



# University of Chester



This work has been submitted to ChesterRep – the University of Chester's  
online research repository

<http://chesterrep.openrepository.com>

Author(s): Michael Huggins

Title: A strange case of hero-worship: John Mitchel and Thomas Carlyle

Date: 2012

Originally published in: *Studi Irlandesi: A Journal of Irish Studies*

Example citation: Huggins, M. (2012). A strange case of hero-worship: John Mitchel and Thomas Carlyle. *Studi Irlandesi: A Journal of Irish Studies*, 2, 329-352

Version of item: Publisher version

Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10034/322207>

## A Strange Case of Hero-Worship: John Mitchel and Thomas Carlyle

*Michael Huggins*

University of Chester (<[m.huggins@chester.ac.uk](mailto:m.huggins@chester.ac.uk)>)

### *Abstract*

The Scottish essayist Thomas Carlyle might be considered a surprising influence on the Young Ireland movement of the 1840s and its most militant leader, John Mitchel. Carlyle has become notorious for his anti-Irish sentiments, expressed most forcefully in his *Reminiscences of my Irish journey* in 1849. Yet his critique of the Benthamite and liberal *Zeitgeist* was a significant influence on Mitchel. This article examines what it was in Carlyle's thought that appealed to Mitchel. Carlyle's antagonism to liberal conceptions of progress informed Mitchel's intellectual development and prompted specific political perspectives that can in some measure be viewed as a Carlylean response to Ireland's crisis in the 1840s. Mitchel made many of the same historic and philosophical assumptions as Carlyle, legitimising the present struggle for Irish nationality via a critique of contemporary laissez-faire doctrine. Thus, Swift's *saeva indignatio* was inflected in Mitchel by his encounter with Carlyle's work, shaping Mitchel's anger in terms of the spiritual-material polarity at the heart of Carlyle's *Signs of the Times* (1829). This 'sacred wrath' helps explain why Mitchel is often seen as someone who hated England more than he loved Ireland.

*Keywords:* Ireland, Mitchel, Carlyle, nationalism, poverty, famine, racism, slavery

Thomas Carlyle's attitude to Ireland was long considered, partly on the basis of what he said about Irish immigrants to Britain in *Chartism*, dismissive and hostile. In that work he famously wrote, «Immethodic, headlong, violent, mendacious: what can you make of the wretched Irishman?»<sup>1</sup>. It should also be acknowledged that this was only one instance among many in which Carlyle appeared to dismiss Ireland and the Irish. As a consequence, the friendship between the notoriously pro-Union Carlyle and the most radical of the men who campaigned for repeal of the Act of Union between Britain and Ireland during the 1840s is, on the face of it, difficult to understand. As was suggested some years ago, anti-imperialists

and revolutionaries «were attracted to Carlyle for reasons which now seem quite contradictory, irrational»<sup>2</sup>.

In relation to the young Irish men who idolised him, the friendship with Charles Gavan Duffy, proprietor of «The Nation» newspaper during the period when John Mitchel was its chief writer (from late 1845 to late 1847) lasted for many years and spanned a number of decades. It has been the subject of most attention – not least because Gavan Duffy published an account of the friendship not long after Carlyle's death, which associated his own name in a public way with that of the celebrated Scot<sup>3</sup>. Yet the more perplexing and difficult relationship to understand is that between Carlyle and Mitchel, who is remembered as the most fiery-spirited, outspoken and militant critic of the Union. Understanding the reasons for Mitchel's enthusiasm for Carlyle (and the enthusiasm was not solely on his side, as will be demonstrated), casts some light on the provenance of some of the political and social ideas of this man who was to be a critical link in the chain of Irish republicanism down to the men who fought against British rule in the early twentieth century. It seems strange to consider that Thomas Carlyle should have influenced the development of Irish republicanism, yet this essay will demonstrate why that is so.

Even the briefest of considerations suggests that an exploration of Carlyle's influence on Mitchel seems apposite. While Gavan Duffy and Carlyle corresponded over many years, Gavan Duffy was able to maintain an intellectual distance from Carlyle that meant he did not uncritically repeat all the Scot's ideas. Contrarily, Mitchel absorbed and repeated Carlyle's views on a number of matters, including race, poverty and crime. When Carlyle asked Gavan Duffy what had caused the conflict between the two Irish men, Gavan Duffy replied that Carlyle «had taught Mitchel to oppose the liberation of the negroes and the emancipation of the Jews» and that «Mitchel wanted to preach these opinions in «The Nation», but I could not permit this to be done, my own convictions being entirely different»<sup>4</sup>. While a number of their contemporaries, as well as later scholars, noted the influence of Carlyle upon Mitchel (and one celebrated scholar suggested that Mitchel influenced Carlyle), that influence has not been given sufficient attention<sup>5</sup>. This essay will consider Carlyle and Mitchel through a number of manuscript sources, as well as demonstrating the ways in which Carlyle's ideas and attitudes resurfaced in some of Mitchel's own work.

Carlyle's most trenchant thoughts on Ireland and the Irish were published after his death (to Gavan Duffy's regret) and appear, at least at first sight, to confirm the impression of prejudice and bigotry of which Carlyle long stood accused. In the *Reminiscences of my Irish Journey in 1849* (published by Carlyle's notoriously anti-Irish biographer, James Anthony Froude, in 1882 and not to be confused with Carlyle's better-known *Reminiscences* published in two volumes the previous year), the Scot's private diaries of his second visit to Ireland demonstrated a keen eye for the ways in which the Irish had been

badly governed, but also his prejudices. Like many of his contemporaries, Carlyle believed he could «read» personalities from physical characteristics, and this he began to do while observing his fellow-passengers on the boat to Ireland. Passing the Wexford coast on the ferry, he believed (wrongly) that he was gazing at Vinegar Hill, scene of the rebels' last stand in 1798, and wrote that it was just one of «ten thousand futile, fruitless "battles" this brawling, unreasonable people has fought». After he met Gavan Duffy in Dublin, talk turned to an «Irish-versus-English character; wherein, as I really have no respect for Ireland as it now is and has been, it was impossible for me to be popular». He thought Kildare was «one of the wretchedest wild villages I ever saw; and full of ragged beggars ... exotic altogether, "like a village in Dahomey"». In a similar way, the Claddagh in Galway city was «as like Madagascar as England». Catholics on Lord George Hill's Gweedore estate were «lazy, superstitious, poor and hungry ... their one *true* station in the universe is servants, "slaves" if you will». These people were «dark barbarians», most of whom would not work as long as they had potatoes or other means of existing<sup>6</sup>. As the journey around Ireland continued, Carlyle repeatedly recorded his horror at what he saw as scenes of beggary, squalor, savagery and superstition<sup>7</sup>. In relation to Ireland, it is this Carlyle – impatient, intolerant, bigoted – that has most frequently been commented upon. Given all this, Carlyle's friendly relations with Mitchel and Young Ireland do, at first sight, appear remarkable.

Carlyle also alluded to Ireland in a number of works published during his life, particularly from the 1830s until the early 1850s. During this period his engagement with Irish issues seems to have been most acute, and this engagement suggests another dimension to Carlyle's vision of contemporary Ireland. Carlyle's attitude to Ireland and the Irish, moreover, has recently been subject to considerable re-evaluation, although usually in order to achieve a better understanding of Carlyle's thought, rather than a fuller appreciation of its impact upon Young Ireland. A number of scholars have suggested that Carlyle was far from wholly negative about Ireland. Jules Siegel noted that many people have not properly understood «the complex ways in which Ireland was perceived by Carlyle»<sup>8</sup>. Roy Foster has recently written that although the *Reminiscences* were «violently prejudiced» Carlyle «had always seen the causes of Irish degradation as misrule, oppression, and the hopeless economics of absentee landlordism and potato dependency»<sup>9</sup>. Noting Carlyle's belief in providential justice, Roger Swift has suggested that the growing presence of the Irish poor in Britain «was England's punishment for her mistreatment of Ireland»<sup>10</sup>. John Morrow has gone further and suggested that the Scot's attitude to Ireland and the Irish was not another expression of «stock mid-century anti-Irish prejudices» but instead was consistent with his perspective on the social, moral and political ills of contemporary society<sup>11</sup>. Another scholar has suggested that Carlyle emphasized race in his writings on Ireland «to resist progressive narratives»<sup>12</sup>. Some evaluation of Carlyle's perspective on Ireland

and the Irish is, therefore, worth pursuing before considering Mitchel, in order to establish what common ground there may have been between the two men.

Morrow has pointed out what he considers a critical distinction between the imagery deployed by Carlyle in *Chartism* and that of much contemporary British commentary. According to Morrow, Carlyle saw the migration and impact of the Irish in Britain not as a contagion, which could potentially poison British society, but as retribution for centuries of misrule and maladministration. This distinction opens the way to a redefinition of Carlyle's attitude to the Irish, which sees the desperately poor, famine-ravished island as the victim of *laissez-faire* and 'mechanicalism'. Morrow's assessment appears to endorse that offered by Charles Gavan Duffy, whose lengthy friendship with the Scot resulted in the publication of his *Conversations with Carlyle*. In that book, Gavan Duffy attempted to rectify the impression that Carlyle had been a difficult, misanthropic person and that he was particularly hostile to Ireland and the Irish. The book recalled conversations and divulged extracts from the correspondence between the two men over the years. Given that it is hard to see Gavan Duffy, Mitchel and other Young Irelanders tolerating Carlyle if it were otherwise (and Morrow points this out), this suggestion appears convincing<sup>13</sup>.

Carlyle's negative thoughts on Ireland and the Irish, published during his life and posthumously, might therefore be viewed as a consequence of the extremity of the problems he had already identified. In *Chartism* he wrote that a government which allowed these things to happen should «drop a veil across its face, and walk out of court under conduct of proper officers», while «We English [sic] pay, even now, the bitter smart of long centuries of injustice to our neighbour island»<sup>14</sup>. He even went so far as to tell his readers that «The Sanspotatoe is of the selfsame stuff as the superfinest Lord Lieutenant»<sup>15</sup>. These attitudes confirm the notion that Carlyle's attitude to the Irish was more complex than has sometimes been suggested. While his comments on the equality of peasant and lord lieutenant are made specifically in a spiritual context, they do contrast with the sense of Irish racial inferiority expressed in his private journal some years later. The remarks on the Irish immigrants in *Chartism* lay the blame for Ireland's degradation at the door of governments, conforming to the Carlylean critique of the mechanical age.

Thus Ireland's crisis in the 1840s can be seen as much as a symptom of all that the self-appointed prophet considered wrong with contemporary society, an «advanced manifestation of a far broader movement in modern European history» as of Irish inferiority<sup>16</sup>. Carlyle's preface to his *Reminiscences* confirms that his 1849 visit to Ireland was prompted at least partly by a desire to see the problem at first hand. He wrote:

Ireland really *is* my problem; the breaking point of the huge suppuration which all British and all European society now is. Set down in Ireland, one might at least feel, "Here is thy problem. In God's name, what wilt thou do with it?"<sup>17</sup>

What did Carlyle consider the problem to be? Clearly this is not the place for a lengthy discourse on Carlyle's thought, but some brief outline may be sketched in order to prepare the ground for an examination of what appealed to Mitchel. For it appears that Carlyle influenced Mitchel in two complementary ways. First, he offered a broad critique of contemporary society that appealed enormously to Mitchel (and others among the Young Ireland movement). This critique was to inform much of what Mitchel had to say about politics and society, despite the apparent conflict in the conclusions the two men drew about the problems of mid-nineteenth century Ireland. Second, Mitchel was indebted directly to Carlyle for a number of perspectives he offered on the contemporary world. The connection Gavan Duffy made between Carlyle's views on race and Mitchel's are an excellent example, which will be considered below.

The first point is perhaps best made by noting that the foundations of Carlyle's social criticism lie in his antipathy to secular visions of enlightenment and progress. This antipathy was evident in writings such as *Signs of the Times*. For Carlyle, the spirit of enlightenment had led to Benthamite utilitarianism in the «Mechanical Age»<sup>18</sup>. In that work, first published in 1829, Carlyle contrasted the spirit of the age with an idealized past. Despite his protestations that social regression was unwelcome and unnecessary, a similar point was made some years later in *Past and Present* (1840), in which a mediaeval monastic community was contrasted favourably with the modern workhouse. In *Signs of the Times* Carlyle complains, «It is by tangible material considerations that we are guided, not by inward and spiritual»<sup>19</sup>. This polarity runs through the essay and, indeed, much of Carlyle's thought, his prophetic voice demanding a reorientation of human enterprise towards an inner, spiritual world, its values and verities. As Roy Foster succinctly put it, «“Manchester” was the real enemy and moral regeneration the answer»<sup>20</sup>.

A consequence of this vision (which was expressed with ever greater bitterness as Carlyle aged) was hostility toward narratives of human society as progress towards the perfection of political and social systems. He defined as «Mammon-worship» the current consensus in favour of *laissez-faire* and political economy. This compromised the spiritual progress of the species as a whole, and also had the effect of reducing the masses to sullen resentment in the face of the injustices done to them. Owen Dudley Edwards was surely wrong, however, to identify Carlyle's «solution» as a revolutionary alliance between the Irish poor and British workers<sup>21</sup>. Instead, Carlyle's gospel of work envisioned a strictly hierarchical society in which labour was directed from above. Liberal economic and social policy compromised a necessary paternalism, and its absence in the contemporary world was part of the reason for the disaffection of the working masses<sup>22</sup>. Carlyle did not believe in the Chartists' cause. Chartism, urban rioting and rural machine-breaking were symptoms of the profound malaise he identified in *Signs of the Times*, and the solution

required a rigid social hierarchy in which the masses were led and directed by men of «higher wisdom», for their own material benefit and spiritual welfare<sup>23</sup>.

Specific aspects of Carlyle's critique of his age can be discerned in his dislike of philanthropy, expressed forcefully in the *Latter Day Pamphlet*, his views on modern penal theory, on race and slavery, and in his enthusiasm for the heroic leader who would direct society to greater ends than the merely material. His dislike of philanthropy was particularly focused on the new Poor Law, which led to the construction of the workhouses that so dismayed him during his visit to Ireland. For Carlyle, the workhouse fostered dependence and laziness, rather than alleviating distress. When he visited one of the most notorious workhouses at Westport, Co. Mayo, in the summer of 1849, he asked rhetorically, «Can it be a *charity* to keep a man alive on these terms? In face of all the twaddle of the earth, shoot a man rather than train him (with heavy expense to his neighbours) to be a deceptive human swine»<sup>24</sup>. Philanthropy, which for Carlyle led to a muddling of the heaven-ordained absolutes of right and wrong, was damaging to the moral fibre of the individual recipient, discouraging labour and encouraging sloth. Irish and black people were encouraged also by diet to become slothful and lazy, one dependent on the all-too-readily available potato and the other similarly dependent on pumpkins. Therefore the Irish «won't work ... if they have *potatoes* or other means of existing»<sup>25</sup> while, at the same time, there are «beautiful blacks sitting there up to the ears in pumpkins»<sup>26</sup>.

His enthusiasm for great men is apparent in both his annotated letters and speeches of Cromwell, and in his mammoth study of Frederick the Great. The figure of Cromwell was, of course, a sensitive one in Ireland and Mitchel's review of the book will be considered later. Carlyle's discussions about Cromwell with Gavan Duffy demonstrated this important aspect of his thought:

My fixed hope is that just men, Irish and English, will yet see it as God the Maker saw it, which I think will really be a point gained for all of us, on both sides of the water. It is not every day that the Supreme Powers send any missionary, clad in light or clad in lightning, into a country to act and speak a True Thing there.<sup>27</sup>

Carlyle identified personally with Cromwell, who was «above all “rubbish” in his time» as Carlyle conceived himself to be in his own<sup>28</sup>. Therefore, what appears to be a paradox in Carlyle – a sympathy for the plight of the unjustly treated poor but a simultaneous conviction of the need for their compulsion by a heaven-appointed master – is consistent with his vision of social (and, for that matter, racial) hierarchy.

The modern prison was, along with the workhouse, a potent symbol of the folly and moral bankruptcy of contemporary liberalism. In the *Latter Day Pamphlets* (1850) Carlyle railed against a «model prison» that he had visited, in which the convicts were cared for more than the industrious poor outside,

who were taxed in order to keep in luxury those who had given themselves over to the devil. The attempt to reform prisoners was «sowing of your wheat upon an Irish quagmire»<sup>29</sup>.

However, perhaps Carlyle's best-known tirades against philanthropy were reserved for the anti-slavery lobby. While Carlyle stopped short of demanding the re-introduction of slavery, his racism was thorough and profound. In the *Latter Day Pamphlets* his antipathy to abolitionist philanthropy was explicit and forceful:

«Here is a distressed Nigger,» they proclaim, «who much prefers idleness to work, - should not he be free to choose which? Is not he a man and brother? Clearly here are two legs and no feathers: let us vote him Twenty millions for enfranchisement, and so secure the blessing of the gods!» My friends, I grieve to remind you, but it is eternally the fact: Whom Heaven has made a slave, no parliament of men nor power that exists on earth can render free. No; he is chained by fetters which parliaments with their millions cannot reach.<sup>30</sup>

This line of thought, so shocking even in its day, had been expressed publicly the previous year in a magazine article which was eventually published as a separate pamphlet in 1853 as the notorious *Occasional Discourse on the Nigger Question*. This had also claimed that there was a heaven-ordained racial hierarchy, and although he did not seek a return to slavery, it was the duty of black people «to be servants to those that are born wiser than you, that are born Lords of you»<sup>31</sup>.

Thus Carlyle offered direct critical commentary in relation to specific political and social issues of his day. These criticisms were concrete expressions of his broader concerns about the spirit of the age in which he lived, the age of the «dismal science» of political economy in which God's work was being abandoned in favour of secular, enlightened notions of perfectibility and progress. The critique of specific aspects of Carlyle's times was to find its way into Mitchel's thought, inspired as Mitchel was by Carlyle's dissenting voice<sup>32</sup>.

It is this Carlyle, attacking the vices and follies of the age in his prophetic voice, who appealed to Mitchel. It is not clear when Mitchel first discovered the work of Carlyle, but in a letter to his life-long friend John Martin in late 1838 Mitchel enthused about Carlyle's *French Revolution*: «It is the profoundest book, and the most eloquent and fascinating history, that English literature ever produced»<sup>33</sup>. In 1849, in a long letter home to his sister Matilda from a prison-ship anchored at Bermuda, Mitchel contrasted «Carlyle's great book» with an inferior history by Lamartine<sup>34</sup>. Indeed, late in Mitchel's life the work was seen as having been a direct inspiration to Mitchel in 1848, when a new French revolution had inspired him to proclaim an Irish revolution (led, in Carlylean manner, by himself). Florence Edward MacCarthy (the son of the Young Ireland poet Denis MacCarthy) met Mitchel in 1874 when Mitchel returned to Ireland after many years abroad. MacCarthy was reading Carlyle's

*French Revolution* at the time and remarked of the book in his diary, «Perhaps more than any other, it stimulated poor John Mitchel & led to his fate in 1848»<sup>35</sup>. Indeed, Carlyle had compared the French *sans-culotte* of 1793 to the Irish «sans-potato»<sup>36</sup>. In 1848 Mitchel linked directly the new revolution in continental Europe with the situation in Ireland, seeing a revolutionary movement developing in which the «sans-potatoes» would play their role. Almost twenty years later Mitchel still referred to the spring of 1848 in the same terms, repeating the image of «sympathetic subterranean electricities» taken directly from Carlyle's first *Latter Day Pamphlet*, adding that between France and Ireland there had ever been «a sympathetic moral electricity»<sup>37</sup>.

The Young Ireland men had already been enthusiastic followers of Carlyle, meeting at each other's homes to take tea and discuss his work, some time before Mitchel arrived in Dublin to begin his career on «The Nation» in the autumn of 1845, following the death of Davis<sup>38</sup>. Mitchel's move to Dublin coincided with the publication of his *Life of Aodh O'Neill, Prince of Ulster*, the first in Gavan Duffy's «Library of Ireland» series, popular historical works that were intended to create a heroic Irish past in which precisely the kind of Carlylean values described in *Signs of the Times* were said to have flourished. During the summer preceding publication Mitchel exchanged a number of letters with Charles Gavan Duffy about the book, which had been read in manuscript by both Gavan Duffy and Thomas Davis. Davis, in particular, had objected to the presence in it of too many «Carlylish phrases». After some initial resistance, Mitchel responded by rewriting parts of the book, commenting to Gavan Duffy, «As to the Carlylean phrase ... out with it by all means. I shall begin to hate the name of Thomas»<sup>39</sup>.

The book was a success and may be viewed as an early incursion of Carlylean thought into the romantic construction of the Irish nation that was to dominate militant Irish politics for a century. For it was not only in matters of style that Mitchel was indebted to Carlyle. Its vision of the past was of the prophetic sort, from which the historian gleaned moral guidance that was antithetical to the vulgar, material present. The past was a heroic age in which precisely the kinds of values identified by Carlyle in *Signs of the Times* and *Past and Present* informed the needs of the present day. Mitchel's preface to the work proclaimed a Carlylean enthusiasm for «truth» and lamented the retreat of a proud, vehement, poetical Gaelic people before «what is called "Civilization"»<sup>40</sup>. Its contemporary lesson (founded on dubious racial deductions) was of the need for pan-confessional and racial unity in order to construct anew an Irish nation. As with Carlyle, the historian was indistinguishable from the prophet. Just as Carlyle was able to sweep in a few short lines from «the mud-beach of Thanet» in 449 to the contemporary achievements of «this Nation», so Mitchel linked a heroic Irish past with the present<sup>41</sup>.

The two men first met when Mitchel was part of a deputation of Young Irelanders who travelled to London to visit the imprisoned William Smith

O'Brien in May 1846. Gavan Duffy's visit to Chelsea the previous spring has been noted much more widely than this particular occasion, partly because of an over-reliance by historians on Gavan Duffy's memoirs. During the 1846 visit, the young Irish men spent an evening with the Carlyles, and Mitchel took a walk with Carlyle. After the visit Mitchel made his admiration for Carlyle perfectly clear in a letter to John Martin. He told Martin that Carlyle's presence was «royal and almost Godlike», adding, however, «I scarcely agreed with him in any single thing he said the whole night, and told him my mind occasionally broadly enough»<sup>42</sup>. At this encounter, it is likely that the two men argued over Carlyle's representation of Oliver Cromwell's campaign in Ireland during 1649. The previous year Carlyle had published an annotated edition of Cromwell's correspondence and speeches, in which he sought to justify Cromwell's violence in Ireland. The book had been reviewed in «The Nation» of 10 January 1846 by Mitchel, although Carlyle assumed the review had been written by Gavan Duffy. Mitchel offered little criticism of Cromwell's role in England, though he differed greatly with Carlyle over Cromwell's conduct in Ireland. Nevertheless, he wrote that «Thomas Carlyle has long been our venerated and loved preceptor»<sup>43</sup>. Carlyle was pleased with the review which, he said, was «heroic» and had discerned Cromwell's essential greatness, despite «a maelstrom of Irish indignation»<sup>44</sup>. Perhaps, during the visit to London, Mitchel invited Carlyle to see Ireland for himself. By July Carlyle had written to tell Gavan Duffy that he was planning a visit to Dublin, but did not desire publicity<sup>45</sup>. When he did visit Ireland that autumn, Carlyle visited and dined with the Mitchel family on two evenings and, in a note accompanying a letter from his wife, Carlyle described Mitchel thus:

Mitchell's [sic] wife, especially his mother (Presbyterian parson's widow of the best Scotch type), his frugally elegant small house and table, pleased me much, as did the man himself, a fine elastic-spirited young fellow with superior natural talent, whom I grieved to see rushing on destruction, palpable by 'attack of windmills,' but on whom all my dissuasions were thrown away.<sup>46</sup>

In 1874, shortly before his death, Mitchel recalled that during Carlyle's visit the two men had taken a tour outside Dublin accompanied by the novelist William Carleton. The three men stopped at Dundrum, where Carleton and Mitchel had played a long-jump game, while «Carlyle stood gravely by & marked the leaps with little pieces of straw»<sup>47</sup>. Mitchel wrote to John Martin in great excitement after the visit from Carlyle, telling Martin that «*Sartor Resartus* has been in Dublin, has been here, and for two evenings we have heard his prophesyings ... We have had some angry altercations with him». Yet again, Mitchel acknowledged that there was much that set him at odds with Carlyle, but his admiration remained sincere and affected both his thought and writing style<sup>48</sup>. Notwithstanding the pleasures of Carlyle's company, the two men were never to see each other again. After dining with

Mitchel and Gavan Duffy at the Bray Hotel, Carlyle left Ireland, later recalling how Mitchel and Gavan Duffy stood on the quay «that autumn evening at Kingstown» as his boat departed<sup>49</sup>.

According to Gavan Duffy's memoir of Carlyle, it appears that Carlyle was very fond of Mitchel, but increasingly dismayed by his increasingly militant separatism. He wrote to Gavan Duffy, «Alas, you must tell Mitchel that I read with ever greater pain those wild articles of his, which, so much do I love in them otherwise, often make me very sad.» A little later Carlyle added:

Mitchel I reckon to be a noble, chivalrous fellow, full of talent and manful temper of every kind. In fact, I love him very much, and most infinitely regret to see the like of him enveloped in such poor delusions, partisanships, and narrow violences, very unworthy of him.<sup>50</sup>

However, it could be suggested (as Gavan Duffy did) that Carlyle was at least partially responsible for Mitchel's transformation. One of Carlyle's specific objects of Irish loathing was Daniel O'Connell, whose Repeal Association he considered to be little more than dishonest Whiggery and office-seeking. That dislike appears over and again in his writings. One example from a letter to Gavan Duffy will give an idea of his perspective on O'Connell's «noisy unveracities», «I could wish the man never had been born! – Mitchel may depend on it, it is not repeal from England, but repeal *from the Devil*, that will save Ireland»<sup>51</sup>. Indeed, Carlyle suggested that O'Connell «died with his mouth full of superstitious nonsense», a suggestion that does little to dispel the notion that anti-Catholic bigotry was part of Carlyle's perspective<sup>52</sup>. Until he met Carlyle, Mitchel gave no hint that he was anything other than a loyal lieutenant of O'Connell but he, too, became hostile to the leader of nationalist Ireland from the mid-1840s. While some of this may be attributed to the political wedge that O'Connell drove consciously between himself and the Young Ireland group through the so-called «peace resolutions» in the summer of 1846, it seems clear that by this time Mitchel was developing his own Carlyle-inspired critique of O'Connell's means and ends. The split was already becoming apparent by late 1845, when O'Connell publicly attacked Carlyle's work on Cromwell a matter of two weeks before Mitchel's generally favourable review in «The Nation»<sup>53</sup>.

Gavan Duffy's belief that Mitchel became arrogant at this time suggests that Mitchel may have begun to see himself as a Cromwell, self-righteously directing the sans-potatoes as a heady revolutionary atmosphere swept Europe. Gavan Duffy's description of the atmosphere created in Dublin by the events on the continent in early 1848 supports this view. Mitchel's new newspaper, the *United Irishman*, proclaimed revolution and to the «confiding multitudes» it seemed as if the French revolution of that spring had been Mitchel's work:

The boldness with which he threatened and assailed the Government in the *United Irishman* delighted the people; and his reputation grew with a rapidity only

known in revolutions, and was swollen by the most amazing myths ... His latest profession on any subject was set up as a sort of eternal standard of right, from which deviation was shameful ... The effect of this intoxicating incense on Mitchel's character was very injurious – from being modest and taciturn, he became dogmatic and arrogant.<sup>54</sup>

As Owen Dudley Edwards put it, «Carlyle's *Cromwell* may never have convinced Mitchel ... but it made a "Cromwell" of him»<sup>55</sup>.

While Carlyle visited Ireland at length in the summer of 1849, Mitchel was by now a prisoner in Bermuda and Gavan Duffy and he no longer friends. Nevertheless, it appears that before Mitchel's transportation in May 1848, Carlyle and Mitchel corresponded occasionally<sup>56</sup>. When Mitchel was tried for the newly-created offence of treason-felony, Carlyle had written animately to the lord Lieutenant, Lord Clarendon, emphasizing Mitchel's virtues and pleading for clemency. It was perhaps a mark of Carlyle's affection for Mitchel that he wrote at all, as he appears to have been a man little-disposed to beg for anything:

Mitchell [sic], enveloped in such frightful aberrations, is nonetheless intrinsically a gifted, brave, and even noble minded young man ... who, had it not been for a certain windy "Liberator" and loud false-prophet, the baleful misleader of many, might have done his country real service.<sup>57</sup>

Only one letter between the two men appears to have survived, a letter from Mitchel to Carlyle in 1866, replying to a letter Carlyle had written to him at the time of his conviction for treason-felony in May 1848. According to Mitchel, he had passed the letter unopened to his wife, who had kept the letter until she joined him in Van Diemen's Land some three years later. Mitchel expressed sympathy for the death of Carlyle's wife, and explained how Mitchel had lost two of his sons during the recently-ended American Civil War. It also related how he had «provoked the vengeance of two governments» in the United Kingdom and also the United States, where his recriminatory writings after the civil war had been ended by imprisonment. He hoped that Carlyle had received his two books, the *Jail Journal* and *The Last Conquest of Ireland (perhaps)*<sup>58</sup>.

There the contact between the two men ended, although it had effectively concluded when Mitchel was sent into penal exile in May 1848. Despite that, it appears that Carlyle recalled his disciple with affection. In 1852 he received a letter from Mitchel's brother, to which he replied «for John's sake»<sup>59</sup>. Yet in relation to Irish politics, Carlyle's influence continued because of his effect on Mitchel. Indeed, Owen Dudley Edwards has attributed the blood-sacrifice motif in Irish politics to the influence of Carlyle's *Past and Present*, read by Mitchel and transmitted by him to Pearse and others<sup>60</sup>. Dudley Edwards did not consider the United Irishmen or Robert Emmet to have been part of the

transmission of this idea, although Marianne Elliott has shown conclusively that men like Russell and Emmet consciously attempted to shape a tradition of self-sacrifice in Irish politics that may have ancient origins, although it should also be considered that the notion had a more contemporary resonance as a favoured motif in romanticism<sup>61</sup>.

While Carlyle may not be responsible for the blood-sacrifice motif in republicanism, his influence can be seen in Arthur Griffith's approval of Mitchel. Griffith, founder of *Sinn Féin*, wrote a preface to a new edition of the *Jail Journal*, which was published in 1913, at the time when Mitchel's posthumous influence on militant nationalism was at its height. In the preface Griffith approved of Mitchel because he had dissevered the demand for Irish independence «from theories of humanitarianism and universalism». Griffith continued, «Even his views on negro-slavery have been deprecatingly excused, as if excuse were needed for an Irish Nationalist declining to hold the negro his peer in right». Similarly, Mitchel «laughed at theories of human perfectibility and equality, and despised the altruism which sees in the criminal a brother to be coaxed, not a rogue to be lashed»<sup>62</sup>. Griffith identified those ideas about humanitarianism, universalism, slavery and criminality as bequests of John Mitchel to Irish nationalism, when they could as easily be attributed to Thomas Carlyle.

The direct influence of Carlyle on Mitchel is visible in writing style and in relation to a number of specific matters. One of the figurative ways in which Carlyle expressed his aversion to the age was through the image of steam, associated most of all with the expansion of the railway network, a symbol of liberal conceptions of progress. A letter to Gavan Duffy in 1846 demonstrates this usage. Carlyle wrote to Gavan Duffy from southern Scotland, where he had been spending time with relatives just before his first visit to Ireland. A railway was under construction nearby and Carlyle said that the workers were brutalized by the work and wages, an aspect of the new order in which «all the world here as elsewhere calculates on getting to heaven by steam»<sup>63</sup>.

The same usage of the railway and of steam recurs in Mitchel's work to make exactly the same point. One passage from a letter to a friend in Ireland while Mitchel was in penal exile in Van Diemen's Land illustrates the extent of his absorption of Carlylean thought and style. Mitchel told Marie Thomson that the idea of civilization once meant the cultivation of social and political functions, talents, rights and duties, but now:

It means steam, that carries all men on no matter how base an errand. It means the *Printing press*, that multiplies as the sands of the sea, teachings no matter how false or vile; it means the electric telegraph, whereby lies will put a girdle round the globe in less than Ariel's forty minutes ... it means anything but *Justice*. The idea of *Justice* ... is disappearing before the commerce fiend.<sup>64</sup>

Mitchel used this image a number of times to express his disdain for contemporary visions of progress. For example, in his most famous work, the *Jail*

*Journal*, Mitchel used a similar device as a means of criticizing contemporary political economy, «Your English and Yankees go *too* much ahead – hardly giving themselves time to sleep and eat, let alone praying – keep the social machinery working at too high a pressure ... Do they call this *living?*»<sup>65</sup>. Steam, pressure and progress were all associated with the Mammon-worship of the age, which Carlyle, too, found so objectionable. When Mitchel learned of the defeat of the Hungarian nationalist Louis Kossuth, this caused further reflections in a Carlylean vein, «this world is ruled now by Order and Commerce (Commerce, obscenest of earth-spirits, once named Mammon, and thought to be a devil)»<sup>66</sup>. Britain and the northern United States inspired him to «despise the civilization of the nineteenth century, and its two highest expressions and grandest hopes most especially». The stylistic and tonal debt to Carlyle is particularly evident in these passages<sup>67</sup>.

The anti-progress theme recurs in Mitchel's correspondence across many years. «I have contracted (owing to an exaggerative habit) a diseased and monomaniacal hatred of 'progress', & would rather like to go back and see people go back», he wrote to a friend in Ireland in 1855<sup>68</sup>. His correspondence and journals reveal a loathing for the progress symbolized by the extension of railways to the west and the enslavement of man to machine in factory capitalism. He often contrasted these with an idealized pastoral life. Mitchel was living in east Tennessee at the time he wrote this comment on «progress», attempting to build an independent yeoman's life for his family on a farm outside Knoxville, a life he had fantasized about for some years. In the same letter he noted that the extension of the railways meant that «people from the more eastern states will press in, bringing with them all the improvements & elegancies of life, wherein you know this Yankee nation whips the airth [sic]». Mitchel began to identify the northern United States with Mammon, «their ardent and devout worship of the Great God Dollar is ... if possible even more ferociously bigoted than the British devotion to *their* God, the one true and eternal Pound Sterling»<sup>69</sup>. Once he was living in the United States, this critique of dollar-worship became conflated with his increasingly strident defence of slavery.

In the *Jail Journal* he confessed that he had long admired the independent farmer, «a rural pater-familias». The American south offered an idealized vision of rural harmony in which the independent yeoman was the head of a family that included slaves<sup>70</sup>. In this fantasy, slaves were cared for much more than the white wage-slaves of Manchester. This passage reflects Carlyle's view that the «dismal science» of supply and demand cut the knot that should tie black and white<sup>71</sup>. «How much better had I servants that were bound to me, and to whom I were bound», Carlyle exclaimed in the *Occasional Discourse*<sup>72</sup>.

Mitchel's debt to Carlyle over race is also clear, for example, in this passage from the *Jail Journal*, in which Mitchel described the Brazilian slaves he saw from the ship taking him across the ocean following the sentence of trans-

portation: «These slaves in Brazil are fat and merry, obviously not overworked nor underfed, and it is a pleasure to see the lazy rogues lolling in their boats, sucking a piece of sugar-cane, and grinning and jabbering together»<sup>73</sup>. In a similar vein Carlyle wrote of black men in Jamaica, «Sitting yonder with their beautiful muzzles up to the ears in pumpkins, imbibing sweet pulps and juice; the grinder and incisor teeth ready for ever new work»<sup>74</sup>. While the *Occasional Discourse* was published after Mitchel's exile began, it seems very likely that he received a copy of *Fraser's Magazine*, in which it was first published, while he was living in Van Diemen's Land, or perhaps read the reprinted essay while he was preparing the *Jail Journal* for publication soon after his arrival in New York. Indeed, Mitchel courted controversy almost immediately upon his arrival in the USA, writing in his newspaper «The Citizen» that he would like to own «a good plantation well-stocked with healthy negroes in Alabama»<sup>75</sup>. Images of contented indolence, fecklessness and black inferiority recur in Mitchel's writings. He was aware that some of his associates in the national movement found his position distasteful, but he told one Dublin friend that he was «perfectly assured ... that you (& the majority of the civilized nineteenth century world) are altogether wrong on the question, & I absolutely right on it»<sup>76</sup>. Some years later, while living in Knoxville, he wrote a letter to his sister that was intended to shock and amuse. In the letter he described himself as an «inveterate southerner» who looked forward to the re-opening of the African slave trade, so that he could «buy ... negroes at \$300 a piece»<sup>77</sup>.

The defence of slavery became a personal crusade in Mitchel's letters from the United States and in his journalism while he was there. The details of his controversy with Henry Ward Beecher over slavery, his support for the south during the Civil War and his imprisonment after the Civil War are not the subject of his essay, but demonstrate a remarkable, sustained conviction in respect of slavery. He repeated, in the same horrified tones, Carlyle's dismay at the money the government had spent on abolition, «twenty millions borrowed to turn negroes wild (set them "free" as it was called)»<sup>78</sup>. He dismissed *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as a clever but untrue book, and demonstrated a similarly wilful ignorance over the conditions on the ships that brought slaves from Africa. Indeed, mistreatment on the ships was often the fault of the «humanity pirates» who sought to stop the trade, and on-board conditions had worsened because of the anti-slavery legislators<sup>79</sup>. Like many contemporaries, Mitchel assumed the innate inferiority of black people was ordained by God. However, like Carlyle, his defence of slavery was an expression of Mitchel's dissent from the philanthropic spirit of the age. The observation by Gavan Duffy quoted at the beginning of this essay that Mitchel had learned his anti-abolitionist and anti-semitic sentiments from Carlyle drew the following response from the Scot, «Mitchel, he said, would be found to be right in the end; the black man could not be emancipated from the laws of nature, which had pronounced a very decided decree on the question, and neither could the Jew»<sup>80</sup>. In his

attitudes to the criminals with whom he had regular contact during his years of transportation, both in Bermuda and Van Diemen's Land, Mitchel also betrayed a decidedly Carlylean attitude. His regular descriptions of the physiognomy of the criminals reveal a familiar mid-nineteenth century belief that physical characteristics revealed something of the moral and spiritual status of the person. On a close look at the convicts on board the Bermuda prison ships, he saw «evil countenances and amorphous skulls ... burglars and swindlers from the womb». The similarity in tone between this observation and Carlyle's outburst about the «ape-faces» seen on his visit to a prison is striking<sup>81</sup>. Mitchel's solution to the problem of crime and punishment was the gallows, and in another discourse with a familiar Carlylean tone, he said that society had «no right to make the honest people support the rogues». Later, in Van Diemen's Land, he came one day across a convict work detail, and noted that «they gave us a vacant but impudent stare ... I wish you well my poor fellows, but you all ought to have been hanged long ago». Reformers like Howard and Beccaria were «genuine apostles of barbarism»<sup>82</sup>.

Mitchel's attitude to some employees who worked as hay-makers for him in Van Diemen's Land during January 1853 is further, remarkable, evidence of this Carlylean attitude. For these «two or three horrible convict cut-throats» were «all from Ireland»<sup>83</sup>. However, their nationality notwithstanding, the «hateful Government and state of society in England» that punished the poor and honest for being poor and honest had rewarded these men «so richly». As a consequence,

I look upon these quiet well-behaved men reaping, not too arduously, singing or smoking in the fields ... instead of rejoicing in *their* improved conditions and behaviour, I gaze on them with horror, as unclean and inhuman monsters, due long ago to the gallows-tree and oblivion ... The Devil's in it!<sup>84</sup>

This observation is remarkable because it is not too difficult to imagine that, writing in «The Nation» or the *United Irishman* just a few years earlier, Mitchel might have found some reason for their behaviour in the British government's famine policies. Abstracted from that context, he saw them only as Carlylean monsters. Mitchel's comment invites the deduction that something more than Ireland's oppression at the hands of England was at work in Mitchel's mind.

Many years later Mitchel still harboured similar notions. Even the commutation of the death sentence to transportation for life in the case of his friends among the Young Ireland movement was «a foul aggravation of the original atrocity». He said he was in favour of capital punishment, but «we are Christians now ... we keep such men alive, whether they will or no; we shave their heads; we set them to break stones, and feed them on convict rations, and take credit for the enlightened humanity of our age»<sup>85</sup>. Again, the philanthropic, liberal spirit of the age was the object of his scorn.

Gavan Duffy was exasperated by the way in which Mitchel appropriated specific Carlylean postures, none more so than his proposal for a poor-rate strike. This plan, suggested during the depths of the great famine in 1847, demonstrates that Mitchel's attitude to the relief of poverty was also derived from Carlyle and, in the context, is quite remarkable. Despite the famine conditions, Mitchel clung to a Carlylean revulsion at state intervention to alleviate poverty. This revulsion was focused both on the workhouses and also the poor rate. Gavan Duffy complained that Mitchel's proposal «would starve the people whom he desired to save» through non-payment of the poor rate<sup>86</sup>.

While the men of Young Ireland all started from a position of opposition to the extension of the 1834 Poor Law to include emergency relief from destitution, most abandoned that opposition when the great famine made state intervention inevitable<sup>87</sup>. Mitchel's contrary position was suggested in «The Nation» during the summer of 1846, when temporary government relief measures were welcomed, but accompanied by a warning that alms-giving would «tend to keep those who are already paupers, paupers still». The article asked, «How are industry and enterprise to grow up, while men are taught to rely upon receiving Government task-work ... How are manly independence and public spirit to take root among a nation of beggars?»<sup>88</sup>. An extension of the poor law to include outdoor relief would be «simply another stride, and a gigantic one, in the *wrong* direction». It would treat the symptoms of Irish poverty, not the causes<sup>89</sup>. For Ireland, «a "Poor Law" of *any* kind is ... the most compendious and certain road to universal beggary», and it would degrade and harden the people into pauperism<sup>90</sup>.

This opposition was transformed into fierce denunciation when, in the spring of 1847 Mitchel witnessed relief work in Dublin, the poor gathered to consume soup with chained spoons while officials and the wealthy gathered to admire their own efforts to relieve hunger. Mitchel saw such poor relief not only as a reflection of poverty and hunger but of the de-moralizing effects of such schemes. He had a profound sense of humiliation that the Irish poor accepted such charity and that they appeared passively to accept their plight<sup>91</sup>. This perspective suggests that Mitchel, while angry at the effects of famine, saw the Irish poor (or, for that matter, Irish criminals working for him in Van Diemen's Land) as an abstract object in his own Carlylean cosmos. That cosmos was formed from similar matter as Carlyle's. Both men had been brought up as Presbyterians, Carlyle the son of an adherent of the strict anti-burgher sect and Mitchel the son of a liberal Unitarian minister. Both had been destined for the ministry by their families but had been unable to sustain their belief in the orthodoxies within which they were raised. Yet both continued to see the problems of the contemporary world in terms that moved beyond the fashionable utilitarianism of their times to a belief in a broad principle of transcendence that, in Carlyle took shape in his gospel of work and empire, and in Mitchel took the form of the nation.

Having traced the ways in which Mitchel absorbed much that could be considered Carlylean, both in tone and content, it remains nevertheless remarkable that Mitchel was able to reconcile his enthusiasm for Carlyle the prophet with his first-hand knowledge of Carlyle the bigot. For it seems apparent in the case of Carlyle that his attitude to Ireland hardened. Rather than develop a more «nuanced» approach to Ireland during his visit there, as Morrow suggests, the *Reminiscences* suggest that a visceral racism, elitism and bigotry simply took over at times<sup>92</sup>. Carlyle even went out to smoke rather than tolerate Gavan Duffy's ill-concealed anger over Carlyle's attitude towards Ireland, later describing the Irish man as a «vinaigrous logician» in his journal<sup>93</sup>. It was in *Chartism*, ten years before the journey around Ireland recorded in the *Reminiscences*, that Carlyle was most inclined to blame Ireland's problems on misgovernment, to concede that the Irish were «of the selfsame stuff» as the Lord Lieutenant and that Britain's neighbour island was the victim of injustice<sup>94</sup>. By the time he wrote four articles on Ireland in 1848, sympathy for the Irish poor was abandoned, and the journey with Gavan Duffy the following year was so pungently recorded in the *Reminiscences*. Perhaps if Mitchel had been able to read the *Reminiscences* he might have been unable to tolerate Carlyle further, although it seems probable that, as the apostle of opposition to cant, Carlyle made his feelings clear to Mitchel on the occasions of their meetings, thus prompting the arguments that punctuated those encounters. William Dillon's authorized biography of Mitchel does suggest that Mitchel's enthusiasm for Carlyle dimmed and became more qualified in later years, although he never ceased to regard the Scot as a man of genius<sup>95</sup>. Indeed, Mitchel's exclamation in a letter that the *Latter Day Pamphlets* were «trash» confirms this suggestion<sup>96</sup>. It is also notable that Mitchel's attack on Froude, Carlyle's biographer, in *The Crusade of the Period*, barely mentions Carlyle.<sup>97</sup> Nevertheless, Carlyle appears to have worked his magic effect on Mitchel as on the many other educated younger men who admired his prophetic voice without endorsing everything he wrote, who saw in Carlyle a voice crying in the wilderness during uncertain times. It seems ironic that, while insisting on Ireland's particular national characteristics, Mitchel's ideas were formed in a cosmopolitan cultural matrix that connected Ireland with the United Kingdom as a whole and, indeed, with continental Europe.

The critical bifurcation between Carlyle and Mitchel was over progress and empire. As Siegel notes, «the emergence of a modern Empire built on an industrial model ... provoked strong emotions, contradictory emotions»<sup>98</sup>. For all his aversion to what was currently labelled progress, Carlyle remained attached to a vision of humanity in which a dominant people would supplant and rule those less attuned to his great philosophy of work. So had Hengst and Horsa's descendants, from primitive beginnings in Kent during the dark ages, effectively elbowed aside and marginalised the Celtic natives of Britain to become the powerhouse of the world<sup>99</sup>. Carlyle marvelled at the achievements

of the dynamic Anglo-Saxon race-community in a narrative of progress and development. For Carlyle that progress led to the domination of the world and its people by superior beings. He saw Ireland at a lower level in his racial hierarchy, as when he was horrified at the thought of the West Indies becoming a «black Ireland»<sup>100</sup>. Mitchel was thus caught in a paradox when he discerned that the Irish were among those people whose destiny it was to be ruled by the historically dynamic Anglo-Saxons. This paradox makes sense of Mitchel's well-known assertion, reflecting on his feelings about Ireland many years later in a letter to a friend, that says:

I have found that there was perhaps less of love in it than of hate — less of filial affection to my country than of scornful impatience at the thought that I had the misfortune, I and my children, to be born in a country which suffered itself to be oppressed and humiliated by another.<sup>101</sup>

Thus, while Mitchel could absorb a range of Carlyle's ideas, he was left with a comprehensive antipathy to progress, which saw him, unlike Carlyle, anathematize Britain and its imperial mission. Carlyle believed the one positive aspect of contemporary Britain was in that very mission. However, in Mitchel's case the past was not only a resource for the construction of an imagined national community but also an antithesis to an imperial present. So, while Carlyle the prophet legitimized Mitchel's southern yeoman slavery fantasy, Mitchel extended this, through his absorption in a historic legitimization, to a past in which Anglo-Saxons had been the «fair-haired, white-armed ... slaves» of the superior Irish clans (here Mitchel may well have been quite consciously inverting Carlyle's racial hierarchy). Where Carlyle explicitly compared the Irish with black slaves, Mitchel asked, «Can the American mind picture a race of white men reduced to this condition? White men! Yes, of the highest and purest blood and breed of men»<sup>102</sup>. While Carlyle described England's mission as «the conquest of the terraqueous planet for the use of man», Mitchel saw himself as a victim of England's imperialism, sailing across the «terraqeous globe» to penal exile in Van Diemen's Land (in terms of Mitchel's stylistic debt to Carlyle, it is worth noting that the very same expression had appeared in *Sartor Resartus*, too)<sup>103</sup>.

Carlyle and Mitchel evidently shared crude concepts of race that were widespread in the period, but stood on other sides of what they saw as a division between Anglo-Saxons and Celts, both using spurious history-making, anthropology and race to legitimize their claims. While they arrived at contrary conclusions in relation to Ireland, Mitchel made many of the same historical and philosophical assumptions as Carlyle. The two men reacted in apparently opposite ways to the horror of the great famine. Faced with overwhelming Irish realities, Carlyle articulated his dismay in hatred of the indigent, a personal sense of superiority and in racism. The famine stimulated a «sacred wrath» in Mitchel (one which particularly inspired people like Griffith and Pearse)<sup>104</sup>.

Yet, as this essay has shown, his anger was similar to Carlyle's. At the height of the great famine in 1847, Mitchel wrote a preface to a new publication of a pamphlet by Swift in which he claimed that Swift's *A Short View of the State of Ireland* (1728) had contemporary relevance. Now, Swift's *saeva indignatio* was inflected by Mitchel's encounter with Carlyle to confer a spiritual quality upon his anger, one that can be traced back to the spiritual-material bipolarity at the heart of *Signs of the Times*<sup>105</sup>.

The profound intellectual and moral impact of Thomas Carlyle seems all the more remarkable because of Mitchel's frequently expressed awareness that the two men disagreed so fundamentally over Ireland. While it has been acknowledged that in Irish nationalist autobiography, «it is conventional for such narratives to suggest the absolute identification of the individual with the nation», it appears that, in Mitchel, Ireland was an abstract projection of his own spiritual, social and intellectual marginality<sup>106</sup>. Like Carlyle, Mitchel could not accept the authority of the religion handed to him by a devout father. Just as Carlyle's reading of the German romantics «provided him with the opportunity to transform the morality of his Calvinist childhood» into a contemporary faith, so Mitchel's sensibilities were transposed by his engagement with Carlyle into an abstract projection of his own ego, articulated instead as the oppressed nation<sup>107</sup>.

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup> T. Carlyle, *Chartism*, in A. Shelston (ed.) *Thomas Carlyle: Selected Writings*, Penguin, London 1971, p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> J. Siegel, *Carlyle's Ireland and Ireland's Carlyle*, in S.R. McKenna (ed.), *Selected Essays on Scottish Language and Literature: a Festschrift in Honour of Allan H. MacLaine*, Edwin Mellen Press, Lewiston 1992, p. 198.

<sup>3</sup> C. Gavan Duffy, *Conversations with Carlyle*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York 1892.

<sup>4</sup> Ivi, p. 117.

<sup>5</sup> K. Fielding, *Ireland, John Mitchel and his "Sarcastic Friend" Thomas Carlyle*, in J. Schwend, S. Hagemann, H. Volkel (Hrsgg.), *Literatur im Kontext: Festschrift für Horst Drescher*, Frankfurt am Main-New York 1992, p. 137.

<sup>6</sup> T. Carlyle, *Reminiscences of my Irish Journey in 1849*, Harper Brothers, New York 1882, pp. 12, 19, 34, 47, 64, 168, 210, 211, 214-215.

<sup>7</sup> Ivi, pp. 100, 120, 141.

<sup>8</sup> J. Siegel, *Carlyle's Ireland*, cit., p. 195.

<sup>9</sup> R. Foster, *Words alone: Yeats and his Inheritances*, Oxford UP, Oxford 2011, p. 83.

<sup>10</sup> R. Swift, *Thomas Carlyle and Ireland*, in D.G. Boyce, R. Swift (eds), *Problems and Perspectives in Irish History since 1800*, Dublin 2004, p. 125.

<sup>11</sup> J. Morrow, *Thomas Carlyle, "Young Ireland" and the "Condition of Ireland" Question*, «The Historical Journal», vol. LI, 3, September 2008, p. 644.

<sup>12</sup> J. Dugger, *Black Ireland's Race: Thomas Carlyle and the Young Ireland Movement*, «Victorian Studies», XLVIII, 3, 2006, p. 462.

<sup>13</sup> J. Morrow, *Thomas Carlyle, "Young Ireland"*, cit., p. 644.

<sup>14</sup> T. Carlyle, *Chartism*, cit., p. 169.

<sup>15</sup> Ivi, p. 170.

- <sup>16</sup> J. Morrow, *Thomas Carlyle, "Young Ireland"*, cit., p. 644.
- <sup>17</sup> T. Carlyle, *Reminiscences*, cit., p. iii.
- <sup>18</sup> T. Carlyle, *Signs of the Times*, in A. Shelston (ed.), *Thomas Carlyle: Selected Writings*, cit., p. 64.
- <sup>19</sup> Ivi, p. 81.
- <sup>20</sup> R. Foster, *Words Alone*, cit., p. 50.
- <sup>21</sup> O. Dudley Edwards, "True Thomas": *Carlyle, Young Ireland and the Legacy of Millennialism*, in D.R. Sorenson, R.L. Tarr (eds), *The Carlyles at Home and Abroad: Essays in Honour of Kenneth J. Fielding*, Palgrave Macmillan, Aldershot 2004, p. 67.
- <sup>22</sup> J. Morrow, *Thomas Carlyle*, Hambledon Continuum, London 2006, pp. 17, 102.
- <sup>23</sup> T. Carlyle, *Chartism*, cit., p. 78.
- <sup>24</sup> T. Carlyle, *Reminiscences*, cit., p. 176.
- <sup>25</sup> Ivi, pp. 214-215.
- <sup>26</sup> T. Carlyle, *Occasional Discourse on the Nigger Question*, with an introduction by E. August (ed.), Kessinger Publishing, Whitefish 2006, p. 5.
- <sup>27</sup> C. Gavan Duffy, *Conversations*, cit., p. 13.
- <sup>28</sup> T. Carlyle to Charles Gavan Duffy, London, 12 Mar. 1846, Ms. 5756, National Library of Ireland, Dublin (henceforth *NLI*).
- <sup>29</sup> T. Carlyle, *Latter Day Pamphlets*, in A. Shelston (ed.) *Thomas Carlyle: Selected Writings*, cit., p. 293.
- <sup>30</sup> Ivi, p. 308.
- <sup>31</sup> T. Carlyle, *Occasional discourse*, cit., p. 32.
- <sup>32</sup> Ivi, p. 5
- <sup>33</sup> W. Dillon, *Life of John Mitchel*, 2 vols, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., London 1888, vol. I, p. 37.
- <sup>34</sup> J. Mitchel to Matilda Dickson, Bermuda, 5 Mar. 1849, Ms. 3226, *NLI*.
- <sup>35</sup> Diary of F.E. MacCarthy, 31 Mar. 1875, Ms. 7251, *NLI*.
- <sup>36</sup> T. Carlyle, *The French Revolution*, Charles C. Little and James Brown, Boston 1838, vol. II, p. 459.
- <sup>37</sup> T. Carlyle, *Latter Day Pamphlets*, Chapman and Hall, London 1850, p. 6; J. Mitchel, «The Nation», 28 Dec. 1867.
- <sup>38</sup> R. Davis, *The Young Ireland Movement*, Gill and Macmillan, Dublin 1987, p. 32.
- <sup>39</sup> J. Mitchel to Charles Gavan Duffy, Banbridge, 9 July 1845, 22 Aug. 1845, 11 Sept., 1845, Ms. 5756, *NLI*.
- <sup>40</sup> J. Mitchel, *The Life and Times of Aodh O'Neill, Prince of Ulster*, J. Duffy, Dublin 1845, pp. v-vi.
- <sup>41</sup> A. Shelston, *Introduction to Thomas Carlyle: Selected Writings*, cit., p. 11; T. Carlyle, *Chartism*, cit., p. 202.
- <sup>42</sup> W. Dillon, *Life of John Mitchel*, cit., vol. I, pp. 109-111.
- <sup>43</sup> J. Mitchel, «The Nation», 10 Jan. 1846.
- <sup>44</sup> T. Carlyle to Charles Gavan Duffy, London, 19 Jan. 1846, Ms. 5756, *NLI*.
- <sup>45</sup> T. Carlyle to Charles Gavan Duffy, Scotsbrig, 22 July 1846, Ms. 5756, *NLI*.
- <sup>46</sup> Note written by T. Carlyle, accompanying letter from Jane Welsh Carlyle to Thomas Carlyle, 4 Aug. 1846, in C. De L. Ryals, K.J. Fielding (eds), *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle*, Duke UP, Durham 1993, vol. XXI, p. 26.
- <sup>47</sup> Diary of F.E. MacCarthy, 10 Sept. 1874, Ms. 7251, *NLI*.
- <sup>48</sup> W. Dillon, *Life of John Mitchel*, cit., vol. I, pp. 128-129.
- <sup>49</sup> C. Gavan Duffy to Thomas Carlyle, 16 June 1849, Thomas Carlyle Papers, Ms. 1766, f. 243, National Library of Scotland; T. Carlyle to C. Gavan Duffy, London, 17 Nov. 1848, Ms. 5757, *NLI*.
- <sup>50</sup> C. Gavan Duffy, *Conversations*, cit., pp. 26, 27.

- <sup>51</sup> T. Carlyle to Charles Gavan Duffy, London, 1 Mar. 1847, Ms. 5757, *NLI*.
- <sup>52</sup> J. Siegel, *Carlyle's Life*, cit., p. 197.
- <sup>53</sup> J. Mitchel, «The Nation», 27 Dec. 1845, 10 Jan. 1846.
- <sup>54</sup> C. Gavan Duffy, *Four Years of Irish History*, M.H. Gill, Dublin 1887, p. 196.
- <sup>55</sup> O. Dudley Edwards, «True Thomas», cit., p. 70.
- <sup>56</sup> W. Dillon, *Life of John Mitchel*, cit., vol. I, p. 128.
- <sup>57</sup> T. Carlyle to Lord Clarendon, London, 26 May 1848, Ms. Clar. Dep. Irish Box 8, Bodleian Library, Oxford.
- <sup>58</sup> J. Mitchel to Thomas Carlyle, 12 Sept. 1866, Thomas Carlyle Papers, Ms. 1768, f. 171, National Library of Scotland.
- <sup>59</sup> C. Gavan Duffy, *Conversations*, cit., pp. 177-178.
- <sup>60</sup> O. Dudley Edwards, «True Thomas», cit., p. 67.
- <sup>61</sup> M. Elliott, *Robert Emmet: the Making of a Legend*, Profile Books, London 2004, pp. 65, 87; I. Berlin, *The Roots of Romanticism*, London 1999, p. 9.
- <sup>62</sup> A. Griffith, *Preface*, in J. Mitchel, *Jail Journal*, Sphere Books, London 1983, pp. ix-x.
- <sup>63</sup> T. Carlyle to Charles Gavan Duffy, London, 29 Aug. 1846, Ms. 5756, *NLI*.
- <sup>64</sup> J. Mitchel to Marie Thomson, Bothwell, Van Diemen's Land, 4 Oct. 1852, T/413/2, Public Record Office of Northern Ireland, Belfast (henceforth *PRONI*).
- <sup>65</sup> J. Mitchel, *Jail Journal*, Sphere Books, London 1983, p. 136.
- <sup>66</sup> Ivi, pp. 264-265.
- <sup>67</sup> M. Dillon, *Life of John Mitchel*, cit., vol. II, p. 218.
- <sup>68</sup> J. Mitchel to Marie Thomson, Tucaleechee Cove 1 Nov. 1855, T/413/1, *PRONI*.
- <sup>69</sup> J. Mitchel to Matilda Dickson, Bermuda, 5 Mar. 1853, Ms. 3226, *NLI*.
- <sup>70</sup> J. Mitchel, *Jail Journal*, cit., p. 66.
- <sup>71</sup> T. Carlyle, *Occasional Discourse*, cit., p. 34.
- <sup>72</sup> Ivi, p. 22.
- <sup>73</sup> J. Mitchel, *Jail Journal*, cit., p. 131.
- <sup>74</sup> T. Carlyle, *Occasional Discourse*, cit., p. 4.
- <sup>75</sup> J. Mitchel, «The Citizen», 14 Jan. 1854.
- <sup>76</sup> J. Mitchel to Marie Thomson, New York 24 Apr. 1854, T413/4, *PRONI*.
- <sup>77</sup> J. Mitchel to Henrietta, Knoxville [sic] 20 June 1856, Z 314 (5) 4, Bigger Collection, Belfast Central Library.
- <sup>78</sup> J. Mitchel, *The Last Conquest of Ireland (Perhaps)*, R. & T. Washbourne Ltd, Glasgow 1861, p. 94.
- <sup>79</sup> J. Mitchel to Marie Thomson, New York 26 Apr. 1854, T/413/4, *PRONI*; Mitchel, *Jail journal*, pp. 138-139.
- <sup>80</sup> C. Gavan Duffy, *Conversations*, cit., p. 117.
- <sup>81</sup> J. Morrow, *Thomas Carlyle*, cit., p. 146.
- <sup>82</sup> J. Mitchel, *Jail Journal*, cit., pp. 63, 100, 236.
- <sup>83</sup> Ivi, p. 271.
- <sup>84</sup> Ivi, p. 272.
- <sup>85</sup> J. Mitchel, «The Nation», 11 Jan. 1868.
- <sup>86</sup> C. Gavan Duffy, *Four Years*, cit., p. 175.
- <sup>87</sup> D. Dwan, *The Great Community*, Field Day, Dublin 2008, p. 44.
- <sup>88</sup> J. Mitchel, «The Nation», 15 Aug. 1846.
- <sup>89</sup> Ivi, 22 Aug. 1846.
- <sup>90</sup> Ivi, 29 Aug. 1846.
- <sup>91</sup> J. Quinn, *John Mitchel*, University College Dublin Press, Dublin 2008, p. 21.
- <sup>92</sup> J. Morrow, *Thomas Carlyle*, cit., p. 120.
- <sup>93</sup> T. Carlyle, *Reminiscences*, cit., p. 50.
- <sup>94</sup> T. Carlyle, *Chartism*, cit., pp. 169, 170.

<sup>95</sup> M. Dillon, *Life of John Mitchel*, cit., vol. I, p. 37.

<sup>96</sup> J. Mitchel to W. Smith O'Brien, Bothwell, Van Diemen's Land, 7 Sept. 1851, Ms. 444/2794, *NLI*.

<sup>97</sup> J. Mitchel, *The Crusade of the Period*, Lynch, Cole and Meehan, New York 1873.

<sup>98</sup> J. Siegel, *Carlyle's Life*, cit., p. 198.

<sup>99</sup> T. Carlyle, *Chartism*, cit., pp. 202, 204.

<sup>100</sup> T. Carlyle, *Occasional Discourse*, cit., p. 31.

<sup>101</sup> M. Dillon, *Life of John Mitchel*, cit., vol. II, p. 104.

<sup>102</sup> J. Mitchel, *Last Conquest*, cit., p. 117.

<sup>103</sup> T. Carlyle, *Chartism*, cit., p. 205; J. Mitchel, *Jail Journal*, cit., p. 206; T. Carlyle, *Sartor Resartus*, with an introduction by K. McSweeney, P. Sabor (eds), Oxford UP, Oxford 1987, p. 135.

<sup>104</sup> J. Mitchel, *Last Conquest*, cit., p. 143.

<sup>105</sup> R. Mahony, *Historicising the Famine: John Mitchel and the Prophetic Voice of Swift*, in C. Morash & D. Hayes (eds), *Fearful Realities: New Perspectives on the Famine*, Irish Academic Press, Dublin, 1996, pp. 131-137.

<sup>106</sup> S. Ryder, *Male Autobiography and Irish Cultural Nationalism: John Mitchel and James Clarence Mangan*, «Irish Review», 13, Winter 1992-1993, p. 70.

<sup>107</sup> A. Shelston, cit., p. 16.

#### *Manuscript sources*

##### *National Library of Ireland, Dublin*

T. Carlyle to C. Gavan Duffy, London, 12 Mar. 1846, Ms. 5756.

J. Mitchel to M. Dickson, Bermuda, 5 Mar. 1849, Ms. 3226.

Diary of F.E. MacCarthy, Ms. 7251.

J. Mitchel to C. Gavan Duffy, Banbridge, 9 July 1845, 22 Aug. 1845, 11 Sept., 1845, Ms. 5756.

J. Mitchel to M. Dickson, Bermuda, 5 Mar. 1853, Ms. 3226.

T. Carlyle to C. Gavan Duffy, London, 29 Aug. 1846, Ms. 5756.

J. Mitchel to W. Smith O'Brien, Bothwell, Van Diemen's Land, 7 Sept. 1851, Ms. 444, f. 2794.

T. Carlyle to C. Gavan Duffy, London, 19 Jan. 1846, Ms. 5756.

T. Carlyle to C. Gavan Duffy, Scotsbrig, 22 July 1846, Ms. 5756.

T. Carlyle to C. Gavan Duffy, London, 17 Nov. 1848, Ms. 5757.

T. Carlyle to C. Gavan Duffy, London, 1 Mar. 1847, Ms. 5757.

##### *National Library of Scotland*

C. Gavan Duffy to T. Carlyle, 16 June 1849, Thomas Carlyle Papers, Ms. 1766, f. 243.

J. Mitchel to T. Carlyle, 12 Sept. 1866, Thomas Carlyle Papers, Ms. 1768, f. 171

##### *Public Record Office of Northern Ireland, Belfast*

J. Mitchel to M. Thomson, New York, 24 Apr. 1854, T/413/4.

J. Mitchel to M. Thomson, Tucaleechee Cove, Tenn., 1 Nov. 1855, T/413/1.

J. Mitchel to M. Thomson, New York, 26 Apr. 1854, T/413/4.

J. Mitchel to M. Thomson, Bothwell, Van Diemen's Land, 4 Oct. 1852, T/413/2.

*Belfast Central Library*

J. Mitchel to H. Mitchel, Knoxville [sic], 20 June 1856, Z 314 (5) 4, Bigger Collection.

*Bodleian Library, Oxford*

T. Carlyle to Lord Clarendon, London, 26 May 1848, Ms. Clar. Dep. Irish Box 8.

*Newspapers*

«The Citizen» (New York)

«The Nation» (Dublin)

#### *Works Cited*

- Carlyle Thomas, *Chartism*, in A. Shelston (ed.), *Thomas Carlyle: Selected Writings*, Penguin, London 1971, pp. 151-232.
- , *Latter Day Pamphlets*, in A. Shelston (ed.), *Thomas Carlyle: Selected Writings* Penguin, London 1971, pp. 285-311.
- , *Signs of the Times*, in A. Shelston (ed.) *Thomas Carlyle: Selected Writings*, Penguin, London 1971, pp. 59-84.
- , *The French Revolution* (1837), Charles C. Little and James Brown, Boston 1838.
- , *Latter Day Pamphlets*, Chapman and Hall, London 1850.
- , *Occasional Discourse on the Nigger Question* (1849), with an introduction by E. August (ed.), Kessinger Publishing, Whitefish 2006.
- , *Reminiscences of my Irish Journey in 1849*, Harper Brothers, New York 1882.
- , *Sartor Resartus* (1836), with an introduction by K. McSweeney, P. Sabor (eds), Oxford UP, Oxford 1987.
- Davis Richard *The Young Ireland Movement*, Gill and Macmillan, Dublin 1987.
- Dillon William, *Life of John Mitchel*, 2 vols., Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., London 1888.
- Dudley Edwards, Owen, "True Thomas": *Carlyle, Young Ireland and the Legacy of Millennialism*, in D.R. Sorenson, R.L. Tarr (eds), *The Carlyles at Home and Abroad: Essays in Honour of Kenneth J. Fielding*, Palgrave Macmillan, Aldershot 2004, pp. 60-76.
- Dugger Julie, *Black Ireland's Race: Thomas Carlyle and the Young Ireland Movement*, «Victorian Studies», XLVIII, 3, Spring 2006, pp. 461-485.
- Dwan David, *The Great Community*, Field Day, Dublin 2008.
- Elliott Marianne, *Robert Emmet: The Making of a Legend*, Profile Books, London 2004.
- Fielding K.J., *Ireland, John Mitchel and his "Sarcastic Friend" Thomas Carlyle* in J. Schwend, S. Hagemann, H. Volkel (Hrsgg), *Literatur im Kontext: Festschrift für Horst Drescher*, Frankfurt am Main-New York 1992, pp. 131-143.
- Foster Roy, *Words Alone: Yeats and his Inheritances*, Oxford UP, Oxford 2011.
- Gavan Duffy Charles, *Conversations with Carlyle*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York 1892.
- , *Four Years of Irish History* (1883), M.H. Gill, Dublin 1887.

- Griffith Arthur, *Preface*, in J. Mitchel, *Jail Journal*, Sphere Books, London 1983, pp. v-xii.
- Mahony Robert, *Historicising the Famine: John Mitchel and the Prophetic Voice of Swift*, in C. Morash, D. Hayes (eds), *Fearful Realities: New Perspectives on the Famine*, Irish Academic Press, Dublin 1996, pp. 131-137.
- Mitchel John, *The Life and Times of Aodh O'Neill, Prince of Ulster* (1868), J. Duffy, Dublin 1845.
- , *Jail Journal* (1854), Sphere Books, London 1983.
- , *The Last Conquest of Ireland (Perhaps)*, R. & T. Washbourne Ltd, Glasgow 1861.
- , *The Crusade of the Period*, Lynch, Cole and Meehan, New York 1873.
- Morrow John, *Thomas Carlyle, "Young Ireland" and the "Condition of Ireland" Question*, «The Historical Journal», vol. LI, 3, 2008, pp. 643-667.
- , *Thomas Carlyle*, Hambledon Continuum, London 2007.
- Quinn James, *John Mitchel*, University College Dublin Press, Dublin 2008.
- Ryals Clyde De L., Fielding, K.J. (eds), *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle*, vol. XXI, Duke UP, Durham 1993.
- Ryder Sean, *Male Autobiography and Irish Cultural Nationalism: John Mitchel and James Clarence Mangan*, «Irish Review», 13, 1992-1993, pp. 70-77.
- Shelston Alan, *Introduction* in A. Shelston, *Thomas Carlyle: Selected Writings*, Penguin, London 1971, pp. 7-31.
- Siegel Jules, *Carlyle's Ireland and Ireland's Carlyle*, in S.R. McKenna (ed.), *Selected Essays on Scottish Language and Literature: a Festschrift in Honour of Allan H. MacLaine*, Edwin Mellen Press, Lewiston 1992, pp. 195-209.
- Swift Roger, *Thomas Carlyle and Ireland*, in D.G. Boyce, R. Swift (eds), *Problems and Perspectives in Irish History Since 1800*, Four Courts Press, Dublin 2004, pp. 117-146.