

Introduction: Religion and Prose

John Powell

Shortly after I began my graduate program and long before I could claim any academic specialty, Richard Levine edited a series of essays entitled *The Victorian Experience* (1982), which included separate volumes on novelists, poets, and prose writers. Being a student of high politics and much in need of cultural context, I remember how useful this was. Eight prose masters: Carlyle, Macaulay, Newman, Mill, Darwin, Ruskin, Arnold, and Pater – big names and a challenging corpus, but more or less well-defined. I occasionally dipped into the books on poets and novelists, but it was the prose writers who seemed to be about the kind of social change that informed legislative politics, which was of most interest to me. I was attracted, too, by Levine’s editorial approach, which encouraged recognition of the “contemporary relevance” of Victorian prose, and insisted on “a style as close as possible to the lucid and fluent of the best writers among us.”¹ This was probably the first time I had thought seriously about the importance of style, as opposed to the function, of writing. Levine’s admonition also began to erode in my mind those artificial barriers between literary and academic work, and I learned to appreciate it when people like John Henry Newman and Walter Bagehot did both at the same time. It also set me to thinking about *style* in its relation to *prose*, two words that then existed for me in dictionary definition, but now began to suggest themselves as larger, more amorphous, and potentially more powerful concepts. By this time, I had read *On Liberty* (1859), but had not yet considered what John Stuart Mill might have to do with the Holocaust. Edward Alexander’s “John Stuart Mill: A Post-Holocaust Retrospect” provided me with a framework for thinking about Mill’s ideas, how he expressed them, and how little con-

trol he had over them once they were published. This helped me move beyond the walls of Parliament and the pages of *Hansard's* in my study of politics, and to recognize that the consequences of the failure to remove Jewish disabilities in 1848, and of the settlement that allowed Lionel de Rothschild to take his parliamentary seat ten years later, did not stop with the political moment. These debates were about traditions, ideas, and principles that began in the distant past, were passed along in some form to every citizen in the kingdom, coalesced in a political moment, and moved out in all directions, both culturally and temporally. If Mill had ideas about liberty and toleration and Jews, so too did the simple workman who sat in the chapel on Sunday. I didn't imagine that they got their ideas from exactly the same places.

So Rothschild took his seat in the House of Commons in 1858. In only thirty years, dissenters, Catholics, and Jews had been admitted to Parliament and were legislating for the country – liberalism in action, tangible proof that Britain was changing. According to Alexander, however, this was not an unmixed blessing. Mill's classic defense of liberty, I learned, published in the following year, might be read as profoundly anti-Semitic, focusing on abstractions and forgetting people. I had missed that point on my first reading of *On Liberty*. Alexander was drawing on his own considerable research into the careers of Matthew Arnold and Mill, informed by the work of Cynthia Ozick, who in "A Liberal's Auschwitz" (1975) had portrayed the liberal as "humanist – which is to say, he is an anthropomorphic idolater; his god is called humanity."² Liberalism in the service of dehumanization made little sense to me at the time. But it proved to be a good introduction to paradox and irony, hallmark characteristics of human behavior and expression throughout history, and central to much of the best from the Victorian era. Thinking about this particular historical case in this way suggested to me that individuals, cultures, and modes of representation were all complicated. Furthermore, I began to sense that simplifying ideas – even the "good" ones of my youth, like "progress," "liberty," "freedom," and "order" – were subject to criticism.

I.

In politics, the dangers of "liberty" were clear enough, thanks to the French Revolution and Edmund Burke, whose clarity and verve in the defense of order seemed so much like a brilliant statement of the obvious. But as we are reminded by Rowland Weston in this issue, the early nineteenth century was the site of a "bewildering complex of religious, political, and historiographical" tensions that invested every step toward personal freedom and social progress with what many feared was a sinister inheritance (411 below). At the same time, many people imagined that even the most benign defense of order and authority masked a secret reverence for the *ancien régime*. Was it possible for men to debate these fundamental issues without going to the barricades, to welcome women into the conversation without destroying the home, to publicly examine the implications of modernization without undermining God or destroying the authority of the Church? The answer in Britain was mainly "yes." Developing the mentality, means, and will to undertake civil and productive debates was one of the great achievements of the age, and the prose expressions of this system of conciliation are among the most appealing representations of the period. From our vantage point today, there is a wistful attraction to the sensibility that enabled Macaulay, the arch exponent of progress, to praise Burke, the patron saint of modern Conservatism, as "an honest friend of civil and religious liberty," as if the differences were less important than the discussion itself.³

Throughout the nineteenth century, religion was at the forefront of the cultural debate about social reform, and central to much of the discussion about empire and foreign policy. It will here be useful to examine a specific literary exchange involving religious reform at the highest levels, in order to suggest the nature of the literary exchange, its social function, its potential for effecting change, and its unanticipated aftermath. In 1838 a promising young politician penned an audacious defense of the alliance of Church and State – *The State in its Relations with the Church*. William Gladstone was twenty-nine, and eager to "vindicate the idea of a National Church established by law."⁴ His book created a sensa-

tion, rather more positively before than after it was reviewed by a host of eminent men, including Thomas Arnold, John Keble, and, most notoriously, Macaulay. Gladstone built his argument from the bottom (or, perhaps more properly, from the top) – God in man in State:

Wherever there is power in the universe, that power is the property of God, the king of that universe.... Now this property is as it were realised, is used according to the will of the owner, when it is used for the purposes he has ordained, and in the temper of mercy, justice, truth, and faith, which he has taught us. But those principles never can be truly, never can be permanently, entertained in the human breast, except by a continual reference to their source, and the supply of the Divine grace. (33)

Why, then, we now come to ask, should the governing body in a state profess a religion? First, because it is composed of individual *men*; and they, being appointed to act in a definite moral capacity, must sanctify their acts done in that capacity by the offices of religion; inasmuch as the acts otherwise cannot be acceptable to God, or anything but sinful and punishable in themselves. (28)

National will and agency are indisputably one ... France is a person to us, and we to her. A wilful injury done to her is a moral act, and a moral act quite distinct from the acts of all the individuals composing the nation.... A nation then, having a personality, lies under the obligation, like the individuals composing its governing body, of sanctifying the acts of that personality by the offices of religion, and thus we have a new and imperative ground for the existence of a state religion. (38-39)

This view of Church and State was profoundly contrary to the temper of the times – which indeed is often a recommendation for public discourse.

eBut it was also awkwardly put, built upon a scholastic foundation that "spoke" in the Church, but rang hollow in the general population. The ordinary citizen might harken to the Gospel of Matthew and the Revelation of John, but what sense were they likely to make of Gladstone's references to "Mar. c. 8. ratified by enactment the cardinal-legate's dispensation" and "the Eighth Book of the Ecclesiastical Polity"?⁵

The State in its Relations with the Church was reviewed in the *Edinburgh Review* by Macaulay, a prodigy of letters with considerable public experience in the Whig government, and reputedly the best-read man in England. In a sharp review, usually cited for its colorful rhetoric, Macaulay more prosaically located the central problem in Gladstone's prose:

Here are propositions of vast and indefinite extent, conveyed in language which has a certain obscure dignity and sanctity, attractive, we doubt not, to many minds.... Let us examine the words closely; and it will immediately become plain that, if these principles be once admitted, there is an end of all society. No combination can be formed for the purpose of mutual help, for trade, for public works, for the relief of the sick or the poor, for the promotion of art or science, unless the members of the combination agree in their theological opinions.

Macaulay goes on to draw some amusing scenarios based on the application of Gladstone's principles, but the main point he makes applies to both argument and expression – no amount of "dignity and sanctity" can atone for "obscurity."⁶ Macaulay and most Britons were just as incredulous to learn in 1838 that "France is a person" as the American electorate was in 2011 to learn from Mitt Romney that "corporations are people, my friend," thus deserving additional tax breaks.⁷ However true either proposition may be in a theological or legal sense, the application of the principle makes a mockery of the common sense.

Several aspects of this literary exchange are suggestive about the nature and value of the prose culture in Britain during the Victorian era.

First, Gladstone was operating in a marketplace of goods (books, pamphlets, and articles) and ideas (nature of God, relationship between Church and State, the social ideal) that enabled him, as an individual, to present an ideal relationship between two great social institutions. He was able to do this when neither the Church nor any of its more gifted theologians or churchmen were willing to do so, but made himself subject to public scrutiny in the process. This marketplace effect – of sales, of personal and published responses, of the views of editors and publishers – combined with Gladstone’s political instincts to bring about a change in his own thought that then had considerable impact on British society more generally. Though it is difficult to trace with perfect accuracy the role played by this very public scrutiny, it was clearly an important cause of a marked change of opinion that would have an immense impact on Britain. It is difficult to think of a set of circumstances more likely to force Gladstone to think through the implications of his ideas; as long as the discussion remained in Oxford and the Church, there was a fundamental acceptance of many of his premises and of his scholastic method. There is much evidence to suggest that Gladstone almost immediately began to regret parts of what he had written, that he substantially altered the text in the revised edition of 1841, and that he had begun to gauge the level of political hostility it engendered, particularly from Tory leader Sir Robert Peel.⁸

Society clearly benefitted by having access to Gladstone’s argument. If it were true that by yielding to the “strong disposition to overthrow the principle of the established church,” society would be supporting a “tyranny” that would “crush and grind into the very dust its framers,” Britons might then have had the means of forestalling the disaster.⁹ In the same way, society benefitted from the critical examination of Gladstone’s argument. While most of Macaulay’s criticisms were artful expositions of liberal tendencies of the age, the views of John Keble writing in *The British Critic* were subtle and prescient, noting “a certain utilitarian tone,” and fearing that Gladstone might not hold firm to his convictions.¹⁰ While Gladstone disagreed with some specific criticisms

leveled against his argument, it was impossible for him to imagine that he had not had a fair hearing, and he ultimately came to the conclusion that he must adjust his position. There was clearly some personal benefit in abandoning his position on the relationship between Church and State, just as Keble had suggested he might. Explaining himself to Newman in 1845, Gladstone admitted that

The State cannot be said now to have a conscience....
But the State still continues to act in many ways *as if* it had a conscience. The Christian figure of our institutions still remains, though marred by the most incongruous associations. There are, therefore actual relations of the State to religion – I mean to determinate religion – which still subsist and retain much vitality, and offer opportunities of good in proportion to it, however they may be surrounded with violent moral contradictions. For the sake of these opportunities I think that public life is tolerable and, in my case, as it at present stands, obligatory. But it is like serving for Leah afterwards to win Rachel.¹¹

This strained rationalization had a logic of its own, enabling Gladstone in the same year to support an increase in the government grant to the Roman Catholic seminary at Maynooth, and two years later to vigorously argue in favor of the admission of Jews to parliament, much to the chagrin of many of his Oxford constituents who had once favored his defense of Church and State. In whatever way he continued to justify the ideal of Church and State acting together, as he did until the end of his life, the practical result of the public opposition to it was in the opposite direction, and one of his first measures as prime minister was the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland. In losing a gifted amateur theologian, Britain gained one of the greatest liberal and reforming prime ministers in its history.¹²

Finally, in this episode we again find the unflinching honesty wrapped in a civil discourse that characterized much of the Victorian

prose exchange. For all the sport at Gladstone's expense, Macaulay wrote with a "courtesy of antagonists who bear no malice" and though dissenting from his opinions, publicly admired his talents and respected "his integrity and benevolence"; and his view in private was the same.¹³ The two politely explained themselves in a friendly exchange of letters after publication of Macaulay's review. Almost thirty years later, in reviewing G.O. Trevelyan's *Life of Macaulay*, Gladstone admitted the skill of the great historian, admired his character, and appreciated the part he had played in elevating public discourse:

Mediocrity is now, as formerly, dangerous, commonly fatal, to the poet; but among even the successful writers of prose, those who rise sensibly above it are the very rarest exceptions.... The inexorable conscientiousness of Macaulay, his determination to put out nothing from his hand which his hand was still capable of improving, was a perfect godsend to the best hopes of our slipshod generation.¹⁴

Gladstone then paid Macaulay the enormous compliment of critically comparing him to one of the great historians of the ancient world:

Ease, brilliancy, pellucid clearness, commanding fascination, the effective marshalling of all facts belonging to the external world as if on parade; all these gifts Macaulay has, and Thucydides has not. But weight, breadth, proportion, deep discernment, habitual contemplation of the springs of character and conduct ... these must be sought in Thucydides, and are rarely observable in Macaulay. But how few are the writers whom it would be anything less than ridiculous to place in comparison with Thucydides!¹⁵

Here are evident many of the hallmarks of the best Victorian prose: precision, clarity, and art: "the subtle gifts of rhetoric," and all in the vein of honesty and mutual respect.

II.

Victorian society was changing as rapidly as our own. In no area of culture was this more prominent than in religion, where the divine authority of God had been "legible" in some tangible way to almost every Briton for a thousand years. By making the Church a responsible party in social change, the Tories opened the Church to the kind of criticism that was more generally applied to the State. In the wake of the Gorham controversy (1850), which clarified the extent of the royal supremacy, it no longer seemed sufficient simply to debate the historical precedents that might be brought to bear on Church action in the modern age – "Did the Statutes of the Reformation involve the abandonment of the duty of the Church to be the guardian of her Faith? (2) Is the present composition of the Appellate tribunal conformable either to reason, or to the Statutes of the Reformation?; (3) Is the Royal Supremacy ... any bar to the adjustment of the Appellate jurisdiction in such a manner, as that it shall convey the sense of the Church in questions of doctrine?"¹⁶ By the time Gladstone penned his answers, the debate had moved beyond these narrow grounds, outside the authority of the church, and into the press where every person had a more or less equal opportunity to persuade their readers: dissenters, Tractarians, rationalists, Erastians, Roman Catholics, Jews, and freethinkers all weighed in on the role of religion in society. The able exponents of the old *Via Media* were still there, but they were plying among a multitude, playing their part but generating only as much authority as any particular argument and its attending style could generate.

The question might be asked, then, how did all this loose talk affect the religion of Britain? For many years, there was an assumption, rooted in the late-century critique of men like W.E.H. Lecky and Herbert Spencer, that the church's decline was necessarily linked to modernization. This view has been challenged, and the debate is herein rehearsed and updated in the forum on Victorian secularization, the details of which I recommend to you (17-81 below). The issue generally has turned on identifying elements of "vital" religion, as opposed to what is merely

habitual or formulaic. Regardless of one's view, however, whether the origins of serious religious decline should be situated in the nineteenth or the twentieth century, it is clear that religion remained a central concern of almost all public discourse throughout the nineteenth century, whether regarding Cathedrals and Church prerogatives, industrial policy, imperial administration, scientific inquiry, historical interpretation, the function of the family, or the explanatory power of folklore. In a thoughtful examination of Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* and Thomas Carlyle's *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History*, W. Clark Gilpin suggests how one might accommodate both the decline of dogmatic religion and the centrality of religious issues:

When nineteenth-century prose addressed the matter of religion, as it so frequently did, Victorian society provided the *secular space* in which religious differences could be negotiated, religious perspectives debated and experimented with, and religious practices and commitments brought to bear on the structures of civil society. (38 below)

This brings me back to *Victorian Prose*, wherein Martin J. Svaglic explains the continuing appeal of John Henry Newman:

What should be stressed at the outset is that his strong hold on or at least fascination for so many diverse modern writers is his breathtaking insight into the problems of unbelief implied in Huxley's well-known remark that one could compile a primer of infidelity from his writings.¹⁷

In the freedom of a secular space, Newman might disarm before defending: "I am far of course from denying that every article of the Christian Creed, whether as held by Catholics or by Protestants, is beset with intellectual difficulties"; and to express honest doubt in the service of faith:

If I looked into a mirror, and did not see my face, I should have the sort of feeling which actually comes upon me, when I look into this living busy world, and see

no reflexion of its Creator. This is, to me, one of those great difficulties of this absolute primary truth, to which I referred just now. Were it not for this voice, speaking so clearly in my conscience and my heart, I should be an atheist, or a pantheist, or a polytheist when I looked into the world.¹⁸

Though the content of their religious conclusions was radically different, Newman and Mill were working the same house. Alluding to Mill's famous remark from *On Liberty* – "When their enemies said of the early Christians, 'See how they love one another' (a remark not likely to be made by anybody now), they assuredly had a much livelier feeling of the meaning of their creed than they have ever had since" – Svaglic observes that "there is virtually nothing in this withering passage which could not have been said by Newman, indeed was not said in one or more of those four o'clock sermons at St. Mary's that were reputed to have put all other sermons out of the market when they were first published in the 1830s."¹⁹ Newman, like Mill, was relying on the truth of the matter, at least insofar as it might be judged in the marketplace of ideas.

Levine's book of essays also suggests a paradox about the nature of prose itself that informs our understanding of this "secular space." In an age characterized by dramatic levels of religious, scientific, and industrial change, Newman was the only churchman on his list, and he was reclusive and idiosyncratic; Darwin was the only scientist; there were no mill owners or entrepreneurs, and no major politicians. The subjects of these essays were in fact all literary men. Even Darwin and Mill, who are thought of primarily as scientist and philosopher, published dozens of articles and books, and were made famous by their own exposition. The power of their ideas, however, has always overshadowed their considerable rhetorical skills. The sixth chapter of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* is a model of insulating prose, not unlike passages more commonly noted in Newman. And his work is quietly resplendent with disarming phrases like "here, as on other occasions, I lie under a heavy disadvantage..."; "we should be extremely

cautious...”; “and it is, no doubt, extremely difficult even to conjecture....” If upon reading Darwin and Mill one is not overcome with the intense “verbal presence” of, say, Carlyle, they will be compensated with subtler pleasures of style and content.²⁰ To say that any of Levine’s subjects were writing in “the ordinary form of written language” was to invoke the barest and most narrow definition of prose. These were brilliant men with big ideas and, generally, commanding styles. But one could hardly turn a page of the story of Victorian Britain without finding less commanding stylists, or men with smaller minds, or unusually independent women who exerted comparable influence. Certainly no stylist, Gladstone was a considerable man of letters who published dozens of original books and articles, sold hundreds of thousands of copies, and was clearly read, in large measure because of his prominent position in politics. Samuel Smiles, the editor, reformer, railway administrator, and biographer took twenty years to find a publisher for *Self Help* (1859), then sold more than 250,000 copies during his lifetime. Harriet Martineau, the gifted social and literary critic, historian, biographer, journalist, and translator – and a staunch secularist – refused to write for Dickens’ *Household Words* because it was “anti-catholic on the sly.”²¹ John Keble, the Tractarian Anglican priest, fearful of the decline of the Church, published a “series of devotional lyrics organized around the Book of Common Prayer,” selling half a million copies in the nineteenth century (62-63 below). All of these flourished along with the great prose writers. But great and common alike shared a more or less democratic venue for expression – a public, “secular space” – where one’s opinion was validated by the quality of one’s appeal. Nineteenth-century prose was an eclectic mix of ideas, style, and forms of communication, in which a weakness in one or more of these areas need not disqualify a work as an important cultural marker. One might argue that in 1859, *Self-Help* flourished because of the simplicity of its sociology, *On the Origin of Species* prospered because of the complexity of its science, and that neither required the “verbal brilliance” of Carlyle to powerfully affect Western culture.²²

III.

Today we more than ever need the kind of space created by the Victorians – a space that encouraged first principles; expected learning; valued honesty; rewarded clarity; and demanded civility. Fairness went without saying, and was noticed in its absence. Today one wonders if most public figures care to convince those with whom they disagree, or can even imagine what an argument might look like from the other side. Most seem satisfied with the echo from their base. Consider how different the expectations of both readers and authors of nineteenth-century prose. After reading Gladstone's passionate expostulation against W.G. Ward's controversial *Ideal of a Christian Church* (1844), the Romanizing Tractarian Frederick Oakeley thanked him for his review in preparing for a round of brutal honesty:

You will prefer my expressing a sincere, to a mere complimentary, opinion of the article to which you have drawn my attention. Fully acknowledging then its ability, and the occasional fairness of its concern, I still cannot feel that on the whole it is characterised either by so full an acquaintance with the book under review, or so constant a desire to do justice to those very many parts of it which are a subject of controversy among English churchmen.

Was Gladstone dismayed? Not at all:

I thank you very much for your note. I have only this fault to find with it, that it seems to me as if you had not said all you felt, or had not said it as strongly as you felt it: and if you would so far allow me to occupy the position of a friend, as to speak to me on this, or any occasion of censure, without the smallest reserve or worldly regard of any kind, I should be so much the more a gainer; and should also have a pleasure in it, because such freedom would be properly interpreted as a sign of confidence.²³

This is a response deeply informed by Christian teaching, which is not surprising in coming from Gladstone. But all prose in the nineteenth century, both in its content and reception, was deeply informed by Christianity. What linked Victorians of vastly differing religious opinions, and what separates them from us now, was “their readiness to make moral judgments and our readiness to suspend them.” As Josef Altholz cogently reminds us, “Our objectivity is their immorality.”²⁴

Oklahoma Baptist University

Notes

¹ Richard A. Levine, ed. *The Victorian Experience: The Prose Writers* (Ohio UP, 1982), x.

² Ozick is cited in Edward Alexander, “John Stuart Mill: A Post-Holocaust Retrospect”; in Levine, *The Victorian Experience: The Prose Writers*, 86-87. On the ongoing life of this issue, see Bryan Cheyette’s argument that Liberal anti-Judaism, “a key concern of much Anglo-Jewish literary studies... [involves] the nature of liberalism and modernity and the extent to which these supposedly inclusive formations should be placed at the heart of the history of European and Western oppression.” “Liberal Anti-Judaism and the Victims of Modernity,” *American Literary History* 13 (Autumn 2001): 541.

³ Cited in Levine, *The Victorian Experience*, 29.

⁴ Gladstone, *The State in its Relations with the Church*, 3rd ed. (London: John Murray, 1839); Perry Butler, *Gladstone: Church, State and Tractarianism: A Study of his Religious Ideas and Attitudes, 1809-1859* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 79.

⁵ Gladstone, *State in its Relations with the Church*, 9.

⁶ T.B. Macaulay, “Gladstone on Church and State” [1839], in *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans Green, 1883), 468-70, 497.

⁷ Phillip Rucker, “Mitt Romney says ‘corporations are people’ at Iowa State Fair,” *Washington Post*, 11 August 2011, <http://www.washingtonpost.com>.

washingtonpost.com/politics/mitt-romney-says-corporations-are-people/2011/08/11/gIQABwZ38I_story.html (accessed 8 March 2012).

⁸ D.C. Lathbury, ed., *Correspondence on Church and Religion of William Ewart Gladstone*, 2 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1910), I:17-18; Richard Shannon, *Gladstone, 1809-1865* (London: Methuen, 1982), 81, 84; Eric Evans, "'The Strict Line of Political Succession?' Gladstone's Relationship with Peel: An Apt Pupil," in *Gladstone Centenary Essays*, ed. David Bebbington and Roger Swift (Liverpool UP, 2000), 37-38.

⁹ Gladstone, *State in its Relations with the Church*, 318-19.

¹⁰ Cited in Richard Helmstadter, "Conscience and Politics: Gladstone's First Book," in *The Gladstonian Turn of Mind: Essays Presented to J.B. Conacher*, ed. Bruce L. Kinzer (U of Toronto P, 1985), 33.

¹¹ Lathbury, *Correspondence on Church and Religion*, I:71-74.

¹² On the complex role of reviewers of *State in its Relations with the Church* in Gladstone's developing political principles, see Shannon, *Gladstone*, 83-87.

¹³ Macaulay, *Critical and Historical Essays*, 497. For a similar case of antagonism without malice, see Andrew Armond, "Gladstone's Via Media Theory of Development," 146 below.

¹⁴ Gladstone, *Gleanings of Past Years*, 7 vols. (London: John Murray, 1879), 2:275-76.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 339.

¹⁶ Gladstone, *Gleanings*, 5:181.

¹⁷ Martin J. Svaglic, "John Henry Newman: The Victorian Experience," in *Victorian Experience*, 49.

¹⁸ John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (New York: Modern Library, 1950), 237-40.

¹⁹ Svaglic, "John Henry Newman," 52.

²⁰ G.B. Tennyson, "Carlyle: Beginning with the Word," in *Victorian Experience*, 10.

²¹ Maria Weston Chapman, *Harriet Martineau's Autobiography*, 7th ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1885), 2:95.

²² The "simple" power of self-help was obvious in the policies of

Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, and has again become prominent in recent recession-driven economic debates in Britain and the United States. On Carlyle, see Tennyson, "Carlyle: Beginning with the Word," in *Victorian Experience*, 13.

²³ Oakeley to Gladstone, 8 January 1845, British Library Add. MS 44363, f. 5; Gladstone to Oakeley, draft, 10 January 1845, BL Add. MS 44363, f. 11.

²⁴ Josef Altholz, "The Warfare of Conscience with Theology," in *The Mind and Art of Victorian England* (U of Minnesota P, 1976), 62.

