboard, now to larboard," according as one element in the shifting cargo temporarily outweighs the other.

(80)

That such a condition might be amusing to an impartial observer is quite likely, but to Newman and Keble and Froude in 1833 the situation was pitiful and they had determined to remedy it.

Newman states that his position in the Tractarian movement was based on three principles:

First was the principle of dogma: my battle was with liberalism; by liberalism I meant the anti-dogmatic principle and its developments. This was the first point on which I was certain. (81)

The Anglo-Catholic nature of the movement is visible from the second principle:

Secondly, I was confident in the truth of a certain definite religious teaching, based upon this foundation of dogma; viz. that there was a visible Church, with sacraments, and rites which are the channels of invisible grace. I thought that this was the doctrine of Scripture, of the early Church, and of the Anglican Church. Here again, I have not changed in opinion; I am certain now on this point as I was in 1833, and have never ceased to be certain. In 1834 and the following years I put this ecclesiastical doctrine on a broader basis, after reading Laud, Bramhall, and Stillingfleet and other Anglican divines on the one hand, and after prosecuting the study of the Fathers on the other; but the doctrine of 1833, was strengthened in me, not changed. (82)

The third principle definitely excluded Rome from the Tractarian creed:

From my boyhood and in 1824 I considered, after Protestant authorities that St. Gregory I, about A. D. 600, was the first Pope that was Antichrist, though, in spite of this, he was also a great and holy man; but in 1832 - 33 I thought the Church of Rome was bound up with the cause of Antichrist by the Council of Trent. When it was that in my deliberate judgement I gave up the notion altogether in any shape, that some special reproach was attached to her name, I cannot tell; but I had a shrinking from renouncing it, even when my reason so ordered me, from a sort of conscience or prejudice, I think up to 1843. Moreover, at least during the Tract Movement, I

(81) Newman, John Henry, Apologia, p. 73.
thought the essence of her offence to consist in the honours which she paid to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints; and the more I grew in devotion, both to the Saints and to Our Lady, the more impatient was I at the Roman practices, as if those glorified creations of God must be gravely shocked, if pain could be theirs, at the undue veneration of which they were the objects. (83)

Naturally enough cries of "Popery" went up all over England when the Tracts appeared, because Evangelism and Liberalism and High Anglicanism were older and more established, while Tractarianism seemed to the average man revolutionary and foreign.

Newman's anxiety to convince his readers of his true feelings towards Rome in 1834 led to another statement of his attitude to Catholicism as a Tractarian:

I felt such confidence in the substantial Justice of the charges which I advanced against her, that I considered them to be a safeguard and an assurance that no harm could ever arise from the freest exposition of what I used to call Anglican principles. All the world was astounded at what Froude and I were saying; men said that it was sheer Popery. I answered, "True we seem to be making straight for it; but go on awhile, and you will come to a deep chasm across the path, which makes real approximation impossible." And I urged in addition, that many Anglican divines had been accused of Popery, yet had died in their Anglicanism; now, the ecclesiastical principles which I professed, they had professed also; and the judgement against Rome which they had formed, I had formed also. Whatever deficiencies then had to be supplied in the existing Anglican system, and however boldly I might point them out, anyhow that system would not in the process be brought nearer to the special creed of Rome, and might be mended in spite of her. (84)


Newman was forced into an admission of the branch theory:

The Catholic Church in all lands had been one from the first for many centuries; then, various portions had followed their own way to the injury, but not to the destruction, whether of truth or of charity. These portions or branches were mainly three: - the Greek, Latin, and Anglican. Each of these inherited the earlier undivided Church *in solido* as its own possession. Each branch was identical with that early undivided Church, and in the unity of that Church it had unity with the other branches. The three branches agreed together in all but their later accidental errors. Some branches had retained in detail portions of Apostolical truth and usage, which the others had not; and these portions might be and should be appropriated again by the others which had let them slip. Thus, the middle age belonged to the Anglican Church, and much more did the middle age of England. Dr. Howley sat in the seat of St. Thomas the Martyr; Oxford was a medieval University. Saving our engagement to Prayer Book and Articles, we might breathe and live and act and speak, as in the atmosphere and climate of Henry III's day, or the Confessor's, or of Alfred's. (87)

The fallacy in Newman's argument was, of course, "our engagement to Prayer Book and Articles." The Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-Nine Articles, particularly the latter, constituted the cornerstone of the Anglican Church. The Thirty-Nine Articles were the principle of individuation which gave the Established Church its essence, separating it from the Church of Rome. Moreover the opposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles to Rome constituted a difficulty for Newman's young disciples who were being taught by him that the two Churches agreed substantially. Newman shows us how the problem arose:

From the time that I had entered upon the duties of Public Tutor at my college, when my doctrinal views were very different from what they were in 1841, I had meditated a comment upon the Articles. Then, when the Movement was in its swing, friends had said to me, "What will you make of the Articles?" but I did not share the apprehension which their question implied. Whether, as time went on, I should have been forced, by the necessities

of the original theory of the movement, to put on paper the
especulations which I had about them, I am not able to con-
jecture. The actual cause of my doing so, in the beginning
of 1841, was the restlessness, actual and prospective, of
those who neither liked the Via Media, nor my strong judge-
ment against Rome. I had been enjoined, I think by my Bishop,
to keep these men straight, and I wished so to do; but their
tangible difficulty was subscription to the Articles; and
thus the question of the Articles came before me. It was
thrown in our teeth; "How can you manage to sign the Articles?
They are directly against Rome." (88)

Thus the Via Media, as it stood, was untenable; it rested on
the supposition that the differences between Rome and Anglicanism were
only accidental. But the shadow of the Thirty-Nine Articles hung over
the Via Media. Something more must be said or done, because men per-
ceived or thought they perceived an essential inconsistency between the
Articles and the Via Media.

Newman tried to solve the problem and his solution, Tract Ninety
brought about his downfall as an orthodox clergyman of the Established
Church. He defined his purpose in Tract Ninety as this:

The main thesis of my Essay was this: - the Articles do
not oppose Catholic teaching; they but partially oppose Roman
dogma; they for the most part oppose the dominant errors of
Rome. And the problem was, as I have said, to draw the line
as to what they allowed and what they condemned. (89)

It is hard for us today to think of a reconciliation of the

Thirty-Nine Articles and the Roman Catholic Church without laughing at the absurdity of such a proposal. Distance lends perspective and Newman was too much in the thick of the fight to see the hopelessness of attempting such a reconciliation. At any rate we cannot doubt his sincerity of mind in making the futile attempt:

The prospect was encouraging; there was no doubt at all of the elasticity of the Articles: to take a palmary instance, the seventeenth was assumed by one party to be Lutheran, by another Calvinistic, though the two interpretations were contradictory of each other; why then should not other Articles be drawn up with a vagueness of an equally intense character? I wanted to ascertain what was the limit of that elasticity in the direction of Roman dogma. But next, I had a way of inquiry of my own, which I state without defending . . . . . . .

my method of inquiry was to leap in media res. I wished to institute an inquiry how far, in critical fairness, the text could be opened; I was aiming far more at ascertaining what a man who subscribed it might hold than what he must, so that my conclusions were negative rather than positive. It was but a first essay. And I made it with the full recognition and consciousness, which I had already expressed in my Prophetical Office, as regards the Via Media, that I was making only a "first approximation to the required solution;" - "a series of illustrations supplying hints for the removal" of a difficulty, and with full acknowledgement "that in minor points, whether in question of fact or of judgement, there was room for difference or error of opinion." (90)

That Tract Ninety constituted a virtual attack on the Articles and a virtual defense of Catholic doctrine cannot be denied when we pause to consider one of its tamest statements:

In the conclusion of my Tract I observe: The Articles are "evidently framed on the principle of leaving open large questions on which the controversy hinges. They state broadly extreme truths, and are silent about their adjustment. For instance, they say that all necessary faith must be proved from Scripture; but do not say who is to prove it. They say that the Church has authority in controversies; they do not say what

authority. They say that it may enforce nothing beyond Scripture, but do not say where the remedy lies when it does. They say that works before grace and justification are worthless and worse, and that works after grace and justification are acceptable, but they do not speak at all of works with God's aid before justification. They say that men are lawfully called and sent to minister and preach, who are chosen and called by men who have public authority given them in the Congregation; but they do not add by whom the authority is to be given. They say that Councils called by princes may err; they do not determine whether Councils called in the name of Christ may err." (91)

Tract Ninety was written and published in 1841. The controversy it caused increased its sales and it ran through many reprints during the next few years, not because the public approved the ideas but because they found it interesting and took pleasure in denouncing its author.

The beginning of Newman's period of intense storm and stress can be seen in his description of the way in which Tract Ninety was received and in the way in which the ensuing controversy affected him:

In the sudden storm of indignation with which the Tract was received throughout the country on its appearance I recognize much of real religious feeling, much of honest and true principle, much of straight forward ignorant common sense. In Oxford there was genuine feeling, too; but there had been a smouldering stern energetic animosity, not at all unnatural, partly rational, against its author. A false step had been made; now was the time for action. I am told that, even before the publication of the Tract, rumours of its contents had got into the hostile camp in an exaggerated form; and not a moment was lost in proceeding to action, when I was actually fallen into the hands of the Philistines. I was quite unprepared for the outbreak, and was startled at its violence. I do not think I had any fear . . . . I saw indeed clearly that my place in the Movement was lost; public confidence was at an end; my occupation was gone. It was simply an impossibility that I could say anything henceforth to good effect, when I had been posted up by the marshall on the buttery hatch of every College of my University, after the manner of discommoded pastry-cooks, and when in every part of the country.

and every class of society, through every organ and opportunity of opinion, in newspapers, in periodicals, at meetings, in pulpits, at dinner-tables, in coffee-rooms, in railway carriages, I was denounced as a traitor who had laid his train and was detected in the very act of firing it against the time-honored Establishment. (92)

The Anglican authorities, while they did not officially condemn the work immediately, asked Newman to withdraw it, but he refused:

I would not do so for the sake of those who were unsettled or in danger of unsettlement. I would not do so for my own sake; for how could I acquiesce in a mere Protestant interpretation of the Articles? how could I range myself among the professors of a theology, of which it put my teeth on edge, even to hear the sound. (93)

Newman was stubborn, but he had reason to be; doubt had already crept into his soul:

Confidence in me was lost; - but I had already lost confidence in myself. Thoughts had passed over me for a year and a half before, in respect to the Anglican claims, which for a time had profoundly troubled me. They had gone: I had not less confidence in the power and the prospects of the Apostolic movement than before; not less confidence than before in the grievousness of what I called the "dominant errors" of Rome; but how was I any more to have absolute confidence in myself? how was I to have confidence in my present confidence? How was I to be sure that I should always think as I thought now? (94)

In this state of mind Newman and a few friends retired to the village of Littlemore, where he might devote himself to his own inner struggle.

Between July and November, 1841 Newman received the "three blows which broke him." He had come to Littlemore still believing in Anglicanism, but he had started in his seclusion there a translation of St. Athanasius, which became the first of the three blows which killed his faith in Anglicanism:

I was reading and writing in my own line of study, far from the controversies of the day, on what is called a "metaphysical subject;" but I saw clearly, that in the history of Arianism, the pure Arians were the Protestants, the semi-Arians were the Anglicans, and that Rome was what it was then. The truth lay, not with the Via Media, but with what was called "the extreme party". (95)

The second factor was the changing attitude of the Anglican hierarchy towards him:

The Bishops one after another began to change against me. It was a formal determinate movement. . . . . . . . They went on in this way directing charges at me for three whole years. I recognized it as a condemnation; it was the only one that was in their power. At first I intended to protest; but I gave up the thought in despair. (96)

The third blow was the affair of the Jerusalem Bishopric. The Prussian king asked that some Anglican clergyman be consecrated Bishop of Jerusalem to exercise spiritual jurisdiction over the Anglicans and all Protestants of every sect in the Holy Land. The favor with which this measure was received by the English Parliament, by most Anglicans, and by the Archbishop of Canterbury himself horrified Newman:

This was the third blow which finally shattered my faith

in the Anglican Church. That Church was not only forbidding any sympathy or concurrence with the Church of Rome, but it actually was courting an intercommunion with Protestant Prussia and the heresy of the Orientals. The Anglican Church might have the Apostolical succession, as had the Monophysites; but such acts as were in progress led me to the gravest suspicion, not that it would soon cease to be a Church, but that, since the sixteenth century, it had never been a Church all along. (97)

Nevertheless Newman's own loss of confidence in himself would not allow him to leave the Anglican Church and he kept up his study of the Fathers of the Primitive Church and his theological investigations to strengthen the position of Anglicanism in some way.

He later analyzed his activity over a period of ten years from 1835 to 1845 in this fashion:

For the first four years of the ten (up to Michaelmas, 1839) I honestly wished to benefit the Church of England, at the expense of the Church of Rome.
For the second four years I wished to benefit the Church of England without prejudice to the Church of Rome.
At the beginning of the ninth year (Michaelmas, 1843) I began to despair of the Church of England, and gave up all clerical duty; and then, what I wrote and did was influenced by a mere wish not to injure it, and not by the wish to benefit it.
At the beginning of the tenth year I distinctly contemplated leaving it, but I also distinctly told my friends that it was contemplation.
Lastly, during the last half of that tenth year I was engaged in writing a book (Essay on Development) in favor of the Roman Church, and indirectly against the English. (98)

Even after he had resigned his clerical office in 1843 Newman

avoided Catholic influences:

Between the autumns of 1843 and 1845, I was in lay communion with the Church of England, attending its services as usual, and abstaining altogether from intercourse with Catholics, from their places of worship, and from those religious rites and usages, such as the Invocation of Saints, which are characteristic of their creed. I did all this on principle, for I never could understand how a man could be of two religions at once. (99)

Newman’s intellect and will seemed to be pulling in opposite directions, the former toward Rome and the latter opposing that Romeward force. The ordeal of his mind can be seen from a letter written to Mrs. J. Mozley on November 20, 1844:

I have gone through a great deal of pain, and have been very much cut up. The one predominant distress upon me has been this unsettlement of mind I am causing. This is a thing that has haunted me day by day. And for days I had a literal pain in and about my heart, which I suppose at any moment I could bring on again. . . . . . . .

Besides the pain of unsettling people, of course I feel the loss I am undergoing in the good opinion of my friends and well-wishers, though I can’t tell how much I feel this. It is the shock, surprise, terror, forlornness, disgust, scepticism to which I am giving rise; the differences of opinion, division of families—all this it is that makes my heart ache.

I cannot make out that I have any motive but a sense of indefinite risk to my soul in remaining where I am. A clear conviction of the substantial identity of Christianity and the Roman system has now been on mind for a full three years. It is more than five years since the conviction first came on me, though I struggled against it and overcame it. I believe all my feelings and wishes are against change. I have nothing to draw me elsewhere. I hardly ever was at a Roman service; even abroad I knew no Roman Catholics. I have no sympathies with them as a party. I am giving up everything. I am not conscious of any resentment, disgust, or the like to repel me from my present position; and I have not dreams whatever—far from it indeed. I seem to be throwing myself away. (100)

In his novel *Loss and Gain* Charles Reding, the chief character, passes through the same kind of an experience. Newman gives us a picture of Reding's leaving Oxford to join Catholicism, a picture which is almost, if not entirely, autobiographical:

He crossed to the Meadow, and walked steadily down the junction of the Cherwell with the Isis; he then turned back. What thoughts came upon him! for the last time! (101)

Newman's ordeal was coming to an end as we can see from this statement:

I had begun my *Essay on the Development of Doctrine* in the first month of 1845, and I was hard at it all through the year till October. As I advanced, my view so cleared that instead of speaking any more of "the Roman Catholics", I boldly called them Catholics. Before I got to the end, I resolved to be received, and the book remains in the state in which it was then, unfinished. (102)

In a letter of October 8, 1845 to Mrs. J. Mozley, Newman wrote these words:

This night, Father Dominic, the Passionist, sleeps here. He does not know of my intention, but I shall ask him to receive me into what I believe to be the One Fold of the Redeemer. (103)

Newman's spiritual crisis was over after his conversion to Catholicism. No longer would he suffer the torturing doubts that he had known as an Anglican. He now had a religion in which he was entirely satisfied. Thirty years after the visit of Father Dominic he could look back

From the time that I became a Catholic, of course I have no further history of my religious opinions to narrate. In saying this, I do not mean to say that my mind has been idle, or that I have given up thinking on theological subjects; but that I have had no variations to record, and have had no anxiety of heart whatever. I have been in perfect peace and contentment. I never have had one doubt. I was not conscious to myself, on my conversion, of any change, intellectual or moral, wrought in my mind. I was not conscious of firmer faith in the fundamental truths of Revelation, or of more self-command; I had not more fervor; but it was like coming into port after a rough sea; and my happiness on that score remains to this day without interruption. (104)
CONTRAST AND CONCLUSION
For the unobservant, Carlyle and Newman cannot be thought of at the same time in view of the apparent dissimilarities in their careers and their works and in view of the sneering statement often ascribed to Carlyle that "Newman had the brains of a rabbit." Certainly the two men are far apart, "the rugged, irascible, hirsute Scotch farmer's son, and the subtle, delicate, low-voiced English priest", as Jefferson B. Fletcher sees them. (105)

The difference of their personalities is perhaps even more apparent when we consider the literary style of the two men. It would seem that there is no ground for comparison between the language of the Apologia and the Sartor Resartus, or the Idea of a University and the French Revolution, or the Second Spring and the Latter-Day Pamphlets. Beneath the language of Newman we see the refined gentleman of Oxford and the humble priest of the Oratory; vigorously breaking through Carlyle's words we see the choleric Scotch czar of Chayne Row. The classical style of Newman is worlds apart from that eccentric and blasting language known as Carlylesque:

Carlyle's style is like the full untutored swing of the giant's arm; Cardinal Newman's is the assured self-possession, the quiet gracefulness of the finished athlete. The one, when he means to be effective, seizes the most vehement feelings and hurls them impetuously at the object. The other, with disciplined moderation, and delicate self-restraint, shrinks instinctively from overstatement, but penetrates more directly to the core by words of sober truth and vivid exactness. (106)


(106) Shairp, John Campbell, Aspects of Poetry, p. 382.
Newman could not have written like Carlyle; Oxford was not Ecclefechan, and the conservatism impressed upon her sons by the English school could never vanish in wild and stirring and not always coherent outbursts of language:

He never could be quaint, odd, or affected, he went up to the heights as by steps that were visible to all. If, on certain subjects, he remained obscure, even to himself, as he confesses in a charming letter of his old age, the reason cannot be found in his choice of words, but lies below them. Thus he is the opposite of Carlyle, whose vocabulary we learn as though a foreign tongue, which in fact it is, made harder still by what Johnson would term its 'unfractuosities' - a prophet's dialect, not the medium by which men in the street talk to one another. Newman's, on the contrary, is common English made perfect. (107)

No one can question their differences of personality and of literary expression; but we must seriously question that common opinion which denies Newman a place as a reformer and a prophet of his century, a place which has never been denied to Carlyle. The sage of Ecclefechan has been rightly honored for his denunciations of the mechanistic materialism of industrial England, for pointing out the follies of free trade and the mistakes of universal suffrage, and even the general godlessness of the age. Newman, on the other hand, often has been termed "the most religious mind of the century" and he has been recognized as the author of some of the most graceful prose in English literature; but such an opinion has unconsciously restricted him to the secluded, academic cloisters of Oxford and has made him merely the subtlest and

cleverest of the English clergymen who indulged in theological speculation. Newman is almost given the position of master of distinctions and of sub-distinctions and of scholastic disputations and of theological aridities, thereby implying that he is an excellent theorist in dogmatic controversies but not a social reformer.

Newman's activities were not confined to research in theology and ecclesiastical history; on the contrary, he was interested in the social and political changes of the time, though not a well known social reformer. The reader of Newman must bear in mind that the English cardinal was opposed to liberalism in all forms of human activity. Latitudinarianism was but one aspect, a religious one, of the rising tide of liberalism in every field of thought and activity in the nineteenth century. Though he was most famous for his aversion to the religious features of liberalism, he was opposed to it as a practical social and political philosophy. Newman was a product of High Church, Tory Oxford and his outlook was essentially conservative. This conservative opposition to liberalism was so strong that we find Newman sacrificing the friendship of Mr. Whately in 1829 by disagreeing with him over the re-election of Sir Robert Peel as member of Parliament from Oxford. Peel had ridden roughshod over the university's Tory element by voting in favor of Catholic Emancipation. Peel thus aroused Newman's anger, not through any bigotry on Newman's part toward Catholics, but because, believing as he did in the union of Church and State and inasmuch as Catholics were not members of the national Church, he could not in conscience see why anyone outside the pale of the Established Church be granted political
The same antagonism towards liberalism is reflected in his state of mind when in the Mediterranean countries in 1832 when he found himself upset by liberal victories in England:

England was in my thoughts solely and the news from England came rarely and imperfectly. The Bill for the Suppression of the Irish Sees was in progress and filled my mind. I had fierce thoughts against the liberals. (108)

So fiercely burned the fires of his essentially authoritarian mind during this Mediterranean trip that Newman confesses to a somewhat childishly petulant manifestation of his antagonism toward even a symbol of contemporary liberalism:

It was the success of the Liberal cause which fretted me inwardly. I became fierce against its instruments and its manifestations. A French vessel was at Algiers; I would not even look at the tricolor. (109)

Newman's own definitions of general liberalism and of its specific religious aspect, Latitudinarianism, show that his antagonism proceeded from a fundamental aversion to what he considered the essential fallacies of any form of liberalism, religious or otherwise:

By Liberalism I mean false liberty or thought, or the exercise of thought upon matters, in which, from the constitution of the human mind, thought cannot be brought to any successful issue, and therefore, is out of place. Among such matters are first principles of whatever kind; and of these the most sacred and most momentous are especially to be reckoned

the truths of Revelation. Liberalism then is the mistake of subjecting to human judgement those revealed doctrines which are in their nature beyond and independent of it, and of claiming to determine on intrinsic grounds the truth and value of propositions which rest for their reception simply on the external authority of the Divine Word. (110)

Nor can it be said that Newman showed himself a turncoat and a true political liberal by his efforts for recognition of his Catholic countrymen after his conversion in 1845. In *The Present Position of Catholics in England* he was advocating tolerance for Catholicism, which would not be condoned by the strict Anglican Toryism of his youth; nevertheless he had not abandoned conservatism and authoritarian principles, but had merely gone over to an older, more conservative, and what he believed to be a more authoritarian Church. Catholicism was for him the Church of Christ endowed with divine authority; naturally he demanded at least tolerance if not recognition for Europe's oldest authoritarian institution. In no way had he deserted the cause of tradition; he had discovered and consequently fought for a Church which he now believed to be the only one possessing the totality of authority.

Furthermore his *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* was a social rather than a dogmatis document. It was a summary of changed religious beliefs with short arguments for his acceptance of various dogmas and with frequent denials of deceptions and double-dealing. In it he was not concerned with elaborately dogmatic controversies for their own value; he was trying to convince the English people of the prejudice of their

(Newman was not, of course, the type of social reformer who thinks and speaks entirely in economic terms and in purely political inquiries. He was convinced that religion was the most important thing in life; the Tractarian movement was essentially moral, and therefore a social crusade, rather than a purely dogmatic enterprise.

We must not overlook the fact that the sermons of the Tractarians received greater attention from the public than their researches in ancient Church history; Newman's own sermons were those of a moral reformer, not a dogmatic controversialist;

They were the expression of a piercing and large insight into character and conscience and motives, of a sympathy at once most tender and most stern with the tempted and the wavering, of an absolute and burning faith in God and his counsels, in His love, in His judgements, in the awful glory of His generosity and His magnificence. They made men think of the things which the preacher spoke of, and not of the sermons of the preacher. Since 1828 this preaching (of Newman's) had been going on at St. Mary's, growing in purpose and directness as the years went on, though it could hardly be more intense than in some of its earliest examples. While men were reading and talking about the Tracts, they were hearing the sermons; and in the sermons they heard the living meaning, and reason, and bearing of the Tracts, their ethical affinities, their moral standard. The sermons created a moral atmosphere, in which men judged the questions in debate. It was no dry theological correctness and completeness which were sought for. No lover of privilege, no formal hierarchical claims, urged on the writers. What they thought in danger, what they aspired to revive and save, was the very life of religion, the truth and substance of all that makes it the hope of human society. (111)

No, the Tractarian movement was not a mere dogmatic tempest

(111) Church, Richard William. The Oxford Movement, p. 113 - 114.
in a theological teapot, but a social and moral crusade with as many practical applications as Carlyle's Gospel of Work. Both the Sartor Resartus and the Tracts had a sound object:

There was one aim in men so different as Thomas Carlyle and John Henry Newman. Each said, Let us put a soul into our dead conventions and help men to live true lives to the highest aims. (112)

Carlyle and Newman were both authoritarian inasmuch as both of them were opposed to the rationalistic liberalism of their times. Though Carlyle fervently desired the happiness and amelioration of conditions for the common man, he was anti-democratic in his scorn for universal suffrage. In this respect he was as conservative as Newman, but Carlyle did not hesitate to denounce the upper classes of England. Both men were aristocratic in their belief in the necessity of authority. Carlyle's hero-worship was a belief in strong men as the leaders of mankind in all fields of human activity, religious, social, or political. Newman's authoritarianism is best exemplified in his insistence on dogma and on the importance of antiquity as a guide to truth.

In this respect Newman and Carlyle have special significance in the light of present day European history. Newman stands for the conservative, authoritarian, generally monarchial Catholicism inherited from the past; Carlyle has been accepted for his emphasis on the hero by Nazi Germany, and also for his belief that the solution of a nation's problems depends on her Strong Man. The two men are thus symbolic of

two different modern concepts of authority, the institution and the
strong individual, or to furnish a concrete example, the monarchy and
the dictator.

The religious ordeals of the two men, as noted in the *Sartor
Resartus* and the *Apologia* present some interesting parallels and striking
contrasts.

Both men spent their childhood in an atmosphere of stern Calv
vinism, but they reacted in far different ways when confronted with the
scepticism of the written word. Carlyle lost his faith and plunged into
the abyss of the Everlasting No; Newman did murmur "how dreadful, but
how plausible" when confronted as a boy of fourteen by the works of
Thomas Paine and Hume and Voltaire but they had no serious effects. (113)

Newman advanced through the influence of dogma from Calvinism
to Anglicanism to Catholicism. Carlyle went from Calvinism to unbelief
and a rejection of Christianity through Locke, Hume, Gibbon, Bentham,
Adam Smith and Voltaire and came back again to a belief in God, though
not in Christianity, by means of Goethe and the chief works of German
Romanticism and Idealism. Certainly no other religious quests starting
from the same point could have progressed and ended as differently:

No two conclusions could be more utterly at variance
than his whose *Sartor* led Thomas Huxley "to know that a deep
sense of religion was compatible with the entire absence of
theology" and his for whom a religion without theology were

as a lamp without oil. (114)

Newman’s ordeal of doubt during the days at Littlemore was in at least one respect more difficult to bear than Carlyle’s Everlasting No, because Newman was, as he frequently mentions in his Apologia and in his letters, conscious of the way in which the world watched and waited for the final outcome. His disciples were anxiously looking to him for a solution of their own difficulties in his ultimate decision and his enemies watched and waited in leering expectancy. His mental strain was thus intensified by his lack of privacy, a difficulty with which Carlyle was never faced.

It is extremely doubtful that Carlyle would have been able to understand Newman’s problem during those four years at Littlemore because of the Scotchman’s aversion to all forms of theology:

Theologies, rubrics, surplices, Church articles, and the enormous, ever-repeated thrashing of the straw. A world of rotten straw; thrashed all into powder, falling the Universe and blotting out the stars and worlds; - Heaven pity you with such thrashing floor for world and its draggled dirty farthing-candle for sun! There is surely other worship possible for the heart of man; there should be other work or none at all, for the intellect and creative faculty of man. (115)

In their religious developments Newman was more thoroughly and consistently authoritarian. He believed that dogma and a visible Church were of supreme importance in directing the religious energies of

(114) Atlantic Monthly, 95, p. 674.
men. Carlyle, on the other hand, had no use for dogma or churches; he found the ultimate sanction for the existence of God and of religion in his own soul, in his certainty of truth and justice. (116)

If one were asked to pick, *prima facie*, which of the two men would make the customary Victorian compromise between extremes, he would probably select the suave and gentle Newman rather than the belligerent, sharp-tongued Scotchman. Nevertheless when the problem of religious belief came up, it was Carlyle, not Newman, who compromised.

Newman saw that the *Via Media* of High Church Anglicanism was a compromise and he eventually perceived that it was an unsatisfactory middle position between Protestantism and Catholicism. He became convinced that in one extreme, the Catholic Church alone, the totality of Divine Truth and Authority could be found, and he threw himself upon that extreme, thus leaving himself open to the attacks of those who did not understand his views.

Carlyle was typically Victorian in making a compromise between the two extremes which presented themselves, contemporary rationalistic scepticism and ecclesiastical Christianity. He chose the middle ground; certain that Christianity had failed and was wrong, he revolted from the spiritual bankruptcy and utter negation imposed on him by the scepticism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. He found something to which he might cling in a belief in a God unadorned by theologies and liturgies.

and churches.

Even in this undogmatic religious choice Carlyle was forced to make a compromise between the intellect and the emotions.

His intellect told him in terms of the rationalism of eighteenth and nineteenth century science and thought that this was a cold, mechanical world without a God, or at best a world with a God Who exerted no control over it. His emotions and his conscience told him there was a God, there was truth and there was justice even though the world took little account of these virtues.

Carlyle found consolation in German idealism, in the distinction of the Reason and the Understanding as advocated by Kant and his countrymen. By bisecting the human intelligence and awarding certain properties to each which the other half did not possess, Kant offered a compromise between modern scientific scepticism and man's strong religious conviction.

Carlyle eagerly made use of this solution which he found in German literature and philosophy. He selected the approach of German Idealism to philosophical problems rather than the approach of the realist; instead of proceeding from the data of objective evidence in order to know whether or not God exists, Carlyle took the much easier way of German subjectivism; he merely assumed the absolute and primitive truths of the moral and religious order which are known subjectively by the idealists and without necessity of objective proof.
Such a distinction was very useful and to a certain extent highly satisfactory, particularly when provided with the theory that the Understanding has nothing to do with spiritual matters and that religious scepticism is caused by the usurpation of the province of the Reason by the powers of the Understanding.

This solution which Carlyle borrowed from the Germans is very similar to that of Modernism as advocated by Loisy and Tyrrell in the early years of the twentieth century. The German distinction is the parent of the Modernist's principle of Vital Immanence, namely that God cannot be known by the light of the human reason alone but by faith-knowledge only, which is a sort of direct revelation to the individual by God Himself Immanent in the heart of man.

The answer provided by German idealism is, like the Modernist's solution, an evasion. It leads eventually to relativism, to a denial of the absolute nature of truth. Though Carlyle's religious difficulties were apparently solved by the distinction of the Reason and the Understanding, such an answer would be a failure for a large percentage of mankind pragmatically and psychologically. It is unsatisfactory psychologically because men have no consciousness of two mutually exclusive, water-tight compartments in the mind; eventually the pragmatic, practical, sceptical mind is going to lose confidence in such an answer because it will come to the conclusion that such a distinction is a free assumption, an invention without psychological foundation, a mere evasion of the horrors of pessimism.
Carlyle seemed content with the answer of the great Germans. He never defended it philosophically, never showed why the subjective approach was more sound philosophically than the realistic. It was a loophole through which he squeezed into a world without the pessimism that the Age of Reason forced upon its underlings. It was, whether conscious or not, a typically Victorian compromise between extremes, between intellectual scepticism and religious emotion.

Newman had a different problem. He had never suffered the tortures of rationalistic doubt visited upon Carlyle; he had been confronted by the works of Hume and Paine and other prophets of Enlightenment when only fourteen, but unlike Carlyle, he had not lost his faith because of the strong hold of dogma on his authoritarian soul. After he became convinced that the Catholic Church was the true Church of Christ, he was faced with a conflict between his emotions and his intellect: his emotions, the strength of old ties, of lifelong friendships and environment urged him to stay where he was; his new found faith in Catholicism, his intellectual conviction of the superiority of the Roman Church urged him on. Under such conditions there could be no compromise; Newman had a true dilemma: High Church Anglicanism which at one stage of his life had been a Via Media between Protestantism and Catholicism had vanished as a practical solution and he must now choose between Anglicanism, which he now thought to be essentially Protestant, and the Roman Catholic Church. There could be no compromise now and Newman with his eyes open and his heart heavy embraced Catholicism, sad because he was giving up the old, happy life and glad that he had found what he considered
the truth, even if in an alien camp.

Ultimately we must admire Newman's solution to his spiritual crisis because it required greater courage than did Carlyle's evasion; moreover we cannot help wondering if Carlyle did not sometimes doubt the validity of his own solution in the recesses of his own heart, even though he left no record of such dissatisfaction in his writings.
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