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The Tory idealism of Thomas Carlyle (1795–1881) proved peculiarly congenial to Canadian authors during the colonial period and in the first sixty years after Confederation (1867), one possible reason being that the Canadian parliamentary system founded at Confederation was a projection and protector of the hierarchical and varied community that Carlyle’s principles embraced. The earliest influence of his tenets is particularly evident in emigrant literature, and his social philosophies are integral to the United Empire Loyalist myth as promulgated by William Kirby (1817–1906). Canadian academics such as George Robert Parkin (1846–1922) and Archibald MacMechan (1862–1933) taught Carlylean doctrines in the classroom to students who included two Confederation poets, Charles G. D. Roberts (1860–1943) and Bliss Carman (1861–1929), and the humorist, L. Maud Montgomery (1874–1942). As a result of the influence of his doctrines on these as well as other canonical writers, such as Archibald Lampman (1861–99) and Stephen Leacock (1869–1944), Carlyle’s sublime humor helped define Canada in the first years of the twentieth century.

Carlyle’s discussion of forms in his lectures On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the
It is meritorious to insist on forms; Religion and all else naturally clothes itself in forms. Everywhere the formed world is the only habitable one. The naked formlessness of Puritanism is not the thing I praise in the Puritans; it is the thing I pity, – praising only the spirit which had rendered that inevitable! All substances clothe themselves in forms: but there are suitable true forms, and then there are untrue, unsuitable. As the briefest definition, one might say, Forms which grow round a substance, if we rightly understand that, will correspond to the real nature and purport of it, will be true, good; forms which are consciously put round a substance, bad.1

According to Carlyle, all societies and individuals require political and social order. Form – or order – is what makes a community habitable, a life livable; it is the conqueror of shapelessness, chaos. Furthermore, true forms, religious or otherwise, are organic: they clothe without being works of artifice and so are complementary, not distorting. Carlyle arrived at his view of a naturally ordered society having eschewed what he regarded as the unnatural forms placed on English society preceding and during the Victorian period. His ideal community is, therefore, one in which individual responsibility is not legislated (social legislation, he argues elsewhere, is the sign of an unhealthy community), and yet it is one in which everyone plays a role. The community is whole and active.

While Carlyle is best described as a social critic, not a theorist (he disdained formulas), he was a literary theorist, and his social philosophy is present in his theories on humor, harmony, and the inverse sublime. Carlyle’s first major text, Sartor Resartus (1833–34), is a comic work in which he demonstrates how unnatural forms – particularly, outdated religious forms – disfigure rather than adorn society. The protagonist of Sartor Resartus, Diogenes Teufelsdröckh, shares his author’s view of forms:

“All visible things are emblems; what thou seest is not there on its own account; strictly taken, is not there at all: Matter exists only spiritually, and to represent some Idea, and body it forth. Hence Clothes, as despicable as we think them, are so unspeakably significant.2

Because Carlyle held that “[c]ustom . . . doth make dotards of us all,”3 he argued that old ideas that had become mechanical needed to be stripped away and new forms, natural forms, allowed to grow. In Sartor Resartus, this stripping away is done with an almost surgical irony. To underscore his technique and purpose, Carlyle has his Editor (who has charge of making sense of Teufelsdröckh’s papers) remark that it is “[w]onderful . . . with what cutting words, now and then, he [Teufelsdröckh] severs asunder the confusion; shears down, were it furlongs deep, into the true centre of the matter.”4 But despite its razor sharpness, the humor Carlyle practiced is not the acerbic wit of the rake; it is genial and inclusive. The exposed form beneath, like the undressed form of Puritanism in the lectures On Heroes, is to be pitied for its bareness and praised for its spirit. The style of comedy that Carlyle championed, then, blends humor and pathos to create sympathetic laughter, not ridicule. The “finest” laughter, he explains in “The Hero as Poet,” “is always a genial laughter.”5 This harmonious humor, producing genial laughter, was the comic expression of the same social vision that idealized an organic or whole community.

The relationship between humor and sociology was not lost on early Canadian authors. Tory writers who saw Carlyle’s organic community as the promise of Confederation praised responsibility and labor. At a time when the creation of a Canadian literary canon was viewed as a national imperative, most Canadian humor adhered to the theories of sympathetic humor expounded by Carlyle, especially his concept of the inverse sublime.

Humor and Sociology

In an 1830 review in Fraser’s Magazine, Carlyle lamented that the “true fountain of comic inspiration has long since been dried up in England,” adding that the drought would continue with the result that “the cursed and Typhonian influ-
ence of utilitarianism shall upset and destroy all existing institutions, and society should begin again, as it were, ‘ab ovo.’”

The national comic vision was, of course, not dead in England; as is the truth of all nations, it was and is irrepressible. What is, nevertheless, significant about Carlyle’s indictment of English humor is his reference to the dampening effects of utilitarianism in a statement about comic inspiration. This was not mere hyperbole. For Carlyle – as well as for numerous other nineteenth-century literary theorists – the humorous and the social were inseparable. Richard J. Dunn has examined Carlyle’s oeuvre in terms of his comedy and his social ethos: “According to his theory, humour is more a philosophic attitude than a stylistic device; it is ultimately the perspective which reconciles man’s laughter with his more serious reflections; it gives meaning and purpose to laughter.” Carlyle’s philosophical attitude and, consequently, his sense of the type of literary community needed to produce and endorse true humor led to his bitter statement in Fraser’s that comedy was effectively dead in an England, where the utilitarian values of theorists such as Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806–73) were in vogue.

At issue in much of Carlyle’s writing during the most productive period of his prolific literary career (1827–43) is the human cost of the industrial revolution; for this reason, Carlylean comedy regrets rather than endorses the growing mechanization of society. His was a deeply conservative humor. Carlyle had been raised a Presbyterian, and from Calvinism he gleaned a righteous suspicion of human nature that left him pessimistic about the utopian economics of his day. Carlyle’s religious sensibility – combined with the tangible evidence of working conditions in English mills – aided in his rejection of Adam Smith’s laissez-faire economic policy of laissez-faire. As a philosophical concept, laissez-faire is rooted in the notion that man is fundamentally good, and that his acquisitiveness, if left unregulated, will prove ultimately beneficent to his community. Public welfare is a side effect of an economy guided by Smith’s “invisible hand” of self-interest.

In An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations (1776), Smith explains that the individual, “[b]y pursuing his own interest[,] . . . frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it.” In the field of economics, laissez-faire therefore operates on the principle that, socially, self-interest can serve the greater good. Also current in Victorian economic and social thought was the Benthamite belief that whatever causes the greatest happiness is for the greatest good. Carlyle’s reading of the story of Job did not suggest to him, however, that happiness is a meaningful standard for human value. Like his friend and literary correspondent, the American philosopher Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803–82), Carlyle felt it was more important for individuals to be self-reliant than to be happy, and so he saw the ability to realize self-worth through labor as a more responsible and Christian basis for determining what might prove to serve the greatest good.

As a result of his conservative humanism, Carlyle challenged the landed gentry on the Corn Laws (1815–46), and yet he also opposed working-class Chartism. The fact that Carlyle, like Karl Marx (1818–83), decried the abuses of Adam Smith’s laissez-faire capitalism did not mean that he favored revolution. Despite his sympathies for the common man, Carlyle was neither a communist nor a radical. He was a Tory. The true hero in Carlylean philosophy is not the rebel perse (although his heroes included Oliver Cromwell) but the individual who creates or maintains order. In part, Carlyle was able to uphold his conservative values despite the more radical views of other reformers (including those of his friend John Stuart Mill) because he rejected the major philosophical tenets that had shaped the rational revolution of the late eighteenth century. His English translation of texts in the tradition of German idealism in combination with his inherited beliefs showed him a route out of the dominant philosophical concourses that ran like tributaries from Lockean empiricism and Continental ra-
Crucial to Burke's Toryism is the conviction that civil institutions should be maintained and improved rather than abandoned or overthrown. In Reflections, Burke argues that "we procure reverence to our civil institutions on the principle upon which nature teaches us to revere individual men; on account of their age; and on account of those from whom they are descended." And, in a statement that resounds in Carlyle, Burke rebukes the Tiers Etat at the time of the French Revolution: "The best [of them] he scoffs, "were only men of theory." Along with their Toryism, with their belief in slow progress and in the importance of the past, both Burke and Carlyle also adapted their social critiques to literary practice in their theories on the sublime. Burke wrote A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful (1757) while, in his essays on Jean Paul ([Johann Paul Friedrich Richter] 1763–1825), Carlyle described the "humorous sublime."

Throughout his writing, Carlyle's contempt for theories that in effect diminish humanity — that reduce it by suspending human values like a numerator over a variety of social causes — is palpable. "Men who rebel, and urge the Lower Classes to rebel," Carlyle inveighed against the Girondins in Chartism (1839), "ought to have other than Formulas to go upon." It was precisely because they had privileged ideas over humanity, formulas above belief, that he heaped scorn on them. To Carlyle, they were men "to whom millions of living fellow-creatures, with beating hearts in their bosoms, suffering, hoping, are 'masses,' mere 'explosive masses for blowing-down Bastilles with.'" Although Carlyle included Rousseau among his heroes, he remained deeply suspicious of his work and prized the German model of intuitive knowledge above either English empiricism or, especially, Continental rationalism. Like Edmund Burke (1793/30–97) in Reflections on the Revolution in France (1790), Carlyle strongly associated Continental rationalism with the moral depravity of the Reign of Terror (1793–94).

Burke's and Carlyle's beliefs were in close accord on several important issues, and Burke's Toryism is visible in Carlyle's social outlook. Crucial to Burke's Toryism is the conviction that civil institutions should be maintained and improved rather than abandoned or overthrown. In Reflections, Burke argues that "we procure reverence to our civil institutions on the principle upon which nature teaches us to revere individual men; on account of their age; and on account of those from whom they are descended." And, in a statement that resounds in Carlyle, Burke rebukes the Tiers Etat at the time of the French Revolution: "The best [of them] he scoffs, "were only men of theory." Along with their Toryism, with their belief in slow progress and in the importance of the past, both Burke and Carlyle also adapted their social critiques to literary practice in their theories on the sublime. Burke wrote A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful (1757) while, in his essays on Jean Paul ([Johann Paul Friedrich Richter] 1763–1825), Carlyle described the "humorous sublime."

To see Carlyle's humor as being a reflection of his serious philosophic attitudes, then, is to recognize the deep conservatism behind his comic vision. But although Carlyle's humor was conservative, it was also comprehensive. While Carlyle distrusted the revolutionary spirit, he did not advocate stasis. He clarifies this position in "Characteristics" (1831): "Change is universal and inevitable," but "[t]he true Past departs not, nothing that was worthy in the Past departs; no Truth or Goodness realised by man ever dies, or can die; but is all still here, and, recognised or not, lives and works through endless changes." Carlyle's perspective on the present is not one in which it is necessary or even useful to break free from the tyranny of history (as it would be for some modernists after the First World War). "The bough that is dead shall be cut away, for the sake of the tree itself," he expostulates in Past and Present (1843), but nowhere in his writing does he advocate uprooting the tree for the sake of a new growth or even a wall. Nor is it his view that it would be desirable (were it possible) to turn back the clock; rather, he sees the present as being in a constant state of transition while maintaining faith in what he deems to be the...
tangible virtues of the past. 26 Specifically, as a result of this worldview, Carlylean humor is broad and encompassing, not aloof and limited. His comedy achieves breadth by blending humor and pathos to create what Leigh Hunt (1784–1859) had defined in 1807 as the “humorously pathetic.” 27 This style of comedy privileges sympathetic identification over superiority, and it gives Carlyle’s humor depth by making it inclusive rather than exclusive or even indifferent.

Looking overseas to a society in which utilitarianism seemed to him to hold less sway than in Britain, Carlyle in the same 1830 Fraser’s article in which he decried utilitarianism prophesied that “[i]n America will be for the next century the fair and ample field for comedy.” 28 Carlyle’s endorsement of the United States, which was perhaps based on Burke’s earlier attempt at conciliation with America, was short-lived. He would later regard the American Revolution (1775–83) as a gross error, but at the time, his positive assessments of America and of the potential for American humor indicate the degree to which he felt that the social and the humorous were interrelated. 29 In truth, Carlylean humor did have an impact on the American literary marketplace, but Carlyle’s brand of comedy proved particularly enduring in Canada, a country that had not severed its ties with the past, a country where social and political progress tended to be conservative in vision, orderly in execution.

Carlyle was no stranger to the Canadian situation. When a younger brother, Alexander (1797–1876), was no longer able to support himself in England, Carlyle urged him to emigrate to Canada. In an 1843 letter, while Alexander was still in Chelsea, Carlyle wrote: “I hope yet to see you in Canada some day; and sit by your hearth on ground that belongs to yourself and the Maker alone!” 30 Had Carlyle fulfilled his wish, had he visited Alexander in Canada in 1867, he would almost certainly have felt at home with political developments in the country. In Canada he would have encountered a hierarchical form of government modeled on the British parliamentary system, a form that sounded peculiarly Carlylean when compared by advocates such as Thomas D’Arcy McGee (1825–68) to American democracy. Carlyle had written in Chartism that American democracy could exist only in a fertile land where work was abundant and “[w]here no government . . . [was] wanted, save that of the parish-constable” and that even then it was best seen as a temporary measure, “as a swift transition towards something other and farther.” 31 McGee’s comments in a speech delivered in Cornwall, Ontario, and recorded in the New York Times on 2 July 1867, the day after Confederation, are a forceful expression of political beliefs that are very similar to Carlyle’s:

Democratic rule may be good in some respects; but our representative system, founded upon the recognition of the right of all classes, acknowledging the claims of minorities to protection from the tyranny of majorities . . . is the highest system of free government yet instituted among men. In established representative institutions here we are doing true service to the people of the United States, we are teaching them the advantage of our form of government over theirs. If there are among our neighbours’ minorities, religious, political or social, borne down by the weight of the mere majority, they have only to look across the St. Lawrence to find a place of asylum where they can obtain that security denied them at home. 32

What McGee approvingly describes – a hierarchical system that can protect the rights of all classes – is a fundamental aspect of the Carlylean political ideal.

Twelve years after “Characteristics,” in which he depicted society as a living organism with each individual playing a vital role, Carlyle returned in Past and Present to his theme of social connectedness, and examined and named the concept of wholeness. Society, Carlyle maintained throughout his literary career, should be regarded more in terms of something living than of something legislated. Like the various constituents of a body, persons in a community are distinct from each other but still essential to the survival of the group as a whole. In “Characteristics” he stresses this interconnectedness:

To understand man . . . we must look beyond the individual man and his actions or inter-
This passage merits examination. Here, in germination, is the Carlylean doctrine of wholeness— an idea of individual and collective responsibility that might be called a gestalt theory of society (that is, a theory in which the whole is greater than the sum of its parts). According to Carlyle’s interpretation of the social sphere, individuals are enlarged by their communion with others. This enlargement is spiritual and moral. Carlyle’s delineation of society as “genial” projects a familial identification between persons and their community. As is generally the case in home life, it is in society that “Morality begins; here at least it takes an altogether new form, and on every side, as in living growth, expands itself.” This is a description of neither communism nor democracy, but of wholeness: “Society [in the past] was what we can call whole, in both senses of the word,” Carlyle explains in “Characteristics”: “[t]he individual man was in himself a whole, or complete union; and could combine with his fellows as the living member of a greater whole.” Unlike communism or democracy, the principle of wholeness could not simply (or entirely) be legislated into existence, but required active participation from members of the community. When Carlyle asserts that “all men, through their life, were animated by one great Idea; thus all efforts pointed one way, everywhere there was wholeness,” the “one great idea” to which he refers is that of personal responsibility. In Past and Present, Carlyle illustrates his argument with a striking allusion to Nova Scotian author Thomas Chandler Haliburton and his character, Sam Slick, who appeared in Haliburton’s satirical sketch— “Vagrant Sam-Slicks, who rove over the Earth doing 'strokes of trade,' what wealth have they? . . . Slick rests nowhere, he is homeless.” What Carlyle advocates, then, is very different from what was to become the great American export: democracy. In contrast to Carlyle’s ideal of responsibility and difference, the American system touted freedom and stressed homogeneity.

Carlyle’s organic society is representative of the underlying social philosophy that, according to McGehee’s Cornwall speech, Canada’s parliamentary system was established to protect; and Carlyle’s humor, which was the product and reflection of his ideologies, found fertile soil in the newly shaped country. During his lifetime, Carlyle’s influence crossed a seemingly incompatible political divide: his doctrines resonate in the writings of emigrant authors such as Susanna Moodie (1803–85) and Catharine Parr Traill (1802–99), and also in the work of Kirby, a neo-Loyalist mythographer. After Confederation and into the first third of the twentieth century, while his reputation waned in Europe, Carlyle’s philosophical attitude remained a force on Canadian writers, critics, and academics engaged in the project of identifying and promulgating a sense of national identity. And his influence was especially enduring among Canadian scholars and among the Confederation poets and humorists.

**HUMOR AND HARMONY: CARLYLE’S INVERSE SUBLIME**

During his lifetime and into the Edwardian period, Carlyle was critically acknowledged for his humor. In an 1866 letter, George Meredith advises: “In reading Carlyle, bear in mind that he is a humourist.” Likewise, in 1903, G. K. Chesterton (1874–1936) relates Carlyle’s sense of wholeness to Old Testament humor:

The profound security of Carlyle’s sense of the unity of the Cosmos is like that of a Hebrew prophet; and it has the same expression that it had in the Hebrew prophets—humour. . . . Other writers had seen that there could be something elemental and eternal in a song or statute, he alone saw that there could be something elemental and eternal in a joke.
Carlyle needs to be seen.

In the nineteenth century, most critical discussions of humor derived from one of two sources, either the superiority theory as espoused by Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) or the incongruity theory first sketched by Aristotle (384-22 BCE) in *Poetics* and expounded by theorists from Joseph Addison (1672–1719) to Carlyle. Neither of these concepts can be said to constitute a theory, but, by the dawn of the nineteenth century, ideas turning on incongruity dominated critical views of what humor should be and what it should do, whereas explanations based on superiority had outlived their popularity with critics and theorists. During the Restoration period, the comic sensation of superiority – what Hobbes described as “Sudden Glory,” along with the type of humor said to produce that sentiment – suited the sociopolitical creed of a society reacting against Puritanism.

Hobbes’s statement that the work of Carlyle’s theory of social wholeness was translated in his humor as comic harmony. His first major work, *Sartor Resartus*, is a transcendental, semi-autobiographical account of the author’s spiritual and intellectual growth that also includes his views on the spiritual condition of his culture. Despite – or perhaps because of – its serious objectives, *Sartor Resartus* is a work of humor. Peter Allan Dale observes that the “humor, the essentially friendly and sympathetic rather than satiric laughter that Teufelsdröckh and his Editor inspire, keeps the reader constantly in mind of the fact that the ultimate aim of the book is not Denial but Affirmation.”

Carlyle demonstrates how meaningless creeds and dead traditions can be parted from the body beneath, how the stultifying weight of outdated beliefs can be shed in deference to the truly human. The metaphor was not new when Carlyle employed it; Jonathan Swift (1667–1745) in *A Tale of a Tub* (1696) also used clothing as an allegory for religious beliefs. In Swift’s work, man is held up to righteous ridicule because beneath his disguise he is not noble but pretentious. For Swift, man is a species of hypocrite, and the very existence of his clothing proves the meanness of what lies beneath. In contrast, Carlyle disrobes his subject of his beliefs in order to sympathize with the unadorned human condition, not to condemn it. He notes in *Sartor Resartus* that “there is something great in the moment when a man first strips himself of adventitious wrappages; and sees indeed that he is naked, and, as Swift has it, ‘a forked straddling animal with bandy legs; yet also a Spirit, and unutterable Mystery of Mysteries.’ The clothes are extraneous; they are not indicators of character flaws. The distinction is important and points to a change of attitude towards humor that occurred principally during the Victorian period, and against the background of which Hobbes associates laughter with egotism, an explanation that can stake only a modest claim to a theory of comedy (although Sigmund Freud’s “tendency wit” resembles Hobbes’s Sudden Glory). Hobbes’s commentary amounts to a rebuke to laughter, and the power of the interregnum and Cromwellian legal piety to influence literary productions waned with time. By the nineteenth century, Hobbes’s kind of laughter, associated with Cavalier wit, was regarded as vulgar and irreverent.
“great minds” is not to laugh but to “free others from scorn” suggests the influence of the Bible on his understanding of the human condition. Throughout *Leviathan*, Hobbes attempts to reconcile the ways of God with the workings of a nation; and laughter, in the Bible, is consistently associated with vanity and moral stupidity. A New Testament story that is common to the Synoptics associates laughter with shame. In Matthew, Jesus raises from the dead the daughter of a ruler: “Give place: for the maid is not dead, but sleepest," Jesus says to an astounded, disbelieving household, which replies by “laugh[ing] him to scorn” (Matt. 9:24, and see Mark 5:40 and Luke 8:53 [AV]). In that story, laughter is next to blasphemy, because the laughter expresses superiority where humility is warranted. If laughter in the New Testament is linked to arrogance, in the Old Testament it is associated with foolishness, and its very sound is cacophonous, not cheerful. According to Ecclesiastes 7:4–6: “The heart of the wise is in the house of mourning; but the heart of fools is in the house of mirth. . . . For as the cracking of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of the fool: this also is vanity.” Biblical outrage at laughter is consistent with Hobbes’s condemnation of it. And Carlyle, while himself a humorist, was likewise antagonistic to certain uses of laughter.

Carlyle was, of course, aware of the Biblical disapproval of laughter, and in three separate works he condemns humor arising from an assumption of superiority. In the lecture “The Hero as Poet,” he argues that “good laughter is not the cracking of thorns under the pot,” and he contends for a different type of laughter that exists beyond what is described in the Old Testament: “Laughter means sympathy.” In the 1829 essay “Voltaire,” he deflates specifically the kind of humor arising from superiority: “Ridicule,” he comments, “is indeed a faculty much prized by its possessors; yet, intrinsically, it is a small faculty; we may say, the smallest of all faculties that other men are at the pains to repay with any esteem.” In *Past and Present*, he connects a stance of superiority in humor with insincerity, warning that “Such grinning inanity is very sad to the soul of man.”

Backing Carlyle’s rejection of superiority as grounds for humor was Victorian gentility. Donald Gray describes Victorian society as one that “championed benevolence and gentle manners as marks of high civilization,” and for this reason Carlyle’s admonition against superiority in humor placed him among the majority of critics. Most nineteenth-century writers rejected superiority in favor of incongruity as an explanation of laughter, one that suggested a kindlier humor, but this alternative theory likewise suffered from vagueness and was open to a wide range of interpretations.

Incongruity, as the concept was first used by Aristotle to frame a theory of humor, indicates a duality that in and of itself is bereft of social or moral contexts. Ideology needs to be asserted as a component of incongruity in order for comedy to have propagandistic value. For instance, in *Laughter* (1900), Henri Bergson (1859–1941), writing at the close of the Victorian period, theorizes that “[a] situation is invariably comic when it belongs simultaneously to two altogether independent series of events and is capable of being interpreted in two entirely different meanings at the same time.” This account differs from Hobbes’s in attributing laughter to the intellectual pleasure of observing a paradoxical arrangement rather than to feelings of superiority, but the “independent series of events” to which Bergson refers might involve any actions whatsoever. As an ideological statement, Bergson’s notion of the comic, at least in the passage quoted above, is without content. In another passage, Bergson’s theory is specific because the kind of incongruity he chooses to focus on relates firmly to his arguments about elasticity. “Any arrangement of acts and events is comic,” he writes, “which gives us, in a single combination, the illusion of life and the distinct impression of a mechanical arrangement.” Here, the incongruity is specifically between the living and the mechanical, but the theory of incongruity available to scholars at the beginning of the nineteenth century was broader.
The type of humor Aristotle describes in *Poetics*, a style of comedy that is more kind than cruel, formed the basis of most Victorian ideas about humor. For Aristotle, the ludicrous consists in some defect of ugliness that is not painful or destructive. As an example, Aristotle points to the comic mask, which is “ugly and distorted,” but which does not imply pain. The provisions that Aristotelian humor must exclude pain and combine the possible with the actual, or the ideal with the real, meant that the theory could be used to assert positive social values. Abigail Bloom explains that “implicit in this idea [of doubleness or incongruity] is a normal world order against which difference can be measured.” While the idea of incongruity implied a standard against which Victorian humorists could measure the foibles of society, their humor would not be as aggressive or hurtful as Restoration wit had been. Instead, there was to be what Stuart Tave describes as a “good-natured and good-humored ideal [that] exerted a twofold influence on the comic: it corrected the Puritan by liberating and encouraging the milder forms of comic expression, the smile, or sympathetic laughter, and innocent mirth; and it corrected the rake by controlling and discouraging the more vigorous forms, punitive laughter, satiric wit.” But the humor of incongruity still needed concrete definitions – even a new language of critical terms – in order to enter into academic discourse.

In “Mr. Bannister” (1807), Leigh Hunt described the humor of the stage actor, John Bannister (1760–1836), as more Aristotelian than Hobbesian because of what it did not do – it avoided scorn. But what it did do by marrying humor and pathos rendered it nearly unclassifiable. In Hunt’s description of Bannister one can sense the freshness of the idea. Hunt opines that “to mingle feeling with humor, and humor with feeling, seems to be Mr. Bannister’s nature rather than his art.” The distinction between nature and art is neither irrelevant nor equivocal, but essential and absolute; Bannister’s humor is organic to his characterization – it is the comedic pulse that gives life to his portrayals. Unable to place Bannister’s work within the current terms of critical discourse, Hunt coins a new term:

It cannot be called tragi-comedy, for though it breathes a gentle spirit of humor, its essence is really serious; it differs widely from ludicrous distress, for though it raises our smiles, it never raises our contempt, but in the midst of our very inclination to be amused absolutely moves us with a pathetic sympathy; perhaps it may be defined as the humorous pathetic, the art of raising our tears and our smiles together, while each have a simple and distinct cause.

Here, in embryo, is a definition of the genre of humor that would typify Victorian productions. Hunt’s “humorous pathetic,” itself a form of incongruous humor, would be further explicated by Carlyle, and given a new terminology that translated the dramatic to the literary.

Not surprisingly for Carlyle, he found a language for his humor in German literature. In his 1827 essay, “Jean Paul Friedrich Richter,” he identifies the “humorous pathetic”: “Richter is a man of mirth,” but “in his smile itself a touching pathos may lie hidden, a pity too deep for tears.” Pity, for Richter, is not cathartic (as it is for Wordsworth), but social. In Richter, “a man of feeling, in the noblest sense of that word,” Carlyle could claim a humorist whose humor produced an effect of “harmony,” which is a key word in Carlyle’s epistemology. Harmony, like sympathy, is knowledge. As Carlyle’s Editor claims in Sartor Resartus, a man’s laughter gives insight into his moral character:

Some men wear an everlasting barren simper; in the smile of others lies a cold glitter as of ice: the fewest are able to laugh, what can be called laughing, but only sniff and titter and snigger from the throat outwards; or at best, produce some whiffing husky cachinnation, as if they were laughing through wool: of none such comes good. The man who cannot laugh is not only fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils; but his whole life is already a treason and a stratagem.

True humor is “sympathy,” as Carlyle asserts in “The Hero as Poet.” This statement places Carlyle’s humor in correspondence with his social criticism. According to Tave, “By the beginning
of the nineteenth century an increasing confidence in the goodness of the free play of natural emotion and spirits made frank laughter a sign of an open and universal humanity, and even an unrestrained laughter at times a sign of a large, wise, and sympathetic heart.45 As the age became increasingly mechanical, however, Carlyle perceived that a mechanistic society was beset by a crisis in sympathy. Formulas supplanted extra-rational humanistic values; ideas superseded beliefs. When Carlyle writes of Richter that "Aversion itself with him is not hated; he despises much, but justly, with tolerance also, with placidity, and even a sort of love," the focus on tolerance and placidity was the result of Carlyle’s perception of this crisis in sympathy.46

In Poetics, Aristotle opposes comedy to tragedy, designating tragedy as "an imitation of personages better than the ordinary man," and arguing that tragic characterization should attempt to "reproduce the distinctive features of a man, and at the same time, without losing the likeness, make him handsomer than he is." According to Aristotle, then, tragedy involves a representation of personages of high station in which the characters presented are to be elevated above the common man. In contrast, comedy, for him, is "an imitation of men worse than the average."47 Here, again, there is an attempt at producing difference. In comedy, the personages represented are to be of low station, and they are to be represented in a way that stresses the human aspects that place them below the common man.

In his essays on Richter, Carlyle mixes elements from Aristotle’s genres in order to produce an effect that he calls the inverse sublime. In "Jean Paul Friedrich Richter," he makes his most important statement on humor, one that establishes a method by which the humorous pathetic can be adopted to produce a harmonious humor. As is the case with the Carlylean notion of wholeness, the comedic ideal of harmony is personal and public: True humour springs not more from the head than from the heart; it is not contempt.

Carlyle’s Inverse Sublime

its essence is love; it issues not in laughter, but in still smiles, which lie far deeper. It is a sort of inverse sublimity; exalting, as it were, into our affections what is below us, while sublimity draws down into our affection what is above us. The former is scarcely less precious or heart-affecting than the latter; perhaps it is still rarer, and, as a test of genius, still more decisive. It is, in fact, the bloom and perfume, the purest effluence of a deep, fine and loving nature; a nature in harmony with itself, reconciled to the world and its stintedness and contradiction, nay, finding in this very contradiction new elements of beauty as well as goodness.48

The style of humor that Carlyle admires in Richter is more Aristotelian than Hobbesian, and yet distinct from both of those theoretical orientations. Richter’s humor, in Carlyle’s account, has its basis in incongruity in that it is humanistic, but it does not necessarily have its basis in comedy. Because Carlyle’s inverse sublime draws on the lofty and not just on the low, and because it humanizes its subject (whether high or low), it is twice removed from Aristotelian comedy. Carlyle was evidently aware of the distinction when he wrote in his second essay on Richter, “Jean Paul Friedrich Richter Again” (1830), that Richter "is a Humorist . . . not only in low provinces of thought, where this is more common, but in the loftiest provinces, where it is well-nigh unexampled."49 The purpose of the inverse sublime is to produce a state of harmony, which is the comedic equivalent to social wholeness. In a study of inverse sublimity in Victorian humor, Max Keith Sutton writes: "This analogue to the view of an organically unified existence is the viewpoint underlying the inverse sublimity of Victorian humor. As a way of looking at life, it could appeal to the desires of many persons to see a more human, more poetically interesting world than the one described by scientists."50 While Carlyle’s inverse sublime presents the heroic in comedy as deeply human, the concept also presents a strategy for Carlyle’s more serious writing.

When applied to his serious characterizations of important people, Carlyle’s inverse sublime can be said to have its ancestry in the Puritan artistic sensibilities of Cromwell as well as in Richter’s prose. Cromwell uttered the quintes-
The greatest evidence of Carlyle's influence upon the social theory of Dickens is to be found in *Hard Times*. The novel, inscribed to Carlyle, made a deliberate attempt to weave in as many of his teachings as possible. The multiplicity of details supplying proof of influence is striking. 56

Throughout his writing, Dickens uses humor to elevate lower-class characters by making them sympathetic to his readership. In doing this, he follows not only Carlyle's social theories but also his theories of humor. 57

Although twentieth-century writers would accuse Carlyle of being un-theoretical, he never claimed to be a social theorist; he identified himself as a critic—a censor. Nevertheless, Carlyle's inverse sublimity places his social criticism within literary theory, and his theories on humor in particular influenced his own and later generations of writers. 58

Types of comic characters that Carlyle admires, then, are the Falstaffs and Sancho Panzas of literature whose lives are ruled by their stomachs and yet whose portrayals are poetic, even sportful, and this idea of humor that elevates the subject was especially attractive to Dickens, who might almost be considered Carlyle's protégé in the art of this kind of comedy. Mildred G. Christian, writing on Carlyle's influence on Dickens, remarks about the two writers' personal relationship: "in the enthusiasm of any fresh encounter with Dickens, Carlyle was likely to be carried away with the man's personality and especially with his 'cheerful geniality'—Carlyle's own phrase." Carlyle's enthusiasm for Dickens was more than reciprocated by the younger man. According to Christian, "Dickens, in his nearly thirty years' friendship with Carlyle, maintained, throughout, an attitude of respectful, enthusiastic, loving veneration, such as a son might offer a father." 55

Respecting Carlyle's influence on Dickens's social ideas, Christian describes Dickens as "attempting throughout the period of his novel-writing to be one of those 'wielders of a sharp sickle' whom Carlyle so earnestly desired":
With no financial resources, no one to give him a "push," he launched himself in London in 1873, to practise Medicine for a livelihood, but especially to study what he used to call "problems of the World and of Human Life," and to offer his original solutions in this vast puzzle through the medium of literature. One reads with a certain amused interest how in search for counsel on this project he betook himself immediately after his arrival to the writer whose books had at once stimulated and perplexed his own thought so much in the rural hamlet of Ontario. After a letter in which he asked for an interview with Thomas Carlyle had secured an invitation for "not more than ten minutes," he made his way to Cheyne Row and waited his turn to see the sage of Chelsea. Standing on the hearth-rug, young Crozier explained that he had much to say to mankind about "great problems of the World and Human Life."61

Stewart's sketch of Crozier provides remarkable evidence of the extent of Carlyle's popularity – the reach of his celebrity – in Canada during his lifetime. Even though Carlyle told Crozier to stick to medicine – it paid better – the memory of the meeting between the two men was important enough to Crozier that, nearly fifty years after the event had taken place, it remained as one of the defining stories of his life.

These two examples, the Lutheran psalm and Stewart's eulogistic anecdote, suggest both the subtlety and the penetration of Carlyle's influence on early Canadian writers. In 1908, parishioners in Church of England churches across Canada would have recognized the name in their newly published praise books of the translator of "Hymn 391," the Lutheran psalm "Eine feste Burg ist unser Gott."60 Even twenty-seven years after his death, Carlyle's name remained ubiquitous in Canada. His writing and translations had an impact on every level of Canadian society. A 1921 article in the Dalhousie Review gives surprising evidence of the extent to which Carlyle's celebrity penetrated even small-town Ontario. In "A Neglected Man of Letters," Herbert L. Stewart describes the literary career of Dr. John Beattie Crozier (1849–1921), the author of History of Intellectual Development on the Lines of Modern Evolution (1897). In the course of describing Crozier's intellectual development, Stewart relates the following anecdote:

Carlyle's inverse sublime was not only a term but also a technique that belonged to the literature of a peculiar social vision. His theories on humor inspired a generation of English writers, including Dickens, and his influence on Canadian writers from the colonial to the Confederation periods would prove especially strong.

THE DOCTRINE OF WHOLENESS, THE HUMOR OF HARMONY, AND THEIR IMPACT ON CANADIAN WRITERS

In 1908, parishioners in Church of England churches across Canada would have recognized the name in their newly published praise books of the translator of "Hymn 391," the Lutheran psalm "Eine feste Burg ist unser Gott."60 Even twenty-seven years after his death, Carlyle's name remained ubiquitous in Canada. His writing and translations had an impact on every level of Canadian society. A 1921 article in the Dalhousie Review gives surprising evidence of the extent to which Carlyle's celebrity penetrated even small-town Ontario. In "A Neglected Man of Letters," Herbert L. Stewart describes the literary career of Dr. John Beattie Crozier (1849–1921), the author of History of Intellectual Development on the Lines of Modern Evolution (1897). In the course of describing Crozier's intellectual development, Stewart relates the following anecdote:

Carlyle's Inverse Sublime

With no financial resources, no one to give him a "push," he launched himself in London in 1873, to practise Medicine for a livelihood, but especially to study what he used to call "problems of the World and of Human Life," and to offer his original solutions in this vast puzzle through the medium of literature. One reads with a certain amused interest how in search for counsel on this project he betook himself immediately after his arrival to the writer whose books had at once stimulated and perplexed his own thought so much in the rural hamlet of Ontario. After a letter in which he asked for an interview with Thomas Carlyle had secured an invitation for "not more than ten minutes," he made his way to Cheyne Row and waited his turn to see the sage of Chelsea. Standing on the hearth-rug, young Crozier explained that he had much to say to mankind about "great problems of the World and Human Life."61

Stewart's sketch of Crozier provides remarkable evidence of the extent of Carlyle's popularity – the reach of his celebrity – in Canada during his lifetime. Even though Carlyle told Crozier to stick to medicine – it paid better – the memory of the meeting between the two men was important enough to Crozier that, nearly fifty years after the event had taken place, it remained as one of the defining stories of his life.

These two examples, the Lutheran psalm and Stewart's eulogistic anecdote, suggest both the subtlety and the penetration of Carlyle's influence on early Canadian writers. How aware were parishioners singing "Hymn 391" of the extent to which Carlyle's interest in Northern European literature had affected their own sense of nationalism?60 What complicates any discussion of Carlyle's influence on Canadian writers is that, by mid-century, his ideas had become mainstream to the point that people did not realize they were quoting him. The following two passages describe what might be called the phenomenon of Carlyle's invisible influence (and also show the facility with which English opinions crossed the Atlantic Ocean). In a 27 October 1855 article in the Leader, George Eliot (1819–80) was of the opinion that there was hardly a superior or active mind of this generation that has not been modified by Carlyle's writings; there has hardly been an English
older brother, Canadians could still assert that their country maintained blood connections with the “Sage of Chelsea.” The Globe boasted that, although Carlyle died childless, he “left a large circle of relatives, many of whom are in Canada, to cherish his memory.”68 In the Canadian Monthly and National Review alone, six publications on Carlyle appeared during the first year after his death.69 As late as 1894, John Sharp, writing in the Queen’s Quarterly, could claim a place for Carlyle’s criticism in contemporary Canada:

Carlyle began his work in an age when the selfishness of men was regarded as one of the highest evidences of divine providence, Bentham, Ricardo, Mill, were the names to conjure with, and it was held that if men were let alone, society would run itself. . . . In this vortex or rather co-mingling of vortices Carlyle was the first Englishman to discern and herald the order which was struggling through the disorder . . . . It may be added that notwithstanding the changes of the past sixty years Carlyle’s criticism of society is still vital, and the light which he brought to the problems of his day may still be a torch to us.70

Not only is Sharp’s essay an argument about Carlyle; it is also a document on the peculiar influence that Carlyle exerted in Canada long after his death. Carlyle’s importance to Canadian authors during colonial times is best seen by the degree to which his ideas are disseminated in the writing of two significant groups: British emigrant writers, and writers who subscribed to the Loyalist myth. His doctrine of responsibility focusing on labor as an indicator of personal worth is at the moral core of Alexander McLachlan’s (1818–96) writing; and his idealization of an organic community in which the practice of hero-worship is respected, and in which the need for social continuity with the past is cherished, is at the heart of Kirby’s construction of the United Empire Loyalist myth (as it is in the writings of Ralph Connor [1860–1937], the best-selling writer in the English-speaking world in the 1890s). In all these writers, treatments of Carlyle’s key doctrines are infused with humor: humor allows McLachlan to elevate the
working man, while it enables Kirby to humanize his portrait of Sir Isaac Brock (1769–1812).

Although the four-stages theory that underpins many early Canadian conceptions of social development argued that a fully developed country allows its citizens time for leisure, emigrant literature written in and about Canada during the colonial period is deeply indebted to Carlyle's valuation of work over recreation.73 As noted above, Carlyle's worship of work was one reason why his philosophy was opposed to Benthamism, since he argued that a notion of happiness that is measured solely by material possessions, leisure, and mirth, is not a meaningful goal for any individual's life, let alone for the life of a society; such happiness is a mere byproduct of striving. "It is not what a man outwardly has or wants," Carlyle contends in Chartism, "that constitutes the happiness or misery of him."74 Happiness can be acquired, but it is not properly in itself the product of an individual's acquisitiveness. In any case, the Bible does not promise happiness on earth; rather, in a Carlylean emphasis, it insists that "[i]n the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" and instructs that "[s]ix days shall work be done" for every one day of rest (Gen. 3:19; Exod. 35:2).75

Work is peculiarly suited to Carlyle's worldview for a number of reasons. Labor is private; regardless of how many people work together, an individual's exertions are his or her own. Labor becomes public when it produces order. This was often the case in colonial Canada where, for instance, the labor of clearing land produced tangible results from which neighbors could benefit along with the individual. Moreover, in keeping with the notion of a whole society in which only active participation brings about the full realization of society, such a society was more living than legislated. Labor – both personal and public, but above all active – was not just a metaphor; it was a process.

In emigrant literature a person's labor is the yardstick by which his or her social status is marked within the community. As Catharine Parr Traill observes in The Backwoods of Canada (1836) and Susanna Moodie likewise recognizes in Roughing It in the Bush, the leisured class was unsuited to life in Canada. A gentleman, Traill warns her readers, "brings with him a mind unfitted to his situation; and even if necessity compels him to exertion, his labour is of little value."76 Moodie concurs: "To the poor, industrious working man it [Canada] presents many advantages; to the poor gentleman, none!"77 (Notably, one of Moodie's greatest embarrassments mentioned in Roughing It in the Bush is her inability to milk cows.) In a world sans social registry, the very unsuitableness of gentlemen – and ladies – to colonial life meant that other standards for social status than inherited ones would apply. Carlyle professes in Chartism that the man who can work is a born king:

He that can work is a born king of something; is in communion with Nature, is master of a thing or things, is a priest and king of Nature so far. He that can work at nothing is but a usurping king, be his trappings what they may; he is the born slave of all things. Let a man honour his craftsmanship, his can-do.78

Carlyle's regal language proved important to emigrant authors. In an article, "The Dignity of Labour," which Susanna Moodie and her husband excerpted from Sartor Resartus and printed in their Victoria Magazine (1847–48), Carlyle uses the language of nobility when he describes the "hard hand" of the "toil-worn craftsman" as "indefeasibly royal, as of the septre [sic] of this planet,"79 and this was the idiom of identity throughout emigrant literature. Carlyle's indefeasibly royal scepter of labor was politically empowering for Max in Isabella Valancy Crawford's (1850–87) Malcolm's Katie (1884), who boasts: "‘We build up nations – this my axe and I!’"80 In Alexander McLachlan's poetry, the Carlylean labor ethos found perhaps its most vocal champion.

McLachlan's "Acres Of Your Own" contains the lines, "True men all must toil and drudge. / Nature's true Nobility / Scorns such mock gentility,"81 an aphorism that testifies to the extent to which Carlyle's ideals influenced the poet's social outlook. E. H. Dewart (1828–1903).
Carlylean language of the “orator” who spurs on his fellow men by asserting that “by honest manly toil, / Lords we shall be of the soil.” He continues in the lexicon of aristocracy, claiming that “[w]hen a job is well begun, / Success crowns the persevering.”

Work not only signified social rank and self-worth, but also placed the solitary woodsman or farmer, laboring in the wilderness, in contact with the sublime. Like Saint Paul, Carlyle discerned that the creation of order through labor brought him closer to his own creator: “All true Work is sacred; in all true Work, were it but true hand-labour, there is something of divineness,” he declares in Past and Present; and in the passage quoted by the Moodies from Sartor Resartus, he expresses how “[u]nspeakably touching is it” when he finds “both dignities united: and he that must toil outwardly for the lowest of man’s wants, is also toiling inwardly for the highest.” McLachlan describes the combined work of a number of men cutting the first tree as “a kind of sacrament.” Labor is ennobling according to emigrant writing because it ennobles the soul, bringing the sublime within reach of the understanding and making the poor self-reliant and responsible. McLachlan’s humorous treatment of the theme of labor in Canada serves a serious purpose by elevating the common man and dignifying his work, an aim that is consistent with Carlyle’s social outlook and with his literary theories. Labor was the metaphoric church and castle of emigrant writing, and this theme also proved a component of the United Empire Loyalist myth.

The Loyalist myth in Ontario during the late-Victorian and Edwardian periods held a vital position in the historical and literary productions from this period and helped to define and assert a conservative ethos, one effect of which was the bringing together of disparate communities from Niagara to Kingston and beyond. According to Dennis Duffy, the Loyalist myth “was not a matter of ancient precedent and philosophical positions alone, but a view shaped by specif-
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ic, recollected, ordered, and embellished historical events.” Nowhere was it more strongly asserted than in the writing of Kirby who, like McLachlan, admired and adopted Carlyle’s doctrines, transplanting them in New World soil. In Kirby’s writing, Loyalist history is translated into a near-biblical account of paradise lost (the Loyalist migration from the United States after 1783), paradise regained (the creation of peaceable communities in the Canadian wilderness), and paradise defended and secured (the War of 1812–14, the Rebellion of 1837, the Fenian Raids of 1866). The fact that a small army of British soldiers and natives had, with the help of Loyalist volunteers, defeated a numerically superior enemy during the War of 1812–14 seemingly testified to Kirby’s belief in Loyalist destiny. His treatment of the three mythological stages of Loyalist settlement is indebted to a Carlylean belief in labor, order, and heroism, and his depiction of an ideal community is bolstered by the unifying power of humor as embodied in his hero.

Kirby’s admiration for Carlyle is repeatedly evident in his Annals of Niagara (1896). In the opening chapter, Kirby introduces his history of Loyalism with a Carlylean exhortation:

Riches are deceitful if they occupy too exclusively our thoughts and energies in their acquisition. Pleasures and pastimes that are not the allowable relaxation of honest work or study, weaken the hands and dull the edge of the intellect – deadening the better feelings which dignify and adorn true manhood.

In “The Hungry Year” (1859), Kirby describes Canada, as Carlyle did, as a “land of labour, but of sure reward.” His long poem, The U.E.: A Tale of Upper Canada (written in 1846 and published in 1859) begins in Carlylean fashion by imagining an idyllic past in which labor is ennobling. In Kirby’s Edenic history, people “In cheerful labours pass their peaceful days, / While grateful evening all their toil repays.” D. M. R. Bentley intimates the close connection between Kirby’s long poem and Carlylean doctrine: “As the machinery that would produce Confederation ground forward, Kirby sought a foundation for the future in an idealized past.” In The UE, that past contains a place where “toil repays” and where “Schoolmen” “learn that serving God is love to man.” In Canadian Idylls, that place in the past is also one of supreme order. Remembering a state that never truly existed, Kirby laments:

The world goes rushing by
The ancient landmarks of a nobler time, –
When men bore deep the impress of the law
Of duty, truth, and loyalty unstained.

Order was the byword of the United Empire Loyalists in Kirby’s rendering of their history, but equally important was the manner in which order was created.

Carlyle wrote in “Characteristics” that “[i]t is not by Mechanism, but by Religion; not by Self-interest, but by Loyalty, that men are governed or governable,” and Kirby’s history of the Servos family identifies Carlylean order as the strongest principle guiding the United Empire Loyalists’ exodus from the United States. In The United Empire Loyalists in Canada: Illustrated Memorials of the Servos Family, he pronounces: “While the United States lost the very best and most moral of their people, Canada was the gainer by having its territory settled and the foundation of its greatness laid by the advent of these loyal, high-principled men, who preferred starting the world anew in the wilderness, rather than be untrue to their King and the British flag, which was their own native symbol.” The post–Revolutionary War migration into Canada was predicated on loyalty and resulted in the bringing of order – stability – into Canada. William Renwick Riddell notes that Kirby “stressed that part of Canadian life which most nearly corresponded to his English ideal”.

He was himself, and always thought and wrote of the great mass of Canadians as contented, conservative and intensely patriotic, with no love for drastic political measures, or even reform, and firmly believing in the doctrines of the Established Church of England.

The American Revolution was for Kirby the historical cataclysm that the French Revolution had been for Carlyle, representing the triumph of unhomosocial passions over order. In order to preserve the type of society the United Em-
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Colonel Brock had the social qualities of a popular member of society as well as of a gallant officer. . . . His good humour and affability won their hearts, and man, woman and child loved and honoured Colonel Brock, declaring he was the equal of [Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada, John Graves] Simcoe [1752–1806], and higher praise than that they could not give. . . . His visits to the houses of the farmers were hailed as the happiest of events.104

Brock's good humor produces and defends social harmony. Kirby's Brock resembles Carlyle's Cromwell. In his lecture on "The Hero as King," Carlyle praises the "depth and tenderness" of Cromwell, "the quantity of sympathy he had with things, – the quantity of insight he would yet get into the heart of things."105 The Carlylean warrior does not rule by physical force alone but also by the force of sympathetic insight. The same is true of Kirby's Brock. The passage in which Kirby describes Brock's amiability and humanness may be indebted directly or indirectly to Carlyle's inverse sublime, and it suggests as well the social philosophy of harmony and geniality integral to neo-Loyalist writers during the Confederation period. It was this style of humor that Archibald Lampman would endorse and that a generation of Canadian humorists, including Sara Jeanette Duncan (1861–1922), L. Maud Montgomery, and Stephen Leacock, would produce during the first quarter of the twentieth century.

Carlyle, Canadian Educators, the Confederation Poets, and the Confederation Humorists

In a 1946 letter to the writer Duncan Campbell Scott (1862–1947), the critic E. K. Brown (1905–51) chides himself for "not get[ting] much writing done these days." He explains that he is "reading instead. I have decided to offer a course on Carlyle next quarter, and need to read and reread much. It is more than a decade since I read the French Revolution; and I am glad that it seems even better now than it did then." Even after the First World War, after his importance had di-
Carlyle’s philosophy remained important to many Canadians – even to some Canadian modernists. As suggested earlier, the reason for his staying power may have had something to do with the adaptability of his doctrines to the Canadian sociopolitical environment. Carlyle preached a gospel of social wholeness, of organic relationships between individuals and communities, which suited the Canadian situation after Confederation.

Of the Confederation poets who came under Carlyle’s spell, none was more profoundly influenced and influential than Archibald Lampman. The historical vision and heroic ideology behind his essay on “Gambetta” (1883) has its roots in Carlyle’s On Heroes and The French Revolution (1837). Lampman names and quotes Carlyle three times in order to describe the pulse of French history and Léon Gambetta’s (1838–82) heroism, arguing:

There are times in every nation, especially that of the French with their vehement and sensitive, but at the same time light and changeable character, when some ill-government, some hollow “formula,” has rested so long upon the people, that all the pulses of the national spirit are deadened, and life itself to every active thinking man becomes a heavy, wearisome, unbearable thing, and men begin to cry to one another in their different, dim ways for something living, something human, they know not what – but know that some new thing must come – times in which the old and known leaders of the people have lost all heart or know not in what way to set themselves to the gigantic work. Then rises the brave, powerful, original man whose soul is carried away in the untrammeled tide of energy and hope, who knows no fear or any other retarding impulse – the man too with an “eye,” as Carlyle would say – and tells the people in words of fire, that are borne upon the four winds to every corner of the earth, just what it is they all want.

Lampman’s disdain for formulas is similar to Carlyle’s. His discussion of French character, as D. M. R. Bentley has noted, is likewise drawn from Carlyle and the very language of his essay, Lampman’s “words of fire, that are borne upon the four winds to every corner of the earth” serve both as an endorsement of Carlylean hero-worship, and also as an attempt to replicate its heroic spirit.

In 1885, two years after penning “Gambetta,” Lampman again found inspiration in Carlyle’s writing, this time in Sartor Resartus, for his fairy tale, “Hans Fingerhut’s Frog-lesson.” Lampman’s fairy tale is the story of a poet, Hans Fingerhut, who, because of his unrequited vanity, becomes increasingly “peevish and querulous” to the point that no one will listen to him anymore. Having lost his audience, Hans becomes a tailor, but his personal descent continues. Hans (impotently) assualts a river for speaking in beautiful murmurs and, as one might expect in a fairy tale, he is punished by being magically transformed into a frog, and he must remain in that state until he can correctly interpret the water’s song.

Bentley writes in his introduction to The Fairy Tales of Archibald Lampman that “the very fact that Hans Fingerhut is a tailor aligns him with the craftsmen in several ... of the Grimms’ fairy tales ..., but herein lies a significant difference: Hans is not simply a tailor but, by virtue of his frog-lesson, a tailor re-tailored (sartor resartus) along Carlylean lines so that he is no longer angry, bitter, and out of tune with the natural world.” While the clothing metaphor also has a Swiftian quality, perhaps suggesting A Tale of a Tub, Hans’s rebirth is similar to Teufelsdröckh’s. Both emerge from a spiritual crisis and embrace a positive worldview.

In “The Modern School of Poetry in England” (1885), Lampman expounds on the humorous pathetic in a manner that resembles Carlyle’s discussion of humorous sympathy in his essay on “Schiller,” an essay that Lampman quotes, before almost immediately engaging in a discussion about how humorous geniality is fundamental to the work of true poets:

The work of all the greatest poets has been very varied, and it has been very genial. Looking with a wide and hearty and sympathetic eye upon all life, they have touched innumerable notes, and have absorbed themselves readily into every phase of its humour or pathos. They have laughed and wept with living men and women; and in their laughter is the kindliness of a large heart, in their sadness the sweetness of brotherly sympathy.
In his discussion, Lampman uses terms ("pathos," "kindliness," "brotherly sympathy") that are resolutely Carlylean. Humor is integral to Lampman’s view of serious poetry (as it is to Carlyle’s), although today the two genres are not generally considered together. In a later essay, “Happiness” (1896), Lampman maintains that “[a] quick sense of humor is surely one of the happiest of mortal possessions,” and that humor generates a “kindly feeling,” “tenderness,” and “tolerance” because, for him, humor is a force of moderation that allows for clear judgment.112

Carlyle’s and Lampman’s theories of humor were shared and endorsed by other members of the Confederation group who were attempting to create and define a patriotic literature. Indeed, the most striking example of the penetration of Carlyle’s theories on humor into Confederation thought may be found in Charles G. D. Roberts’s In Divers Tones (1886). His inclusion in his dedication to the journalist Joseph Edmund Collins (1855–92) of the lines “Where the light laughers ring / You may detect a tear,” which indicate the emotional, even moral content of laughter, recalls Carlyle’s statement that “[t]rue humour springs not more from the head than from the heart; it is not contempt, its essence is love; it issues not in laughter, but in still smiles, which lie far deeper.”113 And William Wilfred Campbell’s (1860–1918) discussion of humor in an 1892 column for the Globe is a tacit endorsement of Carlyle’s treatment of humor in Sartor Resartus and of Carlyle himself:

On my humble bookshelves a place has ever been set apart as sacred to volumes of wit and humour. I cannot exactly understand the nature of a man who is impervious to the influences of this essential department of literature. Like Shakespeare’s man who did not appreciate music, he would seem to me a sort of moral monstrosity, lacking one of the qualities that go to constitute an all round personality. He may be a heavyweight, to use a sporting expression, in the affairs of life, but he is among his fellows but bread without leaven, sandwich without the mustard, wine without the sparkle; and, no matter what may be his ideas or qualities as a worker, such a man is sure in the end to be a failure. . . . Men and women of an intensely zealous nature, who are wrapped up in their own ideas of bettering the world, are perfectly incapable of looking at the ridiculous side of anything. On the other hand, the great reformers of all ages have been intensely susceptible to humour, and appreciated it to the fullest extent. Hence all of the greatest humorists have been closely identified with the world’s progress.114

Campbell’s dissertation on humor is fired with the passionate conviction of a literary man who considered literary theory to have a practical application beyond the printed page. In this he resembles Carlyle. Campbell’s association of humor with “great reformers” is a nod to both Carlyle and Dickens, and his “intense zealots” are similar to the older philosopher’s humorless man in Sartor Resartus whose “whole life is already a treason and a stratagem.”115 Campbell and others continued to praise Carlyle’s writing and to espouse his theories long after the philosopher’s death; as a result, Carlyle’s influence on Canadian authorship continued to be strong.116

The Halifax scholar and contemporary of Lampman, Archibald MacMechan, described the same sadness in Carlyle’s humor and gave it a name that resonates in Canadian theories of humor: humorous melancholy. In MacMechan, Carlyle’s philosophies found one of their ablest and most vocal adherents, and MacMechan in turn played a significant role in the literary development of two Confederation humorists, Sara Jeannette Duncan and Stephen Leacock. In the 1880s, MacMechan completed a B.A. at the University of Toronto and he wrote about his experiences and his influences in “Reminiscences of Toronto University”:

When Toronto men of the early eighties call that time Toronto’s Age of Gold, they are thinking chiefly of certain hearts of gold, which every test of time only proves true metal. But it is just possible that the dons of the day did not hold precisely this opinion. We were undoubtedly a licentious crew. . . . We read Sartor for the Blumine episode; we despised “gig men”; our greatest oath was by Saint Thomas of Carlyle.117

MacMechan’s interest in Carlyle con-
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Continued long after graduation. He edited North American editions of Sartor Resartus (1896) and of Carlyle on Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History (1901). In the classroom, he remained devoted to the Sage of Chelsea. In an appreciation published in the Dalhousie Review the year of MacMechan’s death, a former student, G. C. Sedgwich, explained that “Archie was proud of being and remaining a Victorian”; and Wilhelmina Gordon (1886–1968), writing in the Queen’s Quarterly that same year, described how “Carlyle profoundly influenced him.” MacMechan, she notes, “called himself ‘a professed Carlylean,’ and [he] had analysed the style of Sartor as admiringly as the thought.”

MacMechan’s discussion of Carlyle’s humor in his introduction to Sartor Resartus places Carlylean humor in line with what MacMechan calls in later discussions of Alfred Tennyson (1809–92) and Herman Melville (1819–91) the “humour of the North.” He writes: “the essence of . . . [Carlyle’s humor in Sartor Resartus] consists in a juxtaposition of the remote and the incongruous with the result of awakening a feeling of amusement or of scorn or of sadness.” It is the third of these, Carlyle’s ability to turn “the jest into sadness,” that MacMechan also observes in Tennyson and Melville. In his introduction to Select Poems of Alfred Tennyson (1907), MacMechan describes Tennyson’s humor as “deep and rich.” Of Tennyson’s earlier poems, he explains that “[t]he beauty of the form makes us forget the eternal note of sadness in them all. Tennyson’s sadness is the melancholy of the North, which is quite compatible with a gift of humor.” In his groundbreaking essay on Moby Dick (1851), entitled “The Best Sea-Story Ever Written,” and published at a time when Melville was a forgotten man, MacMechan reads in Melville’s “humour . . . the usual tinge of Northern melancholy.”

As a critic of Carlyle, Tennyson, and Melville, MacMechan’s scholarship was substantial and his position in Canadian letters remains considerable. MacMechan authored Head-waters of Canadian Literature (1924), and was one of the patriarchs of Canadian literary studies. His conclusion to Head-waters is particularly striking in speaking to the respect that Canadian critics and academics held for the work of humorists. After assessing the field of Canadian authorship, he names two Confederation humorists, Duncan and Leacock, as belonging to posterity. Duncan had written to MacMechan on 4 May 1905, to thank him for his review of her work: “I need not say that I have taken the greatest pleasure in your generous expression of liking for The Imperialist” (1904), she begins; “I confess I wondered, a little here on my remote hill top, whether anybody had listened to me in Canada and had come rather to the conclusion that I had been too far away to be well heard, or perhaps I had forgotten my country’s note.” It is a measure of his penetration, of his critical insight, that MacMechan, ahead of the majority of critics of his generation, recognized Duncan’s achievement as he had Melville’s. He was also aware of Montgomery’s work. She had been his student at Dalhousie University, and he adroitly picked up on the realism in her comedy, writing in his Head-waters that Anne of Green Gables (1908) “is pervaded with a sense of reality; the pitfalls of the sentimental are deftly avoided.”

In MacMechan, the “professed Carlylean,” all three Confederation humorists found a strong supporter within the upper echelon of Canadian scholarship. MacMechan corresponded with Duncan, taught Montgomery, and concluded Head-waters of Canadian Literature with an endorsement of Duncan’s and Leacock’s work. All three Canadian humorists became internationally famous for works that incorporated Carlyle’s theories of humor and that legitimated his organic doctrines.

Nowhere was Carlyle’s influence more evident during the early years of the twentieth century than on this generation of Canadian humorists born within a few years of each other at the time of Confederation. As late as 1938, in his Humor and Humanity, Leacock expressed Carlyle’s comic theory: “Humor in its highest reach touches the sublime,” Leacock writes; “humor in its highest reach mingles with pathos: it voices sorrow.
for our human lot and reconciliation with it.”26 Leacock and the Leacockean middle way, which combined conservative and socialist values in a Tory political view, reflects Carlyle’s closest comic relation. Carlyle’s dictum, from “The Hero as Poet,” that no one should laugh “at mere weakness, at misery or poverty; never”127 is often repeated in Leacock’s critical and theoretical arguments about humanizing humor; and Carlyle’s sublime humor, a humor that mingle comedy and pathos, is integral to Duncan’s Imperialist and Montgomery’s Anne of Green Gables. Adopting and adapting Carlyle’s doctrines of social wholeness and comic harmony for a late-Victorian and Edwardian readership, the Confederation humorists gave his humor its fullest expression.
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