

**Jude V. Nixon**, Salem State University, University of Economics and Humanities situated in Bielsko-Biała

### **SAINT-SIMONIANS, INDUSTRIAL FEUDALISM, AND LABOR ECONOMICS: CARLYLE AND SOUTHEY**

Thomas Carlyle's relationship to the German and English Romantics has received much critical scrutiny. However, no study has been undertaken an examination of the close friendship and ideological ties between Robert Southey (1774-1843) and Carlyle (1795-1881). Carlyle chronicles his every encounter with Southey, and the *Reminiscences*, completed in 1867 and published in 1881, recalls his impression of Southey, including his appointment to the Laureateship and of Southey becoming the butt of jokes. Even before their first meeting, Carlyle valued Southey's sense of the Romantic: desire for the exotic, the mysterious, love of the rural, interest in the earthy and earthly, the return to medievalism and Gothic, organicism, antiquarianism, feudal model of industry and labor, and enchantment with things natural and supernatural. Both men were influenced by Goethe's *Sorrows of Young Werther* (1774), and both shared a love of Scott, who had recommended Southey for the laureateship. The relationship with Southey prompted Carlyle to reflect on the struggles of great men, and on the particular angst of writers. Southey's views on industrialism, market economy, and labor received wholesale adoption by Carlyle. Carlyle's brief but intense encounter with the Saint Simonians has received much critical attention in studies by Ella Murphy, Hill Shine, Richard Pankhurst, René Wellek, and Ken Fielding. But none of these acknowledge Southey's role in popularizing the Saint Simonians, Carlyle's commentary on them based on the Southey review essay, and how these comments identify key points in the teachings of the Saint Simonians which would subsequently position Carlyle. The few who acknowledge the Southey review have not determined why Carlyle believed that it misrepresented Saint Simon and the Saint Simonians, whose story, says Richard Pankhurst, though largely forgotten today, "represents one of the most remarkable episodes in the history of nineteenth-century ideas, and one which was destined to exercise great influence over the minds of men" (vii).

Carlyle's first comments on Southey (1774-1843) were in 1831. It was in response to Southey's review of the *Doctrine de Saint Simon* (1828-1829), which expanded his already broad, historical interest in religion. "I am reading the Doctrine de Saint Simon, preparatory to a paper upon that subject," Southey announced on 14 March 1830. "The subject is very curious, and the book written with great ability" (*Life and Correspondence*, 488). In the

review, Southey sees this French socialist sect founded by the Frenchman Henri Saint Simon coincident with the destructive politics of the French Revolution. Returning from America hopeful of a new type of revolution in Europe, Saint Simon concluded that “the remedy must be the production of a new general doctrine. Full of this conception, he avoided taking any part in the destructive movements of the French Revolution, and directed his mind toward producing that doctrine, by means of which, society might be resettled, but upon new foundations” (“Review,” 420). Through savants, artists, and economists (Carlyle’s heroes, natural aristocracy, and hierarchy), Saint Simon wanted to establish “a New Christianity” (a “Nouveau Christianisme”) based entirely on the political; his is “a philosophy of the sciences, a philosophy of industry.” “Moses *promised* universal fraternity to mankind” and “Jesus *prepared* it; Saint Simon *realises* it,” say his disciples (“Review,” 424-25).

Carlyle felt that Southey got the Saint Simonians and the entire French religion question wrong. The only thing he got right were areas where Saint Simonianism did not comport with orthodox Anglicanism. It is “an altogether miserable Article,” Carlyle called the piece, “written in the spirit not of a Philosopher but of a Parish Precentor: he knows what they are *not*, so far at least as the thirty nine Articles go; but nothing whatsoever of what they are.” The rest of the review shows little improvement, “despicable enough: blind, shovel-hatted, hysterically lachrymose” (*Letters*, 5: 427). Carlyle’s estimation of the review did not change a year later. By February 1832, the piece was still “trivial, purblind, and on the whole erroneous and worthless” (*Letters*, 6: 117). Carlyle was clearly bothered by the association of Saint Simon to Bentham and Saint Simonianism to utilitarianism. Having had several exchanges with their Paris officials, Carlyle thought Southey’s representation of the Saint Simonians a bastardization, especially their view that “society is only an assemblage of individuals pursuing each his own course for his own ends, regardless of the commonweal, and in disregard of others, or in opposition to them.” Carlyle would also have been troubled by Southey’s overly optimistic, Darwinian view of humans, whom, says Southey, “never has retrograded” but rather “has continually advanced in obedience to its own physiological law, the law of progressive development, the law of human perfectibility” (“Review,” 431). And he would have been bothered by Southey’s ultra-simplified, reductionist view on the core doctrine of the Saint Simonians: “A DIFFERENT DISTRIBUTION OF PROPERTY IS ALL THAT THEIR SYSTEM REQUIRES” (“Review,” 433).

Carlyle commenced his reading of the writings of Saint Simon in 1827, and opened up a correspondence with the sect in 1829 when “Signs of the Times” appeared. The Saint Simonians recognized in the essay clear parallels to their teachings. Writing to them about the

confluence, Carlyle acknowledged their interest in his writings and was content that “these views of mind find some acceptance with you.” Congruently, he found in their writings “little or nothing to dissent from: the spirit at least meets my entire sympathy—the opinions also are often such as I, in my own dialect, have been accustomed to cherish, and more or less clearly enunciate.” Carlyle was most curious about the fact that in Simonianism “Scientific insight has transformed itself into Religion” (*Letters*, 5: 135-36), an issue he had addressed in “Signs of the Times.” Having perused their teachings, he came away finding his own views corroborated.

Southey’s correspondence, as far as I can tell, does not mention Carlyle, and not surprisingly. When the two met first met, Southey was already Poet Laureate and Carlyle a relative newcomer to London, who could only add to his name the serialized version of *Sartor Resartus* (1833). Not until the *French Revolution* (1837) did Southey take notice of him. And by the time Carlyle’s fame grew with the publication of *Heroes and Hero-Worship* (1841), Southey was in declining health. Therefore, the relationship at first was deferential on Southey’s part, which might explain Carlyle’s posturing. René Wellek, describing Carlyle’s approach to observing people, believes that Carlyle “rarely enters a man’s mind sympathetically: he frequently is content with sketching his external physiognomy, with a ‘flame-picture’ or, at his worst, with the lurid light of the theater or the grimace of a caricature” (110). Carlyle first met Southey at the home of Henry Taylor on 7 February 1835, and recorded the meeting a day later in his journal. What stands out is Southey’s complex, perhaps even contradictory, character. No one trait dominates:

Went last night, in wet bad weather, to Taylor’s to meet Southey, who received me kindly. A lean, grey, whiteheaded man of dusky complexion, unexpectedly tall when he rises and still leaner then—the shallowest chin, prominent snubbed Roman nose, small carelined brow, huge bush of white grey hair on high crown and projecting on all sides, the most vehement pair of faint hazel eyes I have ever seen—a well-read, honest, limited (straight-laced even) kind-hearted, most irritable man. We parted kindly, with no great purpose on either side, I imagine, to meet again. (*Life in London*, 1: 20)

The two would meet again frequently. At their 25 February 1835 soiree at Taylor’s, Carlyle was still conflicted, and resorted mostly to caricature:

Southey is lean as a harrow; *dun* as tobacco-*spluchan* [pouch]; no *chin* (I mean the smallest), *snubbed* Roman nose, vehement brown eyes, huge *white* head of hair; when he rises,—all legs, together. We had considerable talk together: he is a man

positive in his own Tory Church of England way; well informed, rational; a good man; but perhaps so striking for nothing, as for his excitability and irritability, which I should judge to be preeminent even among Poets. We parted kindly; and might be ready to meet again. He lives at Keswick (in Cumberland there); thinks the world is sinking to ruin, and writes diligently. (*Letters*, 8: 62-63)

The Southey caricature continued:

A man of clear brown complexion, large nose, *no* chin, or next to none; care-lined and thought-lined brow, vehement hazel eyes; huge mass of white hair surmounting it: a strait-laced, limited, well instructed, well-conditioned, excessively sensitive even irritable-looking man. His irritability I think is his grand spiritual feature; as his grand bodily is perhaps leanness and long legs: a nervous female night shriek when he rises for the first time, and stretches to such unexpected length—like a lean pair of tongs! We parted good friends; and may meet again, or not meet, as Destiny orders. (*Letters*, 8: 80)

Three months later, in May 1835, when Carlyle reflected on their meeting, Southey emerged in a much more favorable light. Contrary to his characterizations of Southey from their first meetings, Carlyle's later recollections admit that he thoroughly enjoyed and valued those encounters. Though the initial impression did not drastically change, Southey was now "a far *cleverer* man in speech; yet a considerably smaller man. Shovelhatted; the Shovel-hat is *grown* to him: one must take him as he is" (*Letters*, 8: 124). In December 1837, when Southey's *The Doctor* appeared (7 vols; 1834-47), Carlyle dismissed it, satirizing it as a version of the good life: "A strange wandering Rabelias [sic] Book called 'the Doctor &' (by Southey) keeps some people talking" (*Letters*, 9: 367). Carlyle had not read the book, only a review of the first four chapters published in *Fraser's Magazine*. The reviewer remarked that "Rabelais was a doctor," and that "it is only fitting that the book of *the Doctor* . . . should be written by *a Doctor*" (Heraud, 661). But Carlyle's unflattering impressions of Southey saw an almost immediate and profound change:

Southey was a man well up in the fifties; hair grey, not yet hoary, well setting off his fine clear-brown complexion; head and face both smallish, as indeed the figure was *while seated*; features finely cut; eyes, brow, mouth, good in their kind; expressive all, and even vehemently so, but betokening rather keenness than depth either of intellect or character; a serious, human, honest, but sharp almost fierce-looking thin man, with very much of the *militant* in his aspect,—in the eyes especially was legible a mixture of sorrow and of anger, or of angry contempt, as if his indignant fight with

the world had not yet ended in victory, but also never should in defeat.  
(*Reminiscences*, 388-89)

Southey would emerge quite favorably in the later *Reminiscences*. Missing in Carlyle's description of him is the biliousness that has come to characterize the *Reminiscences*. His recollection of Southey is a falling in love rather than a falling out of love, a growing appreciation, even reverence, for the man:

I much recognised the piety, the deep affection, the reverence for God and man, which reigned in these Pieces; full of soft pity, like the wailings of a mother, and yet with a clang of chivalrous valour finely audible too. One could not help loving such a man;—and yet I rather felt too as if he were a *shrillish* thin kind of man, the feminine element perhaps considerably predominating and limiting. However, I always afterwards looked out for his Books, new or old, as for a thing of value. . . . In found very much in these Toryisms, which was greatly according to my heart; things rare and worthy, at once pious and true. (*Reminiscences*, 387-88)

A frequent topic of conversation between them was the Reform Bill and Movement, over which Southey expressed dismay. His views derived from his acquaintance with the young English MP, Winthrop Mackworth Praed (1802-1839), poet and politician, and part of the circle of friends around Thomas Macaulay, Bulwer Lytton, and Walter Savage Landor. Like Southey, the former radical turned supporter of the establishment, young Praed was a (Cambridge) radical turned Tory and satirical anti-reformer. He shared with Carlyle and Southey support for Sir. Robert Peel (Tory Prime Minister 1834-35) and a hatred of political reforms, especially the Reform Bill. Carlyle soon discovered Praed, and discovered too that the lines he heard Southey quote, which Carlyle mistakenly took to be Southey's, was in fact Praed's. A delicate child from birth, Praed suffered an untimely death, which Carlyle lamented: "inexorable fate, cutting short his 'career of ambition' in that manner, is perhaps as sad and tragical to me as to another" (*Reminiscences*, 389-90). Writing of this "boy wonder" in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Praed's biographer, Seán Lysaght, believes that he is "best remembered for what he might have become had he not died young; indeed, he came to be seen as a tragic archetype—the young man of promise cut down before his prime" (205).

From their very first meeting, Carlyle saw Southey as a staunchly Church of England man, hostile to Roman Catholicism and intolerant of other religions, and that despite Southey's attraction to Orientalism, evident, for example, in Southey's two epic poems, *Thalaba the Destroyer* (1801) and *The Curse of Kehama* (1810). Carlyle's other views of

Southey also changed. He once thought Southey a short man, but when Southey stood up realized just how much he had underestimated Southey's height, a fitting metaphor for his premature opinion of Southey: "I had counted him a lean little man; but now he shot suddenly aloft into a lean tall one; all legs; in shape and stature like a pair of tongs,—which peculiarity my surprise doubtless exaggerated to me, but only made it the more notable and entertaining" (*Reminiscences*, 390). He also discovered "Southey's *sensitiveness*," a nervousness "I had noticed on the first occasion as one of his characteristic qualities; but was nothing like aware of the extent of it till our next meeting" (*Reminiscences*, 390). More than once the muscular Carlyle detected a certain femininity in Southey, "the singular readiness of the *blushes*,—amiable *red* blushes, beautiful like a young girl's, when you touched genially the pleasant theme," or the "serpent-like flash of *blue* or black blush (this far, very far, the *rarer* kind, though it did recur, too), when you struck upon the opposite" (*Reminiscences*, 391-92). He wondered how Southey's excitable nervousness kept him alive all of these years (approaching sixty): "Now blushing, under his grey hairs, rosy like a maiden of fifteen; now *slaty* almost, like a rattle-snake, or fiery serpent? How has he not been torn to pieces long since, under such furious pulling this way and that?" Carlyle thought Southey "thoroughly honest," "a loyal kind of man," and came away "content and thankful to know of his existence in the world, near me or still far from me" (*Reminiscences*, 392).

Southey's only visit to the Carlyles was memorable. Just before he arrived, Jane was making Carlyle's favorite marmalade ("in taste and in look almost *poetically* delicate") and almost set the house on fire. Their conversation that evening was Shelley, whom both men did not admire. What emerged from the exchange was Carlyle's recognition of Southey's exasperated look, manifestation of the struggles in the life of great men, about which Carlyle routinely writes. The meeting was on the verge of Southey's marriage to the poet Caroline Bowles (on 4 June 1839). Carlyle's last encounter with Southey was again at Taylor's. Their conversation turned to an emerging English democracy and political reforms, which, like the French Revolution, came, both men felt, at the cost of immense social upheaval, a fatal plunge into Carlyle's Niagaran rapids:

with revolutions (probably *explosive*), and a *finis* incomputable to man,—steady decay of all morality, political, social, individual,—this once noble England getting more and more ignoble and untrue in every fibre of it, till the gold . . . would *all* be eaten out, and noble England would have to collapse in shapeless ruin, whether forever or not none of us could know. Our perfect consent on these matters gave an

animation to the Dialogue, which I remember as copious and pleasant.  
(*Reminiscences*, 399)

The remainder of Carlyle's reminiscences of Southey tells of the poet's failed second marriage and sudden declension into death on 21 March 1843: "By degrees all intellect had melted away from him; and quietly unconsciously he died" (*Reminiscences*, 399). To preserve his own impressions of Southey, Carlyle refused to read *Life and Correspondence*, the biography edited by Southey's son, Charles. Carlyle's last word on Southey is very much a tribute, focusing on the poet's diligence and literary versatility, whether poetry, verse plays, histories, polemics, travel narratives, translation, biography, editions, and essays:

Southey I used to construe to myself as a man of slight build, but of sound and elegant; with considerable genius in him, considerable faculty of *speed* and rhythmic insight, and with a morality that shone distinguished among his contemporaries. I reckoned him (with those *blue* blushes and those red) to be the perhaps excitablest of all men; and that a deep mute monition of Conscience had spoken to him, "You are capable of running mad, if you don't take care. Acquire *habitudes*; stick firm as adamant to them at all times, and work, continually work!" This, for thirty or forty years, he had punctually and impetuously done,—no man so *habitual*, we were told; gave up his Poetry, at a given hour, on stroke of the clock, and took up Prose, etc. etc.; and, as to diligence and velocity, employed his very walking hours, walked with a Book in his hand;—and by these methods of his, had got through perhaps a greater amount of work, counting quantity and quality, than any other man whatever in those years of his;—till all suddenly ended. (*Reminiscences*, 399-400)

Given their joint abhorrence of industrialism, it is somewhat ironic that in remembering Southey, Carlyle turned to mechanical metaphors:

I likened him to one of those huge sandstone grinding-cylinders which I had seen at Manchester, turning with inconceivable velocity (in condemned room of the Iron Factory, where "the men die of lung disease at forty," but are *permitted to smoke* in their damp cellar, and think that a rich recompense!)—with inconceivable velocity turn those huge grinding-stones, screaming harshly victorious, harshly glad; and shooting out, each of them, its big sheet of fire (*yellow*, star-like, etc. according as it is *brass* or other kind of metal that you grind and polish there)—beautiful sheets of fire, pouring out each as if from the paper cap of its low-stooping fated grinder, when you look from rearward:—for many years these stones grind so, at such a rate; till at last (in some cases) comes a moment when the stone's cohesion is quite worn-out,

overcome by the stupendous velocity long-continued; and, while grinding its fastest, it flies off altogether, and settles some yards from you, a grinding-stone no longer, but a cartload of quiet sand. (*Reminiscences*, 400)

Carlyle and Southey shared similar views on industrialism, workhouses, and the working poor. When Carlyle writes about the industrial areas of Lancashire and espouses a feudal view of industrialism, he parrots Southey to the letter, especially the Southey of the *Colloquies*. The Young England Movement of John Manners, Alexander Cochrane-Baillie, and George Smythe looked to Southey as their champion of industrial feudalism and Carlyle as his acolyte. Carlyle's *Past and Present* (1843) protests the existence of extreme poverty alongside enormous wealth: "With unabated bounty the land of England blooms and grows; waving with yellow harvests." However, the poor is "made 'poor' enough, in the money sense or a far fataler one. . . . We have more riches than any Nation ever had before. . . . In the midst of plethoric plenty, the people perish; with gold walls, and full barns, no man feels himself safe or satisfied. Workers, Master Workers, Unworkers, all men, come to a pause; stand fixed, and cannot farther. Fatal paralysis spreading inwards, from the extremities of St. Ives' workhouses, in Stockport cellars, through all limbs, as if towards the heart itself" (1, 6). Years earlier, in Letter 38 of *Letters from England*, Southey voiced the same lament, remonstrating against the conditions of the working poor, including children, in manufacturing towns, using the familiar Victorian trope of a Dantean underworld: "these little creatures were playing in the machinery, half giddy myself with the noise and the endless motion: and when he told me there was no rest in these walls, day nor night, I thought if Dante had peopled one of his hells with children, here was a scene worthy to have supplied him with new images of torment" (208). Southey invoked Dante because he saw the poor living in a kind of underground London, a familiar nineteenth-century image of subterranean life in the sewers: "The dwelling of the labouring manufacturers are in narrow streets and lanes, blocked up from light and air. . . . Here in Manchester a great proportion of the poor lodge in cellars, damp and dark, where every kind of filth is suffered to accumulate." Southey's tale of two cities is one Carlyle would repeat, employing the same discourse of circulation, blockage, etiology, crime, and incarceration. Southey remonstrates:

Wealth flows into the country, but how does it circulate there? Not equally and healthfully through the whole system; it sprouts into wens and tumours, and collects in aneurisms which starve and palsy the extremities. . . . But the number of the poor, and the sufferings of the poor, have continued to increase; the price of every thing which they consume has always been advancing, and price of labour, the only



commodity which they have to dispose of, remains the same. Workhouses are erected in one place, and infirmaries in another; the poor-rates increase in proportion to the taxes. . . . Necessity is the mother of crimes; new prisons are built, new punishments enacted; but the poor become year after year more numerous, more miserable, and more depraved. (*Letters from England*, 210-11)

He complained too of the way workers were being displaced by new technology: “The introduction of machinery in an old manufacturing town always produces distress by throwing workmen out of employ, and is seldom effected without riots and executions” (*Letters from England*, 212). Carlyle would later parrot Southey. Their views on industrialism and the plight of workers became inseparable.

Southey was perhaps turned on to the social condition of England from his work on *Sir. Thomas More, or Colloquies on the Progress of Society* (1829). The *Colloquies* addresses topics in politics, morals, and the poor, including the view that “religion is the only foundation of society, and governments which have not this basis are built upon sand” (1: 284). Southey’s reflections in the *Colloquies* are perhaps indebted in part to his reading on the Saint Simonians and acquaintance with Carlyle’s “Signs.” The *Colloquies* questions whether manufacturing can achieve a utopian ideal, and laments the employment of children in the manufacturing system, whose very exploitation creates “a new source of wealth and revenue”:

Yonder children are on the way to a manufactory, where they pass six days out of the seven, from morning till night. It is likely that the little they learn at school on the seventh, (which ought to be their day of recreation as well as rest,) should counteract the effects of such an education, when the moral atmosphere wherein they live and move and have their being, is as noxious to the soul, as the foul and tainted air which they inhale is to their bodily constitution? (*Colloquies*, 1: 166-67)

In the person of Sir Thomas More, Southey blames this abuse on mammonism, the pursuit of wealth. The language is Carlyle’s: “Commercial nations, if they acknowledged the deity whom they serve, might call him All-Gold. And if the sum of their sacrifices were compared, Mammon would be found a more merciless fiend than Moloch.” In More’s sarcasm, “The servants of Mammon are however wiser in their generation than the children of light. They serve a master who rewards them. . . . Yet their power of creating wealth brings with it a consequence not dissimilar to that which Midas suffered. The love of lucre is one of those base passions” (1: 169). This “continual creation of wealth,” More sees, is no indication

whatsoever of “public prosperity” (1: 177-78), which Carlyle, in the *Latter-Day Pamphlets*, echoes in his indictment of the traffic in bogus currency, verbal as well as monetary:

If speech is the bank-note for an inward capital of culture, of insight and noble human worth, then speech is precious, and the art of speech shall be honoured. But if there *is* no inward capital; if speech represent no real culture of the mind but an imaginary culture; no bullion, but the fatal and almost hopeless deficit of such? Alas, alas, said bank-note is then a *forged* one; passing freely current in the market; but bringing damages to the receiver, to the payer, and to all the world . . . with huge costs. The foolish traders in the market pass it freely, nothing doubting, and rejoice in the dextrous execution of the piece: and so it circulates from hand to hand. (179-80)

Michel Foucault and other economic theorists observe an analogous relationship between economic and literary discourse: “The analysis of wealth is to political economy what general grammar is to philology,” Foucault writes. “Money, like words, has the role of designating, yet never ceases to fluctuate around that vertical axis: variations of price are to the initial establishment of the relation between metal and wealth what rhetorical displacements are to the original value of verbal signs” (*Order*, 168, 202-3). Carlyle’s and Foucault’s ideas on an economy of discourse might be traced through Immanuel Kant. In “Was ist Geld?” (“What is Money?”), Kant conceives of money as the thing, the use of which is only made possible in that it is placed into circulation, “veräußert.” In particular, he defines money as “the general *means* of exchanging people’s diligence amongst each other.” Kant calls this function of money “empirical,” whereas the *measure* of the value, the stamp on the coin, is an abstraction of the coin’s materiality (my emphasis). “Therefore the empirical concept of money leads to an intellectual concept of the same” (“führt den empirischen Begriff des Geldes dadurch auf den intellektuellen hinaus”). Kant also points out that it takes human labor to mine the metals of which money is comprised. For him, “the purpose of the circulation is not giving but mutual acquisition . . . of all goods.” He assigns an “empirical” (“empirische”) and “intellectual” (“intellektuelle”) value to money, believing that money has both an “empirical” (means of exchange) as well as an “intellectual” (measure of the value of what is exchanged) concept (“Begriff”). Kant places the weight of the value of money on the image; money must be stamped, “marked with a sign of how much that value should be” (91-94). Marc Shell corroborates this “tropic interaction between economic and linguistic symbolization and production” in *Money, Language, and Thought*: “money, which refers to a system of tropes, is also an ‘internal’ participant in the logical or semiological organization of language, which itself refers to a system of tropes. Whether

or not a writer mentioned money or was aware of its potentially subversive role in his thinking, the new forms of metaphorization or exchanges of meaning that accompanied the new forms of economic symbolization and production were changing the meaning of meaning itself” (3-4). Nowhere in his discussion on money and words does Shell cite Carlyle, arguably the most important nineteenth-century theorizer of money. Shell, however, does refer to Emerson, whose reflections on money and discourse were actually Carlyle’s, and he does recognize Goethe as the only writer who “seriously considered the connection between economic symbolization in paper money and aesthetic symbolization in poetry” (100-1). But Shell ignores the fecund Goethe/Carlyle link. Even the availability of energy from the sun was talked about in economic tropes—capital, store, scarcity, spent, deficit. With much to say about the equation between money and speech, Carlyle calls discourse “the gold-bullion of human culture” and speech “the bank-note for an inward capital of culture.” Language thus becomes counterfeit when words, like coins, circulate without real value: “Every word of man is either a note or a forged-note” (*Latter-Day Pamphlets*, 179-80).

The *Colloquies* observes a similar divide between the real and the representational, a trafficking in fraudulent ware whereby “paper currency” becomes “representative of real wealth”: “All wealth was real, till the extent of commerce rendered paper currency necessary, which differed from precious stones and pictures in this important point, that there was no limit to its production. . . . Your provincial bank notes, which constitute almost wholly the circulating medium of certain districts, pass current to-day; to-morrow, tidings may come that the house which issued them has stopt payment, and what do they represent then? You find them the shadow of a shade.” What results, says More, is something “neither real nor representative, but a mere fiction of policy and convenience” (1:178-79, 181). Alarmed, likewise, by the prospects of fraud, Carlyle analogizes controlled circulation to economic health, a relationship that would also extend in the nineteenth century to self-management and what G. J. Barker-Benfield would describe as the spermatic economy: “How human affairs shall now circulate everywhere not healthy life-blood in them, but, as it were, a detestable copperas banker’s ink; and all is grown acrid divisive, threatening dissolution” (*Past and Present*, 67, 169). A vital economy maintains an equilibrium between conservation and circulation, hoarding and spending, “careful regulation of the nation’s delicate circulation” (Alborn, 186).

Like Southey’s *Colloquies*, Carlyle’s many utterances concern labor economics. In “Signs of the Times” (1829), he sees the “living artisan . . . driven from his workshop, to make for a speedier, inanimate one. The shuttle drops from the fingers of the weaver, and falls

into iron fingers that ply it faster. . . Even the horse is stripped of his harness, and finds a fleet fire-horse yoked in his stead. . . . We war with rude Nature; and, by our resistless engines, come off always victorious, and loaded with spoils” (59-60). Similar observation on the machinery of labor appear in “Chartism”: “The huge demon of Mechanism smokes and thunders, panting at his great task, in all sections of English land; changing his *shape* like a very Proteus; and infallibly, at every change of shape, *oversetting* whole multitudes of workmen, and as if with the waving of his shadow from afar, hurling them asunder, this way and that; so that the wisest no longer knows his whereabouts” (141-42). Southey and Carlyle, both of whom envision a kind of feudal industrialism as answer to the conditions of poverty and misery in the industrial districts of Manchester and Birmingham, informed the politics of such anti-Republican as Lord John Manners (1818-1906) of the conservative Young Englanders, which for a time included Benjamin Disraeli, whose *Coningsby* (1844) portrays Manners in the character Lord Henry Sydney. Schooled by the medieval conservatism of Southey and Carlyle, Manners felt that the machine bound workers together: “there never was so complete a feudal system as that of the mills; soul and body are, or might be, at the absolute disposal of one man, and that to my notion is not at all a bad state of society” (Whibley, 1:106).

Southey’s *Colloquies* present “an attractive picture of the ‘kindly feelings and ennobling attachments’ of the feudal structure.” Carlyle’s “Chartism,” *Heroes and Hero-Worship*, and *Past and Present*, similarly, offer “ample praise of the feudal contract between master and man” (Kegel, 692). Manners emerged from his own pilgrimage to Manchester “convinced that legislative pressures should be brought upon captains of industry to insure that workers not be victims of a heartless supply and demand economic theory.” He also felt, like Carlyle, that there should be a certain interdependence and sustained relations between captains of industry and workers. Manners became distressed over the slow pace of social reform affecting the lives and condition of the working class, even as he defended the role of the aristocracy and the old social order. “‘The worst of this manufacturing feudalism,’ he wrote, ‘is its uncertainty, and the moment the cotton lord is done, there’s an end also to his dependants’ very subsistence’” (Kegel, 693). Effective political management should focus on regulating workers, not alleviating suffering. In blurring or eradicating social barriers, charitable agencies compromise the organization of labor and the chivalried regulation of workers. The twelfth century of Carlyle’s Abbot Samson’s was heroic in part because it boasted a feudal aristocracy responsible for “superintending the cultivation of the land, and . . . the distribution of the produce of the land, the adjustment of the quarrels of the land;

judging, soldiering, adjusting; everywhere governing the people” (*Past and Present*, 65). Rather than maintain the right relations (feudal) between planters and workers, democracy thrives on loosely affiliated political arrangements, *nomadism*, not the *permanency* of relations Carlyle envisions. As such, it creates a “disorganised condition of society” and a “wasteful, chaotic, altogether unarranged manner” of working (*Heroes*, 158).

Indeed, Carlyle learnt much from Southey, whose review first led Carlyle to take the Saint Simonians seriously but then to give them up eventually. Southey also caused Carlyle to understand and then to empathize with the disposition of a despairing prophet. From Southey, Carlyle derived his critique of feudal industrialism, and learnt too about inept governmental leadership, bankrupt culture, economic disparity, dispossessed workers, and the despised poor. Southey’s reward in all of this is how approvingly he is remembered by Carlyle, when so many of his contemporaries were not so fortunate to escape Carlyle’s bilious diatribes. Despite a certain shyness and nervous disposition, which Carlyle considered a feminine trait, “blue blushes and red,” Southey emerges as a man, affectionate, godly, empathetic, loyal, industrious, and chivalrous. The stuff of which he was comprised, Carlyle felt, were “things rare and worth, at once pious and true” (*Reminiscences*, 388).

#### Works Cited

- Alborn, Timothy L. “Economic Man, Economic Machines: Images of Circulation in the Victorian Money Market.” Ed. Philip Mirowski. *Natural Images in Economic Thought*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994. 173-96.
- Carlyle, Thomas. “Chartism.” 1839. Vol. 29. *Works*. 30 vols. Ed. by H. D. Traill. London: Chapman and Hall, 1896-99. 118-204.
- . *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle*. 45 vols. Ed. Charles R. Sanders. Kenneth J. Fielding, and Clyde De L. Ryals. Durham: Duke University Press, 1970-2016.
- . *Latter-Day Pamphlets*. 1850. Vol. 20. *Works*. 30 vols. Ed. by H. D. Traill. London: Chapman and Hall, 1896-99.
- . *A History of His Life in London 1834-1881*. Ed. James Anthony Froude. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1885.
- . *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History*. 1841. Vol. 5. *Works*. 30 vols. Ed. H. D. Traill. London: Chapman and Hall, 1896-99.

- . *Past and Present*. 1843. Vol. 10. *Works*. 30 vols. Ed. H. D. Traill. London: Chapman and Hall, 1896-99.
- . *Reminiscences*. Ed. K. J. Fielding and Ian Campbell. Oxford World's Classics. London: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- . "Signs of the Times." 1829. Vol. 27. *Works*. 30 vols. Ed. by H. D. Traill. London: Chapman and Hall, 1896-99. 56-82.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things*. New York: Vintage, 1994.
- Heraud. "Chapter the First—Inquisitive. Who *IS* the Doctor?" *Fraser's Magazine* 16 (December 1837): 655-76.
- Kant, Immanuel, "Was ist Geld?" *Die Metaphysik der Sitten. Immanuel Kants Werke*. Ed. Ernst Cassirer. Vol. 7. Berlin: Bruno Cassirer, 1922. 91-94.
- Kegel, Charles H. Review of *Lord John Manners and the Young England Movement: Romanticism in Politics*. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 14.3 (1961): 691-97.
- Pankhurst, Richard K. P. *The Saint-Simonians, Mill, and Carlyle: A Preface to Modern Thought*. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1957.
- "Praed, Winthrop Mackworth." Ed. Seàn Lysaght. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Vol. 45. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. 203-5.
- Shell, Marc. *Money, Language, and Thought: Literary and Philosophical Economies from the Medieval to the Modern Era*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- Southey, Robert. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*
- . *Letters from England*. London: Cresset, 1951.
- . *Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey*. Ed. Charles Cuthbert Southey. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1861.
- . Review of "Doctrines de Saint Simon." *Exposition. Première Année*. 1828-1829. Seconde édition. Paris. 1830. *The Quarterly Review*, 45 (July 1831): 407-50.
- . *Sir Thomas More: or, Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society*. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1831.
- Wellek, René. "Carlyle and the Philosophy of History." *Confrontations: Studies in the Intellectual and Literary Relations between Germany, England, and the United States during the Nineteenth Century*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965. 82-113.
- Whibley, Charles, *Lord John Manners and His Friends*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1925.

**Abstract.** *Carlyle's relationship to the German and English Romantics has received much critical scrutiny. However, despite Carlyle's close friendship with Southey, no study of the two, to my knowledge, has been undertaken. Carlyle writes meaningfully of their meetings, and his Reminiscences sketches their many encounters. Even before their first meeting, Carlyle valued Southey's sense of the Romantic. The relationship also caused Carlyle to reflect on the struggle of great men and on the particular angst writers experience. Largely unrecognized, too, is Southey's role in popularizing the Saint Simonians, which in turn would stage Carlyle's commentary on them, identifying key points of correspondence to his own beliefs. Southey also caused Carlyle to understand and then to empathize with the disposition of an exhausted sage, and from Southey he derived his critique of feudal industrialism, inept governmental leadership, bankrupt culture, economic disparity, dispossessed workers, and the despised poor. Southey's views on industrialism, market economy, and labor would receive wholesale adoption by Carlyle. Southey's reward in all of this is how approvingly he is remembered by Carlyle, when so many of his contemporaries were disparaged. Despite a certain shyness and nervous disposition, which Carlyle considered a feminine trait, "blue blushes and red," Southey emerges as affectionate, godly, empathetic, loyal, industrious, and chivalrous. The stuff of which he was comprised were, Carlyle felt, "things rare and worth, at once pious and true."*

**Keywords:** *industrial feudalism, economics, Saint-Simonians*