In any examination of the genesis of Carlyle's literary works his indebtedness to German authors has its part to play. To unravel the tangled strands of German influences is, however, a rather ominous task, as national prejudices and biased opinions have not been altogether avoided in discussions of this topic. Often the question of indebtedness has been denied or affirmed with more fervour than objectivity. Particularly in reference to Sartor Resartus, it has been played down by scholars who did not even read the sources in the original before judging them negligible. Neither the events leading up to the Second World War and its aftermath, nor those of the following decades, up to the 1990s, have done much to foster a more impartial view of what is, first and foremost, a literary not a political issue.¹

A fresh evaluation of Carlyle's relationship to his German sources is called for not only to lift the problem out of a political context, but also to clarify the extent of Carlyle's indebtedness to German Romanticism. These several influences have never before been examined in their entirety. Searching analyses have been written about his debt to transcendental philosophy; but not enough has been said about the combined contribution of poets, novelists, and dramatists of the period on Carlyle the writer. Indeed, the emphasis given German thought has obscured the more obvious literary connections. For this reason R. Wellek rightly demands 'a detailed examination of Carlyle's relation to the German Romanticists.'²

This book attempts to expand previous findings and to provide a broader basis for a comparative study in two ways.

First, it offers a wider range of German authors. Besides discussing such well-known literary personalities as Goethe, Jean Paul [Friedrich Richter], Novalis, Fichte, and Schelling, it also introduces Zacharias Werner, Ludwig Tieck, E.T.A. Hoffmann, F. de la Motte Fouqué, Wil-
helm Hauff, Franz Horn, and the critic Friedrich Schlegel, all of whom are considered in a variety of combinations.

Second, it presents literary perspectives that have hitherto been neglected, such as fictional techniques, thematic patterns, and character delineations. These could hardly have been overlooked by such a style-conscious writer as Carlyle in search of new approaches for his own 'Kunstwerk,' as he calls Sartor Resartus in his Notebooks. Grouping influences according to such topical associations will clarify how Carlyle met with recurring themes and concepts in all his German readings, and how their cumulative impact made the Romantic affinities so effective.

The wider scope offered here rules out a purely mechanical approach in critical method that measures influences in terms of correctness. Much ingenuity has been expended elsewhere to show where Carlyle went wrong, where he did not render abstract thought in its precise meaning, where he had misunderstood the system. Such a negative attitude is hardly fruitful for purposes of literary enquiry. It not only disregards the metamorphosis philosophical notions must undergo to find effective expression in another medium, such as literature, but fails to understand the nature of the creative process itself, which moulds and transforms influences prior to their being employed in the author's own works. Whereas Carlyle has been censured for incorrect application of German Idealism, such writers as Thomas Mann and Samuel Beckett have been praised for introducing Schopenhauer's Pessimism and Sartre's Existentialism into their respective works, in at least as vague a manner.

Carlyle uses philosophical insights to create symbolical myth. To observe this transformation taking place should be our foremost concern in any study of this kind. Even if, as M. Storrs claims, Carlyle knew next to nothing about speculative philosophy, he did possess the ability to grasp the essential spirit of Transcendentalism and its ethical implications, with the intention of expressing it in literature 'in a loose and popular manner.' In order to achieve this end, he did not need command of all the niceties of philosophical thought, which would designate him a student of philosophy rather than a literary figure.

Besides this difference in approach, which takes an imaginative treatment of philosophical sources into account, changes in emphasis are made. While Fichte is still recognized as a central influence on Carlyle's brand of Idealism, stress is laid on his popular works rather than on the Wissenschaftslehre, directed at a scholarly audience. Accordingly, Die Bestimmung des Menschen is included in the investigation as a hith-
erto untapped source for the central chapters of *Sartor Resartus*. Schelling's *Über die Methode des akademischen Studiums* reveals how far the general temper of his teaching blends in with Carlyle's historical-religious notions applied to Palingenesis, or rebirth of society, while aspects of Novalis's 'Die Christenheit oder Europa' are reconsidered in the context of *Past and Present*.

The study does not intend to give a comprehensive view of German Romanticism as a whole. Important publications appeared in the 1980s in the field, but they do not make a contribution to Carlyle's views on the subject, which constitutes the substance of this book. Here, I focus on particular German literary works that Carlyle confirmably knew or may be presumed to have known on the basis of internal evidence. These works are examined in light of his early writings - such as the *Essays, Sartor Resartus, Heroes*, and *Past and Present* - but echoes are also traced in connection with Jean Paul and his influence on Carlyle's style.

No attempt is made to derive from the German works in question all the ingredients that went into the making of Carlyle, at the expense of others that also had a bearing on the emergence of his particular genius. It cannot be overlooked, however, that, according to his own repeated and persuasive testimony, they acted as a uniquely stimulating force on his work. Admittedly, any study of sources must to a degree remain conjectural, and cannot be considered as proof, in the sense of a surety-bond. There is no such thing as an 'ultimate point of view.' This book presents suggestions and proof that may or may not convince the reader. One should bear in mind however that although a similarity of ideas and literary methods need not imply a borrowing, a repeated similarity can hardly be judged a coincidence, especially if the source is revealed.

By providing my own translations of material otherwise not available in English, its relevance can now be examined, while in the past positions have frequently been taken on trust. They cover passages from the works of Schlegel, Horn, Tieck, E.T.A. Hoffmann, Hauff, Fouqué, and Schelling, unless otherwise indicated. The German text is contained in the Notes, to enable readers so motivated to check the sources on the spot. Variations in German spelling at a time when it was not as yet standardized, have to be taken into account. Wherever possible, I have used Carlyle's own rendering of German sources, mainly in the case of Goethe and Jean Paul, as presented in *German Romance, Essays*, and his translation of *Wilhelm Meister*. For Fichte I relied on W. Smith's approved version of *Die Bestimmung des Menschen*. 
Only Carlyle’s literary works, not his personal utterances, have been taken into consideration here. His changed approach to his German sources and the different value judgments he passes on them after they have served their purpose make his purely personal statements highly unreliable as critical evidence. Particularly after 1840, when his creed underwent a significant change in the direction of former Puritan affinities and his concern with problems of faith gave way to a preoccupation with social conditions, his initial enthusiasm for German literature began to flag. He exhibits from then on a growing tendency to belittle all previous stimuli, with the result that his judgment becomes erratic. German Idealism, which at one time had opened up a New Heaven and a New Earth, is termed ‘a kind of disease.’ Fichte, once ‘the adamantine spirit,’ turns into ‘a thick-skinned fellow.’ The wise Goethe, the heavenly Jean Paul, give up their front-row seats in the literary arena to Cromwell, Baillie the Covenanter, and John Knox.

Those among us who have undertaken a study in the history of ideas on a larger scale will know the difficulties the mariner encounters who sails on the sea of thought, eager to find a passage on his voyage of discovery. Besides surf-beaten rocks, sometimes submerged by swelling waves, he believes to see stars, half-hidden by clouds, illuminating the watery darkness. Rarely does he enjoy the motionless sea, while stretched out on a sunny quarter-deck, giving himself up to a sense of direction and fulfilment. By way of analogy, I may state that I found my material partly by painstaking investigation of sources and wide background reading, partly by sheer luck. The task of translating works never before rendered into English – those by Friedrich Schlegel and Jean Paul among them – was demanding but stylistically a most rewarding effort. Above all I tried to do justice to Carlyle’s admired Jean Paul, attempting not only to settle the much-disputed similarity of style question in a more satisfactory manner, but also to reveal the critical impact of this author’s aesthetic theories on Carlyle’s concept of the idyllic and the humorous in fiction. The greatest challenge was to present such diverse material in readable form, that is, as a synthetic whole.

My gratitude goes to the late Professor A.S.P. Woodhouse. Without his classes on Nineteenth-Century Thought and Romanticism – the latter given jointly with Professor F.E.L. Priestley – I would have been ill-equipped for my project, which Woodhouse himself had planned to undertake in future years.

On a more personal level, I would like to deviate from the usual laudatory comments on assistance received from various intellectual
and material sources, beyond the obligation expressed to the two scholars to whom I dedicate this book. It is also evident that I could not have undertaken my study without the critical foundations provided by the impressive research done in the past, listed in the select bibliography. The tendency today is to curtail rather than expand bibliographical citation, omitting those sources that do not have a direct bearing on the topic. For this reason, many outstanding books and articles in English on historiography and related subjects had to be deleted from my original list. My direct predecessor is still C.F. Harrold, whose work I wished to update and expand. However much I appreciate the interest kept alive over many years in Toronto circles—Professor Peter Morgan of University College will have to stand for all—as well as the Canada Council grants I received at the early stages of my research, my work found little furtherance at the University of Saskatchewan, geared to promoting more tangible endeavours, with immediate practical results, rather than the time-consuming investigation of the kind I was undertaking. The only colleague who showed unflagging concern was Professor L.M. Findlay, whom I would like to thank for reading and discussing the manuscript with me. Inadequate library facilities resulted in endless delays in the Inter-Library Loan system. In spite of this severe drawback, I am grateful to the staff of the Reference Department of the Murray Memorial Library, especially Victor Wiebe and Mary Dykes, for their assistance. I am happy to acknowledge my debt to the Canadian Federation for the Humanities. It was with their aid that this book was published, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Without the moral support of my husband, Dr Joseph L. Vida, who did not live to see my book in print, it would not have reached the final stage. As a German scholar in his own right, his wide-ranging knowledge of European literature, his expertise in research methods, penetrative comments, and invaluable advice helped me to find solutions to many intricate problems that appeared insoluble. His confidence in my ability to put the mosaic together never failed me.

I cannot expect that all chapters of this study will be of equal interest or value to my readers, but I believe that in the case of Carlyle to trace influences is to understand him better. Anyone who has wrestled with his meaning knows only too well that he does not set an example for lucid exposition and tidy thought associations. Much is left unsaid or is implied by mere hints, perhaps because certain premises that had become part of his own background he wrongly presumed to be known to others as well. Readers are inclined to have, in J. MacCunn’s words,
ʻan imperfect notion of the connection of the whole, though they recognize the splendour and force of the passages.' This study may be able to suggest solutions by pointing to similar manifestations from the larger field of German Romantic literature.