

victory, to have looked the grim monster in the face without flinching, and in this great triumph to have become a free man. Reading this, one marvels that a man of Carlyle's spiritual insight and moral discernment should look upon death as the greatest possible evil. That some of the greatest men have shrunk from it, is true; we have it on record that, to Dr. Johnson, death was the very "King of Terrors"; nevertheless, thousands upon thousands of men and women, old and young, learned and ignorant, rich and poor, noble and plebeian, have unfalteringly chosen death as the least of two evils. It is difficult to account for this conviction of Carlyle's save on the hypothesis that a strong regard for self was a prominent feature in his character.

(2) Passing over this incident in Carlyle's life, as one throwing considerable light on the moral nature of the man, some attention is due to the reasons which led him to adopt the creed of an extravagant hero worship. His openly expressed belief in intellectual and physical *force* as a moral power and social regenerator, is too well known to need illustration. The effect produced on young and plastic minds by such a writer as Carlyle was for a time very great; we may be thankful that the doctrine that Might is Right has ceased to have the charm with which the eulogist of Mirabeau, Cromwell, and Frederick the Great invested it. The immediate result of such teaching was the formation of a school of thinkers and writers, of which Froude is the ablest representative. It has led to the production of such historical works as Froude's History of England, and State of Ireland, and to the distortion of state documents and historical papers in the interest of the memory of Henry VIII., and other types of physical force and depraved morality. Carlyle himself, by the acceptance of this creed, was un-

consciously and inevitably led to become the defender of Governor Eyre, and the sympathizer with Southern slave-owners. The question then arises, on what ground could Carlyle base his belief in force as worthy of admiration and veneration? The explanation, defective though it may be, will be found in a letter addressed to John Sterling. Sterling did not hold in much respect the moral qualities of Goethe; he came to the rational conclusion that great as Goethe undoubtedly was, intellectually, his moral character was not worthy of admiration; in fact, he was one of the instances, by no means rare, of a great intellect being found in conjunction with a depraved heart. This view of Goethe Carlyle did not accept. "The sight of such a man," writes Carlyle, "was to me a gospel of gospels, and did literally, I believe, save me from destruction outward and inward. We are far parted now, but the memory of him shall be ever blessed to me as that of a deliverer from death. But on the whole, oh, John! what a belief thou hast *in the devil*; I declare myself an entire sceptic in that faith. Was there, is there, or will there be, a great intellect ever heard tell of without first a true and great heart to begin with? Never, if my experience and faith in this God's world have taught me anything at all. . . . Fear no *seeing* man, therefore. Know that *He* is in heaven whoever else be not; that the arch-enemy is the arch-stupid. I call this my fortieth Church Article, which absorbs into it and covers up in silence all the other thirty-nine." In these sentences we have the clue to Carlyle's political, social, and moral creed. A great and true heart must be found with a great intellect; the *seeing* man, the man of intellectual discernment, is the essentially moral man; he lives in heaven, the stupid abide in darkness. False though such a doctrine undoubtedly is, arguments of a specious character