

“There is subject for further enquiry here”:
Vernon Lushington and Thomas Carlyle

DAVID TAYLOR

IN HIS ARTICLE “VERNON LUSHINGTON: CARLYLE’S FRIEND AND EDITOR” the late Kenneth J. Fielding drew attention to fifteen letters in the National Library of Scotland from Thomas Carlyle to the lawyer and positivist Vernon Lushington (1832–1912). Covering the period December 1856 to April 1857, the letters presented by Fielding (NLS MS: 23167) contain Carlyle’s warm thanks and praise for Lushington’s work in assisting in the preparation of Chapman and Hall’s uniform edition of his *Collected Works*. Fielding—perhaps the first person to take notice of Lushington’s work for Carlyle since Frederic Harrison¹—believed that Lushington’s role was more significant than had previously been acknowledged and noted that the credit for what he did in editing Carlyle had been appropriated by another of Carlyle’s assistants, Henry Larkin. Of the potential for Lushington to add to what scholars know about Carlyle, Fielding observed, “There is a subject for further enquiry here which has suffered, like much else, from the exhaustion which overtakes biographers of Carlyle well before they reach the later part of his life” (9). Fielding is partially correct, but “further enquiry” continued to be hampered less by “exhaustion” than by the lack of primary source material, and so Lushington survived more as a footnote in the lives of others than as a scholar in his own right with unique and considerable achievements to his credit. The recent emergence of the previously little known and inaccessible Lushington Archive (LA), which contains family correspondence, diaries, and other material, now provides scholars the opportunity to respond to Fielding’s challenge.²

Vernon Lushington was the fourth son of an eminent ecclesiastical lawyer, Stephen Lushington (1782–1873), who had acted for both Lady Byron and Queen Caroline in their respective matrimonial cases. He had also been an ardent abolitionist who worked closely with William Wilberforce and other members of the Clapham Sect in the fight against slavery. As Dean of the Arches (1858–67), Stephen Lushington was called upon to pass judgment on a number of the controversies that agitated the Church of England and led many believers to experience a crisis of faith. Despite his position within the church courts, he was privately a latitudinarian in matters of religious belief, and as a result, his son Vernon probably experienced a reasonably liberal upbringing. After leaving school, Vernon entered the Royal Navy as a midshipman. Following his discharge in 1849, he was admitted to the East India Company College at Haileybury, where he excelled by winning numerous prizes. From Haileybury, Vernon went to Cambridge, where he matriculated at Trinity College in 1852 with a first class degree in civil law. Afterwards, he went to the Inner Temple, where he qualified for the Bar in 1857. Lushington went on to become Deputy Judge Advocate General, Secretary to the Admiralty and then a County Court Judge.

In 1865, Lushington married Jane Mowatt, a daughter of Francis Mowatt (1803–91), who had been MP for Cambridge (1854–57). Such was Lushington's regard for Carlyle by this time that he wrote to his fiancée in an undated letter suggesting that they take "a volume of Carlyle with us on our wedding trip . . . and I will read some to you; that shall make your heart burn within you, or I shall be sorry!" (LA). This tactic seems to have had the desired result, for some years later, in June 1883, Jane wrote to her husband that she was "on the sofa reading & as far as my pains wld let me—greatly enjoying the Life of Carlyle—poor fellow—'a fellow feeling'—with his sufferings makes me see that all his short comings were the direct result of bodily suffering & what a glorious creature he was mentally—immeasurably superior to Irving—with all his charms—tho' he too might have been otherwise but for trials" (LA).

Lushington had first come under the influence of Carlyle during his time at Cambridge, and he recorded the event in an essay published as five "chapters" in the *Oxford and Cambridge*

Magazine (April–June, November–December 1856).³ Early in chapter one, entitled “His ‘I Believe,’” Lushington relates his purpose in writing:

I intend, on this occasion, to introduce the reader to Carlyle . . . by some words of his, which once did the like office for another young Englishman. The incident to be spoken of is a trivial one, important chiefly to one person only; yet let it not be scorned; for, great or little, it is a true event in human history, helping to make up the sum total of good and evil now in the world; and besides, it is useful for our present purpose. A year or two ago, then, early one morning, at Cambridge, the young Englishman, an undergraduate, “all in his gown so blue,” strolled into a friend’s rooms at College; found him gone out; but on the table lay a book, *Heroes and Hero Worship!* He opened it and read as follows: “It is well said, in every sense, that a man’s Religion is the chief fact with regard to him. A man or a nation of men’s. By religion I do not mean here the church-creed he professes. . . . But the thing a man does practically believe; . . . that is in all cases the primary thing. This is his religion.”⁴ These few sentences made a deep impression on our friend; they set him reading Carlyle in deep earnest, and have kept him doing so;—and now not content with reading, he must needs be writing too! But, forgetting him and his destinies, let us, you and I, reader, ponder these words, for they furnish a fit starting point for our present enterprise. They are true words, profoundly true; at once a help and a warning for our judgment of all human work and character, but especially a clue to discover what we desire to learn respecting him who wrote these very words out of his own heart. (193–94)

The “young Englishman” of whom Lushington writes is, of course, himself, and what he has recorded is his “epiphany moment,” one that was to prove such a significant milestone in his journey of belief and faith. Lushington’s religion, which found its final and definitive expression in Comte’s Religion of Humanity, was most certainly the “chief fact” with regard to him and to all that he undertook.⁵

Lushington’s adulatory critique in *The Oxford and Cambridge Magazine* summed up the major themes of Carlyle’s thought and included a defense of some of Carlyle’s more controversial

views. Carlyle's writings, as Lushington understood them, were particularly germane to Pre-Raphaelite thinking. In particular Carlyle's devotion to factual accuracy is one of the virtues that most stirred Lushington, which he expressed in the June installment:

Carlyle has the manly instinct to love Facts, small and great, he rejoices in them, cleaves to them, will where-soever possible, express himself by them. Abstractions are terms often ill-fitting, too large or too small for the meaning intended; and they receive life only from the effort of thought which refers them to the original facts—that effort ceasing they become lifeless phrases: Carlyle dislikes and avoids them, as also he does nouns of multitude. He resorts to Nature; to the individual facts, which whether old or new can tell the living truth, to him who knows how to read them; “the concrete smacks of the perennial.” Hence his feeling for history as a record not of fact only, but of truth, and the noble use he makes of it in his political writings; hence too his perpetual appeal to the visible realities of modern experience. (699)

Lushington held that Carlyle created historical scenes that were as close to reality as possible, transporting his readers to whatever time or place he wished to locate them. Carlyle was able to use fact to unify past and present. Lushington's quote of Carlyle's *Past and Present* (1843) in the May chapter of his essay, “the Present contains the whole Past and the whole Future” (293),⁶ carried important implications for Pre-Raphaelite painting with its focus on factual accuracy and historical interrelation. Marcia Werner claims that “The Pre-Raphaelites' use of medieval subjects is therefore expressive of their concern with modern political and social issues” (124). For her, it is this “Carlylean conjunction of concrete factuality and interpenetrative temporality, fervently endorsed in *The Oxford and Cambridge Magazine*” (126) that is directly linked to the ethos of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. The essential characteristics of Pre-Raphaelite art—attention to detail, high regard for history, a vision of the Middle Ages as a shining exemplar, and the sense that past and present are one—can all be found in Carlyle.

Lushington's essay received the warm praise of Dante Gabriel Rossetti, who wrote to his fellow poet William Allingham: “Do

you not think Vernon Lushington's *Carlyle* very good in the *O. and C. Mag?* His things and his brother's, Morris's, and the one or two by Jones . . . are the staple of that magazine" (*Letters* 194). Carlyle apparently read the *Magazine* with some amusement and wrote to his brother John (7 May 1856): "I send you a poor *Oxford & Cambridge Magazine*, whh came this morning. If you have anything weighty to do or read, you will not get much good of that! In fact it is chiefly worth looking at in the prophetic way; as an indication of the sense and nonsense working in the heads of those young fellows, who will be Legislators &c in a few years, and endeavouring to execute what they think" (*CLO*). It is perhaps difficult to anticipate the closeness of the Lushington / Carlyle relationship from this rather dismissive assessment.

Lushington probably had first met Carlyle in 1853. Charles Brookfield recorded that on 22 April he made a visit to Lord and Lady Ashburton at their London home, Bath House, where he found a large party that included "[George] Venables, [Richard] Ellice (the Bear), Mr. and Mrs. Carlyle, [James] Spedding, [Richard Monckton] Milnes, [and] Lushington" (2: 393). Although the Lushington referred to by Brookfield is not more positively identified, it was almost certainly Vernon, who was by then a close friend of Monckton Milnes. But it was in late 1856 that Lushington wrote to Carlyle offering his services as an unpaid secretary and an assistant editor, and on 5 December, Carlyle replied: "Your offer is very loyal and generous;—and I do not think unlikely to be accepted if you deliberately persist in so gratuitous a purpose. I have already help,—hired and volunteer;—but your minute acquaintance with the affair is a great temptation" (*CLO*). Carlyle was in the process of revising the uniform edition, and his assistant Alexander Gilchrist was away from Chelsea. Carlyle also pointed out to Lushington on 5 December that his own time, "every moment of it, is taken up with another, much more dreadful Enterprise" (*CLO*). This "Enterprise" was of course Carlyle's biography of Frederick the Great. In short, Carlyle took Lushington up on his offer, and a few days later, Carlyle sent a letter along with a copy of the third volume of the uniform edition, annotated with possible amendments and additions to the text for consideration. Two weeks later (19 December), Carlyle wrote again to Lushington:

"I have gone over the First Volume, under your guidance; and fancy it now ready for the Printer" (*CLO*). The following month Carlyle wrote to Edward Chapman (26 January 1857) and asked him to send both the first and the second volumes of *The French Revolution* to, among others, Lushington, and "following that, monthly, by the others volumes as they come out" (*CLO*). Carlyle had already written to Lushington nine days earlier (17 January): "A *Fh Revn* is waiting for you, if I had time to look after it. Do not *buy* at least, in the interim!" (*CLO*).

By the end of 1856, Lushington was a regular visitor at Cheyne Row, and on 27 December, Jane Welsh Carlyle wrote to her friend Kate Sterling Ross and mentioned "a little fascinating Mr Lushington, with dove's eyes and without two fingers, who comes here now to tea very often" (*CLO*). Her observation of Lushington's missing fingers is interesting. The only other reference to this disfigurement appears to be in the autobiography of Augustus Hare. In referring to the Lushington twins, Hare writes, "it would have been impossible to know them apart, if Vernon had not, fortunately for their friends, shot off some of his fingers" (2: 26). Welsh Carlyle, clearly, was not the only person taken with Lushington, as Carlyle's letter to him of 5 January 1857 suggests: "My wife wishes much, in case you have nothing better to do, that you *wld* come to us Tomorrow (Tuesday) Evg, to meet some 3 (or perhaps only 2) agreeable persons whom she expects. As to the agreeable persons I can say nothing; but will add on my own score that the sight of you will, as always, be pleasant to me again. Come therefore, if you can manage it" (*CLO*).

On 26 April 1857, Carlyle wrote to Lushington to praise him for his revisions to *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*: "[I]n revising your work (a task rendered quite easy to me), I had all along occasion to thank you in silence: all was as lucid and succinct as the best practical intelligence *cd* make it" (*CLO*). The next month (13 May), Carlyle wrote to Joseph Neuberg to invite him for a visit to Cheyne Row, where he would find "a Metaphysical American" (the Congregational minister Henry Strong Huntington) and Lushington, "your fellow-labourer in the *Summary- & Index* departt, who is a very pleasant intelligent man" (*CLO*). Lushington now found himself at the center of the work Carlyle conducted on the outskirts of his main project, *Frederick the Great*.

The closeness of Welsh Carlyle's friendship with Lushington was further demonstrated in 1857 when the sculptor Thomas Woolner wrote: "I saw Vernon Lushington last night; he said that he saw Mrs. Carlyle on Saturday night and that she was looking very ill and thin; this is not brilliant, but that she sees anybody is an improvement. I greatly want to see her but it is no use going so far as it is a great chance for any one to do so" (133). Lushington's concern demonstrates just how close he had become to the Carlyles.

In the National Library of Scotland are several letters from Lushington to the daughters of John Richardson (1780–1864), a Scottish lawyer and a friend of both Carlyle and Sir Walter Scott. Two of these letters, addressed to Joanna Richardson, contain interesting glimpses into the lives of the Carlyles, including a confidential observation on the damage to the couple's relationship that resulted from Thomas's ever increasing absorption in his work. In the first letter, written in 1860, Lushington reveals his now intimate closeness to the Carlyles:

I had a long evening with *him* [Carlyle] a little while back with talk about many things, "sudden death", modern unbelief or *doghood*, Valentine's day, & the whole story of Valentine & Orson,—some part of which I duly got down on paper afterwards for my satisfaction in aftertimes. He spoke kindly of your father, "innocent-hearted", he called him, and said "if he" were not so chained up to his "Prussian matters" he wd. Pay you all a visit at Kirklands, & hoped some day really to do so. Mrs C. is better this winter than for several years' back. But she gave me an account of her daily life, which struck me as very sad,—so lonely it seemed to be—breakfast in silence, dinner separate, & *he* absorbed in his work, out of reach of fireside talk. This between ourselves. Must it ever be that those who give most to the world are themselves strangers to household joys? Sometimes it is so, not always I hope. Our friend Luther had a happy home. But in our time Dickens is another instance; he & Mrs D. must have led a sad life of it, yet scarce any writer writes so much of family happiness. (NLS MS: 3990)

The notes which Lushington made after this visit have fortunately survived among a collection of his positivist papers that

had been sold out of the main archive some years ago. These notes, now reunited with the Lushington Archive in my possession, are entitled "To tea with Carlyle, Friday 17th October 1860." In his jottings Lushington recalled Carlyle's utterances on a variety of random subjects such as Henry Cromwell, Macaulay and *sudden death*, Valentines, and Soldiers. Of Macaulay, whose death had just been announced, Lushington reports Carlyle as saying "Macaulay, poor fellow, yes, he is gone. It is a mistake to think that much intellectual production was lost to us: he had said all he had to say a long time ago." Under the heading "Soldiers" Lushington records Carlyle's comment: "It is one of the gravest thoughts to a citizen, the condition of our fighting apparatus,—no man knows anything about it—Wellington a valiant, clear, determined man, a great captain—but not much theoretical soldiery—Frederick, I suppose had read a thousand times as much!" (LA).

In 1861, Lushington again wrote to Joanna Richardson that he had "just returned from taking tea with Mr & Mrs Carlyle. He spoke to me most kindly, as usual of your father. He seemed very well, & when I came in he was busy correcting proof sheets of Frederick Vol. III. Mrs Carlyle too has passed thro' the winter much better than usual. Among other things he spoke of Scotland 100 years ago, the superior character of the lawyers & society generally in Glasgow & Edinburgh. Lord Hailes' 'Annals of Scotland', he sd. was the best bit of history contributed by British pen in the 18th or 19th century. He gave me the history of steam boats, 'that have since spread a conflagration over the world'—it originated in the little pool of Dalswinton in Nithsdale!" (NLS MS: 3990).

Regrettably, Lushington makes no mention of any words that Carlyle might have said upon the subject of Comte and Positivism, but these conversations took place some years before Lushington made public his beliefs by joining the committee of the London positivists. In any event, Lushington may have felt it unwise to raise this touchy subject with Carlyle, who had expressed his scorn for Comte on a number of occasions, such as in a letter to his brother John (28 November 1853), in which he associates Comte with "some windy French Prophet of the New Epoch" (*CLO*).

The Lushington Archive also contains some notes headed "Frederic" (sic) that appear to be the basis for a lecture—possibly

for the London positivists in the 1880s. These notes reveal how Lushington had by then recognized that the older Carlyle was not the same as the younger man upon whom he had heaped such adulatory praise in the 1860s. In particular Lushington, by then a convinced pacifist, found Carlyle's attitude towards war, as he felt it was expressed in *Frederick*, to be unacceptable. It was a strange conclusion given the fact that it was one of the works that Lushington had helped to revise: "This is not what we want. It is even what we don't want. We don't want to increase, to feed our interest in war: we want to reduce it. We want to study the wide fields of peace where there is so much to learn, so much to do, where too lies the future of the race" (LA). This is also something of a volte-face for Lushington, who in 1855, stirred to action by the Crimean War, wrote and published *How Shall The Strong Man Use His Strength?* (1855), in which he both defended and justified Britain's action against Russia. Carlyle was not supportive of the Crimean war and was particularly concerned at the immensely tragic sufferings of the soldiers.⁷ Like many, it seems that Lushington may have adhered to a simpler but erroneous understanding of Carlyle's more general position with regard to the notion of "might is right."

Lushington then turns to the issue of France and Germany where, naturally, the positivists sided with the French:

I am sorry to think that almost his last performance was one of the viscous kind. In Nov. 1870, when the French & Germans were discussing terms of peace, he wrote an elaborate & of course a very fierce letter to the Times upholding the demand of Germany to keep Alsace & Lorraine. . . . Now I cannot conceive a worse use to put history to than to make Nation's revenge the wrongs, or the fancied wrongs, of 200 years ago. (LA)

After addressing the Franco-Prussian conflict, Lushington condemns Carlyle for urging on "the spirit of bitter war" and encouraging the "insular temper and imperial ambition of England." Even in civil matters Lushington seems to have believed that Carlyle "advocated a coarse violence; how he mocked science and insulted the beautiful art of modern poetry, romance & music."⁸ Lushington then, perhaps with his own first hand observation of the relationship of Thomas and

Jane, berates Carlyle for his neglect of “the gentle influence of Woman.” Finally, Lushington writes that “one almost feels inclined to class him among what his Cromwell wd. have called the Malignants.” Towards the end of his sheet, Lushington pronounces judgment on Carlyle: “His spiritual pride not only darkened his heart, it darkened his mind also so that he could not see things of the utmost importance, he could not get to see them. He could not discern the nature of the Modern Intellectual Movement: he could sympathise neither with its science its poetry nor its art; he condemned it all.” In 1870 Lushington had written to his wife from Switzerland: “My book yesterday & today has been Carlyle’s *Frederic*;—wonderful; disappointing; sad. But every here & there most rousing passages. The extraordinary willfulness of the man is very singular” (LA). Carlyle, ultimately, had let Lushington down.

All of this frustrated disappointment is quite different from the praise that Lushington had heaped upon Carlyle two decades earlier in the pages of the *Oxford and Cambridge Magazine*. However, Lushington concluded his notes on Carlyle and *Frederick* with a more positive note by acknowledging that it would be an injustice to measure Carlyle by his whole career. Instead, according to Lushington, he should be judged “most of all by his earlier, juster, saner, wiser, happier utterances.” Further, Lushington considered that Carlyle’s views on “the dignity & glorious destiny of Labour, and generally of veneration & gratitude to the Past, constitute him to us one of the high & generous forerunners of ~~Positivism~~ the religion of Humanity. He wd. have disclaimed the honour with disdain, but it is his for all that. And I therefore conclude with some stanzas from a Positivist Hymn, which I truly think express the better mind of Carlyle” (LA). Unfortunately, Lushington recorded neither the reason he excised “Positivism” nor the title of the hymn he felt reflected “the better mind of Carlyle.”

Carlyle would certainly have “disclaimed the honour” given him by Lushington, that he had been a “high & generous forerunner of . . . the religion of Humanity.” Given A. H. Clough’s famous complaint to Emerson, however, that “Carlyle has led us into the desert, and he has left us there,”⁹ there may be some truth here. It may be that Carlyle’s prophetic rants cleared the ground for the development of new philosophies such as that

offered by Comte. But though Carlyle may have laid a moral foundation for Lushington, it was directly from the altruism imbedded in Comte's Positivism and the Religion of Humanity that Lushington found expression for the spiritual needs of his life. Carlyle had once wrote to an unidentified correspondent: "Surely it is better for a man to *work* out his God-given faculty than merely to speak it out" (*CLO*: TC to UC, July 1847). On 11 April 1862, Lushington echoed this dictate in a letter to a young friend, H. G. Seeley: "And one thing let us both remember, that it is not in words but in works; not in saying but in doing, that we shall find help & furtherance onwards" (MS: American Philosophical Society). Lushington retained a high regard for Carlyle despite his inability to agree with him in his old age. When Carlyle reached the age of 80, he was presented with an illuminated card signed, as a mark of appreciation, by many noted figures of the nineteenth century. This document now hangs in Carlyle's House, and among the 119 signatures of the great and the good who jostled to express their appreciation of Carlyle is that of Vernon Lushington, whose final public act of appreciation for Carlyle probably occurred in 1894, when a subscription fund was set up to purchase 24 Cheyne Row. To this fund Lushington donated the sum of two guineas.

The question of whether Carlyle had prepared the way for Comte in Britain remains largely a matter for conjecture. An early consideration of the question can be found in *The Positivist Review* (1908), in which J. H. Bridges writes:

To bring these two names together, except for the purpose of contrasting them, will seem to many a sheer paradox. And indeed in every detail of outward form no sharper contrast could be imagined than between the systematic rigid thinker, founder of a school of thought and of a rule of life, and the rhapsodic seer, disdainful of all systems, and the last of whose wishes it assuredly would have been that his own dark oracles should be regarded as forming one. These two men, though they were contemporaries, had no understanding of each other's work. Carlyle, in his *Reminiscences*, *more suo*, spoke of Comte as an "algebraic ghost" whilst for Comte, Carlyle, was *un pur littérateur*, a brilliant writer for effect. (169)¹⁰

In addition to what can be referred to as Carlyle's John the Baptist-like "site clearance" work, it could also be argued that in works such as *On Heroes* he actually parallels Comte's theology. The Frenchman, too, elevates the role of humanity at the same time as he singles out certain individuals who have made notable contributions to the development of human life and thought. It is not without significance that Mahomet, Dante, and Shakespeare can be found along with Frederick the Great in both Comte's pantheon of saints and Carlyle's assemblage of heroes.

When Lushington published his lecture *The Worship of Humanity* (1886), he chose for its title page two epigraphs. One was Comte's positivist motto: "Family, Country, Humanity." The other was taken from Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus*: "Yes, Friends, not our Logical, Mensurative faculty, but our Imaginative one is King over us. . . . The Understanding is indeed thy window, too clear thou canst not make it; but Fantasy is thy eye, with its colour-giving retina, healthy or diseased." As Carlyle had been Lushington's prophet, so Comte had been his priest. In that sense he believed that the two were not incompatible. Lushington's own journey of belief and faith had been one of a natural progression from the stark pessimism of Carlyle to the optimism of a new and a better society offered by Comte's Positivism and his Religion of Humanity.

Roehampton University

Notes

Materials found in NLS MS: 3990 and 23167 are published by the kind permission of the National Library of Scotland.

1. Harrison published a "Memorial Address" in *The Positivist Review*, April 1, 1912 (Archimedes 8, 124 by the positivist calendar). In it, he recounts his friendship with both Vernon and Godfrey Lushington and their work together to form the Church of Humanity in 1870. Harrison particularly praises Lushington's contribution in the field of the Arts "in all its forms, poetic, musical, pictorial, and dramatic." He goes on to say that "the special character of the work which Vernon Lushington gave to our movement was to develop the spiritual side of the religion of Humanity, its

sympathy for all forms of the beautiful, the true, and the loving, its ideal of a great development of art in poetry, in music, in painting—and, above all, its practical realisation of the spirit of love, of charity, or brotherhood.” The “Memorial Address” is followed by a bibliography of Lushington’s positivist writings and concludes with a note that “the index to Carlyle’s ‘Sartor Resartus’ was compiled by Mr Lushington” (92–94).

2. The extensive Lushington Archive (LA) was gifted to the author, and he has now deposited it in an official repository where he is helping to sort and to catalogue the many hundreds of letters. The archive cannot be made available for public access until the cataloguing has been completed.

3. Lushington’s essay on Carlyle was printed as five chapters in the April, May, June, November, and December issues of *The Oxford and Cambridge Magazine*. The first chapter, “His ‘I Believe,’” appeared in the April edition.

4. Lushington quotes from Carlyle’s *On Heroes* (4); he slightly misquotes the final sentence, which should read “That is his *religion*.”

5. At Rugby, Vernon’s twin brother Godfrey was greatly influenced by the Comtist Richard Congreve. Congreve went on to tutor at Wadham College, Oxford, where he further extended his influence over former pupils, including Godfrey, who followed him there. At Oxford, Godfrey became one of the first English converts to Comte’s “Religion of Humanity” and introduced it to his brother Vernon, who, in turn, spread Positivism at Cambridge.

6. The quote accurately reads “For the Present holds in it both the whole Past and the whole Future” (*Past and Present* 40).

7. See D. J. Trela’s “Carlyle, the Just War and the Crimean War.”

8. Lushington, however, also credited Carlyle with his own view of aesthetics in an 1865 letter to his fiancée: “Music and Art, and Nature, & whatsoever is lovely in this world, have a true message to us of Love, which means & includes all good; and if we do not receive good from them, it is wholly our fault or our misfortune. This truth goes to the very root of all judgement of men & things: Carlyle brought it home to my mind (little as it might seem he has to do with such subjects)” (LA).

9. See Joseph Slater 42–43.

10. Carlyle goes further in *Reminiscences*, alluding to Comte as “the miserablest phantasmal *algebraic ghost* I have yet met with among the ranks of the living!” (348).

Works Cited

- American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.
- Bridges, J. H. "Comte and Carlyle." *The Positivist Review* (August 1908): 169–75.
- Brookfield, Charles, and Frances Brookfield. *Mrs. Brookfield and Her Circle*. 2 vols. London: Pitman, 1905.
- Carlyle, Thomas. *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History*. Ed. Michael K. Goldberg. Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1993.
- . *Past and Present*. Ed. Chris R. Vanden Bossche. Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 2005.
- . *Reminiscences*. Ed. K. J. Fielding and Ian Campbell. Oxford, Eng.: Oxford UP, 1997.
- Carlyle, Thomas, and Jane Welsh Carlyle. *The Carlyle Letters Online (CLO)*. Coordinating Ed. Brent E. Kinser. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2007. Web. 15 Nov. 2008.
- Fielding, K. J. "Vernon Lushington: Carlyle's Friend and Editor" *Carlyle Newsletter* 8 (1987): 7–18.
- Froude, J. A. *Thomas Carlyle: A History of His Life in London, 1834–1881*. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, 1884.
- Hare, Augustus J. C. *The Story of My Life*. 6 vols. London: Allen, 1896–1900.
- Harrison, Frederic. "Memorial Address." *The Positivist Review* (1 April 1912): 92–94.
- Jessop, Ralph. "Carlyle's Agnosticism: An Altar to the Unknown and Unknowable God." *Literature and Belief* 25.1–2 (2005): 381–433.
- Kent, Christopher. *Brains and Number: Elitism, Comtism, and Democracy in Mid-Victorian England*. Toronto, Can.: U of Toronto P, 1978.
- Lushington, Vernon. "Carlyle." *The Oxford and Cambridge Magazine* 1 (April–December): 193–211, 292–310, 336–52, 697–712, 743–71.
- . *The Worship of Humanity. An Address Given at Newton Hall, on the Twenty-Ninth Anniversary of the Death of Auguste Comte, 24 Gutenberg 98* [5 September 1886]. London: Reeves and Turner, 1886.
- Lushington Archive [LA].
- Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. *Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti to William Allingham 1854–1870*. Ed. George Birkbeck Hill. London: Unwin, 1897.
- Slater, Joseph, ed. *The Correspondence of Emerson and Carlyle*. New York: Columbia UP, 1964.

Trela, D. J. "Carlyle, the Just War, and the Crimean War" *Carlyle Newsletter* 9 (1988): 2–11.

Werner, Marcia. *Pre-Raphaelite Painting and Nineteenth-Century Realism*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge UP, 2005.

Woolner, Amy. *Thomas Woolner, R.A. Sculptor and Poet. His Life in Letters*. New York: Dutton, 1917.